UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 111—PART 21

OCTOBER 21, 1965, TO OCTOBER 22, 1965
(PAGES 27801 TO 28982)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1965

J
11
.R
v.111
pt.21

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer, and used this verse of Scripture: I Thessalonians 1: 3: *Remembering without ceasing your work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ.*

O Thou blessed and eternal God, we rejoice that Thou art always near us with Thy sustaining grace in all our cares and concerns, our fears and struggles, our hopes and longings.

Inspire us daily with a contributing and participating view of life and one that will always render the largest returns when we give primacy to character, walk in love and serve needy humanity.

May Thy spirit create within us a clear sense of our responsibilities and may we accept its demands and disciplines as well as its joys and delights.

Show us how we may fortify and strengthen our national life and find the secret of its cohesive and conquering power.

Grant that each to the extent of his ability and all with equal fidelity may strive to safeguard our heritage of liberty.

In Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 797. An act to establish the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5493. An act to provide that the flag of the United States of America may be flown for 24 hours of each day in Lexington, Mass.;

H.R. 7475. An act to name the authorized lock and dam No. 6 on the Arkansas River in Arkansas and the lake created thereby for David D. Terry;

H.R. 8353. An act for the relief of Becky Jo and Charles R. Smith.;

H.R. 11267. An act to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove certain limitations; and

H.J. Res. 671. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of November as "Water Conservation Month."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5026. An act to authorize the Burt County Bridge Commission, a public body politic and corporate in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, to refund the outstanding revenue bonds of said Burt County Bridge Commission heretofore issued to finance the cost of the construction of a bridge, together with the necessary approaches and appurtenances therefor, from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebr., across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 919. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force (retired); and

S. 1758. An act to provide for the right of persons to be represented in matters before Federal agencies.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 12 to the bill (H.R. 168) entitled "An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 to the above-entitled bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Carlson to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 619) entitled "An act for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Dodd, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, and Mr. Javits to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9567) entitled "An act to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in post-secondary and higher education."

The message also announced that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 2 to the bill (H.R. 227) entitled "An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to entitle the children of certain veterans who served in the Armed Forces prior to September 16, 1940, to benefit under the war orphans educational assistance program."

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the printing of committee activity reports for the session, I wish to remind the chairmen of all committees that the Joint Committee on Printing has very properly ruled that the printing of such reports both as committee prints and in the Record is duplication, the cost of which cannot be justified.

It is requested that committee chairmen decide whether they wish these reports printed as committee prints or in the Record since the Government Printing Office will be directed not to print them both ways.

INCREASING RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 168, insist on disagreement to Senate amendments 6 and 11; insist on House amendments to Senate amendments 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 12, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Teague of Texas, Dorn, Haley, Adair, and Ayres.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

October 21, 1965.

The Honorable the Speaker,
House of Representatives.

Sir: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the

the property in the District to be attached, rather than twice the value of his claim against the defendant, when the property sought to be attached is of less value than the total claim. It avoids placing an undue burden on the plaintiff who finds the defendant has insufficient property in the District to satisfy plaintiff's claim. (Public Law 89–113.)

Canine Corps of the Metropolitan Police Department—H.R. 1064—authorizes the expansion of said corps as may be necessary for police use. Presently, there are 90 man-dog teams patrolling the streets of Washington.

Chancery locations—H.R. 10274—amends the District of Columbia Chanceries Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 1091; 5 D.C. Code 418a)—regulating the location, construction, alteration, repair, or conversion of chanceries of foreign governments in Washington—by supplementing and clarifying the "grandfather" clause in said act. Recognizing and reaffirming the principle that the use of property runs with the land, the bill specifies that the said act shall not prohibit the future or continued use of a building as a chancery: first, even though such building was so used contrary to law or regulation between May 12, 1958, and October 13, 1964, the owner or occupant not having before the latter date received a written notice from any governmental authority of such unlawful use; and, second, even though such use as a chancery may be interrupted and the building become vacant or is used for other purposes, or where its use is transferred from one foreign government to another.

Condemnation of insanitary buildings—H.R. 1778—amends the act of May 1, 1906, as amended, to update provisions relating to the assessment and collection of taxes applicable to special assessment where the owner of a condemned building has failed to comply with governmental orders to repair or demolish same.

Criminal assaults—S. 1715—amends present law to extend penalties for assaults on police officers to assaults on officers and employees of penal and correctional institutions and places of confinement of juveniles. Present law imposes a fine of $5,000 or imprisonment of no more than 5 years for assaults on police in the District but does not cover such assaults upon correctional officers. The District of Columbia Commissioners urged this legislation (making such assaults a felony) as a desirable means of aiding in the maintenance of discipline at the Receiving Home and Children's Center and empowering the juvenile court judges to take appropriate action where a felonious assault has occurred on supervisory personnel.

Criminal laws—S. 1320—amends and strengthens certain District of Columbia criminal laws and makes others conform to other Federal statutes, e.g., makes a felony of vandalism in injuring, disfiguring, or destroying public property; broadens the existing kidnaping statute, broadens the immunity privileges granted witnesses in civil cases relating to abatement of disorderly house nuisances; restates bonding requirements for private detectives; and permits the substitution of the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel vice the U.S. District Attorney for the District of Columbia in prosecutions municipal in character such as violations of acts relating to licensing and regulating certain professions.

Criminal penalties for telephone calls—H.R. 10497—makes it unlawful to use the telephone to make anonymous calls, or repeated calls, to annoy, abuse, torment, harass, or embarrass anyone, or for any comment, request, suggestion, or proposal which is obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, or indecent. It subjects violators to a $500 fine or 12 months imprisonment, or both, and provides for a pretrial mental examination of a person charged as a violator thereof.

Crime and criminal procedures—H.R. 5688—an omnibus anticrime bill which consolidates various bills and proposals into amendments to the District of Columbia Criminal Code, in order to provide the District of Columbia police with additional tools for law enforcement and to assist the prosecuting officials and the courts in ameliorating crime conditions in the Nation's Capital through changes in the Mallory rule, the Durham rule, and others. This bill passed the House on March 22, 1965, by a 2-to-1 rollcall vote. It has been before the other body for 2 years, as it is identical to a House bill which your committee reported and the House passed on August 12, 1963. Its major provisions have recently been materially changed by the other body, and it is awaiting action by conferees of the two Houses. Conference meetings have several times been requested by me of the other body.

Meanwhile, the Washington crime wave continues unabated. The most recent statistics released by the Metropolitan Police Department shows September 1965 to be the 40th consecutive month with an increase in crime in the Nation's Capital, reaching the very deplorable alltime high of 33,608 serious offenses for the past 12 months. The crime increases in September represent an increase in serious offenses of 112.8 percent from the low point of June 1957.

Daughters of the American Revolution—H.R. 6905—exempts from District taxation certain real property and improvements occupied by the District of Columbia component of the DAR.

Deeds of trust—H.R. 647—provides for the substitution of trustees under deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by means of a written instrument entered into by all the parties, or their successors in interest, notwithstanding any provision of the deeds of trust to the contrary.

Discharge of parolees—H.R. 66—authorizes the Parole Board for the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision when the Board deems that the purpose for which the parole was granted has been accomplished. (Public Law 89–24.)

Dishonored checks—S. 1317—authorizes the District of Columbia Commissioners to prescribe money penalties for handling dishonored checks which have been presented to the District government by persons in payment of a tax, assessment, or other District government obligations. (Public Law 89–208.)

District of Columbia Training School—H.R. 1700—provides for voluntary admissions to this institution for mentally retarded citizens of the District of Columbia, in addition to admissions presently authorized by commitment through court order.

Divorce—H.R. 948—liberalizes the District of Columbia laws, commencing with the act of March 3, 1901, relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriages, to make them conform to more modern laws of other States, including Maryland and Virginia. The bill, as approved, reduces the waiting period prerequisite to filing actions for divorce to 1 year's residence, and eliminates the 6-month waiting period before a decree of absolute divorce or annulment becomes final. It permits absolute divorce, (1) for actual or constructive desertion after 1 year's desertion; (2) for voluntary separation after 1 year; and (3) where one party has been convicted of a felony and has served at least part of a sentence therefor of not less than 2 years in a penal institution. Limited divorce may be granted for cruelty, and a limited divorce may be enlarged into absolute divorce after 1 year. The bill further strengthens provisions for maintenance of a wife and minor children, or both. (Public Law 89–217.)

Fire and Casualty Act of 1940—H.R. 959—amends the same so as to permit domestic insurance companies to do a fidelity or surety business in the District if they maintain a paid-up capital stock of not less than $500,000 and a surplus of not less than $250,000. As the law is presently administered, such domestic insurance companies must maintain a capital stock of not less than $1 million, whereas foreign insurance companies doing a fidelity or surety business in the District must have a paid-up capital stock of only $150,000 and a surplus of $150,000.

Fire and Casualty Act of 1940—H.R. 8466—amends the same to provide for licensing and regulating of insurance premium finance companies which finance premiums on property and public liability insurance. The bill would rectify abuses which have been reported by those desiring to pay insurance premiums in installments, abuses such as excessive finance charges and cancellation of insurance policies without reasonable notice to the insured.

Francis Case Memorial Bridge—House Joint Resolution 230, Senate Joint Resolution 5—names the bridge across the Washington Channel on the Potomac River connecting the Rochambeau Memorial Bridge with the Southwest Freeway in honor of the late U.S. Senator Francis Case, of South Dakota. (Public Law 89–203.)

Home rule—H.R. 10115 (S. 1118)—as passed by the House provides (1) for a referendum of District of Columbia voters to determine if the residents of the District want self-government; (2) the election of a Charter Board to prepare a District of Columbia charter and a second referendum for voter action thereon; and (3) submission of the charter to Congress for approval or disapproval. As reported to the House, title I of H.R. 10115 provided for retrocession of part of the District to the State of Maryland from whence it came, that it might enjoy self-rule and also representation in Congress. The Congress retained jurisdiction over the balance of the District, as well as over the Federal real and personal property within the portion of the District retroceded to Maryland. However, as offered on the floor of the House, H.R. 10115 contained only its original provisions, as above, exclusive of title I referred to. H.R. 10115 was adopted by a rollcall vote in the House of 227 to 124, which constituted thereby a rejection of the Senate-passed bill (S. 1118) for which it was substituted.

Insurance companies—H.R. 11664—confers jurisdiction on the District of Columbia Superintendent of Insurance to regulate domestic stock insurance companies as to solicitation and voting of proxies (41 States have adopted similar laws) and as to the sale of their securities by stockholders, officers, and directors (32 States have enacted similar provisions), thus complying with the intent of the Congress as expressed in the Securities and Exchange Commission Act Amendments of 1964 (78 Stat. 569) that such regulation of insurance be retained by the States and local governing bodies.

Judges' retirement, increase in—H.R. 1066—provides for increase in retirement salaries of judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals and the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, and in addition provides active duty pay when they perform full-time judicial duties.

Marriages, permarital examination—H.R. 3314—requires laboratory tests, as do 45 of the States, to determine if applicants for marriage licenses are infected with syphilis.

Merchant Marine War Veterans Association—H.R. 3862—grants incorporation to such association, whose purposes are, first, to foster appreciation for the wartime services of veterans of the American merchant marine and the U.S. maritime service and the betterment of the plight of said veterans; second, the perpetuation of the Memorial Day shipboard ceremony to honor the war dead of these services, as inaugurated on Memorial Day, May 30, 1958; third, to encourage the retention and availability of a modernized and adequate American merchant marine held in readiness at all times; and, fourth, to encourage the governmental formation of a U.S. Maritime Service Reserve, the acknowledged training branch of the wartime American merchant marine.

Minimum wage amendments—H.R. 8126—amends present District of Columbia minimum wage law (40 Stat. 690; 36 D.C. Code 401) which covers women and minors and extends its coverage to include men. It would increase current minimum wage coverage for persons employed in the District from almost 85,000 women and minors to an estimated 250,000 men, women, and minors. Adding the 151,000 employees in the District who are already covered by the Federal act, a total of 402,500 employees in private industry in the District of Columbia will receive the minimum wage and maximum hour benefits. Emulating the 1961 amendments to the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, the bill adopts the escalation method to reach the $1.25 an hour minimum rate—in two steps by September 1966 for occupations presently covered by minimum wage orders, and in three steps by September 1967 for occupations not now covered. The bill also establishes a workweek of 42 hours effective in 6 months and 40 hours beginning September 3, 1966. Compensation for overtime is fixed at 1½ times the regular rate for employment in excess of the hours indicated. This is another area in which the Commissioners have recommended such legislation as being urgently needed for the District.

Motor vehicle collision reports—H.R. 947—requires that all collisions involving motor vehicles in the District of Columbia, which result in property damage in excess of $100, or in personal injury to any degree, be reported immediately to the District of Columbia Chief of Police. Presently, only collisions involving personal injury are required to be so reported.

Motor vehicle insurance—H.R. 9918—as reported, this bill, first, amended the District of Columbia Fire and Casualty Act to make uninsured motorist coverage a required part of every automobile liability policy with the right of rejection to such coverage reserved to the insured; and, second, amended the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act to strengthen it through provisions such as suspension of license and registration of both owner and operator if law requirements are not met; minimum security deposit of $500 for 2-year minimum and suspension for same period if security not deposited and claim unsettled; proof of financial security required following an accident, to be maintained for 5 years; and impoundment of motor vehicle after accident in case of failure to establish coverage or deposit of security. As passed by the House, there was substituted for the foregoing, provisions establishing an unsatisfied judgment fund, made up of fees—$40 in first year—collected from all persons registering uninsured motor vehicles in the District. Only District of Columbia residents—whether noncar owners or owners of cars registered elsewhere—could qualify to file claims against the fund. Maximum payments would be $10,000 to $20,000 for bodily injury or death, and $5,000 for property damage.

Physicians in "good samaritan cases"—H.R. 5597—relieves physicians of liability for civil damages for any act or omission, not constituting gross negligence, upon the occasion of their rendering free and voluntary medical treatment at the scene of an accident or other medical emergency outside a hospital in the District of Columbia. The bill is similar to laws already adopted in 32 States and is designed to assure that emergency medical assistance will be more readily forthcoming to residents and visitors to Washington, and that the physicians so rendering charitable assistance will be relieved from the threat of unwarranted litigation.

Physicians reporting injuries—H.R. 9985—requires mandatory reports by physicians and hospitals of injuries caused by firearms or other dangerous weapons, occurring during the commission of a crime, or by firearms alone under any conditions. The bill assures a physician reporting such injuries immunity from any liability for damages as a result.

Physicians reporting physical abuse of children—H.R. 10304—provides for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of physical injuries inflicted upon children other than by accidental means and for the protection of such children who may be threatened by further such injury. The bill, similar to the law in 40 States, gives appropriate immunity from any civil or criminal liability to those involved in such reporting, and provides for waiver, in the interest of justice, of physician-patient privilege and the husband-wife privilege.

Podiatrists—H.R. 1669—authorizes the District of Columbia Board of Podiatrist Examiners to waive its own written and oral examinations with respect to an applicant for a license as a podiatrist if he holds a certificate from the National Board of Podiatrist Examiners.

Police and firemen overtime compensation—S. 1719—authorizes compensation for overtime work in excess of basic workweek performed by the Metropolitan Police, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department. Present law does not cover the overtime covered by numerous special events and special assignments, as for parades, demonstrations, traffic control, or other specifically ordered or approved overtime work. The bill provides payment for same at the same rate (1½ times the basic hourly rate) as is allowed nonpolice government employees for overtime work. It is deemed to be another and important part of anticrime legislation initiated by the committee and designed to assist the police in their stupendous efforts against the criminal element in the Nation's Capital. The total annual cost would be approximately $885,000, of which $741,000 would be the District's share: $697,500 for the Metropolitan Police and $43,500 for the Fire Department. The balance would be $39,000 for the White House Police and $105,000 for the U.S. Park Police.

Rail rapid transit—H.R. 4822—authorizes the National Capital Transportation Agency to undertake the construction of subways, rail rapid transit, commuter railroad, and related facilities for the mass transportation of persons mostly within the District of Columbia, with one extension into Arlington County, Va., to serve the heavy employment at the Pentagon, and a short extension into Montgomery County, Md., in order to reach a suitable terminal location. The total system would be 24.9 miles long, double track, with 29 stations. Approximately one-half the system—13.1 miles—would be in subway, 7.5 miles would utilize a portion of existing rights-of-way, and the balance would occupy other exclusive rights-of-way. Its estimated cost is $431 million, exclusive of interest requirements, financed as follows: $100 million Federal contribution; $50 million District of Columbia contribution; and $281 million from the public sale of revenue bonds. (Public Law 89–173.)

Revenues and highway fund—H.R. 11487—provides additional revenue for District needs by revising the income tax schedules (to yield $4 million per annum); by increasing the fuel tax from 6 to 7 cent per gallon (to produce $2 million annually); and by increasing by $35 million the authorized limit on borrowing authority for highway construction (from $50,250,000 to $85,250,000). The bill also provides legislative authority to the District to participate with Maryland and Virginia in comprehensive transportation planning for the National Capital region, in consultation with the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Capital Regional Planning Council.

Sales tax—H.R. 1065—exempts from the District of Columbia sales tax certain printing operations of the majority and minority rooms of the House of Representatives established many years ago to perform printing services for Members of the House.

Taxation of foreign corporations—H.R. 8058—restates provisions of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended, to effectuate the intention of the Congress relating to the tax liability and exemption from taxes of foreign corporations which maintain an office or have representatives in the District of Columbia for the sole purpose of doing business with the United States and also who merely deal with Federal agencies in the District—in "noncommercial" activities—because Washington is the seat of the National Government.

Teachers retirement increase—H.R. 11439—grants retired District of Columbia public school teachers the same increase in annuities, based on increases in cost of living, as are provided to all Federal employees who have retired from the civil service under the act of September 27, 1965 (Public Law 89–205). The bill provides fair, moderate, and direly needed adjustments where the greatest relief is necessary and revises the application of the automatic cost-of-living feature contained in the 1962 amendments to the District of Columbia Teachers' Retirement Act. The additional cost to the District will be approximately $525,000 per year, and will benefit 1,612 retired teachers.

Title transfer of real property—House Joint Resolution 397—authorizes the District of Columbia Commissioners to transfer titles to certain real property in Southwest Washington from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency. It also authorizes the District of Columbia RLA to transfer to the District title to land now occupied by he Southwest Expressway.

Veterans of Foreign Wars—H.R. 4338—authorizes this organization, a charitable and eleemosynary organization, to rent or lease part of its property in the District of Columbia to departments or agencies of the Federal or District Government, or to nonprofit organizations, on which leased property the VFW will pay real estate taxes. (Private Law 89–1.)

Wages exempt from attachment—H.R. 1007—amends the act of March 3, 1901, to stop the practice which has been developed of filing in the District of Columbia actions for garnishment against an employer who also has a business in Maryland, so as to secure payment by attachment of wages of an employee who is a nonresident of the District.

Washington Gallery of Modern Art—H.R. 8418—exempts from District taxation certain real estate and improvements owned by the Washington Gallery of Modern Art.

Waterfront priority holders—H.R. 11428—amends present law relating to the Washington Channel waterfront by providing supplementary directives to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the relocation of displaced businesses who are ready, able, and willing to relocate on the waterfront in accordance with the redevelopment plans for the area. The bill provides for the use of specific procedures by the RLA for the establishment of land values, and attempts to make effective the pledges several times made by the Congress to these displacees.

Youth Council on Civic Affairs—H.R. 3329—grants incorporation in the District of such councils whose purposes are to promote interest, study, and participation in all civic matters affecting the youth of America; offers an organization through which young people may express themselves and benefit themselves and the community; initiates programs and projects designed to meet and deal effectively with such problems as school dropouts, youth employment, vocational guidance youth offenders, and the like. (Vetoed—H. Doc. 292.)

CONFERRING ADDITIONAL JURISDICTION UPON THE SUPERINTENDENT OF INSURANCE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO REGULATE DOMESTIC STOCK INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 11664) to confer additional jurisdiction upon the Superintendent of Insurance for the District of Columbia to regulate domestic stock insurance companies and to exempt such companies from section 12(g)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11664

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, as used in this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, "domestic stock insurance company" means a stock insurance company incorporated or organized under the laws of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall promulgate rules and regulations with respect to the solicitation and voting of proxies, consents, and authorizations of domestic stock insurance companies in conformity with those prescribed by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners. The Superintendent of Insurance (hereinafter "Superintendent") shall have power to revoke or suspend the certificate of authority to transact business in the District of Columbia of any such company which has failed or refused to comply with the rules and regulations promulgated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

(b) The Superintendent shall not revoke nor suspend the certificate of authority of any such company until he has given the company not less than thirty days' notice of the proposed revocation or suspension and of the grounds alleged therefor, and has afforded the company an opportunity for a full hearing. At any hearing provided by this section, the Superintendent shall have authority to administer oaths to witnesses. Anyone testifying falsely after having been administered such an oath shall be subject to the penalties of perjury.

(c) The provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall not apply to securities of a domestic stock insurance company if such securities shall be registered, or shall be required to be registered, pursuant to section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended.

SEC. 3. (a) Every person who is directly or indirectly the beneficial owner of more than 10 per centum of any class of any equity security of a domestic stock insurance company, or who is a director or an officer of such company, shall file in the office of the Superintendent on or before the 31st day of December 1965, or within ten days after he becomes such beneficial owner, director, or officer, a statement, in such form as the Superintendent may prescribe, of the amount of all equity securities of such company of which he is the beneficial owner, and within ten days after the close of each calendar month thereafter, if there has been a change in such ownership during such month, shall file in the office of the Superintendent a statement, in such form as the Superintendent may prescribe, indicating his ownership at the close of the calendar month and such changes in his ownership as have occurred during such calendar month.

(b) For the purpose of preventing the unfair use of information which may have been obtained by such beneficial owner, director, or officer by reason of his relationship to such company, any profit realized by him from any purchase and sale, or any sale and purchase, of any equity security of such company within any period of less than six months, unless such security was acquired in good faith in connection with a debt previously contracted, shall inure to and be recoverable by the company, irrespective of any intention on the part of such beneficial owner, director, or officer in entering into such transaction of holding the security purchased or of not repurchasing the security sold for a period exceeding six months. Suit to recover such profit may be instituted at law or in equity in any court of competent jurisdiction by the company, or by the owner of any security of the company in the name and in behalf of the company if the company shall fail or refuse to bring such suit within sixty days after request or shall fail diligently to prosecute the same thereafter, but no such suit shall be brought more than two years after the date such profit was realized. This section shall not be construed to cover any transaction where such beneficial owner was not such both at the time of the purchase and sale, or the sale and purchase, of the security involved, or any transaction or transactions which the Commissioners of the District of Columbia by rules and regulations may exempt as not comprehended within the purpose of this section.

(c) It shall be unlawful for any such beneficial owner, director, or officer, directly or indirectly, to sell any equity security of such company if the person selling the security or his principal (i) does not own the security sold, or (ii) if owning the security, does not deliver it against such sale within twenty days thereafter, or does not within five days after such sale deposit it in the mails or other usual channels of transportation, but no person shall be deemed to have violated this section if he proves that, notwithstanding the exercise of good faith, he was unable to make such delivery or deposit within such time, or that to do so would cause undue inconvenience or expenses.

(d) The provisions of subsection (b) of this section shall not apply to any purchase and sale, or sale and purchase, and the provisions of subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to any sale, of an equity security of a domestic stock insurance company not then or theretofore held by him in an investment account, by a dealer in the ordinary course of his business and incident to the establishment or maintenance by him of a primary or secondary market (otherwise than on an exchange as defined in the Securities Exchange Act of 1934) for such security. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia may, by such rules and regulations as they deem necessary or appropriate in the public interest, define and prescribe terms and conditions with respect to securities held in an investment account and transactions made in the ordinary course of business and incident to the establishment or maintenance of a primary or secondary market.

(e) The provisions of subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section shall not apply to foreign or domestic arbitrage transactions unless made in contravention of such rules and regulations as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may adopt in order to carry out the purposes of this section.

(f) The term "equity security" when used in this section means any stock or similar security; or any security convertible with or without consideration, into such a security, or carrying any warrant or right to subscribe to or purchase such a security; or any such warrant or right; or any other security which the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall deem to be of similar nature and consider necessary or appropriate, by such rules and regulations as they may prescribe in the public interest or for the protection of investors, to treat as an equity security.

(g) The provisions of subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section shall not apply to securities of a domestic stock insurance company if (i) such securities shall be registered, or shall be required to be registered, pursuant to section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, or if (ii) such domestic stock insurance company shall not have any class of its equity securities held of record by one hundred or more persons on the last business day of the year next preceding the year in which equity securities of the company would be subject to the provisions of subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section except for the provisions of this subsection (g)(ii).

(h) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall make such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the execution of the functions vested in the Superintendent by subsections (a) through (g) of this section, and may for such purpose classify domestic stock insurance companies, securities, and other persons or matters within his jurisdiction. No provisions of subsection (a), (b), or (c) of this section imposing any liability shall apply to any act done or omitted in good faith in conformity with any rule or regulation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia notwithstanding that such rule or regulation may, after such act or omission, be amended or rescinded or determined by judicial or other authority to be invalid for any reason.

(i) This section shall take effect thirty days after enactment.

SEC. 4. Domestic stock insurance companies shall be exempt from the requirements of section 12(g)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended.

SEC. 5. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTH COUNTIES HYDRO-ELECTRIC CO.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10097) for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out "past and future."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask my colleague a question. Has this legislation been unanimously cleared by the subcommittee chargeable therewith?

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. ASHMORE. This has cleared the subcommittee. It has been cleared unanimously.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RALPH S. DeSOCIO, JR.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 2571) for the relief of Ralph S. DeSocio, Jr., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after "amounts" insert "to be".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 615) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That EDWIN W. EDWARDS, of Louisiana, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Public Works.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 379]

Albert
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashley
Aspinall
Baring
Bell
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton
Bonner
Bray
Broomfield
Callan
Callaway
Corman
Craley
Culver
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Edwards, Ala.
Farnum
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Holifield
Hosmer
Ichord
Keogh
King, Utah
Landrum
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McCulloch
McVicker
MacGregor
Mackay
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matthews
Michel
Morgan
Mosher
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Pool
Powell
Quie
Reifel
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Roudebush
Schmidhauser
Sisk
Staggers
Talcott
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tunney
Vigorito
Watson
Willis
Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 355 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDING FUNDS FOR SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 327) to amend section 501(c)(14) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only because it might be advisable to have just a brief explanation from the chairman. Although, Mr. Speaker, as the chairman has said, all of these bills have been unanimously reported by the committee and I know of no controversy in connection with them, still it might be advisable to have a brief explanation at this point.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. MILLS. Permit me to say that I agree completely with my friend from Wisconsin that there should be some explanation of each of them. If the gentlemen will yield, I will endeavor briefly to explain this bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill exempts from income taxation mutual, nonprofit organizations organized before September 1, 1957, and operated to provide reserves for building and loan associations, cooperative banks, and mutual savings banks, if at least 85 percent of their income is attributable to providing such reserve funds and to investments. The bill extends this tax-exempt status to organizations which are similar in essential respects to those already exempt. Present law, however, exempts such organizations only if they provide both reserves for, and insurance of shares and deposits of, member associations.

The bill, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH, also provides that net income derived by such organizations—both that of the organizations exempted by this bill and that of the similar organizations already exempt—which is not related to the provision of reserves or insurance will be taxed as unrelated business income. This will confine the privilege of tax exemption to income derived from the specific services upon which that exemption is based.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it has no objections to this legislation, and the Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 501(c)(14) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to list of organizations exempt from Federal income tax) is amended by inserting after the semicolon the following: "corporations or associations organized before July 22, 1932, and operated for mutual purposes and without profit which perform functions substantially similar to those performed by Federal home loan banks;".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That section 501(c)(14) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to certain organizations exempt from Federal income tax) is amended to read as follows:

" '(14)(A) Credit unions without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit.

" '(B) Corporations or associations without capital stock organized before September 1, 1957, and operated for mutual purposes and without profit for the purpose of providing reserve funds for, and insurance of shares or deposits in—

" '(i) domestic building and loan associations,

" '(ii) cooperative banks without capital stock organized and operated for mutual purposes and without profit,

" '(iii) mutual savings banks not having capital stock represented by shares.

" '(C) Corporations or associations organized before September 1, 1957, and operated for mutual purposes and without profit for the purpose of providing reserve funds for associations or banks described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (B); but only if 85 percent or more of the income is attributable to providing such reserve funds and to investments. This subparagraph shall not apply to any corporation or association entitled to exemption under subparagraph (B).'

"Sec. 2. Section 511(a)(2)(A) of such Code (relating to organizations subject to tax) is amended by inserting '(14)(B) or (C),' after '(6),' in the heading and in the text.

"Sec. 3. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act. The amendment made by section 2 shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAX TREATMENT OF EXPROPRIATION LOSS RECOVERIES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 6319) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recovery of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by governments of foreign countries.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the chairman of the committee for a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of the pending bill is to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide, in the case of recoveries of foreign expropriation losses, a new set of rules generally limiting the tax on the recovery to the benefit previously received in deducting the loss—but applying current tax rates—taking into account factors such as whether the loss offset income taxed at ordinary income tax rates or capital gains tax rates, and the effect, if any, of the loss on foreign tax credits, and so forth. In hardship situations the bill also makes provision for payment of the tax on recoveries in 10 equal annual installments bearing interest at 4 percent. A special rule in the case of life insurance companies provides that a recovery, for purposes of this foreign expropriation loss provision, is to include the release of a life insurance reserve resulting from the release of liabilities. These provisions would apply to recoveries on or after January 1, 1965.

The bill, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable Hale Boggs, also makes provision for taxing recoveries with respect to foreign expropriation losses where a benefit from a tax deduction was received by one corporation holding securities in another whose property was expropriated. In such a case the restoration in value of the securities is treated as a recovery and taxed to the corporation receiving the benefit from the loss deduction. This provision would apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it has no objection to this legislation, and the Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, what is the record with respect to expropriation? Is the business of expropriation of American property in foreign countries increasing or decreasing?

Mr. MILLS. I would not say that it is increasing. The action that we took, to which I referred, some 2 or 3 years ago about losses, had to do with the expropriation of properties in Cuba. I do not know of any expropriation that has come about since that time. The importance of this bill is that we have not provided the proper rules for the future taxation of any of those properties so lost if they are ever recovered; they may or may not be recovered.

Mr. GROSS. And this bill would take care of that?

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman; and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Section 1. Recoveries of Foreign Expropriation Losses.

(a) Subchapter Q of chapter 1 (relating to readjustment of tax between years) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART VII—RECOVERIES OF FOREIGN EXPROPRIATION LOSSES

"Sec. 1351. Treatment of recoveries of foreign expropriation losses.

"Sec. 1351. Treatment of Recoveries of Foreign Expropriation Losses.

"(a) Election.—

"(1) In general.—This section shall apply only to a recovery, by a domestic corporation subject to the tax imposed by section 11, of a foreign expropriation loss sustained by such corporation and only if such corporation elects to have the provisions of this section apply with respect to such loss.

"(2) Time, manner, and scope.—An election under paragraph (1) shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulations. An election made with respect to any foreign expropriation loss shall apply to all recoveries in respect of such loss.

"(b) Definition of Foreign Expropriation Loss.—For purposes of this section, the term 'foreign expropriation loss' means any loss sustained by reason of the expropriation, intervention, seizure, or similar taking of property by the government of any foreign country, any political subdivision thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of the foregoing. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a debt which becomes worthless shall, to the extent of any deduction allowed under section 166(a), be treated as a loss.

"(c) Amount of Recovery.—The amount of any recovery of a foreign expropriation loss is the amount of money and the fair market value of other property received in respect of such loss, determined as of the date of receipt.

"(d) Adjustment for Prior Tax Benefits.—

"(1) In general.—That part of the amount of a recovery of a foreign expropriation loss to which this section applies which, when added to the aggregate of the amounts of previous recoveries with respect to such loss, does not exceed the allowable deductions in prior taxable years on account of such loss shall be excluded from gross income for the taxable year of the recovery for purposes of computing the tax under this subtitle; but there shall be added to, and assessed and collected as a part of, the tax under this subtitle for such taxable year an amount equal to the total increase in the tax under this subtitle for all taxable years which would result by decreasing, in an amount equal to such part of the recovery so excluded, the deductions allowable in the prior taxable years on account of such loss. For purposes of this paragraph, if the loss to which the recovery relates was taken into account as a loss from the sale or exchange of a capital asset, the amount of the loss shall be treated as an allowable deduction even though there were no gains against which to allow such loss.

"(2) Computation.—The increase in the tax for each taxable year referred to in paragraph (1) shall be computed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. Such regulations shall give effect to previous recoveries of any kind (including recoveries described in section 111, relating to recovery of bad debts, etc.) with respect to any prior taxable year, but shall otherwise treat the tax previously determined for any taxable year in accordance with the principles set forth in section 1314(a) (relating to correction of errors). Subject to the provisions of paragraph (3), all credits allowable against the tax for any taxable year, and all carryovers and carrybacks affected by so decreasing the allowable deductions, shall be taken into account in computing the increase in the tax.

"(3) Foreign taxes.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) any choice made under subpart A of part III of subchapter N (relating to foreign tax credit) for any taxable year may be changed,

"(B) subject to the provisions of section 904(b), an election to have the limitation provided by section 904(a)(2) apply may be made, and

"(C) notwithstanding section 904(b)(1), an election previously made to have the limitation provided by section 904(a)(2) apply may be revoked with respect to any taxable year and succeeding taxable years.

"(4) Substitution of current normal tax and surtax rates.—For purposes of this subsection, the normal tax rate provided by section 11(b) and the surtax rate provided by section 11(c) which are in effect for the taxable year of the recovery shall be treated as having been in effect for all prior taxable years.

"(e) Gain on Recovery.—That part of the amount of a recovery of a foreign expropriation loss to which this section applies which is not excluded from gross income under subsection (d)(1) shall be considered for the taxable year of the recovery as gain on the involuntary conversion of property as a result of its destruction or seizure and shall be recognized or not recognized as provided in section 1033.

"(f) Basis of Recovered Property.—The basis of property (other than money) received as a recovery of a foreign expropriation loss to which this section applies shall be an amount equal to its fair market value on the date of receipt, reduced by such part of the gain under subsection (e) which is not recognized as provided in section 1033.

"(g) Restoration of Value of Investments.—For purposes of this section, if the value of any interest in, or with respect to, property (including any interest represented by a security, as defined in section 165(g)(2))—

"(1) which became worthless by reason of the expropriation, intervention, seizure, or similar taking of such property by the government of any foreign country, any political subdivision thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of the foregoing, and

"(2) which was taken into account as a loss from the sale or exchange of a capital asset or with respect to which a deduction for a loss was allowed under section 165 or a deduction for a bad debt was allowed under section 166,

is restored in whole or in part by reason of any recovery of money or other property in respect of the property which became worthless, the value so restored shall be treated as a recovery of property in respect of such loss or such bad debt.

"(h) Special Rule for Evidences of Indebtedness.—Bonds or other evidences of indebtedness received as a recovery of a foreign expropriation loss to which this section applies shall not be considered to have any original issue discount within the meaning of section 1232(a)(2).

"(i) Adjustments for Succeeding Years.—For purposes of this subtitle, proper adjustment shall be made, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, in—

"(1) the credit under section 33 (relating to foreign tax credit),

"(2) the credit under section 38 (relating to investment credit),

"(3) the net operating loss deduction under section 172, and

"(4) the net capital loss carryover under section 1212(a),

for the taxable year of a recovery of a foreign expropriation loss to which this section applies, and for succeeding taxable years, to take into account items changed in making the computations under subsection (d) for taxable years prior to the taxable year of such recovery."

(b)(1) Part II of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items specifically included in gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 80. Restoration of Value of Certain Securities.

"(a) General Rule.—In the case of a domestic corporation subject to the tax imposed by section 11, if the value of any security (as defined in section 165(g)(2))—

"(1) which became worthless by reason of the expropriation, intervention, seizure, or similar taking by the government of any foreign country, any political subdivision thereof, or any agency or instrumentality of the foregoing of property to which such security was related, and

"(2) which was taken into account as a loss from the sale or exchange of a capital asset or with respect to which a deduction for a loss was allowed under section 165,

is restored in whole or in part during any taxable year by reason of any recovery of money or other property in respect of the property to which such security was related, the value so restored (to the extent that, when added to the value so restored during prior taxable years, it does not exceed the amount of the loss described in paragraph (2)) shall, except as provided in subsection (b), be included in gross income for the taxable year in which such restoration occurs.

"(b) Reduction for Failure To Receive Tax Benefit.—The amount otherwise includible in gross income under subsection (a) in respect of any security shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount (if any) of the loss described in subsection (a)(2) which did not result in a reduction of the taxpayer's tax under this subtitle for any taxable year, determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(c) Character of Income.—For purposes of this subtitle—

"(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amount included in gross income under this section shall be treated as gain from the sale or exchange of property which is neither a capital asset nor property described in section 1231.

"(2) If the loss described in subsection (a)(2) was taken into account as a loss from the sale or exchange of a capital asset, the amount included in gross income under this section shall be treated as gain from the sale or exchange of a capital asset.

"(d) Treatment Under Foreign Expropriation Loss Recovery Provision.—This section shall not apply to any recovery of a foreign expropriation loss to which section 1351 applies."

(2) The table of sections for such part II is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 80. Restoration of value of certain securities."

(3) The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1964, but only with respect to losses described in section 80(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as added by paragraph (1) of this subsection) which were sustained after December 31, 1958.

(c)(1) Section 46(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to liability for tax for purposes of the investment credit) is amended by inserting after "personal holding company tax)" the following: ", and any additional tax imposed by the taxable year by section 1351(d)(1) (relating to recoveries of foreign expropriation losses),".

(2) Section 901(a) of such Code (relating to foreign tax credit) is amended by inserting after "section 1333 (relating to war loss recoveries)" in the last sentence thereof "or under section 1351 (relating to recoveries of foreign expropriation losses),".

(d) Subchapter B of chapter 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to time and place for paying tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 6167. Extension of Time for Payment of Tax Attributable to Recovery of Foreign Expropriation Losses.

"(a) Extension Allowed by Election.—If—

"(1) a corporation has a recovery of a foreign expropriation loss to which section 1351 applies, and

"(2) the portion of the recovery received in money is less than 25 percent of the amount of such recovery (as defined in section 1351(c)) and is not greater than the tax attributable to such recovery,

the tax attributable to such recovery shall, at the election of the taxpayer, be payable in 10 equal installments on the 15th day of the third month of each of the taxable years following the taxable year of the recovery. Such election shall be made at such time and in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulations. If an election is made under this subsection, the provisions of this subtitle shall apply as though the Secretary or his delegate were extending the time for payment of such tax.

"(b) Extension Permitted by Secretary.—If a corporation has a recovery of a foreign expropriation loss to which section 1351 applies and if an election is not made under subsection (a), the Secretary or his delegate may, upon finding that the payment of the tax attributable to such recovery at the time otherwise provided in this subtitle would result in undue hardship, extend the time for payment of such tax for a reasonable period or periods not in excess of 9 years from the date on which such tax is otherwise payable.

"(c) Acceleration of Payments.—If—

"(1) an election is made under subsection (a),

"(2) during any taxable year before the tax attributable to such recovery is paid in full—

"(A) any property (other than money) received on such recovery is sold or exchanged, or

"(B) any property (other than money) received on any sale or exchange described in subparagraph (A) is sold or exchanged, and

"(3) the amount of money received on such sale or exchange (reduced by the amount of the tax imposed under chapter 1 with respect to such sale or exchange), when added to the amount of money—

"(A) received on such recovery, and

"(B) received on previous sales or exchanges described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) (as so reduced),

exceeds the amount of money which may be received under subsection (a)(2),

an amount of the tax attributable to such recovery equal to such excess shall be payable on the 15th day of the third month of the taxable year following the taxable year in which such sale or exchange occurs. The amount of such tax so paid shall be treated, for purposes of this section, as a payment of the first unpaid installment or installments (or portion thereof) which become payable under subsection (a) following such taxable year.

"(d) Proration of Deficiency to Installments.—If an election is made under subsection (a), and a deficiency attributable to the recovery of a foreign expropriation loss has been assessed, the deficiency shall be prorated to such installments. The part of the deficiency so prorated to any installment the date for payment of which has not arrived shall be collected at the same time as, and as part of, such installment. The part of the deficiency so prorated to any installment the date for payment of which has arrived shall be paid upon notice and demand from the Secretary or his delegate. This subsection shall not apply if the deficiency is due to negligence, to intentional disregard of rules and regulations, or to fraud with intent to evade tax.

"(e) Time for Payment of Interest.—If the time for payment for any amount of tax has been extended under this section, interest payable under section 6601 on any unpaid portion of such amount shall be paid annually at the same time as, and as part of, each installment payment of the tax. Interest, on that part of a deficiency prorated under this section to any installment the date for payment of which has not arrived, for the period before the date fixed for the last installment preceding the assessment of the deficiency, shall be paid upon notice and demand from the Secretary or his delegate. In applying section 6601(j) (relating to the application of the 4-percent rate of interest in the case of recoveries of foreign expropriation losses to which this section applies) in the case of a deficiency, the entire amount which is prorated to installments under this section shall be treated as an amount of tax the payment of which is extended under this section.

"(f) Tax Attributable to Recovery of Foreign Expropriation Loss.—For purposes of this section, the tax attributable to a recovery of a foreign expropriation loss is the sum of—

"(1) the additional tax imposed by section 1351 (d) (1) on such recovery, and

"(2) the amount by which the tax imposed under subtitle A is increased by reason of the gain on such recovery which under section 1351(e) is considered as gain on the involuntary conversion of property.

(g) Failure To Pay Installment.—If any installment under this section is not paid on or before the date fixed for its payment by this section (including any extension of time for the payment of such installment), the unpaid portion of the tax payable in installments shall be paid upon notice and demand from the Secretary or his delegate.

"(h) Cross-References.

"(1) Interest.—For provisions requiring the payment of interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum for the period of an extension, see section 6601(j).

"(2) Security.—For authority of the Secretary or his delegate to require security in the case of an extension under this section, see section 6165.

"(3) Period of limitation.—For extension of the period of limitation in the case of an extension under this section, see section 6503(f)."

(e) Section 6503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to suspension of running of period of limitation) is amended by redesignating subsection (f) as (g), and by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) Extensions of Time for Payment of Tax Attributable to Recoveries of Foreign Expropriation Losses.—The running of the period of limitations for collection of the tax attributable to a recovery of a foreign expropriation loss (within the meaning of section 6167(f)) shall be suspended for the period of any extension of time for payment under subsection (a) or (b) of section 6167."

(f) Section 6601 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to interest on underpayments) is amended by redesignating subsection (j) as (k), and by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsection:

"(j) Extensions of Time for Payment of Tax Attributable to Recoveries for Foreign Expropriation Losses.—If the time for payment of an amount of the tax attributable to a recovery of a foreign expropriation loss (within the meaning of section 6167(f)) is extended as provided in subsection (a) or (b) of section 6167, interest shall be paid at the rate of 4 percent, in lieu of 6 percent as provided in subsection (a)."

(g) (1) The table of parts for subchapter Q of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Part VII. Recoveries of foreign expropriation losses."

(2) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 62 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 6167. Extension of time for payment of tax attributable to recovery of foreign expropriation losses."

Sec. 2. Effective Date.

Except as provided in subsection (b)(3) of section 1, the amendments made by this section shall apply to recoveries on or after January 1, 1965, in respect of foreign expropriation losses (as defined in section 1351(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 added by subsection (a) of this section) which were sustained after December 31, 1958.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after "chapter 1" insert the following: "of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954".

Page 2, line 8, strike out "section 11," and insert the following: "section 11 or 802,".

Page 2, line 10, after "poration" insert the following: "was subject to the tax imposed by section 11 or 802, as the case may be, for the year of the loss and".

Page 3, strike out lines 5 through 8, and insert the following:

"(c) Amount of Recovery.—

"(1) General rule.—The amount of any recovery of a foreign expropriation loss is the amount of money and the fair market value of other property received in respect of such loss, determined as of the date of receipt.

"(2) Special rule for life insurance companies.—The amount of any recovery of a foreign expropriation loss includes, in the case of a life insurance company, the amount of decrease of any item taken into account under section 810(c), to the extent such decrease is attributable to the release, by reason of such loss, of its liabilities with respect to such item."

Page 6, line 24, strike out "a recovery of property" and insert the following: "property received as a recovery".

Page 7, strike out lines 15, 16, and 17, and insert the following: "172, or the operations loss deduction under section 812,

"(4) the capital loss carryover under section 1212(a), and

"(5) such other items as may be specified by such regulations,".

Page 8, line 6, strike out "section 11," and insert the following: "section 11 or 802,".

Page 9, lines 19 and 20, strike out "gain from the sale or exchange of a capital asset" and insert the following: "long-term capital gain".

Page 10, line 4, strike out "1964," and insert the following: "1965,".

Page 13, line 4, strike out "of" and insert the following: "or".

Page 16, line 2, strike out "for" and insert the following: "or".

Page 16, strike out lines 16 through 22, and insert the following:

"The amendments made by section 1 (except subsection (b)) shall apply with respect to amounts received after December 31, 1964, in respect of foreign expropriation losses (as defined in section 1351(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 added by section 1(a)), sustained after December 31, 1958."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CERTAIN TROPICAL HARDWOODS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 7723) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on certain tropical hardwoods, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7723 would temporarily suspend the import duties on tropical hardwood lumber, such as balsa, teak, mahogany, and virola. None of the species are grown in the United States, and the duties involved averaged about 1 percent ad valorem based on imports in 1964. Virtually all the imports came from six Central and South American countries, from Ghana and Nigeria in Africa, and from Malaysia and Thailand, all of which are classified as less developed countries.

While the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 provides authority for the elimination of the duties on tropical hardwood lumber, the administration has suggested suspension of the duties pending the outcome of negotiations for the permanent removal of the duties on these hardwoods in connection with the Kennedy round trade agreement negotiations. This suggestion was made because of the interest of the United States in assisting the developing countries in their efforts to expand their exports and because the removal of the duties under the trade agreements authority will involve delays incident to trade agreement negotiations. The countries of the EEC and the United Kingdom have already suspended their duties on various species of rough hardwood lumber, and action by the United States along the lines provided for in H.R. 7723 would demonstrate to the developing countries the will of the United States to take prompt action, where possible, to put into effect measures to facilitate the expansion of their trade

Section 1 of the bill would establish provisions in that part of the tariff schedules dealing with temporary provisions amending the tariff schedules that would provide for suspension of the duties on tropical hardwood lumber until January 1, 1968.

Section 2 of the bill reflects the intention of the Congress that the permanent removal of the duties shall be a matter for negotiation in the Kennedy round, but without the need for such staging of reductions as may be required under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. However, all other pertinent procedures and requirements of the Trade Expansion Act will apply.

While the Committee on Ways and Means held no hearings in connection with this bill, the committee was advised that no opposition to the removal of the duties was registered with the Tariff Commission or the office of the special representative for trade negotiations in connection with the announcement by these agencies of the possibility of removal of the duties in connection with trade agreement negotiations. The committee is aware of no objection to the bill. In fact, we checked with people on the outside engaged in hardwood production here, and they have no objection. The committee unanimously recommended enactment of the bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It should be said that under the Trade Expansion Act notice was given of possible elimination and there were no objections registered.

Mr. MILLS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is any substantial amount of this product coming from Ghana?

Mr. MILLS. It is a very small part of the total. Most of this comes to us, as I have suggested, from six Central and South American countries.

Mr. GROSS. Until this nation of Ghana shows a disposition to get out of the Communist orbit I do not know of any reason why we should be doing anything in particular to encourage trade with them. I think we ought to be doing the reverse; we ought to be penalizing them in every way possible instead of helping them with respect to trade and foreign aid.

Mr. MILLS. If this were being done solely for the benefit of Ghana I can assure the gentleman the bill would not be here.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I wish the gentleman had not included that country.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I might say this to the gentleman from Iowa. I do not know that Ghana exports any significant quantity of this material to the United States. Ghana is listed as a producing country, because some of these woods are found in that area.

Mr. MILLS. That is right; only a small part of the total imports come from Ghana.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. And any benefit that Ghana would get would be so incidental, I do not believe the gentleman would want to interfere with other countries that are friendly to the United States such as as countries like Thailand.

Mr. MILLS. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subpart B of part 1 of the appendix to title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 (Tariff Schedules of the United States; 28 F.R., part II, Aug. 17, 1963; 77A Stat.; 19 U.S.C., sec. 1202) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new items:

“ 916.20	Hardwood lumber, rough, dressed, or worked, provided for in item 202.36	Free	$3 per 1,000 ft., board measure	On or before 12/31/67
916.21	Hardwood lumber, rough, dressed, or worked, provided for in item 202.39	Free	$3.10 per 1,000 ft., board measure	On or before 12/31/67
916.22	Hardwood lumber, rough, dressed, or worked, provided for in item 202.41, except Boxwood (Buxus spp.), Japanese maple (Acer spp.), and Japanese white oak (Quercus spp.)	Free	15% ad val.	On or before 12/31/67
916.23	Hardwood lumber, rough, dressed, or worked, provided for in item 202.43, except Alder (Alnus spp.), Almon (Shorea almon), Ash (Fraxinus spp.), Aspen and cottonwood (populus spp.), Bagtikan (Parashorea plicata), Basswood (Tilia spp.), Beech (Fagus spp.), Birch (Betula spp.), Black or tupelo gum (Nyssa spp.), Buckeye (Aesculus spp.), Cherry (Prunus spp.), Elm (Ulmus spp.), Eucalyptus (Eucalyptus spp.), Hickory (Carya spp.), Lauan, red (Shorea negrosensis), Lauan, white (Pentacme contorta and P. mindanensis), Magnolia (Magnolia spp.), Maple (Acer spp.), Mayapis (Shorea squamata), Meranti (Shorea spp.), Oak (Quercus spp.), Sen (Kalopanax spp.), Seraya, red (Shorea spp.), Seraya, white (Parashorea spp.), Sweet (red or sap) gum (Liquidamber spp.), Sycamore (Platanus spp.), Tangile (Shorea polysperma), Tiaong (Shorea spp.), Walnut (Juglans spp.), Willow (Salix spp.), and Yellow poplar (Liriodendron spp.)	Free	$3 per 1,000 ft., board measure	On or before 12/31/67 ”

SEC. 2. For purposes of section 201(a)(2) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1821(a)(2)), in the case of a trade agreement entered into before July 1, 1967, the duty-free treatment provided by item 916.20, 916.21, 916.22, or 916.23 of title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 for any article shall be considered as existing duty-free treatment.

SEC. 3. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A 1965 COMPARISON BETWEEN THE DESIRES OF IDAHOANS AND THE ACTIONS OF CONGRESS

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a report on a questionnaire I had sent out earlier this year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, this, my first session as a Member of Congress representing Idaho's Second Congressional District, has been very busy and interesting. It has passed more legislation than any one session in recent years; however, in many ways, this has been a cause of much concern to me. It appears that the people of the Idaho Second Congressional District would share my doubt as to the quality of much of the legislation passed.

To put this statement into perspective, following is the questionnaire I sent out early in the year, together with the final tabulation converted to percentages of those returned to me; what the Congress has done on the issues; and my position on them. I received over 12,000 replies to the questionnaire, each of which was individually acknowledged and tabulated, thus the results shown herein are completely accurate. The figures do not all add up to 100 percent as the "no opinion" answers were omitted.

The questionnaire follows:

1. In the last 36 years we have had only 6 balanced budgets—a period during which 30 deficits will have increased the size of the public debt from $16.2 to $322.5 billion. The projected deficit for 1966 is the sixth in a row. Do you favor continued deficit spending?

Idahoans said: No, 80.6 percent; yes, 10.1 percent. Due to continued deficit spending, the Congress again raised the public debt—this time to $328 billion. I voted against the increase.

2. In 1966 the Government will make welfare, benefits, and retirement payments of $46 billion. Is this insufficient, about right, or too much?

Idahoans said: Too much, 62.9 percent; about right, 26.4 percent; insufficient, 10.7 percent. This Congress approved many wasteful, extravagant—and in some cases, such as the poverty program, scandalous—social welfare programs which I, in most cases, voted against.

3. Should Federal excise taxes on telephone service, jewelry, luggage, furs, cosmetics, etc., be repealed?

Idahoans said: Yes, 50 percent; no, 39.9 percent. The Congress voted to repeal most of these taxes,. I voted for repeal. I had previously introduced a repeal bill, slightly different from the one that was passed.

4. Should parents be allowed to deduct from their reportable income all or part of the amount they spend in sending their children to college?

Idahoans said: Yes, 70.9 percent; no, 22.5 percent. A number of such bills (which I supported) were introduced, but were not allowed to get out of committee in order that the House might work its will on them.

5. Should the Federal Government provide financial assistance for local secondary and elementary school construction?

Idahoans said: No, 61.3 percent; yes, 31.3 percent. See question No. 7.

6. Should the Federal Government provide financial assistance for local teachers' salaries?

Idahoans said: No, 74.5 percent; yes, 20.4 percent. See question No. 7.

7. Should the Federal Government provide financial assistance for parochial and private schools?

Idahoans said: No, 81.9 percent; yes, 12.7 percent. The Congress did not consider specific legislation comparable to questions Nos. 5 and 6, however, it did pass a stepped-up aid to education bill, payments to be primarily on a poverty basis, and which contained limited aid to private and parochial schools. I voted against the bill.

Mr. Speaker, at this point on the subject of education, it is well to note that I voted for legislation which provides assistance to colleges and universities and to students attending them, and also to authorize loans to assist students to attend postsecondary business, technical, trade, and other vocational schools. In addition, I supported extension and amplification of Public Laws 815 and 874, providing financial assistance to schools in federally impacted areas.

The questionnaire continues:

8. Should a college student who borrows money from the National Defense Student Loan Fund be required to swear (or affirm) "that I bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution * * * against all its enemies, foreign and domestic"?

Idahoans said: Yes, 80.1 percent; no, 14.3 percent. Legislation was introduced in this Congress to abolish the oath, but no action was taken on it.

9. Should the Federal Government institute a compulsory hospitalization plan for all persons age 65 and over to be paid for from the general treasury and by raising the social security tax of the employer and employee who is now working?

Idahoans said: No, 82.1 percent; yes, 11.4 percent. The Congress approved a compulsory plan. I voted against it.

10. Should the Federal Government establish a comprehensive medical, surgical and hospital benefits plan under State administration for all citizens age 65 and over with voluntary, private insurance—and with premiums subsidized according to need?

Idahoans said: Yes, 50.7 percent; no, 38.7 percent. I supported the private insurance carrier plan, but it was not considered except for doctor's and surgeon's fees.

11. Should the present limitation of $1,200 on outside earnings for those receiving social security benefits be increased?

Idahoans said: Yes. 69.7 percent; no, 23.3 percent. I supported such legislation, and introduced a bill to raise the limit from $1,200 to $2,400. The Congress voted to increase the limit to $1,800, including this provision in the medicare package—a part of the administration strategy to gain support for bad legislation by including some good provisions. In voting against the compulsory medicare bill, I regretfully was forced to vote against the increase in outside earnings.

Mr. Speaker, at this point—while dealing with the matter of retirement benefits and related items—I believe it is well to note that I voted against a pay raise for Members of Congress and other high ranking Government officials, but I did vote for a pay raise for regular Government employees, including postal workers. I also voted for an increase in pensions for retired Federal employees and also for liberalization of the Railroad Retirement Act. I firmly believe these pay and pension increases were necessary because of the inflation caused by the fiscal policies of this and the previous administration.

The questionnaire continues:

12. Should a Fair Trade law be enacted by which a manufacturer could set the price below which his goods could not be sold?

Idahoans said: No, 64.7 percent; yes, 22.4 percent. The Congress took no action on "fair trade" or "quality stabilization" bills in this session.

13. The Veterans' Administration has announced plans to close a number of its hospitals and domiciliaries. Should: this be done; a further study be made to see if the closings are justified; have no opinion.

Idahoans said: Further study, 67.7 percent; should be done, 21.9 percent. No legislative action was taken on this, but enough congressional pressure, including mine, was brought to bear on the Veterans' Administration to cause it to drastically modify the closing order.

14. Should the House Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished?

Idahoans said: No, 76.4 percent; yes, 11.5 percent. A move was made to abolish the committee by denying funds for its operation. I voted for the necessary funds.

15. Should laws be enacted requiring the registration of firearms, including hunting weapons?

Idahoans said: No, 68.8 percent; yes, 24.1 percent. No such legislation has come before the House.

16. A proposal has been made to create a national park in a portion of the Sawtooth Mountains. Should this area be made: A wilderness area; a national park; a national recreation area under Forest Service supervision; or should it remain as is under the Forest Service?

Idahoans said: Remain as is, 45.0 percent; wilderness area, 21.4 percent; recreation area under Forest Service supervision, 18.6 percent; national park, 15.0 percent. No House action taken.

17. Should a constitutional amendment be passed which would allow the voters of each State to determine whether or not both houses of its legislature should be apportioned solely on the basis of population?

Idahoans said: Yes, 61.9 percent; no, 26.1 percent. I have introduced two such constitutional amendments, one of them identical to the one proposed by the Idaho State Legislature. No House action taken.

18. Should a constitutional amendment be passed which would allow, on a voluntary basis, prayer and Bible reading in public schools?

Idahoans said: Yes, 74.8 percent; no, 17.8 percent. Here again, I have introduced such a constitutional amendment. Again, such amendments have been bottled up in committee, precluding a vote.

19. Should the "Connally Reservation," reserving to the United States the right to determine which matters are of domestic concern and not subject to the jurisdiction of the World Court, be retained?

Idahoans said: Yes, 69.9 percent; no, 7.3 percent. There has been no serious attempt in this Congress to repeal this provision.

20. Should our immigration laws be changed from the present national origin quota system to a system based on job skills?

Idahoans said: Yes, 40.8 percent; no, 40.4 percent. The Congress enacted such a law. I voted against it when no limitation was sent on immigrants from the Western Hemisphere, but voted for it when such a limitation was imposed.

21. Do you favor expansion, continuation, reduction, or elimination of:

(1) Trade with Communist or Communist dominated countries?

Idahoans said: Elimination, 54.4 percent; reduction, 20.9 percent; continuation, 14.9 percent; expansion, 9.8 percent.

(2) Economic aid to Communist or Communist dominated countries?

Idahoans said: Elimination, 86.5 percent; reduction, 9.8 percent; continuation, 2.8 percent; expansion, 0.9 percent.

(3) Military aid to Communist or Communist dominated countries?

Idahoans said: Elimination, 91.2 percent; reduction, 4.3 percent; continuation, 2.9 percent; expansion, 1.6 percent.

(4) Economic aid to non-Communist countries?

Idahoans said: Continuation, 40.7 percent; reduction, 34.6 percent; elimination, 13.4 percent; expansion, 11.3 percent.

(5) Military aid to non-Communist countries?

Idahoans said: Continuation, 46.6 percent; reduction, 26.8 percent; elimination, 14.2 percent; expansion, 12.4 percent.

Mr. Speaker, in the above, it is apparent that most Idahoans believe that we should continue needed and efficient help to our friendly world neighbors but, under no circumstances, should we aid and abet communism. I voted against the foreign aid bill because provisions to stop aid to Communist countries were rejected.

The questionnaire continues:

22. Should funds for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency be increased, continued at current levels, reduced, or eliminated?

Idahoans said: Continued at current levels, 38.5 percent; reduced, 26.1 percent; eliminated, 24.1 percent; increased, 11.3 percent. I voted against increasing such funds and then later, when a choice was offered between increasing them or holding them at current levels, I voted to hold.

In 1954 North Vietnam agreed to withdraw its forces to north of the 17th parallel, and not to interfere or intervene in the affairs of South Vietnam.

23. Do you believe North Vietnam has violated this treaty?

Idahoans said: Yes, 79 percent; no, 8.6 percent. This is a matter of personal opinion, not subject to congressional action. However, I believe that Idahoans, in their overwhelming belief that North Vietnam has violated the treaty, are in accord with a vast majority of Americans across the country.

24. Do you favor renegotiating this treaty?

Idahoans said: No, 54.5 percent; yes, 31.7 percent. Here again, I believe that Idahoans are in tune with a majority of Americans in believing that renegotiation of the treaty would only lead to concessions to the Communists. This would be a victory for the Reds and would encourage them to take aggressive action someplace else.

25. Do you favor the administration's policy of retaliatory air strikes and other similar measures in Vietnam?

Idahoans said: Yes, 77.4 percent; no, 13.2 percent. The only congressional vote pertaining to this matter was the vote for a supplemental appropriation of $700 million to support the war effort in Vietnam. I voted for the appropriation.

26. Should wheat and feed grain programs be controlled by means of acreage allotments and marketing quotas?

Idahoans said: No, 63.7 percent; yes, 20 percent. The Congress passed an omnibus farm bill that contained acreage allotments for wheat and feed grains. I voted against it.

27. Do you favor acreage allotments and marketing quotas for potatoes?

Idahoans said: No, 73.7 percent; yes, 10.7 percent. No such legislation was before this Congress. Attempts to place acreage allotments and marketing quotas on potatoes have been defeated in previous Congresses.

28. Do you favor continuation of acreage restrictions (proportionate shares) and basic quotas for sugarbeets?

Idahoans said: No, 66.5 percent; yes, 15.7 percent. The Congress enacted legislation continuing and increasing acreage allotments and basic quotas. This action had the approval of the entire beet industry. Since this was the best we could do at this time, I voted for it. Previously, I had introduced a bill which would have increased these marketing quotas even further. Until such time as sugar legislation is no longer a part of our foreign policy, there will be no chance of eliminating such quotas.

29. In your opinion, what has caused depressed meat prices in the United States—meat imports, complications of the wheat certificate plan, or other?

Idahoans said: Meat imports, 56.8 percent; other, 26.9 percent; wheat certificate plan, 16.3 percent. Last year the Congress established a formula for the amounts of meat imports from various countries, to go into effect when imports reached a certain level. According to the Department of Agriculture, imports have not yet reached the automatic "triggering" level. No legislative adjustment has been made this year.

30. Do you favor continuation of the braceros (Mexican farm labor) program?

Idahoans said: Yes, 54.4 percent; no, 28.2 percent. The Congress allowed the braceros program to terminate last year. Hoping to prevent the period of chaos which has been witnessed in some areas, I introduced legislation to bring it back on a modified basis. But, because of pressure brought to bear by the Labor Department, no congressional action was taken.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IMMUNITIES ACT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8210) to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means, with amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, for a brief explanation.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provides that at the discretion of the President the European Space Research Organization—ESRO—may be designated by the President as an international organization for purposes of the International Organizations Immunities Act. Upon such a designation, the organization, to the extent so provided by the President, will be exempt from customs duties on property imported for the activities it engages in, from income taxes, from withholding taxes on wages, and from excise taxes on services and facilities. In addition, the employees of the international organization, other than nationals of the United States, may not be subject to U.S. income tax on the income they receive from ESRO.

For purposes of the International Organizations Immunities Act, an international organization is one in which the United States participates and which has been designated by the President, through an appropriate Executive order, as being entitled to the privileges and immunities in question. The form of the action taken by the President determines the privileges of the type outlined above to which the organization may be entitled. Moreover, if the privileges granted are abused, they may be withdrawn, conditioned, limited, or revoked by the President.

The European Space Research Organization is an organization of 11 Western European countries—Belgium, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom—which was established in June 1962 to undertake the planning of scientific activities in the peaceful use of outer space, and which is interested in establishing a small satellite telemetry command station near Fairbanks, Alaska. Because the United States is not a member of ESRO, it cannot qualify as an international organization under the International Organizations Immunities Act.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has been granted privileges similar to those sought by ESRO in other countries in which it has established tracking stations. The United States, for example, in our Mercury, Gemini, and other space programs, has negotiated a large number of government-to-government agreements, including agreements with certain ESRO member states, which extend to the United States privileges and immunities commensurate with those sought by ESRO.

Favorable reports were received from the Department of State and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on the pending bill, which was introduced by our colleague, the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER. The bill amends the International Organizations Immunities Act to permit that act to be extended to the European Space Research Organization in the same manner, and to the same extent, and subject to the same conditions, as they may be extended to a public international organization in which the United States participates pursuant to any treaty or under the authority of any act of Congress authorizing participation or making an appropriation for such participation. The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this organization is interested in establishing a small telemetry satellite command station near Fairbanks, Alaska. Because the United States is not a member of this particular organization, there is no authority under existing law for the President to issue such an Executive order as is described and permitted under this bill.

As I indicated, the bill itself was introduced by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House of Representatives, and if there are any questions in detail about it I would suggest that my friend here would be in a position to answer any questions which I have not as yet answered.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would add to the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], that if the United States in any way were a member of this organization there would be no question as to their entitlement to this immunity. However, this happens to be one organization which we are not financing.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It seems, and I would feel, that the United States would obtain some benefits from it and I think it should be pointed out also that in other countries we are accorded some of the same privileges and benefits for the tracking stations which are exclusively under U.S. control and ownership. These other countries extend this privilege to us.

Mr. MILLS. What we are talking about here primarily is the right of the President to exclude from our rates of duties the tax that applies on the importation of the things used in the stations from any of these countries to Alaska. While these nationals of the countries are working in Alaska, the President would have authority to exclude from the effects of our income tax laws salaries earned and paid by the organization. That is primarily what is involved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It is the opinion of this Member of the House that Congress has gone much too far in this business of exempting Americans who work for international organizations from the payment of income taxes, and so forth.

Mr. MILLS. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. We are not talking about exempting any of our own citizens from anything. They are excluded specifically from the authority given the President here. He cannot exclude American citizens who might be employed by this organization from the income tax that they otherwise would pay.

The persons he would exclude would be the Germans, the Britishers, or someone who might come from one of these 11 countries abroad to work in Alaska, and only to the extent that his income is from this organization. If he is on the side, while working up there, in the employment of some citizen of Alaska, that national of any other country would pay an income tax.

Mr. GROSS. This, then, is different from some other international organizations where by subterfuge, using the funds of the organizations, income taxes are paid. The American citizen pays his tax, but he is then reimbursed by the international organization to which the United States provides the big end of support money.

Mr. MILLS. That is not involved here.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I may say in this case the particular situation involved, and the only one involved, is it will give us authority to back up our own situation. We are asking that these people be given the same courtesy that Australian citizens and citizens of other places extend to us for the scientific groups we send to these places.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I know of no objection to this bill made by any of the people on our committee. This is saving the U.S. taxpayers' money because they are doing research in the same field that we are, and we do get cooperation. I believe this will be a good precedent, and a good pattern for the future.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8210

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Organizations Immunities Act (59 Stat. 669; 22 U.S.C. 288–288f) is amended by adding a new section 11, to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. The European Space Research Organization shall be deemed to be an international organization for the purposes of this Act."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act with respect to the European Space Research Organization."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the International Organizations Immunities Act (22 U.S.C., sec. 288–288f) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 11. The provisions of this title may be extended to the European Space Research Organization in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same conditions, as they may be extended to a public international organization in which the United States participates pursuant to any treaty or under the authority of any Act of Congress authorizing such participation or making an appropriation for such participation.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act with respect to the European Space Research Organization."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUTIABLE STATUS OF WATCHES, CLOCKS, AND TIMING APPARATUS FROM INSULAR POSSESSIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8436) to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possessions of the United States, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, for a brief explanation.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 8436, deals with a problem that has arisen through the operation of the provisions of the tariff laws that accord duty-free treatment to the products of the U.S. insular possessions outside of customs territory if they do not contain foreign materials to the value of more than 50 percent of their total value. These provisions were enacted in the economic interest of these U.S. possessions and have for their purpose the encouragement of the establishment of light industries in these islands.

However, Mr. Speaker, it has become apparent that these special provisions can be employed as a means primarily of enabling foreign merchandise to avoid U.S. duties.

In 1959 the assembly of watch movements in the Virgin Islands from foreign watch parts was introduced as a very small operation; 4,900 units were produced in that year. But by 1964 production rose to more than 2.4 million units. All of this production entered the United States free of duty even though as I indicated all the watch parts were of foreign production and the only thing that occurred in the Virgin Islands was the assembly of parts in the finished watch movements.

The development of a large watch assembly industry in the Virgin Islands under the umbrella of a special exemption privilege accorded by the U.S. tariff laws for products of U.S. possessions has attracted the growing concern not only of the U.S. watch industry but of foreign exporters of watch movements to the United States as well.

Recently the Virgin Islands Legislature recognizing the need for restricting the watch assembly operations of the islands within the confines of a legitimate operation in the interest of economic development of the islands and preventing these operations from becoming primarily a means of tariff avoidance took remedial action by enacting bill No. 2638 on August 30, 1965.

This legislation will have the effect of establishing quotas for watch movements produced in the Virgin Islands for shipment to the United States and will, in the view of the committee, largely solve the problem with respect to excessive shipments of watch movements to the United States.

The bill deals with Samoa and Guam as well, they being possessions of the United States.

The committee is advised at this time that since the Virgin Islands have closed the door to the expansion of the watch industry in the Virgin Islands for shipment of watches to the United States, that certain firms, foreign and domestic, are now looking upon Guam and Samoa as a possible location for avoidance and use of this loophole in the tariff act.

There is no production or assembly of watches in either Guam or Samoa. The Department of the Interior in discussing the matter with the committee advised us that these matters, that is, the development of a watch industry within Guam or American Samoa could take place, but there is a very high degree of employment within these islands based upon military expenditures.

If such an industry developed within the islands and employees were needed, I have been told from other sources that there would have to be an importation into the islands of people, say, from the Philippines in order to do this job.

The measure cannot be said to be discriminatory of the islands because they do not have any such industry at this time. It would be a travesty if after the Virgin Islands Legislature closed its doors to fail to close the back door to the use of this loophole, and not by citizens of Guam or Samoa, but U.S. owners and foreign firms who go there, not necessarily to help the development of the islands, but to take advantage of a loophole in our own tariff law.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I might say that, at first blush, I was concerned with the possibility that in the drafting of the bill it might be discriminatory; in other words, favorable treatment would be afforded to the Virgin Islands as against our action in relation to other areas. However, the fundamental purpose of the bill is to put a stop to expansion of this business of going through a possession in order to get a duty-free status for commodities.

Mr. MILLS. Exactly.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It was growing. The Virgin Islands cooperated voluntarily by statute putting a limitation on its expansion and retaining the status quo. The bill would simply keep it at the status quo wherever it might be. On that basis, there would be no discrimination as between areas.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am happy to have the explanation relative to the accusations which have been made that this legislation would be discriminatory against Guam and Samoa. I see now the reason for the action taken by the committee.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I assure the gentleman from Hawaii, and confirm what my friend from Wisconsin has said, that we did not at all view this measure as being discriminatory in any respect. Frankly, the bill, as it had been initially developed, applied across the board, but because the Virgin Islands has taken the action themselves, we did not think we needed to take action here. We could exclude them from this overall treatment and preserve the status quo there as well as the status quo in Samoa and Guam, under the terms of the bill. I can assure the gentleman that that is what we are trying to do and not discriminate against anyone.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. While I do not know what any future Congress might do, should the Virgin Islands change their attitude and, for example, repeal the statute which limits their exports of watches to the United States, we would step in immediately. This might be said as a word of warning to the Virgin Islands. We would step in immediately and put them in the same category as Guam and Samoa.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. I should like to join in that thought, which is certainly foremost in my own mind as a member of the committee.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think the reason we did not do that at this time is because of the legislative drafting problem which would be involved in tying our statutes with the statute of the Virgin Islands.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wish this legislation went beyond simply maintaining the status quo. I wish that the tariff had been increased, and very sustantially, in an effort to bring back the watch industry of this country. It is my hope that in the next session of Congress the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills], Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, will bring us legislation to provide for some real protection for American labor, agriculture, and industry against the flood of foreign imports. We are being taken for a joyride under the Trade Agreements Act, and it would be my hope that in the next session of the Congress the committee will take an early and hard look at the subject, to be followed by legislation that will do something about the imports that are pouring in to compound the economic problems of this Nation.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Has this been approved by Rex Lee, the former Deputy Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who is now the Governor of American Samoa? He has done much to develop Samoa.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It has been cleared with the Department of the Interior and the group in charge of looking after the basic welfare of these islands.

Mr. MILLS. The Office of Territories.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman not believe that in the future we should look at these things carefully, to be sure we are not binding the watch industry in Samoa and Guam completely, while we are permitting limited imports from the Virgin Islands? That does not make them equal. If we maintain the status quo and shut off two possessions, Samoa and Guam, while permitting others to do this, this is going to affect the watch industry as it is now.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. We did concern ourselves with this, and we did question witnesses with respect to the economic impact on these islands.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MILLS. This is not done with any thought of injuring Samoa, Guam, the Virgin Islands or any other place. For a long time many of us have been concerned not merely about watches but about other articles which can be produced by some foreign firm outside the customs territory of the United States but within a possession of the United States, and shipped from that possession into the United States, such an article being free from any duty. If they tried to do that from the homeland, a duty would be applicable.

This is not the first instance which has been called to our attention, in which someone has moved into the Virgin Islands to use this particular loophole for his advantage.

The people from the Department of the Interior tell us that it is not necessary to the economic development of Samoa and Guam for those islands to have a watch industry. There are other things which can be done within those islands, which are being done within the islands, which are better from the point of view of the economic development there than would be the development of a watch-assembly industry.

The gentleman understands that they do not make watches; they only assemble the watches.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Let me say that there is no assembly industry in Guam or Samoa today. If this were to be done there, the information furnished to the committee indicates that the local labor could not do it and it would be necessary to import labor from the Philippines or from some other place—non-U.S. labor, fundamentally—so that the only purpose of going there would be, in a sense, to escape the U.S. duties, rather than for the purpose of employing local nationals of Guam or Samoa. In the Virgin Islands there is a different situation.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. When the time comes that some Samoan, out of the 20,000 population of American Samoa, wants to start a watch industry, will the committee assure me he will then receive the same treatment as the Virgin Islands? And can the same be said for Guam; that they will get a proportional quota for bringing in watch parts and watches?

Mr. MILLS. It is entirely possible, as my friend from Wisconsin has pointed out, that a future Congress might want to change this in many respects. I can assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania it is my belief that every Member of Congress would want to be eminently fair to the people of any possession of the United States. We also have a responsibility to be fair to the citizens of the States of the United States as well. We must balance these matters in terms of what we believe is fairness to everyone.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. There is, then, within the attention of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, on neither side, the idea of shutting off completely the watch industry either in Samoa or Guam and permitting it to operate on the present basis in the Virgin Islands?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. We are interested in having some protection for what little watch industry is left in the United States. That is paramount in our minds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure we are all concerned about the welfare of the Samoans. However, my primary concern is for the "Samoans" in Pittsburgh and in the State of Iowa, and my desire that they be employed.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Referring to the statement made earlier by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes] we must remember, however, that Guamians are Americans. I am not objecting to this purely on your representation and the representation of the chairman that Guam would have to import foreign labor in order to start a watch business. Other than that, I would have objected to this bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (a) of general headnote 3 of title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 (Tariff Schedules of the United States; 28 F.R., part II, p. 11, Aug. 17, 1963; 77A Stat. 11) is amended by striking out "except that all articles" and inserting in lieu thereof "except that all articles (other than articles to which subparagraph (iii) applies)", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(iii) An article covered by schedule 7, part 2, subpart E (relating to watches, clocks, and timing apparatus) which—

"(A) contains any foreign material, and

"(B) is imported from an insular possession of the United States which is outside the customs territory of the United States,

shall be dutiable at the rate of duty which is applicable to like articles imported from the foreign country which is the country of origin of the foreign material of chief value contained in such article."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, after the one hundred and eightieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, after the word "possession" insert the following: "(other than the Virgin Islands)".

Page 2, line 9, strike out "imported from" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the product of".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIRED PAY OF JUDGES OF TAX COURT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8445) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the chairman for a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the pending bill, H.R. 8445, is to eliminate an inequity in the provisions of existing law which prescribe the formula for computing retired pay for judges of the Tax Court of the United States. Under present law the retired pay of a judge of the Tax Court, unlike the retired pay of judges of other Federal courts, is based on the salary payable to him as judge "at the time he ceases to be a judge" rather than on the salary of the office, the normal basis utilized in computing retired pay for judges of the U.S. district courts and of the U.S. Court of Claims.

Under present law a judge of the Tax Court of the United States may retire after 24 years of service and thereafter receive retired pay equal to his salary, or after 18 years of service and receive retired pay based on the ratio that the number of years actually served bears to 24 years. A Tax Court judge must retire after having attained age 70 and having served for 10 years or more, and if he has not served for 18 years, his retirement pay will be one-half of his salary. In all such cases, however, the retired pay is calculated on the basis of the salary payable "at the time he ceases to be a judge."

Judges of the U.S. district courts and the Court of Claims may retire after 15 years of service upon attaining the age of 65 and after 10 years upon attaining the age of 70. Moreover, their retired pay is based on the full amount of the salary of the office, thus extending to them the benefit of increases in the salary of the office which occur after their retirement.

The Committee on Ways and Means is convinced that the method prescribed by existing law for computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court, when considered with the stringent statutory limitations imposed on them upon retirement, has been inequitable in operation. All retired Tax Court judges, unless precluded by illness or disability, are subject to recall to active duty for a period of 90 days each year and may be recalled for longer periods with their consent. Any retired judge of the Tax Court who should fail to perform the judicial duties required of him on recall would forfeit entirely his retired pay for the year in which such failure occurs. In addition, in order to insure the availability of retired judges for recall, the retired judges of the Tax Court are prohibited from accepting any other Federal office or employment or from engaging in the practice of law or accounting in the field of Federal taxation. If they do so they would forever lose their rights to retirement pay.

The Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that the longer terms of service required of Tax Court judges and the more stringent obligations imposed on them by law to perform judicial service on recall during retirement requires that the method of calculation of their retirement payments be brought more closely in line with that of the judges of the Federal district courts and of the Court of Claims.

H.R. 8445, which I introduced, is identical to H.R. 8446, which was introduced by the ranking minority member on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable JOHN W. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and has been unanimously reported to the House by the committee without amendment. Its enactment is favored by the administration. The bill would eliminate the disparate treatment in existing law referred to above by providing that the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court be based on the salary of the office. This would mean that Tax Court judges would receive the benefit of increases in the salary of the office which occur after their retirement, and would provide for the calculation of their retired pay in a manner similar to that presently provided for judges of the other Federal tribunals.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this bill (H.R. 8445) is intended to eliminate an inequity in the provisions of existing law which provide for retired pay for judges of the Tax Court of the United States. Under existing law, the retired pay of a Tax Court judge is based on the salary payable to him as judge at the time he ceases to be a judge, rather than on the salary of the office. The formula differs in this respect from the retired pay provisions for judges of the U.S. district courts and the U.S. Court of Claims.

All retired Tax Court judges are subject to recall to active duty by the chief judge for a period of 90 days each year and may be recalled for longer periods with their consent. Any judge recalled for active duty must either make himself available, or forfeit his retired pay for that year. This precludes retired judges from engaging in any other outside activity. Such judges are prohibited from accepting any other Federal office or employment or from engaging in the practice of law or accounting in the field of Federal taxation.

In view of the requirements imposed on the retired judges of the Tax Court, their retirement income should be calculated more nearly in line with that of judges of the Federal district courts and of the Court of Claims. This bill seeks to accomplish this by providing that the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court be based on the salary of the office, rather than on the salary at the time the judge retired. It brings the retirement pay provisions of the Tax Court judges more nearly in conformity with other branches of our Federal judicial system.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1106 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States) and section 7447(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States) are amended by striking out in each such section "at a rate which bears the same ratio to the rate of the salary payable to him as judge at the time he ceases to be a judge" and inserting in lieu thereof in each such section "during any period at a rate which bears the same ratio to the rate of the salary payable to a judge during such period"; and by striking out in each such section "the rate of such salary" each place it appears and by inserting in lieu thereof in each such place "the rate of such salary for such period".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to retired pay accruing under section 1106 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 or section 7447 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on or after the first day of the first calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAX TREATMENT—UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10625) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, with respect to the tax treatment of certain amounts paid to servicemen and survivors, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the chairman of the committee for a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill makes a series of amendments to the Internal Revenue Code designed to provide essentially the same tax treatment under the retired serviceman's family protection plan where provision is made for annuities for surviving spouses or certain child beneficiaries as already is provided in the case of the civil service retirement program and other qualified pension plans. Thus where reduced retirement pay is accepted by servicemen—or former servicemen—in order to provide annuities for their survivors, the amount of the reduction will no longer be taxed to the retired servicemen and such reductions which have been included in retired servicemen's retirement income in the past may be offset against otherwise taxable retirement pay in the future. The exclusion of up to $5,000 paid to a survivor of a decedent which is available where an employer makes the payment to a beneficiary on account of the death of an employee also is to be available to survivors of deceased servicemen who retired because of disability and died before attaining normal retirement age. In addition, the estate and gift tax exclusions available under present law for the value of survivor annuities in the case of civil service annuities and those under other qualified pension plans are also to be made available in the case of annuities provided for survivors under the retired serviceman's family protection plan.

As I indicated, both the Treasury Department and the Defense Department favor this legislation, and the Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. It was brought to the attention of the committee that, possibly through oversight, the Internal Revenue Code does not extend to the retired serviceman's family protection plan the same tax benefits which are extended to pension plans of private employers. This bill remedies that deficiency. The bill provides that the annuity paid to servicemen and their survivors shall be treated in substantially the same manner, for Federal tax purposes, as employer pension programs. Under the bill the annuity paid to a serviceman's survivor is treated as a continuation of the initial pension, rather than a taxable exchange. The survivor is also granted the $5,000 income tax exclusion similar to the exclusion granted in the case of survivor annuities financed by employers. The bill further provides that an election of a survivorship annuity is not to be considered a taxable transfer for gift tax purposes.

The bill was unanimously approved by the Ways and Means Committee, and favorable reports have been received from both the Treasury Department and the Defense Department. Frankly, I wish that the matter had been called to my attention before now. I am very glad that we were able to bring this bill to the floor of the House before adjournment. I hope that the other body will take appropriate action at the earliest possible date.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I am the author of H.R. 10741, an identical bill to that originally introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. Mills]. This is a matter in which I have held longstanding interest.

I wish to commend the chairman and all members of the Ways and Means Committee for reporting the pending bill and, by so doing, moving to correct a long-standing discrimination against all members of the uniformed services. For the first time, retirees from the uniformed services who receive pensions will be allowed the tax advantage which goes to civil service employees who elect to accept reduced annuities in order to insure a source of income to surviving members of the pensioner's family.

The evaluation and history of this legislation is a tribute to the dedication and persistence of one man, Lt. Col. Floyd Oles, vice chairman of the Committee on Retirement of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

It will be remembered that the Department of Defense submitted legislation on this subject in the 88th Congress and this proposal did not meet certain objectives of the Treasury Department. It was, therefore, not reintroduced as a DOD proposal in the 89th Congress. It was for this reason, after considerable discussion with Colonel Oles, that I introduced H.R. 5929 on March 8 of this year.

On April 22 the Treasury Department urged deferment of consideration of H.R. 5929 pending negotiations between the Treasury Department and the Department of Defense and a study which was underway by the staff of the House Ways and Means Committee.

During all of these negotiations, Colonel Oles earned great credit for the manner in which he followed through on various suggestions. It became apparent that H.R. 5929 could not receive administration support. Accordingly, I introduced H.R. 8718 on June 24 in a further effort to accomplish the objectives of the bill now pending before the House. Though this legislation came closer to satisfying all branches of the executive department, it will fall short. Finally, as a result of continued conferences and study, the administration recommended the introduction of H.R. 10625 and, in accordance with proper procedures, it was introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. Because of my long-standing interest in this subject and the efforts I had expanded, Chairman Mills was gracious enough to give his approval to my introducing an identical bill.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, as I have previously stated, corrects a grave inequity in the present law. If a serviceman elects upon retirement to provide a benefit for his wife or other survivor upon his demise he is no longer required to pay income tax on the full amount he would have received except for the reduction. This is a privilege which civil service annuitants enjoy. Furthermore, the bill will provide for a situation where an annuitant has already paid taxes on funds he has yet to receive. Similar relief is granted to the survivor of a serviceman who has over paid.

On previous occasions I have called attention to the gradual erosion of fringe benefits which are supposed to make up for deficiencies in active duty military pay. I have repeatedly shown how the 100-year-old commitment of recomputation rights has now been repudiated. I have also shown how hospitalization rights for retirees have been placed in jeopardy. These things have been morally wrong in my opinion, and they have not been helpful in the maintenance of active duty morale and the retention of qualified career people in the military services. This bill, I am happy to say, is a corrective step in the right direction and I am sure it will be warmly appreciated by the fine men and women, now retired, who have devoted their lives in service to this Nation. I congratulate the Ways and Means Committee for reporting this bill. I urge the House to support it overwhelmingly and pray that the other body will act upon it in a timely manner.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 10625

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 403 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the tax treatment of certain employee annuities) is amended by adding the following new subsection (e) at the end thereof:

"(e) Taxability of Beneficiary Under Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan.

"(1) General rule.—For taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965, the election under chapter 73 of title 10 to receive a reduced amount of retired or retainer pay shall be treated as the election to receive one or more joint and survivor annuities under an annuity plan which is described in subsection (a). For purposes of the preceding sentence, the joint and survivor annuity shall consist of the reduced amount of retirement pay (as defined in paragraph (3)) and the annuity (or annuities) provided for the survivors. For taxable years beginning before January 1, 1966, a serviceman who has elected, under chapter 73 of title 10 to receive a reduced amount of retired or retainer pay shall be treated as receiving, at the time of the payment of any such amount, the total amount of retirement pay (as defined in paragraph (2)) for the period with respect to which such payment is made.

"(2) TOTAL AMOUNT OF RETIREMENT PAY.—For purposes of this subsection, the 'total amount of retirement pay' means the total amount of retired or retainer pay with respect to which the reduction described in section 1436 of title 10 is computed.

"(3) REDUCED AMOUNT OF RETIREMENT PAY.—For purposes of this subsection, the 'reduced amount of retirement pay' means the total amount of retirement pay within the meaning of paragraph (2) minus the reduction in such pay computed under section 1436 of title 10."

SEC. 2. Section 72 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax treatment of annuities) is amended by redesignating subsection (o) as subsection (p), and by inserting after subsection (n) the following new subsection:

"(o) SPECIAL RULES APPLICABLE TO JOINT AND SUVIVOR ANNUITIES UNDER RETIRED SERVICEMAN'S FAMILY PROTECTION PLAN.—In the case of any joint and survivor annuity contract described in section 403(e)—

"(1) the annuity starting date of such annuity contract is the first day of the first period for which an amount is received as an annuity under the contract, except that if such date is before January 1, 1966, then the annuity starting date is January 1, 1966;

"(2) the amount received as an annuity is determined by the provisions of subsection (d) without regard to whether the requirements of subsection (d)(1)(B) are satisfied; and

"(3) for purposes of subsection (d)(1), the consideration paid for the contract by the employee prior to January 1, 1966, is an amount equal to—

"(A) the total amount of retirement pay (as defined in section 403(e)(2)) minus

"(B) the sum of—

"(i) the reduced amount of retirement pay (as defined in section 403(e)(3)), and

"(ii) the aggregate amount (if any) previously excluded from gross income under subsection (b).

"(4) If an individual deposits amounts described in section 1438 of title 10 for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1965, an amount equal to the amounts so deposited shall not be included in his gross income for his taxable year in which such deposit is made, but no such amount shall be treated, for purposes of subsection (d)(1), as consideration paid by the employee for the contract."

SEC. 3. Part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 (relating to items specifically excluded from gross income) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by redesignating section 122 as section 123 and by inserting after section 121 the following new section:

"SEC. 122. REFUND OF DEDUCTIONS UNDER RETIRED SERVICEMAN'S FAMILY PROTECTION PLAN.

"If an individual receives a refund described in section 1439 of title 10, there shall be excluded from gross income so much of the refunded amount as would have been excluded from the gross income of such individual if such individual had received such refunded amount during the taxable year to which such refund relates."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 2039(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exclusion from gross estate of annuities under certain trusts and plans) is amended by striking out the period after "section 501(a)" in paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon followed by "or", and by adding immediately after subsection (c)(3) the following new paragraph (4):

"(4) a joint and survivor annuity described in section 403(e)."

(b) Section 2039(c) of such Code is further amended by adding immediately after the last sentence thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of this subsection, the joint and survivor annuity described in paragraph (4) shall be considered to be provided under a plan which at all times was a plan described in section 403(a) under which all payments or contributions were considered to be made by the employer of the decedent."

SEC. 5. Section 1446 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection (c):

"(c) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"For provisions relating to the tax treatment of amounts paid to servicemen and survivors under this chapter, see sections 72(o), 122, and 2039(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATES.—The amendments made by sections 2 and 3 of this Act shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965. The amendments made by section 4 of this Act shall be effective with respect to decedents dying after December 31, 1965.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That (a)(1) part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items specifically excluded from gross income) is amended by redesignating section 122 as section 123, and by inserting after section 121 the following new section:

" 'SEC. 122. CERTAIN REDUCED UNIFORMED SERVICES RETIREMENT PAY.

" '(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of a member or former member of the uniformed services of the United States who has made an election under chapter 73 of title 10 of the United States Code to receive a reduced amount of retired or retainer pay, gross income does not include the amount of any reduction after December 31, 1965, in his retired or retainer pay by reason of such election.

" '(b) SPECIAL RULE.—

" '(1) AMOUNT EXCLUDED FROM GROSS INCOME.—In the case of any individual referred to in subsection (a), all amounts received after December 31, 1965, as retired or retainer pay shall be excluded from gross income until there has been so excluded an amount equal to the consideration for the contract. The preceding sentence shall apply only to the extent that the amounts received would, but for such sentence, be includible in gross income.

" '(2) CONSIDERATION FOR THE CONTRACT.—For purposes of paragraph (1) and section 72(o), the term 'consideration for the contract' means, in respect of any individual, the sum of—

" '(A) the total amount of the reductions before January 1, 1966, in his retired or retainer pay by reason of an election under chapter 73 of title 10 of the United States Code, and

" '(B) any amounts deposited at any time by him pursuant to section 1438 of such title 10.'

"(2) The table of sections for such part III is amended by striking out the item relating to section 122 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" 'Sec. 122. Certain reduced uniformed services retirement pay.

" 'Sec. 123. Cross references to other Acts.'

"(b) Section 72 of such Code (relating to tax treatment of annuities) is amended by redesignating subsection (o) as subsection (p), and by inserting after subsection (n) the following new subsection:

" '(o) ANNUITIES UNDER RETIRED SERVICEMAN'S FAMILY PROTECTION PLAN.—Subsections (b) and (d) shall not apply in the case of amounts received after December 31, 1965, as an annuity under chapter 73 of title 10 of the United States Code, but all such amounts shall be excluded from gross income until there has been so excluded (under section 122(b)(1) of this section, including amounts excluded before January 1, 1966) an amount equal to the consideration for the contract (as defined by section 122(b)(2)), plus any amount treated pursuant to section 101(b)(2)(D) as additional consideration paid by the employee. Thereafter all amounts so received shall be included in gross income.'

"(c) Section 101(b)(2)(D) of such Code (relating to special rules for employees' death benefits) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Paragraph (1) shall not apply in the case of an annuity under chapter 73 of title 10 of the United States Code if the individual who made the election under such chapter died after attaining retirement age.' "

"(d) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1965. The amendment made by subsection (c) shall apply with respect to individuals making an election under chapter 73 of title 10 of the United States Code who die after December 31, 1965.

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 2039(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exclusion from gross estate of annuities under certain trusts and plans) is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'or' at the end of paragraph (2), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof '; or', and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" '(4) chapter 73 of title 10 of the United States Code.';

"(2) by striking out 'or under a contract described in paragraph (3)' in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof ', under a contract described in paragraph (3), or under chapter 73 of title 10 of the United States Code'; and

"(3) by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'For purposes of this subsection, amounts payable under chapter 73 of title 10 of the United States Code are attributable to payments or contributions made by the decedent only to the extent of amounts deposited by him pursuant to section 1438 of such title 10.'

"(b)(1) Section 2517(a) of such Code (relating to gift tax treatment of certain annuities under qualified plans) is amended by striking out 'or' at the end of paragraph (2), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof '; or', and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" '(4) chapter 73 of title 10 of the United States Code.'

"(2) The first sentence of section 2517(b) of such Code (relating to transfers attributable to employee contributions is amended by inserting '(other than paragraph (4))' after 'referred to in subsection (a)'.

"(c) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to decedents dying after December 31, 1965. The amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply with respect to calendar years after 1965."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill relating to the tax treatment of certain amounts paid to certain members and former members of the uniformed services and to their survivors."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTICLES ASSEMBLED ABROAD

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 11216) relating to the tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad of products of the United States, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the chairman of the committee for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11216 will eliminate an impediment to allowance of duty on U.S. products previously exported and returned to this country as components of articles assembled abroad if the U.S.-produced components have not been advanced in value or improved in condition abroad except by being assembled and except by operations incidental to the assembly process. This impediment, which I will explain later, crept into the pertinent provision of the new tariff schedules without your committee's realization of the effects that it would have.

The impediment consists of a clause which, in practical effect, denies the benefit of the tariff provision in question unless the particular U.S. products contained in the returned assembled article are, prior to their exportation, identified to the U.S. customs authorities as being intended for assembly abroad and returned to the United States as components of particular articles. Your committee's attention was recently called to the fact that this clause in item 807.00 of the new tariff schedules was causing considerable hardship to U.S. exporters and importers and the Bureau of Customs has advised the committee that the clause had created serious administrative difficulties.

The only reason given by the Tariff Commission—which prepared the new tariff schedules under legislative directive—for the clause in question was that it would assist in the identification of the U.S. components. Identification of the components for which claim for allowance in duty under item 807.00 as of U.S. origin is, of course, a sine qua non for receiving the benefits of that tariff provision. However, to require a showing in each case that the U.S. components were previously exported for the purpose of assembly abroad and return to the United States goes much too far and in many instances is utterly impossible. Your committee was given the example of a foreign automobile manufacturer who uses U.S. parts for his cars which are sold throughout the world, including the United States. It is obviously impracticable to segregate the U.S. parts that were intended for incorporation in those of foreign auto manufacturers which may be shipped to the United States. The enforcement of the clause in question in cases such as this could have a serious effect on export opportunities for U.S. producers.

Mr. Speaker, the clause in question is not necessary to assure identification of U.S. components in imported foreign-assembled articles. To be sure, the benefits of item 807.00 are not available unless proper identification is established. The means by which this may be accomplished are varied. In some instances indicia of U.S. origin will appear on the components and mere visual examination will suffice. Your committee believes that the satisfaction of the requirement for identification of U.S. components should be left for the customs authorities to assure by flexible and reasonable practices and regulations. The burden of proof of U.S. origin would, of course, lie with the importer claiming the benefits of item 807.00.

Your committee was unanimous in recommending the enactment of H.R. 11216.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It should be added fundamentally what this does is to make easier the exportation of American-made goods——

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. For use in connection with the manufacture of products some place abroad. It would increase our exports and increase American trade.

Mr. MILLS. And restore the situation to that which prevailed before the 1963 tariff reclassification.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 11216

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the article description of item 807.00 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States is amended by striking out the comma after "exported" in clause (a) and by striking out "for the purpose of such assembly and return to the United States,".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply as if made by the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to further extend my remarks in explanation of the bills just passed and also that other Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in connection with the bills just passed.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at any time during the remainder of the day it may be in order for the Speaker to declare recesses, subject to the call of the Chair.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I hope I shall not have to object, this recess is for the purpose only of expediting the legislation and for no other purpose?

Mr. BOGGS. If the gentleman will yield, that is exactly correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I assume that this has been cleared with the minority leader.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, oh, yes. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], the minority whip, was on the floor a moment ago and there he is now. It has been cleared with the minority.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

TO AMEND THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2542) to amend the Small Business Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Texas for an explanation of this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported by the committee by a vote of 29 to 1, and the 1 "No" vote was not on the merits of this particular proposal. There will be no objection on the part of this one Member. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this vote in effect represents a unanimous report of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

It is a bill to help disaster victims and for other normal SBA activities.

Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to alleviate a very dire emergency situation and I hope that there is no objection to it. I believe it is meritorious in every way.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, is there a money figure contained in this bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, yes, the figure is $120 million. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. This bill has been pending for some time. It has reached the point in SBA as a result of heavy demands on its resources where they are going to have to stop a lot of the relief to these disaster victims and will have to stop the disaster loans involved. This is a terrible thing. I believe everyone is for it.

Mr. GROSS. Now, only a day or so ago we passed a bill providing for relief for hurricane victims in certain States, calling for some $70 million.

Let me ask this question: Will the victims of the hurricane continue to have first call upon this fund or is this now to be used for loans to small business elsewhere throughout the country, in view of the appropriation only a day or so ago?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the appropriations, I will state to the gentleman from Iowa, of a few days ago will not be meaningful and will not be effective unless we pass this bill. This is the authorization. It would not be effective. The other bill to which the gentleman from Iowa refers would not be effective unless we pass this bill. This applies not just to Louisiana but all over the Nation, everywhere there is a disaster.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but what I am asking now is this: Is the $70 million passed a day or so ago in addition to the $120 million as authorized in this bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, that was only for grants the other day. This goes much further than that. This is for loans all over the Nation. It is not restricted to Louisiana or any particular State.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope, in view of the fact that the House approved $70 million the other day, apparently directed largely to Louisiana, Florida, and Mississippi, that those who seek small loans elsewhere throughout the country would be given consideration.

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct; that is one of the purposes of this bill, to make it nationwide.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is the purpose of it.

Mr. PATMAN. I assure the gentleman from Iowa of that.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Davis, the Acting Director of the Small Business Administration, testified before the committee this morning that the disaster victims are the three Southern States, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Florida, would have priority over others in connection with the funds authorized by this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the funds are urgently needed. I regret that they have not been set aside in the past in an emergency fund for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, we have been promised that hearings will be held during the first part of next year by the chairman for that purpose of considering other bills in connection with the Small Business Administration.

Mr. Speaker, no one is more anxious than I to see that the victims of natural disasters be afforded every possible means of recovery, including small business loans. I know from the experience of my own State of New Jersey, when it was severely hit by hurricanes in the past, that these loans are an invaluable aid. This bill is needed, and it should be affirmed.

There is a lesson to be learned in this present state of affairs, however, that should not pass by unnoticed. We are seeing for the second time in a year the consequences of the Administration's decision, acquiesced in by Congress in 1962, to combine the previously separate disaster loan and regular small business loan funds. Last year, you will recall, the Small Business Administration found itself short of funds when disaster struck in the form of earthquake, floods, tornadoes, and the like. Delays in processing application affected both disaster victims and the ordinary small businessman. Now, as a result of Hurricane Betsy, the SBA is again short of funds, both for disaster victims and regular loan applicants, including many Negro small businessmen who had been led to believe that funds would be available as part of the poverty war.

This could have been avoided the first time. It certainly should not have been allowed to happen a second time. More than 9 months ago, on January 14, 1965, to be exact, I introduced a bill which would have provided an additional $200 million for disaster loans, and would have created two separate funds again. Had these funds been kept separate, the SBA, the small business community, and Congress long ago would have been adequately warned of any possible requirement for new authorizations and appropriations. There would have been no need to short change one program to aid the other area of activity.

In May of this year, I tried again. When Senator PROXMIRE appeared before our Subcommittee on Small Business, considering H.R. 8060 and S. 1796, to provide additional aid to disaster victims, I raised the question of dividing the funds into two parts. The exchange between Senator PROXMIRE, the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and myself indicates quite clearly that the appropriate committees of Congress did not receive timely notification of the lack of disaster funds by the SBA, that the then Small Business Administrator, Mr. Foley, had promised the committee the day before the hearing a report on the bill I had introduced the next time small business legislation was considered by the committee, and that the chairman himself indicated an interest in exploring this problem. The exchange from the hearings of May 12, 1965, that I have referred to, reads as follows:

> Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, it is good to see you here. I would like to bring up something at this time, something that I didn't yesterday, in connection with the SBA disaster loan fund.
>
> We all know that about 3 years ago when additional authorization was sought the House passed a bill which maintained a separate authorization for the three. The Senate in its wisdom put them all together, and what we accomplished was that we came out with the Senate version, which seems to happen lots of times.
>
> I feel as a result, as many others do, that one of the problems we ran into with respect to recent disasters was the fact that the fund had been merged and the disaster loan fund hadn't been kept separate and intact so that funds were available at the time of the emergency.
>
> Now, the Senate, I believe, put in a provision at the time 3 years ago when that action was taken that the SBA should notify the Congress when the stated amount of disaster loan funds had been committed, but apparently no such notice has been given to the House Banking and Currency Committee even though the disaster loan funds on November 30, 1963, exceeded the amount calling for notification of the committee.
>
> This year I introduced a bill to amend the act to authorize additional funds to be available exclusively for disaster loans. This would be a $200 million fund of additional authorization, and actually if we take the nature of the fund it would be exactly the same situation we had 3 years ago when the integrity of it was kept separate from the others. I had hoped that we could really seriously consider that this year and give full weight to whether or not we were in trouble in time because of our action 3 years ago. Was any consideration given to this on the Senate side?
>
> Senator PROXMIRE. Frankly, Congressman WIDNALL, I agree with a great deal that you say. As you know, the funds were merged at the express urging of the Administration. The Small Business Administration wanted them merged. They said it would be more convenient, more sensible, and more logical. We yielded to their view. It was the Administration view rather than the Senate view.
>
> Senator SALTONSTALL secured an amendment requiring that the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees and Appropriations Committees should be notified as disaster funds are diminished. Frankly, I haven't been on top of this as you have to know whether or not that notification has been given in the Senate. There was no such concern expressed in the hearings on this particular bill in the Senate, but I know that Members of the Senate would be very sympathetic with the views you have expressed and would feel that as a minimum this committee of the House and the corresponding committee in the Senate should be notified under these circumstances, and you might very well make a strong case for the restoration of the integrity of a separate disaster fund, but that, as you know, is not directly related to this particular bill.
>
> Mr. WIDNALL. My thought was that this particular bill could be amended in that regard somewhere between the Senate and the House. Yesterday when we talked about it with Mr. Foley of SBA, he said they were coming back later with some other recommendations, and at that time they would be prepared to report on the bill that I had submitted. In case they don't come back, I would like to have full consideration of it at this time. I came down this morning because I felt that inasmuch as we are going ahead with something that is pertinent to the subject that we could very well give consideration on this side to amending the bill here so we could get that accomplished.
>
> Senator PROXMIRE. I might say, very respectfully, as you know, there is an administration SBA authorization bill pending in both the Senate and House, and this does ask for substantially more funds for both SBIC program and for the regular SBA program. It seems to me that at that point we would have a very logical vehicle for your amendment, if you prefer to put it in as an amendment rather than as a separate bill.
>
> Frankly, my own preference is pretty obvious. I want to get this bill through as fast as possible because the people in Wis-

consin need it urgently and need it right now.

Mr. WIDNALL. I just wanted to point out, Senator——

Senator PROXMIRE. It is a strong case. I would be sympathetic to it in the Senate.

Mr. WIDNALL. I would like to have some hearings on it, so there could be some real thought given to it.

Senator PROXMIRE. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. WIDNALL, I sympathize with your point of view. When this bill comes up from the Administration, if we consider it, as has been suggested here, you will certainly have plenty of time as far as I am concerned. I guarantee you that.

Mr. WIDNALL. I prefer to do it now, but at the same time I will be satisfied as long as it gets a hearing. I think it is a serious suggestion and it has got merit to it. I don't think we have gained anything by merging the funds.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not at all unsympathetic to your view. I want to know more about it. This is an emergency measure. They not only had one cyclone, they had two. They not only had one flood, they had two. It is really an emergency matter and I hope we can't get it out, and I appreciate your views. Mr. TALCOTT?

Mr. Speaker, the committee went on to note in its report on S. 1796, that:

> S. 1796 will afford immediate relief to some of the victims of future disasters. This is a stopgap measure and will in no way impede the consideration of other more comprehensive bills relating to disaster relief now pending before the Congress.

Since that time, no new, extensive hearings have been held. No report from the SBA on the advisability of separating the two funds came up to the Committee with today's legislation. To my knowledge, the timely warning to the appropriate committees required under the Saltonstall amendment to the 1962 bill did not occur. We are right back where we started, taking hectic, last minute action to save the SBA from a dilemma that not only should not be dealt with in this fashion, but should not have occurred in the first place. Not that I think the SBA or any other human agency could prevent a natural disaster, but as the SBA Executive Director, Ross D. Davis, pointed out to our committee this morning, the SBA budgeted only $20 million for natural disaster loans for the entire year, and $48 million was committed in the first 3 months alone. Yet nobody moved to act on this until now. Surely commonsense dictates a better setup than we are operating under today.

In January of this year, I repeated the warning I had made on behalf of the minority conferees in 1962 on the bill combining the two funds at Administration insistence. It is worth repeating again today. At that time I said:

> We sincerely regret that as this bill comes back from conference a grave error, in our opinion, has been made. The conference substitute leaves the disaster loan authority with the regular small business loan authority. We think this is wrong. No one can tell when natural disaster will again strike to plague our people. The only way the Congress can be sure there will be funds available to assist our people in rehabilitating their homes and businesses when disaster occurs is to maintain the disaster loan program as a separate and distinct authorization—a trust fund if you please—to be available without any question and for the specific purpose for which the authorization was granted. That is just plain good commonsense.

Our chairman this morning indicated that he plans to hold hearings next session on SBA funding in general, and my suggestion for a separate funding as well. I welcome this renewed interest in the suggestion I made last January which, at that time, drew interest and support from a number of Members of Congress. I only hope that nature will be kind to us this fall and winter or we may again face similar circumstances that have twice in the past created unwarranted delay and hardship for disaster victims and the average small businessman alike.

At this point I would also like to include a story in the Washington Post of October 21, 1965, illustrating the unfortunate circumstances now prevailing with respect to small business loans:

DISASTER LOANS DRY UP SBA AID TO NEGROES

(By Leonard Downie, Jr.)

Emergency disaster loans to Louisiana businessmen hit by Hurricane Betsy in September have dried up funds for the Small Business Administration's regular loan programs throughout the Nation.

Hardest hit by the SBA loan drought are the Nation's small businessmen—many of them Negroes—who had applied for loans through the new Small Business Development Centers in 28 U.S. cities.

Applications are no longer being accepted at the centers for regular SBA loans. A backlog of applications for special easy-to-get Economic Opportunity Act loans has built up. And many applicants who have actually received letters approving their loans have not received their money during the past 2 months.

NEEDED, $160 MILLION

Little of the money is expected to be disbursed, and few new loan applications will be considered, SBA officials say, until Congress approves $160 million in supplemental appropriations to foot the bill for Hurricane Betsy and cover the backlog of other applications.

Negro businessmen, meanwhile, are growing restive, as what seemed a promising program to help them enter the economic mainstream has come to a virtual standstill.

They especially had been counting on receiving from the SBA the Economic Opportunity Act loans that require little or no collateral; collateral has been a major stumbling block in their efforts to obtain loans before.

"I know there are some Negro businessmen in Washington who were already budgeting money they expected through the program," James S. Stanback Jr., president of the District of Columbia Chamber of Commerce said. "Now, with no money coming, they do not know what they are going to do."

CENTERED ON NEGROES

The Small Business Development Centers were set up by the Office of Economic Opportunity in 14 cities last July to provide business training and assistance in obtaining SBA loans for needy small businessmen, especially Negroes.

In Washington, only six Negro businessmen had obtained SBA loans in 13 years before last summer. More than half of the 145 loans approved through the local center since then have gone to Negroes.

Nationwide, the number of cities served by the centers quickly doubled, with dozens of requests for them coming from other towns, as the public response exceeded all official expectations.

But now the loan money has suddenly stopped coming. Samuel Harris, director of the Washington center, reported that the SBA stopped accepting applications for regular loans some time ago.

He also estimated that 40 local applications for poverty program loans, budgeted separately by the SBA, are still awaiting SBA approval and that more than a dozen local businessmen who have received letters approving their applications still have not gotten any money.

Berkeley Burrell, president of the National Business League, said the situation is much the same at centers all over the country. Representatives of the league's chapters in cities with Small Business Development Centers "are calling every day to complain about the sudden lack of loan money," he said.

NEW CENTERS CURBED

The SBA also is not allowing new centers to open up in cities asking for them, he added, and Washington's center has two new branches, both staffed and already open for business, that cannot be announced to the public.

Burrell believes that the special effort to help Negro businessmen was never expected to cost as much as it has. "Now that it is adding to the Government's money problems," he said, "I'm afraid they will curtail it sharply or cut it off."

SBA officials insist that Hurricane Betsy is the only reason for the loan embargo. Emergency disaster loans needed in Louisiana, which get top SBA priority, are expected to exceed the $88 million loaned to businessmen in Alaska after the earthquake there in March 1964.

Diversion of large amounts of loan money for the Louisiana emergency has created a backlog of more than 4,000 unfilled loan applications in other parts of the country, one spokesman said.

"As I understand it," another SBA official said, "we are nearly flat broke."

"I realize the anxiety of other people counting on money from us," Randall Tyus, the SBA's special assistant to the administrator for minority group affairs, said. "But we must help these people in the South first."

At one point earlier this month, the entire SBA loan machinery ground to a halt as officials surveyed the application backlog to decide what programs to curtail for now and how much money to request from Congress.

Now the disaster loan program is running smoothly, SBA spokesmen say, and "some money is expected to trickle back down through the poverty loan program, although progress will be slow."

Officials of both the SBA and the Office of Economic Opportunity, which pays for the office expenses and management training programs at the Small Business Development Centers, promise that everything will be back to normal soon.

But Negro business leaders, who believe enough money should have been set aside for the poverty loan program in the first place so that it would not have been affected by the Louisiana emergency, are not so optimistic.

"We need a deeper commitment to the Negro businessman from the administration," Burrell said.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 2542

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4(c) of the Small Business Act is amended by striking out "$1,721,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,841,000,000".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SHIP MORTGAGE BONDS

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2118) to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1185)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2118) to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken by the House amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter retroactively any rights which were the subject matter of litigation pending on the date of enactment of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
THOMAS N. DOWNING,
W. S. MAILLIARD,
THOMAS M. PELLY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
E. L. BARTLETT,
WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2118) to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The last sentence of section 4 of the Senate bill provided that "This section shall not apply to any bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness, mortgage, or assignment if the validity of such bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness, mortgage, or assignment, or the foreclosure, validity, or preferred status of such mortgage, is in litigation on the date of enactment of this Act.".

The House amendment struck from the Senate bill this sentence.

The proposed conference substitute would strike the last sentence of section 4 of the Senate bill and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter retroactively any rights which were the subject matter of litigation pending on the date of enactment of this Act."

It is the position of the House conferees that this amendment is necessary to make it crystal clear that Congress does not intend to retroactively affect in any way rights in litigation pending on the date of enactment of this act. All conferees agreed that the bill must express the concern of Congress that this legislation not in any way prejudge pending litigation or attempt to influence its ultimate disposition.

The managers on the part of the House believe the proposed conference substitute achieves the objectives of both the Senate and House effectively and equitably.

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
THOMAS N. DOWNING,
WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD,
THOMAS M. PELLY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Are all amendments to the bill germane?

Mr. GARMATZ. They are.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill meets certain problems created by a decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit on April 5, 1965, in the case of Chemical Bank New York Trust Co. against the Steamship *Westhampton*. This decision could affect trust indentures and bond financing on American-flag vessels. The *Westhampton* case is still pending in the courts, and there are also pending other cases which we understand will be governed by the decision in the *Westhampton* case. The Senate bill had excluded the pending litigation from the application of the act. The bill passed by the House did not exclude the pending litigation from its application.

In conference it was unanimously decided that in order to be fair to all parties involved in the pending litigation, the legislation should not be applicable to such pending litigation. The House conferees offered an amendment which so provided, and this amendment was accepted by all the conferees.

The conference substitute would exclude from validation under section 4 of the act any bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness involved in pending litigation, in the event the courts finally determine that such bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness is invalid under laws existing prior to the passage of this act. Thus it will be clear that the Congress is not interested in substituting its judgment for that of the courts in the matters now pending in litigation.

I urge immediate acceptance of the conference report on S. 2118 as reported by the conference committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD].

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that the conferees were in a very difficult position in dealing with this legislation because highly technical legal questions are involved on which, as so often happens, good lawyers disagree as to what the situation actually would be under various proposed language in the final section of the bill.

I must, if I understood the statement made by the gentleman from Maryland, even though neither he nor I are lawyers, disagree slightly with his interpretation of the wording that we are now bringing back in the conference report. However, I do not believe this need disturb us too much because this is going to be a question that has to be decided by the courts in those cases which are now in litigation namely, three cases.

The Senate and House both had the same objective, which was not to affect the rights of parties who are presently litigants. But we disagreed as to how this should be done. The Senate language in the opinion of many of us prejudiced the position of certain litigants in court in spite of their declared intention in the Senate report that they did not wish to do so. So we struck out the language. The Senate conferees felt the failure to put something in here about retroactivity and its application would prejudice other litigants who are presently in court. The final language that we have come up with, and I hope any court that reads the proceedings on this bill will understand perfectly clearly that it is the intent of the Congress to leave litigants in precisely the same position they were in before the passage of this bill. I do not know whether this is possible—whether Congress can pass a law and have a judge able to make a decision in a case without taking into consideration the fact that the Congress has passed a law. But certainly that is what we intend.

Mr. Speaker, this is particularly complicated because as a matter of fact the administrative agency of our government that has jurisdiction over these matters thought that the law always was what we are now spelling out in this statute. The committees of the Congress thought this is what the law always was. But the fourth circuit court made it mean something else and we are now trying to correct this without doing injury to the rights of those who may now actually be in court in bankruptcy proceedings against three U.S. vessels.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DOWNING].

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I fully support the conference report.

The urgent necessity for the legislation embodied in S. 2118 resulted from a decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit in the case of Chemical Bank New York Trust Co. against the steamship *Westhampton* decided on April 5, 1965. The implications of this decision threaten the entire replacement program because of its effect upon the validity of bonds and mortgages which are the principal vehicles of financing the new vessels. Throughout the consideration of this legislation before both the House and Senate committees, it has been the expressed desire not to substitute the judgment of Congress for the decision or rulings of the courts with respect to the *Westhampton* case itself and other litigation pending at this time. The Senate passed S. 2118 in a form which in its opinion prevented such interference. The amendment to S. 2118 reported to and passed by the House reflected the judgment of the House committee as to how best to meet this problem and not interfere with the courts. In conference the managers for the House presented substitute language for the last sentence in section 4 of the Senate version of S. 2118. This proposal was accepted by the Senate managers and in the opinion of all of the managers offers the best resolution to this problem and most clearly states the intent of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 509 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 509

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, one thousand additional copies each of the hearings held by that committee in the Eighty-eighth Congress on crime legislation for the District of Columbia; the hearings held jointly by the House District of Columbia Committee and the Senate District of Columbia Committee in the Eighty-eighth Congress on crime in the District of Columbia; and House Report Numbered 176 of the Eighty-ninth Congress, entitled "District of Columbia Crime".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE HEARING ON HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 512 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES 512

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia two thousand additional copies of the hearing held by that committee during the current session on home rule for the District of Columbia.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 513 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 513

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, twenty-five hundred additional copies of the committee hearing entitled "Lower Colorado River Basin Project", Eighty-ninth Congress, first session.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE HEARINGS ON H.R. 2580 TO AMEND THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 519, with a committee amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 519

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives three thousand additional copies of the hearings before Subcommittee Numbered I of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on H.R. 2580, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, dated March 3, 8, 10, 11, 18, and 31; April 6; May 18, 20, 26, and 27; and June 1, 1965.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Committee amendment: Line 4, strike out "3,000" and insert "6,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING AS HOUSE DOCUMENT OF THE STATEMENTS PRESENTED IN HONOR OF HON. CARL VINSON

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 544, with a committee amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 544

Resolved, That the statements made on the floor of the House of Representatives on October 2, 1964, with respect to the Honorable Carl Vinson, together with other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a House document. The copy for such House document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. In lieu of the number of copies of House documents to be printed and their distribution prescribed by section 54 of the Act of January 12, 1895 (44 U.S.C. 131), there shall be printed one hundred copies of the House document referred to in the first section of this resolution which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct and which shall be distributed under the direction of the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers, Representative from the First Congressional District of the State of South Carolina, to the said Carl Vinson and other interested persons.

With a committee amendment, as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, section 2, strike out lines 7 through 9, and insert the following:

"SEC. 2. In addition to the usual number"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT THE DEDICATION CEREMONIES OF THE CARL VINSON ROOM

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 569 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 569

Resolved, That there be printed as a House document the dedication ceremonies of "The Carl Vinson Room", the hearing room of the Committee on Armed Services in the Rayburn House Office Building.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Where is this room?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. This is the Armed Services Committee hearing room.

Mr. GROSS. The Armed Services Committee hearing room?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That has been designated as "The Carl Vinson Room."

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, did that room get wet when it rained the other day and water poured in through the side of that new, $125 million Rayburn Building?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am sure I could not tell the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I have in mind the time a few days ago when they had crews of workmen mopping up the water, and when car service was suspended in the tunnel because of the rain leaks. I am of the opinion that perhaps that building ought to be given back to McCloskey or the Indians, if the latter had anything to do with it.

I thank the gentleman.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF "WHY VIETNAM" AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 570 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 570

Resolved, That the document entitled "Why Vietnam", containing letters, statements, and addresses by President Lyndon B. Johnson, President John F. Kennedy, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, and the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, be printed as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT THE "COMPILATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY LAWS"

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 592 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 592

Resolved, That the compilation of social security laws, prepared by the Social Security Administration for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means, be printed as a House document; and that one thousand additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 4, strike out "two" and insert "one". Line 5, strike out "of which one thousand shall be". Line 6, following the word "Means" strike out the comma and insert a period, and strike out the remainder of line 6. Strike out lines 7, 8, and 9.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF THE REPORT ON THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE 42D BIENNIAL MEETING OF THE CONVENTION OF AMERICAN INSTRUCTORS OF THE DEAF AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 53 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 53

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the report of the proceedings of the forty-second biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, held in Flint, Mich., June 21–25, 1965, be printed with illustrations as a Senate document; and that five thousand additional copies be printed and bound for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement on this particular resolution.

This resolution seems to be, and might be interpreted as being, contrary to the policy of the committee as evidenced by a bill which was approved by the committee some weeks ago, which would have had the effect of limiting or doing away with the printing of the proceedings of conventions as congressional documents.

In this particular instance there were two factors which caused the committee to approve this resolution. First, was the comity with the Senate, since it is a Senate concurrent resolution. The other is that certain papers which were included in these proceedings the members of the committee felt might be utilized as textbooks in the teaching of the deaf.

I would hope that the passage of this resolution would not be taken as establishing a precedent for printing, at Government expense other convention proceedings. I can assure the House our committee in approving the resolution intended that it should not be considered as establishing a precedent.

I want to say that the resolution which was adopted by the committee and which is on the House Calendar, while it will not be called up during this first session of Congress, will be called up during the second session. I would hope it would receive favorable consideration and cut out a lot of the printing that has been done at Government expense, which in the opinion of the author of that resolution, feels should be borne by the organizations themselves.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN MATTERS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by authority of the Committee on Rules, I present a resolution (H. Res. 605) authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction, with a committee amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 605

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 141, Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on Agriculture is authorized to send not more than six members of such committee, two majority staff assistants, and one minority staff assistant to such countries as the committee may determine for the purpose of attending the biennial conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in Rome and of conducting an investigation and study of the operation and administration of Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88–633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country where local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 2, strike out "141" and insert in lieu thereof "89".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any counterpart funds or local currencies left in Italy?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not keep the books, but I understand we have a bundle of them over there.

Mr. GROSS. With all of the junketeers that are taking off these days; I note about 70 absentees this morning, and I know that some of them are off and running to foreign countries, I just wondered if there is going to be enough funds to take care of all the trips presently underway and those that apparently are going to be taken. There have been meetings all over the place the last few days on who is to go where and how. I will say to my good friend from Virginia I was under the impression that the President has asked everybody to travel in this country this year, and keep the dollars at home in order to do something about the balance-of-payments situation. That situation may have improved a little, but only a little. Under the circumstances it is hard to understand now why Congress is off and running all over the world, in direct contradiction to the President's demand on the people of this country, I will say to my friend from Virginia. Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In reply to my good friend from Iowa, I will say that the Committee on Rules in the resolutions of this kind that they have offered has been very circumspect and very niggardly about granting them. They have confined it very closely to specific subcommittees to attend a specific meeting or for a specific purpose over there or to investigate, as in this case the Committee on Agriculture has jurisdiction over the oversight of Public Law 480. They have been accustomed to going over there by subcommittee from time to time by authority of the Congress. That is the purpose of the resolution. I want to say to the gentleman that I share many of his views as to economy in Government and I am not letting any of these get by that I think are not justified.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have been hearing criticism in the last few days that the Government is not providing big enough and fast enough jets to get the junketeers over to Ouagadougou, or wherever they are headed. They are also complaining that they have to take smaller planes when they get to certain countries, which planes they say are not comfortable enough.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have some confidence in the committees that are authorized to take these trips. I do not think they are going to abuse the purposes of the resolution. I do not know anything about the transportation. We have authorized the trip. When Congress passes a resolution such as this, we confine them to the use of counterpart funds which are of no use to us any other way.

Mr. GROSS. I know of the gentleman's interest in this matter and I appreciate the restrictions that he and his committee wrote into these junketing resolutions in the last couple of years. He has tried to do something about it, but I am afraid that we have not gone nearly far enough in putting on the brakes as they ought to be applied. I am opposed to the resolution.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a simple question?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. As I understand, Mr. Speaker, the only thing that is holding up sine die adjournment tonight is the conference report on the sugar "Daddies" bill through conference action by this and the other body; that is, after we complete our business—the supplemental appropriation conference report—for which we are going to recess shortly until about 4 p.m. Could it be that defeating this resolution will enable us to get the conferees back here more quickly since they are out of town today, so that we could adjourn sine die and cut down the unusual expense of this continuing session?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think some people if they had this authority would be a little more anxious to get on their way and it might be helpful.

Mr. HALL. I strongly recommend the defeat of this resolution under those circumstances.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, may I simply say that I agree with what the distinguished gentleman from Virginia has said. We are trying to do the best we can and I think this resolution is in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by authority of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 613) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 613

Resolved, That for the purpose of the studies and investigations specified in H. Res. 133 approved by the House of Representatives on February 16, 1965, that the Committee on Banking and Currency is authorized to send fourteen of its members and four of its employees, two from the majority staff and two from the minority staff, to be divided into two special subcommittees to investigate matters in connection with international financial operations including the operations of the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Fund, the proposed Asian Development Bank, and central and commercial banking operations. One special subcommittee shall investigate and study the international financial operations including the International Monetary Fund and central and commercial banking operations in European countries, and one special subcommittee shall investigate and study international financial operations of a developmental nature including the operations of the International Development Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the proposed Asian Development Bank in Asiatic countries: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88–633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose: *Provided*, That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country where local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] desire to consume any time? If so, I yield to the gentleman 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I desire to speak just very briefly, and I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding to me.

May I state, Mr. Speaker, that this is about as good as we can do in the Committee on Rules. This is the third time we have had this resolution for consideration. The first resolution would have permitted the Committee on Banking and Currency to go all over the world. However, this resolution seems to tie the matter down. I believe this is what we are trying to do, without unnecessarily prohibiting the members of the committee from doing what they should do in their travels. So I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules yielding. I understand that this is the third or fourth attempted resolution for this committee. I just wonder if this resolution was perfected in the Rules Committee before the so-called rump session of the minority or majority of the majority of this committee? I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee after hearing—I believe the fashionable word these days is "tirade"—on the floor the other day about the so-called rump session of this Committee on Banking and Currency knows which group is going to be selected to make these important investigations around the world?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Let me assure the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that this resolution is not in any way connected with that matter so far as I know and is not connected in any way with any dispute that may have taken place recently or not recently in the Committee on Banking and Currency. That does not in any way, shape or form have any connection with this resolution. It is the customary thing which we have done with reference to the Committee on Banking and Currency in order for it to oversee some of the foreign monetary commitments we are undertaking in the way of the International Monetary Fund and the International Banking Corporation, and so forth.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman does not know whether the acting chairman or the regular chairman, by virtue of seniority, will be one who will designate the Members to make this trip, to go on the separate missions around the world?

Mr. SMITH of Viriginia. The Committee on Rules goes no further than to offer a resolution authorizing a certain trip.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I note that this one doubles the number of junketeers who are to take off around the world. The previous bill called for six. This goes to 14, plus, I suppose, the usual complement of staffers.

The thing that intrigues me about this one is that these people are apparently going out and look into and, following the pattern of the past, will come back here promoting a brand new bank—the Asian Development Bank.

From what I have been able to hear this resolution will probably cost us a few billion dollars to be contributed to the capital structure of that proposed new outfit. We have the Inter-American Bank, the World Bank, and any number of other international financing agencies. I just do not like to see a bunch of junketeers take off with the idea of promoting this new Asiatic Development Bank, on top of all the billions we have poured into aid for Asia up to this point.

I do not suppose there is anything the gentleman from Virginia or the gentleman from Iowa can do about this except to grin and bear it. We can only hope for the best and fear the worst.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. When it comes to organizing an international bank or organization of such proportions as the gentleman mentions, I would like to have somebody look into it before we get into this thing. That is one reason why the committee ought to go over there and look it over.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DELEGATION TO ATTEND THE DEDICATION OF THE AMERICAN RESEARCH HOSPITAL FOR CHILDREN IN KRAKOW, POLAND

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 619.

The Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 619

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives is authorized to appoint twenty Members of the House of Representatives as a delegation to attend the dedication of the American Research Hospital for Children in Krakow, Poland, and to designate the chairman of said delegation.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the delegation, including staff members designated by the chairman to assist said delegation, shall not exceed $15,000 and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Expenses of the delegation shall include such special expenses as the chairman may deem appropriate to carry out this resolution.

A member or employee of such delegation (1) shall receive subsistence expenses in an amount not to exceed the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964, (2) shall receive actual transportation expenses, and (3) shall not expend appropriated funds for the purpose of defraying expenses in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Messrs. **GROSS** and **HALL** objected.

STATEMENT BY FOSTER FURCOLO, FORMER CONGRESSMAN AND FORMER GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a statement by Foster Furcolo, former Congressman and former Governor of Massachusetts.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, former Governor Foster Furcolo of Massachusetts, who was my immediate predecessor in Congress from the Second Massachusetts District, has asked me if I would place in the Congressional Record a statement by the former Governor that is self-explanatory. I am glad to extend this courtesy to a former Member of this House. I believe that his statement should be in the Congressional Record because the people of the Nation will be interested in hearing his report on a situation that has been widely publicized. And, most important, the people of Massachusetts are entitled to have the entire Nation know that there was no basis for any accusation against the man they had twice elected as their chief executive.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following statement by former Governor Furcolo with my remarks in the body of the Record:

Statement of Foster Furcolo, Former Congressman and Governor of Massachusetts

If I were a Member of Congress, I would be interested in the outcome of the case against a former colleague. That is one reason why I am bringing the matter to your attention. In addition, I hope the Congress may be interested because what happened to me could happen to anyone in the United States if people are not sufficiently alerted to the danger to prevent any repetition. I think I may have a suggestion that will be helpful in protecting someone else from what I have experienced.

About a year ago you probably read that I had been indicted. I hope that by now you also know that the courts exonerated me and vindicated me of any wrongdoing of any kind whatsoever. But nevertheless there was a period of time when all that you or anyone else could know was that newspaper headlines had said that I was accused of something. The case is all over now and I have won it—but what was it all about anyway? What was the charge?

THE CASE AGAINST GOVERNOR FURCOLO

To understand the nature of the "charge" against me, it is necessary to explain the procedure that Massachusetts follows in filling appointive positions. In most States the senate or other legislative body passes upon the Governor's appointments; but a few States, including Massachusetts, have an executive council perform that function. The Massachusetts Executive Council has 8 members, each representing a district of about 650,000 voters. Every executive councilor runs for office like any other candidate. They are elected by the people and are responsible solely to the people. They are not appointed or selected by the Governor, they are not responsible to him, and he has no power or authority of any kind over them.

The executive council has a variety of functions, one of which is the question of confirmation of the Governor's appointees. That power of the council was involved in my case.

NO ONE EVER ACCUSED FURCOLO OF RECEIVING A BRIBE

The official charge against me was conspiracy to arrange for campaign contributions to be given to five executive councilors to influence them to vote to confirm the reappointment of the public works commissioner, Anthony DiNatale.

The prosecution never at any time accused me of seeking or accepting any money or anything of value.

They never at any time accused me of paying or giving anyone any money or anything of value.

The charge was that someone in the Furcolo administration arranged for campaign contributions to be given to the five executive councilors and that—since I was Governor—I was somehow responsible. By the same reasoning, if a Federal judicial appointee contributed to the campaign of a U.S. Senator, the President of the United States would somehow be criminally responsible under the prosecution's theory.

ABSURD ACCUSATION

The absurdity of the charge is perhaps best illustrated by understanding that the person whose reappointment was concerned—DiNatale—was already the public works commissioner and would continue to be the public works commissioner even if the entire executive council had voted against him. That is because this was a reappointment as distinguished from an appointment.

When a person who already holds office is reappointed, he continues in office even if there is no executive council confirmation of his reappointment. In Massachusetts such a person is known as a holdover. They are not uncommon. For example, our former public welfare commissioner held office with complete power and authority as a holdover for 6 years—1 year under former Governor Herter, 4 years under me, and 1 year under Governor Volpe. A holdover continues in office until the Governor submits another appointment to replace him. Only the Governor can submit a name—the council does not even get to vote upon a name until the Governor submits it.

Public Works Commissioner DiNatale was already in office; and with or without council confirmation would continue in office with exactly the same powers and responsibility as he always had had. In such circumstances, why would I have even the slightest concern about whether or not the executive council gave its confirmation?

In addition, DiNatale was shortly going to leave public works anyway to become a commissioner of the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority. That is in fact just what he did—in July of 1960, some 4 months after his reappointment as public works commissioner was confirmed.

Well, no matter how absurd the accusation becomes when examined in the lights of the facts—which occurred in 1960, 5 years before the accusation, so no one could have invented them just for a defense—the prosecution had still brought the indictment. Was it merely to gain headlines for the Republican nominees in the election that would be held 3 weeks after the indictment (as a crime commission investigator later admitted) or was it in good faith?

FURCOLO CHALLENGED THE PROSECUTION TO BRING THE CASE TO TRIAL

As soon as I was indicted, I asked for an immediate trial but the prosecution successfully blocked my request. Then I offered to give up various rights any defendant has (to file motions; to have specifications, etc.) if the prosecution would immediately give me my day in court. The prosecution again blocked me.

I had publicly indicted the prosecution for bringing a framed-up charge solely for political headlines, so I challenged the prosecution to have the courage to try me before the election. The prosecution did not dare accept my challenge.

As I stated at the time (and as reported in the press of October 15, 1964, right after the indictment):

"Furcolo held a news conference at which he said he wanted to be tried as soon as possible in order to clear both his name and that of the State he once led. At the press conference, before more than 50 reporters and a forest of microphones and TV cameras, Furcolo said it was his right, and that of the public, to have an early trial. 'I want to clear my name as quickly and as fully as possible,' he said.

"More important, here we are a few weeks before election, when charges are made against a man who has served the Commonwealth as Governor for 4 years. This affects every person in the State, and the Commonwealth has a duty to the person charged to either give him an opportunity to clear himself or prove him guilty as quickly as possible."

Furcolo conceded that, in demanding an early judgment, he could be hurting his own cause. "We have not known about the indictment for enough time to properly prepare our case," he said. "The Commonwealth has been investigating for many months—but even though this is a disadvantage to us, we are demanding an early and quick trial."

Furcolo claimed that "those in charge can have a trial in a week, if they want. If I don't get a trial before election day it will absolutely confirm what I say, that this is politically inspired," he declared. "The State's name is entitled to be cleared, as well as my own."

FURCOLO COMPLETELY EXONERATED AND VINDICATED

It was a year later before I finally met the prosecution in open court. The result was complete exoneration and vindication of me. At the close of the prosecution's case, there had not been even a shred of evidence against me. The judge directed a verdict in my favor, completely clearing me. In other words, even if everything the prosecution presented were true, there was still not even a bit of evidence against me. In fact, from the beginning of the investigation right up to the trial's end, the prosecution at no time had anyone who even said I did anything wrong of any kind. There was a directed verdict that cleared my name and completely exonerated and vindicated me.

The result was not simply that I had won my case or that the prosecution had been unable to prove any wrongdoing on my part—the result was much more conclusive and far reaching than that. The public finally realized that there never had even been anything said against me: I had never really even been accused of anything.

THE NEXT TIME IT MIGHT BE YOU

I have merely given you an outline of what happened to me—expanding the details would fill a book. I am telling it to you to alert you and the Nation to what can happen to any person in any State. It is: "There but for the grace of God go I." This time it happened to me—the next time it might be you or anyone.

Is there anything that can be done to prevent the recurrence of such an injustice? I think there might be. True, such protection might be necessary in only one case in a hundred—but under our system of justice and our way of life we believe the protection should be given even if it be only one case in a million.

FURCOLO PROPOSES A COMMISSION OF LAW SCHOOL DEANS, JUDGES, AND EXPERTS

I have a suggestion for those States that accuse by grand jury indictment (I realize that England and some States in this country have abolished the system of indictment by grand jury). I believe that my proposal will not only strengthen and improve grand jury procedures but will also benefit everyone concerned with what happens in the secrecy of the grand jury.

I propose the creation of a commission of judges, lawyers, and deans of law schools to study the problems and then recommend changes in our laws to more fully protect the individual and also improve law enforcement. One specific recommendation I make for the consideration of such a commission is the inauguration of what I have termed "the monitor system." Under my proposal, an accused or a witness is guaranteed fair treatment by a monitor or legal adviser appointed by the court to be a neutral and impartial observer to supervise proceedings before grand juries. Today the only supervision is by the very prosecution that is seeking to indict the person.

Most experienced attorneys share in the informed legal opinion that the grand jury proceeding is subject to too much control and abuse by a prosecution that might be improperly motivated. (The February 1965 American Bar Association Journal has a well-documented thesis on this point.) A neutral monitor would go a long way toward correcting the situation described by the American Bar Association Journal.

THE MONITOR SYSTEM

The monitor would not serve longer than 6 months or be appointed oftener than once in 5 years. Among other matters, the monitor could:

1. Advise on the legality and admissibility of evidence;

2. Require continuity of evidence and prevent intentional intermixing of different cases to confuse the grand jurors;

3. Prevent threatening of witnesses by the prosecution;

4. Prevent the deception of grand jurors by the withholding of evidence, or by the prosecution misinforming or misleading the grand jurors;

5. Advise the grand jurors whether there is sufficient evidence on which to base an indictment. If the monitor informs the court that, in his opinion, the evidence is insufficient for even an indictment, then the court will pass upon the sufficiency of the evidence before accepting an indictment;

6. Require the grand jurors to vote on one matter before hearing other evidence on other unrelated matters;

7. Inform the court when an indictment should be sealed and impounded for 2 months. This precaution could prevent the timing of "political indictments" just before an election. It could also prevent public indictment of a person during his trial on another charge; and

8. Advise on scores of other matters where the grand jurors now must rely on the prosecution.

WOULD MERELY IMPROVE THE GRAND JURY SYSTEM

The monitor would have no vote or control but would merely be present in an advisory capacity, and also inform the superior court of any irregularities or abuses. The monitor system would not change the basic grand jury system or in any way lessen the powers and authority of the grand jury. The grand jury would still make the decision on what evidence it would or would not hear, and whether it would or would not indict, etc. The only difference would be that the grand jury would also have a neutral and impartial observer present in addition to the prosecuting attorney. Under the monitor system, the court could be sure that it would be informed of any abuses or irregularities by the prosecution. If all we want is fairplay, who can object to this?

Instead of simply complaining about injustices of the past, let us correct the system to prevent future injustices. It is in that spirit that I proposed that the Governor of Massachusetts name a panel of persons skilled in law to consider ways and means of improving the procedures by which those accused of crime are brought to trial.

SAFEGUARDS INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, HELPS THE PROSECUTION, HELPS THE GRAND JURORS, AND PROTECTS THE COURTS

I believe my suggestion of the monitor system is helpful to everyone concerned with the indictment process:

1. The grand jurors benefit because they not only have the advice of the prosecuting official but also that of the monitor. A prosecutor seeking an indictment may be biased or unduly zealous but the monitor would have no reason to be anything but neutral and impartial.

2. The individual, whether he be merely a witness or an accused, would obviously be better protected if a neutral observer is present. What fairminded person objects to that?

3. The prosecution itself will be protected from the possibility of an indictment later being quashed because the defendant's rights had been violated. Under the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in the celebrated Escobedo case, there is likely to be a flood of cases challenging every indictment on the basis that the accused had no protection during the grand jury proceedings, a "critical" stage. Under our present procedures, the only protection given anyone at that stage is the very prosecuting official who is seeking the indictment—certainly not much protection. But if a neutral monitor is also present, does that not help to close the loopholes opened up by the Escobedo decision? The monitor system would mean that there was at least a neutral person present, not simply the party proceeding against the accused.

WHO SHOULD OBJECT TO THE MONITOR SYSTEM?

In my opinion, the monitor system I have suggested would improve and strengthen the grand jury system. The change I recommend would unquestionably benefit the grand jurors, the accused, the witness, the prosecution, and the courts themselves. What is wrong with such a proposal?

The need for such protection of the judicial system itself is perhaps best indicated by an editorial in the Boston Post-Gazette, the material part of which reads as follows:

"The fact that not a scintilla of proof was presented to the trial jury of any form of wrongdoing by Furcolo makes it impossible to understand why he was indicted * * *. Foster Furcolo should never have been indicted. His case cannot fail to create a loss of confidence in the judicial system in Massachusetts."

Let me close by quoting from two newspapers. While I am grateful for the opinions expressed in them, I would like to prevent the need of any repetition of such articles for anyone else. What happened to me is over and done with and, fortunately, turned out all right. Let us not look to the past but let us look to the future to prevent such a misfortune happening to any other person.

LAWRENCE SUNDAY SUN

The first article is an editorial in the Lawrence Sunday Sun of October 3, 1965, reading as follows:

"Last week the Sunday Sun wrote an angry editorial about the conspiracy trial against former Gov. Foster Furcolo. During the course of this week, we did more investigating and a great deal more thinking about the whole situation. And we are even more angry now than we were last week. In fact, we feel that the matter is so serious that it merits another complete discussion * * *.

"When it was reported that a grand jury hearing crime commission evidence had indicted Furcolo, we were shocked. At the time the thought occurred to us that perhaps this was the single indictment which justified the crime commission's existence. Corruption has reached a pretty serious level, when even the Governor himself is involved.

"But Furcolo was not actually charged with personal corruption, he was charged with being part of the conspiracy in the bribery.

"The trial itself was shocking. Following the presentation of the State's case, counsel for Furcolo made a motion for a directed verdict—a ruling by the judge that even if the State's entire case were accepted at face value, there was not sufficient evidence to convict him.

"Judge Hudson, the trial judge, accepted this motion, ordered the jury to declare Furcolo not guilty of the charges. Judge Hudson, properly, did not comment on the case. But many persons who were following the case closely did. Nearly all observers reached the same conclusion: there was no shred of evidence tying Furcolo to the bribery incident. The closest the State could come was to present evidence that a demand for campaign funds by members of the executive council was made to a Furcolo aid.

"On the face of the matter, the trial of Furcolo would seem to be an utter disgrace. If the attorney general's office cannot even make out a prima facie case, the prosecution of the case smacks of wanton irresponsibility.

"But was there an explanation? Rumors of an explanation have been circulating around the State. The rumor states that the crime commission presented to the grand jury no evidence against Furcolo, but that the grand jury 'ran away' and brought down the indictment on its own accord. Runaway grand juries are rare, but not unknown—they are a danger when broad and largely uncontrolled power is given to any investigatory body. * * *

"We checked the rumor with Assistant Attorney General Roger Woodworth, who often deals with sensitive questions facing the attorney general. He categorically denied the 'runaway grand jury' theory.

"Why then, we asked, was Furcolo brought to trial? Because the grand jury indicted him, Woodworth answered. Are all indictments brought to trial? We asked. 'Yes, unless they are nol prossed,' he answered. 'Well, when are cases nol prossed?' we asked.

"The nub of the rest of the conversation was that the attorney general only refuses to prosecute when there is reason not to prosecute. We kept trying to get at the reasons. Woodworth only gave us two reasons, but indicated that there were other circumstances. The two reasons given were when a key witness dies or additional evidence indicates that the person is innocent—for example, when another man confesses to the crime.

"We tried another tack. Since the prosecution of Furcolo fell so flat, was the prosecution surprised by developments at the trial—for example, a witness changing his story? Woodworth's answer: 'No.'

"So we tried yet another tack. Was the attorney general's office surprised by the directed verdict? Woodworth answered that the attorney general's office never comments on a judicial decision. This is a good general policy, and we indorse it. But most rules have exceptions. We think that this situation merits an explanation from the attorney general.

"Because as matters now stand it looks to us like the attorney general acted pretty irresponsibly in bringing Furcolo to trial."

THE BOSTON HERALD

The second article is as the situation was capsuled by Editor Emeritus George Minot writing in the Boston Herald (the State's leading Republican newspaper) of "a few more things you don't understand: Why the Commonwealth had the nerve to put former Gov. Foster Furcolo on trial * * * in view of the lack of evidence of any wrongdoing on his part."

WHY NOT TRY THE MONITOR SYSTEM?

My case is over. Everyone agrees it never should have been brought in the first place. How do we prevent a recurrence? I think the inauguration of what I have termed "the monitor system" may be the answer.

Why not try it?

STARTING AT RIGHT TIME

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, America is like a young girl who can always be fresh and lovely and beautiful provided she starts now to take care of herself. We have taken so much of our natural beauty for granted. We presumed—and it was almost without thinking—that our streams could always have fresh, pure water, no matter how much refuse was dumped into them. And we presumed that our air would always be fresh and pure, no matter how many or what kind of fumes were blown into the air.

Now it is to the credit of all Americans that something is being done to maintain this country's beauty. We know now that the beginning can be small—that one can pick up one piece of trash, plant one flower or one tree, or just be aware that beauty is a thing which lasts forever, only if we will it to last, and take steps to cherish it, and preserve it.

I was pleased to read a recent editorial in the Albuquerque, N. Mex., Tribune which discussed efforts to do something about water pollution.

This is a timely and all-important subject and I ask permission to insert the editorial in the RECORD.

HOW SOMETHING CAN BE DONE ABOUT WATER POLLUTION

As President Johnson signed the Water Quality Act he said:

"I pledge that we are going to reopen the Potomac for swimming by 1975. And within the next 25 years we are going to repeat this effort in lakes and streams and rivers all across the country."

Congress has indeed given the Nation an effective law to use in cleaning up our streams and lakes. The bill which was worked out by the conference committee is better than both the original Senate and House versions.

It was far preferable, as the final bill did, to upgrade jurisdiction over pollution control to a water pollution control administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It had been proposed to place the pollution control task in a mere division of the Public Health Service.

The law deals primarily with interstate waters. The States are given until June 30, 1967, to establish quality standards. But if the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare finds they have not done this, or the standards are inadequate, he can act. Not arbitrarily, however. He must call a conference of all interested parties, including municipalities and industries. But even pollution of intrastate waters can feel the hand of Federal enforcement if the pollution affects interstate waters.

The public's thanks for this act "to enhance the quality of water" goes to the authors of the bill, Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, of Maine, and Representative JOHN BLATNIK, of Minnesota, and also to Senator CALEB BOGGS, of Delaware and Representative JOHN BALDWIN, of California, who fought for it.

Said President Johnson:

"There is no excuse for a river flowing red with blood from slaughterhouses. There is no excuse for papermills pouring tons of sulphuric acid into the lakes and streams of the people of this country. There is no excuse for chemical companies and oil refineries using our major rivers as pipelines for toxic wastes. There is no excuse for communities to use other people's rivers as a dump for their raw sewage."

And now something can be done about it. It's the job of the new Secretary, John W. Gardner, to do it.

DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL PROJECT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, on my way to these Chambers this morning I passed our most attractive National Archives Building and saw the inscription carved in stone, "What Is Past Is Prologue," and it seemed so appropriate for the remarks I wish to make here today.

For many weeks now, on and off, the House has been dealing with the by now famous, or perhaps more accurately infamous, Dickey-Lincoln School project. We have been buried under an avalanche of facts and half-facts and this late in an extended session of the Congress I expect my colleagues have had enough of the whole thing. In my six terms in the Congress I have always considered myself a practical man—practical in economics and in politics and I think it is fair to say that my constituents generally regard me this way.

On the basis of practical politics then I should consider this project a fait accompli and thus retire to the rear of the Chamber and remain silent. But every once in a while an issue comes along that transcends practical politics and involves elements of principle that cannot easily be shunted aside. The handling of the request for authorization of $277 million for this project has been the worst in my memory as a Congressman and yesterday, as I heard the impassioned pleas of my Massachusetts colleagues, THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., and EDWARD P. BOLAND, for rejection of this horse-and-buggy project, I determined that I must add further to the record for the months that lie ahead.

As Al Smith said, "Let's take a look at the record." The record on the Dickey-Lincoln School project going back to its original introduction before the House Public Works Subcommittee is laced with misstatements, misconceptions, broken House rules, political chicanery and parliamentary maneuvering.

When on yesterday, this House approved the omnibus public works bill with this travesty of a project included, it did so only because it was maneuvered into a parliamentary position of rejecting a multitude of worthy rivers and harbors projects or taking Dickey-Lincoln School. I think I have been in these halls long enough to feel the temper and inclinations of our membership and I remain thoroughly convinced that had I been given the opportunity—an opportunity that was properly mine had our rules been followed—to offer a motion for recommittal of the omnibus bill and deletion of this hydroelectric hydra-headed monstrosity, that it would have been defeated by a larger margin than it was several weeks ago. How was I denied that right? How did we find ourselves in the position of stuffing this unwanted Interior Department brainchild down the throats of New England? Let us look at the record.

This saga of infamy began, really, last July, just about 3 months ago. The Department and Secretary of the Interior proposed this Dickey-Lincoln School project as an alternative to the now-discredited Passamaquoddy tidal development in Maine. It appeared like a siren from the sea—unknown, unheard of, uncertain. I am certain that at its first appearance the terminology "Dickey-Lincoln School" sounded to most of us like the name of a grammar school our cousin Tillie might have attended. But as events began to unfold, it quickly became evident that we were to be asked to build and buy the world's most expensive grammar school. In an amazing display of political sleight-of-hand by the Interior Department, this project appeared, received approval from the administration, bounced to the Senate side of this Chamber and was approved by the Senate, without any public hearings—and all within 72 hours.

Now I can picture myself conceiving of a project for my district that would ultimately cost a third of a billion dollars and ramming it through the House Public Works Committee in 3 days' time. In the first place, while I love my district, I love the taxpayers who live there far more, so even in my wildest yearnings for benefits for that district I would not propose such a travesty on the legislative and appropriations process. But, obviously, my standards are not those of the Interior Department. It should have sent up the warning flags for all of the Members of the House when this project whistled through the Senate like a night train through Paducah Flats. But honest men that we are, we assumed that the parties in interest would, in due course, get their hearing and that then a reasonable legislative judgment would be made by the Members of this House. Little did we realize, at that time, that not only were the opponents of this project outside of the House itself to be jobbed, but that the Members of the House itself were to be jobbed as well.

The night train, having whistled through the Senate, had to slow down a little when it reached the House Public Works Committee. Now questions began to be asked. What does this project really mean? Will it help to lower power costs in the New England area or is it just an Interior gambit to finally crack the New England area with public power? Is the project economically feasible? Is it really a reclamation and flood control project or is it a pure power project? What will happen to the power to be produced?

Those questions and many more were asked. But there were not very many answers forthcoming from the Government agencies involved. It became clearly evident during the House hearings that there were a lot more answers required before the Congress could reasonably proceed with an authorization of such magnitude—an authorization that constituted more than 10 percent of the entire public works bill. During these hearings some members of the committee sat nonplussed, to say the least, at such statements by the Secretary of the Interior as "There are no marketing plans" and "No, we did not consult the electric companies of the area on the need for this power." Ninety-five percent of the power to be produced was to be sold outside the State of Maine and yet no one knew where or how or when this could or would be done.

It was a genuinely incredible performance It seemed to many of us that to even be asked to support this project was an absurdity. Not only was the disposition of the power output in question but then it became evident that the power was going to be more expensive to produce in 1972 than power now being produced in New England by large thermal-electric and nuclear plants due to be completed shortly. It became clearly evident from the hearings that this was a horse-and-buggy project conceived in ignorance and dedicated to the proposition that if you throw enough numbers around, the Congress could be fooled.

From my own personal knowledge, as a result of the hearings, a majority of the public works committee had all but decided to reject the project entirely, when the political sleight-of-hand began again. It squeeked out of committee narrowly, but was never voted on by the subcommittee that had conducted the hearings because there were not enough votes for it there. Instead it was passed to the full committee without recommendation and was adopted there—where there were enough votes. Once again the red warning flag should have gone up to all of us. The usual Senate procedures had been flaunted and now the same thing was starting on the House side.

By now the controversy was really warming up. First an effort was made to send the entire project back to the committee and the temper of the House's attitude was felt when the effort failed on a tie vote—one of the few this session. At this stage of developments it was clear to a majority of the Members that this project was indeed a strange one. It almost seemed that it could not stand the light of diligent examination. Why was the House to proceed so quickly? Wasn't it reasonable to get some answers to the many questions that were floating about? Evidently the House thought so because they supported my amendment to the omnibus bill that would have required a thorough study of this project by the Corps of Engineers. This seemed like a reasonable and objective approach to the problem at hand. And by rollcall vote the House agreed.

Those of us who felt the will of the House having been expressed that the matter was disposed of until next spring found in short order that we were wrong. Once again the maneuvering started and we suddenly had a group of conferees who did not reflect the view of the House. They are all able and honest men but they did not reflect the expressly stated view of the majority of the Members who answered the rollcall.

The next thing we knew the project had been reinserted in the conference report after the meeting with the Senate. Now this, in of itself, is not too unusual. A conference is convened for the purposes of a meeting of the minds. It is unusual, however, that the express wishes of the House, on a rollcall vote be traded away, as Congressman BOLAND pointed out in his remarks yesterday. That, however, was only the beginning of the maneuvering that denied me the right to offer an effective motion for recommittal of this project.

As aptly described by Congressman CRAMER, of Florida, there was a case of the kidnapping of the papers. Under the rules of conference the papers of the conference report should have been returned to the House for action first. This was not done. And perhaps even more significantly was never explained to the Members of the House. Before we knew what had happened the papers went to the Senate and were adopted.

This, of course, left the House then in the position of simply voting the entire bill up or down. There could be no amendments and this is exactly what the proponents of this project had in mind. They clearly indicated that this project could not stand on its own merits. It could not stand the light and heat through examination. It could not even stand to be voted on by the Members of the House.

Now in six terms in the Congress I have won and lost a lot of fights. An effective, working Congressman does not expect to win them all. He is willing to accept defeat when it reflects the views of the majority of the House—that is the democratic tradition. But when a project of this kind is squirmed, cajoled, twisted, and wormed through a labyrinthine of parliamentary maneuvering that denies the Members of this House their right to be recorded then I will not accept that as the proper conduct of this House.

The next act of this tragedy is already underway. While House Members were being forced into the unfair postion yesterday of having to vote on the entire bill the Senate had started another night train on this project. The supplemental appropriation bill was whistling down the track and carrying a load of $1,800,000 for this project. A load that was placed on the train even before the House had authorized the project.

From the simple standpoint of fair play this appropriation must be removed from this bill. The Members of the House have been run over by one night train. I do not expect they want to get hit by another. All elements of fair play aside such an appropriation is completely unjustified by the facts. This project does not deserve a penny of appropriation until some agency of the Government determines whether it is even feasible.

I said at the outset of these remarks that past is prolog—and this is so in the Dickey-Lincoln School project. Never, in all my years in the House, have I seen such sheer political power applied to a project. I am not a sensitive man but I am a sensible one and I cannot and will not accept any more of this political chicanery on behalf of a project that cannot stand public examination. I am sure that I will be joined by many of the distinguished Members of the New England delegation in continued opposition to this project. We will not content ourselves to accept this action yesterday by doing nothing. We will, we must, insist on complete and thorough examination of this misconceived, malformed, mismanaged project.

A REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK IS URGENTLY NEEDED

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to complete one of the items of longest standing on America's roster of unfinished conservation business. This is the establishment of a Redwood National Park on the northern coast of California.

The Secretary of the Interior first called for preservation of a representative forest of these trees—the tallest growing things in the world—in 1879. And legislation has been before Congress to accomplish this goal intermittently since 1911.

But these efforts have been uniformly frustrated. Almost two million acres along California's coast were once forested with magnificent stands of Sequoia sempervirens. Today, probably only 200,000 acres are still in virgin growth, and most of this is in small isolated blocks.

The depletion of this great esthetic resource has occurred mostly because the acreage of redwood land was allowed to pass into private ownership before its value to the Nation was fully recognized. Today only 485 acres of redwood forest land in the Muir Woods National Monument just north of San Francisco is administered by the National Park Service. Some 50,000 acres of virgin stands are protected in California's State parks, but this acreage, unfortunately, is badly scattered. Nowhere is a major block of virgin forest preserved where the entire growing range of the species from sea level to 2,000 feet can be represented.

IDEAL AREA FOR PARK LOCATED

The National Park Service located such an area in 1963. Working with the National Geographic Society, it found the largest remaining concentration of virgin redwood growth to be in northern Humboldt County along what is appropriately known as Redwood Creek. Here just south of Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park it confronted an unbroken panorama of the last large valley of virgin redwoods, and in this valley it discovered the world's tallest trees. On a flat 10 miles upstream from the village of Orick, it found a tree that reached skyward more than 367 feet.

In September of 1964 the National Park Service issued a report in which it framed a number of alternate proposals to designate this superlative area as a Redwood National Park. Though local timber owners have opposed these proposals to purchase their lands, opinion throughout California and the Nation has been overwhelming in its approval of preserving this last remaining area of virgin redwoods as a national park.

THE NEED IS URGENT

While some may believe, Mr. Speaker, that further study is needed to define and detail a proposal for a national park there, I would remind them and the Members of the House that we are dealing in this case with a quickly vanishing resource. The redwoods are not a static commodity which will wait for leisurely consideration by Congress. The lumber companies that own the land are logging it while we are talking about it—and at an ever-quickening rate. Over 1,000 acres of the forest, which the National Park Service proposed only last year to be within the park, have been logged in the last 12 months alone. In the past year, the output of redwood lumber in Humboldt County has jumped 34 percent. The lumber companies apparently feel that one of the ways they can defeat this proposal for a Redwood National Park is to scar the area so badly that it would no longer be desirable. Some experts feel this can be accomplished in 2 to 5 years.

Now that the issue has been raised, it is clear that we are in a race with the loggers for a Redwood National Park, and clearly this will be the last race we shall ever be able to run. For when this last block of virgin forest is logged, there are no others. It is imperative that we wait no longer—that we move now.

THE BILL EXPLAINED

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, the bill I have introduced today would establish a Redwood National Park of 90,000 acres in the area recommended by the National Park Service. This proposal embraces all of the land recommended by the Park Service in their first proposal, plus the drainages of Bridge Creek, Devils Creek, and Skunk Cabbage Creek, as the Sierra Club, one of the outstanding conservation organizations in our country, has recommended. Almost half of the acreage in the proposed park is forested with virgin redwoods. The balance is cutover land in varying stages of second growth that is needed to protect watersheds—and 12 are completely protected in my proposal—to provide development space, and to connect major areas of virgin forest.

Not only will the area I am proposing as a Redwood National Park include the world's tallest trees, it will also include the best surviving example of redwood forest of the slope type on the surrounding hills. And it will also include the largest hill mass completely forested, from top to bottom, with virgin redwood forest. Thus the entire growing range of the redwoods, from sea level to 2,000 feet, will be protected—providing the surest opportunity for perpetuation of the species in a spacious and complete habitat.

Mr. Speaker, the park also will afford splendid opportunities for diversified recreation. The entire coastline from the mouth of the Klamath River to the mouth of Redwood Creek—18 miles—is included within the boundaries I have drawn. This is spectacular shoreline of high, plunging headlands; long, wide beaches; and tawny bluffs backing the beaches. Roosevelt Elk, too, roam these beaches, as well as the prairies inland. There are also 22 miles of river frontage along Redwood Creek, which is suitable for spring float trips. The valley of Redwood Creek provides a sunny sheltered area back from the beach for camping during foggy seasons.

FINANCING

Under my bill, financing for the park would come from two sources. One would be composed exclusively of Federal money derived from the land and water conservation fund and from appropriations from the Treasury. Another would be composed of money from private sources that the Federal Government would match on a 50-50 basis. It is expected that private foundations would contribute substantially to this second fund.

Other provisions in my bill provide protection to owners of land used for residential and resort purposes within the proposed park. If their use of the land conforms to zoning standards for the park, their land would not be subject to condemnation. A five-man board to advise the Secretary of the Interior on administration of the park would also be established, and it would include local residents.

AID TO LOCAL ECONOMY

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that a Redwood National Park would aid the local economy, not impair it as some critics of the park proposal fear. An economic study done for the National Park Service showed that the economy would be stimulated by a new tourist industry within a very few years and that this stimulus would more than offset any losses from curtailed logging. Continued logging, furthermore, can only erode the tax base by removing the high-value, old-growth timber from the rolls, leaving only the low-value bare land to be taxed for the next 40 years or more. A Redwood National Park would provide a new source of revenue to diversify a declining lumber economy, and it would preserve a vanishing resource for the world to use and enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to take this measure under consideration at the earliest possible opportunity. The trees are going too fast for us to move slowly. The sooner hearings can be held and action scheduled, the better is our chance of rescuing this endangered resource from its last peril. We are presented with a golden opportunity, but it will not be available to us for long.

Under unanimous consent, I include the bill to establish a Redwood National Park, which several of our colleagues are joining me in introducing, at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. 11723

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That:

SECTION 1. (a) In order to preserve a significant example of coastal redwood (Sequoia sempervirens) forest in association with streams and seashore for purposes of public inspiration, recreation, and scientific study, the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter referred to as "the Secretary") is authorized to establish an area to be known as the Redwood National Park within that portion of Humboldt and Del Norte Counties, California, which is particularly described in subsection (b).

(b) The area referred to in subsection (a) (hereinafter referred to as "the park") is the area enclosed within the following boundary:

Beginning at the point approximately three-quarters of a mile south of the mouth of the Klamath River which is the Williams Triangulation Point (51; sec. 8, T. 13 N., R. 1 E., unsurveyed);

Thence east one-quarter mile;

Thence due south to the summit of Flint Ridge;

Thence south and southeasterly along the hydrologic divide between Richardson Creek and the ocean to a point one-eighth of a mile north of the portion of Highway 101 which runs northeasterly to the town of Klamath;

Thence northeasterly paralleling said highway at a distance set back from the highway of one-eighth of a mile to a point one-eighth of a mile from the Klamath River;

Thence southeasterly across said highway at right angles to a point one-eighth of a mile on the opposite side of the road;

Thence southwesterly paralleling said highway at a distance set back from the highway of one-eighth of a mile to a point where the highway turns southerly;

Thence southerly paralleling said highway to the east at a distance set back from the highway of one-quarter of a mile to the northern boundary of Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park;

Thence along the eastern boundary of Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park to the southwestern corner of section 33, T. 13 N., R. 1 E. (unsurveyed);

Thence south one-eighth of a mile;

Thence east one-quarter of a mile;

Thence south one-eighth of a mile;

Thence east one-half mile;

Thence south one-quarter of a mile to the boundary of Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park;

Thence southerly along the boundary of said park to a point opposite the head of the East Fork of Brown Creek;

Thence southeasterly paralleling on the east the road, which runs along the divide between Prairie Creek and the Klamath River, but set back from the centerline a distance of 100 yards as measured on the ground surface, to a point where the road leaves the crest of the divide near the head of Surpur Creek;

Thence southeasterly parallelling the divide between Surpur Creek and Lost Man Creek, at a distance 100 yards east of the divide as measured on the ground surface, to a point of juncture with Holter Ridge (which divides Tectah Creek and Lost Man Creek);

Thence southwesterly paralleling the crest of Holter Ridge, at a distance 100 yards east of the ridge as measured on the ground surface, to a point of juncture with the Bald Hills Road;

Thence paralleling the Bald Hills Road, at a distance 100 yards east of the centerline of the road, to the spur road leading to Coyote Peak and beyond (sec. 29, T. 9 N., R. 3 E., unsurveyed);

Thence southerly and later westerly paralleling that road, but set back a distance of 100 yards to the east as measured on the ground surface, out Arbor Camp Ridge to Hooker Triangulation Point (3139);

Thence southwesterly to the north (or east) bank of Redwood Creek;

Thence one mile downstream along the mean high-water line of that bank of Redwood Creek;

Thence one and a quarter miles due west;

Thence southwesterly paralleling the hydrological divide between Devils Creek and Panther Creek, at a distance 100 yards southeast of the divide as measured on the ground surface, to the road along the divide between Redwood Creek and Maple Creek;

Thence northwesterly paralleling the road, which runs near the divide between Redwood Creek and Maple Creek, but along a line 100 yards southwest of the centerline of the road, as measured on the ground surface, to a point at the head of Pitcher Creek;

Thence due north to the summit of Peak 2745 (south of Rodgers Peak);

Thence generally northerly, 100 yards west and southwest as measured on the ground surface of the hydrological divide between the drainages flowing into Redwood Creek and those flowing directly into the ocean, to Stone Triangulation Point (1070; southwest corner of sec. 8, T. 10 N., R. 1 E., unsurveyed);

Thence generally in a northerly direction paralleling the road, running north to Highway 101 from Stone, but 100 yards generally to the west, as measured on the ground surface, for approximately one mile to a point one-half mile south of Highway 101;

Thence east one mile;

Thence northeast one mile;

Thence due north for approximately one mile to a point of junction with Highway 101 where the Bald Hills Road begins;

Thence two and one-quarter miles due west to a point immediately north of Hufford Triangulation Point (415);

Thence south to the summit of Hufford Triangulation Point;

Thence southwesterly to the summit of Orick Triangulation Point;

Thence south to the north bank of Redwood Creek;

Thence southerly and westerly along the mean high-water line of said creek to its mouth;

Thence northerly along the mean low-tide line of the ocean to a point due west of the point of beginning;

Thence due east to the point of beginning.

SEC. 2. (a) As rapidly as funds become available for the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to acquire by purchase, gift, condemnation, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or otherwise, the land, waters, and other property, and improvements thereon and any interests therein, within the area described in subsection (b) of section 1 of this Act: *Provided*, That no property which has been improved and in use for residential purposes or for commercial resort purposes, for at least two years prior to the enactment of this Act, shall be subject to condemnation if the property continues to be so used and conforms to zoning bylaws established by the county in which the property is situated. Zoning bylaws must conform to standards set by the Secretary for this proviso to apply. Such standards shall be designed: (1) To permit only such minor property improvements as are compatible with the purposes of the park; (2) to promote the purposes of the park by establishing acreage limits, frontage and setback requirements, and procedures for public notice of zoning, variance, and exceptions.

(b) No private property within the area described in subsection (b) of section 1 of this Act which is used for residential or resort purposes shall be acquired by condemnation for one year following the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal property located within the area described in subsection (b) of section 1 may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in carrying out the provisions of sections of this Act.

(d) In exercising his authority to acquire property in accordance with the provisions of this section, the Secretary may enter into contracts requiring the expenditure, when appropriated, of funds authorized by the sections of this Act, but the liability of the United States under any such contract shall be contingent on the appropriation of funds sufficient to fulfill the obligations thereby incurred.

(e) When the Secretary determines that lands and water or interests therein have been acquired by the United States in sufficient quantity to provide an administrative unit, he shall declare the establishment of the Redwood National Park by publication of notice in the Federal Register.

(f) The Secretary is also authorized to define and acquire, by purchase, donation, or otherwise, easements on lands within any watersheds tributary to the park for the purpose of regulating land-treatment practices thereon to improve the supply, quality, and reliability of water in the park and to protect the park from flooding, channel erosion, and gravel movement.

(g) Furthermore, the Secretary is authorized to define and acquire, by purchase, donation, or otherwise, scenic easements near or adjacent to the park boundaries and along Highway 101 north from Patricks Point State Park to Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park.

SEC. 3. The administration, protection, and development of the Redwood National Park shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 and the following), entitled "An

Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," as amended and supplemented, and in accordance with laws of general application relating to the National Park System as defined by the Act of August 8, 1953 (67 Stat. 496; 16 U.S.C. 1c): *Provided*, That no tolls nor entry fees shall be levied by the National Park Service for public use of and access to Highway 101 and other through roadways within the area described in subsection (b) of section 1 of this Act, and nothing herein shall affect the concurrent police jurisdiction of the State of California over such roadways.

SEC. 4. A general advisory board to be known as the "Redwood National Park Advisory Board" is established to advise the Secretary of the Interior on any matters relating to the management of the park, including standards for regulations relating to zoning. The Advisory Board shall be composed of five residents of the State of California, two of whom shall be residents of the counties in which the park is situated. The Governor of the State of California shall appoint these two members of the Board, and the Secretary shall appoint the remainder. The Board shall meet not less than twice yearly upon the call of the member designated as Chairman by the Secretary, or additionally upon request of the Secretary.

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, except that no more than $100 million shall be appropriated to pay for the acquisition of land, waters, and improvements thereon and interests therein, and incidental costs relating thereto, by the United States acting alone: *Provided*, That additional sums not to exceed $50 million are authorized to be appropriated as matching funds for the acquisition of land, and interests therein, to the extent of the value of sums or property which non-Federal sources donate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

AMERICAN PROPOSAL IN THE UNITED NATIONS ON ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I note with regret that the United Nations yesterday disapproved by a vote of 82 to 12, an American proposal to write a specific condemnation of anti-semitism into the U.N. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I am not one to praise American diplomatic policy indiscriminately. As a Member of Congress, I feel it is my responsibility to maintain a position of detachment in dealing with the administration. My criticism, I feel, must therefore add weight to my praise. I think you will recognize that my commendation of the U.S. position has been carefully evaluated and is deeply held.

The United States took a courageous stand in seeking to condemn anti-semitism. It is fine to speak in general terms of ending racial injustice, but the terrible tragedy of what occurred in Nazi Germany during our lifetime gives a special poignancy to dealing specifically, as the Catholic Church has recently done, with anti-Semitic hatred. The United States sought to condemn this heinous form of discrimination in no uncertain terms. What the United Nations did in response, is not, of course, to be interpreted as acquiescent in the practice of anti-Semitism. Far from it. But I believe, none the less, that the opponents of the United States proposal, whatever their motives, were mistaken in voting the way they did.

I would like to express my appreciation to the countries that joined the United States to vote in favor of the anti-Semitism amendment. They were Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Israel, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Uruguay.

I fail to understand why Greece, our friend and ally, joined with Communist Hungary to spearhead the opposition to the anti-Semitism amendment. We knew last week that the Communist countries would vote against it in order to acquire some cheap political profit in the Arab countries. I am sorry so many friendly countries chose, for reasons best known to them, to abet the leadership that Moscow provided against the humane American position.

Once again, I commend the Johnson administration, the State Department, and Ambassador Goldberg for their enlightened stand, and I hope that the matter will not here die. I look forward to another day when the United Nations will see this question with clearer vision.

HLINKA SILVER AWARD BESTOWED UPON ABBOT KOJIS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Right Reverend Theodore Kojis, OSB, Abbot of St. Andrew's Benedictine Abbey, in Cleveland, has been named to receive the Hlinka Silver Award for his outstanding work in behalf of the Slovak nation's struggle for religious freedom and self-government. This is a highly prized award. Americans of Slovak descent from Detroit, Chicago, Pittsburgh, and New York will gather in Cleveland on October 23 at a testimonial banquet honoring Abbot Kojis.

This award is named in memory of the great Msgr. Andrew Hlinka, who, at the turn of this century, championed the Slovak cause of freedom and self-government. It was Monsignor Hlinka, who founded the Slovak People's Party and encouraged the Slovaks to strive for national recognition. Slovakia had long been submerged by foreign rule, but the spirit of the nation was preserved by the inspiring work of dedicated men.

Monsignor Hlinka rose to prominence in Europe as a leading advocate of self-government for Slovakia and all the other nations of Central-East Europe. The Wilsonian principle of self-determination provided a powerful stimulant to his work and for the cause of the Slovak people. It was in that spirit that he journeyed to Paris in 1919 with the hope of seeing President Wilson to plead the case of his people.

While Monsignor Hlinka's hopes were not realized, his dedication and determination left an indelible mark on the life of the Slovak nation. The Hlinka Silver Award is a memorial to the Slovak love of freedom and the determination of her people to win full and unfettered recognition as a nation.

Abbot Kojis is a worthy recipient of this prized award. He has devoted a lifetime of work in support of the cause of justice for the Slovak nation. He has been a source of hope and encouragement that the long-delayed freedom and self-government of Slovakia will soon become a reality.

Only five Americans have won this coveted award during the 41 years it has been bestowed upon outstanding leaders. Cleveland is proud of Abbot Kojis and the three other Clevelanders who have won it in past years—Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis Dubosh, John Sabol, and the late Philip Hrobak.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STADIUM—REDSKIN CONTRACT: A DRAIN ON THE TAXPAYERS

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, relative to my duties and responsibilities as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I have for some time been concerned about the serious situation presented by the deficit operation of the District of Columbia Stadium ever since its construction was finished. In the last 2 fiscal years, the stadium has operated at a total cash deficit of more than one and one-quarter million dollars—a cash deficit made up out of the revenues or borrowing of the District of Columbia government. These deficits have been solely in connection with the operation of the stadium and the servicing of the debt without any payments toward retiring that debt.

The District of Columbia's own budgetary difficulties are well known to you and my colleagues in the House and to all thoughtful citizens of this community. The burden which these cash deficits have added to the otherwise desperate situation of the District of Columbia is indeed intolerable. When I first investigated this matter, I was indeed dismayed to learn that during the fall of the year, when so many of our citizens are interested in watching high school, college, and professional football games, the District of Columbia Stadium stands empty on most Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays. I was interested, however, to learn that some attempt—however belated—is being made to bring in more college games which will increase the stadium's revenues somewhat.

But the fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that the greatest potential source of revenue for the stadium in the fall months is from professional football. However, ever since it was opened, the stadium has been used for only seven regularly scheduled professional football games plus one exhibition game in each year.

Why is this, Mr. Speaker? It may be difficult to believe, but this situation results from the fact that the District of Columbia Armory Board—a public body which now includes Walter N. Tobriner, president of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners—entered into a contract with the owners of the Washington Redskins professional team which provided that the Redskins, and the Redskins alone, have the right to play professional football in the District of Columbia Stadium.

When this was called to my attention, I addressed a letter to Mr. Walter N. Tobriner on August 25, 1965. I noted that the present contractual arrangements present an intolerable situation which must be remedied and I asked Mr. Tobriner to advise me as to the steps which the Armory Board intended to take to eliminate the grant of exclusive professional football rights to the Redskins.

Mr. Tobriner's response to me indicated a timid and hesitant reluctance to face the matter. Despite the serious financial burdens facing the Board of Commissioners and the taxpayers, he said that the Armory Board had been advised that the exclusive provisions in the contract were "prima facie valid" and accordingly without the consent of the Redskins the Board was in no position to lease the stadium to another football team without seriously risking a breach of its agreement and substantial damages. His sole suggestion for solving the matter was for representatives of another professional football team to negotiate separately with the Redskins in an effort to have them voluntarily waive this restriction.

Since my letter to Mr. Tobriner, Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor of the Department of Interior has written to the Secretary of the Department of Interior an opinion in which he has stated that this restrictive covenant "violates the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act." It thus appears that the Armory Board is, in effect, aiding and abetting a violation of the laws of this country by the Redskins in maintaining this exclusive franchise. In the face of this ruling, I cannot believe that the District of Columbia Armory Board can continue to drag its heels in this matter.

It has been reported in the papers that that Armory Board has now retained special counsel to review the legality of the Redskins' contract. I sincerely hope that this is not merely another attempt by the Board to avoid taking necessary action here. Regardless of the opinion of this private counsel, there is no question that, in the face of the finding by a high Government attorney, the Board should take every step to repudiate this exclusive provision. I have today written Mr. Tobriner another letter, pointing out my hope, which all persons concerned with the District of Columbia government and this matter must share, that the Armory Board will correct this inequitable and illegal situation as soon as possible and eliminate the Redskins' monopoly on professional football in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia Stadium was built in the interests of the taxpayers—not the Washington Redskins. Under the exclusive Redskin covenant, the taxpayers are carrying a much larger share of the burden of paying off the stadium debt than is morally or legally justified. The hapless taxpayers are subsidizing—at tremendous expense—an exclusive franchise for one privately owned, profitmaking enterprise—the Washington Redskins.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Record I shall include my correspondence with Commissioner Tobriner, a copy of the opinion rendered by the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior relative to the stadium contract, and a brief history of the stadium funding arrangements:

August 24, 1965.

Hon. Walter N. Tobriner,
Commissioner, District of Columbia,
District Building, Room 504,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Commissioner: I am writing this letter to you in your capacity as a member of the District of Columbia Armory Board which is responsible for operation of the District of Columbia Stadium, to inquire about what steps, if any, the Board intends to take to revise the stadium's present lease with the Washington Redskins. Under this lease, that team has been granted the exclusive right to play professional football in the stadium for a 30-year period.

This inquiry is prompted by serious concern, which is shared by many others, over the drastic financial plight of the stadium. As you know, in fiscal year 1963, the net deficit before depreciation in the operation of the stadium amounted to $601,000. This loss increased in 1964 to $665,000. In both of these years, the District of Columbia government and ultimately its taxpayers have been required to make up these deficits to avoid default on the interest due on the stadium bonds. The matter is likely to become even more serious in the future. Beginning in 1970, the stadium bonds themselves will begin to mature, and unless future operations are more successful, the District of Columbia will be required to appropriate even larger sums to pay off these bonds.

In view of the District of Columbia's own budgetary difficulties, I am sure that you will agree with me that this is an intolerable burden on the District of Columbia government and its taxpayers, diverting sums sorely needed for far more important purposes such as education, welfare, and the provision of additional police in the District. It is clear that every effort should be made to put the stadium on a sound fiscal basis and to eliminate the serious drain on the District government.

In this connection, I believe that the Board should give the highest priority to taking whatever steps are necessary to revise its present lease agreement with the Washington Redskins. As noted, under this lease that team has been vested by the Board with exclusive rights to use the stadium for professional football games over an extended period of 30 years. However, on an annual basis, the Redskins' use of the stadium has been limited to seven regular games and one exhibition game. The stadium has thus remained empty over many weekends during the fall, contributing further to the enormous stadium deficits.

Professional football has grown continually in spectator interest and indeed is now regarded as America's most popular spectator sport. It is plain that, with the elimination of the restrictions imposed by the lease with the Redskins, the stadium could be used by one or more additional professional football teams, which would help immeasurably in solving the serious financial plight confronting the stadium. This would also provide more enjoyment of the stadium by the residents of the District of Columbia and surrounding areas for whom, in the final analysis, this facility was built. This is clearly to be preferred over the present arrangement under which the District of Columbia government and its taxpayers are subsidizing at great expense an exclusive franchise for one privately owned, profitmaking enterprise.

One might view with some skepticism a recently reported reversal of policy on the part of the present Redskin management whereby they will now permit the scheduling of college games—heretofore precluded by their insistence on their contractual rights. At first glance, this change of heart would seem very generous but it might be suggested that this reversal is designed to preclude competition from another professional football franchise in Washington where only one stadium is available and where the awarding of a franchise will undoubtedly hinge on stadium availability.

Most college games are of provincial interest and unless they are of national-interest caliber such as Army-Navy, they cannot hope to generate the impressive gate revenues which professional teams can and do.

I sincerely hope that you agree with me that the present arrangement presents an intolerable situation which must be remedied. I would accordingly appreciate it if you would advise me as to the steps which the Armory Board intends to take to eliminate the grant of exclusive professional football rights to the Redskins.

Very truly yours,
William H. Harsha,
Member of Congress.

Government of the District of Columbia, Executive Office.
September 20, 1965.

Hon. William Harsha,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Harsha: With reference to your letter of August 24, 1965, concerning use of the District of Columbia Stadium by professional football, I advise you that the matter of the exclusive rights of the Washington Redskins at the stadium was considered by the Armory Board at its meeting on September 15, 1965. As you may be aware, the Armory Board received a proposal from a local syndicate, represented by one Norman F. Hecht, for use of the stadium by a football team which Mr. Hecht's syndicate expects to operate under a franchise to be obtained from the American Football League.

The Armory Board has been advised that the clause in its lease with the Washington Redskins which grants the Redskins exclusive rights for exhibiting professional football at the stadium is prima facie valid and that, without the consent of the Redskins, it is in no position to lease the stadium to another professional football team without serious risk of breaching its lease agreement with the Redskins and incurring liability for substantial damages.

The Board is, of course, very desirous of improving its financial situation at the stadium and would be most happy to enter into an arrangement which would achieve such a result. Accordingly, the Board advised Mr. Hecht that he should explore the possibilities with the Redskins and offered to meet with them at any time to discuss the matter.

I appreciate your interest in the District of Columbia and in the financial condition of the stadium and hope that an arrangement can be worked out to the satisfaction of all concerned.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia.

OCTOBER 20, 1965.

Hon. WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TOBRINER: You will recall that I wrote you on August 24, 1965, concerning the provisions in the lease which the District of Columbia Armory Board had entered into with the Redskins under which any other professional team is precluded from using the District of Columbia Stadium for a period of 30 years. As I pointed out in that letter, this exclusive provision clearly added an intolerable burden on the District of Columbia and its taxpayers, and every step should be taken to eliminate it. By letter of September 20, 1965 you replied, indicating that the Board would take no action because it had been advised that the lease was "prima facie valid."

Since this letter, as you are aware, the Solicitor of the Department of Interior expressly ruled on October 4, 1965, that this exclusive franchise provision violated the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act. It has been further reported in the press that the Armory Board has now retained outside counsel to consider the legality of this provision. Clearly, it can no longer be said that the provision is "prima facie valid." On the contrary, if the Department of Interior position is correct, then the Armory Board is in the indefensible position of aiding and abetting a violation of the Federal laws. All interested persons hope that retention of outside counsel by the Board is not merely an attempt to avoid discharging its obligation to the public. It seems clear to me that, regardless of the private counsel's opinion, the public interest requires that the Board initiate every necessary step to cancel this provision, particularly in view of the ruling of illegality by a high Government attorney.

I would appreciate it if you would keep me advised of the action which the Board takes in this matter.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM H. HARSHA,
Representative to Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, D.C.

MEMORANDUM

To: Secretary of the Interior.
From: Solicitor.
Subject: Legality of the restrictive covenant in the Redskins lease on the District of Columbia Stadium.

I. STATEMENT OF FACTS

A. The current status of the District of Columbia Stadium lease

On December 24, 1959, the District of Columbia Armory Board entered into a lease agreement with Pro-Football, Inc. (the Washington Redskins) whereby the Redskins received a lease for the years 1961 through 1990 on the District of Columbia Stadium. The lease provides, at paragraph 2(e), the following:

> The lessor shall have the right to lease or otherwise permit the use and occupancy of the stadium during any period exclusive of such specific dates referred to herein for any purpose or purposes (except as provided in subsec. (a) of this par. IX), including (but not limited to) school, college or other amateur or professional baseball, football, and basketball games and, also, for such other use or purpose as the lessor may determine, provided that at no time during the term of this lease agreement shall the stadium be let or rented to any professional football team other than the Washington Redskins.

We have recently been advised that at least one group of local businessmen is interested in obtaining use of the District of Columbia Stadium for an American League football team at times when it is not used by the Redskins. The AFL has presently not issued a franchise for a Washington team.

The District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957, as amended,[1] authorizing construction of the stadium, directs the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property and then "enter into a contract with the [District of Columbia Armory] Board for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the stadium * * *."[2] The term of such a contract is not to exceed 30 years. In addition, after a period of not more than 50 years, during which stadium indebtedness is to be eliminated, "all right, title, and interest in and to the stadium constructed under this act shall vest in the United States."[3] The land is presently owned by the Government as part of its national park system.[4]

It is significant to note that both these provisions arise from the 1958 amendment. Under the act as originally passed the Secretary relinquished all right and interest in the stadium land to the Armory Board when construction was completed, and all interest in the stadium itself eventually reverted to the District of Columbia. In addition, the act was amended to qualify all the powers exercised by the Board by making them subject to the contract with the Secretary. Therefore, in passing the 1958 amendments, Congress specifically intended the Secretary to maintain substantial interest in the stadium.

On December 12, 1958, the Director of the National Park Service, acting pursuant to the act as amended and on behalf of the Secretary, entered into a 30-year contract with the District of Columbia Armory Board for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the stadium.[5] The terms of the contract set forth this basis for the contract requirement in the 1958 amendment:

"Whereas it is the intention of the parties that any acts, policies, or decisions of the Secretary under this contract will be consistent with reasonable protection to the Board against loss of its investment and against substantial increase in costs, hazards, and difficulties of its operations hereunder:"

It is significant for present considerations that the Secretary is authorized to take actions designed to protect the Board financially. This intent to provide financial protection for the Board is reflected in a further 1958 statutory amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to make periodic loans when necessary to facilitate stadium financing.[6] Since its opening the stadium has been operating at a loss, such loss being borne both by District of Columbia taxpayers and taxpayers of the United States.[7]

Several provisions in the Secretary's contract with the Armory Board recognize his continuing jurisdiction over the stadium. Section 2(b) of the contract permits the Secretary to request use of the stadium, at cost to the Board, for civic, recreational, and charitable purposes when it is not being used for commercial purposes. Section 3 requires the Secretary to provide parking areas, and provide and maintain landscaping and incidental roadways. Section 4(b) requires Secretarial approval of the construction of the stadium and other buildings constructed on the stadium property. Under section 6 the Board is required to furnish an annual financial statement to the Secretary. The Board is to pay $100 consideration annually to the Secretary. Finally, in all insurance required to be carried by the Board, the Secretary is to be named as coinsured.

This contract is still in effect and binding on the parties. By the act of 1957 as amended, Congress has authorized the Secretary to represent the United States in the construction, maintenance, and operation of the stadium. By entering into a contract with the Armory Board, the Secretary did not relinquish the interest or obligations placed upon him by Congress. Therefore, the Secretary has continuing interest, both as contracting party and congressional delegate, in the operation of the stadium and may take such actions to insure its proper development as are not inconsistent with the contract or the authorizing legislation.

B. The availability of stadiums in the District of Columbia area for professional football games

1. District of Columbia Stadium

District of Columbia Stadium is a modern, well equipped facility designed for professional sports events. It has a seating capacity of about 50,000 and an ample parking capacity. It is located near the core of the metropolitan area, easily accessible by private automobile and public buses from all parts of the metropolitan area. It has ample facilities for equipment storage and dressing rooms for home and visiting teams. There is a massive scoreboard to report the progress of other league games. Beer may be and is sold at concessions counters.

2. University of Maryland Stadium, College Park, Md.

University of Maryland Stadium seats 43,000 and has adequate parking facilities. The president of the university has publicly announced that the stadium is not available for professional games. Traffic access is somewhat less desirable than at District of Columbia Stadium. Because the stadium is within the premises of and controlled by a university, there would be restrictions on use of the field for practice by home and visiting teams. Beer could not be sold on the premises. University of Maryland Stadium therefore is neither an available nor a reasonably feasible facility for professional football games.

3. George Washington High School Stadium, Alexandria, Va.

George Washington Stadium seats 14,950 and has parking facilities for a commensurate attendance. At substantial expense stadium capacity could be increased to 25,000, and additional parking space built. There is no present assurance, however, that the city of Alexandria would permit use of the stadium or its expansion. Even if expanded to 25,000 seats, however, the capacity would be inadequate for popular games. The stadium is used by several school teams, thus severely restricting availability for home and visiting team practice schedules. There are no adequate facilities for home and visiting team equipment storage. The stadium is located on a congested stretch of U.S. Highway No. 1 south of the District of Columbia. Severe traffic jams could be expected from sizable crowds. Beer could not be sold on the premises.

George Washington Stadium therefore is not a reasonable alternative site for professional games even if available, and its availability is at present questionable.

---

[1] 71 Stat. 619, as amended, 72 Stat. 421 (1958).

[2] Ibid., sec. 3.

[3] Ibid., sec. 7.

[4] H. Rept. 2145, 85th Cong., 2d sess. (1958), p. 7.

[5] Contract No. 14–10–0100–1030.

[6] 72 Stat. 421, sec. (14).

[7] Hearings before Subcommittee of House Committee on Appropriations, 89th Cong., 1st sess., Feb. 13, 1965, p. 735.

C. Local competition for professional game spectators

The Redskins are currently the only professional football team based in the Washington Metropolitan area. The nearest team is the Baltimore Colts. Most of the residents of the District of Columbia area are not spectators or potential spectators for Baltimore games, primarily because of the distance involved. A sample survey of the addresses of the Redskins 40,000 season ticket holders would almost certainly confirm this conclusion. Neither the Redskins nor the Colts solicit, in any significant way, season or individual ticket patronage in the other city by advertisements in local news media. When the Redskins play at Baltimore, the Washington telecast is not blacked out, and Baltimore receives telecasts of their games at District of Columbia. All home games of each team, however, are blacked out in their home areas.

II. THE APPLICABLE LAW

A. The restrictive covenant violates the Sherman Act and the FTC Act

Professional football is in interstate commerce and is subject to the jurisdiction of the Sherman Act. *Radovich* v. *National Football League*, 352 U.S. 445 (1957).

Section 1 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. sec. 1) declares unlawful all contracts, combinations or conspiracies which unreasonably restrain interstate commerce. Section 3 of the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. sec. 3) contains the same prohibitions, but with respect to commerce within the District of Columbia and the territories.

Prohibited restraints include exclusive dealing contracts which substantially lessen competition. The restrictive covenant in the Redskins lease is such a contract. The landlord has agreed to make the facility available, for professional football purposes, exclusively to the Redskins.

The effect of the covenant is to foreclose all competitors to exhibiting professional games in the Washington market. Exclusive agreements foreclosing much less than all the available facilities have been held to violate the antitrust laws. The controlling case is *FTC* v. *Motion Picture Advertising Service*, 344 U.S. 392 (1944). In that case the Federal Trade Commission challenged contracts whereby distributors of advertising motion pictures contracted with theater owners for the display of these films, and required in such contracts that the theater owners not display advertising films furnished by others. One of the respondents had contracts with 40 percent of the theaters in the area in which it operated. The three other respondents had similar exclusive dealing arrangements with other theaters. All four respondents together accounted for 75 percent of the theaters using advertising films in the United States. The Commission found these agreements to be unfair methods of competition in violation of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. The Supreme Court upheld the Commission on this basis:

"The number of outlets for the films is quite limited. And due to the exclusive contracts, respondent and the three other major companies have foreclosed to competitors 75 percent of all available outlets for this business throughout the United States. It is, we think, plain from the Commission's findings that a device which has sewed up a market so tightly for the benefit of a few falls within the prohibitions of the Sherman Act and is therefore an "unfair method of competition" within the meaning of sec. 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act."

It should be noted that while in the MPAS case the FTC charged the exclusive agreements were violations of section 5 of the Federal Trade Act, the Supreme Court held that they violated section 5 because they violated the Sherman Act.

Also noteworthy is the fact that the total foreclosure of facilities by four firms was 75 percent, whereas the Redskins have alone foreclosed 100 percent of the available facilities in the market. The Redskins covenant is therefore an a fortiori violation of the Sherman and FTC Acts, and the principle of MPAS.

The leading monopolization case, *United States* v. *Aluminum Co. of America*, 148 F. 2d 416 (C.A. 2, 1945), holds that a firm with dominant or monopoly position in a market monopolizes unlawfully if it acts to maintain or enhance its market position. The particular act involved need not be a predatory one, or one which otherwise would be unlawful. Thus Alcoa, a monopolist found to have monopolized in violation of the Sherman Act, simply expanded its capacity from time to time to meet anticipated increases in the demand for its aluminum products.

The Redskins are, by virtue of being the only professional football team in the District of Columbia metropolitan market, a monopolist. The act of excluding all competitors from the market conclusively demonstrates that it is using its position to maintain its monopoly position, and is therefore prohibited by section 2 of the Sherman Act.

B. The participation of the Armory Board in the lease does not exempt the Redskins action from antitrust coverage

Exemptions to the antitrust laws may be given only by statutory authority, and implied exemptions are disfavored. The rule was cogently stated in *United States* v. *Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.*, 310 U.S. 150, 225–227 (1940), a case where defendants sought to justify price fixing on gasoline by claims that their conduct had been acquiesced in by officers of the Department of the Interior. Justice Douglas rebuffed that argument in these words:

"As to knowledge or acquiescence of officers of the Federal Government little need be said. The fact that Congress through utilization of the precise methods here employed could seek to reach the same objectives sought by respondents does not mean that respondents or any other group may do so without specific congressional authority. Admittedly no approval of the buying programs was obtained under the National Industrial Recovery Act prior to its termination on June 16, 1935 (sec. 2(c)), which would give immunity to respondents from prosecution under the Sherman Act. Though employees of the Government may have known of those programs and winked at them or tacitly approved them, no immunity would have thereby been obtained. For Congress had specified the precise manner and method of securing immunity. None other would suffice. Otherwise national policy on such grave and important issues as this would be determined not by Congress nor by those to whom Congress had delegated authority but by virtual volunteers. The method adopted by Congress for alleviating the penalties of the Sherman Act through approval by designated public representatives would be supplanted by a foreign system." (At pp. 225–227.)

The statutes relating to the Armory Board contain no provisions which expressly or impliedly authorize it to grant Sherman Act immunity.

The Supreme Court has also held, under the so-called lawful act doctrine, that private persons cannot use even a lawfully granted privilege for trade restraining objectives. The most recent statement of the rule was made by Justice White for a unanimous court in *Continental Ore Co.* v. *Union Carbide Corp.*, 370 U.S. 690 (1962). In that case the Canadian subsidiary of one defendant (Electro Met of Canada) had been granted an exclusive purchasing agency for vanadium by the Canadian Government during World War II. The defendant had allegedly used this privilege in a course of conduct designed to force the plaintiff out of business. The Court stated:

"Respondents are afforded no defense from the fact that Electro Met of Canada, in carrying out the bare act of purchasing vanadium from respondents rather than Continental, was acting in a manner permitted by Canadian law. There is nothing to indicate that such law in any way compelled discriminatory purchasing, and it is well settled that acts which are in themselves legal, lose that character when they become constituent elements of an unlawful scheme."

Similarly, the FCC grant of a broadcasting license to NBC was held no defense to a Sherman Act charge that NBC obtained the license as a part of a conspiracy between NBC and RCA to monopolize certain broadcasting markets. *United States* v. *Radio Corp. of America*, 358 U.S. 334 (1959).

These cases illustrate particular applications of the consistently recognized rule that persons dealing with an agent of the Government are charged with notice of the limitation on his authority and that the Government is bound only on the acts of agent which are within his authority. *Farm Security Admin.* v. *Herren*, 165 F. 2d 554, 564, (C.A. 1948), *cert. denied*, 333 U.S. 875 (1948). As the Supreme Court stated in *Federal Crop Ins. Corp.* v. *Merrill*, 332 U.S. 380, 384 (1947): "Whatever the form in which the Government functions, anyone entering into an arrangement with the Government takes the risk of having accurately ascertained that he who purports to act for the Government stays within the bounds of his authority."

Thus, an inherently invalid agreement acquires no cloak of legality merely because it was entered into by a public official or acquiesced in for a long period of time. Where the property or interest of the United States is at stake, the doctrine of estoppel does not operate.[8] If the United States is not bound by the action or inaction of its own employees, a fortiori it is much less accountable for the actions of officials of other governmental units which exceed the law and which prejudice the interests of the United States.

In sum, the participation of the Armory Board in the lease conferred no antitrust immunity on the Redskins and in no way precludes termination of the exclusive provision in the lease.

THE REMEDIES

Section 5 of the FTC Act is enforced by FTC cease and desist orders. A Sherman Act violation is a misdemeanor punishable by a maximum jail term of 1 year and a maximum fine of $50,000. The Attorney General may also bring equity suits to enjoin Sherman Act violations, whether or not criminal proceedings have been instituted.

Early in the history of the Sherman Act the Supreme Court ruled that courts would not enforce an agreement which violated the act. *E. Bement & Sons* v. *National Harrow Co.*, 186 U.S. 70, 88 (1902). Thus the restrictive covenant in the District of Columbia lease would not be enforceable in the courts. It should be noted, however, that this does not give the Armory Board the option to disregard its other obligations under the lease. The courts look with great disfavor on attempts to evade lawful agreements which are severable from unlawful ones. The courts will go no further than "the point where the judgment of the court would itself be enforcing the precise conduct made unlawful by the act * * *" *Kelly* v. *Kosuga*, 358 U.S. 516, 521 (1959).

Moreover, since the Redskins may claim the covenant was the sine qua non of this signing the lease, they, and not the Armory Board, would have the option not to continue under its other terms.

---

[8] *United States* v. *California*, 332 U.S. 19, 39–40 (1947); *Utah Power & Light Co.* v. *United States*, 243, U.S. 389, 408–409 (1917).

CONCLUSIONS

1. The restrictive covenant is a contract in unreasonable restraint of trade in violation 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

2. The restrictive covenant is an act of monopolization in violation of section 2 of the Sherman Act.

3. The restrictive covenant is an unfair method of competition in violation of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

4. The restrictive covenant is unenforceable, and not binding upon the Armory Board.

5. Adherence to the covenant by the Armory Board by refusal to consider other lease offers which would not impinge on the Redskins' use of the stadium could cause considerable losses to the Treasury over a period of nearly 30 years.

6. Adherence to the covenant will allow the use of a public facility to perpetuate a private monopoly.

I should add that at a conference on October 1, 1965, members of my staff showed the above memorandum to Donald F. Turner, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice. Mr. Turner stated that he had no objection to the conclusions set forth in the memorandum.

FRANK J. BARRY, *Solicitor.*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STADIUM FUND

1. The original debt is $19,800,000. Negotiable bonds were issued in this amount as the "4.2-percent stadium bonds of 1970–79" to cover the following estimated costs:

Preliminary engineering and economic surveys	$27,500.00
Construction of the stadium:	
Basic contract cost	14,247,187.50
Other estimated costs	1,319,812.50
Construction contingencies	600,000.00
Total	16,167,000.00
Miscellaneous equipment and furnishings	101,500.00
Engineering and administration costs	570,000.00
Operation and maintenance costs for 1 year after construction	485,000.00
Bond interest payable prior to 1 year after construction	2,292,000.00
Other items and contingencies	157,000.00
Total	19,800,000.00

2. No amounts have been paid on the balance. In addition, to date, no funds have been available for deposit in the sinking fund for redemption of the outstanding bonds.

3. The following table indicates the interest payments to bondholders:

Source of funding	Payment	Date paid	Amount
Stadium fund	1	Dec. 1, 1960	$415,800
Do	2	June 1, 1961	415,800
Do	3	Dec. 1, 1961	415,800
District of Columbia borrowing	4	June 1, 1962	415,800
Stadium fund	5	Dec. 1, 1962	415,800
District of Columbia borrowing	6	June 1, 1963	415,800
District of Columbia borrowing ($240,000); stadium fund ($175,800)	7	Dec. 1, 1963	415,800
District of Columbia borrowing	8	June 1, 1964	415,800
Do	9	Dec. 1, 1964	415,800
Do	10	June 1, 1965	415,800

4. The following schedule indicates the funds which the District of Columbia Commissioners have been required to borrow from the U.S. Treasury:

Loans from Treasury

Date	Rate of interest	Amount
June 1, 1962	3	$415,800
May 31, 1963	3⅛	415,800
Dec. 1, 1963	3⅝	240,000
May 28, 1964	3⅞	415,800
Dec. 1, 1964	3⅞	415,800
June 1, 1965	4	415,800
Borrowed to date		2,319,000

Repayment to Treasury

Date	Principal	Interest	Total
Dec. 31, 1963	$415,800	$19,736	$435,536
Do	415,800	7,630	423,430
Aug. 13, 1964	240,000	5,111	245,111
Do	415,800	1,501	417,301
Repaid to date	1,487,400	33,978	1,521,378

5. Funds to repay these loans are included in the 1966 estimates as follows:[1]

Date of repayment,	July 1, 1965
Principal	$831,600
Estimated interest	10,900
Total	842,500

[1] These loans were repaid on July 1, 1965 as follows:

Principal	$831,600
Interest	10,769
Total	842,369

DEDICATION OF COLUMBUS STATUE IN STATE CAPITOL

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, on Columbus Day, October 12, 1965, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller unveiled a white marble bust of Christopher Columbus in the State capitol in Albany, N.Y.

This was a particularly historic occasion because it represents the first time that any State legislature authorized a bust of Columbus to be placed in its State capitol.

I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time the dedication remarks of Governor Rockefeller, and of Senator Joseph Marine and Assemblyman Anthony Gioffre, the cosponsors of the bill which provided for the purchase and placement of the bust in the State capitol:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT DEDICATION OF BUST OF CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS, STATE STREET LOBBY, STATE CAPITOL, ALBANY, N.Y., OCTOBER 12, 1965

In this place which has known much history, it is highly appropriate that we should today unveil this magnificent tribute to Christopher Columbus by the people of the State of New York.

I congratulate the sculptor, Ferrucci Vezzoni, on the masterpiece he has created, and I extend the thanks of 18 million New Yorkers.

It is appropriate indeed that the distinguished representatives of both Italy and Spain should join in this ceremony as their countries joined centuries ago in giving Columbus to the world and making his voyage possible.

This ceremony results from legislation introduced by State Senator Joseph A. Marine and Assemblyman Anthony B. Gioffre, and guided through the Assembly by Speaker Anthony Travia.

It is fitting that our secretary of state, John P. Lomenzo, should be in charge of this ceremony.

It is appropriate, also, that this representation of the great explorer should face in the direction of the south mall, for it looks upon a scene on which the people of New York State are making a voyage of discovery of their own.

I refer to the discovery that government buildings can also be graceful and inspiring;

That there need be no conflict between the beautiful and the utilitarian in government architecture;

That there is nothing in the laws of nature or the nature of man to require that a State which is big and vital and productive must also be guilty of the mundane, the graceless, the ugly.

Like Columbus, who explored a new world in the geographical sense, we plan here to explore a new world of beauty and refreshment of the human soul.

I therefore unveil this remembrance of a great past event in a spirit of dedication to a great future, a future in which we build upon a great heritage to enrich the cultural and spiritual lives of all.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY ASSEMBLYMAN ANTHONY B. GIOFFRE

I was happy to have been invited to Albany today to participate in the unveiling ceremonies of the bust of Christopher Columbus.

Senator Marine and I were cosponsors of the bill which provided for the purchase and placement of the bust in the State capitol. This bill was introduced at the request of John F. Nave, State legislative chairman of the Order Sons of Italy in America. I am particularly gratified to see that he together with Salvatore H. Migliaccio, grand venerable of the Grand Lodge of the State of New York, together with many other members of the Order are present at these ceremonies.

It is particularly gratifying to note that recognition has been finally given in our State capitol to the memory of a great man, Christopher Columbus, the discoverer of this great country of ours. Hundreds of thousands of our residents, consisting of adults and children visit our State capitol annually and will now for the first time be able to view a bust of Columbus in the entrance to the capitol.

Columbus Day is now a State holiday in most of our States, including the State of New York. Although efforts have been made to make it a national holiday, Congress has failed to do so. It is my intention to introduce a resolution during the 1966 legislative session memorializing Congress to make Columbus Day a national holiday.

Let us hope that within the very near future recognition will be given by Congress making Columbus Day a national holiday.

REMARKS OF SENATOR JOSEPH E. MARINE

His Excellency, Governor Rockefeller, Hon. John P. Lomenzo (secretary of state), Assemblyman Anthony B. Gioffre, Gen. Cortlandt V. R. Schuyler, Commissioner of General Services Salvatore Migliaccio, grand venerable, State of New York, Order Sons of Italy in America, John Nave, legislative chairman, Grand Council Columbian Association (Lt. Mario Biaggi), representatives and members of organizations who have come here from all over the State to witness the unveiling of the bust of Christopher Columbus and pay homage to a great man.

In making possible this appropriate exercise of respect, the legislature and our Governor recognize that no more significant event is commemorated by Americans than the discovery of this land of ours, and the very beginning of American history.

Actually, Columbus was publicly honored in this country for the first time back at the start of the American Revolution, when one of our earliest warships was named after him.

This first monument to his memory was erected in 1792, in Baltimore, on the 300th anniversary of his departure from Palos, Spain. Today, in hundreds of cities, towns, and villages throughout the land, we find evidence in one form or another of the deep and abiding respect a grateful nation has for the vision, determination, and courage of the great navigator.. It is only fitting and proper that here in Albany, the capital of the Empire State of New York, there be placed a memorial to Christopher Columbus.

The idea of Albany as the site came from the Grand Lodge of the State of New York, Order Sons of Italy, through its Grand Venerable Salvatore Migliaccio and submitted by its energetic legislative chairman, John Nave, actively supported by the Grand Council of Columbian Associations in Civil Service under the leadership of Lt. Mario Biaggi, president, and Italo-American organizations throughout the State.

Like Columbus in doggedness and determination, Mr. Nave would not be denied in this lofty objective. Both as a member of the order and as a legislator, I was honored and privileged in being asked, along with my colleague Assemblyman Gioffre, to shepherd the proposal through the legislature.

Unlike Columbus, once we got it out of the senate committee on finance and the assembly ways and means committee, we had clear and smooth sailing by a unanimous vote in both houses and onto the shoreline of Governor Rockefeller's office where it received a gracious welcome and a firm signature into law.

Every schoolchild can give an acceptable version of the courageous vision that Christopher Columbus finally translated into fact on October 12, 1492, when a sailor aboard the caravel *Nina* announced the appearance of what turned out to be the New World.

To me, as to many others, this bust which is soon to be unveiled will be symbolic of the determination and courage which Christopher Columbus possessed; of his refusal to be deflected from his high purpose; of his conviction that man could sail aroun.. the world and not off its edge into empty space; of his tenacity against great odds and in the face of scorn, ridicule, and frustration.

The bust will symbolize the old glories and the new grandeurs. We whose roots branch out from Italian soil are justly proud of our heritage, and of becoming flourishing transplants in this America that Christopher Columbus discovered. The greatness of America is a tribute to those immigrants from Italy—and from all other foreign countries—who had the courage, strength, and vision to face the dangers and hardships of adapting themselves to new and strange surroundings, and making the most of their opportunities; from the earliest days of settlement on up through the pioneering and fighting years of American history to the challenge of the present.

The bust symbolizes the growth of the little Italian acorn into a mighty American oak. In New York State alone there are over 3 million Americans of Italian origin, descendents of and present-day participants in the fabric of our Nation's glorious history, ready to penetrate new darkness, to brave new courses on uncharted seas, all for the love of our country and fellow man.

Let us rededicate ourselves to honor Christopher Columbus in deed as well as in ceremony.

Thank you.

DIAL DU 6-5550 FOR THE DEMISE OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us are familiar with the film, "Dial M for Murder." Well, the Maritime Administrator, Mr. Nicholas Johnson, has come up with his own version of that production: "Dial DU 6-5550 for the Demise of the American Merchant Marine." Yesterday, one only had to dial DU 6-5550 to hear the dulcet tones of the Maritime Administrator on a recording extolling the virtues of the controversial Interagency Maritime Task Force report. In this recording, the Maritime Administrator took particular pains to point out that the only dissenting member of the task force was the Secretary of Labor. According to an article appearing in today's issue of the New York Times by Mr. George Horne, the Secretary of Labor protested and, about noon, the Maritime Administrator made a new recording leaving out the reference to the dissent of the Secretary of Labor. But, more importantly, what the Maritime Administrator meticulously failed to mention in the recording was the action of the Maritime Advisory Committee on the task force report. This committee, appointed by the President, is composed of knowledgeable members of both industry and labor. Upon receiving the task force report, the Maritime Advisory Committee unanimously voted not to accept the report. And among those so voting, I understand, were American owners of foreign-flag ships. Certainly there could be no more damning condemnation of the task force report.

The singular success of the task force report, if there be any, was to unite an otherwise divided industry. For this result, I must in all honesty congratulate the Maritime Administrator.

Now, I understand that the Maritime Administration has disclaimed that this recording was made for public dissemination. Rather, the agency disclaimer states that it was solely for use by agency employees. I do not pass judgment on this. But, it does seem to be inconceivable that a person of the reputed intelligence of the Maritime Administrator could be so naive as to think that the recording would not come to the attention of the public. Therefore, I can only conclude that this was an attempt by the Maritime Administrator to sell a controversial program largely authored by himself. Coming as this does on the eve of adjournment, I am particularly disturbed since it implies that the Maritime Administrator contemplates taking advantage of the adjournment. The time is long overdue when the fate of our merchant marine should be taken from the public forum and placed before appropriate congressional committees. The American merchant marine is too vital an asset of this Nation to be used as a ploy by the unexperienced and the uninformed.

If there be any question in anyone's mind concerning the ineptness of our Maritime Administration, I recommend that they read an article which appeared in the Baltimore Sun on October 18, 1965, entitled, "Around the Waterfront: Foreign Ships Seem Winners." This same article appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 19, 1965, having been inserted by the Honorable EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Democrat, of Maryland. Written by Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor for the Sun, and probably one of the most knowledgeable writers in the maritime field, the article is concerned with the favored treatment being accorded foreign-flag ships to the detriment of the American merchant marine. It is a provocative article. It is worthy of being read by all who are interested in the well-being of the American merchant marine and its ability to respond to the demands of our commerce and our defense.

True, Vietnam has not reached the magnitude of the Korean conflict. Yet, to meet our commitments there we have been required to augment modern merchant vessels furnished by subsidized American-flag operators with older ships broken out from our national defense reserve fleet and foreign-flag ships. In several instances, these foreign-flag ships have refused to transport cargoes bound for Vietnam. This in itself should have been a sufficient indictment of our misplaced reliance on foreign-flag ships, attesting to the need for a strong American merchant marine. But, adding insult to injury, we now have the Maritime Administration granting permission to American-flag subsidized operators to charter foreign-flag ships for service on subsidized commercial trade routes. American-flag operators have been forced into this position because of the number of their ships committed to Vietnam movements and the nonavailability of American-flag tonnage to replace these ships. To me this is appalling. I can only conclude that our merchant marine has been allowed to degenerate to such an extent that not only must we look to foreign-flag ships to carry some of our defense cargoes in a limited war such as Vietnam, but that we must also rely upon foreign-flag ships to carry a portion of that commercial trade moving on subsidized trade routes.

If additional American-flag ships are required, then why does not the Maritime Administration break out additional ships from our national defense reserve fleet? Could it be that our reserve fleet has been allowed to degenerate so that there are insufficient ships left in the fleet suitable for employment in Vietnam movements? In an article appearing in the Journal of Commerce of October 13, 1965, the Honorable HERBERT C.

BONNER, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, has expressed his understanding that "we have less than 150 useful ships in our reserve fleet." The Honorable EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Democrat, of Maryland, ranking majority member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, has expressed a similar concern. My own concern over this matter was expressed in my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 19, 1965, entitled "Vietnam—A Lesson in Sea Power." Certainly there must be some ships left in the reserve fleet that are equal at least in caliber to the 22-year-old American-built liberty ships which the Maritime Administration recently permitted an American subsidized operator to charter for service on its commercial trade route.

Also, if, as the article by Helen Delich Bentley states, the time-charter rates on foreign ships has risen 250 percent since last December, why should the United States be singled out for such unwarranted prices? It would seem more reasonable to me to spend such money to reactivate idle American-flag tonnage, than continue to pick up the tab for foreign-flag operators. But, this does not appear to be of any great concern to those charged by law with the promotion of the American Merchant Marine. Foreign-flag operators need not even concern themselves with the additional cost involved in refusal to carry Vietnam-bound cargoes which have been loaded. As Mrs. Bentley points out in her article:

> When the Mexican vessel *El Mejicano* began the rejections of Vietnam cargo, after having a full load aboard in Long Beach, Calif., the U.S. Military Sea Transportation Service gave it a cargo to Okinawa. The loss of money for double loading and discharging, the time lost to get the supplies to the men on the war front made no difference.

And now we have the Maritime Administration exerting its efforts to keep foreign-flag operators happy.

The use of foreign-flag ships, however, is only symptomatic of the real problem—the complete and utter lack of constructive and knowledgeable Federal leadership. Not quite as charitable as I, Helen Delich Bentley has labeled it "irony, stupidity, or sabotage." I must say that the current performance of the Maritime Administrator with his telephone recording certainly lends support to Helen Bentley's version.

For months now I have been expressing my alarm over the dangerous drift of our merchant marine policy, riddled as it is with inconsistencies and vacillation. The latest move to permit American-flag subsidized operators to charter foreign-flag ships is but one example of this. The Secretary of Commerce, for example, has been urging private industry for months to reduce expenditures abroad to correct our unfavorable balance of payments. Then, along comes the Maritime Administrator, who is supposed to be under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, granting permission to charter foreign-flag ships and promoting the concept of building our ships abroad. Also, in league with this movement to build abroad, we have the Department of Defense building ships in Great Britain. I can only explain this blatant inconsistency by the adage, "Do as I say, not as I do."

Now ostensibly the purpose of allowing American ship operators to charter foreign-flag ships is to enable them to maintain and protect their commercial trade while their ships are committed to Vietnam. For the life of me, I cannot see how this goal is to be attained by chartering 22-year-old Liberty ships. Furthermore, upon reading the letter of September 17, 1965, which the Maritime Administrator sent to the subsidized operators concerning foreign-ship charters, I cannot see how an operator could charter an American-flag ship. On its face, the letter tells the operator that he can charter an American-flag ship but without subsidy, and then that he must agree to include profits in subsidized accounting but not losses. Perhaps the Government does have to be protected in some fashion in these transactions. But I can only read these guidelines as saying, "Heads you lose, tails I win."

Similar inconsistencies arise in the area of commercial cargo promotion. I understand that through internal reorganization an Office of Maritime Promotion will be established in the Maritime Administration. Composed of some 70 personnel taken from existing divisions and offices within the agency, the function of this new office will be to promote commercial cargoes for American-flag ships. Now the concept does appear to have merit. But why all the sudden concern for commercial cargo promotion at a time when we do not even have sufficient American-flag ships to carry Government proprietary cargoes, or defense cargoes to Vietnam, or that portion of commercial cargoes carried by American ships? Certainly the effort would have been more profitably expended in prosecuting our vessel replacement program. This program is already behind schedule by some 90 ships. These are 90 new and modern ships that we should have had available today for Vietnam. We also would have had an additional 90 ships traded in under this replacement program. If this had been done, then today we would not be finding it necessary to look to foreign-flag ships to carry our cargoes. This is why I say we need constructive Federal leadership. This is why I also say that the chartering of foreign ships, appalling as it may be, is only symptomatic of the real program—a need for Federal leadership. Chartering of foreign-flag ships is tantamount to an admission of the ineptness and abysmal failure of the Maritime Administration to promote the American merchant marine.

One need no longer wonder what prompted me to introduce my bill, H.R. 11355, on September 30, 1965, to establish an independent Federal Maritime Administration. What we are now harvesting are the seeds of indecision and vacillation planted with the enactment of reorganization plan No. 7 of 1961.

The American merchant marine does need a voice. It needs a knowledgeable voice of mature men dedicated to the promotion of the American merchant marine. We do not have that voice now. We shall never have that voice until we establish an independent Federal Maritime Administration.

While I may have taken the present Maritime Administrator to task, personalities do not enter into my bill to create an independent agency. To the contrary, the central issue is a maritime policy which will be vigorously prosecuted. We have a maritime policy set forth in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, but it is not being carried out. Rather, today, we have nothing but masterly inactivity from a subordinate agency which is incapable to responding to the Congress. And it is the Congress which is ultimately responsible for the fate of the American merchant marine. As Mr. William W. Jordan, president of the Marine Firemen's Union, recently noted in his column, "The President's View of Things," and I quote:

> I don't know whether an agency such as is proposed by Congressman MAILLIARD would help this Nation to once again become a leading maritime power, but I do damn well know that under present Maritime Administration policies the United States will never again be a leading maritime power. I, for one, am willing to take a look at any proposal. Too many of us are "fiddling as Rome burns."

STAFF REPORT ESTABLISHING ILLEGALITY OF RUMP SESSION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there have been varying news reports about Tuesday's rump session conducted by a minority of the Banking and Currency Committee. The facts, of course, are quite plain.

I am placing in the RECORD a report prepared by members of the Banking and Currency Committee staff who observed the rump session. This report fully sets out the facts of this illegal meeting. This report establishes: First, that the regular third Tuesday meeting, under which the group claimed to be operating, had been duly canceled by me; second, that no quorum was present on any votes taken in the rump session; and, third, that the chairman, a number of other members of the committee, and the staff were not informed about the plans to hold the session.

I want to reemphasize that no bank merger bill has been reported this session from the Banking and Currency Committee. Any documents purporting to be reports of the Banking and Currency Committee on S. 1698 or any other bank merger bill are false. The committee has made no such report.

When a bank merger bill is reported out of the Banking and Currency Committee, it will be done in a proper manner according to the rules of the House. A bill will be reported only in a duly constituted meeting with a quorum of the committee actually present.

I insert the staff report at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D.C., October 20, 1965.

To: Chairman PATMAN.
From: Paul Nelson.

As directed by you I am setting forth several facts concerning the gathering of various members of the Banking and Currency Committee in the committee's hearing room on the morning of October 19, 1965, as I and several of the staff observed them.

First, you will recall that on Monday, October 18, I informed you of the fact that Tuesday, October 19, was the regularly constituted meeting day of the Banking and Currency Committee. In reply you informed me that the committee would not meet that day and as such directed a memorandum to me so stating. The full text of your memorandum to me follows:

"MEMORANDUM

"OCTOBER 18, 1965.

"To: Paul Nelson, Clerk.
"From: WRIGHT PATMAN, Chairman.

"Rule I of the rules of procedure of the Committee on Banking and Currency for the 89th Congress states that the committee shall meet at 10 a.m. on the first and third Tuesdays of each month unless canceled by the chairman.

"The Banking and Currency Committee will not meet on October 19, 1965, which is the third Tuesday in the month.

"Since it is customary only when a committee meeting is scheduled to notify the members, it will not be necessary for you to notify the members that the meeting has been canceled."

What follows is a rendition of the observations made by several members of the staff regarding the occurrence in the committee's quarters on the morning of October 19:

1. Mrs. Deem observed while sitting at her desk in the outer office that Congressman OTTINGER's administrative assistant, Mr. Paul A. Schusberg, came in and asked for Congressman OTTINGER. Mr. Schusberg told Mrs. Deem that he was waiting for Mr. OTTINGER, and that the Congressman was coming to the committee room prior to going to his office.

Several moments later Mr. MOORHEAD entered the committee's anteroom and stated to Mrs. Deem that he wanted to get something out of his desk in the committee hearing room. Mrs. Deem went with Mr. MOORHEAD and asked if he wanted the lights turned on since it was quite dark in the committee room. Mr. MOORHEAD replied that he thought he could find what he needed without turning the lights on. At that point Mrs. Deem retired from the committee room.

Mrs. Deem observed, after the passage of another 5 or 6 minutes, that there was a great deal of shuffling and noise emanating from the hearing room. She then started back into the committee room to determine what had occurred, and at that point Mr. ANNUNZIO came through the door from the committee room indicating that it was dark in the hearing room. Mr. ANNUNZIO asked if he could have the lights turned on because there were a "lot of members in there." Mrs. Deem then proceeded to turn on the lights.

2. Several members of the staff notified me that commencing at 10 o'clock various members of the committee were milling outside the doors of the committee room in the corridor and subsequently Mrs. Deem and others informed me that various members had entered the hearing room and taken their chairs.

I then called you and you indicated that I was to inform the members of the committee that you were unavoidably detained for an emergency matter and that no meeting could be considered until the chairman arrived to consider it; that the meeting for the 19th had already been canceled which was authorized under committee rules. I dictated a memorandum to this effect to carry into the hearing room, and prior to entering the hearing room met Mr. ANNUNZIO. I informed Mr. ANNUNZIO of your whereabouts and also presented him with a copy of the memorandum of October 18 from the chairman canceling the meeting. It is my understanding that Mr. ANNUNZIO took this memorandum into the committee room and presented it to Mr. ASHLEY who was occupying the chair at the time.

3. At approximately 10:15 a.m. several members of the staff were sitting in the hearing room and noted that Mr. REUSS had at that time entered the committee room and as senior majority member present assumed the chair. Mr. ANNUNZIO was recognized at this point by the Chair and asked the chairman to rule whether or not the meeting was legally constituted. Mr. REUSS stated that as the ranking member present he would first determine whether or not a valid meeting was in progress, pursuant to the committee rules and the rules of the House. Mr. REUSS questioned several members concerning the reason for the meeting and the circumstances under which it was called, including proper notice to all the members. Mr. REUSS also referred to the telephone message received from Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN as well as the memorandum dated October 18, 1965, as noted above, that the committee meeting for Tuesday, October 19, had been canceled. Mr. REUSS presiding then ruled that the gathering did not constitute a valid meeting of the committee under the rules of the committee and of the House, ordered the group disbanded, and withdrew from the committee room along with Mr. ANNUNZIO.

4. It was noted by 5 members of the committee staff that at approximately 10:56 a.m. there were 15 members of the Banking and Currency Committee within the committee room. These members were: Messrs. MOORHEAD (who was in the chairman's chair), ASHLEY, STEPHENS, GRABOWSKI, GETTYS, OTTINGER, CABELL, WIDNALL, FINO, Mrs. DWYER, Messrs. HALPERN, DEL CLAWSON, JOHNSON, STANTON, and MIZE.

5. The committee staff also noted that at approximately 11:12 a.m. 15 members of the committee were present as follows: Messrs. MOORHEAD (in the chairman's chair), ASHLEY, STEPHENS, GRABOWSKI, GETTYS, OTTINGER, CABELL, WIDNALL, FINO, Mrs. DWYER, Messrs. HALPERN, DEL CLAWSON, JOHNSON, STANTON, and MIZE.

At 11:15 a.m., Mr. HALPERN left the room. At 11:15 a.m. Mr. MOORHEAD (from the chairman's chair) moved under the "procedures previously adopted" the question regarding the Ottinger amendment. The amendment, according to Mr. MOORHEAD, carried by voice vote. At approximately 11:16 a.m. Mr. MOORHEAD moved the question on the Ashley substitute as amended by the Ottinger amendment. According to Mr. MOORHEAD it carried unanimously by voice vote. The vote was announced at approximately 11:19 a.m.

Mr. STEPHENS asked that the record show that committee staff members Nelson, Morse, Prins, and the microphone operator (G. McMurray) were present. At no time were the staff members able to count more than 16 members in the committee room at any one time. The staff was informed by Mr. MULTER, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Messrs. REUSS, GONZALEZ, MINISH, and TODD that none of them was informed in advance of the purported meeting. It is likely that several other members also received no notice.

During the course of the proceedings, the staff noted that, on every vote taken, proxies executed by absent members were voted. Under rules of the committee, proxies cannot be counted as part of a quorum.

6. At approximately 11:40 it was noted by members of the committee staff that Chairman PATMAN entered the room and assumed his seat. The chairman ruled that the gathering did not constitute a duly called and assembled meeting of the committee, that there was no record of the gathering, that it was strictly informal, but invited the members to freely discuss any matter they wished. Mr. TODD made the point of order that a quorum was not present. The chairman responded that there was not a valid committee meeting in the first place.

7. It should also be reported that the Ward & Paul reporter who appeared at this gathering informed committee staff (as was subsequently verified by Mr. Ward, of Ward & Paul) that Ward & Paul's office had been called the previous day to have a reporter present in Mr. MOORHEAD's office to transcribe a "technical hearing" and that Mr. MOORHEAD would pay for the services. The reporter informed committee staff that he arrived at Mr. MOORHEAD's office at 9:30 and Mr. MOORHEAD took him to the committee hearing room whence he began by direction of Mr. MOORHEAD to transcribe the minutes of the gathering.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a freedom of information bill (S. 1160) has passed the Senate. Yet here in the House, the bill, H.R. 5012, introduced months ago, is still rattling around in committee. The only conceivable reason for the lack of progress of this measure is the well-known and well-publicized White House opposition.

As the 1st session of the 89th Congress draws to a close amid generous press and television reports of the legislative accomplishments of this session, it is significant to note that despite the unusually heavy legislative output, the House has failed once again to come to grips with the question of the public's right to know. Regardless of what else may have been accomplished this year, this is a serious defeat for the people of this Nation and for our system of government which depends so fundamentally on an informed electorate.

The obvious need for adequate information in a democratic society needs no emphasis, for without the knowledge necessary to cast an intelligent vote, the value of the vote itself is diminished. And without the fullest possible access to Government information, it is impossible to gain the knowledge necessary to discharge the responsibilities of citizenship.

With these words, the chairman of the House Government Operations Subcommittee on Government Information and Foreign Operations, the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], stressed the people's "right to know," as he opened hearings on bills to create a Federal public records law. As a minority member of this subcommittee and as a sponsor of the bill, I have been deeply interested in this legislation. My remarks will detail the unfortunate lack of progress of this important bill.

The Freedom of Information Subcommittee began hearings on November 7, 1955, and since then has documented case after case of unauthorized withholding of information by Government agencies and Federal officials—from the press, the public, and Congress. The subcommittee's investigations have resulted in thousands of pages of printed hearings and reports and have proved, in the words of its chairman, "the unfortunate fact that governmental secrecy tends to grow as Government itself grows." The subcommittee's work has demonstrated again and again that the fight for freedom of information is a continuing one.

The official policy of the executive to withhold information at its discretion is no innovation in our Government. Before our Federal Government was 1 year old, the executive branch had denied a congressional request for information. The executive has steadfastly asserted this as its prerogative for 175 years or more. But Congress has never forced the issue.

During this decade, the subcommittee has been working to help assure an informed public. Its vigilance has helped maintain for the Congress and for the public a degree of availability of information that is so necessary for intelligent decisions by the electorate and its representatives.

Realizing that continued documentation of individual cases of unwarranted secrecy will never determine the basic issue involved, the subcommittee moved into the legislative field. On February 17, 1965, and subsequently, some 19 Members of the House and 22 Members of the Senate have introduced proposals for a public records law. Sponsors include:

S. 1160, by Mr. LONG of Missouri. Cosponsors: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CASE, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. HART, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

H.R. 5012, to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records, by Mr. MOSS; H.R. 5013, by Mr. FASCELL; H.R. 5014, by Mr. MACDONALD; H.R. 5015, by Mr. GRIFFIN; H.R. 5016, by Mr. REID of New York; H.R. 5017 by Mr. RUMSFELD; H.R. 5018, by Mr. EDMONSON; H.R. 5019, by Mr. ASHLEY; H.R. 5020, by Mr. MCCARTHY; H.R. 5021, by Mrs. REID of Illinois; H.R. 5237, by Mr. GIBBONS; H.R. 5406, by Mr. LEGGETT; H.R. 5520, by Mr. SCHEUER; H.R. 5583, by Mr. PATTEN; H.R. 6172, by Mr. MOSHER; H.R. 6739, by Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama; H.R. 7010, by Mr. WIDNALL; H.R. 7161, by Mr. ERLENBORN; H.R. 11321, by Mrs. DWYER.

The purpose of the proposed public records law is to require every agency of the Federal Government to "make all its records promptly available to any person," and to provide for court action to guarantee the right of access, with the exception of certain specified categories of sensitive Government information which would be exempted from the disclosure requirement.

The bills are similar to S. 1666 which passed the Senate in the 88th Congress but was not acted upon in the House. In February 1965 when the House bills were introduced, and I am one of the original cosponsors, it was pointed out that the 10 years of study by the House subcommittee have shown that Federal agencies have exercised broad powers to withhold information, and that what was needed was a clear delineation of sensitive Government information which must be held confidential and an enforceable right of public access to the rest of the facts of Government.

Hearings on these bills were held by our House Government Information Subcommittee this year—March 30, 31, April 1, 2, and 5, 1965. Almost without exception, non-Government witnesses who testified were in support of the bill, and witnesses who testified on behalf of the executive branch were in opposition to the bill. At the conclusion of my remarks is a listing of witnesses, both public and private, and their positions with respect to this legislation.

In mid-May, subcommittee members were sent a revised committee print prepared by the staff in anticipation of a meeting of the subcommittee and asking for comments on the print.

On May 24, 1965, a subcommittee meeting was called and met and adjourned in the absence of a quorum. On June 1, 1965, a brief subcommittee meeting was held at which time the committee print of the redrafted bill dated May 20, 1965, was discussed. The redrafted committee print represented, in my opinion, a complete revision of the earlier bill, and an almost total concession to the executive branch, by codifying congressional support for Executive secrecy under the concept of Executive privilege. Because of the scope of the revision, the meeting ended without any agreement having been reached. A third subcommittee meeting, scheduled for June 3, 1965, was canceled.

Mr. Speaker, the redrafted bill was a bad bill. Press reports indicate that it has gone through a variety of drafts with the Justice Department coordinating the executive branch work with the committee staff. When one recalls the testimony of the Justice Department before the subcommittee, it is not difficult to figure out why it was a bad bill. Asking representatives of the Justice Department to assist in the drafting of a freedom of information bill is like asking the wolf to guard the sheep.

Their redrafted committee print would write into law a provision whereby any information, regardless of its nature, could be withheld from the public "by direction of the President."

Further, there was no provision to protect against circumvention by delay. Legal remedy would not be available until a determination to withhold was specified. Yet, there was no requirement that such a determination be made by the bureaucrat who withholds information and no time limit was specified. Numerous examples of the looseness of the language could be cited, but suffice it to say that the redrafted bill would do more harm than good.

Since June 1, 1965, some 4½ months ago, when the committee print was briefly discussed, a pall of silence spread over the information activities of the subcommittee—and it is noticeable by contrast with the publicity that accompanied the introduction of the bills and the opening of the hearings. Fortunately, that staff-prepared committee print has now died a quiet death.

But, from the record of these hearings, one thing is clear: The executive branch, as might have been expected, is opposed to the bill. I will not take the time of the House to recount the Government testimony. The hearings are available. Suffice it to say that the Government witnesses were almost united in their opposition to the bill.

Surely, the House has not been paralyzed by this opposition. If there is such a thing as "executive privilege" in this regard, it is only inherent in the proper exercise of the President's constitutional duties and is probably limited to instances where the safety of the Nation is involved.

H.R. 5012 as originally introduced as well as the recently passed Senate bill gives full recognition to this possibility when it exempts from availability to the public matters that are "specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy" and other pertinent exemptions.

From the hearings it appears that the fact of the matter is that the executive agencies do not intend to settle for anything short of unlimited discretion if they can help it.

The Federal agencies have protested the inadequacies of the exemptions and apparently would like to broaden the protected categories of information and records to the point where effectiveness of the legislation would be completely vitiated. At the best, the legislation they favor would be a farce by merely preserving the status quo. At worst, it would further circumscribe the public's right to know and put into law the broadest possible concept of executive privilege.

The original H.R. 5012 is a good bill. The recently passed Senate bill is basically a good bill. By present policy, the burden of getting information from an agency that wishes to withhold it has been on the public and the press when information sought is withheld. H.R. 5012 and the Senate passed bill shifts the burden to the agency; for under this bill, the Government can at least be forced to make public it reasons for withholding information on those occasions when it chooses to do so. The basic shortcoming of the Senate bill appears to be that it applies only to administrative procedures, unlike the House bill which amends the general statutes.

The substitution of a "positive" emphasis for a "negative" one and court enforcement of the right to know should tend to provide a more healthy climate for freedom of information.

The need for a well-informed public, the protection of certain Government information, and the right of individual privacy are all involved. The original bill, possibly with some modifications, seems a reasonable compromise of the conflicting views involved.

The principle of freedom of information is not to be taken lightly. Recommendations by the Hoover Commission Task Force on Government Reorganization generated the introduction in Congress of freedom of information legislation in the early 1950's.

As Senator Long of Missouri, a sponsor of this legislation, has said:

> I think it no part of the duty of a public servant to protect the people from the truth. * * * The Government may not always be able to tell the whole truth, but it should tell nothing but the truth. * * * While the handful of leaders who must determine the Nation's course and their advisers are men of good faith and ability, the critical questions of war and peace cannot be left to the experts, free of scrutiny by citizens and Congress. The citizen cannot abdicate his responsibility. And I would add that the Government likewise cannot shirk its responsibility to keep the citizenry informed.

Interestingly, Pope John XXIII, in the encylical Pacem in Terris, said:

> Peace can only come * * * from observance of the "universal, unvoidable, and inalienable" natural law rights which include: The right to freedom in searching for the truth and in expressing and communicating one's opinions. * * * The right to be informed truthfully about public events.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Nation celebrated National Newspaper Week. This week, honoring the Nation's press, should remind us all that the very foundation of our democratic system is the people's right to know. I believe strongly that the public's business must be conducted in public if our system is to prevail.

Appropriately, and to their credit, the Senate, on October 13, 1965, passed unanimously a bill clarifying and protecting the right of the public to information. The other body has done its work well in this regard, as it did in the last Congress. Only House action remains. The Government Operations Committee has a job to do for the American people. Hopefully, it will act promptly and wisely. House Report No. 2084 of the Government Operations Committee, 86th Congress, 2d session, set forth the following comment on this problem which I hope indicates the attitude of our committee today:

> Secrecy, the first refuge of incompetents, must be at a bare minimum in a democratic society, for a fully informed public is the basis of self-government. Those elected or appointed to positions of executive authority must recognize that government in a democracy cannot be wiser than the people.

Mr. Speaker, the press reports are pessimistic on the prospects for this legislation, attributing the poor prospects to the strong administration opposition. I, for one, am still hopeful—for how could an administration which claims to be interested in encouraging the participation of all citizens in Government stand in opposition to this legislation? Why should President Johnson have asked the Congress to pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965, for example, if his administration is intent on denying the public access to the information it needs to draw informed conclusions? Why should the administration have any objection to the goal of assuring the people's right to know about the conduct of Government? Why should the President, on the one hand, speak frequently of his interest in people and on the other hand deny those people their constitutional right to information on the conduct of Government?

Mr. Speaker, I have no way to know what is in the minds of the President or his associates in the executive branch. I have no way to determine what is behind the administration's strong vocal opposition to this legislation. Further, I have no way, at this point, to know whether or not the House, unlike the Senate, will buckle under to White House pressure on this matter. My remarks today are intended simply to inform the House and the American people of the fact that while the 1st session of the 89th Congress has passed a great deal of legislation, it has failed to assure freedom of information. I hope and trust that the committee will do its work, report out a good bill, and give the House a chance to work its will.

[From the Hollister Publications, Oct. 7, 1965]

Bulwark of Freedom

In guaranteeing freedom of the American press, the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution established a vital, powerful bulwark to guard, protect, and defend the greater freedom of the individual.

From their earliest beginnings, America's newspapers have fought off attempts to deprive them of their freedom to gather, report, and interpret the news honestly and objectively. They have had their John Peter Zengers and Elijah Lovejoys, fighters and martyrs to the cause of press freedom. And despite Government attempts to manage the news, America's thousands of daily and weekly newspapers have stubbornly maintained their integrity. At the same time, they have fought off attacks on the press by leftist and rightist groups which would like only their views reported.

And thanks in part to competition from radio and television, the American press has steadily increased its services to the reading public, so that your newspaper today is one of your best bargains.

Thomas Jefferson eloquently stated the case for a free press:

"The basis of our Government being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a Government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

It is fitting, therefore, for America's millions to salute their free press with the observance of National Newspaper Week, which starts Sunday. If freedom of the press ever were eroded, all other freedoms soon would be lost.

Mr. Speaker, following is a list of noncongressional individuals and the organizations they represent who testified or submitted statements for or against H.R. 5012 before the House Subcommittee on Government Information:

STATEMENTS (APPEARANCES) IN SUPPORT

Joseph Costa, National Press Photographers Association.

Lawrence Speiser, director, Washington office, American Civil Liberties Union.

Robert M. Benjamin (offered amendments), representing American Bar Association, accompanied by Chisman Hanes.

John H. Colburn, editor and publisher, Wichita (Kans.) Eagle and Beacon; representing the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

Richard D. Smyser, chairman, Freedom of Information Committee of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association.

Creed Black, managing editor, Chicago Daily News, and chairman, American Society of Newspaper Editors' Freedom of Information Committee; accompanied by William P. Rogers, counsel; and Eugene Patterson, editor, Atlanta Constitution, committee member.

Dale W. Hardin, manager, Transportation and Communication Department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, accompanied by Verne R. Sullivan, assistant manager, Transportation and Communication Department.

Julius Frandsen, chairman, Sigma Delta Chi's Committee for Advancement of Freedom of Information, accompanied by Clark R. Mollenhoff, vice chairman.

Walter B. Potter, publisher, Culpeper Star-Exponent, representing the National Editorial Association.

John A. McCart, operations director, Government Employees Council, AFL–CIO.

STATEMENTS (APPEARANCES) IN OPPOSITION

Norbert A. Schlei, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, Department of Justice; accompanied by Webster P. Maxon, Director, Office of Administrative Procedure, Department of Justice.

H. T. Herrick, General Counsel, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service; accompanied by Gilbert Selden, Assistant Director, Office of Mediation Activities.

Fred Burton Smith, Acting General Counsel, Treasury Department; accompanied by Mrs. Charlotte T. Lloyd, Chief, Legal Opinion Section, Treasury Department.

STATEMENTS AND LETTERS FROM ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS IN SUPPORT

John F. Griner (primary objectives desirable; exceptions), president, American Federation of Government Employees.

Ralph F. Fuchs (suggests amendment), Indiana University School of Law.

Carl L. Shipley, attorney, Shipley, Akerman & Pickett, Washington, D.C.

G. B. Burnham, president, Burnham Chemical Co.

Andrew J. Biemiller (supports principle of—but recommends changes), director, Department of Legislation, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Magazine Publishers Association.

Vincent T. Wasilewski, president, National Association of Broadcasters.

Green Bay Press-Gazette, Green Bay, Wis.

Allied Daily Newspapers of Washington.

Meriden Record Co., Meriden, Conn.

Hidalgo Publishing Co., Inc., Edinberg, Tex., James V. Mathis, editor and publisher.

Kermit Overby (suggested inclusion in the committee report of language to protect REA borrowers); director, Legislation and Research Department, Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Washington, D.C.

American Trial Lawyers Association, Aviation Law Section, New York (support—with reservations).

Maritime Administrative Bar Association.

Railway Labor Executive's Association (no objections).

Statements and letters from organizations and individuals in opposition: None.

COMMENTS FROM DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES IN SUPPORT

Legislative branch

General Accounting Office: In general agreement—suggests changes.

Independent agencies

Civil Service Commission: No objection.

Federal Power Commission: No specific objections or reservations to the provisions of this bill with two exceptions.

Federal Trade Commission.

COMMENTS FROM DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES IN OPPOSITION

Executive Office of the President

Bureau of the Budget: Does not adequately protect the public interest.

Executive departments

Department of Agriculture.

Department of Commerce (Patent Office, Maritime, Bureau of Public Roads, Assistant Secretary for Administration).

Department of Defense.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Department of the Interior.

Department of Labor.

Post Office Department.

Department of State.

Department of the Treasury.

Independent agencies

Atomic Energy Commission.

Civil Aeronautics Board.

Federal Aviation Agency.

Federal Communications Commission (agrees with underlying purpose of bills).

Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Federal Maritime Commission.

Federal Reserve Board.

General Services Administration.

Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Interstate Commerce Commission.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

National Labor Relations Board.

Securities and Exchange Commission.

Selective Service System.

Veterans' Administration.

S. 1160

An Act to amend section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 324, of the Act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238), to clarify and protect the right of the public to information, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3, chapter 324, of the Act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Every agency shall make available to the public the following information:

"(a) PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER.—Every agency shall separately state and currently publish in the Federal Register for the guidance of the public (A) descriptions of its central and field organization and the established places at which, the officers from whom, and the methods whereby, the public may secure information, make submittals or requests, or obtain decisions; (B) statements of the general course and method by which its functions are channeled and determined, including the nature and requirements of all formal and informal procedures available; (C) rules of procedure, descriptions of forms available or the places at which forms may be obtained, and instructions as to the scope and contents of all papers, reports, or examinations; (D) substantive rules of general applicability adopted as authorized by law, and statements of general policy or interpretations of general applicability formulated and adopted by the agency; and (E) every amendment, revision, or repeal of the foregoing. Except to the extent that a person has actual and timely notice of the terms thereof, no person shall in any manner be required to resort to, or be adversely affected by any matter required to be published in the Federal Register and not so published. For purposes of this subsection, matter which is reasonably available to the class of persons affected thereby shall be deemed published in the Federal Register when incorporated by reference therein with the approval of the Director of the Federal Register.

"(b) AGENCY OPINIONS AND ORDERS.—Every agency shall, in accordance with published rules, make available for public inspection and copying (A) all final opinions (including concurring and dissenting opinions) and all orders made in the adjudication of cases, (B) those statements of policy and interpretations which have been adopted by the agency and are not published in the Federal Register, and (C) administrative staff manuals and instructions to staff that affect any member of the public, unless such materials are promptly published and copies offered for sale. To the extent required to prevent a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, an agency may delete identifying details when it makes available or publishes an opinion, statement of policy, interpretation, or staff manual or instruction: *Provided,* That in every case the justification for the deletion must be fully explained in writing. Every agency also shall maintain and make available for public inspection and copying a current index providing identifying information for the public as to any matter which is issued, adopted, or promulgated after the effective date of this Act and which is required by this subsection to be made available or published. No final order, opinion, statement of policy, interpretation, or staff manual or instruction that affects any member of the public may be relied upon, used or cited as precedent by an agency against any private party unless it has been indexed and either made available or published as provided by this subsection or unless that private party shall have actual and timely notice of the terms thereof.

"(c) AGENCY RECORDS.—Except with respect to the records made available pursuant to subsections (a) and (b), every agency shall, upon request for identifiable records made in accordance with published rules stating the time, place, fees to the extent authorized by statute and procedure to be followed, make such records promptly available to any person. Upon complaint, the district court of the United States in the district in which the complainant resides, or has his principal place of business, or in which the agency records are situated shall have jurisdiction to enjoin the agency from the withholding of agency records and to order the production of any agency records improperly withheld from the complainant. In such cases the court shall determine the matter de novo and the burden shall be upon the agency to sustain its actions. In the event of noncompliance with the court's order, the district court may punish the responsible officers for contempt. Except as to those causes which the court deems of greater importance, proceedings before the district court as authorized by this subsection shall take precedence on the docket over all other causes and shall be assigned for hearing and trial at the earliest practicable date and expedited in every way.

"(d) AGENCY PROCEEDINGS.—Every agency having more than one member shall keep a record of the final votes of each member in every agency proceeding and such record shall be available for public inspection.

"(e) EXEMPTIONS.—The provisions of this section shall not be applicable to matters that are (1) specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy; (2) related solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of any agency; (3) specifically exempted from disclosure by statute; (4) trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from any person and privileged or confidential; (5) inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters which would not be available by law to a private party in litigation with the agency; (6) personnel and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy; (7) investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes except to the extent available by law to a private party; (8) contained in or related to examination, operating, or condition reports prepared by, on behalf of, or for the use of any agency responsible for the regulation or supervision of financial institutions; and (9) geological and geophysical information and data (including maps) concerning wells.

"(f) LIMITATION OF EXEMPTIONS.—Nothing in this section authorizes withholding of information or limiting the availability of records to the public except as specifically stated in this section, nor shall this section be authority to withhold information from Congress.

"(g) PRIVATE PARTY.—As used in this section, 'private party' means any party other than an agency.

"(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This amendment shall become effective one year following the date of the enactment of this Act."

CONTROL OF PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL THROUGH A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced House Joint Resolution 781, which proposes that the U.S. Constitution be amended to permit Congress to regulate and control the distribution of pornographic material.

Alarmed citizens all over the country have been writing their Congressmen, protesting the dissemination of obscene material, especially to young people. I have received such letters and many appeals for action from my constituents, and, being greatly concerned by the insidious effect of such material, especially on young people, I have concluded that drastic measures are needed to combat this billion-dollar traffic in printed filth.

While many people know of the problem and have taken the time to write to their Congressmen about it, many others are not aware of the magnitude of the pornography racket in the United States. Since World War II it has been estimated that dealing in smut is a $500 million a year business. The Post Office is said to receive some 70,000 complaints a year about obscenity in the mails. A study made in 1958 indicates that the traffic in mail order pornography is doubling every 5 years, and that approximately 1 million children a year are, even now, receiving pornographic filth in the family mailbox.

I feel that this is a particularly reprehensible racket because it is directed, in large part, to the impressionable teenager who, curious to learn more of life and sex, is easy prey to the professional purveyors of obscene material. It is also distressing because, not content to wait for the teenager to go to a store to buy this material, the purveyors of obscenity actually seek out the teenager and send such materials to his home.

Little or no pretense is made that the material has any literary or artistic value. A frequent theme is to glamorize brutality and horror. The people who are in this disreputable business are in it for one thing, and one thing only, that is to make money. They are indifferent to the fact that the young people who read their material may be adversely affected by it.

Most of the proposals which have been made in Congress in the past to remedy this situation have taken the form of amending and strengthening existing laws which are designed to prevent the carrying of such material in the mails or to prevent it from entering the country from abroad. While I feel that such measures are worthy of consideration, I am convinced that the situation has become sufficiently alarming to warrant more drastic measures. I have, therefore, proposed amending the Constitution of the United States to give the power to regulate distribution of pornographic materials and to provide penalties for unauthorized distribution notwithstanding any other provision of law.

This is a practical response to the call for help from the alarmed parents, the concerned citizens, the civic and religious groups, who have urged Congress to legislate in this area. I hope that my proposal will evoke discussion and interest in Congress and among the public so that in the not too distant future, some effective weapon may be placed in the hands of law enforcement authorities to curb the abuses which obviously exist today, abuses which will continue to increase in alarming proportions in the future if forceful action is not taken.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Williams] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **WILLIAMS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me this afternoon be vacated and put over until tomorrow.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF VIETNAM PROTESTERS NEEDED

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **WAGGONNER**. Mr. Speaker, as a preface to a brief explanation of a bill which I am introducing today, I would like to reiterate a statement I made here on the floor of the House on April 14 of this year, when this body was considering House Resolution 310 which authorized the expenditure of funds for the additional expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. These funds were, as you will remember, to finance that committee's investigation of the Ku Klux Klan.

At that time, I made the following statement:

> Let there be no question in anyone's mind where I stand on the subject of un-Americanism. I am opposed to it in any form it takes. I think Chairman Willis will bear me out when I say that I have stood beside his committee every time it has been criticized by the extremists of the leftwing. I have supported every appropriation request and I intend to keep on supporting the House Committee on Un-American Activities as long as they do their job because I am opposed to un-Americanism in any form.

Later, I made this statement:

> I know nothing of their (the Klan's) activities in Louisiana or any other State and I have no idea what an investigation will unearth, but if un-Americanism is suspected, then it is my position that an investigation should be undertaken. But, it should not stop with an investigation of the Klan. There are a number of organizations that should be put under this same spotlight.

I then went on to point out the obvious un-Americanism of the American Nazi Party and the Black Muslims.

In conclusion, I made this point and it is the point I wish to make again today:

> Let it (an investigation) be a starting point but by no means, the finishing point. Before we are through let us see what is under the rocks of all these other groups as well.

This was the conclusion of my statement.

I believe the time has now come to undertake that continuing search under the rocks.

The newspapers have been filled in the past week or so with stories concerning the anti-Vietnam demonstrations which have been gaining momentum here in this country and abroad in the past weeks. These demonstrations have taken the form of attempts to arrest military commanders, burning of draft cards, picketing of draft boards, and similar publicity stunts.

The principal force behind these acts is, apparently, a group calling itself the "Students for a Democratic Society."

I am mystified as to where they got that title since they are, principally, beatniks and unbathed delinquents rather than students; they certainly have no belief in democracy and they are a rabble instead of a society.

I would like to make it perfectly clear that it is not my belief nor is it my position that anyone disagreeing with our policy in Vietnam is either a Communist or a Communist dupe. Certainly there are many who question our presence in Vietnam and the wisdom of past and present moves. But these are loyal Americans who hold an honest difference of opinion to which they are entitled.

Let it be clear that I am talking about these particular demonstrations of the past week, this particular organization and the others associated with it.

I was encouraged to read the President's denunciation of these anti-American activities and also to know that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is interested in the Communist involvement that undoubtedly exists.

I note, too, that, earlier this week, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee declared that these demonstrations have, and I quote, "clearly passed into the hands of Communist and extremist elements."

That committee took the same position I mentioned earlier, that the great majority of persons who differ with our policy in Vietnam are loyal Americans. But the group I am talking about has failed to prevent, limit, or control the Communist domination that now exists in this movement.

Unfortunately, these young men and women have been encouraged by self-appointed intellectuals both in and out of Government, who, from their lofty ivory towers have for months now assailed the President, the Congress, and the Department of Defense for our strong stand against the proliferation of communism in Asia and elsewhere.

When responsible Federal officials, for instance, rise to impeach this Nation, to speak from offices of major importance against the military policy of our Government, when professors who are admitted Marxists are kept on the payroll of colleges, when civil rights leaders dare the unqualified gall of advising our Ambassador to the United Nations, is there any wonder that young men and women follow in their misguided steps?

These self-proud pacifists are the same leaders, and these bearded beatniks are the same followers who have dominated the race riots, demonstrations, lawlessness, and strife that have ripped this Nation apart for a number of years. The roll call of one group would find the same members present as would a roll call of the other. Though there are some who are able, in this instance, to see the Red hand in these anti-Vietnam demonstrations, they were never able and they are still not able to see the same influence and the same leadership infiltrated and controls now the civil rights attack upon the Nation.

Perhaps then, this will provide them the evidence and give them an opportunity to reexamine their thoughts as to who are the promoters, who are the organizers, and who has benefited from the past and present civil rights strife.

In the sure conviction that they are one and the same, the Communists, I am today introducing a bill to authorize the Committee on Un-American Activities to conduct an investigation and study of the organization known as Students for a Democratic Society and the extent and character of its involvement in the current demonstrations relating to official U.S. policy in Vietnam.

It is my hope that those Members who supported House Resolution 310, as I did, will now demonstrate that they have an equal concern over the activity of this anti-American group and its followers.

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION—SHAME OF AMERICAN INACTION

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Upon previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **HALPERN**. Mr. Speaker, we are confident that this first session of the 89th Congress will be known for its legislative accomplishments. We have acted upon a great many substantive issues which for many years have undergone sustained debate.

And yet in this year 1965, it remains a source of particular disappointment and irony that the Congress has consistently failed to officially reopen consideration of the Genocide Convention.

Last February I introduced a House resolution urging U.S. ratification of the Genocide Convention, and have repeatedly urged it passed as a means of rallying official opinion behind this important document. The Convention still rests before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which, since its first and only consideration in 1950, has subsequently denied further hearing.

It is incomprehensible to me that this treaty has stirred so many misgivings, and that because of unfounded fear the Senate has not given its advice and consent. More than 65 nations have approved the Convention, including the Soviet Union. We are supposedly a civilized state, with a constitutional and inherent respect for human rights, and yet we have failed to take this one step to generalize certain protections which are recognized in our own national statutes.

Briefly, parties to the Genocide Convention pledge to prevent and punish the crime of genocide, which is defined as an act committed with the intent to destroy wholly or partially a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group. This may take the form of killing members of a group, causing them physical or mental harm, inflicting conditions calculated to bring about destruction of a group, and so forth. Accused persons are to be prosecuted in the state where the offense is committed, and parties to the treaty must enact legislative implementing machinery if necessary.

The motivation for this document was, of course, the Nazi outrage against 6 million Jews and 2 million Polish citizens perpetrated before and during World War II during the Hitler regime. And historically we can look back upon numerous acts of genocide directed at minority groups. It was the nightmare of these occurrences which prompted the drafting of the Genocide Convention, which men saw as a means of preventing such inhuman crime against future generations.

The United Nations General Assembly unanimously approved the Convention on December 9, 1948. The United States was one of the original signatories of the treaty, which came into force on January 12, 1951. In May of 1950, a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported the document favorably, with four "understandings." These were subsequently redrafted by the whole committee which thereafter took no conclusive action.

Thus for 15 years the United States has failed to accede to the provisions of this most important covenant.

Discussion regarding the provisions of the pact has bogged down in a hopeless academic quagmire which obscures the essentials. I do not deny that the text raises pertinent questions as regards the effect on our Federal-State relationship, personal rights, the power of Congress, and sovereignty. But these legal considerations are not insurmountable, and they should not be made a subterfuge for inaction. The protective intent of the convention is far too important to permit a wholesale retreat from principle.

Under the treaty, we would certainly undertake concrete responsibilities and obligations such as the other nations have agreed to accept. The full import of the convention is, of course, intimately allied with our own legal and constitutional framework, guaranteeing the individual rights and freedoms which are inviolate. It is unquestionable that the protections conferred by the convention are for the most part guaranteed by our domestic law. Hence the complexities and contradictions which opponents profess to discern are not substantive and should not be considered as real obstacles.

It is equally true that our failure to act positively on this matter has injured, or at least blurred, the impression of human justice and moral underpinning which we insist upon claiming before the docket of world public opinion. It is not wholly convincing to argue that others have a responsibility to consider human and moral prerogatives when the United States will not undertake international treaty obligations consistent with this imperative. The official reticence to reopen meaningful debate on this subject is truly appalling, and reflects adversely on the foreign policy goals we have set for ourselves.

It was a particular pleasure and inspiration for us to welcome the Pope to the United Nations during this General Assembly session. He pleaded to the statesmen of the world to devote their energies toward the construction of a stable peace and conditions of human justice. And in this search nothing is more important than the achievement of common agreements between nations, agreements which seek to prevent the cruelties of the past that have scarred human history. The Genocide Convention forms a part of this essential task.

This covenant is one of the great items of unfinished business in the foreign policy arena, a matter of overriding concern to mankind.

The United States can no longer afford indecision on an issue of such grave consequence. We are all agreed that group persecution of racial and religious minorities is an outrage of such terrible dimension that constructive steps must be taken to prevent and punish it as an international crime. This is the purpose of the Genocide Convention, and our official hypocrisy and apparent indifference is an affront to human dignity.

It should be a matter of priority for the Senate. Here in the House we can act on numerous resolutions, identical in purpose, and thereby help to generate the effective public opinion which the issue demands. It is imperative that the legislature press vigorously for affirmative action when we reconvene next January.

HOMER HOOVER SPEAKS ON LIONISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there as many thousands of men throughout this country who quietly and effectively promote the general welfare through the work of service clubs. They are usually unheralded in their work and yet their accomplishments are noteworthy and they should receive the commendation of their fellow man.

One of these gentlemen is a good friend of mine, Homer Hoover of Wooster, Ohio. He has served during the past year as International Director of the Lions Clubs. I myself am a member of the Johnstown Lions Club and have always been proud of this association although I must freely admit that my contribution has been small indeed by comparison with the service club giants such as Homer Hoover. Mr. Hoover retired earlier this year as manager of the Sears, Roebuck & Co. retail store at Wooster after more than 20 years of service. He is a community leader in his own right in addition to his service club activities and is the chairman of the 1965 United Community Fund for Wayne County.

Homer Hoover has traveled throughout the length and breadth of this land spreading the gospel of Lionism. He has traveled to many foreign countries in this capacity and is a living example of the fine precepts of this organization. He truly epitomizes the service club tradition of service to fellow man and has brought great honor to his home club and to our fine organization.

He recently spoke at a Lions Convention in Puerto Rico and delivered a fine address. Mr. Speaker, in the thought that other Members of this body would like to receive the benefit of his words of wisdom, I am including with these remarks this address. It is a meaningful statement of what Lionism means to one of our Nation's outstanding Lions and, as the saying goes, tells what "makes them tick." I commend it to everyone who sometimes gets a bit cynical and feels that this generation is floundering and losing track of basic values. Lionism, like many other fine civic organizations, quietly and effectively stresses these basic values of service to fellow man in thousands of cities and villages throughout this Nation in a manner which makes it a important part of community life. How much better off we would be if these values were emphasized day after day throughout the world by other men of good will such as Lion Homer Hoover.

REMARKS OF MR. HOOVER

Since time began men have grouped themselves together for mutual understanding, encouragement, and benefit. They have formed societies for the betterment of the world, for cleaner living, higher thinking, and worthwhile accomplishment.

We in Lionism are closely knit together by intimate bonds of club life. Lions Clubs is a group of men banded together in the spirit of community service, doing things as a team which could not be done as an individual.

We seek and find comfort and consolation in the wholesale society of our fellow men. We become stronger and finer and better, by having other men as our friends. As a result of this our knowledge of the world increases, and we become more broadminded, more human, and more like the manner of men that God intended we should become.

The Bible tells us "None of us liveth to himself alone." Lions International is an association of Lions Clubs joined in a common program under a universal emblem with the united purpose of exerting worldwide influence for good which no single club could possibly attain. This is the overall picture of Lionism with strengthened effectiveness and accomplishment through cooperation. It is an inverted pyramid. The base is the individual Lion expanding upward into clubs, districts, countries, and areas, until at the top is a broad plateau of promise to the needy, the handicapped, and the stricken peoples of the world.

The age in which we are living is no doubt the frothiest in history. Standards seem lowered and ideals lost; and never in the history of the world has there been such a need for organizations like Lions. Never has there been such a need for men—big men, good men, and men of unselfish idealism.

We are distracted, not because we are helpless, but because we have forgotten the rules men live by. We think of our rights and not of our obligations to each other. We must get back to voluntary cooperation which is the mainspring of life.

Our Lionism, forming as it does one big society over the world, upholds every noble and redeeming ideal of humanity. It makes all communities better by its presence. It makes each individual better for having belonged. It brings out the best in human nature, the give-and-take, the openheartedness and comradeship of Lions, and leaves no place in our lives for selfishness, cheapness, or narrowmindness.

Our members are welded together in an unbreakable union. You have been invited by one of our Lions to join our Lions Club because they wish you to share the rewards of Lionism in this community.

The one thing I like about Lionism is that when we come into this room we forget selfishness. Personal resolve becomes one of human sympathy, combined with the spirit of brotherhood. We renew moral courage in a combination with faith, and we take a bulldog grip on fundamentals, and resolve to be better men.

All members pull together, with a common objective, with a spirit of friendship, strengthened by a common desire to live up to the Golden Rule and we all place civic and social progress on a high plane.

You are joining the largest service organization in the world. We have well over 750,000 active members in 17,000 clubs in 130 countries or areas of the free world.

Too often we are prone to stress the size of our organization to which we belong. We take pride in being a member of the biggest and the best. In this case Lions International. Yet, I would like to tell you as forcibly as I can that despite its size and its worldwide station, membership in Lions International is purely a personal thing.

Every organization in the world is cursed with one common problem. Even though it is a problem common to all, it is far from simple, and in fact is quite complex and is masked by a variety of names and by every means known to man. Lionism suffers from this problem, though not to the extreme degree that is common to many, it is serious enough to cause continuing concern. In a word, that problem is "inertia." Webster explains it perfectly: "Indisposition to exertion or action."

The signs are simple. There is the problem; the solution; and the action needed to attain the solution. The first two parts are comparatively easy. The problem is easy to define and intelligent discussion usually develops the best methods needed to resolve the problem. However, it is the action, the doing, the translating of words into deeds, that bogs down the solution.

Think a minute. Have you ever given much thought as to how your Lions Club is run? You attend State meetings; you revel in the fun and fellowship, sponsored by the clubs. We all enjoy the benefits of these many activities, but how many of us are willing to contribute our time or talents to insure the success of these programs. This is when inertia sets in.

Your meetings and all other activities connected with your Lions Club don't happen, they are planned. They run smoothly and efficiently on silent wheels oiled by the sweat and effort, the time and talents of the few who are dedicated to the many. Whether the problem is to run a meeting, plan a membership campaign or sell tickets for one of our events, the only solution is hard work and cooperation from as many members as possible.

But before this problem is solved, those responsible for directing these activities must first solve the problem of overcoming the inertia of the many who are content with agreeing that the problem must be met but who are willing only to give lipservice to its solution. Every activity of Lions has to have direction, and direction means work and dedication.

While we have a goodly number of highly dedicated workers in our Lions Clubs, there are still too few doing too much for too many. This is not to say that those who are doing the work are complaining or don't like it; not at all.

All of those responsible for the smooth operation of your Lions Club looks on it as a labor of love, but they could operate more efficiently, and we would derive more benefits, if there were more workers to share the load. We like the benefits but we hate to exert the effort it takes to overcome our inertia and translate it into action. Let's try it anyhow, what do you say? You will find each member kind, generous, and decent to everyone else.

You may have thought of Lionism as just a luncheon club, or just another organization. This great organization's slogan is "We are the eyes of the blind," also, "We serve."

A few years ago Lions International held a motto contest. Hundreds of excellent suggestions were received from Lions all over the world. Many were clever. Many were impressive. But out of the large number received, the judges selected a simple two-word motto. They chose "We serve" and it became the official motto of Lions International. The motto was nothing fancy. But it is strong in its modesty and simplicity, applicable to all forms of Lions service, easily translatable and understood in any language and universal in its meaning.

We serve—we care not what you need, your trouble, your distress. We care not your race, your nationality, your beliefs. You may be as near to us a next door neighbor, or as far as the other side of the world.

We serve—not for headlines, but for heartlines. Not for personal benefit, but for personal warmth of a sharing hand. Not to stand above you, but to stand with you until your distress is no longer yours or ours.

"We serve"—beautiful words, defining the work done by a host of good men, unselfishly eager to help others in their own cities, their own countries across the world.

I strongly recommend that all clubs use the motto, "We serve." We can work under this simple, sincere motto, "We serve," knowing that out of the sum of our efforts will come better days.

To be a real Lion implies service. Too few in any organization take responsibility. Perform all duties delegated to you. Come right in and be a real Lion. You will get out of it only as much as you put in.

A man is a Lion when he can look over the rivers, the hills, and the far horizon with a profound sense of his own littleness in the vast scheme of things and yet have faith, hope, and courage.

When he knows that down in his heart every man is as noble and as vile, as divine, as diabolic, and as lonely as himself and seeks to know, to forgive, and to love his fellow man.

When he knows how to sympathize with men in their sorrows, yes, even in their sins, knowing that each man fights a hard fight against many odds.

When he has learned how to make friends and to keep them, and above all, learned how to be friends with himself.

When he loves flowers, can hunt the birds without a gun, and feels the thrill of an old forgotten joy when he hears the laugh of a little child.

When he can be happy and high minded amid the meaner drudgeries of life.

When star-crowned trees and the glint of sunlight on flowing waters subdue him like the thought of one much loved and long dead.

When no voice of distress reaches his ears in vain and no hand seeks aid without response.

When he finds good in every faith that helps any man to lay hold of higher things and to see majestic meanings in life whatever the name of that faith may be.

When he can look into the wayside puddle and see something besides mud and into the face of the most forlorn mortal and see something beyond sin.

When he knows how to pray, how to love, how to hope.

When he has kept faith with himself and his fellow men and with God.

When in his hand is a sword for evil, in his heart a bit of song, glad to live, but not afraid to die.

In such a man, whether he be rich or poor, scholarly or unlearned, famous or obscure, Lionism has wrought her sweet ministry.

The longer we dwell on our misfortunes the greater they become.

The satisfaction you receive from your membership will in the final analysis be purely personal. You will benefit from your membership only to the extent of personal satisfaction you enjoy as part of our fellowship. The rewards you get out of your membership will be a satisfaction to yourself, when you have helped someone less fortunate than yourself.

The rewards you get in Lionism, you can't hang in your trophy room or dangle from your watch chain, but you will wear them in your heart and the world will see them in the glow of your whole being and the pride of your walk because you have done purely personal, wonderful worldwide things.

We sang a popular song a few years ago, "Everything Is Going My Way." We may say everything is lovely.

I have a fine family, a good business. I have many pleasures and some luxuries. These are things not to be laughed at. These are things to be truly thankful for.

Did you ever take into consideration, while things may "be going my way" today, that tomorrow they may be going in the opposite direction? Life is like that. Things were "going our way" in America until the Japs hit us at Pearl Harbor. We never had been attacked before, and in just a few short hours we lost most of our Pacific Fleet. This Nation woke up, and history will record that Japan defeated Germany at Pearl Harbor.

Beauty is all around us. It has always been here. We move so fast in our scramble for business and money, the landscape is blurred. If we take time to look around, it is here just the same.

To many, the road is rough, because they make it so. To many life has become difficult.

It is our great objective that Lionism helps men to better vision and to see beauty in the world. Be proud of belonging to the greatest organization of service-minded men on the earth—"the Lions." Work with your fellow Lions in every group project or activity that will benefit your fellow men in any way. Give your time, your resources, your efforts, to the satisfying work of Lionism.

Things in the world would be vastly better if we would each of us inject just a little more kindness in our daily lives. If we would forget our rights and think more of our obligation to each, this world would be a much better place to live in.

Most of us are born with an instinct for beauty and perfection; however, we are too busy to remember it. Lions should devote their efforts to helping those who are less fortunate than themselves. With that bright emblem the Lions pin on your lapel, you will never walk alone.

"Art thou lonely, O my brother
Share thy little with another
Stretch a hand to one unfriended
And thy loneliness is ended."

I promise that, in sharing a little, in stretching a hand, you will find true rewards in a Lions membership and they will be purely personal.

A poet once put it far better than I could:

"DOING FOR OTHERS

"Doing things for others can be a lot of fun
I guarantee it's one sure way to put blues on the run.

"For when we think of someone else, we overlook ourselves
Thereby placing worries on the highest shelves.

"A tender word or kindly act does much to pave life's road,
Helping those who struggle to bear their heavy loads.

"The surest way to happiness is doing what we can
To follow God's example and help our fellow man.

"Some folks do not agree with this, but in my heart I know.
By doing things for others my joys are sure to grow."

Goodby and God bless you all.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11539. An act to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 27 and 55 to the bill (H.R. 8370), "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes."

And agrees to the conference report.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor have until midnight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 8310.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. MAHON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 11588) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1198)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11588) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 7, 12, 15, 20, 21, 22, 49, 50, 52, 61, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, and 77.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 19, 23, 25, 27, 28, 32, 35, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 54, 57, 58, 59, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 79, 86, 87, and 88; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$20,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,162,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,185,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,222,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$219,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 14, 18, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 48, 53, 55, 56, 60, 62, 63, 66, 70, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, and 89.

GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN
(with reservations),
JOHN J. ROONEY
(except as to amendment No. 7),
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
JOE L. EVINS,
FRANK T. BOW,
CHARLES R. JONAS (with reservations),
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN O. PASTORE,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
CARL HAYDEN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
LISTER HILL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN STENNIS,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
MIKE MONRONEY,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11588), making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $200,000 for "Office of Information" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $20,000,000 for "Rural water and waste disposal grants" instead of $30,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees call on the Secretary to establish firm guide lines, standards, rules and regulations to assure fair and proper administration of this program and to provide maximum protection to the Department and the public interest in the use of the funds provided.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $4,500,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Farmers Home

Administration" instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER IV

Independent offices

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $125,000 for "Civil Aeronautics Board" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $2,200,000 for "Civil Service Commission" as proposed by the House instead of $2,630,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $200,000 for "Salaries and expenses, automatic data processing coordination" instead of $450,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Deletes proposal of the Senate to provide $12,000,000 contract authorization for rent supplement contracts and appropriate $360,000 for liquidation of such contracts during the current fiscal year. Funds for rent supplements are denied at this time without prejudice. Congress has only recently authorized legislation for this program and the new Department should have more time to develop sound plans and criteria which can be reviewed when funds are sought early next year. These should contemplate that Federal assistance will be used only to implement workable programs developed by communities, or in the absence of this, official plans of community development. Funds used in this way will assist communities for orderly development, consistent with underlying purposes of all housing assistance by the Government.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $50,000,000 for the "Housing for the elderly fund" as proposed by the Senate instead of $35,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9: Authorize $125,000 for administrative expense for Housing for the elderly as proposed by the Senate instead of $25,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 10 and 11: Appropriate $675,570,000 for the "Urban Renewal Administration" for fiscal year 1966 as proposed by the Senate instead of $675,520,000 as proposed by the House; and authorize $570,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $520,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate to limit rehabilitation grants to $1,500,000 and code enforcement grants to $75,000,000 in each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $8,162,000 for "Urban planning grants" instead of $6,325,000 as proposed by the House and $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate $26,975,000 for "Open space land grants" as proposed by the House instead of $36,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and inserts language making such funds available until expended as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to increase administrative expenses for rehabilitation loans by $190,000.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $12,000,000 for "Grants for neighborhood facilities" instead of $9,000,000 as proposed by the House and $15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $2,185,000 for "Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses" instead of $1,971,500 as proposed by the House and $2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds are not included for the airport study proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate $1,000,000 to conduct studies with respect to methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of natural disasters instead of $1,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $450,000 for the "Federal Housing Administration" for administrative expenses related to a rent supplement program as proposed by the Senate instead of $170,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20: Authorizes $1,000,000 for nonadministrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration as proposed by the House instead of $1,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Deletes proposal of the Senate to appropriate $185,000 for the "Interstate Commerce Commission".

CHAPTER V

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 22: Deletes $4,500 for "Construction and maintenance, Bureau of Land Management" proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $638,000 for "Construction, Bureau of Indian Affairs" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $11,222,000 for "Construction, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife" instead of $10,500,000 as proposed by the House and $11,347,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House amount includes an additional $155,000 to meet the full cost of damage at the fish genetics research facility, Beulah, Wyo.; $500,000 for repair of flood damage to wildlife refuges caused by Hurricane Betsy in September 1965; and $67,000 to construct and equip a headquarters for the North Central Reservoir investigation group, Pierre, S. Dak.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $1,400,000 for "Solid waste disposal, Bureau of Mines" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $500,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Water Resources Research" instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $75,000 for "Forest research, Forest Protection and Utilization" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $146,000 for "Construction of Indian Health Facilities, Public Health Service" as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER VI

Department of Labor

Amendment No. 29: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which adds $444,000 for "Office of the Secretary, Federal contract compliance program".

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Amendment No. 30: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which would have the effect of inserting $160,000,000 for "Higher educational activities" instead of $173,200,000 proposed by the Senate. The reduction of $13,200,000 is the amount included in the Senate amendment for the National teacher corps.

Amendment No. 31: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which inserts $2,935,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Education".

Amendment No. 32: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 33: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which inserts $8,310,000 for "Grants to States, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration".

Amendment No. 34: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which inserts $1,000,000 for "Research and training, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration".

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $560,000 for "Grants for correctional rehabilitation study, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which inserts $390,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration".

Amendment No. 37: Strikes appropriation of $12,000,000 for "Community health practice and research" and language as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 38 and 39: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer motions to recede and concur in the Senate amendments which insert an appropriation of $24,000,000 for "Community health practice and research" and language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Inserts an appropriation of $625,000 for "Air pollution" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Inserts an appropriation of $4,000,000 for "Environmental engineering and sanitation" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Inserts an appropriation of $628,000 for "Water supply and water pollution control" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $50,000,000 for "Grants for waste treatment works construction" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Inserts an appropriation of $125,000 for "Foreign quarantine activities" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 45 and 46: Insert appropriation of $20,200,000 for the "National Institute of Mental Health" as proposed by the Senate instead of $19,700,000 as proposed by the House and earmark $500,000 to carry out the provisions of section 231 of the Social Security Amendments of 1956 as proposed by the Senate.

National Cancer Institute

The Senate report on the bill contained language on pages 32 and 33 concerning approval of contracts for the cancer program. The Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has indicated that to follow the instructions included in the report might create serious problems for the Institute. The Secretary has stated:

"Review and approval of each individual contract by the Advisory Council to the National Cancer Institute introduces such a fundamental change in policy that I would be extremely reluctant to see it introduced without a thorough study. I assure you that I will initiate such a study immediately and will report back to the congressional Appropriations Committee early next year."

The conferees have agreed to hold this matter in abeyance with the distinct understanding that the Secretary "will initiate such a study immediately" and that the two Committees on Appropriations will receive the final report of the study not later than the end of next February.

Amendment No. 47: Inserts an appropriation of $25,000,000 for "Regional medical programs" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which inserts an appropriation of $120,000 for "Assistance for repatriated United States nationals".

Amendments Nos. 49 and 50: Appropriate $25,000,000 for "Grants for maternal and child welfare" as proposed by the House instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and earmark $15,000,000 for special project grants for comprehensive health care and services for school age and preschool age children as proposed by the House. In connection with the latter program the conferees direct the Department and the Welfare Administration to organize its operations and frame its policies to ensure that there will be complete coordination of this program with health services for children provided under programs administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The conferees intend that there be no duplication in the administration of these programs. The appropriate subcommittees of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees will carefully review the experience of both programs to determine that full coordination has been accomplished.

Amendment No. 51: Appropriates $219,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary" instead of $163,000 as proposed by the House and $275,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates $1,500,000,000 for "Economic Opportunity Program" as proposed by the House instead of $1,510,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will have the effect of making not more than $10,000,000 available for carrying out the purposes of section 205 (d) of title II, of the Economic Opportunity Act at the discretion of the Director instead of providing not less than $10,000,000 to carry out said section.

Amendment No. 54: Provides that contracts entered into under the Economic Opportunity Program may not be for in excess of twenty-four months as proposed by the Senate instead of one year as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 55 and 56: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer motions to recede and concur in the Senate amendments which contain restrictive language applying to the Economic Opportunity Program.

CHAPTER VII

Legislative branch

Amendments Nos. 57, 58, and 59: Appropriate $32,750 for various Senate items as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur to provide a total amount of $425,000 for "Contingent expenses of the Senate".

Architect of the Capitol

Amendment No. 61: Restores language of the House providing the appropriation of $300,000 for plans in connection with the extension of the West Central Front of the Capitol. The conferees reiterate the statement carried in the House report on this item which reads as follows: "* * * there is no authority to proceed with construction contracts, or even detailed plans and specifications until the Commission approves the plan, a further estimate of cost is available, and the Congress appropriates the money for the work in a future bill."

Amendment No. 62: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in order to provide $405,000 for "Senate Office Buildings".

Amendment No. 63: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in order to adjust certain salary rates relating to the "Senate Office Building".

CHAPTER VIII

Public works

Department of Defense—Civil Functions

Amendment No. 64: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 65: Appropriates $30,000 for "General investigations" as proposed by the Senate for a study of the Red River Basin, Tennessee.

Amendment No. 66: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate $900,000 for "Construction, general" instead of $1,950,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided includes $300,000 for initiating planning on the Dickey-Lincoln School project, Saint John River, Maine, and $100,000 for initiating planning on the Rowlesburg Reservoir, West Virginia.

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 67: Appropriates $500,000 for "Construction and rehabilitation, Bureau of Reclamation" for advance acquisition of rights-of-way on the Auburn-Folsom South Unit of the Central Valley reclamation project, California, as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER IX

Department of State

Amendments Nos. 68 and 69: Appropriate $500,000 for "Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 70: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment appropriating $500,000 for the "Facilities for International Pacific Halibut Commission".

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 71: Appropriates $50,000 for "Salaries and expenses, general administration" as proposed by the House instead of $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 72: Deletes funds for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Business Economics" as proposed by the House instead of appropriating $165,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 73: Appropriates $203,200,000 for "Development facilities grants, Economic Development Administration" as proposed by the House instead of $254,500,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provides not to exceed $3,200,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 74 and 75: Appropriate $18,125,000 for "Technical and community assistance, Economic Development Administration" as proposed by the House instead of $19,325,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provides not to exceed $5,100,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 76: Restores language of the House appropriating $105,000,000 for "Economic development, Economic Development Administration" and deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 77: Appropriates $18,250,000 for "High-speed ground transportation research and development" as proposed by the House instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. If the balance of the funds authorized for fiscal year 1966 are required prior to June 30, 1966, a supplemental estimate will be considered.

Amendment No. 78: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment appropriating $125,000 for "HemisFair 1968 Exposition".

Amendment No. 79: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 80: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment appropriating $10,000,000 for "Control of outdoor advertising and junkyards".

Amendment No. 81: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment appropriating $60,000,000 for "Landscaping and scenic enhancement".

Amendment No. 82: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment appropriating $750,000 for "Administrative expenses, highway beautification".

Amendment No. 83: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment appropriating $290,000 for "Highway safety".

Related agencies

Amendment No. 84: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment appropriating $84,000,000 additional for the "Revolving fund" Small Business Administration.

Amendment No. 85: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment appropriating not to exceed $35,000,000 for "Southeast hurricane disaster".

CHAPTER XI

Claims and judgments

Amendments Nos. 86, 87, and 88: Appropriate $26,508,212 to pay for certain claims as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,130,470 as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER XII

General provisions

Amendment No. 89: Reported in technical disagreement.

The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in order to validate obligations which may be made between the expiration date of the continuing resolution and the date of enactment of this Act.

Geo. Mahon,
Jamie L. Whitten (with reservation),
John J. Rooney (except as to amendment No. 7),
John E. Fogarty,
Joe L. Evins,
Frank T. Bow,
Charles R. Jonas (with reservations),
Melvin R. Laird,
Manager on the Part of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11588) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will indulge me a very few moments for a general statement, to be followed by a few specific references to the bill and report pending before us.

Mr. Speaker, we have come to the last appropriation bill of the session. I have heard our able Speaker on more than one occasion speak pridefully of the prerogatives of the House of Representatives. And, as I look back through the years, and even now, in my mind's eye I can see the late beloved Sam Rayburn standing here in the well and speaking of his pride in the prerogatives of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I believe now is a good time to reaffirm the pride which each one of us has in the power and the prerogatives and in the dignity of the House of Representatives. We may not always legislate aright, but we do legislate, and our American system has stood the test of the years.

Mr. Speaker, it is unerringly accurate to say that all legislation on complex subjects is a result of compromise. Movements toward progress in legislating would come to a screeching halt without this genius for compromise which has characterized the American Congress since the days of George Washington. Some flexibility is required, and certainly flexibility was required in the handling of this last bill of the session which had 89 separate amendments of the other body and was so highly controversial in some respects.

Mr. Speaker, no member of the conferees—and I could probably safely also say the Congress—is satisfied with everything contained in the bill now pending before us. Certainly I, myself, am definitely opposed to some sections of the conference report, but action had to be taken, and we took it. We are prepared to discuss with you the actions which were taken.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a great year this session. The President has provided magnificent leadership. No President in history has had such a remarkable batting average with his legislative program.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about arm twisting. I do not discount the persuasiveness of the President and I would add that any President who believes in his program should fight for it. The President and his aids have been brilliant in the combat—I should not say "combat," because it has been really done in the atmosphere of discussion, good will, and in a spirit of give and take.

But, Mr. Speaker, let none be deceived. Members of the Congress at this session, as in previous sessions, have had their eyes constantly upon the folk back home. If I be not badly mistaken, and I think I am not, they have sought to vote in accordance with the wishes of the folk back home. That is the explanation of the tremendous accomplishments of this Congress, working under the able leadership and in consonance with the wishes, insofar as we knew—as each of us as an individual Member saw it—with the folk back home.

TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS OF THE SESSION

Now, Mr. Speaker, at this session we have appropriated a lot of money. With this bill now pending before us, in the sum of about $4,741,000,000, we raise the total appropriations for this year, for this session, to $107,037,000,000, to which must be added, for a complete picture, the so-called permanent appropriations of roughly $12,270,000,000—making a grand total of about $119,307,000,000, a colossal sum. I should add that the principal item of permanent appropriation is for interest on the public debt—it is over $11 billion of the total.

Mr. Speaker, those who say that this is not enough will not be able to convince the American people nor the Members of this Congress.

We have cut the appropriation budget requests by about $2,410,000,000 during this session.

THE PENDING SUPPLEMENTAL BILL

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the conference report and bill pending before us it provides, as I said, for the appropriation of about $4.7 billion. This is about $229 million below the request made by the Executive; it is about $125 million below the figure adopted in the other body; and it is about $527 million above what the bill was when it was before the House. We asked the Director of the Budget to cut off some of these estimates which were scheduled to come to the House and to send them directly to the other body. The other body considered some $607 million of budget estimates which the House did not consider.

With respect to the content of the bill, most of us are familiar with it because it has not been too long ago that we passed this bill, and we are generally familiar with the estimates that went to the Senate. This conference bill eliminates the rent supplement item put in by the other body, but language is contained in the statement of the managers stating that this is done without prejudice to the program. However, the program had been launched under such an ill omen it became necessary to call a halt, because the administrator of the agency had indicated the announcement and the promulgation of rules and regulations which were abhorrent to many Members of the Congress, many of whom were strong supporters of the rent supplement program.

It is true when he observed that he was running against the wishes of the Congress he came to Capitol Hill with a series of letters saying, in effect, "I am sorry, we will change this," and he then offered a different type of proposition than had previously been offered, but, Mr. Speaker, a man convinced against his will is somewhat of the same opinion still, and we felt it was wise to take a little time to digest this program and let the agency come up with regulations and let us see with our own eyes what the regulations will be before we take action. If there is anything wrong or illegical with that approach I fail to see it. This is not a repudiation by this body, it is not a veto of the program. It is an action in good, commonsense under the circumstances.

There has been some discussion about a small item in the bill of $300,000 to look into the possibility of protecting the west front of the Capitol. We put this money back in the bill, but there can be no contract let for any remodeling of the Capitol west front. The money is as the House proposed it, namely, for preliminary plans and estimates of costs. The Capitol is shored up on the western front.

For the higher education bill, we were confronted with a budget request of $274 million. The other body inserted $173.2 million of this request. We provide $160 million for higher education in this conference report.

We provide $25 million for the heart, cancer, and stroke program.

For economic development—the old ARA, accelerated public works, and Applachia aid programs—we provide a total of $332,475,000, of which $203 million is for development grants.

For the highway beautification program, which passed the House not long ago under most strenuous circumstances, we were confronted with a budget request of $92 million. The other body put in about $71 million and this amount was agreed to in conference.

The Small Business Administration has been provided with a total, overall, of $195 million. This was necessary by reason of Hurricane Betsy and other disasters.

One of the controversial items in the bill, which I voted against, and which the House previously repudiated by a small margin, was the so-called Dickey-Lincoln project, a power project in Maine. We undertook to maintain the House position in opposition to this amendment by the other body, but we had to come to an agreement. We realized we had to give and take, and compromise, if a meeting of the minds were to be achieved. So we put that in this bill. We agreed to $800,000 for initial planning which does not mean, in my judgment, an irrevocable commitment to the project.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that covers the main features of the pending report.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I include a summary of the figures on the bill:

Comparative statement of conference action compared with budget estimates, House bill and Senate bill

Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Recommended in Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
Ch. I. Agriculture	$125,271,000	$105,140,000	$137,340,000	$126,840,000	+$1,569,000	+$21,700,000	−$10,500,000
Ch. II. District of Columbia	(3,067,886)	(2,067,886)	(2,067,886)	(2,067,886)	(−1,000,000)		
Ch. III. Foreign operations	12,600,000	12,600,000	12,600,000	12,600,000			
Ch. IV. Independent offices	1,773,014,000	1,738,372,500	1,776,081,000	1,760,078,000	−12,936,000	+21,705,500	−16,003,000
Ch. V. Interior	71,765,000	56,094,000	60,204,500	59,575,000	−12,190,000	+3,481,000	−629,500
Ch. VI. Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare	2,185,960,000	1,797,826,000	2,072,775,000	2,064,519,000	−121,441,000	+266,693,000	−8,256,000
Ch. VII. Legislative	3,927,640	4,485,640	4,848,390	5,148,390	+1,220,750	+662,750	+300,000
Ch. VIII. Public works	845,000	310,000	2,790,000	1,740,000	+895,000	+1,430,000	−1,050,000
Ch. IX. State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	708,536,000	458,171,000	738,801,000	649,336,000	−59,200,000	+191,165,000	−89,465,000
Ch. X. Treasury, Post Office	77,777,000	35,300,000	35,300,000	35,300,000	−42,477,000		
Ch. XI. Claims and judgment	11,508,212	6,130,470	26,508,212	26,508,212	+15,000,000	+20,377,742	
Total	[1] 4,971,203,852	4,214,429,610	4,867,248,102	4,741,644,602	−229,559,250	+527,214,992	−125,603,500

---

[1] Includes $607,083,742 not considered by the House.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has indicated that an appropriation of $300,000 had been included in the bill, as he expressed it, to explore the shoring up and rehabilitation of the west front of the Capitol. As the gentleman knows, I have been strongly opposed to the proposal that we extend the west front of the Capitol. Unfortunately, I was not able to offer an amendment when this bill came up the other day in the House. I was pleased, however, to see that the Senate supported my position and deleted the funds. My question is—Does this $300,000 that has been included for a study include the possibility of studying the shoring up of the west front without making any extension of it and without actually covering up the historic original walls and without adding restaurant space and additional office space and really distorting the present balance of the Capitol, an action which has been so strongly opposed by the American Institute of Architects.

Mr. MAHON. The $300,000 would be used to study the problem—and it is a problem. We must preserve this monument. It is not only a monument but it is a working place, as we have found out during this long session of the Congress. The $300,000 includes funds that might be used in considering the possibility of a design to meet the requirements. But it does not authorize any contract for any sort of construction, and it leaves it for us to handle this issue as it comes along.

I realize there are architects—who do not work in the Capitol—who have views that we should hardly do anything to the Capitol at all. But we have people who do know something about it and it is up to them to figure out a way and it is up to us, and those employed by the Congress, to figure out a way to preserve the Capitol and increase its utilitarian aspects.

We could talk endlessly about it. I appreciate the gentleman's position. I know what many others have said. I know what certain architects have said. I know what the Architect of the Capitol said. When the east front was enlarged, some architects said we should have enlarged the west front rather than the east front.

Mr. STRATTON. The only point I am trying to get assurance on was whether the decision of the conference committee represents some change from the original position of the House.

Mr. MAHON. It does not. It is identical to the original position of the House.

Mr. STRATTON. I am sorry to hear that because of course the original position of the House was that this $300,000 was appropriated to explore the recommendation of the engineering firm which had considered the possibility of saving the west front of the Capitol without covering it up and had rejected that possibility and had recommended instead an extension project similar to the one already completed on the east front. I understand that the conference agreement does not involve any actual construction, but it does jeopardize still further any efforts at preservation of the historic beauty of the original Capitol.

Whether we ought to cover up the last historic portion of this building and destroy the present architectural balance of the Capitol should certainly be a question that ought to be considered the right of the Congress to make. It ought not to be left merely to the engineers of some engineering firm to decide. It is a question we should decide. I was hopeful that perhaps the gentleman from Texas could indicate in the legislative history here that that subject could at least be explored with these funds and not leave it an entirely closed question so that the only thing we will be spending this money for is how best to extend and cover up this sole remaining portion of the historic original Capitol Building.

Mr. MAHON. The Speaker of the House and other members of our Building Commission of course will give consideration to this whole problem. This is just one step in trying to determine how best to handle this problem. I cannot predict at this time what the Building Commission will recommend or what future Congresses will decide to do with reference to this very difficult subject.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I should like to point out to the gentleman from New York that there is a provision in the report of the conferees that I think the gentleman may be interested in. The conference report states:

> There is no authority to proceed with a construction contract or even detailed plans and specifications until the commission approves the plan and further estimates of cost are available and the Congress appropriates money in the regular appropriation bill.

With that language in the conference statement, there is no question that nothing can now be done except to make the study and preliminary plans to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. According to the figures that I have before me, the supplemental appropriation bill shows an increase for State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary of $191 million, plus, over the House figure. Could someone state briefly why this increase, which appears to be the most substantial for any agency, department, or combination of agencies or departments of the Government?

Mr. MAHON. When this chapter was before the Committee on Appropriations, some very sharp reductions were made by the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. Substantial additional budget estimates falling under this heading went to the other body.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] such time as he may require.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the very pertinent inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, I should first like to point out that every dollar of the money saved at the time of passage of this supplemental bill by the House was recommended by the State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary Subcommittee has been preserved in the conference between the House and Senate. The reason for the increase in the figures mentioned by the gentleman is that additional substantial budget estimates for necessary and proper items which were not before the House and the subcommittee at the time of the consideration and passage of this bill, were subsequently presented to the other body.

For example, in relation to the Department of State, an item of a half million dollars for salaries and expenses was inserted in this bill by the other body. This item is in connection with implementation of the new immigration legislation passed by both Houses of the Congress and signed by the President on Liberty Island and is necessary in order to carry out the provisions of that act.

There is also an item for the Department of State, International Commissions for office facilities for the International Pacific Halibut Commission at the University of Washington in the northwest area also amounting to a half million dollars. That item, likewise, was not before the House, and is now included in the pending conference report.

Another item included in the bill relates to the HemisFair 1968 Exposition, $125,000, to plan for the extent of participation by the United States in HemisFair 1968, which has already been authorized by law.

Among the other items there were also an item for the control of outdoor advertising and junkyards, Bureau of Public Roads, in the amount of $10 million, and one for landscaping and scenic enhancement, Bureau of Public Roads, $60 million.

I should also like to point out that there was an item for the southeast hurricane disaster, to wit, Hurricane Betsy, which was inserted by the other body, in the amount of $70 million, and which the conferees agreed should be cut in half to $35 million pending some further details, and a formal request for funds of the House Appropriations Committee in the next session of this Congress.

So with all these and other items added to the bill by the other body, we find that it results in the figures shown on the sheet to which the distinguished gentleman from Iowa has referred.

I should like to point with pride to the right-hand column of this sheet, which compares the conference action presently pending with the Senate version of the bill. The gentleman from Iowa will see that the State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary Subcommittee did pretty well by the taxpayers of the United States. In looking at his copy, I think the gentleman would fully agree with that statement.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I see it is $89 million below the figure proposed by the other body. I would have to say that up to that point it represents a saving.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman I am sure will remember that when this bill was considered in the House on Thursday of last week, it was not necessary for the gentleman from New York, the present speaker, or the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], the ranking minority member to explain the subcommittee action. The House took exactly the action that was proposed by this subcommittee. At that time the subcommittee considered funds to the extent of only 10 percent of the total amount of the bill, but cut 50 percent of the total savings in the $4.2 billion as it passed this body.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Am I correctly informed that no money went into this supplemental appropriation bill to bail out the defunct United Nations?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. There are no funds included in this bill or requested for contributions to the international organization, United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the September 1965 rate of expenditures from the Federal administrative budget reached $9.5 billion. This is the highest level of monthly spending in the Nation's history except for June 1964, which was high because of spending pressure at the end of the fiscal year. This September's spending is the highest level for any September in our history.

If the average level of expenditure for the first 3 months of this year continues, the Johnson administration will spend at a level of $102 billion for fiscal 1966. This would be the largest annual expenditure in the Nation's history. It would necessitate a rise in the debt ceiling.

The Johnson administration's original administrative budget estimate for fiscal 1966 was $99.7 billion, which should result in an average authorized monthly expenditure rate for fiscal 1966 of $8.3 billion. The Federal administrative budget is the statement of estimated expenditures for Federal Government programs, excluding Federal trust funds and other special items.

Judging from the level of expenditures for the first 2 months of the present fiscal year, $7.2 for July and $9 for August, the administration would have spent at a level of $97.2 for the entire fiscal year. This figure would have been well below the administration's estimated figure of $99.7 for the present fiscal year. Previously I have noted these figures in public statements and calculated this possible rate of expenditure for fiscal 1966. I have also taken account of the fact that President Johnson spent only $96.5 in fiscal year 1965, a figure below the estimated and authorized expenditure for that year of $97.9 billion.

This gap between authorized Federal expenditures and actual Federal expenditures had led me to state that the real President Johnson was hiding his true nature. While requesting continuingly larger sums of money from Congress, he had imposed tight expenditure restraint. President Johnson is now taking off his mask. At the present average level of expenditure, he will spend well above the $100 billion mark in fiscal 1966, the largest sum in the Nation's history including adjusted figures for the World War II years. And President Johnson will undoubtedly be required to come back to Congress for new legislation allowing a rise in the debt ceiling.

The truly extraordinary nature of this spending figure is shown by another measurement. For each of the fiscal years 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1965, the gap between the highest and lowest monthly expenditure figure was respectively $1.8 billion, $1.8 billion, $2 billion, and $1.8 billion. But the gap between highest and lowest expenditures for fiscal 1966 is already $2.2 billion.

Clearly the Johnson administration's annual expenditure level will rise. At the present rate it will rise above $100 billion for fiscal 1966, requiring a rise in Federal debt and perhaps increasing inflation pressures. From January to July 1965 the consumer price index rose from 108.9 to 110.2, a rise of 1.3 percent. The 1.3-percent rise for the first 6 months of 1965 was about equal to the 12-month rise from 1963 to 1964, of 1.4 percent.

Following is a chart following the receipts and expenditures of the Federal administrative budget on a monthly basis from fiscal 1962 up to and including the first quarter of fiscal 1966.

Administrative budget

[In millions of dollars]

	Receipts	Expenditures
FISCAL YEAR 1962		
1961—July	2,982	[1] 6,322
August	6,367	7,631
September	8,945	6,771
October	3,141	7,796
November	6,424	7,485
December	7,967	7,160
1962—January	5,357	7,395
February	6,729	6,858
March	9,104	7,749
April	5,754	7,289
May	7,024	7,229
June	11,615	[2] 8,102
Total, fiscal year 1962		[3] 87,787
FISCAL YEAR 1963		
1962—July	3,566	7,252
August	7,089	[2] 8,541
September	10,053	7,827
October	3,030	8,524
November	7,027	8,070
December	8,360	7,572
1963—January	5,533	8,013
February	7,305	[1] 6,763
March	9,663	7,806
April	5,735	7,590
May	6,953	7,470
June	12,061	7,715
Total, fiscal year 1963		[4] 92,642

Administrative budget—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Receipts	Expenditures
FISCAL YEAR 1964		
1963—July	3,547	7,865
August	7,290	8,305
September	10,095	7,815
October	3,400	8,776
November	7,131	7,784
December	8,803	8,289
January	5,853	8,492
February	8,047	7,521
March	10,148	7,871
April	6,609	7,930
May	6,136	[1] 7,511
June	12,401	[2] 9,527
Total, fiscal year 1964		[5] 97,684
FISCAL YEAR 1965		
1964—July	3,487	7,410
August	6,653	8,083
September	10,072	8,450
October	3,398	8,329
November	7,037	[1] 7,051
December	8,856	[2] 8,770
1965—January	5,642	7,676
February	7,518	7,146
March	11,188	8,139
April	8,549	8,268
May	7,268	8,116
June	13,377	9,081
Total, fiscal year 1965		[6] 96,519
FISCAL YEAR 1966 [7]		
1965—July	3,807	7,240
August	7,350	8,990
September	10,999	9,452
October		
November		
December		
1966—January		
Total, fiscal year 1966 (estimate)		[8] 99,687

---

[1] Low.

[2] High.

[3] Expenditures fluctuated within range of $1,780,000,000.

[4] Expenditures fluctuated within range of $1,781,000,000.

[5] Expenditures fluctuated within range of $2,016,000,000.

[6] $97,900,000,000 original preliminary estimate. Expenditures fluctuated within range of $1,719,000,000.

[7] Cumulative totals 1st 3 months fiscal year 1965, $23,900,000,000; 1st 3 months fiscal year 1966, $25,700,000,000.

[8] For 1966 fiscal year monthly expenditure should average $8,307,000,000. Actual 1966 1st quarter monthly expenditure average is $8,561,000,000.

Source: Statistics taken from the Treasury Bulletin.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I will not speak long on this bill. I spoke when the supplemental appropriation bill was before the House.

I raised the question of the amount of money being placed in the supplemental appropriation bill. I believe it is most unfortunate that we have before us a bill which is going to cost the taxpayers $4,741 million.

I do want to compliment the chairman of the committee and the conferees for the valiant effort which was made to preserve the House position on these various items which were before the conference. I believe an excellent job was done. I believe the House position has been preserved.

The Senate had before it some items in the budget which we did not have.

All in all, I believe the conferees have brought back a bill as near to the House position as they possibly could. As the chairman has said, there are matters here which none of us like. Nevertheless, I believe the conference was a good one and I hope the conference report will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report provides large sums for urban renewal. I am concerned in the relationship to the expenditures of these funds to actual needs and the proper protection of private interests.

The Urban Renewal Administration should not consider these liberal appropriations as an invitation to proceed roughshod or ruthlessly against private owners and operators of property not of necessity needed for their purposes.

I have had brought to my attention the fact that in one area consideration is being given to condemn and take valuable income property that, after the taking, shall be used in its present state for the same purposes to which it is put by the present owner. I cannot conceive this to be the purpose or intent of the law.

If a private enterprise, taxpaying venture is to be continued in its present state after being taken by the Urban Renewal Administration, what possible excuse can there be for its inclusion in projects paid for by the American taxpayer?

Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by the Urban Renewal Administration that this is not their objective. However, after this liberal appropriation has been enacted and Congress has adjourned, I would consider it an affront to me, and to the Congress if excuses were found to circumvent the will of this House.

I bring this to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, so that all interested parties may know that a careful and vigilant examination will be made of all expenditures of the Urban Renewal Administration and I would suggest that in any case where such property is to be taken that the Congress be advised before there is any final action.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield for a question to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will respond to this question. I appreciate his comments in connection with the reconstruction of the west front. The gentleman read from the conference committee report to the effect that after the survey had been made the plan would be approved by the Commission, as I understand it, and funds would have to be appropriated by the Congress.

Is it the understanding of the gentleman from Ohio that the only way in which the House itself could pass on whether it approved or disapproved a particular proposal for preserving the west front would be either to reject or to approve the requested funds? The approval of a plan itself would be in the hands of a commission rather than the Congress?

Mr. BOW. It is a little difficult for me to answer the gentleman's question. I would have to refer him to someone who knows more about what has been authorized. Many things are authorized in the Congress, and it is difficult to keep up with all the authorizations.

The point I was making to the gentleman is that the House will have an opportunity, before any of the things the gentleman is talking about could take place, to consider the matter. It will be necessary that there be an appropriation to do this. There is no construction contract here, and not even detailed plans. So before anything could happen it would have to come back to the House for action.

I believe the gentleman would be protected at that time.

The gentleman asked whether the commission could go forward or whether there was an authorization for them to do so.

I am sorry, I must say to the gentleman, that I do not believe I am competent to answer that question.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I just want the Record to show that amendment No. 66, which appropriates some $900,000 for two projects, one of them being the Dickey-Lincoln School project, has had a very interesting journey during this session of Congress. I would like to point out to the Members of this House that in the authorization bill that was passed yesterday, the omnibus rivers and harbors bill, there were 144 projects all over this Nation. In the regular appropriation bill which came from the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations, on which I serve, the Senate put in 23 of these unauthorized projects. Our committee agreed to 20 of them with the restrictive language that the appropriation would not be effective until the bill was authorized. So the authorization occurred yesterday.

Now let me say this: Of the 23 projects that the Senate said were top priority projects, the Dickey-Lincoln School project was not included. As a result 124 projects, in which I presume 200 Members or better here are interested, will have to wait until next year for their money. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we have given carte blanche to this particular project, and I do not think we should have done it. I can understand the position of the House conferees here. It is late in the day and we are in the waning days of this session. All of us I think want to go home and so do I. However, I do not think we ought to handle this kind of a project in this way.

I will say what I said yesterday, that is, in the 11 years I have served on this Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations I have supported these projects all over the Nation. The record will show that my record is probably as good a record as anyone has in this House on these particular projects. The record will show also that no project, no project of this magnitude, has ever been approved in a supplemental bill unless there was great urgency for it. Where is the urgency here? This is not a flood control project. We have been approving flood control projects in supplementals for years, not pure power projects. However, a project like this, where there is no real urgency for it, is one that we ought not to approve today. I know the facts of life. I have no illusions about it. I do not criticize the House conferees at all. I think they have done a good job.

I have said before and I repeat now that I object to this project at this time because it has not been given sufficient study. It should not have been carried in this supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] has worked faithfully and ably through the years on the Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations. This is a big project. I would have much preferred that it go over for consideration next year. It will go over to next year for the construction money. This action today is not an irrevocable commitment, as I see it. We were confronted with a united wall of support among the Senate conferees who were led by Senator Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine. She was supported very tenaciously by others. It became necessary to come to an agreement, and this is what has developed.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to my friend from North Carolina, another valuable member of the committee.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I concur in what has been said. I do not serve on the Subcommittee on Public Works, and therefore I knew very little about this project except what I learned in listening to the debate that has occurred on it several times in this Chamber. The parliamentary situation is, however—and I ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon], to correct me if I am wrong—that this item is in technical disagreement and it will have to be approved by this body this afternoon. So those who are firm in their opposition to this will have an opportunity, if they care to do so, to ask for a separate vote on this item. Is that not correct?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, when we reach this amendment in the bill.

Mr. JONAS. When we reach amendment No. 66.

Mr. MAHON. In view of the fact that the project has been included, as a package, a compromise, between the two bodies, and in view of the fact that only $800,000 is provided for initial planning of the project, it seems to me the better part of wisdom to approve the action taken by the conferees and permit this bill to move through this body and the other body and on to the President.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JONAS. That is the reason why, even though I should be opposed to this item, I do not feel in good conscience that I could repudiate the action of the Congress in which I have participated; and I only made the observation that an opportunity will be presented when we reach amendment No. 66 for anyone who cares to do so, to take the required action.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **MAHON.** I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. **KELLY.** Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I resent the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts who remarked that tears of a female Member of the other body had bearing on including the Dickey-Lincoln project. I assure him that I voted previously to exclude the project but I did not succumb to emotional speeches of his of yesterday to delete the project.

Mr. **DAVIS** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **MAHON.** I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. **DAVIS** of Wisconsin. I have worked with the gentleman from Massachusetts who has served on the Public Works Appropriations Committee, on two separate hitches. I have great confidence in his ability, his sincerity and his integrity and yet I can understand his reluctance to bring this issue before the House at this stage of the proceedings in view of the fact that he is a conferee and that he does feel that overall the House has come out very well with respect to this bill. I do feel strongly that here is one of the chestnuts in this area that those of us who have worked in it over the years appreciate. I do feel that the House should at least express itself in connection with this and, as I understand it, there will be an opportunity for that to be done when amendment No. 66 is offered after the conference report has been approved; is that correct?

Mr. **MAHON.** The gentleman is correct.

Mr. **ARENDS.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **MAHON.** I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. **ARENDS.** Mr. Speaker, along with some of the Members of the House, I think the conferees as a whole have done a businesslike and a very good job. However, with particular respect to amendment No. 66, which we are presently discussing, and with respect to the item of $800,000 that is provided, I believe we must be frank and say that this entering wedge will provide the means to go ahead with the project next year. That is exactly what we will be faced with here from now before the Appropriations Committee. I hope that the Membership is not so naive as to believe that it is not now on its way to the beginning of the $800,000 appropriation.

Mr. **MAHON.** Mr. Speaker, I think we should agree that these funds are only for planning for the project. I realize this is the way projects begin. The gentleman from Illinois knows, as do the rest of us, that the Congress can work its own will if it does not wish to pursue the project further.

Mr. **ARENDS.** Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Wisconsin said a few moments ago we will get the opportunity to vote on this matter and to express our own opinion.

Mr. **MAHON.** Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. **BARRETT.** Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] if the action taken by the conferees on this bill means that we have killed the rent supplements?

Mr. **EVINS** of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. **MAHON.** I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. **EVINS** of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if I may answer the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I would say to the distinguished gentleman that the action of the conferees did not kill the rent supplement program. As a matter of fact we approved $450,000 for the use of the Federal Housing Administrator for expenses looking toward implementing the rent subsidy program at a later date. We also approved another item of $2,185,000 for the office of the Administrator including over $300,000 specifically tied to making studies and market surveys in connection with the rent supplement program. They should come up with some sound projects and programs and develop some good applications to implement the program.

So, Mr. Speaker, we did not kill the program. We only stood by the position of the House of Representatives, since the House had voted three times recently against funding the program at this time.

Mr. **BARRETT.** Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas will yield further, I assume that what the gentleman from Tennessee is saying now is if in the event the agency comes up with a workable program in the new session of Congress, the money will be very quickly allocated for the rent supplements?

Mr. **EVINS** of Tennessee. If the Members of the House and the gentleman from Pennsylvania will read the report, there is language in the report which says:

> Funds for rent supplements are denied at this time without prejudice.

The report goes on to say:

> Congress has only recently authorized legislation for this program and the new Department should have more time to develop sound plans and criteria which can be reviewed when funds are sought early next year. These should contemplate that Federal assistance will be used only to implement workable programs developed by communities, or in the absence of this, official plans of community development. Funds used in this way will assist communities for orderly development, consistent with underlying purposes of all housing assistance by the Government.

Let me say that funds for the rent supplement contracts are deferred at this time, without prejudice. When they come back they should have better plans and good applications for us to consider.

I think the House has gone as far as we can at this time in view of the recent House actions rejecting the rent supplement program at this time. We can, and will consider the matter again, early next year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **BARRETT.** Mr. Speaker, I must express my disappointment over the failure of the conference report to include even a modest fund to launch President Johnson's rent subsidy program. The Senate restored $12 million and I had hoped that the conferees could accept at least part of that sum.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot recall a subject which has been surrounded by more misunderstanding and misinterpretation. Some of it, of course, has been deliberately created by the opponents of any Federal aid for housing low-income families. But unfortunately some of it has also existed among members who believe in such aid and who for example have been long-time supporters of the low rent public housing program.

The rent supplement program has one simple objective—to enable private capital and private enterprise, supplemented by a Federal rent supplement payment, to provide decent housing for poor families who otherwise will be forced to continue to live in slums. Let me stress that again Mr. Speaker. The only persons eligible for the program will be those whose incomes fall below the limit of eligibility for public housing. In addition, these people in need of housing help must be either elderly or handicapped, displaced by governmental action, now living in slum housing, or victims of a natural disaster. How anyone can oppose a modest rent subsidy to help house these unfortunate low-income people is beyond my comprehension.

The opponents have used the question of assets as a red herring to try and defeat the program. Mr. Speaker, the administration has made it crystal clear that the program will be restricted entirely to low-income families and to families with very limited assets. These people do not own stocks or bonds. Most of them do not even have any savings, so I urge those who have been misled by exaggerated and distorted arguments about excessive assets to put their fears at rest on this score.

Mr. Speaker, for more than a generation Congress has been struggling to find ways to provide decent shelter for the poor. Our great low-rent public housing program has done yeoman work but because of its many restrictions and local conservative opposition only 600,000 units have been built since the program was first authorized in 1937. The imaginative new rent supplement program is a new approach to housing the poor in addition to our low-rent public housing program.

The great new feature of the rent supplement program is that it is essentially a private enterprise program. It will enable our homebuilders, our mortgage bankers, our financial institutions, our nonprofit church groups, our labor unions, and our elderly housing sponsors to throw their resources and energy into a new program to provide decent housing for our families of modest income.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot delay this vitally needed program much longer. I can only hope that in the next few months our colleagues will improve their understanding of the program so that we can see a sizable appropriation for rent supplements in the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I note that the Senate committee report on this supplemental appropriation bill contains the statement that it is the committee's intent that review and approval of research contracts used in the NIH cancer program are to be reviewed through the appropriate study sections and advisory councils in the same manner as research grants.

I have examined the law in this connection and I do not find support for this interpretation. Public Law 89–115, which provides the authority for the expenditure of funds for NIH research contracts, contains no such requirement and, in fact, makes no mention of advisory councils. Rather, the authority to approve contracts is vested in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I take no position on whether or not advisory council review and approval would be desirable in connection with research activities supported by contract for the accomplishment of specific research objectives of the Public Health Service—the purpose for which the contract authority is intended. This is a matter which should be examined on its merits. However, I wish to point out that the law at present does not appear to make provision for advisory council participation in contract decisions.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I protest again the failure to fund the rent supplement program. The other body voted $12 million after the House struck out funds on October 14. Now the conferees have eliminated the appropriation. This action is in callous disregard of the ill-housed of the Nation. There are 1.5 million people in New York City residing in substandard housing. In New York City each year there are 100,000 applications for public housing.

We must have a massive low-rent housing program. The Housing Act of 1965 did not begin to meet the need. It limited new public housing construction to 35,000 units per year, a drop in the bucket compared to the need. At the same time the new rent subsidy program as finally drafted applied to families with incomes at the eligibility level for public housing. It offered hope to those trapped in the slums. Now the hopes are dashed by the refusal of the conferees to appropriate even a token amount to get the program underway.

Last summer the rent supplement program was approved as part of the Housing Act of 1965. It was intended to go into effect in this fiscal year. It is deplorable that the conferees are preventing even the minimal start represented by the $12 million appropriation adopted by the other body.

This Great Society legislation is meaningless without funds. I urge the administration to follow through on this legislation to see that it is implemented for the benefit of millions of Americans living in destitution.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in the waning hours of this memorable session of Congress, in which so much worthwhile legislation has been enacted into law, we would do well, I believe, to pay our respects to our Speaker: The Honorable John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts' Ninth District.

For in everything we have accomplished over the past few months, there is a trace of the Speaker's handiwork. Indeed, the Speaker can take much credit for all that has occurred in the 89th Congress, to date, and for the spirit of liberal reform emanating from the great mass of our recent legislation.

Everyone familiar with the grand, illustrious career of Speaker McCormack, must recognize that here is a man born and reared among the finest of American traditions, to which he has remained the dedicated servant, to this very day. Everyone familiar with the record of the man also must recognize the fact that in standing stanchly for reform, in so many vital areas, over so long a period of public service, he has exerted as much moral influence on Congress as any man in Washington today.

Exceptional in many ways, he has managed to combine the intellectual and the spiritual with a compelling dedication to public service that has earned for him the affection of thousands, and the respect of all. And as a representative of the people, he has never forgotten the problems of the people.

The childhood of John W. McCormack was one of abject poverty. When a boy of 13 and in the eighth grade, he was required to leave school, following the death of his father, to help support his mother and his two younger brothers. He shined shoes, sold newspapers, and salvaged coal from the railroad yard. Sometimes there was not enough money in the family to pay the rent of less than $2 a week. Food came often from a "pauper basket" containing mostly fish and potatoes.

Not everyone experiencing poverty in childhood reacts in the same way. Many are embittered. And in their bitterness, some turn to crime. Others, avoiding criminal conduct and achieving success in a lawful manner, nonetheless reject their background, completely, turning against the class from which they came. Not so, however, in the case of John W. McCormack, who responded to the challenge of poverty in the manner of someone to whom challenge was nothing more than the steppingstone to victory. Upon achieving the goals he had established for himself he thereupon set to work in the attempt to ease the burdens of the poor, through political action. And in so doing he has accomplished much.

John McCormack escaped from the status of shoeshine boy and news hawker by way of a job as office boy in a law firm, paying $4 a week. In the evenings and in his spare time, with his employer's encouragement, the boy read law. And in 1913, at the age of 21, he passed the Massachusetts bar examination.

With this behind him, John McCormack became, in short time, a successful trial lawyer, building up a practice that ran to $25,000 to $30,000 a year. From there it was but a single step to politics and John McCormack took the step, as a man of the people, determined to serve the people.

In 1917 John McCormack was elected to the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention, from which he resigned, in 1918, to enter the Army. Following the war he was elected, in 1920, to the Massachusetts House of Representatives. In 1923 he was elevated to the State senate, and in 1927 became senate floor leader for the Democratic majority. In 1929 he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from the Massachusetts 12th District, to fill a vacancy. He has been in Congress ever since.

History and the House of Representatives are unlikely soon to accord to another the respect, prestige and influence John McCormack has gained, since assuming the powers of the speakership. This may in part be due, however, to the fact that by the time John McCormack became Speaker he already had acquired a name and reputation of considerable renown.

John McCormack first attracted national attention in April 1934, when he became chairman of a Special Committee Investigating un-American activities, in which capacity he first displayed to the country his strong, unwavering antipathy for the goals and the policies of international communism. Devoted to the cause of democracy and the free enterprise system, he could not abide the rantings of the Communists. It was therefore with great fervency that he had worked, throughout the depression years, to solve American economic problems along lines in keeping with American traditions.

Under the circumstances, John McCormack was among the first to embrace a great many Roosevelt New Deal measures designed to stabilize the economy in the interest of the little people—the small consumer and the small businessman. He voted for the social security law, then regarded as highly controversial; the so-called pump-priming bill of 1938, the tax-the-wealth plan of 1935, the wage-hour law, the Wagner Housing Act, and the regulation of stock exchanges. In every instance he threw his weight to the side of reform, secure in the knowledge that by standing still nothing could be achieved.

For his work in behalf of reform in committee, on the floor of Congress, and in the several election campaigns, wherein the wisdom of his proposals and the charm and power of his personality earned for him a large army of admirers—John McCormack was soon to rise to a position of great political consequence. In 1938 he was named chairman of the Democratic caucus, and in 1940, when the late Sam Rayburn, of Texas, became Speaker, John McCormack was the choice of President Roosevelt to succeed Rayburn as majority floor leader. He was elected to that post, which he held for 22 years, excepting only those brief moments when the opposition party controlled the House of Representatives, at which time he became minority leader.

As leader of the majority, John McCormack revealed himself a master politician, and a man who never seemed to get tired from overwork. In 1941, aside from helping to drive through the lend-lease bill, he also was required to arrange a compromise between prolabor Democrats and antilabor Democrats over the question of pending antistrike legislation. Largely through his efforts, extremists on both sides were controlled and a compromise solution was reached without serious political repercussion.

In the matter of supporting the American cause, in World War II, no political leader exceeded the efforts of John McCormack. Nor was anyone more facile in the matter of beating down partisan and erroneous attacks of political nature, against the national leadership.

And as the war drew to a close and the prospect of postwar problems appeared, John McCormack spoke out, in the knowledge that economic distress for the world and for the country would fall hardest on the people already hardest pressed—the poor. As he saw it, an important element in the postwar world was the need to so adjust, regulate, and channel our system of private enterprise that mass insecurity would be minimized to the greatest extent possible. He also saw the need for international peacemaking machinery of the kind embodied in the makeup of the United Nations.

As a member of the army that marched with Franklin D. Roosevelt, from the brink of national disaster to the heights of national recovery and the victory in World War II, John McCormack became well acquainted with Roosevelt, whom he proclaimed, "the preserver of democracy." He has declared his conviction that Roosevelt will be ranked in history alongside George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. And in his knowledge of Roosevelt he draws upon a long span of personal experience.

The same can be said, for that matter, with respect to John McCormack and several other Presidents, including Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, and Lyndon B. Johnson. Although he served under Herbert Hoover as well, John McCormack was at that time a very young Congressman and in no position to do much more than say hello to the Commander in Chief. Starting with Roosevelt, however, he acquired sufficient prestige and importance to become the close acquaintance of every President. Truly, his record as a Congressman and majority leader rendered him the logical successor to the great Sam Rayburn as Speaker of the House. For during the same years that Mr. Rayburn was speaker longer than anyone else in history, John McCormack was setting a similar record as House majority leader. And as he excelled as majority leader, so he now excels as Speaker. And from the moment he assumed the speakership, John McCormack has behaved like a veteran.

The Speaker necessarily fills a triple role. He presides over and heads the House. He leads his party in the House and is a key legislative and political advisor to the President. And, like all other House Members, he must run for election biennially to represent a congressional district.

As Speaker, John McCormack has not acted in the manner of a "czar," but has, instead, endeavored to establish a broad base leadership, or something in the nature of a team operation. That is not to say that he has relinquished authority and responsibility. It is merely that he is not quick to impose his will to end factional disputes or discipline those Democrats in the House who stray from the Democratic Party reservation. Instead, he is inclined to tactfulness, patience, and what might be called the long way around, to influence colleagues and win votes.

Speaker McCormack nevertheless has demonstrated that he intends to keep and use the prime powers and prerogatives of his office. He has not stood in the way of either the Democratic steering committee or the Democratic study group. But neither has he permitted these or any other elements to determine his mode of management of the House and the policymaking work of the Speaker and his leadership team, comprised of himself, the majority leader, and the party whip. This "team," incidentally, is the creation of Speaker McCormack, and its value is immense, as we have seen over the past session. The team is responsible for sounding out House sentiment on specific bills and issues, and of determining in advance the way that individual Members will vote, prior to launching a drive in behalf of one bill or another. The results of this policy are evident in the abundance of bills passed without difficulty since Speaker McCormack assumed his post.

Moreover, in considering the qualities of the Speaker, we must recognize that as a Representative, alone, he has immense responsibilities. His district includes 16 of the 22 wards in Boston. It has a population of almost 400,000, and a voting total in the vicinity of 50,000. From early morning until 6 o'clock or thereafter in the evening, including Saturdays, Speaker McCormack is at the Capitol dividing his time and activities between his east front office suite and the Speaker's rooms near the entrance to the House Chamber.

A sad note, so far as the Speakership is concerned, is the fact that John McCormack as Speaker cannot—or at least usually does not—engage in debate on the House floor; and that is, indeed, a tragedy, for of all the Members of the House none can be said to excede the Speaker in the area of argumentive style. His irony, his wit, his sharp tongue, and quickness of mind, render him one of the most interesting and colorful debaters in the history of the House, and the absence of his arguments in these times is altogether regrettable.

The honors bestowed upon Speaker McCormack reveal, in part, the extent to which he is revered by his fellow man. In keeping with his distinguished legal background, he has received honorary law degrees from Boston University, Holy Cross, Boston College, Villanova, Tufts, Providence College, Stonehill College, Georgetown University, Catholic University, Suffolk University, and Staley College. He also holds the Peace Medal of the Third Order of St. Francis. He is a member of the Order of Malta, first class; Knight Commander, Order of St. Gregory the Great, with star. Interested in the welfare of all mankind, the Speaker has been honored not only by his countrymen by also by many millons of people across the sea. He holds today the title of commander, Legion of Honor, Republic of the Philippines; commander, Order of Duarte Sanches Y Mella, Dominican Republic; grand officer, Order of Merito Della Republica, Italy; Titular De La Cruz De Aloy Alfaro, Panama; grand commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix, with star, Greece.

In addition to these honors, the Speaker is a member of the Knights of Columbus and holder of the Bellarmine Medal, Bellarmine College, Louisville, Ky., 1957, and the Cardinal Gibbons Medal, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., 1963. And for his work in behalf of civil rights for all Americans he only recently was honored with a citation presented by the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs.

Indeed, the record of Speaker McCormack is one of outstanding performance and outstanding recognition. On all problems he has responded with the alacrity of a man who is the willing servant of public duty, and always with that same resourcefulness which never seems to fail him.

He is a great American and has turned in a magnificent record in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-one Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 251, nays 84, not voting 97, as follows:

[Roll No. 380]

YEAS—251

Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ayres
Baldwin
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Beckworth
Belcher
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bow
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Carter
Casey
Chelf
Clancy
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Dole
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.

Farbstein
Farnsley
Fascell
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Hathaway
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holland
Horton
Howard
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Krebs
Latta
Leggett
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
Macdonald
Machen
Mackie
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Miller
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Stafford
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitten
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wydler
Yates
Zablocki

NAYS—84

Abernethy
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Battin
Bennett
Betts
Brock
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clawson, Del
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dowdy
Duncan, Tenn.
Erlenborn
Findley
Fisher
Fountain
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Hansen, Idaho
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Herlong
Hutchinson
Jonas
Kornegay
Kunkel
Langen
Lennon
Long, La.
McClory
McMillan
Mills
Mize
Morton
Nelsen
Passman
Poff
Quillen
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Selden
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Whitener
Williams
Younger

NOT VOTING—97

Abbitt
Albert
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Aspinall
Baring
Bell
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton
Bonner
Bray
Buchanan
Cabell
Callan
Callaway
Carey
Celler
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Conable
Cooley
Craley
Culver
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Fallon
Farnum
Feighan
Fino
Fogarty
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Hanley
Hansen, Wash.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Holifield
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Keogh
King, Utah
Kirwan
Laird
Landrum
Lindsay
McCarthy
McVicker
MacGregor
Mackay
Madden
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
Michel
Morgan
Mosher
Multer
Murray
O'Konski
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
Pool
Quie
Reifel
Reinecke
Roberts
Robison
Roudebush
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Sisk
Staggers
Talcott
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tunney
Vanik
Vigorito
Watson
Widnall
Willis
Wright
Wyatt
Young

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Fuqua against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Bray against.

Mr. Albert for, with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. MacGregor against.

Mr. Gerald R. Ford for, with Mr. Murray against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Roudebush against.

Mr. Widnall for, with Mr. Matthews against.

Mr. Martin of Nebraska for, with Mr. Watson against.

Mr. Robison for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Talcott against.

Mr. Conable for, with Mr. Martin of Alabama against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Glenn Andrews against.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Quie against.

Mr. Lindsay for, with Mr. Edwards of Alabama against.

Mr. Don H. Clausen for, with Mr. Michel against.

Mr. Andrews of North Dakota for, with Mr. Buchanan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Schmidhauser with Mr. George W. Andrews.

Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Mosher.

Mr. McVicker with Mr. Willis.

Mr. Madden with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Reinecke.

Mr. Vanik with Mr. Staggers.

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Craley.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Bonner with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Cabell.

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Callan.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Clark.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Farnum.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Mackay.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Schisler.

Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Pool.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Hanley.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. Young with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Toll.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Diggs.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Carey.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Culver.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.

Messrs. ROGERS of Texas, COLLIER, BYRNES of Wisconsin, and MIZE changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 14: Page 9, line 3, strike out "$26,975,000" and insert "$36,000,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "$26,975,000, to remain available until expended."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 18: Page 10, line 14, insert:

"Natural Disaster Study

"For necessary expenses to enable the Administrator to conduct studies with respect to methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of natural disasters, as authorized by law, $1,600,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 408, 89th Congress, or similar legislation."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$1,600,000" named in said amendment, insert "$1,000,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 29: Page 17, line 15, insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

"Office of the Secretary

"Federal Contract Compliance Program

"For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the Department of Labor under Executive Order 11246 of September 24, 1965, including service as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $444,000."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 30: Page 19, insert:

"Higher Educational Activities

"For grants, contracts, payments, and advances under titles I, III, IV (except payments under parts C and D), V and VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for grants under part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, $173,200,000, of which $10,000,000 shall be for grants and contracts for college and university extension education under title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, $5,000,000 shall be for the purposes of title III, $60,000,000 shall be for programs under part A of title IV of that Act, $10,000,000 shall be for loan insurance programs under part B of title IV of that Act of which $2,500,000 for the student loan insurance fund and interest payments shall remain available until expended and $7,500,000 for advances shall remain available until June 30, 1968, $15,000,000 shall be for the purposes of title VI of the Act, and $40,000,000 shall be for grants for college work-study programs under part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H.R. 9567, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation: *Provided*, That in administering the appropriation included in the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1966, related to elementary and secondary educational activities, the amount authorized to be appropriated by title II of the authorizing Act shall be deemed to include amending provisions contained in section 6 of H.R. 9022, Eighty-ninth Congress."

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "$173,200,000" named in said amendment, insert "$160,000,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 31: Page 20, line 7, insert:

"Salaries and Expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $2,935,000, of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be for the National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf, and not to exceed $100,000 shall be for the National Conference on Education of the Deaf: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H.R. 9567, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 33: Page 20, line 16, insert the following:

"Grants to States

"For an additional amount for 'Grants to States', including grants to public and other nonprofit agencies, institutions and organizations, $8,310,000, of which $500,000 is for grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services under section 2 of said Act; $5,000,000, which shall remain available for the periods specified in section 1(3) of said Act, is for grants for planning for the development of comprehensive vocational rehabilitation programs, and for grants for planning, preparing for, and initiating special programs to expand vocational rehabilitation services, as authorized by section 4(a)(2) of said Act; $1,500,000, which shall remain available for the period specified in section 14(i) of said Act, is for grants with respect to workshops and rehabilitation facilities as authorized by section 14 of said Act; and $1,310,000 is for grants to workshops for improvement projects under section 15(b) of said Act: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H.R. 8310, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 34: Page 21, line 10, insert:

"Research and Training

"For an additional amount for 'Research and training', $1,000,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H.R. 8310, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 36: Page 21, line 21, insert:

"Salaries and Expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $390,000, together with not to exceed $115,000 to be transferred from the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, as provided in section 222(d)(5) of the Social Security Act, as amended: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated by this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H.R. 8310, Eighty-ninth Congress or similar legislation."

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 38: Page 23, line 3, insert "For an additional amount for "Community health practice and research', $24,000,000, of which $3,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 310 of the Public Health Service Act, $9,000,000 for carrying out section 314(c) of the Act with respect to home health service programs, $1,000,000 for carrying out section 314(c) of the Act with respect to grants to schools of public health, and $11,000,000 for carrying out parts C, E, and F of title VII of the Act and of which $200,000 shall be available for scholarship grants to eligible schools for award to first-year students in the current academic year only; together with $2,100,000 to be transferred, as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act, from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein and to be expended for functions delegated to the Surgeon General by the Secretary under title XVIII of the Social Security Act: *Provided*, That the sums appropriated for carrying out parts C, E, and F of title VII of the Public Health Service Act shall be available only upon enactment of H.R. 3141, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 39: Page 23, line 23, insert "Grants and payments for the next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after March 31 of the current fiscal year, grants and payments under part F of title VII of the Public Health Service Act for the next succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, and the obligations incurred and expenditures made hereunder shall be charged to the appropriation for that purpose for such fiscal year."

Mr. **MAHON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 48: Page 27, line 10, insert:

"Assistance for Repatriated United States Nationals

"For an additional amount for 'Assistance for repatriated United States nationals', $120,000, of which $40,000 shall be apportioned for use pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), only to the extent necessary to provide for requirements not anticipated in the budget estimates."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 53: Page 29, line 16, insert "not less than $10,000,000 to carry out the purposes of section 205(d) of title II, and "

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert "not more than $10,000,000 to carry out the purposes of section 205(d) of title II, in the discretion of the Director, and"

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 55: Page 30, line 18, insert

"*Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for any grant until the Director has determined that the grantee is qualified to administer the funds and programs involved in the proposed grant."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 56: Page 30, line 23, insert: "*Provided further,* That all grant agreements shall provide that the General Accounting Office shall have access to the records of the grantee which bear exclusively upon the Federal grant."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 60: Page 31, line 12, insert:

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

"*Miscellaneous items*

"For an additional amount for 'Miscellaneous items', $225,000.

"For an additional amount for 'Miscellaneous items', fiscal year 1965, $200,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Salaries, officers and employees, Senate', fiscal year 1965."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 62: Page 33, line 17, insert:

"*Senate Office Buildings*

"For an additional amount for 'Senate Office Buildings' $405,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 63: Page 34, line 1, insert:

"The paragraph contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1960 (73 Stat. 407) which read 'Hereafter, the Architect of the Capitol is authorized, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to fix the compensation of one position under the appropriation "Senate Office Buildings" at a basic rate of $7,020 per annum' is hereby amended by striking out the amount $7,020 and inserting in lieu thereof the amount $7,700."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 66: On page 35, line 12, insert:

"*Construction, general*

"For an additional amount for 'Construction, general', $1,950,000; *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment of S. 2300, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

"In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: '$900,000'."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the chairman of the House conferees yielding to me so that I might explain to the House the basis upon which I believe this motion should be rejected.

There are two very good reasons for it. One of them is that this is a very questionable project upon its merits; the other is the manner in which this project and this matter comes to us at this time. Many times we have gone to conference on the regular public works appropriation bills and have hammered out agreements on the basis of give and take, which has occurred with respect to the public works appropriation bill so recently approved here in this House.

It always seemed to me unfair, and this is the position which I took when I found myself as chairman of the conferees on the public works appropriation bill a number of years ago, so I am taking a position completely consistent with that position. This project recently authorized comes in a supplemental appropriation bill that has come in through the backdoor. It represents an unfairness to every Member of this body because it comes by reason of an afterthought appropriation over in the other body. That is exactly what has occurred with reference to this.

I am not going to belabor that point. You have heard much about this Dickey-Lincoln proposition, so you do not care to hear more about it during this session. But this is the crux of this matter and it is on that basis I hope the motion will be voted down in order that I might submit for your consideration a motion that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment No. 66.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this project has been discussed before, even as recently as yesterday. Frequently in the past, public works appropriation bills have contained funds for recently approved projects. This is not breaking precedent in that regard. In the recently approved appropriation bill for public works there were some recently authorized projects. It is true that this is a rather large project. It is very controversial and I have opposed the project myself in the past, as the gentleman knows, and others have opposed it. But this is a part of an effort to come to an agreement on a very controversial bill, and under these circumstances certainly those of us on the conference committee must insist on the action taken by the conferees.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to point out that amendment No. 66 not only applies to the project being discussed but also applies to a project in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. There is an additional project in this amendment.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, it appears that a great many Members have recently become experts upon the power needs of the State of Maine, and hydroelectric power development in general.

I am not a suspicious man by nature, but I would hazard a guess that the screams of the special interest groups over authorization of the Dickey project have been unusually loud and their tears copious.

The $800,000 appropriation contained in the supplemental appropriations conference report will provide for planning by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers so that this preliminary work can commence prior to the next fiscal year. The money will be used for soil and foundation exploration, aerial and ground surveys, hydrology and power studies, and site development.

I would say to my fellow Republicans that our party has always subscribed to the philosophy that the Federal Government should intervene only when it is demonstrated that the private sector is unable to do the job as well.

In the case of the Dickey project, let me say that the private power companies have not been either able or willing to give our State power at a price our citizens or our industries can afford. They have not been either able or willing to reduce rates meaningfully so that our State could compete for its fair share of the Nation's prosperity.

And, gentlemen, I speak for every major Republican officeholder in my State when I make this statement.

I say to my Republican colleagues, "Help the State of Maine, and do not further diminish the influence of our party in the Pine Tree State."

We in Maine do hope that more of our friends in other New England States will commence to help us obtain our goals. They are fair and just.

In 1820 Maine separated from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and one of the reasons was that the mother State persisted in looking at our people as "country cousins." I implore them not to again seek to relegate Maine to a status something less than they enjoy.

To all Members of the House I urge an affirmative vote for acceptance of the supplemental appropriations conference report for 1966.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin), there were—ayes 105, noes, 95.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 166, nays 162, answered "present" 1, not voting 104, as follows:

[Roll No. 381]

YEAS—166

Adams
Addabbo
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Bennett
Bingham
Boggs
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Carter
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Corman
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dow
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farbstein
Farnsley
Fascell
Flynt
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Harris
Hathaway
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holland
Howard
Huot
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Krebs
Leggett
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
Macdonald
Machen
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Morrison
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Pickle
Poage
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Redlin
Resnick
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Senner
Sickles
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Stafford
Stalbaum
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Weltner
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitten
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Yates
Zablocki

NAYS—162

Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Ayres
Baldwin
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Betts
Boland
Bow
Brock
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Erlenborn
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Gettys
Giaimo
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Herlong
Horton
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Kunkel
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McMillan
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias
May
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morris
Morse
Morton
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Neill, Mass.
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rogers, Tex.
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
St. Onge
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stanton
Steed
Stubblefield
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Watts
Whalley
Whitener
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Vivian

NOT VOTING—104

Abbitt
Albert
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Aspinall
Baring
Bell
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton
Bonner
Bray
Cabell
Callan
Callaway
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Conable
Cooley
Craley
Culver
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Fallon
Farnum
Feighan
Fino
Fogarty
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Hanley
Hansen, Wash.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Holifield
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Kee
Keogh
King, Utah
Kirwan
Laird
Landrum
Lindsay
McCarthy
McVicker
MacGregor
Mackay
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
Michel
Morgan
Mosher
Multer
O'Konski
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Quie
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rooney, Pa.
Roudebush
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Staggers
Talcott
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tunney
Vanik
Vigorito
Watson
Widnall
Wright
Young

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Hansen for, with Mr. Vivian against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Chelf against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Bray against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Lindsay for, with Mr. Hosmer against.

Mr. Reid of New York for, with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota against.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Widnall against.

Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Watson against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Roudebush against.

Mr. Carey for, with Mr. Martin of Nebraska against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. MacGregor against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Laird against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Gerald R. Ford against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Talcott against.

Mr. Tenzer for, with Mr. Michel against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Don H. Clausen against.

Mr. Tunney for, with Mr. Conable against.

Mr. Albert for, with Mr. Quie against.

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Bell against.

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Mr. Mackay for, with Mr. Robison against.

Mr. Hungate for, with Mr. Edwards of Alabama against.

Mr. Vanik for, with Mr. Glenn Andrews against.

Mr. Culver for, with Mr. Martin of Alabama against.

Mr. Farnum for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.

Mr. Hanley for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee for, with Mrs. Bolton against.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Mosher against.

Mr. Cabell for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Schisler for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Mr. Hawkins for, with Mr. Clark against.

For this day:

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Callaway.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Fuqua.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. O'Neal of Georgia.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Vigorito.

Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Matthews with Mr. Ottinger.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.
Mr. Young with Mr. Sisk.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. McVicker.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Shipley.
Mr. Craley with Mr. George W. Andrews.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Callan with Mr. Schmidhauser.

Mr. HOLLAND changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN]. If she were present she would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 70: Page 36, line 19, insert:

"INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

"Facilities for International Pacific Halibut Commission

"For provision of office and other facilities necessary for carrying out the Northern Pacific Halibut Act, as amended, $500,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 78: Page 41, line 9, insert:

"HEMISFAIR 1968 EXPOSITION

"For expenses necessary for planning the extent of participation by the United States in HemisFair 1968, as authorized by law, $125,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H.R. 9247, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 80: Page 41, line 16, insert:

"CONTROL OF OUTDOOR ADVERTISING AND JUNKYARDS

"For control of outdoor advertising and junkyards, as authorized by the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, including payments to the States, $10,000,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 2084, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 81: Page 42, line 5, insert:

"LANDSCAPING AND SCENIC ENHANCEMENT

"For carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, section 319, as amended by the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, $60,000,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 2084, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 82: Page 42, line 12, insert:

"ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

"For necessary administrative expenses for carrying out the provisions of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, $750,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 2084, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 83: Page 42, line 19, insert:

"HIGHWAY SAFETY

"For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, section 135, $290,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 2084, Eighty-ninth Congress, or similar legislation."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 84. Page 43, line 15, insert:

"REVOLVING FUND

"For additional capital for the revolving fund authorized by the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, to be available without fiscal year limitation, $84,000,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of authorizing legislation."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 85. Page 43, line 21, insert:

"SOUTHEAST HURRICANE DISASTER

"For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Southeast Hurricane Disaster Relief Act of 1965, such amount as may be necessary but not to exceed $70,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of authorizing legislation."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

"In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: '$35,000,000.' "

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 89. Page 46, line 6, insert:

"SEC. 1202. The appropriations, authorizations, and authority with respect thereto in this Act shall be available from July 1, 1965, for the purposes provided in such appropriations, authorizations, and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1965, and the date of enactment of this Act in anticipation of such appropriations, authorizations, and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof, and the terms of Public Law 89–58, Eighty-ninth Congress, as amended."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the conference report and on the various and sundry motions may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resignation from a committee:

OCTOBER 21, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Very sincerely yours,
CHARLES H. WILSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF CHARLES H. WILSON TO BE A MEMBER OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 620) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That CHARLES H. WILSON, of California, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Post Office and Civil Service.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASES IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 168) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1201)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H.R. 168) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6 and 11.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 7, 9, 10, and 12, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the Senate amendment numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the action proposed by Senate amendment numbered 8, as amended by the House, strike out line 1 on page 9 of the House engrossed bill and all that follows down through line 12 on page 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 6. (a) Chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'§ 4116. Defense of certain malpractice and negligence suits

"'(a) The remedy by suit against the United States as provided by section 1346(b) of title 28 for damages for personal injury, including death, allegedly arising from malpractice or negligence of a physician, dentist, nurse, pharmacist, or paramedical (for example, medical and dental technicians, nursing assistants, and therapists) or other supporting personnel in furnishing medical care or treatment while in the exercise of his duties in or for the Department of Medicine and Surgery shall hereafter be exclusive of any other civil action or proceeding by reason of the same subject matter against such physician, dentist, nurse, pharmacist, or paramedical or other supporting personnel (or his estate) whose act or omission gave rise to such claim.

"'(b) The Attorney General shall defend any civil action or proceeding brought in any court against any person referred to in subsection (a) of this section (or his estate) for any such damage or injury. Any such person against whom such civil action or proceeding is brought shall deliver within such time after date of service or knowledge of service as determined by the Attorney General, all process served upon him or an attested true copy thereof to his immediate superior or to whomever was designated by the Administrator to receive such papers and such person shall promptly furnish copies of the pleading and process therein to the United States attorney for the district embracing the place wherein the proceeding is brought, to the Attorney General, and to the Administrator.

"'(c) Upon a certification by the Attorney General that the defendant was acting in the scope of his employment in or for the Department of Medicine and Surgery at the time of the incident out of which the suit arose, any such civil action or proceeding commenced in a State court shall be removed without bond at any time before trial by the Attorney General to the district court of the United States of the district and division embracing the place wherein it is pending and the proceeding deemed a tort action brought against the United States under the provisions of title 28 and all references thereto. Should a United States district court determine on a hearing on a motion to remand held before a trial on the merit that the case so removed is one in which a remedy by suit within the meaning of subsection (a) of this section is not available against the United States, the case shall be remanded to the State court.

"'(d) The Attorney General may compromise or settle any claim asserted in such civil action or proceeding in the manner provided in section 2677 of title 28, and with the same effect.'

"(b) The analysis of chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'4116. Defense of certain malpractice and negligence suits.'

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar month which begins more than one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, but, in the case of an act or omission which occurred before such effective date, such amendments shall apply only if no suit or civil action has been commenced before such effective date with respect to such act or omission."

And the House agree to the same.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
W. J. BRYAN DORN,
JAMES A. HALEY,
E. ROSS ADAIR,
WILLIAM H. AYRES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
GEORGE SMATHERS,
JOHN WILLIAMS,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H.R. 168) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The amendment of the Senate numbered 8 struck from the House bill all of section 8 which would have provided for defense by the United States of certain malpractice and negligence suits against physicians, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration for their acts or omissions while in the exercise of their duties. The House amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 would have restored that section with a change in the section number.

Under the conference agreement the section has been restored to the bill as section 6 and additional personnel carrying out duties in and for the Department of Medicine and Surgery are brought within the group made eligible to have the United States defend malpractice and negligence suits arising out of their acts or omissions occurring while in the exercise of their duties.

The Senate receded from its amendments numbered 6 and 11 and receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 7, 9, 10, and 12.

On October 19, 1965, the House concurred in amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, and 13.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
W. J. BRYAN DORN,
JAMES A. HALEY,
E. ROSS ADAIR,
WILLIAM H. AYRES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 168) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House with a vote of 348 to nothing. There was little disagreement between the two Houses. The conference report was unanimous.

Unless there are questions by Members, I intend to yield to the gentleman from Indiana and then move the previous question.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas to give us a brief explanation to refresh the recollection of Members upon this bill.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill would provide a 10-percent increase to all service connected veterans. The cost of the bill would be approximately $178 million. That is by far the most important part of the bill.

I am happy to report to the House that this is a unanimous report and that in essence the position of the House has been fully supported, and the action which the House took on Tuesday is practically identical with the conference report recommended for your approval today.

The major items in dispute; namely, the question of a windfall to certain veterans or widows who are receiving pension in connection with social security; the extension of the Veterans' Preference Act to an additional category; the inclusion of the specific language of 125,000 hospital beds and 4,000 additional nursing home-care beds in the Veterans' Administration medical system; provision for malpractice insurance for certain professional personnel in the Veterans' Administration medical system; were all resolved favorably, and I am happy to recommend the adoption of this report.

The American Legion has supported the action of the conferee. I have received the following telegram from the National Commander of the American Legion:

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The American Legion is pleased to learn that conference committee will meet today on H.R. 168. Prompt action by this committee is a constructive and responsible effort to provide relief for the nearly 2 million service disabled veterans of this Nation. Our main concern is that nothing delay the increase in compensation to these needy veterans. Beyond that the Legion strongly supports the provision to make statutory the authorization of 125,000 VA hospital beds. With respect to the language providing relief for certain individuals on the pension rolls we recognize the difficult problem faced by the Congress. The chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee has given assurance that the entire matter of pension income limitations will be reviewed next session. We hope that at that time action will be taken to provide a lasting remedy not only for pensioners adversely affected by increases in social security payments but also for all persons adversely affected by increases in other retirement type income.

L. ELDON JAMES,
National Commander, the American Legion.

Mr. Speaker, I have received the following telegram from the legislative director of the DAV:

WASHINGTON, D.C.
October 20, 1965.

Congressman OLIN TEAGUE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In view of your appointment as a conferee to consider H.R. 168 we wish to advise that the Disabled American Veterans takes strong exception to the Curtis pension amendment. The pension amendment is patently unfair since it gives no consideration to those veterans whose income is derived from sources other than social security. This is so despite the fact that these veterans may have the same degree of disability, the same income level, and be in the same age bracket as those veterans whom the amendment seeks to benefit. It totally ignores any veteran who may be eligible for the pension rolls in 1966 or any subsequent year. We do not believe increased compensation benefits which will be accorded to nearly 2 million service-connected wartime disabled veterans should be imperiled by the adoption of an unrelated pension amendment. The Disabled American Veterans urge you to let stand the language pertaining to the 125,000 hospital bed ceiling, since it would serve to make statutory and establish once and for all the intent of Congress, and in a long-standing controversy with the Bureau of the Budget and the VA on this issue. Respectfully urge you agree to a reasonable solution which will permit the passage of H.R. 168 during this session of Congress.

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director of Legislation,
Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. Speaker, there has been the mistaken belief that some veterans are losing VA pensions because of the social security rate increase. All cases will receive more in 1936 than they received in 1964.

VA pension increase of 1964 and Social Security Amendments of 1965:

Ten percent retirement income exclusion for pension was designed to compensate for 7 percent social security increase.

Bills originally contemplated simultaneous passage and effect.

Pension law passed earlier effective January 1, 1965. Social security delayed to July 30, 1965.

Pension is monthly benefit based on annual income.

Comparing 1964 with 1965:

First. Everyone gets more pension.

Second. Everyone gets more social security.

Third. A few—1½ percent—get an additional windfall.

Fourth. And everyone continues to get more pension and social security in 1966 than they got in 1964.

The attached typical cases shows that the veterans get a higher VA pension in 1966 and also gets higher social security payments.

A TYPICAL CASE—VETERAN ALONE—SOLE COUNTABLE INCOME IS SOCIAL SECURITY

1964

Social security: $648 per year; VA pension, $840 per year; annual combined, $1,488 per year.

1965

Social security: $696 per year; VA pension, $1,125 [1] per year; annual comined, $1,821 per year.

1966

Social security: $696 per year; VA pension, $900 per year; annual combined, $1,596 per year.

NOTE: He gets more social security, $48 per year; he gets more VA pension, $60 per year; his total income is increased by $108 per year over 1964.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE COMPARATIVE PRINT

(Showing changes proposed to be made by amendments of the Senate numbered 5 through 12 (inclusive) to H.R. 168. Matter proposed to be omitted by Senate amendments 5 through 12 is enclosed in [black brackets]; matter proposed to be inserted is shown in *italic type*. For convenience of reference, the number of the Senate amendment is shown in boldface type adjacent to the amendment made by it. The changes made by Senate amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, and 13 are shown in roman type to reflect the concurrence of the House in these amendments on October 19, 1965.)

H.R. 168

An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 314 of title 33, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "$20" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$21";

(2) by striking out "$38" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$40";

(3) by striking out "$58" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "$60";

(4) by striking out "$77" in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "$82";

(5) by striking out "$107" in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "$113";

(6) by striking out "$128" in subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof "$136";

(7) by striking out "$149" in subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof "$161";

(8) by striking out "$170" in subsection (h) and inserting in lieu thereof "$186";

(9) by striking out "$191" in subsection (i) and inserting in lieu thereof "$209";

(10) by striking out "$250" in subsection (j) and inserting in lieu thereof "$300";

(11) by striking out "$525" in subsections (k) and (o) and inserting in lieu thereof "$600";

(12) by striking out "$340" in subsection (l) and inserting in lieu thereof "$400";

(13) by striking out "$390" in subsection (m) and inserting in lieu thereof "$450";

(14) by striking out "$440" in subsection (n) and inserting in lieu thereof "$525";

(15) by striking out "$200" in subsection (r) and inserting in lieu thereof "$250"; and

(16) by striking out "$290" in subsection (s) and inserting in lieu thereof "$350".

(b) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases authorized by this section, the rates of disability compensation payable to persons within the purview of section 10 of Public Law 85–857 who are not in receipt of compensation payable pursuant to chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 315(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "$23" in subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "$25";

(2) by striking out "$39" in subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "$43";

(3) by striking out "$50" in subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "$55";

(4) by striking out "$62" and "$12" in subparagraph (D) and inserting in lieu thereof "$68" and "$13", respectively;

(5) by striking out "$15" in subparagraph (E) and inserting in lieu thereof "$17";

(6) by striking out "$27" in subparagraph (F) and inserting in lieu thereof "$30";

(7) by striking out "$39" and "$12" in subparagraph (G) and inserting in lieu thereof "$43" and "$13", respectively; and

(8) by striking out "$19" in subparagraph (H) and inserting in lieu thereof "$21".

(b) Such section 315(1) is further amended by (1) striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (G), (2) striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (H) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and (3) adding at the end thereof the following:

"(I) notwithstanding the other provisions of this subsection, the monthly amount payable on account of each child who has attained the age of eighteen years and who is pursuing a course of instruction at an approved educational institution shall be $40 for a totally disabled veteran and proportionate amounts for partially disabled veterans in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection."

---

[1] 9-month windfall in 1965, $225 (application of 10 percent exclusion in Public Law 88–664 preceding Social Security Amendments produced the temporary eligibility for windfall rate).

(c)(1) Section 101(4)(C) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "twenty-one years" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-three years".

(2) Section 414(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-three".

Sec. 3. (a) Section 360 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting immediately before the words "the Administrator" the following: "or (3) has suffered total deafness in one ear as a result of service-connected disability and has suffered total deafness in the other ear as the result of non-service-connected disability not the result of his own willful misconduct," and (2) by inserting immediately after the words "kidney involvement" the following: "or such total deafness in both ears".

(b) Such section 360 is further amended by adding the following at the end of the catchline: "or bilateral deafness".

(c) The analysis of chapter 11 of such title 38 regarding section 360 is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof: "or bilateral deafness".

(d) Section 314(o) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting the words "has suffered total deafness" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "if the veteran has suffered bilateral deafness (and the hearing impairment in either one or both ears is service connected) rated at 60 per centum or more disabling and the veteran has also suffered service-connected total blindness with 5/200 visual acuity or less,".

(e) Section 314(p) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by deleting "$525; and" and substituting therefor the following: "$600. In the event the veteran has suffered service-connected blindness with 5/200 visual actuity or less and (1) has also suffered bilateral deafness (and the hearing impairment in either one or both ears is service connected) rated at no less than 40 per centum disabling, the Administrator shall allow the next higher rate, or (2) has also suffered service-connected total deafness in one ear, the Administrator shall allow the next intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of $600;".

Sec. 4. Section 560(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out ", who has attained the age of forty years,".

(5) [Sec. 6. Section 106 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

["(e) Each person who has incurred a disability as a result of an injury or disease described in subsection (b) shall be entitled to the same rights, privileges, and benefits under the Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387–391), as a person described in section 2(1) of such Act."]

(6) [Sec. 7.] Sec. 5. Subsection (c) of section 230 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Administrator shall establish and maintain an office in Europe at such location as he deems appropriate. The head of such office shall be responsible for the performance of such duties as may be prescribed by the Administrator in the administration and operation of veterans' programs in that area (7) [and shall, during his tenure in such position, be accorded by the Secretary of State the diplomatic designation of Attaché]."

(8) [Sec. 8. (a) Chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"§ 4116. Defense of certain malpractice and negligence suits

["(a) The remedy by suit against the United States as provided by section 1346(b) of title 28 for damages for personal injury, including death, allegedly arising from malpractice or negligence of a physician, dentist, or nurse in furnishing medical care or treatment while in the exercise of his duties in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, shall hereafter be exclusive of any other civil action or proceeding by reason of the same subject matter against such physician, dentist, or nurse (or his estate) whose act or omission gave rise to such claim.

["(b) The Attorney General shall defend any civil action or proceeding brought in any court against any physician, dentist, or nurse (or his estate) of the Department of Medicine and Surgery for any such damage or injury. The physician, dentist, or nurse against whom such civil action or proceeding is brought shall deliver within such time after date of service or knowledge of service as determined by the Attorney General, all process served upon him or an attested true copy thereof to his immediate superior or to whomever was designated by the Administrator to receive such papers and such person shall promptly furnish copies of the pleading and process therein to the United States attorney for the district embracing the place wherein the proceeding is brought to the Attorney General, and to the Administrator.

["(c) Upon a certification by the Attorney General that the defendant physician, dentist, or nurse was acting in the scope of his employment in the Department of Medicine and Surgery at the time of the incident out of which the suit arose, any such civil action or proceeding commenced in a State court shall be removed without bond at any time before trial by the Attorney General to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place wherein it is pending and the proceeding deemed a tort action brought against the United States under the provisions of title 28 and all references thereto. Should a United States district court determine on a hearing on a motion to remand held before a trial on the merits that the case so removed is one in which a remedy by suit within the meaning of subsection (a) of this section is not available against the United States, the case shall be remanded to the State court.

["(d) The Attorney General may compromise or settle any claim asserted in such civil action or proceeding in the manner provided in section 2677 of title 28, and with the same effect."

[(b) The analysis of such chapter 73 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"4116. Defense of certain malpractice and negligence suits."

[(c) Section 4116 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section shall take effect on the first day of the calendar month which first occurs more than one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, and shall apply only to an act or omission occurring before such date with respect to which no suit or civil action has been commenced.]

(9) [Sec. 9. (a) Subsection (c) of section 5033 of title 38, United States Code, is hereby repealed.]

Sec. 6. (a) Subsection (c) of section 5033 and paragraph (3) of section 5035(b) of title 38, United States Code, are hereby repealed; and paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 5035 (b) of such title are hereby redesignated as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

(b) Section 5034(1) of such title is amended by striking out "one-half bed" and inserting in lieu thereof "one and one-half beds".

(10) [Sec. 10. (a) Section 5001(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by redesignating paragraph (2) thereof as paragraph (3) and by inserting immediately after paragraph (1) thereof the following:

["(2) The Administrator, subject to the approval of the President, is authorized to establish and operate not less than one hundred and twenty-five thousand hospital beds in facilities over which the Administrator has direct and exclusive jurisdiction for the care and treatment of eligible veterans who are tuberculosis, neuropsychiatric, medical, and surgical cases."

[(b) Paragraph (3) of such section (as redesignated by subsection (a) of this section) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The nursing beds authorized by this paragraph shall be in addition to the hospital beds provided for in paragraph (2) of this subsection."]

(11) *Sec. 7. Section 503 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(a)" after "503", and by adding at the end thereof the following:*

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, in the case of any individual—

"(1) who, for the month in which the Social Security Amendments of 1965 was enacted, was entitled to a monthly insurance benefit under section 202 or 223 of the Social Security Act, and

"(2) who, for such month, was entitled to pension under the provisions of this chapter, or under the first sentence of section 9(b) of the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959,

there shall not be counted, in determining the annual income of such individual, any increase in benefits under such sections of the Social Security Act which resulted from the enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965."

(12) [Sec. 11] *Sec. 8.* The amendments made by the first section and sections 2, 3, and 4 of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 641. A joint resolution authorizing Father Flanagan's Boys' Home to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

The message also announced that the Secretary request the House of Representatives return to the Senate the bill (S. 619), entitled "An act for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli," together with all accompanying papers.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2118) entitled "An act to amend sections 9 and

37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9047) entitled "An act to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10305) entitled "An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately one hundred and twenty-four million, two hundred thousand pounds of nickel from the national stockpile."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 67. A concurrent resolution to authorize certain corrections in the enrollment of S. 919.

S. Con. Res. 65. A concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a Senate document 10,000 copies of a study, entitled "The Anti-Vietnam Agitation and the Teach-In Movement," prepared for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE HAS A DEEP AND ABIDING CONNECTION WITH THE LIFE OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the deep and abiding relationship which Pennsylvania Avenue has with the life and times of President John F. Kennedy. It is a connection without parallel in this Nation. It was along Pennsylvania Avenue that he travelled to the Capitol of the United States to deliver his universally acclaimed inaugural address, and it was along this avenue that he returned to the White House after he had delivered it.

This avenue was the scene of some of his greatest triumphs. Along this famous avenue he travelled with heads of foreign states, and on other ceremonial and state occasions. It was along this avenue that his body was borne on a caisson to rest in state at the Capitol. This avenue witnessed his years of lightning, and the day of drums.

No other place, except the White House, knew him so well during his all too brief years as President. The long and intimate relationship of this ceremonial avenue of the Nation with President Kennedy has hallowed it, and given it a meaning and an importance and a connection with him which is forever denied other avenues and other areas and places in the Nation's Capital.

Thus it comes with a real sense of shock and of sorrow to learn that plans utterly unknown to most citizens of our country are far advanced to deny to Pennsylvania Avenue which knew him so well a continuing connection with the life of President Kennedy. Under these little known plans, in which the people of our Nation were not consulted, a site which has no symbolic connection whatever with the life of President Kennedy may well be the location of the great Presidential Memorial the Congress has authorized to be erected to honor him in the Nation's Capital.

This site, on the Potomac River, is surrounded by high-rise luxury apartments costing up to $125,000 each, and by a highway maze developed after the site was chosen by the Congress in 1958, several years before the election of President Kennedy, and several more years before the fateful time of his assassination. It is a site that is lacking in any true monumentality, and there was no thought given at the time of its selection to the possibility that it would one day be selected as the site of a memorial to President Kennedy.

In fact, it is well known that at one time President Kennedy was seriously considering the possibility of dropping the National Cultural Center project entirely, due to the deficiencies of the present site and to other factors.

What is also true is that the change from the concept of the National Cultural Center to a Presidential Memorial to honor President Kennedy was accomplished without any basic and fundamental change in the architect's plans for the National Cultural Center. Heretofore, in the long history of presidential memorials, nationwide contests were held and a great national effort, with an enormous expenditure of time, effort, and money, was made to fit the memorial to the President being honored. This was not done in this case. No basic or fundamental change was made by the trustees, or the architect, to relate this memorial meaningfully to President Kennedy as had always been done in the case of earlier Presidents. It was, indeed, widely reported in the press at the time that the National Cultural Center was a badly faltering project until the happy thought struck some of the present trustees that the National Cultural Center could be made successful without a single basic change, or even an additional day's work by the architect, by simply naming it in honor of President Kennedy.

The failure of the Center's trustees to demonstrate any responsiveness to the new and vital national role it was to play as a presidential memorial is difficult to understand. Certainly, if the effort were to be made by the trustees to make it a distinctive memorial to President Kennedy—and to relocate it on Pennsylvania Avenue, which has a vital and identifiable relationship to President Kennedy, would be such an effort—they would have the overwhelming support of the American people, and it would be readily accessible to several million more citizens each year, for it would be close to a subway station, and other changes could be made which would make it more of a Presidential Memorial, and less of a publicly supported facility similar to the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts in New York City, for the privileged and well-to-do.

What is difficult to understand is why the good and dedicated people in charge of this project are so utterly unresponsive to the real meaning of a Presidential Memorial which has a significant connection with the life of President Kennedy, and to the unique possibility they have of relating this memorial meaningfully to him. They are missing an opportunity to do so, and are not supported in their course by most of our citizens. Why should President Kennedy be denied a fitting memorial which, in at least some significant regard, beyond the use of his name to bail out a faltering cultural project, was related to him and an avenue which he traveled in life and which has an intimate connection with him.

Some of the oldest and closest friends of President Kennedy, President Eisenhower, and President Johnson, including Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, have said that the present site could well be reexamined at this time to the benefit of all of the citizens of our country. A recent petition published in the Washington, D.C., Post, listed such distinguished Democrats as Mrs. Dean Acheson, Hon. and Mrs. Thurman Arnold, Mrs. Alfred Friendly, Mrs. W. John Kennedy, Mrs. Phyllis Nitze, Mr. and Mrs. Jack Coopersmith, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., and Mrs. Cyrus Vance, as calling for a 60-day moratorium on work toward the construction of the Center to enable a review committee, appointed for the purpose, to hear, study, and make recommendations concerning all questions relating to the location of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. The pleas of such distinguished citizens have been ignored and dismissed by the present members of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of the Kennedy Arts Center. Surely, President Johnson, safely back from the hospital, where the fervent prayers of all of our citizens supported him, can now heed the petition offered by these leading citizens, many of whom are his close personal friends. Why should he not respond to their plea? The failure to relate the Kennedy Arts Center, not superficially, but deeply with and to the life of President Kennedy, as was suggested during his lifetime by members of the President's Advisory Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue, shows a lack of imagination, a narrowness of vision, and a failure to be responsive to the life of President Kennedy which will be deplored through the long future years by the millions of our citizens who loved him, elected him President, and those additional millions of our citizens who, together, sorrowed at his untimely passing.

Where there is a will there is a way, and many of the roadblocks and impediments to the relocation of the Kennedy

Arts Center on such a commanding site on Pennsylvania Avenue, near the White House, as the combined site of the old District Building and the Coast Guard building would disappear like the morning dew if the trustees indicated their interest and willingness to consider a Pennsylvania Avenue site for the center. President Kennedy was deeply interested in the rejuvenation of Pennsylvania Avenue, is is President Johnson, and not even the stoutest proponents of the Kennedy Arts Center have attempted to deny that it would make a major contribution to bringing to Pennsylvania Avenue, as President Kennedy did during his brief years as President, the life and spirit which he sought in his rejuvenation of Pennsylvania Avenue.

The leading proponents of the present Potomac River site have themselves been for years divided on the question as to the best location for this performing arts center. Here is how one of the able and distinguished advocates of this cultural project, our colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], a close friend of President Kennedy, characterized the present riverside site during President Kennedy's own lifetime:

> Pennsylvania Avenue is another L'Enfant plan gone amok. Intended as the city's principal ceremonial route, it is most noted now for its junky commercial structures and its eye-shattering vista from the magnificence of Capitol Hill at one end to absolutely nothing at the other end. Might I say again, it was not intended so.
>
> Currently, a specially appointed committee is studying how to bring the grand avenue up to its potential. The committee's initial deliberations sound ominously as if the thoroughfare may end up as yet another "garden city" creation of useless open spaces interspersed with massive, monopurpose buildings.
>
> Pennsylvania Avenue would greatly benefit from the entertainment facilities, which instead are being boxed into one huge, marketable economy package known as the National Cultural Center.
>
> The center will contain a concert hall, a theater, and an opera house, each of which by itself could breathe life and verve into downtown Washington.
>
> Instead, housed under one incredibly large roof, these facilities are being banished to an unused park site just north of the Lincoln Memorial.
>
> If the center was meant as a monument, its location would not be out of keeping. But as a building to be used, it is isolated from all the related services of the central city. Any getting to and from the center is going to burden Washingtonians with many hours of driving confusion, once the highway fanatics have finished surrounding the center with a new inner loop highway. I have a mental picture of the center rising like a huge meat ball in the middle of a plate, with miles of spaghetti artistically wrapped around it.

An equally dedicated, knowledgable, and sincere colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] had this to say on the same subject a little over a year ago, on March 17, 1964—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 4, page 5487:

> Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I have long supported efforts to construct theater, opera, and concert hall facilities in Washington. Since the concept for the National Cultural Center has been transformed into a "living" memorial to the late President Kennedy, my enthusiasm for this project has become even greater. It is a real shame that in our Nation's Capital space for the performing arts is severely limited and wholly inadequate. The construction of the Kennedy Center is, therefore, not only a fitting tribute to a President who fully understood the value of the arts in our society, but also a benefit to our Nation and to the generations that will come to the Center and know and enjoy the arts as President Kennedy knew and enjoyed them.
>
> It is because I believe so deeply in the promise of the Center and its role as a memorial that I look with dismay upon an apparent lack of imaginative planning regarding the Center, its site, and its mission.
>
> Regarding the latter, I seriously question a policy that precludes the housing of resident performing organizations at the Center. The National Symphony, whose members come from all corners of our land, is sorely in need of a first-rate concert hall and yet I am given to understand that the symphony will not be in residence at the Center. All major observers of the American theater predict that its future lies in the development of permanent resident companies providing a measure of employment security to the actor and a varied repertoire for the public. And yet I am informed that the theater is being planned with a view to housing only touring and visiting companies; that proper rehearsal rooms, adequate storage space and necessary workshops will not be provided to meet the needs of a resident or repertory theater organization. Regardless of the alleged value of current plans for the use of the Center, I question the wisdom of impeding for all time the future development of a resident theater at the Center by constructing such limited facilities. I have the same apprehension regarding planning that relies heavily on traveling groups of the dance and the opera at the Center while rising costs continue to discourage extensive touring.
>
> Of even greater concern to me, however, is the location of the Center. I am not satisfied that criticisms regarding its position amidst a maze of highways, its remoteness from downtown transportation, parking, and dining services, and its own inadequate yet extremely expensive parking facilities have been answered. I do not believe that sufficient study has been made of alternative and possibly superior sites by the National Capital Planning Commission or by the Fine Arts Commission or by those who control the Center's activities. The Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission has expressed disapproval of the present site, and the National Capital Planning Commission has never to my knowledge voted on the suitability of the location.
>
> To my mind, the Center belongs in downtown Washington where it can be served by existing transportation and restaurant facilities. It belongs downtown where commercial parking facilities are available and where additional parking space that may be constructed will be used by the public in the daytime as well as at night. It belongs downtown so that the city will gain from the added life it will generate in the evening hours, an activity that is lacking now when, at the end of the business day, the heart of the city becomes dark and forbidding. The Center belongs downtown because its audiences will bring business to the Washington businessman and, in turn, revenue for government. Last, but most important, it belongs downtown because, as a memorial to our late President, it should be easily reached by all who come to this Capital City, and it should not be relegated to a remote corner.
>
> One year ago, President Kennedy gave his heartiest endorsement to a report drawn by his ad hoc Committee on Federal Office Space. This report called for the revitalization of Pennsylvania Avenue as a lively, friendly, and inviting, as well as dignified and impressive avenue. The report warned against lining the avenue with a solid phalanx of public and private office buildings which close down completely at night and on weekends, leaving the Capital more isolated than ever.
>
> The Kennedy Center—located on Pennsylvania Avenue—will help realize that plan which had the full support of the late President. It will bring life as well as dignity to the avenue. What more fitting place for a tribute to President Kennedy than on the avenue that saw his greatest triumph as he rode from the Capitol on Inauguration Day? What more fitting place for such a memorial than on the Avenue of Presidents?
>
> In supporting this appropriation, I strongly urge that the National Capital Planning Commission, the Fine Arts Commission and the trustees of the Center explore new sites on Pennsylvania Avenue and I intend to follow this very closely.
>
> Though it is by no means the only possible site, I recommend that particular consideration be given to the present location of the District Building and the Coast Guard Building. The District has outgrown its present building and has already planned to relocate in the near future. The Coast Guard Building is old and becoming very inadequate. The relocation of both these activities is inevitable. If this were done, the Kennedy Center could be located on a plot that is entirely owned by the Federal Government and no dislocation of private business would be necessary. I am asking the District government and the Coast Guard to provide me with their plans for the future use of these facilities. If it proves feasible, I shall do all that I can to see the Kennedy Center located on this site.
>
> It is not too late to build this memorial with vision, with planning. I fail to see the cause for haste while serious questions still remain. We owe it to ourselves and to the future that memorials built to last the ages will be built with utmost study and care. Sadly, I do not believe this is happening in this matter and I hope that my colleagues will join me in insisting that it does.

Here, also, is the exact text of the statement made by William Walton, a close and intimate friend of President and Mrs. John F. Kennedy, before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior and related agencies, on February 24, as chairman of the present Commission of Fine Arts many of the members of which were appointed by President Kennedy:

> I know if my Commission were asked for an opinion, we would wish that the Cultural Center were in a different site, but they would like to see it built. The way it is always presented to us is that if you upset the applecart there will be no Cultural Center. So many citizens of this city remain quiet for fear of preventing the building of this Cultural Center.

Recently I polled nearly 35,000 consumers of cultural entertainment of the Washington-Maryland-Virginia area. These were the audiences of the most outstanding of this area's cultural organizations, the American Light Opera Company, the National Symphony Orchestra Association, the Opera Society of Washington, the Washington Ballet, and the Washington Civic Opera Association, the officers of which took no position on the site question at all. With the public statements of such distinguished close personal friends and associates of President Kennedy as I have referred to above to guide them, plus their own innate commonsense, more than 5,000 of the 35,000 polled replied; and more than 70 percent of these 5,000 voters voted for prompt hearings at which qualified experts can help Congress reexamine the side for the Kennedy Arts Center. Less than 30 percent of those voting voted that hearings are not necessary; the Center should be built at the river site. Many distinguished citizens voted, among them Louis H. Bean, the dean of pollsters, whose Bean Poll has been given the highest accolades by pollsters and leading Americans of all walks of life.

The rapid and heavy response in my own poll is considered by experts to be extraordinary, since the respondents had to read a long statement of pros and cons, furnish their own postage and sign their names and addresses, and many Federal workers, as is well known, are unwilling to sign their names in connection with controversial issues related to the Government. In addition to card responses, there were many letters from thoughtful citizens, expressing their rightful indignation and frustration with the undemocratic way in which the trustees of the Kennedy Arts Center have totally refused to pay any attention to those who wish to reexamine the site problem even including the distinguished Democratic signers of the petition which I have mentioned. In a letter to President Johnson on October 5, I said, in reporting on the poll, that:

> I should be very pleased to make these cards available for your inspection, so that you can be satisfied as to every detail. That so many people voted is the very best evidence of the importance of this issue in the minds of the citizens of this area whom the Kennedy Center will serve.

In a surprising sequel to my offer, which has deeply disturbed the officers of the organizations participating in my poll, I received, under date of October 11, a letter from the Special Assistant on the Arts at the White House endorsing the following statement which he proceeded to circulate widely:

> It may well prove that these organizations have done themselves the greatest disservice of all. Section 501(c)(3) denies tax-exempt status to organizations which substantially attempt to influence legislation. And loss of tax exemption seriously endangers the sources of charitable contributions. In additions, the National Symphony, the Washington School of Ballet, and the Washington Civic Opera received from the District of Columbia Recreation Board over $49,000 of public funds appropriated by the Congress and a similar amount is provided in this year's budget. It is hardly appropriate for these funds to be used to support opposition to the Kennedy Center site when that site has been endorsed by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia as well as the Recreation Board.

Many drawbacks to the present site have been cited, the lack of accessibility to pedestrians, its location in the flight pattern of increasingly noisy planes, including jets, the failure to provide a subway station, the maze of highways. A new and significant objection has been raised by Louis C. McCabe, Ph. D., president of Resources Research, whose firm recently completed a study for the Joint Subcommittee on Washington Metropolitan Problems which is headed by Senator Alan Bible. Mr. McCabe's letter is included at this point in my remarks, for it is remarkably clear and self-explanatory and does not need any elucidation by me:

RESOURCES RESEARCH, INC.,
Falls Church, Va., October 20, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
Representative, State of New Jersey, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIDNALL: As a resident of Maryland, living in the Washington metropolitan area, I must commend you for calling for a reexamination of the site for the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. Herewith I enclose a card which you have provided but I wish to comment further on my belief that it would be a serious mistake to locate the Center in Foggy Bottom as conditions in that area now exist.

Perhaps many others who have suggested the relocation have it mind the reason which I wish to point out, but feel that the statement for their opposition would be indelicate to bring up. You, no doubt, are aware of the sewer outfall into the Potomac at the end of G Street near the proposed site. In the summer months, the odor from this sewer outfall is sometimes almost overpowering. Resources Research, some 3 years ago, undertook a sampling program of the extent and levels of pollution of the Potomac from Great Falls to below the entrance of the Anacostia River. Our study was done for Senator BIBLE's Joint Subcommittee on Washington Metropolitan Problems by Dr. Gilbert V. Levin of our staff.

Some 200 million gallons daily of raw sewage flows into the Potomac at the foot of G Street as a result of the combined sewage system of the District. This system of combined sewers is responsible for the sewage discharge into Rock Creek which subsequently enters into the Potomac near the proposed site. The sewer gases escaping into the air from these effluents are responsible for the blackening of the gold equestrian statues which the Italian people gave to the United States. The statue upstream from Memorial Bridge is exposed to such a fumigation from the sewer outfall that the U.S. Park Service maintenance people are unable to keep it polished even for the most important visitors to the United States.

It might be possible to scrub the ventilation air going into the building at an excessive cost but visitors to the Center in time of low water on the Potomac would experience a very objectionable odor outside of the buildings.

In time, we hope, of course, that the storm sewers and the sanitary sewers can be separated but this will cost perhaps $200 million to accomplish. I know that the President is extremely interested in cleaning up the Potomac but this will take place many years after the Kennedy Center is built.

Please call on me or my associates if we can be of further help in this important community problem.

Sincerely yours,
LOUIS C. MCCABE, Ph. D.,
President.

Enclosure.

I include a memorandum which I received from Roger L. Stevens, White House Special Assistant on the Arts, under date of August 20, 1965, stating he would be "glad to present all—my—points to the Trustees—of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts—at their next meeting." I assume this offer still stands, and that he will present this statement to the trustees. I also include a number of other items for the information of the trustees.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 20, 1965.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HONORABLE WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

Concerning your memorandum which I received on August 16 about the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. I will be glad to present all your points to the trustees at their next meeting.

I would like to call your attention to the fact that the board of trustees consists of a very prominent group of Americans who have given both time and money to the Center. They are a group that is outstanding in the fields of business, Government, and the performing arts. I am sure they will give the points raised every consideration.

ROGER L. STEVENS,
Special Assistant on the Arts.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 15, 1965]

A PETITION RELATING TO THE LOCATION OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Whereas the location of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts is of utmost importance to the future of the city and to its inhabitants and visitors, and

Whereas questions have been raised about the suitability of the river site as proposed,

We, whose names appear below, urge a 60-day moratorium on work toward the construction of the Center to enable a review committee appointed for the purpose, to hear, study, and make recommendations concerning all questions relating to the location of the Center.

Alice S. Acheson, Mr. and Mrs. John Archbold, Hon. and Mrs. Thurman Arnold, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Arrott, Mrs. Wayne Barnett, Mr. and Mrs. J. Henry Berne, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Biddle, Miss Cornelia M. Bowie, E. Fulton Brylawski, Mrs. John A. C. Bucknell, Mr. and Mrs. Frederick Bunting, B. Bernei Burgunder, Mrs. Poe Burling, Mr. and Mrs. Calvert Carey, Mr. and Mrs. Albert B. Carter, Jr., Aldus H. Chapin, David Sanders Clark, Mr. and Mrs. Jack Coopersmith, Dorothy F. Cowen.

Rose F. Cox, Andre deLimur, Miss Barbara Donald, James A. Donohoe, Jr., Richard Dudman, Mr. and Mrs. Clive L. DuVal II, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Eicholz, Dr. and Mrs. Julian Eisenstein, Col. and Mrs. Robert F. Evans, Mrs. Herbert Fales, Carl Feiss, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Finkenstaedt, Mrs. William Thompson Finley, Jr., Jean Friendly, Mrs. Gerhard A. Gesell, Mrs. John Timberlake Gibson.

Rev. and Mrs. C. Leslie Glenn, Charles C. Glover III, Mr. and Mrs. Philip Gore, Lucia T. Greenway, Randall H. Hagner, Jr., Mrs. Gilbert Hahn, Jr., Mrs. Forbes Hall, Mr. and Mrs. Edward F. Hamm, Jr., Henry H. Hecht, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Barklie Henry, Mr. and Mrs. H. Struve Hensel, Mr. and Mrs. Francis Hill, Mr. and Mrs. Frederick Hill, Gretchen Hood, Marshall Hornblower, Miss Virginia Livingston Hunt, John R. Immer.

Mr. and Mrs. Macgill James, Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Keck, Mrs. W. John Kenney, Mrs. Sherman Kent, Katharine McCook Knox, Alice Graeme Korff, Arthur Lambert, Jr., Mrs. Casanove Lee, Mrs. Newbold LeGendre, Mr. and Mrs. H. Gates Lloyd, Arthur T. Lyon, Mrs. Atherton Macondray, Mr. and Mrs. Noel Macy, Arthur K. Mason, Katherine Ward McGuire, Perkins McGuire, Mrs. Howard Ripley McPeck, Constance Mellen, Rt. Rev. Paul Moore, Jr.

Mr. and Mrs. Edward P. Morgan, Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Morgan, Phyllis Nitze, Mr. and Mrs. James Newmeyer, Jr., Robert Brewer Norris, Garrison Norton, Mrs. Norman S. Paul, Arthur Phelan, Jr., Laughlin Phillips, Rear Adm. Neill Phillips, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., Gen. and Mrs. William Ritchie, Mr. and Mrs. Norborne Robinson, Mr. and Mrs. Godfrey,

A. Rockefeller, Corina Rogers, Mr. and Mrs. Kermit Roosevelt, Mr. and Mrs. David Rust, Hon. and Mrs. Edward W. C. Russell.

John H. Safer, Maureen S. Shanley, Richard Sinclair, Mr. and Mrs. Francis Spalding, Mrs. Philip M. Stern, Mr. and Mrs. John Stillman, Mark Sullivan, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Carlton Swift, Jr., Lloyd Symington, Mr. and Mrs. Cuthbert R. Train, Russell E. Train, Mrs. Cyrus Vance, Mr. and Mrs. DeForest Van Slyck, Hon. and Mrs. Henry Villard, Hon. and Mrs. Henry, Villard, Phillip H. Watts, Mrs. Eric Wentworth, Mrs. Frank West, Tom Wicker.

Letters of support for this petition should be sent to Post Office Box 1807, Washington, D.C., 20013.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., September 15, 1965.

Mr. ROGER L. STEVENS,
Special Assistant on the Arts,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEVENS: Last week I introduced S.J. Res. 109 which would require the National Capital Planning Commission to make a detailed study and to hold public hearings on the best possible site for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Enclosed you will find a copy of that Resolution plus the remarks I made on the floor at the time I introduced it.

As you can see, I have suggested no particular alternative site for the center. My only interest in this matter is to secure the best possible location for a cultural center that will be an integral part of the Nation's Capital for many years to come. I am sure that you and your fellow members of the Board of Trustees also share this desire.

I would appreciate it very much if at the next meeting of the Board of Trustees you would place on the agenda a review of this matter by your organization. Perhaps a representative group of citizens from the Nation's Capital could also present their views at this same meeting.

Thanking you for your consideration of this matter, I am, with best wishes,

Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
U.S. Senator.

DIOCESE OF WASHINGTON, MOUNT SAINT ALBAN,
Washington, D.C., September 14, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I was very much interested in your bill, H.R. 10558, and completely agree with you as to the urgency of making the John F. Kennedy Center available to all citizens of Washington and, particularly, to those who could not reach the Center by car or who could not pay the kind of prices necessary to make it self-supporting. Many of the people of our diocese are in that position. In view of the Government's increasing concern for the culturally deprived and, particularly, because of President Kennedy's own concern, it seems incredible that a cultural center would be of such a nature as to be unavailable to the culturally deprived.

Good luck to you in your efforts with this bill.

Sincerely,

The Right Reverend PAUL MOORE, Jr.

DIOCESE OF WASHINGTON, MOUNT SAINT ALBAN,
Washington, D.C., October 13, 1965.

Mrs. FRANK G. WISNER,
John F. Kennedy Center,
1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. WISNER: I am sorry that my letter to Congressman WIDNALL has been of concern to you. I realize that you asked me to serve on a committee relative to the Center. I could not serve because of the pressure of other duties. I don't quite understand what Archbishop Hannan meant about my agreeing to serve on the committee. He must have misunderstood me. I did say that I was concerned, and I understood at the time that he was to keep me posted. I was unaware, when this committee business was going on, of the implications of the site, since I was very new in Washington. However, I do not feel that, because I had been asked to serve on a committee, there was any reason I should not write a letter to Congressman WIDNALL.

My letter caused much more stir than I thought it would. I write many letters expressing opinions when I have them, and I think this one has caused more reaction than all the rest put together. My only concern when I wrote the letter was that the location of the site and the financial aspects of the programing be such that it would be available to all the people of Washington, and not just to those who could afford expensive tickets and who happened to own an automobile or could afford a taxi. If the present location is available to mass transportation, and if the financial arrangements are such that the Center's activities are within reach of all the people of Washington, then I would be happy.

I would be perfectly glad to meet with you or the ladies you mentioned in your letter, but I do not feel that anything would be gained by it, since I have nothing further to say than the contents of this letter, nor do I intend to become any more deeply involved in this particular issue.

Faithfully yours,

The Right Reverend PAUL MOORE, Jr.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS,
Washington, D.C., October 12, 1965.

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS ON THE LOCATION OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The American Institute of Architects has received information that serious consideration is being given to the possibility of relocating the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. The Pennsylvania Avenue plan suggests possible sites which were not available when the project was first conceived.

While the institute recognizes that plans for the Center are already well advanced, it questions whether the present location is adequate to receive properly a building of the size and importance of the contemplated Center, and it believes that another location might provide a more appropriate site for this great memorial to the late President Kennedy.

The institute therefore strongly urges that studies be made by the architect of the Center, the Pennsylvania Avenue Council and the National Capital Planning Commission, to investigate the possibility of placing the Center on the proposed National Square or in some other location where it might better serve its purpose as a memorial to John F. Kennedy and as a center for the performing arts, and where this important building might make a greater contribution to the life and appearance of the city of Washington.

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 1, 1965]

ARCHITECTS AND KENNEDY CENTER

SIR: Your August 25 editorial, "Closed Issue," concerning the site of the Kennedy Center is inaccurate and misleading.

The proposal for a study of other sites came not from "a smattering of local architects" but from the American Institute of Architects, which acted entirely independently of Congressman WIDNALL. The AIA includes nearly 18,000 members representing about 90 percent of the architectural firms in the country. The same position has been taken at various times by the American Society of Landscape Architects, the Architectural League of New York, the Committee of 100 on the Federal City, the Washington Building Congress, the Washington Planning and Housing Association, the Federation of Citizen's Associations, and many distinguished writers on architecture and city planning. This position unquestionably represents the opinion of most informed experts in the field of architecture and planning.

The AIA reopened the question of the cultural center site because it recognized that this will be one of the most important buildings in Washington. This being so, the center must be placed in an appropriate setting where it can be easily reached and where it will make the greatest contribution to the life of the Nation and the city.

Since the present site fails to meet these requirements in many ways, it is obviously good sense, good economics, and good planning to find a location that is suitable. To admit at this late date that a mistake has been made is embarrassing, and some time and money will be lost in correcting the original error. This is a low price indeed to pay for the benefits that would result from making a change.

DAVID NORTON YERKES,
Director, Middle Atlantic Region, American Institute of Architects.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 22, 1965]

FROM A CANDY BOX, A TARDY AND UNPLEASANT SURPRISE

(By Ada Louise Huxtable)

Official Washington has just found, to its surprise, that there is a great deal of discontent among architects, city planners and cultural leaders with the site of the $46.4 million Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. Somebody inquired—in this case, the assistant to the chairman of the temporary Pennsylvania Avenue Commission, charged with the rebuilding of the Capital's ceremonial boulevard.

Now, finally, 60 days before construction contracts are to be let for the national cultural center, an investigation was made by the commission, and the extent of the criticism uncovered was "appalling."

If somebody had asked, some time ago, it would have been clear that there has been a good deal less than professional enthusiasm for the site, a traffic island on the edge of the Potomac, and the design, a glorified candy box by Edward Durell Stone.

PRIMARY OBJECTIONS

Ever since the Potomac site was chosen in 1958, and an even bigger candy box proposed that had to be cut down to the present large economy bonbon size when funds proved hard to raise, critics have pointed out the inconvenience of the location, its inhospitality to pedestrians, its dependence on the automobile for transportation, and its isolation by encircling throughways.

With the initiation of the Pennsylvania Avenue plan in 1962, the question was raised immediately as to whether a Pennsylvania Avenue site might not be more valid and logical in terms of total Washington planning and downtown rehabilitation.

But although far from built, the center proved to be unmovable. One of the Pennsylvania Avenue Commission's architect members, Minoru Yamasaki, resigned in protest when the possibility of locating the cultural center on the avenue faded and an unbroken line of Government buildings with an FBI fortress at its center took over. He based his action on the fact that President Kennedy's directive on the avenue had been to seek liveliness and variety and specifically to avoid a solid phalanx of overbearing official structures.

The arguments, then and now, for the relocation of the center were cogent. They stressed the factor of centrality rather than isolation, the need for new vitality downtown, particularly at night, the desirability of bringing people back to the heart of the city, and the regeneration of that heart by the impetus to further building and development that a cultural center would bring.

Those arguments have been reinforced recently by the fact that urban renewal has been made available to Washington for the first time under the housing bill just passed, and by the reality of the long-discussed Washington subway which has now entered the practical planning stage.

The argument against relocating Washington's cultural center at this late date is, unfortunately, equally strong. It is a question of money, and in the American scale of values nothing is stronger than that. The $46.4 million cost has been raised, $15.5 million by public subscription, $15.5 million by congressional appropriation, and a $15.4 million repayable loan.

TOTAL QUESTION

To move the building now would not mean just picking up the candy box and dropping it on Pennsylvania Avenue. It is a question of total redesign for an appropriate solution for a completely different kind of site.

This means scrapping old plans and incurring large additional design costs. Site acquisition and land clearance expenses would be largely underwritten by Federal urban renewal.

Obviously, redesign will not be undertaken happily by any architect who is pleased with a solution that he has brought to the point of construction, and who is then asked to start all over. Mr. Stone has done this once, when the size of the original project was drastically reduced.

Just as obviously, Congress will howl at the idea of adding new design costs to existing budgets and appropriations. The real question is whether such an expenditure would be justified by the value of the results.

This could be determined by careful professional analysis. How much would redesign costs be? How would relocation affect the economic revitalization of downtown Washington, one of the city's serious problems? How would these effects balance against the extra costs? Would the long-term central city benefits be far-reaching enough to justify the expenditure? Does all this outweigh the simpler procedure of going ahead with present plans, on the present site, which has little to recommend it beyond a fine water view?

As it stands now, the Kennedy Center is a par-for-the-course example of what might be called the typical derrière garde design of cultural centers being produced like good old American hotcakes in good old American cities.

Promoted by public spirited nonprofessionals with a warm, if not very expert interest in the arts buttressed by economic and social power and immense good will, these centers have developed a curious identity never envisioned by their well-meaning sponsors. They are monuments to middlebrow culture.

STIFLING

With few exceptions they wrap up popular performance in a comfortable cocoon of prettily pretentious building ranging on the conventional scale from dull to pompous. They smother, rather than promote anything that is new, creative, exciting, or experimental. They are static rehashes of old esthetic formulas rather than proving grounds for new ideas and contributions, and in architecture, recent American contributions have been notable.

These amateur, bourgeois efforts compound many errors. Site selection is one, as in Washington. Professionals worry about the impact of a major building project on the total city and its processes of growth, change and decay. They are concerned with the urban interaction of the social, economic, esthetic, and functional aspects of such an undertaking. The potential renewal effects of dispersal of the arts are weighed against one-stop concentration. Amateurs do not think beyond the status value of a monument to culture.

In terms of architecture and planning these centers generally leave the top level of the country's creative talent untouched, settling for something safe and prestigious. Attempts at progressive solutions are reduced to the acceptably familiar. The results, almost uniformly, are dazzlingly mediocre.

SCHMALTZ VERSUS ELEGANCE

A small, but telling bit of evidence: Denmark is contributing furnishings to the Kennedy Center by one of her leading designers, Poul Kjaerholm. This raises some intriguing speculation on how Mr. Kjaerholm's uncompromisingly sophisticated elegant, original and distinctly contemporary furnishings will fit into the determinedly updated schmaltz of Mr. Stone's plushy red and gold interiors as currently planned. There would be no question if the building were a parallel innovation, equally in tune with our times. The standards would match. The best that can be expected is another compromise, by Mr. Kjaerholm, or a revealing contrast that could be fetchingly unintentional high camp.

The boom in cultural centers is bringing the arts to a mass public on a scale never before possible. This is fine. Nobody argues the point. But the real point is that the same job could be done just as well by considerably better buildings and plans. In artistic terms, this design failure is the ultimate cultural irony.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 7, 1964]

THE KENNEDY MEMORIAL

As its first order of business today the House is scheduled to vote on a bill to provide some $30 million in public funds to establish a national cultural center as a memorial to President Kennedy.

Like so many other indiscriminate tributes, this proposal has been rushed through the Senate—and now the House—out of a sense of grief, irrespective of its meaning or its appropriateness. While John F. Kennedy was a highly cultured and civilized man, his interest in the arts was only one of many pursuits. Congress would do well to pause to consider whether this is the best way to honor his memory. We doubt that it is and at least we think more time should pass before an irrevocable decision is made.

Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, raised some extremely pertinent questions on this subject in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD published last Friday, which Members of the House would do well to read before voting on the proposed memorial today. There is no need for the haste which is now being shown—haste that makes one wonder whether Mr. WIDNALL is not right in asking if this particular memorial concept may not be a mere face-saver "for an otherwise faltering project" unable to raise the required funds through public subscription.

The National Cultural Center should stand on its own merits. The proposal to finance it now in important part through public money is a complete reversal of the original plan, which was that the Federal Government would provide only the site. Furthermore, as Mr. WIDNALL points out, the Government is in effect pledging itself to provide annual operating funds to keep the project solvent—because obviously a Presidential memorial cannot be allowed to go bankrupt. In addition, the provision for a loan of $15.4 million for construction of parking facilities is, as Mr. WIDNALL says, tantamount to putting "a first mortgage on a Presidential memorial for the first time in our history.

These are valid objections, and Mr. WIDNALL raises many others. Together they strongly suggest that the Congress, which has yet to provide a memorial to Franklin D. Roosevelt, is being too hasty in deciding on the national memorial for John F. Kennedy. There is no need for haste or waste, which are so inconsistent with the President's character, particularly with his sense of fitness and his intellectual deliberation.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 22, 1962]

PLAN AFOOT TO SHIFT CULTURE CENTER SITE—GROUP ENVISIONS 3 SECTIONS ALONG PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE

(By Willard Clopton)

A plan to locate the proposed National Cultural Center downtown instead of in Foggy Bottom is being quietly pushed by members of a White House advisory group.

Their idea is to break up the Center into its three component parts—opera house, concert hall, and dramatic theater—and spot them at strategic locations along Pennsylvania Avenue NW.

The group, a working subcommittee of the President's Advisory Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue, discussed the proposal at a closed meeting last week.

The Committee was set up last summer to develop plans for making Pennsylvania Avenue the showcase thoroughfare envisioned by Pierre L'Enfant more than 150 years ago.

SINGLE BUILDING PLANNED

As presently designed by famed architect, Edward Durell Stone, the Cultural Center would occupy a single building located on a 15-acre site along the Potomac River just north of the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge. A nationwide drive to collect $30 million to build the structure began last month.

At its meeting December 13, the advisory subcommittee reportedly considered these criticisms of the Center's present site and design plans:

The site is so far from the center of Washington that it could do little to enrich the city's cultural night life.

The location is not served by major public transportation facilities, whereas Pennsylvania Avenue is along the route of the city's proposed subway system.

Housing all performing arts stages in a single building might result in a structure so large as to be out of proportion to the rest of the city.

OPPOSE FINAL DECISION

Both the full committee and the subcommittee are headed by Nathanial A. Owings, San Francisco architect. Others at last week's meeting were William Walton, Washington artist; Frederick Guthein, president of the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies; Paul Thiry, chief architect of the Seattle World's Fair. Ralph Walker, a member of the Fine Arts Commission, and Polly Shackleton, Democratic National Committeewoman for the District.

The proposed shift brought expressions of dismay yesterday from Jarold Kieffer, secretary-coordinator of the Center.

Any change in plans now, he said, would undermine the fund-raising campaign. "We can't expect people to give when they don't know what kind of building there would be or where it would be."

He also said a change of location would need to be approved by Congress and that the process could take as long as 2 years.

HAS NOT HEARD CRITICISM

"I haven't yet heard any criticism of the present design that can't be answered, he said. "President Kennedy likes it. Ike liked it. The Fine Arts Commission likes it."

"Any change now could be fatal. What we are really talking about is whether to kill the project."

Downtown Progress, Inc., a businessmen's group seeking ways of revitalizing the central city, is taking no stand on the issue.

"The present site for the Center was picked before our organization was created, Knox Banner, director of Downtown Progress, said yesterday, "So our position is that this matter of a site is a decision to be made by the people who are raising the funds and who are responsible for building the Center."

FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
October 21, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: As one of the 144 signers of the petition to President Johnson and his Special Assistant on the Arts, Mr. Roger L. Stevens—who doubles in brass as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center of the Performing Arts, I have received a memo dated October 15, 1965, from Mr. Stevens replying to some questions which we raised. Mr. Stevens has made a reply but he has not been able to answer the points we raised.

On behalf of the performing arts groups of the District of Columbia and of the members of our Federation (representing 40 citizen organizations and over 20,000 members) I am enclosing an analysis of this memorandum as I believe that there are many points involved here to which Congress should give its attention before committing such a memorial ot posterity.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. IMMER,
President.

REPLY TO MEMORANDUM LETTER OF OCTOBER 15, 1965

The JFKCPA is not a performing arts center. It consists only of certain halls and auditoriums where events can be held. There are no other facilities for the performing arts of the District of Columbia or of the rest of Nation. There are no facilities for the National Symphony, the Washington Ballet, or any other performing arts group. There are no practice rooms, rehearsal halls, working rooms, shops for stage scenery, storage for stage sets not on the stage, meeting rooms for performing arts groups, committee rooms, office space, audition rooms, or any of the many of other facilities needed in a performing arts center.

The concert hall is too small to be used by the National Symphony (2,700 seats compared to 3,500 in the Constitution Hall). I predict that they will never use it and I point out that there has been no commitment to do so. The fact that there is no storage space for extra stage sets forces one to the conclusion that the entire project has been designed primarily and exclusively for the presentation of New York road shows. No repertory theater can use it.

The project as now designed does not satisfy the requirements of the enabling legislation. Where can it present and develop programs for children and youth and the elderly? There are no rooms for these purposes. How can it provide facilities for other civic activities if there are no committee or general meeting rooms? I question whether the Center as now designed is a proper or suitable memorial to the late President. He had a concern for the average man. Is it a proper honor to him if his memorial can be reached only by those in limousines or those who can pay $1.75 for a parking fee in addition to $10 for a ticket? I am surprised that his family would stand by and see such mockery made of the ideals John F. Kennedy expressed while he was President.

There has been a great deal of misrepresentation in connection with this project. The basic figures will not stand up. The work of reputable consulting firms has been distorted in order to provide an acceptable answer. One of the leading parking experts in the country developed figures on parking—but used the criteria given them by the Center trustees—figures which are false and untenable. Only those traffic surveys favorable or acceptable to the project have been revealed. How long would it take to empty the garage of 1,600 cars after a performance? Would it take 3 or 4 hours? The assignments to the traffic studies cited have been carefully defined and no recommendations affecting the site selection have been permitted.

There has been a lot of misrepresentation regarding savings of four structures under one roof. My own alma mater, the University of Illinois, now has under construction a true cultural center, consisting of four auditoriums equal to the size proposed here, each in a separate building rising out of a large elevated platform. It has in addition more parking, plenty of classrooms, workshops, conference rooms and storage areas to serve the teaching needs of a great university. The total cost of this project is $15 million including the foundation and the parking garage. One could construct every building of the finest marble and still be below the projected cost of the present Center design. A congressional committee should compare these projects before proceding on this project.

SITE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Stone's concept of large white building in a parklike setting is a truly magnificent one. The only trouble is that there is no parklike setting. Mr. Stevens omits many facts and thereby misleads Congress and the critics. He does not tell you that the approaches to E Street rise 30 feet above the level of the plaza on the east side of the structure; or that at one point an approach road (on the southeast corner) is less than 12 feet from the plaza and 8 feet higher. To the north there is the Watergate Town rising to an impressive height and bulk. Across the freeway to the east looms the Columbia Plaza. To the south there are only the approaches to the Roosevelt Bridge. To the west the 7-acre bulk of the Center overpowers and destroys the rustic effect of the 2-acre Roosevelt Island. The parklike setting is a mockery and the trustees of the Center realize this all too well.

Reference is made to the Watergate complex to the north and the confidence that its height can be kept to that of the Kennedy Center. Even this permits a 13-story building that can be built within 175 feet of the north side of the Kennedy Center Building. This will be the most congested area in Washington when it is completed.

TRAFFIC PATTERN

The traffic pattern is an unbelievable nightmare. There is no direct access to the Center from the inner loop which had been designed to carry the greater part of the traffic in the area. Only New Hampshire Avenue is available to provide direct access to the Center. The park roadway is not wide enough to accommodate large streams of traffic. In times of flood or high water all exits will be closed and the Center cannot be used at all. The only access from the south to the garage must across over the exit road from the east loading plaza which will create the worst kind of traffic hazard.

The integrated system of pedestrian walks and approaches is a mockery. Ladies attending concerts in the District of Columbia at night do not walk four or five blocks on isolated integrated walkways. It isn't safe. This is an isolated part of the city. It is a "traffic island" surrounded by freeways which can be approached only by automobile or bus.

RAPID TRANSIT

On this point Mr. Stevens plays very loosely with the truth. Mr. Stevens has been given no reason to believe that a subway station will ever be built any closer to the Center than the present proposed station at 23d and H Streets. This whole section presented by Mr. Stevens is highly misleading. It would cost over $6 million to provide a station for the Center. Why does Mr. Stevens not tell the Congress about this figure? Such a subway, incidentally, would have to be blasted out of almost solid rock.

ACOUSTICS (AIR TRAFFIC)

Although Mr. Stevens lists the eminent experts he has called in he very carefully does not provide any assurance that the noise level of jets flying directly overhead can be overcome. There is a very good reason for this lack of assurance on Mr. Stevens' part.

DOWNTOWN AREA

Mr. Stevens has been advised of several suitable sites on Pennsylvania Avenue. He makes no reference to that land to the north of the Archives Building which the Pennsylvania Avenue plan indicates as being suitable for a cutural center. Again it is misleading to refer to 18 acres of parklike setting (unless one includes all the surrounding highways). It is my understanding that Mr. Stevens is not speaking truthfully when he says that the officials of the Pennsylvania Avenue plan have no present plans to include a cultural center. It is plainly marked on the official release of the plan and no disclaimer has been made by those officials.

His reference to the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade may be understandable when it is recalled that Mr. Ralph Becker, general counsel and principal paid employee of the Center, is a director of the board of trade and head of the Culture Center Committee of that organization.

LATENESS OF HOUR

The statement referring to the "over $3 million for the construction work done to date" cannot be correct as no construction work has been done. If the building were moved to the Pennsylvania Avenue area with a saving of $15 million for a garage, $1 million for sound conditioning, $6 million for a subway station and the $5 million spent for additional site—then this would more than offset any loss caused by moving the Center downtown.

REVIEW

There has never been objective consideration of other sites, or at least not in the last 2 years. I attended the hearing held by the National Capital Planning Commission which preceded the approval of the present site and the preliminary drawings and plan. I can tell you that every organization appearing before that subcommittee testified against the site and the plan. Yet two days later the plan was approved. No performing arts group in the District of Columbia has approved the final design for this Center and I predict that none of them will. This is not a performing arts Center and it is not a suitable memorial to our late President.

JOHN R. IMMER,
President, Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia.

FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
October 5, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I have just received from Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY. I had written to him enclosing a copy of a letter to the editors of the Washington Evening Star and the Washington Post. Both papers published these letters, copies of which are enclosed.

I feel that this letter from Senator KENNEDY is highly significant, and it indicates that the complete responsibility for the site of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts rests with the President. The Trustees of the Center are so deeply committed to the present site, despite its overwhelming disadvantages, and who are completely unwilling to consider the views of the people of the District of Columbia without whose patronage the Center will be a white elephant. As they did not select the original site and since the Kennedy Center Act does not authorize them to select a site they have no authority over the site issue. The responsibility belongs clearly to the President and to the Congress.

In the interest then of the entire future of the performing arts in the Nation's Capital, I request you to transmit this letter to the President along with the latest result of the poll you are taking of the views of the citizens of the metropolitan area who must be relied upon to support this great arts center and presidential memorial.

Assuring you of the complete support of the federation in this matter, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. IMMER,
President.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
September 27, 1965.

Mr. JOHN R. IMMER,
President, Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. IMMER: I just wanted you to know how much I appreciated your writing and expressing your reasons for opposing the present site for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. I certainly respect your opinion but feel that it is out of my hands and that it is not appropriate for me to be involved at this time.

I have, however, brought your views to the attention of Mr. Roger Stevens. My thanks and best wishes.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 28, 1965]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: ACCESSIBLE CENTER SITE

SIR: Bishop Paul Moore, Jr., is to be commended for pointing out the strange lack of concern for the poor and culturally deprived of Washington in the present plan for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. He has endorsed in no uncertain terms the bill, H.R. 10558, offered by Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, to relocate the Center on or near Pennsylvania Avenue. Related measures have been introduced by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, and Representative CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

Bishop Moore points out (1) on the present river site the Center will not be available to low-income, culturally deprived families who do not have cars and who cannot afford to pay the prices to make the Center self-supporting; and (2) in views of President Kennedy's own concern for the culturally deprived it seems incredible that the Kennedy Center would be of such nature as to exclude this group.

Tickets for admission to the Lincoln Center in New York City are now up to $9 per person. Tickets for the Kennedy Center, built for the most part with tax funds, will cost at least as much. (Compare this with the $3.60 top at Constitution Hall for the concerts of the National Symphony Orchestra and its thousands of low-priced tickets.)

Representative WIDNALL and his colleagues want the Center to be readily accessible to all, not just those who can afford taxis, parking fees and limousines.

The Kennedy family must be as shocked as is Bishop Moore and other civic leaders in the Nation's Capital over the lack of any real concern for the culturally deprived in present plans for the Kennedy Center. The American Institute of Architects is right in its objections to the present site and Congress should hold immediate hearings so that this presidential memorial will be of benefit to those who cannot afford $10 tickets.

JOHN R. IMMER,
President, Federation of Citizens Associations.

FEDERATION OF CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
October 11, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: The White House Arts Adviser, Mr. Roger L. Stevens, has appeared before your committee on behalf of a supplemental request for $17 million for the National Arts and Humanities Act.

The John F. Kennedy Center or the Performing Arts, of which he is the chairman, is costing the taxpayers at least $27 million more than it should and still does not satisfy the requirements of the authorizing legislation. (An equivalent arts center for the University of Illinois is costing $15 million.) The excess costs of the Kennedy Center not originally authorized is detailed as follows:

Garage	$15,400,000
Subway station for Center	6,000,000
Soundproofing from jets	1,000,000
Additional site	5,000,000
	27,000,000

It is to be expected that the same or equivalent amount of unplanned expenses will be duplicated in his administration of the National Arts and Humanities Act. We urge that you go over his budget requests most carefully.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. IMMER,
President.

THE FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

RECOMMENDED MOTION BY THE CITY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE, OCTOBER 7, 1965

Whereas the project to construct the J.F.K. Center for the Performing Arts is at the point of initiating construction on a site located on the banks of the Potomac River in the so-called Watergate area;

Whereas many citizens of the District of Columbia who desire to support a cultural center project have grave doubts as to the wisdom of major aspects of the present plan for the Center including its location for the following reasons:

1. Access to the Center by those attending performances in the three (or possibly four) halls will be unsatisfactory with regard to parking, traffic flow, or location relative to the planned rapid transit system.
2. Estimated operating costs indicate that a subsidy will probably be necessary.
3. Local art groups such as the National Symphony, the Washington Opera Society, etc., may not be able to use the Center.
4. The location of the Center along the landing and takeoff path of aircraft from Washington National Airport may cause objectionable noise, particularly within a few years when jet aircraft will undoubtedly be operating from the airport; and

Whereas many changes have taken place since this location was originally agreed on including a major reduction in acreage for the Center, the approval of a plan for construction of a rapid transit system for the District of Columbia and the Washington metropolitan area and the establishment of the National Historical Site along Pennsylvania Avenue; and

Whereas the federation has previously taken the position that the Center should be located in another area than on the Potomac such as on Pennsylvania Avenue:

Now, therefore, the FCAWDC in regular meeting October 14, 1965, does hereby express its view that the grave doubts as to the wisdom of the present plans and particularly the location of the JFKCPA should be resolved before the project moves into the construction phase and for this purpose expresses its strong support for Senate Joint Resolution 109 sponsored by Senator MUNDT and similar measures sponsored by other Members of Congress requiring that immediate hearings be held taking into account all of the factors which have changed since the present plan on the Watergate site was approved for the purpose of determining if the project should proceed as presently planned or should be revised, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the trustees of the JFKCPA, the District of Columbia Commissioners, NCPC, NCTA, FAC, and the appropriate committees of the House and Senate.

Approved by the federation October 14, 1965.

G. W. BRADY,
Chairman, City Planning and Zoning Committee.
MABEL E. MORRIS,
Mrs. Edward B. Morris,
Secretary.

NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Saturday is the ninth anniversary of the Hungarian revolution and freedom fight. This great uprising marked by national heroism was doomed to failure when Soviet troops were permitted to crush the revolt. Therefore, on this ninth anniversary the Hungarian people remain in bondage. It is gratifying to note that Hungarian organizations across this country and throughout the free world are effectively working together toward the day when freedom can be restored to their homeland and a legitimate government once again created by the people of Hungary.

Mr. Speaker, the Iron Curtain remains as full evidence of the colonial practices of the Soviet Union. Hungary and the other non-Russian peoples of Eastern Europe are held in colonial bondage by the Communist rulers in Moscow.

As we come to the close of a long congressional session, it would be most fitting for us to rededicate ourselves to the development of a foreign policy unlike the present one of coexistence; rather, a foreign policy based on the necessary redevelopment of freedom in Eastern Europe and wherever communism maintains dictatorial control.

KINGSPORT, TENN., AMERICAN LEGION POST RAPS PEACE PLEAS BY STUDENTS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Quillen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, Hammond Post No. 3 of the American Legion, which is located in Kingsport, Tenn., and of which I am proudly a member, is one of the Nation's outstanding Legion posts. At their meeting on Monday evening of this week, the post passed a resolution in regard to the recent nationwide demonstrations against the U.S. Vietnam policy. This resolution, in which I wholeheartedly concur, condemns and decries the un-American activity of irresponsible demonstrations against the united efforts of our Nation in Vietnam and against our Selective Service System in its conscription of able-bodied young Americans for the defense of freedom and the defeat of the worldwide Communist conspiracy.

For the information of my colleagues and the readers of the Record, I insert at this point in the Record the copy of this resolution which appeared in the Kingsport Times on October 19, 1965.

Legion Raps Peace Pleas by Students

Hammond Post No. 3 of the American Legion Monday night sharply criticized the recent nationwide demonstrations against U.S. Vietnam policy by college students.

Copies of the resolution, which praises the soldiers now fighting in Vietnam and deplores the actions of several groups of college students about the country, are scheduled to be sent to the 241 American Legion posts in Tennessee and to other State veterans' organizations.

The resolution reads:

"Whereas many thousands of dedicated young Americans in the Armed Forces of the United States are presently engaged in a life-and-death struggle against the forces of communism in Vietnam, daily risking their lives in the fight against the envelopment of the world by Godless communism; and

"Whereas at the same time, many thousands of young Americans are actively demonstrating against this concerted action in Vietnam and also are protesting against the draft, thereby serving to thwart and undermine the united efforts of our Nation and to subvert our younger citizens and to weaken their devotion to the principles of Americanism; and

"Whereas the American Legion would not be surprised or shocked at any actions of the beatniks or long-haired hoodlums who seemingly feel no allegiance to any principles or any obligation to the free Nation which gives them unlimited opportunity and freedom of speech; but the American Legion is greatly upset and disturbed at seeing so many young college students participating in and leading such un-American demonstrations while their contemporaries are fighting and dying in Vietnam: Now, be it

"*Resolved by Hammond Post No. 3, the American Legion at Kingsport, in regular meeting assembled on this 18th day of October 1965,* That this post, while reaffirming its belief in the freedom of speech, vehemently and emphatically condemns and decries the un-American activity of irresponsible demonstrations against the united efforts of our Nation in Vietnam and against our Selective Service System in its conscription of able-bodied young Americans for the defense of freedom and the defeat of the worldwide Communist conspiracy; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the local news media, the department adjutant, and every American Legion post and veterans' organization in the State of Tennessee."

CONGRESSMAN FINDLEY'S BEGINNING IN POLITICS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of my colleague from Illinois, Congressman Paul Findley, to forge a more meaningful Atlantic Union are well known to the Nation. Not so well known, however, is the story of Congressman Findley's beginning in politics, as well as the beginning of his deep interest in the effectiveness of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The following article from the Freedom & Union newsletter details Congressman Findley's early exposure to the importance of an Atlantic Union:

Two Thousand Dollars in Prizes Offered Students for Atlantic Union Editorials

A NATO-wide contest for the best editorial by a college student on "Youth Needs Atlantic Federation Now," is announced by Federal Union, Inc., the nonprofit educational membership association which publishes Freedom & Union. The winners will receive the Paul Findley Prize, named in honor of the rising young Illinois Congressman, who now represents counties which Lincoln once represented in the House.

Behind the name of the prize hangs a story of special interest to student journalists now. Representative Findley began his career in journalism and politics by entering, when 19, a contest sponsored by Federal Union for the best editorial written by an American college student on the subject, "Youth Needs Union Now." The prize he won was 1 day in Washington, D.C., as the personal guest of Clarence K. Streit, author of "Union Now." That day was December 26, 1941.

After lunch with his host in the National Press Club, young Findley hastened to the Capitol—for it happened that Winston Churchill was addressing that day a joint session of Congress in the House. Worming his way through the crowd, he reached a gallery door of the House, where he got a fleeting peek at the Prime Minister, but that was all.

Subsequent events suggest that this led the disappointed youth to decide to assure himself a seat in the future by getting elected to Congress. And he was elected by his home district just 19 years later, in 1960.

The study of "Union Now" and world affairs which Findley made is reflected in his prize-winning editorial, which we print in full on the next page. The degree to which it stands up now, a quarter century later, shows him to have been a gifted student with rare grasp of a vast subject.

CONTEST RULES AND PRIZES

Now, some facts for those interested in entering the present contest:

1. The Atlantic awards will be: First prize, $189 (the first Federal Union began in 1789); second prize, $87 (the first Federal Constitution was drafted in 1787); third prize, $54 (the first proposal of interstate democratic union was made by Benjamin Franklin in 1754).

These national prizes may also be given in each NATO nation, with at least four entries: First, $67 (in remembrance of the second Federal Union, that of Canada in 1867): and second, $48 (in remembrance of the first move toward a federal constitution in the Old World, that of Switzerland in 1848). Additional Atlantic and national prizes, as for honorable mention, may be also given; if so, they will be announced in our January issue. The prize money now totals $2,055.

2. All editorials must be received by the student editorial contest committee, Federal Union, Inc. 2700 Ontario Road, Washington, D.C., at the latest by next March 4—the birthday of the world's first Federal Union in 1789, and the day when Paul Findley's 1941 editorial was printed. Entries must be in English, or accompanied by English or French translation. There must be seven copies of the original or translation. Those from the United States and Canada must be in the form of clippings of the editorial as published in a college or other newspaper. From all other NATO nations, editorials may be—since there are fewer college newspapers in them—submitted only in typewritten form, although proof of publication in any printed paper will be counted by the judges as a favorable point. No editorial shall be more than 1,000 words long.

3. All winners of any prizes or honorable mention, Atlantic or national, will receive a free subscription to Freedom & Union for 1 year, and a personal letter of appreciation from Congressman Findley.

4. All those entering this contest will receive free on request from Federal Union, Inc., a packet of information about Atlantic Federal Union, at least one copy of Freedom & Union, and—while the limited supply lasts—a personally inscribed and autographed copy of the $1 paperback edition of Clarence Streit's latest book, "Freedom's Frontier—Atlantic Union Now," for only 25 cents from Americans and Canadians, and free to all other competitors.

5. The names of a distinguished panel of judges for this contest, both Atlanticwide and National, and any changes in these rules, will be announced in our January issue at the latest, and will be sent by January 31, 1966, to all those entering.

6. The prizes will be made public at the Federal Union convocation to be held in April in Springfield, Ill.

FINDLEY'S INSPIRING CAREER

Competitors for this Paul Findley prize may be inspired by details of the career of the 1941 winner. That contest aroused in young Findley a deep interest in the principles of government—particularly the U.S. Federal Constitution and its history, and the possibilities which the extension of Federal Union between democratic nations now offer for peace and greater liberty. This interest grew during his service in the Pacific in World War II. When he returned to civilian life, Federal Union, Inc., was preparing to launch Freedom & Union. This appealed to him both as a federalist and a budding journalist. He applied for a job and was employed by Editor Streit as assistant editor—his title on the masthead of volume I, No. 1 of this magazine which appeared in October 1946.

After a year, there came to him an opportunity to be editor of a weekly newspaper, the Pike County Republican, in Pittsfield, Ill., near his hometown. He seized it, became its publisher, prospered and got a second weekly in the region. Thus he laid the foundations for his bid for Congress in 1960.

A conservative Republican on domestic issues, he came out for Atlantic Federal Union in the 1962 election, and increased his majority to around 10,000. In 1963 he accepted election to the board of Federal Union, the first Member of either House to identify himself thus with Atlantic Union in 20 years. He then led in persuading his party to set up the task force now known as the GOP House Committee on NATO. His party named him chairman of it in 1965, after he had made in 1963–64 a number of forthright Atlantic Federalist speeches in the House and in his district * * * and been reelected by a 20,000 majority, although President Johnson carried his district by 32,000.

In June the House Republicans selected him to head the factfinding mission to NATO, they sent to Paris, and later named him a member of the congressional delegation to the NATO Parliamentarians Conference this month in New York. At this writing, he is about to introduce a strong resolution for Atlantic Federal Union, as its chief Republican sponsor in the House.

[From the Illinois College Rambler, Mar. 4, 1941]

YOUTH NEEDS UNION NOW—THIS WINNING STUDENT EDITORIAL LED REPRESENTATIVE FINDLEY TO CONGRESS

Through the failure of a past generation of leaders to realize the need for a strong Federal union of democratic nations, the youth of the United States faces a dark and uninviting future—one of sacrifice and hardship. Out of this failure has arisen another, and even more chaotic war world.

Today's youth will bear the brunt of the war's cost: First by bearing the arms and by giving their lives; later, by facing a more regimented society and perhaps limited liberty and opportunity; and, as if this were not enough, ultimately, by paying the monetary costs of the war by retiring the ever-mounting national indebtedness.

Faced with these prospects, youth feels justified in asking that their sacrifices be not made in vain: that their efforts in checking the forces of lawlessness and aggression may constitute a positive contribution to a world order which will maintain the principles of justice and tolerance.

The United States has all but officially joined the other English-speaking democracies in an all-out drive to check Hitler. To argue the merits of our action in adopting this policy is trite. Lengthy controversy may arise over the extent and administration of aid to Britain, but our entry into the war is no longer an issue; it is an accomplished fact.

Through a succession of measures beginning with the alteration of the Neutrality Act in 1938, Congress has in substance declared the military interests of this Nation to be inseparable from those of the British Empire. President Roosevelt has advised Winston Churchill that the United States "hangs breathless on thy fate." Today, though not officially at war with Germany, our country is readjusting its entire national life to a war basis, and our unlimited aid to Britain may be expected to continue in every necessary form until it is no longer required.

The issue confronting the Nation today, then, is not "How much aid should we give Britain?" or, "Can we keep out of war?" The issue is "Will we, who are engaged in this death struggle with Hitler, form now a basis for future peace?"

The isolationists cry that the United States is retracing her steps of 1917–18—a costly sacrifice of arms, men, and living standard in return for 20 years in which to prepare for another war. They warn that the Allies in 1919 not only failed to correct the conditions which had produced the war but laid the foundations for the present struggle.

The isolationists forget, however, that peace efforts following the armistice in 1918 proved a failure largely because a group of U.S. Senators blocked our participation in the League of Nations, the only means through which the Allies could correct the conditions which had caused the conflict. Furthermore, they forget that the League, strengthened by U.S. membership, could have effectively assured world order and prevented the present world conflict.

Instead of continuing an unconstructive, negative attack on issues that have long since been decided, the isolationists should center their attention on preventing future wars. They should take precautions against a recurrence of the tragedy of the past two decades; they should seek a basis for removing forever the causes of warfare. An allied victory in the war might permanently remove Hitler as a menace to the world, but if the democracies should contribute nothing more to world peace than another humiliated Germany and another impotent League of Nations, a new crop of even more menacing dictators would be inevitable.

Once more the United States has chosen the road to war; but this time youth asks Congress to join the other democracies in choosing also a road to peace. The United States and the British Empire are making a tremendous investment in this war against Hitler. For our country the economic and social consequences will be incalculable; and the prospect of dead, wounded, and mortgaged youths is unappealing.

To make this investment in human life and property return the best possible dividends, youth pleads for world government as the foundation for future world security. Youth asks the United States to join the other English-speaking democracies in forming a federal union now.

Union now—that the productive and military resources of the democracies may be utilized at their maximum efficiency; that the British Empire and the United States, already committed to a common policy, may most effectively coordinate their war programs.

Union now—that the tremendous human and monetary investment the democracies are making in the war may return the greatest possible dividends; that the sacrifices of today's youth be not in vain.

Union now—that the democracies may have the strength of unity which will be necessary to stop and destroy the German military machine; that the democracies, when they arise from this struggle, may also be united in rebuilding a divided, war-torn and embittered world into one of peace and cooperation.

Sincere and able men warn against the foreign entanglements and loss of national sovereignty which entering a Federal union would involve. They regard such a union as a costly experiment which might threaten our way of life.

However, the monetary costs and insignificant sacrifices which the union would require are dwarfed by a year's national defense budget; and our way of life is far more likely to survive under a union of democratic nations than if our Government is forced to drain the national wealth and pigeonhole our civil liberties in order to participate in an endless cycle of European wars; and finally, our sovereignty would not be lost under a Federal union but would be placed on a more expansive and more secure foundation. Rather than revoking our present rights under our State and National citizenship in favor of what Columnist Johnson terms "a form of madness," we would be adding a third citizenship, through which we could gird ourselves with a virtually unassailable military front; provide, through a huge free trade area, the foundation for a lasting prosperity; and form the nucleus of a just and democratic world government.

The United States is joining the allied democracies on a long road of suffering and sacrifice; but if our country prepares for it now, by joining a Federal union, the end of that road may be the realization of the ancient prophet Micah's dream of peace, when the nations "shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree, and none shall make them afraid."

In the words of Abraham Lincoln, "Let us strive on * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

—PAUL FINDLEY.

INCREASED ECONOMY IN TRAVEL OUTLAY

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was my privilege to bring to the attention to the Members of this House the splendid concern of Mr. Frank Memmott with the problem of economy in our Government at a time when all possible economy is vital.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to present to the House the report of Mr. Memmott on the actual implementation of his directives. I requested a copy of this report from Mr. Memmott, which I will here insert in the RECORD:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D.C., September 27, 1965.

MEMORANDUM

To: Under Secretary.
Through: Assistant Secretary—Mineral Resources.
From: Director.
Subject: Increased Economy in Travel Outlay.

We have read with interest your memorandum of September 17, 1965, and the memorandum from the Bureau of the Budget concerning reduction of Government travel costs. Although you did not ask for a specific response at this time, we feel that you should know of the progress the Bureau of Mines has made in this area of cost reduction.

Economy in travel costs is not a new or unfamiliar subject within the Bureau. Contrary to the general trend within the Department toward increased annual outlays, and despite expanded Bureau program activities, we have succeeded during the past several years in establishing a downward trend in travel costs. For example, our travel budget in fiscal year 1964 totaled $1,165,800, whereas the total cost was $1,032,290, or 89 percent. An even greater saving was achieved in fiscal year 1965 when total travel costs were reduced to $943,215, or 77 percent of the $1,215,000 travel budget.

These reductions were not easily achieved. They resulted from a constant surveillance of travel costs throughout the year by this office. Periodic reports were one of the ways we used to determine how effectively different levels of management supported our travel policy (see enclosed tabulations). Requests for participation in professional and scientific meetings were systematically screened and, with very few exceptions, only those employees who were scheduled to present papers or were otherwise active program participants were granted approval. We have, to the greatest extent possible, made full use of appropriately located Bureau field officials to attend intrabureau and departmental conferences and meetings as a means of reducing travel costs. Close control of general, area, and trip travel authorizations has also been effective in limiting travel only to the essential.

Although the first quarter of fiscal year 1966 review of travel costs has not yet been completed, we are confident that our record of thriftiness will continue to be evident. You may be assured that our fiscal year 1966 travel costs will not exceed the 1965 level, and with the continued hearty cooperation of Bureau personnel that has made possible our achievements thus far, we are hopeful of arriving at total costs below that figure.

We would like to point out that our efforts to reduce travel to accommodate only our most essential needs has caused pressure on this office by our own personnel who have protested that other agencies of the Department and the Government have had a less stringent travel policy. Despite these complaints, we have stood firm in our attitude toward travel. To relieve us of the consternation from such disparity in travel regulations in the future, we hope that other agencies will adopt a strong travel policy similar to ours.

FRANK C. MEMMOTT,
Acting Director.

Enclosures.

Fiscal year 1964

	Total	
	Budget	Cost
Administration:		
Director's office	$8,000	$4,351
Program coordination	4,000	1,914
Mineral reports	3,600	1,664
Assistant Director, administration	50,050	33,280
Eastern administrative office	11,000	10,703
Western administrative office	16,750	13,782
Subtotal	93,400	65,694
Mineral Resource Development:		
Assistant Director	85,100	58,966
Area I	30,500	24,998
Area II	9,500	5,643
Area III	12,000	10,103
Area IV	15,300	13,405
Area V	33,100	28,476
Area VI	12,300	11,128
Area VII	33,100	28,790
Area VIII	37,000	36,290
Marine Minerals Technology Center	3,800	3,576
Subtotal	271,700	221,375
Minerals Research:		
Assistant Director	4,500	3,911
Director of Coal Research	80,250	75,734
Petroleum Research	86,750	78,387
Metallurgy Research	99,500	78,118
Mining	131,500	120,341
Subtotal	402,500	356,491
Health and Safety:		
Assistant Director	$24,300	$23,135
District A	49,300	49,170
District B	40,900	40,811
District C	27,500	27,442
District D	51,300	51,178
District E	91,100	91,057
Safety Education and Training Group	9,500	9,431
Health and Safety Research and Testing Center	43,000	42,830
Subtotal	336,900	335,054
Assistant Director, helium	4,800	4,800
Amarillo	56,500	48,876
Subtotal	61,300	53,676
Grand total	1,165,800	1,032,290
Administration	93,400	65,694
Mineral Resource development	271,700	221,375
Mineral Research	402,500	356,491
Health and Safety	336,900	335,054
Helium	61,300	53,676
Total	1,165,800	1,032,290
Percent	89	

Fiscal year 1965

	Total	
	Budget	Cost
Administration:		
Director's Office	$7,000	$6,188
Program Coordination	4,000	1,673
Mineral Reports	4,000	1,802
Assistant Director, Administration	46,610	29,273
Eastern Administrative Office	14,500	12,096
Western Administrative Office	17,600	11,541
Subtotal	93,710	62,573
Mineral Resource Development:		
Assistant Director	88,500	55,622
Area I	34,300	18,145
Area II	8,000	5,311
Area III	12,800	6,919
Area IV	25,600	24,201
Area V	30,290	20,303
Area VI	12,300	9,667
Area VII	17,000	12,974
Area VIII	46,300	27,081
Marine Mineral Technology Center	4,000	3,564
Subtotal	279,090	183,787
Minerals Research:		
Assistant Director	6,000	5,130
Director of Coal Research	70,000	64,529
Petroleum Research	78,000	64,081
Metallurgy Research	102,500	83,348
Mining	133,000	108,437
Subtotal	389,500	325,525
Health and Safety:		
Assistant Director	35,000	20,084
District A	50,000	40,247
District B	41,000	38,802
District C	28,000	24,357
District D	53,000	52,752
District E	105,800	82,564
Safety Education and Training Group	10,000	9,594
Health and Safety Research and Testing Center	44,000	40,175
Subtotal	366,800	308,575
Assistant Director, Helium	9,500	7,300
Amarillo	75,500	55,455
Reserve	900	----------
Subtotal	85,900	62,755
Grand total	1,215,000	943,215
Administration	93,710	62,573
Mineral resource development	279,090	183,787
Mineral research	389,500	325,525
Health and safety	366,800	308,575
Helium	85,900	62,755
Total	1,215,000	943,215
Percent	77	

Mr. Speaker, as all of my colleagues may see, there has been a fine effort to save money all the way down the line. The effort has been to cut spending, not to spend all the money appropriated for each of the programs listed.

This is precisely the attitude we hope to find in all of the branches of the Federal Government. It is my hope that other heads of departments in the Government will follow the excellent example of Mr. Memmott. It is well worthy of emulation.

MARYWOOD COLLEGE 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, there is a saying to the effect that, if you educate a man, you have educated a man; but, if you educate a woman, you have educated a family.

For 50 years, Mr. Speaker, Marywood College in Scranton, Pa., has been sending forth a host of educated women. From her halls have come scientists, teachers, economists, librarians—women in all the learned professions of America. From her halls also have come the mothers of yesterday, of today, and tomorrow.

Marywood College is a pioneer and the child of pioneers. It was the first Catholic women's college in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Sixty-five years ago, in 1900, a group of courageous nuns—sisters—Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, purchased a tract of 50 acres of woodland overlooking the city of Scranton, and drew up plans for the erection of a new mother house and a seminary for girls. It was called Mount St. Mary's and was completed in 1902.

But, with the completion of the girls seminary, Mother M. Cyril and Bishop Michael J. Hoban saw a new need, that of a college for the young women of the area. Sisters were selected and sent for advanced study at 10 different colleges and universities, to prepare for the opening of the college.

In 1915, just 50 years ago, under Mother M. Germaine, Marywood College opened her doors. It grew and prospered under the leadership of Sister Immaculata, cofounder and first dean, who held that office from 1915 to 1943.

Sister M. Cuthbert, who had assisted Sister M. Immaculata, assumed the office of dean in 1943. In 1943 also, the first president, separate from the superior of the community, was chosen in the person of Sister M. Sylvia. She was succeeded by Sister M. Eugenia, who was in turn succeeded by the present president of Marywood, Sister M. St. Mary.

The power to grant three degrees—bachelor of arts, bachelor of music, and bachelor of science in home economics—was assured by the first charter. Very soon the college was empowered to grant the master of arts, 1922; bachelor of science in education, 1922; bachelor of science in library science, 1946; bachelor of science in medical technology, 1952; and master of science in education, library science, and psychology, 1954.

The college is further empowered to enable students to qualify as guidance counselors, 1938; school librarians, 1929; vocational home economics teachers, 1936; teachers of the mentally retarded, 1948; psychological examiners, and public school psychologist, 1942; and for the certificate in theology for sisters, 1953.

Marywood became the first institution of higher learning in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to offer a college credit course via television in "The History of Drama." Her esthetics course, part of a splendid course in drama, won outstanding praise from Theater Arts magazine as early as 1952.

Marywood has produced a constant flow of highly talented musicians. The college was host to the All Pennsylvania College Orchestra, with Maestro Alfredo Antonini conducting, and Miss Carolyn Dooley of Marywood as piano soloist. Marywood has also looked to the young, and was one of the first two colleges in the country to champion the new contemporary approach to music for the grade and high school child, by conducting specialized summer workshops in music education in cooperation with the American Institute of Music Education.

Marywood is one of the pioneers in the study of audio-visual aids in education. One of the finest psychoeducational clinics in northeast United States is located on her campus, working with children who need help in bringing their intellectual capacities to full fruition.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, Marywood College is a school that any Congressman would boast to have within his district.

This year Marywood is 50 years young. She has grown from the small hardy beginning in 1915 to a magnificent college, the largest Catholic women's college in America.

Last week, with a mass celebrating her 50th anniversary, and with a eucharistic luncheon held at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City, Marywood alumnae celebrated the birthday of their alma mater. Under Miss Elizabeth Horan, the Marywood alumnae are now the international alumnae, with daughters of Marywood all over the world.

I am sure that all of my colleagues here in the Congress, Mr. Speaker, will join me in saluting Marywood College in this, her 50th anniversary year. In an age which demands education, learning, and the great tranquillity that comes from spiritual depth, I am proud that Marywood College is still young, still growing, still sending forth young women who have the learning and spiritual depth which we will need tomorrow in a growing America.

I could not possibly close these remarks without first turning to those women who built this college 50 years ago, and who have made this college such an outstanding institution of higher learning. I am sure that all of my colleagues join in extending compliments of the Congress and the gratitude of all Americans who know the values of education to the women who are not only educators but also models of learning and piety, the sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary.

ACTIVITIES OF SIGMA NU FRATERNITY, SAN DIEGO STATE COLLEGE

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the activities of Sigma Nu fraternity of San Diego State College. While a few irresponsible troublemakers are making the headlines by reviling our efforts in Vietnam, Sigma Nu is conducting a drive to supply needed blood for our fighting men in Vietnam.

The fraternity is sponsoring a rally October 26 in San Diego and hopes that 5,000 donors will be on hand to give blood for use in the battle areas of Vietnam.

I consider this display of real red-blooded Americanism more typical of the moral fiber of our young people today than the marches of the unwashed and bearded. By donating blood, instead of tearing up their draft cards, these young people are showing our Nation that our fighting men have their support instead of their scorn.

I am hopeful that this campaign will spread to the other campuses across the Nation. It is an appropriate gesture. It could not only save the lives of wounded in Vietnam, but it is a fitting way to demonstrate that we here at home are blood brothers with those who have gone forth to fight for freedom in the jungles of far-off Vietnam.

A civilian blood bank is a realistic, patriotic, and useful way for those at home to help those overseas.

CRASH IN SAN DIEGO OF PROTOTYPE CHARGER COUNTERINSURGENCY AIRCRAFT

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the evening before last I learned of the crash in San Diego of the prototype Charger counterinsurgency aircraft built by Convair Division of General Dynamics. Thankfully, the Navy test pilot successfully ejected and the airplane crash-landed on the open spaces of Lindbergh Airfield injuring no one. This is a most unfortunate setback to a program that deserves our support not only because of the vital mission for which the aircraft is intended but also because the aircraft was the product of free, enterprising American industry, not built with Government funds.

The crash occurred on the Charger's 196th flight with a total test flight time of about 200 hours on the airplane. Twenty-two hours of a 40-hour military flight test program were logged when the crash occurred. This military flight evaluation program involving pilots from the Air Force, Navy, Army, and Marines was being conducted by the Department of Defense. Clearly, there was military interest in this aircraft as a potential new and valuable weapon for limited wars such as Vietnam has been.

Flight testing to date had demonstrably shown the capability and merit of this prototype aircraft. It would certainly seem wise now for all the parties involved in the testing of this aircraft to move quickly to the development of a new Charger so that these vital tests can be completed and decisions necessary to the national defense made on the basis of full information.

STANDARDIZATION OF FIREHOSE THREADS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, for several Congresses now I have introduced a resolution calling for the standardization of firehose threads. Though this may sound like a small and insignificant matter of concern for the Federal Government recent hose coupling problems in major disaster forest fires on both the east and west coasts indicate that a serious problem exists.

My friend, Battalion Chief Robert Ely, of San Diego, Calif., chairman of the International Association of Fire Chiefs, Committee on Standardization of Firehose Threads, recently stated that the friendly climate of mutual aid since World War II has been limited time and time again by the varying threads used by civil defense, military services, State agencies, rural fire departments and the Forest Service. For over 90 years the IAFC has been trying to get all firehose screw threads standardized. To ponder this in light of the magnificent space and undersea advances this Nation has made during that same span of 90 years immediately causes one to realize how great is the oversight on the part of Government of effectively fighting disastrous fires.

Chief Ely's committee has submitted a resolution calling for all possible aid and assistance from all members of the IAFC, all national fire organizations and governmental agencies, so that standardization of all firehose threads can be completed before 100 years have elapsed. I am greatly hopeful that the Congress will finally see fit to act on my legislation, House Concurrent Resolution 122, during the 2d session of the 89th Congress. The need for its passage is obviously evident.

I ask unanimous consent to include as a portion of my remarks the attached resolution.

STANDARDIZATION OF FIREHOSE THREADS

Whereas the International Association of Fire Chiefs has repeatedly advocated the standardization of firehose threads since the inception of our organization in 1873; and

Whereas this Nation's large-loss fires are increasing yearly with the records showing lack of uniform firehose threads as a contributing factor; and

Whereas the needed standardization can be accomplished at a minimum of labor and cost by the use of hose-threading machines and bushing inserts presently available; and

Whereas we as fire chiefs have the responsibility of recommending and maintaining proper standard procedures and equipment to provide adequate and efficient fire protection for our citizenry; and

Whereas, notwithstanding the persistent work of the International Association of Fire Chiefs to further nationwide standardization of firehose threads, there still remain many areas laboring under the handicap of nonstandard threads: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the International Association of Fire Chiefs, in conference assembled, this 22d day of October 1964, in Houston, Tex., intensify its efforts to accomplish complete standardization of firehose screw threads throughout the country, by asking for aid and assistance from all fire chiefs, all national fire organizations, manufacturers, and governmental agencies; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be promulgated to all branches of the Federal Government, all national fire organizations, and other interested parties.

THE NATURE OF ONE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET CRISIS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House an excellent piece of reporting. It is an example of the type of background information Congressmen need to make sound judgments and decisions. It is an article from the Morgan Guaranty Survey of September 1965, titled "The Nature of the Common Market's Crisis."

In a few pages the survey gives a sound background for understanding the developments within the European Economic Community—EEC—that led to the present EEC crisis. The article confirms many of the comments that I made in my remarks in the nature of the EEC crisis in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 26.

Though I am grateful to the survey for supplying this information, it should have been supplied much earlier to the Congress by the executive branch. The State Department, for example, has the responsibility to present us with similar lucid analyses of events of such profound importance for our foreign policy. The office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, which has occasionally sent reports on the progress of the current trade talks in progress at Geneva to the congressional delegates to these negotiations, could have taken the opportunity to present the background of the EEC crisis authoritatively.

THE NATURE OF THE COMMON MARKET'S CRISIS

President de Gaulle's press conference of September 9 did not in itself create a crisis in the development of the European Economic Community. Nor did the crisis start, as so many reports would have it, with the French decision last June to walk out of the Common Market negotiations in Bussels. The actual causes, rather, go back to fundamental problems and conflicts inherent in the idea of community that were only partially perceived, and certainly not adequately dealt with, at the time the Rome Treaty, EEC's basic document, was written.

What General de Gaulle has now done with acute precision is to spell out the problems and define the conflicts. Despite the dismay his action has stirred, it could well have the outcome of ultimately putting relations among the Six on more certain and less troublesome footing.

EEC's crisis has less to do with the particulars of economic policy than with the fundamental issues of constitutional form and the lodgment of ultimate power. What is involved most crucially is the Community's momentum toward becoming a political entity above its member nations. This, declared General de Gaulle, is unacceptable to France because it threatens French sovereignty.

He might have noted that it likewise threatens the sovereignty of each of the five other members, and might have asked—since rhetorical questions are not out of place in his press conferences—whether any or all of them were more ready than France to sign and seal the substantial surrender of autonomy which the erection of a supranational authority would demand. The general was issuing, in other words, not so much an ultimatum as an invitation to his fellow heads of state in EEC to think through one more time the conditions on which the economies of their countries are to be harmonized.

All this was no more than realists in the Common Market had reason to expect. Where the French leader jolted even the realists was in his strong implication that the Rome Treaty must be rewritten. France, he indicated, would require removal of "basic errors" and "ambiguities" from the treaty before it would be willing to go any further with the work of harmonization.

That work has been at a virtual standstill since last June 30, when French Foreign Minister Couve de Murville abruptly ended a session of EEC's Council of Ministers that was laboring to reach agreement on the knotty issue of the Common Market's financing arrangements for agriculture. On the basis of a previous understanding among the Six, those arrangements—involving member country payments into and receipts from the Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund—were to have been worked out by June 30. The failure of the Council to meet the deadline, said the French, was the reason for their walkout.

Important as agricultural matters are to France and its farmers, and anxious as the French were to reach an agreement, close observers of Common Market affairs tended at the time to doubt the completeness of that explanation. Negotiations beyond deadlines, it was pointed out, have become commonplace for EEC. Moreover, sharp though the farm differences were, it seemed clear to most that the possibilities of compromise had not been exhausted, nor even fully explored, and that in time a solution would have been found.

As President de Gaulle's statements have now made clear, it seems far more likely that even in June France had decided that the time had come to face the crucial issue of supranational trend. In fact, with the effective veto power of individual member countries over major decisions scheduled by the Community's timetable to end next January 1, there exists widespread conviction that General de Gaulle might well have been forced to create a critical issue sometime this year if one had not presented itself. "Sooner or later," he declared, "the crisis was inevitable." With the transition to majority voting getting near, "sooner" presumably seemed better.

In any event, the end of June would have ushered in a period of enforced repose for the Community. The vacation period was on hand, and looming beyond that were the complications of the German national election in September and the French one in December. The French, meanwhile, could proceed with reasonable confidence that delay in fixing the terms of EEC's agricultural financing wouldn't necessarily mean that any less money would ultimately flow to France, since in practice there is a timelag of many months in disbursements. Nor should it have distressed the French Government that postponing agricultural agreement meant further loss of time for the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations. Paris right along has been distinctly cool toward U.S. determination to get EEC to lower its farm import barriers.

At the center of the controversy, quite obviously, is the gut issue of how much political federalism the Community is to have, if any. Is the absolute sovereignty of each of the six to remain untouched, or is the Common Market to evolve in the direction of political federation, with its institutions (its executive body and its parliament in particular) wielding political authority which is independent of that possessed by the individual member countries?

The latter course was clearly in the minds of some of the community's original sponsors and was the chief reason for the enthusiasm with which the U.S. Government supported EEC from the start. It is precisely the concept which President de Gaulle is now challenging. "Nothing," he declared on September 9, "which is important at present in the organization, and later in the operation of the Common Market of the Six, should be decided and, even more, applied, except by the responsible public authorities in the six states; that is, the governments controlled by the parliaments."

While perhaps not so explicitly stated before, this has long been President de Gaulle's view. It has, moreover, numerous other adherents in Europe, a fact which tends to be underappreciated but which is vitally important in trying to assess the probable outcome of EEC's present crisis. There is rather wide agreement, actually, that few countries of Europe, big or small, have reached a stage where they are psychologically ready to abide by majority votes on economic issues other than the most trifling.

AGRICULTURE AND MUCH MORE

Although the squabble over agricultural financing is clearly of subordinate importance in the present controversy, its details and its chronology help illuminate what the fight is really all about. The origin of the trouble traces back to 1962, when, as a condition for agreeing to further industrial tariff cuts, the French insisted that a start be made on a common agricultural policy.

Among other things, agreement was reached at that time on a formula under which member countries would make payments into and withdraw money from an Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund. The formula penalized farm imports from nonmember countries, the intent being to encourage and subsidize agricultural production within EEC.

This arrangement covered only a 3-year period. Thereafter, a new formula to be worked out no later than June 30, 1965, was to cover the remainder of EEC's transition period, which runs through 1969. In December 1964, anticipating the approaching deadline, the Council of Ministers instructed the Community's nine-man executive Commission to draw up and submit proposals for continuing the Fund's operations. The Commission also was asked to investigate how receipts from EEC's common external tariff, scheduled to go into effect July 1, 1967, might be used to replace payments to the Community's budget from national treasuries. It was from this latter request that the whirlwind blew.

STRETCHING THE MANDATE

In carrying out its assignment, the Commission made the fateful decision to construe its mandate in exceptionally broad terms. Besides providing a new formula for operating the agricultural fund, it proposed eventual transfer to the Community's coffers of all proceeds flowing from the common external tariff. Although provision was made for the redistribution to national governments of revenues in excess of normal Community needs, one very significant consequence of this arrangement would have been to make budgetary discipline over the Commission by member countries far more difficult.

Predictably, this was a highly controversial recommendation, since even previously the executive body's budgets had been a source of considerable friction. Still more sensitive was the Commission's suggestion that the EEC Parliament in Strasbourg—an institution that draws no real power from the Rome Treaty—assume partial authority over the Community's budget—and thus, in effect, the potential for materially influencing Common Market affairs.

The Commission's recommendations, formally submitted to the Council on April 1 of this year, triggered immediate opposition from the French. They angrily protested the coupling, in an omnibus package, of nonfarm proposals with those relating to agricultural financing, emphasizing that only for the latter, and for nothing else, was there a June 30 deadline.

The French thought they perceived the Commission's strategy, and they found it offensive. They believed the Brussels group was counting on France to swallow a measure of distasteful integration because of its special interest (as EEC's most important agricultural nation) in getting the details of farm financing settled. Reportedly, the implied suggestion that France might compromise its sovereignty for financial considerations was particularly infuriating to President de Gaulle.

Despite the strong protest from Paris, the Commission—in what is now regarded as a serious miscalculation of its strength—proceeded to try to line up support for its package. In May it sought and won the backing of the Strasbourg Parliament for its proposals, a tactic which could only add to the displeasure which the French already felt.

Since there is no public record of debate within the Council of Ministers, the precise position taken on the package by each of the community's members other than France is not known with certainty. The Dutch, who consistently have been the most federally minded among the six, unquestionably provided the commission's strongest support; beyond that, generalizations are risky. Italy, hardest hit of all by the financing formulas applicable from 1962 to 1965, seems to have been principally preoccupied with winning concessions on the matter of contributions to the agricultural fund.

The dialog between France and Germany on the commission's proposals presents, in retrospect, something of a puzzle. On the basis of conversations between the French and German Under Secretaries of State, the French toward the end of June were operating on the assumption that they had reached satisfactory agreement with Bonn on essentials. Then, on June 30, the deadline date, the German Bundestag passed a resolution supporting the Strasbourg Parliament's desire for budgetary power. This abruptly altered the complexion of the Council's deliberations, again giving primacy to the supranational issue, which had been tending to recede into the background. Probably the Bundestag's action, more than any other single event, was what prompted M. Couve de Murville to break off discussion at 2 a.m. on July 1.

Had agricultural financing alone been the issue, it seems highly improbable that any such outcome would have occurred. Italy and France, it is true, differed quite sharply on the length of the period for which financing arrangements were to be set. Germany, moreover, had introduced some complicated economic requests during the council sessions of June 28 and 29. But there had been considerable progress, and just before the Bundestag's move the general expectation of close observers of the Brussels negotiations was that a way of compromising differences on financing would be found—perhaps not by the midnight deadline on the 30th but probably with only a short extension.

A settlement covering agricultural financing alone would have been strongly displeasing to the Dutch, whose legislature had instructed its government not to agree to a plan for farm financing which did not allow for a strengthening of the powers of the Strasbourg Parliament. But the prevailing belief was that even that problem might have been circumvented by the council through some mildly worded declaration of eventual intent to consider changes in Parliament's status. Conceivably the Dutch might have balked at such a maneuver, but a position of intransigency would have been difficult for them to maintain had the other five members come to agreement.

But the Bundestag's unexpected vote of support for the Parliament's budgetary powers seemed to convince the French that the issue of supranationalism would have to be dealt with decisively before Community integration went any further. "Now we know," President de Gaulle declared September 9, "heaven knows that we know—that there is a different concept of a European federation in which * * * the countries would lose their national personalities. * * * The combination—premeditated or not—of the supranational demands of the Brussels Commission, of the support that several delegations declared themselves ready to give them and finally of the fact that some of our partners at the last moment went back on what they had previously accepted, forced us to bring the negotiations to a close."

The issue, then, focuses on the constitutional form the Community is to have and on the location of power within the organizational structure. President de Gaulle is calling for agreement among the Six on the precise limits of the commission's and the Parliament's authority. He clearly is no longer content to rely on anything like a "gentlemen's agreement" that the vote of a majority will not be used to ride roughshod over a dissenting nation's will. Agricultural financing, despite its great importance to France, is secondary, and that is undoubtedly why the French chose to stay away from the July meeting of the Council even though the commission by that time had belatedly drafted a new set of proposals restricted in essence to agricultural matters.

WHAT FUTURE FOR ECC?

All sorts of difficulties attend any effort to anticipate when and how resolution will come. The relevant considerations range all the way from purely personal animosities among the individuals involved to profoundly different philosophies of political organization. The only thing that can be said with reasonable safety is that the end of the crisis is at least some months off. The new German Government needs time both to get itself organized and to assess the French demands. The French, meanwhile, are nearing the start of their own election campaign. Thus, the chances are that a resumption of EEC negotiations will be delayed, with no hard bargaining likely for the rest of the year.

Eventually, however, France can be rather sure of getting its Common Market partners to focus on the question of revising the Rome Treaty. Waiting may prove all that is necessary. The agreement reached last April to merge the executive apparatuses of EEC, the European Coal and Steel Community, and Euratom contemplates the writing of a new document unifying the three existing treaties. This would afford France an opportunity to make proposals for eliminating the supranational features of the Rome Treaty which it dislikes.

Since last April's agreement calls for creation of a single executive commission for the unified community, the merger when it takes effect should provide some element of a fresh start in relationships between the Commission and the Council of Ministers. Some students of EEC's recent difficulties attach high causal weight to French dissatisfaction with present Commission personnel; with or without new faces, the mere event of unification will give the Commission a chance to get off on a new, more amicable footing with the Council.

In a confrontation as confused and ramified as the present one, anything is possible, including even EEC's eventual disintegration. The chances, however, of such an extreme outcome still seem small. A solid alinement against France on the issue of supranationalism, which conceivably could wreck the Community, is unlikely. Moreover, all ECC members, including France, seem convinced that the Common Market has had a lot to do with their prosperity.

Political scientists are busy noodling over the question of how reduced power for the Commission would affect EEC's future development. The prevalent theoretical preference for strong executive leadership inclines most observers to the view that any weakening of the Commission would make further progress toward economic harmonization more difficult. If the Commission's job is that of a catalyst, this line of reasoning goes, it can function effectively only if it has freedom to take venturesome initiatives, to propose boldly. This year's experience, however, casts some question on that basically plausible analysis. If it had not been for the Commission's boldness last spring, there might not have been a midyear explosion, and agricultural harmonization might now be much further along.

BAD NEWS FOR GATT

In Washington, concern over the Common Market deadlock centers on the harm it does to the Kennedy round tariff negotiations in Geneva. EEC's wrangle prevented it from putting forward the agricultural proposals that were supposed to have been submitted on September 16, and there would appear no prospect that this failure will be remedied anytime this year. This could mean a serious loss of negotiating time, since Congress insisted when granting authority for the Geneva negotiations that cuts in industrial tariffs be made conditional on a lowering of EEC's agricultural barriers.

With U.S. bargaining authority running to mid-1967, there will still be leeway for constructive negotiations if EEC can resolve its troubles by early 1966 and then go speedily ahead with the submission of tariff proposals for farm products. If the crisis is not settled rather early in 1966, however, the outlook for a satisfactory outcome of the Kennedy round would dim, because the farm negotiations are bound to be troublesome and lengthy. This, in turn, could have a pronounced impact for a long time to come on world trade liberalization, since the prevailing judgment in Washington is that it will be a long while before another reciprocal trade measure is voted if the high hopes attached to the 1962 act come to nothing.

MEETING THE CHALLENGE OF AUTOMATION

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in October 1964, I published in the National Association of Secondary-School Principals bulletin an article titled: "Automation." In that article I expressed many of my views on automation, which on review I find still valid today.

Essential to an understanding of automation is that it is an age-old phenomenon. The process of human invention and exploitation of inventions is the story of man's material progress. Though we tend to think of automation as a purely contemporary problem, the only way in which modern automation differs from earlier automation is that the pace of change is very highly accelerated. The type of technology now associated with this accelerated pace of change is often called cybernetics.

As the pace of automation grows faster and economic changes accelerate new jobs are being created and old jobs are being destroyed faster. Fortunately, although scholars have not sought the answer to this key question with enough diligence, commonsense and what existing studies there are indicate that new jobs are being created in much greater number than the number of jobs being destroyed. These jobs averaged out are not only of higher skill levels but bring higher pay. But there is a lag between the absorption of the new jobs by adequately skilled workers, and the result is "frictional" unemployment.

How can we activate processes of job and skill adjustment required by rapid economic change? For one thing we must find workable solutions to several immediately observable problems:

First. New jobs are frequently outside the business and geographic areas are where the jobs rendered obsolete exist.

Second. Displaced workers are frequently not the ones best suited to be trained to take newly created jobs. Obsolete jobs are very often inferior to jobs newly created by automation, and the jobs going begging today are jobs which demand skills higher than the national average of skills.

Third. With continual upgrading of job requirements and the displacement of man power with machine power, those who were born with very limited mental talents could be phased out of the labor market. Brains have taken priority over brawn as a job requirement.

The process of adjustment required by the above results of automation can be helped in a number of ways. First, and essentially, it is important that continual upgrading of job skills occur at all levels of employment. Education and training at all levels for all skills must be considered an investment in human capital, equal in priority if not to be given higher priority to investment in machinery and research and development.

A person holding down a job which is too easy for him does a disservice to himself, to society and to the person with fewer natural abilities who could fill the less demanding job. With a system of proper job analysis we can find a sufficient number of economically sound jobs which even persons of limited IQ can perform.

Solving the problems of skill upgrading, and placement of workers could be greatly facilitated by institutional changes.

For example, unions could contribute more to the continual upgrading and shifting of skills required by automation. Unions absorb new jobs in their "jurisdictions" only slowly, and give up their control over old jobs very reluctantly. Thus unions tend to take positions in defense of the status quo which is represented by the jobs held by their members. These are often obsolescent jobs. Unions in this case accurately represent the sentiment of the worker whose skill is becoming obsolete. They do not, however, represent their member's best interest, which will always be to continually upgrade his skills and his income, even if this upgrading and job shifting process might require the worker to move to a new firm in the same or a different locale. Unions should facilitate the pace of change by encourging and promoting the upgrading of their member workers' skills and helping workers make the change from one job to another without unduly great expense and effort.

Another institutional remedy is in management's organization and planning to facilitate job change. Management frequently has failed to anticipate that the process of rapid innovation requires the timely phasing out of certain skills, accompanied by on-the-job training for the new skills in demand.

Government, too, should modernize its institutional mechanisms so that an employee of one company who has a job which will be phased out would be trained at the same time for a new job. The cost of the training would be borne by the company that would use the new skills.

Further, Federal tax law inhibits, rather than encourages, the mobility and flexibility of labor which are so vital in coping with frictional and structural unemployment.

To this end a very large number of Republicans in both House and Senate have joined Senator WINSTON PROUTY and myself in introducing H.R. 10934, the Human Investment Act of 1965. This Republican measure operates on the elemental principle that taxation is a charge on the earnings of enterprises and individuals, and that these entities are prevented by this charge from doing things they would ordinarily do. By removing part of their tax burden, the Human Investment Act hopes to encourage firms to increase their training programs.

But the problem is deeper simply than encouraging firms to train the workers they need by means of financial encouragement.

Unions should take a new, progressive approach to problems caused by unemployment and economic change.

Government should realize finally that it can provide some basic services that will help firms to meet their skill needs.

Management and its associations should devise on their own initiative imaginative ways of quickly obtaining the job skills they need.

The article referred to follows:

AUTOMATION

"The anatomical study of the fossilized remains does not tell us when men emerged, and we must have recourse to other methods of approaching the question. Bergson's answer to it is often quoted. Man, he said, appeared on earth at the time when weapons and tools were first fashioned. For the paleontologist, as for the student of prehistory, the phenomenon of man's becoming man is contemporary with the first appearance in history of implements." (Reference "Larousse Encyclopedia of Ancient and Medieval History 1963.")

Some economic historians have pointed out that the progress of man can be followed in his increased ability to use energy. Hand tools, of course, increase the energy of men in an absolute sense, but more importantly they direct his energy more efficiently to the purpose at hand.

The early Egyptians learned that the inclined plane and buoyancy of water greatly increased the "manpower" of a man. However, not until late Roman times were there watermills in Rome, set in motion by water from the acqueducts. The use of watermills was slow to spread throughout the Empire. By the 12th century watermills were still not a common sight. The use of the power of wind, other than to sail ships, does not appear until the end of the 12th century. "During the 9th and 10th centuries there was a distinct improvement in harnessing (of horses), when the fixed wooden head collar came into use * * *. The origin of this new harness is unknown * * *. Through this new invention the sources of energy at the service of man gained the considerable addition of horsepower. Before that he had had at his disposal only manpower, the tractive power of oxen, and water power from driving the watermills." (Reference, "The Agrarian History of Western Europe A.D. 500–1850" by H. Slicher Van Bath translated by Olive Ordish 1963, p. 63, 64.) Yet, as in the use of watermills or other new invention, centuries passed before use of the invention became widespread. The invention of the horse collar somewhere in Germany may well be an important factor contributing to the added leisure time which produced the Renaissance.

The industrial revolution beginning in the middle of the 18th cenutry can be closely identified with the advent of steampower. However, as each new basic invention which increased the sources of energy available to mankind was discovered, the time required for its widespread application diminished.

Steampower was hardly fully exploited in the first 100 years of its existence before the internal combustion engine and electrical power moved into prominence. And, now, less than 50 years later, electronics, atomic energy, and jet propulsion engines are moving in.

Basic research as well as applied research lie at the bottom of all material human progress. The invention of the zero in India and its spread through Arabia to the Western World was as important to basic research as was the invention of the horsecollar to that of applied research. The invention of the new science called cybernetics is as important to basic research as the invention of electronics is to applied research, the computers themselves.

Mr. H. Slicher Van Bath says: "Perhaps the best way to illustrate progress during the last century is to calculate the minimum number of man-hours needed to produce a certain quantity of cereals from a given area. In 1830 the production of 1,800 litres of wheat on one hectare using the ordinary plough, harrow, sickles, flails, took 144 man-hours. In the United States in 1896, with the aid of the machines in use at the time, this had been reduced to 22 man-hours; in 1930, when using tractors and combine harvesters, the time was brought to 8¼ man-hours." I do not know what the figure for 1964 would be; however, it is probably less than 1 man-hour. In the past decade, agricultural employment in the United States has declined 42 percent while, at the same time, there has been a continuing rise in farm production. Today agricultural production in the United States is limited by consumer satiation, not by ability to produce.

My basic point is that the term "automation," which is used so freely today, relates to nothing new under the sun. The process of human invention and engineering to exploit new inventions is the story of mankind's material progress. Nor does his process follow the Toynbee cycle of the rise and fall of nations. It seems to spiral ever upward; perhaps the rise and fall of nations is an essential factor in this upward spiral.

The most that can be said for coining a new term to describe the inventing and engineering process during our own times is that its rate has increased and continues to accelerate. Technological change is moving at an extraordinarily rapid pace. From time to time we have applied new names to describe rapid acceleration, e.g. the industrial age, the steel age, the electrical age, the electronic age. Now we use the term "automation," which in turn is giving way to cybernetics.

It is possible that the very increased rate of innovation in products and processes has produced a new phenomenon. Cybernetics may be introducing something different because of its great rate of change.

I believe that we are facing some new problems for a simple reason. The rate of innovation is now moving much faster compared to the human life span. Until the present, innovation, although rapid, did not disrupt en masse the life of individual human beings, even though it did affect the history of nations.

Let me put it this way. In 1900 a young man entering the labor force could probably count upon the skill he had learned or was about to learn as an apprentice for his livelihood during his entire working life. Today, with the rapid rate of innovation, the skill learned as a youth may become obsolete and unusable within 10 or 15 years.

The key question involving rapid innovation is not whether it is disruptive to the lives of individual men and women. Because it destroys jobs, it is disruptive. Nor is the key question whether it is becoming increasingly difficult for the individual man and woman to cope with it by learning new marketable skills for the new jobs that automation has created. Automation does create new jobs. The key question is does automation create more jobs than it destroys?

Scholars have not sought the answer to this key question with sufficient diligence. However, to the extent that studies have been undertaken and to the extent that commonsense and history have a hearing, the answer is clearly in the affirmative. Regrettably we have not yet moved economics out of the area of commonsense as we have the physical sciences. We are still floundering in a miasma of misinformation and prejudice. Commonsense and history could rescue us and put us on firm ground so we could move on into the higher realm of specialized sense—beyond commonsense. (Reference study by Dr. Yale Brozen entitled "Automation—the Impact of Technological Change," written for the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, and published by that organization in March 1963 "* * * between 1951 and 1961, 20 million new jobs were created and 13 million jobs were destroyed, leaving a net gain of 7 million jobs." "87 Million Jobs" by Congressman TOM CURTIS published by Duell, Sloan and Pearce, New York, affiliate of Meredith Press, 1962.)

If automation creates more jobs than it renders obsolete, then we are confronted with a problem which has been traditional in the United States, a shortage, not an overabundance, of manpower. Under these circumstances our unemployed and our underemployed become one of our greatest economic assets. I believe that this is, indeed, the case.

Furthermore, existing studies of automation, or of cybernetics, reveal that the jobs rendered obsolete are inferior to the new ones being created. They are inferior in two ways; the old jobs pay less; and the old jobs require more brawn and less brain. Furthermore, the old jobs require less training in order to attain the most efficient performance. However, one of the gratifying benefits of automation is more leisure time, which can be allocated both to increased recreation and to the training which the new jobs require. (It is more than symbolic that the word, "scholar," is derived from the Greek word, leisure time.)

Automation requires an increase in the average age of entry into the labor force. More time is required to learn the skills demanded by the new jobs. It is an anachronism that our Bureau of Labor Statistics still uses age 14 as the age of entry into the work force. The average age of entry is now over 19, and it will continue to increase as more and more of our high school graduates go on to college and as more and more of our college graduates go on to graduate school. Note also that adult education has been increasing by leaps and bounds in recent years to meet the great demand for further training, retraining, and appropriate mental recreation which the higher order of skills require.

I would hazard a guess that most people would consider the increased demand for brain rather than brawn and the utilization of more and more time for recreation and education in accord with their concept of an increasing standard of living and the pursuit of happiness. Certainly human freedom is unshackled from these natural forces; these shackles should not be replaced by those imposed by society.

I have presented the optimistic side of automation. However, there are hard realities involved in the rapid rate of obsolescence of human skills that automation creates as many technological changes are experienced during a human being's lifespan. The proper way to proceed is to analyze the problems and see if we can't cope with them. Surely sabotage is not the proper course. (Again the history of a word reveals much. The word, "sabotage," is derived from the French word sabot, a wooden shoe, which, it is said, the French worker of 1800 threw into the machinery to break it, blaming the machine for robbing him of his job.)

The hard realities of rapid innovation are that the new jobs created are frequently outside the business and geographical area where the jobs rendered obsolete exist. The obsolete jobs are directly related to a human being, while the newly created jobs are still looking for a human being for attachment.

Furthermore, the obsolete jobs often are related to a particular labor union, while the newly created jobs are outside the jurisdiction of that particular union and, being new, have not yet been unionized. The union leader finds his own interests coincide with the inertia of the displaced employee. Instead of accommodating the process of innovation he may tend to sabotage it outrightly or with featherbedding.

Management frequently has failed to anticipate that the process of rapid innovation requires the timely phasing out of certain skills, accompanied by on-the-job training for the new skills in demand. Government, too, has not understood the process of innovation. It should have already established the machinery through which an employee of company X, holding a job being phased out, would train at the same time for the new job, not with company X, but with company Y. Of course, company X should not be charged with the cost of the retraining from which it derives no economic benefit. However, it would be relatively easy to set up the mechanism whereby the costs of retraining could be borne by the ultimate user. Furthermore, the Federal tax laws inhibit, instead of encourage, the mobility and flexibility of labor which are so vital in coping with frictional and structural unemployment.

Probably the reality most often overlooked is that the displaced worker frequently is not the one best suited to be trained to take on the newly created job. The obsolete jobs tend to be considerably inferior to the jobs newly created by automation. Furthermore, the jobs going begging today are jobs which demand skills higher than the national average of skills. The process of training for the high skills in demand usually requires that a person holding down a good job upgrade his skill in order to prepare for the new and better job. His old job then becomes available for someone below him in the ladder of skills, who will upgrade his skill in a similar and simultaneous manner through night school or on-the-job training. Meeting the changes demanded by automation requires a massive and constant upgrading process all along society's ladder of skills.

A person holding down a job which is too easy for him does a disservice to himself, to society, and to the person with less natural abilities who could be doing the less demanding job. For example, a person with two arms who preempts a job which a one-armed man might do and who refuses to undertake an available job which requires two arms thwarts the upgrading process which automation demands.

Finally, I would observe that possibly we face a problem which has never before been presented to us quite so clearly. Yet it is an age-old problem. With the continued upgrading of skills and with greater emphasis upon brain instead of brawn, those who were born with very limited mental talents could be phased out of the labor market. Throughout much of history the person deficient in brawn tended to be an economic drone. A similar situation may now be developing with regard to those endowed with very limited mental capacities. However, I believe that by a system of proper job analysis we can find a sufficient number of economically sound jobs which persons of limited IQ can perform. Even many of those we presently institutionalize can perform useful tasks during a period of cybernation. After all, a human brain with a 60 IQ is still a much more versatile and usable thinking apparatus, particularly with regard to dealing with variables, then the most talented computer.

MANY IN UNEMPLOYMENT COUNT DO NOT COUNT

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the administration places a strong emphasis on reducing the unemployment rate to an arbitrarily defined level. This level is now set at 4 percent of the work force as measured by our present Bureau of Labor Statistics—BLS. The administration seems to forget that our unemployment statistical series gives us at best a very crude indication of real unemployment. Criticism comes from opposite sides, one side arguing from time to time that the series underestimates real unemployment, the other side arguing that it overestimates real unemployment. My own judgment is that probably both sides are correct. When we are in an economic downturn the series tends to underestimate and in periods of economic upturn it overestimates.

A recent survey conducted by the Wall Street Journal indicates that the present estimate of unemployment, 4.4 percent of the work force in September, is unrealistically high and that determination of the real significance of the present level of unemployment requires more than just an awareness of the overall jobless rate. The survey concluded that a large segment of the group presently labeled "unemployed" is made up of persons only temporarily idle while between jobs or not seeking employment in any more than a cursory manner. Another sizable portion includes wives, sons, or daughters of the family breadwinner. These unemployed often do not need work to support their families. Many others are people who find it difficult to get work because of old age, lack of training, education or physical or emotional capability.

There is a further sign that unemployment may not be as bad as the statistical sampling leads us to believe. State employment offices and private agencies cite numerous instances of jobs going begging either because many persons ostensibly in the labor force do not really want a job or are too selective in what pay or type of work they will select. What is true, I believe, is that there is a high incidence of people not working in our society, not working because of lack or incentive or lack of skills, not because of a lack of jobs. Not working is not the same as unemployed as defined in our BLS unemployment statistics.

The proof of this important fact lies in a statistical series to which too little attention has been paid; namely, the "Labor Force Participation Rate." In 1964 that rate was 57.4 percent, the lowest since 1947. The rate in 1956 was 59.3 percent, and averaged 58.54 percent for the decade 1951–60. The average for the first 4 years of this decade 1961–64 is 57.51 percent. If the labor force participation rate in 1964 was 59.3 percent as it was in 1956, and not 57.4 percent, 2,548,717 more men and women would have been in the labor force. Attention is directed to the following:

Labor force participation rate

	Percent
1947	57.4
1948	57.9
1949	58.0
1950	58.4
1951	58.9
1952	58.8
1953	58.5
1954	58.4
1955	58.7
1956	59.3
1957	58.7
1958	58.5
1959	58.3
1960	58.3
1961	58.0
1962	57.4
1963	57.3
1964	57.4

For 1965 the monthly unadjusted figures are:

January	55.9
February	56.4
March	56.5
April	56.9
May	57.7
June	59.3
July	59.8

I include this article from the October 13 Wall Street Journal entitled "Who's Still Jobless?" in the RECORD at this point.

WHO IS STILL JOBLESS?—MANY IN GOVERNMENT'S COUNT ARE NOT UNDER STRAIN TO WORK

(By Albert R. Karr)

YOUNGSTOWN.—William J. Anderson, 66, relaxes on a lounge chair on the front porch of his modest home here and relates how he retired as a steel plant millwright late in 1963. He looked for a job until his Ohio unemployment compensation ran out last June and since then has taken life easy.

"I do not want to be tied down anymore—I worked since I was 10 years old and that was long enough," he says.

In nearby Hubbard, Ohio, Mrs. Kay Barita, 52, leaves her chores in her paneled kitchen long enough to tell a visitor how she worked for 20 years until she was laid off at a meat packing factory last fall. For half a year she drew $42 a week in jobless pay, which came on top of her husband's take-home pay of about $125 a week. She tried until recently to find a new job. Now, she says, "They have my name. If they need anybody, they can just call me."

Mr. Anderson and Mrs. Barita are among a good many people throughout the United States who recently have been looking for a job. Also, like an unknown number of others, they haven't been particularly eager to find work, are not in serious need of employment and are not readily employable.

Significantly, either one conceivably could have been counted as unemployed in the U.S. Government's monthly survey of the Nation's work force and thus contributed to the sample on which Uncle Sam calculated the percent of the work force that is jobless. Any interviewees who say they are not working and are looking for a job are classed as unemployed. Yet neither Mr. Anderson nor Mrs. Barita would seem to fit most people's notion of the "hard-core unemployed"—those desperate for jobs who are searching for any means to keep themselves and their families clothed and fed.

FIGURES UNDER FIRE

How typical are people like Mr. Anderson and Mrs. Barita among the unemployed? No one knows for sure, partly because it is nearly impossible to say whether a particular person really wants a job and needs it. But there is a growing amount of criticism of use of the Government's raw figures on the total unemployed.

Administration officials were pleased that the official jobless rate dropped to 4.5 percent of the work force in mid-July, the lowest since 1957, in the face of a seasonal influx of teenagers in the job market, and fell further to 4.4 percent in mid-September. But they still express concern at even this much unemployment in a record-shattering economy.

Many of the critics say that the 4.4 percent figure is unrealistically high and is used wrongly to justify Government measures aimed at creating jobs. Federal officials, while admitting their jobless estimate is an imperfect measure of unemployment, say that any alternative method might understate or overstate the problem even more. So-called "secondary workers" such as teenagers and married women are included in the listing of unemployed, the Labor Department says, because they account for over one-fourth of all workers; if they're to be counted as employed when working, they must be counted as jobless when they lose a job and search for another, the Department argues.

There is evidence, though, that any judgment of the seriousness of current unemployment requires more than just an awareness of the overall jobless rate. Interviews with more than 50 jobless individuals such as Mr. Anderson and Mrs. Barita, at State unemployment offices and other spots in the Youngstown, Pittsburgh, and Erie, Pa., areas and talks with State and Federal employment specialists in a number of States suggest that hard-core unemployment is a much smaller problem than the Government's official jobless figure would indicate.

FEW ARE UNDER REAL STRAIN

This survey indicates that a large segment of the ranks of the currently unemployed is made up of persons only temporarily idle while between jobs or not seeking employment in any more than a cursory manner. Another sizable group includes wives, sons or daughters of the family breadwinner, who often don't have to support their families. Many others are people who find it difficult to get work because of old age, lack of training, education or physical or emotional capability.

A sampling of unemployed persons in Youngstown and Erie turned up 34 family household heads out of work. Of these, only four had been jobless longer than 3 months, or were actively looking for work and were without immediate prospects. Among 16 nonbreadwinners, only one wanted work and hadn't found it for some time. The rest were either laid off seasonally, were between jobs, or indicated they weren't under much strain to find another. Of the five who could be classed as hard-core unemployed, one was a heart patient and one an alcoholic.

Such a sampling itself can be misleading, of course, since such persons as the large number of teenagers in the market and the unemployed who've exhausted their State payments obviously don't show up at State compensation offices. Nonetheless, nearly two-thirds of the Nation's unemployed are covered by such payments. And many State employment officials say their overall jobless rates are no longer cause for major concern. This gives evidence that the brisk economy is, for now anyway, overcoming the effects of automation on employment.

In Ohio, where the jobless rate is about 3 percent Beman Pound, director of unemployment compensation, exclaims, "It's almost fantastic that you can get down this low in an industrial State. I don't know what full employment is, but this is getting pretty close."

The Journal survey turned up a good many persons even among jobless pay recipients who weren't eager to find any job other than one they might be recalled to, and some none at all.

One reason for their lack of concern is that their joblessness is only temporary and not hurting too much financially. U.S. long-term unemployment (15 weeks or more) was under 1 percent at mid-September. State officials maintain that a considerable amount of short-term unemployment is inevitable as the result of such things as businesses closing and new ones starting, seasonal fluctuations and other changes.

"I don't want to take any job that isn't better than the one I had," says a laid-off machine operator at a toy factory in Erie. He was put out of work about 2½ months earlier because of the plant's seasonal closedown, but with full expectation of early recall. Meanwhile, he has been subsisting on unemployment compensation.

Many of the interviewed jobseekers weren't overly eager to find work even though they had no long-term prospects for getting employment. Mr. Anderson, the retired steel plant worker, is a case in point. He says he was forced to retire at 65 in 1963 and couldn't find a desirable job afterward—one comparable to his $575-a-month mill position.

"What the heck—they don't bother with an old man—too many young fellows out looking for work," Mr. Anderson snorts. He finally gave up seriously trying to find a job, though he still makes some modest attempts, at least while drawing unemployment compensation benefits. Those benefits, which lately ran about $85 a month, supplemented $70 in pension from the steel mill, $124 in social security benefits and a $48-per-month veteran's pension. The jobless pay ran out in June, but in September Mr. Anderson's wife started drawing $46.50 monthly in social security benefits of her own. "I really didn't need a job," Mr. Anderson admits; his income and living expenses "run nip and tuck."

A retired storm window salesman interviewed in the Youngstown office of the State bureau of unemployment compensation expresses a similar lack of fervor about seeking work. He says he spends 4½ months every winter as a racetrack betting teller in Florida, then comes home to Youngstown and collects jobless pay. "I'm 77—I can't get work here," he explains.

State employment offices and private agencies cite numerous instances of jobs going begging either because many persons ostensibly in the labor force don't particularly want a job or are too selective in what they'll accept—as to pay or type of work. State unemployment officials in New York City report difficulty in filling such relatively unattractive and low-paying jobs as shirt-pressers in dry cleaning shops. And "thousands" of employable young persons in the Philadelphia area are "not only not work-oriented, but hardly even trying to find work," according to Jack Brown, executive director of Pennsylvania's Bureau of Employment Security.

SOME JOBS SNUBBED

Employment agencies say that many persons who once would have filled domestic-help positions now turn up their noses at being cooks, cleaning women, or maids, causing a surplus of such jobs. Servants willing to live in the homes where they work are especially hard to find, agencies say.

Part of the problem of heavy Negro unemployment, jobless experts add, is that Negroes no longer are willing to fill the menial jobs that they traditionally have held. The civil rights movement of the last few years has helped foster a resentment toward such work, they say, and the low pay of many such jobs often doesn't offer enough attraction to Negroes who are already getting relief benefits.

Harry King, a 40-year-old Negro who formerly drew $1.75 an hour washing windows of high-rise buildings, lost his job last summer when the washing concern folded. He's been taking in $100 a month, often less, by odd painting jobs. He also gets $41.50 twice a month on relief. Standing on a street corner in Pittsburgh's Hill district, a Negro ghetto, Mr. King makes it clear that he doesn't want any job that pays under $70 a week. "What's the sense of my taking a job for less?" he asks. "By the time I pay carfare and my rent, I've got nothing left. Very few people mind working, but they'd like to get something for it."

There are also a number of jobless persons who want work and probably could find it if they were willing or able to move to get available jobs. When a major steel company interviewed over 1,200 men laid off when Studebaker Corp. closed its South Bend, Ind., plant in an attempt to fill openings for steelworkers at a mill about 50 miles away, only 3 ended up being hired.

"I would have said that everybody we interviewed was suitable—we'd have taken them, but they didn't take us," comments an official of the steel company.

Many jobless persons, to be sure, are serious about wanting work. But, it is also clear, an important segment of that group isn't in dire need of jobs and their inclusion in Government statistics on the unemployed appears to paint an unduly gloomy picture.

CUBAN REFUGEE SITUATION

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on my monthly radio-TV broadcast, which goes back to my congressional district in Indiana, I had as my guest yesterday my good friend and colleague, Congressman PAUL ROGERS of Florida.

Because of Mr. ROGERS' interest and understanding of the Cuban refugee situation and, since he represents a section of south Florida, it is my feeling that the Congress and the Nation should be interested in Congressman ROGERS' observations.

During our discussion, I am happy to say, Congressman ROGERS offered many enlightening observations; however, one of the most important referred to the fact that Castro unilaterally initiated the recent sending of refugees to our shores, without the consideration or the release of hostages or political prisoners.

Mr. ROGERS went on to say that it is indeed a pitiful sight to see these people landing on our shores in boats of all kinds. It was also mentioned that it is unfortunate the Organization of American States has not been invited to play a more predominant role in the final determination of the fate of these people.

As a Congressman from the Midwest it seems appropriate to remind my colleagues that this problem is not a localized problem, affecting only Florida, but it is a national problem involving security.

The fact remains that our intelligence sources were caught completely off guard by Castro's announcement and the problem of screening processes—which must necessarily go on to insure that Castro is not planting agents in the United States—is a real difficult one which I believe the Congress should concern itself with. With Cuba now a Communist satellite in our hemisphere every precaution must be taken to insure the authenticity of these refugees.

Insofar as the reuniting of families is concerned, there is no question about the justifiable humanitarian side of this problem. We owe the State of Florida our applause for what she is doing for these people; however, as it relates to the Nation, it seems in order to remind the Nation of the Communist doctrine as it tries to infiltrate and conquer from within.

Again, my thanks to Congressman ROGERS for sharing his valuable time with me and the people of the 10th Congressional District in Indiana.

PROPOSAL TO MAKE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PART OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, only with the thought of trying to be helpful, I am offering a plan for the solution of the District of Columbia problem. In doing this, I make the following observations:

First, pure home rule is difficult to resolve because of a genuine constitutional question as well as the inability to solve the problem of financing;

Second, representation by a nonvoting delegate is no representation at all;

Third, giving the District two Senators and representation in the House on the basis of its population elevates it to the rank of a State when, as a matter of law and fact, it is only a city; and

Fourth, it is, however, difficult to deny any community as large and important as the District of Columbia the right of representation in the Federal Congress. This is more justified than home rule.

After all, representation is basic in our philosophy of government.

I have therefore introduced a resolution for a constitutional amendment providing that, for the purpose of representation in Congress, the District shall be considered a part of the State of Maryland. This would permit its local government to remain, as now, under the legislative control of Congress. But it would provide representation in the body which controls it. The two Maryland Senators would represent both the State and the District and be elected by the voters of both the State and the District. The District of Columbia would be divided into congressional districts as if it were a part of Maryland and, for the purpose of redistricting, Maryland and the District would be considered together as if they were one State.

This plan could not be classified as retrocession because nothing would be ceded to Maryland. It would leave the District just as it is, a Federal city under legislative control of Congress, but, at the same time give its residents representation in Congress.

Such a proposal does, however, conflict with the 23d amendment, which treats the District as an entity. This difficulty is best overcome by repeal of the 23d amendment and inclusion of its provision in the new proposal. The resolution reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the Congress.

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The twenty-third article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of representation in both Houses of the Congress and the appointment of electors of President and Vice President, the District of Columbia shall be considered as part of the State of Maryland.

"SEC. 3. Section 2 shall not take effect until the transmission by the President to the Congress of the statement, as provided in section 22 of the Act of June 18, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 2a), showing the number of Representatives to which each State would be entitled following the next decennial census of the population after the ratification of this article."

CONGRESSMAN CLEVELAND COMMENTS ON RESULTS OF SECOND NEW HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, for the third successive year, I have sent questionnaires to my constituents and wish to take this opportunity of presenting the results to the House. I wish I could also share with my colleagues the many interesting and constructive comments which constituents returned with their answers but space limitations do not permit.

The questionnaire was mailed generally to all postal patrons in my district last June. I believe the replies are an important indication of how a large group of thoughtful citizens feel about some of the current issues facing the Nation.

LUMP LEGISLATION

Because so many of the legislative proposals of the Great Society come to us packaged in large omnibus bills containing numerous, distinctly separate programs under one attractive-sounding title, it proved difficult to frame questions that could be answered "yes" or "no." There is a growing tendency to legislate by lump and by label, a tendency I view with concern. This situation, however, provides no excuse for not asking the people how they feel on the issues and, although I do not always agree with my constituency—and certainly all of them do not always agree with me—I think it is important to the cause of good government that issues be discussed and ideas exchanged.

In the following reporting of the results, I have noted not only the "yes," "no" and "not sure" tabulations but also the figures showing the number of blanks, which in some instances are significant. Question 9(c), for example, apparently was poorly drafted as indicated by the large number who did not answer it.

DISTRICT SWITCHES ON FOREIGN AID

Perhaps the most significant information provided by the results is the general disfavor now accorded by my district to the foreign aid program. My previous polls had not clearly indicated this. It is obvious that my constituents now feel that the foreign aid program should be carefully reevaluated and I agree.

Before getting to the results, I want to comment briefly on my own positions on the questions. Many constituents who replied asked how I felt on these issues and I think they are entitled to know.

CLEVELAND ANSWERS QUESTIONNAIRE

I am on record as supporting U.S. policy generally in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, although reserving, of course, the right to criticize these policies when I think they are wrong. My chief criticism continues to be that our Government has not made our intentions to stand by our commitments clear enough. Such failures, in my opinion, have always encouraged miscalculations by aggressors.

I voted again this year to continue the foreign aid program, although I voted for the moderate cuts that were made and voted, also, against continuing aid to Indonesia and Egypt, and countries trading with North Vietnam.

AGAINST REPEAL OF 14(b)

I voted against repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act. I supported the voting rights bill, after first cosponsoring and voting for the broader, more equitable Republican alternative, which, among other things, would have retained literacy tests where not clearly discriminatory. Also, I voted for the clean elections amendment proposed by Republicans to help insure that ballots are honestly cast and counted.

I have long favored increasing a Congressman's term from 2 to 4 years, but only if there is added a limit on the number of terms that a Congressman can serve consecutively.

GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

Although I strongly oppose Senator DODD's gun control bill (S. 1592) because it goes too far, I do feel that strengthening of Federal control over the distribution of firearms is in order. I will support legislation that bans the shipment across State lines of mail-order weapons to those under 18 and to persons with felony convictions. I would support Federal control over the transportation of concealed firearms, and I would support legislation to impose increased penalties for crimes involving the misuse of firearms, and legislation to curb the flood of foreign firearms that are being dumped here. In my opinion, the foregoing objectives can be obtained without denying ownership of firearms to American citizens of good repute using them for lawful purposes. Legitimate gun dealers, hobbyists, and sportsmen need not be penalized nor should any legislation be permitted to infringe on a citizen's right to keep and bear arms as guaranteed by the second amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

NEW DEPARTMENT—FARM SUBSIDIES—IMMIGRATION

I voted against creating the new Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, supporting instead the Republican proposal to create a new office of Housing in the Executive Office of the President. This would have done the job more efficiently, I believe, and was far more comprehensive. I strongly favor limiting the dollar amount of subsidies that could be paid to any one farm or farmer. Evidence from governmental sources shows that Federal farm subsidies are going to large farm operations in disproportionate amounts while the small farmer is not being helped.

I voted for the new immigration law, the chief purposes of which are to permit the reuniting of families, the entry of persons with needed skills, and the abolition of the outmoded national origins quota systems.

DRAFT—IMPORTS—REFORMS NEEDED

I oppose ending the military draft but favor a revision of procedures to guarantee fairer and more equitable treatment for all young men.

I favor Federal income tax exemptions or credits for the cost of higher education and have introduced legislation to accomplish this purpose.

I favor quantitative restrictions or agreed upon quotas to limit imports of woolen products as promised by the administration for 4 years, and also restrictions and quotas for other imports of a similar nature. Beyond that, I have long advocated a general reform of the U.S. tariff schedule so that the rates of

duties will reflect the differing wage rates in foreign countries shipping goods to us. New rates should also reflect those cases where the manufacturing of goods being shipped to the United States is being subsidized by foreign governments. The purpose of such rates would not be protectionism in the traditional sense. The purpose would be to establish more equitable conditions of international competition, orderly marketing, expanded foreign trade, and improved standards of living for all.

I voted against the administration's rent-subsidy plan.

Questionnaire results

	Yes	No	Not sure	Blank
In general, do you favor—				
1. U.S. policy in Vietnam?	4,415	1,556	873	198
2. U.S. policy in the Dominican Republic?	4,699	1,161	964	218
3. Continuing the foreign aid program?	2,602	3,058	1,003	379
4. Continuing aid to Indonesia and Egypt?	780	4,964	1,045	253
5. Repeal of sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which allows States to pass right-to-work laws?	1,713	4,161	872	296
6. (a) Federal legislation to guarantee voting rights?	5,353	1,072	286	331
(b) Retaining literacy tests where these are not discriminatory and not just used to prevent Negroes from voting?	5,880	767	235	160
(c) A "clean elections" amendment to insure a fair vote count?	6,126	257	418	241
7. Increasing Congressmen's terms from 2 to 4 years?	3,999	2,332	590	121
8. Limiting the number of terms a Congressman can serve?	2,283	4,097	479	183
9. (a) Stronger Federal legislation to control sales of guns?	4,176	2,429	301	136
(b) Ending mail-order sales of all guns?	3,869	2,717	307	149
(c) Limiting ban to concealed weapons, e.g., pistols?	2,827	2,692	975	548
10. A new Cabinet-level Department to deal with public housing and urban affairs?	1,924	3,876	1,096	146
11. A top limit on subsidies paid to any one farmer or farm to spread benefits which now heavily favor big operators?	5,880	495	443	224
12. Changing our present national origins system of immigration to permit entry of persons with needed skills regardless of national origins?	3,656	2,540	695	151
13. Permitting persons with close relatives in the United States to enter without regard to country of origin?	2,493	3,455	891	203
14. Ending the military draft?	1,282	5,097	405	258
15. Federal tax exemptions or credits for costs of higher education?	5,088	1,336	463	155
16. Quantitative restrictions or agreed-upon quotas to limit imports of woolen products (as promised for the past 4 years)?	4,496	1,267	1,077	202
17. Restrictions on other imports of a similar nature?	4,132	1,489	1,170	251
18. President Johnson's proposal to subsidize rent for low-income families in lieu of additional public housing?	1,528	4,339	962	213

FURTHER COMMENT ON CONDITIONS AT THE SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Members will recall that on Tuesday, the 19th, I made reference in the RECORD and quoted a number of passages from an official report of the Veterans' Administration concerning conditions at the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Salt Lake City, Utah. May I emphasize that the report is an official VA report; it is not conclusions or findings on my part.

This morning, I was visited by the Associate Deputy Administrator, the Deputy Chief Medical Director, and an Assistant Chief Medical Director, who presented me with the following statement on behalf of Dr. McNinch, the Chief Medical Director, which I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks at this point:

STATEMENT BY DR. JOSEPH H. MCNINCH, VA'S CHIEF MEDICAL DIRECTOR, ON THE SALT LAKE CITY VA HOSPITAL

The recent publicity of alleged irregularities at the Salt Lake City VA Hospital was based on a report by VA's own internal audit service following an extensive audit of station activities. Such audits are conducted periodically within the VA organization as a sound management device to assure the adequacy of personnel and programs.

A followup study of the report by our Department of Medicine and Surgery generally supported the findings of the internal audit service, and corrective action has been taken.

I am satisfied personally that the hospital is rendering excellent medical care to sick and disabled veterans, and that the administrative laxities that were uncovered have been ended.

By far the most serious of the allegations was that resident physicians had refused a nurse's request to check the condition of a patient she believed to be seriously ill. The hospital director confirmed this allegation, and reported that it involved isolated incidents on just one of the many wards at the hospital—a geriatric ward. Partly to blame was a misunderstanding between the psychiatric service and the medical service as to supervisory responsibility for the geriatric ward.

The officer-of-the-day physician determined to be primarily responsible for nonresponse to the nurse's request was reprimanded by the hospital chief of staff the day immediately following the first incident. When the same resident physician—who has since left VA's employ—again failed to respond in a similar situation, the patient was seen in a matter of minutes by another physician. Although some irregularities included in the audit report required further investigation and confirmation, I considered the failure of physicians to respond to call so serious that, when I received the audit report, I took immediate action to require the director to take measures to assure there would be no repetition of such incidents. I have received assurances that there will be none.

On October 12, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs approved disciplinary actions recommended by me in connection with the total report on the hospital. These actions, which are now being carried out, will be noted in the official records for each of staff members involved.

Mr. Speaker, I also insert as a part of my remarks the text of letters presented to me by officials of the Veterans' Administration at their conference previously referred to:

AUGUST 30, 1965.

HOSPITAL DIRECTOR,
VA Hospital,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

Dear ———: I have had presented to me the report of internal audit that was conducted at your station from May 19 to July 23. This report has some 210 recommendations. These are not yet fully staffed out because of the brief time that has elapsed since receipt.

There are three items which do not need further staff work to announce my positive position. I want my positive position to be known to you and I desire that you make this position crystal clear to every member of your professional staff.

Item 1: It is set forth in the audit report (p. VIII–2) that "some service chiefs state that their primary responsibility is to the teaching program first, research second, and the care of the veteran third." Nothing could be farther from the truth. I have on many occasions stated in strong language that the primary mission of D.M. & S. is the care and treatment of the veteran patient. It is for the purpose of strengthening our medical competency to achieve this goal that we engage in the most worthwhile activities of research and teaching. It does the VA medical program irreparable damage to have members of the professional staff disseminate such ill conceived and fallacious views. You are directed to take immediate steps to see that these staff members are properly oriented to the mission of D.M. & S.

Item 2: I am most distressed to read in the internal audit report (p. VIII 4–5) about the difficulties that your station is experiencing in getting proper OD coverage of the geriatric ward. It is inconceivable that physicians will refuse to respond to emergency calls from nurses who are caring for these patients as apparently is occurring at your station. Has the age of specialization advanced (regressed) to that degree that specialists have relinquished their professional and moral obligations to the sufferer. I direct that you take immediate and forceful action to correct this situation.

Item 3: The internal auditors uncovered and a later central office investigation confirmed and set forth the pertinent details that involved funds which were obtained by members of your staff for professional work done on non-VA patients. These funds were deposited to "Castro-enterology development fund" and "pulmonary disease fund" maintained and controlled by the University of Utah. Questionable disbursements were made from these funds. Notwithstanding that the origin of this procedure antedated your assumption to the position of Director of the hospital, it has continued during your tenure.

I will communicate with you further on this subject after the report of investigation has been fully studied and analyzed. At this time, however, I direct you to see to it that your staff members take immediate action to terminate their activities as they relate to the professional care of ineligible patients and as they relate to the obtaining of funds, their deposit to the university account and their expenditures. This, as you undoubtedly know, involves primarily your chief and assistant chief of the medical service.

I desire that you confirm by return mail that the actions directed above have been taken.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———,
Chief Medical Director.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL,
Salt Lake City, Utah, September 7, 1965.

CHIEF MEDICAL DIRECTOR,
Department of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans' Administration Central Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ———: Your letter dated August 30, 1965, was received at 3:45 p.m., Friday, September 3. I have complied with your directed action in the absence of Dr. ———, hospital Director, as follows:

Item 1: The chief of staff met with the entire professional staff this afternoon and reminded each member that the primary mission of D.M. & S. is the care and treatment of veteran patients. Enclosed is a copy of a memorandum given to each chief of service.

Item 2: The responsibility for OD coverage for the geriatric wards has been assigned to and assumed by the full-time senior staff of the psychiatric service.

Item 3: This matter has been discussed with Dr. Renzetti, Chief, Medical Service, and with Dr. Englert, Assistant Chief, Medical Service. Enclosed is a copy of a memorandum personally presented to each physician. Both individuals have indicated that they will comply with your directed action.

The chief of staff and I have discussed your letter with Dr. ——— by telephone. When he returns to duty on September 13, 1965, he will correspond with you further on each of the matters cited in your letter.

Sincerely,

——— ———,
Acting Hospital Director.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL,
Salt Lake City, Utah, September 7, 1965.

To: All concerned.
From: Acting Hospital Director.
Subject: Chief Medical Director's letter of August 30, 1965.

The following excerpt from a letter received September 3, 1965, from the Chief Medical Director is presented to make clear the policy of the VA and of this hospital with reference to the importance of patient care. Each member of the staff must be well aware of the policy clearly set forth in the quotation.

"It is set forth in the audit report (p. VIII–2) that 'some service chiefs state that their primary responsibility is to the teaching program first, research second, and the care of the veteran third.' Nothing could be farther from the truth. I have on many occasions stated in strong language that the primary mission of D.M. & S. is the care and treatment of the veteran patient. It is for the purpose of strengthening our medical competency to achieve this goal that we engage in the most worthwhile activities of research and teaching. It does the VA medical program irreparable damage to have members of the professional staff disseminate such ill-conceived and fallacious views."

——— ———.

SEPTEMBER 7, 1965.

Re Chief Medical Director's letter of August 30, 1965.

ASSISTANT CHIEF, MEDICAL SERVICE,
Acting Hospital Director:

The following is an excerpt of a letter from the Chief Medical Director that was received at approximately 4 p.m. on Friday, September 3. Dr. McNinch has made his position unmistakably clear in item 3 of his letter, which is quoted for your immediate compliance:

"Item 3: The internal auditors uncovered and a later central office investigation confirmed and set forth the pertinent details that involved funds which were obtained by members of your staff for professional work done on non-VA patients. These funds were deposited to "gastroenterology development fund" and "pulmonary disease fund" maintained and controlled by the University of Utah. Questionable disbursements were made from these funds. Notwithstanding that the origin of this procedure antedated your assumption to the position of director of the hospital, it has continued during your tenure.

"I will communicate with you further on this subject after the report of investigation has been fully studied and analyzed. At this time, however, I direct you to see to it that staff members take immediate action to terminate their activities as they relate to the professional care of ineligible patients and as they relate to the obtaining of funds, their deposit to the university account, and their expenditures. This, as you undoubtedly know, involves primarily your chief and assistant chief of the medical service."

——— ———.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL,
Salt Lake City, Utah, September 20, 1965.

CHIEF MEDICAL DIRECTOR,
Department of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans' Administration Central Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ———: This will serve as a further reply to your letter of August 30 as promised by ——— ——— reply of September 7.

I am particularly concerned about the accusation of item 1. The service chiefs accused have not been identified by internal audit; I have been unable to identify them. During the 2 years I have been here all service chiefs have repeatedly manifested a primary devotion to patient care. In no instance, has any one of our service chiefs put either research, or teaching, ahead of patient care. For me the exemplary behavior of these service chiefs speaks louder than the report of the internal audit team. Nevertheless, corrective action has been taken as indicated by Mr. ———.

It is true that the internal audit did find two exceptional instances of failure on the part of residents to respond promptly to call as noted in item 2. These should never have occurred; when they were discovered, corrective action was taken. Furthermore, after October 1, the responsibilities for 24 hours coverage on the wards where these defections occurred will rest with senior staff rather than with residents. There will be no recurrence of this sort of negligence.

The problem referred to in item 3 has been corrected also. Our staff no longer provides service at this hospital to ineligible patients. Such patients as were formerly ineligible will be handled in the future as prescribed by D.M. & S. circular No. 10–65–196 (July 1, 1965), or M–1, part I, change 72, chapter 4, paragraph 4A.08 (July 20, 1962) and Interim Issue 10–435, paragraph 3 (June 3, 1957). Payments are not made to our staff, they are made to the university. As faculty members of the medical school our staff members simply advise the school how some of the funds should be spent; disbursement is made by the medical school.

Establishment of a pulmonary laboratory and a GI laboratory at the medical school in December will further reduce the number of nonveterans referred to these clinics on hospital grounds.

Neither the internal audit team, or Mr. ——— ———, the investigator, nor our own investigation has turned up a single instance in which any of our staff obtained any supplemental income from these funds.

Sincerely,

——— ———,
Hospital Director.

Mr. Speaker, it is a source of considerable regret to me, and I am sure will be to all those who are sincerely interested in the conditions described in the VA report, of the lack of forceful action on the part of the Chief Medical Director in this regard. I have not been advised of the disciplinary actions which have been recommended by the Chief Medical Director. I can only assume that they are of a decidedly mild variety or else I would have been told in detail what action was planned.

I know that one of the four resident physicians who failed to respond is no longer with the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Salt Lake City, Utah. I assume that he left of his own volition. I can only repeat, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion the four residents who refused to respond to the call for the care of a veteran who had become seriously ill should be dismissed with prejudice. It is shocking to me that the Chief Medical Director would, for one moment, tolerate this condition. In my opinion, his action indicates nothing more than a slap on the wrist and a pious hope that nothing like this will transpire again.

I would also like to reiterate my original statement that the Hospital Director and the former Hospital Director and the Assistant Hospital Director, who deny all knowledge of the conditions prevailing at this station, have removed themselves from any consideration for positions of responsibility or trust in the Veterans' Administration medical system. A former Chief Medical Director, one who was more decisive, quickly removed the present hospital director when he was serving as area medical director for what, in my opinion, was a much less serious infraction of the rules.

If the Veterans' Administration believes that the situation at the Veterans' Administration hospital, Salt Lake City, Utah, can be handled by the brief statement of the Chief Medical Director reproduced elsewhere in my remarks, it is very much mistaken. Full and corrective action will have to be taken, however painful that may be to the Chief Medical Director.

I have read with some amazement the reply of the hospital director, inserted by my colleague, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] in which he defends the practice of admitting non-Veterans' Administration patients. I would remind all Members that the Veterans' Administration hospital system was created to take care of veteran patients. It was not created to take care of individuals who did not serve in one of the branches of the Armed Forces. In view of the hospital director's response to the official Veterans' Administration report, and again I must emphasize it is a Veterans' Administration report and not my report, I can only draw the conclusion that he believes the treatment of non-Veterans' Administration patients to be in order, while at the same time denying to central office officials that he had any knowledge of the practice.

Mr. Speaker, because of the attitude displayed by the Chief Medical Director in his statement which I have previously referred to, I have referred the text of my remarks, including the quotations from the Veterans' Administration official report, to the Attorney General to determine if there has been a violation of the law, and also to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. I regret the necessity for this action, but the attitude of the Chief Medical Director leaves me no alternative and I include as a part of my remarks the text of a letter which I have sent to the Attorney General and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 21, 1965.
Hon. NICHOLAS KATZENBACH,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KATZENBACH: Enclosed is a copy of the remarks which I made on the floor of the House on Tuesday, October 19, which I believe you will find self-explanatory. They appear at page 27433 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date.

In view of the apparent reluctance of the Veterans' Administration to take action, which in my opinion is warranted and in fact essential, I would appreciate it if you would have carefully reviewed the portion under the title "Admission of Nonveterans' Administration Patients" and advise me as to your conclusion as to whether or not this is a violation of law. It seems to me that it most clearly is and that appropriate action should be taken.

I shall look forward to hearing from you at your early convenience.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 21, 1965.
Hon. SHELDON S. COHEN,
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COHEN: Enclosed is a copy of the remarks which I made on the floor of the House on Tuesday, October 19, which I believe you will find self-explanatory. They appear at page 27433 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

I ask your particular attention to the statement contained in the Veterans' Administration report which relates to the receipt of certain moneys in which a doctor's liability insurance premiums and expenses for professional society dinner meetings were paid from the fund and I assume were not counted as income.

This is a matter which in view of the reluctance of the Veterans' Administration to take appropriate action would apparently be of concern to officials of your agency.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

NORA ISABELLA SAMUELLI—RETURN OF BILL AND PAPERS TO THE SENATE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Secretary of the Senate:

IN THE SENATE OF THE
UNITED STATES,
October 21, 1965.

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 619) entitled "An Act for the Relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli," together with all accompanying papers.

FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the Senate is granted.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES DURING REMAINDER OF THE WEEK AND FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS THE SAME DAY REPORTED

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at any time during the remainder of the week it may be in order for the speaker to declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair and that during the remainder of the week it shall be in order to consider conference reports the same day reported, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXVIII.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the distinguished majority whip would explain to us what is involved in the definition of the "week" and what is involved in the definition of the clause, and why we do not pass a sine die adjournment resolution, which would make all such procedures in order.

Mr. BOGGS. Of course, the answer to the first part of the question is obvious. The definition of the remainder of the week is tomorrow and Saturday, Friday and Saturday.

Mr. HALL. This does refer to the calendar week and not a legislative week.

Mr. BOGGS. The other phase of the request would waive the printing in the RECORD of conference reports before they can be called up.

We are hopeful of adjourning this Congress either tomorrow or Saturday. The basis for the request is exactly that, to facilitate adjournment.

Today we asked for authority for the Speaker to declare recesses in order to take up this very important conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill, which we were able to do, and to dispose of.

Mr. HALL. The history of the House indicates that when prior authorities for recess have been granted by unanimous consent there have been other devices used, not under the present administration, and I believe it is necessary to get a legislative record established so that we will know the full intent before any unanimous consent request is granted.

Finally, we could have had the sugar bill, the sugar daddies' bill, or the sugar plum bill back here today, if we had had conferees in town to confer on it. It is about time that we began to act under the other rule of procedure which says we can perform all of these functions—without printing in the RECORD or otherwise—in the last 3 days prior to a sine die adjournment. Such a resolution would bring this about.

Mr. BOGGS. I assure the gentleman that there is no intent to do anything other than to expedite the remaining business of this session.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all anxious to expedite this long, drawn out session. I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISPOSAL OF ZINC FROM STOCKPILE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PHILBIN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 9047) to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile or both.

AUTHORIZING DISPOSAL OF NICKEL FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 10305) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 124,200,000 pounds of nickel from the national stockpile.

URBAN RENEWAL, CAMDEN, N.J.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, all of us who serve in the House are familiar with the purpose of urban renewal. The grant of Federal funds and the power of eminent domain to curtail slum neighborhoods, tear down buildings, and resell the cleared land to private developers at a reduced price has the very lofty objective of attracting new industry, new housing, new business, and thus stimulate the economy of the community by the development of new ratables.

I personally have read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in magazines, in books, and in newspaper stories throughout the years a great many criticisms of this program. I knew, for example, that in my own district a classic example existed to dramatically illustrate the sad and complete failure of an urban renewal program. I hoped that something might be done, but it now appears that nothing can be done.

Instead of developing the already acquired land, acquired at considerable cost to the taxpayers, the city of Camden, N.J., is now planning additional urban renewal projects and programs. I am calling this matter to the attention of the Congress to point out the great need for more careful planning on the part of city officials and Federal agencies in the allocation of Federal funds and the use of the power of eminent domain by municipal officials. Unless there is some positive, attainable project that will utilize the land cleared of taxpaying properties, it seems to me that we are creating additional problems for our towns and cities, rather than eliminating them.

For example, in the city of Camden, N.J., I find upon investigation that a contract was executed between the Federal Government and the local housing authority of Camden, N.J., in April of 1959, to acquire land and properties at Kaighns Point, situated in the southern part of the city. The purpose behind the program was desirable and laudable, as are most of the aims of these programs. It was intended to remove substandard and unsightly buildings and to utilize the vacant land for light industry and/or business for the purpose of increasing the beauty of the area, developing the whole section of the city, and bringing new ratables to the city. Now what actually happened?

Well, the acquisition started in December 1959, followed by demolition of more than 300 taxpaying properties. The demolition was completed in April 1963 and as of that date, acres of land were cleared in preparation for the coming of business, industries, and housing. What was the cost? Well, I am told by the Housing and Home Finance Agency that the estimated gross project cost, including acquisition, demolition, relocation, site preparation, and so forth, was $2,527,503. Of course, as usual, the Federal Government paid the lion's share. In this case the Federal Government paid $1,388,470, with the city of Camden contributing in cash and noncash items almost $700,000.

Now what did the city gain? Absolutely nothing. What did the Federal Government gain? Absolutely nothing.

What did it cost the Federal Government? Not counting the salaries of all of the Federal officials who participated in and worked on the program, the cost to the Federal Government was a minimum of $1,388,470.

This is bad enough, but the real loser was the city of Camden and its citizens. Why do I say this? Because, Mr. Speaker, it not only cost the city of Camden $694,000 in cash and noncash items of expenditure, but it has cost the city the loss of taxes from the properties that were demolished in 1961–62. I do not know how much this is in dollars and cents. I do know, however, that approximately 300 buildings of all kinds and sizes were demolished. I do know that all of these property owners were paying real estate taxes to the city of Camden and I do know that as of October 1965, the only thing that has replaced these properties on these acres of ground at Kaighns Point, in Camden, N.J., has been weeds.

In other words, the Federal program in the city of Camden has not only cost the Federal taxpayer, but it has brought irreparable harm to the city of Camden and the city taxpayer. The land is still vacant. The city has lost taxes on all of these properties for 3 years and no relief is in sight.

Now it would be easy to blame this upon the city officials who approved the plan and sought the Federal funds. It would be easy to criticize these officials for not doing anything with this land since 1963. But I prefer to lay the blame at the doorstep of the Federal Government, for if these programs were not available, or if available were more strictly supervised with more stringent criteria, such boondoggles as Kaighns Point, Camden, N.J., could not occur.

I urge the Congress, therefore, to take this as another example of the outrageous waste involved in some of the Federal programs that have been enacted in recent years. I have only to mention the accelerated public works program which did not create jobs but prevented public works from being performed; the area redevelopment program with its grants for ski lodges and luxury motels, and all of the other abuses that have been spread throughout the pages of the Congressional Record for the past several years.

Accept, Mr. Speaker, Kaighns Point, Camden, N.J., as another red flag of warning to the Congress of the United States. It should serve also as a warning to municipal officials throughout this country. Do not get involved in Federal programs unless you know exactly what you are doing. Do not accept the Federal grant to tear down taxpaying properties unless you are sure you can replace them with other taxpaying properties.

Do not let this happen in your community.

Do not let this happen in this country.

TOWARD THE GREAT SOCIETY—HEALTH

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, enactment of the medical care for the aged bill has somewhat overshadowed the great strides made by the 89th Congress toward providing a healthful life for all Americans regardless of age or financial position. The Democratic administration has launched a broad attack on the Nation's health problem.

A great need exists to bring our proven medical research capabilities into closer relationship with actual medical practice. Making a major effort toward this objective, the 89th Congress has authorized $340 million in grants over the next 3 years for establishment of regional medical programs designed to make the latest advances in diagnosis and treatment available to all heart, cancer, and stroke patients throughout the country. These three diseases presently account for 70 percent of the deaths in the United States each year.

This Congress has also approved legislation which will enable us to maintain into the 1970's the present ratio of 149 physicians per 100,000 population. It provides for a 3-year extension of the present matching grant program for construction of teaching facilities at medical, dental, and other professional health schools, and for extension of the present medical student loan program. A new scholarship program for needy students and a new grant program to improve the quality of teaching in health professional schools is also provided.

In 1963 Congress approved funds for the construction of community centers for the care and treatment of mentally ill and retarded persons. However, at that time funds for staffing the centers were dropped from the bill. This year Congress has approved $73.5 million over 3 years for initial grants, and additional sums for continuing grants, to community mental health centers to meet initial staffing costs of technical and professional personnel. It is estimated the centers will receive more than $225 million over the next 7 years for staffing assistance. More than $100 million over the next 3 years will be available to train teachers of mentally retarded and handicapped children.

The vaccination assistance program which assists communities in intensive immunization programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus, has been expanded and will also cover immunization against measles for 20 million preschool children. The program for family health service clinics and other health services for the 1 million domestic migratory workers and their families has been extended. Congress this year also authorized $280 million for a 3-year extension of the matching grant program for construction of health research facilities.

The Drug Abuse Control Act of 1965 tightens Federal controls over the distribution of depressant and stimulant drugs. It does not interfere with the use of drugs in proper medical practice. It deals with the substantial illicit traffic in drugs in order to protect the public health and safety. Of the 9 billion barbiturate and amphetamine tablets produced annually in the United States, an estimated 50 percent are distributed through illicit channels.

Each year 120,000 disabled persons are being rehabilitated under Federal-State programs. Yet many handicapped, particularly those with more severe physical and mental disabilities remain outside the mainstream of American life. The doors to employment remain closed not because of their inability to work but because society has not fully recognized their abilities. Congress has approved legislation that will step up the State vocational rehabilitation services to reach the Democratic administration's goal of rehabilitating 200,000 persons annually.

The 89th Congress has made remarkable progress toward conquering our three major killers—heart disease, cancer, and stroke, toward providing improved care for the mentally ill in their own community, toward a continuation of our vital health research activities, and toward providing health services for medically needy children. But much remains to be done before the most modern medical skills and treatments are available to all who need them. We still have a long way to go to catch up on long neglected health needs to prepare for future health demands.

TOWARD THE GREAT SOCIETY—REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, every American deserves the opportunity to build his own place in our abundant land. Why should opportunity be closed to a person merely because of the circumstances of the area in which he lives?

As President Johnson said:

> The conditions of our distressed areas today are among our most important economic problems. They hold back the progress of the Nation, and breed a despair and poverty which is inexcusable to the richest land on earth. We will not permit any part of this country to be a prison where hopes are crushed, human being chained to misery, and the promise of America denied.

Approximately 27 million Americans now live in economically distressed areas scattered throughout the country—in Appalachia, in the Ozarks, the mountainous Northwest, the upper New England area, upper Great Lakes, the desert high plateau area of Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona and the Deep South.

Economically distressed areas are caught in a strangling web of circumstances which blocks progress and leads only to further decay. Young people leave school early to find jobs and means of support. No jobs are available so they leave the area taking their desperately needed energy to the cities. Only the older folks stay behind. As income goes down, schools, hospitals, and other public services deteriorate. Only the toll of human poverty grows, as more of the strength of our Nation is sapped away.

The Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 and the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1962 have shown that vitality can be restored to economically dying areas. Helping business to expand and build new plants, along with construction of needed public facilities can produce jobs. And the cost of creating these jobs is less than the cost of supporting these workers and their families through public assistance. ARA, through some 550 projects, with 300 in rural areas, has created jobs for 115,000 unemployed.

The new Public Works and Economic Development Act approved by the 89th Congress will bring new industry, jobs, and a fresh start on economic life for residents of poverty pockets throughout the United States. And at the same time it will help build new public facilities—roads, water systems—needed to attract new business and to create more jobs.

Over the next 5 years, a total of $3.25 billion in grants and loans for public works, development assistance, and technical assistance will go into economically depressed areas throughout the country. A key feature of the new program calls for comprehensive, long-range economic development planning on a multi-county and multi-State basis through establishment of regional planning commissions. Poverty and development potential know no boundaries.

The initiative, the ideas, and the request for help must come from the local areas. The Federal Government will step in only when it is asked to assist in creating conditions under which private business can provide jobs and increased income. Only those projects offering substantial promise of increasing economic development will be assisted. We can be assured that in the long run the increased economic activity stimulated by this program will return its costs many times over to the Federal Treasury.

This legislation will not work alone, but with the manpower retraining program and the antipoverty programs which are helping people to improve their abilities to obtain and to hold a job it will bring renewed hope for the unemployed and their families. The Public Works and Economic Development Act will bring new hope and increased prosperity to our distressed areas and increase prosperity for the Nation as a whole.

THE PROBLEM OF HUNGER IN THE WORLD

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, this year has found the Congress making great progress in our war against poverty, our war against ignorance, our war against disease, and the war against social injustice in our country.

But, Mr. Speaker, we must not let our desire for progress on our internal problems deter our attention entirely from the problems which face the rest of the world. Today, I particularly want to speak to the problem of hunger in the world.

More than half of the people in the world today suffer from either an inadequate or improper diet and the numbers of starving people are growing at a fantastic rate. Experts tell us that there is an increase of 1 million people in the world every week, most of them hungry.

This much talked about population explosion is most serious in the underdeveloped countries of the world. In these areas centuries of substandard living are now being aggravated to the breaking point, and there can be little doubt that it is making a sizable contribution to the success of the insurgent forces of communism in these trouble spots.

Now, however, for the first time in history, the American people have the ability to make real progress against the scourges of hunger and ignorance in the world. By accepting this as a challenge we have the opportunity to demonstrate both the ability of the American system to produce, and the compassion and concern of the American people, a free people, for their fellow men.

Taking advantage of our ability to produce food and working within the framework of a well planned and coordinated program, we can have the opportunity to mount a most effective war, not only against the problems of hunger and ignorance, but also against the forces of tyranny and oppression.

Ours is a nation of people concerned about the problems of individual people. Ours is a nation which, under God, seeks to serve people rather than be served by people, and has compassion and concern for the needs of our people. We cannot, and will not, deny to Americans the freedom of opportunity or food for their bodies. We cannot be true to these principles and, at the same time, ignore the problem of starving people elsewhere in the world.

The 4-year farm bill just passed goes a long way toward improving the economic condition of the American farmer. But both commonsense and our moral responsibilities tell us that it is not enough for a long-time solution.

Nothing short of full-capacity production with a fair return for the farmer can be justified. Nor can we justify, over a long period of time, a continuous reduction of our ability to produce food while people are still starving in the world.

One year ago our President told us:

> There is a great moral principle at stake. It is not right—in a world of such infinite possibilities—that children should die of hunger, that young people should live in ignorance, that men should be crippled by disease, that families should live in misery, shrouded in despair.
>
> If we truly mean our commitment to freedom, we must help strike at the conditions which make a mockery of that hope.
>
> We have the skills and resources to improve the life of men. I do not believe we lack the imagination to find ways to shatter the barrier between man's capacity and man's needs.

The National Council of Churches in their resolution on world hunger earlier this year said:

> For Christians the issue is clear and final. For us the issue is sharpened by the fact that for the most part the world's resources lie in areas where Christians predominate, and the world's needs in areas where Christians are fewest. For Christians the holy gifts of knowledge and scientific skill and the needs of our neighbors lay a mandate on our conscience to which only one answer is possible.

For Americans, there is only one answer. We must turn our creative abilities loose on the problem of shifting the emphasis from one of restriction of production and disposal of surplus foods to one of utilization of our great agriculture productive capacity to feed the hungry people in the world.

Such a program would have favorable impact within this country also. Our farmers would, with full farm production, buy more machinery, more fertilizer, more gasoline and tires, and many other items from American industry. Transportation systems would increase their income by hauling the additional production. The impact would be favorable all through our economy.

A word of caution, however. As we develop these programs, we must not let ourselves destroy the initiative of the people to provide for themselves. We must not bury their pride in an avalanche of charity. We must give our help in a manner which will encourage these countries to become independent partners with the United States, rather than dependents.

I believe, for example, that we can use our food to encourage the unemployed and hungry people of those countries to increase their own food production or to work on schools, water systems, and other needed public facilities. I believe, also, that our food can be used to help the underdeveloped countries build a sound agricultural base which is the first step toward a sound and progressive industrial economy. I am certain, also, that people can look more objectively at the alternatives of communism and democracy when they are sound of body and mind, and when they are not faced every day with the fear of want.

Mr. Speaker, early in the next session, I will be introducing legislation which I hope will be the first step taken by our country in a new, vigorous effort to both help the hungry people in this world, and, at the same time, strengthen the economy of rural America. I hope it will deserve the support and approval of the Congress. I also want my colleagues to know that I would appreciate any suggestions or alternative ideas which they might want to offer.

TOWARD THE GREAT SOCIETY—ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moorhead] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in a complex industrial society such as ours, stress is too often placed on the material aspects of life—jobs, housing, food—to the neglect of our intellectual and esthetic development. A starved mind and spirit is harmful to society, just as is a starved body.

Arts and letters are our most precious heritage. They reveal, in the words of President Johnson, "the inner vision which guides us as a nation. And where there is no vision, the people perish."

At long last the arts and humanities have been officially recognized as a vital element in America's pursuit of excellence. The 89th Congress has established a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities to encourage, promote, and support our cultural development.

The Foundation is composed of two endowments; one for the creative and performing arts including music, drama, dance, movies, photography, architecture, and so forth, and one for the humanities which includes the study of language, literature, art, history, philosophy, and so forth.

The arts endowment will provide matching grants to groups and to individuals for actual production or performance of works of art, training of artists, construction of necessary facilities, and to encourage public appreciation and enjoyment of the arts.

The humanities endowment will provide nonmatching grants and loans for research, fellowships, and grants for training purposes, support of publication of scholarly works, for the interchange of information, and to encourage public understanding and appreciation of the humanities.

Limited funds totaling $21 million annually for 3 years are available to assist private, State, and local initiative in encouraging and supporting the arts and humanities. Much greater support is now given the sciences through the National Science Foundation, and to health through the National Institutes of Health.

This legislation will not create artistic and literary excellence but it will create the conditions under which arts and letters can flourish through recognition of special achievements, through making works of our artists and humanists available to all the people, and through encouragement of public understanding and appreciation of artistic talent. Through support of the humanities we shall broaden the boundaries of understanding of the sources and goals of human activity.

In the not too distant future we hope to have a National Ballet Company and a National Opera Company, a National Repertory Theater to perform ancient and modern theater classics throughout the country, and an American Film Institute. With the help of State and local governments and private organizations the Foundation will support symphony orchestras, commission musical works by American composers, and bring more artists to our universities. The humanities endowment will help to build the great audience for the Great Society.

Most important, cultural opportunities will abound not only in the cities but will be brought to all parts of the country. No longer should any community be culturally starved.

Upon signing this legislation, President Johnson said:

> What this bill really does is to bring active support to this great national asset, to make fresher the winds of art in this great land of ours. The arts and the humanities belong to the people, for it is, after all, the people who create them.

THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE STILL HOPES THAT THE TREASURY WILL CONSIDER THE POSSIBLE ADVANTAGES OF SLIGHTLY WIDENING THE PERMISSIBLE LIMITS OF EXCHANGE RATE VARIATION

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to a speech on the Treasury's gold policy made by Leland Howard, Director of the Treasury's Office of Domestic Gold and Silver Operations. Mr. Howard's statement explores some of the suggestions that have been made for changing the present gold policy and explains why these policies are impracticable and undesirable. I find myself in general agreement with Mr. Howard's line of reasoning. I think that his speech is a useful and comprehensive statement of the current Treasury position. However, I believe that Mr. Howard's discussion is gravely defective with respect to its handling of the proposal for broadening the range of exchange rate variations which the Joint Economic Committee and its Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments have strongly urged the administration to consider.

Whether by design or by inadvertence, Mr. Howard has grouped this proposal with the proposal for freely fluctuating exchange rates. His discussion leaves the impression that larger limits for exchange rate variations would have the same results as free exchange rates. Nothing could be more misleading.

If limited exchange rate variations were equivalent to free exchange rates, we would be on a free exchange rate system today. For contrary to Mr. Howard's statement, we have neither a rigid policy of buying and selling gold at $35 an ounce nor a system of completely fixed exchange rates.

The policy of the United States is to buy gold at $34.9125 per ounce and to sell it for $35.0875 per ounce; the Treasury applies a charge of 0.25 percent in its gold transactions with foreign monetary authorities. To criticize Mr. Howard for having said that we have a "rigid policy of buying and selling gold at $35 an ounce," when in fact we maintain a spread of 0.5 percent between our gold buying and selling price may seem to be stressing a trivial difference, making a mountain out of a molehill. But the traditional difference between our gold buying and selling price highlights a basic and important fact about the international monetary system; the present system rests on fixed exchange parities, but it does not rest on fixed exchange rates. Under the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund all member countries have established par values for their currencies. These par values are expressed in terms of gold or in terms of the U.S. dollar of the weight and fineness in effect on July 1, 1955.

The articles of agreement also provide for changes in par values in cases of fundamental balance-of-payments disequilibrium. Among the major countries, however, changes in par values have been infrequent.

Actual rates of exchange among the currencies differ from par values. The actual rates are influenced by free market forces and are stabilized by the monetary authorities of the governments concerned through purchases or sales of their own currencies in the foreign exchanges markets. The articles of agreement of the fund require member countries to limit the variations in their exchange rates to plus or minus 1 percent of par values.

The reason I emphasize these technical details is to bring home the point that, while we live in a world of fixed exchange rate parities, we live at the same time in a world where actual exchange rates fluctuate within specified limits. This is not new. The fixity of exchange parities and limited freedom for exchange rate variations were basic features of the 19th century gold standard just as they are basic features of the system we have today.

The members of the Joint Economic Committee see in this limited exchange rate flexibility a positive tool for increasing the stability of the international monetary system and for facilitating the process of adjustment to international imbalances. We have urged the administration to give serious consideration to expanding the permissible limits of exchange rate variations, while at the same time maintaining the present system of fixed exchange rate parities. We reasoned that the advantages of the present system with its 1 percent flexibility on either side of parity values might be expanded if the flexibility were increased to, say, 2 or 3 percent on either side of parity values.

These were the advantages that we thought could follow from such an expansion in the limits of permissible exchange rate variations:

First. It would permit the monetary authorities greater freedom to pursue independent monetary policies without providing incentives for short-term capital movements; the authorities would have greater scope for short-term intervention in the forward exchange market to offset interest rate differentials.

Second. It would permit exchange rate variations to play a somewhat larger role in the adjustment process than is now possible.

Third. It would discourage speculation by increasing the risk of losses in relation to the possibilities for profit.

The Joint Economic Committee's interest in such an expansion of permissible exchange rate variations has been stated in numerous of its reports. First, in its 1964 Report on the U.S. Balance of Payments. Again, in its 1965 Joint Economic Committee Report. And most recently, last August, in the report of the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments entitled "Guidelines for Improving the International Monetary System." In addition, the Banking and Currency Committee of the House in its April 1965 report on increasing the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States also recommended that the administration consider this proposal. I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record at this point the relevant passage from the report of the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments. I call special attention to that part of the subcommittee report which states that:

> We do not insist that broader limits for exchange rate variation be adopted, for we have not fully explored their implications nor weighed any possible disadvantages against the benefits we recognize. But we do insist that the expertise of the administration be brought to bear on the idea and that it receive the serious consideration which it merits.

To equate the proposal for broader limits for exchange variations with freely fluctuating exchange rates, as Mr. Howard does in his speech, is to treat rather cavalierly the Joint Economic Committee's recommendation. Clearly, a modest and evolutionary enlargement of today's limits on exchange rate variations in no way amounts to abolishing all limits for exchange rate variations, which is the implication of the proposal for freely fluctuating exchange rates.

Under unanimous permission I include the full text of Mr. Howard's remarks in the Record at this point:

TREASURY'S GOLD POLICY

(By Leland Howard, Director, Office of Domestic Gold and Silver Operations, at the 1965 Mining Convention of the American Mining Congress, Las Vegas, Nev., Oct. 14, 1965)

I welcome this opportunity to meet with this distinguished gathering of representatives of one of our Nation's most essential industries and to have the opportunity to restate the Treasury's position on gold.

At the very outset and before I proceed further, I believe it would help in explaining Treasury's position if I pointed out the difference between thinking of gold as a commodity and as a monetary metal. You as producers are interested in bringing out of the ground a ton of material for which you can obtain a price, on the basis of the metal or metals therein, that will offset your cost of mining the ton of material. As the cost of mining increases you feel that the price of gold should increasase. The fact that the metal content of an ore body is not inexhaustible, is even forgotten sometimes. As a monetary metal, however, the price of gold must by the nature of its use remain stable. We in the Treasury think of gold as a monetary metal—not as a commodity. The gold dollar is the standard of unit and is defined as $15\frac{5}{21}$ grains of gold nine-tenths fine. This amounts to one thirty-fifth of an ounce of gold and therefore makes the official price of gold $35 per fine ounce. Also, we must keep in mind that the dollar not only is involved in our domestic economy, but also is used as a reserve currency by others as a supplement to the world's gold supply.

Our Government's policy on gold, therefore, is essentially the same today as it was in 1934, when Congress enacted the Gold Reserve Act. Our basic policy has been—and remains—one of centralizing the gold stock of the country in the hands of the Government under the jurisdiction of the Treasury and maintaining a fixed price of $35 an ounce for gold.

Prior to World War II the dollar evolved as a key currency of the world and since World War II the world has accepted the dollar in increasing amounts as a supplement to the gold supply in furnishing liquidity to the trade between the countries of the world. A great many countries made a decision that the dollar best met their needs as a reserve asset and because of its general acceptability and other factors the use of the dollar in private trading transactions became worldwide. To reach this position required confidence in the dollar. This has been possible for a number of reasons, but a fundamental aspect has been our policy of buying and selling gold at a fixed price to foreign governments, central banks and under certain conditions to international institutions, for the settlement of international balances and for other legitimate monetary purposes. Our pledge to maintain that price has been and still is the foundation upon which the stability of the gold exchange standard is based.

The dollar is the only currency that maintains this link between money and gold, and the monetary system of the entire free world is hinged to this interconvertibility which we maintain between gold and dollars. Because of the importance of this link, successive Presidents of both political parties have given assurance that the $35 price would be defended with all the resources of the country. Doubt as to our intention of continuing this pledge could cause a severe drain on our gold supplies and could disrupt not only our economy but also the economies of the countries of the free world.

We do not, I might note here, sell gold to foreign individuals. However, we sell gold for legitimate industrial, professional, and artistic use in the United States.

Inasmuch as the dollar claims held by others, which we stand ready to convert into gold, were accumulated through our balance-of-payments transactions, I think it would be appropriate to trace briefly the history of the U.S. payments picture during the period since World War II. This will give us a picture of where we stand today.

Our payments balance was in surplus during the period 1946 through 1949 and totaled about $7 billion. During this period our gold stock rose by $4.5 billion and amounted to $24.6 billion at the end of 1949.

In 1950 our balance-of-payments picture changed from surplus to deficit and during the 7-year period through 1956 we had a total deficit of $10.7 billion. During this period our gold stock declined only $2.5 billion. At the end of 1956 our gold stock amounted to $22.1 billion.

In 1957, due to the Suez crisis, we again showed a surplus in our balance of payments which amounted to $500 million; however, our gold stock increased $800 million. Our gold stock at the end of 1957 amounted to $22.9 billion which was nearly $3 billion more than we had at the close of World War II and only $1.7 billion less than we had at the end of 1949.

In 1958 we started a period of very large and persistent balance-of-payments deficits which have been with us every year since. During the period 1958 through 1964 our deficits amounted to $24.3 billion and our gold losses were $7.4 billion.

On the basis of figures for the first half of this year we are running a deficit of about $1.3 billion on an annual basis. Our gold losses, however, have been large and we lost $1.2 billion during the first half of this year, not including $258.8 million paid into the International Monetary Fund on June 30. Our gold stock after this payment stood at $14 billion.

The picture today with respect to foreign exchange holdings shows that foreign monetary authorities hold about $14 billion in their reserves. Private holdings amount to about $11 billion. Nonmonetary international institutions also hold about $1.5 billion.

The U.S. balance-of-payments deficits which provided the vehicle for the accumulations of dollar balances by others, plus our loss of gold, have provided in many quarters the opportunity to come forth with a variety of solutions to our problem, some of which relate to gold. Let's take a look at some of these proposals.

It has been said that a subsidy to gold producers in the United States would bring forth enough gold within a few years to offset our decrease in gold stocks. This decrease has amounted to $8.8 billion in the past 7½ years—the period when our gold losses were greatest.

Is it conceivable, therefore, that subsidization could reverse the trend and cause such an increase in production that our gold stocks would reach the 1950 or 1958 level? What does experience tell us? In 1934, when the price of gold was increased 69 percent—when labor and supplies were cheap, so that it was feasible to rework old ore dumps and tailing piles and to dredge the gold-bearing streams in the West—our gold production slightly more than doubled. Consider the different economic conditions prevailing today—the present cost of labor and machinery—and speculate as to the kind of subsidy that would be required to insure the large-scale production necessary to restore the lost gold. The Department of the Interior a few years ago, in commenting on one of the proposed subsidy bills, indicated that a 100 percent subsidy would about double today's production.

At that rate, it would take the increase due to the subsidy about 170 years to replace the gold losses of the last 7½ years.

In this connection, let's take a look at recent gold production figures here in the United States and in the free world.

In the U.S. production reached its peak in 1940, when it amounted to $170 million. In 1964, U.S. production amounted to only $51.4 million. Free world production, on the other hand, has increased from $738 million after World War II to $1.4 billion in 1964. Estimates are that for at least the next few years free world production will continue to increase. As it now stands, based on 1964 figures, U.S. production is only 3.7 percent of free world production.

A subsidy, in short, cannot solve the problem. And it would present a very real danger to our dollar.

We cannot afford to run the risk of having a second price for gold in the United States alongside the official price. Our creditors—those that hold dollar balances—would interpret any price other than the official price to mean that we had made a judgment that the official price was too low; that in some way, directly or indirectly, we were on the way to changing our official price. This could lead to speculation against our currency.

We often hear it said that subsidies are paid by other countries, therefore, why not by the United States.

The answer is that the monetary units of other countries do not have the status of the dollar, and other countries do not have the responsibility for maintaining a fixed relationship between their currencies and gold. Gold in the United States is a monetary metal and cannot be treated as a commodity, as are products of other industries, or as gold is treated in some countries. The usual reasons, therefore, for urging gold subsidies in other countries or for urging subsidies to other industries in this country are not applicable to gold in the United States.

Another suggested solution to our balance-of-payments problem is to return to a gold standard system. Some may have other motives but many advocates of this solution believe that the international monetary system at the present time is experiencing a surplus of liquidity mainly because of too many dollars. They believe the automatic adjustment which they attribute to the gold standard would correct the situation and bring about a balance.

A return to the gold standard and its so-called automatic adjustment implies a sharp curtailment of world reserves and world liquidity. Inherent in this solution is the threat of worldwide deflation. Some who suggest the return to the gold standard recognize the threat of dangerous deflationary pressures and, therefore, recommend that there be a general increase in the price of gold so as to offset this deflationary pressure.

Such suggestions are thoroughly unacceptable to the United States. They combine the proposal that the world once again accept automatic regulation of its money supply according to the vagaries of world gold production with the proposal that the implied and stated commitments of the gold exchange standard be repudiated to the advantage of a few and the disadvantage of many. It is easy to see how it might be appealing to the major gold-producing countries, including the Union of South Africa and the U.S.S.R., and even perhaps to a few countries holding a high proportion of their reserves in gold. It would, of course, be discriminatory against countries which have kept a substantial fraction of their reserves in the form of reserve currencies. We believe our commitment to maintain the fixed parity of $35 an ounce between gold and dollars is basic to the stability of the world monetary system.

It has also been proposed that we abandon our rigid policy of buying and selling gold at $35 per ounce, thus letting the exchange rate for the dollar fluctuate or float. Some advocates would limit the amount of fluctuation, whereas others would let the dollar float freely. This school holds that fixed exchange rates create the need for large reserves.

They feel that fixed exchange rates tend to restrain individual countries from following indicated and desirable domestic policies. They contend that if exchange rates were free to move up and down in the market, a balance-of-payments deficit would be reflected in a cheapening of the country's currency which would bring about desired adjustments in the trade pattern; that is, lower imports and higher exports.

During the postwar period we have striven through the International Monetary Fund and through international monetary cooperation to develop a payments system based on stable exchange rates firmly linked to gold. Free exchange rates would introduce uncertainties and disruptions in exchange transactions and would not be conducive to trade between countries, which has grown so greatly since World War II under a system of basically fixed exchange rates among the major industrial countries. It should be noted, for example, that world trade virtually doubled in the last decade alone, while domestic economies were moving briskly forward.

The theoretical arguments for floating exchange rates can be presented with great effectiveness and appeal but we believe that such a system, in practice, could prove extremely disruptive to world trade and financial transactions.

There is another school that would have the United States continue its fixed selling price of gold at $35 but they would have us suspend purchases or make purchases on a limited scale. This plan contemplates a lower price for gold by removing the United States from the buying side at the fixed $35 price. The advocates of this plan contend that the guaranteed price for gold is conducive to speculation, especially by individuals, and, therefore, if the guaranteed price is removed, private speculation in gold would at least be less attractive. It is further contended that the desire of some countries to hold a large proportion of their reserves in gold would be dampened.

This plan would be in serious conflict with the various obligations of IMF members, who have agreed to maintain a parity within a margin of 1 percent on either side of the declared par value. This proposal itself, of course, is based on the assumption that the United States' offer to buy gold is the controlling factor in the gold market. But certainly this assumption can be challenged. And, in any event, the risks inherent in a move that could trigger generalized uncertainty and doubt far outweigh whatever dubious advantages such a move might offer.

At this point I wish to repeat what I said before; namely, the role of the dollar internationally has been possible for a number of reasons but the overriding one is the knowledge that dollars are freely convertible into gold at the fixed price of $35 per ounce. At the same time we have offered to buy gold freely, thus making it a two-way street. The fact that we have not varied from this policy and this fixed price for over 30 years, plus the fact that we are the only country which stands ready to exchange gold for its currency internationally, has made the dollar—along with gold—the basic international reserve assets. We cannot afford to take side excursions from our present policy which could cause a loss of confidence in us and in turn the dollar.

In summary, I point out that the root cause of our monetary problem is our balance-of-payments deficit and this is the problem to which we must direct our attention and which we must solve. This is the course of action which we are following and must follow, for we cannot continue to sustain deficits of the magnitude of recent years. Consequently, it is essential that we continue to pursue vigorously the measures outlined by the President to stem the outflow of dollars abroad and thus reduce substantially, if not completely eliminate, the deficits which have led to our gold losses in the last few years. Our effort in this direction, by the very nature of the problem, must be broad. Not only does it involve many interrelated programs which require support and participation by many departments and agencies of the Government but it also requires the understanding and cooperation of business, labor, and finance.

AN OMBUDSMAN TO HANDLE CITIZENS' COMPLAINTS

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on October 12, the British Government issued a white paper announcing its intention to establish a Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration or British Ombudsman.

Thus Britain will become the fifth country—after Finland, Denmark, Norway, and New Zealand—to adapt and adopt an institution which originated in Sweden and has won worldwide interest as a means of protecting citizens against administrative error and abuses.

In Scandinavia and New Zealand, the ombudsman—the word means representative or agent—receives complaints from the people about their grievances with the bureaucracy. He can look into the complaints, make recommendations for remedies if he finds fault with the bureaucracy, and can publicize his recommendations if this will help to bring about justice for aggrieved individuals. He is an agent of parliament.

I hope the United States will soon adopt an ombudsman in a form suited to our needs, traditions, and governmental system. I have proposed an American Ombudsman whom I call, more pronounceably, an Administrative Counsel of the Congress.

H.R. 4273 to provide an Administrative Counsel is pending before the Committee on House Administration. The proposal is also being considered by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. I have described the proposal in detail in the RECORD of February 3, 1965, on pages 1880–1881.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A BRITISH OMBUDSMAN IS MEANINGFUL FOR THE UNITED STATES

The adoption of an official modeled after the ombudsman by Britain is particularly meaningful for the United States for two major reasons:

First. Britain will be the first large country to adopt the ombudsman idea.

Second. Like U.S. Congressmen, members of the British House of Commons have a traditional role of helping their constituents in the constituents' problems and grievances with the administration. Although this role is not as highly developed in Britain as in the United States, it is an important part of the British political system, known as "constituency surgery." British Government white paper points out that the establishment of the ombudsman or Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration is not intended to "erode" this role of Parliament and its members but to help them to do the job better.

> In Britain, Parliament is the place for ventilating the grievances of the citizen—by history, tradition and past and present practice. It is one of the functions of the elected Member of Parliament to try to secure that his constituents do not suffer injustice at the hand of the Government. The procedures of parliamentary questions, adjournment debates and debates on supply have developed for this purpose under the British pattern of parliamentary government; and members are continually taking up constituents' complaints in correspondence with ministers, and bring citizens' grievances, great or small, to Parliament, where ministers individually and Her Majesty's Government collectively are accountable. We do not want to create any new institution which would erode the functions of members of Parliament in this respect, nor to replace the remedies which the British Constitution already provides. Our proposal is to develop those remedies still further. We shall give Members of Parliament a better instrument which they can use to protect the citizen, namely, the services of a Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration.

THERE ARE MANY SIMILARITIES BETWEEN THE BRITISH AND AMERICAN PROPOSALS

The Administrative Counsel of the Congress, as proposed in H.R. 4273, is likewise intended to help Congressmen help their constituents and not to supplant them in this role.

Both the American and British ombudsman would be adapted to the existing role of American and British legislators as advocates for citizens in their troubles with the bureaucracy and to the larger size of their countries by the same device: funneling citizens' complaints through Members of Congress or the House of Commons.

When the Administrative Counsel in the United States or the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration in Britain had finished investigating the case, he would report back to the Member of Congress or Commons who had referred the case to him. Under both proposals, the ombudsman could make special reports to the legislature and would make yearly reports. The action to be taken when an administrative error is not corrected as a result of the ombudsman's recommendations would be left to Congress and Parliament.

The funneling of complaints through Members of Congress and Commons will allow a screening out of complaints which do not belong in the ombudsman's hands. It will retain unimpaired the important relationship between constituents and Members of Congress and Commons.

I am pleased that many of the aspects of the British Government's proposal are the same or similar to views I have stated independently on the nature and purposes of the ombudsman in the United States.

MOST COMMENTARY FAVORS THE OMBUDSMAN PROPOSAL

The publication of the white paper on the ombudsman has inspired much commentary on that proposal and on the need for an ombudsman in the United States.

I include hereafter the full text of the British Government white paper and a number of articles and editorials which I believe will be of value to Members interested in considering the adoption of an Administrative Counsel of the Congress.

Among the following articles is an editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of October 17 endorsing the proposal for an Administrative Counsel. In addition, the New York Times, the New York Daily News, and the Christian Science Monitor have recently commented favorably on the ombudsman:

The Parliamentary Commission for Administration

1. The Government has decided to introduce legislation for the appointment of a Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration. This white paper explains the reasons for this decision and the role which they envisage for the Commissioner.

2. The interests of the citizens who is affected by a decision of Central Government are already safeguarded in a number of ways. He may have an opportunity of putting his case at an inquiry held before administrative action is taken. He may have a right of appeal to a tribunal against a decision. He may have a remedy before the courts.

3. But these arrangements cannot cover every instance where a private person feels that he is suffering injustice as a result of faulty administration on the part of a Government department.

THE CITIZEN AND PARLIAMENT

4. We have examined the arrangements made for the scrutiny of such individual grievances in Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Norway, and New Zealand. The broad objective in each country has been the same, but in each case the detailed arrangements have been made to suit the particular circumstances of the particular country. In Britain, Parliament is the place for ventilating the grievances of the citizen—by history, tradition and past and present practice. It is one of the functions of the elected member of Parliament to try to secure that his constituents do not suffer injustice at the hand of the Government. The procedures of parliamentary questions, adjournment debates and debates on supply have developed for this purpose under the British pattern of parliamentary government; and members are continually taking up constituents' compliants in correspondence with ministers, and bringing citizens' grievances, great or small, to Parliament, where ministers individually and Her Majesty's government collectively are accountable. We do not want to create any new institution which would erode the functions of members of Parliament in this respect, nor to replace remedies which the British Constitution already provides. Our proposal is to develop those remedies still further. We shall give members of Parliament a better instrument which they can use to protect the citizen, namely, the services of a Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration.

5. Under our proposals, the Parliamentary Commissioner will be an independent officer, whose status and powers will be conferred by statute. He will be appointed by the Crown; his salary and pension will be a charge on the consolidated fund; and he will be secure from dismissal, except by parliamentary motions. He will report to Parliament each year, and otherwise as occasion requires.

FUNCTIONS OF THE PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER

6. The Commissioner will act only at the instance of a Member of the House of Commons, as the elected representative body in Parliament, and on a complaint of personal injustice suffered by the complainant. It will be for the Member to decide whether the complaint appears to be one appropriate for reference to the Commission. A complainant will not be restricted to approaching the Member for his own constituency; Members will doubtless establish their own conventions for insuring that the constituency Member is kept in touch when another Member takes up a case. Most complaints will come from private individuals, but companies or other corporate bodies—other than those under publicly elected or appointed authority—will not be excluded. The Commissioner will be authorized to consider any complaint sent to him by a Member of Parliament from anyone lawfully resident in Great Britain or, so far as matters controlled by the Government in Westminster are concerned, in northern Ireland. Visitors from abroad will be included if the complaint relates to something which happened while they were lawfully present here. So will persons living abroad if their complaint is about the administration of individuals' rights or obligations arising here. But we do not intend that the Commissioner should cover complaints about our high commissions, embassies, consular offices or other posts of Her Majesty's government abroad.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION TO BE COVERED

7. Except for some exclusions which are explained later in this paper, the field for the Commissioner will be the whole range of relationships between the private person and the central government. We propose to list in the statute the bodies to be subject to investigation by the Commissioner in matters within his scope. The proposed list is as follows:

Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Food.

Ministry of Aviation.

Office of the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.

Civil Service Commission.

Colonial Office.
Commonwealth Relations Office.
Customs and Excise.
Ministry of Defense.
Department of Economic Affairs.
Department of Education and Science.
Export Credits Guarantee Department.
Foreign Office.
General Register Office.
General Registry Office, Scotland.
Ministry of Health.
Home Office.
Ministry of Housing and Local Government.
Central Office of Information.
Inland Revenue.
Ministry of Labor.
Ministry of Land and Natural Resources.
Land Registry.
Lord Chancellor's Department.
Office of the Lord Privy Seal.
National Assistance Board.
National Debt Office.
Ordnance Survey.
Ministry of Overseas Development.
Paymaster General's Office.
Ministry of Pensions and National Insurance.
Ministry of Power.
Ministry of Public Building and Works.
Public Record Office.
Public Trustee.
Department of Registers of Scotland.
Registry of Friendly Societies.
Royal Mint.
Scottish Office:
Department of Agriculture and Fisheries for Scotland.
Scottish Development Department.
Scottish Education Department.
Scottish Home and Health Department.
Scottish Record Office.
H.M. Stationery Office.
Ministry of Technology.
Board of Trade.
Ministry of Transport.
Treasury.
Treasury Solicitor's Department.
Office of the Minister Without Portfolio.
Welsh Office.

It has been agreed that the Crown estate office shall be included too. So also will the post office as regards its functions relating to national savings and to the control of broadcasting and wireless telegraphy or as the agent of any body which is itself subject to the Commissioner. The list will need to be amended from time to time as the structure of the Government machinery itself is changed, and we shall seek power to do this by subordinate instrument.

EXCLUSIONS

8. The exclusions which we propose to make from the Commissioner's field of investigation are those where there are dominant considerations of national or public interest—namely, the exercise of powers to preserve the safety of the state; matters which Ministers certify as affecting relations with other countries; matters relating to the administration of colonial territories; and the exercise of powers in relation to investigating crime or determining whether a matter shall go to the courts. The Commissioner will not normally pursue matters which are within the competence of the courts; he will have discretion to act if he thinks that the remedy open in the courts is not one which the complainant could reasonably be expected to use, but this will not affect anyone's right of access to the courts. He will not pursue issues already covered by tribunals or other quasijudicial bodies, or by the Council on Tribunals and its Scottish Committee—of both of which he himself will be an ex officio member. Nor will he look into the exercise of the Prerogative of Mercy or into the exercise of the personal authority of the sovereign in conferring honors and privileges, or into appointments by the Crown or by Ministers. He will be excluded from investigating actions of departments in personnel matters, including orders and discipline in the Armed Forces. Finally, purely commercial relationships, of departments with customers or suppliers will not come within his purview.

PROCEDURE

9. We intend the Commissioner's procedure to be as informal as possible, subject to the requirement that if he takes up a case he must give to the person against whom the complaint lies the opportunity to comment on it. He will be empowered to decide whether the parties can be legally represented, but legal representation will be the exception, not the rule. Legal aid will not be available. The Commissioner will be able to call for oral or written evidence; and he will have power to compel production of documents, including departments' minutes, but excluding Cabinet or Cabinet Committee documents. He will have power to take evidence on oath, although we would expect this power to be used infrequently. In this connection the sanction to be invoked in the event of defiance of the Commissioner will be to refer the matter to the High Court, or in Scotland to the Court of Session, or in Northern Ireland to the Supreme Court of Justice, for consideration as if it were contempt of that Court.

10. The Commissioner will have discretion to refuse to pursue a case where he thinks there are insufficient grounds for the complaint or where he does not regard it as within his scope. He will not normally pursue a case where the matter complained of had been known to the complainant more than 12 months previously but he will have discretion to do so.

11. The Commissioner will be concerned with faults in administration. It will not be for him to criticize policy, or to examine a decision on the exercise of discretionary powers, unless it appears to him that the decision has been affected by a fault in administration. If he finds nothing wrong, he will inform the Member of Parliament who has approached him. If he finds that there is justifiable cause for complaint and the Department responds to his invitation to put it right, he will inform the Member. So far as the Commissioner is concerned, this will be the end of the matter, save for a possible reference to the case in his annual report to Parliament. If the Department does not act to the Commissioner's satisfaction, it will be open to him to report his conclusion to Parliament ad hoc.

12. It will be for Parliament to decide what arrangements to make to receive and act upon reports from the Commissioner. This will not be a matter for legislation. It may well be found convenient to establish a Select Committee to take these reports in the first instance. This committee would have the usual powers of a select committee to summon witnesses (including Ministers) and to take evidence and report to Parliament.

13. It will be for Parliament, with the help of this committee (if one is appointed), to consider what action should be taken on the reports of the Commissioner—whether the annual report, or reports ad hoc. The Commissioner in his annual report may comment on defects in the system which have come to his notice as a result of investigating individual complaints.

14. We do not intend that a reference to the Commissioner should automatically hold up action on the case by the Government; sometimes this might be contrary to the public interest. Ministers will have discretion to proceed with a case even where it is being examined by the Commissioner. They will also have discretion to prevent disclosure of information by the Commissioner where the safety of the State or the public interest makes it necessary to do so.

15. The fact that we are proposing this scheme does not mean that we think that the administration of Government departments is open to serious criticism or that injustices are frequently suffered by individual citizens. Far from it. We are in no doubt that the tradition of integrity and impartiality in our public administration is being fully maintained. But our proposal should increase confidence in that administration—by enabling complaints about administrative action to be fully and impartially investigated, so that, if a grievance is justified, it may be remedied, or, if it is unjustified, this may be demonstrated. It should also result, as has proved to be the case in other countries, in the further improvement of administrative standards and efficiency.

CONCLUSION. TWO PRINCIPLES

16. In formulating our proposals we have paid regard to two important principles. First, that this new institution should serve to develop and reinforce our existing constitutional arrangements for the protection of the individual. Secondly, that the scope of the scheme must be made as clear as possible, so that everybody may know as plainly as may be what cases the Commissioner will be able to take up and what their rights and obligations will be in relation to his inquiries.

17. In due course, it may be desirable to consider extending the powers of the Commissioner to deal with complaints of the private citizen against the administrative actions of other public authorities. But, first, we intend to seek experience of the Commissioner in the field of relationships between the citizen and central government.

[From the Times of London, Oct. 13, 1965]

MOVE TO PRESERVE RIGHTS OF COMMON—OMBUDSMAN WILL ACT AT M.P.S' REQUEST

In an attempt to preserve the traditional rights of Members of Parliament to raise the grievances of their constituents in the Commons the Government proposes that the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration whom they will appoint to rectify injustices caused by maladministration "will act only at the instance of a Member of the House of Commons, as the elected representative body in Parliament."

In this way, the Member of Parliament will preserve his freedom to take up a grievance in the House if he so chooses, though the Government expects that most cases will be referred to the commissioner who will have the right "to compel production of documents, including departments' minutes, but excluding Cabinet or Cabinet committee documents."

The commissioner, according to the white paper published yesterday explaining the basis on which the Government will proceed to legislate in the next session of Parliament, "will not normally pursue matters which are within the competence of the courts" or issues already covered by tribunals and other quasi-judicial bodies, nor will he investigate complaints where the purely commercial relationships of departments (such as the Post Office) with customers or suppliers are involved. He will not investigate actions of departments in personnel matters, or orders and discipline in the Armed Forces or the police.

But it is clear that the commissioner will be authorized to examine documents which in the past have been kept from the courts on the plea of Crown privilege. Senior Ministers said yesterday this would be allowed so long as there was no breach of secrecy and where the commissioner thought it necessary to help him in his task.

NO POLICY DECISIONS

The commissioner will be able to recommend the payment of lump sums to compensate people who have suffered injustice or damage as the result of faulty administration.

For the first few years, the commissioner's range of inquiry will be limited to the administrative acts of central Government departments (including the Scottish office and the Welsh office); later the activities of public authorities and local government may be brought into the scheme. Indeed, there is talk in Government quarters of encouraging big local authorities to proceed independently to set up their own "Ombudsmen."

It is expected that his salary will be over £8,000 a year. He will have deputies authorized to carry out inquiries in Scotland, Wales, and other parts of Britain.

Ministers are emphasizing that the commissioner will be limited to detecting faults in the administration; he will not be allowed to stray into the realm of policy decisions.

The commissioner's procedure is to be as informal as possible. "Legal representation will be the exception, not the rule," says the white paper.

NORTHERN IRELAND CALLS FOR DEFENDER

Mr. James O'Reilly, Nationalist member for Mourne, has tabled a bill in the Northern Ireland House of Commons demanding the appointment of an Ombudsman. He says the bill aims to meet a widespread need for providing protection for the ordinary citizen. The bill is entitled "The Public Defender" (Protection of the Citizen) bill (Northern Ireland).

Mr. Brian McConnell, Minister of Home Affairs, said there was little change in the Government's attitude to the appointment of an Ombudsman in Northern Ireland. "Ours is a smaller area and for this reason there is closer contact between the administration and the citizen than there is in Britain."

[From the Times of London, Oct. 13, 1965]

THE WATCHMAN

The case for a naturalized ombudsman in Britain is not that the citizenry is groaning under the weight of a corrupt or capricious bureaucracy. It is that when grievances alleging maladministration do occur (as they are bound to from time to time in so vast a field) the means of pursuing them are limited, uncertain, and difficult.

Since the nation lacks any developed system of administrative law such as the French possess, redress through the courts is impeded by technical and procedural snags, by the settled reluctance of the judiciary to be drawn into pronouncing on the merits of administrative disputes, and by the sheer expense of the process. The area covered by tribunals and statutory inquiries, now under the supervision of the Council on Tribunals, has been cleaned up well since the publication of the Franks report in 1957, but the area is restricted and excludes many of the most frequent causes of friction. The time-honored methods of ventilation in the press and of representation to a Member of Parliament are chancy. In Parliament the approaches open to Members of Parliament—correspondence with a Minister, parliamentary questions and adjournment debates—may or may not elicit the full facts. If they do not, either there is no satisfaction or, in rare cases, recourse is had to a judicial tribunal, a sledgehammer, not uncommonly, to crack a nut.

The Government's proposal is to strengthen the parliamentary means of investigation and redress by the appointment of a Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration of similar status and with similar powers of those of the Comptroller and Auditor General. In that they are closely following the example of New Zealand, which has helped to dispel doubts about the possibility of grafting a Scandinavian scion on to Westminster political stock. The main difference is that whereas Sir Guy Powles in New Zealand can act on complaints from the public or on his own motion, the officer proposed by the Government would be able to act only on the instance of a Member of Parliament. The condition may have been necessary in order to overcome the suspicion of Members of Parliament lest they should be left out of the act; and, provided they do not establish a restrictive convention that a Member of Parliament does not handle the complaint of another's constituent, the condition is acceptable at any rate at first.

The commissioner's scope is circumscribed in other ways. He would be concerned only with complaints arising out of a person's dealings with the organs of central government. Police, public corporations, local government, to name three fertile sources of grievance, would be outside his province. He would have access departmental files, which is an important and necessary concession, and could summon witnesses; and a Minister's power to block his investigation "in the public interest" is tightly restricted to considerations of security, relations with other States or colonies, crime detection and prosecuting functions. The white paper is not equally explicit about Ministers' discretion to prevent disclosure of information by the commissioner. It should be made clear that "public interest" in this case too is to be interpreted in the same restricted sense. Crown privilege must not be allowed to reenter by the back door. Publicity is of the essence. Another limitation of the proposed office is that the commissioner's function is purely recommendatory. If a department did not accept his recommendation it would be for Parliament, to which he would report, to decide what to do about it.

The Government have produced a minimal edition of the innovation. It is not necessarily the worse for that. The institution stands a better chance of becoming established if it does not rove too widely at first. Tall oaks from little acorns grow, and if this one is nurtured properly it may come in time to occupy an important place in the administrative arrangements of the country. The development of the French conseil d'état and of the Scandinavian Ombudsman shows that such institutions are capable of becoming not merely valuable means of redress but a positive influence making for competent and fair administration, an assistance not an impediment to officialdom.

For that to happen in Britain the mood of Parliament and of Ministers must be one of encouragement from the outset: agreement not to make false issue out of M.P.s' privileges or the doctrine of ministerial responsibility, and acknowledgment that the innovation contains the springs of growth into areas of public administration which it is precluded from entering at first. Its introduction ought, too, to be accompanied by an enlargement of the work of the Council on Tribunals. The commissioner would not be free to examine discretionary decisions unless they appeared to have been affected by a fault in administration. In other words, citizens would not be able to go to the commissioner simply in the hope of getting a more favourable decision in their case. Such decisions, when not matters of policy, are more appropriately reviewed by administrative tribunals. But there are still gaps in their coverage which could be made good by extending the range of matters under the notice of the Council on Tribunals.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Oct. 17, 1965]

THE CITIZEN'S "PROTECTOR"

In the Scandinavian countries, an "ombudsman" functions as the protector of individuals caught up in bureaucratic delay or outright abuse. Complaints ranging from delayed welfare payments to mistreatment at the hands of insolent officials are referred to him. If the complaint is legitimate, the ombudsman publicizes the abuse and recommends action to the national parliament. This power, naturally enough, keeps most administrators on their best behavior. It has worked so well, in fact, that Britain has decided to set up a similar office for processing grievances.

Congressman Reuss, of Wisconsin, is seeking an American variation on the ombudsman. His proposed bill would create an Administrative Counsel, who would be attached to the House and given a small staff of specialists in administration. Valid complaints, coming into congressional offices, would be sent to him for corrective action.

The idea has great merit. The processing of individual grievances cuts deeply into the primary role of Congressmen as legislators. There is less time to ponder, to study, to debate legislative issues. Indeed, Congressmen are caught in a frustrating bind. The same rapid expansion of Government services that makes it so difficult for them to keep abreast of legislation has also produced a greater spawning ground for hidden abuses and individual injustices. Some clear avenue of relief is needed. The ombudsman, geared to our Federal system and armed with sufficient authority to do the job, may be the answer.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 14, 1965]

PUBLIC PROTECTOR

Britons who think they are being pushed around by their Government will soon have a sort of supergrievance committeeman to protect them. The Labor government is planning to set up a parliamentary office to act on complaints from people who don't like the way they are being treated by officialdom. The model is the "ombudsman" system that already exists in Sweden, Finland, Norway, Denmark, and New Zealand.

The British decision is a reminder that Congress has been letting the dust accumulate on a similar proposal first put before it 2 years ago by Representative Henry S. Reuss, of Wisconsin. The proliferation of Government agencies in this country has been accompanied by a parallel rise in the frustrations of citizens trapped in the toils of bureaucracy. Ten million people now work for Federal, State, and local agencies; their number and the range of their activities keep growing. So does the flow of appeals for help sent to Congressman by distracted citizens.

An American ombudsman, operating with full independence from Congress, the White House or any political party, would provide a kind of citizen's review—or at least sounding—board. Congressmen would be relieved of the burdensome task of investigating the flood of complaints from their constituents. Civil servants would have some protection from politicians trying to make them look wrong when they had been right. And the citizen would feel just a bit less lonely in his jousts with the colossus that is his Government.

[From the New York Daily News, Oct. 14, 1965]

WANTED: OMBUDSMEN

"Ombudsman" is a Scandinavian word having a funny sound to non-Swedish, Norwegian, Finnish, or Danish ears.

But an ombudsman has duties that are anything but funny, and he is an extremely useful citizen in countries where he exists—so useful that the British Government intends to borrow the ombudsman idea from the Scandinavian nations in the near future, as New Zealand already has done.

An ombudsman's job is to collect citizens' grievances against government or governmental bureaucrats and fight for redress in all appropriate and effective ways.

In a country where government monkeys intimately with the private lives of the people, an ombudsman (the ancient Romans, we imagine, would have called him a Tribune of the People) is almost the indispensable man. He is long overdue in Britain.

Also, he is becoming due in the United States, as big daddy Government rapidly and relentlessly extends his overlordship of all our lives, our property, and our business. Let's get cracking on setting up as many ombudsmen as we need, at Federal, State, and local government levels.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 15, 1965]

OMBUDSMAN

Few things are as frustrating for the individual as finding himself seemingly helpless in the toils of bureaucracy. And few things are as unjust as a wrong verdict pronounced by a bureaucracy against an individual when the individual manifestly has right on his side. Few lands are as jealous of individual rights as the countries of Scandinavia. It is natural, therefore, that the Scandinavians should have invented the ombudsman—and all honor to them for having done so.

The ombudsman is a public official without political or departmental commitment whose only job is to investigate complaints of individual citizens when they believe they are the victims of the inefficiency, injustice, or corruption of officialdom.

New Zealand—that Scandinavia of the Antipodes—was first to follow the Scandinavian example by appointing an ombudsman. Now Britain is doing likewise. In Britain he will be called the "Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration." If we know our Britons, it will not be long before they come up with a shorter (and perhaps more colloquial) name for him.

There has been a lively correspondence in the Times about the proper title for the new official. Among the suggestions: National Referee, Sentinel, Lord Protector, Defensor, Umpire-General, and People's Counselor. Somewhere along the line, even the French "Conseil d'Etat" was brought into the argument.

It seems to us that even if it is a mouthful at first sight, "Ombudsman" is good enough. The most acceptable alternative would surely be some pithy word already existing in English that can precisely describe the office of ombudsman. With all respect for the good intentions of those who have decided that Britain needs an ombudsman, we think the title "Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration" somewhat pretentious.

We agree with the Oxford man who wrote to the Times: "If we establish such a post, let us give credit where it is due, and borrow this word from Scandinavia to describe the man who in those three countries, and in New Zealand, has proved such a useful defender of individual rights."

[From the New York Times, Oct. 13, 1965]

BRITAIN TO APPOINT AN OMBUDSMAN

(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON, October 12.—Nearly 400 years after Shakespeare wrote of "the insolence of office," Britons can shortly expect to have a public champion against official incompetence and corruption.

In a white paper today, the Government announced plans to set up a "Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration." He will be the local version of the ombudsman in Scandinavian countries, investigating citizens' complaints against officials.

A special British touch will require members of the public to make their complaints through Members of Parliament. The M.P.'s will decide, initially, whether a matter is worth referring to the ombudsman. "In Britain," the white paper explained, "Parliament is the place for ventilating the grievances of the citizen—by history, tradition, and past and present practice.

"It is one of the functions of the elected member to try to secure that his constituents do not suffer injustice at the hands of the Government."

Another, unstated reason for filtering complaints through M.P.'s is that handling such matters for constituents is good politics, here as in the United States.

Parliament, which has to approve legislation to create the ombudsman, might not be so keen about a plan taking away this political prerogative. As the draft stands, no serious objection is expected.

Sweden has had an ombudsman since 1809. More recently the idea has been adopted by Finland, Denmark, Norway, and New Zealand.

The Parliamentary Commissioner here, as in the other examples, will be entirely independent of the Government. He is expected to be paid about $28,000, a very high salary by British standards, and will be removable only by vote of Parliament.

His powers to investigate wrongdoing in Government departments will be broad. He will be able to compel oral or written testimony and to take evidence under oath. Failure to answer his demand for evidence will be treated as contempt of court.

The white paper makes the point that the commissioner will be concerned with "faults in administration," not policy. It will be up to him, at least initially, to draw the line between them.

COMMISSIONER'S NEXT STEP

If the commissioner finds something wrong, he will so report to the member of Parliament who referred the complaint to him. He may also mention the case in an annual report to Parliament. He will have no actual power to overrule officials, but they are expected to follow his recommendations in most cases.

Exclude from the commissioner's scope will be all judicial proceedings, such as criminal prosecutions, and military and foreign affairs matters. Nor will he handle complaints against nationalized industry or local government, the white paper said.

The biggest impulse for the creation of a British ombudsman came from what is known as the Crichel Down affair, which came to a climax in 1954.

That concerned some farmland on Crichel Down, in Dorset, which was taken by the Royal Air Force in World War II. When it was no longer militarily useful, it was turned over to the Ministry of Agriculture instead of being returned to the owners.

The original owners fought for years to get their farms back. Finally an official investigation found that bureaucratic evasion and deception had been operating. The Minister of Agriculture of the day, Sir Thomas Dugdale, dramatically resigned.

There was no way for the affected farmers to sue the Crown or the officials to test the issues in court. British law limits much more severely than American the right to sue against official action, so the only practical recourse has often been to make a public protest or request a member of Parliament to ask a question in the House of Commons.

If the new ombudsman plan had been operating, the former owners of the Crichel Down land could have taken their complaints to him.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Oct. 16, 1965]

U.S. "COMPLAINT OFFICE" SUGGESTED

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Representative HENRY S. REUSS is convinced that there's an ombudsman in America's future.

"Sooner or later it will have to come to this, and we would save a lot of taxpayers' money by having it sooner than later," the Wisconsin Democrat said Saturday.

Ombudsman means "representative" in Swedish. Actually, he is a sort of public grievance man who handles complaints of citizens against administrative lapses or abuses of the government.

Sweden introduced the ombudsman in 1809 and this public defender idea has since spread to almost a dozen countries, from Scandinavia to New Zealand.

REUSS believes the ombudsman idea would work here, and would save time, money and wear and tear on Congressmen.

WOULD AID CONGRESS

"A Congressman is an ombudsman in a way, and a good one," REUSS said. "But with this, he'd be able to do a better job of serving his constituents."

When a U.S. citizen has a question or complaint about some Government program, such as social security, veterans' benefits or the like, he usually writes a letter to his Congressman. If he's really steamed up, he'll write to both his Senators at the same time.

As the three elected representatives go to bat for the constituent, they don't know, usually, that they are all working on the same problem.

Beside the matter of duplication, their limited staffs do not include experts on all the spreading governmental programs that confront the citizen.

BILL INTRODUCED

With an ombudsman—and REUSS has introduced legislation to establish one—a centralized staff of 100 to start with would handle all such citizen complaints funneled to it by Congressmen. The staff would include specialists in all the fields where problems crop up.

His plan provides for no direct access to the ombudsman by citizens, as in the Scandinavian countries. All matters would have to come through the offices of Congressmen and Senators. The answers would go back to the inquiring citizens by the same route.

REUSS said his office spends about half its time serving these needs of constituents. An ombudsman, he argues, "would let the Congressman concentrate on central issues in domestic and foreign policy, and he could vote more wisely."

[From the Congressional Quarterly, Editorial Research Reports, Oct. 14, 1965]

AN AMERICAN OMBUDSMAN

(By Richard Spong)

An idea which has been kicking around the U.S. Congress without much attention for the past several years is certain to be given another and more studious look when Britain's Parliament approves legislation establishing the new office of Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration. This is the British version of the Scandinavian Ombudsman, who is charged with investigating and pressing citizens' complaints against the government and public officials.

Several measures to create an American Ombudsman have been introduced in recent sessions of Congress. Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat of Rhode Island and Representative HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat of Wisconsin are sponsors of measures (S. 984, H.R. 4273) pigeonholed in committees at present that would establish what they call an administrative counsel of the Congress.

This individual, in the language of Representative REUSS, "shall review the case of any person who alleges that he believes that he has been subjected to any improper penalty, or that he has been denied any right or benefit to which he is entitled under the laws * * * or that the determination or award of any such right or benefit has been * * * unreasonably delayed."

The Ombudsman has proved a successful device for democratic government in Sweden, where it was established in 1809. Since then it has spread to other countries, to Finland in 1919, Japan in 1948, Denmark in 1955, and Norway and New Zealand in 1962.

Now the British Labor Government, in a white paper of October 12, proposes the establishment of a Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration who would be an Ombudsman with a special British complexion. He would be entirely independent of the government, but—and the point is important—the public would make its complaints through Members of Parliament. "In Britain," the white paper explains, "Parliament is the place for ventilating the grievances of the citizen—by history, tradition, and past and present practice." It's also good politics for M.P.'s to handle the chores of their constituents.

Most British papers welcomed the Ombudsman proposal. The Times reasoned sedately: "The development of the French Conseil d'Etat and the Scandinavian Ombudsman shows that such institutions are capable of becoming not merely valuable means of redress but a positive influence, making for competent and fair administration—an assistance not an impediment to officialdom."

But the Daily Express sees the proposal as just another Labor gimmick, arguing: "Parliament, the press, and the judiciary are well able to look after the rightful interests of the public. If the Ombudsman emerged as a serious rival for the protection of the public interest there might be a danger that the traditional safeguards of the people would be undermined."

In a welfare state the British Ombudsman will have plenty of complaints, though nationalized industry is to be off limits for him—along with local government, judicial proceedings, and military and foreign affairs. A congressional Administrative Counsel would be equally busy.

An American Ombudsman would lighten the "casework" load of Senators and Representatives and still—by handling only complaints funneled through Capitol Hill—leave the flow of political power undisturbed. Representative REUSS, in testimony before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress some time ago (May 11, 1965) soberly observed: "I do not believe that Members of Congress, who want to be reelected, would consent to remove themselves entirely from dealing with constituents' problems."

In a radio broadcast on October 14, 1965, David Brinkley argued for an American ombudsman, albeit one whose role would be somewhat different from what I have envisioned. The script of his broadcast follows:

The British and four other countries have, or will have, somebody in the Government citizens can write to and get answers. We could use one here. Back in a moment.

Sweden has had for 150 years a public official called an ombudsman. His job is to accept complaints from the citizens about their dealings with the government, investigate, see if they have any substance, and if they do, take some action. Now the British are adopting the idea. Finland, Denmark, and New Zealand already have, and it is occasionally recommended that the United States try it. If we did, the results surely would be interesting, because it appears that you can scratch any American and find somebody with a complaint, a question, a suggestion, or a criticism he wants to take up with the Government. And if we were to have an ombudsman, all of these would immediately fall into his lap.

Where they fall now are in the White House mailroom and on the desks of Congressmen, Government officials, newspaper and broadcast reporters. Most of them are in two categories: Questions and complaints about social security payments, generally from those who think they ought to be getting more and questions and complaints about veterans' benefits, generally from those who think they ought to be getting more. Plus the other Government welfare programs where people think they have had a bad deal. And with all the new welfare plans now going into effect—medical care and the others—this kind of complaint is bound to increase. Complaints sent to the White House are routinely referred to the agencies involved: Social Security, Veterans' Administration, the Health and Welfare Department. And, eventually, they will answer. But the agency answering the complaint is the same agency being complained about, so it is unlikely the answer will say anything the writer has not already heard. Complaints to Congress get roughly the same treatment. All congressional offices are understaffed for this kind of thing. They have neither the people nor the time to make personal investigations of complaints about veterans and social security payments. So they ask the agencies involved for the answers, pass them along in their own replies, and that's about all they can do.

In addition, there are always those who want their poems printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or broadcast on the Voice of America, those with plans for saving the world, paying off the debt, and other good ideas that, regrettably, appear unworkable If there were a Federal Government ombudsman, a sort of national Mister Fixit, all this would go to him. He would have to have the power to force the right answers out of the bureaucrats, keep a tabulated record of the complaints so he could detect unusual centers of bungling and incompetence in the Federal Establishment and help repair them and so perform a service both to the public and to the Government. The bigger the Government gets, and it grows every day, the more complaints there will be and the less chance of getting adequate answers. So, sometime, we may come to it, somebody to write to in the Government who can and will do something. As for the poems and the plans for saving the world, he could just send them back with a polite note.

In addition, I include a very thoughtful review of a new book on the ombudsman edited by Prof. Donald C. Rowat of the University of Toronto and entitled, "The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender," University of Toronto, 1965. The reviewer Prof. Stanley V. Anderson of the University of California at Santa Barbara is one of the leading experts on the ombudsman. He is a professor of political science and a lawyer.

[From the New Republic, October 23, 1965]

COMPLAINT DEPARTMENT

(By Stanley V. Anderson)

The ombudsman is an independent commissioner appointed by the legislature to investigate citizens' complaints of bureaucratic abuse. He has the power to compel testimony, the duty to form an opinion, and the right to publish his views. He does not have power to change an administrative decision nor to punish civil servants other than by reprimand.

As a result of ombudsmanic inquiries, the administration may choose to alter a previous position or to subject an employee to disciplinary proceedings. The former is common, the latter rare. In either case, the authorities act because they are persuaded by the reasonableness of the ombudsman's views, and not because they are bound by his judgments. Equally important, an agency may revise a troublesome regulation or the legislature may amend an unworkable law, pursuant to the ombudsman's suggestion.

Sweden provided for a Justitieombudsman (JO)—literally, an "agent for justice"—in the constitution of 1809. Finland, for centuries a part of the Swedish kingdom, followed suit in 1919 after breaking ties with Russia. In the decade from 1952 to 1962, the institution was adopted in Denmark, Norway, New Zealand, and West Germany—in the last, for military affairs only. More recently, proposals have been put forward in Australia, Canada, England, Holland, and Ireland. This year, ombudsman bills were dropped in the legislative hoppers of California, Connecticut, Illinois, and New York. Another was introduced in the New York City Council. Gov. Edmund G. Brown accorded the California bill emergency status before it was defeated in the senate committee on government efficiency; the measure is under interim study awaiting reintroduction by by Assembly Speaker Jesse M. Unruh.

The literature on Ombudsmen is extensive, but scattered and repetitive. Professor Rowat, chairman of political science at Carleton University in Ottawa, has provided a benchmark by putting 28 articles between two covers. Nearly half of the text explicates existing Ombudsman systems. Next, a few related institutions are described, such as the Army Inspectorate-General and the erstwhile Philippine Presidential Complaints and Action Committee (PCAC). The demise of the latter suggests that the effectiveness of an Ombudsman is limited to marginal defects in administration, and "does not meet the [more basic] need for a rationalization of government power and structure." With a population three times that of Sweden, the PCAC received complaints at a rate of 30 to 1 over the Swedish total of about 2,000 a year.

In the third section of "The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender," the editor presents some current proposals. One of these is sponsored by Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, who urges the creation of an administrative counsel of the Congress to take some of the load of constituent complaints from Congressmen's shoulders, thereby permitting more time to be devoted to the consideration of legislation. The staff of an administrative counsel could develop an expertise which would enhance the efficiency and efficacy of representatives to the executive branch. Besides providing more boon and less doggle, the administrative counsel might be able to pinpoint troublespots whose manifestations today are diffused in the offices of 100 Senators and 435 Representatives.

Finally, Professor Rowat has collected 10 short essays in a concluding section designed to "present some of the arguments for and against transplanting the institution."

Ombudsman countries range in population from New Zealand's 2,500,000 inhabitants to Sweden's 7,500,000. Would the office be able to function if there were 18 million potential customers (Canada, California, or New York), or if there were 50 million (Great Britain), or 190 million (the United States)?

The New Zealand ombudsman has testified that with additional staff assistance he could handle four times his present workload, which is somewhat in excess of 1,000 complaints a year. In Sweden, the civil ombudsman, the deputy civil ombudsman, and the military ombudsman have recently combined forces to allow for more rational distribution of cases. Though not raised in the book under review, it might also be argued that there is a minimum size—perhaps under 500,000—below which a city or state has small need for an ombudsman, due to the accessibility of its political leaders.

Must the population in question be homogeneous, as are those in Scandinavia and

New Zealand? Would the implementation of an ombudsman office keep us from attacking more serious problems of public administration?

To resolve these doubts, "the best test is a practical trial, preferably as a limited and reversible experiment," according to Prof. Fritz Morstein Marx' essay. In this vein, but independently of the Rowat study, Prof. G. V. V. Nicholls has secured the cooperation of the government of Nova Scotia in permitting the law students at Dalhousie University to serve as unofficial ombudsmen—a form of legal aid in the administrative sphere.

Further scholarly research might also be useful. For example, legislators sometimes argue that they are already functioning as ombudsmen. Yet no systematic investigation has ever been made of complaint-handling procedures, or of the number and kind of grievances which enter an elected official's office, whether in the executive or legislative branch. A study in this domain is being carried out by the Institute of Governmental Studies on the Berkeley campus of the University of California. Such inquiry is valuable whether or not an ombudsman office is instituted, because it permits an appraisal of the adequacy of existing complaint machinery.

The trouble with the lawmaker-as-ombudsman approach is that some legislators are more able, more interested, and more influential than others. At the State level, many citizens are not aware of this avenue of complaint. In my opinion, the availability of elected officials as buffers between citizen and bureaucracy ought to be widely publicized, particularly if politicians insist upon a monopoly.

Throughout the Western World, legislatures have been declining in importance vis-a-vis the executive. The underlying reason may be found in the vast complexity of modern life, which provides the experts of the executive branch with an automatic fait accompli. Even as to grievances, lawmakers reply greatly on executive agencies for the evaluation of complaints which legislators receive. To restore the balance, legislatures need to create tightly knit highly qualified counterparts of administrative mammoths. Praiseworthy efforts in this direction may be seen in Congress Joint Economic Committee, in Federal and State comptrollers general, and more generally in the professionalization of staff assistance for Congressmen and State legislators, their committees and reference libraries. There has, however, been little professionalization of the complaint handling function.

The Rowat book, then, is timely and provocative. But if the ombudsman idea is going to be more than words, it will have to burst the confines of academic speculation and be tested in one or more of our 50 State "laboratories." Success in Scandinavia and New Zealand would seem to justify the experiment: the ombudsman has served as a homeopathic cure for some of the common ailments of bureaucracy—slowness, rudeness, obtuseness and error—and proved to be a prompt, inexpensive and flexible means of helping to keep administration prompt, inexpensive and flexible.

WHY THE COMMUNISTS KEEP FIGHTING

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last weekend we witnessed a shocking spectacle as the antidraft movement reached a new peak with demonstrations all over the country. These latest demonstrations are shocking not only because many of the demonstrators are violating a new Federal law by destroying their draft cards, but also because the demonstrators—supposedly well-informed, well-educated college students—are demonstrating incredible ignorance about the situation in Vietnam.

I want to make it clear that I firmly believe in the right of assembly. I believe in the right of free speech. I believe in the right of assembly. But I also believe in the law, and those who are breaking and perverting it by destroying draft cards and seeking to undermine the Selective Service Act are a disgrace to this great Nation and should be punished to the fullest extent of the law.

The tragedy of these demonstrations against U.S. policy in Vietnam is that they are having an effect directly contrary to that which apparently is desired. The demonstrators, most of them misguided and uninformed youths, are not promoting peace but postponing it. They are not convincing President Johnson and the Congress that we should terminate our commitment in Vietnam. But they are misleading the Communist leaders in southeast Asia into believing that the antiwar demonstrations will eventually force the administration into pulling out of Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest in all seriousness that if these young demonstrators really want the fighting in Vietnam to end, they should take their placards and signs to the Communist capitals, for there lies the ultimate responsibility for the continued bloodshed. The demonstrators must awake from their naivete. They must realize that not only are they playing right into the hands of the Communists, but are in many cases actually being led and controlled by Communists.

Back in January, I was gravely concerned over the situation in Vietnam and the lack of any clear definition of our policy in southeast Asia. I was among the first to call upon President Johnson to enunciate our goals and aspirations in that strife-torn corner of the globe, and to take the initiative in seeking an honorable, peaceful settlement of the conflict. Beginning with his speech at Johns Hopkins University, the President has done just that, but all our overtures have fallen on deaf ears in Hanoi and Peiping. Let there be no doubt who is prolonging the fighting in Vietnam. If our young demonstrators do have doubts, they would do better to spend their time in the classrooms and libraries getting the facts, rather than creating the illusion that they can force our Government to end its commitment in Vietnam and permit another Communist puppet state to be born.

This is not to say that our policy in southeast Asia should not be subject to full and open discussion. Certainly, no phase of our foreign policy is sacrosanct and beyond question. But we are now committed to spare no effort in seeking a just peace and the antidraft and get-out-of-Vietnam movements are having no effect other than to hinder those efforts. By their lack of responsibility and disrespect for the law, the demonstrators are putting this country in a disgraceful and dangerous position.

We cannot escalate the military conflict, as the radical right would have us do, to the point where a world war and nuclear holocaust would be likely, but neither can we abandon the people of South Vietnam and the freedom-loving countries of the world who rely on our strength to protect them from Communist domination, as the radical left and the antidraft demonstrators advocate.

NELSON CRUIKSHANK

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, on October 1 of this year, Nelson Cruikshank retired from the post as director, department of social security, AFL-CIO. Nelson Cruikshank is an eloquent and forceful fighter whose efforts span the development of the social security system in the United States from its inception to the most recent enactment of medicare. The bill we passed this year bears the mark of his efforts.

His long and distinguished career started as director, social service department of Brooklyn, N.Y., Federation of Churches. He had worked his way through Ohio Wesleyan University and Union Theological Seminary by working in auto factories in Toledo, Ohio, and as a seaman on Great Lakes steamships.

He was director, workers education center at Yale University, from 1933 to 1935, and director, workers education project, WPA and New York University, 1935 to 1936. From 1937 to 1942 he served as labor relations representative, Farm Security Administration. During the last 2 years of this period he was director of the migratory labor camps program.

He was executive assistant to labor members of the National Management Labor Policy Committee, War Manpower Commission, and Deputy Vice Chairman of Labor Relations, War Management Commission, during 1943–44.

He served as AFL director of social insurance activities from 1944 to 1955 and as director, Department of Social Security, AFL-CIO, from 1955 until his retirement on October 1.

Nelson Cruikshank's service to humanity has extended beyond his service to the working men and women of this country. He was a member of the U.S.

Commission for UNESCO and a U.S. delegate to the first General UNESCO Conference in Paris, France, in 1946.

He represented the United States at the first General Conference of the World Health Organization in Geneva, Switzerland, in 1948. He has been:

Representative, AFL, as adviser, Economic and Social Council, U.N.—Geneva, Switzerland, 1948;

Federal Advisory Council of the U.S. Department of Labor;

Labor Committee of the National Planning Association;

Social Security Advisory Council, U.S. Senate Finance Committee, 1948–49;

Consultants' group to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1953;

Statutory Advisory Council on Social Security Financing 1957–58;

Statutory Advisory Council on Social Security Financing, 1963;

National Advisory Committee, White House Conference on Aging, 1960–61;

National Commission on Community Health Services;

Department of Church and Economic Life, National Council of Churches of Christ in America, 1964;

Independent Relations Research Association, executive committee, 1960.

While he has "retired," he has already announced plans to teach at a social studies seminar at Michigan State this coming spring.

Let us wish him well in his "retirement" and continued success in his service to his fellow man.

FOR A HAPPY RECOVERY

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is to the great credit of the President and to the American people that the country remained on such an even keel as the Chief Executive went to surgery.

Across the land, Americans felt a great relief to know that the operation was over, and that it was a success. Two recent editorials, one from the October 9, 1965, New York Herald-Tribune and the other from the October 9, 1965, Baltimore Sun, express the Nation's prayers that the President will rest well in these days, and that he will have a good, speedy, and complete recovery.

I commend these two editorials to the attention of our colleagues:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Oct. 9, 1965]

Happy Recovery, Mr. President

To any one who has emerged from an anesthetic after major surgery, bemused, relieved and apart from all the world, nothing will better illustrate the peculiar and lonely eminence of the Presidential office than the query one reporter directed to Bill Moyers. Was Mr. Johnson's condition, asked the questioner—3 hours after the operation—such that he could make any Presidential decisions that might be necessary?

The idea that the drowsy aftermath of surgery might be punctuated by a shrill call on the hot line is enough to frighten the most hardened veteran of recovery rooms. True, Vice President Humphrey was standing by and world crises, after all, do not occur every hour on the hour (although sometimes it must seem so to the President). Nevertheless, there was a considerable amount of past and future history compacted into the operating room at the Bethesda Naval Hospital yesterday morning, and there was a very general sigh of relief when the word came out that—despite the complication of a ureter stone—all was going well.

To that expressive sigh there is little that can be added now, except to wish the President a happy and speedy recovery. He has met this physical crisis with courage, good sense and a patent awareness of the national interest in the premises. For that, as well as for the successful outcome of the operation, the country is grateful.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Oct. 9, 1965]

Get-Well Card

Before the President entered the hospital we were told that according to all the signs his operation would be routine, though of course this operation is major surgery. Nevertheless, the Nation could not but feel apprehension as it awaited the news that the signs had turned out to be right. That news when it came was most welcome. We now wish for Mr. Johnson a swift end to the inevitable postoperative discomfort, a good rest with a minimum of heavy work and an early return to normal energy and vigor, which in his case is energy and vigor beyond what in most men would be called normal.

DR. W. DEMING LEWIS INAUGURATED AS 10TH PRESIDENT OF LEHIGH UNIVERSITY IN BETHLEHEM, PA., OCTOBER 10, 1965

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rooney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there are many things of which we in the 15th District of Pennsylvania are justifiably proud—one of the foremost being our education system and our magnificent institutions of higher learning.

On October 10 it was my great privilege to take part in the inauguration of one of America's most brilliant and respected scholars, Dr. W. Deming Lewis, as the 10th president of Lehigh University in my native Bethlehem, Pa.

I hope I may be forgiven a touch of chauvinism in my remarks about Lehigh University, but I feel compelled to point out that few private institutions in our history have left a stronger or more indelible mark upon the intellectual and scientific communities.

In Dr. Lewis, Lehigh is fortunate in having a man of international reputation as a space scientist and educational philosopher. His inauguration ushers in a new era of academic progress for Lehigh, already among the Nation's finest universities.

Dr. Lewis is a Rhodes Scholar whose standing in American education can best be attested to by the simple fact that Dr. Nathan M. Pusey, president of Harvard, Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, dean of the School of Science at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and adviser to our late President Kennedy and the Right Honorable Lord Shawcross, former member of Parliament and Chancellor of Sussex University, appeared at Lehigh on the ocassion of his inauguration as President to pay tribute to him.

Dr. Lewis' own remarks on his acceptance of the presidency are a major contribution to the continuing dialog on higher education's role in the community, the Nation and the world.

It is with great pleasure that I call the attention of my colleagues to the text of Dr. Lewis' remarks. The text follows:

Lehigh's Role as a Developing University

(Inaugural Address of W. Deming Lewis, on the occasion of his inauguration as 10th president of Lehigh University)

Mr. Magee, trustees, faculty, staff, alumni, and students of Lehigh University, delegates and distinguished guests, I accept the charge which the trustees today formally place in my hands with deep feelings of dedication to work which has already begun. In the few minutes I shall speak to you this afternoon I would like to outline the challenge and the task which today face our university.

Our eminent guest speakers, Lord Shawcross, Dr. Pusey, and Dr. Wiesner, represent and personify traditions and forces of the utmost importance to Lehigh and indeed to all universities. We understand Lehigh's own tasks better if we understand what each of these three unusual men represents and ponder the significance of what he has personally done.

Lord Shawcross, simply by being an Englishman, symbolizes the constitutional and elective processes of government of free people under which universities such as our own can thrive and grow and without which they could not exist in the form we know them. His long service as a barrister and his work as chief prosecutor for Great Britain at the International Military Tribunal in Nuremburg exemplify the processes by which free institutions, including universities, can, in practice, achieve justice. His service as chancellor of Sussex University demonstrates, I assume, a belief that while nations must nourish universities so can universities strengthen nations.

Dr. Nathan Pusey as head of this nation's oldest university symbolizes and personifies to all of us the great traditions and idealism of university men everywhere. His institution is a preeminent example of the modern university. The university of today has its roots in the isolation and asceticism of the monastery. Its central stem and main branches are energetically occupied with activities designed to shape and guide the leaders and thinkers of the future and to discover new knowledge. Its tendrils and offshoots are becoming interwound with an increasingly numerous and diverse set of human activities. Dr. Pusey and Harvard, while fruitfully working toward these many goals symbolize for all of us the achievement of one central goal of great value—broad education with emphasis on fundamentals and attention to humanities and the development of the intellect.

Dr. Jerome Wiesner, as dean of science of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and as former chief scientific adviser to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, symbolizes and personifies the relatively recent great surge of importance of science and technology in the affairs of men, universities, and nations. It has been clear since August 1945, that the survival, as well as the prosperity, of nations will henceforth depend heavily on their scientific and technical competence. No one has seen more clearly than Dr. Wiesner the consequent need for an adequate and coherent policy of support for science and technology in the universities, or has thought more searchingly about how it should be formulated or worked more effectively toward its practical realization.

The presence of these three men here reminds us then that a university has a complex and crucial role in society today. On the one hand it must keep part of itself free from the struggle of the outside world in order that many of its people can be free to learn and teach and discover the truth. On the other hand it must prepare people and help to prepare nations for this struggle. On the one hand a university must preserve and understand the intellectual treasures of the past. On the other hand it must encourage the questioning of conventional wisdom in order that greater wisdom can be found. On the one hand its stock in trade is activities of mind and spirit. On the other these mental and spiritual activities can flourish only within a stable and healthy framework of faculty salaries, student life, auxiliary services and physical plant.

I would now like to become more specific and talk about Lehigh in particular. Both for this occasion and because we reach the modest age of 100 this year it is appropriate to take note of our position and to consider where we want to go from here.

Lehigh, in spite of raising its entrance requirements to the most stringent ever, has reached a new high in undergraduate enrollment. This is, in part, due to its high reputation and in part, of course, to the current pressure for admission on all colleges because of increasing population and increasing requirements for education.

Many institutions are adjusting to these pressures by making dramatic increases in undergraduate size and some new undergraduate institutions are being established. These expansions in undergraduate capacity are necessary but they can usually be undertaken only where substantial public funds are provided.

It appears that Lehigh can serve the cause of undergraduate education better by remaining private, retaining approximately its present undergraduate enrollment and still further upgrading the quality and character of the undergraduate experience which it offers. The quality and character of Lehigh's alumni as well as their impressive record of achievement and their enthusiastic loyalty all confirm the wisdom of such a course.

The present structure of three undergraduate colleges with great flexibility for curriculum interchange provides a strong base for development of future undergraduate courses and programs. That such development must take place goes without saying, and there is too little time to say here what its lines might be. It is, in any case, clearer than ever in this age of exploding knowledge that we cannot prepare men for life by the inculcation of specific techniques and information alone. We must in the future place even greater emphasis on developing the powers of the intellect and on understanding fundamentals.

Lehigh, some 5 years ago, made a different decision about its graduate school. It was decided that the graduate enrollment, unlike the undergraduate enrollment, should be systematically expanded.

It would have been more comfortable financially and far simpler administratively to retain the size of the graduate program or even to reduce it gradually, thereby permitting Lehigh to abandon its status as a university and to devote all of its resources to the honorable task of being a first-rate college. But it would not have been right.

There is today a tremendous and growing need for graduate programs. The need is particularly great in engineering and science where Lehigh has great strength. It is growing rapidly in the field of education where Lehigh is also strong. It is expanding into the social sciences, the humanities and business administration. Lehigh has resources in all of these fields.

Now Lehigh is indeed a private university but it has a public obligation. This arises from its tax-exempt status, from its charter and most of all from the feeling of its trustees, faculty, and staff. It will, therefore, do whatever it can do well to meet the growing need for graduate education. It will go as far as it can with private resources. Where there is still further need it has sought and will continue to seek further support in the form of appropriate grants and contracts from public agencies.

In doing this, Lehigh will be helping rather than hurting its undergraduate program. This help will come from the higher numbers of truly outstanding faculty which can be attracted to an institution which offers research and graduate teaching opportunities along with its undergraduate program.

Expansion of a graduate program is not without dangers, especially for a private university of modest size and endowment. The hardheaded financial realities of life must be respected even by universities. We cannot afford rapid expansion in all fields at once. Perhaps we could expand slowly in all, but not without losing the competition everywhere for many of the best men, both faculty and students, to larger institutions with greater resources. Instead we will select a few fields in which we have unusual opportunities, and expand rapidly in these. This will require some hard choices but they have to be made if we are to succeed.

Thus, we have already selected as a so-called salient field the application of mathematics. This salient cuts across the physical sciences and engineering disciplines and is rapidly extending its importance in the social sciences and the disciplines of business administration. The digital computer is magnifying the importance of, and resources available to, workers in this field.

To implement this decision we have created an interdisciplinary center for the application of mathematics. We have made a number of new appointments of men who will work both in this center and in academic departments where mathematics can be fruitfully applied. They will join others with such interests who are already on our staff.

Education is another graduate field where unusually rapid expansion is taking place at Lehigh. This is in response to the intense demand for more well-trained administrators and teachers for primary and secondary schools. We are also taking the lead in developing programs to meet the impending burst of need for community college personnel.

There are other fields where significant graduate programs already exist at Lehigh. From time to time, when the need is felt and where opportunity and resources permit, we shall increase this number, but we shall do it only if we can be reasonably sure that a program of high quality will be constructed.

As I mentioned earlier one evidence of the excellence of Lehigh's undergraduate program is the unusually large number of able and successful men which it has produced over the years. A few of these men serve on the board of trustees, they and many of the others serve enthusiastically on such helpful projects as the current centennial drive. A surprisingly high percentage of those asked so far have given and given generously to this drive. This project has helped and will help us still further to achieve the goals of the university. Watching the success of this work has been one of the most rewarding aspects of my first year here.

There is another way in which well-qualified alumni can help still further and that is by establishing a closer contact with the academic activities of the university. A university is an instrument of society, though it must be insulated from many of the daily struggles and pressures of the outside world it should understand and perhaps respond to major trends and developments there. If for no other reason it should do so because most of its students will eventually live in the outside world. There is also a need for segments of the outside world to be better informed of what is going on in the university.

To help meet both of these needs for Lehigh we are in the process of establishing a system of committees to visit the various academic departments and interdisciplinary centers of the university. These committees will be made up of qualified and interested people, alumni wherever possible, from business, government, and other academic institutions. They will advise, but of course not control, they will be concerned with policy, but of course not with details of curriculum and administration. We believe they will be most helpful.

One final word. The spirit of its faculty is a significant determinant of the quality of any university. None of our plans for progress can be effective without an excellent faculty. With an excellent faculty even faulty plans will succeed. Accordingly, we are making determined efforts to preserve the substantial faculty strength which Lehigh already has. This must include the identification of and reward of quality in all possible ways. It must clearly include recruiting of new faculty of high quality. Perhaps, most important of all, it requires uninhibited and meaningful discussion among and with all faculty and staff who might have something useful to say about the welfare of Lehigh. I feel that this has been going on during the past years and hope it will continue.

These, then, are the seeds of a program for Lehigh. We will toil at the cultivation and hope that the harvest is good.

THE CHARGER

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, my home community of San Diego, Calif., has been the site of many advances and developments in aviation and aerospace. Many of the names of aircraft and missiles now famous throughout the world were first heard there. These range from the Spirit of St. Louis to the Atlas ICBM.

Most recently a new aircraft by the name of Charger took to the skies over San Diego. There had been high hopes that the name of this prototype counterinsurgency—COIN—aircraft built by the Convair division of General Dynamics would in time join the ranks of other famous San Diego-built products.

Most unfortunately, the aircraft crashed the evening before last. The Navy test pilot successfully ejected during his landing approach because an emergency had developed. No one, thank God, was killed, but the aircraft was totally destroyed.

This accident is unfortunate not only for itself but also because this aircraft built by private money and designed to meet a growing national defense need was undergoing a military test-flight evaluation that might well have insured its future and the fame of its name. The aircraft had logged more than 200 hours and had clearly demonstrated the valuable contributions it could make to counter-insurgency and limited war actions.

But development programs have met with setbacks before; many famous products trace early failures in their history. I hope and believe that the Charger has a great future of service and contribution. I hope and believe that all concerned now will move quickly to rebuild the program, complete the testing, and make the decisions that must be made if national needs are to be met.

GEN. ROBERT E. WOOD BRANDS CANAL ACTION

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since the joint announcement on September 24, 1965, by the Presidents of the United States and Panama concerning the status of three proposed canal treaties to replace the 1903 convention, I have read many news stories and editorials in the mass news media commenting on that proposal.

Among the first and best of these were a news story quoting a statement by Gen. Robert E. Wood and an editorial, both in the September 26, 1965, issue of the Chicago Tribune.

As an important builder of the Panama Canal, business executive with vast experience, and an experienced statesman, General Wood's views carry great weight.

The indicated news story and editorial follow:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Sept. 26, 1965]

Canal Action Branded a Mistake—General Wood Raps Johnson Plan for New Pact

President Johnson's decision to relinquish U.S. sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone is a "terrible mistake" that will undermine the Nation's position in Latin America. Gen. Robert E. Wood, one of the few surviving builders of the canal, said yesterday.

The move also could jeopardize national defense by placing a vital transportation link under the control of another government, said General Wood, a director and retired chairman of Sears, Roebuck & Co.

SEES DIRE RESULTS

"What I really think of it—Johnson's decision—is unprintable," he said. The only hope I can see in this thing is that (the Johnson administration) doesn't tell what it is going to give to Panama.

"If Panama only gets some little control over local matters, it might be all right, but if the plan is to set up a joint participation in control of the canal between the United States and Panama, it would be terrible."

Johnson announced Friday that a new treaty will be negotiated to supplant the 61-year-old treaty that gives the United States "all rights, power, and authority" over the 33-square-mile Canal Zone "in perpetuity."

The new treaty would place the zone under joint United States and Panamanian administration, the President said.

General Wood was one of Gen. George W. Goethals' assistants in constructing the canal in 1905, the Army assigned General Wood, then 25 years old, to work on the canal. He was on loan to the Isthmian Canal Commission and stayed until 1915. His responsibilities included the hiring and housing of workers and the purchase and distribution of all supplies.

RECALL EARLIER WARNING

General Wood warned in January 1964, that any arbitration of U.S. treaty rights in the Canal Zone would "finish" the United States in Latin America. It was a time when widespread anti-American rioting broke out in Panama, a symptom of resentment over U.S. control of the canal.

Then Wood conceded that Communists could have had a hand in organizing students leading the riots, but he held that the Panamanian Government was using the threat of a Communist takeover as a bludgeon to force the United States to modify the pact.

"My opinions are still the same," he said yesterday.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Sept. 26, 1965]

For the Starving, a Canal

Because thousands of Panamanians are ill fed and living on our doorstep in squalor, we have agreed to hand over a canal which they can neither eat nor live in. That is about the size of Mr. Johnson's agreement to abrogate the treaty of 1903, which unequivocally gives us sovereign rights in the Canal Zone. He apparently hopes that this great concession will appease the anti-American agitators.

The immediate purpose of the announcement was to strengthen the hand of Panama's President Marco Robles when the National Assembly meets this week. Had he failed to achieve any change in the status of the canal, he would have been noisily castigated by the opposition, which consists largely of leftwingers playing upon the poverty and nationalistic sensitivities of the people.

But does anybody seriously believe that these agitators, who include Communists and Castroites, are going to quiet down and go home simply because one of their talking points is removed? History offers abundant proof that they will simply find other excuses to heckle the Government and denounce the United States.

When the anti-American riots broke out in January 1964, Mr. Johnson said with what sounded like conviction that the United States could not allow the security of the canal to be imperiled, and that this country intended to honor its obligation to run the canal efficiently and securely. His present unilateral concession is all the more conspicuous as evidence that rioting against the United States does pay off and that anything the United States says, no matter how firmly, is subject to dickering, compromise, and even retraction.

The promised concession applies not only to the present canal, which is considered outdated and is tentatively scheduled for replacement with a sea-level canal. It also sets a precedent for the new canal; and by hinting strongly that the new canal will be built in Panama rather than in one of the neighboring countries, Mr. Johnson has undercut the incentive for Panama to offer concessions in return.

We are yielding a great deal for an uncertain reward. What is particularly tragic is that the need for appeasement might have been averted entirely if we had followed the advice of men like our former Ambassador to Panama, Joseph S. Farland, who resigned in 1963 with the prophetic warning that anti-Americanism in Panama would grow to unmanageable proportions if the United States did not pay more attention to the crying needs of the Panamanian people. What sense did it make to lavish billions of dollars of aid on places like India, Indonesia, and more remote parts of Latin America, while allowing such poverty to exist so near and in such striking contrast to the park-like luxury of life in the Canal Zone?

Nationalism is only one factor behind the discontent of the Panamanians. Sovereignty over the canal is not going to improve their living conditions. Had the United States built Panama—a country with only one-third the population of the city of Chicago—into a showcase with improved sanitation, education, housing, roads, and opportunities for employment, and had it done this in time, we might have had a more satisfied and friendly people living along the canal which means so much to us. The Communists and agitators might then have been left talking to each other.

JOHN WILDER PARKHURST: POST-WAR SALUTE TO A BRAVE SOLDIER

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the official histories of our Armed Forces in World War II have now been largely completed but the full history of the individual heroes in it is far from finished. One of these heroes was young John Wilder Parkhurst—1925–1945—of Winchester, Mass., an ambulance driver for the American field service in southeast Asia.

A son of Richard Parkhurst, distinguished former member of the U.S. Maritime Commission, business executive, authority on the Merchant Marine, and a member of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, this gifted son of a gifted father had a future that would probably have been brilliant.

Volunteering for service in 1944, he soon found himself in southeast Asia. Within a period of 1 years' service, he won the admiration of his associates for personal bravery in caring for his wounded comrades.

At last, 20 years later, one of the Nation's leading writers, Harry W. Frantz, of Washington, D.C., in eloquent words, has told the moving story of young Parkhurst.

In order that this splendid eulogy may become what the author intended—a legacy for his family, a contribution to history, a tradition in the U.S. Army, and an inspiration for the youth of our land—it merits a place in the permanent annals of the Congress.

The eulogy follows:

JOHN WILDER PARKHURST: POST-WAR SALUTE TO A BRAVE SOLDIER

(By Harry W. Frantz (SSU 10, Armee Francaise en Orient, 1917), Bethesda, Md., July 27, 1965)

Twenty years after World War II, I have had the good fortune to read a collection of tributes, military citations, personal letters and other memorabilia about a brave American youth who lost his life in India but inspired a lasting tradition in the annals of the American field service and stirred the hearts of countless friends who knew of his service and his sacrifice.

As I read these records there constantly recurred to mind a thought attributed to George Washington which meant, in essence, if not in exact text: "We can only raise a standard to which the wise and the good may repair: the event is in the hand of God."

John Wilder Parkhurst of Winchester, Mass., raised his standard to the humane service of the ill and wounded in World War II, volunteering, despite a negative record of fitness for combat service, to drive an ambulance for the American field service.

After a training period near Bombay he served with British, Indian and Gurkha troops in the dangerous Assan-Burma theater during 1944 and 1945. The Allied campaign there ushered the defeat of Japan's armies in southeastern Asia, and appreciably hastened the end of the terrible war.

The unforeseen event "in the hand of God" was John's untimely death at a British General Hospital at Calcutta on July 3, 1945. The immediate cause was officially reported as pneumonia, but he had long since suffered devastating attacks of malaria, and according to one diagnosis typhoid fever, during his service along the battle fronts. In childhood he had suffered infantile paralysis.

At the time when his work was done he was barely over 20 years of age, having been born at Boston on April 21, 1929; and as recently as June 1943 had graduated from the Vermont Academy. Except for his patriotic determination to serve the Allied cause he would soon have enrolled at Dartmouth College. His wartime letters revealed his potential for becoming a talented writer.

There were some wonderful compensations for John Parkhurst's untimely end on earth, for he left innumerable friends at home and abroad. His brave and ardent service on far-distant battlefronts gave almost legendary meaning to his life, and had an inspirational value which will grow with the passing years.

His personal bravery and determination to serve the sick and the wounded were attested by his comrades, by the gratitude of the human wrecks which he conveyed to field surgical stations and hospitals, and by laudatory reports by the high command of British and Indian military and medical services. Among such witnesses to his merit and that of his companions of the American Field Service was the renowned Mountbatten of Burma, a mastermind of the military struggle against the Japanese in southeastern Asia.

Back in his sorrowful homeland, John's memory was honored and revered through ceremonial events and lasting symbols at the Vermont Academy, Dartmouth College—his intended alma mater had he survived the war—and at the American Field Service headquarters in New York.

From the records of his wartime service one might surmise that John had been influenced in schooldays by Rudyard Kipling's fascinating novel about Kim—"the Little Friend of All the World," by the haunting lyrics of "The Road to Mandalay," and the bizarre accounts of life and adventure along the northwestern and northeastern frontiers of India. For reasons known only to God, John's destiny led him along similar routes to service and adventure.

The imponderable hopes, fears, loyalties, affections and speculations which must have passed through John's mind as his ambulance conveyed war's victims along the shell-wracked and disease-ridden overland Road to Rangoon and Mandalay might also have been a metaphysical counterpart to the fictional masterpieces of Joseph Conrad, the great literary assessor of life and destiny of white men in the great region between Suez and Singapore.

The celebrated German philosopher Goethe once wrote that adaptability is the mark of human greatness. If evaluated by this simple rule, John's service in World War II attested his superior character. Among British Tommies, Gurkha soldiers, Indian camp-followers, the wild tribesmen of Burma, stretcher bearers, nurses, physicians, privates or officers of all ranks, he manifested the singular qualities of industry, courage, humor, perception and innate friendliness which mark the person of superior adaptability.

His American Field Service section officer Percy Gilbert in a reminiscent postwar letter recalled:

"I can't tell you how much John meant to all of us. I knew him very well, and he was one of the hardest workers I have seen in my 3½ years overseas with the Field Service. He did not know the word 'giveup.' Despite his handicap he went through the thick of the Burma campaign.

"He had many narrow escapes performing his duties. You could never get him to talk about them, but by delving and asking British officers and his friends I learned of his exciting escapes. He never said a word about the hardships he endured, of which I knew he'd had many. A great many British officers talked to me about his fine work and about his courage for volunteering for tough jobs."

An abbreviated record of John's service and stations, compiled by his father, Mr. Richard Parkhurst of Winchester, Mass., from British and A.F.S. records, contained the following highlights:

April 5–May 4, 1944: In transit across India (Poona) to Imphal (Assam).

May 1944: 33d Indian Corps, 7th Indian Division, on Dimapur-Kohima road, and the so-called Bokajahn track.

June 15, 1944: On Jessami track, east flank of Kohima-Imphal road; here his jeep section was known as the "Hell Patrol."

February 26, 1945: 33d Indian Corps, 19th Indian Division.

April 18, 1945: 7th Indian Division, 114th Brigade, 4/5 Gurkha Rifles.

June 1, 1945: 33d Indian Corps, 4/15 Punjab Regiment.

June 15, 1945: Hospitalized. Brigade to Calcutta.

July 3, 1945: Died British General Hospital 2, Calcutta.

Dates of service with the 5th Indian Division and some operational locations were lacking, but Mr. Parkhurst noted: "In general, however, the territory covered was the territory covered in transit from Poona to Imphal in Assam, thence to Rangoon in Burma. Imphal to Rangoon saw heavy fighting most of the way."

John Parkhurst's letters to his folks at home, remarkable for detailed observation and sensitivity to ever-changing environment, disclosed his swift adaptation to the unpredictable vicissitudes of army life in the mountain, jungle, and river terrains.

Writing from Poona, India, on March 3, 1944, he said that he had taken the British commando judo course and had started the study of Urdi (Hindustani). He made notes about the fruit peddlers, roadside magicians, and new military acquaintances. In a characteristically humorous vein he continued:

"Possibly a description of my little corner of India would prove enlightening. My bed is on the left of one of the doors as you come into the barracks. It's a teak frame, teak being used as you use pine, with a frame across. I was lucky enough to get a mattress of sorts. My head is to the wall, on which hangs my battle dress and bush jacket and Ghurka hat.

"A very deep windowsill is on the left, under which is a sort of three-story bookcase holding my shaving stuff, sewing and mess kits, colored glasses, and vitamin pills. Two wires go the length of the barracks, passing over my head and feet. During the day, my mosquito net is rolled and tied with two blue ribbons to the one at the head. At the foot is my everything—a roof-tin trunk.

"In the morning my bearer clatters in with his hobnailed shoes, rattles my cup, and goes away. I reach a peak of anticipation, then fall asleep. At exactly this moment he returns with my tea. I drink this and fall asleep. He then drops the net on my face, usually twice. I get up."

Describing the arduous routine of an ambulance driver's work, John wrote from his car at Dimapur, Kohima, in May 1944:

"As usual, I am writing in the back of my ambulance, this time on the bottom of a wash basin which I made out of a petrol tin. We have been fairly busy of late, and as our hours are necessarily irregular, it can easily occur that you can be up 20 hours or more. An average run takes about 8 hours, both ways, and if you get caught at night, longer. The road is typical mountain stuff for this section, and the average down speed, with stretcher cases, is between 5 and 10 miles per hour, with frequent stops. It's rather grueling driving, with both you and the fellows in back feeling each bump.

"I had one unpleasant night recently when I was the last vehicle down before the road closed, and the fog so thick that when I looked out of the cab window I couldn't see the road. To top the run off, I broke down at the hospital, luckily after the patients had been disposed of.

"Most of today I spent on my back underneath the car, changing oil, greasing, tightening, cleaning filters, and generally getting things in shape. It's a great feeling, after a day like that, to start the crate and hear her purr."

In several letters, John commented on the strange native tribesmen with whom he came in contact. Writing from the Imphal region, he said:

"There are some particularly interesting people in these parts known as Nagas. They are of Mongolian origin, and lead particularly hard lives. You see them a good deal, walking on the roads, with colored blankets, long-handled, thick-bladed knives and ancient rifles.

"No one ever knows just where they're going, only every little while one will wander in with a few Jap heads. I talked with one the other day who had an 1872 Lee-Enfield rifle, which his grandfather probably killed an Englishman to get. It was only a single shot, and he made the cartridges himself, but he'd got 20 with it. Another guy (Naga) had his wife and family cut into small pieces, and swore he'd get 100 for every piece. He brought in 35 heads the other day. Naga women are having a rough time. We often find them dead in captured bunkers."

In another letter John said that when he came to a Naga village he first went to see the chief.

"He, if in a good mood, greets you warmly," John wrote. "If he isn't in a good mood, it is just as well to leave right away. A good next step is to take the chief and a couple of his men, sons and hangers-on down to the ever present river for a little grenade fishing. You pitch the grenades upstream and the natives haul the fish out about 50 yards downstream, stunned but otherwise unwounded. A couple of grenades usually gets up to 30 fish, some nearly a foot. Since it would take the villagers a good day with their nets to do this, the chief is happy about it all, and takes you up to his house.

"The village is all built on bamboo stilts about 10 feet off the ground, and you walk up on a notched log to a sort of veranda. The chief seats you, mumbles something, and tea appears. He then gives you a whacking great cheroot which smells and tastes like burning leaves. You sit and beam at each other, drinking tea and smoking the cheroot with apparent gusto, while all the chief's relatives peep at you from the doorway. The women are particularly handsome, with oval faces, slant eyes, and silver bangles. Eventually, you leave, generally stopping to watch the women weaving cloth on looms."

In January 1945, on his first annual leave of absense, John had the good fortune to visit the Northwest Frontier. Of this excursion he later wrote:

"I had a wonderful time on my leave. It's a wonderful country up at the Northwest Frontier. They were hospitable at various outposts we detoured to see, and we were always asked into the mess. Some of the married officers at Peshawar had us to tea, and nobody was stuffy or 'pukka' at all. I suppose because it's an out of the way place where visitors are welcome and Americans unusual.

"Even tribesmen would grin and show you the right direction or gather in the bazaar in groups up to 50 or 60 and point and jabber. The day that I went down in blue jeans and an Afghan goat-hair jacket and hat caused them to treat me like a brother. The United States just doesn't know how much of a standard it is, as a free country as well as materially."

After the allied capture of Mandalay in March 1945, John wrote to his father:

"The past 2 months have been the most interesting, and by far the toughest, as far as enemy activity goes, of any I've spent out here. Two of us were attached to a crack Indian battalion and went with them, often as the only vehicles in the capture of the city. We made runs under all kinds of circumstances, including night runs to company positions which were being attacked. The whole show ended with our working 50 hours straight. My only injury is a quantity of blisters from digging. I don't mind telling you I never thought I'd get out of it with a whole skin, but when you're resigned like that you're not afraid and although on your toes, part of your brain seems out of commission.

"The battalion officers are all young and good guys as well as good soldiers and the Jawans (Indian private) are plenty tough.

"We were always included in battalion conferences and saw the plans developed and executed, and were told what to expect. This is good because some of the battalions, notably the British ones, will just say: 'Well, there may be some wounded here, you can find your way alright, and I think the sappers have been over the road.' This often leads to sticky situations."

In his last letter to his parents, written June 3, 1945, John wrote in part:

"The good old monsoon has started again. A year ago we were in Kohima. From Kohima to beyond Rangoon is a long way, and there are divisions who have marched 700 miles of that distance, not counting side tracks to various battles.

"I am at present waiting for a bullock cart ambulance. The road back is impassable and I shall have to hike some 8 miles with this thing.

"I often forget to mention how much I enjoy the clippings and cartoons you send, but I keep most of them for days and read them many times. Letters I almost memorize."

Before many weeks John would have sailed for home at end of his first enlistment. Instead he was struck by malaria, and was hospitalized in Calcutta. After his death on July 3, 1945, he was buried the next day in the United States Military Cemetery at Barrackpore, near Calcutta. Six members of the American Field Service acted as bearers, and there was a Guard of Honor from a British regiment with which he had served in Burma—the Royal Berkshire and the York and Lancaster. Later his remains were transferred to the Wildwood Cemetery, at Winchester, Mass.

His long-cherished dream of enrollment at Dartmouth College was never realized, but became part and parcel of the Dartmouth tradition. His parents installed a memorial fireplace in the President's office in Parkhurst Hall, and according to John's wish—recorded in a letter written from the Burma jungle provision was made for winter logs through the years to come.

"Cheer and warmth will spread from the fire on the hearth through long days and nights uncounted, reflecting the dreams of loyalty and warm-hearted friendship among men," said an editorial in the Boston Traveler.

A letter from a friend written shortly after John's death (author unnamed) posed the eternal riddle, which only God could answer:

"It is so hard to understand the divine plan that denies to the most unselfish the greatest glory of homecoming. But he has peace and perhaps even happiness, since many of his friends must be with him."

To this one might add that he will be remembered in the Eastern Hemisphere when the monsoon breaks the terrible heat of the desert winds, and he will be alive in the hearts of his friends and kin in the Western Hemisphere when the joy of springtime stirs anew the spirit of adventure and service in countless youthful hearts.

Who else in 20 years could have lived so bravely and served so nobly in two hemispheres?

FROM RESEARCH TO CONSUMER

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I include the following speech for delivery at annual meeting of the American Public Health Association, Chicago, Ill., October 19, 1965:

FROM RESEARCH TO CONSUMER

(By Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.)

These are exciting days of a dramatic year for the consumers of health services—and they include every man, woman and child in the United States. Probably never before in our history has our nation taken so many bold strides upward toward one of our highest national goals—the provision of the best in health care, in the healthiest possible environment, to all our people.

From these few words you will have inferred correctly that I am interpreting the subject of this address in its broadest terms. When it comes to health, all of us are consumers. And we should be the beneficiaries of all the research done which has relevance to our physical and mental well-being.

This year I have had the privilege of serving in a Congress which has done these things:

Provided the greatest appropriation for medical research in history;

Driven a broad highway through the economic barriers that has separated the people who need health care most—our older citizens—from the care they need;

Enacted the Older Americans Act, which provides a strong central focus and responsibility within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on all matters of concern to older people and those who work with and for them;

Created a bold new approach to the delivery of top-quality health care in every region of our country by authorizing regional medical programs designed to bring together the worlds of medical research, medical education, and medical practice;

Greatly strengthened the ability of our health professional schools to prepare greater numbers of better trained practitioners to serve the medical, dental, nursing, and public health needs of present and future generations;

Enacted vigorous new legislation to accelerate the cleansing of our Nation's rivers and waterways.

These are the great milestones. But there are other markers to progress that also deserve mention—extending and expanding vaccination assistance and support of migrant health services, extending and expanding the health research facilities construction program, providing for a greatly improved system of medical libraries, permitting Federal funds to support staffing of community mental health centers.

This is a shining record. All of us in the 89th Congress are proud of it.

But we are the first to recognize that it is less than half the battle.

What happens now depends on the thousands of people who, like yourselves, are engaged in the daily struggle to deliver the goods to the consumers of health services.

I can say with confidence that you will benefit from outstanding leadership at the peak of the giant pyramid. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with its distinguished new Secretary, and the Public Health Service with its brilliant young Surgeon General, have enthusiastically accepted the President's challenge to fulfill the unfulfilled aspirations of a nation of consumers.

Are you, in the States and communities, ready to tackle old problems in new ways? Are you ready to break free from the bonds of traditional and comfortable practices?

Unless you are, all that we do in the U.S. Capitol, and all that the Public Health Service does on Independence Avenue, and all that the National Institutes of Health does on its great research campus in Bethesda will fall far short of our lofty target.

We have, all of us, been falling far short for years. For our target is nothing less than the full delivery of the great promise of scientific research to the individual consumer. Let us consider a few examples of promises unfulfilled.

Twenty years ago, dental research gave us, in fluoridation, a highly effective method for preventing tooth decay. It is safe, it is economical, and it can reduce the attack rate of this most common of human ailments by about two-thirds. And yet today only 50 million people have access to fluoridated water systems. Another 150 million, who could be and should be its beneficiaries, are being denied the protection because what is purely and simply a health measure has, by some strange magic, been turned into an emotionally inflamed political issue. How much longer must our children wait before reason prevails?

Medical research in recent years has produced wonders which cross the border of the miraculous in heart surgery. Some thousands of our fellow Americans are enjoying healthy and productive lives today because they were among the lucky ones—they got to the right doctor, at the right time, and their case was brought ultimately to the operating theater of one of our great citadels of medical excellence. But hundreds of thousands with similar conditions are gone because they didn't make the right connection.

Medical research has yielded brilliantly effective new tools for the early diagnosis of cancer. Of these, the one with perhaps the greatest potential for saving lives involves the use of soft-tissue X-ray techniques to diagnose cancer of the breast. Yet how much hope can we hold out for this development when thousands of women still die every year who could have been saved through the use of the Papanicolau smear technique for early diagnosis of cervical cancer?

Medical research combined with advanced physics and engineering has now brought us the capability for automating many of the steps in a standard medical examination, for screening of electrocardiograms by a computer a thousand miles away at the end of a regular telephone line, even for compiling a usable nationwide system for medical records. The economies in precious professional time and resulting expansion of professional service, made possible through the use of such twentieth century methods, thrill the imagination. How long will it be before these things help, not a few of the lucky ones but the millions of health consumers

Are these public health problems? You bet your life they are. For these problems—such diseases as heart disease and cancer which kill nearly three-fourths of our people, and such problems as the effective use of professional effort—are the fundamental problems of the public health. Public health people can no longer hide behind the old walls that separated your profession from private practice. For those walls, like the walls of Jericho, are tumbling down. In today's America, with today's patterns of sickness and health, your profession has the opportunity of a lifetime—to pull together, community by community, State by State, the many resources which must combine to protect and prolong the life of each individual member of the consuming public.

Consider, for example, the furiously controversial medicare legislation. Beyond all doubt, the high cost of medical care, striking our older people at a time of their lives when most of them are least well prepared to pay, has been a tremendous deterrent to the application of research knowledge for the improvement of health. Beginning next year, this obstacle will have been greatly reduced. The older people will benefit; their children who have been paying the bills will benefit; their physicians will benefit—for they will now be able to prescribe in accordance with medical need instead of tempering their course of action in accordance with the patient's financial capability.

But nothing in the Medicare Act can possibly guarantee that the older people are actually able to receive the care to which they are now financially entitled. That historic enactment will not, of itself, create a single new hospital bed. It will not improve the quality of care in a single nursing home. It will not make home nursing service available in a community where none now exists. It will not increase the supply of nurses whose rapidly diversifying capabilities are so indispensable to the care of the older patient.

In short, it will do nothing to assure that older people can buy what they are now able to pay for. Our older citizens will become a consumer group with greatly increased purchasing power. But you, the health forces of the Nation, must create and staff and administer the services they want to buy.

And, in my view, you who work in the public health field have a very special responsibility to do this job. For this is essentially an organizing job, a focusing job, a task of administration in its broadest sense. It cannot be achieved by anything less than the full health resource. And the local and State health departments are still the only agencies specifically charged with viewing health resources as a whole, with seeing where the pieces fit together, where the gaps are, where additional strength is needed to serve the people fully and well. Meeting the initial demands of medicare will require high-powered short-range planning and action. But unless these plans and actions are carried out in logical relation to health planning and action for longer range goals, the ultimate result will be detrimental.

In a somewhat different way, public health people have a parallel challenge in the environmental health fields. To a large extent modern medical research and public health measures, as we know them today, had their beginnings in the Nation's efforts to rid itself of the great epidemic diseases. Diligent and painstaking research sought to isolate the disease organisms and trace them to the particular environmental factor responsible for their transmission. Vast campaigns to drain mosquito breeding swamps, to improve the quality of drinking water, and protect the food and milk supplies from deadly contaminants were undertaken. Techniques of massive communitywide immunization were introduced and, one by one, the terrible scourges, that had terrorized the Nation for so long, began to yield.

The translation of research into consumer benefits was so successful that today, a case of typhoid, cholera, smallpox, yellow fever, and other such diseases, is observed by medical students as an example of past medical problems.

But if the history of environmental health research and application is dramatic, its present status is rather dismal. Today, every major waterway in the country is polluted—in degrees ranging from minor to slightly less than open flowing cesspools. The supply of potable water is dangerously low even in New England and New York, areas once rich in natural water resources.

Smoke, soot, and noxious gases billow forth—from buildings, from automobiles, from burning garbage dumps. In New York City, 63 tons per square mile of this dust settle out of the air every month—blackening buildings, corroding statuary, damaging plant life, and doing we know not what to man. I am sure that all of you here today are well aware of the ability of the Nation to "smother itself under a blanket of refuse." Some 800 million pounds of solid wastes must be disposed of in this country every day.

I could go on citing statistics, but I think my point is clear. These environmental difficulties are rapidly reaching astronomic proportions and the hazard to public health is multiplying every day.

The picture is not entirely black. Almost every State now has some kind of air and/or water pollution control legislation; Federal, State, and local governments have contributed billions of dollars to the construction of new sewage treatment plants. Monitoring stations situated in various parts of the country pour in information concerning the quality of the air and water across the Nation. Industrial cooperation in eliminating some of the more acute pollution problems has been sought and often obtained. We have conducted and are continuing to conduct numerous research projects on the control of environmental hazards.

Some of these projects have yielded information from which all of us, as consumers of research results, have benefited. One notable example, I think, is the development and use of the sanitary land-fill method of solid waste disposal. By burying wastes in this manner many communities have been able to convert swamp lands into productive property, and at the same time, eliminate the nuisance and public health hazards inherent in open refuse dumps and other methods of incineration and disposal.

In the area of food and milk protection, our research and application of research has been especially successful. The fact that the average consumer purchases his food and milk supplies from supermarkets, restaurants, and vending machines with complete confidence in the safety and purity of such supplies attests to this fact. As food sources have moved further away from the ultimate consumer, new methods of inspecting, testing, packaging, and distribution have been developed and applied commercially. The recent development of an ion exchange technique for removing radionuclides from milk is a good example of this type of research to consumer progress.

Yet these attempts at control, these instances of successful research and development in environmental health, represent little more than the finger in the dike when compared with the rising tide of environmental hazards.

It seems axiomatic that one cannot hope to effectively eliminate a problem until one knows the nature and extent of the problem itself. Yet, in a way, this is what we have been attempting to do in environmental health. Pushed by the enormity of present problems, pressed by a public that demands action, we are working feverishly to answer these demands. But our success has been minor, for in dealing with the environment we lack the broad base of scientific knowledge necessary to develop programs that will not only control present hazards but prevent future growth of these hazards.

Up until now we have concentrated our research efforts on the categorical areas of the environment in place of studying it as an integrated whole. We have learned that certain concentrations of pollutants in the water will kill a man; we know that breathing high concentrations of certain gases is fatal. We know that crowded city living conditions, increased levels of noise, light, temperature, and so on, cannot possibly be considered beneficial to health.

But a death certificate seldom lists "pollution" as a cause of death. We do not know how much and in what way continual exposure to low levels of toxicants in the total environment of an individual contributes to illness and death. We do not know what amounts of these contaminants men can tolerate without eventual adverse health effects. Nor do we know the long-term health effects of metropolitan living.

We must have this information if we are to reach our goal of a hazard-free environment. And we must reach this goal. It is painfully obvious that the most fruitful research into disease and the finest clinical facilities will be of little value if mankind must breathe air contaminated with harmful impurities, drink polluted water, and suffer the physical and mental debilities resulting from crowded urban living.

I look to the Environmental Health Sciences Center now being planned by the Public Health Service to perform and coordinate our national environmental health research program in such a way as to develop this needed knowledge. I look to universities and private research organizations to intensify their research efforts in this field. I look to those of you here today to encourage this research effort, to cooperate with each other—and the people back home—in working out control measures and educating the public to the problems we, as a nation, face.

We are, all of us, swept up in a flood tide of public insistence upon better conditions for living. This tide is not created but merely given practical expression by the Congress and the executive branch of the Federal Government. Its source is the realization by the American people that they are not receiving the full measure of benefit from the great advance of medical research, and that they no longer need live in unhealthy and dangerous surroundings. The great new legislative thrusts and the great sums of money appropriated for health are an effect and not a cause of this public demand.

We in the Congress will continue to support the forward sweep of medical science—for although research has accomplished great things, our leading scientists tell us that we are only beginning to reap the full dividend. We will continue to respond to the public's just demands by appropriating funds for health programs. And we will continue to explore new and promising avenues for health legislation to strength the Nation's health resources.

But in the last analysis, the burden rests squarely upon your shoulders. You cannot wait for the last word to be spoken on environmental hazards before you apply the knowledge already available to control pollution. The people will not let you. Nor can you wait for traditional practices and time-honored channels to deliver the life-saving results of medical research. The people will not let you.

The people—the consumers of the benefits of health research—have waited long enough.

THE DRAFT CARD BURNINGS

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that a certain element of our youth in this country today must be taught the distinction between democracy and anarchy. Those college students and others who are burning their draft cards and organizing programs for avoiding the draft are in a minority—they certainly do not represent a true cross-section of American youth today. But what they are doing is wrong—legally and morally wrong—and I feel compelled to speak out against it. These people are not conscientious objectors. They are simply protestors, and there is a big difference between the two. I sympathize with legitimate conscientious objectors who out of deep moral and religious conviction believe that all war is wrong and that they cannot bring themselves to bear arms against another. Politics does not enter into their decision, and we are willing to listen to and respect their view. That is democracy. But on the other hand, I have no sympathy with those who are deliberately flaunting the law by destroying their draft cards, and by devising improper ways of avoiding the draft, on the basis that they do not approve of our Nation's military efforts in Vietnam. This is sheer anarchy and it cannot be permitted to continue.

When our Nation issues a call to arms, it is our duty to respond, whether we like it or not. I am sure there are many fighting men in Vietnam today who would rather be elsewhere. But they are there because our Nation has judged that it is in the best interests of the United States and the rest of the free world to have them there. We can have only one national policy. We cannot have a different Secretary of State and a different Secretary of Defense on every college campus around the country. When our leaders speak they speak for all of us. We most certainly do have the right to protest, but there is a line beyond which protest cannot step, and I fear that this line has now been overstepped by our card-burning, draft-dodging students. Their behavior is a disgrace.

There have been many times of crisis in our Nation's history when the issues were confusing, and where there was no clear-cut decision for many people between right and wrong. As a matter of fact, our own Revolutionary War was one of those times. There was far from unanimous enthusiasm for the decision to break from England. But when the decision was finally made, and the call came, Americans responded. Where would we be now if they had not responded? Our political leaders, I am sure, will continue to look for the best road through our present difficulties in Vietnam. But their search is not being made any easier by irresponsible people committing irresponsible acts.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY SALUTE TO ZAMBIA

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Zambia celebrates its first anniversary of independence on October 24. On this momentous occasion, we wish to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Kenneth Kundas, President of the Republic of Zambia; and to His Excellency Hosea Josias Soko, the Zambian Ambassador to the United States.

This is a date to which the people of Zambia may point with a good deal of pride; for the achievements of Zambia's first year offer the prospect of a future of progress and accomplishment.

During the last days of the former Federal Government of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, a white paper was circulated which painted a grim picture of the economic consequences of the breakup of the Federation for what was then called Northern Rhodesia. That was only 2 years ago; just 1 year before Northern Rhodesia was to become the independent Republic of Zambia. Contrary to the dire predictions of the Cassandras of 2 years ago, the political stability and economic growth of this new republic have been most impressive. In fact, in its first year of independence, Zambia held a balance-of-payments surplus estimated at $45 million.

Most of Zambia's prosperity has been the result of the large revenues which have accrued from its rich mineral resources, most particularly from its famous "Copper Belt," an area endowed with a quarter of the world's known exploitable copper reserves. As the world's third largest producer of copper—over 600,000 tons per year—Zambia has attracted over $100 million of private American investment.

Recognizing the natural dependence of one product exporters on the vicissitudes of the world market, the Government of Zambia has launched a series of ambitious and far-reaching economic development plans to balance the economy. Such plans include new electrical power projects, large-scale improvements in the transportation system, and a concerted effort to upgrade agriculture to bring the traditionally self-sufficient but poverty stricken Zambian farmers into the cash economy.

Alongside of the Government's plans to place the entire Zambian population on a more equal footing economically, the Government of Zambia has begun an extensive program to improve the educational level of all citizens. A great deal of accomplishment has already been achieved in a concerted drive to provide for more school buildings. Zambia's efforts in this direction have been expressed both in the substantial amount of funds allocated for this crucial project and the large number of skilled artisans and supervisory staff members devoting their energies almost entirely to school building.

In education, as in the wide range of social projects undertaken by the new republic elsewhere, the Government is working closely with voluntary organizations and with Great Britain, the former colonial ruler. The same spirit of cooperation has been evidenced in Zambia's relations with our country and in the halls of the United Nations.

It is this willingness to cooperate with other nations, not only in achieving its own goals but in promoting the brotherhood of mankind, that above all, inspires optimism in the future of this young republic which achieved its independence on United Nations Day. It is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the Republic of Zambia on its first anniversary.

TOWARD THE GREAT SOCIETY—WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, in this abundant land of ours 15 million children live in a dark, ugly world of despair. Some 35 million Americans, or one-fifth of the citizens of the richest country in the world, live in poverty.

The Democratic administration has launched a massive effort to help the poor break out of the poverty cycle. Although just 1 year old, the antipoverty programs have given over 1 million children and young people their first chance to achieve a better life. With the aim of keeping the children of poverty from becoming the parents of poverty, the major thrust of the economic opportunity program is directed toward the youth of our Nation.

There are now over 13,000 youths receiving a 2-year program of education, vocational training, and work experience at 66 Job Corps centers including 49 conservation camps and 13 residential training centers—8 for men and 5 for women.

One of the most successful antipoverty programs is the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which provides young men and women full- or part-time work experience while enabling them to continue their education and to improve their employability. Work experience is gained through newly created jobs in hospitals, settlement houses, parks, libraries, schools, and in other public services. Some 354,000 youngsters have participated in 933 NYC projects. Neighborhood Youth Corps have had a noticeable effect on the declining number of high school dropouts. Of the class which entered fifth grade in 1957, approximately 71 percent—an all-time high, will be graduating from high school next June.

During this fall school term, 105,000 needy students attending 1,000 colleges and universities have part-time jobs through the OEO work-study program. Without this help most of these youngsters could not continue their schooling.

The other antipoverty program aimed directly at children is Project Head Start, which provides preschool training to prepare deprived youngsters for regular school. This past summer over 561,000 preschoolers attended 13,344 Head Start Centers in 2,500 communities. Half a million volunteers—teachers, doctors, dentists, neighborhood workers—prepared these children for school and for life, both mentally and physically. This program has met with such tremendous success it will be made a permanent part of the American educational system.

Community action programs, which utilize available local resources to help low-income families in the community, are providing a wide range of activities such as assistance in job training, counseling, housing, health services, special education. American communities have truly met the challenge. More than 90 percent of all communities with over 50,000 population are mounting full-scale offensives against the causes of poverty in their areas.

Other economic opportunity programs provide basic education for adults over 18 who cannot read or write English; employment and training for heads of families receiving assistance under aid to families with dependent children program; loans to persons in rural areas for agricultural and nonagricultural purposes; and loans for small business establishments.

The determining factor in who wins the war on poverty will not be Federal or State or local funds—it will be people—people helping people. Every segment of American life is participating in the battle—bankers, labor leaders, social workers, educators, businessmen, clergymen, doctors. And the poor are helping to work out their own salvation. Poverty does not deprive them of their potential for leadership and self-help.

A great many of the poverty programs are being assisted by the Domestic Peace Corps—VISTA. We now have 1,230 Volunteers in Service to America. These dedicated Americans, age 18 to 82, give up a year of their own lives and go to live and work with the poor in Harlem slums, in Appalachia, on Indian reservations. This is how the war will be won—people helping people.

The war on poverty is off to a good start. The 89th Congress voted to double funds available for these programs to accelerate the jobs that must be done. The doors to the American way of life and economic abundance are being opened to all our citizens.

TOWARD THE GREAT SOCIETY—EXCISE TAX REDUCTIONS

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965 may well become the most significant piece of consumer-oriented legislation passed by the 89th Congress. The act, which reduced the Federal excise burden by $4.6 billion, was designed to help business and buyer alike. Our intent in Congress was the same as President Johnson's: to make it easier to buy through lower prices.

Reduction or elimination of Federal excise taxes, referred to as "nuisance" taxes, have in many cases resulted in lower consumer goods costs without depriving any merchant or manufacturer of revenue. These taxes had increased costs of doing business because of collections and accounting and reporting.

We have reduced the excise on new cars by 3 percent with annual downward changes until January 1, 1969, when the levy will be 1 percent of maufacturers' cost, instead of the 10 percent that had been in effect for many years.

The excise has been entirely repealed on most consumer items, such as refrigerators, freezers, radios, television sets, phonographs, cameras and film and other photo supplies, most sporting goods, electric light bulbs, farm equipment formerly taxable, auto parts, air conditioners, appliances, furs, jewelry, luggage and handbags, and toilet preparations.

A number of important excise taxes remain in effect. They are the excises on tobacco and alcohol, automotive lubricants and tires, motor fuel, and an assortment of other items.

Most of the excise tax structure, Mr. Speaker, was imposed during wartime to provide a temporary source of revenue. They were to be eliminated when normal conditions returned. However, that gay "return to normalcy" never seemed to come, so that by fiscal 1964, the excises had been extended, increased, and expanded to provide some $13.9 billion in revenue.

With all of the excise tax revisions recommended by the administration and passed by the 89th Congress in full effect, about $11.3 billion in Federal excise taxes remains in effect.

In his message recommending the excise tax reduction, President Johnson said:

> To insure that the excise tax reductions make the maximum contribution to continued price stability and balanced prosperity, I call on American business to translate lower excise taxes promptly into lower retail prices for consumers.
>
> Business will share fully in the benefits of excise tax cuts through the larger sales volume they will generate. Rising volume will boost profits and create more jobs.

Mr. Speaker, ever since the excise tax reduction went into effect, I have been keeping close watch on consumer price trends, to make sure that lower prices actually are paid by the consumers.

It would be unconscionable if the business community were to adopt a policy of not passing the excise tax reductions on to the buyer. I say this after a review of the volume of testimony in July and August of 1964, in which one representative after another for various sectors of the business and industrial community pleaded for repeal of Federal excises, so as to lower prices and increase business volume.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has done its part. It remains up to the businessman to accept his part, to pass on the savings as was promised in the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means. I am confident that this will take place. If we find widespread breach of faith, we well ought to begin thinking of reimposition of the taxes so recently repealed.

FIRST SESSION OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Moeller] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is my duty to report today on the record of the first session of the 89th Congress, and on the position I took on the major legislative proposals considered by the U.S. House of Representatives.

By all odds, the single most important piece of legislation enacted during 1965 was the medical care program for the elderly. When it becomes effective next July 1, this blessed act will guarantee adequate hospital-medical services for America's 19 million senior citizens—including tens of thousands in southeastern Ohio.

The measure—a composite of the superior features of separate bills offered by the administration, congressional Democrats, certain Republicans and the American Medical Association—is especially needed in Ohio. Our State was one of only nine in the Nation that failed to ratify the Kerr-Mills Medical Assistance Act of 1960 and, thus, has no general health care program for the aged.

But come July 1, no longer will the elderly anywhere in America have to live in dread and fear that a single illness might wipe out the savings of a lifetime and leave them broke and penniless for the future.

I worked and fought and labored for the medical care program for many years, and the proudest moment of my legislative career came July 30, 1965, when I stood by President Johnson's side as he signed the bill into law.

If it had done nothing else but approve the medical care bill, I think this Congress would have earned for itself a lasting place in history.

However, we also approved such landmark legislation as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; the Appalachian Regional Development Act, of which I am coauthor; and the regional medical centers program, to name just a few.

At this point, let me make it perfectly clear that I supported the Johnson administration position when I felt it was meritorous, and voted "no" when I felt it lacked merit.

The myth that President Johnson pressured Congress to get what he wanted is just that—a myth without fact or foundation. Although the White House consulted me many times about legislation, never once did the President resort to arm-twisting tactics.

Among the proposals supported by the administration and opposed by me were foreign aid; the closing of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals; the creation of a Cabinet-rank Department of Housing and Urban Affairs; curtailment of the soil conservation program, and home rule for the District of Columbia.

I also help lead the successful fight against the administration's ill-advised plan to impose a consumer tax on bread to finance, in part, the 1965 farm program. I strongly supported the bill itself, but insisted that it should be funded out of general Federal revenues and not through the imposition of another consumer tax. My view prevailed.

Following is a résumé of the major programs enacted by Congress and which I did support and vote for.

ECONOMY, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, JOBS

Authorized the Public Works and Economic Development Act, which provides $3.3 billion in Federal grants and loans to communities for construction of water and sewerage facilities, industrial parks, access roads, and other improvements essential to economic growth and expansion. The need for this program is particularly acute in southeastern Ohio.

Expanded the Economic Opportunity Act (the antipoverty program) which contained the Job Corps; the Neighborhood Youth Corps; community action programs; Operation Head Start, loans to farmers and rural families, and other programs designed to attack the causes of poverty while providing assistance to the untrained, the undereducated, and the poor. It has achieved outstanding success in our 10th district.

Extended through June 1969 the Manpower Development and Training Act, under which hundreds of young men and women have been and are being trained in career opportunities at the Technical Training Center at Jackson, Ohio. Some 92 percent of the Center's graduates have been placed in permanent jobs.

Passed into law the Appalachian Regional Development Act, a long-range, $1.1 billion program to assist in the economic and industrial revitalization of southeastern Ohio and other distressed areas lying in Appalachia. It can do for our area what the fantastically successful Tennessee Valley Authority did for the region it serves.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND EDUCATION

In addition to passing the medical care program for the elderly, Congress also:

Increased social security pensions by 7 percent across the board, retroactive to January 1, 1965. This raise is providing an estimated $1.6 million a year in additional benefits for the 34,000 social security recipients in our 10th district.

Expanded assistance for child health and crippled children's services; increased payments under Federal-State programs for dependent children, the blind and the disabled; eased eligibility requirements for social security pensions for the permanently and totally disabled, for widows and for those over age 70; raised to 22 the age that children of deceased beneficiaries may draw social security benefits while attending school.

Authorized a 5-year program to develop multipurpose regional medical centers to fight heart disease, cancer, strokes, and other major diseases that account for the vast majority of all deaths in the United States.

Extended through 1970 the Community Health Service Act, authorizing grants to States and communities for mass immunization programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and measles.

Approved the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which initially authorizes $1.3 billion in Federal grants to strengthen and improve the quality of our public schools—especially those in distressed areas. The act contains more than $1 million for elementary and secondary schools in southeastern Ohio. Without question, this is one of the most significant bills of its kind passed by Congress since the Lincoln administration laid the groundwork for land-grant colleges a century ago.

Authorized the Higher Education Facilities Act, a 5-year undertaking to help States support community service programs of colleges and universities, to raise the quality of instruction in smaller colleges, to improve library facilities, and to make available scholarship grants for "exceptionally needy" students.

MILITARY, NATIONAL DEFENSE, VETERANS

In these vital fields, Congress appropriated $700 million additionally to prosecute the war in Vietnam. This action served notice that Congress, on a bipartisan basis, stands behind the administration's policy in Vietnam and that the United States would abandon no part of southeastern Asia to the Communists.

Provided pay increases averaging 10.4 percent for members of the armed services, the most substantial raise they have had since the early 1950's.

Appropriated funds to provide increased VA pensions to some 1.3 million veterans, and widows and children of veterans.

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL

Congress, I think, acted effectively to extend the blessings of our society to farmers and rural residents—the two segments of the population that have not shared fully in the economic progress of this Nation. Here are some of the things we did in 1965:

Extended and strengthened the Food and Agriculture Act, and provided a guaranteed increase of $300 million in the income of our farmers.

Increased from $200 to $450 million the amount of low-interest loans that the Farmers Home Administration may insure annually. During fiscal year 1965, approximately $182.6 million was loaned to 12,168 farm families to buy, enlarge, and develop farms; more than 82,000 farm families who might otherwise have been forced to leave their farms and move to the cities were provided with FHA loans to strengthen their economic positions.

Increased to $450 million funds for the rural water system program, which provides insured loans for water and sewerage projects, community recreation projects, shifts in land use, and farm purchases.

I have hit only the high spots in this résumé of congressional activities in 1965. If any of my people from the 10th district of Ohio have questions about any Federal program, or if any need assistance from Uncle Sam, they should contact me without hesitation.

At a later date I will report on the Federal projects, programs, and grants to be awarded in my congressional district.

TOWARD THE GREAT SOCIETY—MEDICARE, SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker—

> No longer will older Americans be denied the healing miracle of modern medicine. No longer will illness crush and destroy the savings that they have so carefully put away over a lifetime so that they might enjoy dignity in their later years.

So spoke President Johnson as he signed into law the medical care for the aged bill. Enactment of this bill by the 89th Congress culminated an intensive legislative effort to provide our citizens both dignity and security in their senior years.

Now every American age 65 and over will be covered by a basic plan of hospital insurance financed through the social security system. In addition, every senior citizen will have the option of enrolling in a voluntary supplementary plan which, for a $3 monthly contribution, will cover physicians' fees and other medical services. Briefly, the compulsory hospital plan provides 60 days of hospitalization, with a $40 deductible for each spell of illness, up to 100 days' posthospital care in a nonhospital facility, up to 100 visits for home health services after a hospital stay, and outpatient hospital diagnostic services available as required with a $20 deductible during a 20-day period.

The voluntary supplementary plan will pay for 80 percent of a patient's bill, after a $50 annual deductible, for physicians' and surgical services in hospital, clinic, office or home; up to 100 visits a year for home health services without requirement of prior hospitalization, and other medical services whether provided in or out of a medical institution, such as X-rays, electrocardiograms, ambulance services, surgical dressings, casts, braces, rental of certain medical equipment as oxygen tents, wheelchairs, iron lungs, hospital beds. Benefits under the two plans will go into effect July 1, 1966.

Enrollment in the basic hospital plan is automatic at age 65; however, persons who do not receive social security, railroad retirement benefits, Federal civil service retirement annuity, or public assistance payments should contact their local social security office. Those who are 65 or older desiring to enroll in the voluntary plan covering doctor's fees and other medical services should enroll before March 31, 1966. Others not yet 65 should enroll during the 3 months prior to reaching age 65.

Along with providing medical care for 18 million senior citizens this bill provides a 7-percent across-the-board increase in social security benefits for 20 million social security beneficiaries, retroactive to January 1, 1965.

The Kerr-Mills program, which provides medical assistance for the needy aged, is vastly expanded and will now include more comprehensive medical care for the blind and the disabled as well as the needy aged. Programs for materal and child health, crippled children, health care for needy children, and mental retardation planning are expanded.

Other amendments made to the social security law will gradually raise maximum family benefits to $368 effective in 1971; will continue child's insurance benefits until age 22 if he is attending school or college; will provide option to widows to receive actuarially reduced benefits at age 60; will liberalize earned income limitation by exempting first $1,500 a year; will permit disability payments to workers who have been or expect to be disabled for at least 12 consecutive months; will liberalize eligibility requirements by providing basic benefit of $35 a month at age 72 or over for 355,000 persons with minimum of three quarters of coverage; and will continue widow-widower benefits at reduced rate in event of remarriage.

To finance the 7-percent social security benefits increase and other improvements made in the program, including the basic hospital insurance plan for the aged, the social security taxable earnings base is increased to the first $6,600 of income and the tax rate is gradually raised from the present 3.62 percent to 5.65 percent in 1987.

It has now been 30 years since Congress enacted the social security law to provide workers with basic economic security and dignity in their twilight years. Many amendments over the years have improved the original law. The 89th Congress has again brought the act up to date to face new needs and challenges of the 1960's.

PICKLE HARVEST IN MICHIGAN

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the pickle harvest in my State of Michigan.

Since the termination of the Mexican bracero program under Public Law 78, we have all heard, I am sure, many cries of despair from those who profited from the use of low-wage foreign workers. We have been engulfed in predictions of gloom of what would happen without the braceros to harvest the crops. I would like to call attention to just one crop in one State to show how right the Secretary of Labor was that sufficient domestic workers could be recruited to harvest the crops.

Braceros have formed the major source of labor used in harvesting Michigan pickles in past years. Last year, for example, during the peak harvest period almost 80 percent of the pickers were braceros. The termination of the bracero program could thus have been expected to have a considerable impact.

However, this year, with the end of Public Law 78, the Department of Labor, its Farm Labor Service and Public Employment Service, processors, growers, and their associations conducted extensive recruitment campaigns throughout Michigan and nearby States to obtain sufficient labor. This campaign was very successful. By the last week in June, it was estimated that about 16,500 domestic migrant workers from outside Michigan were committed for work in the pickle harvest, which normally would have started in late July and early August.

Late planting and extremely cool and dry weather during the growing season delayed the beginning of the harvest by 2 to 3 weeks. In fact, severe drought conditions in many areas raised a question of whether nonirrigated fields would even be harvested. This prompted growers to notify the Michigan Employment Security Agency that they did not contemplate any additional recruitment at that time.

Because of the uncertain weather conditions, the actual pickup of workers who had been recruited and hired in Kentucky, West Virginia, Mississippi, Louisiana, and other States was deferred from 2 to 3 weeks. Workers who arrived early for the harvest were idle and turnover increased. Three or four more days of drought in July would have resulted in much acreage being abandoned.

Then came heavy rains, and the demand for workers became acute, but by that time, many workers previously recruited were no longer available. A crash recruitment program was then undertaken.

Despite these problems, a substantial number of domestic workers was recruited. Compared with the previous year, domestic employment was up 5,700 workers by the end of July, 7,400 by mid-August, 9,000 by the end of August, and 2,100 on September 15. These employment gains were directly attributable to the fact that Mexican braceros were not available. Had those foreign workers been available, it is almost certain that growers would have found domestic workers not available.

There has been another very interesting fact emerge from the situation this year. The Secretary of Labor has repeatedly charged that the use of Mexican braceros at low wages had adversely affected the employment of domestic workers by keeping farm wages depressed. Again it would seem that he was correct.

Last year, Michigan pickle growers paid their workers $1 an hour. A few paid piece rates which guaranteed earnings of $1 an hour. This year, most employers increased their wage rates to meet the regulations issued by the Secretary of Labor last year, and hourly rates were raised to $1.25 an hour. In fact, at the peak of the harvest, when labor supply was most critical, a number of growers changed their method of payment. They offered piece rates of 35 cents per pail for the first 15 pails, and 45 cents per pail for all additional. The hourly guarantee of $1.25 was kept. In marked contrast to previous practice, these rates were paid without regard to the size of the pickles picked. In the past, higher rates were paid only for small pickles.

Workers were instructed to pick all pickles found. The experience under this system was good, and worker productivity increased. Earnings of over $2 per hour was reported by many workers. This change in the wage rate was due to the tight labor situation, and would not have occurred if an ample supply of braceros been made available.

While official reports as to the production and value of the Michigan pickle crop will not be available for at least another month, domestic workers were employed in far greater numbers and at higher wages than in the past. It is estimated that domestic wage payments will be about $2,500,000 greater this year than last. To which, I must add, this money will all be spent in this country in contrast to the earnings of braceros who take a large portion of their earnings back to Mexico. These gains would never have been made had the Mexican program been still operative. Though there were problems, the significant thing is that the pickle crop was harvested, and that more jobs were provided for our own American workers and at higher wages.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CAHILL (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FOGARTY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ZABLOCKI, for 1 hour, tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ADAIR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROCK in two instances.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. CLEVELAND.

Mr. GURNEY.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. MCDADE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CULVER.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois.

Mr. WOLFF.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1758. An act to provide for the right of persons to be represented in matters before Federal agencies;

S. 2084. An act to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems;

S. 2092. An act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to various fruits and vegetables to provide for paid advertising; and

S. 2300. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1317. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer which was imported during May 1963 for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.;

H.R. 1386. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Pomona College;

H.R. 1393. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Eduvigis Aran Heffernan;

H.R. 1781. An act to amend section 113(a) of title 28, United States Code, to provide that Federal District Court for the eastern district of North Carolina shall be held at Clinton;

H.R. 2565. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of the University of Chicago;

H.R. 2578. An act for the relief of Maxie L. Rupert;

H.R. 2762. An act for the relief of Manlio Massimiliani;

H.R. 2906. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lily Ning Sheehan;

H.R. 3079. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eleni Bacola Ciacco, doctor of medicine;

H.R. 3126. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the University of Washington;

H.R. 3905. An act for the relief of Bibi Daljeet Kaur;

H.R. 4832. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of St. Louis University;

H.R. 5006. An act for the relief of Diosdado F. Almazan;

H.R. 5217. An act to permit the vessel *Little Nancy* to be documented for use in the coastwise trade;

H.R. 6312. An act for the relief of Mario Menna;

H.R. 6655. An act for the relief of Pieter Cornelis Metzelaar;

H.R. 6666. An act to provide for the free entry of a 90-centimeter split-pole magnetic spectrograph system with orangepeel internal conversion spectrometer attached for the use of the University of Pittsburgh;

H.R. 6720. An act for the relief of Ping-Kwan Fong;

H.R. 6906. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer and one split-pole spectrograph for the use of the University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.;

H.R. 7282. An act for the relief of Richard D. Walsh;

H.R. 7357. An act for the relief of Dr. Felipe V. Lavapies;

H.R. 7453. An act for the relief of Margaret Elizabeth and Frederick Henry Todd;

H.R. 7608. An act to provide for the free entry of one automatic steady state distribution machine for the use of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.;

H.R. 8135. An act for the relief of Jennifer Rebecca Siegel;

H.R. 8232. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer-gas chromatograph for the use of Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla.;

H.R. 8272. An act to provide for the free entry of an isotope separator for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.;

H.R. 8646. An act for the relief of Rifkin Textiles Corp.;

H.R. 9351. An act to provide for the free entry of one shadomaster measuring projector for the use of the University of South Dakota;

H.R. 9495. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9587. An act to provide for the free entry of a Craig countercurrent distribution apparatus for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.;

H.R. 9588. An act to provide for the free entry of an electrically driven rotating chair for the use of the Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, La.;

H.R. 10198. An act to amend the requirements relating to lumber under the Shipping Act, 1916;

H.R. 10256. An act for the relief of James D. W. Blyth, his wife, Jean Mary Blyth, and their daughter, Penelope Jean Blyth;

H.R. 10292. An act for the relief of Hilda Shen Tsiang;

H.R. 11096. An act to authorize the disposal of graphite, quartz crystals, and lump steatite talc from the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both;

H.J. Res. 397. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District; and

H.J. Res. 597. Joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of rocketry.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

October 20, 1965:

H.R. 23. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9022. An act to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; to eliminate inequities in the application of Public Law 815 in certain military base closings; to make uniform eligibility requirements for school districts in Public Law 874; and for other purposes.

October 21, 1965:

H.R. 1218. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt & Export Co.;

H.R. 4088. An act for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc.;

H.R. 9545. An act providing for the acquisition and preservation by the United States of certain items of evidence pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy;

H.R. 11303. An act to amend section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended;

H.R. 11369. An act to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become parties to title II of the Compact on Taxation of Motor Fuels Consumed by Interstate Buses and the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity;

H.R. 11420. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 571. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25, 1965, as National Parkinson Week.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 22, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1696. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

1697. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the popular election of the Governor of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1698. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the acquisition, transfer, conveyance, and lease of certain property in the District of Columbia for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States, as sites for other international organizations, and as sites for governments of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

1699. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases as of August 31, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1700. A letter from the national corporation agent, Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., transmitting the financial statement of the Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., covering the period August 1, 1964–July 31, 1965, pursuant to Public Law 84–224; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 9963. A bill to promote the economic development of the State of Alaska by providing for U.S. participation in the statewide exposition to be held in Alaska during 1967; with amendment (Rept. No. 1187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2542. An act to amend the Small Business Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 509. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on crime in the District of Columbia, and House Report No. 176, entitled "District of Columbia Crime," without amendment (Rept. No. 1189). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 512. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearing on home rule for the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1190). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 513. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on "Lower Colorado River Basin Project," 89th Congress, 1st session; without amendment (Rept. No. 1191). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 519. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on H.R. 2580 (89th Cong., 1st sess.), to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; with amendment (Rept. No. 1192). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 544. Resolution to provide for the printing as a House document of the statements made and other pertinent matter presented in honor of Hon. Carl Vinson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1193). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 569. Resolution that there be printed as a House document the dedication ceremonies of the Carl Vinson Room, the hearing room of the Committee on Armed Services in the Rayburn House Office Building; without amendment (Rept. No. 1194). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 570. Resolution authorizing the printing of the document, "Why Vietnam," as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 1195). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 592. Resolution providing for printing as a House document the "Compilation of Social Security Laws"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1196). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 53. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the report of the proceedings of the 42d biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf as a Senate document; without amendment (Rept. No. 1197). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. H.R. 11588. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 1198). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 10607. A bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. Report pursuant to (63 Stat. 377); without amendment (Rept. No. 1200). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee of Conference. H.R. 168 (Rept. No. 1201). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee of conference. H.R. 9047 (Rept. No. 1202). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee of Conference. H.R. 10305 (Rept. No. 1203). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. POWELL: Committee of conference. H.R. 8310. An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1204). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 11722. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 11723. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 11724. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction for the costs of removing diseased trees where the removal is required by a local governing body; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11725. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct two modern stern-ramp trawlers to be used for experimental commercial fishing, research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 11726. A bill to establish a Redwood National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 11727. A bill to authorize the grade of brigadier general in the Medical Service Corps of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 11728. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of individuals irrespective of race, creed, color, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11729. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11730. A bill to provide protection against lynchings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 11731. A bill to authorize the negotiated sale of two inactive Liberty ships to the Santa Rosa Board of County Commissioners, Florida; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 11732. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Washington Country National Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 11733. A bill to prohibit Federal assistance to certain educational institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 11734. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize increased appropriations for assisting construction of municipal sewage treatment works, and to strengthen authority to enforce pollution abatement; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 11735. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11736. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for the free importation of certain specialized educational equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 11737. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study and formulate a comprehensive plan containing recommendations regarding the action that should be taken to preserve, develop, and make accessible for public use and benefit the Long Island Sound and related shoreline areas in the States of New York, Connecticut, and Rhode Island; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H.R. 11738. A bill to provide a program of Federal assistance to elementary schools throughout the Nation to improve educational opportunities through provision for the services of child development specialists and to provide a program of Federal assistance for the training of such elementary school personnel in the institutions of higher education, and for other educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11739. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 11740. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that emphysema developing a 10-percent degree of disability within 10 years after separation from service shall be considered to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 11741. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 11742. A bill to amend chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, to provide additional protection for civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, to prescribe additional penalties for violations of civil rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11743. A bill to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 11744. A bill to clarify the tax status of American Indians; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 11745. A bill to provide a program of Federal assistance to elementary schools throughout the Nation to improve educational opportunities through provisions for the services of child development specialists and to provide a program of Federal assistance for the training of such elementary school personnel in the institutions of higher education, and for other educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 11746. A bill to prohibit the use of appropriated funds by officials or agencies of the Government for the purpose of influencing the vote in any referendum or election held pursuant to an act of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 11747. A bill to amend section 3203, title 38, United States Code, to restrict the conditions under which benefits are immediately reduced upon readmission of veterans for hospitalization or other institutional care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11748. A bill to amend section 111 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the prepayment of certain expenses associated with the travel of veterans to or from a Veterans' Administration facility or other place, in connection with vocational rehabilitation or counseling, or for the purpose of examination, treatment, or care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 11749. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 11750. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer the bathyscaph *Trieste II* to the city of San Diego, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOW:

H.J. Res. 780. Joint resolution designate Columbus Day, the 12th day of October in each year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.J. Res. 781. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to empower the Congress to regulate the distribution of pornographic literature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.J. Res. 782. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H. Res. 616. Resolution authorizing the Committee of Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H. Res. 617. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to conduct an investigation and study of the quality of education made available overseas to children of members of the Armed Forces, and of civilian officers and employees, of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 618. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Un-American Activities to conduct an investgiation and study of the organization known as Students for a Democratic Society and the extent and character of its involvement in the current demonstrations relating to official U.S. policy in Vietnam; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Res. 619. Resolution authorizing the Speaker to appoint a delegation from the House to attend the dedication of the American Research Hospital for Children; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 11751. A bill for the relief of Mr. George Panourgias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 11752. A bill for the relief of Lei-May Ling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 11753. A bill to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Indiana University; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 11754. A bill for the relief of Ignacio Aiello, his wife, Maria Theresa Aiello, and their children, Gaetana Maria Aiello, Paola Aiello, Andrea Aiello, and Anna Aiello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 11755. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Angelou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 11756. A bill for the relief of Giovanni D'Amico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 11757. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Stabile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 11758. A bill for the relief of Antonino Sutera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 11759. A bill for the relief of Barbara Elizabeth Ella Stadler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY (by request):

H.R. 11760. A bill for the relief of Dr. Siddiq Nabi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 11761. A bill for the relief of George Tsilipetros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 11762. A bill for the relief of Mr. I Ping Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 11763. A bill for the relief of Haviv Schieber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

282. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Assembly of Naha City, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands, relative to the method of election of the Chief Executive of the Government of the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

283. Also, petition of the City Council, Cambridge, Mass., relative to water pollution in the Charles River; to the Committee on Public Works.

284. Also, petition of the Massachusetts Medical Society, Boston, Mass., relative to certain directives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

Thursday, October 21, 1965

The Senate met at 9:30 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who in the quietness dost speak to listening hearts, we pray Thee cleanse the thoughts, that color our outlook to all that we see and touch for we know that only to the pure dost Thou grant the vision of Thy face.

May those who here speak for the people be patient in argument, charitable in judgment, and slow to wrath. Grant us to know Thee that we may truly love Thee, and so love Thee that we may freely serve Thee.

We would bring to this, our daily altar of prayer, our inmost selves cluttered and confused, where the good and evil, the petty and the great, the wheat and the tares, are so entwined.

In our private lives, and in our public service, help us this and every day, to live more nearly as we pray.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 20, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 19, 1965, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 322. An act for the relief of Choy-Sim Mah;

S. 611. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Mount Edgecumbe Boarding School, Alaska;

S. 779. An act for the relief of Henryda Lyska;

S. 903. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to painting, illumination, and dismantlement of radio towers;

S. 1012. An act for the relief of Dr. Otto F. Kernberg;

S. 1397. An act for the relief of Vasileos Koutsougeanopoulos;

S. 1576. An act to amend the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), as amended, providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of Old St. Louis, Mo., and for other purposes;

S. 1689. An act to amend paragraph (a) of the act of March 4, 1913, as amended, by the act of January 31, 1931 (16 U.S.C. 502);

S. 1775. An act for the relief of Erich Gansmuller;

S. 1856. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell uniform clothing to the Naval Sea Cadet Corps;

S. 1873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clara W. Dollor;

S. 2232. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf," approved September 2, 1958, as amended, in order to further provide for a loan service of educational media for the deaf, and for other purposes;

S. 2273. An act to render immune from seizure under judicial process certain objects of cultural significance imported into the United States for temporary display or exhibition, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 69. Joint resolution to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the new reports on the Executive Calendar, beginning with Marvin E. Frankel, of New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Lt. Gen. William Henry Sterling Wright, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list;

Rear Adm. Thomas F. Connolly, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving; and

Harvey P. Lanham, and sundry other officers, for temporary promotion in the Navy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Marvin E. Frankel, of New York, to be a U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John W. Reynolds, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. Philip Randolph Lee, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Bernard L. Boutin, of New Hampshire, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, it is a distinct pleasure for me to rise in support of the confirmation of Bernard Boutin as Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I have known Bernie Boutin for over 20 years as a neighbor, a fellow Democrat, and a close friend. His confirmation today is a tribute to the record of accomplishment which he has built as an outstanding public servant.

Bernard Boutin served as mayor of my home city of Laconia, N.H., for two terms, during which he demonstrated the administrative ability, capacity for hard work, and sterling honesty which have characterized his public service. The mayoralty of Laconia can be a different job, as I know from experience, but Mayor Buntin's record paved the way for a long succession of Democratic mayors from Laconia.

Bernard Boutin came to Washington as Deputy Administrator of the General Services Administration during the beginning of the Kennedy administration, and so distinguished himself that he was made GSA Administrator after a year had passed. As Administrator of this multi-billion-dollar organization, he performed so superbly that, as I have learned discussing his nomination with colleagues in the Senate, he is today regarded as the finest Administrator in the history of the General Services Administration.

A year ago, Administrator Boutin left the GSA to enter private industry, as executive vice president of the National Association of Home Builders. At the urging of President Johnson, he has left his highly paid post to again take up the burdens of public office. I am certain that his outstanding executive ability will stand him in good stead as he enters upon the difficult job ahead.

Mr. President, in going over the many sterling qualities which Bernard Boutin will bring to his new post, it is important to mention that the Government will be getting two good workers for the price of one.

Alice Boutin, the new Deputy Director's wife, I am certain will continue as her husband's gracious partner in the days to come. Together with their 10 children, the Boutin family will continue to see to it that the new Deputy Director's job will be of the highest order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles W. Halleck, of Maryland, to be associate judge of the District of Columbia court of general sessions for the term of 10 years.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order entered yesterday, October 20, 1965, the Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] for one-half hour.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR FONG

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, in the past few weeks, much news coverage has been given me for recommending among others my son and niece to the Post Office Department for summer work.

The fact that I am a man of means and that the Post Office Department summer hire was confused with the program of work designed for needy students contributed much to the news value of the articles.

Unfortunately the articles were misleading. They were also incomplete.

These news articles stated that these jobs were intended for needy youths.

This is not true. The Postmaster General and other high officials of the Post Office Department have repeatedly stated that the Post Office Department summer job program was not a program for the needy.

HELP PROVIDE OVER 400 PRIVATE JOBS

The news articles on the post office job episode referred to me as a millionaire, but no mention was ever made that, as a millionaire, I helped to provide permanent employment for more than 400 people in Hawaii and part-time and summer employment for students.

Ever since my graduation from Harvard Law School in 1935, I have, through various businesses, helped to create jobs and to provide a livelihood for many, many people in Hawaii.

Finance Factors, Ltd., and its family of companies have been leaders in creating jobs for the people of Hawaii. I have been president and chairman of the board of directors of Finance Factors from the time it was founded.

The principal activities of this family of companies are industrial loans, finance, investments, home building, real estate development, rentals, insurance, stocks and bonds brokerage, and wholesaling and retailing of marine supplies. Also included in this family of companies is Finance Factors Foundation, an organization engaged in charitable, educational, and benevolent activities.

The Finance Factors family of companies with assets exceeding $50 million provides full-time jobs for 338 persons throughout the State of Hawaii. In addition, the Highway Construction Co., Ltd., of which I am chairman of the board of directors, and which engages in all phases of heavy construction work, provides full-time jobs for 90 persons.

Together these enterprises provide full-time jobs for a total of 428 men and women in Hawaii. The Library of Congress reports that a company employing 400 employees ranks in the top 1 percent of the Nation's private employers.

ALSO HELP PROVIDE JOBS FOR STUDENTS

Furthermore, for more than 10 years, Finance Factors has been a part of the State's cooperative office education program. This is a division of the vocational training student program of the department of education.

Each year under this cooperative office education program, Finance Factors hires high school students who attend classes in the morning and work in the afternoon. They also work during the summer. In 1963, 12 students were hired; in 1964, 8, and in 1965, 6.

A number of these student hirees have graduated and remained with the company as permanent employees.

SUMMER CONSTRUCTION JOBS PAID MORE THAN POST OFFICE JOBS

Highway Construction Co., Ltd., this year hired 10 students, most of them college students. They were paid from $3.20 an hour to $3.60 an hour, which far exceeds the rate of pay at the post office.

Just this summer, Highway Construction Co., Ltd., alone provided more jobs at higher pay for Hawaii's students than received by those obtaining post office jobs through my recommendation. Besides, the post office jobs were mostly part time, whereas these construction jobs were full-time positions.

REASON FOR WORKING IN POST OFFICE

The fact that my son Rodney wanted to secure a new, different, and instructive experience in the Post Office Department as an addition to his already diversified work experiences was never mentioned in news articles.

Rodney had worked one summer as a tray boy at Libby, McNeill & Libby; one summer as a clerk at the Liberty Bank of Honolulu; one summer as a construction worker at Highway Construction Co., Ltd.; part of one summer as a lot boy at Used Car Sales, and the other part at Pacific Marine Supply; and from time to time as a farmhand on my banana farm, hoeing weeds, fertilizing, harvesting, and carting the bananas to market.

During his spare time he has learned to build boats by blueprints, repair marine engines, make commercial signs and posters, and take and develop photographs as a hobby.

With this varied work background and knowledge, he felt that the approximately 2-month post office summer job would give him experience in one of the biggest departments of the Federal Government.

Undoubtedly the prospects of experience to be gained prompted other Members of Congress like myself to suggest next of kin for post office jobs.

HOW I CAME TO REFER NAMES TO POST OFFICE

In early June, an official at the San Francisco regional post office telephoned me, inviting me to submit names for summer employment. As this program was not for the needy, he did not state any requirement that the nominees must be needy youths.

On inquiring how many I was to recommend, I was told "about four." I then asked Rodney to give me names of four University of Hawaii students who wanted to work.

After giving me the four names, Rodney said he also would like to work and see how the post office functions. But as he had intended to attend summer school, I said he should spend his time on his studies.

Rodney said by strictly budgeting his time he thought he could hold a part-time job, apply himself to his studies, and build a hydroplane—boat—he had planned as a summer project.

Like other parents, I am trying to make sure my children complete their schooling. I am trying to teach them to make good use of their time, to set goals and, by their own efforts and hard work, to achieve them. Knowing that people who are pressed for time usually use their time efficiently, I consented to recommend him for a part-time job.

FOUR JOBS AVAILABLE, SON LISTED SIXTH IN PREFERENCE

I therefore agreed to submit his name—but as No. 6 on my list. My niece also asked that she be recommended. I listed her as No. 5.

Had I wished to insure first consideration for my son, I would have listed his name first. I added my niece and son as No. 5 and No. 6, respectively, with no assurance whatever that they would also be given employment, for my quota was four. I was not even assured that four would be appointed. The post office could have rejected every nominee.

My letter to the San Francisco regional office reads as follows:

> June 15, 1965.
>
> Mr. Raymond R. Holmquist,
> *Regional Director, San Francisco Regional Office, Post Office Department, San Francisco, Calif.*
> (Attention of Mr. Raymond Germaine.)
>
> Dear Mr. Holmquist: Pursuant to Mr. Germaine's telephone conversation, I am submitting the following names for employment for the summer in the city of Honolulu listed according to preference; Kathleen Kong, Wayne Nishigaya, Randy Ko, Ronald Matsumura, Carolyn Fong, and Rodney Fong.
>
> With warm best wishes and aloha, I am,
> Sincerely yours,
> Hiram L. Fong.

In previous years, I was not invited to recommend anyone for summer jobs at the post office. Nevertheless, I did recommend several students for such jobs at the Post Office in Washington, D.C. In the past 5 years, I have had three appointed, less than one a year. This year I was surprised that not only were the first four persons I named employed, but the whole list.

THEY WORKED, EARNED THEIR PAY

The duties assigned to my son and niece were at night. Hours were irregular. To my knowledge, both fulfilled their tasks satisfactorily. Both worked for their pay and put in their time just as all employees are expected to do.

Actually, Rodney could have worked in a construction job paying $3.60 an hour—which is much more than the post office job. Instead, he was willing to work in the post office for less money to diversify his experience.

In this way, a higher paying job was available for someone else seeking summer employment.

I am pleased and proud that my son preferred to apply himself constructively during part of his summer vacation instead of merely to loaf and play.

I believe every boy should earn his way through life. No one should be a freeloader.

The son of a man of means would be severely criticized for being a perpetual playboy, living a life of ease without gainful work—and rightly so.

Critics cannot logically condemn persons of means for a life of leisure, then turn around and condemn those who do work, on the ground they are depriving someone else of a job.

SON RESIGNED ON HIS OWN

On August 26, my son resigned. For he had gained the impression that the post office summer program was for the needy, after reading a magazine article and the post office questionnaire asking summer employees how they were going to use their earnings.

Rodney resigned without consulting me.

I am proud that, as soon as he thought this was an antipoverty program, he decided he did not want to deprive a needy person of a job.

His impression that this was an antipoverty program was mistaken, but to him the impression was real.

POST OFFICE PROGRAM NOT FOR NEEDY

Every year for the past several years, the Federal Government has had a program of hiring young people for summer work to replace regular employees on vacations, to reduce overtime of regular workers, and to work on special projects. About 50,000 youths have been hired each summer, long before there was any antipoverty program.

This year on May 23, President Johnson proposed a second summer hire program, called Youth Opportunity Campaign, with the goal of increasing job opportunities for youths age 16 through 21 by half a million jobs in Government and business.

This was to involve not only the Federal Government, which was to supply 25,000 jobs, but State governments, cities of 10,000 or more, and private businesses throughout the Nation.

The President named Vice President Humphrey to head a task force to work out the details of the program.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY SAID NEED NOT A REQUIREMENT

Recently, the Vice President confirmed that the Youth Opportunity Campaign did not require that youths be needy.

On September 18, 1965, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin published an article relating to an interview with reporters on September 16, as follows:

> The Vice President contended the Federal Youth Opportunity Campaign launched last spring by President Johnson carried no requirement that the youngsters be poor.
>
> He said any such means test would be "humiliating to young people." Stressing that many of the youngsters were earning money for college expenses, Humphrey said many families not in the poverty bracket need help for those high costs.

ANTIPOVERTY FUNDS NOT USED FOR POST OFFICE SUMMER HIRES

Assistant Postmaster General Tyler Abell said the hiring of summer help for the Post Office was not, in any way, related to the Federal antipoverty program.

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin story, published on September 4, continued:

> Abell said criticism across the Nation has been based upon the misconception that the program was aimed at helping poverty-stricken youths.
>
> "This is not true," he said.
>
> "These funds were appropriated, as they have been for several years to give the Post Office the help that it needs."

At a hearing of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, which I attended, on the nomination of Lawrence F. O'Brien, to be Postmaster General, Mr. O'Brien testified that "it was my understanding the Department did not make use of so-called poverty appropriation funds" in paying its summer workers—committee transcript, September 1.

Assistant Postmaster General Richard J. Murphy wrote to Representative Albert H. Quie on August 16:

> The legislation concerning the war on poverty, to which you refer, has no direct relationship to the summer employment program of the Department, which is operated from departmental funds.

CONGRESSMEN NOT TOLD TO NAME NEEDY

As I was asked to submit a list of names, I naturally assumed that the post office summer jobs were the regular summer-hire jobs that had been available for years.

Other Members of Congress evidently were under the same impression.

In the Honolulu Star-Bulletin for August 30, the following appears:

> Representative Patsy T. Mink said there was no insistence that the young people come from low-income families.
>
> "As I recall, the request said nothing about them having to be financially needy," said Representative Spark Matsunaga.

U.S. Representative Albert H. Quie told the House that he was called in early June by the post office. He said:

> I was not offered a quota but was simply told I could submit names for consideration. However, neither was anything said about the youths being economically or educationally disadvantaged.

POST OFFICE SUMMER PROGRAM DIFFERENT

A joint statement released in August by Postmaster General Gronouski and Civil Service Commission Chairman John W. Macy, Jr., after a review of the Post Office Department's summer hiring program, disclosed further facts, as follows:

> This review shows that there had been a basic misunderstanding on the part of some department officials regarding the relationship between the regular summer employment program of the department and the additional summer employment undertaken in response to the youth opportunity campaign.
>
> The misunderstanding was caused in part by the nature of the Post Office Department's summer requirements. In previous years seasonal assistants were used to replace regular postal employees who were on vacation and to reduce excessive overtime worked by regular employees. They were paid at the same rate, $2.29 per hour (PFS-3 level), paid to full-time employees for similar work.
>
> This summer the Department did not believe that it was practicable to differentiate between the duties assigned to individuals appointed under the new youth opportunity campaign.
>
> This contrasts with the operations of other agencies where it was possible to create special employment opportunities for Youth Opportunity Campaign referrals and consequently to pay the minimum Federal Youth Opportunity Campaign wage rate of $1.25 an hour.
>
> In view of the similarity of duties and wage rates, the Post Office Department treated all summer appointments as one group.

COMPETITIVE EXAMS STARTING NEXT YEAR

Recently, the Civil Service Commission announced plans for competitive examinations for most Federal summer jobs starting in 1966. A competitive testing plan, separate from the general summer employment examination, is being developed for summer jobs in post offices throughout the Nation. The post office test will be open to children and relatives of Members of Congress on the same basis as all other youths.

I heartily approve selection of young men and women, including children and relatives of Members of Congress, for summer jobs on the basis of competitive examination. It will assure selection on the basis of merit and will give everyone an even break according to ability.

Summer hiring programs for the "disadvantaged," which call for referral of needy youths by employment service offices or by welfare organizations, will not be affected by the new competitive examining programs, according to the Civil Service Commission.

SUMMARY

Vice President HUMPHREY and top post office officials have publicly stated the post office summer job program was not for needy youths. No antipoverty funds were used for it.

In inviting me to submit four names, the post office did not specify these were to be needy persons.

I submitted six names in order of preference, listing my son last and my niece next to last. I had no prior indication nor assurance my son and niece would even be considered for jobs.

The Post Office, surprisingly, offered employment to all names on my list. My son and niece both worked their required hours and earned their pay.

I am glad they were ambitious enough to want to work. I believe their experience was valuable.

By working part time at the post office at lower pay, my son made available a higher pay, full-time summer job for someone else in the highway construction firm of which I am chairman of the board of directors.

Various businesses, of which I am president and chairman of the board, provide year-round employment for 428 men and women in Hawaii, as well as part-time and summer employment every year for high school and university students.

In the future most Federal summer jobs will be filled by competitive examinations taken by young men and women, including children and relatives of Members of Congress. I believe this is a fair method of selection.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a joint statement of Postmaster General John A. Gronouski and Civil Service Commission Chairman John W. Macy, Jr., on appointments of seasonal assistants in the Post Office Department be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL JOHN A. GROUNOUSKI AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION CHAIRMAN JOHN W. MACY, JR., ON APPOINTMENTS OF SEASONAL ASSISTANTS IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Summer appointments in the Post Office Department have been reviewed by the Department and the U.S. Civil Service Commission. This review shows that there had been a basic misunderstanding on the part of some Department officials regarding the relationship between the regular summer employment program of the Department and the additional summer employment undertaken in response to the Youth Opportunity Campaign.

The misunderstanding was caused in part by the nature of the Post Office Department's summer requirements. In previous years seasonal assistants were used to replace regular postal employees who were on vacation and to reduce excessive overtime worked by regular employees. They were paid at the same rate, $2.29 per hour (PFS–3 level), paid to full-time employees for similar work.

This summer the Department did not believe that it was practicable to differentiate between the duties assigned to individuals appointed under their regular summer employment program and those appointed under the new Youth Opportunity Campaign. This contrasts with the operation of other agencies where it was possible to create special employment opportunities for Youth Opportuntiy Campaign referrals and consequently to pay the minimum Federal Youth Opportunity Campaign wage rate of $1.25 per hour.

In view of the similarity of duties and wage rates, the Post Office Department treated all summer appointments as one group. Referrals from sources which had furnished names for consideration for summer employment in the past were accepted and considered for employment to all summer jobs. State employment service referrals were also sought. However, the Department did not at the outset of the program use the State employment service's offices as the prime recruiting source.

After the initial hiring effort, the Post Office Department made all seasonal appointments solely on the basis of the needs of the Department and the needs of the individual. This included using the State employment service referrals as the primary source. A final report of hiring, in fact, shows that the State employment offices provided the largest source of employees.

The Postmaster General and the Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission have determined—based on the information developed in their now completed reviews—that a thorough study of future summer employment procedures in the Department will be completed in time for use in the summer of 1966. The purpose of this study will be to establish future summer employment which will meet the operating needs of the Department on a full merit basis.—August 16, 1965.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, the Senator from Vermont is recognized.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as the first session of the 89th Congress draws to a close it seems appropriate to comment briefly upon some of the issues of foreign policy that are of concern to my constituents and to constituents of other Members of the Senate.

When I pick up the morning paper I get quite concerned to note that according to some pollster or other 60 percent of the American people support President Johnson's foreign policy; 30 percent oppose it; and the rest have no opinion.

American citizens, and even the President, are entitled now and then to have something more solid to grapple with than percentage figures gleaned by anonymous aids who sample carefully construed cross-sections of our society.

My views are not based on polls but are an attempt to put my reflections into the stream of American thought.

By and large it seems that during this session of the Congress members of the Republican Party have endeavored with reasonable success to maintain a nonpartisan attitude toward the President's conduct of American foreign policy.

It has even been suggested that the President's desire to obtain a consensus for his policies has been so effective that my colleagues in the Republican Party have been constrained to silence.

But we do have some Members of Congress who have spoken out in a most critical manner.

What Republicans may have failed to offer in the way of criticism of the President's policies in Vietnam, or the Dominican Republic or elsewhere, has been more than made up for by some of the dissident voices within his own party.

What this adds up to is that although we have been reasonably successful in keeping foreign policy out of partisan politics, it is nevertheless a subject which concerns most Americans.

It excites comment and debate on the campuses, in the press, and in the Congress.

It is also discussed in a serious mood at the crossroads.

This debate is healthy.

It is a characteristic of American society.

In the election year ahead, I hope there will be no effort to seek partisan advantage by either party in these democratic discussions of foreign policy.

At the same time I urge the President to weigh with great care the criticism and comment from those outside his bureaucracy regardless of party.

The President knows ours is not a society in which "the King can do no wrong."

I sometimes suspect, however, that there may be individuals within the bureaucracy who put both ears to the ground to find out what the White House thinks or would like to hear before deciding on their own recommendations.

Certainly recent books on the Kennedy years suggest that Presidents must be cautious in distinguishing between self-generated consensus and consensus arising out of full and free discussion.

I am one who is put on guard by statements such as those made a few days ago by an Assistant Secretary, who said:

> The facts * * * are undisputed.

And:

> All those in our Government who had access to official information were convinced.

I hope the President is also on guard.

> The public demands certainties.

Said Henry Mencken, but he added:

> There are no certainties.

Having said these things, I hasten to add that I believe the policies of the President during the past year have been a fair reflection of the attitudes of the American people.

I would not deny that a strong President is able to educate, persuade, cajole, or even intimidate the American people into particular courses of action, domestic or foreign.

This has been done.

But ideally—and this is the usual pattern—the broad lines of the foreign policy of the United States are determined by an interplay between public attitudes and the demands of foreign policy as the President and his advisers see those demands.

This is a condition which our foreign friends often fail to understand.

What the President proposes is likely to be the disposition of the American people.

But a President must be cautious and not construe the disposition and advice of the bureaucracy to be the disposition of the American people or their representatives in Congress.

I believe history will show that during the first years of his Presidency, Mr. Johnson has faithfully reflected changing public attitudes toward the conduct of American foreign policy.

He has presided over a foreign policy characterized by a significant change in direction and tone.

It will long be debated whether these changes resulted from the personal impact of one man serving as the most powerful Executive of the world, or whether these changes stemmed from the basic attitudes of Americans toward the world.

I am fully satisfied that the changed emphasis in our foreign policy is attributable in large part to the impact of the American people on the President, and not vice versa.

I do not believe President Johnson has brought the six-shooter and frontier justice to international relations.

But he surely is reflecting some dissatisfaction with the state of international relations.

There is little doubt that American foreign policy during the past year has changed course toward a hardening of attitudes toward other nations.

We have increased our commitment in Vietnam; we have hardened our attitude toward Indonesia and its President; the Chief of State of Pakistan was made to feel the concern of this Nation at his turn toward Communist China; the United States was quick to react to the burning of its library in the United Arab Republic and is not likely again to rush into long-term commitments of food to assist the Nasser regime maintain its power; and General de Gaulle's coolness has been reciprocated.

There have been some gestures toward softening relationships with other nations—notably our withdrawal of opposition to permitting delinquents to vote in the General Assembly of the United Nations, but even in that instance we made it clear that we ourselves were abandoning the double standard in the United Nations.

There are those who may fix the 1962 missile crisis in Cuba as the turning point in American policy—the moment when President Kennedy with the full backing of the Nation announced to the world that we had had enough.

The President's demand that Soviet missiles be removed from Cuba was met.

He stopped short of the use of force, however, to ascertain whether the removals had in fact taken place and he stopped short of the use of force in removing the thorn of Castro from our flank.

The marked hardening of public attitudes in the field of foreign policy which has taken place during the past 2 years deserves comment because such comment may help Americans understand themselves.

Even more important, this expression may help foreigners understand that American policy enunciated by the President reflects a basic change in our public attitude.

It may be old-fashioned in this day to claim that the American people are basically an idealistic people.

Our continent has been filled with immigrants who fled other countries to seek a new life here—not just a rich life in a monetary sense, but a rich life in the sense of freedom, equality, and trust in one another.

We mobilized in World War I for the ideal of creating a world safe for democracy.

We fought World War II for the ideal of a world of peace, free of want and fear.

We fought in Korea for the ideal of a United Nations capable of using force to prevent aggression; and we fight today in South Vietnam for the ideal that aggressors should leave their neighbors alone.

I am not so naive as to believe that these "ideals" encompass all the reasons we have fought wars—but they state the basic reason why Americans as a people have been willing to mobilize their resources to wage war.

After World War II this Nation went on its most idealistic binge.

We supported the United Nations; we liquidated our Armed Forces; we engaged in massive programs of economic recovery; we provided economic assistance to nearly a hundred nations; we helped arm nations—never for offense, but always for defense, of course. We engaged in vast programs of exchanges of persons in the hope that international understanding would promote peace.

What is happening today is that American idealism is being tampered by a growing disillusionment that runs deeper and deeper.

Let me illustrate.

The American dedication to the ideal of a United Nations as an instrument to maintain international peace, to develop friendly relations among nations, to achieve international cooperation in solving economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian problems, and, in general, to harmonize the actions of nations, has given way to disillusionment with the United Nations as a peacekeeping instrument.

I need not spell out the reasons for this, but only to mention disregard of article 19, the substitution of the concept of universality of membership for the concept of selectivity, the willingness of many nations to use the United Nations only when it serves the narrow national interest.

American disillusion with the ideal of foreign aid as a means to help poorer nations develop their economies is deepening to the point of threatening the entire concept.

American AID was formerly mostly in the form of outright gifts.

But other nations did not follow that pattern.

American AID then took the form of low-interest loans.

But other nations did not follow that pattern.

Most important of all, American aid was based on an assumption that there would be substantial amounts of self-help—that the rich of a poor nation would invest in their own economies; that they would pay their taxes, that they would support land reform, and show some interest in the poor of their own societies. This has proved largely a false expectation.

The wealthy of underdeveloped countries have no stomach for social change.

They are quick to describe any effort toward tax collection as communism and land reform as revolution.

In general they reject the measures which have produced reasonably affluent and productive societies in Europe and the United States.

Indeed, there is accumulating evidence of an alarming division in many of the newer countries.

The vested interests object to constructive change as communism, thereby leading the poor to believe their only chance of development lies along that path.

There seem to be a very few statesmen who realize that change is not communism, or that communism is not the most rapid way to develop wealth.

There is a middle way.

It is largely the path of Western Europe and the United States.

It involves the acceptance of change by the vested interests and an intelligent recognition by the poor of the facts of economic life.

Let me speak more of this last point.

For some 50 years now there has been a widely accepted myth that the best way to produce the greatest wealth for the greatest number in the shortest period of time is for the state to step in and control all individuals and their activities for the benefit of all of society.

Security is a government job.

This is the Marxist route of development and the myth is widely accepted that the Soviet Union is a great example of how a poor, nonindustrial society can by strict control and totalitarian means create wealth.

It is assumed almost without question that Russia is a great power today because it is a Socialist society.

Few people contemplate, however, what Russia might have been today had she developed more in the pattern of free enterprise.

For one thing, she would have been able to feed her own people.

For another, she would not be struggling today to work out a state balance between industrial production and the demands of her people.

But most important of all, had the Soviet Union given greater scope to the ingenuity of individuals free from state economic and political controls it is likely that her great potential could have found common cause with the West to produce not only wealth, but cultural and intellectual freedoms that would have served all mankind.

American disillusionment is, I believe, in part attributable then not only to our growing realization of the wastage of our foreign aid arising from the stingy gregariousness of the vested interests in the underdeveloped states, but to the wide and superficial acceptance of the blithe myth that socialism is the sure path to rapid development.

Another aspect of U.S. foreign aid policy that has created great disillusionment is in the area of military assistance.

Americans have been prone to believe that words in agreements have meaning.

They have believed that when military assistance is given to a nation to help protect itself from potential external aggression the aid will be used for that purpose.

But now we have seen India and Pakistan, both recipients of American military assistance, firing away at each other.

American Sidewinders mounted on American-supplied aircraft have been used to shoot down aircraft supplied by the American aid program.

The United States has become the world's great supplier of military equipment—the munitions makers of the late 20th century.

It is no great surprise that idealistic Americans have become disillusioned not only with military aid, but with nations whose agreements are meaningless.

I could continue with this catalog of situations which over the years have contributed to a growing American disillusionment with our relations with other nations.

But I think the point is clear.

It is that at a time when the people of the United States were wont to believe that nations were beginning to see the commonality of their interests, they found instead that most nations cannot or will not see and act beyond their own parochial national interests.

They cannot see that aggression against Goa breeds aggression elsewhere; that abandonment of an article in the United Nations Charter leads to a withering of influence of the total organization; that a destroyer loaned to one country breeds a demand for countervailing power in a neighbor; that a national interest served in one state is often at the expense of the national interest of another.

These are the things which are turning America away from a foreign policy which, with all its errors, was nevertheless fundamentally a policy of idealism and faith and generosity.

This big, sometimes blundering, but basically idealistic Nation of ours which had pinned its hopes on the peaceful settlement of disputes, the integrity of the written agreement, the potentiality of the United Nations, the concept of freedom of trade and information and expression, and, in short, the generous and humane instincts of man, is now turning into a nation of nationalists.

Our foreign policies of the last 2 years reflect that disturbing fact.

President Johnson has not led the Nation into paths of toughness, he has rather reflected the growing cynicism of America.

No longer will this Nation make long term commitments of food-for-peace programs to countries not able or unwilling to prevent our libraries from destruction; no longer will we see the United States picking up the checks for United Nation's peace keeping functions; no longer will we see aid programs not tied to purchases in the United States; no longer will we see growing economic assistance on a grant basis; no longer will we see economic assistance based on unreliable commitments to social reform in recipient nations.

America is becoming hardheaded and realistic.

The world is not as postwar Americans thought it was to be.

We are doubting now that our national interests are served by generous, untied foreign aid and by the multiplying of international institutions.

Perhaps all I am saying is that the United States has come of age.

We moved from isolationism in the 1920's and the 1930's to internationalism in the 1940's and the 1950's.

In the period of isolationism we did not want to be bothered by the world because of our profound conviction that we knew what was best for ourselves and could isolate ourselves from the unpleasant facts of life beyond our borders.

But during the period of our internationalism we went to the opposite extreme.

We thought the world was made up of people like ourselves; people with the same ideas of human dignity; with the same concepts of the sanctity of the agreement; with the same willingness to move toward governments of majority rule.

As a nation we seemed to feel that with enough good will spread around, plus generosity, we could manage to help create a world if not in our image, at least a world compatible with ours.

But now we are becoming cynical, or perhaps more worldly.

We no longer fume if we find we are not loved by the French or if a developing nation threatens to turn to the Russians if it does not get all the help it wants from us.

We seem to be on a pendulum which is swinging back toward a degree of isolation.

This, however, is not the isolation in which we try to close our doors to the problems of the world.

It is rather an isolation characterized by a more immediate concern with narrowly conceived national interests.

We are becoming infected with some of the nationalism which seems so rampant today.

I confess to being somewhat depressed by these developments because they are indeed changing the image of America.

Perhaps it is too late to stop this trend.

I cannot help feeling, however, that if President Johnson were to make a mighty effort to present to the world the picture of the idealistic America which he has so successfully implemented at home, if he would sternly insist that those nations which are the recipients of our aid make a determined effort to stand by their commitments, if he would make it crystal clear that American aid will not be forthcoming to any country in response to threats to turn to the Communist governments or any other form of international blackmail, then this trend could be reversed and the American people would support him and praise him for the effort.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say once again to the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont that he has given the Senate and the country much food for thought. He has, in effect, to use a colloquialism, "laid it on the line." I only hope that his speech will receive the consideration which is its due. I believe that there is a great deal in his remarks to digest, a great deal to study, and a great deal to understand with respect to this rapidly changing world.

It is not always true, as the French say, that the more things change the more they remain the same, because so many currents are loose.

It is time to evaluate and reevaluate, to look at the field of foreign policy and find out just where we are going in the right direction and in the wrong direction, and to come up with constructive criticism, as the Senator has done, not alone on this occasion, but on many occasions.

As always, when the Senator from Vermont speaks, he performs a real service to the Nation. His words could well be heeded in all quarters.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana for his kind remarks.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, October 21, 1965, the Vice President signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 9811) to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs, and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

H.R. 4421. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo. (Rept. No. 929).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 641. Joint resolution authorizing Father Flanagan's Boys' Home to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs (Rept. No. 930).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a Senate document of 10,000 copies of a study entitled "The Anti-Vietnam Agitation and the Teach-In Movement," prepared for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary (Rept. No. 931).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 2688. A bill to provide for the regulation of present and future surface and strip mining, for the conservation and reclamation of surface and strip mined areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. NELSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 2689. A bill for the relief of Maria Fernandes Carvalho Santos; and

S. 2690. A bill for the relief of Chan Wing Cheung (also known as Bill Woo); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2691. A bill for the relief of Guillermina Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

S. 2692. A bill to place certain lands in trust for the Pawnee Indian Tribe, Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARRIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 2693. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to make unlawful the transmission over a telephone system of any recorded message which does not identify the subscriber through whose telephone such message was transmitted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGEE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 2694. A bill for the relief of Koji Kondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2695. A bill for the relief of Rosanna Genovese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2696. A bill for the relief of Abraham Ezekiel Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PELL, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 2697. A bill to establish a Peace by Investment Corporation, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2698. A bill for the relief of Martin F. Gettings' estate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 2699. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yeong-Cheol Koh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2700. A bill to insure the fairness and reasonableness of charges by U.S. flag vessels for transportation of military property, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S.J. Res. 121. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim April 9, 1967, as Bataan-Corregidor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

TO ENCOURAGE ALL STATES TO TEST NEWBORN INFANTS FOR PHENYLKETONURIA

Mr. MONTOYA submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 66) to encourage all States to test newborn infants for phenylketonuria, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MONTOYA, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO AUTHORIZE CERTAIN CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF S. 919

Mr. ALLOTT submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 67) to authorize certain corrections in the enrollment of S. 919, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. ALLOTT, which appears under a separate heading.)

THE STRIP MINING CONSERVATION BILL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, there is no conservation problem more serious in a number of regions of this Nation than the ripped and gouged landscape left behind by strip mining operations.

Many observers of strip mine operations and State efforts to set reasonable standards are convinced that the only hope for a sensible strip mine policy is Federal regulation.

For some months now I and my staff have been working on the very complex problems involved with drafting such legislation.

Today I send to the desk for referral to the proper committee the results of our efforts—the Mined Lands Conservation Act. It is my intent during the coming months to circulate this bill for comment to experts in the field and concerned citizens for their criticism and comment. I would hope that it will be possible to hold hearings on this problem and this bill in the coming session.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2688) to provide for the regulation of present and future surface and strip mining, for the conservation and reclamation of surface and strip mined areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NELSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Mined Lands Conservation Act."

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds and declares that the mining of minerals by the surface or strip method, both past and present, (1) destroys natural beauty, (2) damages the terrain for an indefinite period, (3) causes erosion of the soil, (4) contributes to stream pollution, (5) adversely affects commercial and industrial development, (6) damages real property, (7) destroys forests, wildlife habitat, and other natural resources, (8) menaces the public health and safety, (9) cannot be made subject to uniform conservation requirements because physical and chemical conditions on spoil areas and spoilbank characteristics can differ from State to State, county to county, bank to bank and even from spot to spot on a particular bank, and (10) the diversity of State regulations, or the lack thereof, creates competitive disadvantages for firms operating in a given market area and thereby interferes with the orderly and fair marketing of minerals in commerce. The Congress further finds that these results are detrimental to the economy of the nation.

(b) The purpose of this Act is to provide for (1) the regulation of present and future surface and strip mining, (2) the conservation and reclamation of surface and strip mined areas, (3) the promotion of public recreation, flood control, soil erosion control, water pollution control, forestry, agriculture, restoration and preservation of natural beauty, enhancement of fish and wildlife habitat, and other natural resource values, and the public health and safety, and (4) promoting the elimination of competitive disadvantages for firms operating in a given market area which interfere with the orderly and fair marketing of minerals in commerce.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this Act:

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior;

(b) The terms "surface mining" and "strip mining" are interchangeable, and mean the mining of minerals after complete removal of the surface or overburden above the deposit to be mined in a series of rows or strips, and include "auger mining" when conducted in conjunction with such mining;

(c) The term "overburden" means the earth, rock, and other materials which lie above a natural mineral deposit;

(d) The term "spoil" means all overburden material removed from over the mineral after it is either deposited into the area from which the mineral has been removed, or deposited on undisturbed land;

(e) The term "spoil bank" means the material of whatever nature removed and deposited on the surface so that the underlying mineral may be recovered;

(f) The term "stripping pit" means any trench, cut, hole, or pit formed by removal of the surface or mineral as a result of surface or strip mining;

(g) The terms "person" or "operator" are interchangeable and mean person, partnership, association, corporation, or subsidiary of a corporation which owns, leases, or otherwise controls the use of land on which surface or strip mining is conducted, which is engaged in the mining of minerals as a principal, and which is or becomes the owner of the minerals recovered as a result of such mining, and includes any agent thereof charged with the responsibility for the operation of such mine.

(h) The term "mine" means (1) an area of land from which minerals are extracted in nonliquid form, (2) private ways and roads appurtenant to such area, (3) land, excavations, and workings, structures, facilities, equipment, machines, tools, or other property, on the surface, used in the work of extracting such minerals from their natural deposits in nonliquid form, and (4) the area of land covered by spoil;

(i) The term "reclamation" means the reconditioning or restoration, when appropriate, of the area of land affected by surface or strip mining operations and such contiguous lands as may be necessary for an effective continuing use and management program, under a plan approved by the Secretary;

(j) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication between any State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, or any territory or possession of the United States and any other place outside the respective boundaries thereof, or wholly within the District of Columbia or any territory or possession of the United States, or between points in the same State, if passing through any point outside the boundaries thereof;

(k) The term "State" means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or a territory or possession of the United States;

(l) The term "area of land affected" means the area of land from which the overburden is removed, except that in stripping pits not more than one hundred (100) feet in depth the area shall include the area occupied by the spoil banks; it also includes all lands affected by roads constructed to gain access and to haul minerals; and

(m) The term "operation" means all of the premises, facilities, roads, and equipment used in the process of producing minerals from a designated surface or strip mine area.

SEC. 4. Each surface or strip mine the products of which enter commerce, or the operations of which affect commerce, shall be subject to this Act.

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary is authorized to create within the Department of the Interior the Mined Lands Conservation Administration.

(b) In administering this Act the Secretary shall cooperate to the fullest extent possible with other departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Federal Government, with State governments, and with all other interested agencies, governmental and nongovernmental. He may obtain from any Federal agency any information, data, advice, or assistance which he may need and which can reasonably be furnished, and such agency may expend its own funds for such purpose with or without reimbursement.

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary shall develop, establish, administer, and from time to time revise, after consultation with advisory committees appointed pursuant to section 7 of this Act, policies, programs, rules, regulations, model standards and reclamation requirements (1) for the regulation of present and future strip mining, and (2) for the conservation and reclamation of surface and strip mined areas.

(b) After consultation with an appropriate advisory committee, the Secretary, by a notice in the Federal Register, shall designate the rules, regulations, model standards, and reclamation requirements which shall be applicable to present and future surface and strip mining, and to the conservation and reclamation of surface and strip mined areas.

(c) The provisions of section 4 of the Administrative Procedures Act (5 U.S.C. 1003) shall be applicable to rules, regulations, model standards, and reclamation requirements designated pursuant to subsection (b) of this section.

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary is authorized to establish advisory committees to assist him in the development of rules, regulations, model standards and reclamation requirements (1) for the regulation of present and future strip mining, and (2) for the conservation and reclamation of surface and strip mined areas, and to advise him in the examination and evaluation of policies and programs to carry out the provisions of this Act. Each such advisory committee shall include among its members an equal number of persons qualified by experience and affiliation to present the viewpoint of persons or operators of mines and areas to which such rules, regulations, model standards, and reclamation requirements are applicable, and persons similarly qualified to present the viewpoint of interested citizen groups, and Federal and State agencies.

(b) Members appointed to such committees from private life shall, while serving on business of the committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business they may be paid travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2).

SEC. 8. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person or operator to operate a mine subject to this Act by the surface or strip mining method without first obtaining a license as a surface or strip mine operator from the Secretary. Applications for such a license shall be made upon forms prepared and furnished by the Secretary, and shall contain such information as the Secretary shall require. Licenses shall be for one year, subject to renewal annually.

(b) Before any person licensed as a surface or strip mine operator shall proceed to operate a mine by the surface or strip mining method, he shall apply on forms prepared and furnished by the Secretary for a permit for each separate operation, and shall furnish such information as the Secretary shall require. Any permit shall permit the operation of a mine for one year, unless sooner suspended, and shall be subject to renewal annually.

(c) Any person who proceeds to operate a mine by the surface or strip mining method without having applied for and received a license and permit shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction shall be sentenced to pay a fine of not less than five thousand dollars ($5,000) or more than ten thousand dollars ($10,000), or undergo imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both. Such fine shall be payable to the Secretary.

(d) The Secretary shall not issue any new license or renew an existing license if he finds that the applicant has previously failed and continues to fail to comply with any of the provisions of this Act.

(e) When a license and a permit have been issued the operator shall file with the Secretary a bond for each operation on a form prescribed and furnished by the Secretary, payable to the Secretary, and conditioned on the faithful performance by the operator of all of the requirements of this Act. The bond shall be signed by the operator and a corporate surety licensed to do business in the State where the mine is located.

(f) The fee for the license, and the renewal thereof, shall be established by the Secretary; and the bond shall be established by the Secretary in an amount which he deems sufficient to cover the costs of the conservation and reclamation requirements established by him.

(g) The Secretary shall use funds received as fines, fees, or by forfeiture of bonds to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 9. The programs, rules, regulations, model standards, and reclamation requirements established by the Secretary shall include, but need not be limited to, grading, drainage, backfilling, plantings, revegetation, and any other measures or practices deemed by the Secretary, after consultation with appropriate advisory committees, to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 10. The Secretary is authorized at any time to cause to be made in a mine such inspections and investigations as he shall deem necessary for the purpose of determining compliance with applicable rules, regulations, model standards, and reclamation requirements, or for the purpose of evaluating the manner in which a State plan approved under section 15 of this Act is being carried out.

SEC. 11. For the purpose of making any inspection or investigation authorized by this Act, authorized representatives of the Secretary shall be entitled to admission to, and shall have the right of entry upon or through, any mine.

SEC. 12. The Secretary is authorized to require operators of mines to submit, at such times as he deems necessary, and in such form as he may prescribe, reports detailing the steps and actions taken by them to comply with the provisions of their bond and the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 13. Any operator who violates any of the provisions of this Act shall forfeit his bond, and upon such forfeiture the Secretary shall revoke his permit.

SEC. 14. (a) Any person or operator whose application for a license or permit has been denied by the Secretary, or whose bond has been ordered forfeited by the Secretary, or who has otherwise been aggrieved by an action of the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this Act, may appeal to the Secretary for annulment or revision of such order or action, and the Secretary shall issue regulations for such appeals which shall include due notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Any final order made by the Secretary on appeal shall be subject to judicial review by the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which mine affected is located, upon the filing in such court of a notice of appeal by the operator aggrieved by such final order within twenty days from the date of the making of such final order.

(c) The appellant shall forthwith send to the Secretary by registered mail or by certified mail a copy of such notice of appeal. Upon receipt of such copy of a notice of appeal the Secretary shall promptly certify and file in such court a complete transcript of the record upon which the order complained of was made. The costs of such transcript shall be paid by the appellant.

(d) The court shall hear such appeal on the record made before the Secretary, and shall permit argument, oral or written or both, by both parties.

(e) Upon such conditions as may be required, and to the extent necessary to prevent irreparable injury, the United States court of appeals may, after due notice to and hearing of the parties to the appeal, issue all necessary and appropriate process to postpone the effective date of the final order of the Secretary, or to grant such other relief as may be appropriate pending final determination of the appeal.

(f) The United States court of appeals may affirm, annul, or revise the final order of the Secretary, or it may remand the proceedings to the Secretary for such further action as it directs. The findings of fact by the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive.

SEC. 15. (a) Any State which, at any time, desires to assume responsibility for development and enforcement of standards and reclamation requirements in mines located in the State shall submit, through a State regulatory agency, a State plan for the development of such standards and requirements and their enforcement.

(b) The Secretary shall approve the plan submitted by a State under subsection (a) of this section, or any modification thereof, if such plan—

(1) designates the State agency submitting such plan as the sole agency responsible for administering the plan throughout the State,

(2) provides for the development and enforcement of standards and reclamation requirements for regulating surface and strip mining, and for the conservation and reclamation of surface and strip mining areas in mines in the State which are or will be substantially as effective for such purposes as the standards and reclamation requirements which the Secretary has established pursuant to this Act, and which provides for inspection at least annually of all such mines,

(3) contains assurances that such agency has, or will have, the legal authority and qualified personnel necessary for the enforcement of such standards and reclamation requirements,

(4) gives assurances that such State will devote adequate funds to the administration and enforcement of such standards and reclamation requirements,

(5) provides that the State agency will make such reports to the Secretary, in such form and containing such information as the Secretary shall from time to time require.

(c) The Secretary shall, on the basis of reports submitted by the State agency and his own inspection of mines, make a continuing evaluation of the manner in which each State having a plan approved under this section is carrying out such plan. Whenever the Secretary finds, after affording due notice and opportunity for a hearing, that in the administration of the State plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any provision of the State plan (or any assurance contained therein), he shall notify the State agency of his withdrawal of approval of such plan and upon receipt of such notice such plan shall cease to be in effect.

(d) (1) If any State is dissatisfied with the Secretary's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under subsection (a) of this section, or with his final action under the second sentence of subsection (c) of this section, such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted to the Secretary by the clerk of the court. The Secretary thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(2) The findings of fact by the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive; but the court for good cause shown may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

(e) The provisions of sections 8, 12, 13, and 14, of this Act shall not be applicable in any State in which there is in effect a State plan approved under subsection (b) of this section.

SEC. 16. There are authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 17. If any provisions of this Act, or the applicability thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

TO PLACE CERTAIN LANDS IN TRUST FOR THE PAWNEE TRIBE, OKLAHOMA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to place certain lands in trust status for the Pawnee Indian Tribe of Oklahoma. The particular segment of land identified in this bill is a relatively small area of less than 800 acres on which is the old Pawnee tribal school near Pawnee, Okla. In addition to the school, this bill includes also four small cemeteries of about 10 acres each. This bill provides that all right, title and interest in these properties and the improvements on them be held by the United States in trust for the benefit of the Pawnee Indian Tribe. At the present time, the tribe has only a short-term, year-to-year, revokable permit to the school in question. This prevents the very thing that the tribe most needs and wants to do—the development of a long-term educational program of benefit to the tribal members. Moreover, a revokable permit of this kind prohibits any potential long-term lease that might benefit the tribe.

Legislation is necessary to clarify this matter because of a considerable confusion which has arisen regarding the ownership of this property. A court decision in 1920 held that the title to the Pawnee school and agency was the property of the Pawnee Tribe, but subsequently in 1950 in the case of the Pawnee Tribe of Oklahoma against the United States, the Indian Claims Commission reversed this decision and held that this property was ceded to the United States as surplus land under an agreement of 1892. I am advised by the Bureau of Indian Affairs that any final long-term disposition of this land for the benefit of the tribe cannot be accomplished without legislation.

The Pawnee Tribe of Oklahoma is one of the Nation's most progressive Indian groups. Acting with wise leadership and considerable foresight of the members, this tribe has improved its educational and economic situation beyond what might have been expected and what some have been able to accomplish. Knowing as I do their interest in education and knowing as I do the plans that tribal leaders have made for this property for the benefit of all of their people, when they obtain title to it, I sincerely urge the passage of this bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2692) to place certain lands in trust for the Pawnee Indian Tribe, Oklahoma, introduced by Mr. HARRIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSMISSION OF CERTAIN RECORDED MESSAGES BY TELEPHONE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would provide that anyone making use of recorded telephone messages be required to state in that message the name of the sponsoring organization.

I have done this because I believe that the increasing use of these recorded telephone messages to dispense what can only be construed as extremist propaganda attacking such institutions as the Parent-Teachers Associations represents a threat to our traditional concepts of responsibility in public expression.

I am pleased to note that in recent weeks a number of Americans have indicated their concern over this telephone propaganda and several Members of this body have so indicated in speeches to their fellow Senators.

To me this bill is all the more important because at the present time there exists a gap in our regulatory legislation which pertains to similar propaganda efforts over radio, television, and in other news media. This bill would help to eliminate that gap and make sure that those who present these recordings, for whatever reasons, could be held responsible for what they say.

This bill would not in any way restrict the freedom of expression of these groups unless, of course, they are ashamed to stand behind their messages but would give the public the information necessary to make rational judgments on the validity of the charges expressed on the recording tapes.

Mr. President, I believe this bill represents a reasoned and rational approach to the problem and I hope it will receive prompt attention.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2693) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to make unlawful the transmission over a telephone system of any recorded message which does not identify the subscriber through whose telephone such message was transmitted, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McGEE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PEACE BY INVESTMENT CORPORATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill, for myself and on behalf of Senators Hartke, Cooper, Morse, Pell, and Scott, which would create a federally chartered Peace by Investment Corporation.

The bill in its present form contains certain revisions of S. 1992, which I introduced on May 19 with the same cosponsors.

These revisions were undertaken as a result of a colloquy between myself and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee on June 14. At that time I had agreed to do my utmost to work out with AID and private experts certain technical problems in the bill in such a way that when it comes before the Senate or an ad hoc subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee the details of the bill will be settled and the questions which it will be called upon to consider and advise the Foreign Relations Committee about will be the basic concept involved. At that time Senator Fulbright assured me that he will do his best to have a hearing on the bill before adjournment. Senator Morse, a cosponsor of the bill and a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, also expressed the belief that hearings on this bill could be held before adjournment.

In view of the unavoidable delay involving the revision of this bill I realize the difficulty the Foreign Relations Committee would have in holding hearings on this bill before adjournment. However, I hope that hearings will be possible on this bill during the adjournment period.

I would now like to explain briefly the two changes made in S. 1992:

First. The basic functions of the Corporation are further clarified by specifically indicating, first, that investments or loans made by the Corporation would be made to finance undertakings of a profitmaking nature; second, that emphasis would be placed on investments in small and moderate sized businesses; and third, that the Corporation, in addition to making investments and loans, would provide technical assistance.

Authority provided by S. 1992, for the Corporation to act as an investment trust and to establish two insurance systems, has been deleted. However, when the Corporation is transferred to private ownership and management as provided by section 6 of the bill, it would be empowered in addition to the corporate powers and duties set forth by section 7 of the bill to exercise the functions of an investment trust and to establish such insurance systems as may be deemed in furtherance of the purpose of this act.

Second. A change was also made in section 4 of the bill dealing with the basic financing of the Corporation.

Section 4(b) of S. 1992 would have authorized the Corporation to offer for public sale a total of $2½ billion worth of class B stock, valued at $5 per share, limiting the total amount of such stock outstanding at any time to $1.25 billion and to $375 million in any 1 year.

In order to alleviate the relatively large risk taken by a large number of small investors who would invest their funds in class B stock, section 4(b) of the bill was modified as follows: the Corporation would now be authorized to sell to the public debentures in denominations of $5, or any multiple thereof; these debentures would be fully and unconditionally guaranteed as to principal by the U.S. Government. The aggregate amount of the bonds would be limited to $375 million in any one year and the total amount outstanding at any time would be limited to $1.25 billion. The Corporation would be authorized at the option of the holder of these bonds to exchange such bonds for class B stock which the Corporation may issue subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

I very much hope that this measure will now be given full and careful hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee before the end of 1965.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2697) to establish a Peace by Investment Corporation, and for other related purposes, introduced by Mr. Javits (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INSURANCE OF FAIR AND REASONABLE CHARGES BY U.S.–FLAG VESSELS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF MILITARY PROPERTY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, a bill, for appropriate reference, to insure the fairness and reasonableness of charges by U.S.-flag vessels for transportation of military property, and for related purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum prepared in support of this bill be included in the Record at this point.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2700) to insure the fairness and reasonableness of charges by U.S.-flag vessels for transportation of military property, and for related purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The memorandum presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

Memorandum in Support of Legislation

The 1904 Cargo Preference Act, 10 U.S.C. 2631, provides:

> "§ 2631. Supplies: Preference to U.S. vessels.
>
> "Only vessels of the United States or belonging to the United States may be used in the transportation by sea of supplies bought for the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps. However, if the President finds that the freight charged by those vessels is excessive or otherwise unreasonable, contracts for transportation may be made as otherwise provided by law. Charges made for the transportation of those supplies by those vessels may not be higher than the charges made for transporting like goods for private persons."

The formula requiring that the charges of U.S. vessels "may not be higher than the charges made for transporting like goods for private persons" has been the source of continuing friction between U.S.-flag berth operators and MSTS because of differences between (a) many military and commercial cargo items, and (b) the methods of handling military and commercial cargoes.

Apart from the obvious fact that most items of war material have no commercial counterpart, even a general comparison between military and civilian rates is complicated and obscured by the fact that MSTS insists on f.i.o. (free-in-and-out) rates under which the Government pays for loading and discharge of military cargo, whereas stevedoring is included in the commercial rates. Comparison involves more than a simple subtraction of stevedoring costs from the commercial rates due to many complex cost-accounting factors.

MSTS has found the pricing requirement of section 2631 troublesome because the GAO holds it accountable for proving that the rate on any military item did not exceed the comparable civilian rate. Such proof is often impossible on an item-by-item or shipment-by-shipment basis. MSTS and the industry have been unable to agree on any method of proving comparative costs which MSTS will accept, in consequence of which—

(a) MSTS has recommended that the industry cease to be exempt from renegotiation;

(b) The Maritime Commission has undertaken a massive investigation of military rates;

(c) MSTS is threatening to procure military transportation on a competitive bid basis;

(d) The industry is engaged in a vast project to furnish cost data to MSTS which MSTS now claims it does not want and will not heed no matter what the figures prove.

The result of the "civilian-equivalent" limitation is thus seen to be turmoil on many fronts. The turmoil might be justified if the civilian-equivalent formula were inherently rational or guaranteed fair treatment to either the carriers or the Government, but in truth it does neither. Commercial rates, even if accurately comparable to military, are not a meaningful yardstick of reasonableness because they are largely compelled by foreign-flag competition. If foreign-flag lines (which are not normally eligible to lift military cargo) drop their commercial rates, U.S.-flag lines must meet them whether they are compensatory or not. If commercial rates rise in a tight market, U.S.-flag lines are free to charge them, whether they are reasonable or not. Thus the commercial rates by which military rates must be judged may be too high or too low, and in either event fail to serve as a sensible guide for procurement of military transportation. In these circumstances, the civilian-equivalent formula seems to have no virtues which merit its retention in view of the disruptive consequences listed above.

Among the listed consequences is the prospect of competitive bidding among U.S.-flag lines for military cargo. While competitive bidding on public contracts generally sounds wholesome and plausible, it is not a fair or workable system when the bidders within the eligible class have disparate costs. Various carriers in the U.S. merchant marine do have disparate costs, the disparity being governmentally imposed by the subsidy program. Subsidy is awarded to equate the costs of subsidized U.S.-flag lines with the costs of foreign-flag lines. If unsubsidized lines were required to meet such costs, they would in effect be in price competition with foreign-flag carriers—who are legally debarred from military carriage—and could not effectively compete on that basis. Thus, competitive bidding would be a real threat to the unsubsidized component of the U.S. merchant marine.

The bill substitutes a standard of fairness and reasonableness for the civilian-equivalent test. The "fair and reasonable" criterion is the universal regulatory standard and would insure the Government against excessive payments for military transportation by sea, and the carriers against exposure to noncompensatory revenues. It would remove the element of the fortuitous from the system of justifying military rates.

The bill provides that rates should be reasonable for U.S.-flag carriers "due regard being had for all relevant costs." This could result in different rates for different carriers or classes of carriers (e.g., subsidized versus unsubsidized). In that event, an allocation system would be needed for the higher cost lines. An allocation system is now in effect administratively, and the bill would not go much beyond the giving of statutory sanction to the current practice.

TO PROCLAIM APRIL 9, 1967, AS BATAAN-CORREGIDOR DAY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim April 9, 1967, as Bataan-Corregidor Day.

This day will commemorate the 25th anniversary of the fall of Bataan and Corregidor.

It will recognize the sacrifices made by the courageous American and Philippine soldiers who, vastly outnumbered, ill-equipped, and short of food, medical supplies, and ammunition, fought on for 6 months after the outbreak of World War II to purchase vital time for the United States to rebuild and consolidate its defense in the Pacific.

Under the inspired and historic leadership of Douglas MacArthur and Jonathan Wainwright, the American and Philippine forces made one valiant stand after another in the face of overwhelming odds.

For 3 months after the fall of Manila in January 1942 our forces fought on across the Bataan Peninsula.

Even after Bataan was forced to capitulate in April 1942, the surrounded and embattled men of Corregidor continued to defy the enemy nearly a full month, until, their supplies exhausted, their guns empty, and their forces overrun, they were forced to surrender that final bastion.

The horrors of the death march which followed the fall of Bataan and Corregidor are graven in blood in the tragic history of war.

All Americans should pause on the 25th anniversary of the epic defense of the Philippines to recall the courage, honor, and fortitude of those Americans and Philippines of Bataan and Corregidor who symbolize for all mankind and for all time the meaning of manhood, loyalty, and courage in defense of one's country.

The dedication of this one day, April 9, 1967, as Bataan-Corregidor Day will honor the memory of those men.

But the epic of the defense of the Philippines will live in glory as long as men recall the meaning of courage.

With Pericles, we say of those men of Bataan and Corregidor:

> Heroes have the whole earth for their tomb; and in lands far from their own, where the column with its epitaph declares it, there is enshrined in every breast a record unwritten, with no tablet to preserve it, except that of the heart.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 121) to authorize the President to proclaim April 9, 1967, as Bataan-Corregidor Day, introduced by Mr. Dodd, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TO ENCOURAGE ALL STATES TO TEST NEWBORN INFANTS FOR PHENYLKETONURIA

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, in the past decade, great strides have been made in helping the mentally retarded and in assisting them to become contributing members of our society.

President Kennedy, in February 1963, in his special message to Congress on mental illness and mental retardation said:

> First, we must seek out the causes * * * and eradicate them.

Two major mental retardation bills were passed in the fall of 1963: Public Law 88-156, "Maternal and Child Health, and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963," and Public Law 88-164, "Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1963."

President Johnson, on June 15, 1964, expressed the Federal Government's determination to continue to combat mental retardation when he said:

> We have made progress. But our efforts have only begun. We will continue until we find all the answers we have been seeking; until we find a place for all those who suffer with the problem.

Phenylketonuria has been proven to be one of the causes. Although this disease has been known to the medical profession for over 20 years, treatment aimed at preventing brain damage from it is quite recent. This disease can be arrested if detected within the first few weeks of life and if treatment is undertaken immediately.

This has been recognized by the medical profession. Many hospitals in States where laws have not been enacted for testing newborn infants for phenylketonuria have voluntarily undertaken this program. This is most commendable and should be encouraged.

In New Mexico, over one-half of the hospitals perform tests for phenylketonuria and legislation will be introduced in the New Mexico State Legislature next which, if enacted, will make such examinations compulsory.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has reported that there are approximately 5½ million mentally retarded in the United States today. Many of these are a result of phenylketonuria and mental retardation could have been prevented if detected in infancy. Most of the State training schools for the mentally retarded are overcrowded and have long waiting lists for admission.

I think you will agree with me that continued efforts must be encouraged in order to reduce mental retardation in the United States. The potential mental and social growth of those suffering from phenylketonuria should not be thwarted through neglect of treatment. No longer is it necessary for these infants to grow up mentally retarded and a drain on society. Rather, it is now possible for them to become working and contributing members of their community.

The Children's Bureau of the Welfare Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been working closely with State Health Departments throughout the Nation on programs for the mentally retarded and especially for retardation caused by phenylketonuria. The Senate concurrent resolution which I am submitting today is in recognition of this contribution and I hope it will encourage those States where no law exists for the detection of phenylketonuria in all newborn infants, to implement such a program.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 66) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

> Whereas phenylketonuria and other diseases are now known to cause mental retardation in children;
>
> Whereas tests have been devised which enable physicians to determine whether a newborn infant is suffering from phenylketonuria and certain of such other diseases;
>
> Whereas timely treatment of infants suffering from phenylketonuria and certain of such other diseases can usually prevent such infants from becoming mentally retarded on account of such diseases;
>
> Whereas in recognition of the importance of the timely discovery and treatment of phenylketonuria and certain of such other diseases, 32 States have enacted legislation providing that infants born therein be subjected to such tests: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that the Children's Bureau of the Welfare Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in carrying out its duties continue to take proper measures to advise the public of the need for providing timely tests of newborn infants to determine whether they suffer from phenylketonuria or other diseases which, if timely treatment is not provided, will subsequently cause such infants to become mentally retarded, and to encourage, throughout the United States, public authorities, hospitals, and others concerned with the public health, to institute appropriate programs to provide for the giving of such tests to newborn infants.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at their next printing, the names of Senators Allott, Brewster, Case, Cooper, Murphy, Muskie, Randolph, Saltonstall, Scott, and Williams of Delaware be added as additional cosponsors of Senate bill 2646 and Senate Joint Resolution 117, relating to the commemoration and observance of the millennium of the origin of Poland as a Christian nation.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2627) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act for the purpose of providing additional protection for the interests of participants in and beneficiaries of employee welfare and pension benefit plans.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the resolution (S. Res. 139) to provide three summer interns for each Senator, the name of the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the following Senators be added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 143 to condemn the discriminatory practices perpetrated by the Government of Rumania against the Hungarian minority peoples: the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 2657) to establish a Federal Commission on Alcoholism, and for other purposes, my name be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of October 15, 1965, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

S. 2657. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Alcoholism, and for other purposes: Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina.

S. 2658. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission to study and investigate problems relating to the export of beef from the United States and to consider ways and means of increasing the export of beef from the United States: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BASS, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota.

NOTICE CONCERNING H.R. 9778, A BILL TO AMEND TITLES 10 AND 37, UNITED STATES CODE, TO CODIFY RECENT MILITARY LAW, AND TO IMPROVE THE CODE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the subcommittee now has under consideration H.R. 9778, 89th Congress, 1st session, and the accompanying report thereon, House Report No. 900, regarding revision and codification of titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the code.

The purpose of this notice is to advise any and all interested parties of the consideration of this legislation by the subcommittee and that the subcommittee desires to have any statements or comments relating to the proposed legislation. The statements or comments requested are for the purpose of allowing any and all persons to express their views as to such legislation.

It is required that such statements or comments be forwarded to the Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, room 341, Old Senate Office Building, on or before January 5, 1966.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and myself, as chairman.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H.R. 1778. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended;

H.R. 2571. An act for the relief of Ralph S. DeSocio, Jr.;

H.R. 5597. An act to relieve physicians of liability for negligent medical treatment at the scene of an accident in the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 10097. An act for the relief of North Counties Hydroelectric Co.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6 and 11 to the bill (H.R. 168) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes; that the House insisted upon its amendments to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 12 to the bill; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. DORN, Mr. HALEY, Mr. ADAIR, and Mr. AYRES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 2084. An act to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems;

H.R. 1317. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer which was imported during May 1963 for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.;

H.R. 1386. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Pomona College;

H.R. 1393. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Eduvigis Aran Heffernan;

H.R. 1781. An act to amend section 113(a) of title 28, United States Code, to provide that Federal District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina shall be held at Clinton;

H.R. 2565. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of the University of Chicago;

H.R. 2578. An act for the relief of Maxie L. Rupert;

H.R. 2762. An act for the relief of Manlio Massimiliani;

H.R. 2906. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lily Ning Sheehan;

H.R. 3126. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the University of Washington;

H.R. 3905. An act for the relief of Bibi Daljeet Kaur;

H.R. 4832. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of St. Louis University;

H.R. 5006. An act for the relief of Diosdado F. Almazan;

H.R. 5217. An act to permit the vessel *Little Nancy* to be documented for use in the coastwise trade;

H.R. 6312. An act for the relief of Mario Menna;

H.R. 6655. An act for the relief of Pieter Cornelis Metzelaar;

H.R. 6720. An act for the relief of Ping-Kwan Fong;

H.R. 6906. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer and one split pole spectrograph for the use of the University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.;

H.R. 7282. An act for the relief of Richard D. Walsh;

H.R. 7357. An act for the relief of Dr. Felipe V. Lavapies;

H.R. 7453. An act for the relief of Margaret Elizabeth and Frederick Henry Todd;

H.R. 7608. An act to provide for the free entry of one automatic steady state distribution machine for the use of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.;

H.R. 8135. An act for the relief of Jennifer Rebecca Siegel;

H.R. 8232. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer-gas chromatograph for the use of Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla.;

H.R. 8272. An act to provide for the free entry of an isotope separator for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.;

H.R. 8646. An act for the relief of Rifkin Textiles Corp.;

H.R. 9351. An act to provide for the free entry of one shadomaster measuring projector for the use of the University of South Dakota;

H.R. 9495. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9587. An act to provide for the free entry of a Craig countercurrent distribution apparatus for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.;

H.R. 9588. An act to provide for the free entry of an electrically driven rotating chair for the use of the Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, La.;

H.R. 10198. An act to amend the requirements relating to lumber under the Shipping Act, 1916;

H.R. 10256. An act for the relief of James D. W. Blyth, his wife, Jean Mary Blyth, and their daughter, Penelope Jean Blyth;

H.R. 10292. An act for the relief of Hilda Shen Tsiang;

H.R. 11096. An act to authorize the disposal of graphite, quartz crystals, and lump steatite talc from the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both;

H.J. Res. 397. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District; and

H.J. Res. 597. Joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of rocketry.

SECRET BALLOTS BY WORKERS UNDER TAFT-HARTLEY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, during the course of the debate on H.R. 77, the bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, I submitted several amendments.

One of the amendments would remedy the abusive NLRB practice which requires an employer to recognize and deal with a labor organization that alleges employee support on the basis of authorization cards. Under the amendment, the NLRB could not order an employer to recognize or deal with a union unless it was selected by a majority of the employees in a secret ballot election. The enactment of this measure would restore original congressional intent to the National Labor Relations Act.

Under existing interpretations, an employer may be forced to recognize and deal with a labor organization which does not represent a majority of his employees. Moreover, employees are being deprived of the right to express their choice in a secret ballot election. These anomolous developments have crept into a statute which was meant to extend democratic principles to the process of labor organization. The growing card check system, nurtured by administrative decisionmaking, has made a mockery of congressional intent regarding the method by which bargaining agents should be chosen, and has resulted in the denial of voting rights for employees.

The basic flaw in the system is that a publicly signed card is treated as the equivalent of a secret ballot. Experience has shown, however, that for a variety of reasons, cards are an unreliable indicator of the signer's true intent. The NLRB itself declared in the Sunbeam case that "authorization cards are a notoriously unreliable method of determining majority status of a union."

The use of "authorization cards" in lieu of secret ballot elections has received widespread attention. It was deplored in the committees and on the floors of both bodies of Congress. It has been the subject of critical editorial comment in newspapers throughout the country. The matter was the subject of a special 1-day hearing before the House Labor Committee, and was thoroughly explored in the Senate hearing on the confirmation of the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Act.

During his confirmation hearing on August 3, 1965, before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board testified at pages 60 and 61 of the hearings, and I quote:

> Now the Board also has conceded in public statements and indeed, I am sure that this appears probably in some of our printed decisions, the cards are less reliable than a secret election.

The Chairman also testified that the cards, and again I quote: "are unreliable because they are secured by coercion; they are unreliable because they are secured by misrepresentation; they are unreliable because they are signed by fraud; and they are unreliable because they are forgeries."

It was contended that the Board can deal with cases in which these circumstances appear. But can it? Theoretically, the law may provide appropriate means with which to deal with these cases, but does this alone furnish a meaningful remedy? Certainly the time, expense, and efforts required to present a lawsuit of this kind preclude justice in its fullest sense. Where a situation is subject to the variety of abuses actually experienced with authorization cards, it should not be permitted to continue in existence. The uncertain and cumbersome case-by-case approach should not remain the exclusive path to justice.

Despite unanimous agreement that secret elections are superior, the open card check system has been defended on the ground that it is a time and work saving device. This excuse is without merit.

A very recent case illustrates the point. *Peoples Drug Stores*, 8 C.A. 3528, was decided on September 24, 1965. Slightly over 100 employees were involved. Rather than going through the orderly process of a secret ballot election which could have been conducted in 2 hours, the Retail Clerks Union filed refusal to bargain charges and presented cards which added up to a majority. Peoples Drug petitioned for an election which was dismissed because of the pending charge.

The hearing lasted 7 days. The decision is 48 pages long. Six months elapsed between the close of the hearing and the trial examiner's report. Over 5 months elapsed before NLRB affirmed the trial examiner's report. The employer has now petitioned the U.S. court of appeals for review of the decision. I do not know how many days were consumed by the NLRB investigators and attorneys in preparing for trial, but they apparently interviewed every employee. The NLRB attorney prepared a long brief for the trial examiner and another for the Board. I do not know how many days and weeks attorneys for the employer spent in investigation, preparation for trial, and brief writing. I assume it was considerable, in view of the length of the briefs and the evidence in the record that the employer's attorney interviewed each employee on several occasions. The end is not in sight. Attorneys for the NLRB and the employer must designate portions of the record to be printed, write briefs, and argue before the court.

All this in lieu of a 2-hour election. I understand that the Peoples Drug case is typical of the so-called card-check cases, and it just is not true that any time is saved by the card-check procedure.

In the Peoples Drug case, it is doubtful that the NLRB or courts will ever arrive at the true desire of the majority of the employees affected. Almost every employee was called by one side or the other in the trial. Many testified that they signed the cards believing that the only purpose was to obtain an election. The trial examiner found various reasons for discrediting this testimony. Their cards were counted.

Various employees testified that they signed because they were told that by signing then they would not have to pay an initiation fee which would be necessary later because the union had a majority. The trial examiner dismissed this by saying that the real motivation was membership and not to save money. Their cards were counted.

One employee testified that she signed a card in the store and threw it into the trash can. Another employee found it and turned it in to the union. The card was counted.

One school-age employee testified that he signed the card at home at the insistence of the union organizer and his father, a union member. His card was counted.

One employee testified that she signed a card to please a fellow employee who told her it was just to obtain an election. The next day she tried to get her card returned and was refused. Her card was counted.

One employee testified that she signed a card while on pregnancy leave and later decided not to return to work and so notified the employer. Her card was counted although she would not have been eligible to vote in an election.

One could go through the testimony picking out similar examples. They show that employees sign cards for many reasons. They show that employees sign cards today and change their mind tomorrow. They show that cards are not an accurate measure of employee desires.

We have at our disposal the means with which to cure the problem finally and effectively. We can enact legislation which would require that all bargaining agents be designated by a secret ballot vote of the employees who would be affected.

Mr. President, the average employee in a factory, mill, or shop is no match for the zealous well-trained union organizer. They have ways of obtaining signatures from workers which cast a dark cloud over all union representatives. The honest, responsible unions suffer from the acts of the unscrupulous; ironically, these acts which damage the sincere are sanctioned by the law as it has been interpreted.

I shall illustrate my point by quoting from the transcript of an actual case recently tried before the NLRB, *Dan Howard Sportswear*, Case Nos. 13CA6835 and 13RC10461.

In this case, the union representative approached various employees and requested them to sign cards. The cards actually stated that the signer authorized the union to represent him for purposes of collective bargaining. But, the representations orally made to the employees were misleading and fraudulent.

For example, one employee testified that the organizer requested her to sign a card, and now I am quoting from the verbatim transcript, page 553,

> So I (the employee) asked him (the organizer) what was the card for. And he told me the card didn't mean anything, that all it meant was that I wasn't antiunion. So then I asked him if I signed this card did it mean I was in the union. And he said no, there would be an election and the vote would be what counts.

Needless to say, the union demanded recognition, not on the basis of an election, but on the basis of cards. In this same case, six other employees testified under oath that they were misled into signing cards.

Occurrences of this kind are not uncommon. Unsophisticated working men and women can be victimized by fraudulent organizers and racket unions which exploit and initimidate employees and employers alike. Congressional responsibility demands adoption of my amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following editorials which endorse the substance of my amendment be printed at this point in the Record. "If Section 14(b) Is Repealed, Workers Must Have Secret Vote," from the August 31, 1965, Lexington Leader, "Protecting the Vote," from the July 13, 1965, Cincinnati Enquirer, "More Democracy in Unions," from the August 6, 1965, Wisconsin State Journal, "Denying the Right to Secret Ballot," from the August 22, 1965, Parkersburg News, Parkersburg, W. Va., "Right To Vote on Unions," from the September 5, 1965, Toledo, Ohio Blade, and "Secret Elections on Unions," from the August 6, 1965, Birmingham Post-Herald.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Lexington Leader, Aug. 31, 1965]

If Section 14(b) Is Repealed, Workers Must Have Secret Vote

The Senate this week is expected to vote on repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, the section which allows States to have laws prohibiting union shop contracts.

Repeal is demanded by the labor unions and supported by President Johnson, and it passed the House of Representatives after a rule had been adopted to bar any amendments. The vote was 221 to 203.

Now the question is up to the Senate, and there, too, labor and administration forces are predicting they will achieve success, although by a very slim margin. In the Senate, however, they will not be able so easily to impose a no-amendment rule, and there is one amendment which, if 14(b) is repealed, should be attached to the repealer.

It is an amendment giving rank and file workers the right to vote by secret ballot on the question of whether they do or do not want to belong to a union. Strangely enough, present regulations deny employees this right, which would seem to be basic, in many cases.

The Leader believes, and often has stated, that section 14(b) should be retained in the Taft-Hartley Act. It believes that, if repeal is achieved, it must be accompanied by a "right to vote" provision which will insure that a majority of workers in any particular instance actually do prefer the union.

Under present rules of the National Labor Relations Board, a union can be certified as bargaining agent for employees if the union presents "pledge cards" signed by a majority of the employees. These cards are no substitute for a secret ballot, they are not even secret, and in numerous instances they do not represent the workers' true preference for union membership. They make coercion possible and even likely.

The intent of the "right to vote" provision is to make sure that an uncoerced majority of workers wants the union. It would do this by requiring a fair, secret election, and it would permit the use of "preference cards" as a determining factor only if an employer had, by unfair means, destroyed an employee majority.

This, surely, is an amendment to which no legislator, no union leader should object, and it is needed to protect a reasonable, fundamental right of millions of workers.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, July 13, 1965]

Protecting the Vote

Congress, spurred by pressure from the President and the union leaders, very well may amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to deprive the States of their present power to pass laws to prevent compulsory unionism. There are 19 States that say in effect that an employee can't be compelled to join a union to hold his job.

If the act that the late Robert A. Taft, of Cincinnati, helped fashion is amended to prohibit such protection, the change should not take place without serious thought to protecting the right of employees to vote on whether there is to be a union in their factory, shop or store. The right of the employee to have his say on his future in regard to his job should be regarded with as much importance as the right of each qualified citizen to vote on candidates and issues.

Certification of a union as the bargaining agent for a group of employees should not be made on the basis of signatures to cards, as pressures conceivably could be used to obtain these that would not be operative in a secret election supervised by the National Labor Relations Board. Nor should there be a recognition simply on the basis of a contract between employer and union leader because there have been cases where so-called sweetheart contracts scratched the back of the employer and the union boss but sold out the workingman.

[From Wisconsin State Journal, Aug. 5, 1965]

The Section 14(b) Issue—More Democracy in Unions

The congressional battle over compulsory unionism is largely symbolic rather than a bread-winning issue, but it has been obvious for a number of months that the Johnson administration had enough votes in Congress to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Wisconsin has never had such right-to-work legislation and today only 19 States—few of them industrial—have such laws.

The repealer has already cleared the House and will be approved by the Senate and signed into law by President Johnson as part-payment for the generous campaign help given to Democratic candidates by organized labor. Mr. Johnson is now behind the repealer push although as a Congressman and Senator he took the opposite position. Texas is still one of the 19 States with right-to-work legislation in effect.

The pros and cons of the issue have been battered about since the law's enactment in 1947 and they provide ample material for both sides to continue the debate into the next century.

However, because of the November landslide, Congress will decide the issue in favor of the union position, a result which does not change this newspaper's basic objection on the grounds that this is another State right being usurped by the Federal Government. A majority of the people in each State should have the right to make their own decision.

Recognizing that Congress will soon conclude action on the repealer that will affect 19 States, the Wisconsin State Journal supports a series of amendments to the repealer which will improve democracy in unions in all 50 States. The amendments, all of which were rejected at Chairman Representative Adam Clayton Powell's direction by the House Labor Committee, should have the support of the working man in that they improve his individual rights as a union member.

One would forbid a union to deny or limit membership or apprenticeship on account of race, color, religion, or national origin. Discrimination has become a barrier to union membership for many Americans, both in the South and industrial North.

The labor law would be improved by the inclusion of this one amendment. Three others which would improve union democracy would:

Exempt from compulsory unionism persons whose religious beliefs or scruples forbid them to join a union but who are willing to contribute a sum equal to their union dues to the U.S. Treasury or an appropriate charity.

Require a secret ballot to determine that a majority in a union shop favor the union which was to bargain for them.

Forbid a union to fine or penalize a member for exercising any constitutional right, including freedom of speech.

A further amendment which should be approved would prohibit a union from using dues or assessments for political purposes not directly connected with the union's statutory function as a bargaining agent. The role of labor as an exclusive political machine for one political party has reached such giant proportions that it has a negative effect on the two-party system.

Partly as a concession to the large percentage of people who strongly oppose compulsory unionism and partly in recognition that the labor laws are in need of improvement in order to provide more democracy for the members, these amendments should become law.

[From the Parkersburg News, Aug. 22, 1965]

Denying the Right to Secret Ballot

If Congressmen were elected to office by some of the same procedures used by a union to get selected as the employees' representative, there would be a hue and cry around the country that would make the current dispute over the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law look like a tempest in a teapot. The fact is that in some instances the National Labor Relations Board in Washington is depriving employees of the right to a secret ballot election in determining whether or not they want a union. In some cases the Board is actually requiring businessmen to bargain with a union when a majority of their employees do not want that union.

Senator Fannin, of Arizona, on June 29, in a speech on the floor of the Senate said, "While Congress is struggling to secure the right to vote for all Americans, the National Labor Relations Board is eliminating such right for the American workingman in determining union representation."

Several Senators have introduced bills to guarantee employees this right to a secret ballot election and irrespective of the outcome of 14(b), we think that Congress should enact one of the employee right-to-vote bills now pending.

The News suggests that even if a Senator favors repeal of 14(b), he cannot and should not in good conscience vote for such repeal without first guaranteeing employees the right of a secret ballot to determine whether they want a union in the first instance. Certainly, if a Senator is opposed to the repeal of 14(b), he should support the employee right-to-vote amendment.

Let's not put the cart before the horse. Before Congress gets rid of right to work, let's make sure that employees are guaranteed the "right to vote."

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade, Sept. 5, 1965]

Right To Vote on Unions

In approving the bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law—and thus denying the States the right to prohibit the union shop—the Senate Labor Committee did permit one amendment.

Persons who object to union membership on grounds of religious conscience will not be required to join a union to hold their jobs. Instead, they need only pay a charitable organization sums equivalent to union dues.

This concession to conscience was mandatory, as the Blade had insisted before, unless Congress was going to grant unions a dictatorial power over workers in a plant which the Nation does not choose to exercise over its citizens.

If conscientious objectors are to be exempted from military service even in time of war, what possible justification could there be for requiring conscientious objectors to join a union?

Strangely enough, however, the Senate Labor Committee, having recognized the right of conscience even in labor matters, refused to accept another amendment which would have guaranteed workers in a plant a secret vote on the issue before they could be forced to join a union.

Isn't that also a fundamental democratic American right? Even George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, has said he has no objection to writing this secret-ballot clause into the revision of the Taft-Hartley law.

But the excuse given for blocking what seems an eminently fair proposal is administrative difficulties.

The National Labor Relations Board says, on the one hand, that it already orders a secret election whenever a management insists on it. But the Board contends, on the other hand, that it would be "snowed under" if it were obliged to conduct secret elections at every plant where a union seeks recognition.

At a time when the Nation is sparing no effort or expense to extend voting rights to everybody, should they be denied in labor matters because it is too much trouble to give a minority the chance to prove that it may be the majority?

[From the Birmingham Post-Herald, Aug. 6, 1965]

Secret Elections on Unions

Passed by the House is an act repealing the right-to-work laws, now in effect in 19 States. A strong effort will be made to pass the repealer in the Senate, with good likelihood of success.

If this repealer is passed and the right-to-work laws thus are outlawed, Congress should take another step and spell out the right of employees to have a secret ballot election on the question of whether they should be represented by a union.

The right for such an election, supposedly a part of the Taft-Hartley Act, has been weakened by administrative and judicial decisions which have substituted a card check for the secret ballot.

From Senator Javits, of New York, a strong friend of organized labor, has come a bill which would insure the right of a secret ballot election to decide whether employees want to be represented by a union.

In a recent House speech Representative Ashbrook, of Ohio, said, "Despite the clear intent of the Taft-Hartley framers to safeguard employees' voting rights, the courts and the National Labor Relations Board in recent years have eroded such protections in labor representation elections.

"The crux of this issue is the NLRB's practice of ordering union recognition and collective bargaining based on a count of so-called authorization cards rather than by secret ballot. This practice does not simply violate the secret ballot principle. From a purely judicial and administrative standpoint, it has also created a coast-to-coast shambles in the labor-management field."

These cards are signed by workers, saying that they authorize the union to represent them in collective bargaining. It has been found that the cards do not always express the true intent of the signer.

Senate action on the repeal of section 14(b) still is pending. But whether it is repealed or not, action also should be taken by Congress to nail down the fact that secret elections must be held on the question of union representation.

INTEREST RATE RISE THREATENS U.S. ECONOMIC EXPANSION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the record of the past 53 months of the economic expansion has brought many blessings to this country: a huge growth in jobs, a sharp drop in unemployment, a big increase in wages, dividends, and profits, and, of course, a massive increase in the Nation's basic economic strength, the rapid modernization of our factories, and a vast improvement in skills of literally millions of Americans.

Of course, there have been many reasons for this happy economic experience, but one exceedingly important element has been the availability of credit. Our remarkable economy has thrived and grown to a considerable extent on the desire of individual citizens and corporations to borrow. We borrow to buy or build our homes, to buy our cars, and the myriad of things that go into our homes.

For this reason a rise in the cost of borrowing—that is, in interest rates—could and would slow down our economy. On the basis of past experience with rising interest rates, a recession could very possibly follow.

It is not easy to pinpoint responsibility for the interest rate level. The Constitution gives the Congress clear authority to establish interest rates in article I, section 8 of the Constitution, whereby Congress is given the right to coin money and regulate the value thereof.

The Congress has delegated this authority to the Federal Reserve Board. In doing so the Congress has also shared its power over interest rates with the President, who appoints the Federal Reserve Board and obviously can have great influence on its policies.

Virtually every economist agrees that the Federal Reserve Board can—if it will—determine the level of interest rates by the quantity of money it permits to flow into the economy. It regulates the supply of money, and therefore interest rate levels, by its open-market operations—buying and selling Government securities, raising or lowering the rediscount rate, or varying reserve requirements of the Nation's banks.

I go to considerable pains to spell this out, Mr. President, because some—including at times the Governor of the Federal Reserve Board—deny that the Federal Reserve Board can establish the level of interest rates. Obviously, the FRB's weapons are adequate to do the job if it has the will to do it.

It has now become evident that the banking community, with the sufferance of the FRB, is raising interest rates. A scattered series of newspaper reports has disclosed how this expansion has been going on, led by some of the larger New York banks.

This morning Frank Porter, of the Washington Post, reports, in a remarkably clear and comprehensive article, on just how widespread the rise in interest rates has become.

Porter shows how interest rates have risen in spite of the opposition of the Johnson administration. He writes:

> The basic disagreement broke into the open a fortnight ago when Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler addressed the American Bankers Association in Chicago. He quoted President Johnson as saying in effect: "Why won't people stop, look, and listen and count three before taking steps that would change the mix of economic policy that has characterized this balance of expansion?" If this was a veiled suggestion that bankers hold the line on interest rates, they weren't buying it—in theory at least. The next day they passed a resolution calling for a reduction in the rate of credit expansion and higher interest rates in response to "market forces."
>
> Interest rates have been moving up over a broad range during the past year with most of the increases coming the last few months.

It is also made clear how interest rates have been rising when he says:

> The yield on Moody's A-rated corporate bonds, for example, has inched up to 4.70 percent from 4.58 percent in June. High-grade municipal bonds increased their yield from 3.06 percent at the beginning of the year to 3.32 percent at mid-September. The Treasury 91-day bill rate has jumped from a bit over 3.5 to 4 percent in the past year.
>
> A number of larger banks have raised their minimum charges on loans to sales finance firms by one-fourth of a percentage point. Earlier this month Chase Manhattan raised rates to nearly all business customers by one-fourth to one-half of a percentage point.

Porter says further:

> In every category except the mortgage market, which recently has been reported as becoming firm, the demand for loanable funds has climbed at a heady pace. Commercial, industrial, and agricultural loans have jumped 20 percent in the past 12 months.

Mr. President, the Congress has a heavy responsibility for the action of its creature, the Federal Reserve Board. This responsibility is clear and constitutional. The continuation of the remarkable period of economic expansion is at stake.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Frank C. Porter, "Fed Put in Middle of Power Struggle," from this morning's Washington Post be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fed Put in Middle of Power Struggle

(By Frank C. Porter)

Administration economists are in the anomalous position of almost—but not quite—hoping that the rapid pace of business expansion slows down for a while.

The reason is trouble in the money market.

Washington officialdom still has unpleasant memories of 1957 and 1960 when tight money received a major share of blame for choking off expansion and bringing on recession.

Administration fiscal experts, proud of their contribution to the longest peacetime business expansion in history, see credit pressures building up again.

The situation has not reached crisis proportions. But these economists fear any further increase in interest rates could dampen the economy like a drunk at a WCTU convention.

The result is a growing power struggle—so far more real than apparent—between the Johnson administration and the Nation's big bankers. Caught squarely in the middle is the quasi-independent Federal Reserve System.

The basic disagreement broke into the open a fortnight ago when Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler addressed the American Bankers Association in Chicago. He quoted President Johnson as saying in effect: "Why won't people stop, look and listen and count three before taking steps that would change the mix of economic policy that has characterized this balance of expansion?"

If this was a veiled suggestion that bankers hold the line on interest rates, they weren't buying it—in theory at least. The next day they passed a resolution calling for a reduction in the rate of credit expansion and higher interest rates in response to "market forces."

Interest rates have been moving up over a broad range during the past year with most of the increases coming the last few months.

YIELDS INCH UP

The yield on Moody's A-rated corporate bonds, for example, has inched up to 4.70 percent from 4.58 percent in June. High-grade municipal bonds increased their yield from 3.06 percent at the beginning of the year to 3.32 percent at mid-September. The Treasury 91-day bill rate has jumped from a bit over 3.5 to 4 percent in the past year.

A number of larger banks have raised their minimum charges on loans to sales finance firms by one-fourth of a percentage point. Earlier this month Chase Manhattan raised rates to nearly all business customers by one-fourth to one-half of a percentage point.

The banks' prime rate—the interest they charge their largest and best customers—has remained unviolated at 4½ percent. A year ago several banks rescinded increases on a direct appeal by President Johnson. But the banks have found ways of circumventing this admonition and the prime rate is rapidly becoming a myth: They merely grant this privileged rate to fewer and fewer customers and up the rate to others.

DEMAND CLIMBS

In every category except the mortgage market, which recently has been reported as becoming firm, the demand for loanable funds has climbed at a heady pace. Commercial, industrial, and agricultural loans have jumped 20 percent in the past 12 months.

Whereas business was able to finance a large part of its expansion out of depreciation charges and undistributed profits a year ago, the greatly quickened pace of plant and equipment outlays has sent firms scurrying to the banks and to the bond market, where new corporate offerings are the highest in nearly a decade. And capital spending is only part of the story; the business expansion is putting new strains on the money market to finance inventories, purchase materials and extend customer credit.

Administration officials resolutely insist there is little danger of overheating the economy and cite several factors that may ease credit demand in the coming weeks: a working down of stockpiled steel, resulting in repayment of loans to finance these inventories; a continued lull in homebuilding; the deflationary effect of higher social security taxes next January 1.

CONTROL LOST?

Some analysts feel that Washington has already lost control of the money market. They point out that Government bond yields are already bumping their heads on the 4¼-percent statutory ceiling above which the Treasury cannot float new issues. This drives the Government into the short end of the market where the demand for funds has already pushed the 91-day Treasury bill rate above 4 percent. If it goes much higher the Federal Reserve System's discount rate—the interest it charges on loans to member banks—must be raised from its present 4-percent level. Otherwise the commercial banks can borrow from the Fed, buy Treasury bills and make a killing through arbitrage.

But if the Fed jumps the discount rate—say to 4½ percent—then the banks will have to pass on this added cost to customers through a wide range of interest increases. They are already in a net borrowed position, meaning that loans to them from the Fed are greater than their reserves in excess of those required by law to cover deposits.

RETURN MAY DROP

As these higher interest rates spread, what John Maynard Keynes called the marginal efficiency of capital will decline. Companies will discover that the return expected on their investment is not worth the high cost of investment funds. Then, theoretically, the economic expansion will slow or come to an end.

There are others—notably Prof. Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago—who feel interest rates will take care of themselves if the Federal Reserve encourages an orderly growth in the supply of money through its purchases or sales of Government securities.

The Fed's own figures show that while the economy is growing at a rate of 5 percent annually in real terms (after price corrections), the money supply (currency and demand deposits in banks) has increased only 3.5 percent over the past year. "The Fed has not quite financed the expansion," Business Week quotes a prominent New York bond dealer as saying. Others speculate that the Reserve Board may have helped bring on the tight credit situation by holding the money supply in the $159–$161 billion range from November 1964 through May of this year.

But although the Fed continues to keep the banks in a net borrowed position, there is evidence it is loosening up on the money supply.

Since May it has let the supply grow by nearly $6 billion with the greatest increase coming in September and early October.

This may already have been reflected in a slight easing of interest rates over the past 2 weeks. At any rate, the eyes of both the administration and the financial community will be riveted in coming months on the Fed's Board of Governors, where their respective points of view have almost equal representation.

WISCONSIN PAPER INDUSTRY CONTRIBUTION TO PUBLIC SERVICE THROUGH RESEARCH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the paper industry continues to make a most significant contribution to the economic vitality of Wisconsin. With a capital investment of $658 million and an annual payroll of $260 million, the paper industry employs better than 1 out of 10 of my State's citizens engaged in manufacturing.

During the depression, the paper industry unlike the great majority of our Nation's industries, maintained a practically full working force.

We are proud of the paper industry in Wisconsin not only for its economic contributions, but also for its public interest in the areas of timber conservation and water purification. The paper industry spends millions of dollars annually in these two fields to provide northern Wisconsin with one of the finest recreation areas for hunting and fishing in the United States.

The New York Times of October 17, 1965, contained an article on the Institute of Paper Chemistry at Appleton, Wis. The Institute of Paper Chemistry is an excellent example of paper industry's constant efforts at technological improvements as well as public service.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Search for Knowledge—The Institute of Paper Chemistry," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEARCH FOR KNOWLEDGE—THE INSTITUTE OF PAPER CHEMISTRY

In late fall of 1929 executives of a number of papermills in Wisconsin rented two rooms above the gymnasium of nearby Lawrence College and went about creating a unique educational institution devoted exclusively to the science of papermaking.

Its sponsors agreed to provide $45,000 each year for 5 years, obtained a charter from the State of Wisconsin to grant degrees, hired a technical director—and accepted three students as the inaugural class. The first M.S. degree was granted in 1931; the first Ph. D. in 1933.

The name of the new organization—the Institute of Paper Chemistry.

Today, the institute—national in character and internationally recognized for its academic standing—is located at Appleton, Wis. Its campus covers 32 acres of land, with 170,000 square feet of space, plant and facilities worth over $6 million, and an annual budget of $2.75 million. Currently, 45 faculty members teach the science underlying papermaking to 75 students.

The institute represents a remarkable partnership of advanced education with the pulp, paper, and paperboard industry, where students are educated at the graduate level through a program specifically suited to its research, production and management needs. A nonprofit, nonstock corporation, it is supported by dues from any paper company that wishes to belong. Its board of trustees is comprised of chief executives of member paper companies. No State or Federal tax moneys go toward its maintenance.

In return, the institute carries out fundamental and applied research projects (2,500 to date), maintains the world's finest pulp and paper technical library, and conducts tests and analyses of procedures and equipment not generally available in commercial laboratories. Stream quality measurement is offered by which a company may have the biological quality of a stream measured before and after a mill is installed, or annually to record the continuing status of the aquatic biological life.

And finally, the institute graduates annually an elite corp of "scientific generalists" educated in the latest scientific and technological knowledge of the industry. So far, 356 M.S. and 234 Ph. D. degrees have been granted by Lawrence University to institute scholars (although the institute is an entirely separate organization). Students in the regular curriculum are graduates from colleges and universities in the United States and abroad—150 U.S. schools and 15 foreign countries have been represented at the institute.

Once accepted, a student has little to do but study.

Full-time scholarships to regular students cover tuition, books, accommodations (single and married quarters) and a living allowance. The total amount granted for scholarships every year is close to $215,000. No part-time work, either for an industry employer or on the many research projects carried out by the Institute, is permitted. And once the student graduates he can work for any company—paper industry or not. But the records show that 9 out of 10 graduates join the industry. They fill high research, production, sales and management positions, with many of them becoming top executives of paper and board companies.

Faculty members, along with a staff of 80 scientific and technical people, are organized into research teams to work in biology, organic chemistry, physical chemistry, physics, technology,. paper evaluation, graphic arts, and containers. Much of the research is fundamental in nature and is directed at generating background information in these specialized areas. The findings often result in increased operating efficiencies, the modification of existing processes and procedures, or in some cases the creation of new and improved products.

The achievements of the institute include such diverse products as an unusual paper designed to filter radioactive debris from the atmosphere, part of a sampling program for the U.S. Government; the isolation and identification of 600 chemicals derived or related to wood; the development of a paper house (during World War II) which could be assembled without tools or need of a foundation, could accommodate four people and was guaranteed to stand for a year in any climate. It stood for 7 years.

But as the president of the institute, Dr. John G. Strange says, "Every pulp, paper, and paperboard company in this country is using in some way or other, research provided by the Institute of Paper Chemistry."

Even beyond the continuing education and research activities conducted, the faculty, staff and curriculum are made available to the industry through summer conferences, seminars, and other special programs. One of these is the annual executives conference, when—as the name implies—paper industry executives meet for a 2-day session to hear the institute's annual report meet with research and faculty members, and learn the direction the institute will take in the forthcoming year.

ROBERT ABERNETHY'S SERMON: NEED FOR CHRISTIAN LOVE TO GUIDE COMING SCIENTIFIC EXPLOSION OF KNOWLEDGE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, no one can estimate the power of sermons on the policies of this country. In my judgment the effect may be very significant indeed. Here in Washington alone, the inspiration, the reminder of the lessons taught by Jesus and the prophets, the appeal to make one's life a testament to God, has surely had a profound effect and the effect continues.

In the Cleveland Park Congregational Church, where my wife and I belong and worship, the sermons of the Reverend James Brown have served a number of national leaders as a deep and powerful stimulation for a full and sensitive life.

Recently Reverend Brown asked the National Broadcasting Co.'s news analyst, Robert Abernethy, who is also a member of the church, to deliver the Sunday sermon.

Mr. Abernethy discussed the startling changes that have already flooded our lives and the far more remarkable changes that seem about to swamp us in the coming scientific explosion of knowledge.

He spoke of what the church can contribute to the terribly difficult problem of adapting to these changes, of harnessing and directing them to build a compassionate world. He asks, what difference does the Christian church really make? What difference does it make to be a believing, practicing Christian? His answer:

> The difference is that most of us are not content with a minimum idea of God. No matter how much we may try to ignore it we are hosts to the hope and sometimes the conviction that there exists a degree of truth and love that is so powerful we can explain it to each other only in the most primitive terms. Father, spirit. What makes the church so important and so practical is the fundamental faith that it is possible for each of us—by discipline and grace—to experience something of this unrivaled power. This is the essential difference between Christians and others; this is, we hope, what carries us beyond mere good intentions * * *. With love, however—love of God and our neighbors and each other—there is just no predicting the extent of the revolution there could be. This is what Christ taught. This is what saints have preached for 20 centuries. This is what Jim Brown talks about every Sunday and, indeed, what the church is all about. A Christian society is as revolutionary a condition as you can imagine, and it is our job to promote that revolution. To be ourselves * * * to live what we profess * * * is not just to cope with change, but to lead it. If we ever begin to do that, the changes of the last 30 years will seem insignificant compared to the change we can help create, beginning here and now with each of us in all we do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Robert Abernethy's sermon be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COPING WITH CHANGE

(Sermon delivered by Robert G. Abernethy at the Cleveland Park Church, Washington, D.C., October 10, 1965)

It may seem to you presumptuous in the extreme for one such as me to stand in this place this morning. But let me offer two excuses: first, Jim Brown asked me, and he is a persuasive man; second, I consider the church a community of seekers, not a society of the elect, and it is in the spirit of the seeker that I accepted Jim's request.

I bring you greetings, first of all, from Yankee Stadium, where it was my assignment and my privilege last Monday night to play a small part in the coverage of Pope Paul VI's celebrations of mass. My job was to observe his arrival and departure, so I was outside—across Babe Ruth Field—on the roof of an 11-story apartment building on Jerome Avenue. Now, the Bronx is changing somewhat but it remains predominantly Jewish. So there was I—the grandson of two Baptist ministers, the nephew of two others, and scheduled to stand here this morning—there was I, the Protestant, talking about a Catholic mass while dissolving the bitter cold of that night with a cup of coffee brought up by one of the Jewish ladies who lived below. Obviously, I had no special qualifications for my comment: I can only assume that with my friend, Herb Kaplow, assigned to the Vatican Pavilion at the World's Fair our employers—in traditional New York style—were trying to offer a balanced ticket.

But this was not all. The lady who brought coffee brought with her her 11-year-old son, and—prompted by his questions—I found myself giving a small lecture to him on the use of Latin by priests and Hebrew by rabbis.

And then we were all quiet as we listened to 90,000 Roman Catholics sing "Praise to the Lord, the Almighty" and "Now Thank We All Our God." Until a year ago, you know, Catholics did not sing these hymns. But the results of the spirit of Pope John the 23d and of the Ecumenical Council are taking hold fast: I cannot wait for my Catholic friends to learn the joys not only of Lutheran hymns but of Methodist ones, too.

There is a story going around about Pope Paul which, I want to make clear, is apocryphal. They say he hopes the Ecumenical Council does not finish its work before he dies because he really does want to be buried a Catholic.

I do not know how it was in your home as a child but I confess to you that in my home there was significant prejudice against Catholics. As far as I am aware, Jews were all right and we were all for Negroes but Catholics were out. I have the impression that this waspish feeling was so common until very recently that one really could not imagine a visit to New York by the "Pope of Rome." But things have changed, and quickly. The search of the Catholic Church for aggiornamento—bringing itself up to date—plus our own experience of a Catholic President—have created a whole new climate.

This ecumenicism is just one example of what I want to talk about today: change and our response to it. Ours is a time of many revolutions—interacting, accelerating, changing not just the surface conditions of our lives but even some of our most fundamental ideas. Of all the revolutions through which we are living none is more important than the scientific one—the tremendous expansion in our total amount of knowledge about things and, indeed, about life itself. Biologists and chemists are literally on the verge of the artificial manufacture of cells that reproduce themselves.

Before the scientific method of pursuing truth became respectable the church offered certain explanations of the nature of the universe, and we have to admit that as science has challenged these explanations the response of the church was not always graceful. When Galileo insisted that it was really the sun that was at the center of our part of the universe the Inquisition summoned him to Rome and forced him to recant. (That, by the way, was under Pope Paul the Fifth.) In our time, we have about conceded the fight with Darwin, although we do not talk much about it. And the same probably goes for the ideas of Einstein and Freud.

I want to make one thing very clear: We are all in this rocky boat together—men and women, old and young. Do not blame your children for the ideas of a contemporary of yours or even of your parents or grandparents. The revolutions of our time affect all of us together and we must all together help each other not just cope with them but guide them toward a richer and healthier life for everyone.

Some of you have heard me quote Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer on the subject of accelerating change. Bear with me once more, for he makes the point well. "What is new," said the man who supervised the development of the atomic bomb, "is the prevalence of newness, the changing scale and scope of change itself, so that the years of man's life measure not some small growth or moderation or rearrangement of what he learned in childhood but a great upheaval."

More scientists mean more knowledge which challenges more scientists who produce more knowledge. I am sure you are familiar with the science writers' estimate that 90 percent of all the scientists who ever lived are alive today.

In addition to the scientific revolution—the great upheaval of new knowledge—there are so many others. When the U.N. was formed in 1945, 51 nations signed the charter. Two weeks ago, at the opening of the 20th session of the General Assembly, the 115th, 116th, and 117th members were admitted. In these new nations people want a better life and see no reason why they should not have it. But the world's soaring population—growing by about 65 million each year, 180,000 a day, 125 each minute—is canceling out most increases in productivity. So the revolution of rising expectations becomes a revolution of rising frustrations, and serious men fear widespread famine in the 1970's.

We have our own revolutions here at home, too. One of them is urbanism. Seventy percent of us now live in what Dr. Eckler would call an urban area: that means 70 percent of us on just 1 percent of the land. I am a native Washingtonian—native bred, if not native born. I grew up near woods within the District of Columbia that were not part of a park; just undeveloped, unsubdivided woods. Since then I have gone my old-fashioned way, dimly conscious of exploding suburbia but—like the church facing the idea of relativity or the uncertainty principle—not quite yet wanting to talk about it. (I almost always get lost in the suburbs; I wish change would include street signs you could see—especially at night.)

The other day I ventured out through what I remember as the little village of Bethesda to talk to some people at the National Institutes of Health. They decided I should meet a man who was in Falls Church—which, as far as I am concerned, might as well be Richmond—so they gave him a call and he got on the beltway and was with us in about 10 minutes. Then we all went to lunch at a place called Linden Hill. The decor and the atmosphere were like Beverly Hills or Miami Beach. They even had models strutting through the dining room calling our attention—and listen to this—to a line of fashions sold by a store in Rockville. I wanted to tell them there was no such thing as fashion in Rockville, but I was afraid they would not believe me.

The point is that this is a time of accelerating change for all of us. The question is: How do we face it.

I do not know what your idea of God is, but whatever it is, surely it must include the concept of absolute truth. I think the Christian—of all people—should not just welcome but should seek out every truth he can find about the world and life, for it seems to me that the more we understand about our world the closer we are to what is eternal. What is happening in the laboratories at NIH, and Harvard, and Berkeley, and a thousand other places all over the world—this measured search for observable truth—is a thing of real beauty. Scientists feel this: they call brilliant insights "beautiful."

A friend of mine who studied at Oxford tells me he knew a young mathematician there who cried whenever he contemplated the binomial theorem.

Toward this first great revolution of our time, then, it seems to me that the Christian response should be one of joyful welcome because truth is holy in itself.

Also, do not forget that not all new ideas undermine Biblical claims. Many people have been at least fascinated and often permitted a much deeper and more honest faith by Dr. Leslie Weatherhead's interpretation of Christ's miracles in the light of recent-day psychology. I am thinking particularly of the book, "Psychology, Religion, and Healing."

And one more benefit of new knowledge. When the engineers get hold of it and begin applying it to the business of everyday work and living they improve the conditions of life for the overwhelming majority of us. We may look with nostalgia on the good old days but throughout the history of mankind days were in fact not so good for most people. Life, in the words of Thomas Hobbes, was "poor, nasty, brutish, and short."

In his second look at his famous 1959 Rede lecture on "The Two Cultures," C. P. Snow—since then Sir Charles Snow and now Lord Snow—said: "* * * when anyone is asked what he would have been in a previous incarnation he nominates—if he is modest—something like a Jacobean cleric or an 18th-century squire. He wouldn't have been any such thing. The overwhelming probability is that he would have been a peasant. If we want to talk about our ancestors, that is whence we came." And then Lord Snow quotes J. H. Plumb on the myth of what he calls a "pretty-pretty" past: "No one in his senses," wrote Plumb, "would choose to have been born in a previous age unless he could be certain that he would have been born into a prosperous family, that he would have enjoyed extremely good health, and that he could have accepted stoically the death of the majority of his children."

Science and technology have changed that for those of us lucky enough to live in the rich nations. Science and technology have given us such productivity that for the first time in human history it is at least theoretically possible for every human being on earth, at last, to have enough of the basic physical necessities of life. And who can be anything but grateful for such changes as the development of a polio vaccine—removing within the last 10 years at least one of the fears of every parent.

Beautiful new truths, of course, sometimes have ugly applications. Christmastime in 1938 was an exciting time for physicists because they had just learned that two Germans, Hahn and Strassemann, had proved that an atom of uranium could be split. And then the excitement of 1938 became the holocausts of August 1945.

Today the world population is not exploding because of the irresponsibility of the masses but because of the knowledge and, indeed, the charity of the few—wiping out such wholesale killers as malaria, cutting the death rate without doing anything equally dramatic about the birth rate or the food supply.

The Christian must be concerned about how truth is used. And here again we return to just a minimum idea of God. God is truth and, even more essentially, God is love. This is the heart of the Christian idea, the central message of that cross, the reason for the church itself. We are here this morning because we believe the church to be a most practical institution, responsible for nothing less than the preservation and encouragement of truth and love in the lives of each human being on earth. We care about other people and we give our time and our money to trying to make life for others a little happier.

Never has there been greater need for this kind of unselfish neighborliness. Sometimes it seems as if the more comfortable we get the less we care about each other—just in such little things, for instance, as being polite in a store. There's room in this world for an unlimited amount of the spirit for which the church stands.

As Christians, then, we welcome new knowledge, we work in the world to try to see that it is applied with love, and we also care about each other—or we ought to. Sometimes in middle class America we pretend that life is nothing but achievement and well-being. If we have been sick we do not even want our friends to know about it. We may be so tortured by something we cannot even notice a spectacularly beautiful morning, but let anyone ask us how we are and we always answer, "Fine, just fine, thank you."

Do you read the class notes in an alumni magazine? I do, occasionally. I seem to belong to a college class no member of which is ever fired or divorced or alcoholic or criminal or anything else unpleasant. We just go on from one promotion to another—always full of energy, never concerned about the balance in the checkbook, ever surrounded by a happy and adoring family.

But you and I know real life is different. You and I know that no matter how many changes there have been certain facts of life remain for all of us: accident, disease, loneliness, death. No one in this church is so busy or so prosperous or so well adjusted or so successful that his life and happiness hang by anything thicker than the slenderest of threads. We are all fragile creatures, and as such we need each other's interest and love.

Long before his own trip to Bethesda last week President Johnson used to tell the story of his father, Sam Johnson, who got sick once and had to go to the hospital in Austin. One day before his father had recovered Lyndon Johnson went to visit. His father ordered him, as the President puts it, "to bring him his breeches." The boy protested, reminding his father that he was not yet supposed to leave. But Sam Johnson insisted: he might have good doctors and efficient nurses but that was not enough; he told his son: "I want to go home, where they care when you live and know when you die." And he put on his breeches and went.

The church is a community of people who care about each other—when we live, when we die. By such caring—by what used to go by the name, "fellowship"—we help each other cope with change.

Well, you say, fair enough—and tame enough. If we care about truth and love so do many other institutions: universities, perhaps, or charitable foundations. What is the difference? The difference is that most of us are not content with a minimum idea of God. No matter how much we may try to ignore it we are hosts to the hope and sometimes the conviction that there exists a degree of truth and love that is so powerful we can explain it to each other only in the most primitive terms. Father, spirit. What makes the church so important and so practical is the fundamental faith that it is possible for each of us—by discipline and grace—to experience something of this unrivaled power. This is the essential difference between Christians and others; this is, we hope, what carries us beyond mere good intentions.

With such attitudes, then, we face the changes of the past and present and prepare ourselves for those to come. We should all get a good grip on something, because what is coming is unprecedented turbulence. Like that we have already experienced it is beginning with new ideas. Dr. Glenn Seaborg, the man who discovered plutonium and now the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, said in 1963, "I am not hesitant to predict that man's knowledge of nature and himself will more than double in the next three decades—that is, the scientific discoveries and advances of the next 30 years will be more than equal to all those of past years and centuries.

And again Lord Snow, again from the Rede lecture of 1959: "The rate of change has increased so much that our imagination can't keep up. There is bound to be more social change, affecting more people, in the next decade than in any before. There is bound to be more change again, in the 1970s."

We can expect new revolutions in biology and medicine. We really may put men on the moon within 5 years. And on this earth we have unprecedented opportunities for discovering how to live together. It seems to me that neither of our two greatest problems—war and poverty—defy mastery. At the very least we should be able to increase farm productivity and adjust trade so the poor southern half of the world can feed itself.

I cheer the goal of a Great Society—in the United States and all over the world. What scientists and engineers have made possible the rest of us ought to be able to make real. But let there be no mistake about the essence of any society that is great. It is not Federal aid, important though that may be. It is not free universities, vital as they are. It is not even efficient industry and agriculture, necessary as that is. What is essential for greatness is the spirit preserved and cultivated and preached and—God help us—lived by the people of the church.

We may speak by way of synchronous satellite, and have the gift of urban renewal and fast trains; we may understand more and more knowledge, and bestow twice our present foreign aid to help the poor—but without love.

With love, however—love of God and our neighbors and each other—there is just no predicting the extent of the revolution there could be. This is what Christ taught. This is what saints have preached for 20 centuries. This is what Jim Brown talks about every Sunday and, indeed, what the church is all about. A Christian society is as revolutionary a condition as you can imagine, and it is our job to promote that revolution. To be ourselves, to live what we profess, is not just to cope with change, but to lead it. If we even begin to do that, the changes of the last 30 years will seem insignificant compared to the change we can help create, beginning here and now with each of us in all we do.

I began with an ecumenical reference. I conclude with one. I am extremely fond of an anthology collected by Victor Gollancz in a book called "Man and God." The insights of Protestants and Catholics are mixed together with those of Hindus and Hasidic Jews. It's a long book, like some sermons, but it finally ends with a couplet credited to Angelus Silesius:

"Friend, let this be enough. If thou wouldst go on reading,

"Go and thyself become the writing and the meaning.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN OFFICE EQUIPMENT TO MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 899, H.R. 11267.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11267) to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove certain limitations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 913) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pursuant to the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, as amended, (2 U.S.C. 112a), each Member of the House of Representatives receives an office equipment allotment of $2,500 ($3,000 for Members representing districts with more than 500,000 population). This allowance may be used to obtain, except in the case of electric typewriters, not more than two of each of the following general types of equipment:

1. Addressing machines.
2. Automatic typewriters.
3. Electric typewriters.
4. Recording machines for dictating and transcribing.
5. Duplicating machines.
6. Automatic letter-opening machines.
7. Automatic letter-sealing machines.

H.R. 11267 would repeal subsection (d) of the first section of the joint resolution which contains the provision limiting a Member to no more than two machines of the same type. In recent years this restriction has become increasingly unrealistic, and its repeal would give Members needed latitude in selecting within their allotments the types and numbers of office machines that would best satisfy their individual needs.

DAVID D. TERRY LOCK AND DAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 902, H.R. 7475.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7475) to name the authorized lock and dam numbered 6 on the Arkansas River in Arkansas and the lake created thereby for David D. Terry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 916), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 7475 is to name the authorized lock and dam No. 6 on the Arkansas River in Arkansas and the lake created thereby for David D. Terry. Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such lock and dam and lake are referred to shall be held to refer to such lock and dam as the David D. Terry lock and dam, and the lake as the David D. Terry Lake.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Lock and dam No. 6 on the Arkansas River is located 12 miles southeast of Little Rock, Ark., and is about 154 miles upstream from the mouth of the Arkansas River. This project was authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1946 and is a component part of the overall navigation plan of the Arkansas River.

The late David D. Terry served the Fifth Congressional District of Arkansas from December 1933 to January 1943, and during that time, as well as afterward, he was recognized as a leader in developing the program for flood control and navigation along the Arkansas River. He then served as director of the Division of Flood Control, Water, and Soil Conservation of the Arkansas Resources and Development Commission from 1945 to 1953.

COST TO THE UNITED STATES IF LEGISLATION IS ENACTED

Enactment of this legislation will not result in any cost to the Federal Government.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee believes it fitting and proper to name the lock and dam on the Arkansas River, Ark., in honor of the late Honorable David D. Terry, whose untiring efforts have resulted in great contributions to the national welfare and to his beloved State of Arkansas. Accordingly, enactment of H.R. 7475 is recommended.

DISPLAY OF U.S. FLAG AT LEXINGTON, MASS.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I make the same request as to Calendar No. 904, H.R. 5493.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5493) to provide that the flag of the United States of America may be flown for 24 hours of each day at Lexington, Mass.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 918), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide that the flag of the United States may be flown for 24 hours each day in Lexington, Mass.

STATEMENT

In recognition of the historical events which took place on the green at Lexington, Mass., this bill would authorize the flying of the flag 24 hours a day at this location. An identical measure passed the House in the 88th Congress. In view of the national significance of the events which took place at Lexington, the committee believes that this measure is desirable and appropriate.

Accordingly, the committee recommends favorable consideration of H.R. 5493 without amendment.

WATER CONSERVATION MONTH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I make the same request as to Calendar No. 905, House Joint Resolution 671.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 671) to authorize the President to proclaim the month of November as "Water Conservation Month."

Mr. KUCHEL. One of the younger and more able Members of the Congress is the distinguished Representative from California, Mr. Ed Reinecke, author of House Joint Resolution 671, who has been interested and has devoted himself to water conservation, particularly in the West. He has developed intriguing statistics in demonstrating the way the American people use water and, regretably waste it. He is interested in water conservation, and what may be done to lessen waste in the use of water by the American people. So are we all.

The fact that we now have proclaimed in Congress that November should be Water Conservation Month was the result of his attempt to help to awaken an interest in the problem of water conservation and he will follow this resolution with substantive legislation in the field of conserving the use of water. I wish him well in his future efforts in this important field.

On that basis, I am delighted that the resolution passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 919), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize and request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the month of November 1965 as Water Conservation Month.

STATEMENT

The designation of November of 1965 as Water Conservation Month would call attention to the public of the United States the importance of water conservation to the maintenance of public health and the national economy.

The committee is of the opinion that the resolution has a meritorious purpose and accordingly recommends favorable consideration of House Joint Resolution 671, without amendment.

CRUSADE FOR SAFETY DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I make the same request for Calendar No. 906, House Concurrent Resolution 448.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 448) to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating September 3, 1965, as Crusade for Safety Day which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 3, after the word "designating", to strike out "September 3, 1965" and insert "November 26, 1965".

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 448

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating November 26, 1965, as Crusade for Safety Day and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities designed to reduce traffic accidents.

The title was amended, so as to read: "Concurrent resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating November 26, 1965, as Crusade for Safety Day."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 920), explaining the purposes of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the concurrent resolution, as amended, is to authorize and request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating November 26, 1965, as Crusade for Safety Day, and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities designed to reduce traffic accidents.

STATEMENT

On September 3, 1965, the Postmaster General of the United States joined other Maryland officials to issue a special traffic safety stamp in Baltimore, Md., to call to the attention of the public the need for safe driving to stop the tragic slaughter on our Nation's streets and highways.

Baltimore was selected as the site for the issuance of this special traffic safety stamp because the members of the Safety First Club of Maryland originally suggested that such a stamp be issued as a means of reminding the driving public that "safety is everybody's business."

It is shocking to note that during the year 1964, 48,000 Americans were killed in traffic accidents. Another 3,840,000 Americans were injured and there were 285,000 pedestrian casualties.

The committee is of the opinion that this resolution is meritorious and is a means of calling to the attention of the public the need for safe driving.

Accordingly, the committee recommends favorable consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 448, with amendments.

WHISKEYTOWN - SHASTA - TRINITY NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, CALIF.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 907, H.R. 797.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 797) to establish the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a vast new recreation area in northern California is about to be established by the Congress. To serve the needs of literally millions of people for outdoor recreational activity, a national recreation area, Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity, will offer to all Americans four beautiful manmade lakes, with 500 miles of shoreline, and a magnificent expanse of hills and mountains and virgin forests and streams, for the perpetual enjoyment and wonder.

H.R. 797 would provide for full development and public use and enjoyment of the wonderful recreational resources of this area of California in the establishment of a national recreation area.

The Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity Recreation Area will consist of three separate units. One of the units—Whiskeytown—will be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, the other two—Shasta and Clair Engle-Lewiston, which are mostly within the Shasta-Trinity National Forest—by the Secretary of Agriculture. The bill contains provisions to assure coordination of the administration of the three units. Although separate, these units are in close proximity to each other so users can easily enjoy all of them during a brief stay.

This recreation area is centered on four beautiful artificial lakes which are reservoirs in the great Central Valley project in California. The reservoirs provide nearly 50,000 acres of water surface, and their shorelines total more than 560 miles. The center of this complex is approximately 200 miles north of San Francisco, 300 miles south of Portland, and 175 miles northwest of Reno. Present estimates are that the recreational use of these units of the national recreation area will be about 5¼ million visitor-days by 1975 and that this will double by the year 2000. In California, our population is expected to almost double by 1980. We may expect, as well, a doubling—if not a tripling—of the demand for outdoor recreation opportunities in the wake of increased leisure time, income, and mobility.

Although the reservoirs and the water-based recreation which they will afford will, undoubtedly, be the central attractions of the national recreation area for most of those who will visit it, the surrounding countryside is also an important part of the picture. This is rugged country which offers many opportunities for hiking, camping, nature study, fishing, photography, picnicking, and other types of outdoor recreation.

In order to provide for the fullest use and enjoyment of the recreation opportunities which the reservoirs and their surroundings present, and to preserve these opportunities for future generations, it is important that substantial land areas be set aside, kept available, and administered as provided in H.R. 797.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has stated:

> The four reservoirs provide some of the finest recreation waters in California in a setting of outstanding mountain scenery. They provide an excellent base on which to develop a diversified and balanced recreation program. They offer an opportunity to help meet the recreation demand for 14.8 million activity days use in Shasta and Trin-

> ity Counties by 1980 forecast by the California public outdoor recreation plan.

Substantiating this estimate is the actual count of visitors during 1964. A total of 1,332,000 visitor days of use were recorded by the Forest Service and the National Park Service for these three areas. The President of the United States, in his message to Congress on the natural beauty of our country, said:

> Our present system of parks, seashores, and recreation areas—monuments to the dedication and labor of farsighted men—do not meet the needs of a growing population.

He then proposed that the Land and Water Conservation Fund be used to acquire lands needed to establish the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area.

Interstate Highway No. 5—U.S. 99—serving the Pacific Northwest, northern, central, and southern California, crosses Shasta Lake and is only a few miles east of Whiskeytown, Shasta, and Clair Engle Lake via U.S. Highway 299. This places the reservoirs within 2 days' drive of the metropolitan areas of the entire Pacific coast. Designation of this area as a National Recreation Area will certainly bring greater use from people outside the immediate vicinity.

A substantial part of the development costs of the area might well be incurred even if H.R. 797 were not passed, since the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior already have authority to install certain recreation facilities at the reservoirs covered by this bill. However, these facilities are by no means adequate to meet the anticipated increasing use.

A greater acceleration and intensification of development of these areas for public use will be required. Better and additional roads leading to and within the units are essential. More numerous and enlarged facilities for launching boats and for camping, picnicking, and swimming will be required. Advantage should be taken of the excellent opportunities for scenic drives, one of the most popular forms of outdoor recreation according to the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. To protect these valuable and useful public properties there needs to be an intensification of administration of the area.

This legislation will assure the conservation and wise use of all the resources of this area for the American people. Yet, the bill provides safeguards to the owners of improved properties within the units against arbitrary takings. It authorizes the acquisition of scenic easements in situations where these will meet public needs equally as well as the acquisition of fee title to private lands. It provides for public hunting and for the continuation of mineral exploration and utilization through leases and permits to be issued by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture under safeguards that will make these uses compatible with the national recreation area objectives.

An excellent feature of H.R. 797 is the recognition of county ordinances in the two State governmental subdivisions involved, Shasta and Trinity Counties. These have indicated a desire to adopt zoning regulations to restrict the use of privately owned land to compatible activities. This provision will mean a reduction in the amount of land which must be acquired, so the cost of the project will be reduced.

This bill has the solid support of private enterprise, local and State governments, and the Federal agencies who are ready to proceed with this program.

Mr. President, for these reasons I urge that H.R. 797, to establish a Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity Recreation Area, be passed by the Senate.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 797, a bill authorizing the establishment of the Whiskeytown-Trinity-Shasta Recreational Area in northern California.

At the outset I would take this opportunity to congratulate Congressman BIZZ JOHNSON for his leadership in making this dream land available as a national park for all the American people. Certainly the recreation-minded public is indebted to Congressman JOHNSON for his efforts. I would also like to congratulate my distinguised colleague, Senator KUCHEL, for his leadership and work on the Senate side.

Whiskeytown, Shasta, and Trinity are three noncontiguous units surrounding reservoirs at the northern end of California's Central Valley. Over 250 thousand acres of land and water are included within this area. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation reported in 1963 that this area provided some of the finest recreation waters in California in a setting of outstanding mountain scenery. They provide an excellent base on which to develop a diversified and balanced recreation program. They offer an opportunity to help meet the recreation demand for 14.8 million activity days' use in Shasta and Trinity Counties by 1980 forecast by the California public outdoor recreation plan. Over 4 million activity days' use by 1980 will be made by people coming from beyond 250 miles, according to the forecast.

Giving validity to these estimates is an October 1 press release by Secretary Udall. In this release on the increasing popularity of recreational areas at newly created Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs, the Secretary states that—

> The largest increase in recreation use at a new Reclamation reservoir occurred at Whiskeytown Reservoir on Clear Creek in northern California. The number of visitors to this area of blue water, and green, wooded hills, multiplied six times. In 1963, only 63,000 traveled to the reservoir; last year, 390,000 visited. Nearby Clair Engle—formerly Trinity—Lake on the Trinity River supplied outdoor recreation opportunities for 323,000 in 1963 and 388,000 in 1964. At Lewiston Lake, a few miles south on the same river, 60,000 visitors were recorded in 1963 and 107,000 in 1964.

Mr. President, all of my colleagues are familiar with the rapid population expansion which the entire Nation is experiencing, and of course the increase in my State staggers one's imagination. California's population will double by 1980. It is therefore vital, Mr. President, that we make certain that our expanding population will have available fine recreational areas where they can enjoy their leisure hours.

For those of you who are unfamiliar with the location of this recreation area, I would say that it is located on Interstate Highway 5, a major highway of the Pacific coast. It is only 1 day's drive from the expanding population of the San Francisco, Sacramento, and Portland areas. It is within 2 days' drive for the metropolitan area of the entire Pacific coast—an area whose population exceeds 20 million and which is expected to increase to 58 million by the year 2000.

The enactment of H.R. 797 will conserve the recreational potential of this area in perpetuity. Mr. President this legislation has the complete support of the community. It has the enthusiastic support of private enterprise, both local and State governments, and all the Federal agencies involved. Therefore, for all of these reasons, Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will give this legislation their support.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 922), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 797 is to establish the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area in the State of California.

The proposal to create this new national recreation area is a companion to the one to create the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area (H.R. 89). Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity in the West will serve the same purposes as the Delaware Water Gap area will serve in the East; namely, preserving in comparatively undeveloped condition large open areas of land, centered on Federal reservoir developments, in order to provide outdoor recreation opportunities for millions of visitors each year from the large metropolitan areas that are within reasonable driving distance of it. Both of these areas will be valuable inland additions to the system of similar areas under Federal control along the coast. This system now includes Cape Hatteras, N.C.; Padre Island, Tex.; Point Reyes, Calif.; and, with heavy emphasis on their conservation aspects, Cape Cod, Mass,; and Fire Island, N.Y.

H.R. 797 is a successor to H.R. 3618 and H.R. 8489, 88th Congress, and to H.R. 10912, 87th Congress, all of which were also introduced by Congressman JOHNSON. Hearings on H.R. 797 were held on September 17, 1965.

ADMINISTRATION AND LOCATION

The Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity recreation area will consist of three separate units. One of the units (Whiskeytown) will be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, the other two (Shasta and Clair Engle-Lewiston, which are mostly within the Shasta-Trinity National Forest) by the Secretary of Agriculture. The bill contains provisions to assure coordination of the administration of the three units.

These three units are centered on four reservoirs—Shasta, Clair Engle (formerly known as Trinity), Lewiston, and Whiskeytown—which have already been constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation as features of the Central Valley Federal reclamation project. The center of this complex is approximately 200 miles north of San Francisco, 300 miles south of Portland, and 175 miles northwest of Reno. Sacramento, Redding, Salem, Eugene, and Medford all lie within easy distance of it. It is readily accessible by Interstate Highway 5 (U.S. 99). Present estimates are that the recreation use of these units of the national recreation area will be about 5¼ million visitor-days by 1975 and that this will double by the year 2000.

DEVELOPMENT

Taken together, the four reservoirs mentioned above provide nearly 50,000 acres of water surface, and their shorelines total more than 560 miles. The breakdown of these figures together with the elevations of the reservoirs above sea level is as follows:

	Water surface	Shoreline	Elevation
	Acres	*Miles*	*Feet*
Shasta	29, 500	365	1, 065
Clair Engle	16, 500	145	2, 370
Lewiston	610	15	1, 900
Whiskeytown	3, 250	36	1, 220

Although the reservoirs and the water-based recreation which they will afford will undoubtedly be the central attractions of the national recreation area for most of those who will visit it, the surrounding countryside is also an important part of the picture. This is rugged country which offers many opportunities for hiking, camping, nature study, fishing, photographing, picnicking, and other types of outdoor recreation. The Trinity Alps which rise to 9,000 feet, Shasta Bally with an elevation of over 6,200 feet, and Clear Creek with its waterfalls, rapids, steep canyon walls, and trout fishery resources are among the outstanding features of the area.

In order to provide for the fullest use and enjoyment of the recreation opportunities which the reservoirs and their surroundings present and to preserve these opportunities for future generations, it is important that substantial land areas be set aside, kept available, and administered as provided in H.R. 797. Without substantial additions of land back from the reservoirs, as provided in the bill, the Federal land immediately around them would soon become badly overcrowded, there would be serious danger of incompatible developments not far from their shorelines, and adequate provision could not be made for overnight camping facilities and for other types of land-based recreation.

Based on the projected visitation mentioned above, the plans of the National Park Service and the Forest Service for development of the area envision very substantial increases in the limited number of campgrounds, picnic areas, boating and swimming sites, marinas, launching ramps, parking facilities, and roads and trails that have already been installed. An outline of the project development of the area will be found in the brochure entitled "A Report on the Proposed Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area" prepared by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and dated April 1965. Appropriate fees for the use of the area and the facilities that are installed will be set under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.

It is for such reasons as those just outlined that H.R. 797 calls for the inclusion of approximately 129,900 acres of land and water in the Shasta unit, 83,500 acres in the Clair Engle-Lewiston unit, and 42,000 acres in the Whiskeytown unit. More than 70 percent of this area—approximately 184,600 acres—is already owned by the United States. A small fraction, 1,250 acres, is owned by the State of California. The remaining 70,700-plus acres are in private ownership and nearly half of this—about 29,700 acres—is railroad grant land now owned by the Southern Pacific Co. The private land is for the most part mixed with the Federal land in a checkerboard pattern.

In summary, the area and present land-ownership picture is as follows:

	Total area		Federal		Private and State land
	Land	Water	Land	Water	
Shasta	100, 360	29, 500	75, 240	29, 500	25, 120
Clair Engle-Lewiston	66, 390	17, 110	47, 950	17, 110	18, 440
Whiskeytown	38, 737	3, 250	11, 563	3, 250	27, 174
Total	205, 487	49, 860	134, 753	49, 860	70, 734

LAND ACQUISITION

Provisions have been written into H.R. 797 for acquisition of the privately owned land within the boundaries of the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area. A certain amount of this land may be acquired by exchange for other Federal lands in the State of California. Most of it, however, will have to be acquired by purchase, donation, or condemnation. The land and water conservation fund (Public Law 88-578, 78 Stat. 897) is available as a source for appropriations for acquisitions of such land.

Fortunately most of the 70,700 acres that need to be acquired is undeveloped. The great bulk of it is forested land. Nevertheless there are some private homes in the area, and provisions appropriate to this circumstance are included in the bill. These provisions are similar to those that have been adopted by the Congress in earlier acts dealing with the national seashores.

The first of these provisions (sec. 2(c)) grants the owners of residential property a right, notwithstanding acquisition of the property by the Government, of continued use and occupancy by himself and members of his family of the home and related buildings for a period terminating on his death or the death of his spouse or on the date his last surviving child reaches the age of 30. The value of this right, if the owner elects to retain it, will be taken into account in determining the purchase price of the property.

A second provision (sec. 2(d)) assures the owners of any improved property, residential or commercial, that it will not be taken by condemnation as long as its use conforms to a valid local zoning ordinance which has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, as the case may be.

In both of these instances, "improved property" is defined as property on which the improvements in question had been built before February 6, 1963, or on which they were under construction on that date and, in addition thereto, not more than 3 acres of land. The protective provisions are not applicable to reservoir-front land or land needed for access to the reservoir shores.

A third provision (sec. 2(h)) deals with the matter of developing unimproved land in order to provide public accommodations and conveniences for visitors to the Shasta and Clair Engle-Lewiston units of the national recreation area. This provision authorizes suspension of the power of condemnation with respect to such property if its owner presents and carries out an acceptable development plan which is consistent with approved zoning ordinances and with the purposes of the act. This provision also authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to issue a certificate to the owner of such property as evidence of his approval of the proposed plan of development. Land required for administrative sites, campgrounds, rights-of-way for access, and other similar purposes is not covered by this provision. It is not the intent of the committee, as the language of the bill makes clear, that the authority to waive acquisition shall be exercised in favor of development plans—subdivisions, for instance—which will not serve the needs of the general public or the Government.

At the subcommittee hearing, concern was expressed on behalf of holders of patented mining claims within one of the units of the proposed national recreation area, that language in the bill might be construed as indicating that permits for use of national forest land adjacent to, or so located as to be needed in connection with the operation of, the mining claims could no longer be issued. The committee wishes to make clear that nothing in the bill is intended to change the authority for, or prohibit the issuance of, permits to make such use of national forest land in the national recreation area, subject to reasonable conditions, including those that may be appropriate to lessen the adverse effects of the mining operations on the recreational and esthetics values, taking into consideration that effective utilization of mineral and other resources of the area may properly be made.

COST

Section 10 of the bill limits the amount authorized to be appropriated for land acquisition and for development of recreation facilities to $21,600,000 and $22,700,000, respectively. Nearly 59 percent of the costs which are expected to be incurred during the first 5 years of the program will be connected with the Whiskeytown unit, 28 percent with the Clair Engle-Lewiston unit, and 15 percent with the Shasta unit. Should the amounts authorized to be appropriated prove to be insufficient, whether because of rising land prices or for other reasons, the departments concerned will have to seek additional authorization. The committee points out that a substantial part of the development costs of the area might well be incurred even if H.R. 797 were not included, since the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior already have authority to install certain recreation facilities at the reservoirs covered by the bill.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO INVESTIGATE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 911, Senate Resolution 154.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The resolution will be stated.

The **Legislative Clerk**. A resolution (S. Res. 154) providing additional funds to investigate juvenile delinquency.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 154) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 154

Resolved, That S. Res. 52, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to February 8, 1965 (authorizing an investigation of juvenile delinquency), is hereby amended on page 3, line 1, by striking out "$220,000.00" and inserting in lieu thereof "$240,000.00".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 925), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 154 would increase by $20,000, from $220,000 to $240,000, the expenditure authorization of Senate Resolution 52, agreed to February 8, 1965, for use by the Committee on the Judiciary (acting through its Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency) from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966 "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts; and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics."

During the 2d session of the 88th Congress the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to expend $211,000 for the same purposes.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 62.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 62) to authorize the printing of additional copies of the hearings held by the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs during the 89th Congress, 1st session, on S. 9, the cold war GI education bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 62) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 62

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare two thousand additional copies of the hearings held by its Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs during the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, on S. 9, a bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 912), explaining the purposes of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 62 would authorize the printing for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held by its Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs during the 89th Congress, 1st session, on S. 9, a bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period (the cold war GI education bill).

The printing cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing cost estimate

Back to press, first 1,000 copies	$2,146.84
1,000 additional copies, at $513.03 per thousand	513.03
Total estimated cost, S. Con. Res. 62	2,659.87

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 63.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 63) providing additional copies of hearings on antitrust and monopoly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 63) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary two thousand additional copies of volume 2 and volume 3 of the hearings held by its Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly during the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, on economic concentration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 913), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 63 would authorize the printing for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary of 2,000 additional copies each of volumes 2 and 3 of the hearings on economic concentration held by its Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly during the 89th Congress, 1st session.

The printing cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing cost estimate

Pt. 2:	
Back to press, 1st 1,000 copies	$2,449
1,000 additional copies, at $803 per thousand	803
Estimated cost, pt. 2	3,252
Pt. 3:	
2,000 additional copies, at $557 per thousand	1,114
Estimated cost, pt. 3	1,114
Total estimated cost, S. Con. Res. 62	4,366

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it was agreed that the Senate would start on the nominations at 10:30, but I am glad to yield briefly to the senior Senator from Ohio.

TELL THE AMERICAN PEOPLE THE TRUTH

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a great newpaper chain—Scripps-Howard—has as its masthead on the editorial page the slogan:

> Give light and the people will find their way.

This is very true.

Referring to this slogan leads me to denounce a present Defense Department policy and that of top officials of the executive branch of our Government. In changing the policy heretofore followed in reporting casualties—dead and wounded—in our conflict in Vietnam, information is being denied the American people. I refer to accurate information to which they are entitled. I denounce the present policy of reporting light losses or moderate losses. This is as misleading as is the statement regarding some Air Force strike or battle and then reporting 128 Vietcong dead or some other estimate of Vietcong dead. Those of us who served in World War II recall reports of the number of enemy killed in action and know that some of those reports were subject to 90-percent discount to give them accuracy. American people should be accurately informed by official statements issued at least once a month informing them of the total number of Americans killed, wounded, and taken prisoner in that period.

Of course, I am not advocating that at the end of each battle or airstrike we report anything other than that losses were light or moderate. Giving complete detailed information at that time might be of aid to the enemy.

The American people are entitled to know the extent of the loss of life in the fighting in southeast Asia to which we are committed and intend to see through to ultimate victory or cease fire or armistice sustaining the integrity and independence of South Vietnam. Furthermore, they can take it, as the saying goes. I am not proposing that following each battle or airstrike, when some of our planes are shot down or casualties incurred, that we immediately disclose those casualties at the time. This might give information to the enemy which would be to our prejudice.

Our President and officials in the Defense Department should however issue an accurate news release at the end of this month, informing the American people fully as to the total killed in action, the total wounded in action, and the total taken prisoner during the month of October. Then, this policy should be followed each month hereafter.

I urge this. I ask that an announcement that such policy will be followed be issued from top officials of the executive branch of our Government, and without delay.

TYPICAL SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE IN THE EXPLORATION OF INNER SPACE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the dramatic nature of experiments and exploration in the limitless realm of outer space has captivated the American people to the point where regrettably very limited attention has been given equally significant efforts to expand knowledge of an area in what might be termed "inner space."

In more prosaic fashion, bold and imaginative endeavors have been in progress during recent years to unravel secrets of an equally important aspect of man's environment, the vast expanse of undersea regions of the globe on which we exist. By virtue of the fact that much of this effort is technological and attempted primarily through scientific and engineering instruments, the element of suspense and fascination with persevering and often hazardous exposures of human beings has been missing.

Recently three teams of venturesome individuals dubbed "aquanauts" completed unprecedented research off the southern California coast with an oceanographic operation centered on Sea Lab II. Over a period of a month, dedicated personnel ascertained the possibility of living and working for prolonged periods at considerable depth. The effects of submerged environment were measured carefully in a variety of novel experiments.

The desire to obtain first-hand personnally gained knowledge in the underwater realm presents unique problems. One of the most perplexing stems from limitations of visibility and necessitates employment of artificial aids of unique character.

I have been informed that a small engineering-manufacturing firm in California made a contribution of tremendous value to the success of the Sea Lab II undertaking and I believe the American people would be interested in the role played by Birns & Sawyer Cine Equipment Co.

In order to carry on underwater photography and to expand the area of human observation, artificial illumination was essential. Experience quickly demonstrated the inadequacy of most common underwater lights generally utilized near the surface. Customary equipment proved disappointing at the lower levels, extending to a depth of 205 feet. Working life of usual lights for some reason was extremely limited and the process of replacing burned-out bulbs was both time consuming and costly.

After many exasperations, unusual lighting equipment perfected by Birns & Sawyer, a Los Angeles firm, was put to use. The lights lasted a much longer time. When bulbs eventually burned out, replacement was simple since the act could be accomplished inside Sea Lab itself in a matter of minutes, instead of sending a diver down from the surface or raising the equipment to topside.

The experience was a grueling test and the performance a most reassuring accomplishment. It is most gratifying that a small company with only 47 employees contributed so significantly to the success of the venturesome undertaking. Equally pleasing is the fact that the development of the equipment did not entail any expenditure of public funds as no research or development money from Federal sources was spent in conceiving and producing the lighting apparatus.

I believe this accomplishment is a notable tribute to the imagination and competence of a typical small business enterprise and merits an expression of gratitude on behalf of mankind.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the proviso that I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, once again I shall have to do a little backtracking. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may retain the floor, yield 10 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and then propose another quorum call, which will be a "live" quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kentucky.

PROMOTION OF SMEAR CAMPAIGN BY NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS OF DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I would like to address myself briefly today to a matter which involves the good name and the integrity of both our great political parties.

As a Republican, I jealously guard the good name of my own party and its leaders. I believe my friends on the other side of the aisle do the same with respect to theirs. For that reason, I believe that my Democratic colleagues have as much interest in the matter I have in mind as do I.

I gave this matter my first public attention during a speech I delivered in Cleveland last week. That speech, incidentally, was given in connection with a series of dinners across the country honoring a great Republican and a great former President, Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower.

At that time I expressed amazement that the national headquarters of the Democratic Party was using its money and its influence to promote a smear against some of our most honored citizens, General Eisenhower among them. I cited a three-volume blacklist prepared by an organization known as Group Research, Inc., which professes to maintain a vigilant watch over—and I am quoting—"extremists of all shades who threaten American democracy."

During those remarks in Cleveland, I also drew attention to the fact that this list of dangerous extremists who are threatening our country carries the name of General Eisenhower along with that of the hatemongering Gerald L. K. Smith; that it draws no distinction between Bishop Fulton Sheen and the American Nazi leader, George Lincoln Rockwell.

I expressed surprise that funds collected by the Democratic National Committee were used to finance such a smear campaign, and that Democratic National Chairman John Bailey was sending out letters urging support for the organization conducting the smear and recommending that the blacklists be made available in such places as our schools and churches.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Chairman Bailey be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, Mr. Bailey's obvious purpose was to educate our children and our adult citizens alike on the persons considered dangerous to our Republic including General Eisenhower, including Bishop Sheen, including Cardinal Cushing, including the late President Herbert Hoover, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, Dr. Milton Eisenhower and both Senators from Illinois—EVERETT DIRKSEN and PAUL DOUGLAS—just to mention a few of the 2,000 persons listed.

I found it somewhat surprising that Chairman Bailey was trying to purge from the ranks of the Democratic Party such dedicated liberals as Senator DOUGLAS and Senator TOM DODD, of Connecticut, both of whom are recorded in the blacklist. And that by implication he also was disqualifying for continuing membership in the party, Mr. Democrat himself—James A. Farley.

If there is any doubt as to what Chairman Bailey intended by the circulation of this list, that doubt is dispelled by an ad placed in the New Republic by the compilers of the list. That ad was placed this year and it may have been financed by some of the $10,000 which Chairman Bailey contributed to Group Research, Inc. Certainly the ad had Mr. Bailey's endorsement.

The ad is topped by pictures of hooded Klansmen with their backs turned; a swastika-adorned Nazi shouting into a microphone; Gen. Edwin Walker, the one-time Birchite candidate for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination in Texas; and the John Birch Society leader, Robert Welch. It is under such a heading that Group Research and Chairman Bailey advertise their wares; and with the accompanying text which speaks of the dangerous extremists who are threatening our country, the brand is clearly placed on all those whose names appear in the list.

Most of these facts, which I have just mentioned, were revealed in my speech last week in Cleveland.

I might have let the matter rest there had it not been for a strange sequence of events in the days which followed.

First of all, Chairman Bailey and his associate in this venture, Mr. Wesley McCune, issued innocent denials of my charges in Cleveland. They were attempting to harm no one, they said, the hooded Klansmen, the shouting Nazi, and the pictures of Walker and Welch notwithstanding.

Next came an even more surprising development. The three-volume list of dangerous persons and organizations which had been promoted so assiduously by Chairman Bailey and Mr. McCune, and at considerable expense to the treasury of the Democratic National Committee, suddenly became a much-guarded secret.

It was not for sale.

It could not be purchased.

When a professor in good standing attempted to make a purchase, he was turned down by Mr. McCune himself. When a member of a local PTA, whose subscriptions previously had been solicited by Chairman Bailey and Mr. McCune, asked about the availability of the list, he was asked why he wanted it and then refused.

The same thing happened when a member of my staff made inquiry.

I asked myself what was happening.

Was the evidence being removed?

My curiosity was further aroused.

I resorted to my own devices, and I obtained the now closely guarded list which Chairman Bailey once had sought to distribute so widely through the churches, the schools, the PTA's, and other places where good citizens gather.

I studied it; and the more I studied it, the more amazed I became. Here was a list which not only found something dangerous, in its implications, about a great number of our top citizens, but also saw a peril to our Republic in such organizations as the American Farm Bureau Federation and the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa.

By the implications carried on Chairman Bailey's list, even the persons who have received awards from the Freedoms Foundation are tainted. That, apparently, would include high schools throughout the country, students who have been proud of their awards, as well as the prominent citizens who have been blacklisted because of their contact with this organization which is devoted to preservation of American traditions of freedom.

Acceptance of such an award is the crime committed by Senator Douglas, of Illinois. It is one of the crimes committed by Senator Tom Dodd, of Connecticut, who has established a high reputation for his effective and sensible resistance to the spread of international communism.

It also is the crime committed by dozens of other persons on this 2,000-name list.

In reading through the ad I mentioned a moment ago, and which I have had reproduced for any inspection desired, I came across a description of Group Research, Inc., the creator of this list. This description says, in part:

> Group Research, Inc., is a 4-year-old private, nonprofit organization of professional research people who maintain vigilant watch over the activities of extremists of all shades who threaten American democracy.

Having learned that a grade-school pupil may become suspect by accepting a Freedoms Foundation award, I then started looking for other names which would fit into the other shades over which this organization watches so vigilantly.

How about Gus Hall, the head of the Communist Party of the United States?

I looked for his name, but he is not there.

J. Edgar Hoover is there, but not Gus Hall.

I looked for the names of some of those who have promoted the cause of Fidel Castro in this country. I found none.

The list abounds with the names of highly respected professors, priests, ministers, and public figures. Senator Frank Carlson, of Kansas, one of the most respected men in the Senate is there. So is the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University. Also Billy Graham, Cardinal Spellman, Norman Vincent Peale, and the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, of Washington.

I am surprised that my name was not there. I say to the Senator from Kansas, "I am a little disappointed that my name was not there. I did not make the list, but you made it."

Then there are the names of Gen. Omar Bradley, Arthur Godfrey, Ozzie and Harriet Nelson, and Jackie Robinson. Robinson gets special mention in another part of this smear publication because he once testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities and got an award from Freedoms Foundation for it.

If the purpose of this list is only to identify rightwing extremists, then a lot of useless work has been performed to accomplish it. Look through the pages of the 2,000 names and one will find a very thin scattering of the Gerald L. K. Smiths, the George Lincoln Rockwells, the Robert Welch's, and so on. If we could find 1 in 10 among the names of the innocents, we would be doing well. Perhaps a 1-in-20 count would be more accurate.

And this blacklist does not smear just individuals.

In its detailed report on publications of the right wing, it includes the highly respected Reader's Digest. Researcher McCune appears to be particularly offended by the fact that the Digest's circulation is large, that it reaches into many millions of homes. He describes some of its articles as vicious and includes in his blacklist the Digest's owners, Mr. and Mrs. Dewitt Wallace.

The names of many respected reporters are scattered through this blacklist.

Remember Victor Riesel, the reporter and columnist who was blinded a few years ago by an acid-throwing thug after he had exposed racketeers in some of New York's gangster-ridden labor unions? Riesel also writes frequently about attempted Communist infiltration of labor unions.

Riesel is included in this smear list.

Remember, Gus Hall, the top Communist, is not here. But Riesel is.

There are some strange comments in the publication of Group Research, Inc. The compilers and editors suggest at one point, for example, that any writers or speakers who make use of their information on extremists, use it without revealing its source. That suggests some things. It suggests to me that either they are not willing to stand behind their work, or they want someone else with a better standing than theirs to peddle it to an unsuspecting public.

I want to remind the Senate that this so-called research organization boasts that it watches over the activities of dangerous extremists of all shades. But by its own record, it shows that it cannot tell the difference between a shouting, bawling Nazi and a respected man of the cloth. Neither, apparently, can it tell the difference between an honest citizen engaged in honest pursuits, the imperial wizard of the Ku Klux Klan, or the head of the John Birch Society. It lumps them all together and damns them with equal fervor.

When the compilers of this list look to the left, they obviously lose their sight completely. If we are to accept their own boast that they watch over extremists of all shades, then they see nothing wrong with the extremists of the left even though they be members of the Communist Party.

There are listings of former Communists who have turned against the party and joined anti-Communist groups. Examples of those listings are Benjamin Gitlow and Elizabeth Bentley. There also are listings of a large number of organizations which are described as anti-Communist.

I suggest that this venture into blacklisting is Birchism of the left; that it out-Birches the Birches and does it with the money and the blessings of the Democratic National Committee and its chairman.

I would like to point out here that I am joined in many of my conclusions on this matter by Gov. Mark Hatfield, of the State of Oregon, who certainly has no affinity for the extremes of either the right or the left.

Governor Hatfield learned of the existence of the list at about the same time that I learned of it. We both undertook the study of it without the knowledge of the other. We both were astounded at what we learned.

It is coincidental that, speaking in Salem, Oreg., on Thursday a week ago, Governor Hatfield brought up the same point that I brought up in Cleveland. We had had no contact with each other. We learned of this and came to the same conclusions.

I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of my remarks, a statement which was released by Gov. Mark Hatfield in Portland, Oreg., on October 14, be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MORTON. I have arranged to have some enlarged reproductions of some key exhibits which have a bearing on this exercise in blacklisting by Chairman Bailey and Group Research.

One of them is the ad with the hooded Klansmen and the shouting Nazi, together with the declared purposes of the list.

Another is one of the pages from the list. There are 60 names on this page. All are in the same type. All are listed in exactly the same way. One of the names is that of Bishop Fulton Sheen. Four places further on is the name of Robert M. Shelton, imperial wizard of the Ku Klux Klan. He could teach the Communists something with regard to taking the fifth amendment. He testified yesterday and his lawyers are smarter than any Communist lawyer. He did not merely take the 5th amendment, he took the 1st, 4th, 5th, and 14th.

A little further on is the name of former Texas Governor, Allan Shivers. Charles B. Shuman, head of the American Farm Bureau Federation is near the bottom of the page. That is a sample of what goes on in these books, page after page.

The third item is a reproduction of a letter circulated and signed by Democratic National Chairman John Bailey, urging support for Group Research, Inc., and the circulation of its lists.

I will make these items available for anyone who wishes to see them.

Perhaps further information may become available at the Democratic National Committee Headquarters and at the offices of Group Research, Inc., at 1404 New York Avenue in northwest Washington. We have an excellent press corps in this city. Perhaps its members can unlock the secrecy which so recently has been thrown around these publications.

Mr. President, I thank my colleague, the Senator from Montana.

EXHIBIT 1

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1965.

DEAR FRIEND: The Democratic National Committee receives a constant flow of mail from Democrats in all parts of the country reporting on activities of the John Birch Society and others of the radical right and asking for our help.

So far as possible we have tried to provide this help. But to do so we have had to depend heavily on the only national research organization that has systematically kept track of the activities of the radical right and has readily available the information on individuals and organizations that is so essential to combating their activities.

This organization is Group Research, Inc., which was established 4 years ago as a private, nonprofit organization. Since then it has rendered invaluable assistance to organizations with rightwing problems—among them the League of Women Voters, the National Education Association, the Parent-Teachers Association of America, the National Council of Churches, and the AFL–CIO.

Enclosed is a brochure describing this organization, and a sample copy of the newsletter that is its principle publication. If the radical right is active in your area you may want to give serious consideration to subscribing to the newsletter, and perhaps the other services that are available. It is our experience, and that of others, that you will find them extremely valuable in countering rightwing activities.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. BAILEY,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT 2

STATEMENT FROM GOV. MARK HATFIELD, OF OREGON, AT THE EISENHOWER BIRTHDAY DINNER, PORTLAND, OREG., OCTOBER 14, 1965

Oregon played an important role in the Eisenhower years, and we proudly join in saluting him tonight. As we do so, our minds will turn to the many honors accorded him both in this Nation and around the world. But we should not be blinded to a facet of American life which sought to villify him and which sought to destroy his reputation as a great soldier, a great President, a great leader.

He was castigated. But so great was his fame, so honorable his service, the charge did not stick and its sponsors have not been successful in damning his name.

Their spew of venom was aimed from the extreme right—those who operate beyond the bounds of good taste and decency and tear away at the fabric of our Nation. They see a Communist or a Communist agent behind every tree and they see most of us as at least a dupe.

But tonight, in the brief time assigned to me, may I say that General Eisenhower, and his brother, and some of his colleagues, and his minister, and his aide, and some of the organizations he headed, and many of his friends are all wrapped up very neatly in a literary package which is aimed at what it terms the dangerous right wing. If this kind of thinking prevails, this Republic is undermined.

To say the least I am deeply disturbed to see the advancement of an organization called Group Research, Inc., which has demonstrable financial and promotional support from the Democratic National Committee. This organization has published a directory and individual index which lists Dwight D. Eisenhower, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, John Foster Dulles—and hear this—Cardinal Cushing, James A. Farley and hundreds of other great Americans right alongside Gerald L. K. Smith, Robert Welch, Lincoln Rockwell, and Robert M. Shelton.

This research outfit, which avoids the obviously clumsy, blatant approach of the ultra-right-wing extremists, uses the sly subversion of claiming only to list facts without conclusions. The office of the Clerk of the House in the Nation's Capitol shows $5,000 contributions on March 25, 1965, and again May 20, 1965, toward its support from the Democratic National Committee.

The operation is headed by Wesley McCune, former public relations man for the National Farmers Union and a press man in the Department of Agriculture during the Brannan administration. In an ad in the July 24, 1965, New Republic, the organization characterizes itself:

"Group Research is a 4-year-old private, nonprofit organization of professional research people who maintain vigilant watch over the activities of extremists of all shades who threaten American democracy. It is supported by business, labor, religious, educational, and many other organizations interested in maintaining traditional American freedom.

"Group Research reports facts, not opinions. All citations are from original sources and responsible secondary sources such as major newspapers, magazines, and other publications.

"Group Research facilities and materials are used by major television and radio networks, the major newspapers and many of the leading writers in the country. It is directed and staffed by experienced and responsible people with years of high-level newspaper experience."

The ad has pictures of the hooded Klan, swastika and haranguing in an emotion-aimed format together with Gen. Edwin Walker, and Robert Welch.

Yet in the pages of the advertised publications are the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame and a Presidential appointee to public projects like the Civil Rights Commission; Gen. Omar Bradley; Clergyman Edward L. R. Elson, of National Presbyterian in Washington, D.C., onetime Eisenhower minister; Dr. Kevin McCann, aid of General Eisenhower's on many occasions and former university president in his own right. You can even find Arthur Godfrey, Jackie Robinson, Ozzie and Harriet Nelson, Pat O'Brien, and Dave Garroway in the pages of this fantastic publication.

My point, on this evening honoring General Eisenhower, is not to defend him, or his aids, or his colleagues, or his minister because they need no defense. It is to decry the work of those who in their zeal to point a finger at a danger in our society have maliciously trampled the bounds of decency. They list not one easily recognizable Communist. Does the Democratic National Committee not consider that element at least an equally dangerous threat?

This approach—the lumping of the known patriots with the wild-eyed radicals—outdoes McCarthy. It misleads. It smears. It destroys. It defames. It feeds on fear. And to think it is subsidized by one of our Nation's two political parties. I call upon every responsible Democratic leader from Bethesda to precinct committeeman in Oregon to disavow this scurrilous compilation.

There is no place in America for such shoddy efforts which are disguised as scholarship, paraded as it was last month before the American Political Science Association at its annual meeting.

We are gathered to honor General Eisenhower but let us ever be vigilant to those who would destroy a good name, whose ever it is.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 296 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen

Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair commence the call of the Executive Calendar by laying before the Senate the nomination of Francis X. Morrissey, to be a U.S. district judge for the district of Massachusetts.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Francis X. Morrissey, of Massachusetts, to be a U.S. district judge for the district of Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President,——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the question before the Senate is the confirmation of the appointment of Francis X. Morrissey as judge of the U.S. court for the district of Massachusetts.

This is a controversial nomination, the most controversial before the Senate this year. It has received wide publicity and has been much discussed in the Senate and the country. But not all of the publicity has been informative; and not all of the discussion has been informed.

I wish at the outset to state what is clearly not at issue.

First. Judge Morrissey's integrity and character—his moral fitness for this solemn post—are not at issue. He was nominated by the President of the United States, upon the advice of the distinguished Attorney General, after exhaustive study of his character and fitness by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Leading citizens of Boston, the Massachusetts Bar Association, the Massachusetts Trial Lawyers Association, the District Attorneys Association, the great majority of the Massachusetts lawyers and judges who have been heard to speak, all have testified to his integrity and his devotion to duty and to the public service.

Even many of those who have strongly opposed his nomination have stated that they have no doubts as to his character, and that his judicial temperament, based on 7 years on the court, are equal to the highest standards of the Federal judiciary.

Second. With the exception of one small group of witnesses, Judge Morrissey's legal qualifications and ability are accepted. His legal qualifications have been attested to by the Massachusetts Bar Association and the Trial Lawyers Association, the men who have tried cases before him for 7 years in the Boston courts. His qualifications have also been found perfectly adequate by 60 of his fellow judges of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, who went on record as approving his nomination. They echo the sentiments of the great majority of all lawyers and judges in the State.

These are the people who know him best.

These are the people whose causes will stand or fall on the quality of justice dispensed in his court.

They are satisfied—as the President of the United States is satisfied, as the Attorney General is satisfied, and as I am satisfied—that Francis Morrissey will fulfill the high tradition of the U.S. district court in Massachusetts.

There is one preeminent voice that is not satisfied: it is the voice of the American Bar Association. Two prominent lawyers connected with the association—one the chairman of its Committee on the Federal Judiciary—testified that Francis Morrissey was unqualified.

The ABA was not satisfied with Judge Morrissey's experience in the trial of cases—even though he has presided for 7 years over a busy and wide-ranging court, deciding matters similar to the bulk of the business of the Federal court, to the satisfaction of his colleagues and superior judges, and to the satisfaction of the great majority of lawyers who have practiced before him.

And the ABA was not satisfied with Judge Morrissey's legal education and training—perhaps because he attended a local law school at night, rather than a national law school by day.

I think it well to point out, however, that good judges are not to be found only in great law schools. And to restrict judicial appointments to the graduates of such schools is to adopt a selection system which is profoundly undemocratic. In fact, respected legal scholars, in books and leading law reviews, have seriously questioned whether approval by the American Bar Association is desirable for all judges. One of our finest judges, the late Judge Charles Clark, of the second circuit court of appeals, a former dean of the Yale Law School, said that such a system has "a very obvious danger, even though all too generally overlooked, that of overstressing professionalism of looking to the head exclusively, and not the heart."

But even by its own standards, I do not believe that the American Bar Association's judgment on Judge Morrissey is correct.

Entirely apart from the fact that their appraisal of his judicial experience is flatly contradicted by the Massachusetts bar, the association gave no consideration whatever to his other experience. For example, he spent 8 years as head social worker of the Massachusetts Department of Correction, and 2 years as its deputy commissioner; yet the ABA gave no weight to this experience as equipping him for the sentencing of convicted criminals—one of the most difficult tasks of a Federal judge, one which is almost wholly within his own discretion and judgment. For another example, he was an organizer of the President's Committee on Bail and Criminal Justice; yet the ABA gave no weight to this experience as equipping him for the equally difficult task of determining which persons awaiting trial should be admitted to bail, and the amounts of bail that should be set.

But the most serious assault on Judge Morrissey was not the professional judgment of the ABA. The most serious assault—which raised the greatest controversy over the nomination—was the work of one witness who appeared on its behalf, regarding an incident in Judge Morrissey's life 32 years ago.

This witness testified that his investigation had shown that after failing to pass the bar in Massachusetts, Judge Morrissey went to Georgia; obtained a law degree at a bogus school without faculty or facilities; was admitted to the bar in Georgia on the basis of that degree; and after only 3 days in that State returned to Massachusetts.

Judge Morrissey's testimony was directly to the contrary on almost every fact. He testified that he was in Georgia not for 3 days but for the whole summer. He testified that he was residing that summer, and at the time he made his application for the bar, not in Boston, but in Georgia. He testified that the Southern Law School did have a faculty; did teach bona fide courses; did have a library; and that he did study there. And he testified that he did not leave Georgia immediately, but stayed on in Georgia for some months thereafter.

The conflict in the testimony—and therefore Judge Morrissey's integrity and veracity—then became a central issue of his confirmation.

Because of the gravity of the controversy that arose, the Attorney General ordered a full inquiry by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

That investigation showed that on every controverted point, the testimony of Judge Morrissey was correct—and the testimony of the ABA witness was wrong. The Attorney General concluded after reviewing these results:

> There is no basis whatsoever to question either Judge Morrissey's credibility or his recollection of the events surrounding his studies in Georgia.

No one who knew Frank Morrissey could doubt that he was telling the truth. But those of us who have put our faith, in the past, in the reliability of the investigating techniques and judgment of the American Bar Association, must think carefully what weight to give their future judgments—or their judgments in the very case before us. If representatives of the ABA can use such techniques against Francis Morrissey, they can do so against any nominee for any judicial position in any State, and that is something with which Senators should be very seriously concerned. It is one thing to pass on a man's qualification. This is entirely proper and we welcome it in the Senate. It is another to attack, by innuendo and accusation and insufficient evidence, a man's character. We do not welcome that in the Senate.

Senators may, nevertheless, ask why did Francis Morrissey leave Massachusets for Georgia in 1932? Simply stated, the answer is that he was young and he was poor—one of 12 children, his father a dockworker, the family living in a home without gas, electricity, or heat in the bedrooms; their old shoes held together with wooden pegs their father made. As the child of this family, Frank Morrissey could not afford to study law full time, but had to study at night, working during the day, snatching what time he could for his family. At least partly as a result, he failed the bar examination. This was in the middle of the depression, at a time when 14 million people were out of work—and, like many others, he looked for opportunities elsewhere.

He did what was required to practice law in Georgia. But he could not get enough work there, so he returned to Boston, there to continue his legal studies and efforts, both before and after passing the Massachusetts bar examination.

This, then, is the record of Francis Morrissey. His character and integrity are established beyond doubt; his legal qualification attested to by the bench and bar of his State; his testimony and veracity have been vindicated against his detractors.

And so we are asked to vote—after a careful assessment, I have determined that a majority of the Members of the Senate are prepared to support Judge Morrissey's confirmation. If we took up the nomination this morning, the debate would be prolonged, but the nomination would be confirmed. However, a number of Senators, for whom I have the greatest respect, have indicated to me that as a result of the widespread controversy they are not prepared to say with certainty that their doubts have been entirely resolved at this time.

I have the greatest respect for the Senate, as a deliberative body, and I respect the effort each Senator makes to be fair, especially when the reputation of an individual is involved. Much of the controversy over this nomination concerns events so remote in time and obscure in place, that unless one has been following the testimony extremely carefully, understandable confusion could arise. If Senators have any questions at all they should have the chance to air them fully, and seek the answers through the proven process of our committee system.

I have the greatest respect, as well, for the Federal judiciary, as the arbitrator of our disputes and the protector of our liberties. I would wish any man placed on the court on my recommendation to be able to take his seat free of unresolved controversy. I would want any nominee of mine to be confirmed on a record clear and complete enough so that any fair-minded person, after study, would conclude from the record that the judge has the necessary integrity and qualifications; and that the Senate's decision to that effect had been made after due deliberation, in a climate free from the press of adjournment, the pressure of partisanship, and the atmosphere of controversy.

I am certain that these conditions can be met in the case of Francis Morrissey. But they cannot if the Senate is asked to vote in the present heated atmosphere, only 1 week after the charges have been made and only 2 days after the Attorney General has submitted his report.

The Judiciary Committee will be able to carefully consider all the information that has come to light since the hearing was held a week ago Tuesday. It will be able to evaluate each of the assertions and reports that have appeared in the news media. I know that the place where this can be done fairly, judiciously, and in a way on which Senators can rely, is through the committee system of the U.S. Senate.

I have been asked why, in view of the unfavorable publicity given this nomination, I would not, in my own interest, ask that it be withdrawn. Let me simply say that when a man has been unfairly attacked and unjustly accused, I cannot in good conscience desert him. And I should not. I am satisfied that a full and complete record, made with care and deliberation, will uphold my judgment to the satisfaction of any fair-minded man; such a record will result in his confirmation by a greatly increased majority; and that he will be a credit to the Federal judiciary.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Francis Morrissey be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois reserves the right to object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts knows the disconsolate spirit and anxiety that have beset me since this nomination was submitted to the Senate. I have said on many occasions that I thought Prof. John Fisk was right in his history on the critical era in this Republic that, were it not for the Federal judiciary, the Constitution could never have been made to work.

President Monroe uttered a similar sentiment with respect to the inferior courts at the Federal level, all of which have been created by act of Congress.

It was through my devotion to the integrity of the Federal judiciary system that I labored as earnestly as I knew how on this whole matter, and it was at my request that Judge Morrissey be called back for further interrogation.

That second meeting took place in my office, and there we voted on his nomination. It still concerned me deeply.

I have made considerable preparation on this case. I want to salute the junior Senator from Massachusetts. I think he has risen to every expectation of what the country desires in a Senator in fulfilling his oath, his duty, and his sense of responsibility. I think he rises to the highest tradition of the U.S. Senate. I think here he has displayed magnanimity and complete fairness. He has exemplified his complete integrity in the action that is now proposed in the form of a consent request.

I salute him, and I am glad we shall have another opportunity, and perhaps a better atmosphere, unencumbered by the contagion of adjournment and the press of legislation to give consideration to the matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it was with a sense of deep regret that I listened to the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts make his announcement in this Chamber this morning. He was correct when he stated that if this matter had been brought to a vote, the votes were here to confirm the nomination of Francis X. Morrissey. But I think he has exercised superior judgment. He has recognized that had the vote been carried to a conclusion in the atmosphere which exists at the moment, the results might have been anything but beneficial.

I join with my distinguished colleague, the minority leader, in commending the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for grasping the nettle himself, making his own offer, exercising his own independent judgment, in arriving at the conclusion which he has.

It was not an easy conclusion, but it was a courageous decision. I think it redounds to the credit of the distinguished Senator, and I believe he has earned a greater degree of respect all around for the independent judgment and the independent decision which he has just made.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator made a great and moving speech today.

As one who has not had the opportunity to study the matter as have other members of the committee, I am reminded of something that could have happened to me.

There was an occasion when I suggested a man to be a U.S. district judge. He had been a law school classmate of mine. He had been my law partner. He was one of the most intelligent, honorable, and decent men I have ever known.

Word came to me that if I submitted the man's name, a prominent lawyer in town intended to call the bar association together and have them adopt a resolution that the man should not be confirmed because I had not consulted them.

I said, "Go ahead. If you want to try that, send your resolution up here, Mr. Bar Association. I know this man's record better than you. I will go before the U.S. Senate and tell them what I think of him and you can go before them and tell them what you think of him."

That was the last that I heard about the matter. I believe they endorsed my nominee, or else stayed quiet about the matter. Today they all agree that he is a fine and courageous judge.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] has made an eloquent speech.

So far as this Senator is concerned, I am convinced that, if the Senator had demanded a rollcall vote today, his nominee would have been confirmed because of the high regard that Senators have for the good judgment and integrity of Edward Kennedy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, has the Chair ruled?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

The Chair hears none, and the nomination is recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION—100 DAYS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, today I received material from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which I understand is being sent to all Senators. I shall not place these items in the Record, but I commend them to all Members of the Senate.

In its first 100 days this Commission, headed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., has received, analyzed, and initiated appropriate action on 1,383 individual complaints alleging discrimination in employment. This is a remarkable figure when we consider that, projected over its first year of operation, the Commission will receive more complaints than all the State commissions combined have received in the past 2 years.

Another interesting point brought out in the statistics furnished is the clear fact that employment discrimination affects minority persons in every part of our Nation. This is not just a Southern problem or a big city problem; it is an American problem.

I wish Mr. Roosevelt and his associates well as they continue the very difficult job of promoting and insuring equal employment opportunity for all Americans without regard to a person's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

BURT COUNTY BRIDGE COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 901, H.R. 5026.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 5026) to authorize the Burt County Bridge Commission, a public body politic and corporate in the County of Burt and State of Nebraska, to refund the outstanding revenue bonds of said Burt County Bridge Commission heretofore issued to finance the cost of the construction of a bridge, together with the necessary approaches and appurtenances therefor, from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebr., across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment on page 2, after line 22, to strike out:

> Sec. 3. The said Burt County Bridge Commission is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of tolls so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of the Army under the authority contained in the General Bridge Act of 1946, enacted August 2, 1946.

And, on page 3, at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "4" to "3".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 915), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

By enactment of June 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 257), the Federal Government granted to the county of Burt, State of Nebraska, authority to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge in the vicinity of Decatur, Nebr., and Onawa, Iowa, in accordance with the provisions of the General Bridge Act of 1906 (34 Stat. 84). The 1940 enactment provided procedures for financing the construction of the bridge and authorized the charging of tolls for its use with the rates therefor adjusted to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of the bridge, including interest and financing charges, within a period not to exceed 20 years from the completion of the bridge. The enactment further required that when the cost of the bridge is amortized it shall thereafter be maintained and operated by Burt County free of tolls.

The authority granted by the initial act to construct the bridge expired and was extended by an enactment of April 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 89). The location of the bridge was planned as a crossing over the proposed stabilized channel of the Missouri River.

Pursuant to the General Bridge Act of 1936 (33 U.S.C. 525 et seq.) the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers approved on March 10, 1950, the location and plans for a bridge to be constructed by the Burt County Bridge Commission from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebr., across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa.

Construction of the main portion of the subject bridge was completed by November 1951. At the time construction was commenced, the Missouri River had not been stabilized in the vicinity of the bridge and the main flow of the river was some distance from the intended stabilized channel. This permitted the construction of the bridge in the dry. However, it was not until the summer of 1955 that the river was actually brought to the designed stabilized location. Due to this condition, first traffic over the bridge was delayed until November 1955.

It is indicated that the collection of tolls for use of the bridge began in 1956. The initial bonds for the financing of the Burt County Bridge are reported to have been issued in March 1950 at 3¾ percent interest and to presently be in default on interest payments.

The Burt County toll bridge serves a Federal-aid primary highway route but no Federal aid participated in the financing of the structure.

H.R. 5026 as introduced authorized the Burt County Bridge Commission to refinance the toll bridge by refunding outstanding revenue bonds through the issuance of refunding revenue bonds. No limit was specified as to the period during which the refunding revenue bonds were to be issued but H.R. 5026 required that the proposed bonds be amortized within 50 years following their date of issuance and permitted a maximum rate of interest of 6 percent over this period.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The committee struck section 3 from the bill as the language was redundant, having already appeared in the act (Public Law 577 of the 76th Cong.) which created the commission. The committee felt that its presence in the act contributed nothing to the content of the bill.

FEDERAL COST

No increase in Federal cost would be involved in this legislation.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee notes there are extenuating circumstances relating to the beginning of operations and the initial financing of the Burt County Bridge which justify the extension of the time period beyond the present authorized limit. The bridge was planned as a crossing over a proposed stabilized channel of the Missouri River. While the structure was completed about November 1951, because of difficulties in stabilizing the channel as part of a Federal river improvement project, the river was not brought to desired location under the bridge until 1955. At that time it was necessary for the bridge commission to issue an additional $225,000 worth of bonds to force the river back under the bridge after the channel had been cut by the Corps of Engineers. The first tolls were collected in 1956. The prior bonds were paid off in 1961, but at that time they were 10 years behind the original bond issue. The original bonds were to be paid off in 1980, but this is a financial impossibility with the back interest.

The situation as it developed in connection with the Burt County Bridge Commission is one that the committee believes was created without any fault of the commission itself. In all equity, circumstances have developed requiring that the commission be given an additional period of time within which it may properly finance the bridge in question.

The committee recognizes that the 1946 Bridge Act was designed to remove the Congress from having to act on every individual bridge commission authorization for changes in their authority. However, the committee recognizes the situation of the Burt County Bridge Commission as unique and has taken this action as it is felt to be the only equitable means of resolving the situation.

The committee recommends the enactment of H.R. 5026.

OFFICIAL RESIDENCE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 900, S. 2394.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2394) to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments on page 3, line 14, after the word "buildings).", to insert "In the event the Commission acquires land for the purpose of constructing a suitable building, the General Services Administration is hereby authorized and directed to perform such construction. Any alterations or improvements authorized by this subsection shall be carried out by the General Services Administration."; in line 20, after the word "by", to strike out "gift or purchase," and insert "gift, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise,"; on page 4, line 8, after the word "be", to insert "the responsibility of the General Services Administration, and shall be"; in line 10, after the word "the", to strike out "United States, and there" and insert "United States. There"; and, after line 12, to strike out:

SEC. 6. If the Commission is unable within a reasonable period of time to acquire a suitable residence for the Vice President, it shall report that fact to the Congress, together with its recommendations for such additional legislation as it determines may be necessary to acquire such a residence.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 6. The Commission shall undertake to complete its duties under this Act before the expiration of the eighteen-month period which commences on the date of the enactment of this Act; and, if upon the expiration of such period, such duties have not been completed, the Commission shall submit to the Congress a report indicating the progress which has been made by the Commission in carrying out such duties and the additional period of time necessary to complete such duties. If the Commission shall have determined that it cannot complete such duties, it shall so indicate in such report, and shall immediately take proper measures so as to terminate its existence within the thirty-day period following the submission of such report.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established the Commission for the Acquisition of an Official Residence for the Vice President (referred to hereinafter as the "Commission"), which shall be composed of three members appointed by the President, one from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life.

(b) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. Two members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 2. (a) The member of the Commission from the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in additional to that received for his services in the executive branch, but he shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) The members of the Commission from private life shall each receive $75 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to select and acquire, on behalf of the United States, a suitable building in the District of Columbia, together with appurtenant buildings and grounds and appropriate furnishings and equipment, for use as the official residence of the Vice President of the United States.

(b) In carrying out its duties under subsection (a) of this section, the Commission may select and acquire an existing building with appurtenant land (including any federally owned building and land) and make necessary alterations and improvements, or may select and acquire land (including federally owned land) and provide for the construction thereon of a suitable building (together with appurtenant buildings). In the event the Commission acquires land for the purpose of constructing a suitable building, the General Services Administration is hereby authorized and directed to perform such construction. Any alterations or improvements authorized by this subsection shall be carried out by the General Services Administration. Any acquisition for the purposes of this Act may be made by gift, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, or in the event the Commission selects federally owned property, the agency or department having jurisdiction over such property shall, subject to the approval of the President, make such property available for such purposes.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $1,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing provisions of this Act.

SEC. 5. The care, maintenance, repair, alteration, refurnishing, improvement, heating and lighting (including electric power and fixtures), and operation (including the employment of a staff) of the official residence and grounds of the Vice President shall be the responsibility of the General Services Administration, and shall be provided at the expense of the United States. There are authorized to be appropriated annually such amounts as may be necessary for such purposes.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall undertake to complete its duties under this Act before the expiration of the eighteen-month period which commences on the date of the enactment of this Act; and, if upon the expiration of such period, such duties have not been completed, the Commission shall submit to the Congress a report indicating the progress which has been made by the Commission in carrying out such duties and the additional period of time necessary to complete such duties. If the Commission shall have determined that it cannot complete such duties, it shall so indicate in such report, and shall immediately take proper measures so as to terminate its existence within the thirty-day period following the submission of such report.

SEC. 7. Upon the completion of its duties under this Act, the Commission shall submit to the Congress a final report concerning the action taken hereunder, and upon the expiration of thirty days following the submission of such report, the Commission shall cease to exist.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 914), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 2394 is to provide for the creation of a Commission to select and acquire a site and furnish an official residence for the Vice President of the United States. It further authorizes the appropriations required to operate and maintain the residence, including its staffing.

THE NEED FOR S. 2394

When we speak of establishing a residence for the Vice President, we speak of more than a home for an individual and his family; we speak of a national institution and a monument which will belong to all the American people.

It is unrealistic to expect a Vice President in today's world to fulfill his many responsibilities without the aid of an official residence. This may not have been the case in the past, when the Vice-Presidential office was regarded as something in the nature of an honorary office. This no longer holds true. The Vice President of today is deeply involved in the administration of Government and as such deserves a residence befitting the new status of his office. The social functions in which he is expected to serve as host are matters of no small concern to the Government. They also require so much space, so large a staff, and so much expense, that it is altogether unreasonable to expect the Vice President to take care of matters of this kind on his own in his own home.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee believes it is fitting and proper that an official residence be provided for the Vice President. In today's atmosphere of turmoil and trouble throughout the world which requires stability and continuity in our two highest public offices and with the need for security so dramatically brought out by President Kennedy's assassination. We impose upon the Secret Service the duty of protecting the Vice President, but permit the occupant of the office to reside at indefensible locations dictated by personal income or wishes. Protecting the Vice President, would be made much less difficult in an official residence whose location could be chosen partly with security precautions in mind.

The committee further believes that by establishing this official residence for the Vice President we will also be providing for the American people another great national monument surpassed only by the White House and the Capitol itself. Although numerous suggestions were received as to possible sites for the residence, the committee does not feel that it can declare a preference thereby tying the hands of the Commission being created. However, the committee will pass on to this Commission all the suggestions and proposals it has received.

WIND RIVER INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, WYOMING

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 9.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, what is Senate Joint Resolution 9?

Mr. JACKSON. Senate Joint Resolution 9 pertains to the forgiveness of irrigation funds due in the State of Wyoming. The joint resolution was originally introduced by Senator SIMPSON and Senator McGEE, and was acted upon unanimously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] be added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 909, Senate Joint Resolution 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 33) to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 33) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) all reimbursable construction costs heretofore incurred at the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, shall be allocated against the total irrigable acreage in the project according to present land classifications.

(b) The costs so allocated to land that passed out of Indian ownership prior to March 7, 1928, shall be canceled by the Secretary of the Interior if the patent from the United States contained no recital to the effect that the land is subject to irrigation construction charges, and the purchaser did not sign a contract to pay construction charges.

(c) Land that passed out of Indian ownership prior to March 7, 1928, shall, if the patent from the United States contains a recital to the effect that the land is subject to irrigation construction charges, either past or future, be subject to a lien in favor of the United States for such charges.

(d) Reimbursable construction charges hereafter incurred at the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, shall be allocated against all irrigable acreage in the project according to land classifications then in effect, shall be a lien against the land, and shall not be subject to cancellation on the ground that the land was conveyed with a paid-up construction charge. Any such paid-up construction charge shall be deemed to mean a construction charge incurred prior to the date of this Act.

WIND RIVER INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, WYOMING

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 9. Senate Joint Resolution 9 is identical to Senate Joint Resolution 33. The distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] are cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 9) to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 9) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) all reimbursable construction costs heretofore incurred at the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, shall be allocated against the total irrigable acreage in the project according to the present land classifications.

(b) The costs so allocated to land that passed out of Indian ownership prior to March 7, 1928, shall be canceled by the Secretary of the Interior if the patent from the United States contained no recital to the effect that the land is subject to irrigation construction charges, and the purchaser did not sign a contract to pay construction charges.

(c) Land that passed out of Indian ownership prior to March 7, 1928, shall, if the patent from the United States contains a recital to the effect that the land is subject to irrigation construction charges, either past or future, be subject to a lien in favor of the United States for such charges.

(d) Reimbursable construction charges hereafter incurred at the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, shall be allocated against all irrigable acreage in the project according to land classifications then in effect, shall be a lien against the land, and shall not be subject to cancellation on the ground that the land was conveyed with a paid-up construction charge. Any such paid-up construction charge shall be deemed to mean a construction charge incurred prior to the date of this Act.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the action in the passing of Senate Joint Resolution 33 be rescinded and that it be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 923), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The bill would cancel unpaid reimbursable construction costs on non-Indian land if the purchaser of that land bought it prior to March 7, 1928, without knowledge of the construction charges. That knowledge would have been acquired by a contract to pay such charges or a recital in the patent that the land was subject to such charges. Those who purchased their land prior to March 7, 1928, but had knowledge of the reimbursable construction charges will be held liable for those charges. Those persons who purchased the land after March 7, 1928, are charged with the responsibility of knowing that a lien was placed against the land on the Indian irrigation project for the payment of reimbursable construction costs because of the general lien laws of 1928.

The committee was informed that most of the persons who acquired their land after March 7, 1928, did, in fact, have knowledge of the obligation to pay the construction charges. However, most of the land was sold prior to 1928 and did not contain lien statements in the deed and no restrictions or contracts for repayment were signed by the owners. The committee in its deliberations decided that the construction costs to be canceled should be based on costs incurred prior to the 1928 Lien Act.

MAXIMUM FLOOD DETENTION CAPACITY OF WATERSHED PROJECT STRUCTURES

The bill (S. 2679) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Control Act, as amended was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666), as amended, is amended by striking out "more than five thousand acre-feet of floodwater detention capacity" and inserting in lieu thereof "more than twelve thousand five hundred acre-feet of floodwater detention capacity".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 921), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill would increase the maximum flood detention capacity permitted for any single structure under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act from 5,000 acre-feet to 12,500 acre-feet.

Hearings on this legislation were conducted by the committee's Subcommittee on Soil Conservation and Forestry. All witnesses, including the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Army, favored enactment, pointing out that the increase in maximum flood detention capacity would permit the best use of available sites, reduce Government costs in some cases by reducing the number of flood detention structures that were needed, permit certain projects to be undertaken where the flood detention requirements of the only available sites were in excess of 5,000 acre-feet, and make it feasible to undertake certain projects which could not be undertaken unless the most economic sites were used.

The Department of the Army testified that retention of the present limitation would have the effect of making flood control storage in headwater areas under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act less efficient and more costly than it would be if capacities up to 12,500 acre-feet could be utilized. The Department of the Army, in view of this, interposed no objection to the bill, but pointed out that provision for greater flood detention capacity in structures installed under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act would make more difficult the coordination of headwater plans under that act and downstream plans prepared by the Corps of Engineers, stating:

"In taking this position the agencies concerned have also taken cognizance of the fact that authority for construction of reservoirs with greater flood control capacity under Public Law 566 would make more difficult the coordination of headwater plans prepared by the Department of Agriculture and downstream plans prepared by the Corps of Engineers because the zone of overlap in the amount of flood control storage that each agency could provide would be increased. In order to prevent possible conflict and duplication of effort in this zone of overlap, the Department of the Army has suggested that its program should be directed to those flood control storage possibilities that would reduce flood damage primarily downstream from the 250,000-acre headwater areas and that the Public Law 566 program should be designed to provide projects that would reduce flood damages primarily upstream from the 250,000-acre drainage area portions of a river basin. As a result of the interagency discussion of recent years, it is the understanding of the Department of the Army that the rules and regulations to assure coordination as required by subsection (5) of section 5 of Public Law 566 will be amended to incorporate the foregoing procedures if the 5,000 acre-foot limitation is raised."

Rather than leaving this problem of coordination open to subsequent adjustment from time to time through administrative regulation, the committee felt that it should be settled at this time, so that Congress, in taking action on the bill, would have full knowledge of the effect of its action, and so that future jurisdictional disputes and problems would be avoided insofar as possible. The committee therefore at the time of the hearings requested the Department of the Army to submit an amendment providing for coordination as set out in its testimony, and this was done. The Department of Agriculture was then requested to comment on the language suggested by the Department of the Army, and it did so, objecting to the proposed language and suggesting alternative language. The committee, after considering both proposals, earlier this year agreed on legislation that it believed would have settled the matter. However, the committee received many requests not to report the bill at that time, and to give the Departments further time to work out an understanding that would provide greater ease of coordination and would be satisfactory to all those concerned with watershed protection and flood control projects. That agreement has now been reached and is appended hereto as exhibit A. It is upon the assumption that this agreement will be carried out in a way that will provide the most efficient and effective means of protecting our watersheds, preventing floods, and providing for the best use of our resources that the committee reports this bill.

BECKY JO AND CHARLES R. SMITH

The bill (H.R. 8353) for the relief of Becky Jo and Charles R. Smith was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 924), explaining the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve Becky Jo and Charles R. Smith of Kannapolis, N.C., of liability to refund $198.10 based upon the payment of a class Q allotment by the Army which was subsequently determined to have been an overpayment, because of a failure to withhold that amount from Mr. Smith's Army pay. The bill would authorize the refund of any amounts repaid or withheld because of this liability.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is the Senate in legislative or executive session?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in legislative session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the nomination of David G. Bress of the District of Columbia to be U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I do not want to interfere with a procedural motion, but I wonder if the Senator has notified the Judiciary Committee. I understood that the committee was now holding a hearing on the same question. Perhaps it is still holding the hearing.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, composed of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the chairman have concluded the hearing and have decided unanimously that the nomination of Mr. Bress should be confirmed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, may we have a copy of those hearings?

Mr. EASTLAND. The hearings of this morning have not been transcribed. We sent the Senator a copy of the other hearings.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. About 5 minutes ago I received a transcript of the hearings held yesterday. I had just started to read the transcript of the hearing that was held yesterday. Could we not have an opportunity to read the transcript of the hearing that was conducted today? I do not believe the Senate ought to be called upon to consider the nomination without the transcript of the hearings having been printed and without knowing something about the testimony.

I am advised that the full membership of the committee has not even had the advantage of seeing the transcript.

That may completely satisfy the question in my mind. However, how can we know if we do not see the transcript of the hearings? Surely we would not want to hold a hearing on the floor of the Senate.

It seems to me to be that the more orderly procedure would be to let the nomination go over until the transcript of the hearings could be printed and we could see what the testimony was.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold for a moment? The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of David G. Bress, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia for a term of 4 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the reason for calling this nomination up at this time is that it was reported from the Judiciary Committee, as I understand, by a vote of 12 to 0. The hearings covering the testimony have been published and the transcript has been on each Senator's desk for a week or more.

I have postponed consideration of the nomination of Mr. Bress at the request of various Senators on at least three, perhaps four occasions. One of those postponements was due to the fact that, supposedly, additional evidence had been uncovered which—and I use the term advisedly—had not been brought to the attention of the Judiciary Committee.

On that basis we did postpone the last calling up of the nomination 2 days ago, I believe.

Since that time a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, composed of the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the ranking minority member, and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] have, according to my understanding, gone into this testimony quite thoroughly. Before I ventured to call this nomination up this morning, I consulted each of the three members of that subcommittee personally, and they said they were prepared to go ahead.

On that basis I sent word to the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware that the nomination of Mr. Bress would shortly be laid before the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As the Senator knows, we had this nomination up for consideration, on Monday or Tuesday of this week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It was before the Senate on Tuesday. I came here fully expecting that we would consider the nomination at that time. So did the majority leader. He motioned the nomination before the Senate. It was the pending business, but suddenly it was withdrawn.

First, the majority leader wanted to temporarily lay the nomination aside for a few minutes to consider a conference report, at which time we both thought we would resume consideration of it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In the meantime the Judiciary Committee apparently became suspicious that there was some additional testimony that needed to be looked into. It was the decision of the committee, not mine. I thought we were going to proceed. The members of the Judiciary Committee said that something had been called to their attention that disturbed them, and they considered it of sufficient importance to warrant further examination.

I understand it was the majority leader, based upon their request, who asked that the consideration of the nomination be dropped and that it be carried over until after the committee had had an opportunity to hold some hearings and find out about it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, I merely asked that it be postponed. I do not think I was as direct as the Senator has said. I know the Senator wants to be fair.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Sure. However, we all understood, and the Senator will agree it was carried over pursuant to the request of the Judiciary Committee. The consideration of the nomination on Tuesday was withdrawn on the request of the committee in order that further hearings could be conducted on the same question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To keep the RECORD straight, it was postponed at my suggestion to give the subcommittee an opportunity to go into additional material.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. The subcommittee, as I understand it, requested the majority leader to change plans. However, that is beside the point. They must have considered these points to be serious enough to deserve consideration.

All I ask is that I have an opportunity to read the transcript of the hearings which were held. I think it is a perfectly reasonable request. It is possible that the transcript of the hearings, after we read them, will eliminate all the questions which may have been at issue. However, I believe that the matter should have proper consideration. Why would the subcommittee want to hold hearings if it is not going to let the Senate have the benefit of reading the transcript of those hearings?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator so desires, the subcommittee will spread its information on the RECORD for all to see. Perhaps we should consider this as a Committee of the Whole. It is time we do away with further postponements, and face up to the matter of this nomination, so that it can be decided one way or the other.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, we pay for these transcripts. I have one of them, of a hearing held at 4:30 last night in Room 212 of the Capitol. I do not know where that is. Three members of the committee it says were present.

I did not receive this transcript until about 15 or 20 minutes ago. I have read only about a third of it.

I understand that another series of witnesses appeared before the committee this morning. I have no idea who the witnesses were or what their testimony was.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Why not ask the subcommittee members?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the matter was important enough for the subcommittee to consider it, I think it is important enough that the Senate be allowed to read the transcripts of those hearings. They are transcribed officially and printed at the expense of the Government. We pay for it.

This morning's hearing was not held at my instigation. It strikes me that the procedure being followed is highly irregular.

When the nomination first came from the White House the committee held public hearings. I testified and at that time made it very clear in the RECORD why I was objecting to the nomination, and that other than that, I had no reason to question the man's background and knew nothing about it. I specifically stated that I did not know him.

After the hearings were over and after the committee had reported the nomination to the Senate the Department of Justice initiated a special FBI investigation—not upon the basis of any information that came from JOHN WILLIAMS. I never even knew they were doing it; but something had been called to their attention by someone, parties unknown, and a rather intensive—they used the word—FBI investigation was initiated.

I was curious. I wondered what it was all about. I discussed it with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], a member of the committee.

He said, "I know nothing about it."

I discussed it with the minority leader, Mr. DIRKSEN.

He said, "I never heard of it." He suggested that I discuss it with the chairman of the committee.

I went to the office of the chairman of the committee a week ago last Friday and asked him if there was a special FBI investigation and what it was about.

He said, "I know nothing about it." He called the Bureau on the telephone, or called somewhere, and was told that there was such an investigation.

He said, "Why was I not advised about it? I want to see a copy of it."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. I believe I have related the circumstances correctly, have I not?

Mr. EASTLAND. I know of no special investigation. The Bureau acquired additional information, as I understood. That was brought to my office, and I thought in the light of it, that we should go into the matter.

We did go into it. Senator DIRKSEN was a member of the subcommittee. He was engaged in the Morrissey hearings, and we appointed Senator HRUSKA to take his place. After going into the question in a manner that we considered full and complete, we were of the unanimous view that there was nothing to it, and that the nomination of Mr. Bress should be confirmed.

A day or two ago, I understood that the distinguished Senator from Delaware had some questions about the handling of the Viner estate by Mr. Bress. We met in the office of the majority leader, I believe it was yesterday, with the minority leader and Senator HRUSKA, and we discussed with the Senator from Delaware the entire case.

The Senator gave us some ideas about additional information that he thought we should obtain; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The meeting yesterday afternoon was not in the minority leader's office, it was in the majority leader's office.

Mr. EASTLAND. The majority leader's office.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. Bress was in another room at the time. I did not see him.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Mississippi said he would hold hearings, and immediately thereafter I asked the Senator the question, "Is it not a fact that as the chairman you have announced that you are going to try to prove a point without the benefit of the information which the hearing will develop? How did you know? If you had made up your mind already, why hold the hearing?"

Mr. EASTLAND. No; we had not——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have the floor. I will yield to the Senator in a moment.

Mr. EASTLAND. We had not made up our minds on anything. We thought we were doing the Senator from Delaware a favor. We had gone into the matter thoroughly. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is on the floor, and I understand he agrees with what I have said.

We have not found one scintilla of evidence of wrongdoing of any kind or character on the part of this nominee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Perhaps that is true from the standpoint of the Senator from Mississippi. However, I should like to ask the Senator a question. He is a lawyer. If he were handling an estate, would he handle the transactions in relation to the stock certificates in the same manner for one of his clients as was done in the Viner case; that is, without notifying the attorney for the opposite side or without notifying the widow of the issue of some new certificates. Would he have participated in such a transaction?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. Bress had no more to do with that——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is not my question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. Bress had no more to do with that than did the Senator from Delaware.

I ask the Senator from Nebraska, am I correct or not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Just a moment. Mr. Bress was the attorney of record. I am merely asking the Senator from Mississippi because I am only a layman, and perhaps I do not know how lawyers operate.

I ask the Senator if he would conduct a case in the same manner and consider it ethical. If the Senator's answer is "Yes" we will proceed on that premise.

Mr. EASTLAND. The matter was handled by Mr. Philipson of the same firm, who accepts full responsibility for it. We talked with him this morning. We examined the two Viner brothers this morning. There was nothing in the transaction that connects Mr. Bress with anything.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It may well be. But why is the Senator afraid to have us read the testimony? That is the only question.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am not afraid for anybody to read anything. There is one thing certain. The testimony we heard this morning thoroughly and completely and fully exonerates this nominee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is fine.

Mr. EASTLAND. I ask the Senator from Nebraska, the minority member——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In all fairness——

Mr. EASTLAND. Who did the questioning——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have the floor, and I will ask the Senator from Nebraska in a moment. I have the floor unless he wants it.

In all fairness to Mr. Bress—and I have made no charges against the man—I want to get the record straight. The Senator from Mississippi and his committee thought the matter raised by the FBI was serious enough after the nomination had been reported to the Senate so that an FBI investigation was initiated. Whether it was a special investigation or whether it is now the policy of the administration to send nominations up, get them reported to the Senate, and then get an FBI report afterward I do not know. But the fact remains that there was an FBI investigation initiated by the Department of Justice without any suggestion on my part. I had never heard of the man and had no reason to suggest it. They initiated it.

The fact is that they did not make the results of their second investigation available to the committee. They told the committee nothing about it. The Senator from Mississippi, who is chairman of the committee, admitted that a week ago last Friday when I questioned him that he had never heard of the report. He said, "I will ask for it and read it."

On the following Monday, when we were voting on the cloture matter, the Senator from Mississippi came over here on this side of the aisle and asked the Senator from Nebraska and me to step over. He said, "I have read this FBI report and, ROMAN, it disturbs me greatly." He said, "We must look into it."

Those are the Senator's words, not mine.

Mr. EASTLAND. We have looked into it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. The Senator said it disturbed him. He looked into it; then he said he was satisfied. I have a copy of the second hearings and have had an opportunity to read it. It was publicly released, as was proper. I am waiting for the third hearings.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator was furnished a copy by the chairman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Not of these last hearings. I was furnished a copy of the second hearings—those held on a Monday morning about 11:30, and the chairman at that time thought the nominations were coming up at 12:30; but the Bress nomination was not brought up until Tuesday, so I did have an opportunity to read it.

On Tuesday, the nomination was before the Senate, and I was ready to discuss it and so stated. I did not mention in any way a question of postponement. Quite the contrary, I said, "Let us go through and discuss it."

The chairman of the committee, however, must have heard something from somewhere, because he asked the majority leader to call the nomination back or hold it up so that he could make a further investigation.

The final hearing was held this morning. All I wish to do is read the record. It may be that if I do it will completely answer all the questions that have been raised.

I think that is the proper procedure. This nomination can be brought up tomorrow, at which time we shall have had time to read the record of the hearings. That is all I am asking. If it is important enough and disturbing enough to the chairman of the committee——

Mr. EASTLAND. That is a matter for the majority leader.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The majority leader will go along if that is agreeable, if it is important enough for the committee to confer. What is disturbing is, why they wished to hold hearings and then not print them. It is important to Senators that we have an opportunity to read it and form our own opinions, and I believe that is only proper procedure. That is all I am asking.

Mr. EASTLAND. There is no question about it. There cannot be any question about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Mississippi made that same statement before he held the hearings—almost verbatim. He said that there is no question that we are going to hold hearings and prove it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. We held hearings yesterday after conferring with the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, no. The Senator tried to get what he thought was in my mind.

Mr. EASTLAND. The information the Senator had was that if he thought there was anything wrong, it should be pointed out, and we would go into it with witnesses, under oath, to find out whether the Senator was right or wrong.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I told the chairman of the committee——

Mr. EASTLAND. If the Senator was right, we would agree with him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I told the chairman of the committee that I would be glad to work with him if he was really interested in examining this case. The Senator said he was going to hold hearings and that there was absolutely nothing to it. If he was so sure why go ahead with hearings?

Mr. EASTLAND. I said that——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Words were used either by the chairman of the committee or the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]—I forgot which, because both were there—but the words used were, "This is a little hanky-panky deal, but maybe Bress is not involved." The word "hanky-panky" was used.

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a minute—the Senator knows better than that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It was said.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator knows better than that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, no, it was said——

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator knows that the chairman made no such statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I said those words were used at that meeting.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I have no monopoly on the words "hanky-panky," but I am afraid that I did use them on that occasion.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Delaware charged me with using those words.

Mr. HRUSKA. These were not charges, but inquiries which the Senator from Delaware made into the subject. I used those words loosely, and not in any derogatory way at all.

The Senator from Delaware furnished me with a very fine analysis and comments upon the results of his investigation of the court files in question on the Viner Estate. The Senator did a great deal of work on it. He spent $40 of his own money for photostatic copies of some of the files which were not available for the purpose of taking them out of the courthouse. He also did a great amount of work, over a period of several days, in addition to the efforts and analysis of a staff member over the weekend.

The analysis raised a great many questions. The analysis was brought before the chairman, suggesting that in order to get these questions answered and in order to get positive answers as to what we felt as a result of the first hearings, there should be further testimony.

I spent a great part of 2 days studying those files. The files stand almost 12 inches high. There are six cases involved, not one. They involve guardianship, administration procedure, a declaratory judgment action, and an action attacking the management and survivor contract, a rather complicated item.

Therefore, Mr. President, on this basis, I felt that we should have more information of a positive nature from the persons involved. We had Mr. Bress' further testimony yesterday afternoon, and the transcript lies on the Senator's desk. It was furnished to me this morning. It was not given to me by the reporter until today.

Mr. President, not more than an hour and a half ago, we finished testimony on members of the law firm and the two brothers who survived who were the principal persons involved in the litigation. The transcript of this testimony will not be available until tomorrow morning.

I feel personally satisfied that there is no charge, even in the nature of "hanky-panky," or anything else, which can be leveled against either the law firm or Mr. Bress. That is my conscientious and best conclusion. I base it upon long years of practice on my own, and the fashion in which the matter was handled.

I sympathize, however, with the position of the Senator from Delaware, after having spent many hours over a period of many days working out the analysis and raising the questions therein. I feel that in fairness to him he should be given at least an opportunity to read the testimony and to satisfy himself.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Nebraska will agree, I am sure, that the analysis was presented to him before his committee had heard Mr. Bress. There has not been one single public utterance anywhere that I have made in this connection.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have never made any charge against Mr. Bress. I said that we wished to be completely fair. I did not raise the points which were raised by the Department of Justice as a result of their second FBI investigation. If it was considered serious, I thought it should be inquired into. But it we are to inquire into it why do we not have an opportunity to read it?

I was not alone in saying that the answers were important enough to read. All I am asking is, Why do I not get an opportunity to read the answers? I may arrive at the same conclusion as the Senator from Nebraska. At no point have I tried to take the position that this was right or wrong. As I have stated to the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Mississippi it was for other reasons I questioned the advisability of the appointment of Mr. Bress at this time to this particular position. In view of the fact that the grand jury is now sitting on a rather important case in which he was the defending attorney I thought we should wait. I still feel that way about it.

Why take Baker's lawyer and put him in the position of prosecuting attorney?

I was placed in the delicate position that I did not wish the latter incident which arose to make it look like something I was trying to drag up to justify my earlier position. This last complaint has no relationship to my first objection. I wish to keep the two separated. I wish to be fair, and I have made no charge. I am making no charge now that the conclusions may not be perfectly proper, but I am saying that there was an element of doubt, not in my mind, but in the minds of representatives of the Department of Justice. The element of doubt was in the mind of the chairman of the committee when he came over on this side of the aisle last Monday and said to the Senator from Nebraska and to me: "After reading this, it disturbs me." That was the word he used—"disturbs."

Mr. President, if it disturbed the Senator from Mississippi, it disturbed me. I have gone into this matter. I still say that the floor of the Senate is not the place to discuss this matter. If it develops later that there is a difference of opinion, we have no choice but to discuss the case. But I do not believe it is fair to Mr. Bress to discuss it on the floor of the Senate today in this manner.

We cannot discuss these points without their appearing to be a semiform of an allegation. If I disagree with the conclusion and the testimony, certainly I would reserve my right to come to the floor of the Senate and discuss it. Personally, I still believe that the nomination should have gone to the committee. The committee should have held its sessions and its investigations officially as a committee.

In effect, the transcripts we now possess are transcripts of hearings which a committee held on the nomination of a man whom it had already approved. To me it looks like the jury trial of a case after the judge has rendered his verdict. I speak as a layman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have not studied the court cases referred to here concerning Mr. Bress. I oppose his nomination for other reasons.

I hold in my hand the Washington Post for October 15, 1965, which discusses the difficulty in arriving at finding someone for the job. After discussing the controversy, it states:

> Abe Fortas, intimate adviser to the President, who is now a Justice of the Supreme Court, then recommended Bress be substituted.

Mr. President, I shall not elaborate on my objections to Mr. Bress at this time. The country is more indebted to JOHN WILLIAMS, the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware, than to any other man in the United States for the work he has done in exposing corruption under the Dome of the Capitol.

The whole Bobby Baker story has not been told yet, but the Senate would be hanging its head in shame if it were not for the work JOHN WILLIAMS has done.

As I say, I have not read these cases, but I thoroughly believe that if the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] presented certain matters to the committee and the committee held a hearing, that hearing should be printed and available before we proceed with the consideration of the nomination.

Regardless of what those hearings show about the court cases, I cannot go along with Bress, because he was a part of the legal apparatus of Bobby Baker's transactions. He points out that that was just another client; that he served merely for the corporation, and not Baker. But the Serv-U Corp. was not "just another corporation." It was not an existing corporation which hired many lawyers, each of which was employed to do something. It was a corporation that was created by Bobby Baker, who was the mainspring in it. It received its first contract from a defense contractor immediately after it had obtained a $1 billion contract award. It obtained a contract for placing vending machines in that corporation at a time when it did not have a single machine or a single candy bar or a single employee or another contract.

So I am not impressed by the statement that he appeared only as attorney for the corporation and he did not know that there was any connection with Baker or have information about the real moving party behind it, because Serv-U Corp. was not an ordinary corporation by any means.

I feel, in fairness to the Senator from Delaware, that these hearings should be printed and available so he can peruse them. I have not gone into these cases. I am not in a position to judge.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. That was my original contention.

I want to make this point clear. I still oppose the nomination of Mr. Bress on that basis.

As I said at the time I testified I knew nothing derogatory about Mr. Bress, but I did question the advisability of his nomination to this post, which involves a case as sensitive as that of Bobby Baker, one which involves the prestige of the U.S. Senate, and which involves the prestige of the administration by virtue of the fact that the present President was majority leader at that time. The prestige of the executive and legislative branches is at stake.

The grand jury is in session considering this case. We cannot escape the fact that Mr. Bress was attorney of record at the time Baker was sued by Mr. Hill of the Capitol Vending Co. That is a matter of court record.

Mr. Hill said he was paying Baker $650 a month in cash, delivered in a room off the Senate Chamber, under the Dome of the Capitol, for helping him to obtain a contract. That is a highly improper and illegal procedure for any employee of the U.S. Government to be engaged in.

Mr. Hill said when the ante was raised from $650 a month to $1,000 a month he objected, and Baker then interceded to cancel his contract.

Mr. Bress was attorney of record for Baker's Serv-U Corp. He now says he never knew Baker was a stockholder. Yet in the court record, filed in the district court, there are papers signed by David G. Bress, in a suit filed against Robert G. Baker, room F-80, Capitol, Washington, D.C.; Fred Black, Jr., Washington, D.C.; Ernest D. Tucker, Washington, D.C.; and Serv-U Corp., as defendants.

The record shows that Mr. Bress was attorney of record for the Serv-U Corp., and Abe Fortas was attorney for Robert G. Baker.

This report was filed October 22, 1963. Within 10 days of that period I was before the Rules Committee, and I gave them a financial report showing that Baker was a stockholder in the Serv-U Corp., and in fact had borrowed about half a million dollars on his stock from a bank in Oklahoma. The Rules Committee knew it. He posted 2,850 shares as collateral for a loan from the Fidelity Bank & Guaranty Co. in Oklahoma. That financial statement was filed in October 1963, 8 months before Mr. Bress became attorney for the Serv-U Corp.

Certainly he knew Mr. Baker was a stockholder.

Based on all the records of the committee and statements in the public press, Baker was the major owner. Mr. Bress said in committee that he received a sizable fee for representing Baker's company on this case, which was settled out of court on a prearranged schedule that no announcement would be made of it until after the 1964 election so it would not influence the outcome of the election. He settled the case for his clients, but he said he did not know that Bobby Baker was a stockholder.

This is the first time I ever heard of a lawyer winning a case without knowing the identity of his client.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. This took place on September 21, 1964. This is what Fred Black, Jr., president in this get-rich-quick under the Capitol Dome business said. It lists the attorneys—David G. Bress, Esq., by Stanley Klavan, Esq., for the defendant Serv-U Corp.

It does not give a long name of a law firm. It shows that Bress was present by his agent.

At that time Mr. Black was asked this question:

> Did there come a time, Mr. Black, when you and Mr. Baker had any conversation with regard to the establishment of a business to conduct vending machine service?
>
> Answer. There did come such a time.
>
> Question. Could you tell us when that was?
>
> Answer. No, I couldn't tell you the date.
>
> Question. Could it have been in the year 1962? Would it refresh your recollection——
>
> Answer. No. It was before that, I'm sure 1961.
>
> Question. 1961?
>
> Answer. I would imagine 1961 or 1962. I'm not positive.

The point is that no one could have gone into these legal matters thinking they represented a long-established corporation and be unaware of its origin, its purpose, its conduct, and who the real controlling parties were.

Serv-U Corp. originated in Bobby Baker's mind. Bobby Baker made the contracts. Right after the Apollo contract was let, North American Aviation canceled with the vending machine company that had been giving it good service for years and gave it to the nonexistent Serv-U Corp.

No attorney could prepare to defend that corporation without being aware of those facts because that was what the whole controversy was about.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree with the Senator. I made the statement the other day that, if Mr. Bress said he represented Serv-U Corp., which was controlled by Baker at that time, without knowing who the owners were and without finding out, he is a little too naive to be appointed U.S. Attorney. How is he going to prosecute a case if he does not know the identity of the client?

I understand that in this matter his defense is that he was only the attorney handling the case in the court. He was the attorney of record, but he said he did not know what was going on and did not know about it.

I am not a lawyer. As a layman I have to hire lawyers, but I always hire them with the thought that they know what they are doing.

I am disillusioned. Frankly, I believe I know more about this case than Bress, and he was paid for handling it. I thought that lawyers did some work to earn these fees.

This nomination was reported to the Senate, and then hearings were held after the fact. This is a highly irregular procedure, in my judgment.

This new evidence was so important that they had to have extra testimony. I emphasize again that this new testimony was not taken on my request. I never requested that the committee go into this matter. They did it on their own decision. They thought this FBI report was of such importance and so disturbing that they had to examine it.

They have examined it. All I want to do is read the testimony.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The charge was made that Mr. Bress did not know who he was representing.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. Mr. Bress himself said he did not know that Baker was in the Serv-U Corp.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let us get the record straight. He said an official brought the list of stockholders to him and that Baker was not on the list of stockholders; that he found out later that he had an equitable interest in some stock.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, then he did find it out later. I am glad that at least he found out to whom he should send his bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am glad he found out the identity of his client; I dislike to think he settled the case without knowing.

Mr. EASTLAND. What has that to do with it?

May I ask the majority leader a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I could not think the man was so naive he did not know the name of his client.

Mr. EASTLAND. He found it out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is wonderful. Did he find it out before or after collecting his fee?

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question of the majority leader?

Can we take up the Bress nomination at 4 o'clock?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If we are going to take it up at 4 o'clock today, why not take it up now? There will not be an opportunity to examine the hearings by that time.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, there will.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator mean for the purpose of giving the Senator from Delaware an opportunity to read the transcript of the hearings held this morning?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How long were the hearings?

Mr. EASTLAND. I will ask the Senator from Nebraska how long the hearings were.

Mr. HRUSKA. I would say an hour's testimony. I do not know how long it takes to type that up.

Mr. EASTLAND. More stenographers will be put on it, and it will be brought here as quickly as possible.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wish to make it clear that no matter what the outcome of this debate, I am learning a great deal today about how lawyers operate.

Is the Senator telling me that he thinks that with these hearings not printed as yet we could still be ready to proceed at 4 o'clock?

I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that he and the nominee before the Senate may not prepare their cases, but I usually do a little homework.

I would want time to look over the hearings. If I am not to get the time to look over the record I would rather proceed now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska held hearings this morning that are now in the process of being printed.

Mr. EASTLAND. The full subcommittee was presented with some information before it was over. The Senator from Nebraska asked to examine the witness.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I know of no more capable man in the Senate than the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have not taken a firm position in this matter. I have been awaiting all the evidence and information I can obtain. I merely suggest that there are other Members of the Senate who have a potential interest in reading the record of hearings, with all due respect to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. He wishes to read them, I am sure. I would like to read them, and I believe other Senators would want to read them. I believe they should be available to the Senate if we are to decide this question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If they are important enough to hold hearings, and apparently they thought so, they should be printed.

Last Tuesday they received some information from some unknown source. They did not say where, but they thought some further phase needed investigation.

They pulled the nomination back from the consideration by the Senate at that time. I wish to make it clear that it was not upon my request that it was postponed so they could better inform themselves.

All right. They have informed themselves. Let us proceed.

But I want to know what disturbed them and will be asking some questions.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. We want the Senator to have time to become convinced. I am certain that if he reads the record, this testimony, that even he would be convinced there is nothing to the allegation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That may be true. Significantly the Senator from Mississippi was equally certain of his position before the hearings were held.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; the Senator from Mississippi was not equally certain. I resent the implication. I do not belong to anybody. I do not vote anybody's ticket except what I believe is right.

I held hearings at the request of the Senator to do what was right. I think I have done what was right. The decision was unanimous.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Let us hope the Senator went about it with an open mind.

At any rate, are we going to proceed now, or shall we have an opportunity to read the hearings? Does not the majority leader think it is a reasonable request to carry this nomination over until we get the hearings?

The hearings will be here tomorrow and available so that any Senator interested can read them.

Mr. HRUSKA. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I believe the Senator from Delaware is entitled to an opportunity to read the transcript. I seriously doubt whether he could do it between now and 4 o'clock.

I believe the point of the Senator from Iowa is a good one. There are other Senators with an interest in this record and this case; and they have to have information on it to base an intelligent and conscientious vote on the issue before the Senate.

I may not agree with the conclusion reached by the Senator from Delaware, but I believe in fairness to the Senate that we should have an opportunity to consider the entire record.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is much merit in the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, based on the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senate is not going to adjourn now. I am merely proposing an order that when the Senate adjourns today, it stand in adjournment until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection. May I ask the distinguished majority leader a question, while he is in the Chamber?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. At what time will he find it convenient to have the Senate consider the conference report on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, which is ready to be taken up?

Mr. MANSFIELD. At any time.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senate will be in session for several hours?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Four, five, or six hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David G. Bress to be U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

NOMINATION OF DAVID G. BRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my hope that the testimony which was taken by three of the ranking members of the Committee on the Judiciary will be made available not only to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] but to all other Senators.

Once again, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Bress nomination was reported to the Senate by a vote of 12 to 0, that the hearings on that nomination have been on the desks of Senators for at least 10 days or 2 weeks, and that the majority leader on at least three, four, or five, occasions—perhaps more—has postponed consideration of the nomination. The nomination will be considered at this session of Congress.

I hope that Senators who are interested—especially the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]—will have access, at least in its typewritten form, to the testimony which was taken by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and his colleagues this morning. This will afford time to study the testimony, so that when the Senate convenes tomorrow, we shall be prepared to work the will of the Senate one way or the other on the pending nomination.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The reason for not proceeding last Tuesday on the nomination was not the fault of the Senator from Delaware. I did not try to delay it; I urged that the Senate go forward and get rid of it then.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Delaware has made that statement four or five times, and I have said four or five times that the Senator from Delaware is absolutely correct. It was the majority leader who took it upon himself, because of circumstances which I thought were called to the attention of the subcommittee by the Senator from Delaware himself, to postpone consideration of the nomination.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, no.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. I called up the sugar bill so as to give the subcommittee an opportunity to consider the nomination further.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. To get the Record straight——

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is what I want—a straight Record.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. We came in on Tuesday, ready to discuss the Bress nomination. When some of the members of the subcommittee learned that I planned to raise certain questions they decided they had better go back and do more homework. Apparently they were not prepared to answer questions at that time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Questions raised on the basis of court records which the Senator from Delaware had in his possession; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. They found out I had examined certain court records; but why should that disturb them?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thought the Senator had the court records.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I had copies of some of the records and had examined them at that time. The subcommittee found out on Tuesday that I had examined the background of the case which prompted the special FBI investigation. They suddenly realized that they had not examined the case; I can only guess that they were afraid they would not be able to answer some of the questions that might be asked and wanted a further opportunity to do their homework. That was the situation.

It was not at my request that consideration of the nomination was postponed last Tuesday. I was as well prepared to discuss it then as I am now, if Senators wish to proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have nothing further to say.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

RECONSTRUCTION OF AREAS IN STATES OF FLORIDA, LOUISIANA, AND MISSISSIPPI DAMAGED BY RECENT HURRICINE BETSY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 903, H.R. 11539.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 11539) to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to provide assistance to sufferers from disasters caused by Hurricane Betsy. The bill does not provide any sort of Federal grant for any situation in which people were able to insure themselves against this disaster.

Unfortunately, insurance companies, for a number of reasons which they have explained logically, will not insure people against the effects of tidal waves. Sometimes hurricanes have a way of pushing ahead of them huge amounts of water. The tidal wave pushed ahead by Hurricane Betsy was from 9 to 20 feet high when it hit the flat coast of Louisiana. In a number of areas all homes and buildings were completely wiped out by the tidal wave.

Fortunately, under existing legislation it is possible for the Small Business Administration to make disaster loans to the people who were damaged. But a great many of those who suffered are poor. Some of them have nothing but welfare checks upon which to exist. Others have nothing but their social security income as retired persons, or social security income because they are widows with small children. Some of the people who have suffered are in no position whatever to pay back loans.

Rather than to place those people in a position in which they would have to declare bankruptcy or go into debt to the point where they could never recover from a disaster against which they were unable to protect or insure themselves, it is proposed by the administration that there should be some degree of forgiveness of loans made to persons who suffered losses of a completely uninsurable nature. We feel the utmost gratitude to the President, the Director of the Budget, to former Governor Ellington, Robert Phillips, and the other fine and able people who have come to the aid of such persons. That is the main difference between this measure and provisions authorized by existing law.

The bill also provides for the initiation of a study which we hope will lead to a Federal program to insure people against the devastating effects of hurricanes.

As a sponsor of the bill, together with my distinguished senior colleague from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the distinguished Senators from Florida [Mr. Holland and Mr. Smathers], and the distinguished Senators from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland and Mr. Stennis], I urge that the executive branch proceed expeditiously to make a study and submit a program to enable people to insure themselves against such horrible disasters.

The bill will not help persons whose situation is like that of the junior Senator from Louisiana in any respect; in fact, I would not expect it to do such a thing. It would not help Baton Rouge to any appreciable extent, although that city suffered damage amounting to approximately $50 million.

The force of the hurricane there was such that huge trees were uprooted, and one of those huge trees crushed in the roof of my home and the rain did much damage.

With respect to damage to my own home, the insurance company made a settlement for $15,000, which I thought was fair. We will repair our home. We probably lost $1,000 or $1,500 beyond what was recovered by way of insurance.

That is because we were in a position to protect ourselves. Private industry took care of that. Private industry is beginning to have great concern over this because it involves so much money that it might cause them to go out of business all over the world. They share in the underwriting of these expenses.

Unfortunately, very little could be done for these poor people who were wiped out and lost everything they had as a result of the tidal wave which accompanied the hurricane. It was the worst disaster as far as property damage is concerned that has ever hit the United States.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana. The bill, in the very nature of it, would not answer all of the problems created by the disasters of the type and character which we have been experiencing in Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, and the other gulf and eastern seaboard areas. However, at least we would be able to afford some relief for those people who have suffered such severe damage and who are not in a position, either through private insurance or in any other manner, to provide for themselves.

The part of the bill which appeals most to the junior Senator from Florida is section 5 which would provide:

> The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall undertake an immediate study of alternative programs which could be established to help provide financial assistance to those suffering property losses in flood and other natural disasters, including alternative methods of Federal disaster insurance, as well as the existing flood insurance program.

As the able junior Senator from Louisiana has so well stated, the problem is now that no insurance company will insure against wind-driven water. Obviously, in a hurricane such as the one suffered by the people living in the Northeast several years ago, and all up and down the eastern seaboard and gulf coast, the real damage is done by the water which has been driven by winds of 150 miles an hour in some instances. There is no window or door that can keep it out.

The enormous tides rise and they destroy all types and character of property. There is nothing that anyone can do about it. The insurance companies frankly state that they do not want that kind of insurance. They cannot afford to run that kind of program.

This enormous amount of damage ranged upwards into the hundreds of millions of dollars in Louisiana this year. We have had damage ranging up to almost $400 million in damage in Florida on past occasions. There is no way for one to insure against this type of loss.

I believe that this bill is a start on the kind of program that is most desirable. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his leadership on this particular program.

I was pleased to join as a cosponsor of the bill at its inception.

I do hope that the Senate will give the measure immediate approval.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I was pleased to join as a cosponsor of this measure. I congratulate the Senator from Louisiana for his leadership in this particular instance.

It happens that his good State of Louisiana suffered much more serious damage on this occasion than our State did. However, that is not the point. The question concerns what may happen in the future. We must have some kind of program under which people can insure against losses which are otherwise uninsurable. It is a matter to which this Congress should give its approval.

I strongly support the measure offered by the Senator and hope that it will be speedily enacted.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of LOUISIANA. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am concerned about the enactment of H.R. 11539, the Southeast Hurricane Relief Act of 1965. This bill would provide disaster relief to victims of the recent Hurricane Betsy in the States of Florida, Mississippi, and Louisiana. I believe that this kind of legislation is generally unwise and discriminatory. It sets a serious precedent for the future.

Like other Senators, Mr. President, I have sympathy for the helpless victims of Hurricane Betsy. I have seen the ravages of natural disasters in my own State of Wisconsin, just this last spring, and I know too well the suffering that follows such a catastrophic event, and the very serious noninsurable losses which have occurred from the floods. However, I am deeply concerned about this bill.

In the first place, let me state briefly what this bill would do.

Section 2 of this bill would amend the Federal Disaster Act to authorize the sale of trailers to the victims of the hurricane who have occupied them as temporary quarters.

Section 3 of this bill would provide additional relief under the disaster loan program authorized by section 7(b)(1) of the Small Business Act. In the case of property loss or damages in these three States resulting from hurricane Betsy, the SBA, to the extent the loss or damage is not covered by insurance or otherwise, shall at the borrower's option on that part of any disaster loan in excess of $500, cancel up to $1,800 of the loan or waive interest on the loan of not more than $1,800 for a period of 3 years. SBA also may make a loan to a damaged privately owned school, college, or university and may waive interest payments and defer principal payments on the loan for the first 3 years of the loan.

These college loans may be made without regard to whether the money might be obtained from private sources.

Section 4 of the bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans under the consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in the case of property loss or damage in these three States resulting from flood, high waters or wind driven water or uninsurable crop loss caused by Hurricane Betsy.

Under this section the Secretary shall, to the extent the loss is not insured, at the borrower's option on that part of the loan in excess of $500, cancel up to $1,800 of the loan or waive interest on the loan for a total amount of not more than $1,800 over a period of 3 years. These loans may also be made regardless of the fact that private financing might have been obtained.

Section 5 of the bill would provide for a study by the Department of Housing and Urban Development of alternative methods of Federal disaster insurance, including earthquake insurance. This provision is similar to S. 408, which passed the Senate in January and is now pending in the House. S. 408, sponsored by Senator WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, and Senators BARTLETT, BIBLE, BOGGS, CASE, CHURCH, CLARK, COOPER, DOUGLAS, GRUENING, HART, HARTKE, JACKSON, JAVITS, LONG of Missouri, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, MONDALE, MONTOYA, MORSE, MOSS, NEUBERGER, PELL, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, SCOTT, TYDINGS, and YARBOROUGH, is a very desirable bill, and I would hope that the House would act on it promptly.

This bill also authorizes the appropriation of $70 million.

I am especially concerned about sections 3 and 4 of this bill: The forgiveness of up to $1,800 of disaster loans above the $500 and the waiver of interest payments up to the same amount to the victims of Hurricane Betsy is discriminatory legislation. It discriminates against the victims of other disasters in other parts of the country who are still either making payments on disaster loans already received or who are now seeking disaster loans from SBA.

The Presiding Officer, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] and I worked hard to get legislation through Congress earlier this year in order to help the disaster victims in our States. It took us many weeks to accomplish this. The legislation that we achieved did some good. However, it was of general application, not just for Minnesota or Wisconsin, but also for Louisiana, Florida, Mississippi, and all the other States of the Union.

SBA is declaring a disaster area under the authority granted by section 7(b)(1) of the Small Business Act practically every day in some part of the United States. The losses suffered by the victims of these disasters is no less painful, both physically and financially, than those suffered by Hurricane Betsy.

I would like to point out that there is now a provision in the Small Business Act which provides that the Administrator of SBA may suspend the payment of principal and interest on disaster loans, regardless of where they are made, for 5 years.

Therefore, if a victim cannot make his payments or pay his interest, if he cannot make his amortization payments, they can be forgiven. This suspension is available to both homeowners and small business concerns and may be granted if SBA determines that it is necessary to avoid severe financial hardship to the borrower. The maturity of SBA disaster loans has also been extended to 30 years. These provisions are contained in Public Law 89-59, which I introduced. These are sensible and necessary additions to SBA's disaster loan program. They are nondiscriminatory and they suspend, not cancel, payments of principal and interest payments until the borrower can get on his feet again.

Before such a far-reaching amendment to the Small Business Act is passed the committee charged with the oversight of the Small Business Administration should be given an opportunity to hold hearings. I believe that the Agriculture Committee should also closely examine the provision of this bill which would amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to provide for the cancellation of principal and the waiver of interest on disaster loans made under that act in the three States covered by this bill.

Disaster victims need help. They need the help and sympathy of their Government regardless of the part of the country the disaster strikes. This bill would single out three States and grant substantial relief to disaster sufferers denied to those who may be equally hurt in other parts of the country.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am deeply concerned with H.R. 11539. I favor the authorization of $70 million for victims of Hurricane Betsy. I recognize the deep human problems involved. I plead with the leadership that, in the future, they should strive very hard to insist that legislation of this kind be of general application, not confined simply to three States. We should do whatever we can to see that the appropriate committees have an opportunity to hold hearings and consider the legislation. I am sure that the committees would give very sympathetic consideration to the measures and that under those circumstances we could have more orderly and far more equitable legislation.

The way this bill is drafted, if we have a similar disaster in Wisconsin next year, we will not be in a position to obtain this relief, nor will Minnesota, or any other State, including Florida and Louisiana. This legislation is confined to this very specific disaster. It is confined to these three States and it is discriminatory.

I shall have a little more to say about this bill later. However, I thank the distinguished author of the bill for yielding. I hasten to add that I think he and the two Senators from Florida have performed a great service for their States and that it is a very human action that they are taking. I would have done the same thing.

I do hope that, in the future, we shall try to make the legislation more general, and not discriminatory.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the discrimination in this bill results from the discrimination that the good Lord created when he decided to send Hurricane Betsy to Louisiana. We suffered $2 billion in property damage and substantial loss of life.

If there is anyone who thinks that he was discriminated against because Hurricane Betsy did not get to him, as far as the Senator from Louisiana is concerned, he would be glad if that person had obtained his wish.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator did not want to leave that impression.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct. I did not want to leave that impression.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure that the Senator is aware that with the terrible disasters, hurricanes, and floods that have been hitting throughout this country, we should pass general legislation which would permit all the States to benefit if a disaster should strike in that area. Wisconsin was hit by this terrible act of God last spring. It could happen again. It it does, the relief for my State should not depend on political power or influence. It should flow equally to all, based on considered and universally applicable national policy.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am aware of the circumstances. We passed a bill through the Senate that would do just about the sort of thing the Senator suggested. If the Burke-Bayh bill—we call it the Bayh bill—which was sponsored by about 50 Senators, perhaps including the Senator from Wisconsin—were moved through the House committee and became law, perhaps we would not even have to be here asking for a Hurricane Betsy bill to provide help for the victims who suffered so badly from that catastrophe.

I assure the Senator that, as one Member of this body, this Senator will do everything in his power to aid the victims of any natural disaster. I have already discussed the matter with my colleague from Louisiana, Representative HALE BOGGS, of the Second District, which includes the part of the State so badly hit. He and I and the rest of the Louisiana delegation are all going to work together to help pass the sort of general legislation which the Senator says we should pass.

The thing which makes it difficult to get such a bill through is that many Members of the House are reluctant to approve what they regard as buying a pig in a poke—to approve a bill, in this case, which could conceivably cost a fantastic amount of money, without knowing how much it is going to cost.

Yesterday the Senate voted a $70 million appropriation to effectuate this bill. The conference has agreed to cut that in half. I am still most grateful to the conferees that they went along with us that far.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The conferees did agree upon the $35 million figure, and we also agreed upon an item which was regarded as sufficient to allow a thorough study to be made of this whole disaster field, so that at the next Congress, or at the next session of this Congress, legislation dealing with the general subject, which has been so ably discussed by the Senator from Wisconsin, could be produced and considered, based upon the idea of allowing citizens to participate by insuring themselves against losses that are otherwise uninsurable. We have had many matters of this kind, such as the Alaskan situation and the Columbia River flood, the floods along the Kansas River and the Missouri and others, that they have taught us the lesson that this is one general field in which sound legislation is much needed. We have put an appropriation in this supplemental bill and in the conference report just concluded—which I think will be considered here in the Senate very shortly—that will set underway a careful study, to try to bring back to the Congress just such a bill as has been discussed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. The able Senator from Wisconsin may be assured that, should disaster strike his area, we would all extend to him the same sympathy which we now feel for our own people as a result of the losses which they have suffered from Hurricane Betsy. No less sympathy would be expressed to the people of Wisconsin, or those of any other State of the Union which incurred one of these natural disasters. We must see if we cannot start some type or character of program to provide for Government administered coverage in the area of relieving suffering and damage which is uninsurable, not only for Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and the States now encompassed in this particular bill, but in future times, we would hope the same principle could be extended, as has been so appropriately expressed by the Senator from Louisiana, to all areas of this Nation. This is an urgent need for everybody in our Nation. Nobody knows at what time there may be a tremendous thunderstorm, an earthquake, a catastrophic fire, or other disaster of such magnitude that the insurance companies could not take care of it and would not wish to try.

We are trying to move into that field, to answer the need which now exists and for which there is presently no action.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Tidal waves and earthquakes are the two biggest examples of that. May I assure the Senator that I appreciate the fact that he has stated that notwithstanding his reservations, he will not vote against the bill. As I have told the Senator privately, if his State should ever be visited with a similar disaster, he could count on my vote to help provide for his people. Some time ago, he was working diligently to help his people when they suffered a similar disaster. He felt that certain Federal officials were rather indifferent with respect to the problems which existed in his State. I assure the Senator that as long as the Senator from Louisiana is here, he will be sympathetic toward all disaster victims everywhere. I appreciate the fact that the Government of this country has done much to help us in our hour of need, and we deeply appreciate the assistance of the Senate, including the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator will yield briefly, I wish to say that I deeply appreciate what he has said. I would certainly count on him. He is not only a compassionate, sympathetic Senator, but also a Senator with great strength and force, and most effective in anything he sets about to do.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wish also to thank the Committee on Public Works, headed by its able chairman, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. This bill does not do anything for Michigan, but that State is represented in this body by a very great and generous statesman, who has a heart as big as that of any man who ever served here. He demonstrated his leadership in bringing this bill out of the committee with a very fine committee report, and if he will permit me to do it, I should like to suggest that somebody erect a statue to him, because he has demonstrated great leadership.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of the names of the members of the Committee on Public Works be printed in the RECORD at this point, so that the victims of the disaster in my State may know the names of their benefactors.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC WORKS

PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan, chairman.
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia.
STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio.
EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine.
ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska.
FRANK E. MOSS, of Utah.
LEE METCALF, of Montana.
B. EVERETT JORDAN, of North Carolina.
DANIEL K. INOUYE, of Hawaii.
BIRCH BAYH, of Indiana.
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, of New Mexico.
FRED R. HARRIS, of Oklahoma.
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky.
HIRAM L. FONG, of Hawaii.
J. CALEB BOGGS, of Delaware.
JAMES B. PEARSON, of Kansas.
GEORGE MURPHY, of California.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, not only do I sympathize with the Senator from Louisiana and others who have suffered in this disaster, but I have a deep interest in the subject myself. In 1951, the Middle West went through one of the most disastrous floods in its history. I believe the States of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri suffered damages amounting to approximately $1 billion.

Following that flood, the senior Senator from Kansas and others became interested in a flood-insurance program. The RECORD will show that we introduced some legislation. We did not receive much support from the administration departments, the Bureau of the Budget and others. There were many problems involved.

If we are starting on a program of some type to work out something to enable an individual to protect himself, I wish to support it. I realize the problem. Some private insurance companies tried to do some of this; there are some of them still trying to get some rulings from the Treasury, in order to protect themselves or any private insurance company handling flood insurance. This is a field we should get into.

I introduced some legislation at the time of the Midwest floods, and when we get to this point again, I shall go back and dig up some of the old bills and some of the speeches I made on the subject, and the records of some of the hearings which were held.

I commend the Senator and assure him that I wish to be of help.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is it section 5 of the bill which is being discussed? Does this relate to the study?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. I think section 5 provides for the study.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The provisions of section 5 are substantially the same as the legislation that I introduced twice before, passed the Senate both times, but was sort of bottled up in the Rules Committee in the House.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is aimed in that direction. The Senator has shown great leadership in that field, which I appreciate. Had he been able to prevail at an earlier date, I suppose the Government would owe us much more money than we will ever get out of this relief bill here. The Government would probably owe us $400 or $500 million, because we would have been wise enough, I believe, to take out the insurance. We suffered last year a disaster of a similar nature, and we regret that private industry does not feel it can appropriately insure this type of loss.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. We are encouraged. The private companies have combined to discuss the feasibility of their participation in coverage, and their initiative is most appreciated. It is hoped by this Senator that the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance will avail himself of the thinking of the private sector. As a speculative guess at this point, it seems to me that ultimately, probably, the insurance program can be a combination of private and Government coverage for disasters which now are wholly uninsured.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there is another aspect of this subject which concerns me very deeply as chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business Administration.

Mr. President, the supplemental appropriations bill for 1966, which passed the Senate yesterday, contains two increases to SBA's revolving fund. One of these increases—$76 million—is the maximum amount authorized to be appropriated under existing law. There was another request by SBA for an additional $84 million. This $84 million is contingent upon authorization legislation being enacted by Congress.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield at that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator has demonstrated his leadership by pushing the request for legislation through his subcommittee. It was bottled up in the House Committee on Banking and Currency, but I am happy to say that the bill was reported this morning. At this moment, I know that the bill has been called up for discussion on the House floor. I am informed that there is no doubt the bill will pass. It may already have done so.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, both these amounts will be used for disaster loans, particularly for those persons and businesses injured by Hurricane Betsy.

There is pending before the House S. 2542, which would increase the total authorization for SBA's revolving fund by $120 million. If this amount is passed by Congress, it would leave out of the $120 million authorization $36 million remaining in the authorization authority under which appropriations could be made for all other lending purposes of the SBA. This is true since the additional $84 million request is contingent on the passage of this $120 million authorization.

During recent hearings by the Senate Small Business Subcommittee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and I both raised the point that the thrust of the entire SBA operation is now centered on disaster loans and that the regular business loan program of the Small Business Administration is being neglected. It was brought out at these hearings that SBA is no longer accepting applications for regular business loans. I should like to make it clear at this time that there is $36 million remaining in the authorization authority which SBA, with Budget permission, of course, could request to be appropriated, but which the Budget Bureau has not permitted. This amount is badly needed by SBA for its regular business loan program, programs under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and loans under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Mr. President, this means that the SBA loan program has ground to a halt, and is not even taking applications. It will remain at a halt because, as I say, all available appropriations are needed for disaster purposes.

I intend to introduce legislation in the near future to separate the SBA disaster funds from the regular loan funds of the SBA, so that the devastating impact of disasters on the SBA lending programs can be eliminated in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the this morning's Washington Post entitled "Disaster Loans Dry Up SBA Aid to Negroes," which shows why new legislation in this field is needed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 21, 1965]

DISASTER LOANS DRY UP SBA AID TO NEGROES

(By Leonard Downie, Jr.)

Emergency disaster loans to Louisiana businessmen hit by Hurricane Betsy in September have dried up funds for the Small Business Administration's regular loan programs throughout the Nation.

Hardest hit by the SBA loan drought are the Nation's small businessmen—many of them Negroes—who had applied for loans through the new Small Business Development Centers in 28 U.S. cities.

Applications are no longer being accepted at the centers for regular SBA loans. A backlog of applications for special easy-to-get Economic Opportunity Act loans has built up. And many applicants who have actually received letters approving their loans have not received their money during the past 2 months.

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY MILLION DOLLARS NEEDED

Little of the money is expected to be disbursed, and few new loan applications will be considered, SBA officials say, until Congress approves $160 million in supplemental appropriations to foot the bill for Hurricane Betsy and cover the backlog of other applications.

Negro businessmen, meanwhile, are growing restive, as what seemed a promising program to help them enter the economic mainstream has come to a virtual standstill.

They especially had been counting on receiving from the SBA the Economic Opportunity Act loans that require little or no collateral; collateral has been a major stumbling block in their efforts to obtain loans before.

"I know there are some Negro businessmen in Washington who were already budgeting money they expected through the program," James S. Stanback, Jr., president of the D.C. Chamber of Commerce said. "Now, with no money coming, they don't know what they are going to do."

CENTERED ON NEGROES

The Small Business Development Centers were set up by the Office of Economic Opportunity in 14 cities last July to provide business training and assistance in obtaining SBA loans for needy small businessmen, especially Negroes.

In Washington, only six Negro businessmen had obtained SBA loans in 13 years before last summer. More than half of the 145 loans approved through the local center since then have gone to Negroes.

Nationwide, the number of cities served by the centers quickly doubled, with dozens of requests for them coming from other towns, as the public response exceeded all official expectations.

But now the loan money has suddenly stopped coming. Samuel Harris, director of the Washington center, reported that the SBA stopped accepting applications for regular loans "some time ago."

He also estimated that 40 local applications for poverty program loans, budgeted separately by the SBA, are still awaiting SBA approval and that more than a dozen local businessmen who have received letters approving their applications still have not gotten any money.

Berkeley Burrell, president of the National Business League, said the situation is much the same at centers all over the country. Representatives of the league's chapters in cities with Small Business Development Centers "are calling every day to complain about the sudden lack of loan money," he said.

NEW CENTERS CURBED

The SBA also is not allowing new centers to open up in cities asking for them, he added, and Washington's center has two new branches, both staffed and already open for business, that cannot be announced to the public.

Burrell believes that the special effort to help Negro businessmen was never expected to cost as much as it has. "Now that it is adding to the Government's money problems," he said, "I'm afraid they will curtail it sharply or cut it off."

SBA officials insist that Hurricane Betsy is the only reason for the loan embargo. Emergency disaster loans needed in Louisiana, which get top SBA priority, are expected to exceed the $88 million loaned to businessmen in Alaska after the earthquake there in March 1964.

Diversion of large amounts of loan money for the Louisiana emergency has created a backlog of more than 4,000 unfilled loan applications in other parts of the country, one spokesman said.

"As I understand it," another SBA official said, "we are nearly flat broke."

"I realize the anxiety of other people counting on money from us," Randall Tyus, the SBA's special assistant to the administrator for minority group affairs said, "But we must help these people in the South first."

At one point earlier this month, the entire SBA loan machinery ground to a halt as officials surveyed the application backlog to decide what programs to curtail for now and how much money to request from Congress.

Now the disaster loan program is running smoothly, SBA spokesmen say, and "some money is expected to trickle back down through the poverty loan program, although progress will be slow."

Officials of both the SBA and the Office of Economic Opportunity, which pays for the office expenses and management training programs at the Small Business Development Centers, promise that everything will be back to normal soon.

But Negro business leaders, who believe enough money should have been set aside for the poverty loan program in the first place so that it would not have been affected by the Louisiana emergency, are not so optimistic.

"We need a deeper commitment to the Negro businessman from the administration," Burrell said.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, while the article points up the local impact on the SBA program, the effect is nationwide, in States such as Wisconsin, Alabama, Louisiana, New York, Oregon, and New Hampshire, and all the rest.

We have received complaints in our committee that small businesses cannot borrow money. We know that this is something Congress intends they shall be permitted to do. But the SBA does not have the funds to make loans available at this time.

Let me once again congratulate the Senator from Louisiana for his leadership in this Hurricane Betsy matter. I hope and pray that in the future this kind of legislation will be more general and not so discriminatory as this particular bill is.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will my colleague [Mr. LONG] yield to me?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am grateful for the action which is about to be taken on the pending bill. We had introduced another bill requesting that more funds be allocated to the victims of the disaster, but because of the fact that it did not contain approval from the Budget Bureau, we proceeded with the bill now before the Senate.

I am glad to say that the Committee on Appropriations, in its supplemental bill, provided for at least half the money which we requested. I am therefore hopeful that come January, when another appropriation bill will be presented, we may obtain the remainder of the money provided for in the pending bill.

It is a small amount in comparison to the losses sustained, but we are grateful for what Congress has done.

It is indeed heartening the way our Government has reponded swiftly, with aid and assistance for our unfortunate citizens who suffered such great losses. As I said before, more will be needed, but words cannot express the pride I feel in the way our country has come to the aid of our people. On a moment's notice the President went to New Orleans to see for himself the tragic aftermath of Hurricane Betsy and immediately mobilized the emergency resources of the Nation to offer comfort to the victims. Though the scars of the disaster will remain long, the memory of a kind President and a compassionate Nation will be remembered longer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the action of the Senate today in passing H.R. 11539 climaxes efforts which began in the 87th Congress more than 3 years ago. In both the 87th and 88th Congresses bills containing language similar to that appearing in section 5 of H.R. 11539 were passed by the Senate. For a variety of reasons the House failed to give its concurrence.

Early this year the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] once again introduced a bill to provide for a Housing and Home Finance Agency study of the costs involved in implementing a Federal disaster relief insurance program. Within a few weeks the bill had been reported out by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and had been, once again, passed by the Senate and sent to the House. As a result of devastation caused by the March 27, 1964, Alaska earthquake this year's proposal called for a study of the actuarial factors involved in a federally supported earthquake insurance program as well.

In the House this summer the Banking and Currency Committee gave the Senate-passed version of the bill (S. 408) its careful consideration and reported it favorably to the full body. It is this House and Senate approved language which now appears as section 5 of the hurricane Betsy relief bill which we pass today and which has already been passed by the House.

Mr. President, since the Alaska earthquake of a year and a half ago there have been some 40 additional natural disasters striking almost every part of this Nation. Except for the tornadoes of the Great Lakes States in the early summer these disasters have consisted primarily of an earthquake in the Pacific Northwest, spring and early summer floods along the west coast and in the upper Midwest and hurricane-transported water damage along the gulf. For neither earthquake nor water damage is commercial insurance available at reasonable rates.

For a number of years now the insurance industry has been concerned about its inability to provide flood or earthquake insurance at reasonable rates. Because of the reluctance of this somewhat conservative industry to think in terms of Federal participation in insurance no such proposals have come from its leaders.

Yet the yearly accumulation of flood and earthquake damage continues to mount. Mr. President, with the successful passage of section 5 of the bill presently under consideration we come to the point of recognition by the Federal Government of its obligation to provide some sort of assistance in this field.

Once the HHFA has completed the 9-month study of flood insurance factors and an equivalent study of earthquake insurance factors the Congress will be in a better position to determine what form Federal assistance in this area should take. It may be that the study itself once completed will provide sufficient data for the insurance industry to use in setting up a privately financed program. This, however, does not seem likely as the insurance industry has for many years studied the problem and determined over and over that privately supported flood insurance is financially unfeasible. Thus it may be then that what will come out of this study will be a proposal for a Federal reinsurance or upper limit guarantee which, in the manner pioneered by Federal Housing Administration insured loans, will encourage reasonable flood insurance schemes to be proposed by private industry.

Or, it may be that nothing will induce the industry to establish flood and earthquake insurance programs at reasonable rates. In this case the Federal Government will have no alternative but to establish its own Federal disaster insurance program. If this becomes necessary all that remains is to implement a statute which is already on the books, the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956—Public Law 84–1016). If merited at that time Public Law 84–1016 could be expanded to include earthquake insurance as well.

Those of us who have worked to assure passage of language authorizing and appropriating money for a flood and earthquake insurance study trust that the Housing and Home Finance Agency—incorporated now in the newly created Department of Housing and Urban Development will bend its efforts toward providing for the Congress the most thorough and all-encompassing study of the factors involved in earthquake and flood insurance. Thus, when the report is received, we will be in a position to make an intelligent decision as to what sort of Federal program is needed in this area.

Surely the massive loss of real and personal property which occurs yearly in the United States can, in some measure, be insured against through some sort of federally supported or federally assisted program. The study which H.R. 11539 authorizes is the first necessary step toward this goal.

Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal of June 9 and again of October 18 of this year discussed proposals being considered here in the Congress and elsewhere in the country for a Federal disaster insurance program. These articles will, I am sure, be of interest to the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that they appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 9, 1965]

STATE AIDS BELIEVE ANY FLOOD INSURANCE REQUIRES FEDERAL AID—COMMISSIONERS LIKELY TO SOUND OUT WASHINGTON AS FIRMS ARE RELUCTANT TO HANDLE PROBLEM

NEW YORK.—Any workable program to insure property owners against flood damage will require large-scale Federal participation.

That view appeared to be gaining support among State insurance regulators at the semiannual meeting of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners here, despite wide misgivings among insurers and State officials regarding Federal "encroachments."

An NAIC committee on property and casualty coverages will meet late today and is expected to recommend that the organization schedule conferences in Washington to find out what kind of Government participation might be arranged. It will act on the basis of a report of a subcommittee to which the flood insurance question was assigned more than a year ago.

This report includes the findings of a group of insurance industry representatives who were asked last year to explore the question of private concerns' capabilities in the field of flood coverage. That panel indicated earlier this week that after extensive studies it could make "no recommendations of any specific program for flood insurance on dwelling buildings." That report in effect tossed the problem back into the State officials' laps and left no way out but an indemnification plan based largely on Government aid.

Basically, the view of insurance men is that flood damage is not an insurable risk in the same sense as fire or hurricane losses, in which the premiums paid by many persons provide funds to compensate the relatively few who have losses. It is argued that hardly anyone would buy flood insurance unless he is in a location, such as a river valley or the seashore, where damage would be probable—a situation inconsistent with the insurance principle of risk spreading.

The insurance industry panel said it had considered a mandatory approach, in which all dwelling policies would include a charge for flood coverage, and a plan in which flood coverage would be optional. It said it found neither approach workable "on a feasible business basis."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 18, 1965]

CONGRESS MULLS A PLAN TO AID FUTURE VICTIMS OF FLOODS, HURRICANES—FEDERAL INSURANCE WOULD GIVE PROPERTY DAMAGE COVERAGE NOT OFFERED BY COMPANIES

(By Joseph W. Sullivan)

WASHINGTON.—Protection for property owners against a major hazard that U.S. insurance companies have never been willing to cover at any price may soon be made available by Uncle Sam, without charge.

The hazard, which already has inflicted damages of well over a billion dollars on U.S. homes, farms, and businesses this year, is water—water propelled by a flooding river, high tide, hurricane or just plain windstorm.

Because these perils are capable of inundating entire communities, insurers blanch at the prospect of paying for their havoc. Moreover, because insurance against them has appeal only in the localities where the peril is greatest, there's little way for an insurer to apply his golden precept of collecting premiums from the many to pay the claims of a few.

These same considerations, however, are serving to spur efforts within the Johnson administration and in Congress to come up with some alternate form of relief payments for the afflicted. For the greater the destruction, the greater the pressures for the Government to step in and help out. Galvanized by this year's freakish combination of heavy winter and spring flooding in many parts of the West and Hurricane Betsy's more recent devastation of the Louisiana lowlands, congressional majorities are plainly prepared to start the relief funds flowing, though the form, size and exact timing of help are still in doubt.

FEDERAL INDEMNITY PAYMENTS

Creation of a federally subsidized disaster insurance program in which property owners would pay some premium to get protection, is one possibility getting consideration. Most of the attention, though, centers on providing unadorned Government indemnity payments for home and business losses in designated disaster areas.

"Private property owners have no effective way to protect themelves against the worst forms of natural calamity, and the Federal Government is the only entity with the resources to step in and fill the void," declares an official of the Federal Office of Emergency Planning. The OEP figures to spend close to $100 million this year to help clean away flood and storm debris, restore public facilities and services and provide emergency housing to disaster victims; but under present law it can't do anything about compensating private losses.

As a starter in that direction, the House is due to approve today a special "Betsy" bill providing what amounts to Federal grants of up to $1,800 each to uninsured Louisiana, Florida, and Mississippi residents whose property was damaged or destroyed by the hurricane. The Senate Public Works Committee plans to take up the measure tomorrow and barring some end-of-session mixup it should be enacted by late this week.

BROADER DISASTER RELIEF

The Betsy bill does no more than set a precedent, however, and despite its $70 million price tag, it's stingy alongside the much broader disaster relief legislation that's being readied to follow. Indeed, after ratifying the Betsy bill last Wednesday, the House Public Works Committee immediately turned its attention to a Senate-passed indemnification bill that would set far higher ceilings on individual payments for all future disasters—$22,500 in the case of residential damages and $75,000 for business property. Because nobody has a firm idea how much this scheme might ultimately cost, the House group will probably extend its deliberations on the measure into the new session of Congress that begins in January. Both congressional and administration disaster aid specialists are agreed, though, that some version of the broad relief measure should be enacted soon.

"The simple fact that we have to resort to special, sectional acts of Congress to provide relief to some disaster areas is indication enough that present provisions are inadequate," declares Democratic Senator BIRCH BAYH, of Indiana, chief sponsor of the Senate-passed bill. Only by pledging prompt attention to the broad Senate measure were leaders of the House public works unit able to get an assurance from Chairman PAT MCNAMARA of the Senate Public Works Committee that he'd take up special aid for Betsy victims.

Actually, indemnification of private property losses is only one feature of the multibenefit aid plan approved by the Senate with administration backing. The legislation would also commit the Federal Government to picking up the entire tab for reconstruction of storm-damaged schools, highways, sewage works, and other essential public facilities. In addition, it would greatly liberalize eligibility standards and terms of Small Business Administration disaster loans—the principal form of Federal assistance now available to individual disaster victims.

These SBA home and business rebuilding loans, which carry an interest charge of only 3 percent, can now be offered for a term of no more than 20 years, and only to borrowers who can't qualify for private credit. The Senate bill would extend the maximum loan term to 30 years and, more important, make low-cost SBA credit available to all comers in any area the agency declares to be disaster stricken. (Portions of 38 States have been so designated within the past 18 months.)

"This may take some business away from private mortgage lenders," concedes one of the bill's proponents, "but why should a provident man whose home has been washed away have to pay 6 percent for rebuilding money when his neighbor with a lousy credit rating is only paying 3 percent?"

The Senate bill's provisions for reimbursing property owners for their losses would make the States handle damage claims and require them to put up one-third of the funds. The money would only go out for damage categories against which insurance can't be obtained "at reasonable rates" and total reimbursement would be limited to 75 percent of the amount of a disaster loss. Also, high-risk areas especially vulnerable to repeated flooding would be excluded from coverage; States would have to adopt "flood-plain zoning controls" that would rule out such areas.

NO WIND PROTECTION

Thus a man whose $30,000 home is completely washed away by a flood could qualify for the maximum $15,000 Federal grant, plus $7,500 from his State government—provided he hadn't built in an area ruled off limits by his State's flood-zoning plan. If, on the other hand, his home were destroyed by a tornado or by hurricane winds (as contrasted with hurricane waters) there would be no Federal-State reimbursement because he could have obtained private insurance against wind perils. Eligiblity of an earthquake victim would depend on the availability and rates for earthquake insurance in his locality.

"We feel we've taken care not to discourage sound business practices in any way," says Senator BAYH. And neither insurers nor mortgage lenders have any great quarrel with his assertion, though the lenders are far from pleased with the bill's broadening of SBA loan eligibility standards.

The insurance industry, for its part, has long agonized over its inability to offer flood insurance and is glad to have protection against the torrent of abuse that invariably follows rejection of mass water damage claims. There are misgivings, to be sure, about just where a Federal intrusion into the indemnity field may ultimately lead. But the Bayh bill, at least in the judgment of insurance industry envoys in Washington, poses no imminent threat.

COULD AID INSURERS LATER

"It doesn't discourage purchase of any form of insurance that's on the market now, and by encouraging the States to develop flood-zoning systems, it could pave the way for making private flood insurance practical," observes one industry man. Should flood zoning ever become refined enough to permit accurate scaling of insurance rates according to flood risks, the Bayh bill is designed to cede jurisdiction back to the industry, at least in lower risk areas.

But what may be good for insurers and money lenders may not represent "sound business practice" for Uncle Sam, some flood control experts suggest.

Average flood and tidal damages of around $400 million yearly over the past decade, as compiled by the U.S. Weather Bureau, could soar much higher, the weathermen concede. Even the estimated $1.9 billion in damages inflicted over the past 12 months—a high water mark—could be dwarfed in a few hours, it's acknowledged, if a wayward hurricane should ever blow into the New York area at full tilt.

Once before, in 1956, Congress authorized creation of a flood indemnity fund, built on an insurance framework under which persons seeking protection would pay 60 percent of the premium, Uncle Sam 20 percent and the States the balance. But the Federal Flood Indemnification Administration, set up to run the program, quickly became mired in ratesetting quarrels. And when it came back to Congress in 1957 for $500 million just to get the program going, the House Appropriations Committee balked. Without any funding, the program perished.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM AND THE GENEVA CONVENTION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, not so many months ago, our defeatists and our doomsday criers, as well as our enemies, were telling us that the war in Vietnam could not be won.

Some of them said we could not possibly win, because the French who knew southeast Asia so much better than we do had not been able to win with an army of 500,000 men.

This is an argument which I have always found singularly unimpressive.

Indeed, on the basis of their entire record in Indochina, the French colonialists should be the last ones to be held up as an example or to be asked for advice on how to conduct a counterguerrilla war.

Some said that we could not possibly win because we ourselves were unequipped to fight a guerrilla war in the jungles of Vietnam. But their pessimistic appraisal has been given the lie by the events of recent months in Vietnam.

And there were those who said that we could not possibly win because Hanoi and Peiping were prepared to fight for 10 or 20 years if necessary. They said that Communist regimes are infinitely more stubborn and persevering than democratic governments can ever be, and that these regimes are inherently too proud to admit defeat.

This appraisal of Communist staying power was proved wrong in the Korean war, and it is my conviction that it will again be proved wrong in Vietnam.

Communist pride is a contradiction in terms. The Communists have no pride. They are history's supreme opportunists.

When hard pressed, they have always been willing to call a halt to the battle, even at the cost of important diplomatic concessions.

In the days after the Bolshevik revolution, Lenin lectured some of the more stubborn of his party members on the need for knowing how to take one step back, so that they would at a future date be able to take two steps forward. And, at the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, Lenin purchased peace with the German Army by major territorial and other concessions.

So it simply is not true that Communists are too proud to back down or to compromise.

When I returned from the Far East last May and reported that the war in Vietnam was going much better than could be gleaned from a reading of the press and that there were many reasons for being sanguine about the future, I was accused by some editors and by some of my colleagues of naivete and wishful thinking. I know that one Senator said on the floor of the Senate later that I did not know what I was talking about.

But today I do not think that anyone will challenge the statement that the war is going very much better for our side.

Virtually all the accounts from Vietnam are now agreed that the much-touted Vietcong monsoon offensive failed to make serious headway; that our side has, by and large, had the better of the Communists in the important engagements that have taken place since last June 1; that morale on the Government side has improved tremendously; and that there are clear signs that the morale of the Vietcong is beginning to crack.

This is the theme of an article in this week's issue of Time magazine, which I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. DODD. I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Back to Geneva 1954? An Act of Political Folly" be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the Time article makes it clear that the vastly improved situation in Vietnam could not possibly have come about without large scale American intervention. But it also underscores the fact that it is the South Vietnamese Army, and not the American forces, that is doing most of the fighting and suffering most of the casualties. And the South Vietnamese forces are now fighting better because, with our assistance, they are now confident of the final outcome of the struggle.

Time points out that in the 4 months after U.S. combat units went into action, some 3,000 Government soldiers were killed compared with 275 Americans. It also points out that, as the U.S. buildup has grown larger, Government losses in action have gone down dramatically—from 1,300 in July, to 800 in August, to 567 in September.

There are many evidences of declining Vietcong morale. Their dead, whom they previously used to remove from the battlefield even at the risk of their lives, are now frequently left on the field of battle in large numbers. Their weapons, which they previously considered far more precious than lives, are now frequently left behind by the retreating Vietcong.

But perhaps the most important single piece of evidence of the declining Vietcong morale is the fact that during the month of September defections from the Vietcong to the Government side reached the all-time high of 1,654. Against this figure, the Vietcong was able to boast of only 225 Government defections during the previous month of August.

The Vietcong still have a lot of fight in them. But all the indications are that the tide of battle has now turned. Prisoners and defectors both report that recent allied victories have caused the Vietcong to lose much of their cockiness and that continuing offensive action by American and Vietnamese troops and by American and Vietnamese aircraft now make it virtually impossible for them to rest in one place for any peirod of time. They say that the Vietcong are kept constantly on the move, so that they do not have time to take care of their weapons properly; that they are short of sleep and short of medical supplies and short of food and of other essentials.

The incredible youth of the recent prisoners and defectors is another clue to the desperate situation of the Vietcong. There was a time when the Vietcong relied to a large degree on volunteers. But many of their newly recruited contingents are made up for the most part of 14- and 15-year-old boys who have been conscripted into the Vietcong army against their will and against their parents' will.

There is every reason for believing that over the coming months things will continue to get worse for the Vietcong and will continue to go better for our side.

The American buildup now stands at approximately 150,000. It will soon go to 200,000 men.

The men already in Vietnam may have been raw at the point of arrival; but they are now shaping up into battle-hardened guerrilla veterans.

The cooperation between our Army, Navy, and Air Force is constantly improving, and so is cooperation between our own forces and the Vietnamese armed forces.

The Vietnamese Government under General Ky is shaping up impressively.

Against the background of the growing American buildup in South Vietnam and the deteriorating military position of the Vietcong, there is increasing evidence that the Communists now realize that they cannot win the war and they are therefore seeking to extricate themselves at the conference table, as they were able to extricate themselves from the Korean war through the prolonged conference at Panmunjom.

Needless to say, the Communists hope to achieve at the conference table the victory which has been denied them on the field of battle.

And the formula they have chosen for this is a call for the return to the Geneva Convention of 1954.

I have myself seen at least a dozen broadcasts from Moscow and even from Peiping over the past 2 months calling for a return to the Geneva Convention. And only this week the papers announced that the Soviet leaders had issued a joint statement with the Danish Prime Minister, on the conclusion of his visit to Moscow, deploring the war in Vietnam, and calling for its termination through a recommitment to the terms of the Geneva Agreement.

Now it is a pretty good rough rule of thumb that anything the Communists consider good for themselves is almost certainly not good for the free world. But unfortunately so much confusion has been generated about the Geneva Convention that there are many people in our own country—and they are by no means confined to those who oppose the Vietnam war—who are convinced that there would have been no war in Vietnam if we had not encouraged President Diem to violate the Geneva Convention, and who believe that the way to settle the dispute is to return to this formula on which the interested parties had previously agreed.

It is my conviction that the Geneva Agreements were a fraud perpetrated on a still naive and gullible Western World by the Communist powers.

The Communists never intended to abide by the restrictions which the agreements theoretically imposed on them; and the record is overwhelming that the Communists were in violation of the agreements from the first day.

On the other hand, they sought to use the Geneva Agreements to prevent the South Vietnamese Government from defending itself and to compel the integration of the South with the North under terms that could only have led to the communization of the complete country.

COMMUNIST SABOTAGE OF THE GENEVA AGREEMENTS

The public confusion on the origins of the Vietnamese war stems in large measure from the sabotage by the Communist members of the three-nation International Control Commission set up to supervise the carrying out of the Geneva Agreements.

By 1961, reports of 1,200 offensive incidents by Communist agents, ranging from one-man assassinations to large-scale military actions, had been presented to the Commission.

The Commission, however, took no action because the Polish Communist member consistently refused to investigate reports of North Vietnamese intervention in South Vietnam.

In this way, this entire massive body of evidence of Hanoi's intervention in South Vietnam was muted and rendered ineffective.

Mr. President, during the course of the past summer, I had an exchange of correspondence with Mr. Theodore Beaubien Blockley, a former member of the Canadian foreign service who, in the post-Geneva period, served as senior political adviser to the Canadian Commissioner to the International Control Commission for Vietnam, and as legal counselor to the Canadian Commissioners for Laos and Cambodia as well as Vietnam. He also served for some period of time as the acting leader of the Canadian delegation in Hanoi.

I was so impressed by what Mr. Blockley had to say about the manner in which the Geneva accords were manipulated and flouted by the Communists, that I asked Mr. Blockley whether he could provide me with a detailed account of his experiences which I might bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate. I felt that this would be particularly valuable, because no member of the International Control Commission has, to my knowledge, heretofore told the inside story.

I hope every Member of the Senate will read the full text of Mr. Blockley's letter. Here is a member of the Control Commission who served in North Vietnam during that period of time, and he now tells us what really went on.

On September 29, Mr. Blockley wrote me a long letter from which I plan to quote extensively in my further remarks. But before I do so, I would like to try to dispel some of the confusion that unfortunately exists about the terms of the Geneva agreement and about the purported violation of the agreement by the South Vietnamese Government and by the United States.

THE TERMS OF THE GENEVA AGREEMENTS

Insofar as they pertain to Vietnam, there were two items of importance in the group of documents generally referred to as the Geneva accords, or Geneva agreements.

The first was an agreement for a military truce signed by the French and the Vietminh. This truce called for the regroupment of the opposing military forces on both sides of the 17th parallel, provided that people wishing to move from one regroupment zone to the other might do so, and established a three-nation International Control Commission to supervise the truce.

This military agreement also placed ceilings and restrictions on the amount and type of military forces and equipment which might be maintained in each zone.

In addition to this truce between the French and Vietminh, there was also a curious document entitled a "Final Declaration" of the Geneva Conference. This document, signed by no person or no nation, called for, among other things, the holding of free elections in July 1956 to establish democratic institutions under which the country might be unified.

It should be clear to even the most inexperienced lawyer that such unsigned declarations bind no one and that unilateral declarations, such as those issued by the United States and the State of Vietnam at the Geneva Conference, have just as much validity, if not more. At least they were signed by someone.

At the final session of the Geneva Conference on Indochina on July 21, 1954, the Vietnamese delegate formally protested "against the hasty conclusions of the armistice agreement by the French and Vietminh high commands only," and against various provisions of the agreement.

He protested particularly "against the fact that the French high command was pleased to take the right, without a preliminary agreement of the delegation of the State of Vietnam, to set the date of further elections."

He concluded by saying:

> The Government of the state of Vietnam wished the conference to take note of the fact that it reserves the full freedom of action in order to safeguard the sacred right of the Vietnamese people to territorial unity, national independence, and freedom.

The United States took the position in its declaration that it would support the Geneva Agreements and would view with concern any attempt to upset them with force.

On the subject of reunification, we maintained we would support the principle of free elections under United Nations supervision.

The South Vietnamese authorities also announced that they would not interfere with the provisions of the Franco-Vietminh truce, but they made it plain that they bitterly resented the artificial division of their country.

But putting aside this question of who agreed to what at Geneva, and putting aside the fact that the final declaration is an obscurely worded document, it is plain that the documents issuing from this conference 10 years ago were quite clear on what sort of elections were to be held in Vietnam. They were to be free elections. And it has been as plain as a pike-staff for the past decade that by no stretch of the imagination could free elections ever have been held in North Vietnam.

Free elections would only have been possible throughout the territory of Vietnam if, over the 2-year period between the Geneva Convention and the proposed date of the elections, there had been complete freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom of political organization in the North, as well as the South.

In the South, these conditions were at least met within certain limits.

But in the North the victorious Vietminh regime proceeded immediately to the imposition of a totalitarian Communist regime. The press and radio were taken over by the state. Opposition political organizations were illegalized. Scores of thousands of oppositionists were murdered and hundreds of thousands imprisoned.

You do not, however, have to take my word for the above statements. I want to quote from Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, the current Defense Minister of North Vietnam, as he spoke to the 10th Congress of the North Vietnamese Communist Party in October of 1956:

> We made too many deviations and executed too many honest people. We attacked on too large a front and, seeing enemies everywhere, resorted to terror, which became far too widespread.
>
> Whilst carrying out our land reform program we failed to respect the principles of freedom of faith and worship in many areas.
>
> When reorganizing the party, we paid too much importance to the notion of social class instead of adhering firmly to political qualifications alone. Instead of recognizing education to be the first essential, we resorted exclusively to organizational measures such as disciplinary punishments, expulsion from the party, executions, dissolution of party branches and cells. Worse still, torture came to be regarded as a normal practice during party reorganization.

So, 3 months after the time that free elections were to be held in Vietnam, we have the spectacle of the North Vietnamese themselves admitting they were running a police state where executions, terror, and torture were commonplace.

Free elections under such circumstances would have been a travesty of the letter as well as the spirit of the final declaration of the Geneva Conference.

I have already made the point that the appendix to the Geneva Convention calling for national elections in 1956 was not legally binding on the government of South Vietnam.

But if one wishes to argue that this clause was binding on both sides, then it is clear that North Vietnam was from the very first in violation of the Geneva Accord on this point because its very first act was to destroy all those political preconditions which might have made free elections possible.

COMMUNISM AND DEMOCRATIC ELECTIONS

There is another matter to which the current advocates of nationwide elections in Vietnam have not, I believe, given adequate consideration.

Their advocacy is generally justified on the grounds that a nationwide election is the only democratic and reasonable manner of settling the Vietnam dispute.

Most of them would, I believe, be prepared to concede that Communists, when they engage in election campaigns or when they seek to win the support of the people in a country or an area they do not yet control, generally masquerade as non-Communists.

Thus the Bolsheviks promised the peasants peace, bread, and land.

The Chinese Communists presented themselves as agrarian reformers.

Ho Chi Minh presented himself as a nationalist, anticolonialist leader.

Fidel Castro pretended to be a constitutionalist democrat in revolt against the Batista dictatorship.

But when they came to power Lenin and Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh and Fidel Castro all dropped their masks, and set about the business of erecting totalitarian Communist states and collectivizing their peasants and terrorizing their subjects.

Neither the people of the Soviet Union nor the people of China nor the people of Vietnam nor the people of Cuba nor the people of any other Communist state ever voted for communism as such or ever gave their support to a movement which promised them communism. They were defrauded—but by the time they discovered that they had been defrauded, it was too late to do anything about it.

I believe that most of those who advocate a nationwide election as a solution for the Vietnam impasse, would also be prepared to concede that, once the Communists establish themselves in power, they do not accord their subjects the option of voting them out of power if they are dissatisfied with their rule.

What they are proposing, in effect, therefore, is that we agree to a one-time election in Vietnam. And if the people of North Vietnam who have been under Communist Party discipline for 12 years are pressured into voting for the Communist slate, and if they are joined by a sufficient number of people in South Vietnam who have been led to believe that they are voting for national independence, the result of the election must be considered binding for all time by all countries because, so the argument goes, the Vietnamese people will have opted for communism.

In my opinion, any such one-time election is a travesty on democracy and has absolutely nothing to do with the process of self-determination.

For my own part, I would be prepared to agree to nationwide elections in Vietnam if strong international machinery could be set up to assure the Vietnamese people of complete political democracy for a period of several years after the election, with the understanding that there would be a second election at the end of that time.

I am convinced that in any such second election the people would turn against the Communists in as overwhelming numbers as the Hungarian people turned against their Communist regime. But I am also convinced that no Communist regime would ever or could ever agree to such democratic elections because the Communists also know that such elections would mean the end of communism.

Communist violations of the Geneva Convention were not confined to the establishment of a totalitarian state.

Article 15 of the agreement on Vietnam said that withdrawals of the regular armed forces were to take place without hindrance, destruction, or sabotage of any public property, and without injury to the civilian population. Dr. Frank N. Trager, professor of international affairs at New York University and one of this country's leading experts on southeast Asia, has pointed out in a recent issue of "Vietnam Perspectives":

> As a matter of record the withdrawal of the Vietminh forces from the zone of the south was accompanied by considerable looting and destruction of public buildings and railroads, systematic destruction or theft of the files, documents, and especially land registries in the upper provinces close to the 17th parallel, and kidnaping or murder of local officials. But, by contrast to the activity of the irregulars who were left behind, these were transient woes visited upon the Government and the people of South Vietnam.

Professor Trager went on to point out that in 1955 the irregular cadres who have been left behind in South Vietnam were formally organized into the so-called army of liberation and that it was at this early date that the Communists embarked upon their systematic campaign of terror and kidnaping and sabotage and military action disguised as internal revolt against the Government of South Vietnam.

In a memorandum to the Soviet Government in April 1956, the British Government refused to accept the statement that the South Vietnamese authorities had been breaching the military articles of the Geneva agreement, and presented figures to prove that it was in fact North Vietnam which had been breaching the military clauses of the agreement.

Let me quote from this British memorandum for the purpose of helping to reestablish some perspective on what really happened:

> The Soviet Government was no doubt aware that similar accusations by the Vietminh high command have already been investigated by the International Commission and, as explained in the Commission's fourth and fifth interim reports, shown to be without foundation.
>
> Nor can Her Majesty's government give any credence to the charge of preparation of "military cadres" for the so-called campaign to the north with the aim of starting a new war in Indochina. In this connection Her Majesty's government consider that a comparison of military developments in North and South Vietnam provide the best guide to the attitude and intentions of the authorities in the two zones.
>
> At the time of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities, the force at the disposal of the French Union high command in Vietnam amounted to approximately 300,000 men. Since then over 100,000 French troops have been withdrawn and there will soon be none left, while the Vietnamese Army has been reduced by 20,000 men. In North Vietnam, however, there has been no such reduction in military strength since the conclusion of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities. On the contrary, the Vietminh Army has been so greatly strengthened by the men and reequipment of irregular forces that, instead of the 7 Vietminh divisions in existence in July 1964 there are now no less than 20. The striking contrast between mas-

> sive military expansion in the north and the withdrawal and reduction of military forces in the south speaks for itself.

Mr. Blockley, in his letter to me, said that the evidence of espionage, subversion, and sabotage by the North Vietnamese Government was so massive that he was able to get the Legal Committee of the Commission to bring in an unanimous report on this subject. But then, says Mr. Blockley:

> The signing Polish member was recalled, the report repudiated by the Poles, and the Indian legal adviser got his knuckles severely rapped by New Delhi.

Mr. Blockley went on to point out that the story of what happened in North Vietnam after the Geneva Convention is largely unknown because the minutes of the meetings of the International Control Commission and texts of the various majority and minority reports have not been published. He said that these documents would reveal a "constant and flagrant flouting by the Communists" of the terms of the convention and that, despite instructions from their governments to keep contention to a minimum, "The Canadians were compelled to register their dissent from the protection accorded the North Vietnamese by the Poles and Indians on a number of occasions."

Mr. Blockley further expressed the opinion:

> The agreement was never really intended to work, and the Commission was always intended to be a facade behind which the Communists * * * were able to mount the assault which finally broke in full fury a few months ago.

Mr. Blockley said that the agreement was hardly signed before the Communist North Vietnamese Government had breached it. He pointed out that although almost a million non-Communists managed to get away from North Vietnam as the French were surrendering, the agreement provided for exit permits for all others who wished to leave. These were denied tens of thousands of persons of whom the Commission had knowledge. "How many millions more there were of whom the Commission had no knowledge we shall never know,'" Mr. Blockley said in his letter.

The Commission did know that there was a large-scale revolt in one of the provinces of North Vietnam, said Mr. Blockley, largely over the matter of the refusal of the North Vietnamese authorities to issue the exit permits which had been promised the local population, and to which they were entitled under the agreement. Canadians serving on the Commission's local team saw evidence of the suppression of the revolt with their own eyes, he said, and received full accounts, but the Commission would not, and could not, do anything about it.

Early attempts by some Canadians and a very few Indians to insist that the North Vietnamese carry out the terms of the agreement in respect to certain individuals were tantamount to sentences of death for them, Mr. Blockley reported. The Canadian delegation and even the Indian delegation destroyed thousands of petitions from people in North Vietnam who clearly came within the protecting clauses of the agreement so that there would be no chance of the petitions falling into the hands of the Communist authorities.

During Chou En-lai's state visit to Hanoi, Mr. Blockley was invited, as acting leader of the delegation at the time, to attend the numerous receptions which were accorded Chou. In the course of the evening, he had two long talks with Ho Chi Minh and two with Chou En-lai.

Early next morning, said Mr. Blockley, he was roused by the delegation officer of the day who informed him that a mob had gathered at the delegation office building, and had forced itself into the courtyard of the building, despite the effort of armed Communist guards, and unarmed Canadian soldiers, to keep them out. He was driven hurriedly to the office building. The crowd, which was over a thousand and growing rapidly, let the car through when the orderly officer called out:

> C'est Monsieur l'Ambassadeur Canadien.

Entering the building courtyard, said Mr. Blockley, he found 200 or 300 more North Vietnamese milling around, with a score or so of anxious Canadian soldiers keeping them from going up the staircases into the offices themselves. He went up to a half-way landing on one of these staircases, and shouted for silence. Then he singled out an impressive looking Vietnamese matron to act as spokesman, demanding to know from her what the demonstration was all about. The matron told him that the rumor had quickly spread about Hanoi during the preceding evening and night that the Canadian delegation now enjoyed cordial relations with the Communist authorities, and would now be able to insure the issuance of exit permits to those who had been denied them.

So—she added quite simply to Mr. Blockley—

> I knew there would be thousands coming for them today, so I came early for mine, as have these other people.

In the meantime truckloads of armed police and soldiers had been arriving outside, and struggles were developing as they tried to seize people in the crowd. Shouting so that he could be heard above the commotion, Blockley managed to arrest these activities, and then he addressed the crowd from the outside staircase landing.

> Que vous êtes fous-fous-fous. How mad you are to come here—

He said—

> The Canadian delegation can never, never, never help you; the International Commission can never, never, help you—it does not want to help you. Never come near this building again, nor go near the Commission building. And tell everybody else so. Now, run, run, run, and get away as fast as you can.

As he cried out the last words, Blockley signaled to the Canadian soldiers who swung open the great gates, and the crowd in the courtyard erupted into the crowd outside, and all turned and scattered bowling over many police and soldiers who, miraculously, refrained from opening fire.

Mr. Blockley concluded his account of the incident with these words:

> Mercifully, only two or three truckloads of prisoners were borne off in the police vans. All efforts in the Commission subsequently to insure these luckless ones were not punished for attempting to exercise their rights under the Geneva Agreements went without success.

Mr. Blockley said that he frequently returned to his office or his residence to be greeted by North Vietnamese who had somehow managed to smuggle themselves in and who would then plead with him to save them, sometimes throwing their arms around his feet. Among them, he said, there were even some government officials. But since there was absolutely nothing he could do to help them escape, he had no alternative but to compel them to depart by threatening to call the Communist police.

Commenting on this entire experience, Mr. Blockley's letter said:

> In view of the Commission's sorry record of failure to extend any sort of protection to persons entitled to such protection under the Geneva Agreements, anyone who suggests it could do any better in assuring a terror-free election throughout North and South Vietnam must be utterly disingenuous, incredibly ignorant, or downright pro-Communist.

Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the complete text of my letter from Mr. Theodore Beaubien Blockley.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

WHAT KIND OF SETTLEMENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in preparing for the day when the Communists accept our invitation to meet us at the conference table, the first thing we must do, therefore, is to set the record straight in our own minds on the Geneva Convention, so that we will not again be entrapped by a call for a return to the Convention or by any formula similar to the Geneva Convention.

And we must also set the record straight in our own minds on the subject of coalition governments with Communists because I am convinced that such a coalition in Vietnam would be an invitation to total disaster.

The administration has advised the rulers of Hanoi that we place no preconditions on the convening of the diplomatic conference to terminate the hostilities in Vietnam.

But this does not mean that the administration is prepared to accept any conditions posed by the Communists or that it will consent to a peace which would, within a short period of time, result in turning South Vietnam over to Communist control.

President Johnson made this abundantly clear when he warned that there was no power on earth that could force us from Vietnam or that could compel us to abandon the Vietnamese people, who look to us for protection.

There are details of any agreement that cannot be foreseen. On the other hand, I cannot think of any more generous proposal for the settlement of the Vietnamese conflict than the proposal outlined by the administration earlier this year.

This proposal did not call for unconditional surrender on the part of North Vietnam.

It did not even call for compensation to South Vietnam or for territorial concessions on the part of the North.

It asked simply that Hanoi call off its war of aggression against the Government of South Vietnam—and, in return for this, it offered North Vietnam the prospect of participating as a beneficiary in the multibillion-dollar Mekong River plan.

Less than this we could not demand.

More than this we cannot offer, without gravely compromising the freedom of South Vietnam for which so many American boys have now given "the last full measure of devotion."

EXHIBIT 1

SEPTEMBER 29, 1965.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD,
Washington, D.C.,
United States of America.

DEAR SENATOR DODD: Thank you for inviting me to write and tell you of some of my experiences, and views I formed, while I was a member of the Canadian delegation to the International Control Commissions in Indochina. A career diplomat in the Canadian Foreign Service, I was, in 1957–58, Senior Political Adviser to the Canadian Commission on the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam (to give it its full name in English). I also served as legal adviser to all three Canadian Commissioners (for Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia) and also was acting leader of the delegation to the Vietnam Commission on a number of occasions. In the course of this service I had several conversations with Ho Chi-minh, Pham Van Dong and General Giap; and with Premier Chou-en-lai and several of the Russian leaders.

The study of the Geneva Agreements (1954) I was called on to make in connection with the performance of my duties led me to the firm conclusion that no legal or moral obligations devolved upon the Government of South Vietnam from the operation of the agreement relating to Vietnam.

The parties to this agreement were France, a defeated colonial power endeavoring to extricate itself from the consequences of a military defeat at the hands of an insurgent body, the other party to the agreement, which was itself opposed by another very large segment of the population.

By no norm of international law with which I am familiar could the onerous undertakings of a colonial power in favor of one segment of the population—of the national community—be regarded as devolving upon another segment of the community which was subsequently successful in wresting its own independence from the colonial power.

As signatories of the agreement, both France and North Vietnam are in breach of the agreement, but it is absurd to talk of the United States or South Vietnam, who opposed the agreement, as having "broken" it.

In any event the agreement was hardly signed before the Communist North Vietnamese Government had breached it. Although almost a million non-Communists managed to get away from North Vietnam as the French were surrendering (an extraordinary mass "voting with the feet" to which I have seen little reference recently), the agreement provided for exit permits for all others who wished to leave. These were denied tens of thousands of persons of whom the Commission had knowledge; how many millions more there were of whom the Commission had no knowledge we shall never know. The Commission does know that there was a large-scale revolt in one of the Provinces of North Vietnam, largely over this matter of the refusal of the North Vietnamese authorities to issue the exit permits which had been promised the local population, and to which they were entitled under the agreement. Canadians serving on the Commission's local team saw evidence of suppression of the revolt with their own eyes, and received full accounts, but the Commission would not, and could not, do anything about it.

Early attempts by some Canadians and a very few Indians to insist that the North Vietnamese carry out the terms of the agreement in respect to certain individuals were tantamount to sentences of death for them. I have referred in an earlier letter to the hours spent by members of the Canadian delegation, including myself, in destroying thousands of petitions from people in North Vietnam who clearly came within the protecting clauses of the agreement, so that there would be no chance of the petitions falling into the hands of the Communist authorities. To give some of the Indians their due, I was told by some of them that they had done likewise with petitions addressed either to their delegation or to the Commission Secretariat.

During Chou En-lai's state visit to Hanoi, I was invited, as acting leader of the delegation at the time, to attend the numerous receptions which were accorded him. At the first of these I was singled out by Ho Chi Minh as the only person at the reception besides the guest of honor, Chou, with whom he conversed. In the course of the evening, I had two long talks with him, and two with Chou En-lai.

Early next morning I was roused by the delegation officer of the day who informed me a mob had gathered at the delegation office building, part of which had forced itself into the courtyard of the building, despite the effort of armed Communist guards, and unarmed Canadian soldiers, to keep them out. I was driven hurriedly to the office building, the crowd (which I estimated at over a thousand and growing rapidly) letting the car through when the orderly officer called out, "C'est M. l'Ambassadeur canadien."

Going through a postern in the main gates of the carriage entrance to the building courtyard, I found 200 or 300 North Vietnamese milling around in there, with a score or so of anxious Canadian soldiers keeping them from going up the staircases into the offices themselves. I went up to a half-way landing on one of these staircases and shouted for silence, then singled out an impressive looking Vietnamese matron to act as spokesman, demanding to know from her what the demonstration was all about. She told me the rumor had quickly spread about Hanoi during the preceding evening and night that the Canadian delegation now enjoyed cordial relations with the Communist authorities and would now be able to insure the issuance of exit permits to those who had been denied them. "So," she added quite simply, "I knew there would be thousands coming for them today, so I came early for mine, as have these other people."

In the meantime truckloads of armed police and soldiers had been arriving outside, and struggles were developing as they tried to seize people in the crowd. Shouting so that I could be heard above the commotion, I managed to arrest these activities, and then I addressed the crowd from the outside staircase landing. "Que vous êtes fous—fous—fous"—"How mad you are to come here" and going on in French, "The Canadian delegation can never, never, never help you—it does not want to help you. Never come near this building again, nor go near the Commission building. And tell everybody else so. Now, run, run, run, and get away as fast as you can."

As I cried out the last words I signalled to the Canadian soldiers who swung open the great gates, and the crowd in the courtyard erupted into the crowd outside, and all turned and scattered, bowling over many police and soldiers who, miraculously, refrained from opening fire (although we had heard rifle fire in Hanoi previous nights).

The last I saw of the marvelous old Vietnamese dame, she had kilted her ground-length skirts up to her knees, had nimbly dodged two or three soldiers and police, leaped into a pedicab which she must have arranged for beforehand, and careened off down the street, rounding a corner on two wheels while a policeman who had been pursuing her in another pedicab lay sprawled in the street, his pedicab operator, either deliberately or accidentally having upset in attempting to round the same corner.

Mercifully, only two or three truckloads of prisoners were borne off in the police vans. All efforts in the Commission subsequently to ensure these luckless ones were not punished for attempting to exercise their rights under the Geneva Agreements went without success.

In view of the Commission's sorry record of failure to extend any sort of protection to persons entitled to such protection under the Geneva Agreements, anyone who suggests it could do any better in assuring a terror free election throughout North and South Vietnam must be utterly disingenuous, incredibly ignorant or downright pro-Communist!

I will but briefly mention the dreadful experience of finding North Vietnamese in my office and in my residence—the Lord knows how they had managed to get in, evading both the Vietnamese and Canadian guards—who would then plead with me to save them by smuggling them out, breaking down and throwing their arms around my feet, even threatening me, and whom I in turn would have to threaten with calling the Communist police before they would leave. Some of these were actually government officials.

When I first arrived in Hanoi I was tendered a reception which was attended by many of the North Vietnamese leaders. Assigned an escorting officer who spoke impeccable French, and very good English, I managed to duck out from under his guard, leaving him pinned down by the British Consul-General and the French Delegate-General. I managed to slip off with three young majors of the North Vietnamese Army, one of whom, I noted—to the evident pleasure of all three—wore the "Hero of Dien Bien Phu" medal, North Vietnam's equivalent of the Medal of Honor. Quickly establishing rapport with the majors—I served for close to 15 years in the Canadian and British Armies and Air Forces—I turned the conversation to political matters. In an effort to convince me of the nobility of the ideals of communism, the "Hero of Dien Bien Phu" referred to the recent conduct of his chief, Col. Ha Van Lo, Head of the North Vietnamese Liaison Mission with the International Commission.

Col. Ha Van Lo, to whom I had been introduced, was standing across the room regarding us with a baleful stare. He looked like a character actor out of Hollywood central casting. A former mandarin, he had a long, thin, cruel, basilisk face—quite the most frightening I have ever seen. Col. Ha Van Lo, said the young major, had had a captive turned over to him quite recently. The captive was his own brother, an officer on the opposite side—in the South Vietnamese Army. Col. Ha Van Lo had then proceeded, personally, to torture his own brother to death—not too quickly—extracting a lot of useful information from him during the process, said my admiring informant. Didn't that prove what a magnificent thing communism must be, to make a man do that to his own brother? Fortunately, at this point my escorting officer came hurrying up to reclaim his charge!

From time to time there has been some measure of public outcry, in the United States, Canada, and in Europe, over the rough treatment sometimes accorded their prisoners by the South Vietnamese soldiery. But one rarely hears of the truly ghastly treatment of South Vietnamese captives by the North Vietnamese. Several of my own non-Communist friends have been most horrifyingly done to death by the Communists. One, Colonel Nam, had his poor shattered corpse dumped in front of his house in Saigon for his wife and children to find. No American photographer found it worth photographing.

As a lesser example of this strange dual morality—the new double standard—we seem to apply as between acts of the Communist world and acts by those on our own side—or perhaps it is only a double standard applied by our western press, radio, and television reporters, commentators, editorialists, all concerned with the International Commission seemed to take it for granted that the Canadians in North Vietnam should be restricted to a 3-block area around their living quarters and office buildings, whereas the Poles, in South Vietnam, would be permitted to go off to summer resorts like Cap St. Jaques, to wander about Saigon at will, and to enjoy the company of local Vietnamese. In my early days in Hanoi the only diversion for Canadians was to go for a postprandial walk around an artificial lake, with a beautiful little pagoda in the middle. It appeared to be the only place in the city where a modicum of privacy was possible, at night, because the Vietcong's operation of Hanoi's powerhouse was so inefficient, and the park lights merely glimmed at night.

The first night, walking alone, I joined the promenade round and round the "p'tit lac," and heard voices in the darkness say softly, "G'night Mister Canada," "Bon soir, M'sieu." At first I would turn to return the salutation, but would only encounter inscrutable Oriental faces, none seemingly aware of my presence. Shortly, I learned to reply looking straight ahead, without endeavoring to discover who had addressed me. After I had been in Hanoi a while, I learned that it was possible to hold conversations this way—the person talking with me remaining some distance to the side and alternatively moving ahead or falling behind, usually screened by two or three friends—all of us falling silent as newcomers approached.

After I had become friendly with a number of persons this way, mostly university students, 15 or 20 of them would cluster around a park bench which had, in preparation, been inched into the darkest spot in the park, between two glimmering lamp bulbs, at the farthest point from either. From these young men I learned that the whole student body of Hanoi University had been expelled and was being sent to work on the fields, with a complete new undergraduate year being brought in from the country. Hanoi youth were to be left to "cool off" and no high school graduates from the big city schools would be taken into the university that year. The wholesale expulsion was because of a protest by some 20 or 30 students over some issue which I do not remember, if I was ever told. The protesters themselves had disappeared; it was generally surmised they had been executed. The expulsion order applied even to the graduating medical course, and North Vietnam was desperately short of doctors.

I have endeavoured in this letter to give some small indication of the inadequacy of the Geneva Agreement relating to Vietnam, and the inability of the International Control Commission (as well as the lack of desire) to protect the people of Vietnam and to give them that freedom of choice which it was pretended was the objective, among others, of the Geneva Agreements.

In my opinion, the agreement was never really intended to work, and the Commission was always intended to be a facade behind which the Communists—and I do not mean merely the Polish or Vietnamese Communists—were able to mount the assault which finally broke in full fury a few months ago.

Espionage, subversion and sabotage was the subject of a unanimous report I finally managed to bring in in the Legal Committee of the Commission; the signing Polish member was recalled, the report repudiated by the Poles, and the Indian legal advisor got his knuckles severely rapped by New Delhi.

I have not gone into the minutiae of constant and flagrant flouting by the Communists of such restrictions as even the Agreement did place upon them; despite instructions to keep contention to a minimum, the Canadians were compelled to register their dissent from the protection accorded the North Vietnamese by the Poles and Indians on a number of occasions. I recommend that you ask the Canadian Government for their record of the Commission's activities, including majority and minority reports to the cochairmen and the minutes of the Commission's meetings. There is no doubt whatever that the Poles have made their record, and the meetings minutes, available to the North Vietnamese, the Chinese and the Russians. I myself have seen North Vietnamese officials with copies of the minutes of previous meetings in their possession.

There is, of course, the Canadian Government's white paper on the Vietnam Commission, issued quite recently, and, in line with this policy, there seems no reason why the Canadian Government should not give qualified Americans, such as the members of your committee, access to selected dispatches from the Canadian delegates and alternates to the Commission; after all, the U.S. State Department provides the Canadian Department of External Affairs with selected classified material which is very useful for the information of Canadian policymakers, and is released to Canada as an ally of the United States by order of the U.S. Government.

It is very hard for Canadians and Americans to realize that assassination is employed by the Communists as a means of political action, and the spoofing of the fact by novels, movies and television shows makes the idea still less credible to the average Canadian and American. But I have had official dealings with chairmen and secretaries of assassination committees, so designated officially by the North Vietnamese Government. These dealings were part of my duties as a member of the Commission. And the activities of the particular committees concerned extended far out of Vietnam and into Europe. The Communists also employ, of course, subtler assassinations than that of the body. Many people are deterred from coming forward and offering their assistance in the present struggle for these reasons.

But I should count myself a traitor to the spirit of man if I did not offer every assistance which I could give to help you in your work of trying to correct the error and sophistry—making the worse appear the better thing—associated with public consideration of the situation in Vietnam, not only outside the United States, but even within the United States itself. In 1936, although a Canadian, I joined the British Royal Air Force to play a small part in combating nazism—German national socialism; were I 20 today I should be trying to join the U.S. Air Force to make my small contribution in the struggle against Communist socialism, whose fruits I have seen. Regarded as too old today to join an Air Force, I am ready to do what I can.

With my highest regards,
Yours sincerely,
Theodore Beaubien Blockley.

Exhibit 2

[Vietnam perspective, August 1955]

Back to Geneva 1954?—An Act of Political Folly

(By Frank N. Trager, professor of international affairs at the Graduate School of Public Administration, New York University)

Various voices, including the distinguished U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman, have urged that in seeking an effective and reasonable settlement of the war in Vietnam "much (may) * * * be said for a return to the Geneva Accords in 1954, not just in their 'essentials' but in all their specifications." (Senator J. W. Fulbright, "Address on Vietnam," the New York Times, June 16, 1965.)

Close study of these agreements leads to an opposite conclusion neither the "essentials" nor the "specifications" of Geneva 1954 should be sought again. They were written in haste and ended in compromise with, and concessions to, the Communist powers. They add up to political folly. These agreements aided Communist North Vietnam to initiate further struggle against South Vietnam and prevented any objective peacekeeping machinery from performing its assigned function. They also fed the Pathet Loa in Laos and helped to bring the country almost to ruin. (The Western solution as proposed in the Geneva 1962 Agreements for Laos: majority voting within the Control Commission, more careful definition of the controls, freedom of movement for the Commission with provisions for its movement, are better than those of 1954, but still not good enough. They have been effectively negated by the Pathet Lao military hold on the territory now legally assigned to them—territory contiguous to China and to North Vietnam which they have illegally held since and because of ambiguities in Geneva 1954.)

The 1954 agreements contain a declaration of 13 articles; and 3 agreements governing the "cessation of hostilities" in Cambodia (33 articles), Laos (41 articles) and Vietnam (47 articles). It is quite probable that those who recommend these "essential" and "specific" agreements have not fully studied them—or even, in many cases, read them.

Nine states took part in the Geneva 1954 Conference: Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (the Communist North), Laos, France, the People's Republic of China, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, the State of Vietnam (soon to become the Republic) and the United States. The latter two refused to sign the Declaration. They issued separate "declarations." The United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R. became the cochairmen to oversee the execution of the agreements. Though the Conference began (on the Korean questions) on April 26, it reached the Indochinese questions on May 8, ending on July 21.

The U.S. declaration held that it would abide by the Geneva Declaration provided that the signatories refrained in the future from the threat or use of force; it also indicated that "any renewal of the aggression in violation of the * * * Agreements" would be viewed "with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security"; and that it would "not join in an arrangement which would hinder" the peoples of Vietnam in determining their own future.

In this connection it should be emphasized that though neither the United States nor the Republic of Vietnam were signatories to the Geneva Agreements of 1954, this fact of itself did not wholly relieve the two governments from observing the provisions of these Agreements provided all other parties to them abided by them. There is precedent in international law for observing treaties and agreements which cover a zone or subject of interests even if a government is not signatory to the treaty. However, any breach of the articles of the agreement by any of the contracting parties automatically suspends or destroys the basis for compliance by other contracting or related parties. It certainly relieves nonsignatories from any actual or implied obligation to observe the provisions of the treaty or agreement.

It is clear that the U.S. representatives at Geneva had little confidence in its conclusions; that they expected trouble and therefore provided legitimate tests by which the United States could legally and honorably determine its course of action. Any objective examination of the post-Geneva conduct of North Vietnam with respect to the key provisions of the Agreements; military matters, treatment of civilian populations in the zone of the south from which its cadres were to depart and in its own territory, and aiding and abetting internal subversion, yields data sufficient to declare that the Democratic Republic of Vietnam violated the Agreements almost as soon as they were signed. Those who now say that the United States was (and is) guilty of violation when in the critical years, 1954–56, it applied the tests written into the Agreements to determine the bona fides of the contracting parties, are either misinformed or willing dupes of a Communist propaganda line.

The various non-Communist state delegations at Geneva were in part the victims of French political pressure, created by Premier Mendes-France who came to power in mid-June on a policy which promised a solution to the Geneva conference and the end of the Franco-Vietnamese war by July 21 or his resignation. Premier Mendes-France was openly in opposition to the U.S.-supported European Defense Community concept—as was the U.S.S.R. He thereby gained (in secret sessions) some cooperation from Molotov, the Russian representative, in fulfilling his timetable but at the expense of compromises and concessions which the Western powers and the State of Vietnam had not wanted to make. Since the Geneva Conference was called to end the hostilities in French Indo-China, and since France was to be the cosigner of the cessation of hostilities agreements with the Communist North Vietnam, as well as with the Kingdoms of Laos and Cambodia, the Western powers reluctantly and unwisely acquiesced in France's position.

The assorted 134 articles of the Geneva Agreements[1] treat 5 major topics: The cease-fire; regroupment of forces and treatment of populations; post-cease-fire military assistance; elections; and international supervisory arrangements to guarantee the first 4.

1. Cease-fire: The Western powers wanted to insure agreement on cease-fire before political questions were discussed. The Communists insisted on their being coupled and won out since the military situation had been steadily going against the French, climaxed by the fall of Dienbienphu on the very day, May 8, when the discussions on Indo-China began. The Communist delegations (as in 1965) made a determined bid to include the Communist Khmer (Cambodian) and Pathet Lao forces as regular members of the Geneva Conference on the grounds that these were "national liberation forces." Here, at least the opposition of the royal Lao and Cambodian governments prevailed over the Vietminh (Communists) delegation from Hanoi. But the latter won a major concession, as we shall see, when this type of question came up under regroupment. Though the cease-fire agreements prohibited the "resumption of hostilities" (Cmd. 9239, Vietnam, article 10, 19 and 24) and though these articles refer to "armed forces" and "regular troops," nothing that the Americans and the British could do succeeded in persuading the French negotiators to insist that "irregular" i.e. guerrilla forces, be included in this prohibition.

Withdrawals of the regular armed forces, including equipment and supplies (Cmd. 9239, Vietnam, article 15), were to be completed within 300 days. They were to take place without hindrance, destruction or sabotage of any public property and without injury to the civil population. As a matter of record the withdrawal of the Vietminh forces from the zone of the south was accompanied by considerable looting and destruction of public buildings and railroads, systematic destruction or theft of the files, documents and especially land registries in the upper provinces close to the 17th parallel, and kidnaping or murder of local officials. But by contrast to the activity of the "irregulars" who were left behind these were transient woes visited upon the Government and people of South Vietnam.

Immediately after the Geneva Agreements were signed, the leader of North Vietnam, Ho Chi Minh, publicly vowed to bring about the reunification of his state with that of the Republic of Vietnam. There is nothing reprehensible in such a view. Many Vietnamese, like many Germans and Koreans are pledged to the eventual reunification of their countries. What is at issue is the methods employed to achieve the goal. In 1955, the Vietminh "irregular" cadres in the South organized what came to be called the "Army of Liberation" and began its military, terror, and kidnaping operations against the Republic of Vietnam.

In mid-1956 I toured the delta of South Vietnam to visit installations of the Philippine-manned Operation Brotherhood, a medical and social work nongovernmental aid effort and the Cai San resettlement villages of northerners who voted with their feet against the Communist north. In both areas we had to have military protection because our jeeps and canal boats were subject to Vietminh fire. The country was at war with an enemy led, trained, inspired, and encouraged by Communists whose loyalty was to Hanoi, and who were attempting to overthrow a legitimate government which had become a republic the previous year.

The irregulars using arms and ammunition cached prior to the withdrawal of the regular armed forces, were the cadres of the Vietminh; i.e. the Communist north, left behind in the south to carry out guerrilla warfare as planned. They operated under various names such as the Patriotic Front or United Front or Fatherland Front. Estimates vary but somewhere between 5,000 to 10,000 irregulars were thus available in the south to conduct warfare. And though the armed forces of the contracting parties were not to commit acts and operations, nothing was said in the agreements about infiltration, terrorism, assassination, and covert military operations—classic aspects of Communist tactics—which could be and were conducted by these irregulars.

2. Regroupment and treatment of population: The aim of the Communists was to insist on large regroupment and assembly areas which could then be controlled by their forces. The Western Powers apparently never agreed on what they wanted. The Cambodians won out on having no regroupment area in their state—only withdrawals. But the Communists, also won out elsewhere by demanding the north and northeastern provinces of Laos and then settling for those provinces contiguous to Communist China and North Vietnam—a position further reinforced by the Geneva 1962 agreements.

Each party (Cmd. 9239, art. 14c) undertook to refrain from "reprisals or discrimination against persons or organizations on account of their activities during the hostilities and to guarantee democratic liberties." The Communists used this to attack the Diem government when it sought to repress the (northern) army of liberation which began to operate in 1955. But, it used terror, assassination, and suppression to wipe out dissident, anti-Communist leadership in the north. And, as we shall see, inspections could not or were not undertaken.

According to article 14d, during the 300 days assigned to military regroupment and exchanges, civilians were to enjoy the option of choosing to remain or to depart from residence. This period was extended by agreement to a new cut-off date, July 25, 1955. By then approximately 861,000 persons left the North for the South, as against less than 5,000 choosing the North. This latter figure must be coupled with approximately 100,000 Vietminh troops of various kinds inclusive of their dependents who went north as part of the military exchange. However, the obvious disparity in numbers led the North to impose restrictions and brutal punishments on those who sought to go South. Summary arrests, denial of permits, intimidation by "show trials" of those who served as leaders of the exodus and executions, served to inhibit the exercise of the option. Residual petitions affecting 95,000 persons in the North were presented to the International Control Commission. Nothing ever came of these. They and an unknown number were never allowed to leave the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.[2]

3. Military Assistance: Articles 16–19 (Vietnam) banned "troop reinforcements," "additional military personnel," new war material, new bases and foreign controlled bases. These terms were either not defined or ill-defined. Rotation, replacement of war material, etc. were permitted under inspection. But the inspection teams were not allowed to function particularly in the classified military security areas of North Vietnam close to the Chinese border. And though the American military advisers replaced the French after 1955–56, the Viet-

---

[1] The Geneva Agreements are to be found in "Documents Relating to the Discussion of Korea and Indo-China at the Geneva Conference; and Further Documents" (London: HMSO, 1954), (Cmd. 9186 and 9239).

[2] The refugee problem was one of the most far-reaching issues at the time. See Richard W. Lindholm, ed. "Vietnam, The First Five Years" (Michigan State University Press, 1959), pp. 48–103. There is much supporting evidence for the approximated 861,000 figure used above. It climbed in subsequent years by illegal immigration—perhaps another 100,000.

minh argued their illegality and protested while its own forces were augmented by Sino-Soviet materials and advisers and while it was augmenting the Vietcong forces within South Vietnam. Nothing was said in these agreements about the size of national armies, local production of arms and other aspects of war-potential which might make it possible for one state to threaten the security of another.

4. Elections. Though the Western Powers originally suggested that these be postponed until security was established, the Russians proposed elections in 1 year and because of Mendes-France secured an agreement that election consultations be started in 1 year (July 1955) and held not later than July 1956. The French thereby agreed to a provision which they would have no future right or power to enforce. The state of Vietnam had indicated that it would accept elections only if the country were not partitioned and if the United Nations would supervise such elections "so as to insure their freedom and genuineness." Obviously such conditions never were met. And by 1956, the Vietminh organs of repression within the Democratic Republic of Vietnam had made it well-nigh impossible to hold free elections within that Communist country.

5. The International Control and Supervision Commission: Article 34 (Vietnam) created the ICC—as it came to be called—composed, as a compromise, of representatives of three states: India, chairman, Canada, and Poland. The ICC was charged with control and supervision of all the foregoing operations. It was to set up fixed and mobile inspection teams. If the inspection teams could not settle an incident they could report to the Commission. The latter had the power to decide some issues by majority vote (article 41) but "questions concerning violations, or threats of violations, which might lead to a resumption of hostilities * * * must be unanimous" (article 42). These, of course, were the major issues and they required unanimity. Further, any member of the ICC could insist that a question at issue came under article 42, not 41.

The effect was stultification. This was the first application of Moscow's "troika" principle, later advanced for the United Nations itself. Poland could always veto an issue if it was not consonant with Communist policy—and did so. India, especially before its ox was gored by the Chinese Communists, refused to cast a majority vote even on the lesser questions because it would "increase tensions" or some such rot. As a result, the ICC, unable to provide for its own mobility, frequently deprived of necessary help from both Vietnam states, powerless to come to a decision on important matters, served little if any useful purpose. Even Canada, in the first critical months of the ICC chose to interpret its role as an "impartial" one and sought to play out the game as if its impartiality would assist in an ultimate decision-making potential within the ICC. Canada—and all other interested parties learned better later. On those rare occasions when the ICC arrived at recommendations, it lacked sanctions to enforce them. If one of the states refused to accept a recommendation, the best the ICC would do was to refer the matter to the Geneva Conference Cochairmen, the United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R. (article 43). Obviously the Soviets had yet another forum for its in-built veto.

The Geneva Agreements were thus inept, hopelessly ensnared in a mess of irresolution, ill-defined, with no policeman capable of handling any but the most unimportant complaints and minor violations. To go back to their "essentials" or their "specifications" is to go back to a political sieve helpful only in advancing the Communist cause of warfare at the lower end of the spectrum: infiltration, subversion, guerrilla activity—the so-called wars of national liberation.

As another Johnson (Dr. Samuel), said, "Let there be an end on it, sir."

EXHIBIT 3

[From Time, Oct 22, 1965]

SOUTH VIETNAM—A NEW KIND OF WAR

It was only 3 months ago that the lethal little men in black pajamas roamed the length and breadth of South Vietnam marauding, maiming and killing with impunity. No highway was safe by night, and few by day; the trains had long since stopped running. From their tunneled redoubts, the Communist Vietcong held 65 percent of South Vietnam's land and 55 percent of its people in thrall. Saigon's armies were bone weary and bleeding from defections. As the momentum of their monsoon offensive gathered, the Communists seemed about to cut the nation in half with a vicious chop across the central highlands. The enemy was ready to move in for the kill, and South Vietnam was near collapse.

Today South Vietnam throbs with a pride and power, above all an esprit, scarcely credible against the summer's somber vista. Government desertion rates have plummeted and recruitment is up, and it is now the Communists who are troubled with rising defections. Some roads are being reopened for the first time in years, and the much-vaunted Vietcong plan to move into their mass attack third phase is now no more than a bedraggled dream.

The remarkable turnabout in the war is the result of one of the swiftest, biggest military buildups in the history of warfare. Everywhere today South Vietnam bustles with the U.S. presence. Bulldozers by the hundreds carve sandy shore into vast plateaus for tent cities and airstrips. Howitzers and trucks grind through the once-empty green highlands. Wave upon wave of combat-booted Americans—lean, laconic and looking for a fight—pour ashore from armadas of troopships. Day and night, screaming jets and prowling helicopters seek out the enemy from their swampy strongholds in southernmost Camau all the way north to the mountain gates of China. The Vietcong's once-cocky hunters have become the cowering hunted as the cutting edge of U.S. firepower slashes into the thickets of Communist strength. If the United States has not yet guaranteed certain victory in South Vietnam, it has nonetheless undeniably averted certain defeat. As one top-ranking U.S. officer put it: "We've stemmed the tide."

"WE WILL STAND"

It was late July when the President of the United States summoned his aids to a 3-day secret session to deliberate Vietnam. Just back from Saigon was Defense Secretary Robert McNamara with the grim prognosis of peril. When Johnson announced his decision, it was the most significant for American foreign policy since the Korean War: "We will stand in Vietnam." To stand meant in fact that the United States would go to Vietnam in overwhelming force and stay until the job was done. Why? "If we are driven from the field in Vietnam," the President told the Nation and the world, "then no nation can ever again have the same confidence in American promise or in American protection."

By then, 75,000 American servicemen already were present in South Vietnam or pledged to go. The President promised 50,000 more by the end of this year, and the promise was soon outstripped by the deed. The 50,000 were on the scene by mid-September—and they just kept coming. Today the total is 145,000, and it will pass 200,000 by New Year's Day. Target by next summer: 280,000.

Appropriately, the world's most mobile division, the 1st Cavalry (Airmobile)—or "the First Team," as its men proudly style themselves—was among the first off the mark. Within 2 weeks after Johnson's announcement, the first of four supply ships carrying the bulk of the division's 428 helicopters was on its way, and on their heels came the first of the division's 16,000 men, commanded by Maj. Gen. Harry William Osborn Kinnard. At the same time, an advance party of 1,000 men, 254 tons of equipment and 9 "huey" helicopters was quietly whisked to Vietnam from the division's Fort Benning base in a secret, 7-day airlift.

By late August the advance party was on the job: preparing near An Khe deep in the Vietcong-infested Central Highlands a giant helipad for the first team's covey of copters. The division's assistant commander, Brig. Gen. John M. Wright, took machete in hand to show his men how to do it, chopping away the scrub without disturbing the grass, so as to avoid dust storms as the choppers rotated in and out. Today the first team's garrison at An Khe is the largest concentration of fighting men and machinery in southeast Asia since the French left Indo-China in 1954—and predictably its well-turfed 12,000 square feet helipad is known far and wide as "the golf course."

BUILDING TO STAY

If "the golf course" is a triumph of sweat and ingenuity, Cam Ranh Bay, a building 190 miles north of Saigon, is the manifesto of American engineering. Fifteen miles long, 5 miles wide, deep enough for any ocean vessel, rimmed by smooth, sun-blanched beaches, Cam Ranh Bay was probably the world's most underdeveloped great natural harbor. Until, that is, 4 months ago—when the 4,000 men of the 35th Engineer Group went to work.

With bulldozers and dynamite, they have moved mountains of sand, built some 40 miles of road, helped construct a 10,000-foot runway from which the first jets will blast off against the enemy next month. Ammo depots, a 10-tank fuel dump with a capacity of 230,000 gallons, and a T-pier are all under construction; next month a floating 350-foot De Long pier will be towed in from Charleston, S.C.

When finished early next year at a cost that may run as high as $100 million, Cam Ranh will be a port the size of Charleston, easing the pressure on Saigon's chockablock facilities. It will need all the dock space the engineers can clear: one measure of the U.S. commitment in Vietnam is that last January only 65,000 tons of military equipment were fed into the nation by sea; during November more than 750,000 tons will arrive—a tenfold increase. Eventually, Cam Ranh's facilities will be able to store 45 days' supply for all the U.S. forces in central Vietnam. As much as any single installation in Vietnam, Cam Ranh is concrete and steel testimony that the United States is in southeast Asia to stay.

PX'S AND PUP TENTS

Around South Vietnam's four present jet fields—Da Nang, Chu Lai, Bien Hoa, and Saigon—are clustered most of the rest of the U.S. presence in Vietnam. On the "hot pads" at the runway ends of each stand the silver planes, bombs aboard, on phased alert: the first wave is on 5-minute call, the next on 15-minute call, then a group on 30-minute call, finally a wave on an hour's notice. On the average, within 17 minutes of a platoon leader's radioed call for help, the jets can be over the target with almost any combination of weapons he might need: .50-caliber machinegun bullets, cannon shells, Bull

Pup missiles, Zuni rockets, napalm, 260-pound to 3,000-pound bombs. At the newest of the fields, Chu Lai, leveled and surfaced with aluminum matting by the Seabees in less than 30 days last spring, the runway is still so short that the jets take off in a double-throated roar of engines and jet-assisted takeoff bottles, sometimes returning to land carrier-style with an arresting cable at runway's end.

The marines at Chu Lai are accustomed to the roar over their tents on the steaming dunes. Less easy to take has been the choking dust, now damped down by the first northern monsoons, and the fact that the nearest liberty is the Marine headquarters town of Da Nang. "That's like being allowed to leave the State prison to go to the county jail," snorts one leatherneck. In Da Nang and Phu Bai, the rains have turned the infernal red dust into infernal red mud, in which a truck can sink to its door handles. On the perimeters, the marines and infantrymen live like soldiers on perimeters everywhere—primitively, with pup tents, ponchos, and C-rations. The airmen at Da Nang boast big, airy tents with screened windows and solid floors, a new PX and messhall. Most of the 173d Airborne and Big Red One troops at Bien Hoa now have hot meals and floors under their tents.

FROM DEFENSE TO OFFENSE

The U.S. military has been in Vietnam in an advisory role to Government forces ever since the French were swept out in 1954—a role that grew with the swelling magnitude of the Vietcong threat until eventually it required 24,000 men. But it was not until last March, when the 9th Marine Expeditionary Brigade of 3,500 men swarmed ashore at Danang, that the first U.S. combat troops entered the fray. Like the 7,500 men of the 173d Airborne Brigade, and the 101st Airborne's Danang 1st Brigade that soon followed, the marines' first assignment was defensive: creating a protective enclosure around bustling Danang airbase and harbor. The 173d was thrown around Bien Hoa Airbase, together with the 2d Brigade of the 1st Infantry Division—the Big Red One—which arrived in July. The Screaming Eagles of the 101st helped reopen Route 19 from the coast to An Khe, stood watch while the 1st Air Cavalry's advance party hacked out their "golf course."

Standing watch was all that many critics thought U.S. combat troops would—or could—do in Vietnam. Even as the number of GIs swelled, the myth remained that Americans were somehow not up to the wiles of the Vietcong or the woes of the Asian jungle.

U.S. troops were soon besting the Vietcong in fire fights from Chu Lai to An Khe. The 34,000 marines in Vietnam boast a 5 to 1 kill ratio over the enemy, have spread their original beachhead until now they control 400 square miles of territory. When a bad bit of intelligence unloaded the 101st Screaming Eagles from their helicopters right into a battalion of Vietcong near An Khe, the Eagles fought hand-to-mortar until the field was theirs. Soon the increasing aggressiveness of American ground troops everywhere was adding yet another dimension of fear and uncertainty for the Vietcong, already long harassed by U.S. air and sea power.

PLANES AND SHIPS

The United States first bombed the north in August 1964 in tit-for-tat retaliation for a torpedo-boat attack on two 7th Fleet destroyers in the Tonkin Gulf. Regular bombings began last February; since then United States and South Vietnamese planes have flown more than 50,000 sorties against the enemy. The 800 planes in use range from the old prop-driven Skyraider, whose fond jockeys insist that it can fly home with nearly as much enemy lead in it as the 4 tons of bombs it can carry out, to the droop-nosed, brutal-looking ("It's so damn ugly it's beautiful") F-4B Navy Phantom, at 1,700 miles per hour the fastest machine in the Vietnamese skies. Then there is the Navy's Intruder, a computer-fed, electronics-crammed attack ship that virtually flies itself once aloft.

Along with the fighter-bombers goes a covey of other craft; jammers to knock out the enemy's radar, flying command and communications posts, planes whose radar sweeps the sky for signs of attacking Communist aircraft. RF-101 photoreconnaissance planes dive into the smoke to film the raid's damage for analysis back home, using strobelike parachute flares at night. Backing the raids also are the planes and helicopters of the Air Rescue Service, ready to pluck a downed airman out of the enemy heartland.

Some 400 of the daily strike planes are based aboard the carriers of Task Force 77 of the U.S. Navy's 7th Fleet. The two flattops on "Yankee Station" shoot their planes off over North Vietnam, while the "Dixie Station" carrier normally hits only Vietcong in the south. The 30 ships, 400 warplanes and 27,000 men of "77" are not included in the 145,000-man total of forces now in Vietnam. But they are very much a part of the war, and not merely of the air war. When U.S. Marines systematically took apart a Vietcong regiment on the Van Thuong Peninsula south of Chu Lai last August, two destroyers and a cruiser of Task Force 77 bombarded Vietcong bunkers, blasted to pieces a Red company that tried to escape over the beach. Fact is, 7th Fleet Commander Adm. Paul P. Blackburn's floating artillery can make life miserable—and hazardous—for the Vietcong up to 15 miles from the coast, and his screen of smaller craft on patrol duty in "Operation Market Time" has sharply limited Vietcong gunrunning by boat along the shore.

THE GADGETRY

Also at work for the United States in Vietnam is an array of ingenious gadgetry that smacks of baling wire—and of Buck Rogers. Puff the Magic Dragon is an old C-47 transport rigged with three 7.62 Gatling-type guns—each a fascine of six machinegun barrels. In the time it takes to say "puff," the dragon can spit 300 bullets at Vietcong on the ground. "It's a solid bar of fire," explains a U.S. officer, "and the noise is a terrible roar." The Lightning Bug is a UH-1B helicopter fitted with seven brilliant landing lights. It goes sampan hunting along Vietcong rivers or canals. Antipeople peepers include Tipsy 33, a ground-surveillance radar first used by the marines along their Danang perimeter. By the end of this year, a steel-mesh net platform that can be laid by helicopters across jungle treetops will be in use by choppers as a do-it-yourself landing pad; the disgorged troops shinny down through the branches on a metal and nylon ladder.

The single most expensive piece of equipment in use in Vietnam is an Air Force C-130 loaded with $2,500,000 worth of communications equipment. Known as the ABCCC (Airborne Battle Control and Command Center), the plane is in fact a flying command post, equipped with 8 television screens for projecting slides and maps from its data storage drums, which contain 5,000 pieces of military intelligence—the last word for armchair-borne commanders.

STILL SAIGON'S WAR

When massive U.S. intervention in Vietnam was bruited, there were those who argued against it on the grounds that weary South Vietnamese troops would simply quit in relief, let the Americans do their fighting for them. The U.S. buildup has indeed been decisive in halting the Vietcong drive toward victory—but in large part because it has given the South Vietnamese, whose 600,000-man army continues to bear the brunt of battle, the help they need to go on fighting.

It remains very much their war. In the 4 months after U.S. combat units largely went into action, some 3,000 Government soldiers were killed in action compared to 275 Americans. Over the same period, U.S. troops ran 384 company-size operations resulting in contact with the Vietcong; South Vietnamese soldiers conducted 1,605. As the U.S. buildup has mounted, the monthly Government losses have been paired: from 1,300 in July, to 800 in August, to 567 in September.

While Saigon's soldiers got some breathing room, the once-cocksure Vietcong found themselves choking in a new kind of war. Their massive monsoon assaults never materialized—because quick-scrambling allied planes all too often flew off through the rainstorms to blast a company apart before it could attack. Whereas in the first flush of their summer successes the Reds could count on an eye for an eye, by August the kill ratio had dropped to 1 to 3 against them—and they are likely to lose 27,000 men in action this year against an estimated 12,000 for the allies (including 1,000 Americans).

Not only was the mass assault third phase in Mao Tse-tung's guerrilla rulebook arrested, but the Vietcong found themselves being rooted out of havens they had long considered invulnerable. Twice in the last month—first near Ben Cat in the "Iron Triangle" north of Saigon, then last week in Operation Concord in Binh Dinh Province—massive allied sweeps penetrated preserves lethally off limits to anyone but Communists for 15 years.

THE SLEEPLESS ENEMY

Sweep forces usually encountered few Vietcong but often found supplies, such as enough rice in the Triangle to feed a Vietcong regiment for 4 months. They also uncovered dirt-fresh evidences of the Communists' long-famed trenching arts; tunnels up to 40 feet deep and several hundred yards long, with angled corridors and galleries to reduce blast effects, air vents, and emergency exits.

Even the deepest tunnels are not safe from the 1,000-pound bombs of the Guam-based B-52's, falling in sticks neatly bracketed to decapitate a small mountain. When the big bombers, converted from carrying nuclear weapons, first began making the 5,200-mile round trip from Guam to Vietnam, critics snorted that it was overkill run riot, using elephants to swat mosquitoes. But the point was to hit the Vietcong without warning (the B-52's fly so high that they are seldom seen or heard by their targets) in the heart of their 11 major strongholds, keep them edgy and off balance. The SAC planes have hit such strongholds as the Iron Triangle hard and often, and it is now so pitted with B-52 bomb craters and caved-in Vietcong tunnels that wags call it the "Gruyère Triangle." Airpower may well prove to be the guerrillas' worst enemy. The Reds are less and less welcome in villages, since the villagers are learning that their presence may well bring the planes. Forced to move oftener, the guerrillas are getting less and less sleep. Captures and desertions are rising. Recently captured in the Gruyère Triangle: a Vietcong battalion commander's order that his troops eschew, among other things, "collective singing of folk songs" and handclapping for fear of detection.

It once was a rare day when more than a handful of Vietcong weapons was left on a battlefield, but of late the Vietcong have become quite untidy: Operation Starlight netted 614 dead Vietcong and 109 weapons. More recently, Vietnamese troops killed 34 of the enemy—and captured 34 weapons—on an operation. Government figures showing a 300-percent increase in the number of Vietcong defecting under the "open arms" amnesty program may be exaggerated, but the curve is definitely up.

Though harassed, the Vietcong are far from beaten. Despite their heavy losses and their loss of tactical momentum, they still hold vast chunks of South Vietnamese real estate. Thanks to an infiltration rate still running at an all-time high of 1,000 men a month from the north, the Communists have actually managed to increase their strength, now have in South Vietnam an estimated 65,000 main force and regional troops, 80,000 to 100,000 guerrillas, and perhaps 40,000 fellow travelers in logistical and political cadres.

KY TO POWER

Yet the enemy now faces an irrevocable U.S. commitment, and as a result, Saigon of late has had a spring in the step and a sparkle in the eye missing for years. Its visible embodiment is jaunty, popular Premier Nguyen Cao Ky, 35, who has moved with verve from scarf-clad air force commander to chairman of the board in the military collegium now ruling the nation. Ky is the closest thing to a national hero that South Vietnam has, and wherever he goes in Saigon, admiring teenagers gather round.

Ky's promises of social reform and a vigorous attack on corruption, coupled with the recent allied successes against the Vietcong, have so far kept the Nation's fractious Buddhists and Catholics quiescent: they simply cannot find credible grievances that will bring crowds into the street. Even though the Ky government has made no dent in the nation's two big problems—its 680,000 refugees and its soaring inflation—Saigon's political situation, say old hands, is the most stable that it has been since 1960. From time to time, there are complaints that it is too stable, precisely because the military junta is running it, and that civilians ought to be in charge. Ky's Chief of State, Maj. Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu, answers that bluntly: "I don't believe that any civilian government would have enough power to fight the Communists."

Before Ky and the U.S. buildup, Vietnamese desertions were running at a disastrous 500 a month and recruiting was at an alltime low. The desertion rate has now fallen to minimal levels, and Saigon's reserves are at last swelling at the targeted rate of 10,000 new men a month.

WORKING TOGETHER

Perhaps the best measure that the nation increasingly shares Ky's credo is the fact that negotiation with the Vietcong is seldom even discussed. "The only way we can lose this war now," says Thieu, "is in a political or moral way—not in a tactical way. So why should any of us talk of negotiation? If we talk about negotiation now, we give the enemy hope and confidence." Still no one in Saigon—or Washington—has any illusions about the job remaining to be done. Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Army Chief of Staff, used to think in terms of 10 years to finish off the Vietcong, now says cautiously, "Maybe I'm a 9½-year man." Even the most optimistic U.S. officials think 5 years the outside minimum.

With the arrival of the 5,000 marines of South Korea's 15,000-man Blue Dragon brigade at Cam Ranh Bay last week, the allies' combined strength rose to nearly 750,000. Orders for the Vietnamese forces issue from the quiet, air-conditioned offices of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2 acres of yellow stucco French colonial buildings in Saigon that once housed the French high command. Chief of State Thieu heads it. Downtown, in his offices on Pasteur Street, the American commander in Vietnam, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, presides over the complex of U.S. commands ranging from Lt. Gen. Joseph Moore's 2d Air Division to Maj. Gen. Lewis Walt's 3d Marine Amphibious Force. The Army's biggest clout is contained in the recently created Field Force Vietnam under Maj. Gen. Stanley ("Swede") Larsen. Headquartered in Nha Trang in the largest and hardest pressed of Vietnam's four corps areas, Force V includes the 1st Team at An Khe, the 101st Airborne's 1st Brigade, and the arriving South Koreans, who will be under American command. The Royal Australian Regiment and the Royal New Zealand artillery batteries are largely under their own command. Working from the long-established pattern of the advisers' program, U.S. officers confer with their Vietnamese counterparts virtually on a daily basis up and down the line.

THE HEROES

There are many Vietnamese heroes of the long war. One of the most bemedaled is Lt. Col. Nguyen Thanh Yen, 42, of the Vietnamese marines, who has spent 15 years fighting the Communists. A bitter, brown, gnomish man called the "Little Tiger," Yen last week, as he always does, was walking every step of the way with his 1,400-man Vietnamese task force in Operation Concord. Beside him was his adviser, U.S. Marine Maj. William Leftwich, 34, whom one of his superiors has called the best American adviser in the country." They set out early in the dazzling morning sun, trudging past the napalmed black bodies of Vietcong killed in a battle the week before.

By midday the heat had Yen's men gasping. Some were vomiting. Then the Vietcong sprang their ambush. Two marines were killed instantly, and five were wounded. "Get up, you bastards," snarled Yen. "It's only a few snipers—get up and move after them." The marines went, and Bill Leftwich, one of the 6,500 U.S. advisers who sometimes feel that they are the "forgotten men" in the new war, went too. The brittle Yen had run through five U.S. advisers until Leftwich came along. By quiet persuasion, Leftwich got Yen to add an engineering platoon, a 75-mm. howitzer platoon, a support and a signal detachment to what had been a medieval band. Since then, Colonel Yen and his men have been killing Vietcong at a 9-to-1 ratio.

THE ELUSIVE TARGET

The basic U.S. strategy in Vietnam today, now that its defensive enclaves are secured, is to go over to the offensive, hitting out from the bases in fairly large-scale thrusts at main Vietcong striking forces—to break them up, keep them off balance, erode their influence. For the present, the United States is less interested in expanding its geography than in wearing down the enemy. The priority targets, as the United States sees them now: first, the U.S. Marines' Hué-Danang-Chu Lai area, then as much of Binh Dinh province as can be cleared, finally the Hop Tac region around Saigon.

The very success of U.S. firepower so far is likely to make big kills harder and harder to come by, as Operation Concord in Binh Dinh province last week proved. An estimated 45,000 Vietcong have been in Binh Dinh, and in the largest operation of the war, 14,000 allied troops went in at 3 points to try to kill a sizable batch of them. Two hundred helicopters made 358 sorties to drop 5,500 men into Suoi Ca Valley, where a Vietcong regiment was reported. Another 2,500 of the first team were out to clear "Happy Valley" next door to the west, while Vietnamese marines and army battalions closed in from the coast. But as all too often in the frustrating war, there was virtually nobody home. Even where the enemy is decisively smashed, unless allied troops stay, the Vietcong soon slip back.

AFTER THE SHOOTING

The real reason that the battle for Vietnam is only beginning is that battles themselves are only the beginning. When the shooting stops, some sort of Vietnamese authority, ideally local police, must be ready to move in at once to keep the hamlet secure from the Vietcong. After security, the needs multiply: reconstruction of the local economy, land reform, better food and medical care, schools, the beginnings of justice. "In order to win in the long run," says Ky, "there must be a full social revolution in Vietnam—our revolution, no one else can do it for us." U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge agrees, and a large part of his working day and that of the U.S. mission is spent in helping the Vietnamese lay the foundations for their own revolution. "These people," says Lodge, "have always had a strong sense of peoplehood. What we are now trying to give them is a strong sense of nationhood."

U.S. officials estimate that if pacification is really going to work, ultimately each district (comparable to an American county) will need at least 200 administrators, public health officers, teachers, and engineers. South Vietnam has 220 districts, so 45,000 trained men will be needed. Nowhere near that many are in sight.

SHOWING THE WAY

It is the U.S. Marines who are providing the best pilot model for a pacification program. No fewer than 10,000 marines stood guard recently while the peasant near Danang brought in their rice crop free of the Vietcong—who are accustomed to seizing a large part of it for their own supplies. Navy doctors and corpsmen are treating more than 500 civilians a day in forward military marine areas. To the peasants lined up for sick call, the marines hand out food, clothes, toys, and soap (donated in 100-ton lots of slightly used bathtub bars by the Sheraton and Hilton hotel chains), on occasion have even fed the peasants' livestock and rebuilt their pens. They have built schools and paved over the long unused Saigon-Hué railroad to make the only road in the Danang area that is passable during the monsoons. Result: for the first time in 11 years, peasants are getting their produce to the Danang market.

Recently in Phu Bai a navy doctor paused in the midst of treating a long line of village children to wipe his brow and expostulated: "Dammit, if we could just get these people to wash their kids off with soap and water, half of the cases we're treating here today wouldn't be sick." A marine corporal nearby listened and nodded. Next day five marines, four washtubs and a bag of towels pulled into Phu Bai in a jeep, and an assembly line was soon set up. One by one the village's toddlers were dunked, scrubbed, and rinsed (twice), and finally toweled off. By the time the job was done, the villagers had clearly concluded that it was the finest, funniest show ever staged in Phu Bai—and public health had taken one more small step forward in Vietnam.

Meanwhile the marines, day in and day out, in methodical, grinding patrols against the Vietcong, are killing an average 40 Vietcong a week—at roughly the cost of one marine dead and five wounded a day. Typical was a night's work last week. After dusk a marine platoon surrounded a hamlet in which Vietcong had been reported hiding out, split into five squads and sat down to wait. No one spoke, no cigarettes were allowed, nor was mosquito repellent, despite the stinging swarms—for a trained soldier can smell the chemical 50 yards away. Around 3 a.m. a drenching monsoon rain roared in from the northeast, but still not a marine moved. It lasted 2 hours. Finally the wan moon reappeared and picked out four men, its light gleaming from their weapons, heading out of the village. The marines opened fire, a grenade exploded, and the leathernecks had one more kill and three wounded Vietcong prisoners. "I hate this goddamned place like I never hated any place I've ever been before," growled a leathery marine sergeant, "but I'll tell you something else: I want to win here more than I ever did in two wars before."

THE GAUNTLET TAKEN

What happens next in the war in Vietnam depends in part on the Communists. Having been halted in midstride, the Vietcong can drop back to the small-unit actions and the sabotage of phase 2, adding perhaps massive terrorism in Saigon to try to bring down the government. It is the kind of war they are best at, but "deconcentrating," as U.S. strategists call it, would be a political retreat that might well affect the morale of their troops and their hold on the peasants. Alternatively, they could go into phase 3 anyway, perhaps even with a mass assault of divisional size on U.S. units in the hope of discrediting the U.S. presence by a major, one-shot victory. But that might well prove suicidal, for the Vietcong have discovered that these days a mass assault all too easily turns into an avalanche of airborne bullets, napalm, and bombs. Or they might simply fade away to lie low, Br'er Rabbit fashion, in the hope that sooner or later the United States would get weary of waiting and go back home.

That would be the unwisest course of all. For in deciding to stand in South Vietnam, the United States means just that. "After all, we've kept 250,000 men in Western Europe for 20 years," observes a general. "We can wait too." The United States also means much more. It means to counter the Red revolution with a genuine revolution in health, education, welfare, and self-sufficiency for the Vietnamese that the Communists can hardly be expected to understand. The Communists themselves chose South Vietnam as their test case and springboard to the conquest of all southeast Asia. There are signs that they are already beginning to regret it. The United States has picked up the gauntlet, and it is not only Vietnamese nationhood but all of free Asia that stands to be ultimately strengthened by the extraordinary—and still burgeoning—commitment of the lives and talent and treasure of America in Vietnam.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8370) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 20, 1965, pp. 27718–27719, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall not report in detail on the conference agreement. It was agreed to unanimously and was signed by the conferees of both Houses.

Mr. President, perhaps I should inject rather humorously that a conference report based on 3 months of conferring ought to be reasonably acceptable when it is signed by all the conferees, which is the case with reference to this report.

The full text of the conference report and the statement of the managers on the part of the House appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 20, 1965, beginning on page 27718

At this time I wish to pay my compliments and respects to all of the members of the conference committee. Present in the Chamber is the ranking minority member of the Senate conferees, the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] who with the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] represented the minority Members of the Senate. The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona and chairman of the full committee [Mr. HAYDEN], the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and I, as chairman of the Agricultural Subcommittee, represented the majority for the Senate conferees.

The conference was long, extending through various days in meetings held since August 10 to October 20. During much of this period several members of the conference committee were occupied by duties in connection with the farm legislation as it passed through various stages to final action in the conference committee.

The conference bill totals $6,242,929,500. This is $584,118,700 under the 1965 appropriations, $471,054,300 under the Senate bill, $39,704,500 under the revised estimates, and $525,097,500 over the House bill.

The large reduction by the conference in the total amount recommended by the Senate is largely due to the Senate conferees receding on a part of the Senate amendment of $926.8 million to appropriate for the full unreimbursed loss incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation during fiscal year 1964, with which I shall deal later in my statement.

RESEARCH AND EXTENSION PROGRAMS

Perhaps I should discuss in some detail the items for the planning and the construction of agricultural research facilities.

The conference agreement provides appropriations for plans and for construction of several agricultural research facilities. Last year items for research experiment stations were limited in view of the supplemental estimate of $29 million for pesticides which went to research and extension activities of the Department. The pending conference report includes funds for the construction of all but one of facilities for pesticides which were in the budget for 1966. These pesticide facilities are as follows: Gainesville, Fla., $1,840,000; Stoneville, Miss., $1,564,000; and College Station, Tex., $2,990,000.

The facility proposed at Beltsville, Md., was passed over without prejudice.

The budget also requested construction funds for some of the cotton research facilities for which the planning funds were appropriated last year. All six of these facilities are included in the conference agreement: They are as follows: College Station, Tex., $644,000; Mesilla Park, N. Mex., $92,000; Tempe, Ariz., $1,150,000; Stoneville, Miss., for two facilities, $92,000 and $506,000; and Lubbock, Tex., $276,000.

In addition, funds for additional facilities were requested in the budget and agreed to in the conference on research facilities at: Durant, Okla., $500,000, for water pollution laboratory. Georgetown, Del., $500,000, for a poultry research laboratory. Clay Center, Nebr., $300,000, of planning funds for the research facilities for the Midwest Animal Research Center.

All of these items were budgeted.

Some of the foregoing facilities were omitted in either version of the bill or reduced, but the amounts I have just stated are the amounts agreed to by the conference committee.

As I stated earlier, last year the committee did not act upon requests for several laboratory projects, but in the processing of the bill this year the Senate recommended planning funds for several facilities for which feasibility reports had been previously submitted to the committee from the Department of Agriculture. The committee felt it was justified in taking this action to consider these several research projects and stations and does not consider it has set a precedent. Earlier, the Secretary of Agriculture had announced the proposed closure at 43 locations including lines of research and small stations at an annual savings of $5,150,000.

This committee held extensive hearings on each of these projects and made its recommendations several months ago. The other body made almost identical recommendations, but did not go into the matter as extensively as we did in the Senate committee. In the conference the agreement has been reached to continue 21 of these stations and lines of research at an annual rate of $2,389,900.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield. I have not quite come to the point at which I will refer to what the Senator is concerned with. However, I shall be glad to yield to him if his exuberance requires that I yield at this time.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I want to express my appreciation to Senator HOLLAND of Florida, Senator YOUNG of North Dakota and other members of the Appropriation Committee for inclusion of an item of $225,000 for the planning of a National Grain Marketing Research Laboratory to be located in Manhattan, Kans. The estimated cost of the Laboratory is $3,385,000.

There has long been a pressing need for an adequate Grain Marketing Research Laboratory in the United States. In May of 1960 I first stressed the need for this Laboratory on the Senate floor. At that time, during consideration of the Agriculture appropriation bill, I stated:

> The next session of Congress, I expect to introduce legislation and urge its approval, which would give our Nation a sound, adequately staffed, well-rounded research organization which would be housed in facilities

that would be in keeping with the needs for research on wheat.

I have brought this issue before the Senate Committee on Appropriations for the last several years. At the committee meeting last year, I stated I would continue to appear and request this item until it was included. This year the laboratory was not only included in the bill, but also accepted by the conference committee.

Our present program of research is handicapped, limited in scope, and progressing more slowly than is necessary or desirable. We have accumulated large stocks of grain on which the Government pays high storage costs. The quality of our grain delivered in foreign markets has been severely criticized.

Improved grain marketing research facilities can solve a wide range of problems in providing quality grain, and increase our ability to market our products more efficiently at a minimum cost. Practical solutions to these problems are of vital importance to the grain producers, to the grain industry, and to the consumers of all grain products.

I am gratified to have played a part in establishing the National Grain Marketing Research Laboratory, which will aid the development of agriculture and benefit our Nation's economy.

Again I want to express my appreciation to Senator Holland of Florida, Senator Young of North Dakota and other members of appropriations committee for their support of the National Grain Marketing Laboratory.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I can assure him that the committee decided he meant what he said and that he would come back again. Aside from that, we had received a feasibility report from the Department of Agriculture. In addition to that, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], who comes from the second largest wheat-producing State—being exceeded by the State of Kansas—felt that this was a highly meritorious project.

The committee was glad to include this project. We felt that this would be a good year to initiate this research facility in view of the fact that earlier in the session we had cooperated in the closing of a substantial number of research projects and small stations. We wanted to eliminate those research activities which we thought could be closed or discontinued.

We had been postponing for some years the matter of the enlargement of existing laboratories and the appropriation for new facilities.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, as the chairman of the committee stated, the need for this grain research laboratory has been before the committee for several years. The committee had not forgotten about the tremendous merit attached to it. We should have included the measure several years ago. However, it so happened that for several years we were not including any research laboratories at all.

It was appropriate this year to recommend it. The persistence of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], finally paid off, with the help of Chairman Holland of the committee, who insisted very strongly that this item be included in the conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Dakota who was so helpful to our committee.

The Senator from Kansas was not only persistent but also patient. He could see the problems which the committee had been up against in earlier years.

I appreciate the comments of the Senator.

In view of having concurred in the elimination of research activities amounting to $2,760,000, the committee felt justified in moving ahead on the meritorious research stations which had been submitted in the budget estimate and upon other facilities upon which feasibility reports had been received.

The facilities in this category are:

First. Modernization of the livestock research station at Miles City, Mont., to cost $521,000 for which $40,000 was included for plans and specifications.

Second. Modernization of the poultry husbandry research facilities at Glendale, Ariz., estimated to cost $750,000, and $50,000 for plans and specifications was included.

Third. To complete the modernization of the Southwest Great Plains Research Center at Bushland, Tex., estimated to cost $350,000, with $25,000 recommended for plans and specifications.

If I might digress, I felt for a long time that the whole Great Plains soil and water research program has been underemphasized and that the plan to go ahead with that project had been delayed too long. It was built in part a few years ago, and this year we have made it possible for it to be speedily completed. Continuing to list the facilities which I had started to mention, they are:

Fourth. Grain research facility at Manhattan, Kans., estimated to cost $3,385,000, and $225,000 was included for plans and specifications.

Fifth. Modernization of the cereal rust research laboratory at the University of Minnesota, St. Paul, estimated to cost $650,000. An appropriation of $50,000 for plans and specifications was recommended.

I am pleased to report that the conference committee has agreed to each of the above items which were placed in the bill by the committee.

In addition, the Senate committee had included planning funds in the amount of $70,000 for a wool quality research facility to be located at the University of Wyoming.

I see that the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming is present. I shall yield to him in a moment.

The conference report does not include the funds for planning as proposed by the Senate, but the conferees have agreed to an annual expenditure of $70,000 for high-priority wool research at the University of Wyoming.

Before I yield to my friend, the junior Senator from Wyoming, I wish to state that it was felt that the very elaborate research station set up in California to deal with research on wool prevented the setting up of an additional research facility for the same general purpose in the State of Wyoming or anywhere else. However, it would not at all preclude the idea of essential research at an accelerated rate of $70,000 annually being provided at the University of Wyoming.

I now yield to my friend, the junior Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of my subcommittee for yielding. I observe that it must have been divine providence that propelled me through the rear door of the Chamber at this particular moment.

I want to pay tribute first of all to the chairman of the committee for having fought the great fight that he fought in behalf of this matter.

The Senator understands fully the problem of refined wool research in high altitudes. If we are to compete effectively with some of the toughest competition in the world, notably the Australians, we must, and we still believe that we will be able to show as we develop the record, that there is an essential difference in the kind of experimentation and testing that they are in a position to do at installations out on the west coast, and what we would be capable of doing in the heart of the area in which most of the wool in the country is raised.

We have long since come to recognize that the continuance of a healthy wool industry is essentially in the national interest in any time of crisis. We want to improve our capabilities to maintain our competitive role to an even greater degree.

With the help and the leadership of the chairman, we hope that we can continue to make progress and continue on in the best national interest.

I thank the Senator for his efforts in this regard.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senators on our subcommittee and on our full committee—and the junior Senator from Wyoming is one of our able members of both committees—strongly supported a new wool research station, to be located in Wyoming. However, after full discussion in conference, we were inclined to agree with the House conferees that the very elaborate research facility in California can deal with most research problems on wool, and the others can be handled better at some other location, as is proposed in the conference report.

I thank the Senator for his kind remarks.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida, and commend him for his hard and effective work on the measure. Perhaps the general agricultural program leaves many things to be desired. Many segments of agriculture are not happy about all of our farm program.

The fact remains, it is here. When the farmers comply, the Government should comply. I have examined the bill, and particularly wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Florida and his colleagues who served on the committee and on the conference committee for the consideration they have given to the bill generally, and in particular to those features of special interest to my State of Nebraska.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. I was present when the Senator was referring to those items earlier, and I wish to express my thanks.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his gracious comment. His able colleague [Mr. Hruska], who is a member of both the subcommittee and the full committee, has made great contributions to this effort, and we are very happy for both of the Senators from Nebraska that two of the objectives for which they have been working for some years are effectuated this year in the conference report.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, with reference to the nutrition and consumer use field, in which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] has probably been more active than any other Senator in urging the initiation of research programs, the conference committee agreed to include the planning funds for developing plans and specifications for what is called a satellite facility in this field, to be located at the University of North Dakota. The planning funds recommended by the Senator for the central facilities were not agreed to in the conference and can be taken up at a later date. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota in a moment, but I wish to make it very plain that his persevering efforts for some years in calling this field of research to the attention of our committee and the Congress are truly responsible for his accomplishment of a feasibility report on both these objectives, the central one at Beltsville and the satellite facility in North Dakota. I congratulate him upon having reached the further objective of securing the planning funds for the facility recommended by the Department for North Dakota.

I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I express my deepest appreciation to our able and distinguished Senator from Florida, Chairman Holland, and also to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell]. Both Senators have long been much interested in the field of consumer research.

These facilities are something the Department of Agriculture has wanted for years. Human nutrition is a most important field of research, and this will give us a start on a program in which there is great interest all over the United States.

I also appreciate very much the interest my good friends in the House have shown in this program. Chairman Whitten, of the House conferees, Bob Michel, the ranking Republican conferee, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Mahon, and their associates in the conference have done a fine job on this appropriation bill. I always appreciate their efforts on behalf of the farm people. Chairman Holland and my other associates on the Senate committee have done an excellent job.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. It is true that Senator Russell has also been very active in that field. That brings me to Georgia.

Another item included by the Senate is for the initiation of watershed hydrology research in the coastal plains of Georgia with headquarters to be located at Athens, Ga., and $225,000 is appropriated for this purpose of initiating the work for the balance of this fiscal year.

Mr. President, I think it is fair to say that the entire Nation is acutely aware that the field of better use and conservation of water is a matter of tremendous concern to all of us.

In addition to the foregoing laboratories, the conferees have agreed to the inclusion of four projects for soil and water conservation research which were proposed by the members of the conference for the other body. These facilities are as follows:

Oxford, Miss.: Expansion of the sedimentation laboratory at that location to cost an estimated $1 million, and $100,000 is appropriated for plans and specifications.

University Park, Pa.: Modernization of the soil and water research station estimated to cost $400,000, and $40,000 is included for developing plans and specifications.

Pendleton, Oreg.: Modernization of the soil and water research facility at that location is estimated to cost $425,000 and $45,000 is appropriated for plans and specifications.

An appropriation for hydrology research in the Northeast at State College, Pa., in the amount of $225,000 is also included.

Mr. President, I shall be happy to deal with any other feature of the program. Perhaps the school lunch and special milk program would be of general interest. I wish to comment briefly in regard to the appropriations for that program.

The conference committee has agreed to an appropriation of $103 million for the special milk program, which is $5 million below the amount recommended in the Senate version of the bill and is $3 million over the House bill.

The conference committee has also agreed to an appropriation of $157 million, the full estimate, for the school lunch program. This total includes $2 million to be distributed under the formula in section 11 of the amended School Lunch Act for Needy Children. It is expected that the Department will make a good showing next year on this program if it expects the Congress to continue providing funds for this section—which were agreed to in the conference on an experimental basis.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Harris in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. I was occupying the chair at the time the distinguished Senator from Florida commented upon the agreed-upon appropriation of $50,000 for the Cereal Rust Laboratory at the University of Minnesota.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is on the advance planning fund for the modernized facilities.

Mr. MONDALE. That is correct. I wish to express my appreciation, and that of those who have wanted this action for many years, to the senior Senator from Florida. He was quick to recognize the need for this assistance and this program. I know that it was good news for the farmers across the Nation. They have long needed this additional assistance in the critical area of cereal rust diseases, which affect so many of our crops. I know that this appropriation had the support of Senators and Representatives of both political parties, and I wish to express my appreciation to all concerned for this much needed help. It is good news to our farmers.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. It has been very apparent to our committee for a period of years that the problem of cereal rust has been of major proportions, and that it will require even better handling by the Department of Agriculture and by the various States—because the several producing States have research programs in this field. These improved and modernized facilities in Minnesota will greatly improve the departmental research program to cope with the rust problems which are ever-present in the production of wheat.

Mr. MONDALE. We are grateful that the Senate could be represented on this conference committee by the senior Senator from Florida, who has sound understanding and appreciation of this most important project. I am truly grateful.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend, and I accept his statement on behalf of the whole committee, because it so happens that we have on the subcommittee and on the full committee Senators who pretty well represent the whole Nation.

For example, the Senator from Florida might know something about citrus fruits, and perhaps some other things; the Senator from North Dakota would know about wheat, and other Senators about corn, sheep, wool, chickens, and dairying. I see on the floor the sage of the dairy industry so far as the Senate is concerned, the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken]. By pooling the experiences of all of us, we hope we have been able to give reasonably adequate and fair treatment to all segments of that industry which, I think, among all the industries of the Nation, is most important to its continued existence—agriculture. It is more important to us in the field of foreign relations than anything else we have, because all those who represent us in the foreign field say that our greatness in agriculture, our ability to produce vast quantities of grain and other food materials, and fibers for garments, for export to all the rest of the world, or that part of the rest of the world with which we wish to do business, is the ace in the hole as far as our international relations are concerned. So we are certainly interested in giving them the best job possible.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MONDALE. I endorse the observation which the Senator from Florida has made concerning the vast productive power of the American farmer, and the indispensability of that productive power in terms of meeting our needs at home and abroad.

I believe that we are at the threshold of an era during which the capacity of our family farmers, which has been legendary, will be critical to the survival of the world and to the capacity of this Nation to meet its problems in terms of leading the free world.

Let me make one further point. I commend the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] for his leadership and his valuable help in bringing about realization of the Cereal Rust Laboratory at the University of Minnesota. It was a selfless thing for the Senator from North Dakota to have done in one sense, because it is located in an adjoining State to his; but, in another sense, his understanding of the needs for improving research in this field for crops which are predominant in his State is a further reflection of his statesmanship.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his remarks, particularly for the cordial references to the Senator from North Dakota.

I should like the Senator from North Dakota to know that there is no other Senator upon whom the full committee depends more for accurate information and leadership than upon the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I thank my friends for their kind comments. The Cereal Rust Laboratory is a project which we in North Dakota are most interested in.

We would like to have had this research laboratory in North Dakota, but we thought it would be better situated at the University of Minnesota where this kind of research is already underway.

I want to say, too, that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] did an excellent job on this facility, and I commend his determination in effecting its accomplishment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had commented earlier upon the special milk program because it was a matter of particular interest to the Senator from Wisconsin who, I see, has been called from the Chamber.

We intended to retain the full amount of the $108 million which we placed in the bill. We did retain $103 million which is $3 million over the House bill. I do not believe this will adequately take care of the complete need of providing milk for children who do not get adequate quantities of milk in their diet, but it will do a better job than the $100 million would have done.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask my chairman on the Agricultural Appropriations Committee whether the conferees agreed to strike out the appropriation of $200,000 for the eradication of the poultry disease known as salmonella pullorum.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry to say to the Senator from Vermont that this is one of the items on which we had to yield. We did retain in the bill a sizable appropriation for research and survey into the extent of salmonella pullorum, but when it came to starting the regional eradication effort, which is what our item was designed to do, and we were happy to include this in the bill at the earnest request of the Senator from Vermont, we found that for some reason unknown to us the rest of the poultry industry of the Nation other than the Northeastern area seemed to be opposed to that item, and made such a strong showing on the conferees in the other body that this was one of the items on which the House conferees would not yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that the conferees in the other body were not from the 12 to 15 States from which this disease was to be eradicated—most of them, anyway. Therefore, like myself, they probably were reflecting the attitude of their own constituencies.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like the Senator to know that the members of the Senate conference committee stood up sturdily for the item. I would not wish the Senator to be under any misgivings about that.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me state how this particular item happened to be included in the bill passed by the Senate. I had received many requests from poultry and egg producers, and also from State officials in the Northeastern States, for an appropriation which would permit this salmonella pullorum disease—which we used to call just pullorum—I believe before that it was called white diarrhea—but it appears that the States, together with private industry, had spent approximately $20 million and had eradicated the disease to the point that U.S. officials estimated that $200,000 more would completely eradicate it from the 12 to 15 Northeastern States.

The Senate accepted the proposal to appropriate $200,000 for this purpose. After the Senate had enacted the legislation, much to my surprise and somewhat to my chagrin, I discovered that a national organization with headquarters in Kansas City was vigorously opposing the appropriation to eradicate this disease with the nauseating name from the 12 to 15 Northeastern States. It was difficult for me to understand why it would do this.

I received telegrams from associations all the way from Ohio to Maine, requesting that this item be retained.

I understand that the State of Georgia and other Southern States which are nearly free from this disease had evinced a great deal of interest. However, the national organization that opposed an appropriation for the eradication of the disease in the Northeastern States took the position that it was a relatively minor disease, that there were worse diseases that should be taken care of first.

However, the fact remains that they were probably right in assuming if 12 to 15 States were pronounced completely free from this disease, those particular States would logically get orders for hatching eggs, which orders might not be available to other States. However, there was a solution for that. I believe that those other States and this national association should get behind the movement to eradicate salmonella pullorum, and any other bad disease afflicting poultry, from the whole of the United States.

At the hearing, the Department of Agriculture witnesses told us that if they could get $200,000 to eradicate this disease from the 12 to 15 Northeastern States, they could go on from there and eradicate it from the entire United States.

Therefore, I believe that this national organization is shortsighted and rather selfish. I realize that the Senate conferees faced an adamant group made up largely of House conferees from other sections of the country. As I say, I was trying to represent my section of the country, just as the Senator from Florida very ably represents his; but I believe that they were misguided in thinking it would be bad for the Midwest to have the 12 to 15 Northeastern States completely free from this disease at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont for his illuminating and very accurate remarks. Great reams of information have come to all of us on the conference committee, to which the Senate conferees merely replied that they were standing back of the Senate action. The reams of information were to the effect that the Northeastern States would, they feared, obtain a complete monopoly on the shipping of hatching eggs overseas.

I had not realized what a large shipment of hatching eggs goes overseas from this country, particularly to Western Europe, but apparently it is very large. That seemed to be the burden of the complaint of those who did not wish this partial regional eradication to be attempted.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, the development of a large overseas market is probably what prompted the Northeastern States to try to virtually eradicate the disease, or to get it down to the point where it needed only one more push before it would be completely eliminated; but, I believe that all the States in the Union should clean up these diseases.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree with the Senator from Vermont that it would be useful if all States could do that. I believe that the net result of the discussion which has been held over a period of 3 to 4 months on this subject will be to bring about a near eradication greater than anything we have yet seen. Some time in the not too distant future, I hope the country will be completely free from it, and I am sure that the Senator from Vermont feels that way.

I would now like to discuss the compromise reached on the screwworm eradication program.

One of the items which had contributed to delay in the conference committee has been the matter of the basis for continuing cost-sharing in connection with the screwworm eradication program which was initiated a few years ago by the establishment of a barrier zone in the Southwest. Last year, the Appropriation Act provided for the continuation of this activity on a 50-50 cost-sharing basis for the production and the release of the irradiated screwworm flies which are dropped in the barrier zone. This year the budget omitted the cost-sharing language and the House provided $2,806,200, and the Senate approved the same amount; thus, both bodies denied $2,250,000 requested in the budget to place the full cost of the operation upon the Federal Government.

After careful deliberation of this matter following extensive hearings, the Senate Committee recommended the same amount; namely, $2,806,200, and inserted in the bill a provision which would have continued on a permanent basis the cost-sharing provision.

The conferees in the other body would not accept the cost-sharing provisions as we had written in our version of the bill, but have agreed that the appropriation and funds available for maintaining the barrier zone shall be limited to the amount provided by both bodies. In addition, the conferees have agreed to the inclusion of $1 million for the extension of a barrier zone to Arizona and the west coast, of which $600,000 will be matched from State and local sources as the barrier zone is extended to the west coast.

The statement of the managers from the House on this item reads as follows:

> The bill includes $2,806,200 for the maintenance of a barrier zone to protect the screwworm freed areas of Texas and New Mexico and other parts of the country from future infestations from Mexico. The bill also provides $1 million for eradication activities in Arizona, $600,000 of which will be matched by funds from other sources, incident to the extension of the barrier zone to the West Coast. The Department should plan, conduct, and finance the Federal portion of the cost of barrier zone operations within the funds provided. The policy of requiring matching by State and local sources of funds expended for the production, irradiation, and release of flies used to eradicate infestations within the areas involved is expected to be continued.

REIMBURSEMENT APPROPRIATIONS FOR COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The conference committee has agreed to an appropriation of $2.8 billion for the reimbursement appropriation to the Commodity Credit Corporation for the net realized losses incurred by the Corporation in the conduct of authorized farm programs in fiscal 1964. The committee had added $926,800,000 to the bill when it was reported to the Senate. The reason for including this sum was to take some immediate action to bring the financial condition of the Corporation to a more current basis. The law provides that reimbursement appropriations shall be requested of the Congress in the regular budget the year following the fiscal year the loss is realized, but in recent years it has been necessary to process two special supplemental bills to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to discharge all of its authorized activities. These supplemental bills resulted from the failure to request the full amounts for realized losses of the Corporation.

Senators will recall that earlier this session in H.J. Res. 234 there was appropriated $1,600 million for the Commodity Credit Corporation for realized losses and for the conduct of authorized activities under Public Law 480. The Department of Agriculture had subsequently recommended to the Bureau of the Budget the full amount of unreimbursed losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the full amount of realized loss for 1964 in the amount of $3,226,800,000; the balance for the fiscal year 1963 in the amount of $81 million; and $1,057 million balance for the revaluation of the inventory for fiscal 1961. The Bureau of the Budget denied this request, as shown on page 119 of the hearings, and tabulated on page 1008 of the printed hearings.

Our committee thought that this action of the Bureau of the Budget was not in accord with the spirit of Public Law 87-155, approved August 17, 1961, which authorizes reimbursement appropriations for this purpose.

The House conferees were in sympathy with the objective of the Senate in including this additional $927 million, but we were not able to reach an agreement on such a large sum in excess of the official budget request for fiscal 1966.

There has just been transmitted to the Congress from the President a supplemental budget request for fiscal 1966 in the amount of $500 million for reimbursement to the Corporation for losses incurred in fiscal 1964. Upon receipt of this document, the conferees agreed to include in the pending conference report $500 million of the $927 million previously added by the Senate, which leaves an unreimbursed balance of about $427 million for fiscal 1964.

In addition, the Senate conferees have acceded to the interest provision requested in the budget and included in the House bill which provides that the Corporation will not be required to pay interest to the Treasury on unreimbursed borrowings following the close of the fiscal year.

This provision on interest charge is of some benefit to the Corporation, but it is my belief that it would be more appropriate—and our committee urges—that steps be taken in the executive branch to request the full amount of reimbursement appropriations for this purpose and in an orderly manner as intended by law. The conference statement on this subject follows:

> The conferees are of the opinion that future budget estimates for reimbursement appropriations for net realized losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation should include the full amount of the realized losses for any fiscal year as reflected in the accounts and shown in the report of the financial condition of such corporation as of the close of business of such fiscal year.

It is expected that the budget estimate for next fiscal year will include the full loss realized for fiscal 1965, together with the balance of $427 million, which I just referred to, for fiscal 1964, and the small balance of $81 million of unreimbursed losses which goes back to fiscal 1963. That would still leave unreimbursed the balance of the 1961 loss of $1,057 million. This amount ought to be brought up to date as soon as possible so that we might clean up the accounts of the Commodity Credit Corporation and keep them on a current basis as prescribed by law.

These reimbursement appropriations for the Corporation do not change the rate of expenditures for the various activities which are authorized by law but are merely bookkeeping appropriations to reflect the loss incurred each fiscal year on the farm programs which have been authorized by Congress in the various farm measures.

I shall be glad to answer any questions on the report, but if there are none, I ask that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 8370, which was read as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 to the bill (H.R. 8370) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes", with an amendment, as follows:
>
> In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ", of which $20,000,000 shall be derived from amounts appropriated under this head for the previous fiscal year, which amount shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation".
>
> *Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:
>
> In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: $1,500,000 of which $250,000 shall be available solely for preparation and submission of the final report and complete and final liquidation of the Commission's activities not later than June 30, 1966."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the House amendments to the amendments of the Senate be adopted en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe that concludes our action.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a comparative table showing the budget estimate, the House, the Senate, and the conference allowances on the various appropriation items in the agricultural appropriation bill for 1966.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1965 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1966

H. Doc. No.	Item	Appropriations, 1965 (adjusted)	Budget estimates, 1966	House bill, 1966	Senate bill, 1966	Conference allowance 1966	Conference bill compared with—		
							Budget estimates, 1966	House bill	Senate bill
	TITLE I—GENERAL ACTIVITIES								
	Agricultural Research Service:								
154	Salaries and expenses:								
	Research:								
	By appropriation	$122,599,000	$116,892,000	$114,394,000	$124,369,800	[1] $123,622,500	+$6,730,500	+$9,228,500	−$747,300
	By transfer from sec. 32	(11,755,000)	(24,600,000)	(24,600,000)	(16,600,000)	(18,100,000)	(−6,500,000)	(−6,500,000)	(+1,500,000)
	Total available	(134,374,000)	(141,492,000)	(138,994,000)	(140,969,800)	(141,722,500)	(+230,500)	(+2,728,500)	(+752,700)
	Plant and animal disease and pest control	[2] 71,169,200	73,160,000	71,119,000	75,060,000	74,299,500	+1,139,500	+3,180,500	−760,500
	Total, salaries and expenses	[3] 193,768,200	[3] 190,052,000	[4] 185,513,000	[4] 199,429,800	[4] 197,922,000	+7,870,000	+12,409,000	−1,507,800
	Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	2,000,000	4,000,000	2,000,000	4,000,000	3,000,000	−1,000,000	+1,000,000	−1,000,000
	Total, Agricultural Research Service	195,768,200	194,052,000	187,513,000	203,429,800	200,922,000	+6,870,000	+13,409,000	−2,507,800
	Cooperative State Research Service: Payments and expenses	49,997,000	[5] 52,367,000	[5] 51,695,000	55,695,000	[5] 54,795,000	+2,428,000	+3,100,000	−900,000
	Extension Service:								
	Payments to States and Puerto Rico	71,919,000	72,800,000	72,800,000	75,600,000	75,600,000	+2,800,000	+2,800,000	
	Retirement costs for extension agents	7,510,000	7,857,000	7,857,000	7,857,000	7,857,000			
	Penalty mail	3,113,000	3,113,000	3,113,000	3,113,000	3,113,000			
	Federal Extension Service	2,565,000	2,565,000	2,565,000	2,565,000	2,565,000			
	Total, Extension Service	85,107,000	86,335,000	86,335,000	89,135,000	89,135,000	+2,800,000	+2,800,000	
	Farmer Cooperative Service	1,141,000	1,241,000	1,141,000	1,241,000	1,141,000	−100,000		−100,000
	Soil Conservation Service:								
	Conservation operations	104,233,000	104,103,000	105,373,000	106,373,000	106,373,000	+2,270,000	+1,000,000	
	Watershed planning	5,721,000	5,721,000	5,721,000	5,721,000	5,721,000			
	Watershed protection	61,020,000	67,171,000	64,171,000	65,746,000	65,671,000	−1,500,000	+1,500,000	−75,000
	Flood prevention	26,317,000	25,417,000	25,417,000	25,417,000	25,417,000			
	Great Plains conservation program	14,864,000	14,864,000	14,864,000	17,432,000	16,000,000	+1,136,000	+1,136,000	−1,432,000
	Resource conservation and development	1,813,000	4,303,000	2,813,000	4,303,000	4,303,000		+1,490,000	
	Total, Soil Conservation Service	213,968,000	221,579,000	218,359,000	224,992,000	223,485,000	+1,906,000	+5,126,000	−1,507,000
	Economic Research Service: Salaries and expenses	10,922,000	11,366,000	11,072,000	11,591,000	11,536,000	+170,000	+464,000	−55,000
154	Statistical Reporting Service: Salaries and expenses	11,866,000	13,595,000	13,595,000	13,875,000	13,755,000	+160,000	+160,000	−120,000
154	Consumer and Marketing Service:								
	Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs	73,752,000	76,437,000	75,852,000	76,412,000	76,192,000	−245,000	+340,000	−220,000
	Payments to States and possessions	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	2,000,000	1,750,000	+250,000	+250,000	−250,000
	Special milk program	[6] 51,500,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	108,000,000	103,000,000	+3,000,000	+3,000,000	−5,000,000
	School lunch program	[7] 146,400,000	[7] 157,000,000	[7] 155,000,000	[7] 157,000,000	[7] 157,000,000		+2,000,000	
	Food stamp program	[8] 25,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	[9] 80,000,000	[9] 80,000,000	−20,000,000	−20,000,000	
	Total, Consumer and Marketing Service	298,152,000	434,937,000	432,352,000	423,412,000	417,942,000	−16,995,000	−14,410,000	−5,470,000
	Foreign Agricultural Service: Salaries and expenses	[10] 20,779,000	[10] 20,574,000	[10] 20,574,000	[10] 20,574,000	[10] 20,574,000			
	Commodity Exchange Authority	1,169,000	1,169,000	1,169,000	1,169,000	1,169,000			
	Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:								
	Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	[11] 108,552,000	138,350,000	[11] 111,714,000	[12] 135,350,000	[12] 126,278,500	−12,071,500	+14,564,000	−9,071,500
	Sugar Act program	[13] 96,000,000	95,000,000	95,000,000	95,000,000	95,000,000			
	Agricultural conservation program	225,000,000	220,000,000	220,000,000	220,000,000	220,000,000			
	Cropland conversion program	15,000,000	10,000,000	7,500,000	10,000,000	7,500,000	−2,500,000		−2,500,000
	Conservation reserve program	194,000,000	150,000,000	140,000,000	146,000,000	146,000,000	−4,000,000	+6,000,000	
S. 38	Emergency conservation measures	[14] 14,000,000	[15] 24,000,000	4,000,000	30,000,000	24,000,000		+20,000,000	−6,000,000
	Total, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	652,552,000	637,350,000	578,214,000	636,350,000	618,778,500	−18,571,500	+40,564,500	−17,571,500
	Rural Community Development Service	132,000	750,000	500,000	750,000	625,000	−125,000	+125,000	−125,000
	Office of Inspector General	10,116,000	10,961,000	10,416,000	10,491,000	10,491,000	−470,000	+75,000	
	Office of General Counsel	4,039,000	4,229,000	4,139,000	4,229,000	4,184,000	−45,000	+45,000	−45,000
	Office of Information	1,689,000	1,689,000	1,689,000	1,689,000	1,689,000			
	National Agricultural Library:								
	Salaries and expenses	1,599,000	1,865,000	1,599,000	1,865,000	1,699,000	−166,000	+100,000	−166,000
	Library facilities		7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000			
	Office of Management Services	2,483,000	2,579,000	2,483,000	2,500,000	2,483,000	−96,000		−17,000
	General administration	3,553,000	3,848,000	3,848,000	3,848,000	3,848,000			
	Total, title I, general activities	1,505,032,200	1,707,486,000	1,633,693,000	1,713,835,800	1,685,251,500	−22,234,500	+51,558,500	−28,584,300

See footnotes at end of table.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1965 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1966—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Item	Appropriations, 1965 (adjusted)	Budget estimates, 1966	House bill, 1966	Senate bill, 1966	Conference allowance 1966	Conference bill compared with—		
							Budget estimates, 1966	House bill	Senate bill
	TITLE II—CREDIT AGENCIES								
	Rural Electrification Administration:								
	Loan authorizations:								
	Electrification	[16] ($65,000,000)	[17] ($50,000,000)	[17] ($50,000,000)	[18] ($80,000,000)	[18] ($65,000,000)	(+$5,000,000)	(+$5,000,000)	(−$5,000,000)
	Telephone	[19] (70,000,000)	(97,000,000)	[19] (97,000,000)	[20] (97,000,000)	[20] (97,000,000)			
	Total, loan authorizations	(435,000,000)	(447,000,000)	(447,000,000)	(477,000,000)	(462,000,000)	(+15,000,000)	(+15,000,000)	(−15,000,000)
	Salaries and expenses	11,934,000	11,934,000	11,934,000	11,934,000	11,934,000			
	Farmers Home Administration:								
	Rural housing grants and loans		10,000,000		10,000,000				
	Direct loan account:								
	Real estate loans	(60,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(+35,000,000)	(+35,000,000)	
	Operating loans	[21] (300,000,000)	[21] (300,000,000)	[21] (300,000,000)	[21] (300,000,000	[21] (300,000,000)			
	Total, direct loan account	(360,000,000)	(340,000,000)	(340,000,000)	(375,000,000)	(375,000,000)	(+35,000,000)	(+35,000,000)	
	Rural housing for domestic farm labor		5,000,000	2,000,000	5,000,000	3,000,000	−2,000,000	+1,000,000	−2,000,000
	Rural renewal	1,200,000	3,000,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	−1,800,000		
	Rural housing for the elderly revolving fund	5,000,000	5,000,000	2,500,000	5,000,000	2,500,000	−2,500,000		−2,500,000
	Salaries and expenses	41,233,000	44,692,000	42,733,000	44,692,000	44,000,000	−692,000	+1,267,000	−692,000
	Total, Farmers Home Administration	47,433,000	67,692,000	48,433,000	65,892,000	50,700,000	−16,992,000	+2,267,000	−15,192,000
	Total title II, credit agencies:								
	Loan authorizations	(795,000,000)	(787,000,000)	(787,000,000)	(852,000,000)	(837,000,000)	(+50,000,000)	(+50,000,000)	(−15,000,000)
	Direct appropriation	59,367,000	79,626,000	60,367,000	77,826,000	62,634,000	−16,992,000	+2,267,000	−15,192,000
	TITLE III—CORPORATIONS								
	Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:								
	Administrative and operating expenses:								
	Appropriation	7,478,000	8,478,000	7,478,000	8,478,000	8,000,000	−478,000	+522,000	−478,000
	Premium income	(3,638,000)	(3,638,000)	(4,138,000)	(3,638,000)	(4,000,000)	(+362,000)	(−138,000)	(+362,000)
	Commodity Credit Corporation:								
	Reimbursement for net realized losses	2,674,000,000	[22] 2,800,000,000	2,300,000,000	3,226,800,000	2,800,000,000		+500,000,000	−426,800,000
	Limitation on administrative expenses	(37,351,000)	(36,650,000)	(36,650,000)	(36,650,000)	(36,650,000)			
	Public Law 480:								
	Sales for foreign currencies	1,862,000,000	1,658,000,000	1,658,000,000	1,144,000,000	1,144,000,000			
	Emergency famine relief	220,453,000			298,500,000	298,500,000			
	Long-term supply contracts	235,000,000			215,500,000	215,500,000			
	Total, Public Law 480	2,317,453,000	1,658,000,000	1,658,000,000	1,658,000,000	1,658,000,000			
S. 38	International Wheat Agreement	81,838,000	27,544,000	27,544,000	27,544,000	27,544,000			
	Bartered materials for supplemental stockpile	92,860,000	([23])	30,000,000				−30,000,000	
	Total, title III, corporations	5,173,629,000	4,494,022,000	4,023,022,000	4,920,822,000	4,493,544,000	−478,000	+470,522,000	−427,278,000
	TITLE IV—RELATED AGENCIES								
	Farm Credit Administration: Limitation on administrative expenses	(2,931,000)	(2,990,000)	(2,990,000)	(2,990,000)	(2,990,000)			
	National Commission on Food Marketing	700,000	1,500,000	750,000	1,500,000	1,500,000		+750,000	
	Total, title IV, related agencies	700,000	1,500,000	750,000	1,500,000	1,500,000		+750,000	
	APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT								
	Agricultural Research Service: Salaries and expenses, Research	100,000							
	Cooperative State Research Service: Payments and expenses	300,000							
	Extension Service:								
	Payments to States and Puerto Rico	717,500							
	Retirement costs for extension agents	32,500							
	Total, Extension Service	750,000							
	Soil Conservation Service:								
	Conservation operations	1,575,000							
	Watershed planning	600,000							
	Watershed protection	10,220,000							
	Total, Soil Conservation Service	12,395,000							
	Economic Research Service: Salaries and expenses	300,000							
	Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service: Appalachian region conservation program	7,000,000							

Farmers Home Administration:								
Salaries and expenses	325, 000							
Direct loan account	7, 100, 000							
Rural Community Development Service: Salaries and expenses	50, 000							
Total, Appalachian regional development	28, 320, 000							
Total appropriations:								
Title I—General activities	1, 565, 032, 200	1, 707, 486, 000	1, 633, 693, 000	1, 713, 835, 800	1, 685, 251, 500	−22, 234, 500	−51, 558, 500	−28, 584, 300
Title II—Credit agencies	59, 367, 000	79, 626, 000	60, 367, 000	77, 826, 000	62, 634, 000	−16, 992, 000	+2, 267, 000	−15, 192, 000
Title III—Corporations	5, 173, 629, 000	4, 494, 022, 000	4, 023, 022, 000	4, 920, 822, 000	4, 493, 544, 000	−478, 000	+470, 522, 000	−427, 278, 000
Title IV—Related agencies	700, 000	1, 500, 000	750, 000	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000		+750, 000	
Appalachian regional development	28, 320, 000							
Grand total	6, 827, 048, 200	6, 282, 634, 000	5, 717, 832, 000	6, 713, 983, 800	6, 242, 929, 500	−39, 704, 500	+525, 097, 500	−471, 054, 300

---

[1] Includes funds for pay act costs appropriated in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965.

[2] Includes $650,000 for screw-worm eradication appropriated in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965.

[3] In addition, reappropriation of $1,000,000 proposed for special fund.

[4] In addition, reappropriation of $2,000,000 proposed for special fund.

[5] In addition, transfer of $400,000 from sec. 32.

[6] Plus $51,500,000 by transfer from sec. 32 funds.

[7] In addition, $45,000,000 transfer from sec. 32 funds authorized.

[8] Plus $35,000,000 by transfer from sec. 32 funds.

[9] In addition, $20,000,000 to be reappropriated and merged with this account, changed to $100,000,000, of which $20,000,000 reappropriated.

[10] In addition, $3,117,000 transfer from sec. 32 funds authorized.

[11] In addition, transfers from Commodity Credit Corporation provided as follows: Fiscal year 1965, $97,508,000; fiscal year 1966, $96,615,000.

[12] In addition, $75,390,000 transferred from Commodity Credit Corporation, and changed to $81,933,500 in conference.

[13] Includes $6,000,000 appropriated in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965.

[14] Includes $10,000,000 appropriated in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965.

[15] Includes increase of $20,000,000 proposed by budget amendment transmitted by S. Doc. 38.

[16] Includes $90,000,000 reserve authorization.

[17] Includes $65,000,000 reserve authorization.

[18] Includes $50,000,000 reserve authorization, and $60,000,000 in conference agreement.

[19] Includes $7,000,000 reserve authorization.

[20] Includes $15,000,000 reserve authorization.

[21] Includes $50,000,000 reserve authorization.

[22] Includes $500,000,000 supplemental estimate, transmitted in H. Doc. 307.

[23] Amount of $52,500,000 deleted in budget amendment transmitted by S. Doc. 38.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. First, Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Florida for his work not only in the full committee but in the conference.

A number of important appropriations were made for my State. One item which was added in the Senate and retained in conference was $25,000 toward a total cost of $350,000 for the Southwest Great Plains Research Center in Bushland, near Amarillo, Tex. This $25,000 will be used for plans and specifications to complete the construction of modern facilities of soil and water conservation research. This great facility will benefit the agricultural economy of our Nation for generations to come.

Also included is $664,000 for the construction of a cotton disease laboratory and $2,990,000 for a new pesticides research laboratory at College Station, Tex. These research facilities will pay tremendous dividends through the beneficial work which will be carried out there in the years to come.

The Southwest Great Plains Research Center in Bushland and Amarillo, Tex., has been a long needed facility. This item was put in the bill by the Senate. It was not in the House bill. It provides for a survey in connection with a research center in Bushland and Amarillo, Tex. The work was scattered in 16 or 18 huts, so that the work could not be efficiently done. This work is done for the Great Plains area, reaching from the Rocky Mountains and the West to the Mississippi Valley on the east. It includes some 392 counties in the official Great Plains area where there is a water shortage. It will provide a study of water needs and other important research for the Great Plains area so we will not be faced with what we were faced with in the Dust Bowl days.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his remarks. I remarked earlier that the whole committee felt it was too bad that this important research station, vital as it was to the Great Plains, had not been completed a long time ago. We were happy to appropriate for this item. I hope it will be useful.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I have kept up with this matter in the 8 years I have been here. It has not been the fault of either the distinguished Senator from Florida or the Senate of the United States. It did not come before our committee.

There are 392 counties in the official Great Plains area, as defined by the Congress in 1958, starting at about the Texas Pacific Railway, going through the south central part of the State, and up to the Canadian border. It includes parts of 16 States. I commend the Senate for holding in the bill a larger appropriation than had been requested by the Bureau of the Budget. The House provided $14,860,000, and the Senate held the amount by more than $1 million. There are thousands of contracts with farmers involved. They could not begin to process these lands to get them back into range status until this matter could be worked out.

SCREW-WORM PROTECTION

Mr. President, this agriculture appropriations bill contains many items of importance to my State, and I would like briefly to comment upon some of the actions taken in conference.

I commend the conferees for their action continuing the present policy in regard to the screw-worm eradication program. The conference report states:

> The bill includes $2,806,200 for the maintenance of a barrier zone to protect the screw-worm free-areas of Texas and New Mexico and other parts of the country from future infestations from Mexico.

The phrase "and other parts of the country" is the key point, and I commend the conferees for their wisdom in recognizing that this is a national and not merely a local problem. The barrier zone along the Texas-Mexico border, which keeps screw-worms out of the country, protects the whole Nation from screw-worms. If it were not for this barrier zone cattle in all southern parts of the country would be subject to infestation by the screw-worm. Therefore it is just and right that this be a 100-percent Federal program. It would not be just to require the State of Texas and Texas cattle ranchers to pay half the cost of a program that protects against invasion by pests from a foreign country into the whole country as much as it does themselves. The entire Nation benefits from this program and it is right that the entire Nation bear the cost. The policy of requiring matching, by State and local sources, of Federal funds used to eradicate infestations within the areas involved, that is, inside the harvest zone, will be continued.

SKIP ROW COTTON

In the semiarid cotton-growing regions of the Southern Plains, most farmers use a system of planting two rows of cotton, leaving the next two to four rows fallow or planted to other crops, and then planting two more rows of cotton. This method of planting has many benefits. It allows the plants to benefit from moisture and soil nutrients in the fallow land between the cotton rows. Since most farmers in the dry-land areas use two-row cotton strippers, less time is required to harvest a skip-row field and equipment costs are lower. Less cotton is left in the field. The fallow rows make the fields more resistant to wind and water erosion than if they were planted with cotton alone.

Recently the new Secretary of Agriculture proposed regulations under which all the area up to 64 inches in width between the rows of cotton will be considered devoted to cotton production even though the land be planted with some other crop. The effect of this regulation would be to decrease by over 30 percent the acreage computation, and thus the real size of the cotton allotments owned by skip-row growers. In order to avoid this loss the farmer has two equally unattractive choices. He can plant cotton row on row, which would require a larger quantity of water than is available and which would deteriorate the land and increase wind and soil erosion, or he can turn to a new pattern of planting which would meet the regulations, but which could not be harvested by the machinery now used.

I am gratified that the conference report contains the following statement:

> The conferees wish to reaffirm the statements contained in both House and Senate committee reports which call on the Department to retain present practices concerning skip-row planting of cotton. They agree that the elimination of such practice would increase production costs and would fail to utilize the results of extensive research in this area by the Department.

I commend the conferees for their wisdom in this matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. As I mentioned earlier, that was a particularly difficult field. We not only reached a compromise on handling the matter in the two States of Texas and New Mexico, which have had a program, both Federal and State, for some 3 years, but we also extended that program to the Pacific by the same type of provision which was used during the early years of the program in Texas and New Mexico.

We are hoping to get rid of screwworms throughout the United States. At least, that is the intention of the conference action and report.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. As the Senator knows, one of the byproducts of the protection of livestock has been the protection of wildlife and an increase in deer and elk. There has been an increase such as people would not have dreamed of 10 years ago. So the eradication of screw-worms has the byproduct of furnishing an opportunity to multiply the number of those animals.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. For some years, including the past year, I have hunted on a certain pasture not too far from Jacksonville, but closer to St. Augustine, in northeast Florida. There was a time when the deer population was scarce, but since the elimination of the screw-worm, the number of deer has greatly increased. The year before last, after the hunting season—and hunters had taken a large number of deer out—farmers asked the Florida Fish and Game Commission to come in and take out 110 deer, because there were so many in that area, as a result of the elimination of the screw-worm, that they could not be properly nourished.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. One animal biologist has estimated that there are now more deer than there were in the days of the Indians. This is a good byproduct of the program at a time when people have much more leisure time and less working time.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. He is an able member of the committee and has played a full part in forwarding the program.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I join the Senator from Texas in high commendation of the Senator from Florida for the work he has done in bringing to the Senate the conference report in connection with the Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation for 1966. Some of us not on the committee may not fully appreciate it, but those of us who are on the committee know it is a thankless job.

On the other hand, I believe I am correct when I say that those who serve on the committee from time to time realize a rich satisfaction for their work as we see some of the great projects developed across the country, strengthening the economy of the Republic.

Although at times we feel that different courses of action should be followed by the Appropriations Committee, that should not be interpreted, in my judgment, as indicating a lack of appreciation for what they do.

I would be remiss if I did not, on behalf of the people of my State, particularly the people in the Pendleton, Oreg., area, thank the Senator from Florida and the entire membership of the conference committee for retaining in the conference report the $45,000 for a soil and water station at Pendleton, Oreg., the total cost of which will eventually be $425,000.

The Senator from Florida knows that I have been hard at work on this project and similar projects for many years. There is a great need for this laboratory in my State, which has serious water problems, as is true of so many States in the Union.

I take this moment to thank the Senator from Florida very much for the cooperation he extended to us in our State

Mr. HOLLAND. I am grateful, on behalf of myself and all of the members of the subcommittee and the full committee for those generous remarks.

I suppose that everybody who likes to hunt and fish—and the Senator from Florida is one of those—knows about Pendleton shirts.

I was lucky enough to own one at one time. When I heard about the desire for the soil and water station, I naturally put the two ideas together. I was glad to go there and see the station. I was glad to cooperate with the House. Incidentally, the principal drive for this particular station happened to come from the House rather than from the Senate. We were glad to accept it and agree.

Whenever I see a Pendleton shirt now, I shall think of the station.

I hope it will prove to be a blessing to this area of the country.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad that, after 2½ months of deliberation, the Senate-House conferees have successfully concluded an agreement on fiscal 1966 appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. Coming at the close of this session of Congress, with the omnibus farm bill already passed and in the President's hands, the bill assures funds for implementing the agricultural programs.

Reading the conference report, I notice it adopts the higher Senate figure of $106 million for the conservation operations of the Soil Conservation Service—and, of course, the administration proposal for creating a revolving fund into which farmers or SCD's would contribute half the cost of technical assistance was abandoned.

I am very glad, as a member of the Subcommittee on Small Watersheds, that the conferees agreed upon an increase to almost $66 million for watershed protection. The funds for construction are very important to Kentucky, where 21 projects have been approved and are underway.

The bill includes an appropriation of $103 million for the special milk program, which had been reduced to $100 million by the administration, but raised to $108 million by the Senate. And very important, I am glad to see that the amendment of Senator HART, which I cosponsored, has been fully maintained, appropriating an additional $2 million under section 11 of the School Lunch Act for special assistance programs in needy areas.

The State of Kentucky has succeeded in bringing nutritious, hot lunches to many of our eastern Kentucky schoolchildren, but without this additional money, Director Bevins states this special program could not continue through the winter. In the Senate Committee on Agriculture, I had supported the authorization for the special assistance program in 1962, and urged that implementing funds be approved by the Congress for, in many cases, especially in the Appalachian region, the hot meal provided under this program is the only one these children receive.

For the Rural Electrification Administration, I note that the conferees agreed to $305 million plus a contingency reserve of $60 million for the electrification program, an increase over the House figure.

I am disappointed that the Senate recommendation of $10 million for rural housing grants and loans was refused by the House conferees. I know that Congressman PERKINS of eastern Kentucky's Seventh District had taken the initiative in urging the administration to recommend such funds, and I was in touch with him after they had been removed from the administration bill by the House. The rural housing grant program has been of much use in Kentucky, where it provided grants for home repairs and improvements to remove hazards faced by families with low incomes. And, after I had talked to members of the Senate subcommittee, I was very glad when the full amount of this authorization was included by the Senate, and hope the program will again be recommended by the administration and will be approved next year.

The conference bill does include, however, increased funds for meat and poultry inspection, funds for economic research on flowers and ornamentals to be matched by the industry, and $150,000 for an egg-pricing study, which Kentucky's commissioner of agriculture, Wendell Butler, called to my attention.

This appropriation carries funds, not only to support commodity programs, but also for conservation, for the county agent and extension service programs and home demonstration agents. I commend the chairman, Senator HOLLAND, and the members of the committee for their work on this important measure.

MILLIONS OF YOUNG AMERICANS NOT DEMONSTRATING

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I was extremely disturbed by the events of this weekend when thousands of young Americans demonstrated against the conduct of the war in Vietnam and the role of this country in the Dominican Republic. I am even more disturbed by the mounting evidence that our enemies—the Communists—are playing an important role in organizing and directing these youngsters.

As I listened to the reports of these demonstrations and the comments made about the young men and women involved, I felt that this was not a weekend of which Americans could be proud. But as I thought further about this distressing weekend, it came to my mind that while a few thousand Americans were conducting themselves in this manner, while they were decrying American efforts at preventing the spread of communism, and while they were behaving in a manner which can only be described as shameful—there were millions upon millions of other young Americans who were not.

It distresses me, Mr. President, that a generation of stalwart young Americans has been given a black eye which it does not deserve by the activities of a few.

Lest anyone in the world—and more particularly, lest anyone in America—think that these demonstrations typify Young America, let us set the record straight right now.

While a few thousand demonstrated throughout this broad land of ours on Saturday afternoon, millions upon millions of young Americans were too busy to parade. They were doing what young Americans have done for generations—going to football games.

They were too exuberant and too happy to waste their time in snarling defiance of law and tradition.

And while a few thousand draft-age Americans were demonstrating against the draft, nearly 8 million draft-age Americans between 16 and 21 were working to support themselves and to help their families. Of this number, about 3 million were working part time. And is not this in the true tradition of America?

And this weekend, while a few thousand young Americans were demonstrating, millions upon millions of young Americans were attending Sunday school or Sabbath school. Enrollment in such religious training courses has climbed from 29 million back in 1950 to nearly 46 million in 1963, the latest year for which I could get accurate figures.

I would like to contrast for you the picture of the young people marching this weekend with pictures we may have forgotten—pictures of the thousands of young college students who toiled this spring on the levees of the flooding Mississippi, the Des Moines, and the Cedar Rivers to save their fellow citizens. You remember the stories of the devotion of the students who worked sometimes 48 hours without pause just because they were needed.

While a few thousand American youngsters were parading this weekend, we tend to overlook the thousands of men and women on our college campuses who were at work helping the blind children of their communities, or painting the houses of the poor, or raising money for the poor, or collecting food and clothing for the unfortunate.

The front page stories about the demonstrations tend to overshadow the young people's groups in churches and synagogues throughout the land who were staging plays and variety shows to raise money for the poor.

While a few demonstrated, thousands of young Americans were busy working in hospitals without pay or promise of reward, because the need exists.

Hundreds of thousands of high school and college youths in this land are working through the YMCA, the CYO, the YMHA, to improve the communities in which they live and work and grow.

These were the millions of young Americans who were too busy to demonstrate.

Mr. President, every generation of Americans has produced its noisy fringe who profess a disdain for the deep-seated and honored traditions of our people and our Republic. In every generation their noise and confusion has drowned out the dedication to principle of their quieter fellow citizens.

And yet, throughout our history, as crisis threatens and duty calls, each generation has mustered its strength and hardened its resolve. Each generation, as called, has gone forth to wage the battle to preserve America and America's ideals. Each generation, as called, has met the stern test and has won through.

In our own times we can recall it was said of young Americans that they were effete and pampered and lacked the will or the determination to stand together for a cause. This generation came face to face with destiny on December 7, 1941, and they met the challenge. Their nobility of sacrifice shall be emblazoned forever on the coat of arms of the United States.

As it was then, so it is today. This is my firm and heartfelt belief. Those who demonstrate and march and create noise and confusion do not speak for the youth of America. The other millions who work silently, who serve without ostentation, and who hold dear the ideals that are the foundation of our country more truly speak for the young people of America today.

They do not speak in a loud or demanding voice. They do not stand on platforms and beat their breasts and cry out to be heard. This is not their way; as it was not the way of other generations of Americans.

When the chips are down they, too, will meet destiny head-on and they, too, will acquit themselves nobly.

Let no man mistake those feeble demonstrations of last weekend for the true heartbeat of America's young people. That heart beats strong and proud. And it beats true.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I commend the Senator for pointing out that only a small percentage of the youth of America were engaged in publicity-seeking demonstrations over the past weekend. Personally, I am not an advocate of demonstrations.

I realize that many young people do it for the excitement; some do it because of frustration; some get into it because they feel they are not appreciated; and some feel they have not made the grade. Not finding anything else to blame, they blame the system. Therefore, they contend the system must be changed.

Regardless of what their personal opinions may be they are very ill-advised to give vent to their feelings through demonstrations which actually hurt their cause, if they have a cause.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank my distinguished and able colleague from Vermont.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Harris in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1004) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, line 7, strike out "nonpersonal"; on page 2, strike out lines 15 through 18, inclusive, and insert "amended by revising paragraph (15) to read:"; on page 3, line 7, strike out "nonpersonal"; on page 3, line 12, strike out "nonpersonal"; on page 3, strike out lines 18 through 22, inclusive; on page 3, line 23, strike out "7." and insert "6.".

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and services by executive agencies, and for other purposes."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

DISCONTINUANCE OR MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS OF LAW

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2150) to discontinue or modify certain reporting requirements of law, which were, on page 1, strike out line 7 over through and including line 6 on page 2; on page 2, line 7, strike out "(3)", and insert "(1)"; on page 2, strike out all after line 12 down through and including line 18; on page 2, line 19, strike out "(5)", and insert "(2)"; page 2, strike out line 24 over through and including line 4 on page 3; on page 3, line 5, strike out "(7)", and insert "(3)"; on page 3, line 17, strike out "(8)", and insert "(4)"; on page 3, line 20, strike out "(9)", and insert "(5)"; on page 3, strike out line 24 over through and including line 3 on page 4; on page 4, line 4, strike out "(11)", and insert "(6)"; on page 4, line 8, strike out "(12)", and insert "(7)"; on page 4, line 12, strike out "(13)", and insert "(8)"; on page 4, line 19, strike out "(14)", and insert "(9)"; on page 5, strike out line 2 over through and including line 8 on page 6; on page 6, line 9, strike out "(21)", and insert "(10)"; on page 6, strike out lines 13 through 17, inclusive; on page 6, line 18, strike out "(23)", and insert "(11)"; on page 6, line 23, strike out "(24)". and insert "(12)"; on page 7, strike out lines 5 through 13, inclusive; on page 7, line 15, strike out "(27)", and insert "(13)"; on page 7, strike out lines 19 through 22, inclusive; on page 7, line 23, strike out "(29)", and insert "(14)"; on page 8, strike out line 3 over through and including line 3 on page 9; on page 9, line 5, strike out "(35)", and insert "(15)"; on page 9, line 10, strike out "(36)", and insert "(16)"; on page 9, line 17, strike out "(37)", and insert "(17)"; on page 9, line 21, strike out "(38)", and insert "(18)"; on page 10, line 2, strike out "(39)", and insert "(19)"; on page 10, line 5, strike out "(40)", and insert "(20)"; on page 10, line 10, strike out "(41)", and insert "(21)"; on page 10, line 16, strike out "(42)", and insert "(22)"; on page 10, line 22, strike out "(43)", and insert "(23)"; on page 11, strike out lines 1 through 7, inclusive; on page 11, strike out lines 9 through 13, inclusive; on page 11, line 21, strike out "from", and insert "Beginning January 1, 1967, from"; and on page 12, line 19, strike out "from", and insert "Beginning January 1, 1967, from".

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

TAX DELINQUENCY OF FRED B. BLACK, JR.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on Sunday, September 19, 1965, the Washington Post published an article entitled "Black Named in $340,000 U.S. Tax Lien."

This article quotes an Internal Revenue Service spokesman as stating that this $340,000 lien represents Mr. Fred B. Black, Jr.'s delinquency for personal Federal income taxes during the years from 1960 through 1964. This $340,000 lien is in addition to the $91,000 judgment which last year was assessed against Mr. Black as a result of his conviction in the U.S. district court of evading his income taxes in 1956, 1957, and 1958.

This brings the total assessment for delinquent taxes against Mr. Fred Black to $430,000 without the consideration of penalties.

To the casual observer the Internal Revenue Service's filing of liens totaling $340,329 against Mr. Fred B. Black, Jr., for the years from 1960 through 1964 might be regarded as evidence that the Johnson administration is finally getting tough. However, if one examines the facts carefully it becomes apparent that the Internal Revenue Service has been unbelievably negligent in the administration of the Fred Black tax matter.

Why were these liens not filed earlier? The Department knew he owed the taxes.

In the period since early 1964, when Mr. Black's involvement with Mr. Robert G. Baker and the Serv-U Corp. was exposed, this so-called Washington consultant has been permitted to dispose of his assets in a manner that is thoroughly amazing. The Internal Revenue Service, usually so diligent in seizing property to protect the Government's interests, permitted Mr. Black's assets to evaporate.

Mr. Black's major assets were: First, his stock in Serv-U, which had an estimated value of over $500,000; and second, his large home at 4054 52d Terrace NW., Spring Valley, Washington, D.C.

According to press accounts Mr. Black's ownership of Serv-U stock was sold to Mr. Baker for around $65,000 because Mr. Black could not meet a payment on a note after being convicted of Federal tax evasion on May 5, 1964. Of course Mr. Black protested the sale of his big block of stock to Mr. Baker and tried to make it appear that he had made a genuine effort to keep the stock. However, the net result was that Mr. Black got rid of a big asset that could have been subject to a Government tax lien if one had been filed in a timely fashion.

In March 1964 Mr. Black, just before his trial, borrowed $100,000 from the District of Columbia National Bank as a second mortgage on his home in Washington, D.C. This property was already encumbered by a prior mortgage of $65,000 to secure a loan from the Perpetual Building Association in Washington. This closes out his second major asset.

With the Treasury Department sitting idly by while Mr. Black disposed of his assets by placing large mortgages on his property and "selling" or transferring his interest in Serv-U Corp. to Bobby Baker, the Treasury Department is now in a position of holding an empty bag. The assets are gone.

Thus we find that notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Black was convicted in the courts of evading $91,121 in taxes for the years 1956 through 1958, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Black filed his returns for the years 1960 through 1963 without paying his tax liability of another $340,000, and notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Black made no effort to file estimated tax returns as is required by law, but instead created a delinquent tax liability of well over $400,000 not including penalties, the Treasury Department sat idly by and never filed its liens until last week. In the meantime Mr. Black had proceeded to dispose of his assets.

Why has the Treasury Department handled Mr. Black's tax evasion case so leniently, and why did they withhold filing these liens until after Mr. Black had disposed of almost all of his assets?

When we consider this kid-glove treatment which the Treasury Department has extended to Mr. Fred B. Black, Jr., a business partner of Mr. Robert G. Baker, we wonder just how aggressively they are examining Mr. Baker, who pyramided his net worth from $84,000 in 1958 to $2,200,000 in 1963, during which time he paid a negligible amount of tax.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record my correspondence with the Treasury Department of March 31, 1965, and their reply thereto of May 3, 1965, followed by the article entitled "Black Named in $340,000 U.S. Tax Lien," published in the Washington Post of September 19, 1965.

There being no objection, the correspondence and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

United States Senate,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1965.

Mr. Sheldon S. Cohen,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Cohen: Recently the Treasury Department won its tax case against Mr. Fred Black, and this inquiry is not based upon that phase of his obligation.

I have received an allegation to the effect that during the years 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963 Mr. Black filed his timely tax returns but did not include any payments.

In this connection will you please advise me whether or not Mr. Black, over the period of the past 10 years, did file his returns on time and if they were accompanied with payments to cover the tax obligations as reported.

Yours sincerely,
John J. Williams.

U.S. Treasury Department,
Internal Revenue Service,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1965.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: This is in further reference to your letter of March 31 requesting certain information regarding the income tax filing and payment records of Mr. Fred B. Black, Jr.

Our records show that income tax returns were filed for the years 1955 through 1963. The return for the year 1961 was delinquent when filed. All other years were filed on time or within an extended due date granted by the District Director. Income tax returns recently filed for the year 1964 are being processed and are not fully indexed as yet so we cannot, at this time, say with any certainty whether a return for 1964 has been filed.

As you are aware, Mr. Black was convicted by a jury in 1964 of attempted evasion of his income taxes for the years 1956 to 1958, inclusive. He has appealed this conviction to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit where the cases are now pending the court's decision. These appeals are within the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice. It has been concluded, after consultation with the Department of Justice, that in view of the pendency of these criminal appeals it would be inappropriate at this time to furnish any information or comment with respect to the status of payment as to the tax obligations of Mr. Black.

I am sure you understand that as a matter of general policy in cases having pending criminal aspects, action on the civil liability is held in abeyance in the absence of special factors.

With kind regards,
Sincerely,
Sheldon S. Cohen,
Commissioner.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 19, 1965]

Black Named in $340,000 U.S. Tax Lien—Action Cites Income of Bobby Baker's Former Associate

The Internal Revenue Service has filed a $340,429 tax lien against Fred B. Black, Jr., convicted tax evader and onetime business associate of Robert G. "Bobby" Baker.

IRS spokesman Ed York said copies of the lien, covering personal Federal income taxes from 1960 through 1964, were filed Friday in district court here and in Rockville's circuit court. Black's wife, Nina, was also named.

The amounts of taxes ranged from a low of $7,485 in 1964—the year Black was convicted in U.S. district court here of evading $91,000 in income taxes in 1956, 1957, and 1958—to a high of $122,212 in 1961.

Asked for a comment yesterday, Black said the news of the filing took him completely by surprise.

"I didn't have that much income in those years," he said. "Some of them (the years) I owe for, but certainly not that much."

FREE ON APPEAL

Black, who once was reportedly paid $100,000 a year as a consultant for North American Aviation Corp. on Government aerospace matters, is free pending his appeal of his tax evasion conviction.

Following a 2-week trial that ended in May 1964, Black was sentenced to 15 months to 4 years in prison, plus a $10,000 fine. During the trial he denied on the witness stand any intent to defraud the Government.

Until the Bobby Baker affair, Black was just the little-known president of a small public relations firm. It pushed him into the limelight as the partner of Baker in the Serv-U vending machine firm.

CALLED INFLUENTIAL

A civil suit filed by a competitor firm charged that Black conspired with Baker and another associate to cancel a contract with a subcontractor of North American Aviation. The suit was later settled out of court.

Testimony at Black's tax trial portrayed him as an influential, high-spending man with a wide circle of friends in diverse and important positions.

Black's attorney, Hans A. Nathan, could not be reached for comment. The effect of a lien is to give notice that the Government has a claim on a person's assets.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, I submit for the information of the Senate, a brief summary of the activities of the committee and its subcommittees in the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

A full, detailed report on the activities of the committee and all subcommittees will be submitted at the end of the 89th Congress, as has been the custom in the past.

The following is a condensation of the actions taken by the committee and its subcommittees, with brief explanations of some of the legislation processed and enacted into law, or approved by the Senate. Also included are brief comments on certain other bills and subjects on which hearings have been held, staff memorandums prepared and/or reports issued.

Of the total of 74 Senate and House bills and resolutions referred to the Committee during the 1st session of the 89th

Congress, 21 were approved by the Senate and/or enacted into law. Three other bills were approved by the Senate but not acted upon in the House of Representatives, three are pending on the Senate calendar, and the committee postponed action on two House bills until the next session.

BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING

The Committee on Government Operations again reported favorably and the Senate approved, as it has in six preceding Congresses, a bill—S. 2; Senate Report No. 6—proposing the creation of a Joint Committee on the Budget. This proposed legislation, with 77 Senators as sponsors, was developed and perfected by the committee over a period of 15 years, and has repeatedly passed the Senate. It is designed to remedy serious deficiencies in appropriation procedures and to improve the congressional surveillance over the expenditure of public funds. It constitutes a positive approach to the elimination of extravagance, waste, and needless or excessive expenditures.

A joint committee, as proposed, and its staff, would serve the Committees on Appropriations, in the appropriation field, in a manner comparable to that in which the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and its staff, in the field of taxation, serve the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has, for more than a quarter of a century, proved its great worth and service in the revenue field. In the view of the committee, a like joint committee and service is needed in the appropriation and expenditure field. The bill was referred to the House Committee on Rules on January 28, 1965, but no further action was taken.

GAO AUDIT REPORTS

Pursuant to the requirements of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the rules of the Senate, a total of 344 audit reports and other communications relating to fiscal and related operations of the Government were submitted to the Senate by the Comptroller General of the United States, and referred to the committee. These reports were reviewed by the staff of the committee and, when warranted, by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. The great majority of the reports relate to excessive expenditures or agency actions which are considered to be irregular or not in accord with existing law. Unless some specific recommendations for action were suggested by the Comptroller General, the committee took no further action on these reports.

REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT—EXTENSION OF THE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949

The Reorganization Act of 1949, Public Law 109, 81st Congress, as amended and extended, providing the basic authority under which the President may submit reorganization plans to the Congress, expired on June 1, 1965. Upon the recommendation of the committee, the authority of the President to submit such plans was further extended by the 89th Congress, to December 31, 1968.

Under the provisions of the act as extended, reorganization plans submitted to the Congress by the President, when in session, prior to December 31, 1968, become law within 60 calendar days after submission, unless disapproved by a majority of either the House or the Senate by the adoption of a resolution of disapproval.

REORGANIZATION PLANS OF 1965

Under authority of the Reorganization Act, the President submitted five reorganization plans to Congress during the present session all of which became effective. The basic objectives of each of the plans, and the anticipated economies to be effected are as follows:

Plan No. 1 consolidated the Federal customs service, on a career basis, replacing 53 Presidential appointees with civil service employees. Treasury officials estimated that it could result in a $9 million annual saving. The committee recommended disapproval of Senate Resolution 102, to disapprove plan No. 1 (S. Rept. 203), following extensive hearings.

Plan No. 2 established a new Environmental Science Services Administration, combining in a single agency the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory. Savings are estimated at approximately $2 million.

Plan No. 3 transferred to the Interstate Commerce Commission all Federal locomotive inspection activities, which had been operated under the direction of Presidential appointees since 1911, at an approximate saving of $170,000 a year. A hearing was held on plan No. 3 in response to a request from interested parties. No report was filed because no resolution of disapproval was introduced in the Senate. However, a statement in lieu of a report, summarizing the issues and the committee's action, was incorporated in the printed hearings as an introductory statement.

Plan No. 4 abolished nine obsolete interagency committees, transferring their remaining functions to existing officials or agencies, at a saving that was termed "substantial."

Plan No. 5 eliminated eight advisory committees attached to the National Science Foundation and gave the Foundation Director increased authority to delegate his growing responsibilities.

CREATION OF A DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The Congress, upon the recommendation of a majority of the committee, approved a bill—Public Law 89-174—creating a Department of Housing and Urban Development. The act transfers to, and vests in, the Secretary of the new Department the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its Administrator. These include the urban renewal, urban planning, and open-space programs of the Urban Renewal Administration and the planning advances and public facility and other loan programs of the Community Facilities Administration, along with the agency's urban mass transportation program. The act created within the Department a Federal Housing Commissioner, who shall first be one of the Assistant Secretaries; second, head a Federal Housing Administration; third, be provided with such duties and powers as may be prescribed by the Secretary; and fourth, administer, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary, departmental programs relating to the private mortgage market.

The Federal National Mortgage Association, a corporate entity which provides a secondary mortgage market for FHA-insured and Veterans' Administration-guaranteed mortgages, was transferred to the new Department in its present corporate form, with the Secretary replacing the Housing Administrator as Chairman of the FNMA Board.

The act further established within the Department a Director of Urban Program Coordination, to be designated by the Secretary, who shall assist him in carrying out his responsibilities to the President with respect to achieving maximum coordination of the programs of various departments and agencies of the Government which have a major impact on community development; and that the President shall, first, undertake studies of the organization of housing and urban development functions and programs within the Federal Government; and second, provide the Congress with the findings and conclusions of such studies, together with his recommendations regarding the transfer of such functions and programs to or from the Department.

CHART AND REPORT OF GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

As initiated in the 80th Congress, the committee continued the compilation of an annual organization chart and report reflecting by calendar year all reorganizations and changes effected in the basic structure and increases or decreases in personnel of all departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government. The chart and accompanying report for calendar year 1964, reflecting data as of January 1, 1965, were submitted to the Senate March 23, 1965—Committee Report No. 25. The annual chart contains a tabulation of personnel assignments to major operating components of each department and agency. The report contains complete details concerning major reorganizations effected, the resulting improvements in administration as reported by the agencies, as well as the total reductions or increases in Federal personnel.

MISCELLANEOUS REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS

Other reorganization bills, on which no action was taken by the committee, included proposals to establish, first, a Department of Education; second, an Office of Community Development in the Office of the President; third, an Office of Consumers; fourth, a U.S. Department of Transportation; fifth, a Department of Marine and Atmospheric Affairs under a proposed Marine and Atmospheric Affairs Coordination Act; sixth, redesignate the Department of the Interior as the Department of Natural Resources; and seventh, establish commissions, first, to study and appraise the organization and operation of the executive branch of the Government; second, on noxious and obscene matters and materials; third, for the elimination of pornographic materials; fourth, on science and technology; and fifth, Advisory Commission on Health Research Activities.

GENERAL SERVICES

There were a number of bills which would affect the activities of the General Services Administration in various areas, which, first, were designed to broaden or clarify the authority of the Administrator, officers, or employees designated to act in his behalf, or to broaden the functions and activities of GSA; second, provide general authority with respect to certain types of surplus property disposals; third, relate to the transfer of surplus property; fourth, broaden the donable property program—set forth in the report of the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures; fifth, provide for the procurement of property and services by executive agencies—S. 1004, which has passed the Senate and House; sixth, permit GSA to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of equipment which is attached to or is a part of Government-owned buildings—S. 1516, approved by the Senate and the House; and seventh, authorize reimbursement to a State or political subdivision thereof for sidewalk repair or replacement (H.R. 9830).

AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

A bill, H.R. 4845, providing for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies, passed the House as amended on September 2, and was referred to this committee on September 7, 1965. The committee has received a number of communications from Government agencies and public and private users of automatic data processing equipment, as well as from private concerns who are engaged in the manufacture, installation and application of such equipment, requesting an opportunity to present their views at hearings on the bill. The private organizations and industry representatives requested more time to determine what impact enactment of the bill might have on their operations.

In view of the interest which was manifested in the bill, it was determined that hearings should be held before further action or consideration is given to the proposed legislation by the committee. The bill was not received from the House until near the end of the session, and due to the pressure of other business, the committee did not have an opportunity to act before adjournment, but expects to hold hearings on H.R. 4845 and on a companion bill, S. 1584 early in the next session of the Congress.

GENERAL LEGISLATION

The committee also gave consideration to a number of other bills of general application. These included bills which would:

First. Discontinue or modify certain reporting requirements of Federal departments and agencies (S. 2150). The bill was amended and reported—Senate Report No. 545—on August 10, 1965, passed the Senate August 12, was amended by the House and approved on October 18, 1965.

Second. Provide for reimbursement of moving expenses of Federal employees and authorize payment of storage expenses of household goods of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the United States—S. 2374 and S. 2516. The committee requested comments and recommendations from the Bureau of the Budget, and all of the major departments and agencies of the Government. Due to the pressure of other business the reports were delayed, and the committee did not have an opportunity to consider the measures. During the closing days of the session, the House Committee on Government Operations held hearings on a companion bill (H.R. 10607) and ordered the bill reported favorably on October 13, 1965.

Third. Provide for an official residence for the Vice President of the United States (S. 2390). This bill provides that the principal residence located on the grounds of the Naval Observatory in the District of Columbia, together with such lands appurtenant thereto as shall be designated by the Administrator of General Services, be set aside for use as the official residence of the Vice President of the United States. It would authorize an annual appropriation of $100,000 for defraying the expenses of the operation of the official residence. The committee requested comments from the Bureau of the Budget, General Services Administration, Department of the Navy, and other agencies which might have had an interest in this proposal, but has received no reports from any of these agencies.

Fourth. Authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into an agreement with the University of Texas for the Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Archival Depository—House Joint Resolution 632; Senate Joint Resolution 105. These resolutions waived the 60-day waiting period provided by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act in order to enable the University of Texas and the Administrator of General Services to move forward immediately with the proposal made by the university. House Joint Resolution 632 was enacted as Public Law 89-169 on September 6, 1965.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations gave extended consideration to and/or held hearings on several bills relating to legislation referred to it, including, first, Intergovernmental Corporation Act of 1965—S. 561 and S. 689; Senate Report 538; second, Uniform Compensation for Relocation Act—S. 1201 and S. 1681; and, third, Adjustment of Legislative Jurisdiction, S. 1007.

Further details regarding action on these bills and other matters are set forth in the summary of the activities of the subcommittee.

REPORTS OF SPECIAL STUDIES

During the 1st session of the 89th Congress, the committee undertook several special studies and reports on subjects which were considered to be of particular interest to the Congress and the public generally. These included studies dealing with, first, constitutional and legal aspects of Reorganization Act procedures under the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended; second, Government competition with private enterprise with special reference to contracts for technical services; third, legislation authorizing appropriations and establishing revolving funds; fourth, certain aspects of the operation of the Buy American Act of 1933, as amended; and fifth, a reexamination and reappraisal of the committee's earlier work on fees for special services, which is currently underway.

CONSTITUTIONAL LEGAL ASPECTS OF REORGANIZATION PROCEDURES

The study on Reorganization Act procedures was prepared in connection with hearings on bills to extend or make permanent the authority of the President to submit reorganization plans. It was issued as staff memorandum No. 89-1-6, entitled "Constitutional and Legal Aspects of Reorganization Act Procedures, Pursuant to the Reorganization Act of 1949, as Amended," and was inserted in the record of those hearings. It consisted of a review and analysis of applicable court decisions and of the contention, made from time to time, that the delegation by the Congress to the President of authority to reorganize the executive branch of the Government was of doubtful constitutional validity. The study concluded that legislation delegating such authority to the President was constitutionally valid as long as it contained, first, specific guidelines and objectives laid down by the Congress defining the subject and extent of the delegation; and second, provisions enabling the Congress to retain and exercise control over the delegated authority by, first, conferring on the President limited rather than permanent authority; second, providing for an automatic termination of such authority; and third, establishing a procedure whereby the Congress can disapprove reorganization proposals submitted by the President.

GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

The study on Government competition with private enterprise, which is of a continuing nature, was designed to keep members of the committee and of the Senate current on recent developments. Issued as staff memorandum No. 89-1-10 on March 22, 1965, it contained a brief summary and review of past studies and legislative action by the committee as well as information on pending measures and recent events in the field.

With respect to legislation, the memorandum noted that the committee had before it two bills and one resolution dealing with various aspects of Government competition with private enterprise. The basic bill, S. 1264, would establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, and establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be in competition with private enterprise. S. 1263 would require the procurement of certain services by Government agencies from commercial suppliers whenever economy would result from such procurement. Senate Resolution 87 would authorize this committee to make a comprehensive study of the entire field. Both bills and the resolution are identical to legislative proposals which were before the committee in previous Congresses.

With respect to other developments, the memorandum noted that in the course of its continuing surveillance of the subject, the committee staff learned that the Bureau of the Budget was circulating a proposed new directive relating to the procurement of commercial or industrial products and services by the Federal Government which was originally scheduled to be issued earlier this year. An analysis of the draft proposal, together with a study of certain related materials, indicated that major policy changes were contemplated, with particular reference to the utilization of contractor personnel for technical services, which have been supplied by private industry. More specifically, it appeared that the major portion of all contracts of this type, which have been utilized on a large scale by the Department of Defense and several other agencies, were in the process of being terminated and the work is to be performed in the future almost entirely by civil service personnel. This proposed action was based, in part, upon, first, the position of the Department of Defense that national security requires an inhouse capability in the technical service field greater than that which heretofore existed, with the result that services of this type should be performed by civil service personnel, with minor exceptions; second, the position of the Civil Service Commission and the General Accounting Office that contractor personnel are being used as a means of violating manpower ceilings and their extensive utilization may constitute a violation of civil service laws and regulations; third, the position of the General Accounting Office, based upon limited studies, that the use of contractor personnel is far more costly than civil service personnel; and fourth, a report made by the Subcommittee on Manpower of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service dealing with these matters.

The committee staff learned thereafter that the new Bureau of the Budget directive, which will supersede the current directive on Government competition and procurement of commercial or industrial products and services, is still being processed and staffed within the executive branch and is expected to be issued later in the year. It was further learned that the Defense Department agencies are now in the process of converting to civil service virtually all of the technical service positions which have, in the past, been performed on a contract basis by private enterprise.

LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS AND ESTABLISHING REVOLVING FUNDS

The study on legislation authorizing appropriations was issued as a committee print on September 20, 1965, under the title "Legislation Authorizing Appropriations and Establishing Revolving Funds (as of March 1965)." Compiled by the Bureau of the Budget at the request of the Committee on Government Operations, from information furnished by executive branch departments and agencies, it will be printed as a Senate document later in the year—Senate Resolution No. 151—following final review and correction by the departments and agencies concerned.

This study was initiated by the committee to fill the information gap resulting from the fact that, over a period of many years, the Congress has continued to enact legislation authorizing the appropriation of huge sums of money to fund various programs, without either knowledge of or reference to authorizations which have already been enacted. The authorizations dealt with in the report fall into the following categories: First, those which limit the total amount to be appropriated; second, those which require annual renewal; third, those which are of a continuing nature; fourth, those which establish and authorize revolving funds—back-door spending; fifth, those which authorize permanent appropriations which become available without further action by the Congress; and sixth, those which provide new obligational authority outside of appropriation acts, and involve another aspect of back-door spending.

It is believed that this compilation will fill the gap in information which now exists by enabling Members of Congress to determine what action has already been taken, since it will supply detailed information as to the amounts of money which have been authorized previously, the statutory citation and dates of such authorization, and the amounts which have been appropriated pursuant to such authorizations, at least as of March 1965, the cut-off date of this study.

BUY AMERICA ACT OF 1933

A brief study of the operation of the Buy American Act of 1933, as amended, and an implementing Executive order, was issued on September 8, 1965, as staff memorandum No. 89-1-40. It was prepared in response to complaints by American businessmen to the effect that contracts for the manufacture of certain products, for which they had submitted bids to Government agencies, had been awarded by these agencies to foreign bidders whose bids were lower, despite the application of differential formulas provided by the act and the Executive order.

The study reviewed the specific complaints as well as pertinent statutes and regulations and noted that, although the policies and procedures provided for by existing law may, from time to time, result in the loss of business by American business interests, there was no indication that the Government agencies concerned had failed to comply with the legal requirements. The staff study noted further that whether the public interest would be served more effectively by amending the Buy American Act, so as to further curtail and the latitude and discretion of Federal agency and department heads in connection with the award of contracts for construction and supplies to foreign bidders, was a matter of high national policy. It concluded that prior to any action directed toward an amendment of the Buy American Act, careful consideration should be given to the possible impact of such action upon U.S. foreign, defense, economic, and monetary policy, as well as to the views of the departments and agencies concerned with such policies.

SUMMARIES OF ACTIVITIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

The following summaries of activities were submitted by the indicated subcommittees:

SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

The Senate by Resolution 54 authorized the Committee on Government Operations to conduct investigations during the 89th Congress, 1st session, into three fields of jurisdiction, and the committee delegated this duty to its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. The three areas are:

First. Waste and inefficiency in Federal executive agencies.

Second. Crimes and improper activities in the labor and management fields.

Third. Activities of organized crime which utilizes facilities of interstate or international commerce to violate Federal laws.

Major investigations in 1965 resulted in public and executive sessions as follows:

First. Investigation into federally insured banks. The hearings were concerned with allegations of growing abuses in banking practices and the depletion of bank assets by entrepreneurs and speculators. As a result of these hearings, S. 2575 was introduced in the Senate by Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, cosponsored by five other members of the subcommittee and one other Senator, to amend our Federal banking statutes by strengthening certain laws relating to banking.

Second. Diversion of union welfare-pension funds of Allied Trades Council and Teamsters Local 815. Testimony revealed some $4 million in pension funds of both the aforementioned unions were circuitiously transferred to two so-called research foundations in Africa and Puerto Rico. This money lay dormant for several years and none of it was expended for charitable purposes until the subcommittee inquiry began. As a result of these hearings, S. 2627 was introduced in the Senate by Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, cosponsored by seven other members of the subcommittee, to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act by providing safeguards for the rights of union members and other employees.

Third. Alleged misuse of U.S. aid to Iran. An Iranian appeared before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations and testified under oath that there were large-scale diversions of U.S. aid funds intended for Iran. This man produced documents which he said verified his testimony.

An extensive investigation in Iran and in the United States failed to substantiate even a single portion of testimony. No measure of corroboration was received from any source other than the witness himself. The subcommittee was compelled to conclude that it had received spurious documents and false testimony under oath. This matter has been referred to the Department of Justice for appropriate study and disposition.

As a result of hearings by the subcommittee in the 88th Congress concerning various facets of organized crime, the following bills have been introduced in the Senate by Senator John L. McClellan cosponsored by Senator Frank J. Lausche:

S. 2187 would make it a Federal violation to join an organization, such as the mafia, the purpose of which is to carry on organized criminal activity.

S. 2188 provides that it would be a violation of Federal law to obstruct a criminal investigation by means of bribery or coercion in any form applied to a potential witness.

S. 2189 would outlaw private wiretapping and would provide in much the same manner as a search warrant for a court of competent jurisdiction to authorize the establishment of a wiretap for a specified period of time and for specific violations. No effective prohibition now exists in Federal law to private operators and the fact that wiretap evidence is not admissible in court serves to handcuff legitimate law enforcement officers. This bill would remedy this condition.

S. 2190 to provide the Attorney General with authority to grant immunity to a witness in order to secure his testimony. In numerous criminal actions potential witnesses invoke the fifth amendment rather than incriminate themselves.

S. 2191 provides for the handling of narcotic addicts and narcotic traffickers. A principal feature of this bill is the provision that an addict convicted of violation of the narcotic law can voluntarily commit himself to a hospital in lieu of imprisonment for treatment and for necessary care after release from confinement. This same treatment will be available to addicts on a voluntary basis without conviction.

Numerous other inquiries were carried out by the subcommittee without public hearings. Many of these investigations resulted in corrective action by agencies or organizations involved; others produced no evidence to substantiate information or allegations received, and several major inquiries are being currently conducted and it is anticipated they will result in hearings.

On January 24, 1965, Senator John L. McClellan announced that a review of the work of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee and the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field revealed during a 10-year period from 1955 to 1965 that—

First. Ninety-eight persons who had appeared as witnesses before these two bodies had been convicted of either Federal or State violations. These violations covered a wide range of illegal activities and the convicted persons include industrialists, hoodlums, labor leaders, and others.

In addition to the aforementioned, there were 92 convictions of persons concerning whom information was developed during committee investigations but who did not appear as witnesses. They were prosecuted and convicted for offenses based on testimony by other witnesses.

Second. Testimony of witnesses and investigation disclosed evidence of huge losses of income tax revenue to the United States which losses are now in the process of recovery by the Government.

A study of the records of the Internal Revenue Service and the Tax Court of the United States of a selected list of witnesses who appeared before the committees disclosed tax losses to the United States in the amount of $29,096,336.46. The Internal Revenue Service has advised that of this amount $1,226,926.22 has already been collected from the taxpayers and the balance is either in litigation in the Tax Court of the United States or awaiting further processing by the Internal Revenue Service.

The $29,096,336.46 in tax deficiencies, recovery of which is now being sought, averages out to approximately $3 million a year during the 10-year span.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY AND INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS

In February of 1965, during the 89th Congress, 1st session, the Subcommittee on National Security and International Operations was authorized, under the Chairmanship of Senator Henry M. Jackson, to continue auditing the national security policy process and to expand its jurisdiction over national security matters to include international operations and organizations. The subcommittee is building on the work of its predecessors, the Subcommittees on National Policy Machinery and on National Security Staffing and Operations, and it continues the tradition of professional and nonpartisan inquiry established by these subcommittees.

The first phase of the study was devoted to a thorough and careful analysis of key questions in the conduct of national security policy, and the staff prepared two publications: an "Initial Memorandum," which introduces the main problem areas of concern to the subcommittee, and a compilation of "Selected Readings" on the conduct of national security policy.

A set of basic hearings was held during June, July, and August at which testimony was given on key problem areas by outstanding witnesses of broad experience, with established reputations for independence of thought and judgment. The subcommittee has published this testimony in four parts.

The staff and committee members have conferred with leading authorities on national security and government organization at home and abroad, in further preparation for a set of hearings on NATO and alliance operations during the next session of Congress.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

A. LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

First. Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965—S. 561 and S. 689. Hearings were held on March 29, 30, 31, and April 1 and 2, 1965, and the subcommittee, at an executive session held on June 23, agreed unanimously to report S. 561, as amended, to the parent committee. It was passed unanimously by the Senate on August 5. No action has been taken by the House.

Second. Uniform compensation for relocation—S. 1201 and S. 1681. Hearings were held on June 30, July 1, 13, and 14, 1965. Three executive sessions of the subcommittee were held and it is anticipated that S. 1861, as amended, will be reported to the full committee by a unanimous vote.

Third. S. 1007—the adjustment of legislative jurisdiction over Federal lands—was introduced on February 4, 1965. This bill is almost identical to S. 815 introduced in the 88th Congress, 1st session. Hearings on S. 815 were held and several subcommittee executive sessions convened in the 88th Congress, but no final decision was reached. No action has been taken on S. 1007.

Fourth. Five-year record of the advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and its future role: The subcommittee held joint hearings with the House Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations on May 25, 26, and 27, 1965. Legislation based on the findings of these hearings is being prepared and undoubtedly will be introduced in the 89th Congress, 2d session.

B. REPORTS

First. "Disposal of Ellis Island," Senate Report No. 306, June 9, 1965.

Second. "Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965"—to accompany S. 561—Senate Report No. 538, August 3, 1965.

C. RESEARCH AND INFORMATION

First. "1964 National Survey of Metropolitan Planning," March 8, 1965: This study, prepared by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, lists the financial and organizational data on metropolitan planning agencies and includes information on comprehensive transportation planning programs.

Second. "Supplement to Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments," May 17, 1965: This supplement updates the original catalog to include aid programs enacted in the 88th Congress, 2d session. The catalog and supplement list Federal grants-in-aid and other forms of assistance to the States and local units of government. The provisions, conditions of eligibility, procedures for participation, and allotment of formulas for each aid program are contained in this widely circulated report. To date, over 55,000 copies of the catalog have been distributed to Members of Congress, State, and local officials, and other interested persons.

Third. "The Federal System as Seen by Federal Aid Officials": This committee print, soon to be published, lists and analyzes the results of an extensive questionnaire sent to these officials, and explores some key issues in Federal-State-local relations.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID EXPENDITURES

A. REORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE WITH RESPECT TO GOVERNMENTAL ACTIVITIES IN THE FIELD OF POPULATION

Extensive hearings were held on S. 1676—introduced by Senator Ernest Gruening and cosponsored by Senators

Joseph Tydings, Ross Bass, E. L. Bartlett, Paul Douglas, Frank E. Moss, Ralph Yarborough, Stephen Young, Robert C. Byrd, Peter Dominick, Philip A. Hart, Milward L. Simpson, and George McGovern—to bring about such a reorganization and to authorize the President to call a White House Conference on Population in 1967. Fifteen hearings were held on June 22, 23, and 29, July 9, 21, and 28, August 10, 11, 17, 18, 24, and 31, and September 8, 15, and 22. A total of 56 witnesses were heard. Since many additional witnesses have expressed a desire to be heard, it is expected that additional hearings will be held early in the 2d session of the 89th Congress, preparatory to consideration of the bill by the subcommittee.

B. INVESTIGATION OF THE DONABLE SURPLUS PROPERTY PROGRAM

Pursuant to an authorization of the chairman of the full committee, the subcommittee made an evaluation of the surplus property program to determine how it is administered and to ascertain whether additional users should be made eligible to receive surplus property under the donable property provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

The subcommittee conducted hearings on May 24, June 10 and 11, 1965, at which time over a dozen Federal, State, and local officials testified on the procedures, programs, and activities carried on by the various agencies involved in the administration of the donation program as authorized by section 203 of the act.

On August 26 and 27, 1965, the subcommittee held further hearings for the purpose of clearing up any issues carried over from the prior hearings, and to consider six bills which provide for expanding the number of eligible users of surplus property. The bills were: S. 525 to authorize the donation of surplus property to Indian tribes; S. 707 to permit the donation of property for use by public recreation, parks, historical monuments, and for the promotion of fish and wildlife management; S. 1066 to make surplus stockpile material available for donation to schools, colleges, and public health; S. 1362 to authorize the donation of surplus to organizations providing free library services for the blind; S. 1947 to make surplus available to States and political subdivisions before offered for sale; and S. 2015 to permit the donation of certain types of surplus to the Summer Institute of Linguistics. Testimony was received from 7 U.S. Senators and 11 other witnesses on the purpose and justification of each proposal.

At the conclusion of the hearings the chairman stated that in view of the large amount of excess and surplus property generated by U.S. military bases overseas, and the prospective increase of availability of such property. Large quantities of Federal property in overseas areas may become surplus when such bases are closed or curtailed in accordance with the President's recommendations. The subcommittee has, therefore, scheduled additional hearings in Alaska and in Western Europe, during November and December, so that this phase of the program may be given proper consideration in the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

C. INVESTIGATION OF THE PRIBILOF ISLAND (ALASKA) FUR SEALSKIN SALES

An investigation was undertaken into the circumstances surrounding the letting of a so-called research and development contract with respect to Pribilof Island for sealskins by the Department of the Interior. Preliminary hearings were held on this matter on September 23. It is anticipated that field studies will be conducted during the recess, culminating in additional hearings early in the next session of the Congress.

D. REVIEW OF INTERAGENCY PROCEDURES WITH RESPECT TO U.S.-OWNED FOREIGN CURRENCY ACCOUNTS AND PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAMS

A staff study is underway with respect to interagency coordination, efficiency, and economy in the field of participation training programs in the United States and abroad. Emphasis is being placed upon a thorough review of procedures adopted by the various agencies involved to insure elimination of duplication, proper selection procedures, quality of training, and followup evaluation of training received.

Another staff study is examining the degree of coordination among the Departments of Treasury, State, Agriculture, and the Agency for International Development with respect to obtaining maximum benefit from the foreign currencies held in U.S. accounts throughout the world. The focal point of the examination is to ascertain whether the highest possible interest rate commensurate with sound policies is being received on the U.S. deposits.

Public hearings are planned early next session on both of these subjects.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT RESEARCH

On August 20, 1965, Senator John L. McClellan, chairman of the committee, announced the establishment of the Subcommittee on Government Research, composed of Senator Fred R. Harris, as chairman, and Senators McClellan, Ribicoff, Montoya, Mundt, and Simpson. The subcommittee will be engaged in a comprehensive study of the entire research activity and involvement of the Federal Government, in an effort to comprehend the totality of the Government research program in all of the areas in which research is undertaken, including the natural and physical sciences and such social sciences as economics, education, and the humanities.

In its preliminary studies, the subcommittee found that although there is much information concerning the nature and extent of research expenditures and programing in selected areas, there is no comprehensive overall understanding of the entire Federal research activity and involvement or the effect it has on the Nation. One of the basic objectives of the subcommittee will be to fill the vacuum in this area in the legislative branch by conducting intensive analyses of the nature, meaning, scope, extent, and significance of the national research policy which now involves annual expenditures in excess of $15 billion annually, of which approximately $1.5 billion is devoted to basic research and more than $14 billion to applied research and development.

In the course of its work, the subcommittee is devoting special attention to duplication and waste, maldistribution of research activity, and disproportionate emphasis on certain areas to the exclusion of others. An effort will be made to determine how well the science information exchange program is performing the function of informing research institutions of ongoing Federal programs; the extent to which information is now being shared by Federal agencies which are conducting research; the compatibility of data storage systems now in use by various Federal agencies; and the means by which universities and private research organizations and private business are kept informed concerning Federal agency plans and needs for research.

Studies are also being undertaken with respect to the administration of Federal research programs so as to determine whether systems of accounting and recordkeeping are sufficiently similar in various agencies to enable a comprehensive overview of Federal research activity; whether adequate guidelines exist for determining the kinds of projects that should be conducted in-house as opposed to those which should be contracted out; whether there is a coordinated national policy on the proper use of the limited research manpower in the United States; whether legislation is needed to further stimulate research activity and to authorize Federal agencies to conduct research; whether too much money is being expended for research purposes in general, or only in some fields; and whether there are adequate policies and guidelines to govern the disposition of federally purchased research facilities no longer used for the purposes for which they are acquired.

A number of preliminary actions have been taken and the subcommittee expects to hold hearings with respect to specific items later in the year.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, pursuant to Senate Resolution 56 the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization was established this year to handle the reorganization proposals which are being submitted to the Congress in ever-increasing number.

In the overall field of reorganization, the 89th Congress has compiled an excellent record. The broadest public attention has been focused on its establishment of a new Department of Housing and Urban Development, which will give the communities of the Nation an official voice at the highest levels of Government for the first time. This was the first addition to the President's Cabinet since the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was formed a dozen years ago.

We also extended the President's authority to submit reorganization plans to Congress until December 31, 1968. This was the longest extension of this kind granted any President since 1949.

During the year, the President submitted five reorganization plans to Congress, and all of them went into effect. This is what the plans accomplished:

Plan No. 1 placed the entire Federal customs service on a career basis, replacing 53 Presidential appointees with civil servants. Treasury officials estimated that it could result in a $9 million annual saving.

Plan No. 2 established a new Environmental Science Services Administration, combining in a single agency the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Central Radio Propagation Laboratory. Estimates of savings range from $1.8 to $2.2 million.

Plan No. 3 transferred to the Interstate Commerce Commission all Federal locomotive inspection activities, which had been operated by Presidential appointees since 1911, at an approximate saving of $170,000 a year.

Plan No. 4 abolished nine obsolete interagency committees, transferring their remaining functions to existing officials or agencies, at a saving that was termed "substantial."

Plan No. 5 eliminated eight advisory committees attached to the National Science Foundation and gave the Foundation Director increased authority to delegate his growing responsibilities.

Continuing the work in the field of interagency coordination initiated by Vice President Humphrey when he chaired the subcommittee, we began a study of the Federal role in traffic safety. Following 4 days of hearings at which representatives of the automotive industry testified, a safety committee composed of the heads of the four auto companies was established and every major auto manufacturer announced additional safety features on all 1966 model cars.

There is attached a résumé of subcommittee activities during the year and a status report on legislation pending before the subcommittee.

I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the report and résumé was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Summary and status of legislation referred to the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, 89th Cong., 1st sess.

Bill number and sponsor	Short title	Status or recommendation
S. 100 (Ribicoff, Williams of New Jersey)	To establish a Department of Education	Requested departmental reports.
S. 309 (Mundt and 28 cosponsors), H.R. 7465	Create a Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials.	Hearings on H.R. 7465 by a subcommittee of House Committee on Education and Labor, Sept. 1, 3, 8, 14, 1965.
S. 497 (Scott)	Establish in Executive Office of President an Office of Community Development.	Hearings held in connection with S. 1599.
S. 735 (Miller, Allott), S. 309	Create a Commission for Elimination of Pornographic Materials.	Hearings on H.R. 7465 by a subcommittee of House Committee on Education and Labor, Sept. 1, 2, 8, 14, 1965.
S. 1045 (Clark and 3 cosponsors) H.R. 6927	To establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development.	Feb. 18, 1965, hearings. Mar. 31, Apr. 1, 2; May 19, S. 1599 and H.R. 6927.
S. 1052 (Hart and 17 cosponsors)	To establish an Office of Consumers	Requested departmental reports.
S. 1122 (Case)	To establish a U.S. Department of Transportation	Do.
S. 1134 (Ribicoff) H.R. 4623	To amend Reorganization Act of 1949 on a permanent basis.	H. Rept. 184 on H.R. 4623, Mar. 19, 1965. Hearings Mar. 29 (also on S. 1135).
S. 1135 (McClellan) H.R. 4623	To amend Reorganization Act of 1949 to June 1, 1967 (Dec. 31, 1968, authorization).	Hearings Mar. 29. Also on S. 1134. S. Rept. 154, Apr. 8, 1965. Passed Senate, amended Apr. 9, 1965. H.R. 4623 passed House, amended June 3, 1965. Public Law 89-43.
S. 1599 (Ribicoff and 13 cosponsors)	To establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development.	Hearings, Mar. 31, Apr. 1, 2, May 19, 1965. Reported with amendments Aug. 2, 1965, S. Rept. No. 326. H.R. 6927, passed Senate, amended, Aug. 11, 1965. Public Law 89-174. Sept. 9, 1965.
S. 2251 (Muskie and 17 cosponsors)	Marine and Atmospheric Affairs Coordination Act of 1965.	Requested departmental reports.
S. 2162 (Nelson)	To provide for research design, development, and construction of prototype safe car.	Subcommittee held hearings on bill, Federal Role in Traffic Safety, Mar. 22, 25, 26, July 13, 14, 15, 21, 1965.
S. 2411 (Pearson and 28 cosponsors)	Establish a Commission to study and appraise the organization and operation of the executive branch of the Government.	Departmental reports requested.
S. 2435 (Moss and 2 cosponsors)	To redesignate Department of Interior as Department of Natural Resources.	Do.
	RESOLUTIONS	
S. Res. 102 (Pastore and 7 cosponsors)	Disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965	Hearings, May 12, 14. Reported adversely May 20, S. Rept. 203. Resolution disagreed to May 24, plan effective May 25, 1965.
S. Res. 96 (Robertson)	To establish an Advisory Commission of Health Research Activities.	Referred to Subcommittee on Research.
	HOUSE BILLS	
H.R. 6927, S. 1599	To establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development.	H. Rept. 337, May 11, 1965. Passed House, June 16, 1965. Passed Senate, amended Aug. 11, 1965. H. Rept. 884, Conference, Aug. 26. Senate agrees to conference report, Aug. 30, 1965; House agrees Aug. 31. Public Law 89-174, Sept. 9, 1965.

Activities of Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization—Résumé

Hearings held, 14; number of witnesses, 79; printed materials, 1,198 pages.

Amendment of Reorganization Act of 1949: 1 hearing; 1 witness; printed material, hearing, 26 pages, committee print of report, 18 pages.

Establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development: 4 hearings; 19 witnesses (including Senators Clark, Javits, Mayors Goldner, Collins, Wagner); 14 statements, letters, etc., including those from Senators Inouye and Mondale; printed material, all hearings, 298 pages; committee print of report, 37 pages.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965 (Bureau of Customs) (S. Res. 102): 4 hearings; 19 witnesses (including Senators Pastore, Brewster, Tydings, Bartlett, Pell, Fannin, Sparkman, Holland, Young of North Dakota; Secretary of Treasury Fowler; Acting Commissioner of Customs Johnson); 49 statements, letters, etc., including those from Senators Pastore, Gruening, Clark, Scott, Morse, Neuberger; Gov. Pat Brown; Congressmen Rogers C. B. Morton, William J. Green; referrals from Senators Russell, Talmadge, and Hayden; State officials; private organizations; printed material, all hearings, 158 pages, report No. 203, 15 pages.

Federal role in traffic safety: 7 hearings; 34 witnesses (including Senators Nelson, Fannin; Postmaster General Gronouski; General Gruenther; Acting Administrator of GSA Knott; Secretary of HEW Celebrezze; Chairman of ICC Webb; Secretary of Commerce Connor; Commissioner Abersfeller, Federal Supply Service, GSA; Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Shulman; Mr. Abernethy, president, American Motors Co.; Mr. Donner, chairman of board, GMC; Mr. Chesebrough, vice president, Chrysler; Mr. Miller, president of Ford); printed materials, 3 hearings, 646 pages.

Status of Bills, Reorganization Plans, Resolutions

S. 1135, extending the Reorganization Act of 1949: Enacted.

S. 1599, to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development—approved by subcommittee, to be discussed by committee on July 30.

Senate Resolution 102, Reorganization Plan No. 1: Rejected. Reorganization Plan No. 1 effective.

Reorganization Plan No 3: Hearings held July 20.

FUTURE PLANS

Federal role in traffic safety: Hearings to be held with private individuals, organization, officials, as witnesses.

Hearings with related materials and final report to be edited and printed—390 pages of transcript plus related materials on hand at present.

Departmental management study: To determine the real problem areas in "how to run a government." Advisory panel of 10 leading experts from universities, already assembled. Position papers being prepared, preparatory to a study in depth.

Environmental hazards coordination (pesticides) fiscal year 1963-64: 24 hearings held, 198 witnesses. Ten hearings printed (4 parts, 1,044 pages), with 4 appendixes (987 pages). Fourteen hearings, final report (now at GPO), and two appendixes remain to be printed, approximately 335 pages of galleys and 531 pages of manuscript plus a great bulk of related materials.

MAINTENANCE OF LAW AND ORDER

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a distinguished former Member of this body and former minority leader, the Honorable William F. Knowland, wrote an editorial entitled "Confrontation in Oakland," which was published in the Oakland Tribune of October 16, 1965. I believe that it carries thoughts that merit my asking unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFRONTATION IN OAKLAND

The issue confronting the people of Oakland and Alameda County needs to be kept in proper perspective.

The issue is: "Do you support law, order, and due process under our constitutional form of government?"

Intelligent men and reasonable citizens may debate whether three Presidents of the United States should have made commitments in Vietnam and elsewhere in the world. They may debate the issue pro and con and they do every day in public halls, service clubs, union meetings, barbershops and on street corners throughout our land.

But most of them understand that the President of the United States is responsible for the conduct of our foreign policy, that the Nation must speak with one official voice in our relationships with foreign governments and that reaction to a Communist missile buildup in Cuba, a blockade of Berlin or an attack upon our forces or installations around the world cannot be debated for a day, a week, or a month. Of necessity, someone has to have the power to act and under our system that person is the President.

Each 4 years we vote on alternative choices for that high office. No President could carry out a foreign policy for long without congressional legislation and appropriations. We vote on alternative choices for Congress every 2 years.

Granted there are sincere "peace at any price" pacifists to whom the thought of armed conflict is so repugnant that they feel there is no justification for armed action by this or any other nation. The Constitution protects them in their right to hold and express these beliefs.

There are some, not idealistic pacifists, who subscribe to the doctrine "better Red than dead." These may oppose (as they put it) unjust "capitalistic imperialist wars" but find no such opposition to "wars of liberation from the capitalistic yoke by the Soviet or Chinese Communist peoples."

If the United States failed to send supplies or reinforcements to our Armed Forces in Vietnam we would suffer a military defeat there. If we pulled out all our forces on Communist terms all of Vietnam, all of Southeast Asia, and probably all of Asia would go Communist before the next presidential election.

If the pacifists don't know this they are blind to the facts of life and if the innocent dupes don't know it they have not opened their eyes to the threat to a free world of freemen posed by aggressive and militant Communism.

We need not doubt that the hard-core leftists understand this perfectly. These do not march for "peace"; they in fact march for "an American defeat and a Communist victory."

Which brings us to the march scheduled for tonight. Under city ordinances in most municipalities of the land a parade requires a permit. Local authorities have the primary responsibility of maintenance of law and order. Only if and when it breaks down at the local level does the State or the Nation send in forces to restore order.

Here in Oakland there is a parade permit board. Application for a permit was made to this board by the Vietnam Day Committee and was denied. Under "due process of law" the committee had a right to appeal the decision of the permit board to the city council. This was done yesterday and the city council, elected by the people of Oakland, upheld by a unanimous 9 to 0 vote the action of the permit board.

At this point the Vietnam Day Committee had open to it (if they believe the city ordinances of Berkeley or Oakland are unconstitutional as some of their spokesmen maintain) an opportunity to file an action in the State or Federal courts. They might or might not find the courts in agreement with them. But it would be an acceptable policy under "due process."

What is not acceptable is their defiance of local authority and local law.

The police do not enact the laws of our cities, States or Nation. They are sworn to uphold the law and this they intend to do. If disorder comes to our streets tonight it is not brought on by the law-enforcement officials but by those who defy the law and seek to create incidents.

It makes no difference if the parade has 1,000, 5,000 or 10,000 marchers. This is a small fraction of the more than 1 million people who live in the county.

But the lives and property of these 1 million depend upon the maintenance of law and order, and the civil and constitutional rights of all of our people rest upon respect for the Constitution and the laws enacted under our form of government. We recently witnessed in Los Angeles the results of a breakdown of law and order.

If the size of mobs in the streets ever becomes the yardstick for the enactment of legislation, the administration of justice, the administrative acts of public officials or the law-enforcement obligations of peace officers, then our whole constitutional fabric will collapse and either anarchy or some other repugnant system will take its place.

Now is the time for the public to support the constituted authorities by staying away from the areas of defiance to authority so the functioning of the law-enforcement officials will not be handicapped nor will the Vietnam Day Committee be able to claim that the background crowds seen on television are part of the Vietnam Day Committee's supporters when in fact they may be citizens disgusted with the whole performance.

Far better that the unorganized citizens use their constitutional right to petition by writing Mayor John C. Houlihan and the city council and showing now, tonight, that the Vietnam Day Committee's march and defiance of law and undermining of our foreign policy and our Armed Forces do not have their support. Until election day this is the best way to make felt your voice and influence as a citizen of the United States and a resident of this community.

The confrontation in Oakland tonight is being watched throughout the Nation and for this community it is clearly the hour of decision.

AVOIDANCE OF THE DRAFT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, there is great need in the country for the old-fashioned virtues. I refer to patriotism, honesty, integrity, self-reliance, and thrift.

The moral tone of the country needs to be raised. We need a spiritual revival. We need a renewal of love for country.

A shocking form letter came to my office, a letter which is almost an open invitation for individuals without cause to shirk their duty to their country.

This letter was received by a college boy, who turned it over to his father, who in turn sent it to me. I wish to read this letter, which advertises the book on "How To Avoid the Draft," together with a letter that I have sent to Hon. JOHN STENNIS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Preparedness.

The form letter is as follows:

ARMY INFORMATION CO.,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR FUTURE DRAFTEE: If you are worried about the draft—a new privately published book gives you little known facts on draft deferments and exemptions which may affect your entire life.

It gives you a list of over 200 exemptions—from alcoholism to weight—including such defects as warts, drug addiction, scars, and many other physical, mental, and moral disqualifications you probably never even heard of. It gives you important rules for changing your draft status and how to appeal your case even after you've already been classified. You get a whole long list of deferments showing what effect your religious activities, your job, and your dependents may have on your draft status. But that's just the begining.

It explains all 17 draft classifications from 1–A to V–A—including such classes as III–A, IV–B, IV–D, and many others you may not even know about. It goes into details of which occupations, industries, and studies are exempt. It even gives you rules regarding extreme hardship to dependents or children, the laws on conscientious objectors, plus valuable information on the Reserves and National Guard.

This amazing book does nothing more than give you the laws, which you as a citizen should know—and have every right to know. It contains information from such sources as the "Code of Federal Regulations" and other Government books—yet it is privately published and cannot be purchased in any store or obtained from the library, Government, Army, or even the draft board.

It is less than 100 pages and is called "Armed Forces and Draft Information." To order it by mail return the order card and pay the postman $4.95 plus c.o.d. charges. Or to save postage send $4.95 in cash, check, or money order. The supply is extremely limited and the demand is overwhelming. It is completely guaranteed and if you're not satisfied in every way you may return it within 10 days for every single penny of your money back. You've nothing to lose—act now.

Sincerely,

MIKE JAMES MCCORDETS.

Mr. President, the card enclosed, with which to order the book, which among other things, informs a young man how he can have a moral disqualification that will exempt him from the Army, carries a picture of Uncle Sam.

It reads: "Armed Forces and Draft Information."

This is followed by the traditional picture of Uncle Sam in his hat with stars and stripes on it, and his patriotic suit. Uncle Sam is pointing his finger at the young man. This is a portrayal of Uncle Sam such as is used on many Government publications. The group that is sending this type of information to the college students around the land uses Uncle Sam's trademark, so to speak.

The enclosed card states: "Mail this order card today." It tells where to send the order card. A person can either send money or have the book sent c.o.d.

This concern has a first-class mailing permit, No. 15411, San Francisco, Calif. They even pay the postage if one orders the book.

Mr. President, this is taking place while other young men are fighting and dying in far off Vietnam. This is taking place while young men throughout the land are responding to the draft or are volunteering to serve their country wherever it is necessary to do so.

While this is going on, while the great, vast majority of our people perform their duty because they love their country and respect the law, someone is commercializing in this manner and sending this advertisement through the U.S. mails to college students all over the land.

I have transmitted a copy of the circular letter, together with a copy of the order card and the reply envelope to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who is chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the card and the reply envelope, together with my letter to the Senator from Mississippi, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAIL THIS ORDER CARD TODAY

Check one:

☐ Send me your "Armed Forces and Draft Information Book," c.o.d. When it arrives, I will pay the postman $4.95 plus postage. If I'm not satisfied, I will return the book within 10 days for a full refund.

☐ To save postal charges, I am enclosing cash, check or money order for $4.95. Same money-back guarantee applies.

Mail this card to: Army Information Co., 544 Market Street, Suite 904, San Francisco, Calif.

[First class permit No. 15411, San Francisco, Calif.]

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL

NO POSTAGE STAMP NECESSARY IF MAILED IN THE UNITED STATES

Postage will be paid by Army Information Co., 544 Market Street, Suite 904, San Francisco, Calif.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., October 21, 1965.

Hon. JOHN STENNIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STENNIS: I am writing to you as chairman of the Subcommittee, Preparedness Investigating, of the Senate Armed Services Committee. I am enclosing a copy of a form letter received by a young man in Nebraska. This young man is a fine patriot, as is his family. He turned his letter over to his father and his father, quite correctly, forwarded it to me.

This publication must be viewed in the light of many other things which are going on in our country tending to hamper the efforts of those who are now fighting for us. This type of thing gives encouragement to our enemies. It occurred to me your committee might be interested in checking into this.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
CARL T. CURTIS,
U.S. Senator.

AHEPA CONVENTION IN ATHENS, GREECE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, before this Congress concludes, I welcome an opportunity, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to note something which, in the long run of history, I believe will have great significance to all Americans and to people elsewhere.

I refer to something which occurred during August of this year in Athens, Greece. I refer to the convention of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association which was held for the first time in the many years of its existence in their old country, if that is still an acceptable way for us to describe the lands and the islands from which we came.

It was the happy privilege of Mrs. Hart and me to participate for 4 days with the members of the AHEPA and the Daughters of Penelope in their magnificent program in Athens.

I ask my colleagues in the Senate to turn their gaze for just a few minutes to this setting. Once we remember the place about which we talk and the thousands who return there, there will be need for very little more than to suggest that, indeed, it is and was an event of such significance as to direct the attention of the whole country to it through the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Several years ago this order, composed of Americans of Hellenic descent, had presented to it the suggestion that, instead of annually meeting in a city in this country, they meet in Athens.

I am particularly proud that the idea and its execution were the product principally of a very distinguished citizen of Michigan, Socrates V. Sekles, who was the chairman of the board of trustees of AHEPA. He persuaded the board that such an undertaking was feasible. Of course, all would recognize that, if feasible, it was desirable.

Through meticulous planning and skillful management, the AHEPA brought to a climax this idea by the arrival in Athens in August of some 15,000 Greek Americans, there to participate in what could be considered to be both a pilgrimage and a convention.

We were on the eve, it will be recalled, of the final stages of the drafting and debate on an immigration reform bill in Congress.

I was privileged at a banquet, on the AHEPA program, not alone to give my reaction as a son of Ireland rather than a son of Hellas to the convention itself, but also to discuss prospects for immigration reform. This morning, in anticipation of my comments today, I turned to some of the notes which I had prepared for the banquet in Athens.

I find that there I made the prediction that the Congress, in this session, would eliminate the national origins quota concept in our admissions to this land.

I said then—and now that the event has occurred I wish to repeat—that while drama attached to the role that was played in this reform effort by President Lyndon Johnson and President John Kennedy and his brother, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, and by Representative EMANUEL CELLER and others in the Congress, it really was a national response to years of patient explanation by men and women who had assembled in Athens, first of the value which they attach to their American citizenship; second, of the offense that was involved in being told that birth in Greece made some relative of theirs less acceptable in America than birth in England; and third and more important, perhaps, than anything else, in reminding all thoughtful Americans that the contributions made to America by the sons and daughters of Greece and its islands was the best evidence of the values that we could still obtain from that land.

Our own Founding Fathers sought counsel from the writings of the men of Greece, when they sought to fashion here a land in which the dignity of the individual would be respected and the value of ideas acknowledged. It is true enough that when one thinks of Greece, the first thing which comes to mind is the picture of the physical ruins which attract so many tourists. Our strongest reminder of Greece should be the contributions made by the voices and pens of the men of ancient Greece, the country which honored the man of ideas, which tolerated diversity of opinion, and recognized that that was really the only way that truth can be discovered. That is a lesson which, every day in this country, we run the risk of forgetting.

So, as this session of the Senate approaches a close, I wish first to acknowledge my own appreciation for having been permitted to participate in one of the most thrilling activities that it has been mine to share, the meeting in Athens with 15,000 Greek-Americans at the convention of the Order of AHEPA; and second, to speak proudly of the leadership and the role played in that magnificent meeting by Socrates Seckos. I think it not inappropriate, as I conclude, to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the resolutions adopted at that 43d Supreme Convention of the Order of AHEPA in Athens. They are again reminders of the clarity of thought for which the Greeks have been historically noted.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON UNITED STATES POLICY IN VIETNAM

That the 43d supreme convention of the Order of Ahepa records its official approval of the foreign policy of the United States as implemented in the military efforts of our Armed Forces to restore peace and establish justice in Vietnam, thereby protecting southeast Asia from Communist infiltration and preserving not only the American way of life but guaranteeing peace and freedom to all the Western World; and

That we pledge to our great country—the world's finest and most humane democracy, our entire support and cooperation, our every resource, and in the words of the immortal

Declaration of Independence, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor; and

That we call upon all nations and peoples who are allied with the United States to endorse and support our country's stand against communism in this great crusade for the rights of man; and

That we, mindful of our ancestry, invite Greece, where again we are met, where liberty began, where America first declared war on communism, and where the Greek people first stopped the march against the West by Communist guerrilla imperialism, to join us in this struggle for the preservation of the free world and the glory and expansion of Greece now and in the days to come.

THE ORDER OF AHEPA IS AGAINST PARTITION OF CYPRUS

The members of the Order of AHEPA believe that partition in any form or the establishment of a Turkish military base in Cyprus cannot bring about a permanent, effective, and equitable peace to Cyprus.

Partition, autonomous Turkish cantons coupled with Turkish military forces on the island will sow the seeds of future strife, create an uneasy, false peace which could only be maintained by the continuation of two armed camps of Greeks and Turks breeding and fanning the fires of suspicion, hatred, and bitterness. These devices are unworthy of great and constructive statesmanship. The rights of the Turkish minority must be preserved in the same way that all minorities are protected today in Greece and other enlightened nations in the free world.

THE ORDER OF AHEPA ADVOCATES SELF-DETERMINATION IN CYPRUS

Immediately after World War I, President Wilson gave hope and inspiration to the enslaved and downtrodden nations and peoples of the world by enunciating the principle and doctrine of self-determination.

This doctrine was wholeheartedly supported and became a cornerstone of American foreign policy. As a result of this policy, great segments of the world were liberated and many peoples of the world have established their own democratic nations in Africa and Asia. It is a policy that continues to give hope and inspiration to those nations and peoples still enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. It is a policy that has given deserved credit to the United States. There is a struggle going on in the island of Cyprus. The people of Cyprus are entitled to self-determination for the purpose of establishing a democratic government where all the citizens will have equal suffrage, equal protection of the laws, religious freedom, and equal educational, economic, and social opportunities in accordance with American history and tradition.

It is fervently anticipated that once self-determination is granted to the people of Cyprus, the Cypriots will express themselves in favor of Enosis or union with Greece. Such an anticipation is predicated on the fact that 82 percent of the population of Cyprus is Greek, while 18 percent is Turkish; and upon the historical fact that by tradition, culture, religion, and language the island is Greek. Furthermore, it is anticipated that Enosis would result from the application of the principle of self-determination to the island of Cyprus, and that such Enosis would make Cyprus a bulwark against communism in the eastern Mediterranean and a bastion for NATO and the free world. With Enosis it is expected that the Turkish Cypriots will receive the same fair and honorable treatment by Greece as the 100,000 Moslems of Turkish ancestry who live in and are citizens of Greece, and who have never been discriminated against it, and who have lived in peace as a minority in Greece for generations.

THE GREEK ORTHODOX PATRIARCHATE IN CONSTANTINOPLE

Whereas the policies, principles, and resolutions of the Order of Ahepa as related to the persecution of the Patriarch and the Greek Orthodox people in Constantinople, and the islands of Imbros, Tenedos, and Cyprus, and the struggle of these people to gain their true freedom are based on the principles of the Declaration of Independence upon which all Western nations today guarantee to their citizens religious freedom and protection of individual worship; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Order of Ahepa again reaffirm their oft-stated opposition to communism and all other forms of tyranny and subversion.

The Greek Orthodox Christians of Constantinople and other parts of Turkey are being expelled and persecuted. Their properties are being confiscated without compensation. The Order of Ahepa condemns this arbitrary, unjust, and uncivilized treatment of these Christians by Turkey, and calls upon all religious groups and all the Western nations everywhere to come to the aid of these unfortunate victims.

The Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople and its hierarchy are being persecuted and exiled unjustly. The Order of Ahepa condemns these barbaric practices and appeals to all people of every faith to join in this condemnation so that religious freedom may be established in Turkey, for the Greek Orthodox minority.

We believe that religious freedom for Orthodox Christians in Turkey will restore civil liberties and lawful order in that country and strengthen the bulwarks against communism in the eastern Mediterranean.

The Order of Ahepa in convention assembled in Athens, Greece, again endorses these principles and ideals and appeals to all people and governments who sincerely believe in justice and the basic rights of humanity to support them. We invite them to join with us in our efforts to guarantee religious freedom to the Greek Orthodox Christians in Turkey. God willing, the civilized world can do no less.

SURPLUS COMMODITIES TO GREEK HOSPITALS AND SCHOOLS

That the Order of Ahepa request the U.S. Government to continue its distribution of surplus flour and other commodities to hospitals, old-age institutions, and school lunch programs of Greece through CARE and other voluntary agencies, and that the Order of Ahepa go on record as thanking the U.S. Government and American people for their generosity and kindness in the past for these deserving programs.

SELF-DETERMINATION FOR NORTHERN EPIRUS

Whereas northern Epirus has been since time immemorial a Greek land and inhabited by Greek nationals has earned the right to its Greek heritage and to live under the aegis of its motherland Hellas; and

Whereas the Senate of the United States has on two occasions expressed its conviction that northern Epirus is Greek and should be reunited with its mother country; and

Whereas, the conference of Paris in 1946 recognized that a justified demand on the part of Greece for the return of northern Epirus does exist: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the delegates to this 43d supreme conviction of the Order of Ahepa meeting in Athens, Greece, taking into consideration all of the above and in the knowledge that a grave injustice is being committed so long as the Hellenic people of northern Epirus are denied the God-given rights of choice, liberty, and self-determination, we express our sympathy over this oppression of our brothers in northern Epirus and express their fervent hope for the early liberation of this Greek land.

APPRECIATION TO MRS. JOSEPH RAMSAY III

Whereas Mrs. Joseph Gale Ramsay III, of Minneapolis, Minn., has taken upon herself to bring to the United States 18 Greek children for open heart surgery at the University Hospital in Minneapolis; and

Whereas Mrs. Ramsay has provided all the necessary funds, such as transportation, medical, hospital care, and posttherapy care of both child and mother involved; and

Whereas Mrs. Ramsay has shown the motherly affection, plus an unusual interest in the welfare of the child and mother and continues her interest in the patient and mother after recovery: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Mrs. Ramsay's humanitarian deeds be recognized by this body of the supreme convention of the Order of Ahepa and a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Mrs. Ramsay with an appropriate letter of thanks from this convention.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the position of Greece in world history is well known to all of us—it needs no word from me. Perhaps these resolutions will remind us tomorrow, as we should be reminded each day, that men existed many centuries ago who left behind them ideas which will endure forever, and can give us counsel in the days ahead.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania wishes to make a few comments on the same subject.

Mr. SCOTT. Not the same subject. I have a brief unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MORSE. I shall yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania, but if it is not on the same subject, I had agreed to yield first to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator from Mississippi says the Senator may yield to me.

Mr. STENNIS. That is agreeable.

Mr. MORSE. Very well. I merely wished to keep my agreement.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS CONFERENCE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, at this point, my report to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], on my attendance at the Plenipotentiary Conference of the International Telecommunications Union, in Montreux, Switzerland, during the month of September.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE, INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION, MONTREUX, SWITZERLAND—REPORT TO SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

(By Senator HUGH SCOTT)

At the request of the Senate, and with your authorization, I attended, in late September, meetings of the Plenipotentiary Conference of the International Telecommunication Union at Montreux, Switzerland, as congressional adviser to the U.S. delegation. (The Conference will continue until November 12, 1965.) My observations and experiences there were so striking that I wish to give you and the Senate an account of the conditions under which the U.S. delegation is working.

The ITU is the oldest international organization in the United Nations system. In 1865, 20 countries founded the International Telegraph Union, and the ITU is an outgrowth of that union. It accordingly is celebrating its centennial this year and deserves congratulations for the remarkable work it has accomplished during its years of service to communications throughout the world.

Although it is a century old, the ITU is suffering from growing pains. Its plenipotentiary conference meets at intervals of about 5 or 6 years; its last meeting was in 1959. At that time it had a membership of 96 which has now grown to 128, of which 119 are now represented at Montreux. With over 30 new members attending the conference this year—countries without experience in the work of the ITU—reorganization of the union has been more difficult than we had anticipated.

I was impressed with the expertise and care with which the U.S. delegation had prepared for this conference. Over a period of 2 years, agencies in the Government, including the Department of State, the Federal Communications Commission, the Executive Offices of the President, and the Department of Defense, had prepared proposals for the reorganization of the ITU to improve its operations. Preliminary discussions on these proposals had been held with a number of other countries.

I would especially like to commend the excellent leadership of Ambassador Julius Holmes, Chairman of the U.S. delegation to this conference, who was ably assisted by the delegation's two Vice Chairmen, FCC Commissioner Hyde and C. W. Loeber of the Department of State. Our delegation consists not only of officials from Government agencies but also officials from major U.S. firms in the telecommunications field. Government and industry representatives work as a team in the promotion of U.S. interest at the conference.

The growth in the ITU's membership by nearly one-third has very considerably, even dramatically, changed the ITU's nature and has had far-reaching effects on the proceedings of this year's Plenipotentiary Conference. The United States, of course, welcomes the accession to the ITU of newly independent countries, and has actively participated in technical assistance activities in the communications field carried out by the ITU under the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance and the U.N. Special Fund. Nevertheless, the growth of the ITU has had important consequences for U.S. interests, not all agreeable.

In earlier days, ITU Plenipotentiary Conferences brought together experienced officials of leading countries in the telecommunications field for the solution of common problems on the basis of mutual accommodation. Delegations normally knew each other well and worked together continuously between, as well as during, conferences. They were accustomed to parliamentary proceedings. Political problems in general were confined to difficulties with the Soviet Union and limited by the general recognition of all members that the ITU performed a range of unspectacular but essential functions of equal importance to all countries participating in international telecommunications.

With the accession to the ITU membership of a large number of newly developed states, however, the old intimacy based on mutual trust and cooperation on technical problems has largely dissolved. The tendency of many new members to introduce emotionally charged, irrelevant political issues into bodies like the ITU makes for timewasting argument and prevents the sober consideration of policy and operating problems of organization.

We have unfortunately seen a similar escalation of political issues in technical meetings of other United Nations organs as well. This greatly complicates the tasks of U.S. delegations. Consequently, the United States must undertake a long-term task of convincing some of the newer nations that political problems should be reserved for political forums, and that we must continually strive for the greatest possible efficiency and economy in the meetings of organs like the ITU.

U.N. technical programs, in theory at least, are or should be carried out in separate agencies rather than in the United Nations itself. This should free the technical agencies from the nuisance of grappling with political questions. The specialized agencies should look to the United Nations for political guidance.

As a result of the increased ITU membership mentioned above, newly independent states have a ready-made majority when they vote as a bloc and when they can count, as is usually the case, on the support of the Communist member-states. Voting in the ITU, as in the U.N. and most of its agencies, does not depend on the importance of the issue to members of the organizations. Rather, every nation's vote is equally weighted, with the exception of three Soviet votes and, in the ITU, of representation of overseas territories by metropoles. Thus arises the serious danger that some members when motivated by extraneous political considerations can take actions not in the best interests of the organization.

I regretted to see some of the newly developing countries inject political issues into the Conference's deliberations. They failed to recognize that such tactics seriously undermine the technical objectives of the ITU. Although a large number of the less developed countries joined with us in deferring or rejecting certain political proposals made at the Conference, a great deal of time and energy was expended to the detriment of the technical work before the Conference.

Let me cite a couple of examples.

The insistence of African nations upon exclusion of the delegation of South Africa from the Conference, while evoking understanding of the emotional feelings involved, was clearly unconstitutional, as violative of the provision in the ITU Convention that no member may be thus excluded. The U.S. delegation made clear its distaste for apartheid, but tried vainly, with the support of the delegations of most of the advanced countries of the free world, to make clear to African nations the illegality of this action and the dangers for them in such illegal acts. The Soviet Union, as might be expected, played up to the Africans and the Africans, with Soviet assistance and the assistance of other less developed countries, persuaded themselves that a plenipotentiary conference is empowered to do anything. The idea of plenipotentiaries being restricted by a basic treaty which gives the ITU and the Conference itself the legal framework for its existence was brushed aside in a scramble to denounce and exclude duly accredited representatives from an ITU member.

It is important to note, however, that the situation is not impossible; e.g., the attempt by the Soviet Union to secure the support of the less developed countries for a motion to allow observers from non-U.N. organizations to receive official status at the Conference when such observers are not admissible under the ITU Convention failed, despite shrewd efforts to win African and Arab support. Had this move succeeded, East Germans would have sat in the Conference as representatives of an eastern European broadcasting organization with the right to participate in the debates of the Conference. The U.S. delegation took the lead in rallying like-minded nations, including a number of less-developed countries, to defeat this proposal. This episode shows that careful organization and hard work in a good cause can attain useful results.

The U.S. delegation went into the Conference with carefully prepared proposals for improving both the headquarters organization (the General Secretariat, the International Frequency Registration Board, and Consultative Committees for Radio and Telephone and Telegraphy) and periodic assemblies of the Union. Adoption of these proposals would result in substantial economies as well as increased efficiency of the Union. These proposals were discussed with and generally viewed sympathetically by major countries in the telecommunications field during the past 2 years. Because time was lost owing to the interjection of irrelevant political issues and the inability of the Conference to dispatch its business in an orderly and legal manner, and because the group of newly emerging nations was unwilling or unable to make an effort to understand these proposals, prospects for the adoption of these U.S. proposals at this midpoint of the Conference are not very encouraging.

On the other hand, the less developed countries will almost certainly use their voting power in an effort to commit the Union, meaning its financially responsible members, to large increases in outlays for technical assistance to the less developed countries. They will, of course, meet strong opposition from the United States and, we believe, many other advanced countries.

These changed circumstances—the injection of politics into the ITU, the inexperience of many delegations, the different interests of many countries—have put a heavy burden on the U.S. delegation, making it difficult to work on substantive problems before the Conference, the resolutions which are important for U.S. interests. The delegation has taken the lead in arranging late-hour meetings with like-minded delegations to push the work of the Conference forward and some success has been attained.

In these circumstances, the United States may consider itself fortunate that the Conference at midpoint looks like it will accomplish any worthwhile purpose at all. The fact is, however, that despite the snail-like pace so far, I am confident the Conference will avoid damage to U.S. interests and even make some gains in improving the efficiency of the ITU and the economy of its functioning.

In conclusion, let me point out that most of the technical work of the ITU takes place in small working groups, committees, and other meetings held on a year-round basis. These small technical meetings of the ITU have made a remarkable contribution toward the improvement of communications technology over the years. This basic machinery of the Organization remains untouched by the present session of the ITU Plenipotentiary Conference. We hope that, with growing maturity on the part of emerging nations, it will continue to function effectively.

The ITU is too valuable to international progress in person-to-person and international communications, and too valuable to its collective membership, to be allowed to face any future less worthwhile than continued growth and increasing usefulness.

DEATH OF GEORGE A. PARKER

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I note the unfortunate death of a friend of mine, Mr. George A. Parker, a lifelong

Washingtonian and a founder of the old Robert H. Terrell Law School, who died at Freedmen's Hospital after a cerebral hemorrhage, at the age of 79, on October 20.

Mr. Parker was a delegate to the 1964 Republican National Convention. There he made a dignified and courageous statement, or series of statements, on the highly important aspect of civil rights and the Republican position thereon.

Mr. Edward Burling, Jr., said on the 20th about him:

> He was always a leader. He was a man with vision and courage—a man of dignity and conviction—and withal, a lovable, gentle man. I was proud to call him friend. We will all mourn his passing, but we know Washington is a better place for his having lived here.

Among men, Mr. George A. Parker was a man who stood tall, and who, with great integrity and deep conviction, had earned the respect of all who knew him. I, too, am very proud that he was a friend of mine.

I recall with affection and fondness this courageous man who, when it was difficult to do so, took a forthright stand and never flinched.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me.

HIGH HONORS FOR THE 454TH BOMB WING OF SAC STATIONED AT COLUMBUS AIR FORCE BASE, MISS.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the 454th Bomb Wing of the Strategic Air Command stationed at Columbus Air Force Base, Miss., has won a very high honor. In a highly competitive exercise to test the effectiveness of strategic bombing wings, the Columbus wing has been named the most outstanding in the Strategic Air Command.

Forty-four Strategic Air Command air crews competed in this exercise and the Columbus Air Force Base crew, flying a B–52 Strato-Fortress nicknamed "Miss Magnolia" was first for excellence in strategic bombing and navigation.

I had the pleasure of a visit with this crew during their visit to Washington. Incidentally, this crew was one of the first to participate in the B–52 raids in Vietnam, and they did an excellent job there.

The commander of the 454th Wing is Col. William T. Cumiskey of Brooklyn, N.Y. His Fairchild trophy winning crew is commanded by Maj. Max L. Mihura of Ripley, Okla. Capt. Richard W. Helmer, Pine Prairie, La., is copilot; Maj. Chester Godsy, Willow Springs, Mo., radar navigator; Capt. William H. King, Birmingham, Ala., electronic warfare officer; Maj. Richard Agolia, Brooklyn, N.Y., navigator; and M. Sgt. Samuel L. Taulbee, Churubusco, Ind., gunner. Crew chief of the intercontinental bomber is S. Sgt. Clifton L. Johnson, Bonita, La., and the armament and electronics crew chief is T. Sgt. Ted J. Burton of Monticello, Ark.

The 454th Bombardment Wing also won three other silver trophies in the SAC competition. The wing was first in bombing and navigation for a B–52 unit; it was named the best overall organization in bombing; and it had the best B–52 crew in bombing for both missions flown in the competition.

I congratulate the men of the 454th Wing for their outstanding skill, for the very valuable service they perform for the Nation, and for the credit they have brought to their base. I have the highest respect for the Strategic Air Command and I am very much impressed by the singular achievements of this crew and this wing. To be identified as the best of this command is a most remarkable accomplishment. SAC's mixed bomber and missile force of unquestionable strength and flexibility provides a deterrent against aggression for the free world. In addition to its nuclear deterrent role, SAC's B–52's such as the one flown by this group are conducting raids almost daily in Vietnam.

I congratulate also the many fine officers and airmen, as well as the civilians at Columbus Air Force Base, all of whom had a part in supporting and encouraging this crew. The citizens of Mississippi, particularly in the surrounding cities and communities, are most enthusiastic in their support of Columbus Air Force Base and I commend them for their effort. It was the combined work of all that made this achievement possible.

IN QUEST OF SIMPLICITY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on Sunday, October 10, 1965, the Rev. Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, minister of the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, delivered a powerful and moving sermon, entitled "In Quest of Simplicity."

Mrs. Stennis and I were blessed with the happy privilege of hearing Dr. Elson deliver his inspired and inspiring sermon, which carries a message for all of us as we search for that inward strength and inward peace in the complex and complicated life of today.

Dr. Elson, as always, gave us a message of spiritual values and also much sound counsel and advice that is filled with logic and commonsense.

I commend to Members of Congress and all citizens across the Nation the reading of Dr. Elson's moving sermon. I ask unanimous consent to have the sermon printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN QUEST OF SIMPLICITY

(A sermon by the Rev. Dr. Edward L. R. Elson in the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C., October 10, 1965)

"The simplicity that is in Christ."
—II Cor. 11: 3

"The simplicity that is toward Christ."
—II Cor. 11: 3 (RSV)

A few weeks ago the whole world paused to pay its tribute of affection and esteem to a man, who having died at the age of 90, was regarded by many as the greatest man of the century. Certainly Albert Schweitzer was one of the great figures to come across the stage of human endeavor in many generations. In early life, as an organist, he became the greatest living interpretor of Bach. Soon he added to his reputation as an organist world fame as a profound theologian and Christian scholar, who ranged over many fields and produced enduring books such as "The Mysticism of Paul" and "The Quest for the Historical Jesus." Then when most men would be adding to their laurels in these two fields, he attended medical school in order that he might give the remainder of his life in a healing ministry in the heart of Africa. While never abandoning his role as musician and Christian scholar, he became the modern apostle of healing at the center of the African continent. With all his brilliance, that which most distinguished him was his simplicity. He followed Christ wherever the spirit of Christ led him and, when asked what motivated him, he said simply "reverence for life." Albert Schweitzer never sought escape from the realities and complexities of the modern world but his greatness rested chiefly in his simplicity.

How often it is true that men who make the greatest impact on life are men of simplicity. Look again at another great Christian in our age. Think of Pope John XXIII. He came of peasant stock, as a boy worked in the fields, early entered the seminary, lived by its simple disciplines, while mastering the history, liturgics, philosophy, and theology of his church, until at length he was ordained and began serving the simple people of his native land. Then he carried forward with efficiency but with the same simplicity of demeanor and faith in several important appointments under the Vatican. By and by, very late in life, the College of Cardinals, after much prayer, elected him to the sacred office of Pope and bishop of Rome and, as Roman Catholics believe, vicar of Christ on earth and successor to Saint Peter. In religious circles he was regarded as a compromise between several stronger candidates and was spoken of as an interim Pope serving out a difficult period until some stronger man could become a personality around whom the church might rally. The church and the world clothed him in the dignity of his office and all the paraphernalia and ornateness with which that office has been associated throughout the centuries. Yet John himself never ceased to be John, the peasant, the man who followed Christ in simplicity of faith and trust until the very end. Somehow or other, it was this very simplicity that got through to the members of his own church and penetrated the whole world. He seemed to have an extra sense, an ability to be identified with all men, an empathy for people of all classes, races, and nations, a spiritual antenna, which detected the mood, the sentiment, and the longings of the whole human race. His call for the first Ecumenical Council in this century and the atmosphere which he created through it has in a few short years transformed the climate spiritually throughout the whole world. The total impact marks a turning point in history. While he lived to reign as Pope for only 5 years, his influence may well become the greatest of any ecclesiastical figure in this age. Here again it was the simplicity of this Christian which seemed to grip the whole world.

Does it seem strange that two of the greatest but simplest personalities of our age have accomplished so much, when one of the main characteristics of life in our world is the bewildering complexity? Certainly the world in which we live is the most complex in all history. As James Stewart, the Scottish theologian points out, modern life is complex, both in its outward and inward aspects. In economics, politics, and social life our world is complex. What happens to business in Capetown, South Africa, affects the business enterprises of New York, London, Moscow, and Tokyo. An event involving human beings in the Congo has an effect upon the rest of humankind as does the bombing of a church in Alabama or a race riot in Los Angeles. Modern transportation and communication has drawn mankind closer together but has complicated his living. Individual persons crave a larger fulfillment of life at the very time it is very difficult to preserve individual dignity and personal responsibility. Social life has become complex. Crime, for example, is blamed upon everything except the criminal. We live in an age of automation and computers. Everything from producing poultry and beef to supplying armies of men with their food and weapons can now be determined by computers. Man is less significant in our complex age. Moreover tremendous changes are taking place in the systems of thought and standards of conduct which guide men. Religious beliefs, theological creeds, and confessions are being examined and revised as the proposals in our own church suggest. Men speak of the new morality and revised ethical standards. Everywhere people are asking "What are we to believe? How are we to behave? Where are we to find assurance?"

The complexity of modern life may be producing some compensating advantages. We now know that no nation can live in isolation, no economic system operate efficiently except as it is related to the whole world and that science, which has contributed to our complexity, also opens the door to a fullness of life unknown in earlier generations. And the generation which asks questions about religious beliefs and moral codes, which is determined to think things through for itself, may well produce permanent gains for religion.

But having said all this, we must note that complexity steals from us something we can ill afford to lose. With the disappearance of old simplicities there has been also the disappearance of the old contentment. Science and invention, ministering to man's pleasures and sensations, has also increased man's restlessness. The quest for fresh expressions of faith and new patterns of morality has had a disquieting effect upon the home and the family and the collapse of religious conviction has left many without a guiding faith of any kind. Something of simple dignity, something of the quiet, serene, steadfast simplicity has been stolen from us in this hurrying, complex age. With it a certain glory has gone from our common life, which is one reason why men of profound simplicity are in such marked contrast to the rest of us.

Originally the word "simple" in the English language represented a noble, shining virtue. It meant single-hearted, straightforward, clear-cut. But the word has been so abused that today people wonder whether to be "simple" is a virtue at all. Yet it must be remembered that the world's greatest men have been characterized by a deep simplicity of life and character. The really great men—the Isaiahs, the Pauls, the William Careys, the John Wesleys, the John Knoxes, the William Booths, the Abraham Lincolns, the Herbert Hoovers, the Harry Trumans, and the Dwight Eisenhowers have all been men of the simple heart and faith. A man may be a saint without many of the qualities which this complex world ranks high but no man can be a saint without deep simplicity of soul. No wonder then there is a craving for simplicity.

Always when life becomes complex and sophisticated a reaction sets in to return mankind to the profound simplicities of life. Saint Francis of Assissi, leading his little band of friars from the moral and social entanglements of medieval Italy into something like the joy and freedom of first century Galilee. So Martin Luther leading a reformation at one stroke cut through the complex casuistry of papal doctrine and gave back to the individual soul the directness and immediacy of true religion. So in our day we turn to religious retreats with extended periods of quietness and contemplation and find arising amid our machine age new buildings, especially churches, with simple lines and quiet atmosphere.

In our quest for simplicity we must be careful that we are not merely attempting to turn the clock back. We do not want to give up the gains of science or invention, the advances of medicine and education, of transportation and communication, nor do we want simply to say, as some incline to say, "Give me a religion without theology, without mystery, without any requirements of thought and reason." To yield to this would be a false simplification of our complex age.

Yet the simplicity for which we strive is what Paul calls in our text "the simplicity that is in Christ." And as the revised version puts it, "the simplicity that is toward Christ." The simplicity that ought to be in the hearts of those who love and trust and follow Him—the harmony, poise and unity of character—the consistency of an undivided loyalty to Jesus Christ.

Think of the simplicity that is in Jesus. How simple was the earthly life of Jesus. Born a peasant, reared in a humble home, working at a carpenter's bench, going about as an itinerant teacher, he "had nowhere to lay his head" and when He died left as His only possession the seamless robe He wore. When will we ever learn from Jesus the great lesson that between riches on the one hand and happiness on the other there is no necessary connection whatever. There have been and there are rich people who have been and are now happy people but where they have been happy it was something other than riches that made and kept them happy. It was some quality of character quite independent of worldly possessions which made them happy. Jesus of Nazareth is a living rebuke to the pampered artificiality of a great deal of life today.

Or think of the simplicity of Jesus' speech. "The common people heard Him gladly" which was in marked contrast to the rabbis of His time who did not get such a happy hearing. Simplicity of speech is very different from superficiality of thought. Muddy streams are not usually deep. Clear water can be markedly deeper. Jesus' words were so clear that nobody could misunderstand what He said. The simplest language is often the profoundest. Jesus was never shallow in thought and always clear in meaning.

Or think again of how simple was the salvation He offered. He said, "Follow me" and that was all He said and men did follow Him. And how simple is the message of the cross. Indeed other religions sometimes condemn Christianity for its simplicity. Think of how Jesus took the complicated system of moral law and the elaborate religious regulations of the ancient Hebrews and summed them up by saying that the thing which mattered was loving God with one's whole mind and heart and strength and his neighbor as himself. "Jesus is Lord" was the first creed and when Jesus becomes Lord of all life something tremendous happens to human beings. However complicated may be our theological constructions, interpretations, denominational peculiarities, anything other than simple trust in Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord is unlike Jesus Himself. The Christian invitation is "Whosoever will, let him come." That is the gospel as inviting as two open arms, as simple as the cross.

But finally think how simple Jesus was in His own life. However loud the noises about Him, He remained inwardly quiet. However threatened by danger, He preserved His inner peace. However worrisome His disciples became to Him, He continued to believe in their redeemability. However the world misunderstood Him or became hostile to Him, He preserved His integrity and He let us in on His secret. Christ's secret of the simple, serene life was His undivided loyalty to His heavenly Father. "I must be about My Father's business" was the standard of His youth. "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me" was the controlling force of His mature years. In the garden where He made the most important decision He said, "Nevertheless not My will but Thine be done." And at last He called out, "Into Thy hands I commend My spirit." There you have the secret to the coordinated, integrated, powerful life, the life that was whole, from which nothing can be taken, to which nothing needed to be added. The one standard by which every question was decided was an undivided loyalty to God. That was Christ's great simplification of life. It worked then and it will work for us in our crowded, complex age. Here is the answer to the deep craving for the simple life. A heart fixed utterly on Christ, an undivided loyalty toward the God whom we meet in Jesus Christ our Lord.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his usual fine and generous courtesy in yielding to me.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2542) to amend the Small Business Act.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 53) authorizing the printing of the report of the proceedings of the 42d biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf as a Senate document.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2118) to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920.

TRIBUTE TO COL. RALPH E. VANDERVORT, JR.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday, while I was engaged in a conference away from the Senate Chamber, some of my colleagues, Senators McGEE, CHURCH, MOSS, THURMOND, BARTLETT, and CANNON, paid a deserved tribute to a great Army officer known by all of us as Col. Ralph E. Vandervort, Jr., who for a number of years has been the Army's liaison officer in the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with everything these Senators said on the floor of the Senate yesterday as to the dedicated record of Colonel Vandervort. He has a military record of which any officer could be justly proud. He has a great record in combat, as well as in the various administrative posts which he has held.

Particularly out of my own knowledge, I express my deep appreciation to Colonel Vandervort for the many valuable services he has performed for me and the people of my State, particularly many of its servicemen whose cases he has handled so fairly and impartially as liaison officer for the Army in the Senate.

As to some of the cases, the Senator would hear him say when I would present them to him: "Do you ever have an easy one?" Mine always seemed to be rather difficult. Nevertheless, no matter how difficult the service cases were, Colonel Vandervort analyzed them impartially and judiciously, and when he was satisfied that they merited adjustment, he never hesitated to recommend to his superior officers that the adjustment for which I had asked be made.

The fact that his advice was so well heeded by his superiors in the Pentagon bespeaks more than anything I can put into words the high esteem in which he has always been held by his superiors.

I wish to make one further comment about his service to the Senate, particularly his service to my Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs. For Colonel Vandervort has been its liaison officer, too, and was sent abroad with the subcommittee when we went on various official missions to Latin America. I remember particularly on two occasions that he was of great help to me as chairman of the mission which went to Mexico, and on another occasion when it went into Uruguay.

Mr. President, here is an Army officer who, on retirement, will be leaving a record of which not only he can be proud but also the Army can be proud. His is a record so able in service to the Senate that all of us in the Senate owe him a great debt of gratitude.

LAW ENFORCEMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it will be recalled that on May 11 of this year, I addressed the Senate on what is known in the trade as the "point shaving system" or, to be more descriptive, another form of ticket fixing practiced by some officials in the District of Columbia government.

As has been known now for well over a year, the senior Senator from Oregon, as chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia, which has jurisdiction over the operations of the Metropolitan Police Department has been highly critical of the traffic ticket fixing policies that have prevailed for too long a time in the Capital City of the Nation. As a result of my drive to stop what I consider to be the pollution of the stream of justice, I have saved, according to the records of the District of Columbia court of general sessions over $500,000 for the taxpayers of this city. By that I mean over $500,000 has been collected that otherwise would not have been collected as a result of my drive against traffic ticket fixing in the District of Columbia.

I shall continue that drive so long as I serve as chairman of that Subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee, and in the Senate. Not only do I consider it my duty and my trust, but the people of this District are entitled to the kind of protection that my drive is giving them. It is subjective in nature, so it is impossible to say exactly to what extent accidents would have occurred in individual cases if I had not been exercising this surveillance, but when the police are supported, when they know they are not under the pressure of political pull, of course, their morale is improved and a reduction in accidents is effected.

I am very proud of the course of action I have followed, although I have not won a popularity contest in certain quarters. But I am not interested in popularity contests. As one who has served in government service for more than 30 years—20 here in the Senate—I have no intention of every failing to carry out what I consider to be my responsibility.

I serve notice today on all who are connected with the District of Columbia government, including the judges, about whom I shall have something to say before I finish my speech, that I intend to see to it, to the extent that I can, their carrying out the law as the law is, and the responsibilities of their offices as those responsibilities call upon them for corrective action. I intend to do whatever I can to see to it that justice is administered impartially in the District of Columbia, with the "fix" eliminated, and with those persons in the District of Columbia government who at the present time in my judgment, on the record, are guilty of dereliction, either correcting their ways, or I shall exercise whatever procedures that are available to me to require either correction or having someone else occupy their positions.

I addressed a letter on May 10 to the Honorable Walter N. Tobriner, president, District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, on the subject of the point shaving practice and its relationship to the District of Columbia Traffic School. In my letter to Commissioner Tobriner, I stated that it semed to me that the policy behind the point system is to protect the public from dangerous and reckless drivers. I further pointed out in my letter to Commissioner Tobriner that one does not have to go to traffic school repeatedly to learn that he should not drive his automobile when drunk, or dissipate a speed limit, drive after a drivers permit is revoked, drive on one-way streets backward, and other serious moving traffic regulations.

Therefore, I am at a loss to understand some of the referrals to traffic schools. Individuals have been sent to traffic schools in some instances—in too many instances—to protect them from losing their drivers' licenses because they had been guilty of so many other violations, that under the point system, if the penalty were rightly imposed, their drivers' licenses would be taken away from them. Their drivers' licenses should be taken away from them.

We should clean the streets of the Capital City of the Nation, and the police departments and the judges of other cities should clean the highways of this Nation from drivers that are guilty of such shocking, reckless, and dangerous driving as some of those whom I am going to talk about this afternoon have been guilty of, but have been frequently sent back, and back, and back to a driver's training school.

The odor of it is an odor of a political fix, time and time again. The odor is the odor of corruption in the administration of justice.

What is needed is some cleansing of the whole law enforcement atmosphere in the District of Columbia in respect to the problem which I am discussing.

In compliance with my request, Commissioner Tobriner looked into the administration of the point system. Upon concluding his study, Commissioner Tobriner agreed with me that the system of referral to the traffic school has been seriously abused by certain city officials in order for individuals to avoid receiving points which might cause them to have their driver's permit either suspended or revoked. I ask unanimous consent that my letter to Commissioner Tobriner and Commissioner Tobriner's letter be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 10, 1965.

HON. WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER TOBRINER: Preliminary to further hearings on ticket fixing problems, it would be very much appreciated if you would look into the matter of the operation of the District of Columbia Traffic School in relation to suspending points or dropping charges, as described in the attached articles from the Washington Post.

It seems to me that the policy behind the point system is to protect the public from dangerous and reckless driving. One does not have to go to traffic school repeatedly to learn that he should not drive his automobile when drunk, or disobey the speed limit, and other moving traffic regulations.

I would appreciate very much if you, as the Commissioner in charge of police administration in the District of Columbia would look into the administration of the point system and then have breakfast or lunch with me in the near future for a discussion of the problem.

I would also like to know what your thinking is in regard to the suggestion made by George England of the Department of Motor Vehicles, that the administration of the point system should be put under the jurisdiction of his department. Also, would it be advisable to deprive the Corporation Counsel and other District of Columbia officials of all jurisdiction over the point system to the end that the assessment of points would be automatic and irrevocable if the individual is found guilty of the violation for which points are assessible?

It would seem to me that on the basis of my understanding of this problem no administrative officer of the District of Columbia government should have any discretionary power whatsoever to suspend the assessment of points involving any driver. It would further seem to me that the only place where possible suspension of points against a driver should be considered is at the traffic court level and then only when good cause is shown. I think a traffic court judge and not the Corporation Counsel should decide any question involving a possible suspension of the point system in a given case.

Unless the general public has confidence that no ticket fixing exists with regard to the point system, further disrespect for the administration of justice in the District of Columba is bound to grow.

I am very desirous in trying to work out with you and any other officials of the District of Columbia government an informal conference on all phases of the traffic ticket problem which would bring about an amicable and satisfactory solution of this problem. As you know, I am satisfied that very serious abuses existed before I initiated my study of traffic ticket adjustments. Although there has been some improvement, I still am satisfied that additional improvements can be made.

I shall continue to press for public disclosure of all the facts about the matter unless there can be worked out a procedure to be administered by the District of Columbia Commissioners through you as president of the board to put a stop to discriminatory practices in the form of arbitrary discretion in the handling of traffic tickets.

However, I want you to know that I appreciate very much the complete cooperation that you and Chief Layton have extended to me, and I look forward to discussing the whole matter further with you at a mutually convenient time after you have looked into the problem of the administration of the point system.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, June 9, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is in further reply to your letter of May 10, 1965, in reference to the administration of the point system and the operation of the District of Columbia Traffic School.

Upon my return to the city, I called a conference of the officials involved and we had a thorough discussion of this matter. We agree with you that the system of referral to traffic school has been abused in those cases where violators have been sent to traffic school repeatedly for different offenses to avoid the assessment of points. This type of action does tend to defeat the basic purpose of the point system.

However, we do feel that referral to traffic school for the first offense has definite value, not only for the traffic education given, but for the strong incentive it provides to the person to keep his record clean by driving more carefully in the future. Therefore, we plan to establish written criteria to be embodied in a Commissioners' order whereby the Corporation Counsel as well as the Youth Aid Division, Driver Improvement Section of the Department of Motor Vehicles and the police department could send to traffic school only those violators who have point-free records, and who have not attended traffic school during the previous 3 years. However, persons who commit serious traffic violations even for the first time would not be referred to traffic school, but would be taken to court. Such violations would include reckless driving, leaving after colliding, operating after suspension or revocation, and driving under the influence of alcohol.

I personally feel that permitting a person to attend traffic school one time to avoid points on an otherwise clean record provides a real incentive for that individual to be a better driver in the future. Further, by eliminating repeat referrals the abuses you point out would be eliminated. I hope you will agree with this philosophy.

This letter has been discussed with Chief Judge John Lewis Smith, Jr., who has expressed his concurrence with the proposed action. He further advised that he will bring these proposals to the attention of the Board of Judges of the Court of General Sessions, and assures me that their full cooperation is expected.

I will be happy to meet with you at your convenience to discuss this matter.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, though Commissioner Tobriner's report is a fairly satisfactory one, I regret that he is of the opinion that the Corporation Counsel and the Metropolitan Police Department, including the Youth Aid Division, should continue to be allowed to send violators to traffic school who have had point-free records during the previous 3 years. I do not understand why, after the Commissioner agrees that a great many abuses have occurred under the system, he would continue to permit the above-mentioned agencies to refer these motorists to the traffic school to avoid the assessment of points. Why should not they go to court? That is where these cases should be decided.

That is why I proposed a bill this year which was adopted by the Senate, that the number of our District of Columbia judges should be increased by five, two of them should be traffic court judges. The traffic court should be open at least in the early evening and up to probably 10 or 11 o'clock at night. That is where traffic cases should be sent, and not to some administrative office where a political fix or pull can be exercised. They should be in the spotlight of publicity in regard to the administration of justice that prevails in an American court. Either that or let them pay their fines. Either that or let them lose their driver's licenses.

Mr. President, I want to bring the issue out into the open. I am against this kind of backstage maneuvering in connection with this matter of reckless drivers in the District of Columbia.

The hundreds of thousands of innocent people in the Nation's Capital are entitled to better protection than the record I am about to disclose this afternoon is giving them.

On June 1 of this year, I sent a letter to Mr. George A. England, the very able Director of the District of Columbia Department of Motor Vehicles, asking him to cause to be made a study of the actual traffic record for each individual sent to the District of Columbia Traffic School for the past 12 months. I requested Mr. England to include in his study an individual's previous traffic record, whether the individual had been convicted for the offense for which he was permitted to go to traffic school, whether the conviction would have resulted in the suspension or revocation of the individual's driver's permit, whether the individual was operating a motor vehicle after his driver's license had been suspended or revoked, and whether the Department of Motor Vehicles had to cancel this action of suspending or revoking a driver's permit after an individual was sent to traffic school.

On June 29, Mr. George A. England, in his usual very efficient and thorough way, furnished me the information I had requested. I was shocked to read the results of some of his findings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to Mr. England and his letter to me be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 1, 1965.

Mr. GEORGE A. ENGLAND,
Director, District of Columbia Department of Motor Vehicles, Muncipal Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ENGLAND: I would like to receive from you at your earliest convenience, a study of the actual traffic record for each individual referred to the District of Columbia traffic school for the past 12 months.

The above-mentioned study should include an individual's previous traffic record; whether convicted for the offense for which permitted to go to the traffic school; whether the conviction would have resulted in the suspension or revocation of the individual's driver's permit; whether the individual was operating a vehicle after his driver's license had been suspended or revoked; and whether the Department of Motor Vehicles had to cancel its action of suspending or revoking a driver's permit after an individual was sent to traffic school.

Your cooperation in furnishing me the above-mentioned data is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES,
Washington, D.C., June 29, 1965.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The following information relating to your study of the use of the traffic school conducted by the Metropolitan Police Department is forwarded in response to your letter of June 1, 1965.

According to our records, there were 6,158 referrals to traffic school during the period from May 1, 1964, through April 30, 1965. These persons were referred by the following agencies:

Corporation counsel (53)[1]	3,232
Court (26)[1]	1,750
Department of Motor Vehicles (driver improvement)	736
Police Department	6
Volunteer (1)[1]	434
Total	6,158

[1] Number in parentheses represents number of persons whose records cannot be located on the basis of information furnished on the traffic school list.

The number of identifiable referrals, therefore, are:

Corporation counsel	3,179
Court	1,724
Department of Motor Vehicles	736
Police Department	6
Volunteer	433
Total	6,078

I have already furnished Mr. Judd with copies of the complete traffic records in each of these 6,078 cases, together with more refined identification of the source of referral.

In reply to your specific questions, please be advised as follows concerning the 4,909 identifiable referrals by the corporation counsel, court, and Police Department:

1. Individual's previous traffic record:

	Referrals	Clear record	Previous record	Previous record but not sufficient for action by Department of Motor Vehicles
Corporation Counsel	3,179	1,559	1,620	1,272
Court	1,724	338	1,386	654
Police Department	6	2	4	3

2. Whether convicted for offense:

Although the court and the corporation counsel would be in a better position to respond to this question, it is reasonable to assume that, since no points were assessed, there was no conviction in any of these cases.

3. Whether if convicted suspension or revocation may have followed:

Corporation Counsel	297
Court	560
Police department	1

4. Whether violation was one involving operating after suspension or revocation:

Corporation Counsel	12
Court	52
Police department	0

5. Whether the Department of Motor Vehicles had to cancel action as a result of reopening of cases and subsequent referral to traffic school:

Corporation Counsel	38
Court	118
Police department	0

I hope this information will be helpful to you in your study and if there is any further data I can supply, please don't hesitate to call me.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

G. A. ENGLAND,
Director of Motor Vehicles.

Mr. MORSE. During the period from May 1, 1964, through May 30, 1965, 6,078 persons were referred to the Metropolitan Police Department's Drivers' Training School. The Corporation Counsel sent 3,179. The District of Columbia Court of General Sessions sent 1,724. The Department of Motor Vehicles Drivers Improvement Section sent 736. The Metropolitan Police Department allegedly sent six. I say "allegedly," Mr. President, because there is a great deal of discrepancy in the figures supplied by the Department of Motor Vehicles and the Metropolitan Police Department itself. For some reason, the Department of Motor Vehicles, which is supposed to receive a record of all referrals to the Training School, did not receive a great many records from the Police Department. I asked the Police Department to retabulate the number of referrals it made to the Training School from April 22, 1964, through May 31, 1965. The special tabulation made by the Police Department at my request shows that the Department referred 337 individuals, and not 6. I ask unanimous consent that a report on the subject from the Police Department be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT
OF COLUMBIA,
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,
July 9, 1695.

Mr. RICHARD E. JUDD,
Professional Staff Member,
Senate District Committee,
New Senate Office Building.

DEAR MR. JUDD: In response to your inquiry by telephone, I have checked with our Traffic Division regarding the number of persons referred by this department to the Traffic School.

I am advised that a special tabulation made by them shows that from April 22, 1964, through May 31, 1964, a total of 337 individuals were referred by the Metropolitan Police Department to the Traffic School.

Very truly yours,

JERRY V. WILSON, *Inspector,*
Assistant Chief Clerk.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have some reason to believe that the Metropolitan Police Department referred considerably more than 337 individuals to the traffic training school from April 22, 1964 through May 31, 1965.

I have been informed that prior to my making an inquiry of Mr. Tobriner regarding point shaving practices in the District of Columbia, some citizens who needed points shaved in order to maintain custody of their drivers permit would go to the traffic division and have their traffic school card initialed as if they had actually attended traffic school. I understand that this practice fortunately has been discontinued. If it has not, it better be. I hope that is the case.

Drivers are not sent to traffic school unless they have demonstrated that they are poor drivers and high accident risks. It makes it all the worse when after committing serious traffic violations they use political "pull" to avoid even going to traffic school where they may learn to be better and more careful drivers.

Police Department records show that they have a considerable number of volunteers attending the traffic training school. I have a suspicion that the term "volunteers" is considered loosely, for I doubt that there are really very many volunteers.

I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum prepared by Deputy Chief of Police Charles L. Wright, of the traffic division, describing the drivers education program at the school and giving statistical material with regard to attendance at the school, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTIVITIES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC VIOLATORS' SCHOOL IN 1964

The District of Columbia Traffic School began operations in January 1948, following conferences between the Commissioners, District of Columbia police and court officials, the American Automobile Association, the Director of Motor Vehicles, and other organizations and individuals interested in the promotion of traffic safety.

The purpose of the school program is to create a driver education system for all violators of traffic regulations, operators and pedestrians alike, and for those persons, not necessarily violators, who wish to take advantage of its facilities in order to become better and safer operators of motor vehicles.

Since its inception, 86,327 persons, referred by various agencies, have completed the 6-hour course and received completion certificates. Many other volunteer applicants, although not taking the final examination, attended the sessions and benefited as drivers.

The agenda of the course consists of the following:

1. Discussion of principal regulations; interpretation and purpose; question and answer period.

2. Discussion of accident causes; films and slides are shown to demonstrate points covered.

3. Lectures on sound driving practices based on proven tests and recommendations of nationally known safety organizations.

4. Lectures and discussion period on driver attitude particularly toward other drivers, and its importance to safe driving.

5. Lecture by a licensed optometrist on the importance of good eyesight in driving as it affects reaction time and field of vision.

6. Open discussion of regulations and traffic situations; panel of officers answering questions on all phases covered.

7. Following the second session, each person attending and/or referred by some agency must take and make a passing grade on a written examination. Referral agencies will accept minimum passing grades of 75 to 100 percent.

The complete course consists of two, 3-hour sessions held on the same evening of consecutive weeks. Referrals may attend 2 Tuesday or 2 Wednesday evening sessions from 7:30 p.m. to 10:30 p.m., or 2 Saturday morning sessions from 9 a.m., to 12 noon. The first 2 Saturdays of each month from 9 a.m. to 12 noon are set aside for juvenile referrals. The final examination consists of 20 multiple choice or 50 true-false questions on the material covered in the two sessions. The Driver Improvement Section of the Department of Motor Vehicles requires a passing grade of 85 percent; the Juvenile Bureau, 80 percent; the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions (judge and corporation counsel), 75 percent to 100 percent. Illiterates are given an oral examination.

During 1964 these agencies made referrals as follows:

Driver Improvement Section, Department Motor Vehicles	767
Judges and/or corporation counsels	5,883
Juvenile Bureau, Youth Aid Division	1,051
Volunteers, Armed Forces, private industry	1,626
Total for 1964 attending	9,327

The officers assigned to the school also made talks to citizens, business, Armed Forces, and other groups on traffic safety. These officers have also made numerous radio and TV appearances, including a 5 to 10 minute weekly appearance on WMAL-TV's show, "Woman's World." On this program the traffic regulations of the District of Columbia have been discussed.

Approximately 115,000 pieces of traffic safety literature and excerpts from the traffic regulations were distributed by the traffic school.

CHARLES L. WRIGHT,
Deputy Chief of Police in Charge of Traffic.

JOSEPH V. OSTERMAN,
Inspector of Traffic.

(Prepared by: Frederick Campbell, instructor in charge.)

Mr. MORSE. The Department of Motor Vehicles report shows that the Corporation Counsel referred 3,179 traffic violators to the traffic school from May 1, 1964, through April 30, 1965. Of that number referred by the Corporation Counsel, 1,559 had no previous record. There were, however, 1,620 referred to the traffic school by the Corporation Counsel who had a previous traffic violation record.

In fact, more drivers who had been previously found guilty were referred to the school than the drivers who never had a traffic violation before.

During this same period of time, the court referred 1,724 individuals to the traffic school. Of this number, 338 had a clear driving record and 1,386 had a previous record. The Police Department during this same period of time, according to records maintained by the Department of Motor Vehicles, referred six individuals to the training school, as I pointed out before. Of the six referred, two had a clear traffic record, and four had a previous traffic record.

Mr. President, the report furnished me by Mr. England, of the Department of Motor Vehicles, is an interesting one. Let me explain what I mean. Reviewing the individual case histories of all those individuals referred to the drivers training school during a 1-year period of time, Mr. England states that if a conviction had resulted in the above-mentioned cases, the suspension or revocation of a driver's license may have followed in this way: Of those cases sent to the training school by the Corporation Counsel, 297; the court of general sessions, 560; and the Police Department, supposedly 1.

I view with grave doubt the wisdom of such a large number of drivers being allowed to go free, driving automobiles on our streets. They have demonstrated that they can turn their vehicles into dangerous weapons, and have turned them into dangerous weapons. I seriously doubt the justification of the corporation counsel's sending to a traffic school 297 drivers who otherwise may have lost their licenses or had them suspended, based upon their past records, or 560 from the court of general sessions.

The killing of persons by automobiles will not be stopped in America unless the American people start demanding that the killers and potential killers be checked.

Drivers who have demonstrated such a lack of regard for the welfare of people in traffic as to commit the offenses these drivers have committed should not be allowed the privilege—it is not a right—to drive a car. Let us make that point clear, once and for all: No one has a right to drive a car; only a privilege.

If a person cannot demonstrate that he can drive a car safely, the privilege should be taken away from him. Killings will not be stopped, or a reduction in the number of killings will not occur, unless we recognize our softness in regard to unintentional killers or injurers, those professedly, innocent people who "did not mean it," who used bad judgment, who were so clearly reckless that if they had been forced to go to court rather than to traffic school, they may have had meted out to them the justice they should have had meted out to them through the loss of their licenses.

The corporation counsel referred to the traffic school 12 individuals whose violations involved operating motor vehicles after the suspension or revocation of their drivers' permits.

Why in the world did they have to go to traffic school? What would traffic school teach them? They were plain crooked in operating without their licenses. They thought they could get by without their drivers' licenses. Yet they were sent to traffic school. When one is sent to traffic school, he can continue to drive. For the same violation, the court referred 52 individuals to the traffic school. Mr. England advises me that the Department of Motor Vehicles has had to cancel suspension or revocation action for a number of cases reopened by the corporation counsel and the court of general sessions. This occurred in 38 cases referred to the traffic school by the corporation counsel and 118 cases referred to the school by the court.

Under practices in existence prior to my receiving Commissioner Tobriner's report, there was a great deal of room open for abuse. I hope that the information which I have received to the effect that referrals to the traffic school are much more selective than they were, is indeed correct.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point of my remarks statistical data supplied by the Department of Motor Vehicles with regard to referrals to the traffic school for the period of May 1, 1964, through April 30, 1965 showing more detailed information than I have previously discussed.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Referrals to traffic school

MAY 1, 1964 THROUGH APRIL 30, 1965

Corporation counsel	3, 179
Court	1, 724
Police	6
Subtotal	4,909
Driver improvement	736
Volunteer	433
Unable to identify	80
Total	6, 158

By Courts, Corporation Counsel, and Police

Clear record	1, 899
Previous record	1, 929
May result in susp. or rev	858
OAS or OAR	64
Had to withdraw action DMV	156
Driving while drunk	3
Total	4, 909

Number of times person has been to traffic school:

1	4, 474
2	353
3	68
4	11
5	3
Total	4, 909

By Corporation Counsel

Clear record	1, 559
Previous record	1, 272
May result in susp. or rev	297
OAS or OAR	12
Had to withdraw action DIS	38
Driving while drunk	1
Total	3, 179

Number of times person has been to traffic school:

1	2, 977
2	170
3	29
4	2
5	1
Total	3, 179

By Court

Clear record	338
Previous record	654
May result in susp. or rev	560
OAS or OAR	52
Had to withdraw action DIS	118
Driving while drunk	2
Total	1, 724

Referrals to traffic school—Continued

Number of times person has been to traffic school:

1	1, 492
2	182
3	39
4	9
5	2
Total	1, 724

By Police

Clear record	2
Previous record	3
May result in susp. or rev	1
OAS or OAR	—
Had to withdraw action DIS	—
Driving while drunk	—
Total	6

Number of times person has been to traffic school:

1	5
2	1
3	
4	
5	
Total	6

MAY 1, 1964 THROUGH DECEMBER 3, 1964

Corporation counsel	1, 798
Court	824
Driver improvement	388
Volunteer	230
Unable to identify	44
Police	4
Total	3, 288

By Corporation Counsel

Clear record	874
Previous record	682
May result in susp. or rev	209
OAS or OAR	7
Had to withdraw action, DIS	26
Driving while drunk	-----
Total	1, 798

Number of times persons have been to traffic school:

1	1, 703
2	85
3	9
4	-----
5	1
Total	1, 798

By Court

Clear record	162
Previous record	276
May result in susp. or rev	284
OAS or OAR	22
Had to withdraw action, DIS	78
Driving while drunk	2
Total	824

Number of times persons have been to traffic school:

1	706
2	93
3	18
4	7
5	-----
Total	824

By Police

Person had:

Clear record	1
Previous record	2
May result in susp. or rev	1
OAS or OAR	-----
Had to withdraw action, DIS	-----
Driving while drunk	-----
Total	4

***Referrals to traffic school*—Continued**

Number of times persons have been to traffic school:

1	3
2	1
3	-----
4	-----
Total	4

DECEMBER 10, 1964, THROUGH APRIL 30, 1965

Corporation counsel	1,381
Court	900
Driver improvement	348
Volunteer	203
Unable to identify	36
Police	2
Total	2,870

By Corporation Counsel

Clear record	685
Previous record	590
May result in susp. or rev	88
OAS or OAR	5
Had to withdraw action DIS	12
Driving while drunk	1
Total	1,381

Number of times person has been to traffic school:

1	1,274
2	85
3	20
4	2
5	-----
Total	1,381

By Clark King, Corporation Counsel

Person had:

Clear record	61
Previous record	74
May result in susp. or rev	16
OAS or OAR	2
Had to withdraw action, DIS	4
Driving while drunk	-----
Total	157

Number of times person has been to traffic school:

1	136
2	19
3	2
4	-----
5	-----
Total	157

By Robert Campbell, Corporation Counsel

Person had:

Clear record	226
Previous record	222
May result in susp. or rev	39
OAS or OAR	1
Had to withdraw action, DIS	6
Driving while drunk	----
Total	494

Number of times person has been to traffic school:

1	458
2	28
3	7
4	1
5	-----
Total	494

By John Middleton, Corporation Counsel

Person had:

Clear record	226
Previous record	166
May result in susp. or rev	16
OAS or OAR	2
Had to withdraw action DIS	1
Driving while drunk	1
Total	412

***Referrals to traffic school*—Continued**

Number of times person has been to traffic school:

1	382
2	24
3	6
4	-----
5	-----
Total	412

By Thomas C. Bell, Corporation Counsel

Person had:

Clear record	32
Previous record	23
May result in susp. or rev	2
OAS or OAR	-----
Had to withdraw action, DIS	-----
Driving while drunk	-----
Total	57

Number of times person has been to traffic school:

1	51
2	2
3	3
4	1
5	-----
Total	57

By Steven Miller, Corporation Counsel

Person had:

Clear record	20
Previous record	17
May result in susp. or rev	2
OAS or OAR	-----
Had to withdraw action, DIS	-----
Driving while drunk	-----
Total	39

Number of times person has been to traffic school:

1	36
2	3
3	-----
4	-----
5	-----
Total	39

By George Kramer, Corporation Counsel

Person had:

Clear record	21
Previous record	15
May result in susp. or rev	3
OAS or OAR	-----
Had to withdraw action, DIS	1
Driving while drunk	-----
Total	40

Number of times person has been to traffic school:

1	36
2	4
3	-----
4	-----
5	-----
Total	40

By Robert Werdig, Corporation Counsel

Person had:

Clear record	16
Previous record	6
May result in susp. or rev	-----
OAS or OAR	-----
Had to withdraw action DIS	-----
Driving while drunk	-----
Total	22

***Referrals to traffic school*—Continued**

Number of times person has been to traffic school:

1	21
2	-----
3	1
4	-----
5	-----
Total	22

By James Hill, Corporation Counsel

Person had:

Clear record	32
Previous record	19
May result in susp. or rev	1
OAS or OAR	-----
Had to withdraw action, DIS	-----
Driving while drunk	-----
Total	52

Number of times person has been to traffic school:

1	51
2	1
3	-----
4	-----
5	-----
Total	52

By Patrick O'Donnell, Corporation Counsel

Person had:

Clear record	22
Previous record	27
May result in susp. or rev	4
OAS or OAR	-----
Had to withdraw action, DIS	-----
Driving while drunk	-----
Total	53

Number of times person had been to traffic school:

1	49
2	3
3	1
4	-----
5	-----
Total	53

By Robert Miller, Corporation Counsel

Person had:

Clear record	11
Previous record	11
May result in susp. or rev	2
OAS or OAR	-----
Had to withdraw action, DIS	-----
Driving while drunk	-----
Total	24

Number of times person had been to traffic school:

1	24
2	-----
3	-----
4	-----
5	-----
Total	24

By Miscellaneous Corporation Counsel

Person had:

Clear record	18
Previous record	10
May result in susp. or rev	3
OAS or OAR	-----
Had to withdraw action, DIS	-----
Driving while drunk	-----
Total	31

Referrals to traffic school—Continued

Number of times person had been to traffic school:	
1	30
2	1
3	-----
4	-----
5	-----
Total	31

By Court

Clear record	176
Previous record	378
May result in susp. or rev	276
OAS or OAR	30
Had to withdraw action, DIS	40
Driving while drunk	-----
Total	900

Number of times person had been to traffic school:	
1	786
2	89
3	21
4	2
5	2
Total	900

By Judge Neilson

Person had:	
Clear record	156
Previous record	343
May result in susp. or rev	254
OAS or OAR	28
Had to withdraw action DIS	39
Driving while drunk	—
Total	820

Number of times person has been to traffic school:	
1	718
2	79
3	20
4	2
5	1
Total	820

By Judge Howard

Person had:	
Clear record	—
Previous record	1
May result in susp. or rev	4
OAS or OAR	1
Had to withdraw action DIS	1
Driving while drunk	—
Total	7

Number of times person has been to traffic school:	
1	5
2	2
3	—
4	—
5	—
Total	7

By Judge Kronheim

Person had:	
Clear record	11
Previous record	15
May result in susp. or rev	6
OAS or OAR	—
Had to withdraw action DIS	—
Driving while drunk	—
Total	32

Number of times person has been to traffic school:	
1	29
2	3
3	—
4	—
5	—
Total	32

By Judge Smith

Person had:	
Clear record	3
Previous record	3
May result in susp. or rev	—
OAS or OAR	—
Had to withdraw action DIS	—
Driving while drunk	—
Total	6

Number of times person has been to traffic school:	
1	5
2	1
3	—
4	—
5	—
Total	6

By Judge Walker

Person had:	
Clear record	2
Previous record	7
May result in susp. or rev	3
OAS or OAR	—
Had to withdraw action DIS	—
Driving while drunk	—
Total	12

Number of times person has been to traffic school:	
1	11
2	—
3	—
4	—
5	7
Total	12

By Judge Kelly

Person had:	
Clear record	1
Previous record	6
May result in suspension or revocation	5
OAS or OAR	1
Had to withdraw action DIS	----
Driving while drunk	----
Total	13

Number of times person has been to school:	
1	8
2	4
3	1
4	----
5	----
Total	13

By Judge Malloy

Person had:	
Clear record	1
Previous record	1
May result in suspension or revocation	1
OAS or OAR	----
Had to withdraw action DIS	----
Driving while drunk	----
Total	3

Number of times person has been to traffic school:	
1	3
2	----
3	----
4	----
5	----
Total	3

By Judge Barlow

Person had:	
Clear record	1
Previous record	1
May result in suspension or revocation	2
OAS or OAR	----
Had to withdraw action DIS	----
Driving while drunk	----
Total	4

Number of times person has been to traffic school:	
1	4
2	----
3	----
4	----
5	----
Total	4

By Miscellaneous Court

Person had:	
Clear record	1
Previous record	1
May result in suspension or revocation	1
OAS or OAR	----
Had to withdraw action DIS	----
Driving while drunk	----
Total	3

Number of times person has been to traffic school:	
1	3
2	----
3	----
4	----
5	----
Total	3

By Police

Person had:	
Clear record	1
Previous record	1
May result in suspension or revocation	----
OAS or OAR	----
Had to withdraw action DIS	----
Total	2

Number of times person has been to traffic school:	
1	2
2	----
3	----
4	----
Total	2

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me answer right now one criticism which the senior Senator from Oregon is getting from some persons who apparently believe in government by secrecy, because I publicly disclosed the names of some of them. My answer is that, as chairman of the subcommittee dealing with law enforcement in the District of Columbia, I shall continue to disclose your names. Your wrongdoings, so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, will not be hidden, even though you are a Member of Congress; or even though, as in one case, dealing with Mr. Acheson, before he was promoted to his present higher position, you might be U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia. The U.S. attorney has no right to have concealed from public knowledge his misbehavior and violation of the law.

If anyone believes I am going to be silenced, so far as concerns making public what is public information, which I have the right in my official capacity to obtain, let him get it out of his head. He is going to be disclosed, because after all, speaking as one who has worked in the field of criminal law administration for many years, there is no substitute in a democracy for the full disclosure of the public's business.

Law violators should be disclosed, I care not what their status. In my position on this committee, I have become a little weary of the attempts that have been made to find out if the color of one's skin is black. There appears to be no hesitancy in making headlines of cases involving Negroes.

One of my concerns, about which I have expressed strong disapproval time and time again, has been the imbalance in the administration of justice in the District of Columbia. I want every Negro held to the same standards of obedience to the law as white citizens. But law enforcement works both ways. I say to the white people of the District of Columbia that there must be an insistence on equality of administration of the law. That goes also for all employees in high and low places who work for the Government. They have no right to any exemption or difference in treatment with respect to the administration of justice, even though the offense involves merely a traffic ticket.

The Corporation Counsel referred during the above-mentioned period of time 2,977 persons to the traffic school who had no prior offense—170 were referred to the traffic school by the Corporation Counsel after they had been there before; 29 were sent to the traffic school by the Corporation Counsel the third time; 2 were referred to the traffic school by the Corporation Counsel for the fourth time; and 1 individual was referred to the traffic school 5 times by the Corporation Counsel. In order to graduate from the school, they had to pass the exam.

Oh, I know the argument that will be made. It will be said, "But this involves only a traffic ticket." What does that have to do with the principle, whether it involves a traffic ticket or a burglary? We must see to it that the law that relates to these offenses is administered uniformly and without discrimination.

Even though most of the repeaters at the school received respectable scores on the exam, it did not make the drivers good ones. For the life of me, I do not understand what the Corporation Counsel or Assistant Corporation Counsel is thinking about when he demonstrates such insensibility to the rights of the public to be protected from such drivers by allowing such drivers to continue driving on city streets.

In my judgment, the sorry record of the Corporation Counsel is surpassed by the court of general sessions in connection with referring individuals to the traffic school. Many individuals referred to the traffic school by both the Corporation Counsel and the court have demonstrated the potential of committing mayhem on our streets and highways. The driving records of some of the individuals who have been referred to the traffic school show that the driver has little regard for the privileges of other motorists.

I do not take out of the file any exceptional cases. There are too many such as this one. Here is an example of a driver being referred to traffic school who had been guilty previously of 36 moving violations and 59 nonmoving violations.

How in the world can anyone connected with the administration of justice send that culprit to a driving school?

He should have been put to walking exercises. He should have been told to use his heels. They should have given him, figuratively, the boot, rather than the leniency that they gave him by sending him back to traffic school. Here are some of his offenses:

March 1, 1929, passed red light.

June 20, 1929, no D.C. permit.

July 17, 1929, speeding.

August 1, 1929, colliding and failing to stop.

August 8, 1932, failed to give right of way.

September 6, 1932, disobeyed official sign.

September 15, 1937, speeding.

September 15, 1938, speeding.

May 13, 1940, disobeyed official sign.

July 31, 1941, driving through occupied safety zone.

August 17, 1941, colliding (accident).

October 23, 1941, driving wrong side of street—

It does not take much imagination to know what was the matter with him when he did that—

April 8, 1942, passed stop sign.

December 21, 1949, disobeyed official sign.

December 22, 1949, colliding.

February 19, 1950, improper turn—accident.

July 15, 1950, turn wrong lane.

October 26, 1950, disobeyed official sign.

November 16, 1950, disobeyed official sign.

September 5, 1952, failed to give right of way.

March 26, 1956, no rear lights.

March 3, 1956, following too close—accident.

January 4, 1957, passed red right.

August 27, 1957, turn wrong lane.

August 18, 1957, weaving in traffic—

I wonder why he was weaving in traffic.

December 29, 1957, signal device.

March 20, 1960, passed stop sign.

October 2, 1960, disobeyed traffic signal device.

December 7, 1960, violated pedestrian controlled intersection.

August 1, 1960, stop sign.

February 24, 1961, impeding traffic.

July 24, 1961, following too close (accident).

April 16, 1963, speed.

January 12, 1965, disobeying officer.

January 12, 1965, disobeying officer.

Whom do they think they are kidding? He ought to have lost his driver's permit very early in this game.

Here is another one.

Listen to his violations:

April 28, 1949, violated one-way street.

June 15, 1949, driving on wrong side of street.

March 22, 1950, disobeyed signal device.

August 31, 1950, failed to give full time and attention.

September 1, 1950, violated one-way street.

February 2, 1951, disobeyed signal device.

June 21, 1951, operated after suspension.

June 21, 1951, fast auto.

April 17, 1955, passed red light.

August 1, 1955, speed.

September 28, 1955, driving on wrong side street—accident.

June 10, 1956, operating after revocation.

June 10, 1956, unreasonable speed.

June 10, 1956, driving on wrong side street.

June 10, 1956, passed red light.

November 23, 1958, improper turn.

August 14, 1959, unreasonable speed.

February 9, 1960, speed.

February 9, 1960, flashing red light.

June 17, 1960, disobeyed traffic signal.

June 17, 1960, operating after suspension.

December 29, 1962, operating on wrong side of road.

October 18, 1964, driving on wrong side of street.

Referred to traffic school five times.

It is perfectly ridiculous. Does the Presiding Officer know who the equal wrongdoers were? They were the administrators and judges who sent him to traffic school. I will tell anyone where these officials ought to be sent, and that is not to a traffic school, Mr. President, but to retirement.

The automobile should be taken away from this man until he develops some maturity and commonsense. He is a danger to society and to the people of the District of Columbia. Those officers who kept sending him to traffic school, in my judgment, are guilty of malfeasance in office.

I have a few other examples. They all read the same. These are assignments by judges. They have shown no keener sense of responsibility in protecting the safety of the people of the District of Columbia than has the corporation counsel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD some other examples of bad drivers being referred to traffic school.

There being no objection, the examples were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXAMPLES OF BAD DRIVERS BEING REFERRED TO TRAFFIC SCHOOL

1. March 15, 1963, speed; April 1, 1964, passed red light; May 28, 1964, unreasonable speed; December 1, 1964, no left turn. (Referred to traffic school four times.)

2. April 25, 1955, red light; July 1, 1955, speeding; September 28, 1956, turning wrong lane; October 2, 1956, speeding; December 27, 1956, no U-turn; August 2, 1960, failed to yield right-of-way; November 8, 1960, changing lanes without caution; December 14, 1962, passed stop sign; September 10, 1964, passed red light; February 21, 1965, passed

red light. (Referred to traffic school two times.)

3. October 10, 1958, disobeyed signal; July 28, 1959, unreasonable speed; November 22, 1959, failed to keep in proper lane; May 29, 1960, disobeyed signal; July 13, 1960, do not enter; February 28, 1961, red light; October 7, 1962, speed; October 5, 1963, disobeyed traffic light; January 2, 1965, passed stop sign. (Referred to traffic school three times.)

4. December 13, 1958, speed; March 5, 1959, changed lane without caution; June 28, 1959, colliding; December 25, 1959, speed; November 15, 1963, passed red light; August 1, 1964, driving while drunk; August 1, 1964, colliding; August 1, 1964, reckless driving; August 1, 1964, improper left turn. (Referred to traffic school three times.)

5. July 15, 1955, speed; September 17, 1955, colliding; June 20, 1956, speed; November 5, 1956, backing without caution; September 18, 1957, operating after revocation; December 4, 1957, turn wrong lane—accident; April 4, 1960, colliding; July 1, 1960, speed; March 4, 1963, following too closely—accident; July 30, 1964, colliding. (Referred to traffic school three times.)

6. October 16, 1957, no left turn; July 9, 1958, speed; March 24, 1960, no left turn; August 4, 1960, do not enter; October 2, 1962, speed; October 15, 1963, speed. (Referred to traffic school three times.)

7. June 14, 1956, no left turn; August 29, 1958, no left turn; December 9, 1958, no left turn; June 20, 1959, unreasonable speed; September 15, 1959, unreasonable speed; March 12, 1960, obstructing crosswalk; November 2, 1962, broken windshield; July 24, 1963, changing lanes without caution; June 11, 1964, passed stop sign. (Referred to traffic school four times.)

8. September 29, 1961, disobeyed traffic signal; July 11, 1962, changing lanes without caution; December 30, 1963, passed stop sign; March 5, 1964, disobeying official sign; October 13, 1964, failed to pull to curb; February 24, 1965, excess speed. (Referred to traffic school three times.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let us look for a moment at the referral record of the court in regard to the traffic school. Out of 1,724 persons sent to the traffic school by the court, 1,492 individuals were referred to the traffic school for the first time; 182 individuals were referred to the traffic school for the second time; 39 individuals were referred to the traffic school for the third time; 9 individuals were referred to the school for the fourth time; and 2 individuals were referred to the traffic school for the fifth time. Keep in mind that the individuals referred to the traffic school from one to five times continued to maintain their driving privileges. I would like to refine the information I have received a little further in order that we might see exactly which officials in the court of general sessions and the Corporation Counsel's Office are possibly abusing the use of good judgment or authority they might have had in regard to referring individuals to the traffic school to avoid the assessment of points.

For the period of December 10, 1964, through April 30, 1965, Mr. Clark King, Assistant Corporation Counsel, referred 136 people to the training school once; 19 individuals to the training school twice; and 2 individuals to the training school for the third time. Of the 157 individuals referred to the traffic school by Mr. King, 74 individuals had previous traffic records. He referred 16 individuals to the traffic school that otherwise could have had their drivers license suspended or revoked, and 2 individuals who were arrested for driving after their drivers license had either been suspended or revoked.

What in the world a traffic school could do for them, I do not know, except save them some points and make it possible for them to continue to drive.

Mr. King's assistant, by the way, has a very bad record of fixing tickets and shaving points. His name is Mr. Robert Campbell. Mr. Campbell referred 458 people to the training school once; 28 were referred by him to the school twice; 7 were referred to the school for the third time; and 1 was referred to the school for the fourth time. Of the 494 individuals referred to the training school by Mr. Campbell, 222 had a previous traffic record. Of this number, 39 had a driver's record so serious that had the driver not been referred to the training school, it may have resulted in the suspension or revocation of his driver's permit.

Assistant Corporation Counsel John Middleton has also referred a number of people to the traffic training school. Of the total of 412 which he referred, 382 were referred there for the first time; 24 were referred to the traffic school for the second time; and 6 were referred to the traffic school for the third time. It should be pointed out, Mr. President, that Mr. Middleton referred one driver to the training school for driving while drunk.

I cannot understand it. He was driving while drunk. His license should have been revoked. Here there is no place for a second chance. Take his license away for the period of time allowed by the law. Tell him he better take a cure.

I must not digress very much longer on that subject, Mr. President, because the Presiding Officer and others in the Senate know what I think about this policy, even within the precincts of the U.S. Senate.

So, getting back to the subject—there is also an Assistant Corporation Counsel by the name of Mr. Thomas C. Bell. Mr. Bell referred fewer people to the traffic school than some of his colleagues. Of the 57 individuals he referred to the school, 2 were referred there twice; 3 were referred 3 times; and 1 was referred there 4 times.

Mr. Bell has a colleague by the name of Mr. Steven Miller, who apparently is a little harder to get along with because he referred 39 individuals to the traffic school. Of the 39, he sent 3 there twice, and 36 for the first time. Of the 39 individuals referred to the school, 17 had a previous traffic record.

There is another Assistant Corporation Counsel by the name of Mr. George Kramer who believes in shaving traffic violation points. Mr. Kramer sent 40 individuals to the traffic school. Of the 40, 15 of them had a previous traffic record. Mr. Kramer sent 36 to the traffic school once, and 4 to the traffic school twice. Three individuals had a traffic record so bad that their driver's license could have been suspended or revoked.

There is also another Assistant Corporation Counsel by the name of Mr. Robert Werdig. Mr. Werdig referred 22 individuals to the traffic school. Of the 22 individuals referred to the traffic school by Mr. Werdig, 21 individuals were sent there once, and 1 was sent there 3 times. Mr. Werdig sent 15 individuals to the school that had a previous traffic record. Mr. Werdig is the Assistant Corporation Counsel who fixed several housing violation tickets for a real estate firm.

Mr. President, now I would like to discuss the handling of traffic cases by some of the judges sitting on the court of general sessions. During the period of December 10, 1964, through April 30, 1965, the court of general sessions referred 900 errant drivers to the traffic school. Of the 900 drivers referred to the traffic school, 378 had a previous traffic record. There were 276 drivers that had a driving record so bad that had they not been referred to the traffic school, they may have had their drivers permits suspended or revoked. The court of general sessions referred 786 drivers to the traffic training school for the first time. There were 89 of the 900 individuals who passed the school's test and graduated, but were referred to the school the second time.

Pretty poor teachers, I would say. When I was teaching school, if I did not have a better record than that, I would have been concerned about what my superiors might put on my efficiency report.

Out of the 900 individuals referred by the court of general sessions, 21 of these were again referred by the court to the traffic school for the third time; the court of general sessions referred 2 to the traffic school for the fourth time; and, believe it or not, 2 were referred to the school by the court for the fifth time. In most cases, they graduated from the traffic school with honors, to go out on the highway and fail to apply what they supposedly learned in the classroom.

There is a retired judge who volunteers to spend practically all of his retirement on the traffic court to hear traffic cases.

He would like to have been reappointed, but the President of the United States did not see fit to reappoint him.

I have serious questions, Mr. President, whether or not we ought to be using judges who cannot be reappointed. I believe we should add more judges to the court, so that we can at least have an opportunity to confirm their nominations. We do not confirm retired judges who volunteer to serve. That is further evidence in support of the soundness of the Morse bill this year, whereby I had sought to have 5 additional judges with 2 judges assigned to traffic court. This retired judge serves on the court voluntarily. This retired judge interestingly enough is the author of a private relief bill which would permit him to sit on the court of general sessions without a Presidential appointment and receive the same benefits as that received by sitting judges, along with greatly increased retirement benefits. Nice if he can get by with it. I shall be interested in seeing whether he can get by with it.

Should this private relief bill be reported by the Senate District of Columbia Committee without drastic revision, I shall have considerably more to say about it in the days immediately ahead.

In view of the vast movement that has gained headway for early adjournment sine die, while our boys are dying in South Vietnam—an adjournment that I shall continue to oppose, though I am satisfied that the Senate will have its way, and that we and the House will adjourn. So the judge's private relief bill will come up next session, and we will all come back fresh, ready to give that very careful attention in detail and depth, to any piece of legislation that it is so difficult to obtain in the closing hours of any session. I shall await with interest the form of that bill, come January.

Let us look for a moment at this judge's record of referring bad drivers to the traffic training school. You would think by the number of individuals sent to the traffic school by this judge during the period of December 10, 1964 through April 30, 1965 that he is overly sold on what the traffic school is able to do in changing bad attitudes of some drivers. Retired Judge Nielson referred 820 individuals to the traffic school during the above-mentioned period of time. Of the 820 referred to the traffic school by retired Judge Nielson, 343 had a previous traffic record, and 254 individuals had a driving record so bad that had they not been referred to the traffic school they may have had their driver's permit suspended or revoked. Retired Judge Nielson referred 718 people to the traffic school once; 79 individuals to the traffic school the second time; 20 students to the traffic school for the third time; 2 to the traffic school the fourth time; and 1 to the traffic school the fifth time.

Get the significance of it. They save points. They avoid having the points added up so that they will not lose their drivers' permits. Once more, Mr. President, they are exempted, in effect, from that administration of justice that nonviolators have the right to expect of their government. That is what the Senator from Oregon will continue to plead for. We are not going to have respect for the law if at this so-called lower echelon of judicial process the idea spreads abroad that, "This does not result in a uniform application of the law."

I would have those who have been fixing tickets, or have been assigning individuals to the traffic school, come and stand in front of the U.S. Supreme Court and contemplate and meditate what that great citadel of justice symbolizes in this Republic. I have a feeling that if they would do that, their consciences, if nothing else, would cause them to change their course of action.

During this period, Judge Howard referred seven cases to the traffic school—five for the first time and two for the second time.

Judge Kronheim referred 32 individuals to the traffic school—15 of these, or nearly one-half of them, had a previous traffic record. There were six who had traffic records so bad that if they had not been referred to the traffic school they may have had their driver's license suspended or revoked. Judge Kronheim sent 29 to the traffic school once, and 3 to the traffic school for the second time.

Judge Smith, who does not hear many traffic cases, sent six individuals to the traffic school. Three of the six had a previous record. Of the six individuals referred, one was sent there for the second time.

Judge Kelly referred 13 individuals to the traffic school. Of the 13, 6 had a previous traffic record. There were five individuals who could have had their drivers permit suspended or revoked had they not been referred to the traffic school. Of the 13 referred to the traffic school, 8 were referred for the first time; 4 attended the school twice; and 1 for the third time.

Mr. President, I have in my possession a detailed record of more than 6,000 drivers' traffic records which indicates, I believe, without question, that point shaving has been the order of the day. I hope that this situation is changed. If it is not, I shall pursue the matter in the next session of Congress because we cannot have respect for law enforcement and the administration of justice if people know that with political "pull" they can circumvent regulations and statutes of this city in order to maintain their drivers permit which, in most cases, should have been suspended or revoked.

I believe it is generally agreed that traffic courts, with expert traffic court judges, can assist other agencies in curtailing highway deaths and accidents. I also believe it is generally conceded that when police officers consistently, fairly, and diligently enforce traffic laws and regulations, the number of traffic deaths and accidents decline, provided they are given the backing from their superiors to which they are entitled. How would we like to be a police officer? It is not a pleasant task to arrest anyone, or give a ticket for a traffic violation, and get some of the "lip" which they have to take from time to time, and then have someone higher up fix the ticket.

Our police officers are entitled to be supported when they make an arrest within their rightful prerogatives. If they are guilty of any miscarriage of justice, we have procedures to protect our citizens if they suffer at their hands.

By and large, in the field of law enforcement in the District of Columbia, we have a right to be proud of our police officers, and we have responsibilities as citizens to back them up.

I believe that is also fair to say that traffic court judges and policemen must also have the complete cooperation of the prosecuting office in carrying out their responsibilities to see that the public interest is protected. If there is a breakdown in either the police department, the prosecutor's office, or the court, the fair administration of justice is impaired and the public does not receive the protection it expects and deserves.

During 1964, 115 persons were auto traffic fatalities in the District of Columbia while traffic accidents totaled 21,771. This is the highest number of fatalities and traffic accidents in the District of Columbia for many years. This year there have been 76 traffic fatalities and 21,637 traffic accidents so far.

I ask unanimous consent that a table relating to traffic accidents in the District of Columbia be printed at this point in my remarks.

It is estimated that the per capita economic cost of traffic accidents to District of Columbia residents is approximately $35.07 or a total of $26,300,000 in 1964 alone.

I ask officials of the District of Columbia government, holding any position of public trust and responsibility in any of the three offices I have mentioned in the Senate here today, to answer for themselves whether the point-shaving practice, which has been flagrantly abused, is in the public interest.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 18, 1965.

To: Deputy Chief Charles L. Wright.

Subject: Comparative statistics through September 1964 and 1965 for traffic accidents in the District of Columbia.

	1965	1964
Total traffic accidents	21,637	21,771
Total injury accidents	5,707	5,931
Total property damage accidents	15,859	15,749
Total pedestrian accidents	1,510	1,611
Total persons injured	7,878	8,161
Total juvenile pedestrian accidents	896	933

	Total	Pedestrians	Operators	Passengers
Traffic fatalities:				
1965	76	29	26	21
1964	92	49	30	13

ALBERT B. NICHOLSON,
Captain, Accident Investigation Unit.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in yielding the floor, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD any other material bearing upon the many subject matters that I may decide I should like to include in the RECORD today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSAL OF NICKEL FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10305) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 124,200,000 pounds of nickel from the national stockpile. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Oct. 22, 1965, pp. 28452–28453, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

DISPOSAL OF ZINC FROM EITHER NATIONAL STOCKPILE OR SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE, OR BOTH—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill—H.R. 9047—to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Oct. 22, 1965, pp. 28451–28452, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

FISCAL AND MONETARY ASPECTS OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to discuss some fiscal and monetary aspects of our foreign policy.

First, let me review briefly the fiscal, monetary, and economic problems which confront the United States today as a leading member of the free world community. President Johnson touched on these matters in an excellent but little noted speech which he made at the World Bank and Monetary Fund meeting in Washington on October 1. He noted that:

> The international monetary system merits a new and imaginative look—not because its past performance has been faulty, but because a new situation faces us.

II

For the past several years, the United States has been running a deficit in its balance of international payments. This deficit has been occasioned largely by the far-flung, worldwide responsibilities we have undertaken since World War II as part of the foreign policy of the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations. Our exports during this period have always exceeded our imports by several billions of dollars. If this were the whole story, there would be no problem. But primarily because of our military commitments overseas, we have been spending more abroad than foreign countries have been spending in our country. This deficit has been increased both by our foreign aid program and by the huge expenditures of American tourists on vacation overseas.

There are other important elements in the balance-of-payments situation, but these are the principal ones which it is desirable to note for present purposes.

The result of this situation has been to cause both dollars and gold to leave our shores and find lodging in the hands of the central banks of foreign governments and of individual investors and speculators.

The results of the third quarter, reported preliminarily, are less encouraging. Yet it seems reasonable to anticipate that our balance-of-payments deficit for 1965 will be cut to somewhere in the neighborhood of $1.5 billion, as compared with substantially more than twice that amount last year and for several years before.

The net result is that the heavy demands on our gold supply, primarily by the French, and by private speculators, are coming to an end, and, in my judgment, there is little danger of a serious run on gold. At the same time, dollar balances held abroad are beginning to shrink. Italy and West Germany are the principal industrial countries holding large dollar balances, which, if they saw fit, could be converted into gold. But there is little likelihood that these friendly allies will institute a drain on our gold supply.

We are certainly not out of the woods on the balance-of-payments problem; but we have made enough progress to cause us to initiate studies by the central bankers and the financial ministers of the 10 great industrial nations, aided by the able director of the International Monetary Fund, Mr. Pierre-Paul Schweitzer. These studies are intended to develop whether international monetary resources will, in the foreseeable future, be adequate to sustain what we hope will be a constantly increasing world trade.

Let it be noted that an expanding world trade is absolutely essential to the prosperity of the United States of America.

The dollar and the British pound, but principally the dollar, are the reserve currencies of the free world. In other words, the settlement of international accounts and trade balances normally takes place through an exchange of dollars and pounds sterling, rather than in the international movement of gold.

Dollars held abroad have accordingly been the principal source of the international liquidity which is essential to a flourishing world trade.

As the dollars come home, the monetary resources essential to permit the principal trading nations of the world to finance international trade shrink.

In the opinion of the Johnson administration, which I share, this threatened shrinkage poses a real threat to the continuation of a healthy and growing world trade.

I have mentioned international liquidity. A word as to the meaning of the phrase "international liquidity." When commodities or services are traded between two or more countries with different currencies, it becomes important to have a method by which the financial settlements, the credits and the debits, may be settled in the international market. There is no international unit of currency.

Historically, international settlements were made in gold; but there is not today, nor has there been for several generations enough gold in the world to make such international settlements. So historically they have been made in what are known as the reserve currencies, which, as I have said, are primarily the dollar, and secondarily, the British pound. But if there are not enough of these currencies around to provide for international settlements, we have an inadequate monetary liquidity. The end result is that debtors and creditors can find no medium of exchange to settle their claims. The inevitable effect is a shrinkage of world trade, for the very good reason that there are not enough liquid assets around to make the settlements. So the maintenance of an adequate amount of international liquidity is a sine qua non of flourishing international trade. This problem is one for all 93 members of the International Monetary Fund, not merely the 10 major industrial countries whose central bankers play so powerful a role in the international monetary field. Accordingly, Secretary of the Treasury Fowler insisted at the recent Washington meeting that the developing as well as the developed countries of the world had a legitimate stake in the planning which must be done to assure adequate international liquidity.

Prior to the Washington meeting important technical studies dealing with this problem had been made, notably by two international committees whose reports are known by the names of the chairmen of these committees, namely the Bernstein and Ossola reports. These reports furnish the important technical background necessary to permit the deputies of the 10 central banks, the representatives of the International Monetary Fund, and the financial ministers of the various countries and their economists to come up with a workable program.

It is anticipated that a preliminary report will be submitted to the Fund next spring, and that a year from now we should have a plan, hopefully, agreed upon, which will provide the necessary international monetary resources to provide the required liquidity and to keep world trade flourishing. What that plan will be, nobody can now foresee.

My own views are set forth in a speech that I made on the floor of the Senate several months ago. They are not far removed from the position taken by the former Under Secretary of the Treasury, Robert V. Roosa, whose recent book on the subject advocates:

First, the creation of a new type of international money to be called the collective reserve unit;

Second, the distribution by the International Monetary Fund of these collective reserve units among the participating countries, not on the basis of the gold they hold, but on the basis of the extent to which their currencies have been utilized in international transactions; that is to say, reserve currencies, and the extent to which those countries also have drawn on the reserves of the International Monetary Fund over the past 5 years.

The third part of the Roosa plan would provide that all the participating countries would undertake the burden of becoming a reserve center by securing the external convertibility of their currencies into gold.

That means, instead of relying on the pound and on the dollar as the reserve currencies tied to gold, in which the international trading community had confidence, the currencies of all the countries whose money was convertible into gold would be available for the settlement of international balances which, as a technical matter, would be done by the exchange of collective reserve units.

My only quarrel with Mr. Roosa's proposal is that I am convinced that the supply of gold in the world is now and will be for the foreseeable future inadequate to support the reserve currencies which are required to provide an adequate amount of international liquidity through the collective reserve units.

The major countries of the world were forced, a good many years ago, to abandon the old-fashioned gold standard for the very reason that there was not enough gold to go around.

As a result, no individual citizen of the United States can call for gold in exchange for dollars.

We now operate on a so-called "gold-exchange standard" which means that the principal currencies of the free world can be converted into gold on the international market at the price of approximately $35 an ounce.

But as world trade grows and the demand for gold, accordingly, substantially exceeds the supply, demands are made for the delivery of gold from the treasuries of the countries which hold it. This has given us substantial concern in our own country with respect to our gold reserves, which have been shrinking rather dramatically over the past several years.

As I indicated a moment ago, I do not believe there is any further immediate threat of the drain on our gold supply. Nevertheless, gold is a very real limiting factor in connection with the liquidity essential for trade purposes.

If we are to stay on the gold exchange standard, in the long run it will be necessary either to shrink world trade within the confines of the available liquidity or to devalue currencies and thus increase the price of gold, but the economic impact of such a procedure would be disastrous in all countries.

Practically no reputable economist still believes that the problem can be solved by a devaluation process or by changing the price of gold.

In my judgment the only feasible alternative is to eliminate gold as an important factor in international monetary exchanges.

There are presently a number of practical difficulties in the way of taking this somewhat radical step. Perhaps most important is the myth, widely held all over the world, and promoted since the days of Shylock, if not before, that gold has an intrinsic value apart from its status as the basis for the issuance of paper money.

The myth dies hard, and it will be a long time before we get rid of the gold exchange standard.

Nevertheless, I believed there is a job to be done in educating the financiers and the general moneyholding public of the entire world to the belief that the gold exchange standard has outlived its usefulness and that some method of vesting the authority to issue Collective Reserve Units independent of the amount of gold holdings must be devised.

Another difficulty with getting rid of the gold exchange standard is that it involves the yielding of a certain amount of national sovereignty by the monetary and fiscal authorities of the nations, states, vesting in an international body, probably the International Monetary Fund, the authority to parcel out international reserves of money in accordance with fixed standards.

This, in effect, would mean that the supply of money would fluctuate up and down from year to year in proportion to the needs of international trade.

This naturally scares the conservative bankers. It is the same fear of the yielding of national sovereignty which, in my judgment, has made it so difficult for us to arrive at any sensible solution of the arms race.

If we had an international institution, preferably the United Nations, and possibly a new body, such as an international disarmament agency, it could exercise the authority in the limited field of war prevention. Then there would be no great task to arrive at disarmament and keep it under enforceable world law.

But again a historical myth dies hard and so far nations have been unwilling to yield that national sovereignty which is preventing, first, the coming of peace and, secondly, in the monetary fielding fund solution of the problem of how to finance a growing international trade.

What I have been saying with respect to monetary matters is well summarized by President Johnson in the speech earlier referred to.

I ask unanimous consent that a quotation from the speech may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> American dollar deficits have been one of the important factors in this greatest and best sustained period of prosperity that the world has ever known. The U.S. deficit made it possible for many nations to develop their own currencies as strong and convertible sources of international finance.
>
> It is no longer appropriate or possible for one country alone—through its deficits—to be largely responsible for the creation of world reserves. Moreover, the erosion of U.S. reserves could not go on indefinitely.
>
> The world not only expects but the world requires that the dollar be as good as gold.
>
> The long period of large U.S. deficits has come to an end. If growth is to continue and trade is to expand, we must provide an effective and adequate substitute.
>
> This is not a matter of an immediate crisis. But it is a matter on which we must begin to act—now. We must begin now to provide machinery for the creation of additional reserves. Gold alone will not be enough to support the healthy growth which the entire world demands. It will not be enough in the future any more than it has been in the past.
>
> Men who manage money are usually conservative. They should be. No one wants a banker who is careless with other people's money. But let us be clear about what it means in this case to be conservative. It does not mean inaction. Nor does it mean inadequate action.

III

Mr. CLARK. There is an equally important problem confronting our foreign policy in the international economic field and that is the subject of international economic and social development.

A brilliant speech outlining this problem was made by Mr. George D. Woods, president of the World Bank, the International Finance Corporation, and the International Development Association, at the Washington meeting of these institutions on September 27. Extensive discussions of Mr. Woods' speech took place at the meeting of representatives of the countries participating in the Bank and the Fund. Representatives of nation after nation rose to call attention to the difficult economic situation in which they found themselves in their efforts to increase their per capita gross national product, so that their peoples can participate in the spread of an affluent society to countries whose inhabitants are at present living in abject poverty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the speech made by Mr. Woods and of the speech representing the point of view of the underdeveloped countries, made by Jacob Arnon, Director-General of the Ministry of Finance of Israel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the problem of these developing countries is to so increase their per capita gross national product that their peoples can participate in that high standard of living which has been made possible by the wonders of modern science.

There is, of course, another major difficulty which stands in the way of many, but not all, of the countries in Latin America, Africa, and Asia, and that is that by reason of the unrestricted population explosion, the per capita share of the gross national product of each of those countries increases little, if at all, even though their overall, countrywide gross national product does rise significantly. This is because the increased and abjectly poverty-stricken population is outrunning the improvement in their overall economies.

President Johnson referred in his speech to "the growing impatience of both developed and developing nations over the pace of progress" of international economic development. He also referred to the importance of an expanded program of education to make available the thousands, indeed millions, of skilled and trained personnel necessary to raise the level of civilized living in underdeveloped countries. He said:

> In all of the areas of development—wherever you look, whatever you see in the areas of development—the needs are urgent.
>
> In my country, we knew no such urgency in the course of our development. In the early days attendant to our birth, we were an underpopulated nation. Beyond the villages and the towns were virgin forests and deep rivers and wild game and rich and fertile soil. In this environment, a man's life was what he chose to make of it. The opportunity was there. The opportunity was seized.
>
> But there is no such cushion of time among the developing nations of the world today as we meet here.
>
> In many of these nations, the land is overcrowded. The people are poor. The soil is already worn out and tired. There is only the relentless crush of human needs—and a flickering of hope. Well, we need to nourish that hope if we are worthy of the title that we bear of leaders of the world. We need to nourish and preserve and advance and bring to fulfillment that hope.

Mr. President, in my judgment, we need, in addition to monetary reform, a wide expansion of multilateral economic aid to the underdeveloped countries of the world. The rich countries are growing richer, the poor countries poorer; and in many of the poorer countries, unrestricted population growth, as I have noted, is depriving them, on a per capita basis, of whatever improvement in their situation might otherwise take place. Under these circumstances, regardless of the many selfish and carping critics who raise loud objections to our "giveaway programs," we cannot in good conscience cut our own foreign aid program any more deeply than was done by Congress this year.

Entirely in terms of our own selfish interest, we cannot, in the interests of ultimate world peace, crush the legitimate aspirations for a higher standard of material well being of the countries of Latin America, Africa, and Asia. To do so would, in the long run, be a threat to world peace nearly as serious as that presently posed by the arms race and the threat of a worldwide nuclear war.

IV

As I have sat from time to time, not only in these financial meetings, but also at the sessions of the United Nations—and it was my privilege not only to attend the 20th anniversary celebration of the founding of the United Nations, held at San Francisco last June, but also to have the great privilege of listening to the Pope make his historic address in New York a short while ago—one thought has constantly recurred in my mind: Very few people in the United States or elsewhere are aware of the enormous spread of international cooperative institutions. Millions of intelligent men and women all over the world are devoting their lives to various aspects of the great cause of international cooperation, as opposed to international rivalries in terms of armaments. Some understanding of the impact of these widespread efforts will be brought to public attention at the White House Conference on the International Cooperation Year, which will be held in Washington at the end of November.

It will be my privilege to attend that conference as one of 12 congressional delegates, 6 from the House and 6 from the Senate. There are 31 committees presently working on reports which will recommend ways and means of increasing international cooperation in these important areas:

Agriculture and Food;
Arms Control and Disarmament;
Atomic Energy;
Aviation;
Business and Industry;
Communications;
Culture and Intellectual Exchange;
Development and International Law;
Disaster Relief;
Education;
Finance and Monetary Affairs;
Health;
Human Rights;
Labor;
Manpower;
Meteorology;
National Resources Conservation and Development;
Peaceful Settlement of Disputes;
Peacekeeping Operations, U.N.;
Population;
Public Information;
Research on Development of International Institutions;
Science and Technology;
Social Welfare;
Space;
Technical Cooperation and Investment;
Trade;
Transportation Committee;
Urban Development;
Women; and
Youth Activities.

Surely any intelligent appraisal of the international scene must result in the conclusion that old-fashioned go-it-alone rugged American isolationism must become a thing of the past if peace and prosperity are ever to come to the world.

Our future lies in international cooperation, not in the unlimited sovereignty of belligerent nation-states.

Another compelling thought has been forced upon me. No matter where one looks, be it at arms control and disarmament, the future in space, the control of gold and the problems of international finance, the development of peacekeeping institutions and of world law, the future of the United Nations, the cross-fertilization of cultures through the exchange of peoples, the sale of agricultural products, methods of dealing with the population program, peace in the Middle East, wars of liberation in South America and Africa and southeast Asia, the racial crisis in Rhodesia, or the settlement of the German problem, in all of these areas, the categorical imperative is a detente between the United States of America and the Soviet Union. What can be done if these two superpowers work together has recently been illustrated by the action of the Security Council in bringing to an end the undeclared war between India and Pakistan. What could be done in any of the other areas I have mentioned through the cooperation of these two great countries which have never been at war with each other is clear to any student who devotes his attention to the problem.

There is another aspect which is worthy of comment. If Russia and the United States were to come to an agreement, the threat of Communist China would automatically disappear, for the two great nuclear powers, with their superiority in industrial civilization, and, indeed, in conventional armaments, could make it impossible for Communist China further to disturb the peace of the world.

I agree that the road to United States-U.S.S.R. detente is indeed a rocky one. The Russian ideology is very different than ours and abhorrent, in political terms, to an overwhelming majority of the American people. The Russians are rough, tough negotiators who strike hard bargains.

They have an obsolete and illogical phobia on the subject of secrecy. And yet the economic and social benefits to the peoples of both countries of a workable agreement for cooperation are so enormous that, in my judgment, we should bend every effort toward a detente based, not on mutual trust, but rather on mutual self-interest.

I believe it important for individuals in both countries to realize the enormous benefits which would flow from a Russo-American accommodation. Hence, we must work unceasingly on the public opinion and the governments of both countries. This would involve, on our side, as the result of a widespread debate, the bringing to an end of that school of thought, largely the child of the late Senator Joseph A. McCarthy of Wisconsin, that we are engaged in a holy war against godless communism. Holy wars throughout history have almost always failed, whether it be the Crusades against the Mohammedans or the war of Catholic against Protestant on the Continent of Europe in the 16th and 17th centuries.

After the expenditure of blood and countless lives and untold treasure, the Mohammedans in the Middle East are back where they were when the crusade started. The Catholics and the Protestants have, at long last, more than 100 years later, learned to live at peace with each other in Germany.

The Russians are not going to go away from the world, and neither are we. We are going to have great difficulty in changing a number of aspects of their way of life. And they are not going to have any luck at all in their amateur political efforts to change our way of life through supporting the American Communist Party.

I believe that the sensible people in both countries would agree that a way must be found to prevent an irreversible conflict brought on by shortsighted political leaders in both countries, encouraged by the military industrial complex in our country and by the Red army in Russia.

And it is equally important that a change in opinion among the leaders of the Soviet Union be brought about. The concept of the financing of "wars of liberation" all over the world must give way to an understanding that peaceful coexistence cannot be brought into being as long as violent Communist revolutions all over the world are financed and led from the Kremlin.

I do not consider that to be an insuperable task. The economic and social interests of the Soviet Union are fundamentally and essentially the same as ours. Our task is to persuade our own people and the people of the U.S.S.R. also, that the political interests of our two countries are also, in the long range, identical.

I return to the comments which President Johnson made in the course of his World Bank speech:

> I have found, in my 35 years of public life, that it is usually governments—governments who find it difficult to communicate with each other. Little trouble in finding the pathways to friendship is found among the people themselves.
>
> In this world that is shrunk by the jet and frightened by the atom, the peoples—the peoples of every country must urge and demand their governments to join together in dealing with the problems that really concern people and that really matter in the lives of human beings.

There is a rift in the clouds. The Russians have agreed to participate in a conference aimed at setting up an International Bank of Development for southeast Asia.

It may well be that the breakthrough in terms of Russo-American cooperation can come in the monetary, fiscal, and economic development field.

Why should the Soviet Union not also be invited to joint the International Monetary Fund and the International World Bank for Reconstruction and Development? Its economy would profit substantially by becoming members of these two flourishing international institutions.

With the exception of the Union of South Africa, Russia is the greatest producer of gold in the world. They would be far better off, and so, I think, would we, inside the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, just as they consider themselves far better off inside the United Nations, rather than outside it.

In conclusion, I quote the end of President Johnson's speech—a speech which I hope, as the years go by, will obtain a great deal more recognition as one of the important speeches of the year than it has presently received:

> This is work that must challenge and should challenge us all—every industrial country, including the countries of Eastern Europe, and including the Soviet Union.
>
> The world of tomorrow, peaceful, healthy, beautiful, educated—all this awaits us if only we * * * stir ourselves to move forward toward it.

EXHIBIT 1

ADDRESS TO THE BOARDS OF GOVERNORS BY GEORGE D. WOODS, PRESIDENT, WORLD BANK, INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, SEPTEMBER 27, 1965

We meet here in a cause which is always urgent: the cause of raising living standards—which for over half the population of the member countries of the World Bank are intolerably low. In the past year, the Bank and its affiliates have put forth strenuous efforts in this cause. The World Bank Group committed more funds to financing development than ever. Our commitments exceeded a billion dollars for the third year out of the past 4; and our disbursements were more than $800 million.

We not only committed more funds; we committed them for a wider spectrum of purposes. The enlarged activities we have been discussing for the past 2 years made their mark. While the financing of transportation and electric power continued to be our main business, commitments for agriculture, industry and education increased. Our advisory and technical assistance activities stepped up.

The prospect is that the volume of our business will go on rising. This assumes no further deterioration in the peace of the world and continuing stabilization of the international situation. In part, this upward trend reflects the hard work that we and others have been doing to lift the number and quality of development projects in the member countries of the Bank. Activity is increasing under our new cooperative arrangements with the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). I am hoping that as a result, the expanding trend of operations in agriculture and education will continue.

The Bank and the International Finance Corporation continue to be financially strong. In fiscal 1964–65, the Bank sold bonds in Canada, Germany, Switzerland and the United States at rates that compared favorably with general market levels for government issues. For the future, we hope to tap capital markets more frequently than in the recent past. I bespeak the continuing cooperation of the industrialized countries in opening capital markets to us, and in giving our bonds a place of priority in the queue of international issues. Investors in these bonds receive a fair interest rate, enjoy unexcelled security of principal, and at the same time, participate in the task of development.

We are pressing other efforts to encourage private international investment, and two special projects we have undertaken for this purpose are nearing completion.

One is the amendment of the Bank and IFC charters for the purpose of enabling IFC to engage in borrowings from the Bank up to an amount equal to four times IFC's paid-in capital from governments. Substantive action on the charter amendments has been completed, and the amendments will become effective soon. I invite industrial entrepreneurs to note the possibilities that IFC's increased resources will then present.

The second special project on which action is moving to completion is the Convention for the Settlement of Investment Disputes. The convention will enter into force after signature and ratification by 20 States. I am pleased that in the less than 6 months since the convention was submitted to governments, 20 governments of Europe, Africa, Asia, and the Western Hemisphere have signed the convention, and ratification is under way. I am sure that the availability of the machinery to be established under the convention will improve the climate for international private investment and I urge governments to quicken the steps they are taking toward ratification.

As this project advances, we are beginning to consider another type of measure which has been suggested as a further way to encourage the confidence of private international investors. That would be to establish a multilateral system for guaranteeing foreign investments in developing countries against noncommercial risks. In June, the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) transmitted to the Bank for its consideration one possible scheme for such investment guarantees. Using this as a springboard, we have begun an examination of the whole matter.

Mr. Chairman, I think you and most of the governors know that by nature I am an optimist; and certainly I am an optimist about the long-run prospects for economic progress in the less-developed areas. The wealth of the world and the well-being of its peoples unquestionably can increase, and it is my belief that they are going to increase.

At the same time, no one can be happy about the state of the international development effort today. Not enough of the underdeveloped countries have taken the true measure of their problems, and not enough countries—both industrialized and underdeveloped—are taking actions which would adequately respond to the gravity of those problems.

On the side of the high-income countries, income is rising even higher; but the level of development assistance has been stationary for several years. Not enough people understand that the tasks of development not only take a long time, but that any hesitation in the pace of development tends to make them bigger, more complicated, and more difficult. Unless we lenders and donors perceive the urgency of our situation, and soon, such actions as we may be driven to take a few years from now may be too late. Unless we perceive the tremendous size of the problem, they may be too little.

Many of the developing countries are showing what can be done to lift output and living standards. Out of 80 developing countries in the Bank's membership, about one-third have attained in the recent past, rates of 5 percent or more in growth of real income, the target rate of the development decade. A high rate of growth is different from self-sustaining growth, however, and those countries will need encouragement and support for a considerable time to come. On the other hand, in close to half the 80 countries, accounting for 50 percent of their population, income per head has risen by 1 percent or less. Even to keep abreast of recent high rates of population growth is not a negligible achievement, but it is far from sufficient. The average per capita income in this group is no more than $120 a year. At a 1-percent growth rate income levels will hardly reach $170 a year by the end of this century. In some countries it will be much lower. This is crude arithmetic. But its implications are true and sobering. If the present trends are allowed to continue there will be no adequate improvement in living standards in vast areas of the globe for the balance of this century. Only massive and coordinated efforts of both the rich and the poor countries can bring about a substantial acceleration of growth and real progress toward a tolerable level of well-being.

No amont of external assistance, however, can substitute for a greater and more effective effort by the underdeveloped countries in the mobilization and allocation of internal resources. It is this effort which fundamentally determines the rate of growth; it is this effort which provides a basis for external assistance to be received and used effectively.

It is useless to attempt to sugarcoat the fact that in many of the underdeveloped countries, economic performance can be greatly improved. It is essential that these countries take effective measures to increase the mobilization of capital through taxation and through incentives to investment, both domestic and international. It is urgent for many of them to cut down some of the biggest items of waste—excessive military expenditures, prestige projects, inefficient administration, overstaffing of railways and other public enterprises, and subsidies to public services that could and should be self-supporting. These countries should get more for their money through better development programing and project planning; they need, among other things, to maintain fiscal equilibrium and to avoid excessive short-term borrowing. Some must take firm steps to keep excessive population growth from devouring the hard-won gains of development. Nearly all of the low-income countries must redouble their efforts to overcome the lag in agricultural productivity—literally the most vital, yet at the same time generally the most feeble, of the economic sectors in the underdeveloped world.

It is the effectiveness of internal effort which to a large extent is going to determine the future of international development assistance. The low-income countries should take more realistic account of this fact than many of them are inclined to do. In my daily activities, I am constantly and sympathetically aware of the impatience, disappointments, and frustrations in the developing countries; but at the same time I am conscious of the frustration and disillusionment that the industrial countries feel about development finance. Governments which provide development finance are subjected to searching questions by their legislatures and peoples about it. The most careful use of aid by each of the recipient countries is constantly necessary if they are to expect continued assistance, and on a larger scale. Performance will have to stand up to close scrutiny.

Improved performance by the developing countries is vital for accelerating the pace of growth; but it will not by itself be sufficient. A dominant difficulty which these countries face, despite their own best efforts, is the uncertainty which clouds the prospects for their exports. Export earnings, far more than investment and foreign assistance—the ratio is about 4 to 1—finance the imports needed to carry forward the development of the underdeveloped countries. But the demand for many of the commodities exported by these countries has grown only slowly. The rise of export earnings, despite the overall increase of world trade, has been only 3 to 4 percent a year. This is less than enough to support a satisfactory rate of development.

In the short run the problem is further complicated by abrupt and wide fluctuations in some commodity prices. Many underdeveloped countries have had to adapt themselves to unexpected year-to-year variations of as much as 15 percent in their export income. Some have experienced shortfalls twice as great.

The result of the slow and uncertain growth of export earnings is to retard development, to upset continuity of effort, to diminish the impact of external finance. Uncertainty makes it difficult to plan and effectuate the structural changes that would liberate the developing countries from overdependence on a narrow range of exports; it exerts pressures leading to fiscal imbalance, inflation, and stagnation of constructive effort.

Let me suggest that both the high-income and the underdeveloped countries give renewed and purposeful attention to these problems. And let me report to you two initiatives in which the Bank is joining that may help to mitigate some of these problems. The first is a study, organized jointly by the International Coffee Organization, FAO and the Bank. The study will examine the needs of coffee-producing countries to diversify into other lines of production which would impart greater strength and stability to their economies, and will try to identify the possibilities that they have for doing so. A dozen countries in Latin America and Africa depend on coffee as a major source of export earnings: and coffee exhibits some of the worst features of the commodity problem.

The other initiative stems from a proposal put forward by the United Kingdom and Swedish delegations at the 1964 meeting in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, which the conference asked the Bank to study. The proposal aims at defending development programs from the dangers of disruption arising from unexpected shortages in export earnings, by providing supplemental resources under certain conditions to be agreed. Our staff study examines the many facets which impelled the proposal. The study is now nearly ready. I will not attempt to summarize its findings, but I can say that the approach under consideration would call for continuous consultation with the developing countries and close collaboration with the International Monetary Fund. I expect to forward our study to the United Nations in the not too distant future, and I hope that both the capital exporting and receiving countries will give it their earnest consideration.

Another dominant problem of the underdeveloped countries is their continuing need to receive development finance from external sources. Our annual report gives our staff estimate of the magnitude of resources which effectively could be used. The problem of finance is given added urgency by the volume of the debt that already confronts these countries. In 1956, their outstanding international debt was estimated at just under $10 billion. In 1964, it reached an estimated $33 billion. Because of rising interest rates and the accumulation of short-term debt, the amount of money needed annually to service this debt climbed even faster. From 1956 to 1964 it rose over four times, from $800 million to $3.5 billion.

The external debt of many developing countries, of course, was bound to rise rapidly. These countries were newly independent; they had little debt to begin with, and increased it rapidly as they plunged with energy and enthusiasm into economic development. At the same time, it must be admitted that there was much unwise borrowing—brought about in no small part, it should be added, by the proffering of credit from the high-income countries, at unrealistically short terms and in some cases for purposes of little economic value.

The resulting supplier-credit problem is being studied by the bank staff at the request of the United Nations Trade and Development Conference. We hope to be able to suggest ways of eliminating the undesirable features of past practices, while maintaining the use of private credit facilities to finance the international exchange of goods and services.

In any case, the underdeveloped countries as a whole must now devote more than a tenth of their foreign exchange earnings to debt service; and the figure is still rising. On present form, amortization, interest, and dividends are offsetting the actual gross flow to the developing countries from all sources by half, and will continue to offset it at an accelerating rate. In short, to go on doing what we are doing will, in the not-too-long run, amount, on balance, to doing nothing at all.

The predicament of the debtor countries calls for a continuing country-by-country review of existing debt and careful consideration of how to handle it. For some countries already caught in exceptionally difficult circumstances, the solution may lie in a rescheduling of obligations. But for the longer haul, and for the developing countries as a group, the requirement is for a greater flow of long-term capital on less burdensome terms.

At the present time, terms are not easing fast enough. Although the need for more favorable terms is universally accepted in principle, and the United Kingdom and Canada have recently taken substantial steps in this direction, the improvement, on the average, has been small. Given the financial facts of life in the underdeveloped countries, a general easing of terms is clearly indicated if we are to avoid disaster in the future. Otherwise, cases of default and serious interruption of capital flow would seem to be inevitable. And harm done by defaults, in my opinion, is much deeper and serious than the financial figures show; it is truly beyond calculation.

The solution of the debt problem is at least in part within the powers and the means of the developed countries. They have already demonstrated their willingness by the creation of IDA—a major international initiative for transferring capital to the poor countries on concessionary terms. In a few days, the association will complete its fifth year of operations. The record of these 5 years demonstrates that IDA is fully as businesslike as the bank in its concentration on workable, high-priority projects which bring a reasonable economic return, and in its determination to produce the most development for the money spent.

I again acknowledge with gratitude a number of steps which have been taken to augment the initial resources of IDA—the first replenishment in 1964, the special contributions by Sweden, and permission to use part of the subscriptions of some of the developing countries in IDA's membership. The bank itself is acting to supplement IDA's funds. In Tokyo last year, the Governors approved the transfer of $50 million to IDA from the bank's net income. At this meeting, you have before you the recommendation of the executive directors that $75 million more be transferred to IDA in the form of a grant from the earnings of the fiscal year just ended. I trust you will give this recommendation your favorable consideration.

What the bank does to augment the resources of IDA, however, is only supplemental to the contributions made by governments. The first replenishment of IDA funds, as many of you will recall, was intended to support IDA commitments through the current fiscal year, that is through next June 30. It is now time to consider the future of IDA.

As an initial step looking toward replenishing its funds, I recommend that you approve the resolution in the agenda which calls on the executive directors of IDA to examine this question. In the final analysis, the high-income countries in IDA's membership must decide what scale of operations they want IDA to undertake in the future. For our part, we will continue to do our best with the resources entrusted to us.

Mr. Chairman, the replenishment of IDA resources is closely related to the broader issue of assuring that external financing for development, from whatever source, is used to the best effect. Optimum deployment of development assistance requires close coordination among the aid-giving nations; more important still, it requires full understanding and cooperation between them and the recipient countries. As I see it, a primary task of the World Bank Group is to facilitate this essential collaboration.

We have already organized groups consisting of interested aid-giving governments and international financing agencies, to coordinate the finance provided to six of our member countries. Now, as our annual report indicates, we are undertaking to strengthen and intensify the work of these groups and considering the formation of similar groups for other countries. During and after this annual meeting we shall be carrying on discussions in this regard.

Each consultative group has one essential objective: to accelerate economic growth; and it seeks to accomplish this purpose in several ways. In the first place, it aims at enhancing the absorptive capacity of the developing country by helping in the planning of development, in the preparation and screening of projects, and by advising on administrative or financial problems and the like. Second, it is designed to provide the several aid-givers with informed, objective analyses of the country's needs for external finance and technical assistance—not only the amounts it could effectively use, but also the appropriate terms of financing and the purposes that deserve priority. It also undertakes a continuous assessment, in cooperation with the International Monetary Fund and the recipient country, of the latter's economic progress, and attempts to work out agreed solutions to its problems. We expect that these consultations will help to bring about a more adequate and assured flow of aid to the countries with a good record of effective use; and, equally important, encourage the cooperation and mutual trust that is so necessary to our common purpose.

It is our aim over the course of time to bring into this consultative system perhaps a score of developing countries comprising the recipients of much the largest share of international development finance. The Interamerican Committee for the Alliance of Progress—CIAP—is already working in this direction, and our own activities with respect to countries of Latin America will be carried on in cooperation with CIAP and the Inter-American Development Bank. As regional organs evolve for Africa and Asia we shall expect to cooperate with them also. And we look especially to the International Monetary Fund for strength and counsel in all these consultative arrangements.

Mr. Chairman, development, to be successful, requires a dedication and singleness of purpose. However, thus, far, no means have been devised to deeply stir patriotic emotions for massive and intensive economic development in agriculture or in extractive and manufacturing and service industry. Yet development should be waged as a war, a war against intolerable living conditions that must be carried on with a determination to overcome all obstacles.

Let us not forget that the World Bank itself is the child of adversity—its character was written while one of the most violent battles of World War II was raging on the European continent, and at a time well before the end of the war in Asia was in sight.

The Bank has not hesitated to carry on in countries faced by adverse and extraordinary circumstances, when it believed that in spite of these circumstances, the objectives of economic development, in the end, could be achieved. We have carried forward projects without interruption in African, Middle Eastern, southeast Asian, and Latin American countries affected by alarms of war and violent political upheavals which sometimes threatened internal order. It is our sincere belief that intensive economic development is the indicated antidote in the 20th century for the age-old instinct for military encounters. We consistently make disbursements against our commitments in troubled areas, and we intend to continue as long as our judgment indicates that it is not an unreasonable development finance risk to do so.

Mr. Chairman, development is not a short-run problem; it is not something we can give marginal attention to for a period of time and then forget. The developing countries need time to accomplish deep-seated changes: in outlook, in social institutions, in economic organization. We have to measure this time in terms of at least a generation.

While progress may at times seem slow, there is no doubt that the ability of the developing countries to make effective use of capital is increasing. Many of the developing countries are far ahead of where they were a decade or two ago—in the ability to formulate and carry out development policy, in the number of institutions able to conceive and administer measures for economic development, in the number of individuals able to direct private and public enterprises.

This state of readiness represents an opportunity for further advance which the aid-providing countries should seize. It is clearly time to find more development capital, and I can assure you that much more capital, both public and private, can be effectively used. The sheer bulk of the problems of underdevelopment—the number of mouths to be fed, the number of human beings to be maintained in decent shelter and gradually to be educated and made productive—continues to grow. If we do not begin to make faster progress in these matters, the prospect is for discontent, unrest, and tensions that in the end must spill over national boundaries and ultimately infect the rich nations as well as the poor. We have to exchange views and act in collaboration with each other, with speed and on a large scale. It is in this spirit, Mr. Chairman, that I hope this 20th annual meeting of the World Bank Group and our sister entity, the International Monetary Fund, will proceed.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JACOB ARNON, DIRECTOR GENERAL, MINISTRY OF FINANCE, AND ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE BANK FOR ISRAEL, AT THE FUND'S ANNUAL DISCUSSION, SEPTEMBER 29, 1965

May I first identify myself with all the expressions of appreciation for the serious studies which were made last year in search of a solution to the problems concerning international payments and liquidity by the Managing Director of the Fund, the staff, and the economists and statesmen of many countries.

It is my pleasant duty to express my country's appreciation for the special increase in our quota which was proposed to us as a result of the Resolution adopted in Tokyo last year. This increase was a result of the recognition of the growth of Israel's economic potential and its share in international trade. During the last few years, including 1964, our gross national product has been increasing at an annual average rate of about 10 percent and our foreign trade has gone up by an annual average of about 15 percent. In this connection, I should like to suggest that the periodical review of quotas of individual countries should be made at such intervals as not to lag too far behind economic growth.

There is a special point which I would like to bring up with regard to the factors, which, in our opinion, are relevant in deciding about individual quotas, and to which, in our opinion, the Fund has not given the proper weight in its considerations. This is the need for additional international liquidity which is required for the servicing of foreign debts. In many countries, especially the developing ones, the amounts necessary for foreign debt servicing have grown considerably and will do so even more in the future. In planning for the foreign reserves to be available, a country must take into account, not only the payments which have to be made for import of goods and services, but also its obligations for debt servicing. These amounts are a rigid element in the foreign exchange outlays during a specific period. When export proceeds temporarily decrease, the fixed amount which a developing nation has to pay for its debt service considerably aggravates its ability to adjust its import program to the shortfall of its receipts. Consequently, a country which has a heavy debt to service must make provisions for holding much larger reserves than a country in a similar international trade position which has no such debt burden. If the IMF quota is to be the flexible portion of a country's reserve position, which can be increased in time of need, this particular fixed item of debt servicing should be given special consideration in establishing a country's quota. I should like to stress that I've discussed only the international liquidity aspect connected with debt servicing of developing countries, without dealing with the general aspects of the crucial problem of the increasing debt burden.

This point may be added to the many other reasons why the developing countries are taking an increasing interest in the solution of the problem of international liquidity in general. Although it is generally felt that there is no danger of an imminent worldwide reserve crisis during the next few years, it is also agreed that ways should be found of eventually matching international liquidity to the increase in the volume of international transactions. As is stated in the fund's annual report, it cannot be expected that the flow of dollars which reinforced foreign exchange reserves in many countries in recent years will continue in the future at the same level. New devices and methods will have to be found to satisfy liquidity needs, and we believe that they should be created in a period of relative strength and confidence. To wait until the crisis is upon us is to invite a major setback to the development of the free world. We think that the 25-percent general increase in quotas has been a step in the right direction, but it will only become fully effective through the extension of automatic and semiautomatic drawing rights.

Since the urgency of considering this problem has now been recognized, the discussion focuses on two major points, which, in our opinion, are interconnected. The first is that of the institution—existing or to be created—which will decide if and when to increase international reserves. The second is how these newly created reserves will be allocated.

As to the institution, we are opposed to the thinking that international liquidity is the exclusive concern of the well-established, industrialized countries, and that the sole responsibility for a solution must fall upon them. We believe that all countries participating in free international trade share the responsibility in solving major world economic problems, including that of international liquidity. We are aware that probably the final answer to the question of fiduciary international money is ultimately linked with a supranational authority. Our problem, however, cannot wait. We believe that, in the meantime, the appropriate forum in which such solutions should be thought out and carried through is the International Monetary Fund. This has been most convincingly put by Mr. Schweitzer in the annual report, as well as in his opening speech this week.

The Fund's prestige and experience as an international monetary institution makes it the natural center for the function involving deliberate creation of reserves. In the Fund, all groups concerned are represented, and conflicting points of view have an opportunity of being heard and considered. We realize, of course, that any acceptable solution should take into consideration the point of view of the major industrial countries, but the existing voting rights of the Fund are a sufficient guarantee for safeguarding their interests. In our opinion, it would be detrimental to the future of the Fund if a situation should arise when ready-made solutions, conceived by a particular group of members, will be presented to our organization for acceptance or rejection. The Fund, as well as the Bank, have succeeded from the beginning in being viewed by all members as organizations in which decisions are reached after a common effort is made to come to an understanding of a problem, taking into account the different interests that exist in this imperfect world of ours.

We are not involved in the study of mathematics in which abstract, logical thinking provides the right answer. We are trying to study an economic problem, which is not only one of pure economic theory, but is interwoven with the particular interests of different countries. To exclude from the deliberations from the outset all except the industrial countries must necessarily affect the final solution to be offered to all. In effect, any solution which would thus be presented to all members would be the result of compromises made among the industrial countries themselves, while the voice of the developing countries would not have been heard. If we want to prevent the IMF either from becoming a rubberstamp or from facing a split between the developing countries, from the beginning, these deliberations should not be the sole concern of a special group of countries, but the concern of all of us.

As to the question of the allocation of new reserves and where they should in the first instance be used, many proposals are today under discussion. The excellent report of the Study Group on the Creation of Reserve Assets headed by H. R. Ossola from Italy and transmitted to the Deputies of the Group of Ten, rightly points out that "deliberately created reserve assets must, of their nature, initially be distributed without the recipients having to forgo real resources in order to earn them, but will thereafter command real resources." But for this very reason, it seems to us that once it is decided to create additional international liquid assets, it is legitimate to expect that their creation should, in the first place, benefit those countries where the fluctuations in the balance of payments are greatest, and those, which due to their economic growth and increase in their trade, are in need of larger reserves.

We think that insufficient attention has been paid to the possibility of linking the question of international liquidity with the general problem of securing sufficient sources for financing the needs of developing countries. We should consider seriously the possibility, which was discussed in the above-mentioned report of the Study Group of the Ten, of "coupling the creation of reserve assets with the provision of development finance under the direction of an international investment institution, say, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development." We were sorry to learn that this idea of combining the creation of reserve assets with development finance was not widely favored by the experts of the Group of Ten, but possibly this attitude could be changed after reconsidering it in a broader group of countries.

There is an urgent need for coordination of policies of international and national institutions operating in the fields of international investment financing, short-term financing, and liquidity creation so that joint efforts may make an optimum contribution to the narrowing of the dangerous gap between industrialized and developing nations.

This can be a great challenge for the fund, and may I conclude with an expression of the hope and belief that this challenge will be met.

THE PEACE OFFENSIVE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this week marks a kind of anniversary, although I doubt it is one that will be celebrated much. For it was 3 years ago that a frightened and shuddering world watched the United States and the Soviet Union move toward the point of maximum danger in their nuclear confrontation over the emplacement of offensive missiles in Cuba.

Not only did the splendid courage and restraint and strength of will shown by President Kennedy and his advisers bring us through the crisis—it also paved the way for the thaw in the cold war which later made possible the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. Another fringe benefit was the "hot-line" agreement, which is designed to enable the two great superpowers, the Soviets and ourselves, to communicate with each other in order to prevent any misunderstanding which might lead to a confrontation.

No one would claim that the cold war is over, or that it is safe for the Free World to play the lamb and lie down with the Communist lion. But it is also true that in the 3 years which have passed since the Cuban missile crisis, the Soviets have become increasingly sensitive to the risks and dangers of nuclear war with the West, and have demonstrated an increasing interest in a variety of measures aimed at reducing those risks and diminishing those dangers. They have begun to show, in numerous ways, that coexistence is more than just a propaganda slogan for them—that it is a necessary fact of life. It is interesting to note that even their Chinese cousins, who pretend to heap scorn on the policy of coexistence, also know how to coexist when the chips are down—as they were in the recent India-Pakistan conflict.

One of the incidental byproducts of the Cuban missile crisis was the journalistic invention by which policymakers were divided into two categories: "hawks" and "doves." Unlike many such glib characterizations, this one seems to have stuck. The reason it has survived, I suppose, is that it fills a real gap in the language, and serves as a handy tool for dividing, in a general way, those who look primarily toward military solutions to international problems from those who do not, and those who believe that diplomatic initiatives and negotiations are, in the long run, the soundest way to solve the problems over which the Nation-States find themselves in disagreement.

I have long subscribed to the theory, which has probably never been more clearly stated than it was by President Eisenhower in his farewell address, that there is in this country a "military industrial complex," made up of our giant defense producers, our professional military people, and the politicians who expound their views, which is firmly opposed to the creation of a world peacekeeping authority to take the place of national deterrents. This is the group which opposes measures intended to ease the cold war and strengthen the detente with the Soviet Union. This is the group which believes we are engaged in a "holy war against godless communism," in which we must bury them or be buried ourselves.

The presidential election campaign of 1964 offered a rare opportunity for the cold warriors to show their strength, or lack of it. The outcome was a crushing defeat for their champion, and a massive endorsement by the American people of the policies which had brought about a lessening of the dangers of nuclear war through the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, and President Kennedy's challenge to the Soviet Union made at the United Nations in September 1961 to engage not in an arms race but in a peace race.

Sometimes, we fail to appreciate that just as the tug of war between hawks and doves goes on in this country, so it goes on in the Soviet Union as well. The idea of a monolithic Soviet Government without controversy, debate and political struggle is naive and unrealistic. The Russians have their bomb rattlers, just as we do—and they also have their coexisters. In a sense, the fever chart of the cold war is a reflection of these internal political movements—the more the doves on both sides influence policymaking, the stronger the detente becomes; the more the hawks take charge, the chillier our relations become. But it is also true that changes in the cold war can influence the domestic political scenes in both countries. When relationships between the two blocs deteriorate, the doves lose influence, while the momentum of steadily improving relationships tends to consolidate and extend the influence of forces on both sides who favor a policy of detente.

Looking at the national scene today, my judgment is—and I hope it is not merely wishful thinking—that we are moving into a period during which the momentum of improving the relationships between the United States and the Soviet Union can, if not reversed by a major war over Vietnam or some other catastrophe, generate an even stronger and more durable policy of detente on both sides.

I am gravely concerned about developments in Vietnam, but I fully support the President's effort to prevent further violations of the 1954 international agreements. We have a commitment in Vietnam and we must live up to that commitment, as we lived up to our commitments in Western Europe following World War II. It is the official policy of our Government to seek negotiations looking toward a cease-fire and a reasonable and honorable settlement of that war. The President is doing everything possible to bring such negotiations about. Meanwhile, let us keep our eyes on our main goals in the field of international relations—arms control and disarmament, and end to the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and stronger international institutions to maintain peace through law. Our responsibilities for achieving and securing peace are heavy, but all is not gloom, and progress is being made toward our ultimate goals. No one is happy at the thought that Americans are fighting today in Vietnam. No one is happy as coffins come home. Everyone can hope that the conduct of the war will result in an absolute minimum of American casualties—and I hope and pray and believe that it will. Nevertheless, on other fronts, we have real reason for measured optimism.

My reasons for arriving at this conclusion center around the United Nations, although they are not limited to that sphere. This may seem remarkable to my colleagues, in view of the fact that only a few months ago the U.N. was virtually flat on its back, with the General Assembly incapacitated because of a deadlock between the major powers over the dues delinquencies of members who had refused to support certain peacekeeping operations.

Nevertheless, the United Nations figures importantly in the chain of events of recent months which have led me to my guardedly optimistic prognosis for advancing the cause of peace.

I should like to discuss a number of these events.

First. The first significant event was the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Charter of the United Nations, which was held in San Francisco in late June.

I was privileged to attend this meeting as an observer for the Foreign Relations Committee.

In order to join in the commemoration, both Houses of the Congress had shortly before unanimously assented to a resolution, Senate Congressional Resolution 36, which said, in part:

> It is the sense of the Congress that the United States of America rededicates itself to the principles of the United Nations and to the furtherance of international cooperation within the framework of law and order * * *.

The resolution also went on to provide for participation by the Congress in the White House Conference on International Cooperation, about which I shall have more to say in a little while. But just as significantly, it further expressed the sense of Congress that the executive branch should:

> (1) review with a high sense of urgency the current state of international peacekeeping machinery with a view to making specific suggestions for strengthening this machinery, (2) review other major elements of international community and cooperation with a view to making specific suggestions to promote the growth of institutions of international cooperation and law and order, and (3) review urgently the status of disarmament negotiations with a view to further progress in reducing the dangers and burden of competitive national armaments.

There is however a further ground for the hope that Congress may be prepared to take a more positive and mature position on disarmament. On April 8 of this year one-quarter of the total membership of the Senate joined as cosponsors of the "planning for peace" resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, which I have been introducing in the Senate in various forms ever since 1959. The gist of this resolution is its expression of support for the efforts of the President to achieve peace and disarmament under legally effective controls and to develop international institutions capable of permanently keeping the peace. It also goes on to request the President to formulate specific proposals for: First, an international disarmament organization; second, a permanent world peace force; third, world tribunals for the peaceful settlement of all international disputes not settled by negotiations; fourth, appropriate and reliable financial arrangements required for the support of the necessary international institutions; and, fifth, such other institutions as may be needed for the enforcement of world peace under the rule of law.

Hearings were held on this resolution in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 11 and 12, and although the testimony given by administration officials was not as bold as might have been desired, the overwhelming preponderance of the testimony taken was strongly in favor of the resolution. The only notes of dissent came from an isolated spokesman for the radical right.

In view of the well-known hostility of many Members of Congress to the goals of disarmament, international peacekeeping, and international cooperation, one must be careful not to read too much into this expression of sentiment. It should certainly not be construed as an advance blanket endorsement of any of the several intermediate steps toward disarmament which have been under discussion lately. For example the proposal that the nuclear test ban treaty be extended to underground tests, with limited on-site inspection, remains a controversial, if not downright unpopular step in the minds of a significant number of Senators.

The high point of the commemoration at San Francisco was provided by the distinguished Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, who summarized the achievements and shortcomings of the world organization in a 20-year balance sheet, and then went on to ask and answer these fundamental questions:

> Is it really only the scourge of war or the lash of terror that can make us move toward the goal of peace and justice in the world? Can we not make the effort to advance out of our own sense of responsibility and knowledge, rather than be driven like refugees before a storm which may be unleashed by our own inability to take hold of the future? I believe not only that we can, but that we must, make the effort.

That meeting of the United Nations was almost the last important conference in which the United States was represented by the late Adlai E. Stevenson as our Ambassador to the U.N. He was one of the truly great men of my generation, a generation which is itself beginning to pass; and his death has left not only the U.N., but the Nation and the world as well, shorn of an asset of incalculable value. No man will be able for a long time to make up for the loss of eloquence, his wit, his profound understanding, not only of world conditions and of the people of the world, but of the character of his colleagues in the U.N. and in Washington. The esteem in which he was and is held today by his colleagues is truly unique. As one who had the good fortune to have known him personally as a friend, his death meant a real, intense personal loss to me.

Second. A second relatively recent development which centers upon the United Nations was the appointment by President Johnson of Justice Arthur Goldberg to succeed Adlai Stevenson as American Ambassador to the United Nations. The appointment of Arthur Goldberg—whom I am also proud to call a friend—has, however, been a boon to the U.N. in a number of ways. Anyone who shares my view of the need for enforceable world law as an alternative to war must surely appreciate the symbolism of sending a highly respected member of our highest court to represent this country at the U.N. In addition, Justice Goldberg's willingness to leave his high post to assume the ambassadorship reflects most favorably on the prestige and importance of the United Nations. But far and away the most important asset acquired by the United Nations has been the person of the Ambassador himself.

Arthur Goldberg has been described as a "militant dove," and the description is accurate. I can vouch for his devotion to the goal of worldwide law and law enforcement as an alternative to worldwide war and weapons, because he spoke to me about it.

Anyone who has ever had anything to do with him can attest to his limitless energy, resourcefulness, and tenacity in pursuit of an objective on which he sets his sights. One may be sure he did not leave the Supreme Court to become a rubberstamp for the hawks in the Pentagon, the House of Representatives, the Senate, the State Department, or the White House staff.

It was, therefore, particularly gratifying to me to hear him reaffirm, in a speech at the United Nations on September 23, 1965, his conviction that "the work of bringing the rule of law to the relations between sovereign states is the greatest adventure in man's history. There is no alternative except the excluded one of doom for all mankind."

Equally significant was the following restatement of a basic tenet of American foreign policy, first propounded by President Kennedy in 1961:

> The goal of general and complete disarmament to which we are all committed remains elusive, but it is a necessary and indispensable goal. We have to work toward it vigorously and thoughtfully and with goodwill and not be deterred by what must be monetary setbacks. Most of all we should concentrate on immediate practical steps to reverse the arms spiral.

This is in an excerpt from an eloquent speech made by Ambassador Goldberg at the United Nations on September 23.

A third event which took place during September imparted additional momentum to the cause of peace. Three thousand delegates—mainly jurists, presidents of bar associations, and lawyers—from more than 115 countries assembled in Washington to take part in the second World Conference on World Peace Through Law.

They gathered to discuss a variety of subjects—space law, the law of international communications, human rights, international organizations, the law of disarmament, among others—but mainly their concern was the extension of the rule of law in the international community.

This goal was enthusiastically endorsed by President Johnson in his remarks to the delegates, when he characterized the rule of law as "the surest road to a fruitful and a secure peace." President Johnson went on to underline the need to work "toward general and complete disarmament under effective international controls, which must be the world's goal."

Recognizing the need for far more public education on the complex issues of disarmament and peacekeeping, the Conference adopted a resolution urging the prompt study of:

Alternative drafts of disarmament agreements, including:

First. A treaty or treaties to insure the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, nuclear military technology and strategic delivery vehicles.

Second. A treaty for a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

Third. A treaty for a freeze in production of nuclear weapons and strategic delivery vehicles, accompanied by a substantial reduction in such weapons and vehicles.

Treaties for general and complete disarmament under effective international controls.

The various types of disarmament organizations and procedures necessary to verify the performance of obligations under each of these treaties.

Measures, including enforcement measures, needed to insure effective execution of various categories of disarmament treaties.

Measures to strengthen the peacemaking machinery of the United Nations in a disarming world.

Fourth. Development should be noted. The best evidence that the United Nations is out of the doldrums and back in business was supplied not long ago during the very tense and delicate negotiations which ultimately led to a cease-fire in the conflict between India and Pakistan. It should hardly surprise anyone to learn that Ambassador Goldberg was in the middle of the negotiations. His skills as a mediator are legendary, and his experience in the field of collective bargaining, first as the legal representative of a great American labor union, and later as the Secretary of Labor, is unmatched in the United Nations and perhaps in the world. With the American Ambassador showing the way there is reason to hope that the United Nations can become a far more effective organ of mediation and conciliation than it has been in the past.

The need for such development could hardly be more acute. New crises, such as the one now in the offing in Rhodesia, will place additional strains upon the U.N. machinery if violence erupts. Ways must be found to get the parties talking to one another and keep them talking to one another until a suitable accommodation can be discovered and agreed to. But I am confident that the search will be pursued with increased vigor because of Ambassador Goldberg's presence at the U.N.

Fifth. Coinciding with this renewal of the U.N.'s mediating activity was the historic visit and tribute to the U.N. by the Pope. It is hard to imagine any other single act that would do more to restore to the U.N. a sense of confidence in its own potential and a rededication to its own high purposes than this. Speaking for, and as the head of the entire Roman Catholic Church, Pope Paul characterized his message to the United Nations as "a solemn moral ratification of that lofty institution." He declared:

> This organization represents the obligatory path of modern civilization and world peace—

And went on to say—

> The edifice which you have constructed must never fall; it must be perfected and made equal to the needs which world history will present. You give sanction to the great principle that the relations between peoples should be regulated by reason, by justice, by law, by negotiation; not by force, nor by violence, not by war, not by fear or deceit—

He said.

This effect of this declaration was to place the full moral weight of the Roman Catholic Church behind the United Nations and its goals. This is no inconsiderable asset, particularly in the United States where the rabid anti-Communists of the radical right have been trying to get this country out of the U.N. because the Communists are in it. Their weird pseudoreasoning condemns the U.N. as a "Commie front" which is taking over the world, and which will first disarm and then enslave the people of the United States. Despite the decisive defeat of Barry Goldwater, these paranoid ravings persist, and the potential for trouble from people who believe this nonsense continues to be menance to peace.

That is why it is particularly useful for the United Nations, especially now, to have received so strong and unequivocal an endorsement from the one institution in the free world whose basic tenets and philosophy is wholly at odds with Communist doctrine: the Catholic Church.

But there is another aspect to the Pope's speech which, to my thinking, has not received the attention it deserves. In the course of his remarks, Pope Paul asked this rhetorical question:

> Is there anyone who does not see the necessity of coming thus progressively to the establishment of a world authority, able to act efficaciously on the juridical and political levels?

Although the Pope clearly hopes there is not, the answer unfortunately is that there are a great many people who fail to appreciate this necessity. In fact I am very much afraid that the great majority of our fellow citizens fall into this category, and I know that both the Congress and the executive branch generally reflect their views.

As a result, too often the United Nations is defended on the ground that it is useful as a debating society, or that it provides a means for cooling off crises by getting the parties to talk out their problems. As I have pointed out, the role of the U.N. as a mediator and concilator is an important one, which I should like to see greatly strengthened.

But to my thinking the chief importance of the United Nations lies in its potential for developing into what Pope Paul described as "a world authority, able to act efficaciously on the juridical and political levels." That is the greatest need, yet it is a goal which as yet lacks the support of a consensus of informed opinion. It would be unrealistic to hope for such a consensus to materialize simply on the strength of the Pope's statement. Nevertheless, as one who has toiled long and hard in this vineyard, I am delighted by Pope Paul's contribution to the educational effort on behalf of enforcible world law, and I would be even more gratified if its sequel is to be increased interest in the subject by the great community of Catholic scholars across the United States.

Sixth. The sixth item in this catalog of hopeful developments was highlighted not long ago by a major speech urging prompt action to halt the spread of nuclear weapons made on the floor of the Senate by Senator ROBERT KENNEDY.

Senators may remember that earlier this year Senator KENNEDY made another speech on this same theme, and perhaps may be aware of the numerous speeches and statements which I and others have made on the subject of nuclear proliferation for well over a year. The burden of our argument has been simply this: Five nations now have the capacity to explode nuclear bombs. But recent technological advances have greatly reduced the cost of producing nuclear weapons and have made it possible for a growing number of countries to build nuclear arsenals within a relatively short time.

In many of these countries there are great pressures to "go nuke," as the insiders refer to it. In time these pressures may well prove irresistable to politicians who, after all, have to be responsive to public opinion. A good case in point is India, which has both the capacity to build a nuclear arsenal and the military need to produce a counter to China's bomb. Although Prime Minister Shastri has so far resisted the domestic pressures to build an Indian bomb, there are few observers who believe that he and his successors could hold out indefinitely.

The solution, about which there is general agreement between the negotiators of the United States and the U.S.S.R., is to conclude an international agreement, on the model of the limited nuclear test ban treaty, which would prohibit nuclear powers from transferring nuclear weapons to nonnuclear states. Nonnuclear states would have a corresponding obligation not to receive the transfer of nuclear weapons. The nonnuclear states would also be prohibited from manufacturing nuclear weapons and the nuclear states could not help them. Both the nuclear and the nonnuclear states could take no other action to increase the number of independent nuclear entities in the world, whether a state or some other kind of organization.

As I have said, there is general agreement on these propositions; but it can be a long jump from general agreement to a signed and sealed treaty, and so far we have not been able to make the jump.

The obstacle has been, and continues to be, the reluctance of our State Department to discard its outmoded and probably unworkable plan to create a NATO nuclear force, known as the MLF, with West Germany as a member. The Russians have objected to this proposal since they fear that it is simply a device to give the West Germans a finger on the nuclear trigger. Our officials have denied that it would do this, but nevertheless the Russians have refused to sign a nonproliferation treaty which permits the transfer of nuclear weapons to an MLF-type force.

Actually the whole dispute is moot, since MLF is a dead duck anyway: the French have always opposed it, most of the other NATO nations are at best unenthusiastic about it, including the British, who are now backing away from their own alternative to it, and even among the West Germans, whom it was designed to woo, there are differences of its opinion as to its desirability. Even here in the United States the experts at the Pentagon, who never believed there was any military value in the plan, have begun to urge the consideration, as an alternative, of a nuclear consultation committee which the various NATO allies could participate in. Such a device, it is believed, would not be objectionable to the Russians and hence would not pose an obstacle to the successful negotiation of a nonproliferation agreement.

So far the anonymous spokesmen for the State Department, who seem to play so large a role in our foreign policy, have refused to back off their insistence that the MLF plan be preserved.

Parenthetically, I always wonder why there has to be an "anonymous spokesman" for the State Department. Why cannot the State Department issue a press release with a name at the bottom of it, to show which individual within the Department has made the statement, and whether the statement does, in fact, represent the views of the Secretary of State?

Nevertheless I think that there is room for guarded optimism about the prospects for an agreement to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. There is at least a sense of movement in the area, of renewed interest in the subject in the Congress and in the press, and it may be that when our representatives return to the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, hopefully in January, the chances for a treaty will have been substantially improved. And if a treaty can be negotiated on this subject, we may be able to break the logjam on other subjects and proceed to the extension of the existing nuclear test ban to include underground tests.

Seventh. The development which I should like to discuss next has been saved for last for the very good reason that it has not happened yet. I am referring to the White House Conference on International Cooperation, which has been scheduled to take place from November 29 to December 1 of this year.

Since the ICY activities are not nearly so widely known as they should be, I would like to take just a minute to provide some background. A resolution of the U.N. General Assembly designated 1965 as International Cooperation Year. In order to provide for maximum participation by the United States in this event, President Johnson issued a call to Government agencies and private organizations to join in a massive educational program to develop new ideas and focus public attention on the various aspects of international cooperation. This educational effort will culminate in the White House Conference at the end of November.

It was my privilege to be named one of the 12 congressional delegates to the Conference, and I have taken an active interest in the work of a number of the committees, particularly those on Arms Control and Disarmament, Peacekeeping Operations—U.N., Research on the Development of International Institutions, Development of International Law, and Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy.

It is still too early to predict the impact which this conference will have. Some of the reports which I have seen seem quite bold and imaginative; others unfortunately are rather timid. Nevertheless the potential for an important contribution to the on-going debate on international cooperation is there, and I shall certainly be doing what I can to make the most of it.

While all these developments provide a basis for a measure of optimism, the first task—and, in many ways, the most difficult—still remains: creating a climate of opinion in the United States which will make peace possible. There are those who say that we who pursue the goal of world peace through seeking to build strong international institutions which would take the place of arms and make war obsolete, are "soft on communism," and are idealistic dreamers. But they are wrong on both counts.

Anyone who has ever negotiated with the Russians knows how jealous they are of their own sovereignty, and how reluctant they would be to placing themselves under the rule of enforcible world law. The program which I have always advocated has nothing at all to do with unilateral disarmament or other such pacifist visions. The plan of disarmament which I support is nothing less than the Kennedy-Johnson program of general and complete disarmament under strict international controls, adequate to detect and prevent cheating by any party.

An essential part of any such agreement is enforcible world law in the limited field of peace and disarmament. Agreement to such a plan could never be achieved by being "soft" with the Russians. It can be arrived at only through tough, grueling, hard-headed negotiations which would persuade their leaders that it would be the better part of wisdom for them to relinquish this absolute sovereignty and phobia in favor of secrecy, and against an open society, which are two of the most difficult hurdles for us to overcome in our search for peace.

The second error lies in the application of the labels "mystics, visionaries and dreamers" to those who support this program which, of course, includes the last three Presidents of the United States, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson.

The true dreamers are the ones who think we can let the arms race run on indefinitely without eventually blowing all of civilization into the hereafter, or that we can ever arrive at a stable condition of world peace without first having achieved a strong and viable detente with Russia.

The time has come for us to shake ourselves out of this dream world and take heart from our Founding Fathers who knew in 1776 that if they did not hang together they would hang separately.

They knew that the institutions of a nation-state adequate to the need could not be built on the rickety foundation of the articles of confederation, just as we know that the U.N., as it exists today, lacks the power and the authority to enforce world peace through general and complete disarmament.

Therefore we must either revise the U.N. Charter, and revise it radically, as I have pointed out many times in the past, or we must create a new international organization, hopefully on the foundations built by the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva, which would be able to have the administrative institutions necessary to enable it to enforce world peace and disarmament by an agreement between all the majority military nations of the world.

The Founding Fathers had the vision and the courage to put aside narrow parochial interests and found a stable order—because the times demanded it. Anything less would have caused failure by reason of the chaotic conditions which arose during the period between the American Revolution and the adoption of the Constitution. Because of what was done then, the United States was born, survived, and grew to greatness.

We are in a far greater crisis today. It is not mere survival as a nation, but survival as a species—the human species, Homo sapiens—which is at stake. Yet I am enough of an optimist to hope that we will have the wisdom and the courage to heed Pope Paul's admonition, and calling once more upon the spirit of Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin, join with other nations to build the strong international institutions needed to realize the Pope's stirring prophecy:

> No more war, war never again.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A MEMORIAL IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO FATHER FLANAGAN

Mr. **CURTIS**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 641, which was reported today from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 641) authorizing Father Flanagan's Boys' Home to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. **CURTIS**. Mr. President, this proposal has passed the House of Representatives. The Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate has considered it favorably, and recommends its passage.

It would grant consent for Boys Town to erect a monument in the District of Columbia to honor Father Flanagan, the founder of Boys Town, located near Omaha, Nebr., It is a fitting tribute to a man who has done so much for so many boys. He started an institution that will live for a long time, even though Father Flanagan is no longer with us.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 641) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "THE ANTI-VIETNAM AGITATION AND THE TEACH-IN MOVEMENT

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 65, which was reported today from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 65) to authorize the printing as a Senate document of the pamphlet entitled "The Anti-Vietnam Agitation and the Teach-In Movement."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment in line 8, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "Subcommittee on Internal Security of the"; so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the pamphlet entitled "The Anti-Vietnam Agitation and the Teach-In Movement", prepared for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, be printed as a Senate document.
>
> SEC. 2. There shall be printed ten thousand additional copies of such Senate document for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question now is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended. The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 65), as amended, was agreed to.

NORA ISABELLA SAMUELLI—REQUEST FOR RETURN OF PAPERS FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the action of the Senate in disagreeing to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill, S. 619, for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli, requesting a conference with the House thereon and the appointing of conferees on the part of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that a request be made to have the papers returned to the Senate from the House of Representatives.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

SUMMARIES OF ACTIVITIES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the summaries of activity of the following Senate committees during the 1st session of the 89th Congress: Agriculture, Armed Services, Public Works, Rules and Administration, and Space.

There being no objection, the summaries were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
AND FORESTRY,
October 20, 1965.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: During the 1st session of the 89th Congress the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported 16 bills as shown on the attached list.

Twenty-four days of hearings have been held in connection with these and other bills being studied by the committee. We considered and reported 3 nominations and approved approximately 41 watershed projects.

A number of bills are pending before the committee which may receive early consideration during the second session beginning in January 1966.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

LIST OF MEASURES FAVORABLY REPORTED TO THE SENATE BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

SENATE BILLS

S. 7: Establishment of Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area. Approved September 28, 1965 (Public Law 89–207).

S. 199: Relocation of utility costs in watershed projects. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture May 26, 1965.

S. 1270: Extension of boiled peanut exemption from marketing quotas. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture July 26, 1965. The subject matter of this bill was subsequently included in H.R. 9811.

S. 1271: Extension of authority to lease tobacco acreage allotments. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture July 26, 1965. The subject matter of this bill was subsequently included in H.R. 9811.

S. 1689: Increasing authority of Forest Service to rent property from employees. Senate concurred in House amendment October 5, 1965.

S. 1766: Loans and grants for rural water supply systems. Approved October 7, 1965 (Public Law 89–240).

S. 2092: Authorizes paid advertising programs under celery, sweet corn, limes, and avocado marketing orders. Passed Senate August 30, 1965.

S. 2294: Extension of International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949. Reported to House August 4, 1965.

S. 2679: To amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Control Act. Reported to Senate October 20, 1965.

HOUSE BILLS

H.R. 4152: Increases borrowing authority of Federal Intermediate Credit Banks and otherwise strengthens those banks and the production credit associations. Approved October 4, 1965 (Public Law 89–237).

H.R. 5721: Provides for acreage poundage controls on tobacco. Approved April 16, 1965 (Public Law 89–12).

H.R. 5508: Various provisions designed to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture. Approved August 4, 1965 (Public Law 89–106).

H.R. 6691: Validates certain payments made by the Forest Service to Indian firefighters. Approved June 5, 1965 (Public Law 89–34).

H.R. 8620: Permits certain payments under 1965 feed grain, wheat, and cotton programs, even though disasters prevented producers from planting. Approved August 6, 1965 (Public Law 89–112).

H.R. 9497: Extends time for 1966 crop wheat marketing quota referendum. Approved July 24, 1965 (Public Law 89–82).

H.R. 9811: Provides for—

1. Class I base milk marketing orders, and manufacturing milk marketing orders for 1966 through 1969.

2. Extension of wool program through December 31, 1969.

3. Extension of the feed grain program through the 1969 crop with amendments.

4. A 1966 through 1969 cotton price support and diversion program, with provision for limited overplanting for export and transfers of cotton allotments.

5. Extension of the voluntary wheat marketing certificate program through the 1969 crop with amendments.

6. A new 4-year cropland adjustment program under which cropland could be retired for from 5 to 10 years.

7. Miscellaneous provisions relating to acreage measurement, tobacco allotment leasing, the boiled peanut exemption from marketing quotas, a study of the parity income position of farmers, transfers of acreage allotments on State lands, reconstitution of farms, the use of projected yields, and CCC purchases of dairy products at market prices for various programs.

8. Rice diversion programs during 1966 through 1969 if the national acreage allotment falls below that for 1965, and minimum rice value factors for 1966 and 1967.

Senate approved conference report, clearing it for the President October 12, 1965.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

LEGISLATION

Public Law 89-37: Authorizing appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces. Authorizes appropriations for these purposes in the amount of $15,402,800,000.

Public Law 89-188: Military construction authorization. Authorizes military construction and provides authorization for housing construction and maintenance in the amount of $1,780,062,000.

Public Law 89-132: Military pay increase. This bill (1) increased the basic pay of members of the uniformed services with over 2 years of service by 11 percent for enlisted persons and 6 percent for warrant officers and officers; (2) increased the basic pay for members of the uniformed services with under 2 years service by an average of 17.3 percent for enlisted persons and 22 percent for officers; (3) increased the hostile fire pay by $10 per month—from $55 to $65; and (4) revised the cost-of-living formula under which retired pay is increased, resulting in a 4.4 percent increase for persons already retired.

The increases total $991,268,000 for persons on active duty and $56,761,000 for retired persons over full fiscal year.

Public Law 89-198: Cash awards for inventions. Establishes a program of cash awards for suggestions, inventions, or scientific achievements by members of the Armed Forces that contribute to the efficiency, economy, or other improvement of Government operations.

Public Law 89-157: Increasing number of Air Force colonels and lieutenant colonels. Provides enhanced promotion opportunity for Air Force officers to the grade of colonel and lieutenant colonel by authorizing an increase in the number of officers that might hold these grades.

Public Law 89-149: Incentive pay for carrier flight deck personnel. Authorizes payment of incentive hazardous duty pay for members of the Armed Forces who serve on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier during aircraft operations.

H.R. 1805: Promotion of Naval Reserve captains and Marine Corps Reserve colonels from below the zone. Provides permanent authority for the selection of Naval Reserve captains and Marine Corps Reserve colonels from below the normal promotion zone.

H.R. 7484: 3-star rank for Surgeons General. Authorizes statutory rank of lieutenant general or vice admiral for the officers who serve as Surgeon General of the Army, of the Navy, and the Air Force.

Public Law 89-50: Extending the time for filing claims for mustering-out payments. Extends the time for filing claims for mustering-out payments and repeals the authority for these payments on July 1, 1966.

H.R. 724: Transfer of certain Canal Zone prisoners to the custody of the Attorney General. Permits the transfer of the persons convicted of offenses in the Canal Zone to the custody of the Attorney General for transfer to prisons within the United States.

Public Law 89-150: Transportation of remains of deceased dependents of members of the Armed Forces. Authorizes the transportation at Government expense of the remains of a dependent of a member of the Armed Forces on active duty if the dependent dies at, or while traveling to or from the member's place of active duty.

Public Law 89-193: Early payday for members of the Armed Forces. Permits military paydays as much as 3 days before the last day of a pay period when the last day of the pay period falls on a Saturday, a Sunday, or a legal holiday.

Public Law 89-26: Special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services evacuated from danger areas. Authorizes the payment of special allowances and dislocation allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services when these dependents are evacuated to the United States from an overseas danger area.

H.R. 3045. Acceptance of foreign decorations. Authorized members and former members of the Armed Forces who have served in Vietnam to accept and wear decorations and awards tendered by the Government of Vietnam or the governments of friendly foreign forces engaged in the conflict in Vietnam.

Public Law 89-143: Disposition of unclaimed property. Facilitates the disposal of lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property in the custody of the Department of Defense or the Department of the Treasury.

Public Law 89-160: Language training for dependents of members of the Armed Forces. Authorizes language training for dependents of members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in anticipation of assignment to permanent duty outside the United States for their sponsors.

H.R. 5571: Incentive pay for staffs of submarine operational commanders. Authorizes payment of incentive pay for submarine duty to persons qualified in submarines who are attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders if the duties of the person require his serving on a submarine and if he so serves for an average of 48 hours per month during each 3-month period.

H.R. 5665: Advances of funds to Armed Forces of friendly foreign nations. Authorizes disbursing officers of the Armed Forces of the United States to advance funds to members of an armed force of a friendly foreign nation under exigent circumstances if reciprocal privilege is granted to the United States.

Public Law 89-172: Promotion of Air Force Reserve officers to the grades of brigadier general and major general. Reinstates statutory authority for promotion of Air Force reservists to Reserve general officer grades.

Public Law 89-140: Transportation for dependents requiring medical care. Authorizes transportation at Government expense for dependents of members of the uniformed services who are accompanying members at posts of duty outside the United States where required medical care is not available locally.

Public Law 89-51: Amending ROTC legislation. Corrects three technical deficiencies in the ROTC Vitalization Act of 1964.

H.R. 7812: Loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries. Would authorize the loan of 11 ships to 6 friendly foreign nations.

Public Law 89-151: Payment of unused accrued leave to survivors. Authorizes payment to survivors of deceased members of the uniformed services for the unused leave credited to the deceased on the date of his death.

Public Law 89-101: Transportation of vehicles of members of the Armed Forces: For members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States who are ordered to other duty outside the United States where they cannot take their dependents or automobiles, permits the Secretary of the service concerned to authorize the transportation of an automobile owned by the member to such place as the Secretary may authorize.

H.R. 9975: Shipment of automobiles of deceased or missing persons. Authorizes shipment at Government expense from locations within the United States of private vehicles owned by missing or deceased military or civilian employees of the Government.

H.R. 10234: Elimination of reimbursement among the medical facilities of the military departments. Eliminates the statutory requirement for reimbursement among the military departments for hospitalization furnished to a member or a dependent of another military department.

Public Law 89-152: Prohibition on destruction or mutilation of draft cards. Makes a person who knowingly destroys or knowingly mutilates a draft registration card subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both.

S. 28: Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1965. Revises and consolidates the laws relating to stockpile management and permits orderly disposal of stockpile excesses.

S. 1856: Naval Sea Cadet Corps uniforms. Authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to sell uniform clothing to the Naval Sea Cadet Corps.

Considered and favorably reported 15 bills and resolutions authorizing disposal of surplus quantities of 23 materials from the national and the supplemental stockpile, having an estimated market value of $1,020,830,000. These bills and resolutions are summarized under the activities of the Subcommittee on the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves, below.

Considered and favorably reported three measures authorizing disposal of land excess to military requirements.

NOMINATIONS

Considered 49,075 nominations. Eight committee meetings were required for consideration of civilian and military officials to statutory offices traditionally involving personal appearances by nominees before committee.

SUBCOMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee

Conducted hearings on combat readiness of the Army and the proposed merger of the Army Reserve into the Army National Guard.

Continued study of conflict in South Vietnam, including adequacy of equipment and supplies for U.S. forces there.

Continued monitoring implementation of the four nuclear test ban safeguards.

Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee

Held nine meetings in exercising legislative oversight over the Central Intelligence Agency and the policies and programs being carried out by that Agency under the National Security Act and the Central Intelligence Act of 1949.

National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves Subcommittee

Considered and favorably reported S. 28, which would revise and consolidate laws relating to stockpile management and would permit orderly disposal of stockpile excesses.

Recommended 15 separate bills and resolutions authorizing disposal from national stockpile and supplemental stockpile of excess quantities of copper, lead, zinc, rubber, silk noils, raw silk, magnesium, bismuth alloys, diamond dies, hyoscine, chromium, fluorspar, silicon carbide, vegetable tannin extracts, colemanite, chromite, abaca, nickel, quartz, talc, and graphite. The estimated market value of the materials approved for disposal is $1,020,830,000.

Accomplished consultation for Committee on Armed Services with Department of the Navy on contracts affecting naval petroleum reserves.

Status of Forces Subcommittee

Conducted hearings and issued report on that part of the NATO Status of Forces Treaty relating to criminal jurisdiction not waived by host countries in which U.S. forces are stationed.

Officer Grade Limitations Subcommittee

Considered reports submitted by military departments on officer grade distribution.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

In the 10 months since the Senate organized—the Committee on Public Works has reported 21 bills and resolutions, 12 of which have become law. This bare statistical analysis—however—hardly indicates the extent of the committee's work.

At the beginning of the session five major legislative tasks faced the committee. To accomplish this, the committee held 39 days of hearings, including 10 days of field hearings and 6 days of executive sessions and produced one major staff study and a 30-minute filmed report on air pollution, entitled "Ill Winds on a Sunny Day."

All told, the committee held 63 days of public hearings on all measures it considered.

The committee considered and reported legislation which has now been signed into law relating to amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Clean Air Act, and the disposal of solid waste.

The Water Quality Act provides for a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, grants for waste treatment facilities, demonstration grants for sewer separation, and the establishment of water quality standards.

The amendments to the Clean Air Act provide for the establishment of standards to control automotive vehicle emissions, a new Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory, and international air pollution control with our neighboring countries.

A solid waste disposal program was authorized, and provides funds amounting to $92.5 million over the next 4 years to assist in garbage and refuse disposal.

Another piece of legislation (S. 560) which is designed to provide for improved cooperation by Federal agencies to control water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities and to control automotive vehicle air pollution has passed the Senate.

In addition to the above legislative activities, the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution conducted 12 days of hearings in the field and in Washington on progress and programs relating to the abatement of water pollution. These hearings will provide the basis for considering the need and desirability of further amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Another major piece of legislation reported by the committee was the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Bill of 1965. This bill authorizes the construction of 142 water resources projects throughout the United States, at a total cost of about $2 billion. The bill was passed by the Senate after the conclusion of extensive hearings by the committee, spanning a period of over 4 months. In addition to the authorization of individual river and harbor flood control projects, the bill contains a number of general provisions relating to the conduct of this highly important program.

The committee considered and reported the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, which provides grants and loans for public works and development facilities, and other financial assistance in conjunction with long-term planning. It provides for technical assistance, research and information to these areas, and establishes standards for area and district eligibility, as well as provides for regional action planning commissions. It also includes the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions. It authorizes an annual appropriation of $760 million to carry out the purposes of this act.

The committee considered and reported the Appalachian Regional Development Act. This is substantially the same bill that was considered during the 88th Congress. The purpose of the act is to provide public works and economic development programs, and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region. Included under the act is the establishment of a Regional Commission, the development of an adequate highway system for the region, the construction and operation of health facilities, land improvement and erosion control, timber development assistance, mining area restoration and a water resource survey. Including the highway funds, the total authorization for this bill is $1,092 million.

In addition to the major bills the committee considered legislation in the field of disaster relief for the Northwest area, the Hurricane Betsy disaster bill, and an overall disaster relief bill which will eliminate the need for special congressional action whenever a major disaster occurs. Two of these have passed the Senate and the Hurricane Betsy bill has been reported and is on the Senate Calendar.

The committee also considered prospectuses for 90 buildings at an estimated value of $240,507,909 and 38 proposals for watershed development at a total cost of $80,382,531 to the Federal Government.

Another bill reported by the committee which has become law authorized funds for continuation of work by the Corps of Engineers on previously authorized comprehensive river basin plans for flood control and navigation purposes. This bill involves $263 million.

The road legislation included approval of apportionment of highway trust funds for fiscal year 1967, and the highway beautification bill, both of which have been enacted into law.

A third Library of Congress building has been authorized, at a cost of $75 million, and signed into law.

The Subcommittee on Public Buildings and grounds has held hearings on a bill to provide for a long-range land-use plan for the Capitol Grounds. This matter is still pending before the subcommittee.

The final action of this session has been the consideration of the establishment of an official residence for the Vice President. This measure has been reported and is on the Senate Calendar.

RÉSUMÉ OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION DURING THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

During the 1st session of the 89th Congress, 173 legislative items were referred to or originated in the Committee on Rules and Administration. Of these items of proposed legislation considered by the committee, 115 were reported to the Senate. All but 12 of these measures have been enacted or agreed to as of the present date. Of the 14 bills and joint resolutions reported, 7 have become public laws.

Of particular significance are the following legislative items:

1. Senate Concurrent Resolution 2: To establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. Hearings were held early in the session by the Subcommittee on the Standing Rules of the Senate. Subsequently, the concurrent resolution was favorably reported by the committee which was then agreed to by the Senate and the House. This action led to the establishment of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress which has met in almost continuous session for approximately 6 months. The recommendations of the joint committee will be designed to strengthen the Congress, to simplify and expedite its operations, to improve its relationships with the other branches of the Government, and to enable it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. This marks the first complete overall study of the legislative branch in almost 20 years.

2. S. 1310—The National Museum Act of 1965. This bill was the subject of hearings by the Subcommittee on the Smithsonian Institution. On September 10, 1965, the bill was passed by the Senate and is presently pending in the Committee on House Administration. The purpose of S. 1310 is to give recognition to the Nation's museums as significant cultural and educational institutions, and to assist the museum field by authorizing the Smithsonian Institution to strengthen its activities of service to the Nation's museums, now numbering over 5,000 and visited by Americans an estimated 300 million times a year.

3. S. 1474—To create a bipartisan commission to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of Government. This measure was the subject of hearings by the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. Subsequently, it was favorably reported to the Senate where it was passed on August 25, 1965. At the present time the measure is pending in the Committee on House Administration. In essence, S. 1474 proposes the creation of a bipartisan commission of 12 members which would make a full and complete investigation and study of the Federal laws which limit or discourage the participation of Federal and State officers and employees in political activity with a view to determining the effect of such laws, the need for their revision or elimination, and an appraisal of the extent to which undesirable results might accrue from their repeal. This is the first time that such a comprehensive study has been provided for in the last quarter century.

4. H.R. 9495: Increasing the appropriation authorization for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, and for other purposes. This bill was passed by the House on October 5, 1965, and by the Senate on October 18, 1965. It is now awaiting the approval of the President. Basically, the bill increases the appropriation authorization and extends the time for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission to report to the President and to the Congress on a permanent memorial to former President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

5. H.J. Res. 597: A memorial to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of rocketry. This bill was passed by the House on September 20, 1965, and by the Senate on October 15, 1965. It is now awaiting the approval of the President. It authorizes the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to erect a permanent national memorial in the nature of a work of art on the campus of Clark University in Worcester, Mass., in fitting commemoration of Doctor Goddard, the father of modern rocket propulsion.

During the first session of the 89th Congress, through October 19, 1965, the Committee on Rules and Administration considered and processed requests from Senate standing, select, and special committees for additional funds for inquiries and investigations in the amount of $5,387,690. Legislation providing for such expenditures in the amount of $5,363,000 has been approved by the committee and agreed to by the Senate.

In addition to its regular legislative business the Committee on Rules and Administration concluded its long inquiry into the financial or business interests of Members, officers, or employees of the Senate, pursuant to Senate Resolution 212 and Senate Resolution 367 of the 88th Congress. On June 30, 1965, the committee made its final report—Senate Report No. 388—containing specific findings and recommendations. One result of the committee's investigation was the appointment and organization of the Senate Select Committee on Standards and Conduct.

Over and above its heavy legislative docket, the Committee on Rules and Administration resolved many matters of policy and performed innumerable tasks related to its administrative jurisdiction. These included significant studies and improvements in the Senate Restaurant operations, the issuance of completely revised senatorial long-distance telephone regulations and the adoption of regulations for the awarding of service pins to Members, officers, and employees of the Senate.

Gordon F. Harrison,
Staff Director.

Approved.

Senator B. Everett Jordan,
Chairman.

Senate Space Committee Activities

The Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee has been actively engaged during calendar year 1965 in the oversight of our national space program. The committee met January 26 and 27, 1965, with officials from the NASA and the Department of Defense to review the national program for space launch vehicles. Testimony was taken from Mr. James E. Webb, Administrator of NASA, and Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Cyrus R. Vance, and other officials of NASA and the Department of Defense. Because of the classified nature of the testimony by the Department of Defense, these hearings were held in executive session. Subsequently, the testimony taken was declassified and hearings were printed.

NASA's budget request for $5,260 million was submitted early in January and included in S. 927, which was introduced by Chairman Anderson for himself and Mrs. Smith, on February 1, 1965. After a thorough analysis of the request by the staff, open hearings were held on March 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 30, 1965. On March 15, 1965, a classified hearing was held at which time the space programs of the Department of Defense were reviewed. This testimony, along with the testimony held in open hearings, was subsequently published in three volumes containing over 1,100 pages which covered NASA's scientific and technological programs and program management, NASA's program budget detail, and a summary review of NASA's post-Apollo planning. After several days of executive meetings to mark up the bill, the committee on May 13, 1965, reported its recommendations as an amendment to H.R. 7717. In acting on the House approved bill of $5,183,844,850 the Senate committee recommended a total of $5,196,826,350. The committees met in conference in June and agreed to a conference report totaling $5,190,396,200.

NASA's appropriation is contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act and the Appropriation Committees subsequently appropriated a total of $5,175 million in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1966.

On August 23, 24, and 25, 1965, the committee met to take testimony on the national space goals for the post-Apollo period. The committee heard testimony from Administrator James E. Webb and associates of NASA; Dr. Donald F. Hornig, Director of the Office of Science and Technology; and Dr. Harry H. Hess, Dr. Lloyd V. Berkner, and Dr. Gordon J. F. MacDonald, who were testifying as members of the National Academy of Sciences. The committee also heard in closed session Dr. Harold Brown, who testified as Director, D.D.R. & E., Department of Defense. These hearings are now in the process of being readied for publication in the near future.

The committee has also continued its interest in the international aspects of space and NASA's participation. During the present year two Senate documents were published: Document No. 44, "U.S. International Space Programs," which contains the text of executive agreements, memorandums of understanding, and other international arrangements made between 1959 and the present; and, Senate Document No. 56 titled, "International Cooperation and Organization for Outer Space," which contains a comprehensive survey of the patterns of international cooperation in space activities between nations, the international scientific community, the professional associations and industrial organizations.

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES, FILE REPORTS, AND SIGN BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment following today's session until the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, Friday, October 22, 1965, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives; and that committees be authorized to file reports, together with any individual, additional, supplementary, or minority views, if desired; and that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LT. COL. WILLIAM T. SCHUSTER

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The situation, for the sake of the Record, is that after we passed a bill, S. 919, which had been amended by the House, shortly after its passage I was informed by the Air Force that the figure should have been $3,771.33 rather than $4,153.83. I have not had an opportunity to speak to the distinguished majority leader about this personally, but I hope the explanation will be satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 67) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (S. 919) for the relief of Lieutenant Colonel William T. Schuster, United States Air Force (retired), the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the said bill, to make the following corrections, namely, on line 5, page 1, strike out "$4,153.83" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,771.33", and on line 9, page 1, strike out "August 31, 1960" and insert in lieu thereof "October 2, 1959."

SHIP MORTGAGE BONDS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2118) to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Russell of South Carolina in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 20, 1965, p. 27822, Congressional Record.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the bill clarifies certain problems relating to ship mortgage bonds in financing the construction and reconstruction of American-flag vessels. The House and Senate bills as passed were identical, with one exception, that exception was whether or not the legislation should affect pending litigation. The Senate bill included a provision which made the validation of bonds inapplicable to bonds pending in litigation on the date of enactment. The House struck this savings provision. The conferees were appointed to settle this one difference. An agreement has been reached in which a savings provision similar in effect to the savings provision included in the original Senate bill has been adopted by the conferees.

During the conference it was disclosed that the primary concern of the House members, as well as the Senate members, was not to permit the legislation to affect in any way any rights pending in litigation through the enactment of this legislation. It was agreed that all disputes pending before the judicial branch involving rights which would otherwise be affected by the legislation should not be disturbed. The savings provision in the Senate bill originally attempted to accomplish this and the savings provision agreed to in conference has the same purpose. Therefore, any ship mortgage bonds pending in litigation on the effective date of the act that otherwise would be affected by the legislation will remain unaffected and the litigation affecting such bonds will be continued as if no legislation had been passed.

There is one matter that I, and I am sure the other conferees are most interested in clarifying. This question was raised in two aide memoirs from the German Government and a recent letter dated October 7, 1965, from Douglas MacArthur II, Assistant Secretary of

State for Congressional Relations. The suggestion was made in these notes that this legislation in some way was directed against, and discriminatory toward, German interests. Nothing could be further from the truth.

This has been a very complicated matter and I can understand where some confusion could arise. However, I think it must be kept in mind that German interests of citizens of other nations and interests of U.S. citizens are represented on both sides of the Westhampton litigation exempted from the effects of this bill. On the one hand there is an American bank as mortgagee and trustee under the trust agreement, German bondholders under the trust agreement, and German and American guarantors on the bonds and on separate notes. On the other hand, there are 48 general creditors, some of whom are American companies and many are foreign companies including German interests. In fact there are recorded in the Westhampton case no fewer than four German general creditors who have claims based upon supplying labor, materials, and services.

If the Westhampton decision in the court of appeals is sustained, it could mean that the German bondholders could recover against an American guarantor for any losses sustained from being placed in the same position as American, German, and other foreign general creditors. The substance of the matter is that this is not a controversy between German interests and U.S. interests. There are both German and American companies interested in sustaining the validity of the bonds in question, and there are American and German general creditors who are not interested in having any preference recognized.

The difficulty in understanding this saving clause might well be based on the unfamiliarity of some with the tradition and policy we have in this country of considering each branch—the judicial, the executive, and the legislative—as independent, separate, coequal branches of Government. This concept is, of course, foreign to one more familiar with the parliamentary system of government such as that found in Germany. Congress and State legislatures again and again each session pass legislation with special provisions included, generally referred to as saving clauses, which exclude from the effect of any legislative act rights pending in litigation. This is proper. The effort made in this legislation is the same that has been made time and time again in respect to the rights of American citizens or the citizens of any other nation when legislation is enacted. It is my absolute conviction that this legislation is not in any way discriminatory toward any citizen or any nation and I do not believe that it can be substantiated that the effect of this legislation will be to discriminate against any citizen regardless of nationality.

I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 168) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11588) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 29, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 48, 55, 56, 60, 62, 63, 70, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, and 89 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14, 18, 30, 53, 66, and 85 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 1758. An act to provide for the right of persons to be represented in matters before Federal agencies;

S. 2092. An act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to various fruits and vegetables to provide for paid advertising;

S. 2300. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers, and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3079. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eleni Bacola Ciacco, M.D.; and

H.R. 6666. An act to provide for the free entry of a 90-centimeter split-pole magnetic spectrograph system with orangepeel internal conversion spectrometer attached for the use of the University of Pittsburgh.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair).

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8310) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the conference report is signed unanimously by the conferees on the part of the Senate and also signed unanimously by the conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert a statement in the RECORD explaining the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

H.R. 8310 as passed by the Senate made no change in existing law with respect to the allocation of funds among the States for the basic program of grants and no change with respect to the Federal matching provisions. As passed by the House the legislation gave less emphasis to the per capita income factor in allocating funds among the States and increased the Federal share to a flat 75 percent, without regard to per capita income levels in the States, by 1967. The conference committee recommends that we retain the provision for squaring the per capita income factor in the allocation of funds under existing law and accept the House provisions for increasing the Federal share to 75 percent by 1967. This will authorize additional Federal funds for all States under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

Under existing law, there is an open-end authorization on appropriations and no limit on period of time with respect to sections 2, 3, and 4 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. The conference committee recommends that appropriation ceilings be established for the years 1966, 1967, and 1968. New authorizations will be necessary for later years.

In the case of section 3, the conference committee recommends emphasis on new methods for providing rehabilitation services and increased services for the severely disabled with a Federal share of 90 percent for the first 3 years of projects and 75 percent for the final 2 years. The Senate formula for the allocation of funds would be retained.

H.R. 8310 as passed by the House and Senate provided for the construction and initial staffing of sheltered workshops and rehabilitation facilities. A Federal share of 50 percent is provided for in the bill as it passed the House, in the case of construction costs. The conference committee recommends adoption of the Senate Federal matching provisions that authorize the States to decide whether they will adopt a flat 50 percent as the Federal share, a percentage between 33⅓ and 66⅔ percent based on per capita income level, or a variable percent based on economic differences of regions in the State.

The conference committee recommends that construction costs include acquisition of land and the acquisition of existing buildings under the program. In addition, the committee recommends the adoption of the House approved appropriation limitations and authorities for extending initial staffing assistance to all new facilities constructed after enactment of the legislation. The limited amounts of funds authorized to be appropriated will require special consideration to facilities constructed under the new program.

In the case of training grants the conference committee recommends that a Federal share of 90 percent be adopted and that training grants be available to rehabilitation facilities as well as to workshops. A total of $24.5 million in appropriations would be authorized for the 3 years 1966-68.

The conference committee also recommends a maximum of $100,000 for State planning for comprehensive rehabilitation programs, specifying the fields in which training may be supported under the act and the provisions of the bill as it passed the House in the case of the organizational location of the State agency for rehabilitation.

Finally, the conference committee recommends adoption of the Senate provisions for increasing the authorization for appropriations for the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped from $400,000 per year to $500,000 per year.

The conference report is agreed to by all of the conferees on the part of the Senate and by all of the conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the compromise reached between the House and Senate conferees on H.R. 8310, the Vocational and Rehabilitation Amendments of 1965, will provide a greatly expanded program of aid to the States for programs of vocational rehabilitation.

The chief difference between the Senate and House bills was over the allotment formula which determines the amount which each State receives under title II of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and the formula which determined the Federal matching provisions.

The Senate retained the current Hill-Burton formula under which allotments are based on population and per capita income squared, with built-in floors and ceilings on how much and how little each State can receive. The House formula allotted funds on the basis of population and simple per capita income, with a provision that no State's allotment will be less than that for fiscal year 1965. The House formula also contained a maintenance-of-effort requirement.

The conferees agreed to keep the basic Hill-Burton formula but deleted the built-in floors and ceilings. They also included the requirement that no State's allotment shall be less than its allotment for fiscal year 1965 and the maintenance-of-effort requirement.

I strongly support the conference action because by giving added weight to a State's per capita income it gives the poorer States a fairer break and thus provides for a more equitable distribution of funds. Greater social utility will result from funds distributed in this manner. As a Senate member of the conference, I am glad to report this result.

On a related matter, the conference accepted the House provision providing a 75 percent Federal share for basic support grants under title II of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. This will help all States, but especially those with lower per capita income, to improve their vocational rehabilitation services.

The bill will provide grants to pay part of the costs for improvement and extension of rehabilitation services, for new methods and techniques of providing services, for the construction and staffing of workshops, for improved training programs in workshops, for improvement grants, for technical assistance and for the purpose of establishing a national standard-setting body, the National Policy and Performance Council.

Mr. President, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, our beloved LISTER HILL, shepherded this bill through hearings, committee markup, floor action and through conference with all the skill for which he is so justly renowned. This is a significant addition to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, the first in many years. It is another monument to the leadership of the Senator from Alabama in all matters affecting the health of this Nation.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, while I am not in complete agreement with all of the provisions of the conference report to H.R. 8310, I nevertheless would take this opportunity to state that the conference report we are approving is a significant step forward and I believe one of the most important steps taken by Congress to rehabilitate disabled individuals. In 1954 President Eisenhower set as a goal the rehabilitating of 200,000 persons annually. Last year we rehabilitated only 120,000. Being far short of the 1954 goal, we can and must do better. The measure will build upon the 1954 law and will mark a real giant step in the field of rehabilitation.

While the vocational rehabilitation program has not received all the publicity, glitter, and excitement which the antipoverty program has received, it has a record of success at a reasonable cost to which the antipoverty program might well aspire. Its accomplishment has been very great.

Financially, it is a bargain for the taxpayers for every dollar expended for the rehabilitation of disabled persons, $5 is returned to the Federal Treasury. In addition, these citizens also pay taxes to the State and local governments.

This legislation enjoys the greatest of support in California and well it should for it has been soundly conceived and patiently nurtured. The Nation has greatly benefited from this program as well as the many disabled citizens who have participated.

Prior to the amendments made in the vocational rehabilitation program by today's action, California received only $1.04 of Federal funds for every $1 of State funds. With the enactment of this bill, California will receive an additional $10 to $12 million to use in this humanitarian effort. I was pleased to cooperate in making these necessary changes.

Mr. President, it has been my great pleasure, one of the joys of being a Member of this body, to have the opportunity to work with the chairman of the committee, whose name is on most of the health legislation which has come out of Congress over the years. It is an honor for me to be able to work with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from California for the fine work which he did on the bill, and the very great help which he gave to the committee in its writing and in agreement on the bill in conference this afternoon. I am deeply grateful to him for the fine work that he did, and now take the opportunity to thank him for it.

During the past year we have rehabilitated some 120,000 individuals. Under the new program provided in the pending conference report, we hope to rehabilitate 200,000 individuals a year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I cannot stand idly by when someone pays tribute to the abilities and achievements of the Senator from Alabama. I regret that it has not been my privilege to serve on a committee with the Senator from Alabama, but as he knows, I have often gone to him for advice and counsel. It may very well be that I have gotten as far as I have because I have received such good advice and counsel from him on many occasions.

Mr. President, much as I respect the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], I would not wish any member on the Republican side of the aisle to get ahead of the Democrats in expressing our affection and admiration for the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I must say that praise from Caesar is praise, indeed, when such kind words come from the Senator from Louisiana. It is most heart warming and gratifying to me.

Any good work that I may have accomplished has been achieved as a result of the fine help and wonderful and most effective support given me by such dedicated Senators as the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I am most grateful to him for it.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, let me add that being a conferee is one of the most exciting experiences I can think of. I have observed the great influence that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] possesses in the conference committee. I went to the meeting expecting a long discussion, but with the great charm, ability, foresight, and inspiration displayed by the Senator from Alabama, the conference consumed much less time than I anticipated.

The conference report is now before the Senate, and I am very pleased to have been a part of it. Particularly I am delighted that the 75 percent—of which the distinguished Senator knows my great interest—was accepted in conference.

Mr. HILL. That is because I had the very fine help of the Senator from California, who contributed so much to the success of the conference.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1966—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. **PASTORE**. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11588) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. **PASTORE**. Mr. President, the total of the bill, as arrived at in conference, is $4,741,644,602; this is $125,603,500 less than the Senate version of the bill; $527,214,992 over the House version of the bill; and $229,559,250 under the budget estimates considered by the Senate.

Briefly, I will describe by chapter where material changes from the Senate version of the bill have occurred.

Chapter I, agriculture items: The conferees agreed to $20 million for rural water and waste disposal systems, a reduction of $10 million from the amount provided in the Senate version of the bill.

I remind Senators this was the item which was discussed yesterday and in which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] was interested. Senators will recall that the amount proposed by the Senate was $30 million. We have now agreed on $20 million. I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. While he is not completely satisfied, he believes he can live with it.

Chapter IV, independent offices: The House conferees prevailed and the rent supplement program appropriation and annual contract authorization for grants were stricken from the Senate version of the bill.

We have written in the conference report the feeling of the conferees that once the planning and development of this program has been set in motion and we have provided the money for it—because the amount of $450,000 suggested by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts was sustained—the officials will come to Congress in the early part of next year and lay their plans before Congress so we can consider the question of rent subsidies. We tried to maintain the position of the Senate, but we ran up against a stone wall. I personally am not satisfied with it.

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **PASTORE**. I yield.

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Our distinguished friend and colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has had to leave the Capitol for an important commitment in his home State. The Senator from New York is vitally interested in the study now under discussion by the able manager of the bill. The Senator from New York has prepared a statement which he asked me to read and which at its conclusion contains a question which he would very much appreciate having my able friend the floor manager of the bill answer. I read this statement of our friend, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]:

> I think it is shocking that after successive votes in the Senate and House, including direct votes yesterday in the Senate by 37–45 and 37–41 on this supplemental appropriation sustaining the rent supplement program, and denying a cut in funds, the House conferees and the House have now turned it down as a going program and left it only for study. It is a grave disservice to the cause of housing for which so many have fought, including a most eminent Republican, Robert A. Taft, and it must be corrected. I will join with the manager of the bill, Senator PASTORE, in the fight to get this program underway with substantive appropriations come January. And I now would like to ask the Senator this question: Will the Senator ask the administration to get ready with its definitive program and develop its regulations in time for January presentation in the first supplemental appropriation after the first of January so that the matter may again be pressed effectively when we do not face the adjournment deadline and the urgency or so many other appropriations contained in the bill now before us?

Mr. **PASTORE**. In answering the question, let me read what the conferees did:

> Amendment No. 7: Deletes proposal of the Senate to provide $12 million contract authorization for rent supplement contracts and appropriate $360,000 for liquidation of such contracts during the current fiscal year. Funds for rent supplements are denied at this time without prejudice—

That last phrase is important—

> Congress has only recently authorized legislation for this program and the new Department should have more time to develop sound plans and criteria which can be reviewed when funds are sought early next year.

I emphasize the word "early."

In answering the question of the distinguished Senator from California, I would hope that the Federal agency will get busy because the money has been provided for this to work out their plans, to work out their criteria, and their development, and make it their responsibility to come back in the first supplemental, even if it has to be one supplemental, not only for this, but the Teacher Corps, which was denied. We would consider those in January 1966.

> These should contemplate that Federal assistance will be used only to implement workable programs developed by communities, or in the absence of this, official plans of community development. Funds used in this way will assist communities for orderly development, consistent with underlying purposes of all housing assistance by the Government.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from California that I was somewhat disappointed in this matter, but we ran up against a stone wall. We were reminded time and time again of the action taken by the House in eliminating $6 million.

I said on the floor yesterday this bill suffered from the fact that it was not properly explained to the Congress in my opinion.

There was some confusion that might have resulted from the fact that it was just enacted into law.

I am hopeful that in January of 1966 we will have before us some tangible evidence from the agency that is interested in this so that we can get on the job and do something about this situation that needs to be improved, ameliorated, and cured.

Mr. **KUCHEL**. On behalf of the Senator from New York, I thank the Senator for answering that question, because the able Senator knows the views of the Senator from New York on this subject are not the views of either Senator from California.

The Senator from New York has one more question and that is all:

> Also, I am deeply disappointed that the very small amount of $100,000 to study what might be done to improve housing located near airports to deal with noise abatement has been stricken. I ask the manager of the conference report this question: Will he regard with sympathy a new effort to obtain this study authorized under section 1113 of the Housing Act either from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or another appropriate agency in the first supplemental after January 1 in view of the urgent need faced in so many parts of the country by city dwellers living near airports?

Mr. **PASTORE**. I pledge on my honor not only to approach it with sympathy, but with "vigah."

Mr. **SALTONSTALL**. In answer to the question posed by the Senator from California on behalf of the Senator from New York, the Senate yielded on the $100,000 item for two reasons. The House felt strongly the work should be done by the FAA rather than the Housing Commission. Secondly, the FAA had the money to do it. The House stood strongly on that. That is the reason the $100,000 was eliminated.

Mr. **PASTORE**. Regardless, I believe the work should be done. I have an interest in this. I live 5 miles from an airport. I know of every airplane that goes up and every airplane that comes down.

Mr. **KUCHEL**. I thank the able Senator from Rhode Island and the able Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. **SALTONSTALL**. We are in accord that the work should be done.

Mr. **YARBOROUGH**. I desire to commend the conferees and the able chairman for their successful holding in this bill the $160 million of the $173 million placed in it by the Senate to implement the Higher Education Act of 1965. This is a vital education act. It is one of the most vital in the history of the country.

And yet, of seven notable titles, five began new programs. They have money in this bill for five of the seven programs. They could not get the others, but this bill only passed in the last 48 hours and the House had no money for any of these programs.

I believe that our conferees did a tremendous job by having beginning money for the program. I commend the conferees. They are a credit to the Senate.

The $160 million was retained in the bill to begin most of the programs authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965. It is regrettable that money could not be obtained to begin two of the seven programs authorized. But the higher education bill only passed this last 2 days, and all the moneys in the bill to begin the implementation were placed in the bill by the Senate.

The supplemental appropriations bill contains $125,000 for planning the manner and extent of U.S. Government participation in the HemisFair 1968 exposition in San Antonio. I am hopeful that the Commerce Department will take full advantage of this opportunity and appoint a gifted architect to design an exciting Federal pavilion for this event. Some memorable advances have come from buildings designed for fairs, such as the Crystal Palace built for the exposition held in London in the middle of the 19th century and the German pavilion designed by Mies van de Rohe for an exposition held in Europe during the 1920's. The theme of HemisFair—"The confluence of civilizations"—affords a wonderful opportunity for new departures in architecture.

The conferees also retained the $15 million appropriation for title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965. This amount will allow the program to get started. As the sponsor of title VI, with Senators CLARK, LONG of Missouri, MORSE, PROUTY, MCCARTHY, and RANDOLPH as cosponsors, I wish to thank the conferees for keeping this item in the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. It is a personal disappointment to me that the item for the Teachers' Corps was deleted. They said they wanted more time because they were not familiar with it.

Here again, I am hopeful that the administration will send up the Teachers' Corps fund request on the first supplemental bill and do it quickly in January for this is one of the jewels of President Johnson's program.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. There is one matter that was before our committee and the House committee. There were no funds in the bill, and that is a matter of distress for the people who find themselves living around air bases and military installations.

The provision we have written into the law for the relief of this problem with the FHA or VA mortgages provides for a year's moratorium.

I know that in the discussion of the bill the Senator from Rhode Island said earlier we would try to get money for that in the supplemental next year.

People have gone for relief to the FHA and VA by the hundreds and they have been told there was no law and they turned them away.

I placed in the RECORD yesterday a report by officials in Amarillo and the people there who described their plight.

That is the beginning of the evidence. We will have more when the time comes.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator for the contribution.

I will continue. Chapter VI—Health, Education, and Welfare items—the House conferees prevailed and the action taken provides $25 million for grants for maternal and child welfare instead of the $10 million in the Senate version. This was an increase on the part of the House. I subscribe to it.

The Senate conferees were able to hold $160 million of the $173,200,000 in the Senate version of the bill for higher educational activities which has been referred to by the distinguished Senator from Texas in the version of the bill for higher education activities.

In chapter VII, providing for legislative items, the Senate conferees have accepted the provision of $300,000 for the extension of the west central front of the Capitol.

Chapter VIII—public works—the Senate conferees were able to hold $900,000 of $1,950,000 for Corps of Engineers projects—planning money—for Maine and West Virginia.

Now, I am honored to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank the able chairman of the committee. I also wish to express my deep gratitude to my Senate colleagues who supported my efforts for funds for the Dickey project in the conference this morning, and my gratitude to those Members of the House who voted for those funds today.

I shall always remember their kindness in the touch-and-go crucial hours of today and their individual contribution to a victory that was hard earned and over the sturdiest kind of opposition and by a razor thin edge in the House.

I thank the able chairman of the committee.

Mr. PASTORE. The usual graciousness of the distinguished lady from Maine is exceeded only by her generosity to the Senator from Rhode Island.

That concludes my statement.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am advised that the amount appropriated by the Senate for the rural water and waste disposal program was reduced from $30 to $20 million. Was any division made of that $20 million, as to how much would be available for planning and how much for construction grants?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not recall that that was discussed in conference, but I suppose that it is pretty well analyzed in the authorization. While it can be said that the amount was reduced from $30 to $20 million, it was actually increased by $3 million over the Budget estimate.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true; but the Budget vigorously opposed the entire program until it was brought into line by higher authority. It was to be expected that they would not want a program to work when they opposed it at the very start.

Mr. PASTORE. The conference report provides:

> Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $20 million for "Regular water and waste disposal plants" instead of $30 million as proposed by the Senate. The conferees call on the Secretary to establish firm guidelines, standards, rules, and regulations to assure fair and proper administration of this program and to provide maximum protection to the department and the public interest in the use of the funds provided.

Mr. AIKEN. That is a rather reckless statement.

Mr. PASTORE. It sounds like the 11th commandment.

Mr. AIKEN. I think so. Did the Senator discern any inclination on the part of the conferees to refuse to appropriate sufficient funds, provided that the program is not able to work under the amount which has been provided?

Mr. PASTORE. I could not answer the question categorically, because it was not discussed. I am one of the sponsors of the proposed legislation.

Mr. AIKEN. I know.

Mr. PASTORE. Together with many other Members of the Senate, I believe in it. It is a good program. I do not believe the Senator from Vermont will have any trouble in the future getting whatever money is necessary to carry out his project to its fulfillment.

Mr. AIKEN. As usual, the Senator from Rhode Island is reassuring. I hope that the one applicant from Rhode Island will receive its proper amount.

Mr. PASTORE. If the Senator from Vermont is scarred in this crusade, the Senator from Rhode Island will go down dying.

Mr. AIKEN. I would not ask the Senator to do that much, but I appreciate the offer.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The House conferees were just as enthusiastic as were the Senate members, but were bothered by the fact that the amount was above the budget request.

Mr. President, I ask for the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I deeply appreciate what the Senator from Rhode Island has done to aid the victims of Hurricane Betsy. He has done a magnificent job in the effort to retain the amount.

I did not want the opportunity to pass without expressing my appreciation and the gratitude of all the people of Louisiana for the fine work of the Senator from Rhode Island and his Republican colleague, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and all the other members of the Senate conferees.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. On behalf of the 10½ million people in my State, I congratulate the conferees for keeping in the bill funds for the HemisFair of the Americas, to be held in San Antonio in 1968. The House bill did not provide money for this project; the Senate provided funds for it. I am deeply grateful to him, as are all the people of my State.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 11588, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
October 21, 1965.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 29, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 48, 55, 56, 60, 62, 63, 70, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, and 89 to the bill (H.R. 11588) entitled "An Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes", and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert "$26,975,000, to remain available until expended".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$1,600,000" named in said amendment, insert "$1,000,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "$173,200,000" named in said amendment, insert "$160,000,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert "not more than $10,000,000 to carry out the purposes of section 205(d) of title II, in the discretion of the Director, and".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$900,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$35,000,000".

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14, 18, 30, 53, 66, and 85.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the budget estimates, the House and Senate allowances, and the amounts agreed to in conference for each item in the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of H.R. 11588, the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1966

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Version of bill		Conference action
			House	Senate	
	TITLE I				
	CHAPTER I				
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
	SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE				
278	Watershed protection	$171,000	$140,000	$140,000	$140,000
	CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE				
278	Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs (meat inspection)	2,600,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
	OFFICE OF INFORMATION				
	Salaries and expenses			200,000	200,000
	FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION				
278	Rural housing insurance fund	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000
S. 62	Rural water and waste disposal systems	17,000,000		30,000,000	20,000,000
278	Salaries and expenses	4,000,000	3,000,000	5,000,000	4,500,000
S. 62	Salaries and expenses	1,500,000			
	Total, Chapter I	125,271,000	105,140,000	137,340,000	126,840,000
	CHAPTER II				
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
	FEDERAL FUNDS				
291	Loans to District of Columbia	*(3,000,000)*	*(2,000,000)*	*(2,000,000)*	*(2,000,000)*
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS				
278	Operating expenses:				
	General operating expenses	(34,472)	*(34,472)*	*(34,472)*	*(34,472)*
278	Settlement of claims and suits	(33,414)	*(33,414)*	*(33,414)*	*(33,414)*
291	Capital outlay	(3,000,000)	*(2,000,000)*	*(2,000,000)*	*(2,000,000)*
	Total, Chapter II	*(3,067,886)*	*(2,067,886)*	*(2,067,886)*	*2,067,886)*
	CHAPTER III				
	FOREIGN OPERATIONS				
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
	WELFARE ADMINISTRATION				
298	Assistance to refugees in the United States	12,600,000	12,600,000	12,600,000	12,600,000
	CHAPTER IV				
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
	CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD				
S. 62	Salaries and expenses	125,000		125,000	125,000
	CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION				
278	Salaries and expenses	3,330,000	2,200,000	2,030,000	2,200,000

Summary of H.R. 11588, the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1966—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Version of bill		Conference action
			House	Senate	
	CHAPTER IV—Continued				
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued				
	FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY				
261	Civil supersonic aircraft development	$140,000,000	$140,000,000	$140,000,000	$140,000,000
	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION				
278	Sites and expenses, public buildings projects	901,000	901,000	901,000	901,000
278	Construction, public buildings projects	14,763,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
278	Salaries and expenses, automatic data processing coordination	450,000		450,000	200,000
278	Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service	3,510,000	3,510,000	3,510,000	3,510,000
	HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY				
278	Rent supplement program:				
	Annual contract authorization for grants	*(30,000,000)*		*(12,000,000)*	
	Appropriation for rent payments	900,000		360,000	
278	Grants for basic water and sewer facilities	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000
278	Grants to aid advance acquisition of land	10,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
278	Public works planning fund (reconsideration)	*(5,000,000)*	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
278	Housing for the elderly fund	50,000,000	35,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
	Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses	*(125,000)*	*(25,000)*	*(125,000)*	*(125,000)*
278	Urban Renewal Administration:				
	Grants, fiscal year 1966	675,570,000	675,520,000	675,570,000	675,570,000
	Grants, fiscal year 1967	725,000,000	725,000,000	725,000,000	725,000,000
	Administrative expenses	*(570,000)*	*(520,000)*	*(570,000)*	*(570,000)*
278	Urban planning grants (reconsideration)	*(16,325,000)*	6,325,000	10,000,000	8,162,000
278	Open space land grants	15,125,000	26,975,000	36,000,000	26,975,000
	Reconsideration	*(37,800,000)*			
	Administrative expenses limitation	*(125,000)*	*(125,000)*	*(125,000)*	*(125,000)*
278	Rehabilitation loan fund	*(190,000)*		*(190,000)*	
278	Grants for neighborhood facilities	25,000,000	9,000,000	15,000,000	12,000,000
	Office of the Administrator:				
278	Salaries and expenses	3,605,000	1,971,500	2,500,000	2,185,000
278	Limitation on nonadministrative expenses	*(175,000)*	*(175,000)*	*(175,000)*	*(175,000)*
S. 62	Natural disaster study	1,600,000		1,600,000	1,000,000
	Federal Housing Administration:				
278	Administrative expenses, rent supplement program	850,000	170,000	450,000	450,000
278	Mortgage relief fund	500,000			
278	Limitation on nonadministrative expenses	*(1,430,000)*	*(1,000,000)*	*(1,200,000)*	*(1,000,000)*
	Public Housing Administration:				
278	Administrative expenses	1,100,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
	INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION				
278	Salaries and expenses	185,000		185,000	
	VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION				
278	Mortgage relief fund	500,000			
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE				
	CIVIL DEFENSE				
278	Operation and maintenance:				
	Allocation to States	*(3,375,000)*	*(3,375,000)*	*(3,375,000)*	*(3,375,000)*
	Management expenses	*(750,000)*	*(750,000)*	*(750,000)*	*(750,000)*
	Total, Chapter IV	1,773,014,000	1,738,372,500	1,776,081,000	1,760,078,000
	CHAPTER V				
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
	BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT				
	Construction and maintenance			4,500	
278	Oregon and California grant lands	8,320,000	6,320,000	6,320,000	6,320,000
	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS				
S. 62	Construction	638,000		638,000	638,000
	BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE				
278	Construction	10,791,000	10,500,000	11,347,000	11,222,000
S. 62	Construction	500,000			
	BUREAU OF MINES				
S. 62	Solid waste disposal	2,100,000		1,400,000	1,400,000
	OFFICE OF SALINE WATER				
278	Construction	512,000	Language	Language	Language
	OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH				
	Salaries and expenses			1,000,000	500,000
	RELATED AGENCIES				
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
	FOREST SERVICE				
	Forest protection and utilization:				
	Forest research			75,000	75,000
278	Forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization)	23,500,000	22,500,000	22,500,000	22,500,000
	COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF PUERTO RICO				
278	Salaries and expenses	215,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
	PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION				
	Salaries and expenses (reconsideration)	*(1,000,000)*	750,000	750,000	750,000

Summary of H.R. 11588, the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1966—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Version of bill		Conference action
			House	Senate	
	CHAPTER V—Con.				
	NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY				
291	Salaries and expenses	$500,000	$425,000	$425,000	$425,000
291	Construction, rapid rail transit system	5,679,000	3,679,000	3,679,000	3,679,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
	PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE				
	Construction of Indian health facilities			146,000	146,000
	OFFICE OF EDUCATION				
295	Arts and humanities educational activities	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES				
295	Salaries and expenses	17,910,000	10,700,000	10,700,000	10,700,000
	NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS				
278	Salaries and expenses	100,000			
	HISTORICAL AND MEMORIAL COMMISSIONS				
	Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission		20,000	20,000	20,000
	Total, Chapter V	71,765,000	56,094,000	60,204,500	59,575,000
	CHAPTER VI				
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR				
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY				
S. 62	Federal contract compliance program	464,000		444,000	444,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
	FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION				
278	Salaries and expenses	2,727,000	2,727,000	2,727,000	2,727,000
278	Revolving fund for certification and other expenses	Language	Language	Language	Language
	OFFICE OF EDUCATION				
S. 62	Expansion and improvement of vocational education	3,500,000			
278	Educational improvements for the handicapped	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
S. 65	Higher educational activities	274,000,000		173,200,000	160,000,000
S. 65	Salaries and expenses	3,600,000		2,935,000	2,935,000
	VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION				
S. 63	Grants to States	8,310,000		8,310,000	8,310,000
S. 63	Research and training	1,000,000		1,000,000	1,000,000
S. 63	Grants for correctional rehabilitation study	560,000		560,000	560,000
S. 63	Salaries and expenses	690,000		390,000	390,000
	PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE				
278	Chronic diseases and health of the aged	2,835,000	2,835,000	2,835,000	2,835,000
278	Communicable disease activities: (Request for reconsideration)	(8,000,000)	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
278	Community health practice and research	9,000,000	12,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000
S. 62	Community health practice and research	23,246,000			
S. 62	Air pollution	625,000		625,000	625,000
S. 62	Environmental engineering and sanitation	6,525,000		4,000,000	4,000,000
S. 62	Water supply and water pollution control	628,000		628,000	628,000
S. 62	Grants for waste treatment works construction	50,000,000		50,000,000	50,000,000
S. 62	Foreign quarantine activities	125,000		125,000	125,000
278	National Institute of Mental Health	19,700,000	19,700,000	20,200,000	20,200,000
S. 62	Regional medical programs	25,000,000		25,000,000	25,000,000
	SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION				
278	Salaries and expenses (limitation)	*(125,212,000)*	*(125,212,000)*	*(125,212,000)*	*(125,212,000)*
278	Limitation on construction	(3,188,000)	*(3,188,000)*	*(3,188,000)*	*(3,188,000)*
	WELFARE ADMINISTRATION				
278	Grants to States for public assistance	222,000,000	222,000,000	222,000,000	222,000,000
S. 62	Assistance for repatriated United States nationals	120,000		120,000	120,000
278	Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Family Services	1,300,000	867,000	867,000	867,000
278	Grants for maternal and child welfare	25,000,000	25,000,000	10,000,000	25,000,000
278	Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau	346,000	346,000	346,000	346,000
278	Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner	245,000	117,000	117,000	117,000
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY				
278	Salaries and expenses	326,000	163,000	275,000	219,000
278	Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Administration (transfer)	*(250,000)*	*(252,000)*	*(252,000)*	*(252,000)*
278	Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel	88,000	71,000	71,000	71,000
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT				
	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY				
15	Economic Opportunity program	1,500,000,000	1,500,000,000	1,510,000,000	1,500,000,000
	Total, Chapter IV	2,185,960,000	1,797,826,000	2,072,775,000	2,064,519,000

Summary of H.R. 11588, the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1966—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Version of bill		Conference action
			House	Senate	
	CHAPTER VII				
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH				
	SENATE				
	Vice President and Senators:				
	Expense allowance, majority and minority leaders			$2,000	$2,000
	Salaries, officers and employees:				
	Office of the Vice President			30,750	30,750
	Contingent expenses of the Senate:				
278	Miscellaneous items	$135,000		225,000	225,000
	Miscellaneous items (1965)			*(200,000)*	*(200,000)*
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES				
	Gratuities, deceased Members		$60,000	60,000	60,000
	Salaries, officers and employees:				
278	Office of the Clerk	140,840			
278	Office of the Sergeant at Arms	17,000			
278	Office of the Doorkeeper	198,000			
278	Special and minority employees:				
	Minority employees	5,200	5,200	5,200	5,200
	Office of the majority floor leader	1,000			
	Office of the minority floor leader	1,000			
278	Office of the Postmaster	50,000			
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE				
278	Miscellaneous items	1,694,600	3,130,440	3,130,440	3,130,440
278	Telegraph and telephone	480,000	480,000	480,000	480,000
	JOINT ITEMS				
	Capitol Police Board		Language	Language	Language
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL				
	CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS				
278	Extension of the Capitol	300,000	300,000		300,000
278	Senate Office Buildings	405,000		405,000	405,000
	Library buildings and grounds:				
S. 63	Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
	James Madison Memorial Commission		10,000	10,000	10,000
	Total, Chapter VII	3,927,640	4,485,640	4,848,390	5,148,390
	CHAPTER VIII				
	PUBLIC WORKS				
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS				
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY				
	RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL				
	General investigations			30,000	30,000
	Construction, general			1,950,000	900,000
	BUREAU OF RECLAMATION				
S. 62	Construction and rehabilitation	500,000		500,000	500,000
	WATER RESOURCES PLANNING				
278	Salaries and expenses, Water Resources Council	235,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
278	River basin commissions	110,000	110,000	110,000	110,000
	Total, Chapter VIII	845,000	310,000	2,760,000	1,740,000
	CHAPTER IX				
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE				
	ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS				
S. 62	Salaries and expenses	600,000		500,000	500,000
S. 62	Payment to Foreign Service retirement and disability fund	45,000			
	INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS				
S. 63	Facilities for International Pacific Halibut Commission	500,000		500,000	500,000
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE				
	LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION				
295	Law enforcement assistance	9,327,000	7,249,000	7,249,000	7,249,000
	FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM				
295	Buildings and facilities	1,756,000	1,756,000	1,756,000	1,756,000
278	Support of United States prisoners (1965)	*(180,000)*	*(180,000)*	*(180,000)*	*(180,000)*
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
	GENERAL ADMINISTRATION				
290	Salaries and expenses	130,000	50,000	100,000	50,000
	OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS				
278	Salaries and expenses	260,000		165,000	
	BUREAU OF THE CENSUS				
278	Registration and voting statistics	5,955,000	3,750,000	3,750,000	3,750,000
	COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY				
278	Construction of surveying ships	1,687,000	1,687,000	1,687,000	1,687,000

Summary of H.R. 11588, the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1966—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Version of bill		Conference action
			House	Senate	
	CHAPTER IX				
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—continued				
	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION				
290	Development facilities grants	$254,500,000	$203,200,000	$254,500,000	$203,200,000
290	Technical and community assistance	24,450,000	18,125,000	19,325,000	18,125,000
290	Economic development	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000
290	Regional economic planning	9,300,000	6,100,000	6,100,000	6,100,000
	OFFICE OF STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES				
295	Grants and expenses	7,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
	TRANSPORTATION RESERACH				
295	High-speed ground transportation research and development	20,000,000	18,250,000	20,000,000	18,250,000
	HEMISFAIR 1968 EXPOSITION				
S. 62	HemisFair 1968 Exposition	125,000		125,000	125,000
	BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS				
S. 63	Control of outdoor advertising and junkyards	12,000,000		10,000,000	10,000,000
S. 62	Landscaping and scenic enhancement	80,000,000		60,000,000	60,000,000
S. 63	Administrative expenses, highway beautification	750,000		750,000	750,000
S. 63	Highway safety	290,000		290,000	290,000
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT				
	PRESIDENT'S COMMISSIONS ON LAW ENFORCEMENT AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE AND ON CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
278	Salaries and expenses	1,500,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
	SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION				
295	Revolving fund	76,000,000	76,000,000	76,000,000	76,000,000
S. 63	Revolving fund	84,000,000		84,000,000	84,000,000
	Southeast hurricane disaster			70,000,000	35,000,000
	U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY				
278	Salaries and expenses	3,757,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
278	Acquisition and construction of radio facilities	9,604,000	9,604,000	9,604,000	9,604,000
	Total, Chapter IX	708,536,000	458,171,000	668,801,000	649,336,000
	CHAPTER X				
	TREASURY DEPARTMENT				
	BUREAU OF THE MINT				
278	Salaries and expenses	13,877,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
278	Construction of mint facilities	21,300,000	21,300,000	21,300,000	21,300,000
	BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT				
278	Administering the public debt	1,100,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
	POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT				
	(Out of postal funds)				
278	Operations	41,500,000			
	Total, Chapter X	77,777,000	35,300,000	35,300,000	35,300,000
	CHAPTER XI				
283	Claims and judgments	6,130,470	6,130,470	26,508,212	26,508,212
S. 64	Claims and judgments	5,377,742			
	Total, all chapters	4,971,203,852	4,214,429,610	4,867,248,102	4,741,644,602

TABULATION OF ALL APPROPRIATION BILLS HANDLED DURING THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be included at this place in the RECORD a tabulation of all appropriations bills handled during the 1st session of the 89th Congress. Among other things, this table shows that new obligational authority totaling $107,037,566,896 was appropriated during this session. This amount is $2,410,508,000 below the budget estimates submitted to the Senate.

Thus, Mr. President, while this Congress has been referred to as a "rubber-stamp Congress," in the area of appropriations this has not been the case because as indicated in this table, Congress has shaved almost $2.5 billion from the budget estimates submitted by the President.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 1st sess.

[Does not include permanent appropriations.[1] Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Title and bill number	Budget estimates to House	Amount as passed House	Budget estimates to Senate	Amount as passed Senate	Final action	Final action compared with budget estimates to Senate
1965 SUPPLEMENTALS						
Agriculture, CCC (H.J. Res. 234)	$1,742,209,000	$1,600,000,000	$1,742,209,000	$1,600,000,000	$1,600,000,000	−$142,209,000
2d supplemental bill, 1965 (H.R. 7091)	2,226,456,933	2,118,333,083	2,280,251,327	2,257,869,415	2,227,563,977	−52,687,350
Defense (H.J. Res. 447)	700,000,000	700,000,000	700,000,000	700,000,000	700,000,000	
Total, 1965 supplementals	4,668,665,933	4,418,333,083	4,722,460,327	4,557,869,415	4,527,563,977	−194,896,350

See footnotes at end of table.

The appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

[Does not include permanent appropriations.[1] Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Title and bill number	Budget estimates to House	Amount as passed House	Budget estimates to Senate	Amount as passed Senate	Final action	Final action compared with budget estimates to Senate
1966 APPROPRIATIONS						
District of Columbia (H.R. 6453)	($387,467,800)	($356,300,500)	($389,346,800)	($364,358,347)	($360,228,500)	(−$29,118,300)
Federal payment	53,122,000	44,122,000	53,122,000	49,122,000	46,122,000	−7,000,000
Loan authorization	(26,311,900)	(26,311,900)	(26,311,900)	(26,311,900)	(26,311,900)	
Interior (H.R. 6767)	1,240,849,500	1,184,090,300	1,241,549,500	1,230,802,770	1,212,739,070	−28,810,430
Loan authorization	(16,780,000)	(16,000,000)	(16,780,000)	(16,000,000)	(16,000,000)	(−870,000)
Treasury-Post Office (H.R. 7060)	6,708,510,000	6,604,404,000	[2] 7,749,770,000	[2] 7,698,669,000	[2] 7,669,444,000	−80,326,000
Labor-HEW (H.R. 7765)	8,293,814,000	7,964,034,000	8,293,814,000	8,023,101,500	8,011,331,500	−282,482,500
Independent offices (H.R. 7997)	14,531,023,000	14,109,908,000	14,566,023,000	14,299,897,980	14,246,167,800	−319,855,200
Agriculture (H.R. 8370)	5,815,134,000	5,717,832,000	[3] 6,282,634,000	6,713,983,800	6,242,929,500	−39,704,500
Loan authorizations	(787,000,000)	(787,000,000)	(787,000,000)	(852,000,000)	(837,000,000)	(+50,000,000)
State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary (H.R. 8639)	2,167,735,600	2,085,689,900	2,171,935,600	2,052,471,800	2,057,597,150	−114,338,450
Legislative (H.R. 8775)	204,872,222	150,589,107	243,261,617	190,840,167	189,993,297	−53,268,320
Public works (H.R. 9220)	4,373,805,000	4,241,636,500	4,387,616,000	4,327,589,000	4,292,866,500	−94,749,500
Defense (H.R. 9221)	45,272,844,000	45,188,244,000	[4] 46,972,844,000	46,877,063,000	46,887,163,000	−85,681,000
Military construction (H.R. 10323)	2,049,000,000	1,755,495,000	2,049,000,000	1,759,504,000	1,756,635,000	−292,365,000
Labor-HEW supplemental, 1966 (H.R. 10586)	1,553,918,000	1,223,181,500	1,553,918,000	1,407,181,500	1,223,181,500	−330,736,500
Foreign assistance (H.R. 10871)	4,188,923,000	4,001,453,000	4,188,923,000	3,857,188,000	3,932,188,000	−256,735,000
Supplemental, 1966 (H.R. 11588)	4,364,120,110	4,214,429,610	4,971,203,852	4,867,248,102	4,741,644,602	−229,559,250
Total, 1966 bills to date	100,817,670,432	98,485,108,917	104,725,614,569	103,354,662,619	102,510,002,919	−2,215,611,650
Total, all appropriations to date	105,486,336,365	102,903,442,000	109,448,074,896	107,912,532,034	107,037,566,896	−2,410,508,000
Total, loan authorizations	(830,091,900)	(829,311,900)	(839,091,900)	(894,311,900)	(879,311,900)	(+49,220,000)

---

[1] Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about $12,300,000,000 for fiscal year 1966.

[2] Includes $1,035,000,000 supplemental estimate for 1965 (S. Doc. 31).

[3] Includes $500,000,000 additional estimate for 1966 (H. Doc. 307).

[4] Includes $1,700,000,000 additional estimate for 1966 (S. Doc. 45).

TRIBUTE TO EVERARD H. SMITH, CHIEF CLERK OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senate having taken final action on the last appropriation bill of this session of Congress, I now wish to pay tribute to one of the Senate's oldest and most faithful employees. He is Everard H. Smith, the clerk of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, who plans to retire in December after 52 years of service with the committee.

I know of no one who has served the Senate and the committee through the years with greater devotion, greater loyalty, and greater diligence than has Everard.

I feel a special kinship with Everard Smith, because our paths have run along somewhat parallel lines. I had been in the House of Representatives a little more than a year when, on April 1, 1913, Everard was hired by the Senate Appropriations Committee as an assistant clerk. In 1927, when I came to the Senate, my acquaintanceship with Everard ripened into a friendship which I have cherished through the years. In 1938, he succeeded Kennedy Rea as clerk of the committee, in which post he has served ever since.

His 52½ years of service to the Senate exemplify public service in its highest tradition. He never sought the limelight, but he was always there to guide and direct the proper execution of the work at hand. He never presumed upon the prerogatives of the individual Senator, but he was always able to offer sound and constructive advice. He never permitted the exigencies of the moment to alter his sound judgment.

In the more than half a century which Everard served the Senate, he saw and participated in many momentous changes. To detail these would be, to a degree, to write the history of the Senate in the last 50 years. The annual budgetary considerations have changed markedly and have grown a hundredfold over the billion dollar budgets of his early years. He remembers the days when the staff consisted of a chief clerk, an assistant clerk, and a typist. He and Kennedy Rea helped to fashion the budgets which supported the American effort in World War I. During World War II, the committee handled over $450 billion in appropriations. In this tremendous task and for much of that period, Everard and his faithful assistant, Cecil Tolbert, handled these bills by themselves, frequently laboring into the dawning hours of the morning to expedite pressing appropriations. The work completed, he would catch a nap in his office and then be ready for the next day's tasks. He saw the committee grow from 17 members to its present 27. He served under a long line of committee chairmen: Senator Thomas Martin, of Virginia; Francis B. Warren, of Wyoming; Wesley L. Jones, of Washington; Frederick Hale, of Maine; Carter Glass, of Virginia; Kenneth McKellar, of Tennessee; Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire; and the present Speaker. President Truman and President Johnson were members of that committee.

The Senate and the Senate Appropriations Committee owe Everard Smith our most sincere thanks for a job well done. I believe it also appropriate at this time to express our appreciation to his wife whose devotion, loyal support, and unselfishness were, I am sure, a most important factor in his remarkable career. We shall miss Everard when we gather around the table at our hearings and our markups. May the years ahead be as fruitful to him as the past years have been for the committee which he served so well and so faithfully.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as the senior minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee in regard to the splendid service which has been performed by Everard H. Smith, the chief clerk of that committee, who plans to retire shortly.

In terms of service, Everard has established a record as one of our most faithful public servants. His tenure of service, from April of 1913 until the present time, may well be an all-time record of employment with the committee, spanning as it does over half the time the committee has been in existence. I was a junior at Harvard College when Everard first came to work for the Senate Appropriations Committee. When I arrived in the Senate in 1944, he had served my predecessors for 31 years. Since that time—for 21 years—I have been proud to count on Everard as my friend and counselor. No more devoted public official ever served this body.

Woodrow Wilson once epitomized the Everard Smiths of our country. He said:

> There is no question what the roll of honor in America is. The roll of honor consists of the names of men who have squared their conduct by ideals of duty.

I am sure that on that roll of honor the name of Everard Smith will shine forth as the exemplification of the finest tradition of public servant. Everard has never varied, never wavered in his ideals of duty.

He has given of himself without stint throughout his long service. His record of the actual number of hours worked—could it be tabulated—would probably surpass that of any other employee, past and present.

Furthermore, he could always be counted on to provide the factual information on which to base a mature opinion. His advice was much sought after, for he hewed the line to accurate and fair presentation. And he was impartial in his judgment, for he possessed the highest type of integrity. This, in my opinion, is the finest mark of his character.

I wish to thank Everard personally for the assistance and guidance which he has tendered to me in my own work on the committee. Without his help, my own task would have been much more difficult.

In his retirement, it should give Everard a deep sense of gratification to look back over the long years of accomplishment. When he first came to the Senate the committee handled but a small portion of the total budget. There were six appropriation bills: the diplomatic and consular bill, the legislative bill, a sundry civil bill, a fortifications bill, the District of Columbia bill and, of course, a deficiency bill. Everard took part in the process which saw this grow until at the present time nearly all of the funds expended by the Government must be acted on by the committee which he has served so well. On his shoulders, more than on any others, through two world wars and the Korean war fell the burden of keeping the books straight. If he ever made a mistake, no one ever knew it. In contrast, the staff today is considerably larger than it was during much of this period. Many of the staff members he trained. He has a worthy successor in Tom Scott.

I am sure that all of the Members of the Senate join me today in wishing Everard the happiness he deserves in his retirement. He has left an enviable record of which he can justly be proud. It will be difficult to emulate.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with all that has been said by the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Massachusetts about Everard Smith.

At this time, also, I wish to pay tribute to all the members of the staff of the Committee on Appropriations, particularly those who have assisted me—and I believe that includes the entire staff of the Committee on Appropriations—during the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill. I know of no staff that is more dedicated, more efficient, or more conscientious than the staff of the Committee on Appropriations. I am happy to have the opportunity to salute them, to commend them, and to thank them for their cooperation.

INCREASES IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 168) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the conferees on the part of the Senate have reluctantly agreed to the deletion from the final recommended version of the bill, H.R. 168, of the so-called Curtis amendment which sought to give favorable action to a group of veterans and widows who are receiving both pension and social security benefits. The Senate conferees acted on the firm assurance given them by the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives that the entire question of income limitations of non-service-connected pensions would be looked into carefully early in the second session of the 89th Congress.

While the Senate conferees were reluctant to accede to the House position, when advised that the sponsors of the proposal in the Senate have told representatives of the veterans' organizations that they do not wish to impede the progress of this increase in the basic rates of service-connected compensation, the conferees believe that this factor should be taken into consideration in relation to their position.

The House conferees made the point that while there were approximately 30,000 people affected by the Curtis amendment that 98 percent of the rest of veteran pensioners, both veterans and widows, would and could be adversely affected because this amendment would give preferential treatment forever to these 30,000 individuals, while ignoring the possibility of increased retirement in the Federal civil service system as well as State, municipal, county and private retirement systems which this amendment would in no way affect.

Mr. President, I think the Senate conferees took the correct course of action under the circumstances, though as I have indicated it was done with great reluctance. However, when the entire picture is considered of removing any possible action which would jeopardize the passage of this important increase for our service-connected veterans, I think all reasonable men would agree that this was the correct and positive course of action to take.

The conferees also agreed to the inclusion of the 125,000 hospital bed ceiling, plus an additional 4,000 beds for nursing home beds and the so-called malpractice section. These two actions were taken with the acquiescence of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of Labor and Public Welfare, under whose jurisdiction this matter rightly falls.

The House accepted certain technical amendments which had been made by the Senate in connection with the funds for nursing homes to be constructed in certain States.

The conferees have also accepted the section relating to veterans' preference. This, again, upon the strong insistence of the House managers.

These two actions were taken with the acquiescence of the Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, through the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] under whose jurisdiction this matter really falls.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has said, these two matters were properly before the subcommittee. But we yielded our jurisdiction in order to get the bill because the veterans needed the increase and we rendered every possible assistance in order to help bring this bill to the floor.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. The main thing we wanted was to obtain for the disabled veterans—who had had no increase in their payments since 1957, I believe—an increase to help them meet the increased cost of living. The cost of living has risen since 1957, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics by 10.3 percent. This is a 10-percent increase to offset that. I thank the distinguished acting chairman here today on the floor, the Senator in charge of the bill, and the leader of the Senate conferees, the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, for the remarkable job he did in getting the bill out of a tough conference in the closing days of this session, so that these disabled veterans can get this increase to help themselves because of the terrible financial shape they find themselves in because of the increased cost of living.

Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation for the prompt action of the conference committee in bringing back to the Senate H.R. 168 and congratulate this body for its favorable consideration now of this most significant measure. H.R. 168 as adopted in the conference provides a well-deserved increase in the basic rates of monthy compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities. The increase of approximately 10 percent in the rates of service-connected disability compensation payable to wartime and peacetime veterans, including the 10-percent increase in the additional allowances payable where the veteran is 50 percent or more disabled and has a wife, child, or dependent parent is long overdue. The last cost-of-living increase in compensation rates was in 1962, while the most recent increase in dependency allowances occurred in 1957. It is high time that the Congress provided for an overall average increase in compensation rates to offset the 2.5-percent advance in the cost of living since 1962 and the 10.3-percent jump in that same cost since 1957.

The bill reported to the Senate provides increases in compensation payments for all percentage ratings of disability from 10 percent through 100 percent. This allowance, which was last raised in 1957, is usually paid on behalf of a child up to the time that that child reaches the age of 18 years. Furthermore, the more seriously disabled veterans who suffer from multiple amputations or loss of use of more than one extremity or blindness will receive an increase in their statutory award. In the final analysis, nearly 2 million service-disabled veterans will share in monthly compensation increases ranging from $1 for a 10-percent disability to $50 for a 100-percent disability.

An approximate 10-percent increase in the allowances for dependents, payable to veterans who are at least 50-percent disabled, is also provided by this measure. This allowance, which was last raised in 1957, is usually paid on behalf of a child up to the time that that child reaches the age of 18 years. If the child is attending school the allowance is continued until he reaches 21 years of age. Section 2 of H.R. 168 extends the age limit to 23 years of age for a child who is attending school. At the same time, this section increases the monthly payment on behalf of the school child to $40 in the case of a totally disabled veteran, with proportionate increases for disabilities rated at 50 percent through 90 percent. This provision provides a needed stimulus to keep the children of seriously disabled veterans in school and off of the dangerously expanding "dropout" lists and unemployment rolls.

Mr. President, as the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Veteran's Affairs I have had a keen interest and concern in the progress of this compensation legislation. The increases in compensation rates provided in H.R. 168 are necessary, they are just, and they are fair. It is with great pride that I support this bill which in reality offers but a compensatory pittance to those dedicated Americans who have bartered their health and their economic well-being so that freedom might be preserved for future generations.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, no Senator or Representative has worked more diligently or has had the interest of the veterans more at heart than does the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. The Senator from Texas is fast acquiring a nationwide reputation for the fight he is making and has made for veterans.

The other day a taxicab driver asked me: "Do you know Senator YARBOROUGH?" I said, "Yes. I am happy to say that I do." He said: "Why don't these House fellows get on the ball and pass Senator YARBOROUGH's cold war GI bill?"

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I agree with the taxicab driver. We have made a remarkable record in this Congress. It is an outrage that we are about to adjourn with the cold war GI bill languishing in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, where it has been for many months.

We have more than 100,000 men in Vietnam. Some are being killed, and some are being wounded. Some will be mentally injured thereafter, as our experience in the past has shown.

These veterans will return after an average of 2.5 years and have no opportunity to catch up with the other young men. Only 40 percent of the men serve; 60 percent are getting ahead in education and in business.

It is an outrage that these men are treated in this way. The administration should have been down here plugging for that bill. We did not hear one word from the executive department of the Government. We did not hear the executive department saying: "Pass the bill." There was not one telephone call. The Bureau of the Budget fought the bill. I think it is to their everlasting shame and their disgrace that they did so.

I thank the Senator for his words.

It is an outrage that the bill has not been enacted into law, and it falls upon the conscience of those who stopped the passage of the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe that they slow-walked the Senator's bill. I think that later the administration will be for it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. They fought it. They testified against it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am disappointed that the House did not accept my amendment to H.R. 168 because I feel very strongly that America's veterans should not be penalized in a sort of "kill them with kindness" maneuver by the Congress of the United States.

However, I do not wish to stand in the way of the increases in disability compensation rates provided by H.R. 168, and for this reason have not resisted the House action.

I am gratified by the assurance given by the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, that the entire question of income limitations on non-service-connected pensions will be given careful scrutiny by his very able committee early next year.

It is my belief, Mr. President, that steps should be taken to correct an inequitable situation created for some veterans when Congress this year increased social security benefits. My amendment which was accepted by the Finance Committee and by the Senate in approving H.R. 168, would have dealt with this problem.

Some veterans who are receiving pensions from the Veterans Administration have had their pension checks reduced as a result of the larger social security payments approved by Congress this year. A Nebraskan wrote to me just this week saying that effective October 1, his monthly veteran's pension check has been cut from $80 to $48, because he now is receiving a larger social security payment under the terms of the 1965 act. On a yearly basis, this veteran told me, he will receive $84 more in social security, but he will lose $384 from his veteran's pension.

Veterans' pensions for non-service-connected disability are geared to the other income received by veterans and their dependents, including social security benefits. My amendment would have prevented the 1965 increase in social security payments from being included in determining income of these affected veterans. Adoption of this amendment would have protected these veterans and their dependents from gaining on the one hand but losing even more on the other. That is what I meant by saying the Congress is guilty of "killing them with kindness."

Mr. President, I believe this inequity should be corrected, but not at the expense of jeopardizing a needed increase in disability compensation rates as provided by H.R. 168. I am very hopeful that the pledged study by the House committee next year will lead to a satisfactory and equitable solution to this problem.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska offered the amendment to which the committee agreed. I do not believe a single member voted against it. The House conferees were adamant in their position. They said that while there were approximately 30,000 people affected by the amendment, 98 percent of the rest of the veteran pensioners, both veterans and widows, would and could be adversely affected because this amendment would give preferential treatment forever to 30,000 individuals, while ignoring the possibility of increased retirement in the Federal civil service system, as well as State, municipal, county, and private retirement systems which this amendment would in no way affect.

We tried diligently to have the House conferees agree to our position, but we were unable to do so. The House conferees were adamant.

I digress to state from the Senate point of view that we did not accept the amendment on social security because there could have been the possibility of persuading the conferees appointed from the House Ways and Means Committee to accept the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate have a brief period for the transaction of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there morning business?

AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE AIDS IN GOOD INVESTMENT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the American Enterprise Institute of Washington, D.C., has just published its handbook for the current national intercollegiate debates entitled "Crime and Law Enforcement."

Most of us in the Senate share a great concern that the crime problem has become one of our Nation's most serious and pressing domestic concerns. I have already expressed my deep belief that the alarming rapid rise in crime demands that we mobilize all the Nation's resources to combat this scourge on every front. It is, therefore, timely and appropriate that the sponsors of the national intercollegiate debates have selected as the topic to be argued by the young men and women of our universities and colleges this year the proposition, "Resolved: That Law Enforcement Agencies Should Be Given Greater Freedom in the Investigation and Prosecution of Crime."

The AEI debate handbook is designed to serve as a guide to start the student's research but, more importantly, it is intended to stimulate the individual to explore and consider all the varied implications connected with the critical question of crime and law enforcement. Such encouragement of thoughtful consideration of today's major public policy issues by our young people does much to create an informed and interested generation, essential for the future welfare of our Nation.

The handbook is another example of AEI's public service of the same high quality as the legislative analyses series which AEI offers to all Members of Congress to assist us in our study of important legislative issues.

Over the years I have found the AEI legislative analyses to be concise, scrupulously balanced and factual analyses of the significant legislative measures pending before us. I know that the analyses have been of immeasurable assistance to me in my deliberations. I commend AEI on the high standards of scholarship and objectivity which it has achieved in this most worthwhile public service.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased that Senator HRUSKA has spoken of the American Enterprise Institute. The publications of this unusual organization have been of considerable assistance to me. I have found their analyses to be objective and reliable, which is no small achievement when analyzing proposed legislation that is almost always controversial.

Last month, AEI sponsored a seminar on the balance of payments. Sixteen eminent international economists from the United States, England, Switzerland, Peru, Brazil, and Canada gave diverse opinions on proposals to solve our intricate, perplexing payments problem. The Institute will publish the proceedings of this seminar. When this book is issued, I am sure we will find another valuable contribution from the academic world toward the solution of another difficult public problem.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I would to join the Senators who are taking a moment this morning to give a word of thanks to the American Enterprise Institute. AEI has been of considerable assistance to me and my staff during my time in Congress. Their analyses of some of the important legislation we have discussed this session have been thorough, factual, and nonpartisan. Their research is a very real contribution to good government.

As a member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, I appreciate the fact that AEI is sponsoring a task force of 13 political scientists who are putting their minds and experience to work on finding methods through which Congress might be strengthened and streamlined. The contributions of men and women from the academic world to our society have been of great worth, in the past, and I am sure that this study will be most helpful to the Organization Committee.

Mr. MONTOYA. The American Enterprise Institute inaugurated this session a new publication that I find an excellent timesaver. It is the new press summary. I am sure there is not a Senator present who has the time to read the number of newspapers that he would like in order to keep informed on varied opinions.

I have found the AEI press summary to be an essential timesaver by providing meaningful excerpts from the daily press. This publication has permitted me and my staff to keep abreast of the thoughts and opinions of our leading journalists on the most important stories of the day.

The format of the press summary provides easy access to news topics. The excerpting techniques are commendable for their thoroughness without being unwieldy.

SOUTH VIETNAM—WHY WE ARE THERE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, many people in my State write about South Vietnam. The net of their interest is more explanation as to why we are there.

Nowhere have I seen those reasons presented more logically than in a recent address by Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance at the annual dinner of the National Security Industrial Association.

I would hope that all people who are interested in preventing a general war, and who look forward to a more peaceful world, would read this short address.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD an article by Neal Stanford in the Christian Science Monitor, "U.S. Intrigued, Peiping Manifesto Studied."

I also ask that the full text of the address of Secretary Vance be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 11, 1965]

PEIPING MANIFESTO STUDIED

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Not one American in a thousand—possibly a million—knows who Lin Piao is.

But currently Marshal Lin is the most discussed, read, and debated individual among the Pentagon's top echelon, by the State Department's policy planners, and in most foreign chancelleries.

Marshal Lin is vice chairman of the central committee of the Chinese Communist Party, vice premier of Communist China, and the Minister of National Defense.

He has suddenly grabbed the Washington spotlight because some weeks ago, on the 20th anniversary of the defeat of Japan, he delivered an 18,000-word manifesto which the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Cyrus R. Vance, says is "no ordinary commemorative article."

In fact, Mr. Vance and his colleagues in the Pentagon, not to mention some in the State Department, in the White House and along Embassy Row, consider Marshal Lin's political document just about the most important thing to come out of Peiping since mainland China's Communist Party boss, Mao Tse-tung, advanced his famous thesis: "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."

INTENTIONS PROBED

This Lin Piao document not only tells what Peiping's intentions are in Asia, in Vietnam, toward the United States, but what its intentions are on the question of the whole expansion of world communism. It is Peiping's "Mein Kampf." It is Peiping's blueprint for world domination for a thousand years.

The Lin Piao manifesto should, say Mr. Vance and others, be "must" reading for all those who wonder what the United States is doing in Vietnam, who appear to have never given any thought to what Peiping is doing in Vietnam, what its ambitions are in south Asia, in Africa, and Latin America.

The Pentagon thinks seriously enough of Marshal Lin's pontifications to have had its No. 2 man, Deputy Secretary Vance, discuss it at length the other night before the cream of the country's industrial and military leaders.

In speaking of the Russian revolution and the Chinese Communist revolution, Marshal Lin says: "The Russian revolution began with armed uprisings in the cities, and then spread to the countryside; while the Chinese revolution won nationwide victory through the encirclement of the cities from the rural areas, and the final capture of the cities." And then he goes on to assert: "The rural areas of the world today are Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The cities of the world are North America and Western Europe."

His thesis, then, is that just as communism in China succeeded by capturing the countryside, and then encircling and defeating the cities, so the global Communist movement will ultimately succeed first by capturing Asia, Africa, and Latin America—thereby encircling North America and Western Europe—and then by finally and decisively defeating the United States and its Western allies.

And where is this to begin, asks Marshal Lin rhetorically?

It has already begun, he says, in Vietnam. Vietnam, he says, is the "focus" of the revolutionary movement against the United States. "The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution," he continues.

And he falls back on another famous Mao Tse-tung thesis to urge on the Vietcong: "The imperialists and all reactionaries are paper tigers."

FIGHTING IN VIETNAM

Marshal Lin, therefore, does not deplore the fighting in Vietnam—he welcomes it. What the Communist world needs, he makes clear, is more of these "wars of national liberation"—"people's wars launched in different parts of the world."

And he winds up his manifesto with this challenge to the United States: "If you want to send troops, go ahead. The more the better. We will annihilate as many as you can send."

That is bold, tough talk.

But, asks Mr. Vance, who is this "we" who are to do the annihilating?

In Vietnam, at least, says Mr. Vance, it is not Peiping that is doing the fighting. It is Hanoi. "Mao is not risking his own troops to achieve his ends. Rather, Hanoi is being used to attempt to prove the validity of Lin Piao's thesis," Mr. Vance points out.

"For the whole point of Mao's doctrine is that Hanoi and the Vietcong should fight on; and they should reject any offers of reasonable settlement or negotiation; that they should be prepared to wage a prolonged and dirty war—whatever its cost in North Vietnamese blood."

It was Gen. Nguyen Giap, the North Vietnamese strategist who defeated the French at Dien Bien Phu, who candidly said recently: "South Vietnam is the model of the national-liberation movement of our time. If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, then it can be defeated anywhere in the world."

If Americans want to know why the United States is fighting in Vietnam, concludes Mr. Vance, they can read President Johnson's repeated explanations—or they can read Mao Tse-Tung, Marshal Lin, and General Giap.

Remarks by Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus R. Vance at the Annual Dinner of the National Security Industrial Association

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to be here, and to participate in your 22d annual dinner.

I deeply appreciate this opportunity to speak before a group so concerned as you are with the security of our country, and so directly involved with the preservation of its strength and freedom.

Exactly 5 weeks ago tonight—in a distant country—a political document appeared.

It was written by the defense minister of the most populous nation on earth.

It was written by Lin Piao, the vice chairman of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party—Vice Premier of Red China, and the Minister of National Defense.

Ostensibly, it is an article commemorating the 20th anniversary of the defeat of Japan in World War II. But that was merely a convenient occasion for its publication. For it is no ordinary commemorative article.

I want to talk to you about that document tonight. For it tells us not only what Peiping's intentions are in Asia—not only what Peiping's intentions are in Vietnam—not only what Peiping's intentions are toward the United States—but what Peiping's plans are for the whole expansion of world communism.

The document begins with a lengthy analysis of the Communist revolution in China.

Lin Piao states bluntly:

> It was on the basis of the lessons derived from the people's wars in China that Comrade Mao Tse-tung, using the simplest and most vivid language, advanced the famous thesis that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." He clearly pointed out: The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war is the central task and highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries.

Lin Piao then goes on to note that the Chinese Communist revolution differed from the Russian revolution in one essential respect. The Russian revolution, he says, "began with armed uprisings in the cities, and then spread to the countryside; while the Chinese revolution won nationwide victory through the encirclement of the cities from the rural areas, and the final capture of the cities."

Now, he comes to his central point. The "rural areas of the world" today, he asserts, are Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The "cities of the world" are North America, and Western Europe.

Just as communism in China, says Lin Piao, succeeded by capturing the countryside; and then encircling and defeating the cities; so the global Communist movement will ultimately succeed first by capturing Asia, Africa, and Latin America—thereby encircling North America and Western Europe—and then by finally and decisively defeating the United States and its Western allies.

Win Asia, Africa, and Latin America through "wars of national liberation," says Lin Piao, and the United States and its Western allies will be surrounded, will be encircled, will be overwhelmed.

And where is all this to begin? he asks.

It has already begun, he replies. And the place in which it has begun is Vietnam.

Vietnam, says Lin Piao, is now the focus of the revolutionary movement against the United States. No matter what action America may take in Vietnam, he adds, the Communist Chinese determination is unshakable to drive the United States out.

But, ladies and gentlemen, it is not Peiping that is fighting in Vietnam; it is Hanoi. Mao is not risking his own troops to achieve his ends. Rather, Hanoi is being used to attempt to prove the validity of his thesis.

For the whole point of Mao's doctrine is that Hanoi and the Vietcong should fight on; that they should reject any offers of reasonable settlement or negotiation; that they should be prepared to wage a prolonged and dirty war—whatever its cost in North Vietnamese blood; whatever its cost in North Vietnamese well-being.

Hanoi might well ponder whether its future is best secured by fully submerging its own separate interest to Peiping. The North Vietnamese people deserve a better future than that.

Meanwhile, the leaders in Hanoi—much to Peiping's pleasure—continue to make a reasonable settlement impossible. They continue their aggression in the south. They continue to infiltrate soldiers, equipment, and supplies across the border. They continue to employ the twin pressures of temptation and terrorism—tempting the peasants to renounce their loyalty to their village leaders in return for hollow promises; and terrorizing them if they refuse.

Ladies and gentlemen, there could be no clearer justification of why we are standing firm in our resolve to help defend the 14 million people of South Vietnam, against Communist aggression and subversion from the north.

What is the U.S. policy there?

Our policy is simple and straightforward. It is not complicated by any doctrinaire theories of world domination.

First, we are determined to keep our commitment to the people of South Vietnam. We are going to continue to assist the South Vietnamese to resist aggression. We are going to continue to make it clear to Hanoi and to Peiping that terrorism, murder, subversion, and infiltration from the north cannot—and will not—succeed.

As President Johnson has pointed out:

"We are * * * there to strengthen world order. Around the globe from Berlin to Thailand are people whose well-being rests in part on the belief that they can count on us if they are attacked. To leave Vietnam to its fate would shake the confidence of all these people in the value of an American commitment and in the value of America's word. The result would be increased unrest and instability, and even wider war."

Second, we are committed to help create a better life for the people of South Vietnam. We are engaged in a major program of economic and social development there, and we want to see it extended to the whole South Asia region, including North Vietnam.

Everything that we do in Vietnam is governed by those simple reasons for being there.

Our goal is a peaceful settlement. We are ready—now—to go to the negotiating table. We lay down no preconditions for such discussions. We seek a cessation of aggression by North Vietnam. We seek a just peace—and we have made that offer clear on many occasions. We seek the withdrawal of all foreign forces—including our own—from South Vietnam once peace has been restored. And we seek a peace that guarantees freedom of choice for the South Vietnamese people.

Our purpose is firm; our patience is long; and our perseverance is unshakable.

But, as both Hanoi and Peiping have pointed out, the issue is larger than merely Vietnam.

General Giap, the North Vietnamese strategist who defeated the French at Dien Bien Phu, has put the matter candidly: "South Vietnam is the model of the national liberation movement of our times. If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, then it can be defeated anywhere in the world."

And—as we have seen—Lin Piao describes the struggle in Vietnam as merely the curtain raiser in the whole global drama of Communist expansionism.

The issue, then, in Vietnam, important as it is, is not the only task facing the United States and its partners in freedom around the world.

It is an essential task. But it is not the total task.

The total task of free men on this planet is to preserve and nurture freedom everywhere that it is growing.

Lin Piao sees a major crisis in human society in the second half of the 20th century; he sees it taking place on the perimeter of the industrialized world—in Asia, in Africa, and in Latin America.

I think we can agree with him on that.

Let us examine why.

We can begin by reminding ourselves that the Communist mind is a curious combination of ideological rigidity—and tactical suppleness.

The Communist mind is, at one and the same time, philosophically closed—and pragmatically open.

In the past half century we have witnessed an imaginative display of aggressive Communist tactics.

The goal has always been the same: political domination. But the path to that goal has often switched direction.

In our own lifetime, Communist tactics have ranged through a broad and brutal spectrum: everything from outright occupation by the Red army in Eastern Europe, through conventional aggression in Korea, to the guerrilla operations in Greece, Malaya, the Philippines, and now in Vietnam.

Communist tactics have sometimes fomented revolutions, and at other times have captured those initiated by others.

Communist tactics have learned to be as much at home with legal means, as with illegal means; with sophisticated societies, as with primitive ones; with rightist dictators, as with leftist demagogs.

Thus, if one surveys the total Communist movement of the past half century, one cannot fail to be struck with a profound bit of irony; that the Communists in their ultimate view of history are almost insufferably dogmatic and doctrinaire. But in their efforts to manipulate that history, they are almost incredibly pragmatic and practical.

What, then, is our answer to the Communist manifesto of Mao Tse-tung, as written by Lin Piao?

First, our answer is that we agree that the focus of the challenge lies, at the moment, in Vietnam.

But the Government of Vietnam and the United States will not be defeated by Communist aggression from the north. We will continue our support of the people of South Vietnam until a just and reasonable settlement is reached—whether by agreement at a conference table or by a cessation of the aggression, as in Malaysia, the Philippines, and Greece.

Second, we agree with Mao that the lands arching across the southern half of the globe—Asia, Africa, and Latin America—are to play a decisive role in the future of humanity.

But we disagree that their role is to be the hapless victims of Communist externally directed so-called wars of national liberation. On the contrary, we believe that these nations desire to remain fully and freely themselves—uncoerced by subversion stage-managed and supplied from without. We believe that these nations desire, with wisdom and dignity, to seek their own national progress in their own national way. And we stand ready to assist them to do precisely that.

Third, we agree that Mao's clear intent is that his brand of communism should eventually surround, encircle, and finally cut off and defeat Western Europe and the United States.

But we disagree that that is going to happen. Our defenses are strong, and we remain alert and ready for whatever the future may bring. But more important is the fact that the free nations of the world offer a better future for the individual, and a peaceful path to that future.

Finally, we agree with Mao that just as there are cities and countryside within nations, so the world at large—in its current uneven rate of technological advance—can be viewed as a series of industrialized centers, surrounded by a less-developed countryside.

But we disagree that the historical process suggests that the global countryside will storm these centers, and put them to the torch of Communist insurgency.

On the contrary, we believe that the historical process will be precisely the reverse; that the industrialized centers—the fortunate nations of the world—will increasingly seek to bring to the countryside—to the poorer nations of the world—the very assistance and skill that will help these nations to close the poverty gap. And the rich nations will do this by measures that will share talents and resources—by measures that will increase the self-confidence and self-reliance of the poorer nations to achieve their own self-sustaining political and economic growth.

In the United States we issue no global manifestos.

But we do indulge in one dream. We do entertain one grand vision. We do look to one great goal.

We are dedicated to continuing the dialog with the rest of the world that began in an obscure hall in Philadelphia on July 4, 1776.

The men in that hall were revolutionaries.

The men in that hall did not believe that true political power can grow out of the barrel of a gun. They believed that true political power can grow only out of the people themselves—for that is precisely where it is: within each individual human being.

Those men did not rant about class struggle. They said bluntly that all men are created equal.

Those men did not theorize about a dictatorship of the proletariat. They proposed something far more explosive than that. They declared that all men had an inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Those men in 1776 fused, primed, and set off a political explosion that has had more ultimate effect on society than all the dictators of history rolled into one.

The fires of that revolution still burn in this country; and the sparks of that revolution still fly, igniting the tinder of human aspiration all over this globe.

One of the greatest challenges to this generation of Americans is to refine the formulas for creating the driving sparks, for cultivating the leadership talent, for unleashing and organizing the earth's bountiful natural resources, for breaking down the out-of-date barriers to progress throughout the world. We have an enormous challenge to perfect the formulas to do all of these things to permit what Lin Piao calls "the countryside" to find their way up the rocky path.

We must meet that challenge. We must offer the more durable stuff of true, creative revolution.

Lin Piao's statement of Communist China's goals for the world is 18,000 words long.

President Johnson has summed up our goals for the world in three simple sentences:

"Our own freedom and growth have never been the final goal of the American dream. We were never meant to be an oasis of liberty and abundance in a worldwide desert of disappointed dreams. Our Nation was created to help strike away the chains of ignorance and misery and tyranny wherever they keep man less than God means him to be."

Ladies and gentlemen, it is for you and me—and all of us on this small, whirling planet—to insure that this forecast will prevail.

CONGRESS LOSES A HELPING HAND

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I note from the RECORD of October 20 that Col. Ralph E. Vandervort, Jr., will retire from the U.S. Army on October 31.

It is with deep regret that I note this action. For the past 6 years I have consulted on many occasions with Colonel Vandervort on problems dealing with the military establishments in South Dakota and in my capacity as a member of the Defense Department Subcommittee on Appropriations. He has always been most cooperative and efficient in the handling of the problems which I have placed in his hands.

His good services are going to be missed by members of the Congress and I am sure the Department of Defense is going to miss this good emissary which represent them on Capitol Hill. Colonel Vandervort has been a good and valued friend and a dedicated public servant. I wish him the best of success in his future endeavors.

THE ADJUTANT GENERAL OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in August 1961, the Senate was asked to confirm the appointment of the then newly appointed Adjutant General of West Virginia, Gene H. Williams, in the grade of brigadier general as a reserve of the Army.

Questions were raised within the Senate and elsewhere at that time as to the qualifications of General Williams for the appointment.

The Senate Armed Services Committee, recognizing that the position of State Adjutant General is an administrative rather than a line assignment, gave its advice and consent that General Williams' appointment be approved. Approval was granted on August 16, 1961.

Against this background of the events surrounding this action by the Senate, I have the honor and the pleasure to report that the confidence expressed by both the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate as a whole in General Williams' character and ability has been more than justified.

In the 4 years since his appointment, General Williams has performed outstanding service in carrying out a major armory construction program, in administering the mobilization of the largest combat force of the West Virginia Army National Guard, and in bringing to fruition a project to greatly improve the training of Army National Guard Special Forces units, nationwide.

Under General Williams' direction, a total of 30 armories and armory-related structures have been completed, greatly increasing the resources available to West Virginia Army and Air National Guard units in achieving greater readiness status.

When President Kennedy found it necessary to mobilize forces in response to Soviet threats against Berlin, in 1961, one of the major units ordered into Federal service was the 150th Armored Cavalry Regiment of the West Virginia Army National Guard. The performance of this organization throughout its year of Federal service reflected creditably upon the soundness of the support and administrative procedures provided by General Williams' office during the transition period from State to Federal status.

General Williams and his staff successfully administered the return of the 150th Armored Cavalry from Federal to State status, and the necessary reconstitution of the regiment following discharge of men whose term of service had expired. Today, the 150th Armored Cavalry has returned to, and exceeded the level of readiness that it held at the time of its mobilization.

Most significant of all, General Williams recognized early the importance of providing extensive and realistic training areas for the special forces units then being expanded to cope with guerrilla and counterguerrilla warfare.

Thanks to his initiative, a State special forces camp, with access to some 600 square miles of ideal training areas is now nearing completion after 4 years of active planning and supervision by General Williams personally, and his staff.

As a result of this outstanding work, not only the West Virginia Army National Guard, but the Special Forces of the entire Active Army, Army National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve, nationwide, will be provided with a training facility ideally suited to the types of terrain in which they possibly may be employed.

In the course of this work, General Williams has taken the time to complete successfully the resident course of instruction at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., meeting all qualifications since established by the Senate Armed

Services Committee for granting of Federal recognition to State adjutants general.

The record made by General Williams in the 4 years since his name came before the Senate gives ample demonstration of the vigor and vitality, not only of the State-administred National Guard system in West Virginia, but of the National Guard system in the Nation as a whole.

I welcome this opportunity to publicly commend General Williams for the diligence, initiative and demonstrated ability that has characterized his administration as the adjutant general of West Virginia, and for the manner in which he has thereby justified the faith placed in him by the Senate.

WEST VIRGINIA STATE COLLEGE STUDENTS SUPPORT U.S. ACTION IN VIETNAM

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement that I have made, relating to and commending the action of 1,800 students at West Virginia State College at Institute, for endorsing the present Vietnam policy in a letter to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

The letter to President Johnson signed by 1,800 West Virginia State College students in support of U.S. policy in Vietnam was a demonstration of civic responsibility which brings honor to their school and our State.

This spontaneous and orderly action by the majority is in sharp contrast to those staged demonstrations by the few students in other schools in other States who were duped and manipulated by what J. Edgar Hoover terms, "trained agents and provocateurs of the Communist Party."

To my knowledge, there have been no such staged anti-Vietnam demonstrations at any West Virginia school or college. Our State can be proud of that fact, too.

I believe in the administration's policy in South Vietnam. I have said this over and over again. We must fight to contain communism on that line in southeast Asia. For if we do not do it there, we will be fighting a war on a broader front and nearer home.

THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, despite the enormous public relations efforts of the Office of Economic Opportunity, I feel that much of the press of our Nation has been very helpful in giving the public an accurate report on the questionable success of this program throughout the country.

If one were to only listen to Office of Economic Opportunity Director Sargent Shriver you would think the administration's entire poverty program was one of complete success, totally free of administrative error or mismanagement.

The public knows only too well this is not the case. For example, the Chicago Tribune has shown exceptional diligence and public service in seeing to it that their pages include not only Sargent Shriver's announcements and pronouncements but also the legitimate and well-founded complaints of mismanagement and poor administration. I think the Tribune should be commended for its efforts. As an example of its thorough reporting on the poverty program, I ask unanimous consent to place an article by Mary Pakenham of the Chicago Tribune of Sunday, September 5, 1965, covering the efforts of Senators Murphy and Prouty to keep politics out of the poverty program by placing key employees under the political prohibitions provided by the Hatch Act.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GOP Fights Political Activity by Poverty Program Workers—Wants Employers To Be Covered by Hatch Act

(By Mary Pakenham)

Washington, September 4.—Senate Republicans are massing for a last-ditch attempt to keep politics out of the program covered by the administration's new antipoverty bill, the Chicago Tribune learned today.

House-Senate conferees agreed Thursday night on a $1,785,000,000 final version of the authorization bill. It is expected to come to a vote in both chambers this week, unless the Senate forces succeed in having it sent back into conference.

The Democratic majority in the conference struck from the bill an amendment extending the 1939 Hatch Act to cover federally paid employees in the Office of Economic Opportunity's community action and domestic Peace Corps programs.

LETTERS FROM MACY

The Hatch Act, entitled "an act to prevent pernicious political activities," forbids partisan political activity on the part of anyone on the public payroll. Tens of thousands of community action programs employees and a growing number of domestic Peace Corps volunteers would have been affected.

At the time the conference committee was considering the amendment it had before it a letter from John W. Macy, Jr., chief of the Civil Service Commission and President Johnson's personal talent scout, urging that Congress allow the antipoverty staff to engage in politics.

Ever since the so-called war on poverty got under way last November, the political potential of workers in these categories has been a key target for critics.

DESIGNED FOR POLITICS

Each such worker is in a position to earn the gratitude of large numbers of the poor and undereducated, dispensing aid under the aegis of the party in power. That, politicians agree, is the stuff good precinct workers are made of.

In many cases, community action programs have been specifically designed to organize residents of given poverty areas into political pressure groups.

Complaints already have been heard from Mississippi and from cities including Syracuse, N.Y., that antipoverty workers taking part in voter registration drives have failed to distinguish between the democratic process and the Democratic party.

HEADED BY POWELL

Senators in the forefront of the effort to combat this situation will include Winston L. Prouty, Republican, of Vermont, and George Murphy, Republican, of California, coauthors of the stricken amendment. Prouty was a member of the conference committee, which was headed by Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Democrat, of New York.

"The Democratic members of the conference committee," Prouty told the Tribune, "struck a blow on behalf of every Democratic ward heeler and political flunky in America when they threw the Murphy-Prouty political activity amendment into the ash can."

Other Republican conferees said they were shocked by what they called undue interference by Macy.

"The commission believes," Macy wrote, "that it would be unwise to extend the general political activity restrictions of the Hatch Act to such a sizable group of persons in the private sector of community life."

"OPENS PANDORA'S BOX"

Murphy said Macy's letter and the conferees' action on the amendment "opened a Pandora's box of political chicanery."

"On top of the supersalaries, supergrades, and supersalesmanship that have characterized the poverty program," Murphy said, "we now see the administration has stepped in to add superpressure.

"I have always understood the function of the Civil Service Commission to be that of administering the civil service system and not of lobbying or parroting the views of Shriver (OEO Director Sargent Shriver) forces at the OEO."

HEADED BY SHRIVER

Prouty said he also will try to restore to the bill a Senate amendment which would have strengthened the role of the National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity.

The Council, as established last year, has a maximum membership of 15 persons appointed by the President and is headed by Shriver. The amendment would have prohibited the Director of the OEO from serving as Council chairman.

CAN OUR EARTH FEED ITS PEOPLE?

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, 17 years ago, in 1948, a young member of the Walters, Okla., Future Farmers of America Chapter won his State's FFA oratorical contest with a speech entitled "Can Our Earth Feed Its People?" In that speech, the young man pointed out:

> The problem of world food production is no temporary crisis, but a permanent world problem. * * * The people of the world can no longer afford poor, wasteful, and destructive agricultural practices if they are to survive.

What a great experience it must have been for members of the Future Farmers of America attending their national convention in Kansas City, Mo., Friday, October 15, to hear that same former FFA boy, Fred R. Harris, now the distinguished U.S. Senator from Oklahoma, deliver another speech of great significance for America and American agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both speeches by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris], his FFA speech in 1948, and his most recent address to the national FFA Convention, be inserted in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Can Our Earth Feed Its People?

(Address by Senator Fred R. Harris in 1948)

Do you realize that, unless soil erosion and destructive farming methods are overcome, population may outstrip the supply of food?

More than 100 years ago Malthus, an English economist and sociologist, predicted that the time would come when the population of the world would exceed the food supply. Malthus lived at a time when vast new wildernesses were open to exploration, conquest, and colonization. The world population at that time was one-fifth of what it is today, and possibilities to feed it seemed unlimited. Malthus was destined to go down in history as the founder of the Malthusian theory. During that time, and for a century or more afterward, he was largely the object of mockery—but today Malthus seems to be coming into his own with the population of the world now at 2¼ billion people, and within 25 years there will be an additional half billion more. The population of the United States is now increasing at the rate of more than a million a year, that of India at the rate of 10 million a year, and even the once-declining birth rates of England and France are on the upgrade.

At this rate, say population authorities, the world population in 90 years will be twice what it is today. Is that too many people? Not necessarily, provided the earth can feed them. Geographers tell us that the world has 4 billion acres of arable land. The Department of Agriculture estimated that 2.5 acres of land in good production is necessary to feed and clothe one person. If one divides the total arable acres by the number of population, he will find that there are only 1.77 acres per person in the world today. How can this be explained? It can be explained by the fact that at no time in history has man ever had the minimum diet requirement prescribed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in its estimate. Even in modern times people have been dying from starvation alone at the rate of 20 to 30 million a year.

What, then, is to be done? First, there is birth control which will work in theory but not in practice because there can be no specific law governing it. Therefore, the people of the world must look to the soil for their existence.

There are many ways to save the soil and to improve production. Some of these are as follows:

1. By checking the enormous losses of priceless topsoil by wind and water erosion. Do you know that every 24 hours the equivalent of 200 of our best 40-acre farms are carried away by unchecked erosion? That one-half million acres of irreplaceable topsoil are lost each year? This must be stopped by terracing, contour farming, strip cropping and seeding of waterways.

2. By the usage of better agriculture methods, such as the planting of legumes and the rotation of crops. Less than 10 percent of the farmers of the United States can be called good farmers inasmuch as they achieve maximum production from the soil without damaging its fertility. Thirty percent of the farmers are producing only one-half of what they could produce if good, sound farming methods were used while the other 60 percent are destroying our very livelihood—the soil—to produce only enough food to barely feed their immediate families.

3. By the production and application of good fertilizer along with green and barnyard manure. After harvest one can see many columns of smoke laden with the product of the combustion of rich organic matter and potential food for the world's starving millions going up from the burned-off wheat stubble, leaving behind once helpful, now dead, bacteria. These destructive, yes, criminal practices must be stopped if this problem of world food supply is to be solved.

4. By the reclamation of nonproductive land by drainage and irrigation. These are certainly not all of the elements involved but they are some of the most important ones.

The problem of world food production is no longer a temporary crisis but is a permanent world problem. Education, international cooperation and governmental supervision can all contribute. Under natural conditions, Nature is capable of building the soil at a rate fast enough to compensate for the loss by erosion, but it has become evident that the modern farmer with all of his cash-crop methods of farming has placed that soil under conditions so unnatural that nature can no longer maintain that balance alone. Therefore, we must do everything that we can to conserve the greatest resource of our Nation—our soil. You ask, "How may I as an individual help to solve a problem so tremendous in scope?" You, as a farmer, can do this by cooperating with the governmental conservation agencies in all of their efforts and by following on your own farm approved methods of crop rotation and conservation. You, as a member of society, can do this by supporting all legislation which furthers conservation. Today, wholehearted cooperation and extensive education are through necessity the means of attaining this goal.

In England today, no poor farmer is allowed to operate a farm. It is not impossible that such restrictions may spread to other nations. It may be even as Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, of the United States Soil Conservation Service has suggested: that the time will come when every farmer, in order to operate a farm, must pass an examination as do doctors, lawyers, and engineers in order to practice their professions, simply because the people of the world can no longer afford poor, wasteful and destructive agricultural practices if they are to survive."

Address of U.S. Senator Fred R. Harris, of Oklahoma, to the National Convention of the Future Farmers of America, October 15, 1965, Kansas City, Mo.

The Future Farmers of America creed begins: "I believe in the future of farming." And, as a former member for whom that creed continues to have great meaning, I could extend it further to say: "I believe in the future of the Future Farmers of America."

I am proud to be invited here. I am proud to be here because I am proud of the Future Farmers of America. I am also proud to be here because this is Friday, October 15, 1965, which is a most important day in the lives of each of us.

Why is this day so important? I hope to give an answer to that question before I finish. But, before that, let's consider another question: Why am I proud of the Future Farmers of America?

First, I am proud of the Future Farmers of America because as our aims and purposes set forth, we stand for better farming methods and proper use and conservation of our soil and water resources.

But why, some may ask, are better farming methods and proper use and conservation of our soil and water important in a country which enjoys so much surplus productive capacity in farming already? One answer to that question was given in 1948 by an FFA boy, who won his State's oratorical contest with a speech entitled "Can Our Earth Feed Its People?" After commenting upon the explosive growth of the world's population, he said, "The problem of world food production is no temporary crisis, but a permanent world problem. * * * The people of the world can no longer afford poor, wasteful, and destructive agricultural practices if they are to survive." That was my speech, and those were my words. I am convinced they were true when I said them in my FFA speech 17 years ago. I am even more certain of their truth today.

Three billion people live in this world today, and the best estimates are that there will be twice as many—6 billion—by the year 2000, which is just 35 years away. This is a most sobering realization when we consider that of these present 3 billion people, one-third now suffer from starvation, malnutrition, or undernourishment. You and I, in the United States today, are faced with "challenge of life," but millions in other parts of the world are faced with just the "challenge of living."

As difficult and persistent as some of our farm problems have proved to be, I am proud that I live in a generation and in a country where we are talking about food surpluses, rather than about famine, starvation, and want. What a great tribute it is to the work of the Future Farmers of America and to American agriculture that with only approximately 3 out of 10 people involved in producing food and fiber in this country, we are able to produce far more than we can use. By comparison, in the Soviet Union, for example, 7 out of 10 people are involved in the production of food and fiber, and yet they still cannot supply their own needs.

What a great challenge for America and for American agriculture there is and will continue to be in the great and growing need in the world for America's agricultural products. While American farmers are able to produce abundantly for our own people, and our own food expenditures represent only 19 cents out of every dollar spent by American citizens, last year alone we were able to export over $6 billion worth of agricultural products abroad.

So, I say to you: Continue to labor at your goals for better farming and conservation of our soil and water resources. With better American shipping arrangements, with increased world trade, with the continuation of our acceptance of our responsibilities to the starving peoples of the world under our "Food For Peace" program and with the exploding populations here in our own country and throughout the world, our surplus productive capacity in American farming will prove to be one of the great blessings of history.

Second, I am proud of the Future Farmers of America because we work, as we say in our aims and purposes, "to create and nurture a love of country life." Today, I am glad to say that more and more people are recognizing that it should be a high and urgent national purpose of our country to encourage Americans to live and earn their living in the small towns and rural areas of America.

I know that many of you, just as I did, will not take up farming as your life's work. But, I say to you that your training will be good in whatever career you choose. I also say that I hope that you will, as I have, continue to believe that the people of this country should not all live in the large cities.

Not too long ago 75 percent of our people lived in rural areas. Today 75 percent of them live in urban areas. We have witnessed in recent years a mass migration from the rural areas to the large cities, and it has brought with it massive problems—massive problems of transportation, of air and water pollution, of housing, of delinquency and crime.

What a waste it is, how tragic it is, to leave the vast open spaces of clean air and verdant countryside in the heartland of rural America to a mere three and one-half million people, while the rest of our people, the great majority, are squeezed in by the concrete and steel and smothered by the smoke and smog of most of our large cities.

This country must continue to attack head-on the staggering problems in our mass centers of population. But, in doing so, we must not lose sight of the fact that much can continue to be done to slow down and reverse the rural-to-urban shift, and at less cost, at a smaller investment, for the taxpayer. That's why we in the Congress have been interested in rural electrification, in the rural telephone program, the rural area development program, the antipoverty rural community development service which several of us are working with the Vice President to fully implement, the farmers home program expanded this year in the Housing Act, the rural and small town water supply program expanded this year by Congress, and the Economic Development and Public Works Act passed this year.

We must continue to do those things which will help build the private economy and job opportunity in the rural areas and small towns, so that more people can live and work there with greater convenience and more productivity and with a better chance for happiness and the good things of life.

Third, I am proud of the Future Farmers of America because your aims and purposes, the teachings of this great organization, and the heritage of the rural areas and small towns of America are the real moral fiber, the lasting values, of our country. I am proud of the Future Farmers of America because of the qualities of character which it seeks to teach us all.

Self-reliance, enterprise, love of country, thrift, preparation for career and rugged honesty are qualities which the rural heartland of America has long nourished and the Future Farmers of America has inculcated. There are others.

Old-fashioned faith is one—faith in God, without which nations are aimless and individuals are rudderless; faith in ourselves; and faith in our future.

Today, too many of us, I am afraid, as we read and listen to the news of one national and international problem after another, almost want to cry out with Hamlet: "The time is out of joint; Oh cursed spite that ever I was born to set it right."

I get the feeling that at the bottom of much of our boredom and aimlessness today, at the bottom of much of our disorder and delinquency, may be the feeling which many of us have—and spread—that in our day events have somehow gotten out of hand and that circumstances are such that one person can have little effect upon events, as he could, we think, back in the "good old days."

I, too, like to remember those "good old days." But, upon reflection, I think we must all realize that in those "good old days" they had their soup lines and suicides, dust bowls and depressions, wars and rumors of wars.

The realization should come to each of us that this is not the only generation which has problems. Every generation has problems, and every generation must face and solve its own.

The realization must also come to each of us that the problems of our day, great as they are, are not problems caused by chance or circumstances or bad luck, so much as they are caused by people; and people, with God's help, can meet and solve the problems of this generation, as they have in every generation past.

But, this can't be done by shrinking from reality and wishing for the "good old days." It can be done by facing our problems squarely and by remembering that, while our problems are great, no generation ever had greater opportunities.

I remember the words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, spoken of another generation and a different set of problems, but even more applicable to us and to our day, when he said: "To some generations much is given; of some generations much is expected; this generation has a rendezvous with destiny."

Another quality taught by the Future Farmers of America and by rural life is a keen sense of responsibility to others. The FFA motto which begins, "Learning to do, doing to learn, earning to live," puts it all in perspective in the last line which says, "living to serve."

No man can be completely happy and satisfied so long as other men, as they will tonight, go to bed hungry, and ill housed, and ill clothed. No man can be completely satisfied and comfortable so long as there are other men whose humanity, and dignity, and equality of opportunity are questioned and denied.

What an auspicious occasion, therefore, this annual convention is, as it marks the integration, the consolidation of all Future Farmers of America, regardless of race or color.

I congratulate you on this action, consummated in this convention. And I say to you that you have truly made real the words of each vice president of each local FFA chapter, explaining why the emblem of the president of each local chapter is the rising sun, when he says: "The rising sun is the token of a new era in agriculture. If we will but follow our president," the chapter vice president recites, "we shall be led out of the darkness of selfishness and into the glorious sunlight of brotherhood and cooperation."

Diligence, you also recognize, is a great quality. I don't want to say too much about diligence because it means "work." But, you and I know that all of these other qualities are of little value, except with work. For, as the local vice president also says in your chapter meetings: "Without labor, neither knowledge nor wisdom can accomplish much."

But, hand in hand with diligence, goes patience. Patience is also an important virtue. As a former member of the Salvation Army Board in my home town of Lawton, Okla., I used to work in the booth on the street at Christmastime, and I spoke into the microphone a creed of the Salvation Army, which is: "You may not be able to bring joy and happiness to the whole world, but you can help someone near you."

And, I remember the motto of the late Pope John XXIII. It said: "See everything in the world; look on some with a blind eye; and correct a little."

You and I, as individual citizens, may not be able to have direct and immediate influence on what happens in the Dominican Republic or in Vietnam, for example, but we can at least do the things which need to be done in our home towns and local communities. And, unless we are willing to assume responsibilities presented now, we cannot expect to be prepared to assume larger responsibilities which may come our way.

Diligence and patience. Longfellow said: "Still achieving, still pursuing, learn to labor and to wait."

So, as a former member, I am proud of the Future Farmers of America.

But, why is this such an important day for each of us? Because if you and I live to be as old as Methuselah, Friday, October 15, 1965, will never come again.

And, if on this day, we renew our living dedication to the ideals this great organization espouses, this world will be a better place because you and I have helped to make it so.

And, too, we will, with greater feeling, be able to say to ourselves and others the closing words of the FFA creed, which are:

"I believe that rural America can and will hold true to the best traditions in our national life and that I can exert an influence in my home and community which will stand solid for my part in that inspiring task."

POLL SHOWS NEW GI BILL WILL NOT AFFECT REENLISTMENT RATE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the recent hearings on the cold war GI education bill (S. 9) before the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, spokesmen for the Department of Defense proclaimed that enactment of a new GI bill might have a harmful effect upon the reenlistment rate among military personnel. These witnesses offered no substantive proof of their mere theories.

Upon thoughtful consideration of the issue it is a more reasonable assumption that enactment of a new GI bill will cause an increase in enlistments and thus assist the Department of Defense in solving their manpower problems. In a recent survey of 140 Fort McNair soldiers by the Passing Review, a Fort McNair publication, 82.6 percent of those questioned stated that enactment of a new GI bill would not affect their plans for reenlistment in the armed services.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article showing the results of the Fort McNair poll be printed at this point in the Record. The poll results appeared in an article entitled "VA Looks Again; 'GI Bill To Pass in 1966'; McNair Soldiers Vote Hope," which was published in the October 8, 1965, issue of the Passing Review.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

VA Looks Again; "GI Bill To Pass in 1966"; McNair Soldiers Vote Hope

The Veterans' Administration is reconsidering the possible need for cold war benefits for the peacetime soldier.

An informed source in the Senate predicts the GI bill will be law before the 89th Congress adjourns, September 1966.

In a survey conducted by this newspaper among 140 McNair soldiers, 83 percent stated they would take advantage of the GI bill if it is passed into law.

Among soldiers planning to leave the Army upon the completion of their obligation, an equal number intended to either attend college or begin immediate employment. However, 40 percent of those not planning to attend college indicated a wish to attend night school, if they could collect GI benefits.

Soldiers who claimed the bill would not affect their plans for reenlistment accounted for 82.6 percent of the total.

One sergeant first class who has completed 3 years of college and has over 20 years active service said that he would begin working and also hoped to finish his education on the cold war GI bill.

THE HUMAN INVESTMENT ACT NEEDED TO COUNTERACT GROWING MANPOWER PINCH

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, this morning's Wall Street Journal carried as its lead article an account of the desperate manpower pinch that is affecting scores of industries all across the Nation.

The facts of the present situation can be summed up very briefly. There is a tremendous shortage of skilled workers in the economy, at a time when the need for skilled manpower is high and rising. The result, the Journal reports:

A really tight manpower pinch that is beginning to delay many business operations, push up costs, and prod many employers into increasingly offbeat efforts to find workers ranging from computer programers to trash collectors.

The article goes on to point out case after case of employers pirating trained personel from other employers, vital work—such as loading supplies on Vietnam-bound freighters—falling behind schedule, a decline in efficiency and productivity because of unskilled labor, a rise in help wanted advertising costs, and even cash bounties to employees who can bring in a skilled worker to fill a job opening.

Mr. President, the Human Investment Act (S. 2509), which I am cosponsoring with 20 other Senators, would meet this serious national challenge head-on by giving private business a tax credit to spur increases in its job training programs. Identical bills have been introduced by 81 Members of the House. With the problem so acute already, I hope hearings on this measure can be held very soon after Congress reconvenes in January. The sooner the Human Investment Act becomes law, the sooner its benefits will begin working to ease this desperate situation in the manpower market.

I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to, from the Wall Street Journal of October 21, 1965, along with two additional brief items from the same issue, be included in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 21, 1965]

Corporate Manhunt—Manpower Pinch Spurs "Pirating," Increases Costs, Hurts Efficiency—Builders Bid Up Pay Scales; Matson's Ships Sail Late; Job-Hopping Rises Greatly—Sears Turns to Direct Mail

Early this year SKF Industries, Inc., Philadelphia bearings maker, had good luck recruiting workers from factories preparing to cut output. It picked 27, mostly machine-tool operators, from Vertol division of Boeing Co., and from the Government's Frankford Arsenal.

But since then, SKF's manpower pinch has grown worse. It now is looking for 50 tool operators—and it can no longer get them from defense plants. Quite the contrary; since the Vietnam buildup began, helicopter-making Vertol and the Frankford Arsenal have lured back many of the men SKF had spirited away.

SKF's plight is shared to some degree by scores of companies queried coast-to-coast by the Wall Street Journal. Even last year, many began to feel a shortage of skilled workers. Now, with the Nation's biggest boom in its 56th month, their manpower needs have grown much greater—and more varied. One sample: Douglas Aircraft Co. is looking for 850 salaried employees, against 135 a year ago, and for 1,700 hourly workers, against 230 a year ago.

UNEMPLOYMENT DOWN

Meanwhile, the pool of unemployed workers has shrunk drastically. Unemployment in mid-September dropped to an 8-year low of 4.4 percent of the labor force. The jobless-rate among married males—the family breadwinners who generally are the most experienced and reliable workers—matched the record low of 2.2 percent set in March 1957.

The result: A really tight manpower pinch that is beginning to delay many business operations, push up costs, and prod many employers into increasingly offbeat efforts to find workers ranging from computer programers to trash collectors.

As might be expected, the shortage is especially severe in operations that must be expanded rapidly to handle the Vietnam buildup. The Pacific Area Military Sea Transportation Service, which employs 3,900 civilians, is looking for another 1,600 to man five ships just taken out of mothballs for the run to Vietnam, and to fill supporting "paper pushers" jobs ashore. Unable to get them through normal civil service channels, MSTS has begun advertising for them in newspapers in 24 States, reaching as far east as Illinois.

But the shortage is hardly confined to defense-related fields. Chas. Pfizer & Co., big New York drug maker, has 30 percent more job vacancies than a year earlier. It is looking especially hard for scientists, patent attorneys, designers and draftsmen, and, most of all computer personnel.

Amana Refrigeration, Inc., an Amana, Iowa, subsidiary of Raytheon Co., would expand its work force 30 percent if it could. It now employs 1,000 workers but is looking for 300 more.

NO PORTERS

And in Nashville, Dick Hall, manager of the Hermitage Hotel, complains that "we now for the first time in history have no porter in the barbershop and none in the restroom." He can't find dishwashers, either.

Moreover, many employers complain, when workers can be found, they often don't stay. Other employers hire them away almost immediately.

"People we hire seem to have their eggs in more than one basket," says George Hastings, industrial relations director of Aladdin Industries, Inc., Nashville maker of vacuum bottles, lunch kits, and kerosene lamps. "They may have applications in elsewhere; they get a better opportunity and leave. We hire many and they don't even show up for work."

Such "pirating" of employees afflicts both those hiring the most skilled and the most unskilled workers. In Detroit the shortage of skilled construction workers is so bad "that I'd like to get out of this business," says Mel Volin, secretary-treasurer of Coral Stone Construction Co., a home remodeling firm. "We just lost a couple of carpenters for $7 an hour. We were paying $6.50. You really can't get men. We just keep stealing them from each other."

In the same city, but on a lower skill level, Palace Quality Laundry & Dry Cleaners "must have hired 500 people to fill 50 positions this year," complains Richard Boonstra, plant supervisor. "If a man's here 2 weeks we start wondering what's wrong with him."

The laundry, Mr. Boonstra explains, pays only $1.50 an hour, and keeps losing employees to auto plants that pay $2.80 an hour. A short time ago, he relates, one of the laundry workers "came out very honestly and said '1 more day of this and I'll be over at an auto plant.' I asked how come, and he explained that before working in the laundry he was a nonexperienced man. After 2 weeks in the laundry he felt he could say 'I've got experience.' And he was right. They hired him."

One effect of this competition for workers is to push up business costs. In Columbia, S.C., where military construction at Fort Jackson has greatly tightened the market for building workers, contractors have bid up wages considerably above already high union scales. One contractor says electricians in the area now get $4 an hour, against a union scale of $3.72 to $3.85. Bricklayers draw $3.70, against a union scale of $3.50, he says, and pipefitters get $3.88 against a union scale of $3.80.

The labor shortage is great enough to delay operations in some industries. West coast longshoremen for the past 2 months have been working an average of 50 hours a week to handle a huge increase in Vietnam-bound cargo, coming on top of heavy civilian shipments, says Harry Bridges, president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.

But the longshoremen appear to be falling behind handling some civilian cargo. Matson Navigation Co. used to figure on an "in-port turnaround time" of about 12 hours for its ships. But now in-port time is averaging 2 to 3 days, says a spokesman. He calls the delays "substantial and costly."

MORE SCRAP

In some businesses, the quality of work is slipping, too. "There just aren't enough foremen to keep watch on all the skilled and unskilled workers," complains C. H. Rieman, president of Gardner-Denver Co., Quincy, Ill., maker of construction and well-drilling equipment. So, he says, "the scrap and rework trend on parts has gone up noticeably."

Some other effects of the shortage, though significant, are harder to measure. William M. Scranton, president of Miniature Precision Bearings, Inc., Keene, N.H., ticks off a whole series of extra costs brought on by his company's inability to find so many technicians, engineers, and skilled machine operators as it needs.

First, says Mr. Scranton, the shortage means more advertising for help. It also involves "a fairly high-cost training program because you are training many people who have had no training in any skilled line." Then it puts a heavy overtime burden on present employees, who in some departments are working 50 hours a week, and forces some supervisors who should be directing work to pitch in on the production line themselves at times. Finally, he says, "it means you can't produce enough to meet the demand, and therefore you lose some business, because you can't meet the delivery time the customer wants."

To round up more workers, companies are trying every known stratagem and inventing some. Nearly all are intensifying recruiting and stepping up training programs.

Standard Oil Co. (Ohio) has increased its college recruiting staff from three to five, and will add two more by year's end. They'll visit 64 campuses this school year, and also the Army's technical center in Edgewood, Md., where they will try to line up technical people nearing discharge. Sohio further is further budgeting for five times as much help-wanted advertising in 1966 as this year.

General Electric Co.'s jet engine department near Cincinnati is advertising for hourly workers in communities up to 200 miles away. It must expand employment by 800 to work on a new $88 million Air Force contract. It has sent recruiters much farther to find engineers—to New York, Los Angeles, and Florida, among other places.

Chrysler Corp., which is short about 200 to 300 tool and die workers, electricians, pipefitters and similarly skilled craftsmen, has almost doubled the number of apprentices being trained for such jobs in the past year. It also has inaugurated several retraining programs outside the plant for such jobs as mechanics.

Many companies are moving to make jobs more attractive and convenient. Admiral Corp., seeking 300 workers for its TV-set factory in Harvard, Ill., a farming community, has begun running its own bus service to nearby towns.

Sunshine Mining Co. is considering air conditioning the shafts of its silver mines in the Coeur d'Alene area of Idaho, in hopes of drawing about 50 workers from nearby lumber camps; it employs about 100 miners there now. "It would be expensive, but well worth it," says Thomas F. McManus, president. "Who can blame a miner for not wanting to work in a 100-degree mine?"

Among the less conventional approaches, Sears, Roebuck & Co. resorted to direct-mail advertising recently to staff a new store in north Dallas. It blanketed houses in the area with help-wanted pleas addressed to "occupant."

In New York, American Machine & Foundry Co. has offered to buy savings bonds for employees who bring in other skilled workers. But so far this has "not generated any significant amount of new talent," says George Patterson, vice president.

MIXED OPINIONS ON WOMEN

Some other attempts to break the manpower bottleneck have had only mixed results, too. On the plus side, John Stefanik, Cleveland operator of a Sohio service station, is pleased with his experiment in hiring three housewives to pump gas, check oil and wash windshields. The men left in the labor pool for such jobs "aren't worth hiring," he says. Some he did hire "made serious mistakes, wouldn't try to learn the job and insulted customers." In contrast, the lady "gas jockeys" have worked with such enthusiasm that he's now trying to hire three more.

But Littelfuse, Inc., a Chicago-area maker of circuit and control devices, finds hiring women for jobs usually held by men only increases turnover. Many wives, says a company official, work only to make a specified amount of money. "Once she gets that living room furniture, she's as likely as not to lay off work until she needs something else."

Atlanta's Sanitation Department had a rather disconcerting experience when it tried using city prisoners to collect garbage. It "borrowed" 50 to 60 short-term prisoners from the city prison farm to catch up on trash collections. However, about a dozen, when turned loose on the street without guntoting guards, simply disappeared. The use of prisoners for such work has been discontinued.

There are a few exceptions to this picture of a worsening labor shortage. Steel employment has dropped 5 to 10 percent since a labor settlement in early September brought buying cutbacks by customers liquidating strike-hedge inventories. This has erased a manpower shortage, not only in the mills themselves, but among neighboring metalworking concerns.

Youngstown Steel Door Co., a maker of railroad equipment, was reduced to hiring high-school dropouts earlier this year, as the city's steel plants hired away its regular workers to keep their furnaces running full-blast. Now, however, some of the men who had left to take jobs in the mills are returning, and "we have very few openings," says a personnel man. Even so the company has some problems, he concedes: "Absenteeism is up" among employees of departments that have been working 6- and 7-day weeks during the past few months.

Also, some employment agencies take issue with companies that complain they are scraping the bottom of the barrel to get workers.

"Chicago is down to nothing but unemployables," asserts M. A. Donlan, vice president of Amphenol Corp., an electronics concern. But the Illinois State Employment Service says the picture would be a lot better if employers were not so choosy; many companies, it says, demand high school diplomas for common laborers and will not hire skilled workers if they are over 45. Though Illinois employers scream as loudly as any about an "engineer shortage," a spokesman for the service says "if you can place an engineer over 45, you have really accomplished something."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 21, 1965]

CAN'T LOCATE SKILLED MEN? START TRYING ENGLAND, ITALY

Despairing of finding all the workers they need in the United States, more companies are going abroad to hire scarce skills.

Botany Industries, Inc., a men's suitmaker, has imported more than 100 Italian tailors in the past 16 months—applying for their entry, guaranteeing their housing and employment, and helping them get settled here. Unemployed trained tailors are almost impossible to find in this country, but "Italy has them in abundance," says Michael Daroff, Botany president.

Standard Oil Co. (Ohio) and Catalytic Construction Co., a Philadelphia subsidiary of Air Products & Chemicals, Inc., both have sent recruiters on successful trips to London recently; Sohio came away with a new chemical engineer, and Catalytic Construction has signed up 55 English engineers and designers.

The hunt may spread. A spokesman for Catalytic Construction says that, since a new law this year removed many former restrictions on immigration, "we'll be able to go anyplace in the world looking for talent."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 21, 1965]

INDEX OF HELP-WANTED ADS UP SPECTACULARLY IN MONTH

NEW YORK.—Help-wanted advertising rose spectacularly to a record in September, the National Industrial Conference Board reported.

The NICB index of want ads soared in September to 160 percent of the 1957–59 average, up 8 points from the previous month and 34 points from September 1964. The index measures the volume of want ads in 52 major newspapers around the country. "It has been extremely sensitive to changes in general business conditions," says NICB. "Rises in the help-wanted index have generally been followed by dips in the unemployment rate; declines in the index have been associated with increases in unemployment."

WORLD REFUGEE REPORT

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to an extremely useful survey of refugee problems throughout the world. The survey was issued recently by the U.S. Committee for Refugees, a citizens' committee whose work is familiar to all of us.

As in past years, the current survey is definitive in recording the world refugee situation, and the various governmental and private agencies through which the American people render humanitarian assistance to those who flee persecution, tyranny, and military conflict.

As chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, I commend the United States Committee for Refugees for issuing this survey. The committee deserves our thanks for a job well done, in its every effort to help our citizens understand the significance of refugee problems and the continuing need for this country to exert leadership in finding reasonable solutions.

Mr. President, refugee problems seldom dominate the headlines, but the troubles of our time are taking an increasingly heavy task in the flight of people from conflict and oppression.

I am thinking of the more than 700,000 Vietnamese refugees who have fled their villages into areas secured by the government of Saigon.

I am thinking of the many Cubans who choose to leave their homeland, using small boats and the waters between Cuba and Florida as a gateway to freedom.

I am thinking of the continuing refugee flow from Eastern Europe, from Communist China and Tibet, and from several countries in Africa.

The plight of these people is tragic, and rightfully claims the concern of all Americans. This country has long stood in the forefront of those assisting the humanitarian effort for refugees, and there is little reason to believe that our leadership will not continue.

But I feel that the growing number of refugees in many areas, especially South Vietnam, necessitates a greater effort on the part of the United States to stimulate international cooperation in assisting these people, and in finding reasonable solutions to the undeniable problems that exist.

This year is International Cooperation Year. In November a special White House conference will be held to discuss means of stimulating greater international cooperation in many important fields of endeavor. I sincerely hope the agenda will include the international problems created by the flow of refugees.

Mr. President, I believe that Members of the Senate will be interested in the world refugee report of the U.S. Committee for Refugees, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1965–66 ANNUAL SURVEY ISSUE—U.S. COMMITTEE FOR REFUGEES, INC.

U.S. COMMITTEE FOR REFUGEES

Officers: Maxwell M. Rabb, president; Luther H. Evans, chairman of the board; George Meany, vice president; Samuel W. Meek, vice president; Roderic I. O'Connor, vice president; William L. Breese, secretary; Abram Claude, Jr., treasurer; Victor Jacobs, general counsel; R. Norris Wilson, executive vice president.

Members of the board: Marian Anderson, Joseph A. Beirne, William S. Bernard, Walter H. Bieringer, Jacob Blaustein, Dorothea Blum, Madeleine Carroll, Daniel G. Cary, Marcus Daly, Thomas J. Deegan, Jr., Joseph W. Donner, Angier Biddle Duke, Paul C. Empie, Charles W. Engelhard, George J. Feldman, John B. Ford, III, Buell G. Gallagher, Philip J. Goldberg, I. Peter Grace, Mrs. Erwin N. Griswold, John W. Hanes, Jr., Huntington Hartford, Reginald H. Helfferich, Celeste Holm, Frances Humphrey Howard, J. Donald Kingsley, William T. Kirk, I. Robert Kriendler, Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, Peter I. B. Lavan, Ralph Lazarus, Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, Clare Boothe Luce, James MacCracken, Judge Juvenal Marchisio, George M. Mardikian, Edward B. Marks, Robert S. McCollum, Robert Murphy, Ruth Z. Murphy, Henry V. Poor, Jacob S. Potofsky, Marsha Hunt Presnell, Richard W. Reuter, Mary G. Roebling, Mrs. Harper Sibley, Spyros P. Skouras, Richard F. Smith, Lowell Thomas, Ilia A. Tolstoy, Richard H. West, and James W. Wine.

NEW PROBLEMS

The 12 months since the last issue of this survey have seen the development of a great many new refugee problems. There is little evidence that the tragic circumstances which have produced these problems will change for the better in the immediate future. On the contrary, the fighting between India and Pakistan, and in Vietnam, and the continued unsettlement, together with the continuation of political and tribal troubles in Africa, lead us to feel that we are only at the beginning of a massive new and terrible period in this troubled "Century of the Homeless Man."

There are now (September 1) reported to be 600,000 refugees in South Vietnam and it is estimated that there will be a million or more by Christmas. There are 60,000 in Kashmir, made homeless by the fighting between India and Pakistan. Both India and Pakistan, before the recent intensification of the fighting, were already faced with critical refugee problems. We noted a year ago that some 75,000 Moslems were reported to have moved from India into the east wing of Pakistan as a result of intercommunal strife in India, and that 50,000 had fled from East Pakistan into India for the same reason. The flow from East Pakistan to India has now reached 283,177, and while a good many of these refugees had returned to East Pakistan, the revival of intercommunal conflict on a national scale makes us feel that this problem will become extremely serious. In addition, we note in our report that the repatriation of Indians from Burma has now reached 55,249, and because these people have been forced to leave Burma without resources of any kind, they arrive in India as refugees. There is little reason to believe that this flow will stop in the near future.

While we are engaged in the rapidly growing problems of southeast Asia, we must not forget that there are many new refugee problems in Africa that are equally serious. It is reported that 35 out of 49 nations on that continent are involved in refugee programs in one way or another. We strongly suspect that there are a great many refugees, particularly from South Africa, of whom we have no record at all.

NEW SOLUTIONS NEEDED

Most of us continue to think of refugees in terms of the post-World War II situation in Europe. There is reason for praise here, for it was during this period, when many of us, with unstinting generosity, gave the assurances and found the jobs and homes in our communities for over 2½ million European refugees and displaced persons.

Largely due to the continued efforts of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and governmental and private agencies through whom he works, the problem of European refugees has been largely solved. Though the flow of new refugees from behind the Iron Curtain continues at a rate of 10,000 persons per year, the major problems now are outside of Europe—in southeast Asia, in Africa, and in Latin America. They are very different problems, quite unlike the problem of postwar Europe.

We need to bring new understanding to bear upon these problems and find new and imaginative solutions for them. It is clear that resettlement is no longer an answer. Most of the refugees must be given opportunities for self-help and a new life where they are.

We must realize that every refugee problem is different from every other refugee problem and that few generalizations are possible.

In the light of the new situation, we need to find new and less restrictive definitions and answers to a number of very troublesome questions: What is a national refugee? What is a tactical refugee? How does a refugee qualify for intergovernmental assistance? How can we improve both the agility and the efficiency of our service to refugees? What governmental and intergovernmental apparatus is necessary? And so on. We strongly hope that these questions will have wide discussion during International Cooperation Year.

We believe that the American citizen, who has always been so generous in his support of efforts to assist refugees, will continue to give his help—if he knows that his help is effective.

Lastly, there is always the haunting problem of the tired conscience. We are deeply stirred by the plight of a group of refugees when it is carried in the headlines. We forget their problems much too quickly when the headlines shift to other urgencies in our fast-moving world. How can we sustain the generous and patient interest of the American people in the continuing problems of the homeless? We can only hope that all the agencies, who are working day to day and face to face with this grievous human problem, will continue to receive the help they need from our readers and others who think of problems of the world's refugees as an obligation of citizenship in today's world.

HOW LONG IS A REFUGEE A REFUGEE?

The most serious problem arising from an analysis of the many refugee problems in the world is the question, "When does a refugee cease being a refugee?"

Each refugee group, while it bears some similarities to other groups, is unique. The reasons for their flight differ in each case; the circumstances of their asylum differ in each case; the opportunity for and/or rate of resettlement and integration differ in each case. Moreover, while the human situation for the refugee is always grievous, the political significance of the refugees' predicament varies in importance according to a host of circumstances.

The key question comes specifically to the fore when, as in the case of the present analysis, a calculation of the refugee population of the world is attempted. A good case in point is that of Korea. There were originally 4 million North Koreans who fled the Communists into South Korea. The Korean and U.S. Government officials say that these people have now been assimilated and that this figure should not be included in the calculation of the total refugee population. But on the other hand, there are 63 American voluntary agencies working in Korea on the problems of housing, agriculture, resettlement, and a host of other programs designed to meet the needs of the Korean people. The agencies report that their caseloads number in the millions and their reports refer specifically to refugees. We think there is no reasonable way to dispute the agencies' contention that there remain at least 1 million refugees from the north in South Korea who are neither resettled nor integrated.

Again, few would say that the Algerians who have returned to find their homes destroyed are resettled. The work of the High Commissioner with the Algerian refugees was finished when the refugees returned from Tunisia and Morocco. The work of the American Friends Service Committee, the World Council of Churches, and other organizations will not be finished until that desperately needing company of people have been really resettled; that is, until they have become self-sustaining citizens of their new nation.

The ambiguities represented by these refugee problems bring us back to the central question, "When does a refugee cease being a refugee?" We think that, apart from the formal definitions of refugee status which differ so widely, a refugee is a refugee as long as the fundamental needs of himself and of his family are unmet—if he is still in the camp though he may have a job; if he has good housing with no opportunity for work; if he is well cared for though alone and separated from his family and uncertain as to whether they can rejoin him; if, in fact, his loss of citizenship and/or forced migration means his continuing deprivation of a minimally decent life—he is still a refuge.

The world's refugees

Country of asylum	From—	1964	1965	Source
East Asia (area total)		2,592,231	3,020,500	
Hong Kong	China	1,500,000	1,944,000	AFSC; ORM; New York Times.
Korea [1]	North Korea	1,000,000	1,000,000	American Korean Foundation; CWS.
Macau	China	90,000	75,000	UNHCR Report, Mar. 30, 1965; ORM; U.S. Senate, Feb. 9, 1965.
China	Russia	2,231	1,500	WCC Service to Refugees, Annual Report, March 1965; ORM; U.S. Senate.
Southeast Asia (area total)		3,239,692	4,339,526	
Bhutan	Tibet	2,911	3,000	Office of Tibet, U.S.A.
East Pakistan	India	75,000	75,000	WCC.
India (Calcutta)	East Pakistan	2,000,000	2,000,000	CWS-Stroup Report; others.
India [2]	do	50,000	283,177	WCC, April 1965.
Do	Tibet	44,781	41,800	Office of Tibet, U.S.A.; ORM; UNHCR Report, Apr. 21, 1965.
Do	Burma		55,249	Indian Information Service.
Kashmir	(National) [3]		60,000	New York Times, Sept. 5, 1965.
Laos	do	150,000	250,000	U.S. Department of State, July 13, 1965; U.S. Senate, Feb. 9, 1965.
Nepal [4]	Tibet	11,000	8,000	ORM; Office of Tibet, U.S.A.
Sikkim	do	6,000	6,000	Do.
South Vietnam [5]	North Vietnam	900,000	900,000	CRS and others.
Do [5]	(National)		600,000	New York Times, Sept. 5, 1965; U.S. Department of State.
Thailand	Vietnam		40,000	U.S. Department of State, July 13, 1965.
Do	Burma		10,000	Do.
Do	China		7,300	Do.

See footnotes at end of table.

The world's refugees—Continued

Country of asylum	From—	1964	1965	Source
Middle East (area total)		1,231,546	1,301,879	
Gaza Strip	Palestine	283,782	289,155	UNRWA.
Iran		1,500	1,032	UNHCR Report, Mar. 30, 1965.
Israel			52,000	JDC.
Jordan	Palestine	662,525	670,985	UNRWA.
Lebanon	do	152,747	155,170	Do.
Syria	do	129,010	131,375	Do.
Turkey	Iraq	1,482	1,482	UNHCR Reference Service.
Do		500	680	UNHCR Report, Apr. 14, 1965.
Africa (north) (area total)		151,612	2,700	
Algeria [6]	Tunisia and Morocco	150,000		
Morocco		1,612	2,700	UNHCR Report, Feb. 24, 1965.
Africa (Sub-Sahara) (area total)		327,700	695,820	
Burundi	Rwanda	35,000	80,000	New York Times, "Organization for African Unity," Report, Feb. 28, 1965.
Central African Republic	Sudan		5,000	WCC, "Africa Survey," October 1964; CRS-NCWC.
Do	Congo		3,000	UNHCR, Mar. 24, 1965.
Congo	Angola	150,000	250,000	WCC, "Africa Survey," October 1964; CRS-NCWC.
Do	Rwanda	60,000	30,000	WCC, "Africa Survey," October 1964.
Do	Sudan		10,000	Do.
Dahomey	Ivory Coast Gabon Senegal Mali	12,000	12,000	ICMC, Migration News.
Do	Niger		16,000	NCWC, Jan. 22, 1965.
Ethiopia	Sudan		5,000	WCC, "Africa Survey," October 1964.
Do	Somali		70,000	The Times, London, Aug. 27, 1965.
Kenya	Sudan		100	WCC, "Africa Survey," October 1964.
Tanzania (Tanganyika)	Congo		2,000	Do.
Tanzania	Rwanda	16,000	25,000	New York Times, "Organization for African Unity," Report, Feb. 28, 1965.
Do	Mozambique	500	10,000	ACNS, "Man and Migration," Bulletin, February 1965; WCC, CRS-NCWC.
Do	Southern Rhodesia		20	WCC, "Africa Survey," October 1964; U.S. Senate.
Do	Kenya		2,500	CRS-NCWC.
Togo	Ghana	5,700	5,700	UNHCR; ICMC Migration News; LWF.
Uganda	Rwanda	48,000	50,000	ICMC Migration News.
Do	Sudan		40,000	CRS-NCWC; WCC.
Do	Congo Leopoldville		8,000	ICMC.
Senegal	Portuguese Guinea		35,000	ORM: UNHCR Report, May 1965.
Various African countries	South Africa	500	500	ORM.
Zambia (Northern Rhodesia)	Congo and South Africa		30,000	New York Times, "Organization for African Unity," Rept., Feb. 28, 1965.
Zambia	Angola		6,000	Angola Office, New York.
Europe [7] (area total)		105,415	169,197	
Austria		1,585	858	UNHCR Report, Mar. 30, 1965.
France		22,833	62,500	UNHCR; SRA; IRC; JDC.
Germany [8]	East Europe	13,710	15,235	UNHCR; PAIRC.
Greece		4,500	4,775	UNHCR Report, Mar. 30 1965.
Italy	East Europe	787	1,030	UNHCR Report, April 1965.
Spain	Cuba	12,000	13,800	UNHCR Report June 22, 1965; ICVA News.
U.S.S.R.	China	50,000	70,000	U.S. Senate, Feb. 29, 1965.
Europe (various)	Tibet		600	Office of Tibet U.S.A.
Switzerland	do		399	Do.
Western Hemisphere (area total)		262,113	261,077	
Puerto Rico	Cuba	6,000	6,000	CREC.
Do	Haiti	5,000	5,000	ACNS.
United States	Cuba	96,113	89,036	DHEW.
Do	Tibet		41	Office of Tibet, U.S.A.
Do	Haiti		6,000	IRC.
Argentina, Chile, Peru, Colombia, Venezuela.	Europe	130,000	130,000	Tolstoy Foundation; WCC; CWS; UN Press Service.
Various Latin American countries	Cuba	20,000	20,000	CREC.
Dominican Republic	Haiti	5,000	5,000	IRC.
Total		7,910,309	9,793,609	

---

[1] 4,000,000 persons from North Korea became refugees in South Korea during the Korean war. There are no longer any official Government figures about the refugee problem in South Korea. It is assumed that the refugees have been "integrated." Yet, only 1 country in the world (India) is receiving the assistance of more registered American voluntary agencies than Korea. There are now 63 agencies working in Korea in programs of direct relief—medical services of all kinds, education, community development, etc. The value of the services to the Korean people of the 19 agencies registered with the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid is approximately $17,000,000 per year.

[2] The number of persons moving from East Pakistan into India as a result of intercommunal strife has radically increased during the year under review. It is now reported that these people are returning to East Pakistan in considerable numbers. Meanwhile, the result of tidal floods in East Pakistan rendered more than 7,000,000 people homeless during the spring of 1965.

[3] National refugees in Kashmir have fled their homes as a result of the fighting between Pakistan and India.

[4] The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees reports (April 1965) that, whereas some 12,000 refugees from Tibet had found asylum in Nepal since 1960, their present number is thought not to exceed more than 8,000. Approximately 4,000 have left that county for India; however, new fighting along the Tibet-Nepal border was reported on July 19, 1965, and we anticipate that there may be a renewed flow of refugees from Tibet to Nepal as a result of the fighting.

[5] Some of the refugees who fled from North Vietnam into South Vietnam during 1954–55 have been resettled, though they are still receiving substantial resettlement assistance of all kinds. In the meantime, due to the increased tempo of the war in Vietnam, nearly 600,000 of these people have now become refugees again.

[6] Returnees to Algeria from Tunisia and Morocco who had fled their homes during the Algerian war are now generally resettled. Various agencies are working in Algeria, but their services—medical, educational, agricultural, etc.—are extended to the population as a whole.

[7] These figures represent refugees reported to be settled—however inadequately—in countris of asylum. It is impossible to estimate the additional numbers in transit at any given time. For example, there are reported to be some 49,000 Jewish migrants and refugees moving toward eventual final settlement. Again, at present, refugees are moving in increasing numbers from behind the Iron Curtain into Europe at the rate of approximately 10,000 per year. These persons are not included in the record for European countries since they are in transit to permanent resettlement overseas. We also know there are a great number of persons in flight in Africa and southeast Asia.

[8] "Caseload" figures for Germany do not include persons escaping from the East over the Berlin Wall. There are reported to be 10 to 20 escapees each week. Also, the figures in the total do not include 64,292 persons who moved from East to West under Governmental agreement "to reunite families."

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS

ACNS: American Council for Nationalities Service.
AFSC: American Friends Service Committee.
CREC: Cuban Refugee Emergency Center.
CRS-NCWC: Catholic Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference.
CWS: Church World Service.
DHEW: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
ICMC: International Catholic Migration Commission.
ICVA: International Council of Voluntary Agencies.
IRC: International Rescue Committee.
JDC: Joint Distribution Committee.
LWF: Lutheran World Federation.
ORM: Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs, Department of State, U.S. Government.
PAIRC: Polish-American Immigration and Relief Committee.
SRA: Spanish Refugee Aid.
UNHCR: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.
UNRWA: United Nations Relief and Works Agency.
WCC: World Council of Churches.
U.S. Senate: Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees.

HOW MANY REFUGEES ARE THERE?

The total figure representing the refugee problem of the world is not definitive. Our "tally" shows an increase of 1,880,390 over one year ago. The increase is partly due to new refugee problems, as in Africa and Vietnam. It is also partly due to better reporting by our cooperating agencies. For example, this year we have included in our tabulations a number of refugee problems which are not new but which were unreported a year ago, as in the case of the Burmese and Vietnamese refugees in Thailand and some African refugees unreported last year.

We have studied the reports, and "case" tallies of 50 voluntary agencies, governmental and intergovernmental offices and interagency coordinating bodies. Most of them claim only approximate accuracy for their figures.

Surely there are refugees, many thousands of them of whom there is no record and who receive no help at all. There are others who receive different kinds of assistance from more than one agency.

At any moment, given the pace and ferment of the world's life in our time, a new company of the homeless may be seeking asylum.

We believe that the material under review was of sufficient volume and variety of source as to enable us to make defensible judgments. But, we add, our bias is toward the minimal.

The total picture is sad enough. The continuing plight of the homeless need not be exaggerated to be believable.

Behind the cold figures representing the presence of refugee communities around the world are the life and death realties, unspeakable brutalities, fears, hatreds, and miseries which are the daily environment of millions of men, women and children. Moreover, as this is written, there is persuasive evidence that in southeast Asia and Africa, we are only beginning to see the awful consequences in human terms, of intercommunal, intertribal and international strife.

AFRICA

In 1948, there were four independent countries in Africa. There are now 37, of which 27 have gained freedom since June 1, 1960. Thirty-five out of forty-nine national territories are involved with refugee problems in some way.

No one dares venture confident generalizations about Africa. We are uneasily aware that we are among the "instant experts" who try. Anyone who tries to say something about an African problem, whether refugees or something else, will stumble over the many particular problems which will not yield to generalizations.

The number of refugees and the countries of their asylum are listed in our statistical table. Some idea of the complexity of the refugee movement may be gained from the mere exercise of trying to locate the refugees by country of origin and country of asylum on the map.

We believe that the refugee problem is the result of a number of factors. In the first place, most Africans belong to a tribe, and they are deeply conscious of the many-sided meaning of tribal life. The tribe—even a wandering tribe—means a place, a part of the earth that belongs to a particular people and their herds. The tribe determines who a man shall marry, and how. The tribe gives spiritual guidance and its members devote themselves to its welfare. A member of a tribe owes allegiance to its leaders and to its customary ways of life.

To most Africans, therefore, the idea of a state or nation with arbitrary boundary lines is strange and new. It is almost impossible for him to adjust to the new ways imposed upon him by the facts of modern political life. Most Africans refugees became refugees because of this basic misunderstanding.

Another fact of great significance is that many African countries have become focal points for the tension between East and West. In some instances, refugees have been used by the Communists as pawns in their effort to affect the political and economic future of the new nations.

Behind every fact there are a lot of other facts, which make understanding difficult, if not impossible. In general, we are witnesses to an unprecedented political change which is born largely out of the hope for freedom and a desire to participate in the life of the 20th century. Millions of people have been thrust from an almost prehistoric way of life into new patterns of society totally unfamiliar to them. The population of most African countries is surprisingly youthful. They are young people with young and fervent ambitions, hungry for education, and recognition.

As a result of this ferment, many thousands have become wanderers in a new sense—they are refugees. The Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees of the United Nations, the League of Red Cross Societies, and church mission and service agencies from the United States and many parts of the world are trying to meet the worst and largest emergency problems to the best of their ability. All are aware that there will be new problems involving many more thousands. All are aware of the potential catastrophe which is South Africa, with all the terrible possibilities that this impending upheaval involves.

And so, if our impressions of the African situation are not definitive, at least we know that there are thousands of people—men, women, and children—cast adrift by the "to and fro" of warfare and revolution who must have our help; they, like other refugees in other areas of the world, become a part of our responsibility as citizens of the "Century of the Homeless Man."

Country of asylum:	*Refugees 1965*
Africa (North)—area total	2,700
Algeria from Tunisia and Morocco	2,700
Africa (sub-Sahara)—area total	2,700
Burundi from Rwanda	80,000
Central African Republic from Sudan	5,000
Central African Republic from Congo	3,000
Congo from Angola	250,000
Congo from Rwanda	30,000
Congo from Sudan	10,000
Dahomey from Ivory Coast, Gabon, Senegal, Mali	12,000
Dahomey from Niger	16,000
Ethiopia from Sudan	5,000
Ethiopia from Somali	70,000
Kenya from Sudan	100
Tanzania (Tanganyika) from Congo	2,000
Tanzania from Rwanda	25,000
Tanzania from Mozambique	10,000
Tanzania from Southern Rhodesia	20
Tanzania from Kenya	2,500
Togo from Ghana	5,700
Uganda from Rwanda	50,000
Uganda from Sudan	40,000
Uganda from Congo, Leopoldville	8,000
Senegal from Portugese Guinea	35,000
Various African countries from South Africa	500
Zambia (Northern Rhodesia) from Congo and South Africa	30,000
Zambia from Angola	6,000

NEW REFUGEE PROBLEMS IN VIETNAM

(By William P. Bundy)

(NOTE.—Mr. William P. Bundy is Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. He is a lawyer who has had a long career in Government service, both in the State and Defense Departments. He has received the Department of Defense Medal for Distinguished Public Service. Mr. Bundy's article on the refugee problem in Vietnam is a part of a longer statement prepared for presentation before the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees on July 1, 1965.)

In 1954 and 1955 almost 1 million refugees left North Vietnam for the south following the partition of Vietnam by the Geneva accords of July 1954. These people, many of whom had experienced life under communism in Vietminh controlled areas, chose to abandon their homes and most of their possessions to flee from Vietminh rule. They were often led by their religious leaders. By 1957 the Government of Vietnam, with American economic assistance, had completed the monumental task of caring for and largely integrating these refugees into the society and economy of South Vietnam. These northern refugees are strongly anti-Communist and have contributed greatly to the government's military and civil programs.

By the late 1950's it had become clear to the Communists that South Vietnam was not going to fall of its own accord, and in fact with U.S. assistance was beginning to outstrip North Vietnam in economic and social progress. Hanoi therefore activated the Vietminh cadre left behind in the south in 1954 and the current military struggle had begun. Political subversion had been continuous since 1954. As Communist pressure in the South Vietnamese countryside has increased over the last few years ever greater numbers of refugees have left insecure areas to find shelter near or in district and provincial capitals. In 1962–63, over 100,000 mountain tribespeople fled Vietcong-dominated areas in the mountains of central Vietnam. The Ministry of Social Welfare of the Government of Vietnam has reported that in 1965, over 400,000 refugees have moved away from insecure areas; 380,000 Vietnamese were in refugee status on June 12; 230,000 of these are in the central plains and highlands of Vietnam. One may assume that if Vietcong military and terrorist operations continue to intensify, the flow of refugees will continue to grow.

Basic responsibility for caring for these refugees lies, of course, with the Vietnamese Government. As part of its continuing program, the Government has recently released to the provincial governments 47 million piasters (the equivalent of $783,000) for refugee relief. Each refugee receives allowances for food, blankets, mosquito nets, cloth and adequate shelter. Allowances are adequate but are limited to providing necessities in order to avoid attracting refugees unnecessarily.

U.S. private voluntary agencies and the AID mission in Vietnam provide technical and logistical support to the Ministry of Social Welfare's refugee program. For example, AID has under allocation to the program 250,000 sheets of tin roofing and 6,000 metric tons of cement as well as significant quantities of Public Law 480 foodstuffs, blankets, mosquito nets, and surplus clothing. Each American voluntary agency, cooperating with the others and the Government of Vietnam through a coordinating committee, has agreed to procure specific items for refugee assistance. In addition, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Ecuador, France, West Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Ireland, Israel, Korea, Laos, Netherlands, Pakistan, Philippines, Spain, and Turkey have provided varying amounts of assistance to the Vietnamese refugee program.

The motivation of the Vietnamese who left North Vietnam in 1954 and 1955 and of those who are now fleeing from insecure areas differ to some degree. Those who fled from North Vietnam became refugees for political reasons. Many of them knew what communism would mean for the north; almost all of them knew that they did not wish to live in a Communist state. Conditions in

North Vietnam, where most of the people have been from time to time on short rations, would undoubtedly produce a continued flow of refugees if Hanoi's restrictive controls and the difficulty of traversing the border did not make the journey for a refugee nearly impossible.

The motivation of the refugees who are now leaving insecure and Communist controlled areas in South Vietnam is more complex. Most of them are fleeing from conditions of war which are becoming more intense as a result of generally increased military activity in the areas in which they lived. Many left their home areas as a result of their unwillingness to accept further Vietcong terrorism and taxation. Many left at the urging of religious leaders, both Catholic and Buddhist, who know the fate of their religions in Communist areas. Some left as a result of last autumn's typhoons and floods.

While these southern refugees are not motivated as clearly by political opposition to communism as were the refugees from North Vietnam in 1954–55, two things about them are clear: first, they chose to escape the war by moving to Government- rather than Communist-controlled areas, and second, the conditions of war from which they fled were produced by Hanoi's aggression against South Vietnam. Their villages were peaceful until attacked by the Vietcong in strength or in small terrorist teams. The dependents of those who fought back were attacked. Their village administrative and religious leaders were terrorized. In the last 18 months, for example, more than 2,000 local officials and civilians in South Vietnam have been murdered. Their rice fields and sometimes even their villages become battlefields. These pressures are illustrative of the pressures facing many more of the people in the Vietnamese countryside. They are examples of the techniques used by the Communists in attempting to destroy the society and local government which a young nation must build.

The existence of large bodies of refugees present problems, of course, for the Government of Vietnam and for the United States. It is expensive and difficult to care for them, particularly in the face of increasing interdiction by the Vietcong of Vietnam's transportation routes, which is causing higher food prices for the people and further dislocation of the economy in central Vietnam. If not properly cared for, the refugee settlements could become pockets of dissatisfaction. Some of the refugee groups probably contain Vietcong infiltrators.

The instability of the Government of Vietnam hampers to some degree the efficiency of its refugee program. The largest potential problem lies in the strain that rehabilitating the refugees will place on the already heavily loaded Government economic program. While the ultimate goal of the refugee program is to create the conditions under which the refugees can return to their villages in security, the increasing severity of the war will probably force the Government to develop programs for putting the refugees to productive use in the areas in which they have been resettled, until such time as they might have the option of returning to their villages.

We believe that the Government of Vietnam, with our and other free-world nations' help, can overcome or avoid these various problems. Victims of the Communist war in Vietnam, the refugees have shown that they prefer to live in areas under Government control. As such they are potential sources of anti-Communist strength. While the recent refugee movement has not as yet proved to be an unmanageable problem for the Government of Vietnam, the United States will continue to watch the situation closely in case larger scale American assistance in this area becomes necessary.

No End Yet

(By Charles H. Jordan)

(Note.—Charles H. Jordan was named Director General of the Joint Distribution Committee in July 1965. He succeeded Moses A. Leavitt, JDC Executive Vice Chairman who died in Geneva June 21. As JDC Director General for Overseas Operations, Mr. Jordan's title until his recent appointment, Mr. Jordan has been most active in the field of international social welfare. From 1959 to 1961, he served as cochairman of the International Committee for World Refugee Year. Elected as chairman of the Governing Board of the International Council of Voluntary Agencies upon its creation in 1962, he is now serving as president of the ICVA General Conference. In 1963, Mr. Jordan was awarded the Norwegian Refugee Council's annual plaque in recognition of both JDC's and his personal services to the refugee cause. In October 1964, he received the Nansen Ring from the International Sovereign Committee Fridtjof Nansen for outstanding services in the refugee cause.)

In 1964 between 74,000 and 77,000 Jews set out to make new lives for themselves in new lands—refugees and migrants from the lands of their birth. This was no new or startling development; in the past two decades there has not been a single year without substantial numbers of Jewish migrants.

It is never easy for a man to give up his home, to turn his back on the country, the customs, the people, the language he always knew, to trade his lifelong status for that of refugee.

The decision to leave his home is always a difficult and painful one. In the end, more often than not his departure is a matter of survival for himself and his children. He is driven by economic disasters, by political upheavals, by religious or racial persecution. This is particularly true for Jewish minorities; they are caught between quarreling political factions; they become the first victims of economic crises.

The world may be going through a period of general stability, yet changing conditions in a single country or a larger geographical area may turn thousands of Jews into wanderers. Even the past 5 years have reflected the impact of local crises. In 1960—the low point—there were only 35,000 Jewish refugees. Yet in 1962 there were 175,000. For in that year Algeria became independent. The Jews of that country found themselves caught in the crossfire between Algerian nationalists and the French settlers. Their lives were in danger; their means of livelihood were cut off. In a period of 3 or 4 months some 90,000 to 100,000 Jews—almost the entire Jewish population of Algeria—fled the country, the vast majority of them to settle in France.

The volume of Jewish migration varies from year to year. Sometimes from month to month, but it continues. Today, the movement is chiefly from North Africa and from Eastern Europe. Since the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, by far the largest number of Jewish migrants have sought haven there. But there have been very substantial numbers also who have found hospitality and opportunity in France, in the United States, in Latin America, Australia, and other parts of the free world.

The Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) is no longer a migration agency. Of the international Jewish agencies, the Jewish Agency for Israel bears responsibility for immigration to Israel, while the United Hias Service concentrates its efforts on the resettlement of Jewish emigrants in areas outside of Israel.

Nevertheless, in 1964 JDC provided assistance of one kind or another to more than 47,000 Jewish refugees, transients, or repatriates, aiding them directly or through cooperating and subsidized organizations. This aid was made possible because of funds provided in America through the United Jewish Appeal.

JDC's assistance to the migrants is sometimes of a temporary nature, providing maintenance for them en route or in the countries of temporary haven until they are able to depart for the countries of their final destination. Such JDC assistance has been given in recent years in a number of European countries which have provided temporary shelter for refugees—France and Italy in the main, but also Austria and Belgium.

Many of the refugees have been aged or sick and required special and extended care, even the young and able-bodied have had great difficulty in adapting to their new lives and in becoming economically independent. In France, Jewish refugees who held French citizenship were able to call on the government for a wide variety of economic and social assistance. Those who were not French citizens, however, had to turn to local Jewish organizations, subsidized by JDC for relief and medical care, to help in finding housing and jobs, and for the establishment of religious and educational institutions for themselves and their children.

In addition, JDC is still providing support for a small number of refugees from the Nazi period, as well as former displaced persons—even at this late date. But primarily those in need of long-term aid are the aged, the ill, and the handicapped.

There are no universally accepted criteria to determine when a refugee ceases to be a refugee, when a newcomer can be considered "established" in his new home.

To the 47,000 migrants whom JDC aided in 1964 might be added another and even larger group: more than 52,000 men and women in Israel. In that country JDC has established a medical and welfare program, called Malben, solely on behalf of the aged, the ill, and the handicapped who came to the Jewish state from other countries after 1948. A large number of them had lost their entire families in the war or in the concentration camps. Others were in need of aid because their families were unable to provide for them during the difficult period of reintegration.

Many of the 52,000 are being cared for in hospitals and in old-age homes. Others receive financial aid to enable them to live normal lives as a part of a community. And each year, as the population grows older, additional numbers of these former refugees apply to JDC-Malben for assistance. And in most cases those who apply for Malben assistance and receive it will continue to require such help until the end of their days.

Nor does the total size of the migration movement always determine the number who will need JDC help. In recent years, for example, the annual influx into Israel has fallen off from its peak, yet the proportion of aged, ill, and handicapped immigrants increased—and so have JDC's responsibilities. No one could have predicted this, but someone had to be prepared for it.

That was JDC's function, that was JDC's role, as it has been in this and other fields for the more than 50 years since JDC was founded. From its very inception in 1914, JDC has been called upon to assist the homeless and the fleeing. Even during World War I there were frantic appeals for aid from the tens of thousands of Jews in eastern Europe who were driven from their homes by the warring armies of the Kaiser and the Czar.

Despite all JDC's years of experience, there is no method of forecasting the numbers of Jewish refugees—even from month to month. There are too many variables—new political developments, worsening economic conditions, the anti-Semitism which is endemic to certain nationalist movements or the anti-Semitism which finds in the Jew a convenient scapegoat in times of difficulty and crisis.

The number will vary, but it would be naive to believe that the era of the Jewish refugee is ended. That era will end, perhaps, only with the arrival of a man-made millenium—when all men will have forsaken their inhumanity toward other men.

THE CUBAN STORY

The story of the resettlement of Cuban refugees in the United States is still unfinished. It is the story of the only refugee group ever to come to the United States as a country of first asylum. The courage and self-reliance of the refugees themselves are evident in every chapter, from their arrival in Florida and the relief of being free, through the days of waiting and hardships of their daily life on the way to their new homes.

Since January 1961, 177,150 persons have registered with the Cuban Emergency Refugee Center in Miami, Fla. Eighty-eight thousand three hundred and eighty-seven have found new homes in every State. In addition to the essential welfare and reception services provided by the U.S. Government through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, private vountary agencies have done a magnificent job in finding homes and arranging for the detailed and difficult settlement of the refugees and their families.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference, through its refugee service, has resettled 52,574, people, the International Rescue Committee has resettled 18,507; Church World Service 15,181, United HIAS Service 2,125. These four agencies are continuing their work, and because the massive inflow of refugees was stopped by the Castro government, the work of the agencies is now mainly with specialized groups, for whom special services and opportunities must be found. For example, more than 12,000 unaccompanied Cuban children came to this country. Homes have been found for most and schooling and health services provided them by our Government. Many of them have now reached the age of 18, at which time they are transferred to the adult Cuban refugee program. They are too old for child care and, in many cases, too young simply to be on their own. The Cuban Refugee Center has now started a program to encourage American families to take these young people into their homes during their college careers. If there are, among our readers, persons who would like to befriend one of these young men or women, they are invited to write to "Friends of Young Cubans," Cuban Refugee Center, Freedom Tower, Miami, Fla.

The second group having special needs is a company of about 1,000 women who came here, without their husbands, bringing their young children. Many wait and hope that their husbands may join them, and, in the meantime, have learned English and tried to provide a normal home life for their children.

There continues to be a valiant company who will still make their way across the waters to freedom. In May 1965, for example, 72 men, women, and children arrived in eight small boats. These, like the thousands who preceded them, will need homes and jobs.

The resettlement of 80,000 refugees, and their integration into new communities is a real success story. It is a wonderful story of a very large group of people—most of whom have had to learn English—who have perfected their professional abilities and are now working as teachers, medical technicians, engineers, accountants, etc., and who have become self-reliant, valuable citizens and neighbors.

REFUGEES AND THE NEW IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

(By Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY)

(NOTE.—EDWARD MOORE KENNEDY was born in Brookline, Mass., Feb. 22, 1932, one of nine children of former Ambassador to Great Britain and Mrs. Joseph P. Kennedy.

(Senator KENNEDY was elected to the United States Senate on Nov. 6, 1962, to fill the unexpired term of the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy. He was reelected to a full 6-year term by a total vote of 1,716,907. His plurality, 1,129,244 votes, is the largest ever given a candidate for the U.S. Senate in Massachusetts. He is presently serving on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, the Special Committee on Aging, and the Judiciary Committee, where he is chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, and has chaired hearings of the Subcommittee on Immigration.)

A recent Gallup Poll reflects what many believe has long been the attitude of the American people—that the discriminatory national origins quota system of selecting immigrants should be eliminated from the statute books.

There is good reason to believe this objective will be accomplished in this session of Congress. The same forces of common sense and decency which are producing legislative progress in the areas of civil rights and equal opportunity for American citizens, are also producing progress in efforts to reform those laws which govern the admission of immigrants.

The issue of immigration reform inevitably involves attitudes and policies toward refugees. Historically, our country has responded to their needs with compassion, understanding, and sympathy. Through government channels and the private voluntary agencies sponsored by American religious and civic organizations, the people of the United States have played a leading role in providing material assistance and resettlement opportunities to refugees.

Resettlement in the United States has been a particularly conspicuous mark of this Nation's leadership. Chiefly through special measures, over a million refugees have been admitted to the United States since the end of World War II. President Truman's Directive of 1945 and the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 were early post-war indicators of America's active concern for victims of oppression and warfare. In subsequent years Congress enacted the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, the more recent "Fair Share" Refugee Law, and legislation to admit as permanent residents several thousand Hungarian refugees and Dutch-Indonesian expellees from Indonesia. President Kennedy's Hong Kong Parolee Program, announced in 1962 at the height of a serious refugee crisis in the British Crown Colony, authorized the admission of several thousand refugees from Communist China.

With few exceptions, refugee immigrants are proving to be sturdy members of their adopted communities, and are contributing unselfishly to our economy, our social well-being, and our democratic way of life.

Few areas of public policy carry with them the direct citizen participation so keenly displayed in the resettlement of refugees. In every corner of our country people have readily opened their hearts and homes to refugee immigrants—from eastern and central Europe, from Asia, from the Western Hemisphere, from the Middle East, and north Africa. In a real sense the resettlement programs have been, and continue to be, a joint effort of the American people and their Government. They are stories of democracy in action that all the world should hear. They reflect the humanitarian tradition of the United States as a haven for the victims of war, persecution, and tyranny. They promote greater understanding by Americans of conditions in totalitarian societies, and of the continuing need to exert leadership of freemen we as a nation claim is ours.

In light of America's tradition and ideals, and our wealth of experience with refugee immigrants, it is ironic that our basic immigration statute, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, contains no separate provisions for the admission of refugees. The fair share refugee law does not, of course, adequately fill this void. This factor, the continuing flight of people from areas of conflict and oppression, and the periodic pressure for special legislation, underscore the urgent need to include specific refugee provisions in any reform of the basic law.

The legislative recommendations which President Kennedy and President Johnson have sent to Congress clearly reflect this need. So too, does the following recommendation in a recent report of the Judiciary Committee on Refugees and Escapees: "The subcommittee recommends that the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary—in its current review of immigration reform measures—seriously consider the need of a continuing flexible authority in our basic immigration statute for the annual admission, in reasonable numbers, of refugees from all over the world. Such an authority would provide a needed instrument in our foreign policy, and reflect America's concern for the homeless and oppressed."

No thoughtful American will suggest that refugee problems will find their solution in a pattern of immigration to the United States. For example, many problems, especially the newer ones in Africa and Asia, do not lend themselves to resettlement solutions in countries far removed from the asylum areas. Nevertheless, the benefits that resettlement opportunities in the United States would afford to a reasonable number of individual refugees and family units in various parts of the world, many of whom have relatives in this country, are highly desirable.

A sound refugee admission policy will include two basic authorities. The first will permit a regular annual admission of refugees from known areas of continuing need in Europe, North Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. A second authority will permit the President, if he determines it is in the national interest, to act quickly in times of emergency and direct the admission of refugee immigrants from areas of severe crisis. The President's current legislative recommendations on immigration reform make provision for both authorities. I believe Congress recognizes the need in this area. In enacting a just immigration law, we should anticipate that Congress will include humane provisions for refugees fleeing from tyranny, oppression, and conflict.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION YEAR AND SERVICE TO REFUGEES

(By Harlan Cleveland)

(NOTE.—Harlan Cleveland, an administrator, editor and educator, was sworn in as Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, on Feb. 23, 1961.

(From 1945 to 1946, Mr. Cleveland was Acting Vice-President of the Allied Commission in Rome. Thereafter, he was associated with the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) as Deputy Chief of Mission in Italy and, at the age of 29, as Director of the $650,000 China Program of UNRRA with headquarters in Shanghai. He then served as the Director of the China Air Program for the Economic Cooperation Administration in Washington and was appointed by Administrator Paul G. Hoffman to supervise the building of five other U.S. aid programs in the Far East during 1949–50. At the end of 1951, he became Assistant Director of the Mutual Security Agency, in charge of its European program.

(Mr. Cleveland was recently appointed U.S. Ambassador to NATO.)

Anyone with an active concern for the plight of the uprooted and homeless knows that the international refugee situation changes drastically, even over very short periods of time. It is unfortunate, I think, that many people still automatically tend to equate the word "refugee" with the displaced person in Europe after Hitler's war. It is true that there is a continuing problem in Europe, but today's refugees are increasingly non-Europeans.

Today every aspect of caring about—and caring for—refugees is increasingly an international and cooperative effort, whether one is thinking of repatriation, protection, resettlement, integration into new communities, or the provision of emergency relief to sustain life itself. I earnestly hope that during the course of the International Cooperation Year we in this country can decide what we want to do, and what we would like others to do, in a way both practical and compassionate so that what we began in 1965 will benefit the uprooted and homeless long after this International Cooperation Year is over.

In 1965 there are refugee problems in the most exotic and remote corners of the world—and right in our own backyard. For example, we have Cuban exiles in Florida and Central America; thousands of Angolans have sought refuge—ironically enough—in the troubled Congo; tall Watusi tribesmen are scattered over East and Central Africa, and more than 800,000 Palestinians are still on an international dole. We even see Tibetan refugees in Switzerland.

Clearly, we need to remind our people here, and everywhere, that the world refugee picture is very different from the early postwar stereotype, and that citizens and governments alike might profit from a new look at the present phase of an ever-changing problem.

International Cooperation Year, 1965, is a particularly appropriate time for those concerned with refugees to remind their fellow citizens that things have changed, that in 1965 many of the refugees are a different kind of people—with very different problems—from the European "DP" who traditionally has been closer to us culturally and emotionally because of ethnic ties.

I say that 1965 is "particularly appropriate" mainly because it is now, but also because the Government and citizens of the United States are engaged in a unique experiment during this International Cooperation Year (ICY). The ICY program can provide an excellent opportunity to say what needs to be said about the current state of the world's refugees.

The ICY program in the United States is not only an unprecedented experiment in cooperation on international affairs between government and citizenry; it is also a uniquely American response to a U.N. General Assembly resolution designating 1965 as International Cooperation Year, an action originally taken in order to focus world attention on cooperation—or, to put it another way, to correct the misconception that only the crises which dominate the headlines are the truly important things going on in the world on a given day.

In many countries the response to this resolution was to undertake a rather ceremonial or commemorative program, with emphasis on 1965 as the 20th birthday of the United Nations.

In this country, the response to the U.N. resolution took on an additional dimension last October when President Johnson proclaimed 1965 International Cooperation Year in the United States. The President not only agreed with the original idea that it was necessary to emphasize the great and growing amount of cooperation in the world, but he also decided that this country should do something to improve and extend our cooperative arrangements.

The result was his decision to call a White House Conference on International Cooperation at which specific recommendations will be submitted to the President on ways to strengthen or expand mutually beneficial cooperation in thirty-one different fields ranging from arms control through health, labor, meteorology, peacekeeping operations, resource conservation, science and technology, space, trade and urban development.

In each of these thirty-one fields we have set up combined private-Government working committees. These committees have the task of reviewing our present international position in the field of, say, space or trade, determining where we ought to be going in the next few years; and then recommending to the President specific and practical "next steps" we ought to take to reach those goals. Directing the Government side of this joint enterprise is a Cabinet committee. On the private side, the United Nations Association of the U.S.A. is coordinating and stimulating citizen participation. Our report to the President is due in November of this year at a White House Conference.

The result of this rather complicated arrangement is a marvelously untidy and active "idea factory" in which there is a good deal of overlap in the research and development lab—and I am certain that some of our more adventurous committees are preparing effervescent potions for policy prescriptions which will look downright dangerous to experts working on another committee. However, when this program began, the President charged us "to search and explore and canvass and thoroughly discuss every possible approach to cooperation." This we are doing through our formal arrangements in the ICY combined committees.

There is also provision for more direct participation by the citizenry at large. I would like at this time to point out that the United Nations Association has issued an invitation to more than 600 nongovernmental organizations in the United States, asking for a report on their current international activities, and for proposals for cooperative projects which could be undertaken in either government or the private sector. There has been a very encouraging initial response to this invitation, and I expect that we will be hearing from many more nongovernmental organizations through the United Nations Association as the White House Conference approaches. We have already heard once from the U.S. Committee for Refugees, whose resolution on ICY and refugee matters has been referred to the Human Rights Committee of the ICY program. It is my hope that the Government and private committees on human rights can find practical next steps to recommend to the White House Conference this November.

It is true that the U.S. Government already participates fully in major programs of refugee relief which range from the U.S. escapee programs and aid for Tibetan refugees through the international programs of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees and the U.N. Relief and Works Agency. And the work of private citizens in this field is well-known and many sided. But even with all the impressive work that is already being done, I am sure that changes in emphasis will be required as new situations develop. We must be alert in identifying the real needs in these new situations while continuing to fulfill our established commitments. We must strive to give refugees stable and productive lives in their changed circumstances as soon as possible, for a continued dole is a distortion of true humanitarianism.

ELLIS ISLAND—A HISTORIC SITE

President Lyndon B. Johnson, on May 11, 1965, issued a proclamation adding the 27½ acres of Ellis Island to the Statue of Liberty National Monument in New York Harbor. This proclamation closes the prolonged discussion on the possible uses of Ellis Island. Between its opening in 1892, and 1954, when the island's immigration center was closed, more than 16 million aliens passed through its halls—on the way to American citizenship and a new life.

Ellis Island is now to be developed by the National Park Service as a historic site. It will commemorate the story of the immigrant and refugee and their contributions to the building of the Nation. Mr. Edward Corsi, former Commissioner of Immigration, who worked on the island when it was a reception center, made the suggestion for its proposed adaptation as a part of the Liberty Island National Monument. The proposal was made to a Senate subcommittee headed by Senator MUSKIE, of Maine.

A State park is to be developed on the Jersey City waterfront facing Ellis Island. This area, now a blighted flatland, will become a recreational site, with possible access to Ellis Island via a pedestrian bridge.

Ellis Island is not only a place in New York Harbor—it is a place in the hearts and minds of many millions of our citizens. No doubt, at one time, their memories of this place were, at best bittersweet because, on this island were gathered not only the great hopes of the millions who came here but the hardships and frustrations of their journeys as well. By now, with the passage of time, many of the bitter memories are gone and Ellis Island represents to these people and their descendants, their entrance upon a new and fuller life which is the realization of hopes far exceeding the great expectations which they carried from the countries of their birth.

Ellis Island is the place where our country received much of the richest treasure we own—our people—endowed with an almost infinite variety of strengths. Many of these people were refugees escaping from a whole range of oppressive circumstances. They were, as the poet said, tired and they were poor. But they found their asylum here and each, in his own way and place, began a new life which became a part of the fabric of our growing Nation. We are reminded daily that we welcomed not only the tired and the poor, but also the richly talented of every land * * * we welcomed their creativity and their courage and their ambition. We see now, and proudly acknowledge the contributions which have been made by the immigrant and the refugee to the scientific, technical, artistic, cultural, and academic life of our country. We can therefore believe that our country has been made strong and rich and beautiful by a sort of "Peace Corps in reverse" which has been going on through the generations.

There will be millions of Americans who will rejoice that Ellis Island has been recognized as a shrine which symbolizes this central core of our Nation's history. But it is not only the history of the immigrant and the refugee which comes to focus here, it is also the belief in liberty and freedom, symbolized by the Statue of Liberty which becomes a significant part of the public's interest in this new development. So, not only the sons and daughters of the immigrants who entered this country through Ellis Island, but also the devotees of freedom who came at other times and other places, will make their pilgrimage here.

LABOR LOOKS AT IMMIGRATION

(By George Meany, president, AFL–CIO)

(NOTE.—In his rise from labor leader to labor statesman, Mr. Meany has been dedicated to preserving labor's integrity and honesty of purpose, in addition to pursuing the interests of the wage-earning citizen. He has been highly effective in promoting labor unity by resolving jurisdictional disputes and interunion competition for members.

(During World War II, Mr. Meany helped maintain productivity as a member of the War Labor Board. In the postwar period, he has played a leading role in strengthening democratic trade unions abroad through his support of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. He has been a delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations. Currently he serves the national welfare as a member of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy and as a member of the President's Committee on Youth Employment.

(Mr. Meany is a founder member and vice president of the U.S. Committee for Refugees and has been honored widely throughout his career for service to refugees and other humanitarian causes.)

The AFL–CIO is strongly in favor of the administration immigration bill, S. 500. The principal purpose of this bill is to abolish the national origins quota system. This system reflects racial and ethnic prejudices that are absolutely indefensible and in direct conflict with our American principles and our historical heritage of freedom and equality.

Our three latest Presidents have all called for putting an end to the discriminatory treatment accorded immigrants under the national origins quota system—President Eisenhower in 1960, President Kennedy in 1963, and President Johnson today. On January 15 of this year, President Johnson said: "In establishing preferences, a nation that was built by the immigrants of all lands can ask those who now seek admission: 'What can you do for our country?' But we should not be asking: 'In what country were you born?'" He has placed a high priority on action by this Congress on his proposal to phase out the national origins quota system.

The labor movement, whose heritage is inextricably interwoven with that of immigrant forbears and breathren, most heartily endorses his proposal to terminate this manifestly unjust and discriminatory system. The majority of Americans are warmhearted, just, and hospitable; but that image of ourselves, unfortunately, does not generally prevail abroad. This is so largely because the quota system conveys abroad an impression of ethnic meanness and racial bigotry.

The immigration policy of the AFL–CIO was clearly expressed in a statement adopted in February 1965 at the AFL–CIO Executive Council meeting in Miami: "Forty-one years have elapsed since the national origins quotas were established to regulate immigration into this country. These quotas are based on the ethnic and racial composition of our population in 1920. As such, they stand in conflict with the principles of human brotherhood, equality, and justice and with the fact of our ethnic and racial diversity which are the cornerstones of our national strength and tradition. For many years the trade union movement has opposed this discriminatory system and urged its elimination from our immigration laws."

If we desire continued growth and progress we must stop asking those who wish to forge new and useful lives on our shore, "Whence do you come?" and ask instead, "Can you and will you freely accept the responsibilities that go with those rights and privileges which will be yours as citizens of the United States of America?" We must give up the fears and prejudices embodied in our present quota system. We should be confident in our strengths and proud to be chosen as a land in which strangers who come to our shores can have better and more productive lives than they have known before.

S. 500 recognizes the special needs of refugees. That is one of its strongest and most praiseworthy points. The great mass of refugees in the world today are not human beings fleeing from natural disasters like floods or earthquakes. They are mostly refugees from manmade calamaties from the terror of governments engaged in the ruthless extermination of the rights and freedoms of their own people.

The most flagrantly discriminatory provision of the old national origins quota system applies to the Asia-Pacific Triangle region. Over 81 percent of our quota immigrants come from Northern and Western Europe. Over 17 percent come from Southern and Eastern Europe (which is bad enough in its discriminatory impact), making an aggregate of over 98 percent from Europe alone. This leaves a mere 1.53 percent for Asia and the Pacific.

Terrible as this is, it is compounded even further by another peculiarity of the law which states that anyone deriving as much as one-half his ancestry from persons whose race is indigenous to the Asia-Pacific Triangle must be assigned to one of the small Asia-Pacific Triangle quotas. So, a person born in England, for instance, of a British father and a Japanese mother, because he is one-half Japanese, must be assigned to the very small quota for Japan. But a person of Italian ancestry born in England of analogous mixed-race type would be assigned to the much larger British quota.

This hardly helps our image in that part of the world where over one-half of the world's total population lives. Here in this area we are now engaged in a tremendous struggle to save a small country from the threat of a Communist takeover and to prevent liberty and freedom in the entire area from being trampled in the dust. The future history of mankind depends to a great, perhaps decisive extent on the outcome of the events in Asia. Yet in this struggle for men's minds in this area of the world we are handicapped by the most flagrant discrimination of all. We hand the Communists a propaganda weapon against us which they are not slow in using. How shortsighted can we be?

The AFL–CIO is, of course, mindful of its responsibilities not only to our members but to all those who work for a living. While unemployment remains at high levels, unlimited immigration would be a disservice to everyone—including the immigrants.

S. 500 would increase the total number of immigrants to be admitted under the new pooled quota system from 158,000 to 165,000 per year, or only 7,000 a year. Both President Kennedy and President Eisenhower recommended much larger increases. As President Johnson pointed out in his special immigration message: "No immigrants admitted under this bill could contribute to unemployment in the United States."

In 1963, 306,000 immigrants were admitted to the United States. Nearly two-thirds came in as nonquota immigrants or pursuant to private legislation. It is estimated that only one-fourth to one-third of the immigrants into the United States are jobseekers, and many of these are skilled and professional persons. These facts prove that we can accept many more immigrants than we are presently admitting.

Section 10(c)(2) of S. 500 would amend section 203(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act by providing a fourth preference quota for qualified prospective quota immigrants capable of filling particular labor shortages in the United States. We agree that such a preference is proper. But we are concerned lest, through improper administration, our already difficult unemployment problem be made much worse. The manpower needs to be filled by persons entering as fourth preference immigrants must be clearcut and not capable of being filled by unemployed members of our own work force. We, therefore, strongly urge that section 10(c)(2) of S. 500 should state specifically that the jobs to be filled by immigrants under the fourth preference quota must be permanent in nature and not merely seasonal or otherwise temporary.

To further assure protection of the American labor force, we believe that the bill should provide that the ultimate responsibility and authority to determine the existence of skill needs, under the first preference, and labor shortages under the fourth preference established by the bill, should be vested in the Secretary of Labor who alone has the data expertise to make such determinations.

We also strongly urge Congress to put expressly in the hands of the Secretary of Labor the authority to make the determination required by section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii) of the act for the admission of more immigrant aliens coming temporarily to the United States to perform "temporary services or labor."

Finally, we want to take this opportunity to urge the Congress to include in S. 500 a provision amending section 214(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to prohibit absolutely the temporary importation of foreign farmworkers.

We realize that this is a controversial issue but we believe that the Congress should meet it directly. Such foreign farm labor programs as the Mexican bracero and British West Indies importations have been allowed for much too long to limit the job opportunities of American workers, depress their wages and undermine their working and living conditions. The domestic labor supply clearly can satisfy this particular labor demand.

This, then, is the viewpoint of the AFL–CIO. We welcome and support the bill for its basic purpose of phasing out the national origins quota system, once and for all. We want to see it passed with the changes we have recommended.

In the past our heritage of freedom served as a beacon which drew the oppressed of the earth to our shores in an ever-increasing stream. We are a country built from the beginning by immigrants. The slow, painful march toward complete realization of that eternally valid ideal, "All men are created equal"; the overcoming of the violations of its spirit, which have too long been rampant in our history; the final elimination of all forms of discrimination based on race, creed, or color; the attainment of equal rights by all in voting, education, housing, jobs, etc., must include also, the elimination of discriminatory practices growing out of our present immigration laws.

AGENCIES WORKING WITH REFUGEES

I. INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES—UNHCR, UNRWA, ICEM

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y.: The UNHCR was established in 1951 to promote, organize and supervise international action on behalf of refugees. During 1964–65 the High Commissioner continued his programs of assistance to "old" refugees in camps in Austria, Germany and Greece. At the end of 1964 there were less than 1,000 such persons for whom permanent solutions had not been found.

During the period 1955 to 1964, the programs of assistance of the High Commissioner's office have led to the final resettlement of approximately 83,000 refugees from camps in Europe. The High Commissioner is providing direct assistance and coordination for private agency programs in behalf of new refugee groups under the "good office" function. The most serious problem at the present time concerns refugees in Africa, to 140,000 of whom the High Commissioner's office gave service in 1964. (The U.S. Government through ORM remained the principal contributor, both in cash and food commodities to the budget of the High Commissioner.)

United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA), United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y.: UNRWA is a special, temporary, nonpolitical body established by the General Assembly of the United Nations to provide assistance to the Palestine refugees. In cooperation with the "host" governments (Jordan, Lebanon, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United Arab Republic) it carries out its task of providing relief services—basic food rations, shelter, supplementary feeding and welfare to refugees in special need, health services, and education services (general education, vocational and teacher training and some university education).

At the end of 1964, 1,262,649 refugees were registered with UNRWA, of whom 876,297 received all UNRWA services, including food rations. Since half of the Arab refugees are under 18 years of age, UNRWA is striving to expand and improve its education and training programs, 172,720 pupils are taught by 4,723 teachers in 406 UNRWA schools. In addition, almost 60,000 refugee students attend government and private schools subsidized by UNRWA.

UNRWA has 10 residential teachers and vocational training centers with an overall capacity for some 3,500 trainees. One center at Ramallah, Jordan, is for girls, the others are for boys. A total of 32 courses are offered to the young men, and 7 courses to the young women in the vocational training centers.

UNRWA is financed entirely by voluntary contributions primarily from governments,[1] but also from donations from private sources which provide substantial support for the vocational training program. UNRWA is appealing for scholarships of $500 each of which provides a year's training for a refugee boy or girl. Two thousand are needed annually, and donors in return receive photographs and personal histories of the trainees they have "adopted."

UNRWA headquarters are in Beirut, Lebanon, and the agency operates in Lebanon, the Syrian Arab Republic, Jordan, and the Gaza strip, with liaison offices at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, and at the United Nations, N.Y.

Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM), 370 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.: Some 1,350,344 persons have been moved to new countries under ICEM's auspices since February 1, 1952, when the agency began operations. Of this number, 602,324 were refugees. The 1965 budget of ICEM has been fixed at $22.8 million[2] for the transportation and resettlement of 73,000 migrants, about 41,000 of whom are refugees. In 1964, ICEM actually moved over 10,000 more refugees than it did in 1954. Total refugee movements in 1964 were 36,676.

The influx of new refugees in the first 3 months of 1965 shows an increase in the number of refugees from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland; the flow from Yugoslavia and Rumania remains at the 1964 level.

Three groups make up this year's movement figure—the "old" refugees waiting for years for a chance to start a productive and meaningful life, recent refugee escapees, and the members of families of breadwinners who had emigrated on their own years ago.

II. U.S. GOVERNMENT—DHEW, ORM, AID

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (DHEW), Welfare Administration, Washington, D.C.: Operating the Cuban Refugee Program under a February 1961 Presidential directive, DHEW works closely with four voluntary agencies in resettlement efforts, and had, by March 31, 1965, resettled over 87,000 Cuban refugees of the more than 176,000 who voluntarily registered at the Cuban Refugee Center, Miami. Registrations continue as escapees by small boat risk the Straits of Florida crossing from their homeland, and others arrive via Mexico and Spain. With resettlement to sponsors and jobs the principal objective, the program also provides refugees with temporary financial assistance, surplus food distribution, health services, special training opportunities, funds for Cuban children's education in Miami, and foster care for unaccompanied children. The budget planned for fiscal year 1966 is near $32 million, which if spent would bring the total cost of the program to more than $213 million by June 30, 1966.

Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs (ORM), Department of State, Washington, D.C.: The U.S. Government, through the Department of State, is concerned with a variety of refugee problems throughout the world and participates in programs to assist the refugees and otherwise to resolve these problems. Some programs are directly operated by the United States working in cooperation with American and international voluntary agencies. In addition, the U.S. contributes to other refugee programs carried out by international organizations and provides surplus foodstuffs through the food for peace program for distribution to refugees by voluntary agencies, international organizations and other governments.

The U.S. Escapee Program (USEP) operates in Europe and the Near East where, through contracts with voluntary agencies, it assists directly in the integration and resettlement of refugees from European Communist countries. USEP assisted over 6,000 such refugees in 1964.

Under the Far East Refugee Program (FERP), the United States, in cooperation with the Hong Kong and Macao Governments and voluntary agencies, carries out a wide range of programs to assist Chinese refugees from Communist China. Among the projects carried out by FERP are integration, assistance, vocational training, medical services, educational facilities, and the distribution and conversion of surplus American foodstuffs. In 1964, for example, the United States made a grant to the World Rehabilitation Fund for the construction in Hong Kong of two training centers for the physically and mentally handicapped.

The United States maintains an assistance program for the Tibetan refugees in India and Nepal, most of whom fled from Tibet in 1959 and 1960 at the time the Dalai Lama made his dramatic escape. Since very few new refugees are arriving from Tibet, the basic problem is to assist in providing permanent reestablishment for approximately 60,000 refugees. Considerable progress has been made in this respect and thousands of Tibetans have already become reestablished in India. Every effort is being made to complete this program by the end of 1967. In 1964, the United States, in cooperation with American and international voluntary agencies, supported programs which provided food, medical care, technical training and educational assistance to the Tibetan refugees.

The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) plays a vital role in resolving refugee problems throughout the world. In addition to providing legal and political protection to refugees, the UNHCR conducts material assistance programs in their behalf which are designed to meet their most urgent relief needs and to reestablish the refugees as rapidly as possible on a basis of self-sufficiency. In 1964, roughly half of $3 million in UNHCR program funds was used toward resolving urgent refugee problems in Africa. The United States is a member of the Executive Committee of the UNHCR program and is the principal contributor both in cash and food commodities which are so vital in meeting emergency requirements, particularly in Africa.

The United States has been a member of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM) since the Committee was formed in 1951. ICEM provides a wide variety of services to refugees and migrants, its most important being transportation to various overseas countries of resettlement. Through its contribution to ICEM, the United States assists refugees and migrants to resettle and helps countries of resettlement by providing them with skilled and talented people who enrich the economic, political, and social structure of the countries to which they go. Over half of the 69,714 persons moved by ICEM in 1964 were refugees. The United States contributed $4,699,934 to ICEM during 1964.

There are approximately 1.26 million Palestine Arab refugees on the rolls of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). The UNRWA feeds and provides medical care for most of the refugees and houses 490,000 of them. Approximately half of the refugees are located in Jordan, the remainder being in the Gaza strip, Lebanon, and Syria. UNRWA has a primary educational program and an expanding vocational training program. Over the years, the United States has contributed approximately 70 percent of the total cost for the care of these refugees. In 1964, the United States contributed $24.7 million to UNRWA in cash and food.

Agency for International Development (AID), Voluntary Foreign Aid Service, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C.: The AID cooperates very closely with the private voluntary agencies engaging in a wide variety of overseas programs. These programs, while not always exclusively limited to refugees, do in fact, reach a large portion of the world.

Notable among the programs is the distribution of surplus American foodstuffs. AID reported that, for the first 6 months of 1964, private agencies distributed 973,440,704 pounds of food received from the U.S. Government, valued at $70,095,779.

Many American voluntary agencies have had long experience in providing welfare, education, housing, rural development, health, and agricultural services to people in underdeveloped areas.

AID's Voluntary Foreign Aid Service serves as the focal point of contact between the voluntary agencies and AID.

In addition to its contractual arrangements, AID encourages, through the Voluntary Foreign Aid Service, informal noncontractual relationships in technical cooperation overseas between voluntary agencies and the AID missions. The agencies' services are supported from their own resources.

III. VOLUNTARY AGENCIES

American Council for Emigres in the Professions, Inc. (ACEP), 345 East 46th Street, New York, N.Y.: The American Council for Emigres in the Professions, Inc. specializes in counseling, retraining and placement services to refugee professional men and women. In addition to approximately 2,000 academically trained emigres currently in its active files, ACEP registered 1,202 new refugee professionals during the past fiscal year ending April 30, 1965. The majority, 569 came from Latin America, mostly from Cuba and Haiti; 536 came from behind the Iron Curtain—with a significant number of Rumanians among them. The balance of new applicants came from troubled areas in the Near, the Middle and the Far East. Our new registrants were trained originally in 65 fields of learning in the humanities, the social and natural sciences, art, music, and the applied arts and sciences. The largest groups of professionals were doctors, teachers, engineers, lawyers, accountants, linguists and business administrators. The Council was able to secure a total of 318 professional placements—not counting the positions which many applicants found on their own as a result of ACEP's counseling. In addition, 125 interim jobs were secured for applicants while perfecting their English or preparing for ultimate professional employment.

---

[1] In 1964, the U.S. Government contributed $24.7 million in cash and foodstuffs.

[2] The U.S. contribution (through ORM) to the ICEM budget in 1964 was $4,699,934.

As in the past, special reorientation or retraining courses were offered to channel the talents of refugee professionals into areas where there is acute need for trained personnel.

The American Council for Judaism Philanthropic Fund, 201 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.: In 1964 the American Council for Judaism Philanthropic Fund helped 2,142 refugees of Jewish faith from Iron Curtain countries and displaced persons from North Africa and the Middle East resettle in France, Italy, Austria, Belgium and the United States. It gave two scholarships to Arab refugees in UNRWA Vocational Training Schools and continued its support of the Shaare Zedek Hospital and the Association for the Blind in Israel.

American Council for Nationalities Service (ACNS), 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.: ACNS and its member agencies are primarily concerned with services to immigrants and refugees after they arrive in American communities. These services are designed to aid in their adjustment and integration. ACNS also helps in the resettlement of refugees and is particularly involved today with refugees from Cuba and Hong Kong. In the Cuban program ACNS cooperates actively with the several resettlement agencies, aiding in finding jobs and housing. Member agencies of ACNS also seek to stimulate broad community receptivity for resettlement, and promote the establishment of nondenominational resettlement committees composed of representative elements in the community. During 1964 ACNS and its member agencies provided casework services to more than 50,000 immigrants and refugees and group work activities for some 150,000 persons of foreign birth or parentage.

American Emergency Committee for Tibetan Refugees, Inc. (AECTR), 1790 Broadway, room 705, New York, N.Y.: The American Emergency Committee for Tibetan Refugees, Inc., was founded in the spring of 1959, when the Dalai Lama led the flight of Tibetan refugees from the brutalities and ruthlessness of the Communist invaders. It was the first voluntary agency to come to the aid of these unfortunate victims of aggression. The first phase of AECTR aid to the Tibetan refugees was concerned with emergency help. Working in close cooperation with the Indian government, AECTR assisted in setting up primary shelter camps and meeting the urgent needs of clothing, medicines, food, and shelter. Gradually, over the years, the emphasis of the program has shifted toward rehabilitation and reeducation—to get the refugees settled, help them achieve self-support, learn new languages and customs, and become an integral part of their new environment. AECTR gives support to refugees in India, Bhutan, and Nepal.

To assist the approximately 6,000 small Tibetan refugee children who are either orphaned or separated from their families, AECTR has instituted an adopt a homeless Tibetan child program. The cost is $15 per month, or $180 per year. Adopting parents, who may be individuals or organizations, may indicate their preference for a boy or girl and will be supplied additional details about the child on request.

American Foundation for Overseas Blind (AFOB), 22 West 17th Street, New York, N.Y.: As the world's only specialized agency dealing exclusively with the problems of all blind people regardless of nationality, race, color, or creed, AFOB provides service to thousands of refugees who are among the world's 14 million blind people. During the year a complete braille printing plant was shipped to Hong Kong as part of the continuing program of assistance, conducted in cooperation with the Refugee Migration Unit, to blind refugees from China. Responsibility for the rehabilitation program set up by AFOB for refugees in Macau was turned over during the year to local authorities, with AFOB providing consultative services. A survey of programs for the blind in the Gaza Strip was carried out at the request of the Pontifical Mission, and AFOB is providing assistance to the facilities there. Throughout the world, the agency cooperates with UNRWA and other United Nations and U.S. Government agencies.

American Friends of Refugees, Inc., formerly American Friends of Russian Freedom, Inc., 55 West 42d Street, New York, N.Y.: In November 1964, American Friends of Russian Freedom, Inc., officially changed its name to American Friends of Refugees, Inc.

The agency maintains an administrative office in New York, and operational offices in Frankfurt/Main, Germany, and Brussels, Belgium.

In Germany approximately 300 Soviet and satellite escapees were provided assistance with food, clothing, housing, language training, and the securing of visas for the United States and Australia for those desiring to emigrate.

In Belgium an active integration program mainly assisted Russian miners sent to Belgium under the International Refugee Organization (IRO).

American Korean Foundation (AKF), 345 East 46th Street, New York, N.Y.: Although the four million refugees who fled from North to South Korea are listed as "officially integrated," more than one million are still unemployed and live in shacks. The foundation is fighting this poverty with housing for these homeless people. Last year refugees also benefited from AKF's agricultural aid and assistance to hospitals, clinics, laboratories, medical schools and orphanages. Destitute Koreans, refugee and nonrefugee, were assisted by AKF's provision of scholarships, medicines, vocational training, and educational and medical equipment.

American Friends Service Committee, Inc. (AFSC), 160 North 15th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.: The committee continued to provide programs for refugees in Hong Kong and Vienna as well as assisting in the integration of former refugees in Algeria. In addition, the committee continued to resettle refugees in the United States and is supplying material aid to Angolan refugees in the Congo and to handicapped Arab refugees in Jordan and Lebanon. The committee has developed an extensive family planning program as part of its public health education services in Hong Kong. The AFSC's three major programs to aid refugees are in the following areas:

Algeria: Establishment of a series of community development programs in rural villages composed of former refugees and displaced Algerians. The program includes training in manual skills, health education, agricultural extension work, and assistance in the organization of community projects; 250,000 returning refugees have merged with the rural population and benefit from this program.

Hong Kong: A program has been established within the largest resettlement housing project, offering such services as: a cooperative nursery school, a mothers' and a fathers' club, counseling and recreational groups for youth, and vocational training. Community development projects have been established in fishing villages inhabited by refugees around Hong Kong. Ten thousand refugees were directly involved in AFSC programs, while some 55,000 were reached indirectly.

Austria: Final stages of phasing out a resettlement program for Hungarian refugees. Some 300 refugees are involved.

United States: Resettlement of European, Chinese, Cuban and Arab refugees.

American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc. (AFCR), 1775 Broadway, New York, N.Y.: There has been a substantial increase in the number of refugees escaping Czechoslovakia into Germany, Austria and Italy. The AFCR caseload now includes more than 4,000 of such refugees, mostly difficult to resettle. The AFCR program is one of continuing assistance with resettlement, local integration, material and medical help, education, recreation, and rehabilitation of children. Newer refugees are resettled as soon as possible into the United States or other free world countries.

American Immigration and Citizenship Conference (AICC), 509 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.: The AICC, as an association of voluntary agencies, does not conduct programs of direct relief. But its work is of importance to refugees in that it bears upon their admission to this country and integration once they are here. The AICC is a coordinating agency for over 90 nonprofit and nonpolitical agencies interested in promoting a nondiscriminatory immigration policy. Standing committees initiate and carry out studies on immigration legislation, immigrant integration, citizenship preparation, international migration affairs and immigration research. AICC acts as a clearinghouse for information, stimulates conferences on immigration and refugees and provides the means for joint action by its member agencies. AICC's work is bolstered by its numerous publications.

American Middle East Rehabilitation, Inc. (AMER), 54 East 64th Street, New York, N.Y.: AMER's aims and objectives are threefold (1) to help provide vocational training for Palestine Arab refugee youths; (2) to provide emergency relief when needed in the Middle East, and (3) to promote and help support projects designed to help raise the standards of living in the Middle East. Chartered in New York in 1948 as American Middle East Relief, Inc., AMER changed its name in 1963 to more accurately reflect its present emphasis on rehabilitation.

During 1964, AMER raised the equivalent of 101 $500 vocational training scholarships. AMER solicits cash donations which are used to provide scholarships chiefly in UNRWA's vocational training schools. It also solicits gifts-in-kind of medical supplies from American pharmaceutical manufacturers, prepares them for shipment overseas, and donates them to UNRWA. UNRWA uses the money, originally budgeted for the purchase of essential drug supplies, to provide additional vocational training opportunities for some Palestine refugee youths.

Brethren Service Commission (BSC), 1451 Dundee Avenue, Elgin, Ill.: BSC is responsible for the HELP resettlement project for hard-core refugees in Sardinia. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has commended this pilot project for its success in dealing with the difficult-to-settle category of refugees. BSC also operates most of the service centers across the United States where material aid, clothing, blankets and medicines are processed for Church World Service, Inter-Church Medical Assistance, and some for Lutheran World Relief. BSC cooperates with CWS in resettling refugees in the United States, including those from Cuba.

Catholic Relief Services (CRS), National Catholic Welfare Conference (NCWC), 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York: CRS maintains welfare and assistance programs in more than 60 countries. These programs include: local integration, food distribution, vocational training, housing projects, and the provision of emergency supplies and other services.

In 1964, in addition to its continuing assistance in the resettlement of Cuban refugees, CRS was concerned with the growing problems arising from the fighting in Vietnam, and rendered service to 300,000 "tactical" refugees who have fled their homes because of military action.

For the first half of 1964 CRS sent overseas supplies including U.S. Government food surplus amounting to $73,998,320, and contributed to the support of its overseas programs $17,924,380.

Church World Service (CWS), 475 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y.; Church World Service has had a continuing interest in refugee resettlement programs since the end of World War II. In 1964, the Protestant and orthodox churches through CWS, in addition to their resettlement program and other direct services to refugees, maintained relief, self-help and other service projects. These programs were sustained by $32,752,443 worth of surplus and donated supplies, and $12,239,004 in cash expenditures.

CWS has been responsible for the resettlement of 146,431 people through December 31, 1964. During 1964, CWS resettled 1,750 Cuban refugees; 2,698 came to the United States under Public Law 86–648 (Fair Share Law); 2,059 entered under the Chinese Parole Program. CWS has continued to place emphasis on the Cuban Refugee Program and of the 15,107 Cubans registered with the agency since the inception of the Program in 1961, 14,762 have been resettled.

CWS works in very close cooperation with the World Council of Churches Service to Refugees which resettled 13,450 persons during 1964.

Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere, Inc. (CARE), 660 First Avenue, New York, N.Y.: Refugees in Asia and the Middle East are among the nearly 38 million people CARE is helping during the 1965 fiscal year, through food, self-help and medical programs in 39 countries. Now in its 20th year of service, CARE has distributed more than $725 million worth of aid since its inception, including U.S. agricultural abundance, specially purchased food supplies, vocational tools, health and educational equipment, medicines and hospital supplies. In its daily operations, CARE does not serve refugees as a special group, but directs its aid to them as part of its assistance for all groups of needy. However, at times of special stress, it has conducted special refugee programs. Most recently, it authorized purchase and distribution of 200,000 rice packages to help feed refugees uprooted by the war in South Vietnam. Refugees are also among the major beneficiaries of current CARE resettlement and job-training projects in South Korea, Israel, Hong Kong, Jordan and the Gaza Strip. The Agency for International Development (AID) reports that expenditures for all programs for the first 6 months of 1964 were $67,274,255.

Christian Children's Fund, Richmond, Va.: The Christian Children's Fund provides a wide range of aid—financial, medical, educational, food, clothing, care, adoptions—for both refugee and non-refugee children all over the world. Its principal refugee relief projects last year included:

Brazil: assistance to families who have migrated from the country to the city and have not been able to acclimate themselves to metropolitan economics.

Hong Kong: assistance to several roof-top schools for refugee children, providing books, clothes, emergency medical aid, and one meal a day.

India: maintaining refugee children from Tibet in orphanges close to the disputed border areas.

Israel: educational and emergency aid to children of Arab refugees living near Bethany.

Korea: financial aid to orphanages caring for children of North Korean refugees who have either been abandoned or separated from their families.

Direct Relief Foundation (DRF), 27 East Canon Perdido Street, Santa Barbara, Calif.: The Direct Relief Foundation aids both refugees and destitute people with direct contributions of medicines, food and clothing. Last year the foundation administered more than $7½ million worth of aid in Africa, Asia, South and Central America and Europe. Of this amount, $1¼ million went to refugees in Costa Rica, Guatemala, Hong Kong, Macao, South Vietnam, and Jordan. About 99 percent of this aid was in drugs, medicines and hospital supplies.

The Thomas A. Dooley Foundation, Inc., 442 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif: The Dooley Foundation renders medical and health service to refugees and nationals alike who would otherwise receive no care at all. The locations of the program centers are confined to southeast Asia with a total of 11 programs in 5 countries—India, Nepal, Thailand, Laos, and South Vietnam. Of these 11 programs, 4 are primary refugee relief. In India mobile health units serve Tibetan refugees in the Punjab and in the Kulu Valley. There is a self-help program of handicrafts and sales at Mussoorie. The other major endeavor in Tibetan refugee assistance is a program of social and educational assistance in foster home care for over 1,000 Tibetan children in the school center at Mussoorie. The fourth unit primarily concerned with refugee care is directed to an institution caring for nearly 600 orphans in South Vietnam.

Hadassah, 65 East 52d Street, New York, N.Y.: Although the Women's Zionist Organization of America does not deal directly with refugees, its work does affect refugees who are being resettled into Israel. Hadassah's health, social welfare and education facilities benefit refugees as well as native Israelis. Last year the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center handled 250,000 patient visits at its outpatient clinic, gave inpatient service to 15,000 people, provided 5,000 patients with surgery and treated 25,500 emergency cases. It is impossible to determine the number of resettled refugees who availed themselves of these medical services and other Hadassah facilities.

Heifer Project, Inc., 45 Ashby Road, P.O. Box 278, Upper Darby, Pa.: Refugee self-help and resettlement programs are the beneficiaries of Heifer Project aid, which takes the form of donations of livestock, poultry, and technical services. In 1964 HPI participation in refugee projects included:

Jordan: A total of $1,740 toward the purchase of chicks and goats for distribution through the UN program and through the Central Coordinating Committee of Voluntary Agencies.

Hong Kong: $1,112 to Church World Service for small animal purchases.

Ryukyu: $25 for baby chick project.

Congo: 42,750 baby chicks to support the programs of the Congo Protestant Relief Agency and the U.N. chick project.

Japan: 21 heifers, 2 bulls, and 10 pigs for farmers in Hokkaido.

Korea: 50 heifers, 1 bull, 12 goats, and 12 pigs for farm families.

Bolivia: One planeload of livestock distributed in the Santa Cruz area. Refugees benefited from this project only insofar as it related to the colonists from the Orient.

Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training (ORT), 222 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.: Basic refugee services include vocational and technical training, apprenticeship placement and aid in job finding on behalf of Jewish refugees primarily. Several thousand refugees from north Africa were enrolled in ORT training centers located in the Paris region, Strasbourg, Lyon, Toulouse, and Marseilles. Many special courses were organized for adults and increasing attention was given last year to the educational needs of refugee youth. English-language and trade-training programs were established last year in Paris, Rome, and Genoa for several hundreds of refugees destined for English-speaking countries. An interesting sidelight—the language training is conducted by means of electronics language laboratories developed at the Central ORT Institute in Switzerland. The Bramson ORT Trade School in New York, specializing in needle trade instruction to Jewish refugees and other immigrants, gave such training to over 700 persons last year. Other programs were conducted for newly arrived refugees in Israel.

International Rescue Committee, Inc. (IRC), 460 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.: The International Rescue Committee operates programs on five continents to assist refugees from political tyranny. Offices include Miami, Los Angeles, Mexico City, Madrid, Montreal, Geneva, Paris, Munich, Vienna, Rome, Hong Kong, and Léopoldville. By the end of 1964 the IRC had registered 38,316 Cuban refugees and resettled 18,090.

The 1964 European caseload of the Committee consisted of nearly 10,000 refugees of whom 1,347 were resettled in North America and Australia. An increasing number of Haitian refugees were assisted in the Dominican Republic and New York.

The 1964 Hong Kong program included a hotel training school and two day nurseries, with a third day nursery opening in the spring of 1965. In addition, drugs and medical supplies in substantial quantities as well as a wide range of other services were rendered to Chinese refugee children and their parents. In Congo (Léopoldville), the IRC continued to administer urgently needed medical services to the more than 300,000 Angolan refugees.

International Social Service (ISS), American Branch, Inc., 345 East 46th Street, New York, N.Y.: As an international casework agency, ISS continued to help refugee families and children in all parts of the world with problems of immigration, resettlement, adoption of orphan children, and reunion of families. Additional special ISS services for 1964 included: Austria, a new community center opened in Klagenfurt to help integrate refugee families into the local community. Brazil, legal assistance to refugees. Hong Kong, services for refugee children such as adoptions, demonstration immunization programs, counseling and referral of handicapped children. Venezuela, Children's International Center in Caracas (day nursery, recreation, training), the first such center of its kind in South America.

Joint Distribution Committee, Inc. (JDC), 3 East 54th Street, New York, N.Y.: In 1964 the JDC assisted over 47,000 refugees and repatriates. Of these, nearly 16,000 were citizens in a country of asylum; about 31,000 did not have the protection of citizenship and were scattered over 11 countries. JDC helped these refugees with food, clothing, shelter, medical assistance, low cost loans, vocational training, and school and guidance counseling. JDC also maintained a community aid program which provided funds and technical assistance for synagogues, schools and community centers. JDC focused particular attention in 1964 on three chronic refugee problems:

France: Nearly 39,000 refugees, mostly from Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco, and Eastern Europe. Pockets of these refugees are also found in Italy, Austria, and Belgium.

World War II: JDC is still assisting 5,000 war refugees and displaced persons. Most of them, 3,500, are in Australia, 900 in Sweden; and a smaller number in Belgium, Norway, Portugal and Spain.

Prewar JDC aid is still going to small numbers of refugees from Hitler's Europe in such widely scattered areas as Italy, Tangier, Haiti, the Philippines, Portugal, and Spain. In 1964 the welfare, rehabilitation and cultural programs on behalf of refugees and other needy Jews in all parts of the world were sustained by a budget of $29,400,000, provided chiefly by the campaigns of the United Jewish Appeal, and $1,212,558 in the U.S.-donated food for peace supplies and other material aid.

Lutheran World Federation U.S.A. Committee for LWF, 50 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.: The international headquarters of the Lutheran World Federation are in Geneva, Switzerland. Its U.S. member churches are the American Lutheran Church and the Lutheran Church in America. They support its refugee and world service programs—as well as those of the Lutheran Immigration Service, the World Council of Churches, Church World Service and the World Alliance of YMCA's—through Lutheran World Action funds, administered by the U.S.A. Committee for the LWF.

During 1965 U.S. Lutheran churches contributed about 35 percent of the cost of the following refugee services of the LWF Department of World Service, budgeted at over $1,500,000, plus goods:

Austria: Final rehabilitation of hard core refugees and scholarships for refugee students.

Canada: Reception and referral to churches, counseling, granting, and collecting travel loans.

Hong Kong: In addition to distribution of material aid from Luthern World Relief (detailed elsewhere) and other relief sources, the LWF–WS administers a large program of self-help and rehabilitation; education, youth work and vocational training; and medical and health services, primarily for Chinese refugees.

Jordan: Distribution of clothing to 300,000 refugees and needy frontier villagers and U.S. surplus food to 30,800. LWF–WS also operates work projects, industrial training center (120 students), handicraft center for 36 blind boys, nurses' school (60 students), hospital (subsidized by UNRWA for Palestine refugees), and medical clinics.

Syria: LWF–WS operates medical clinics in the Damascus area and contributes to the nursing school of the Palestine Arab Refugee Institute.

Tanzania: At least 25,000 refugees in Tanzania have received help from the LWF–WS. This includes 10,000 Mozambicans, 11,300 Rwandese (mostly Watusi), 2,500 Kikuyus, and 300 Congolese. A tripartite agreement between UNHCR, the Tanzania Government, and the LWF provides for the creation of an agricultural community in the Mwesi Highlands of Tanzania for several thousand refugees from Rwanda. A similar project in southern Tanzania is providing for 10,000 Mozambicans who fled the civil unrest in their home country. The LWF–WS conducts programs of material aid, agricultural, health, community development, education, and water development.

Lutheran World Relief, Inc., 386 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.: Lutheran World Relief gives aid in the form of money, clothing, medicines, technical and vocational assistance, education, and self-help projects. The agency has stepped up its support of land reclamation projects in Korea. It has also worked with the World Council of Churches on various projects, including the resettlement of refugees in South America. The number of refugees registered to receive food and/or clothing from Lutheran World Relief in fiscal 1966 is: 50,000 in Hong Kong, 30,800 in Jordan, 18,250 in Korea, 25,000 in Tanzania, 125 in Chile, and 500 in Brazil. In the calendar year 1964, Lutheran World Relief shipped goods worth $10,439,700 in aid overseas, including nearly $4 million worth of U.S. Government surplus food. Cash expenditures, including ocean freight, totaled $2,061,353.

Meals for Millions Foundation, 215 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.: Both refugees and nonrefugees have benefited from the high-protein multivitamin food supplement developed by Meals for Millions. During the year 1964, a total of 52,615 pounds of multipurpose food (MPF) were distributed to agencies primarily serving refugees in the following areas:

Hong Kong: 40,000 pounds to Rooftop Schools, Children's Meals, and Maryknoll Sisters, Refugee Center.

India: 4,027 pounds to Tibetan refugees in India and 4,556 pounds to the Nepal International Refugee Committee.

Jordan: 2,511 pounds to Sister Odelia Hutten, 510 pounds to Lutheran World Federation, Jerusalem, and 1,011 pounds to St. John's Ophthalmic Hospital.

Burundi-Uganda: 1,167 pounds to Christ the King Secondary School.

The foundation is emphasizing a new policy based on stimulating production of MPF-type foods in those countries desirous of setting up their own plants.

Mennonite Central Committee, 21 South 12th Street, Akron, Pa.: The Mennonite Central Committee, the official agency of the North American Mennonites, conducted refugee relief operations in Asia and Africa. Last year the committee assisted refugees in India, Hong Kong, Vietnam, Burundi and the Congo. The relief program in these areas consisted of:

India: Administered a health program, self-help project and educational program in a government-assigned refugee colony for East Pakistanis in Calcutta.

Hong Kong: Served meals to 5,000 schoolchildren daily, gave educational and family-child assistance to 450 children and made general distributions of clothing.

Vietnam: Assisted refugees from North Vietnam with donations of food, clothing and medicines, including treatment.

Congo: Refugees from Angola benefited from shipments of food and clothing distributed through CPRA.

Burundi: Refugees from Rwanda received food, clothing and medical supplies. This work was conducted in cooperation with Church World Service and the World Relief Commission.

Jordan: Distribution of flour was made to 23,000 social cases, and distribution of clothing was made to government designated needy persons.

Polish-American Immigration and Relief Committee (PAIRC), 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.: The PAIRC conducts a continuing program for Polish post-war refugees in Western Europe as well as newly arrived escapees. The scope of the Committee's work covers: immigration and integration help for new refugees, registration and documentation for "old" refugees under special immigration schemes, provision of sponsorships for regular immigration cases, financial assistance to needy refugees, and cooperation in UNHCR integration programs. The total number of refugees served by PAIRC last year was 21,530. The breakdown is as follows: 15,235 in Germany, 2,521 in France, 2,733 in the Benelux countries, 465 in Italy, 266 in Austria and 310 in other areas.

Project Concern, Inc., P.O. Box 536, Coronado, Calif.: Project Concern is an independent nonprofit relief organization, has established three outpatient medical clinics in Hong Kong and treats over 500 patients a day, has a feeding program for more than a thousand children at the Hong Kong clinics, provides hospital services in Da-Mpao, Vietnam and has a mobile clinic unit paying visits regularly to more than two dozen villages and strategic hamlets.

Project Concern developed in cooperation with the Vietnamese government hospital in Dalat, a village medical officer training program for local young men and women, has an international staff of more than 100 doctors, nurses, pharmacists, laboratory technicians, teachers, and volunteers in many capacities and plans to develop clinics, training programs, and self-help projects for as many of the world's needy as possible.

The Salvation Army, 120–130 West Fourteenth Street, New York, N.Y.: The Salvation Army is engaged in programs of direct service to refugees. One of the major areas of its concern at the present time is the Northeastern India Territory, which has received many thousands of refugees from East Pakistan whose needs have taxed the resources of governmental and private agencies to the utmost. The Salvation Army, while administering to the needs of these refugees to the limit of its resources, has taken a special interest in a group known as the Chakma Buddhists, numbering some 13,000. These refugees present special problems to which the Salvation Army's officers and staff have given sustained attention for many months.

Another area of major concern to the Army is Hong Kong where it sustains programs of assistance to refugees through medical clinics and private schools. One of the medical clinics operated by the Salvation Army is located less than a mile from the border of Red China. The staff of this clinic attended 6,270 persons during March 1965. Additional services to Hong Kong refugees are: nurseries, vocational training centers, a young men's hostel and a convalescent home for children.

Save the Children Federation (SCF), Boston Post Road, Norwalk, Conn.: Although the Federation has no specific programs for refugees, its work inevitably affects them. The agency conducts a worldwide program of child, family and community sponsorships and community self-help projects. In giving aid, the Federation does not distinguish between refugees and nonrefugees. Therefore, no refugee figures are available pertaining to the Federation's operations in the Far East, Near East, Europe and South America.

Spanish Refugee Aid, Inc. (SRA), 80 East 11th Street, New York, N.Y.: The refugees of the Spanish Civil War are still the main concern of Spanish Refugee Aid. Its adoption program has been expanded and now has 220 Americans and Europeans who make monthly contributions and correspond with a Spanish refugee family or individual. Through the Foyer Pablo Casals, a center for refugees in Montauban, France, 218 men and women over the age of 60 receive monthly food packages and clothing, an increase of 18 over the previous year. A number of European committees are contributing to SRA's work, making it possible to increase its general aid to the most needy, but 10,000 refugees still need help, either on a temporary or permanent basis.

Since 1963, SRA has encouraged a program of grants to provide food, clothing, books, and transportation for able teenagers who would otherwise be forced to leave school to help support their families. SRA now plans to conduct a drive to get increased aid for refugees in hospitals and old-age homes.

The Tolstoy Foundation, Inc., 989 Eighth Avenue, New York, N.Y.: The Tolstoy Foundation is in continuous contact with some 20,000 refugees and escapees, registered with the Tolstoy Foundation offices in the United States and overseas. Assistance continues to be given in counseling in emigration, supplying affidavits and connecting processing in all countries of the West; continued emphasis on legal counseling in Belgium and Latin America, and assistance in local integration through establishment of small business enterprises, cooperative agricultural projects, workshops, etc., in conjunction with programs sponsored by the UNHCR.

Still a major objective of the Tolstoy Foundation is the establishment and maintenance of homes for the aged and infirm. In 1964 two new homes were established in West Berlin and in Santiago, Chile—for a combined total of 185 persons—bringing the number of aged persons now guaranteed lifetime care through efforts of the Tolstoy Foundation to 770. The Tolstoy Foundation participates in the administration of these homes and in the filling of vacancies with candidates from its registered constituency in many countries.

In 1965 two more substantial plans are underway for further implementation: a home in Rouen, France, in cooperation with Secours Catholique, for 79 Eastern Orthodox refugees, and the expansion of the home for the aged at the Tolstoy Center in Rockland County, N.Y., by the provision of a nursing home for 86 persons. Assistance to children is centered mainly in West Germany, with valuable cooperation of British voluntary agencies and Swiss foreign aid and continued summer camp programs for children at the Tolstoy Center.

Unitarian Universalist Service Committee, Inc., 78 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.: The Unitarian Universalist Service Committee maintains a program for the benefit of ill Spanish Republican refugees in the south of France. This program has been in continuous existence since 1945, helping each year a higher proportion of decrepit aged single persons and couples without younger relations to support them.

The total numbers helped in 1964 are as follows: 1,108 families, of which 505 live in the Toulouse region and 603 elsewhere, mainly in the southwest; 125 new cases, mostly aged agricultural laborers with little or no social insurance. Four hundred and twenty-nine cases were discontinued, about half by death, the rest because of improved conditions or loss of refugee status.

The United Church Board for World Ministries, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y.: The Division of World Service of the United Church of Christ administered a 1.5 million dollar fund with an additional $750,000 in gifts-in-kind for the relief of refugees last year. It had operations in 50 countries, with special programs in Italy, Jordan, Senegal, Congo, Ghana, India, Argentina, Uruguay, and Ecuador. Special programs were also maintained in Greece and Lebanon under the name of the Congregational Christian Service Committee. With a major emphasis on self-help projects, especially in the field of agriculture, the Board helped finance the work of other agencies. These included: Heifer Project, Inc.; Meals for Millions Foundation; Agricultural Missions, Inc.; Church World Service, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.; Division of Inter-Church Aid, Refugee and World Service, World Council of Churches.

United HIAS Service, 200 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.: In 1964 United HIAS Service celebrated its 10th anniversary. In the year the agency assisted 10,600 men, women, and children to resettle in free countries—more than double the number who were similarly aided the previous year. In planning for 1965, the agency estimates that 11,700 persons will be assisted to resettle in the United States, Canada, Australia, Latin America, France, and other free countries.

The Agency of International Development (AID) reports that for all programs for the first 6 months of 1964 United HIAS Service spent $1,155,351.

United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America, Inc., 105 Grand Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.: About 9,500 Lithuanian refugees in free Western Europe received aid from the Fund. The agency did not receive surplus food and had to increase accordingly its financial assistance to this refugee group. Very few refugees were resettled into the United States, Canada, and Australia. Clothing and medicines are the chief items of aid dispensed by the Fund. Some aid was given to the Lithuanian refugees in Poland.

United Ukrainian American relief Committee, Inc. (UUARC), 5020 Old York Road, Philadelphia, Pa.: United Ukrainian American Relief Committee, Inc., through its European Headquarters in Munich, Germany, continuously assists more than 20,000 Ukrainian refugees and escapees in integration, securing employment and in solving housing problems. The agency continues its immigration program in cooperation with ICEM, sponsoring new immigrants to the United States under the regular quota.

World University Service (WUS), 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.: Needy students from all over the world benefit from WUS aid. Last year WUS continued five major programs aimed at refugee students. They were as follows:

Algeria: Financial assistance was given to 150 Algerians studying in Europe, and food, drugs, clothing, etc. were provided to refugee students in Tunisia and Morocco. In 1965, WUS is helping the Algerian university community get back on its feet, which requires $30,000 in assistance.

Angola: Financial aid ($70,000 since 1961) has been provided on a continuing basis to refugee students from Angola and other African territories ruled by Portugal.

China: More than $600,000 have been provided over the past 6 years to foster higher education in Hong Kong. This program continued last year, in addition to which 16 Chinese professors were brought to the United States to study and 5 students sent to Canada.

Hungary: Since 1956, WUS has been aiding Hungarian refugee students, a $6 million program. They have been able to continue their studies in new countries of residence. There are enough funds on hand to terminate this program in the near future.

South Africa: Grants to colleges in neighboring countries enable nonwhite refugee students from South Africa to continue their educations.

The World Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations (YMCA), 291 Broadway, New York, N.Y.: The YMCA acts as a complementary service to the large global programs of the United Nations, governments and churches; it is concerned with the morale of refugees. It is not a relief or migration agency. It tries to establish community centers in the camps (a home-away-from-home) and through them help in the organization of educational, recreational, religious programs, etc. The agency also offers language training, orientation courses for prospective migrants, camping for the children, together with handicrafts and vocational training. To support all this it conducts leadership training courses among the refugees so that most of the leadership and work comes from them.

World Relief Commission, Inc. (National Association of Evangelicals) (NAE), 33-10 36th Avenue, Long Island City, N.Y.: The major refugee programs of this agency are in Korea and in Bujumbra, Burundi, Africa. Services include distribution of food, clothing, and medicines to needy refugees in those areas, along with projects for the handicapped.

World Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA), 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.: The World YWCA, in cooperation with the National YWCA's, is continuing its services to refugee women and girls in Jordan, Pakistan, Hong Kong and Greece. In Austria a refugee program is carried out jointly with the World Alliance of YMCA's. The YWCA, in its refugee services, puts great emphasis on the provision of basic education, vocational training and cottage industries in order to help the women and girls to become self-supporting. Sociomedical services, youth activities and community services are part of the refugee program in various countries.

ABOUT THE U.S. COMMITTEE FOR REFUGEES

The U.S. Committee for Refugees, the publisher of this report, was founded in the spring of 1958. Among its founder members were representatives of major refugee agencies and private citizens, many of whom continue to serve as its officers and board members. The Committee was established as a result of a White House Conference called by President Dwight D. Eisenhower to discuss international and agency policies in connection with the continuing problems of refugees around the world.

Founded as a coordinating agency with a day-to-day responsibility for the public interpretation of refugee problems, the Committee has functioned successfully with a very small staff and budget; it is supported entirely by the contributions of its friends—individuals and organizations—who are interested in its work.

The Committee's activities are briefly stated as follows:

Assists the United Nations refugee agencies by providing them public information and program assistance in the United States;

Brings to Members of the Congress and to appropriate Government agencies information and recommendations on refugee and immigration legislation, and provides testimony for congressional committees considering pending legislation;

Operates an information clearing house on the work of the more than 50 recognized refugee relief agencies in the United States;

Serves the communication media as a source of information and material on all aspects of the refugee problem;

Provides, through its "World Refugee Report," current comprehensive and authoritative data on refugee situations throughout the world;

Maintains a referral service (to relief agencies) for refugees, former refugees, relatives of refugees, and citizens interested or involved in individual refugee situations;

Furnishes individual students, colleges, universities, and secondary schools with educational materials on the world refugee problem as a part of the social science curriculum.

NEW BOARD MEMBERS

The Board of Directors of the U.S. Committee for Refugees has elected three new directors to its membership within the last 12 months. All of them have had a long-time interest in international service, and bring to the board the added strength of their careers in this area and in the business community.

Our new board members are:

Mr. Marcus Daly, who joined the board in June 1965. Mr. Daly, from 1958 to 1961, was the Director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. He was nominated to ICEM by President Dwight D. Eisenhower and was elected to his post by a unanimous vote of the 28 member Governments of that organization. Mr. Daly, now in the investment and insurance business in New York, has been honored by the Government of Malta and made a Knight Commander of the Order of St. Gregory by Pope John XXIII in recognition of his work in international service.

Mr. Daly brings to membership in the board a long interest in and knowledge of the problems of refugees and migrants around the world.

Philip J. Goldberg, chairman of the board of directors of Hamilton Life Insurance Co. of New York, is one of the country's most influential leaders of the life insurance industry. He heads a complex of seven life insurance companies operating in all sections of the country. Author and lecturer, he is a member of the faculty at Purdue University's Life Insurance Marketing Institute and is the author of several books, including "Estate Planning" and "Tax Planning for

Today and Tomorrow." One of his unique contributions has been the development of charitable endowment funded by life insurance.

Active in philanthropic and community activities, Mr. Goldberg is a trustee of the New York Law School, a member of the board of governors of the American Jewish Committee, a director of the New York chapter of the National Safety Council, and a director of several other organizations and institutions. He recently received from Vice President HUMPHREY the award of the National Council of Senior Citizens for his contributions in behalf of medicare legislation and has been cited in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for his services in behalf of interfaith understanding.

Richard Ferree Smith, director of immigration services of the American Friends Service Committee, was on the AFSC team that served the Palestine refugees in the Gaza Strip in 1949. After the AFSC team withdrew, he remained another year in Gaza as a staff officer of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA).

Mr. Smith was formerly on the staff of the Philadelphia Health and Welfare Council and is a graduate of the Columbia School of Social Work.

Mr. Smith has been responsible for the AFSC refugee resettlement program in the United States. This program has involved helping East Europeans, Cubans, Chinese, Arabs, and Dutch Indonesians secure a new life in this country.

Mr. Smith is a member of the Executive Committee of the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference, a member of the Church World Service Department Committee of the Division of Overseas Ministries of the National Council of Churches, as well as many other committees dealing with immigration and refugee matters.

COMMITTEE FINANCES

In the 12 months ending June 30, 1965, the Committee received $53,775 in contributions from individuals, corporations, organizations, and foundations. This total is almost exactly equal to the income for the previous year. Expenditure for staff and program has remained constant.

The Committee's staff of four persons is at the irreducible minimum; its expenses very small in relation to the size and importance of its program.

The Committee is greatly indebted to a number of corporations who assist us in our work—the J. Walter Thompson Co., the Irving Trust Co., Dennison Manufacturing Co., and others. Their generous assistance helps to make possible the Committee's work at minimum cost.

The Committee's accounts are audited annually by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.

We strongly urge our readers to use the contributor's envelope inserted in this issue. We depend entirely on the gifts—both large and small—of our friends, and we are most hopeful that you will make your contribution now for the work of the Committee, and for assistance to refugees.

Contributions to the U.S. Committee for Refugees, Inc., are tax deductible.

USCR GIFT WRAP

The Committee has once more sponsored the sale of its "Tree of Life" gift wrap during the autumn and pre-Christmas weeks. The paper is offered in an attractive gold pattern on red, green, blue, and white. The package, comprising 8 sheets in the 4 colors, as well as 10 gift tags, is being sold at $2.

The paper, this year as last, was designed by Mr. Thomas F. Naegele of the J. Walter Thompson Co. Mr. Naegele, a brilliant artist, is called Mr. Christmas by some of his friends; he was the designer last year, not only of our gift wrap, but also of the series of five Christmas stamps issued by the U.S. Post Office.

The design has been executed and the paper manufactured by the Dennison Manufacturing Co. We hope our friends will buy it in great quantities and encourage their friends to buy it also.

USCR SCHOLARSHIP FUND

For several years there has been a felt need for scholarship assistance to both young refugees who need help in completing their college or university training and also refugees of more mature years who may need vocational or professional retraining in order to adapt to employment opportunities in the United States.

Mr. Daniel F. Cary, a member of the board of USCR, has made an initial grant to the USCR scholarship fund which is available to acceptable candidates on a revolving-loan-fund basis.

Mr. Cary believes that, in addition to loans, the Committee should be in a position to offer "grants-in-aid" in many situations where repayment of loans is unfeasible.

Mr. Cary strongly hopes, therefore, that there will be further contributions to the scholarship fund which can be made available, either as loans or grants, as circumstances may require.

We believe that there is no more satisfying investment than this; that donors will receive deep satisfaction from the knowledge that their gifts are being used in the education of young men or women trying to become established in their new homeland.

We know from experience that this is an investment in America's future, and we commend it to the utmost generosity of our friends.

JACOB BLAUSTEIN HONORED BY SPECIAL GIFT

Mr. Henry Zarrow, president of the Sooner Pipe and Supply Corp. of Tulsa, Okla., has made a contribution of $500 to the work of the U.S. Committee for Refugees in honor of Mr. Jacob Blaustein.

Mr. Blaustein, who was a founder member of this Committee and is an active member of its board, was honored by Mr. Zarrow because, as Mr. Zarrow wrote, "Mr. Blaustein is a wonderful person who gives much of his time and talents working in the cause of humanity."

Mr. Blaustein was a member of the U.S. Delegation to the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations; Consultant to the American Delegation at the San Francisco United Nations Organization Conference; Member of President Truman's Mobilization Policy Board during the Korean War; former President of the American Jewish Committee; and cofounder of the American Oil Co. He is on the Board of Directors of Standard Oil Co. (Indiana).

The Committee is deeply grateful to Mr. Zarrow for this generous and graceful tribute to a great American.

AN ENCOURAGEMENT TO US ALL

On August 2, 1964, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, then a Senator, entered the annual survey issue of the World Refugee Report into the RECORD of the U.S. Senate. On that occasion Mr. HUMPHREY said, "Mr. President, the U.S. Committee for Refugees, a private citizens committee with whose work many of us are familiar, has recently published its annual survey of the world's refugee problems. This survey, unique of its kind, gives precise information about the various refugee communities around the world and about the efforts of the intergovernmental and American voluntary agencies to meet the needs of these refugees.

"To the best of my knowledge, this publication is the only place where this information is available in such useful form. Many of us know of and participate in the work of the American voluntary agencies and we are all proud of the widespread and generous interest of the American public in this most unhappy problem. Many private and public groups find this information to be essential in carrying out their efforts in behalf of refugees.

"We all feel a sense of indebtedness to the U.S. Committee for Refugees for their persisting efforts in helping the American public to understand the gravity of the refugee problems around the world. Their work is an encouragement to us all to continue our efforts to solve these refugee problems."

The effect of Mr. HUMPHREY's generous action was that the World Refugee Report was circulated to all the subscribers to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD including many public libraries. In addition, copies were requested for circulation by the U.S. Information Agency to its overseas libraries; it was reprinted in full in "The International Altrusan," and the statistical information about refugees was reprinted in a number of other publications including the Bulletin of the International Council of Voluntary Agencies in Geneva.

We recite this record for readers of the current issue, many of whom will be seeing the World Refugee Report for the first time. It is the major publication of the U.S. Committee for Refugees and we think we may be justly proud of its growing usefulness.

In the preparation of this issue, we have had the cooperation of 50 agencies—private, governmental, and intergovernmental. The global work of these organizations in behalf of refugees, represented by their reports to us, is eloquent testimony to the magnitude of the continuing refugee problem. We want to express our thanks to the officers and members of these organizations for their help.

We want also to express our gratitude to the individuals who have contributed articles providing background information for this issue: William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs; Harlan Cleveland, U.S. Ambassador to NATO; Charles H. Jordan, director general, Joint Distribution Committee; Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, U.S. Senate; George Meany, president, AFL–CIO.

THE AUTO PARTS AGREEMENT WITH CANADA

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by Senator HARTKE be placed in the RECORD at this point, with an article which appeared in the Miami Herald on October 4.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARTKE

I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate a Chicago Daily News article written by Frank Flaherty and entitled "Will Auto Agreement With U.S. Hurt Pearson?" which appeared in the Miami Herald on October 4, 1965. This article concerns the recently passed Canadian Auto Parts Agreement.

I am sure the Senate is well aware of my opinion of this legislation. I have always felt this legislation to be wholly one sided; legislation which gives everything to Canada and nothing to the United States. Why can't we learn from the teachings of our distinguished colleague Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon? We should realize by now that one-way deals with foreign countries cannot possibly win the gratitude or promote the political stability of those countries. As Mr. Flaherty points out, the average Canadian will only view this tariff deal in terms of a $50 million loss in tariff revenues. He will still have to pay a high price for his automobile while the American automotive "giants" will accrue larger profits at Canadian expense. And how can Canada, a country with a chronic balance-of-payments problem, afford this added drain on their dollar reserves? I tell you we have had enough of these one-sided errors in our foreign aid policy.

And finally, how can our Government reconcile itself to the fact that it imposes strict "voluntary" restrictions on the flight of capital to foreign countries and then turns around and enacts legislation which encourages this flight. I am sure that I cannot reconcile it to myself.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Oct. 4, 1965]

WILL AUTO AGREEMENT WITH UNITED STATES HURT PEARSON?

(By Frank Flaherty)

OTTAWA, ONTARIO.—Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson's election campaign is in trouble over $50 million.

It has nothing to do with campaign funds. It is an estimate of the amount of duties collected by the Canadian Government in a year on imports of autos, trucks, and parts.

Under the Canada-United States auto free trade deal now before Congress, the Government won't get the $50 million from here on.

Government opponents say this means a handout to the big American auto companies—General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, American Motors, and Studebaker—who make most of the cars and trucks sold in Canada.

Up to now they've been making parts and mostly standard model cars in Canada, selling them at somewhat higher prices than the same cars bring in the United States. Canadians who want fancy or luxury cars get them from American plants through the same dealers, also at higher prices because of Canada's 17½ percent tariff.

The auto tariff deal, signed last January, will establish limited free trade between the two countries on cars and parts. It will be limited because only auto manufacturers will be able to import cars or parts duty free. Any Canadian individual who orders a car from the United States must pay the duty.

So opponents of the Government are saying:

Canada will lose $50 million. The Canadian car user still will pay a high price. The American car manufacturers will earn bigger profits from their Canadian operations.

The Government has counterarguments but is having trouble getting them across to the average voter. It predicts that Canadian car prices will work around to the American level in a few years, but it can't promise that. It can't promise cheaper cars because chances are prices in both countries will move up.

The general benefits its expects for the Canadian economy are more important than a saving of a few dollars on the price of a car.

The auto companies are parties to the agreement. They're committed to increase production, capital investment and employment in Canada. They're expected to manufacture a lot more cars and parts in Canadian plants than before and make them cheaper because they'll have longer runs on fewer models.

The Government stands to gain in taxes more than it loses. More business will lift returns from income tax and corporation profits taxes.

The main reason for the Canada-United States auto trade deal on both sides escapes notice in the current Canadian political debate. It has not escaped notice in the debates in the Senate at Washington. There it is recognized that the United States is buying protection against Canadian restrictions on American trade.

Canada has a tough balance-of-payments problem, aggravated by the fact that Canadians pay out about $70 million for imported cars and parts. Canada is the second biggest car market in the world. Countries that use fewer cars, such as Britain, France, and Germany, see that their own people use homemade cars. Canada could do the same.

The Canadian Government had to reduce its balance-of-payments deficit. It could have imposed restrictions, forcing Canadians to use more Canadian cars by higher tariffs or import quotas. This would have raised prices and restricted the range of choice of Canadian car users. It would also have closed out a big market for American cars and parts.

THE RIGHT TO SNEER—THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, recently I was privileged to read in the Argus-Champion, a weekly newspaper in Newport, N.H., an outstanding editorial entitled "The Right To Sneer."

This editorial is in support of the war on poverty and the Great Society. It points out the needs for these programs and asks for a better understanding of the accomplishments that we are trying to meet by these programs.

In conclusion the editorial asked those who would sneer at the problem of poverty either try to convince people that there is no such thing as poverty or to come forth with a better program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newport (N.H.) Argus-Champion, Sept. 23, 1965]

THE RIGHT TO SNEER

Some of our Granite State politicians and observers of the public scene have developed a knee-jerk reaction to the terms, "Great Society" and "War on Poverty." Whenever they use the terms up comes a conditioned reflex and they add, "whatever that is?"

This is a little sad. Some listeners—or readers—could interpret that reflex as evidence that the politician or observer really believes there is no such thing as poverty, or if there is, there is nothing that can be done about it.

Maybe the war on poverty will result in a catastrophic defeat. Maybe we'll never achieve the Great Society. But it's better to have tried and failed than never to have tried at all.

And even if we don't stamp out poverty entirely, the way we're waging the war on poverty will at least reduce it.

Those politicians and observers evidently have failed to understand the basically different approach in the 1965 attack on poverty from that of 1933.

In the great depression we thought the best way to attack poverty was to create job opportunities, with vast public works projects, public buildings, highways, reforestation, dams, sewers, hospitals, auditoriums, national parks, harbors, histories, art projects, most of which were built, made payrolls possible, and are being enjoyed today.

There was no time then, as there is now, to attack poverty at its roots. There was little or no work for those who wanted work and had the training, skills, and experience to perform it. We had to make jobs and do it fast.

Today's war on poverty is attacking poverty where it starts. We are recognizing that America's great system of free public education is the most important ingredient in her enormous economic growth and power. So our 1965 war on poverty is geared to wipe out inherited poverty, by making sure that each child has a real educational opportunity, and by helping those who missed out on education to make up the deficiency.

The new war on poverty is aimed to inspire us all with the will to work and the ability to perform useful work.

Whether it be Head Start, the Job Corps, Volunteers in Service to America, or the other valuable programs, they are all aimed at helping the individual help himself, not at being a mere dole.

This kind of battle takes longer. The fruit of the Head Start program won't begin to ripen for 15 or more years.

The Job Corps, however, is beginning to bear fruit already as hundreds of young men who only a year ago had nothing to do but hang around the street corner, and little hope of anything else, go to work each day in technical, complicated jobs for which they have been especially trained.

They are happy. They are earning their own way. They are helping produce the wealth of America.

Let those who must sneer "whatever that is?" either try to convince the people that there is no such thing as poverty, or come forth with a better program.

Then they will have earned the right to sneer.

DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST U.S. VIETNAM POLICY—AN OPEN LETTER TO THE MEN OF THE SECOND BATTALION, 7TH MARINES IN VIETNAM

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, without commenting on the number of student protests and demonstrations regarding our Vietnam policy, I thought my colleagues would be interested to learn of a student and his wife at the College of Business Administration, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg., who wrote an open letter to the men of the 2d Battalion, 7th Marines, in South Vietnam, to express their pride and gratitude to the men of that unit.

The letter was written by James A. O'Brien, Jr. and Sandi O'Brien. Jim is the son of one of my constituents, Mr. James A. O'Brien, of Honolulu, executive director of the Hawaii Association To Help Retarded Children.

If there are no objections, I respectfully request that the O'Briens' letter and response from Lt. Col. Leon N. Utter, USMC, commander of the 2d Battalion, 7th Marines, on behalf of his men, be reprinted in the RECORD in full.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Eugene, Oreg., August 9, 1965.

MEN OF THE 2D BATTALION, 7TH MARINES,
Care of Lt. Col. Leon Utter, USMC, Qui Nhon, Binh Din Province, South Vietnam.

DEAR SIRS: After reading about you in the enclosed news story we decided to write to let you know that we are proud of you all and grateful for all you are doing for the United States. We follow Vietnam developments closely and this is the first story we've seen which shows that we Americans can beat the Vietcong at their own game. If this dirty war is ever to end, I'm sure it will be more because of actions like yours, than by air strikes or naval bombardment.

I attend the University of Oregon in Eugene, Oreg., and my wife and I thought that after reading or hearing stories about college student and faculty protests against Americans in Vietnam you might appreciate hearing some praise for a change.

Thanks again for what you're doing and good luck.

Sincerely,

JIM AND SANDI O'BRIEN.

HEADQUARTERS, 2D BATTALION, 7TH MARINES, 3D MARINE DIVISION (REIN), FMF (MAR. No. 14), FPO, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.
OUTSIDE, QUI NHON, SOUTH VIETNAM,
August 21, 1965.

Mr. and Mrs. JIM O'BRIEN,
c/o University of Oregon,
Eugene, Oreg.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. O'BRIEN: We of the 2d Battalion, 7th Marines, are deeply appreciative of your letter of August 11.

I took the liberty of having the letter reproduced and distributed to all our outlying detachments. We have a few more than 1,500 men here and we are scattered in outposts over 92 million square meters of hills and valleys. Morale is exceptionally high—our casualties have been light and mail service is regular.

The reception your letter received was enthusiastic throughout the entire command. Comments ranged from, "How about that?" to "I told you most college guys were smart. Only a few are the beatnik types."

We are all of the firm conviction out here that our job is a necessary one. While the student and faculty protests are irksome and somewhat undermine the positive results we achieve in the field, we sometimes rationalize such behavior with the question, "Where else in the world could they do it except in the United States?"

Needless to say, it makes us all particularly proud when someone like you exercises his right of free speech in a positive manner.

Your letter has more than compensated for what we've read, and 1,500 U.S. Marines send their thanks.

Most sincerely,

LEON N. UTTER,
Lieutenant Colonel, USMC (for the men of 2d Battalion, 7th Marines).

THE ROLE OF TAX POLICY IN THE GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Role of Tax Policy in the Great Society," delivered by the Honorable Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, at the Financial Analysts Federation Conference.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF TAX POLICY IN THE GREAT SOCIETY

(Remarks by the Honorable Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, at the Financial Analysts Federation Conference, Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., Tuesday, October 5, 1965)

Under President Johnson's leadership, this Nation has begun the challenging task of building a Great Society.

Substantial progress has been achieved and a sound foundation for the structure is being laid.

The Great Society will rest upon two major supports—national consensus and economic prosperity.

As the Congress finishes a session which is outstanding in our history for its achievements and as our economy continues strong in a recordbreaking expansion, these two supports appear sound indeed.

Prospects for future achievements are bright.

The goals are many, but some stand out. Clearly, we must do all in our power to:

Give the 35 million people who now suffer the despair of poverty the opportunity to earn a decent life for themselves and a better life for their children.

Give all our children full opportunity to educate and equip themselves to take a constructive part in carrying this society forward.

Give all Americans the opportunity to fulfill their own best hope of achievement, that we may fulfill the promise offered when this land was born.

Make our countryside and our cities more beautiful, healthier, safer, and better places in which to live and work.

Meet our commitments, written and unwritten, throughout the world to those people who look to us in their need for release from ignorance, misery, and hunger.

I would like to consider what role tax policy has to play in achieving the goals of this Great Society.

GROWTH OF THE ECONOMY

Certainly the Great Society will involve Federal expenditures and our tax system must raise the funds to meet those expenditures. In an earlier day this could mark the end of my talk. But today's knowledge has brought us deeper insights.

The accomplishment of the Great Society will require an ever-growing economic base—a base adequate to meet the demands which that society will place on Federal expenditures, State and local government expenditures, and private expenditures.

In our war on poverty, in our efforts to foster education, equal opportunity, health and natural beauty, and in our campaign to improve urban life, economic prosperity is not only essential—it is the most powerful weapon we have.

Government policies must therefore be directed both to achieving an economic growth that matches our potential and to enabling us to keep that potential constantly expanding. We must achieve full employment and then go on to provide an adequate rate of economic growth at full employment.

The use of fiscal policy in meeting these demands is today, as a result of the accomplishments of these last 5 years, far more broad and flexible than most had supposed.

The success of the tax reduction involved in the Revenue Act of 1964 has marked the turning point. This tax reduction, though it came in a period of deficits, brought the larger GNP and larger revenue base that the administration and many economists foresaw. Recognition of this success of the 1964 act tax reduction was a large factor in the speed with which the Excise Tax Reduction Act—involving a further $4 billion staged reduction—was enacted this year by the Congress.

If we did not have the investment credit of 1962, the depreciation reform of 1962—which was liberalized early this year—the 1964 and 1965 individual and corporate income tax reductions, and the excise tax reduction of 1965, next year the Federal tax burden would be more than $20 billion heavier than it will now be.

That is the reduction in tax liabilities measured at a constant income level. But there was no corresponding reduction in actual revenue receipts. As President Johnson said recently:

"I am happy to report that even with such massive tax reduction, we anticipate that Federal revenues for the 5-year period, fiscal 1961 to 1966, will have increased by over $18 billion—almost twice the increase over the previous 5 years when there were no tax cuts at all."

All this has permitted us, I believe—Government economists and business analysts alike—an increasing objectivity in assessing the role of Federal budget policy in our financial system. We are no longer hampered by such rigidities that a budget deficit is always bad—we cannot automatically identify the villain by seeing if he writes in red ink.

For we are now aware that adding a group of expenditures that differ widely in their form—loans, grants, current expenses, capital items—and then achieving a zero balance when these are subtracted from revenues in itself can guarantee nothing as to the direction the economy will move. And we are also aware of such things as fiscal drag and the power of our revenue system yearly to increase its take from the private sector of the economy—at present by about $7 billion annually—and of the need each year to offset that fiscal drag. That doesn't mean that tax reduction is always desirable and must occur every year or that it is always preferable to increased expenditures and is never to yield to debt retirement.

Each year will require its own decisions. They will depend on our expenditure requirements—in terms of domestic needs and foreign obligations—and on the economic outlook—in terms of the need to maximize employment and avoid inflation.

We have balanced these things well in moving toward an interim goal of 4 percent unemployment.

This course is not an easy one to pilot. Like hidden shoals, we will encounter unexpected developments. At times these developments will require rapid temporary adjustments in our fiscal policy—such as quick tax cuts.

It would be beneficial, now that the effects of tax reduction on the economy are better understood, to reach a consensus on the form that a temporary tax change should take so that we thereby would be able, with that consensus in hand, to achieve a speedy enactment if a temporary reduction were ever needed. An appropriate congressional hearing held now for this purpose, before the need ever arises, would be useful in reaching such consensus.

I have talked so far in aggregate terms, and in these terms tax reduction has mainly meant a broad attack on inadequate private expenditures and investment incentives. In the Revenue Act of 1964, and in the recent Excise Tax Reduction Act, we provided a substantial stimulus to consumer demand which serves, of course, to provide the market to induce and support our remarkable increase in business investment. We have also reduced corporate tax rates, and provided the special measures of an investment credit and the depreciation guidelines. Together these business tax measures have meant an increased cash flow and considerably higher after-tax rates of return.

In the Treasury we have begun an intensive study of the investment experience in the past few years to isolate if we can the impact of depreciation reform and the investment credit. We are trying to learn more about our depreciation system, the guidelines and the reserve ratio test through a complex computer study of the effects of varying depreciation rates and lives against the manifold patterns of asset holdings, replacements and retirements that our businesses present.

At the same time, through trips abroad by our experts, we are bringing up-to-date our knowledge of the handling of depreciation under the tax systems of other countries, so that we can consider the comparative position of the U.S. approach.

Finally, in the area of business taxation we are aware of the need for more research regarding the appropriate relationship between the corporate tax and the individual income tax. But a look at the recent foreign changes illustrates the complexities involved in this relationship, and the need to define the goals before coming to any conclusion about whether a change is either necessary or appropriate.

The U.S. approach is basically that of a corporate tax separated from the individual tax, with no adjustment (apart from the $100 dividend exclusion) for the possibility that corporate profits may be taxed at two levels, once as profits to the corporation and once as dividends to individuals. I call this a possibility in view of the considerable uncertainty about whether the corporate tax is shifted.

However, many economists have favored the so-called British approach, under which the two taxes are integrated through the shareholder getting a credit at his level for the corporate tax, and with his dividend grossed up to reflect corporate profits before the corporate tax. Some would even go further and apply this credit and grossed-up inclusion in shareholder income automatically, without the need for a actual distribution by the corporation. But the British this year abandoned their approach in favor of the U.S. approach, though with a lower corporate rate, probably 40 percent.

Meanwhile the French, who previously had the U.S. approach, shifted this year halfway to the former British approach, by giving the shareholder on the gross-up approach a credit for one-half of the corporate tax.

Both the British and the French did not follow the German technique, which grants the corporation a much lower corporate rate (15 percent as against 51 percent) on the corporate profits that are distributed to the shareholders.

The Canadians, who now use a very rough version of the former British approach—they give the shareholder a credit of 20 percent of the dividend without any grossing up of the dividend—are, through their Royal Commission, studying whether they should consider a change.

The key to all these different approaches—bewildering as they are in their variety and susceptibility to change—is probably that the changes are designed to achieve different goals.

The British desire to encourage more corporate investment and hope their change will achieve that by favoring the retention of corporate profits over their distribution. The French appear to desire a greater shareholder participation by their investors, and hence have focused on inducements to the distribution of dividends—a factor which underlies the German approach though with a different technique.

Here in the United States we have stressed corporate investment—witness the investment credit—and hence adequate corporate cash flow and after-tax rate of return. We have recognized that we already possess through our developed capital markets and other institutional factors strong forces in the direction of shareholder participation. Hence our present needs exert a strong pressure for retention of the status quo in the structure of corporate taxation—still leaving room for rate reduction at an appropriate time.

The British have also recognized the relationship between these corporate patterns and the capital gains tax. Thus, along with their move to strengthen corporate retention of profits they have adopted a capital gains tax on the American model, but with inclusion of one-half of the gain, a maximum 30-percent rate, a 1-year holding period for long-term gains (3 years in the case of real estate), taxation at death of unrealized appreciation in value, and with corporate gains subject to tax at regular rates.

ELIMINATION OF POVERTY

Probably the most important goal of the Great Society is the elimination of poverty. This is an extraordinarily complex problem and we are only now beginning to learn about it as we grapple with it. It is an area where the human needs are so compelling that they demand the best we have to offer in both innovation and ingenuity in devising measures—both Government and private—to meet them.

Our tax system must make a maximum contribution to this effort.

The 1964 act lessened the tax burden in this area—with its reduction of the starting rate from 20 to 14 percent and with the adoption of the minimum standard deduction, so that a single individual became taxable at $900 instead of $666, a married couple at $1,600 instead of $1,333, and a married couple with two children at $3,000 instead of $2,667. Moreover, the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, by eliminating many Federal excise taxes, further reduced the burden of Federal taxes on this group.

Looking at our system as it now stands, the poor pay primarily, as Federal taxes, the excises on alcohol and tobacco and the income tax where poverty levels may be above the present dividing line between taxable and nontaxable income. They also pay the gasoline tax, which is a user charge associated with the highway trust fund, and the social security and medicare payroll taxes, which involve a saving for pensions and medical care. In looking at the tax structure, it is clear that the income tax impact deserves our first attention, and the President has said that any future income tax reduction should cover those who live in the shadow of poverty. This suggests at least a change which raises to a higher level of income the dividing line between taxable and nontaxable income.

This Nation cannot afford to continue indefinitely to tax people who cannot afford to pay.

As incomes increased in past years for the population as a whole, the nature of our tax structure over those years—relatively fixed rates and exemption levels—increased the tax burden on lower income taxpayers, as they moved from a nontaxable status to a taxable status, from the lowest bracket rate to a higher rate.

Even our massive income tax reduction in the last 2 years has only set this process back about 5 years.

And even with such reduction, over the past 15 years an examination of effective tax rates (the percentage of overall income actually paid in tax) shows:

A family earning half the national average income ($2,200 in 1950, $4,000 today) went from an effective tax rate of zero to almost 4 perent;

A family earning the national average income went from an effective tax rate of 6½ to 9 percent;

A family earning double the national average income stayed roughly the same;

Higher income families either held their own or realized reductions, often substantial, in their effective tax rates as increased incomes were offset by increased deductions or a greater proportion of capital gains.

Indeed, the spread of effective tax rates is greatest for higher income taxpayers, varying from zero to around 66 percent. Correspondingly, the average effective rate for very high income taxpayers is much lower than is generally realized. For instance, all taxpayers who in 1962 reported adjusted gross incomes of more than $1 million would—at present tax table rates—pay an average effective rate of only 26 percent of their overall income (including capital gain income in full). Furthermore, only 9 percent of those taxpayers would have effective rates of over 50 percent on overall income under present tax table rates.

All this reinforces President Johnson's view that the next tax reduction should focus on the lower income groups.

We are constantly gaining more knowledge of the weapons with which to carry out our war on poverty. Some of the approaches are associated with the sheer alleviation of destitution, through providing funds directly. Others involve programs of income maintenance to counteract the forces which can undercut a person's income. Others look to programs of education, relocation, training and the like to help people raise themselves and their children out of poverty, and to provide employment for those who are employable. As we gain this knowledge we will be in a better position to judge the contribution which a tax system can make in this effort.

TAX EQUITY AND TAX SIMPLIFICATION

A nation that seeks improvement in its society is likely to insist on the improvement of that aspect of Government which exerts a widespread and significant effect on that society—the Federal tax system itself. The tax activity of the past few years has increased public interest in obtaining the fairest and simplest tax system possible.

Tax equity is a complex matter. Two persons may have the same amount of income—wages, net business income, net investment income, capital gains—but the income tax on one may be far higher than on the other. The variance comes about because the income tax has differing treatments for various types of income and for various types of family expenditures, primarily those involving personal expenses. Thus, for example, on the income side, capital gains are taxed at lower rates; on the expenditure side, deductions are allowed for charitable contributions, personal interest, State and local taxes, medical expenses, and so on.

The difficulty in all this lies in deciding which differences in income source and expenditures should be significant for income tax purposes. While economists may, as a whole, agree that the significant differences are few, the Congress has taken a much broader approach. It has shaped our present income tax structure by giving recognition to a wide variety of these differences. And yet there is constant change. Thus, in recent years Congress has said that moving expenses involve an expenditure difference to be recognized under the income tax, and has increased the effect given to child-care expenses. But through restrictions on deductions for certain State and local taxes, casualty losses and entertainment expenses, the significance of these expenditures was lessened. Through elimination of the dividend credit, the significance of receiving current investment income from stocks as against employment income was almost eliminated. Through inclusion of certain group term life insurance, the significance of this difference in the composition of employment income was lessened. Through the adoption of averaging, the significance of yearly variations in income receipt was lessened. The Congress also regards other factors, such as age, as involving a difference to be significant in measuring taxable income or rates of tax.

Clearly the changes—and the differences left unchanged—involve value judgments that are part of our social structure. These value judgments have resulted in the effective or real tax rates being lower for some taxpayers than the nominal rates of tax (i.e., those in the tax tables) since the nominal rates are being applied to a narrower base of income as compared with the economists' definition of income.

This, in turn, involves another value judgment: that our society gains more through this approach of higher nominal rates than it would through some broadening of the base and a consequent lowering of the rates of tax. This approach must rest on the belief that the differentiating deductions and exclusions produce a more equitable distribution of the tax load than would a more uniform tax base and lower rates. But clearly in many cases this is open to serious question. Moreover, the higher nominal rates may have an adverse effect on incentives and may encourage a disproportionate attention to ways to reduce one's tax. Senator LONG's proposal to provide lower optional rates applied to a broader income base, through the taxpayer's waiving these differences in income and expenditure treatment, focuses attention on this matter, and hence merits careful study.

Further, these value judgments mean that a large variety of factors enter into the final determination of a person's tax. In turn this means that the income tax structure is necessarily complex—which brings us to tax simplification. One way to achieve tax simplification is to reduce the differences that are regarded today as significant. Since tax simplification also commands a value, necessarily we are involved in deciding between conflicting goals in considering these differences.

Some would resolve the conflict by narrowing the differences through eliminating many of the preferences and deductions, and lowering the rates in the tax tables. Others would resolve it by keeping the differences but lessening their significance through granting comparable treatment to taxpayers who do not have the actual expenditures—such as increasing the standard deduction. Senator LONG has advocated this approach in some brackets. This lowers the effective rates on these taxpayers, but maintains the higher nominal rates.

The future course of the income tax—and tax equity and tax simplification—will involve the proper balancing of these various factors. Since value judgments are involved, we should not expect the exclusive choice of a single approach. Rather, the unfolding solutions are likely to involve a part of each approach.

Apart from these broad considerations, certain aspects of tax equity and tax simplification also merit study.

One is the relationship of the income tax to the estate and gift taxes. The estate tax, with an available exemption of $120,000 of assets for a married decedent, relates only to slightly under 3 percent of decedents. While obviously these taxes affect only middle and upper income groups, we do not as yet have sufficient information to relate the incidence of these taxes to the incidence of the income tax. Moreover, the impact of all three taxes is affected by the present treatment of capital gains, especially the elimination from the income tax of any unrealized appreciation in value occurring prior to the decedent's death. The serious imbalances which this latter treatment involves, and the adverse effect on mobility of capital through its tendency to lock families into their present asset holdings, are regarded by many economists as our most serious structural tax problem.

There are, in addition, a number of narrower areas in which tax reforms could be made.

Similarly, while tax simplification on a broad scale requires the consideration of the major questions we have mentioned, there are many changes which can be made which do not involve such policy considerations or value judgments. We should therefore examine what can be done through these narrower changes to simplify and improve our tax structure.

COST-EFFECTIVENESS STUDIES

In order to assure the wisest use of resources in achieving the goals of the Great Society, we must make every effort to use the best and most modern methods of program analysis. This applies to new proposals as well as existing programs—and there is no reason to exclude the tax area from such analysis.

The Budget Bureau, at the direction of President Johnson, is now in the process of applying to nondefense expenditures and programs the cost-effectiveness techniques which were used so successfully in the Defense Department. These techniques consist of evaluating proposals, programs, and projects not merely by their cost, but also by what they will accomplish in meeting specified goals. In addition, they require a clearer evaluation of the goals of the programs and projects within a department—a process which in turn allows a comparison of priorities throughout the entire Government.

Taxes forgone because of a desire to benefit a particular activity or to induce certain activities are, in a real sense, moneys spent. In nearly every such situation an alternative to the tax approach is a direct expenditure of funds not involving the tax system. Cost-effectiveness studies would enable us to appraise the efficacy of the tax approach as compared with the direct-expenditure approach. The overall goal, here as in the case of direct-expenditure programs, is a wise allocation of our resources and the avoidance of distorting that allocation through inappropriate tax provisions.

The use of cost-effectiveness studies may not always be the proper or necessary method of evaluating a tax provision or a new tax proposal designed to meet a particular economic or social objective. But in one way or another the evaluation has to be made. Nearly every problem in our society seems at least to invite a tax solution—and indeed the tax solution is often the first solution to be put forward. Such proposals in the tax field thus generally act as early warning devices pointing to social or economic problems that require our attention. Necessarily this involves us in seeing if there is a nontax solution that is more appropriate.

For example, the Treasury, joined by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, believes that the proposal to provide assistance to families with students in college through tax credits is not a desirable use of funds. It will not achieve the objective of permitting more children to enter college. Moreover, the aid it does give is granted in an inequitable manner—the higher a family's income and the more it can spend toward college, the greater is the amount of money received through the tax credit. This is indeed an "upside down scholarship," and one which no alumni body would support if a college were so ill advised as to attempt this approach in its own scholarship program. The Treasury therefore sought an appropriate nontax program—since the objective of aiding students and families in meeting college costs is a desirable one—and early advocated a guaranteed student loan program such as the one President Johnson proposed, which has now become a part of this year's higher education bill. And so in many other fields—pollution, manpower training, research and development—we must consider the nontax approach so as to evaluate the tax approach. Our experience is that the tax system generally does not offer the best route to particular social objectives. The benefits may be misdirected by going to taxpayers who do not need them and by being withheld from those whose low incomes or losses keep them from being taxpayers at all.

Even when the tax approach may be the wiser course, we must be alert to see that the dollars foregone are not being wasted and that the tax privileges are not abused. Thus the Treasury report on private foundations, while recognizing the values of private philanthropy and the contribution of the tax system to such philanthropy, also points out the abuses that are involved and how they can be corrected. The House Ways and Means Committee now has this report under consideration and has invited comments on it for staff study.

Another area where the tax system can be appropriately used is that of taxes imposed as user charges to defray the costs of Government programs conferring special benefits on a particular group. The user charge programs in the transportation area are an example.

Finally, the tax system itself as a functioning mechanism can be the object of cost-effectiveness studies. We need to know more about the administration of that system; such as the degree of compliance in various income areas and the most effective ways of increasing compliance. We need to know what information should be sought on tax returns, what statistical data should be obtained and tabulated and published by the Service in the light of its own needs and the overall reporting requirements placed on the private sector by the Government, how that data can be used to guide us both in the administration of the tax system and in evaluating existing provisions and new legislative proposals, and how the data and information gained can be used constructively to increase knowledge in other areas.

We have learned much about the use of tax policy in the last few years, and many prejudices surrounding this area have been swept aside. Our experience has not led us to discard caution or careful examination in considering future tax changes. But at the same time we have learned that tax policy—properly used—can be highly effective.

We can look forward to such creative use of tax policy on an increasing scale in the years ahead, and I am confident it will prove an effective means of helping us to move forward toward the goals of the Great Society.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. JOHNSON

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, as our mechanized society encroaches more and more on the natural beauty of our surroundings, it will be increasingly more difficult to maintain a pleasant environment in which to live and work. The campaign against ugliness, litter, and pollution will take a great deal of preserverance and imagination.

Such imagination characterizes Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson's campaign for natural beauty. At the recent annual conference of the American Institute of Park Executives in Milwaukee, Wis., she offered park leaders the challenge of turning their parks into outdoor laboratories for young visitors "to find the ways to make them seek and preserve beauty as a way of life."

The Milwaukee Journal should be commended for calling attention to this imaginative suggestion in an editorial which points out that "instilling respect for the natural world, particularly in our young people, is our prime goal in the struggle to retain and enhance natural beauty."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Sept. 9, 1965]

FIRST LADY'S MESSAGE

Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson's campaign for natural beauty is firm and characteristically feminine. Like the housewife who brightens a home with fresh flowers, she proposes among other things to brighten our drab downtowns and our highways with flowers and shrubbery. Here is a crusade against ugliness—against litter, the monotonous, the drab, the polluted river.

"The blessings of progress," she told a Milwaukee audience on Tuesday, "are in many cases engulfing us." The audience was an appropriate one—members of the American Institute of Park Executives in their annual conference.

It will take more than pretty flowers to offset this flood tide of ugliness and Mrs. Johnson knows it. She offered the park leaders a challenge and a task—to turn their parks into outdoor laboratories, to reach out to young visitors with enthusiasm and new ideas, to "find the ways to make them seek and preserve beauty as a way of life."

The point is apt and timely. Park and recreation leaders have the duty, too seldom exercised, not merely to make outdoor beauty available to all comers but to explain it, relate it to ourselves; to make it so exciting that no visitor can ignore it. The natural world isn't dull; it is life itself.

"We abuse land because we regard it as a commodity belonging to us," conservationist Aldo Leopold wrote. "When we see land as a community to which we belong, we may begin to use it with love and respect. There is no other way for land to survive the impact of mechanized man."

Instilling respect for the natural world, particularly in our young people, is our prime goal in the struggle to retain and enhance natural beauty. The First Lady has indicated one practical means of teaching reverence for the land to which we belong.

THE KILLING OF JONATHAN DANIELS, OF KEENE, N.H., AN EPISCOPAL SEMINARY STUDENT

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, much has been written and much has been said concerning the recent trial and acquittal of Thomas L. Coleman, in Haynesville, Ala. He was tried for the killing of Jonathan Daniels, of Keene, N.H., an Episcopal seminary student.

I have followed this case with real interest. I shall continue to follow it and in the very near future will have more to say on this matter.

I ask unanimous consent at this time to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the recent statement of the Reverend John B. Coburn, dean of the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge, Mass., where young Jonathan Daniels was a student.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

On the basis of the fragmentary news reports of the trial and acquittal of Thomas Coleman, I must say that an utterly shocking travesty of American justice has been brought to pass—apparently by a local system of trial which makes it impossible for the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth to be expressed.

Why, for example, was the trial not postponed—as requested by the State attorney general's office—so that the testimony of Father Morrisroe, a white Roman Catholic priest who was shot with Jonathan Daniels, might be made in person?

Why, for example, were there only two Negro eyewitness reports admitted to evidence? Why were not the other young people who were released from prison with Jonathan and either in the group or near him when he was killed permitted to testify?

As far as Jonathan Daniels is concerned, anyone who knew him—and here I include many white citizens of Selma with whom I have spoken—will recognize that he was a person of absolute integrity and honesty whose only concern in the whole tragic situation was to try to help fellow human beings in need and to act as a force for reconciliation and good will among all men. That was the kind of person he was. Any different picture is utterly false.

As far as his carrying a knife, not only have his companions testified to the FBI that he did not, but for him to have done so would have been completely contrary to his character. He was a man of peace, not hate.

Any judicial system which not only permits but apparently encourages such a flagrant denial of justice must be condemned by the citizens of a country where equality before the law and due process of law are essential foundation stones. In my judgment, this calls for a prompt and effective reply from the forces in our country which have the widest responsibility to assure justice for all—the President and executive arm of the Government together with the elected representatives of all the people.

I would only add that I am not here concerned in any way with punishment for Mr. Coleman as a person. He has his reward. I am only concerned that Jonathan Daniels' death may not have been in vain. And so far as the execution of the laws of the land in Lowndes County are concerned, it looks as though it had been. We Americans must not allow ourselves to forget Jonathan or his death or the cause for which he died.

The Reverend JOHN B. COBURN,
Dean, Episcopal Theological School.
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

THE BATTLE AGAINST MENTAL ILLNESS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the battle against mental illness is of vital concern to us all.

Mike Gorman, executive director of the National Committee Against Mental Illness made a very fine speech yesterday in Milwaukee on the new era of mental health services in the community. As Mr. Gorman said:

> For almost two centuries the mentally ill of this Nation have been isolated in "human warehouses."

And now we have the opportunity, the manpower, and the resources to unshackle them. We must eagerly accept this opportunity at all levels of government.

I think Mr. Gorman's remarks will be of interest to all my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in this RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

(By Mike Gorman, Washington, D.C.)

Before attempting to outline the exciting challenges which face us during the next decade, I believe it is necessary to highlight those developments during the past decade which have laid the foundation for a revolutionary change in our care and treatment of the mentally ill.

While there had been growing dissatisfaction with the traditional and unimaginative custodial institutionalization of the mentally ill prevalent in this country for almost two centuries, it was the creation of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health in 1955 which sounded the first important national note of dissatisfaction with this archaic and inhumane system.

The report of the Joint Commission, released in 1961, became the foundation stone for President Kennedy's magnificent February 1963 message on mental health to the Congress. In that historic message, President Kennedy proclaimed the simple principle that alienation and isolation of the mentally ill was no longer acceptable in our democracy.

In asking for citizen involvement in creating this new day for the mentally ill, President Kennedy embraced the rather daring concept that the people themselves—those most affected by the Nation's No. 1 health problem—should have a strong voice in shaping care and treatment facilities in the coming years.

The Congress responded to President Kennedy's plea by passing legislation in 1963 providing limited Federal aid in the construction of a network of community mental health centers. Several State and local plans for these centers have already been approved, and more than 100 communities from 40 States in all parts of this land have indicated an intent to apply for aid during this year in the building of a mental health center.

The 1963 Kennedy proposals also provided for partial Federal aid to support the operating costs of these centers during the first 4 years of their existence. The staffing provisions were rejected in 1963 but, as most of you know, the Congress supported them this year by an overwhelming vote.

I have cited the timetable on this important legislation because I want to stress the very essential point that a long and continuing effort is an absolute minimum in translating any major new concept into statutory form. It isn't just enough to ring the bell for mental health; it requires an enormous push to get through to the movers and shakers of our national policy and convince them—first to listen and then to act.

The battle to remove the discrimination against coverage of mental illness in health insurance policies—whether Blue Cross, Blue Shield, or commercial—is another example of the unrelenting effort which must be waged against the heavy, and in this case superstitious, hand of the past. Although admitting that mental illness filled more than 50 percent of the hospital beds in this country, insurance carriers for many years fought every effort to cover it on the same basis as physical illness. However, in recent years we have made considerable progress and most health insurance plans today cover mental illness to some degree.

I am confident that this movement will be accelerated when the medicare legislation goes into effect on July 1, 1966. Under the basic social security portion of the bill, the Congress has provided coverage for mental illness equal to that for physical illness for people over 65 in all accredited general hospitals. This is a tremendously important provision, since general hospitals now admit more than 400,000 psychiatric patients a year, as against approximately 300,000 admitted to all State and county public mental hospitals.

The medicare legislation is one of the first and most dramatic recognitions of the remarkable fact that three out of four mental patients today are cared for in facilities other than public mental hospitals. It was not always thus.

All progress is not confined to the legislative front in Washington. Last year, the United Auto Workers negotiated with the auto manufacturers a new contract providing $400 a year in outpatient psychiatric benefits for more than 1 million workers and their dependents. This is the first major breakthrough in obtaining insurance coverage of other than hospital care, and I am confident that it will be emulated in many other large industries in the next few years.

All of these developments and many others too numerous to enumerate here really mark the beginning of the end of insurance discrimination against the mentally ill. In essence, they provide a financial buttressing for psychiatric services in general hospitals, for the new community mental health centers, and to groups of people seldom touched before—the elderly, the blue collar workers, and so forth.

We are making somewhat slower progress in the provision of psychiatric services for children. A recent American Psychiatric Association study estimated that there are approximately 4 million children in need of some kind of psychiatric help because of emotional difficulties. Of these 4 million approximately 1 million are so seriously disturbed that they need immediate psychiatric help. Yet in 1963, only a handful of these children were actually treated; most of this was done in token fashion in understaffed and overcrowded clinics.

We are reaping a fearful harvest from the continuing neglect. Over the past 5 years, there has been a doubling of the number of children under the age of 14 in State mental hospitals; the estimate of 14,000 disturbed children in these institutions is revised upward each day.

There is need for a broad, hard look at the way we handle emotionally disturbed children in this country—similar in scope to the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health's survey of adult mental illness. I am happy to report that the Congress this year approved an amendment to the Medicare legislation providing a million dollars in Federal aid over 2 years to help support a nongovernmental survey by a Joint Commission on Mental Health Services for Children.

In all of this legislation, we have merely projected the goals of the future. They are skeletal blueprints; the fleshing out must come through a welding of citizen effort and professional involvement to an intense degree. It was Thomas Woodrow Wilson, a native of Virginia who first saw the light of democracy in New Jersey, who proclaimed the essential truth that "democracy is a continuous making."

Over the past several years, in all parts of the land, more than 30,000 citizens have been involved in developing plans for new kinds of care and treatment for the mentally ill.

As you tear down the outmoded battlements of ancient days, all will not be easy.

Paramount to the success of our mutual effort to provide the bulk of psychiatric treatment in the heart of the community is the availability of psychiatric manpower. For the record, I must note that we have made tremendous progress in training such personnel. In 1949, for example, the National Institute of Mental Health offered only 219 training stipends in the four core disciplines of psychiatric, psychology, social work, and psychiatric nursing; last year, it offered 7,000 stipends.

We have increased the number of people in these four core disciplines from 12,000 in 1950 to 64,000 last year, but the escalating demands for psychiatric services have more than exceeded our remarkable record in producing additional trained people. More intensive treatment programs in State mental hospitals, the need for thousands of skilled people to staff the new mental health centers, and the vastly increasing number of psychiatric units in our general hospitals, the demands as we increase the ability of people to pay for psychiatric services—all these have made tremendous claims upon us. Nor have I mentioned the Macedonian cries which I hear almost every day in Washington for the creation of psychiatric components in the poverty program, the job camp centers, Project Head Start, and so on.

I say we can, and must, respond to this challenge. Because of insufficient funds over the past 2 years, the National Mental Health Advisory Council has turned down more than $20 million in training applications submitted by institutions which have the faculty to teach and the students who desire to enter one or another of the mental health professions. This rejection of thousands of young applicants while our needs are so demonstrable is indefensible.

We can afford to train these people. We have a space program costing in excess of $5 billion a year to put a man on the moon by 1970—we can afford a few million dollars to put thousands of American men, women, and children on their feet on this planet by 1970.

It is really a matter of national will and determination—no less and no more.

In reviewing many of the planning projections for the new era of mental health services in the community, I have also noted an increasing emphasis upon local responsibility. The Federal share in this community mental health center legislation is really quite limited; it can actually only provide a start toward the big goal.

For almost two centuries, local governments have dumped their unwanted mental patients upon the States. This we will no longer abide. We therefore must give to county and other local governments tax resources sufficient to allow them to participate in these new programs. I have heard all the bromides about local taxation reaching a confiscatory level, and I have a separate speech which I usually reserve for county commissioners. The essence of it goes like this: As a portion of real personal income local taxes, like State taxes, have not increased over the past 15 years. A nation which spends in excess of $20 billion on recreation, more than $11 billion on alcoholic beverages, $7 billion on tobacco products, and which can produce 8 million cars in a year to clog highways and freeways built at a cost of $10 billion a year, can afford some local tax money to restore precious people to productivity and happiness.

Maybe what I have outlined is a somewhat long and arduous bill of particulars. However, I do not think it beyond the capability of a people who created the democratic process on these shores.

Fundamentally, and above all else, we need a strong citizen involvement in the field of mental health to present our case not only at the Federal level, but primarily at the State and local level. I am happy to note that the capabilities of the National Association for Mental Health are increasing in the legislative area; I think their constituent chapters made a significant contribution to the passage of the mental health center staffing legislation during the current year.

It is less lonely in Washington these days, and the voice of the people on this great question is increasingly audible.

During the next decade, I deeply believe that the voice of the citizen will insist that after 200 years of darkness and oblivion, our brethren suffering in mind and heart will receive both compassion and care in a manner befitting the dignity of a great people.

I would now like to relate the foregoing comments to the mental health situation in Wisconsin today.

My last appearance before a citizen's organization in this State was in 1956 when I addressed the Dane County Mental Health Association. In looking over the press clippings resulting from that appearance, I find that I rode you pretty hard then for a whole catalogue of deficiencies. While in Madison, I appeared on a statewide radio forum called "It's Later Than You Think," and my remarks indicated that it was even later than that.

I spent 4 hours touring Mendota State Hospital, and was deeply depressed by the shortages of psychiatric personnel and the lack of intensive treatment in an institution located in your capital city. The Wisconsin Diagnostic Center had been opened several years before my visit, and while Dr. Osborn's plans for it seemed quite exciting, the obstacles to implementation were again this same lack of trained professional people.

I reminded you almost a decade ago that "Wisconsin has not yet implemented the recommendations of the 1954 Midwest Governors' Conference on Mental Health. * * * There is a definite need for clear, detailed blueprints for Wisconsin's mental health program."

In talking to State mental health officials, I found no indication that Wisconsin had ever begun the process of training its own native sons and daughters in the psychiatric professions so necessary for the adequate staffing of your State and county mental hospitals.

"Wisconsin has to give stipends and grants to those interested in the psychiatric professions and to schools and hospitals that will set up training centers," I contended in 1956 talk.

Somewhat unkindly, I called your attention to the fact that your neighboring States of Illinois and Michigan had embarked on carefully thought-out statewide programs in support of research, the training of psychiatric personnel and the strengthening of community mental health services.

I say to you today—almost a decade later—that you still have a lot of catching up to do. Illinois, in addition to supporting two multimillion-dollar institutes in Chicago for research and training in the fields of mental illness and mental retardation and, at Galesburg Hospital, the finest research institute I have seen in any State institution in the country, is currently leading the Nation in the building of a network of eight-zone community mental health centers supported by State and local matching moneys. Michigan, which spends a higher per capita sum than any other State for psychiatric research, has the finest network of tax-supported children's residential treatment facilities in the United States.

I realize that you have made considerable progress since 1956, particularly during the administration of Gov. GAYLORD NELSON. I had the distinct privilege of talking to him on many occasions about the mental health program in Wisconsin and sensed his keen determination to move forward in a planned, coordinated manner with a particular emphasis upon lifting the standards in your 36 county hospitals. Established more than 80 years ago, these hospitals over the years became small, understaffed institutions weighted down with the care of chronic patients. Governor NELSON established the first professional standards for care and treatment in these county hospitals, and he instituted a program of State aid to bolster their treatment potential.

Governor NELSON had a keen appreciation of the fact that Wisconsin could never staff its State and county mental hospitals properly until it developed a statewide program of training its own young people in the various psychiatric professions. We carried on a lengthy correspondence on this issue, and in 1960 he wrote me:

"Recognizing the importance of developing and maintaining a supply of trained professional staff to operate its treatment programs, the department of public welfare has inaugurated a program of educational stipends to psychiatric residents, social work trainees, and psychology trainees."

Aware of the importance of research he recommended, and the legislature provided, the first State funds for the Wisconsin Psychiatric Institute at Madison. All of us in the mental health field are indebted to him for these major reforms, as well as for the establishment of the pioneer program for State aid to community mental health clinics, for the legislation creating the children's treatment center, and for many other progressive mental health measures too numerous to enumerate here.

Since it is my understanding that Senator NELSON, who has continued his ardent support of health measures in Washington as a member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, belongs to one particular political party which shall go unidentified, I feel in all fairness that I should point out that the outstanding Republican spokesman in the House of Representatives on all health matters is Representative MELVIN LAIRD of Marshfield.

For more than a decade, MEL LAIRD has been a member of the powerful House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare, and for the past 7 years its ranking minority member. In the Eisenhower years—when the executive budgets were extremely tight—MEL LAIRD frequently took to the floor of the House to support increases in medical research which had been reported by the committee in which he served so ably.

In an historic debate in 1958, when the Congress decided to go considerably beyond the Eisenhower budget in the field of health, Congressman LAIRD had this to say of the potential of medical research and its importance to the health of our people:

"It is this kind of promise that can be sensed in the major disease research fields—cancer, heart disease, mental illness, arthritis, neurological illnesses, dental diseases and others—that leads to the conclusion that raising rather than reducing the appropriations for this work for next year is, as I have said, a very wise investment."

I have testified before Congressman LAIRD for 11 successive years on behalf of the budgets of the National Institute of Mental Health, and I cannot say it has always been an unmitigated pleasure. He does his homework, he racks you up if there are any soft items in your presentation, but he is eminently fair and he is open to persuasion. This very year, on the floor of the House, he defended an appreciable increase in the training programs of the National Institute of Mental Health over the administration budget.

My high regard for him is shared by many national organizations in the health field. Just last year, he received the coveted Albert Lasker Award—the "Oscar" of medicine—for outstanding services in the field of public health. He has also received awards from the National Association for Mental Health, the American Cancer Society, the Association of American Medical Colleges, and many others.

We are trying to help you at the Federal level in your efforts to upgrade the quality of treatment services in your hospitals. For example, during the 4 years of my service as a member of the National Advisory Council of the National Institute of Mental Health, I had the privilege of voting for a 5-year grant of approximately $250,000 to several investigators at the University of Wisconsin who are studying the treatment potential of your county hospitals. As you well know—except for the two Milwaukee county hospitals—professional services in these county hospitals are still quite limited, so we look forward eagerly to the recommendations which will eventuate from the study.

As a member of the Council, I have also been privileged to vote for inservice training grants designed to improve the skills of the nonprofessional workers, particularly psychiatric aids, in your State and county mental hospitals. In awarding these grants, we have given priority to the needs of the county hospitals.

As a member of the Council, I have also kept in close touch with the 2-year planning effort supported by Federal funds and designed to create a progressive blueprint for mental health care in Wisconsin. In these studies, you have involved more than 1,500 citizens from practically every county in the Badger State.

I have reviewed quite carefully a résumé of this planning effort. I realize the enormous challenge involved in recommending a set of services to care properly for an estimated 400,000 of your citizens who suffer in some degree from an emotional disorder.

I have consulted with staff people at the National Institute of Mental Health who have reviewed your plans in some detail; there is a seeming consensus that you are long on generalities and short on specifics. For example, in 1964 you spent $75 million in public moneys for the care of the mentally ill and the mentally retarded, but only about 1 percent of this sum for the research which is the only way we can eventually reduce this heavy load in human agony and losses to our economy. I do not find any sparkling proposals for new research efforts beyond the recommendation for a proposed mental retardation center.

In the summary report, which I have studied very closely, I find a number of platitudinous sentences which disturb me. For example: "Schools are ideally suited for prevention, casefinding, counseling, and referral." This seemingly innocuous statement is really nonsense. Our public schools today, overcrowded and underfinanced, are ideally suited for the creation and nurturing of emotional disorder. This is true of every school system I have investigated, including New York City, during the past decade.

Your report also confirms a longstanding suspicion of mine that you are weighted down with a heavy bureaucratic structure of agencies which dabble in various degrees in the mental health pie. First of all, I am not happy with a division of mental hygiene under a most capable individual, Dr. Leonard Ganser, which is subsumed under an overall State department of public health. Mental health is big business these days, and it should have a voice at the cabinet level in Wisconsin.

Furthermore, I am puzzled that the State plan for construction and operation of mental health centers, under the landmark 1963 and 1965 Federal mental health legislation, is to be administered by your State board of health. It is my understanding that the comprehensive mental health and mental retardation planning program was properly administered by the Division of Mental Hygiene. In other words, one agency supervises the overall planning and another agency plans the construction of facilities. How divisive can you get?

Then you have another agency—the mental health advisory committee. In the summary of your State planning efforts, this agency is referred to as "the statutory body for examining the State's needs and making recommendations for better services, but it was not intended or set up for extended planning or administration."

If it was not set up for these purposes, then what is the justification for its existence? I note, incidentally, that this advisory committee is quite critical of the amorphous generalities contained in the final planning report.

I must confess that I am somewhat disturbed by this repetitive emphasis upon the creation of more agencies and more planning. For example, the summary planning report says: "Wisconsin has the resources for effective programs. It is also blessed with many competent professionals with creative ideas. The difficulty until now has been converting these ideas and these resources into programs and services."

I agree with the foregoing statement. Your potential is enormous—so enormous that you may eventually catch up with Iowa, Illinois, and Michigan. However, what is the planning report's major recommendation for catching up? It is, and I quote verbatim from the summary report:

"There should be created a State mental health and mental retardation program development committee."

In another section of the summary report, there is this gem:

"The urgent task is to get on with the job of forming the committees."

As one who has been deeply concerned with the Wisconsin mental health program over the past decade, I ask you in good conscience in what decade will you stop planning and start the creation of a network of community mental health services designed to bring intensive treatment to every adult and every child in Wisconsin who needs it?

No committee, or committees, will bring these services to you and your loved ones—they will be brought to them by professional people trained by you here in Wisconsin to work in modern psychiatric facilities built by a combination of Federal, State, and local efforts.

Those of us who devised the mental health planning grant program back in 1962 envisioned it very clearly as a one-time opportunity for every State in the country to assess the extent of the problems of mental illness and mental retardation and come up with concrete proposals designed to combat them.

I served on the congressionally sponsored Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health. The title of its final report was: "Action for Mental Health." Out of that report came a series of legislative proposals which are now on the statute books.

We did not propose any additional committees.

May I respectfully suggest that all of you good people who are involved in this mental health revolution move into the action phase in Wisconsin. For almost two centuries, the mentally ill of this Nation have been isolated in what I have often referred to as "human warehouses."

Now you have the precious opportunity to unshackle them—you, the people. Not committees, not bureaucratic agencies, but you the people.

RETIREMENT OF FELTON M. JOHNSTON

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the forthcoming retirement of Mr. Felton McLellan "Skeeter" Johnston as Secretary to the Senate removes from this body one of its most dedicated and able aids.

For more than 35 years Skeeter Johnston has served his Nation well. Except for a brief period during World War II when he served in the Department of State and as a member of the U.S. Army, Skeeter has rendered an invaluable service to the Senate. During his tenure here, he has served as Secretary from the Senate majority and minority and, for the past decade, as Secretary to the Senate.

Skeeter Johnston leaves the Senate with the satisfaction that accompanies a job well done. I personally owe him a debt of gratitude for his unstinting help, which has made my work here much easier than it otherwise would have been. I am thankful, as I know my fellow Senators are, that although Skeeter is retiring from the Senate, he intends to remain here in Washington. After some 33 years in the Senate, a tenure few of us can claim, it is reassuring that he will remain nearby and will be available to give us the benefit of his knowledge and experience.

Although he has never sought elective office, Skeeter's career has always been in politics. In addition to his employment in the Senate, he has been very active in the work of his party. These activities were highlighted when he was chosen to serve as executive director of the Platform Committees of two National Democratic Conventions. In this capacity he was instrumental in drafting the program of the Democratic Party for the Presidential elections of 1948 and 1952.

I should like to mention just one additional item concerning Skeeter Johnston. It is not too well known that, in addition to his success as a public servant, he also is an avid student of spheniscidae. Ever since seeing a specimen in London in 1939, his hobby has been collecting replicas of penguins. For many years, until his collection grew too large, they graced his office in the Senate, and stimulated a great deal of conversation among his visitors.

In associating myself with the remarks of my colleagues praising Skeeter's Johnston's fine qualities, I would like to congratulate him for his many fine years of service and great contributions to the Senate, and I wish for him and his family continued success and happiness.

A POSITIVE MARITIME POLICY—TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BREWSTER OF MARYLAND

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland, Senator BREWSTER, was appointed to the Senate Commerce Committee a little over a year ago. Since that time he has become one of the most consistent and convincing advocates of a powerful merchant marine and a strong shipping and shipbuilding industry. In recent weeks Senator BREWSTER has been an equally consistent and convincing critic of present maritime and administration policy and of the recent Interagency Maritime Task Force Report.

Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland is deeply concerned for the future of the American merchant marine and rightly so.

His views are clearly presented in an article which he wrote for the Maritime Reporter and Engineering News. This excellent article is carried in their issue of October 15, 1965. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's timely call for a positive maritime policy be printed at this point of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Maryland Senator Calls for Positive Maritime Policy—Brewster Decries Low Status of American Merchant Marine

(By Senator DANIEL B. BREWSTER)

(NOTE—DANIEL B. BREWSTER, U.S. Senator from Maryland. DANIEL BAUGH BREWSTER, Democrat, of Glyndon, Md., was born on November 23, 1923, in Baltimore County, Md.

(Senator BREWSTER enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps in 1942. He rose from private to captain and served 2 years in the South Pacific. He was wounded, decorated with the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, and the Gold Star in lieu of a second Purple Heart. He is now a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve.

(He attended Princeton and Johns Hopkins Universities, and received his LL.B. from the University of Maryland in 1949. In 1950, he was elected to the Maryland House of Delegates from Baltimore County at the age of 27. He was reelected to the legislature in 1954.

(In 1958, Mr. BREWSTER was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, 86th Congress, from Maryland's 2d Congressional District. He was reelected to the Congress in 1960, and for two terms served on the powerful House Armed Services Committee.

(Mr. BREWSTER was elected to the U.S. Senate on November 6, 1962, for a 6-year term. He serves on the Armed Services, Commerce, Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the Senate. He is a member of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee.

(In 1964, he successfully represented President Johnson in the Maryland Democratic primary. Later in the year, Senator BREWSTER was chairman of the Maryland delegation to the Democratic National Convention in Atlantic City.

(Senator BREWSTER is a former president and a present director of the Maryland State Fair and Agricultural Society at Timonium. He is a member of the YMCA, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the American Legion, the Reserve Officers Association, and attends St. John's Episcopal Church.

(Senator and Mrs. Brewster own and operate a cattle, horse, and grain farm near Glyndon, Md. They are the parents of two sons—Danny, Jr., and Gerry.)

The report of the President's Interagency Task Force on Maritime Policy has been made "unofficially available" and its recommendations have been carried by major newspapers and trade journals. Whatever the propriety of such a premature release, the fat is now in the fire. These recommendations obviously present the trend of thinking of the task force, and as such cannot go unchallenged.

The report requires comment from all of us who are interested in the preservation of a strong American merchant marine. I believe that the task force proposals would destroy that kind of merchant marine. Implementation of these recommendations would mean a merchant marine neither strong, nor American.

It would produce an incalculable loss to U.S. prestige. Not only our prestige, but our power would be gone.

It would mean the end of passenger service by American lines.

It would mean an immediate loss of employment for 4,000 Americans, and a long-run loss of 20,000 American shipboard jobs, as the task force admits. The report declares that the loss of these jobs is inevitable; I do not believe that this is necessarily the case. I certainly do not contemplate the loss of 20,000 American jobs with equanimity.

The losses to employment in American shipyards would be equally grave. The report urges "reduction" of shipyard capacity to a level which would "adequately support the national security." Press reports indicate that the recent Vietnam buildup has strained present shipyard capacity; future mobilizations would probably result in shortages and critical delays. Reduced shipyard capacity would mean still less adequate support for our national security.

The task force apparently has given short shrift to balance-of-payments considerations. The proposed elimination of American passenger service alone would result in an annual loss of some $125 million. The American loss of work to foreign shipyards would compound this problem. And implementation of these proposals would, by the report's own admission, further reduce the meager 9 percent of this country's foreign trade which is carried on our own ships. Every ton of cargo carried on foreign ships means dollars paid to other nations.

It is difficult to believe that this group could have arrived at conclusions with such far-reaching implications in a period of only 2 months—from June 22 to August 20, the date of the report. And the premature disclosure of these conclusions is absolutely shocking.

Representing as I do the great State of Maryland, which contains the second leading port in the Nation, Baltimore, I have gained some experience in the problems of the maritime industry. This experience has led me to certain conclusions about our merchant marine policy. I personally submitted these conclusions to the members of the Presidential task force for their consideration. Let me review these policy suggestions briefly.

Before I make any suggestions about the U.S. merchant marine policy, however, let us consider some of the reasons why a vigorous and progressive policy is necessary.

The declaration of policy of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 set forth the objectives of the Congress. Since these objectives have since been obscured and, in some instances, ignored, I would like to quote from this declaration of policy:

> It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic waterborne commerce and substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign waterborne commerce at all times; (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency; (c) owned and operated under the United States insofar as may be practicable, and (d) composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel.
>
> "It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine."

From the point of view of national defense, there is no question that a large and efficient merchant marine, coupled with a healthy shipbuilding and ship repair industry, can make a major contribution to our national security. Vessels are needed for troop transport: the entire First Cavalry Division embarked for Vietnam in August by ship. They are needed for supply functions as well. Some 600 ships were required to supply American troops in Korea, and the present situation in southeast Asia has demonstrated the continuing need for such vessels. The shipyards, both naval and private, must also be ready to activate and repair vessels for service in the national defense. The conclusion of the Harvard Business School study for the Navy Department in 1945 still holds true today:

> "The controlling factor in the determination of the characteristics of shipping and shipbuilding activities in the United States in peacetime as well as in wartime is the national security."

The value to U.S. commerce of a healthy merchant marine is equally clear. There will be gains in employment, in returns to the American economy, and in reliability if "a substantial part" of our commerce is carried in U.S. bottoms. This is particularly important in light of persistent balance-of-payments difficulties. Yet today only 9 percent of our foreign commerce moves in

American-flag vessels. Norwegian carriers transport twice as much of the American foreign trade as U.S. flagships; Liberia carries three times as much as we do. And even from this poor position, we are losing ground.

These concerns become all the more urgent in view of the rapid building of the fleets of other nations, most especially of the Soviet Union. The United States ranks only fourth in the world in number of ships afloat. The Soviet Union has already surpassed us in number of ships in the active fleet, and may shortly exceed us in total tonnage afloat.

While nations like Japan and Norway are engaged in determined efforts to build up their fleets, we are falling farther and farther behind. We now rank no higher than 11th among shipbuilding nations of the world. The United States—the leading trading nation in the world—risks becoming low man on the totem pole of international shipping.

Under normal circumstances, a nation whose economy is based upon free enterprise regards a subsidy system as alien and undesirable. It seems to me, however, that there are certain goals—the ones enumerated in the 1936 act—which can be achieved only through the maintenance of a healthy American shipping and shipbuilding industry. Due to several factors, notably the high standard of living of American workmen, these goals simply cannot be met without Government subsidy. It is for this reason that, although I sympathize with those who dislike the general principle of Government subsidy, I feel that certain forms of subsidy are essential in this case.

Construction subsidies are an important means of insuring the adequacy of our merchant marine and of our shipyards. It seems to me to be advisable to continue the present system of construction differential subsidies to the liner fleet. The U.S. liner fleet is the finest in the world, due in large part to the Government aid program—80 percent of the 20-knot cargoliner vessels in the world have been built and operated in the United States. This part of the program should continue.

The first Subcommittee of the Maritime Advisory Committee, after long and careful study of U.S. needs, has concluded that a bulk carrier construction aid program is desirable. This has long been my position.

Given the requirement that ships be built in the United States, we must recognize that this country will never acquire an efficient bulk carrier fleet without Government subsidy. And it is most certainly in the national interest that such a fleet of dry bulk carriers be developed.

Such a program would add $160 million to the annual subsidy of nearly $400 million for a total expenditure of approximately $570 million.

I do not believe that this is too large a price to pay for the development of a bulk carrier fleet, which can be of inestimable value to this country in the future. Moreover, a substantial portion of every dollar of subsidy will return to the Government in the form of income or corporation taxes.

It might prove necessary, once the construction of the new dry-bulk carriers is completed, to grant an operating subsidy to this segment of the fleet as well. I would propose, however, that no such action be undertaken until a detailed study of the requirements had been completed. With the modernization of the fleet and the continuation of the cargo-preference assistance, the dry-bulk carriers might well prove to be self-supporting.

I have cosponsored in the Senate a bill, S. 1558, which would allow the creation of tax-free reserve funds for the construction of new vessels. The enactment of such a proposal would provide construction assistance to the other nonsubsidized operators. The continuation of present trade-in procedures is also to be recommended. Taken together, this construction assistance for liners, dry-bulk carriers, and others would provide a well-rounded program of modernization of the U.S. cargo fleet.

Another important area in which Government assistance is given is that of operating subsidies. Due to the high standard of living of American seamen, there appears to be no alternative to continued operating subsidies, if we are to continue to hire American crews and operate vessels under the American flag. These subsidies must therefore be continued.

It may be noted, however, that a significant increase in construction subsidies, such as I have urged, would produce a much more modern and efficient American fleet. This in turn would reduce the amount of operating subsidy needed.

Another area in which the Government can be of great assistance in promoting a healthy merchant marine is in carrying out the policy of cargo preference. Public Law 664, enacted in 1954, provides that at least 50 percent of U.S. Government-generated cargo shall be carried in American-flag vessels, if such vessels are available at "fair and reasonable rates." In addition, all military cargoes must be shipped on American-flag ships.

Three years ago, the late President Kennedy reaffirmed the importance of this cargo preference, stating in particular that the 50-percent requirement "is a minimum, and it shall be the objective of each agency to ship a maximum of such caroges on U.S.-flag vessels."

Despite this explicit Presidential order, there have been numerous occasions on which the requirement has not been met.

Close congressional supervision has resulted in some improvement of the situation since then, but American cargo shipping is still in a weak and rapidly deteriorating condition. The temptation for Government agencies to ship in foreign bottoms at lower rates still appears to be strong.

I, therefore, feel that a reaffirmation and extension of the cargo-preference policy would be appropriate. The U.S. merchant marine cannot remain healthy without substantial amounts of cargo. The U.S. Government, which is the immediate beneficiary of a strong merchant marine in time of emergency, should be the first to give the American vessels that cargo. I, therefore, propose that 75 percent of this Government's cargo be shipped in American bottoms. In addition, the Congress should continue to oversee carefully the administration of the cargo-preference laws. As a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee, I will do my utmost to see that all Government agencies comply with these regulations whenever practicable.

In general, the Government should expand and intensify its efforts to promote shipping in American bottoms. Some of these efforts can be direct: through an expanded and strictly enforced cargo preference program—the cost of which will be reduced as increasing modernization brings American shipping rates into line with foreign rates.

Other efforts can be indirect: the Maritime Administration's continuing promotion. "For Trade or Trips, American Ships," is an example. Such a dual program, efficiently administered, would greatly strengthen the American merchant marine.

The next area of maritime policy which deserves attention is labor-management relations. The labor situation has been chaotic in recent years. I strongly feel that something must be done about this deplorable situation—operating as far as possible within the framework of free collective bargaining.

When the Government and the taxpayers of this country have as big a stake in the maritime industry as they do—to the extent of nearly $400 million annually—they have a right to expect some stability in labor-management relations, and some continuity in the service for which they are paying a large part of the bills.

The Government should require a no-strike clause in the labor contracts affecting all construction and operations which it subsidizes. Only in this manner can some continuity of service be insured.

I would like to make it clear that I am not proposing compulsory arbitration of collective bargaining issues. When a contract comes up for negotiation, there should be free and unimpaired collective bargaining, aided perhaps by Federal mediation if such mediation would assist in preventing a work stoppage.

But, once a contract has been agreed upon, issues which arise during the life of the contract should be settled by arbitration—not by strike or by lockout. The Federal Government should make this a prerequisite of any construction or operating subsidy.

Lastly, I offer several recommendations which bear on the private shipyards of the Nation. I think it should be the general objective of the Government to encourage the growth and continued health of the private shipyards.

This can be accomplished in several ways. I would oppose a total ban on the purchase of any vessels abroad, but I believe that no such purchases in foreign shipyards should be made without careful consultation with the Congress. Twice during the past year, such purchases have been suggested. The general rule—to be breached only under exceptional circumstances—should be that no work which could be done in American yards, thereby fostering a substantial American construction and repair capacity, should be given to foreign yards.

The Defense Department can aid the maintenance of a strong private shipyard industry in another way: by guaranteeing a substantial portion of the naval repair and conversion work to the private yards. The 65/35 provision formerly included in the annual Department of Defense appropriation would be an effective means of guaranteeing a minimum of 35 percent of such work to private yards.

The proposals which I have made would not be without cost to the Federal Government. If adopted, they might raise the present total annual maritime expenditure substantially. But a nation which can afford $5.2 billion for space, it seems to me, can also afford to spend sufficient funds to insure an adequate merchant marine.

And it would be shortsighted indeed to assume that funds spent to assist the maintenance of our merchant marine are funds lost. Not only will they produce an effective and efficient merchant marine for wartime and peacetime activity, not only will they save the United States substantial amounts of dollars on her international balance of payments, not only will they provide jobs for American seamen and shipyard workers, but they will be paid back to the Government, in large part, in the form of taxes. Thus, the additional spending which would be entailed would represent a relatively small but very important investment—one of the best investments, in my judgment, which our Government could make.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL VANDERVORT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I would like to take this occasion to pay tribute to Col. Ralph E. Vandervort, who is retiring from the Army at the end of this month after 24 years of outstanding active service.

Colonel Vandervort is well known to all of us here in the Senate, where he has long rendered distinguished service as liaison officer of the U.S. Army to the U.S. Senate.

Colonel Vandervort, in his capacity as liaison officer to the Senate, was always cooperative in handling the many problems handed over to him by those of us in this body. He handled these problems with a high degree of efficiency and dispatch, and always in the best interests of the United States. Unquestionably he is a man of great character and integrity. The Department of the Army certainly can feel just pride in having an officer of his caliber, and I am sure will regret the fact that he is retiring. He has reflected great credit upon the armed services.

I am proud to have Colonel Vandervort as a friend and certainly wish him well in all future endeavors. We will miss him here in the U.S. Senate. I also want to express my sincere best wishes to him for continued happiness and success.

SOUTH DAKOTA'S UNANIMOUS PRIDE IN VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], who is necessarily absent, I ask unanimous consent to have a brief statement by him and an editorial inserted in the Record. I am pleased at this opportunity to present this material.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator McGovern

SOUTH DAKOTA'S UNANIMOUS PRIDE IN VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

The unanimity of South Dakota's pride in her native son, the Vice President of the United States, is reflected in a Sioux Falls Argus-Leader editorial on October 10, 1965, written by its veteran editor-emeritus, F. C. Christopherson.

In his editorial, Mr. Christopherson describes himself as a man with some concern about the liberality of Vice President Humphrey's philosophy, but concludes that the sobering influence of the responsibilities of office temper actions and the Nation would have no need for concern about the quality of its leadership under our former associate, now the Vice President.

Mr. Christopherson writes:

"In South Dakota we bask in the reflected glow of the native son who has become so prominent. I feel we have abundant reason to be proud of the man whom this region has produced.

"He is a man of charm. Even many who disagree sharply with him on policy grant that they like him. The fact is that few dislike Humphrey.

"He is a man of character. Though he has been in the rough and tumble of politics in many hectic political campaign battles, his integrity is respected. His associates on both sides of the aisle trust him.

"He has vision, energy, compassion, and imagination. His experience in government has been broad and comprehensive. He has poise and the ability to think clearly and concisely in periods of stress."

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader, Oct. 10, 1965]

Eyes of World on Man From South Dakota

(By F. C. Christopherson)

For a while last week the grave responsibilities of the White House rested squarely on the shoulders of a native South Dakotan.

The man who assumed these extraordinary duties—very likely the world's most important—was born in the small community of Wallace a few miles northwest of Watertown, went to high school in the slightly larger town of Doland in Spink County and moved with his family to Huron while he was in his early twenties.

He was born to neither fame nor fortune. And his family experienced, as did most South Dakotans, the vicissitudes of drought, dust, and depression.

It wasn't an easy life. The average family was pleased, indeed, to be able at that time to acquire the necessities of life. The luxuries were out of reach.

Those were the rugged formative years of Hubert H. Humphrey, the Nation's Vice President and the man who was in effect the Nation's Chief Executive while President Johnson was undergoing surgery.

WHAT HIS ROLE MEANS

Humphrey's special responsibility, of course, continues and will be particularly present until President Johnson has recovered fully from his hospitalization. It will continue thereafter also to a substantial degree as long as he is Vice President. And there's always the possibility, as the historical record demonstrates, that he may be catapulted suddenly into the awesome atmosphere of the President's chair with both the full title and the duties.

In that event he would be the presiding officer of the world's most powerful Nation. His comments on public affairs, even casual remarks, would be studied in Moscow, London, Paris, Peiping, and everywhere else where statesmen assemble.

His words could spread shudders throughout the world or sensations of relief. His acts could affect the lives of those who live in the jungles of Africa, on the steppes of Russia, and in the swamps of Vietnam.

A RAPID UPWARD SURGE

There was nothing in the early years of Humphrey in South Dakota to suggest that destiny had marked him for such a conspicuous role.

He was a typical child of the prairies in his first few years in Wallace. He was just another vigorous and rambunctious high school student in Doland, and he plodded along with other young men while he worked in his father's drugstore in Huron.

But there was within him, as his sparkling career subsequently demonstrated, a yearning to broaden his vision and his aptitude. Always he was learning and, as opportunity presented itself, he moved ahead. Once on his way, he stepped rapidly up the ladder of fame and public responsibility. He was elected mayor of Minneapolis in 1945 and reelected in 1947. He was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1948 and reelected in 1954 and 1960. It was in 1964 that he was elected to the Vice Presidency, assuming office on January 20, 1965.

OUR PRIDE IN HUMPHREY

In South Dakota we bask in the reflected glow of the native son who has become so prominent. And I feel we have abundant reason to be proud of the man whom this region has produced.

He is a man of charm. Even many who disagree sharply with him on policy grant that they like him. The fact is that few persons dislike Humphrey.

He is a man of character. Though he has been in the rough and tumble of politics in many hectic campaign battles, his integrity is respected. His associates on both sides of the public aisle trust him.

He has vision, energy, compassion, and imagination. His experience in government has been broad and comprehensive. He has poise and the ability to think clearly and concisely in periods of stress.

THE DICTATES OF FATE

In the minds of many persons, Humphrey is too liberal in his public philosophy. I share that appraisal and would feel more comfortable about his possible elevation to the Presidency if he were more conservative.

Yet—and I don't believe I'm influenced unduly by the fact he is a native South Dakotan—the prospect of Humphrey being in the White House doesn't disturb me. Such a role, one may be sure, would bring to the fore a determination to serve well with vigor. And there is to be considered the sobering influence of the high office.

President Johnson is now making an excellent recovery from his operation and there's nothing to suggest that he won't complete his term. But fate is unpredictable. If it should decree that it is to be President Humphrey, not Vice President Humphrey, the Nation need have no concern about the quality of its leadership.

COMMUNIST CZECHOSLOVAKIA STILL A POLICE STATE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a noteworthy letter to the editor from Mr. Peter Zenkl, former Deputy Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, appeared in the Washington Post this morning. Mr. Zenkl reminds us that despite the public relations campaign to show the beauty and cultural attractions of his homeland, that country is still oppressed by a Communist, totalitarian, police state. The Communist regime of Czechoslovakia is inviting Americans to come to see Czechoslovakia, but its press, radio and television pours forth, I am reliably informed, vicious daily attacks against the United States, often in tones more vituperative than Moscow uses. We should be very careful in such matters. Mr. Zenkl points out that we should not lose sight of the fact that millions of freedom-loving people are captive of this Communist regime and all the propaganda, cultural exchange and tourism which money can buy will not change this fact.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Zenkl's letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 21, 1965]

Czech Protest

Letter to the Editor:

With increasing frequency one finds in the pages of newspapers throughout the country, prominent and attractive advertising which features the desirability of visiting beautiful Czechoslovakia or of attending cultural and artistic performances presented in this country by Czechoslovak ensembles. Thus, people are invited to fly to Prague, to see a Czech pantomime show in New York, or to listen to the Czech Philharmonic Orchestra in Washington.

It is very true that Czechoslovakia is beautiful and that it has a proud cultural heritage. However, today the American public is in fact not being invited to visit Czechoslovakia, but the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic (CSSR), as the country was officially labeled in the 1960 Communist constitution. It is important to realize that cultural exchanges have meaning to the CSSR only insofar as they provide the much-needed hard currencies and afford a pseudo-legitimate forum for distorted propaganda.

Finally, it should not be forgotten that despite the so-called liberalization of recent years, which sadly enough is not all the Western press tends to make it, the CSSR is still very much a police state (as witnessed by frequent arrests of Western tourists) in which the Communist Party rules with an iron fist against the will of an overwhelming majority of the Czech and Slovak people.

PETER ZENKL.

(The author is a former Deputy Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia.)

WASHINGTON.

SENATOR DODD AND THE BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, a short time ago one of America's great newspapers, the News-American of Baltimore carried an editorial praising Senator THOMAS DODD and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee for their vigorous efforts opposing both extremes, the John Birch Society and the Communist Party.

As I believe that this editorial will be of interest to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore News-American]

BIG BIRCH SECRET?

There always was something weird about the John Birch Society. Any organization that accused former President Eisenhower of being a "conscious, dedicated agent" of the Communist conspiracy had to be a little strange, one way or the other.

Now one of the most conscious, dedicated anti-Communists in American public life has offered a possible diagnosis. He is Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, and he has charged that the society "has been a real windfall to the Communist conspiracy * * * an unwilling abettor of the Communist conspiracy."

Senator DODD observed, in effect, that the society has played into communism's hands by providing Communists with a "convenient caricature" of genuine patriotic elements in this country.

Senator DODD is vice chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, a body that has long proved itself the nemesis of various Communist and Communist-backed subversion activities. He said he is flattered by the society's recent description of him as the "most persistent, continuous, aggressive—and damaging—enemy the society has had in the U.S. Senate.'"

This is flattery, indeed, and Senator DODD can take a well-earned bow.

OPPORTUNITY FOR FOREIGN VISITORS TO UNDERSTAND OUR CULTURE AND WAY OF LIFE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I recently received a letter from a Jaycee chapter in my State explaining one of their projects. Through this particular project the Longmont Jaycees invite foreign visitors in Colorado to live with a local family and participate as a member of the family in various community activities. This gives our foreign visitors an opportunity to better understand our culture and also to see a more meaningful side of our American way of life. I am sure that in many instances this program gives these foreign visitors a totally different and more favorable image of the United States than they might otherwise receive.

Enclosed with the letter I received from the Colorado Jaycee chapter were copies of letters sent to the President of the United States and to Secretary of State Rusk requesting encouragement and support for this very fine program. This type of program is one which is to be commended and deserves support. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letters written to the President and to the Secretary of State by the Colorado Jaycee chapter.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONGMONT JAYCEES,
Longmont, Colo., September 24, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Longmont Junior Chamber of Commerce is attempting to do its share to improve our foreign image. The Longmont Jaycees have undertaken a project this past summer to entertain foreign visitors in their homes. The Jaycees feel that the only way our foreign guests will understand the American culture is to actually live with a family in their home. To stay in an American home has been a first for every visitor the Longmont Jaycees have had except for a fellow from Formosa and one from Vietnam.

From our viewpoint, this has been extremely worthwhile and very successful. Each host family feels they gain so much more from the visit than do their visitors. We do not concentrate on the spectacular. We attempt to follow our regular routine if possible, for example—if Saturday night is regularly spaghetti night, then the host family has their regular spaghetti dinner (unless their visitor has dietary restrictions). Following are a few of the things we have shown our visitors: a supermarket, an irrigation farm, a dairy, a carnival, our community hospital, a drive-in car wash, a rodeo, a beauty parlor, a drive-in restaurant, a Girl Scout camp, a local food processing plant, a triple A baseball game, our new senior high school, a box social party, the FAA center, a gymkhana, the University of Colorado, a veterinary college, the beautiful Rocky Mountains and a great amount of home hospitality.

From what we can learn, this program has been successful from our visitors viewpoint. At the evaluation session with the Department of State, the eight students from Peru listed the week-end in Longmont and the seminar at the University of Oregon as the highlights of their tour of the United States. The medical student from Nigeria intends to offer this same type of program to visitors in Nigeria.

We try to have our visitors spend 2 to 3 days in a Jaycee home. So far we have had eight students from Peru, one fellow from Uganda, six fellows from the Ivory Coast, a man and wife from India, a fellow from Korea, two fellows from Taiwan, a lady from England, a man from Ireland, a fellow from Vietnam, two fellows from Nigeria, one fellow from Ghana, a man, his wife, and 6-year-old daughter from Malaysia, four fellows from Congo (Brazzaville), seven from Congo (Leopoldville), and one from Japan. All our guests were either sponsored by the State Department or one of the foundations.

In June, the Longmont Jaycees presented this as a State Jaycee project. It was adopted and I was appointed the State project chairman. Our goal is that every foreign visitor to Colorado shall have the opportunity to be a guest in an American home.

Since the majority of our visitors have been sponsored by the State Department, I would welcome the opportunity to meet with anyone from the State Department that may be coming to Denver. To me, this meeting would be for suggestions of how we may improve our project.

Very truly yours,
LYLE E. DEHNING, CPA,
Chairman of International Relations.

LONGMONT JAYCEES,
Longmont, Colo., September 28, 1965.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Longmont Junior Chamber of Commerce have undertaken a project which we thought you might find interesting. The enclosed copy of a letter to the President will provide more information.

In our opinion, if every foreign visitor to the United States had the opportunity to meet an average American family (which we feel the Jaycees are), they may go home with a different viewpoint of these United States. The students from Peru were shocked we did not have servants. After they were in our homes and observed the modern conveniences, they understood why servants weren't necessary. The lady from England didn't think that Americans had long to live based on the hustle and bustle of New York and Chicago. She then spent a relaxing weekend in Longmont. She went swimming, attended a box social party, and enjoyed a drive in the Rocky Mountains. The fellow from Korea spent 3 days each in Washington, New York, and Boston, and arrived in Denver very depressed. He came to Longmont and we discovered why. All he had seen in the three cities were large buildings and YMCA rooms. There were many more similar experiences for us this summer.

This is our first attempt at entertaining foreign visitors. We are searching for mistakes we've made and for suggestions of how we may improve our program. We have worked closely with the Denver office of the Institute of International Education.

This project has been adopted as a State Jaycee project and we may present it as a national Jaycee project. Since I am the State project chairman, it would be helpful to me if I could talk with other people doing this same type of entertaining. Last March 17-19, COSERV had its first national conference of the short-term visitors program in Washington. Will there be another one this spring? If so, I hope to attend. Would the State Department be willing to finance my trip to this conference?

Please consider my proposal and inform me of your decision.

Very truly yours,
LYLE E. DEHNING, CPA,
Chairman of International Relations.

PUEBLOS OF NEW MEXICO SIGN NEW CONSTITUTION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] was out in his home State last weekend to speak at a uniquely American ceremony.

I am referring to the program at Santo Domingo Pueblo on Saturday, October 16, 1965, near Albuquerque, in which representatives of the self-governing Pueblos in New Mexico met to sign their all-Pueblo constitution.

I know of no man in America who has more at heart the interests of American Indians than does the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico. Because of his great work in that field, we recently had him out to Oklahoma for the formation of Oklahoma for Indian opportunity, and he made a great speech there.

At the Santo Domingo meeting on October 16, the Pueblos banded together in a federation which is akin to the Federal system of the United States. The all-Pueblo constitution declares that each local Pueblo retains its historic rights of self-government, and at the same time all Pueblo Indians will work together on problems common to all of them.

The junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] captured the spirit of this particular occasion very well in his speech. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech of the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE JOSEPH M. MONTOYA AT THE CONSTITUTION SIGNING CEREMONY OF THE ALL-PUEBLO COUNCIL, SANTO DOMINGO PUEBLO, N. MEX., OCTOBER 16, 1965

Chairman MONTOYA. Ladies and gentlement, I am honored that you have invited me to join with you for this historic occasion.

It is not often that one has the opportunity to participate in the signing of a constitution for a freedom-loving people. The writing and signing of a constitution is one of the supreme acts which a democratic people can perform, and when the occasion is the signing of a constitution for the first Americans, it is a particularly noteworthy day.

In one sense, however, this new statement of the democratic way of life is but an extension of the long and honored history of the Pueblo peoples. On countless occasions in the past, you have banded together for the common good, and for common protection against the dangers which threatened you from without.

The occasion today represents still another manifestation of the united front which the Pueblo leaders will present for the common good of the Pueblo people. In this light, permit me to touch briefly on certain activities involving the Pueblo Indians as these activities relate to the Indians themselves and to the State of New Mexico and the Federal Government.

Jurisdictional problems, especially in law enforcement, have in past years caused some feelings of irritation between the various governmental levels within the State, but I must say that vast progress in solving this problem has been made. The Pueblos have made great strides in establishing uniform codes for traffic control, as well as in civil and criminal cases.

The courts and court procedures of the Pueblo of Laguna might well be used as models for many other jurisdictions, Pueblo and State alike.

The past 20 years have seen considerable improvement in relationships between the Pueblo and adjacent communities. This spirit of fellowship displayed between the law enforcement agencies of the different jurisdictions is highly commendable.

I think it is worthy of note that in the past few years the Federal Government has been able to increase its law enforcement assistance to you from a staff made up of one special officer, to its present strength of 10 officers.

Another important sign of progress is the development of your road systems.

Roads are the initial step in the development of any community. This was true when the Romans accomplished their monumental road building projects throughout Europe, and it is true today. The Pueblos of New Mexico have contributed to progress by giving rights-of-way to the State for the building of many of its main arteries. In doing this, the Pueblos have demonstrated a great deal of insight. What is good for the Pueblos is good for the State, and what is good for the State is, likewise, good for the Pueblos.

Reports on range and agriculture land development have also been encouraging. Plans for this year include land rehabilitation and distribution on 335 acres at Isleta and 150 acres at Cochiti, to add to the nearly 5,000 acres which have been rehabilitated to date at the Pueblos in the middle Rio Grande Valley. Concrete ditch lining is planned, also, at San Ildefonso and Taos.

It is apparent from reports reaching my office that Indian livestock men are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of efficient range and herd management to achieve a more profitable livestock business. A major project this year will be emphasis on proper range management in order to be able to provide much needed range water developments.

Last year, a sheepshearing school for Indian trainees was held at Fort Wingate, under the sponsorship of the Manpower Development Training Act. Twenty-six men participated in the training—12 from Laguna and Acoma, 14 from the Navajo peoples. Nearly all of the Laguna-Acoma trainees are utilizing their training, and several have obtained Economic Opportunity Act loans to purchase shearing equipment. The trainees are shearing approximately 100 head of sheep per day at 25 cents per head, each averaging $25 per day.

Recreation developments, too, promise to usher in a new economic era for the Pueblos. The State of New Mexico and many Federal agencies have long recognized the recreation resources potential of the State, and have emphasized this by giving full support to the construction of the Rio Grande Gorge Bridge. As you know, this bridge will open lines of communication to a potential recreation area that will include the Navajo Dam, the San Juan diversion, and the Cochiti Dam, as well as reservoirs and lakes of lesser size scattered throughout the general land area.

The Indian Pueblos, in preparing their 10-year programs and overall economic development plans, have taken cognizance of the State's emphasis on recreation development. They are coordinating recreation plans with those of the State. This can be specifically noted on two sizable projects. One is the Cochiti Dam, a Corps of Engineers flood and sedimentation control project that will cost $58 million. The project by congressional authorization provides for a permanent pool of 1,200 surface acres, with most of the project lying within the boundaries of the Cochiti Indian Reservation, approximately 50 miles north of Albuquerque.

The recreation and tourism area will extend from the Cochiti Dam to State Highway 4, via the beautiful Valle Grande area to Los Alamos, the Santa Clara Canyon and Puye Cliff Dwelling areas on the Santa Clara Reservation, the Bandelier National Monument, and north to the receration areas being developed by the San Juan diversion project and the Navajo Dam.

In another instance, the Sandia ski area in the Sandia Mountains, approximately 15 miles northeast of Albuquerque, in 1965 contracted for a multimillion-dollar tramway that will traverse the west side of the Sandia Mountains upward to the mountain crest. The tramway access from State Highway 422 is by way of a cooperative Bureau of Indian Affairs and State highway road across Indian land.

The recreation development for all Pueblo reservations, including the Pueblos south and southwest of Albuquerque, varies in size from major development projects such as those mentioned to projects that can expect no more than 10,000 to 15,000 visitations each year. Overall, the improvement in economic condition of most Pueblos and adjacent communities will be substantial. The Pueblos' contribution to developing the recreation potential of the State, now a sleeping giant, is well recognized.

It is gratifying to note that the Pueblo Indians have shared in the funds made available through President Johnson's antipoverty program. This program has contributed significantly to the economic advancement of the Pueblo Indians.

So far, five community action programs have been approved for our Indian communities. These five programs are offering literacy instruction, job training, and employment counseling. My office has received many inquiries about community action, and I am sure that this phase of the war on poverty, as well as other related programs, has only begun to make itself felt in the pueblos.

I have been informed that many Indian people from pueblos have applied to the Farmers Home Administration for loans to purchase farm equipment, home improvements, acquisition of livestock, and to establish or supplement a small business operation at the reservation community.

These are only samples of the opportunities which exist today for enhancing and improving your way of life, and these are only samples of the ways in which you have made use of your opportunities.

I could go on and on, but we all know what I am talking about.

But I do want to say a special word about education, a subject which has been close to my heart for many years.

You of the Pueblos also recognize the importance of education, as evidenced by the number of children you have in school.

The higher education grants provided for Indian children present a unique example of acceptance by the Government of a responsibility to provide the best in education that it possibly can. This is not merely a right of the individual but an obligation of the Government.

I want to take special note of the fact that you as officers of your Pueblos have long made representations to the Federal Government about the great need that exists for post vocational high school technical and vocational training.

You know, and I know, that the most successful way to eliminate poverty, misery, and disease has been through education.

American democracy rests on the understanding and effective participation of all the people. This is just as true today as it was in the days of our Founding Fathers.

As leaders of governments go, Pueblo leaders are indeed silent people. There is little bombast in a form of government which has been amazingly sufficient and stable these past centuries. However, the soft approach should not be mistaken for softness. Rather it should be interpreted as an enduring attitude of peace, one which might well be emulated by all of us.

Perhaps it was this peaceful attitude which impressed President Abraham Lincoln and prompted him to give belated recognition to the Pueblos. President Lincoln ordered ebony silver-crowned canes, one for each Pueblo, on which were inscribed the year "1863" and his name, "A Lincoln, Pres. U.S.A." These canes were transmitted to the Pueblos as symbols of their sovereignty, extending continuing authority and commission for their popular form of government so long satisfactory in serving their administrative needs.

This great man's faith in your ability to unite for the common good is vindicated today more than ever before. He would be pleased with the preamble to your constitution:

> "We, the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, members of the existing all Indian Pueblo Council, by virtue of our sovereign rights as Pueblo Indians and in accordance with our ancient customs and laws, in order to promote justice and encourage the common welfare, to foster the social and economic advancement of all the Pueblo Indians, to preserve and protect our common interests, our inherent rights of self-government, and our rights guaranteed to us by treaties, laws, and the Federal Government of the United States of America, do ordain and adopt this constitution and bylaws for the All-Indian Pueblo Council for the common benefit of all Pueblo Indians."

That is a beautiful statement of a democratic people. Again, I congratulate you on this historic day, and wish you well in your daily efforts to perfect the democratic way of life.

DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the demonstrations across the country protesting our policy in Vietnam illustrate, it seems to me, the price and sometimes the tortures of freedom itself.

The right of public protest, of petition, of free speech, of organizing and directing marches—assuming no local or Federal laws are broken—involves also the right to be wrong, to be mistaken, and even to be misled. Freedom in our system requires that they be tolerated.

Last week, over 100,000 students and protesters turned out in several cities to wave placards and shout slogans. Perhaps 100,000 "kooks" and nitwits out of nearly 200 million people in this country is a tiny minority. But they can do serious harm. They harm the source of freedom by which their actions are to be tolerated. For example:

They offer an opportunity for Communist and leftwing extremists to infiltrate such movements.

There is a real danger that Hanoi and Peiping will misread these demonstrations; that they will hope for disunity in our Government, believe that it exists and thereby prolong the war with mounting casualties.

And lastly, these demonstrations choke off and silence demonstrations of many honest and conscientious citizens who have many serious questions about our Vietnam policy. These responsible people engaged in a responsible debate concerning the welfare of our country should not be associated with such irresponsible protests.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE CLAUDE SCHECKEL, OFFICIAL REPORTER OF DEBATES IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Members of the Congress value and appreciate the very excellent permanent staff assistants who perform the very important jobs which provide the coordination and continuity for what would otherwise be the actions of separate legislators. The House of Representatives and Senate were recently saddened by the death of one of these valued associates, Mr. Claude Scheckel, an official reporter of debates for 20 years.

Mr. Scheckel, who was also the father of a former member of my staff, Mrs. Jeanne Butler, was born March 25, 1892, in Alton, Iowa. In Alton, he grew up with two boys who, while they separated in their early adult lives, ended together in the House of Representatives in later life. One of these boyhood friends was Representative Hoeven, who retired from the House last year. The second was the present distinguished Chaplain of the House of Representatives, Dr. Bernard Braskamp. The third was Mr. Scheckel, who became an official reporter of debates.

Mr. Scheckel left Alton to attend the Kent College of Law in Chicago. He served overseas in World War I and returned to become an assistant state's attorney in Chicago. It was there also that he met and married the lady who became Mrs. Scheckel. He was appointed an official reporter of debates in the House by the late and honored Speaker Sam Rayburn 20 years ago, and served there until his retirement last year. His unfortunate death occurred by drowning while he was on a fishing trip in Canada. He was buried at Arlington Cemetery with military honors. Ironically, considering his affection for the Speaker, his funeral took place on what would have been the 25th anniversary of Mr. Rayburn's service as Speaker of the House, September 16.

We regret the passing of Mr. Scheckel, and I know Members of the Congress join with me in addressing our sympathy to his family and our appreciation for his good and able service to the Congress and to the people of the United States.

TRIBUTE TO JACK VALENTI

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, no one in this country is giving more of his time, his energy, and his imagination to advancing our national purpose, with less public recognition, than Mr. Jack Valenti, President Johnson's Special Assistant, valued adviser, and confidant.

It has been my personal privilege and pleasure to know Jack Valenti and his lovely wife and family.

I have known many good men during my public career, but I have admired and respected no man more than Jack Valenti.

Our country is very fortunate that Jack Valenti is in the White House as President Johnson's Special Assistant.

Therefore, I was pleased to note in the Washington Post of October 17, a column by the distinguished William S. White entitled "Valenti's Service." That column gave long-overdue credit to Jack Valenti's enormous competence, energy, and devotion to public service.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of Mr. White's column inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALENTI'S SERVICE BRUSHED OFF TOO LONG

(By William S. White)

An accumulation of 2 years of fatigue from what is surely the most brutally demanding job in the world is not only delaying—though not really threatening—the complete recovery of President Johnson from his surgical operation.

It is also adding to the already heavy burdens borne by the President's staff people—and to none more than to that extraordinarily able man of all work who is Jack Valenti.

Some men are said to be accident prone; continuously they suffer the small, tiresome mishaps of life. Valenti might be said to be stereotype-ridden, to be pursued by hostile cliches. Though nobody is closer to the President or more nearly indispensable to him, Jack Valenti seems fated to be constantly brushed off with the adjective that patronizes.

His admiration for and devotion to the President are quite open; ergo, he must therefore be servile—a kind of valet.

He is short and compact; ergo, he's described as little or swarthy, and his natural kindliness and courtesy are put down as mere efforts by one J. Valenti to ingratiate himself.

He was in prior life an advertising man; ergo, it follows that he must be an insensitive huckster. The fact that he is nothing of the kind but rather is a skillful and perceptive writer and editor of much White House prose—indeed, the ultimate editor short of the President himself—is not mentioned.

His undergraduate degree was awarded by the University of Houston, which tragically has no hallowed halls, no hanging ivy; hence it follows that he is not really and truly an honest-to-God intellectual. The fact that he made up for his disastrous failure to attend the right college by earning a master's degree at good old Harvard itself is not mentioned.

Indeed the story of Jack Valenti would form an excellent case study chapter in any inquest upon one of the phenomena of current politics. This is the power of snobbery within the Democratic Party—precisely the kind of snobbery, by the way, so long directed from within against both Presidents Truman and Johnson.

The self-consciously "in" people make a profession of screeching against the evils of discrimination, but apply the most juvenile prejudices in their estimates of other men. Among them Valenti is "out," for reasons so puerile as to stagger the adult mind.

He does not worry about his social standing, nor read the Washington women's pages with religious attention. He does not rush around to the precious little parties, where cocktails are sipped in cadence with little digs at other people of the "in set."

He does not solemnly blink his eyes and clutch his forehead to prove his agonized concern for the social justice and the other abstractions about which the "ins" talk—and talk and talk. He only practices social justice. He does not prove his independence by clever bites at his associates and superiors.

He is no drawing room card, maybe because he has too much work to do. He has the regrettable simplicity of the really competent man who needs no megaphone to establish his competence. He is only the little man who is always there, always in there pitching for a President for whom he is glad to work.

What is annoying and significant about the attitudes taken toward men like Valenti is not the plain injustice to persons involved. Of course, it is all essentially quite absurd. But is also damaging to the interests of the country. For the country has simply got to have good, steady men in the White House palace guard—in anybody's White House and not just Johnson's White House. And the sort of high school sorority sniping at the good ones that goes on around here is a very bad thing.

None of these fellows is entitled to sticky sympathy or understanding; it is quite true that nobody forces them to serve in the White House. But this is not to say that they are not entitled to be judged upon the standards of mature men and women. They don't need to be petted and cosseted; they do need to be given a reasonably fair shake.

THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 89TH CONGRESS AND THE LEADERSHIP OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in today's Washington Post there appears a very cogent column by Walter Lippmann which hails both the accomplishments of the 1st session of the 89th Congress and the leadership provided by President Lyndon B. Johnson.

In this column Lippmann notes that—

> The dazzling record of the 89th Congress is above all the record of a great legislative leader who had suddenly become the President of the United States.

In his very apt historical summation of the events which led to the achievements of this Congress, Lippmann very correctly says that much of what we have done is in the form of promissory notes that must be paid, in terms of finances and commitment, by both the administration and the Congress. I am confident that we can meet that obligation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHNSON'S 89TH CONGRESS

(By Walter Lippmann)

The achievements of the 89th Congress are at once an end and a beginning. The Congress has written into law what are in substance a series of promissory notes that the hopes of progressives in this century will begin to be realized. The legislative harvest is only a beginning in that the big promissory notes about education, medicare, civil rights, and poverty have now to be paid off, and not merely in terms of money, which will be available, but in terms of administrative planning and enforcement.

The whole legislative result could not have been achieved but for an unusual conjuncture of circumstances. The first is that an authentic progressive, Lyndon Johnson, was also the most experienced and effective legislative leader of this century. This legislative leader suddenly acquired the enormous power of the Presidency and increased it by an overwhelming electoral victory. For the first time the man in the White House was the man, more than any other, who knew how to work the legislative machine and how to make use of all the President's powers. The dazzling record of the 89th Congress is above all the record of a great legislative leader who had suddenly become the President of the United States.

The murder of President Kennedy shocked multitudes in this country and in Congress into a feeling of remorse that the young President had been so stubbornly and shabbily opposed and frustrated. President Johnson came to the office riding a wave of repentence and desire to atone.

After an impressive period as Kennedy's successor, Lyndon Johnson found himself facing a Republican Party possessed by a wild and crazy impulse to commit political suicide. The behavior of the Republican leaders in 1964 was in the light of history incredible. Out of their weakness and folly came the election of a Congress in which the coalition of old guard Republicans and aging southern Democrats was demolished and overrun by a strong Johnson majority in both Houses of Congress.

But in itself all this is still not enough to account for the achievements of the 89th Congress. A closer look at the difficult legislation, notably medicare and education, shows that the Johnson legislation is very different from the old proposals of the Democratic Party and that the Johnson administration has played a masterly part in making these old projects politically workable. Responsible talk about medicare began in the administration of Franklin Roosevelt, though he himself did not adopt it as a proposal. This was first done by President Truman in 1945. However, the Truman medicare proposal was radically different from that which has been enacted under President Johnson. The essential differences is that in 1945 the proposal was to make health insurance compulsory for the whole population. In the 1950's this proposal was whittled down to the aged, and as a result the legislation became feasible.

The same is true of Federal aid to education. The need for it has been on the legislative table since President Roosevelt's advisory commission reported in 1938 on the unequal expenditures for public education between the richer and the poorer States. But Federal aid was hopelessly blocked in the 1950's and in Kennedy's time by the deadlock about aid to the parochial as well as to the public schools. One of the notable accomplishments of the Johnson administration has been that it has found a way around the tangled issue.

But the combination of all these things is still by no means the whole explanation. In the field of civil rights, where there had been so little progress, there appeared about 10 years ago a combination of Negro protest and of a white change of conscience which has at last made possible the legal abolition of the remnants of chattel slavery.

Enveloping and sustaining everything, there have been over 4 years of sustained expansion of the economy. The country which did not believe it was possible has had a demonstration that by the use of modern economic doctrine, which originated with Keynes, it is possible to manage prosperity. It takes wise and skillful men to do this. But it can be done. We cannot, to be sure, as yet be absolutely certain that it can be done continually and indefinitely, and a certain conservative skepticism is still very much in order. What we do know is that the American economy has been expanding for 55 months and that nothing like such sustained prosperity has ever been enjoyed before.

The success of the great experiment in the management of the economy has revolutionized our domestic political life. Because of it, what President Johnson calls the Great Society—more prosaically, continuing progressive reform—has ceased to incite a class struggle between the haves and the havenots. If indeed the great experiment finally proves itself completely, we have possession of the key to continuing material progress—provided, of course the whole edifice is not destroyed by external war.

THE SEA GRANT COLLEGE CONFERENCE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a unique and pioneering conference which will take place in my home State of Rhode Island at the end of October, and which, I believe, can have substantial meaning to our Nation in the years ahead.

The conference, nationwide in scope, will address itself to the concept of establishing sea grant colleges as a means of advancing education in the developing and immensely important field of oceanography.

Jointly sponsored by the University of Rhode Island and the Southern New England Marine Sciences Association, the conference will be held on October 28 and 29 in conjunction with a meeting of the National Academy of Sciences Committee on Oceanography.

I am particularly interested in this conference, and feel privileged that I will participate in it; for on August 4 of this year I introduced in this Chamber "the National Sea Grant Colleges and Program Act of 1965."

As I said on that day:

> This proposed legislation is directed toward three related problems in the marine sciences: problems which even now are threatening this Nation's position as a world leader in the peaceful exploitation of the marine environment for economic purposes. The bill would provide for a greatly increased educational program in the practical side of oceanography, aquaculture, marine mining and related fields. It would also expand research leading to results of a direct and practical nature, of immediate value to those working in the marine sciences. Finally, it would create an extension service to spread useful information regarding the exploitation of the immense marine resources available to this Nation.

I am especially pleased that Rhode Island will be the locale for this conference. My home State has had a long and historic association with the seas. Almost a century ago Newport became the center for our Nation's beginning research into the mysteries of the marine environment. These beginnings have have been carried forward by the University of Rhode Island, one of the few institutions of higher learning in our country where students have an opportunity to specialize in the marine sciences.

In this regard, I greatly admire the pioneering achievements of Dr. Francis Horn, president of the university, and of Dr. John A. Knauss, dean of the University's Graduate School of Oceanography.

Numbers of our country's leading scientists and educators will share in the conference, including Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, dean of the Institute of Technology at the University of Minnesota. Dr. Spilhaus' imaginative ideas for the establishment of sea-grant colleges contributed to the legislation which I have introduced.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH DESLAURIEUR, A RETURNED PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on Sunday, October 17, 1965, a member of my staff represented me at a testimonial dinner, which was held in honor of returned Peace Corps volunteer Joseph Deslaurier of Cumberland, R.I.

Mr. Deslaurier was honored by his brother-members of the St. Thomas Council of the Knights of Columbus at their hall at 122 Valley Street, Valley

Falls, R.I. This Rhode Island volunteer had served 2 years in the Dominican Republic spreading good will and inspiring the people of that country, which he came in contact with to pursue self-help and community work programs.

Joseph Deslaurier is symbolic of the 12,209 volunteers who are serving in 46 countries around the globe. The interesting factor about this testimonial in his honor is that while serving in the Dominican Republic, he wrote to his brother knights at St. Thomas and informed them of the dire need for educational and athletic equipment for the younger people in the community which he worked.

The members of the St. Thomas Council took heed of his request and rose to the occasion by canvassing the community, and having fund-raising activities in order to obtain a substantial amount of equipment. They, of course, realized that the cost of transporting this equipment by ordinary means, such as air freight, would be prohibitive, so a member of the council, Edward R. Hughes, Jr., contacted my office and, most fortunately, I was able to arrange for free commercial shipping, and, in this way, the St. Thomas Council encountered light or no transportation expenses.

I was very pleased to be able to be of assistance to Peace Corps volunteer Deslaurier in his efforts, and, also, I most regretted not being able to attend his dinner because of previous commitments. I would like to ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD, at this time, a communication I received from Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver. I should also like to commend Peace Corps volunteer, Joseph Deslaurier, for his dedication and perseverance; former Grand Knight Elmer Chadwick for the interest he demonstrated in this program, and, also, present Grand Knight Walter Sullivan for his forthright leadership of the Council, and certainly all the members of the St. Thomas Council Knights of Columbus for their concern and support of the Peace Corps.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 14, 1965.

Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CLAIBORNE: It's very gratifying to hear that returned Peace Corps Volunteer Joseph Deslaurier is being honored by the St. Thomas Council of the Knights of Columbus for the work he did in the Dominican Republic.

I've heard of the superb job Joe did in getting the people in Imbert involved in the support of a community center for the town. A needed tool he had to work with was the sports equipment obtained by the members of the council. Their efforts were greatly appreciated—as was your assistance in obtaining transportation for the equipment.

The Rhode Island volunteers have proven to be the enthusiastic, energetic, persevering type who make the Peace Corps idea work overseas. We look forward to having more of them in the Peace Corps.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director.

LAKE HAVASU CITY, A PROTOTYPE FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the rapid growth of my State of Arizona is a phenomenon that has attracted the attention of the Nation during recent years. Today I am pleased to report a new phase in this history of growth. I refer to the master planning and construction of a unique new community, Lake Havasu City, Ariz., on the lower Colorado River.

The inception and construction of this extraordinary city hold significance for all of us. Lake Havasu City symbolizes the remarkable achievements that can be attained by bold and imaginative free enterprise working in cooperation with enlightened Federal, State, and local governments.

It is a project of immense concept in the tradition of Arizona's pioneering spirit that promises to add immeasurably to the balance and stability of the growth of my State.

Arizona, "the Grand Canyon State," admitted to the Union in 1912, was regarded by most Americans for several decades before and after its admission as a "nice place to visit." There was sun, clear air, scenic grandeur, western hospitality, and wide, wide open spaces. Visitors returned home with Arizona sunburns and tales of their mule ride down the Grand Canyon trails.

Two main centers of population began forming in the south central area of the State—Phoenix and Tucson.

To the west, the Colorado River dividing Arizona and California—"the Nile of the Southwest"—was largely ignored except by outdoorsmen, fishermen, water engineers, and Federal and State authorities seeking feasible methods to make use of the river's waters in a land of desert and mountains.

"It seems intended by nature that the Colorado River along the greater portion of its lone and majestic way shall be forever unvisited and unmolested," was the judgment of a young Army officer who explored stretches of the waterway in 1857.

He cannot be blamed for his inaccurate judgment. Today, while Phoenix, Tucson, and other "old" cities of Arizona are enjoying unprecedented expansion, the "unvisited" Colorado River is attracting hundreds of thousands of visitors and a nucleus of urban life is forming around Lake Havasu City. Arizona's center of gravity is moving perceptibly and opportunely in a northwesterly direction.

A little more than 25 years ago, Parker Dam was completed on the Colorado, backing up waters that created 45-mile-long Lake Havasu. This manmade intervention set the stage for Lake Havasu City, a "desert community with a 23-mile shoreline." Once considered improbable and unlikely, Lake Havasu City now is a reality, the result of the vision and determination of one of this country's leading industrialists, Robert P. McCulloch.

Preplanned to the finest detail and regarded as one of the country's most ambitious projects in the field of community planning, Lake Havasu City is well on its way to being many communities in one—a light industry center, a sportsman's mecca, a vacation resort that will provide services to millions of visitors in the years to come, and a retirement haven.

It combines some of the best of Arizona's magnificent wide open spaces, vast supplies of underground fresh water, and opportunities for making a living and a home far from the smog, traffic, and other disadvantages found in unplanned, congested urban centers. The city has 26 square miles on which to grow.

The city was conceived by McCulloch whose interests include the Nation's largest chain saw manufacturing operation, outboard motor manufacturing, oil and real estate. McCulloch Properties, Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of McCulloch Oil Corp., is developing the founder's dream.

The basic idea was this: to take an ideal but uninhabited property and mold it into a community designed for a projected population of 60,000 residents.

McCulloch engaged the services of C. V. Wood, Jr., famed designer, former Stanford Research Institute executive and chief industrial engineer at Convair, and master planner of many of the Nation's best known recreational facilities, including Disneyland. Even prior to the time the first homesite was sold, the McCulloch interests had spent about $6 million in surveys, engineering, architectural, area planning work and site improvements.

The land use plan for Lake Havasu City developed under Mr. Wood's direction devotes some 12,000 acres to residential sites; 500 acres to commercial activities; 486 acres to parks, cultural and administrative facilities; 95 acres to schools; 130 acres to churches, parochial schools and hospitals; 311 acres to light industry including a science and industry park with a campus-type atmosphere; 3,100 acres to agriculture and bulk acreage; and 1,080 acres to waterfront, beach and marina facilities which will always be preserved for public use.

All of the city's permanent residential area, as well as a majority of its present and future commercial, industrial and civic facilities, are located on the gentle slope of the mountains that "fence" the community to the east. Practically every building, residential or otherwise, will have a view across the lake to California.

Construction, business investment, installation of community services and residential building already are several months ahead of the master plan's detailed schedule. Less than 2 years after groundbreaking, there are approximately 1,500 residents, and the city already is able to serve the needs of thousands of visitors each week.

The first of several planned McCulloch Corp., light industrial facilities are in operation and providing payrolls. Main units of two hotels, the Lake Havasu Hotel and the Nautical Inn, are completed and in service. The city's first shopping and business center, including professional offices and medical clinic, is occupied. The first church has been erected and others are in the planning stages. An elementary school now in its second year is being enlarged, a high school is planned for the district in the near future, and the Arizona College Foundation plans to start construction of Havasu College within 2 years.

It was during my service as Governor of Arizona that Mr. McCulloch made the prediction to me that one day Lake Havasu City would be one of Arizona's largest cities.

Having observed the rapid and orderly progress thus far, and the skill and objectivity with which Mr. McCulloch and his associates are translating blueprints into reality, his prediction may well come true, bringing with it vast benefits to the entire State.

Finally, and perhaps most significant to this body, I wish to point out the commendable safeguards that have been established for the protection of land purchasers, residents, and business investors at Lake Havasu City.

Purchasers of residential property are required to personally inspect the city site and their own homesite before they are allowed to buy.

Moreover, the availability of residential property is coordinated with the growth of other segments of the city, in accordance with the master plan for balanced community growth.

In general, it is the policy to sell residential property only to those who are able and willing to contribute constructively to the city's growth and welfare.

Arizona State Real Estate Commissioner J. Fred Talley, in fact, has proposed to one of our Senate subcommittees that the "see before you buy" policy in effect at Lake Havasu City be used as a model for other large-scale, land-use projects throughout the Nation.

I commend the planners and builders of Lake Havasu City for carrying forward this unique and giant undertaking—a soundly based "instant city" which promises to be an asset not only to Arizona but to the entire Nation—and to convey good wishes to the early residents of the city who are, indeed, pioneers of 1965.

THE GREENVILLE (S.C.) TECHNICAL EDUCATION CENTER

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Tuesday morning, October 18, 1965, I had the pleasure of seeing one of the most remarkable advents to education that had happened in South Carolina in recent times. I am speaking of the Greenville Technical Education Center located in Greenville. Originally begun in 1962, it has in 3 years completely outgrown its present facilities and is now completing a new 62,000-square-foot building for engineering technology.

I was most impressed with not only the courses being taught in many fields, but especially with the students and their attitudes. For those that are distressed with today's young adults, a visit to the Greenville Technical Education Center would soon convince them of the serious intent and purpose of these recent high school, and, in some cases, even college graduates. I saw young men and women who are determined to get the most from these technical courses.

I commend the leaders and officials at the Greenville Technical Education Center for the outstanding job which they have done to provide the area with this invaluable type of schooling. In their engineering technology training, leading to a degree, they have courses ranging from textile technology to chemical technology. A complete list would also include data processing, electronics, mechanical, drafting and design, chemical, and tool and die design.

In their trade division they have fields of study in air conditioning, refrigeration and heating, automotive mechanics, machine shop, sewing machine mechanics, welding, and sewing machine operation. In addition, courses of training are provided in such diverse fields as laboratory assistants, technical secretary, fashion design, construction equipment operation, and construction equipment mechanics.

South Carolina presently has eight technical education centers in operation, with two more under construction. The centers are located in Spartanburg, Columbia, Charleston, Rock Hill, Anderson, Sumter, and Florence, as well as Greenville. Centers under construction are at Greenwood and Conway.

I wish the people over the Nation could see firsthand what South Carolina is doing for our people in this fast-growing State, and the impetus this training gives in attracting and assisting any new industry. This emphasis on technology is part of the changing status of the industry of the State. There is no doubt that Greenville TEC has had a major contributing role in the economic growth of the Piedmont area of South Carolina.

Greenville TEC provides industry and business with an opportunity to improve their employees' skills through specialized training which the school offers at night as well as in the daytime. This year, 11,000 persons will take courses at Greenville TEC, making it the largest institution of higher learning in the State in terms of enrollment.

This school has won the favor of the people and the institutions in the area. Public schools in Greenville County, as well as industry and business, have endorsed the TEC program, and the cooperation of these institutions has contributed greatly to the school's amazing success.

The most remarkable sight on my visit through Greenville TEC was the quality of the training and the equipment there. Instructors, equipment, laboratories, and methods of teaching are as good as any I have ever had the pleasure of witnessing. Most of the students were from average families in the area, many of whom were not able to afford to send their children to a college. They impressed me as dedicated students of college caliber. Some were once college students who lacked enough money to finish their university education. Others were college graduates who need the specialized training that TEC can provide.

I would like to invite my colleagues in the Congress, and other interested people, to visit our technical education center in Greenville, or any one of the other seven now in operation, and see firsthand the splendid training conducted there. Every dollar our State spends on schools of this kind constitutes a worthwhile investment. The people of South Carolina deserve to be highly commended for providing the training opportunities afforded by the TEC and trade schools, which is one of the major breakthroughs in education beyond the high school level. Nothing better describes the TEC school than their motto, "Knowledge Is Power."

DESEGREGATION AND SOUTHERN SCHOOLS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, an encouraging omen for the Republican Party as it recovers from its grievous setback of 1964 is the growing interest manifested by young people in the policies and personalities of the party.

Various groups of young students and professionals have formed to research and develop ideas to serve as the basis of policy positions on which Republican candidates can run. Among these research and policy-oriented groups is Republican Advance at Yale University.

Recently, Mr. President, Republican Advance completed a paper on how public schools are complying with the Supreme Court's landmark school desegregation decision of 1954 and with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, particularly title VI thereof. The paper was prepared by Niles R. Holt.

Republican Advance argues that the slow process of school desegregation in the South over the past 11 years—popularly known as tokenism—suggests a need for additional legislation to implement the terms of the Supreme Court's ruling of 1954. Four specific proposals for legislation are recommended in the Republican Advance paper.

I commend this product of Republican Advance's research and thought to the attention of my colleagues. These proposals merit serious consideration. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Republican Advance paper, prepared by Mr. Holt be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Desegregation and Southern Schools: Enforcing the 14th Amendment

(By Niles R. Holt)

Since 1954, when the Supreme Court declared segregated schools to be constitutionally void, the response of the South has been evasion. During the decade following the decision, Southern State legislatures have passed more than 400 bills aimed at delaying or limiting integration in the schools. Where integration could not be avoided, a new delaying tactic has emerged: Tokenism. During the 1964–65 school year, less than 25 percent of Southern schools (not including the border States) listed themselves as desegregated. Yet less than 3 percent of Negro students attended biracial schools.[1]

---

[1] American Education, January 1965.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964, designed to eliminate tokenism, is only a beginning toward gaining social justice for the American Negro. Its limitations are numerous. Withholding Federal funds from segregated school districts will probably have no effect in areas, particularly rural areas, where school boards will be under pressure from militant Ku Klux Klan and Citizens Council groups. The Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reports that the number of school districts refusing to comply with the 1964 act constantly changes. This fluctuation apparently reflects the indecisiveness of school boards caught between pressures against integration from the local community and the school boards' own awareness of the need for Federal funds.

According to the New York Times, the Justice Department has filed 27 suits against districts which have failed to submit desegregation plans.[2] Officially, the Office of Education reports that "9 or 10" have refused to comply (figures for September 14). The number failing to comply, but not yet indicating outright refusal, is as follows (figures for September 14): Alabama, 6; Arkansas, 10; Georgia, 5; Louisiana, 43; Mississippi, 22; Oklahoma, 1; North Carolina, 2; and Texas, 1. A recent article in the New York Times noted that in almost every case where funds might have to be denied, the southern schools involved are those most in need of financial assistance.[3]

In addition to the inadequacy of the 1964 act, there is a second reason for further school desegregation legislation. The 1954 decision of the Supreme Court made clear that the rights and privileges of all Americans must be specified by the Congress. The 14th amendment to the Constitution states that "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States." But the amendment does not specify these immunities or privileges. Although the High Court heard arguments that segregation was counter to the amendment, it did not base its decision on the amendment. Instead, the Justices based their decision on changed times and social psychology.[4] A few courts have mentioned the 14th amendment in injunctions to school boards to integrate.[5] But only a few have, and it appears that the vagueness of the 14th amendment has crippled its effectiveness. Yet article 5 of the amendment specifies that "the Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article." It is time Congress did so, by specifying that these privileges include education in desegregated schools for all Americans.

Legislation of four kinds is needed:

(a) Legislation requiring school boards to submit grade-by-grade plans for integration to a Federal agency.

(b) Legislation to protect Negro school teachers and administrators from losing their jobs as school are desegregated.

(c) Legislation prohibiting the use of public tuition payments to support private, segregated schools.

(d) Legislation requiring the civil rights division of the Justice Department to submit twice-yearly reports to Congress on the methods of evasion used.

LEGISLATION REQUIRING SCHOOL BOARDS TO SUBMIT GRADE-BY-GRADE PLANS FOR INTEGRATION TO A FEDERAL AGENCY

School boards would be required to submit, for the school year immediately following passage of the legislation, plans for the integration of at least the first four grades of elementary schools. They would be required to integrate at least two grades in each succeeding year. The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to review the plans submitted. Following the pattern of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, school boards would also be required to integrate transportation services and extracurricular activities. Upon recommendation of the Commissioner of Education, the Attorney General would be empowered to file suits against school boards which failed to submit plans or which submitted inadequate plans (provided that these school boards are given an opportunity to revise these plans).

Fines would be provided for individual members of school boards failing to comply. The Attorney General would also be authorized to institute lawsuits against school boards which fail to carry out plans they submit.

This legislation might also include a provision modifying the "freedom of choice" desegregation plans allowed by the Commissioner of Education through the 1964 act. Under "freedom of choice" plans, students are allowed to register at any elementary school within the jurisdiction of their school board. The difficulty with this approach is that it forces the Negro parents, who may fear white reprisals, to decide which school their children will attend. Administration officials are reportedly alarmed that "freedom of choice" plans may produce two types of schools: Integrated and all-Negro.[6] To avoid this situation, a provision could be inserted in the legislation authorizing the Commissioner of Education to review all "freedom of choice" plans. The Commissioner would be authorized to suspend "freedom of choice" plans in those districts which have two or more schools with Negro enrollments of more than 95 percent.

The Commissioner of Education also might be given a limited amount of power to coordinate the integration plans of schools within a single metropolitan area, where public schools in the area are under two or more school boards. Thus suburban and city schools might be integrated under similar plans. The experience of Tennessee schools has shown that desegregation proceeds more smoothly if town and country schools within a single metropolitan area are integrated along similar lines.[7] In rural areas, certain rural and town desegregation plans might be "paired" because rural and town districts often share high schools.

Although such legislation undoubtedly would raise cries of Federal interference in the schools, it would only carry out the decision of the Nation's highest court. The 1954 Supreme Court decision applies to all public schools, whether the schools receive Federal aid or not. Delaware, not a Deep-South State, is an excellent illustration of the need for such legislation. According to the Civil Rights Commission, in Delaware "there is a fear of economic reprisals on the part of Negro parents, e.g., the loss of jobs or credit suspension. Exposing the child to a hostile atmosphere, whether real or presumed, also persuades parents to preserve the status quo."[8] Legislation flatly requiring the integration of schools, with the Commissioner of Education having the power to suspend "freedom of choice" plans in certain cases, would serve to remove this onus from Negro parents.

Most important, such legislation should destroy the effectiveness of pupil placement laws. Pupil placement laws have been passed by 10 southern legislatures. They allow local school boards to choose the school a child will attend on the basis of several factors, including the child's "health, morals, and home environment." The general statement of policies of the Office of Education prohibits the use of pupil placement laws discriminately. The courts, however, have refused to strike down the laws, declaring only that the laws should not be used in a discriminatory way.[9] The laws remain in force, and undoubtedly will be used by districts failing to comply with the 1964 Civil Rights Act. These pupil placement laws should be dealt a deathblow by the proposed legislation.

LEGISLATION TO PROTECT NEGRO SCHOOLTEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS FROM LOSING THEIR JOBS AS SCHOOLS ARE DESEGREGATED

This aspect of desegregation has gained little attention. Samuel Ethridge, a field director of the National Education Association, reportedly estimates that the jobs of 5,500 Negro teachers may be endangered in the next several years.[10] So far, the dismissal of an estimated 500 Negro teachers has been connected with desegregation. Of these, 176 were in North Carolina, 143 in Florida, 62 in Texas, 36 in Virginia, 23 in Arkansas and 21 in Delaware.[11] Since 1955, when it began school integration, Oklahoma has cut 396 Negro schoolteachers and administrators.[12]

A recent article in the Reporter magazine stated that many Negro teachers are afraid to reveal that their teaching contracts have not been renewed for fear that they will be considered troublemakers and will not receive the necessary recommendation for another teaching job.[13] Mr. Ethridge is quoted by the New York Times as stating that "Some are told that if they go quietly and find a job elsewhere they will be given a recommendation. If they try to fight the dismissal, they are warned the recommendation will be withheld."[14] Many Negro teachers, reports the Civil Rights Commission, look upon integration with fear:[15]

"Not all of the pressures (against desegregation) have come from the white community. One survey of about 24 Negro teachers revealed a uniform opinion that 'many Negro teachers oppose desegregation because they fear they will lose their jobs and status,' "

The statement of general policy issued by the Office of Education prescribes integration of schoolteachers as part of any school integration under the 1964 act. This provision is difficult to enforce. Some Negro teachers have not had their contracts renewed because they lacked the same number of teacher credits held by their white counterparts. But attempts to compare teaching qualifications are often difficult and complicated, and "dismissal based on race" has reportedly become increasingly common.

---

[2] New York Times, "Critical Decision Nears on Examiners, School Aid," Sept. 15, 1965, p. 34.

[3] Ibid, p. 1.

[4] Palmer, Charles. "The 14th Amendment: Some Reflections on Segregation in Schools," American Bar Association Journal, July 1965, p. 651.

[5] "Public Education: 1964 Staff Report Submitted to the United States Commission on Civil Rights," pp. 271, 195. (*Adams* v. *Orangeburg* (*S.C.*) *School District No. 5, Pettaway* v. *County School Board* (*Va.*).)

[6] New York Times, Sept. 15, 1965, p. 1.

[7] Public Education: 1963 Staff Report, p. 37.

[8] Ibid, p. 13.

[9] Public Education: 1964 Staff Report, pp. 26, 60, 236. (*Lee* v. *Macon County* (*Ala.*) *School Board, Youngblood* v. *Bay County* (*Fla.*) *Board, Gilliam* v. *Hopewell* (*Va.*) *School Board.*)

[10] New York Times, "NEA Will Study Displacement of Negro Teachers Through Integration," Sept. 8, 1965; Barbara Carter, "Integrating the Negro Teacher Out of a Job," the Reporter, Aug. 12, 1965, p. 31.

[11] Ibid.

[12] New York Times, "Negro Teachers in West Lost Jobs: 396 Cut in Oklahoma After Integration Began in 1955," May 24, 1965.

[13] Barbara Carter, "Integrating the Negro Teacher Out of a Job," the Reporter, Aug. 12, 1965, p. 32.

[14] New York Times, "NEA Will Study Displacement of Negro Teachers Through Integration," Sept. 8, 1965.

[15] Public Education: 1963 Report, p. 14.

In a few cases, Federal courts have intervened. A Federal court in Florida in 1963 forbade two school boards to assign school personnel on the basis of race.[16] Similar injunctions were issued by a court in Texas in 1964 and one in Virginia in 1965. But in Oklahoma, where the greatest number of Negro teachers have so far lost their jobs, the courts did not effectively intervene until 1963, when it was too late to help most of the teachers.

The National Education Association, in cooperation with the Office of Education, has recently begun a study of the situation and plans to set up counseling and relocation centers and retraining schools. The disadvantage of this approach is that it may locate many Negro teachers in the North, leaving nearly all-white faculties in the South and taking Negro teachers away from Negro students who are just entering integrated schools. Although the Justice Department recently announced plans to institute lawsuits to aid Negro schoolteachers who fear loss of their jobs in Mississippi,[17] many lawsuits may be necessary and legal proceedings could be drawn out. Federal legislation is needed immediately. Court action may be too late to help large numbers of Negro schoolteachers in the South. Legislation would require that school boards draw up plans for faculty integration at the same time that plans are submitted for student integration. When Negro teachers at formerly segregated schools are not contracted to teach in the newly integrated schools, the school board would be required to submit to the Commissioner of Education a statement listing the reasons for dismissal.

Integration of Negro teachers into formerly all-white faculties will likely present school boards with two problems:

1. According to the Civil Rights Commission, Negro schools in the South are often overcrowded while some white schools are underutilized. It is possible that Negro students might be assimilated into the existing classes of formerly all-white schools without the necessity of additional teachers. Thus the integration of Negro teachers into the faculty of all-white schools might result in overstaffing.

2. Faced with an overly large faculty, school boards might choose to fire some white teachers. If this occurred, white teachers would almost certainly resent Negro teachers as a threat to their own jobs. This heritage of resentment would not augur well for successful cooperation between white and Negro teachers.

Both problems may be solved by Federal grants in aid to those schools in the South which integrate their faculties. The Office of Education would be authorized to pay half of the salary of Negro teachers in integrated southern schools for a specific period—perhaps 10 years. By the end of this period, most school systems should have increased sufficiently in size that no teachers, white or Negro, need be fired because of overstaffing. No white teacher would need to feel he had lost his job because of integration.

To compete with their white colleagues, many Negro teachers will need to improve their teacher qualifications by earning more credits. Fellowships for Negro teachers are probably not the answer. To use the fellowship, the Negro teacher will have to leave the faculty where he is teaching to attend a college or university. There is the danger that the Negro teacher will not be able to find a job teaching in the South once again after he has improved his education. More useful than fellowships would be an expanded system of teaching institutes during the summer months. By attending several of these institutes, Negro teachers would pick up additional teaching credits.

The Federal Government already contributes funds for institutes under the 1964 Civil Rights Act (secs. 403 through 405). These institutes, however, are designed mainly to train teachers, supervisors, and counselors in ways of coping with the problems of integration. These institutes could be expanded into summer teaching institutes, conducted through local colleges or universities. The amount of money appropriated for the institutes ($3 million in fiscal year 1965) will need to be substantially increased.

This two-sided approach to faculty integration—(1) paying part of the cost of Negro teachers' salaries during the initial period of integration and (2) supporting summer institutes to allow Negro teachers to better their teaching qualifications—has the advantage of minimizing white resentment of faculty integration. It also avoids preferential treatment for the Negro, which Negro teachers in the South have reportedly opposed. Finally, it allows the southern Negro teacher, if he wishes, to remain in the South, where he may be of help in counseling Negro students.

There remains the problem of Negro teachers who have already lost their jobs through integration. A possible solution would be for Congress to authorize the Office of Education to pay, to those southern school boards which rehire these teachers, half of their salaries for a number of years. These rehired teachers would also be eligible to participate in the summer teaching institutes.

LEGISLATION TO PROHIBIT THE USE OF PUBLIC TUITION PAYMENTS TO SUPPORT PRIVATE, SEGREGATED SCHOOLS

One limitation of the 1964 Civil Rights Act is that it does not prohibit school boards, local communities, or States from giving tuition payments to parents who wish to send their children to private, segregated schools or academies. Some courts have issued injunctions against this practice throughout the South, but court action has not always sufficed. The Prince Edward County (Va.) board of supervisors, expecting a court injunction, hurriedly issued tuition checks overnight in 1964, according to the Civil Rights Commission.[18] The commission reports that some school boards have found themselves in financial straits after making tuition payments. It is probable that school boards accepting Federal funds under the 1964 act will nevertheless continue to make these tuition payments. Thus Federal funds would contribute to keeping school boards solvent while the boards continue to make substantial outlays for "tuitions." If these tuition payments were stopped, falling enrollments might close many of these segregated private schools[19] (most of which were founded with the specific purpose of evading desegregation).

LEGISLATION REQUIRING THE CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION OF THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT TO SUBMIT REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON NEW METHODS USED TO EVADE DESEGREGATION

No doubt southern legislatures will continue to show great imagination in creating new methods and laws to limit school integration. Their plans may seriously interfere with the attempts of local school boards to desegregate. Congress must be kept informed on the state of desegregation and on the newest methods of evasion used. Therefore, the civil rights division of the Justice Department might be required to report to the Congress, once in January and once in April or May, on progress in school integration and the methods of evasion encountered. These reports will allow appropriate legislation to be drawn up forbidding specific abuses. Since extra work will be required, the division should be given additional operating expenditures to increase its staff. The 1964 Civil Rights Act, it should be noted, requires reports from the Commissioner of Education only "within 2 years" of the act.

* * * * *

The Republican Party has a commitment to civil rights that goes back a century. It is appropriate that Republican Senators and Representatives introduce legislation to enforce the 14th amendment, which has been virtually ignored by Americans for 100 years. For it is not only morally right that Republicans introduce and strongly support further civil rights legislation. It is also politically right. In the words of Theodore Roosevelt, "While the Republican Party may be beaten even if it stands for progressive policies, it will surely be beaten if it does not."

THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT AND ITS 8,577 UNIDENTIFIED SUMMER EMPLOYEES

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, for 4 months I have been attempting, with no success whatsoever, to procure from the Post Office Department 1 complete roster of the names and addresses of some 8,577 youths who held summer jobs with the Department in the 50 States.

In the course of a voluminous exchange of correspondence, my request has been likened to that of a commercial firm which would use this information for the unclean business of commerce. My assistants and I have been promised the names, only to have the promises refuted.

Mr. President, the mail may not always go through, as indeed some of mine did not go through the Washington post office last weekend. The Postal Department may have other problems and shortcomings. But one problem the Department, under Mr. Gronouski's tutelage, did tackle successfully was in making a ridiculous political issue out of a simple request for identities of persons who were hired in violation of explicit orders from the President of the United State and the Civil Service Commission. I have had several exchanges with Mr. Gronouski. I have had correspondence with the good Mr. Gronouski's executive assistant Michael J. Monroney, Jr., and I have even found in the mails letters from the supervisor of the regional post office in Denver, Colo., but after 4 months of often acrimonious and usually ludicrous fencing, I still do not have the 8,577 names.

So that the record on this matter might be complete, I should like at this point in the RECORD to have printed copies of pertinent correspondence and press dispatches which are themselves a chronolgy of these events. Because my last letter to Mr. Gronouski—dated October 12—is somewhat of a recapitulation, I ask that it be printed first, to be followed in sequence by all correspondence to that point and press dispatches by

---

[16] Ibid., p. 56.

[17] New York Times, "U.S. Intervenes to Protect Jobs of Mississippi Negro Teachers," June 14, 1965.

[18] Public Education: 1964 Staff Report, pp. 277–8.

[19] Such an assertion, relating to the private, segregated academies in Virginia, is made in Public Education: 1963 Staff Report, p. 42.

Nick Kotz of the Minneapolis Star Tribune and other correspondents.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Text of Letter Sent by U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson to Postmaster General John Gronouski Regarding Postal Department Summer Job Program

OCTOBER 12, 1965.

Hon. JOHN GRONOUSKI,
The Postmaster General, Post Office Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. C. R. Crossan, Director of the Post Office Department's Denver region, which purports to be in reply to my letter to you of September 28. I had requested a list of the names and addresses of the seasonal employees hired in the Denver region this summer. Mr. Crossan provided the list of only those assistants hired in Wyoming—a duplication of information I already have.

As you know, I have been attempting, with somewhat less than consummate success, over the past 4 months to procure from your Department the identities of some 8,577 youth who filled summer jobs in the 50 States. These positions, as you well know, were to have been made available on the basis of need—not patronage. In fact, President Johnson has been quoted as saying, "These opportunities will be given, so far as this is practicable, to boys and girls through age 21 who need them the most because of economic or educational disadvantages." A July 22 statement by Civil Service Commission Chairman John Macy is clearly compatible with the President's position.

Mr. Macy told the Associated Press, "It was clearly the intent in this special program that political patronage was not to apply in any form or by any implication." As you know, having been in charge of the Post Office Department during this period, politics certainly did enter into the hiring.

As the Washington Post's Jerry Klutz wrote in a column about August 29, "Gronouski ignored the President's directive, and the newest Federal employee here is aware that Mr. Johnson doesn't like to be ignored on even the smallest matters. Gronouski tossed the jobs into politics by asking Members of Congress to recommend applicants for them and he fixed pay rates at $2.29 an hour. Experienced substitute employees in some post offices were passed over for jobs this summer for inexperienced teenage political appointees, many of whom weren't underprivileged."

The Minneapolis Tribune's Nick Kotz explained the issue quite succinctly in an August 11 article. He wrote: "The Post Office Department had disregarded Presidential and Civil Service Commission regulations and distributed the youth jobs as congressional patronage."

Despite the fact that I serve on the Senate's Post Office and Civil Service Committee and am an elected Member of one of the two Houses of Congress, which once upon a time drafted the laws under which your Department and all others function, I have been unable to get more than piecemeal information on the identity of your summer employees. There has been abundant evidence unearthed, however, attesting to the philosophy under which they were hired.

So that there will be no misunderstanding, allow me to cite a brief chronology of events.

The fact that the Department would retain several thousand youths to fill summer jobs was made known to me in the most indirect fashion: through a news report carried in the June 6, 1965, Denver Post. Several copies of the dispatch were sent to my office by youths who wished me to act on their behalf. My correspondence with your Department on this matter began on June 9 with my letter to you. I was informed by your Mr. Monroney, in a response dated June 11, that there was indeed a summer job program for which I could refer persons. I learned later, however, that openings in my State had already been filled through recommendations from Democrats.

When the political overtones of the program became known to me, I wrote you on August 11 requesting the identities of Wyoming youths already hired. In your reply of August 25 you said, in part, that you would provide such a list should the Post Office and Civil Service Committee formally request it, and then you set about to liken my bona fide request to that of "commercial firms," salesmen, and others who might use such information for business purposes.

On August 27, 2 days after receiving your aforementioned letter, I requested that the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, on which I serve, initiate a request for the subject information. There remains some uncertainty as to the status of that request, particularly as to whether it would be considered, in the idiom of the postal department, as an official request. In any event, Senator MONRONEY assured me that he would attempt to accede to my wishes in this matter.

On September 1, the Postmaster General designee appeared before my committee and indicated that he had no objection to the names being made public. In the context of my questioning of Mr. O'Brien, I asked: "Do you feel that Members of Congress, in the performance of their duties, are entitled to know who works for the Post Office Department and will you supply such information to them when they request it?"

Mr. O'Brien replied: "I can see no reason why the employees of the Post Office Department should not be in the public domain, their names."

I consider this positive response an indication that the policy of your Department, as reflected at least in the judgments of the man who will succeed you, is that of cooperation with Members of Congress.

"Cooperation" or not, I still await the information I seek.

You will recall that on September 13 you authorized postmasters to make "public upon request" the names of employees who worked in their offices as part of the summer hiring program. My wires to these postmasters elicited the desired information. However, there still remained, and their still does remain, the question of the names of postal summer employees hired in the other 49 States—names whose embargo was categorically removed through your own announcement of September 13.

At my request, my assistant, Doug Baldwin, telephoned your executive assistant, Michael J. Monroney, Jr., the son of Senator MONRONEY. His first conversation occurred on the afternoon of Wednesday, September 22. In a memorandum to me, Mr. Baldwin said, in part: "Mr. Monroney told me that the Department was compiling the list of the 8,500 names from its 15 regional offices and when the compilation was complete, 'within the next few days,' would make a list available to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and to Senator SIMPSON 'if he is still interested.' There was no qualifying phraseology in Mr. Monroney's statement to me that the names would be released."

Mr. Baldwin spoke with Mr. Monroney by telephone the second time on the afternoon of Friday, September 27. This second call was to make crystal clear to the Post Office Department that I wished, not only the names, but the full names and addresses to facilitate proper identification.

Mr. Baldwin reported to me: "Mr. Monroney somewhat reluctantly agreed to insure that the list of the 8,500 would include names and addresses, and I then asked him the following question in about this language: 'So that there will be no misunderstanding in the Senator's mind, I want to make this clear. It is my understanding that the names and addresses will be available to Senator SIMPSON and to his committee within the next few days and that this will be the complete list for all 50 States and not just this region.' Mr. Monroney replied in the affirmative.

"In this writer's mind, there is no doubt that the issues and positions were clear in both conversations and that there was at that time no misunderstanding either as to my questions or to the precision of Mr. Monroney's replies.

"Our entire conversation was framed in the context of the key decision already having been made. There was no 'if' talk involved—only how and when."

On Monday, September 27, a news release was issued from my office stating that your Department had agreed to release the names and commending you on your decision to do so. At about 4:45 that afternoon, Mr. Monroney again called my assistant. This time to deny the commitments which elicited the release. He apologized for any misunderstanding that might have occurred. But after several minutes of conversation he admitted that "I could easily not have qualified it (the statement) Friday."

So there, Mr. Postmaster General, the issue rests.

After 4 months of often acrimonious and usually ludicrous fencing among my office, the Post Office Department, and the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, there is still no single source from which the names of all 8,577 postal summer employees can be secured. You have yourself vitiated the regulation under which you kept these names from the public (744.444) in your announcement of September 13.

The question—and, indeed, the only question that remains—is why will you not permit these names to be assembled at one point and then released to the Senate and House committees most directly affected with this issue, together with the individual Senators and Representatives most directly involved?

I think it is fair, as you prepare to depart for your new post in Warsaw, to ask why your Department apparently fears to have such information in the hands of the Senate and, perhaps, the press. There have been many political names involved in this incident to date. Could it be that there are more political bombshells waiting in the wings?

Perhaps the Washington Evening Star of September 9 thought to answer this question when it said, in part, editorially: "It is no wonder that Postmaster General Gronouski has refused to disclose the names of all of his new summer jobholders. The Post Office Department has flagrantly undercut a portion of the antipoverty program which had a great deal of merit, and its explanation, issued a few days ago, to the effect that it had 'misinterpreted' the President's desire simply doesn't hold water."

Mr. Postmaster General, the U.S. Congress has not made your Department's summer job program a political issue. You and your Department have done a most commendable job of that.

Had the names sought by Congress been released 2 months ago, the unconscionable and unnecessary miasma of political distrust and antagonism which surrounds this program would not have been created. The rationale for refusing the names on the grounds that somebody on Capitol Hill might try to commercialize on them is nothing short of ridiculous.

As I again request of you that you authorize your Department to release the names of persons employed under the summer job program, may I leave you with a thought from the September 10 Wall Street Journal. In an editorial entitled, "Setting Youth a Sorry Example," the Journal has this to say: "Before retiring Postmaster General John A. Gronouski takes up his new ambassadorial duties in Poland, it seems to us he ought to be afforded ample opportunity to explain just how, and possibly why, the postal service's summer job program for underprivileged youth turned into a political grab bag."

Releasing the names, without indulging further in bureaucratic abnormalities and obfuscations, would seem to provide you with both opportunity and method.

Sincerely yours,
MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senator.

JUNE 9, 1965.

Hon. JOHN A. GRONOUSKI,
The Postmaster General, Post Office Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: I have seen the press reports of the fact that the Post Office Department has invited Members of Congress to submit names of candidates for 6,000 summer jobs under the President's youth employment campaign. Although the press release quotes your spokesman as saying there was no intention to allocate these summer jobs as political patronage and the Department would have a problem finding qualified youngsters, I have not received an invitation to submit any names of boys from my State of Wyoming.

In addition, one of my staff members called your Department yesterday and was told that no such announcement had been made. Today, however, I have ascertained that there is such a program underway in your Department and that certain Members of Congress were being called upon to submit the names of boys for these positions.

I have always been strongly of the opinion that the Federal Government must be an entity which can be respected and trusted if it is to endure. However, I now find another instance where an agency, the Post Office Department, has misrepresented the facts to the public. Young men in my State saw the news release and sought my assistance on the assumption, and quite naturally so, that I had been asked to help the Post Office Department to find applicants for the 6,000 positions which are available throughout the country. We are in a sorry state indeed if the Government cannot be believed and relied upon and, as disturbing as it is to me, I hesitate to think what effect it would have on the young hopefuls who read your spokesman's statement and called on me for assistance.

I am enclosing letters of application from applicants from Wyoming who are in need of summer employment to complete their education. I hope you will see that these young men are given every consideration regardless of "political patronage," and that I will soon be advised of their placement.

Sincerely yours,
MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senator.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, THE EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., June 11, 1965.

Hon. MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Because the Postmaster General is out of town today and will not return to the office until Monday, I am taking the liberty of answering your letter of June 9 in which you state that your office was not notified of the Department's summer employee program.

To clarify one possible misunderstanding, the Department has not made a public announcement on our summer employee program. You may have reference to an article which received wide distribution in which I was quoted on this program. This story did not involve an official announcement but was rather the result of an inquiry by the New York Times. I am enclosing a copy of this story for your information.

You may be interested in the attached copy of my letter to Congressman QUIE, of Minnesota, which describes the Department's actions with regard to the hiring of summer employees as well as the procedures. It is my understanding that Mr. Belen, the Deputy Postmaster General, called your office late last month to explain this program. However, as I indicated to Walt Kingham on the telephone yesterday, the call was not returned, and we have no record of the person in your office with whom the message was left.

You know, Senator, it is ironic that, when the Department attempts to assist Members of the House and the Senate, we end up being criticized. I want you to know, however, that there was never any attempt to bypass your office nor was this program intended to be handled on a political basis.

I believe I indicated to Walt Kingham yesterday that, if you know of or hear from any young persons who are interested in summer jobs in post offices in Wyoming, you can submit their names to Mr. Crossan, the regional director in Denver, or Mr. Anderson, his assistant. The candidates you recommend will be given consideration along with all other qualified candidates.

Furthermore, let me say in closing that we did not feel it would be advantageous to issue a public statement on these summer positions. We would have been swamped with applications from which it would have been difficult to select the best qualified in the short time available for selection. I also regret the news stories which have appeared because they have resulted in congressional offices being inundated with applications. Our intent from the beginning has been to recruit quietly and on a nonpartisan basis from as many sources as possible.

If you have any further questions please don't hesitate to let me know.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely,
MICHAEL MONRONEY,
Executive Assistant to the Postmaster General.

JUNE 16, 1965.

Mr. MICHAEL MONRONEY,
Executive Assistant to the Postmaster General, Post Office Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONRONEY: Thank you for your letter of June 11 in which you furnish information regarding your summer recruitment program.

My main concern is on behalf of the boys who wrote to me when they read the announcement and whose applications I forwarded to you for handling. Neither I nor anyone in my office had heard of the program until the letters of application were received. If Mr. Belen called my office and the call was not returned, this was the first time it has happened in my office. We have an ironclad rule that all telephone messages are immediately placed on my desk and they stay there until I, or a designated staff member, return them. I have checked with my staff, and no one received a call from Mr. Belen.

I appreciate the interest of the Post Office Department in these young men who need summer employment to further their education.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senator.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, THE EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., June 18, 1965.

Hon. MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is just a short note to acknowledge your letter of June 16 in further reference to the Department's program on summer employment.

I certainly regret that you did not receive Mr. Belen's telephone call late last month at which time he had intended to provide you with information on this particular program. If anyone at the Department was at fault in not leaving word with your office of Mr. Belen's call, it was surely inadvertent because, as you may be aware, we did make contact with the other Members of the Senate and House Post Office Committees to give them this information.

I do hope that we will be able to recoup with the placement of the college students whose names you have sent to me for consideration. Assuming the boys are qualified and assuming there are sufficient vacancies in the post offices in Wyoming where they have expressed an interest in working, I foresee no difficulty.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely,
MICHAEL MONRONEY,
Executive Assistant to the Postmaster General.

AUGUST 11, 1965.

Hon. JOHN A. GRONOUSKI,
The Postmaster General, Post Office Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: I should like to ascertain the identities of Wyoming youth who have gained summer employment in Wyoming under the President's youth opportunity campaign. It is my understanding that your Department made available to Wyoming youths 25 job opportunities at various post offices in Wyoming. I should like to have the names and the method of selection of each of the 25 boys.

I am fully aware of postal regulation 744.444 and its provision which stipulates that: "A single name or a list of names may be furnished on the written request of another Federal agency when properly justified and its preparation would not involve excessive expense."

Sincerely yours,
MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senator.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., August 25, 1965.

Hon. MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter of August 11, 1965, in which you asked for the names and method of selection of each of the persons given summer employment in Wyoming under the President's Youth Opportunity Campaign.

I am pleased to advise that there were 21 such hires in Wyoming this summer. Selections were made of qualified persons who applied directly to postal installations, the State employment organization, and through requested referrals of Members of Congress. In response to a questionnaire sent to these youths, 18 of the 19 who have replied to date indicated they would be returning to school this fall and 17 stated they would use funds earned during their summer employment to assist in their education.

Recently I ordered that a study be made of our regulations regarding the prohibition on release of lists of names of employees. That study has now been completed. We have determined that, in line with our traditional position of cooperating fully with committees of Congress having jurisdiction over Post Office and providing any information properly requested by such committees, we would be agreeable to providing such a list of names should the committees formally request it. On the other hand, we do not feel that it is proper to provide such a list upon request of individual Members of Congress or by individuals outside of the Congress for a number of reasons.

Over the years the postal employee unions have strongly opposed any modification of the regulation to permit the furnishing of names and addresses of employees. Their opposition has been based on the premise that any deviation from a literal application of the regulation would remove the protection employees have against harassment or the invasion of their privacy.

In this area the Department has consistently observed a policy of respecting the views of employees and their organization representatives regarding the furnishing of information which is considered as infringing on their privacy.

While I am certain that you have no intention to use the information you have requested to invade employees' privacy, I am sure you are aware that recently certain newspapers have carried comments concerning the summer employment program which have resulted in a number of our summer employees having their names printed along with comments tending to convey the impression that they were guilty of some serious offense rather than performing a job for the Government in a creditable fashion. If we were to accede to one request and furnish a list of employees, summer or otherwise, there would be no grounds on which to refuse requests from others, some of whom would not have the same good motive as yourself, and who may wish to make use of such lists for political or other purpose.

We have always been willing to provide full information to any Members of Congress on rates of pay for summer employees, the number of employees employed in a given congressional district or post office, the total amount of money spent on summer employment and all information which would tend to be pertinent to a Congressman's inquiry but at the same time protect the individual in his privacy.

However, we have many, many requests from commercial firms, salesmen and others to provide lists of employees for commercial or other purposes. We feel strongly this must be resisted. If a list of summer employees were to be given to individuals there would be no rationale for the withholding of lists of other employees.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. GRONOUSKI,
Postmaster General.

AUGUST 27, 1965.

Hon. MIKE MONRONEY,
Chairman, Post Office and Civil Service Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: For the past several days I have been attempting to get information from the Post Office Department relative to that agency's summer employment program. Specifically, I have sought the names, addresses, and basis of selection of some 25 youths who filled summer jobs in Wyoming.

Through correspondence with the Postmaster General, I have been informed that although such information will not be revealed to individual Senators, it will be provided at the formal request of the committee on which I serve under your able chairmanship.

Since my initial correspondence on this subject, I have been apprised that lists of all of the 7,500 youths employed in summer jobs with the Post Office Department are available and could be released pursuant to action by the proper authority. I am requesting, therefore, that you initiate a formal request on behalf of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to the Post Office Department for the release of names and addresses of all of the youths in our 50 States who found summer jobs in our Nation's postal service.

I am enclosing copies of pertinent correspondence that I have had on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senator.

SEPTEMBER 7, 1965.

Mr. LAWRENCE O'BRIEN,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. O'BRIEN: I want to tell you how pleased I am that your nomination to the high office of Postmaster General was approved by my committee and by the full Senate without acrimony or dissent.

The responses you gave to my inquiries during the hearings augur well for the excellence of your service as Postmaster General. As I read your answers to my questions concerning the release of names to Senators and the public of individual employees of the Post Office Department, it is my understanding that I may expect these names to be made available soon after you take office as Postmaster General. I agree with you fully that there is no reason why the names of employees of the Post Office Department "should not be in the public domain" as you stated at the hearing.

Hopefully, with your cooperation the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee and individual Senators will be able to work more closely with the Post Office Department in assuring the public that the Department and Civil Service Commission will not be unduly engaged in partisan politics as they pursue the public interest.

Looking forward to working with you, I am

Sincerely yours,

MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senator.

SEPTEMBER 28, 1965.

Hon. JOHN A. GRONOUSKI,
Postmaster General,
U.S. Post Office Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRONOUSKI: I would like to have you furnish me with a list of the names and addresses of the summer employees hired in the Denver region this past summer, together with such information as is available concerning the source of recommendation of these employees.

I understand that you have recently indicated that such information can now be released but that anyone interested in obtaining the same would have to do so from the individual postmaster. With all due respect, this would seem to be an unnecessary requirement if such information is, in fact, available at the regional office.

Thank you for your consideration of this request, and all best wishes to you in your new assignment.

Sincerely yours,

MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senator.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
DENVER REGIONAL OFFICE,
Denver, Colo., September 29, 1965.

Hon. MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: In compliance with the Department's request, a listing of summer employees in the State of Wyoming is attached.

Sincerely yours,

C. G. CROSSAN,
Regional Director.

SEASONAL ASSISTANTS HIRED IN WYOMING

OFFICE, NAME, ADDRESS, AND CITY

Casper: James Joseph Steward, 255 South Jackson, Casper; Brookie Peter Turk, 118 South Washington, Casper; Robert Ford, 2726 Hanway Avenue, Casper; Richard Bruce Land, 920 Missouri Circle, Casper.

Cheyenne: Gary Horton, 3618 Dover Road, Cheyenne; Sharon Mothershead, 603 McGovern Avenue, Cheyenne; Tim White, 500 West 31st Street, Cheyenne; Bob True, Box 55, Meriden Route, Cheyenne; Mike Fitzpatrick, Box 79, Route 1, Cheyenne; Jeff McClintock, 1211 Richardson Court, Cheyenne.

Cody: Larry George Mix, Box 1199, Cody.

Laramie: Edward Woods, 2307 Hillside Drive, Laramie; Jerome E. Benson, 1527 Custer, Laramie.

Newcastle: Neil Sweet, Upton.

Powell: Dennis Earhart, Star Route, Powell.

Rawlins: Wallace Wolfe, 1120 Nieman Street, Rawlins.

Riverton: Lance Gunderson, 809 West Park Avenue, Riverton.

Rock Springs: Everett Martin, 211 Thomas Street, Rock Springs; Joe Dee Gatti, 1301 9th Street, Rock Springs.

Sheridan: Bert Roger Bondi, 320 Sherman Avenue, Sheridan; Judy G. Elliot, 1151 Gladstone, Sheridan.

Wheatland: Dick Watson, 401 South 14th Street, Wheatland.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., October 1, 1965.

Hon. MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing in reply to your letter of September 28 in which you request the names and addresses of summer employees who were hired in the Denver region this past summer, together with such information as is available concerning the source of recommendations of these employees.

I will be glad to ask the regional director in Denver, Mr. Crossan, to send you a list of these names as soon as such a list can be compiled.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

JOHN A. GRONOUSKI.

GENERAL RELEASE NO. 129 OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, SEPTEMBER 13, 1965

Postmaster General John A. Gronouski announced today that he was authorizing postmasters throughout the country to make public, upon request, the names of employees who worked in their offices as part of the 1965 summer hiring program. Mr. Gronouski said that because virtually all the summer employees had left the Post Office Department payroll—almost all of them to return to school—the names could now be made public.

"We declined to make the names public while the students were on the payroll because a postal regulation prohibits us from doing so," the Postmaster General said. "Now that their employment has been terminated, the regulation no longer applies."

Mr. Gronouski referred to section 744.444 of the Postal Manual which states: "Lists of employees, including their designations, salaries, or addresses shall not be furnished to any individual, commercial firm, or other non-Federal organization. Addresses, salary, and financial information about individual employees shall not be furnished in response to public inquiries other than to verify information the employee himself has divulged for such reasons as establishing credit, buying insurance, arranging for hospitalization, etc."

The postal regulation which has been in existence for many years is designed to protect postal employees from commercial and political solicitation and harassment.

The Post Office Department hired some 8,600 young people during the summer. While the Department's hiring contributed toward the success of the President's youth opportunity program by keeping the young people off the unemployment rolls, no funds intended for the antipoverty campaign were used.

Postmasters were instructed to utilize the summer employees on an hour-for-hour replacement basis to help reduce the excessive amounts of overtime being worked by some career employees and to fill in for vacationing employees.

Postmaster General Gronouski said he was satisfied that the Department's summer hiring program had achieved its goal of filling manpower needs in post offices while helping many thousands of young people to earn money so that they could return to school this fall.

He pointed out that a survey showed that 94.7 percent of the summer employees planned to use their earnings to help pay for their education. He said the survey further showed that the same percentage were between the ages of 16 and 22.

Of the approximately 8,600 hired under the program, 61 percent were referred by State employment service offices, other local service agencies, or by local postmasters. Many of those recommended by postmasters had previously worked in post offices. Thirty-nine percent were recommended by Members of Congress of both parties.

The survey showed that 95.2 percent of State employment service referrals, 96 percent of the congressional referrals and 92.9 percent of the other referrals planned to use all or part of their summer earnings to finance their education.

"We have had a number of requests from members of the press and from Congressmen for the names of our summer employees," Mr. Gronouski said. "Since these employees are now off our payroll and it would no longer be potentially harmful to them and because I have been advised that it would not violate our postal regulation to make available the names of former employees, postmasters are now authorized to provide the names upon request."

[Office of Senator MILWARD SIMPSON, Republican, of Wyoming]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT TO RELEASE NAMES

U.S. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON says postal officials have reversed themselves on the release of identities of summer employees and will give him the names of all 8,600 youths who held the controversial jobs in 50 States.

The Post Office Department acceded to SIMPSON'S longstanding request after the Senator reaffirmed his insistence that one list of all the names and addresses be made available to him.

Outgoing Postmaster General John Gronouski said in an announcement September 13 that he had authorized individual postmasters to release names locally. However, compiling a national list on the basis of the local releases would have necessitated the writing of from 1,000 to 36,000 letters, SIMPSON pointed out. He insisted that the public has the right to have such information available at one central point in Washington.

Michael Monroney, Jr., executive assistant to the Postmaster General, told SIMPSON the Department will compile a complete job roster from the 15 regional post offices and give the list to the Senator as soon as it is completed "within the next few days."

SIMPSON has contended that "rank political patronage" figured in the hiring of at least 40 percent of the 8,600 youths. The openings were to have gone to economically disadvantaged jobseekers, with preference to those who would have used the earnings to further their education.

"The availability in Washington of all the names involved in the Department's summer job program will enable Congress and the press to determine the extent to which politics, not poverty, figured in the selection of jobholders," Senator SIMPSON said.

"I intend to give the ambiguous regulation under which the Department has heretofore withheld the information close scrutiny. In my view, the regulation is intended primarily to keep from the Congress important information which it must have to consider and draft legislation."

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, June 6, 1965]

POST OFFICE JOBS OPEN TO YOUTH

WASHINGTON.—The Post Office Department has invited Members of Congress to submit names of candidates for summer jobs under President Johnson's youth employment campaign.

About 6,000 summer jobs are available in post offices throughout the country, compared with 1,500 last year.

A Department spokesman said there was no intention to allocate them as political patronage.

"We have to recruit from every source we can," Michael Monroney, Executive Assistant to the Postmaster General, explained. "We are going to have a problem finding qualified youngsters.

"There is no point in scandalizing the country by putting this program on a political patronage basis. Even if we wanted to, it would be more trouble than it was worth."

Monroney said the Department has begun making telephone calls to all Senators and Representatives of both parties to inform them of the increase in summer jobs.

He said the legislators were told that the names of any youths seeking summer employment could be sent to regional offices of the Department, where they would be considered with the names of other applicants.

The summer employees will substitute for vacationing carriers, clerks, and mail handlers. The pay is $2.29 an hour.

Monroney said all 6,000 would be needed. Post offices were able to get along last summer with 1,500 substitutes only by paying overtime, he said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, July 22, 1965]

POST OFFICE DRAWS WARNING ON YOUTH-HIRING PATRONAGE

John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, said today the Post Office Department has been instructed that hiring under the youth opportunity program is not to be treated as political patronage.

Macy said he was surprised to learn from published reports Tuesday that the Post Office Department had informed Members of both parties in Congress that they could suggest the names of youths for summer postal jobs.

"It was clearly the intent in this special program that political patronage was not to apply in any form or by any implication," Macy said.

He also said Postmaster General John A. Gronouski "has gotten the word" concerning hiring under the program.

Almost simultaneously with Macy's comments, the Post Office Department said it had asked Members of Congress to help find deserving young people for the 7,500 jobs the Department is giving out as part of the administration program.

But "this was not a patronage program," a spokesman said.

BOTH PARTIES ASKED

He said the summer program "did not even materialize until late in the spring, and we had to explore every possible avenue to make sure that the jobs were filled. * * * One of the problems we faced in this program was that the U.S. Employment Service was rather slow in submitting names to us, while the Congressmen were extremely prompt."

He emphasized that both Democrats and Republicans in Congress were asked to provide names.

"Many of the names submitted by the Employment Service were found to be unqualified for the type of work involved," he said.

Pointing out that the youth opportunity program is mostly aimed at school dropouts and other unskilled youths, he said postal work requires ability to sort mail, learn basic mail-handling processes, and perform other specialized duties.

In addition, he said, postal employees must pass a security investigation, which bars youths with police records.

The spokesman figured that about 5,000 of the jobs have been filled—more of them from Congressmen's lists than from the Employment Service roster—but most of the remaining 2,500 can be filled from Employment Service sources.

Macy said neither he nor President Johnson had any indication until Tuesday that the Post Office Department had informed Members of Congress they could make recommendations. He said the instructions had clearly stated that Government agencies were to go to the Employment Service offices for names, and that interested youths were to apply to those offices.

"When I heard about what the Post Office Department was doing and when others at the White House heard about it, the Department was instructed about what it should do," he said.

"No other department that we know of did anything of this kind * * *.

"The (Post Office) Department has not made a final report on its program and this report will be received and studied with interest in detail."

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Tribune, Aug. 11, 1965]

POST OFFICE WORKERS: UNITED STATES WON'T NAME YOUTHS IN JOBS

(By Nick Kotz)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Post Office Department has refused to give Iowa and Minnesota Congressmen the names of "youth opportunity campaign" employees hired in their States.

In another development in the postal job controversy, a high-ranking postal official acknowledged to a U.S. Senator that the Department in effect had planned to distribute the jobs secretly as congressional patronage.

Representatives ALBERT QUIE, Republican, of Minnesota, and H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, had both written Postmaster General John Gronouski requesting the names of youths hired in their States.

Richard J. Murphy, Assistant Postmaster General, replied to both Congressmen that Post Office Department regulations prevented the release of names, salaries, or other information about any postal employees.

The two Congressmen, acting independently, had requested the information because the Post Office Department had disregarded Presidential and Civil Service Commission regulations and distributed the youth jobs as congressional patronage. It has been revealed that youths with prominent political connections have gotten some of the 8,500 jobs.

The President and Civil Service Commission had ordered that the jobs go to disadvantaged youths and that hiring be carried out through the employment service.

Concerning the Department's refusal to make public the names, GROSS said: "I don't intend to stand still and let them get away with this, I intend to break down this curtain of secrecy."

QUIE has renewed his request in a strongly worded letter to postal official Murphy. QUIE has now requested names of all 8,500 youths hired.

"Murphy has quoted to me an ambiguous postal regulation to keep this information from reaching the public," said QUIE. He said the Post Office Department "apparently is trying to cover up the scope of political patronage" in the program.

QUIE also pointed out to Murphy that he had only quoted that portion of the regulation preventing the public from learning who works for the Post Office Department.

QUIE noted that another section of the secrecy regulation states that "a single name or a list of names may be furnished on the written request of another Federal agency, when properly justified and its preparation would not involve excessive expense."

QUIE wrote Murphy: "I believe that the interest of Members of the Congress in regard to the operation of certain programs of the Federal Government is certainly a 'proper justification' and is in fact, essential if we are to function effectively as the elected representatives of the people."

Murphy had written QUIE that the secrecy regulation "serves to protect postal employees from harassment or invasion of their privacy. Postal employee organizations have strongly protested any change in regulation on several occasions in the past."

On this point, QUIE replied: "Certainly, I am not to construe from your letter that you believe I intend the harassment or invasion of the privacy of post office employees.

"I assure you I am not. I am, however, interested in knowing whether the intentions of a portion of the so-called war on poverty * * * are being carried out * * *."

The Post Office Department has contended in numerous public statements since the patronage practice was disclosed by the Minneapolis Tribune, that recommendations from Congressmen were sought because the Department needed help in quickly filling the 7,500 jobs (1,000 more jobs later were added).

However, Michael Monroney, Executive Assistant to the Postmaster General, has contradicted the Department's public statements in letters he sent Senator MILWARD SIMPSON, Republican, of Wyoming.

SIMPSON, a member of the Senate Post Office Committee, had written Gronouski asking why he had not been informed about the availability of the youth jobs.

Monroney replied that Deputy Postmaster General Frederick Belen had attempted unsuccessfully to contact SIMPSON and had told other members of the Post Office Committees about the jobs.

Then, contradicting the Department's public statements that it needed the help of Congressmen, Monroney wrote SIMPSON:

"You know, Senator, it is ironic that, when the Department attempts to assist Members of the House and the Senate, we end up being criticized."

SIMPSON also questioned why he had never heard about the jobs until he read a public announcement. The public announcement, in a newspaper interview was made after the patronage procedure was disclosed and the Department decided to contact all Congressmen rather than merely Democrats and members of the congressional Post Office Committees.

Wrote Monroney: "Furthermore, let me say in closing that we did not feel it would be advantageous to issue a public statement on these summer positions. We would have been swamped with applications from which it would have been difficult to select the best qualified in the short time available for selection.

"I also regret the news stories that have appeared because they have resulted in congressional offices being inundated with applications. Our intent from the beginning has been to recruit quietly and on a nonpartisan basis from as many sources as possible."

The postal jobs in Wyoming apparently were distributed as they were in Minnesota, Iowa, and other States.

The Post Office Department said that 25 jobs were available in Wyoming.

It appears that most of the youths were hired on the recommendation of Senator GALE MCGEE, and Representative TENO RONCALIO, both Democrats.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 20, 1965]

POST OFFICE POLITICS EXPECTED TO CHANGE

(By Jerry Klutz)

Lawrence F. O'Brien is given top rating as an astute professional politician and he will take over the Post Office Department, the most political of all Federal agencies, but it doesn't follow he'll play his own brand of partisan politics there.

He'll be prompted in any politics he becomes involved in by the President, who has a reputation as a master politician.

John A. Gronouski, the retiring Postmaster General who was praised highly by the President yesterday when he appointed him Ambassador to Poland, also fancies himself as something of a political operator. He made the most speeches of any Cabinet member during the President's reelection campaign last year and he has been the administration's link with the Polish-American bloc.

But some of Gronouski's politics didn't endear him to the President, chiefly his handling of summer jobs in his Department. In fact, the President is said to have been annoyed by them. This may or may not have been a factor in the shifting of Gronouski to Warsaw.

Mr. Johnson specifically ordered last May that 25,000 summer jobs—one for each 100 regular employees—be given to economically underprivileged youths who would return to school in the fall. He asked agencies to work with State employment services in recruiting and hiring the youngsters at $1.25 an hour. It was all a part of the President's youth opportunity program.

Gronouski ignored the President's directive, and the newest Federal employee here is aware that Mr. Johnson doesn't like to be ignored on even the smallest matter. Gronouski tossed the jobs into politics by asking Members of Congress to recommend applicants for them and he fixed pay rates at $2.29 an hour. Experienced substitute employees in some post offices were passed over for jobs this summer for inexperienced teenage political appointees, many of whom weren't underprivileged.

Representative ALBERT H. QUIE, Republican of Minnesota, has demanded that the Post Office make available to Members of Congress the names of 8,577 employees hired under its Youth Opportunity Program of which 3,380 came through Members of Congress. Gronouski has refused.

The Civil Service Commission made an investigation of Post Office's summer hirings and its full report went to the President about 2 weeks ago. Insiders hint it was devastating in its criticism of the Department.

For the record, Civil Service Commission Chairman John W. Macy informed Congress there had been a "basic misunderstanding" on the part of some Department officials over hiring policy, but that the Department had shifted gears and had hired most of its recent employees from State employment referrals based on needs of the applicants.

Also, the chairman said he and Gronouski had agreed to conduct a thorough study of summer employment procedures in time for use next summer. There were reports that Post Office would be denied further participation in the program because of its failure to play by the rules.

The Post Office incident was said to have been distressing to the President because it reflected on his personnel policies, which stress merit and ability and soft pedal politics. A majority of Mr. Johnson's appointees are well-qualified persons who have distinguished careers in the Federal service, and he has won wide praise for promoting them.

The incident also tended to undermine confidence in a new program announced by the Department to base promotions from within on a strict merit basis.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 10, 1965]

SETTING YOUTH A SORRY EXAMPLE

Before retiring Postmaster General John A. Gronouski takes up his new ambassadorial duties in Poland, it seems to us he ought to be afforded ample opportunity to explain just how, and possibly why, the postal service's summer job program for underprivileged youth turned into a political grab bag. For indications are that a good many of those jobs have gone to youths who are not exactly underprivileged.

Last spring, it will be recalled, as part of his youth opportunity program President Johnson directed Federal agencies to make available 25,000 summer jobs to needy youths to enable them to return to school in the fall. The agencies were to work with State employment services in locating qualified young people. Under this program the Post Office Department hired 8,577 employees.

However, before turning to the State agencies, Mr. Gronouski asked Members of Congress to recommend applicants for the summertime jobs. Many of them, instead of reminding Mr. Gronouski of the President's directive, happily went along with the Postmaster's request. Indeed, one Congressman reports that he was allotted 10 jobs by the Postmaster and 8 or 9 of the youths he recommended were hired. One of these hired was the Congressman's son who was recommended, his father said, by his hometown postmaster. At any rate, 3,380 of all the summertime postal jobs available were filled through recommendations of Congressmen.

Several Congressmen, to their credit, seem to be having second thoughts about this whole scheme and have asked Mr. Gronouski to disclose the names of those hired under the youth program. So far he has refused, although it is hard to see on what grounds his payroll can be kept secret.

Plainly this facet of the youth opportunity program needs further inquiry by Congress, not only in the Post Office Department but also in cities where the program has become enmeshed in political tugs of war. For it is bad enough that the purpose of the youth program anywhere can be distorted, but perhaps worse is the sorry example for underprivileged youth being set by their privileged elders in public places.

[From the Wyoming State Tribune, Sept. 19, 1965]

POST OFFICE JOBS HELD BY RELATIVES OF DEMS

A poll of post offices in some of Wyoming's major cities showed today relatives of some active Democrats were employed in the Federal administration's summer post office job program.

Postmaster General John Gronouski had ordered the names released this week. His order had been in answer to a congressional push led by Senator MILWARD SIMPSON, Republican, of Wyoming, demanding the names be released.

SIMPSON said the program had called for award of the jobs based on need.

At the Cheyenne post office, Robert Henry True, Jr., Jeffrey McClintock, Timothy John White, Gary Francis Horton, Sharon K.

Mothershead, and Mike Fitzpatrick were employed.

The McClintock youth is son of Archie G. McClintock, a 1964 Democratic candidate for the legislature. His mother is a Laramie County committeewoman.

Horton is the son of Mrs. Bernard Horton, a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1964. His father is editor of the Wyoming Eagle, a Cheyenne newspaper.

White's father is District Judge Philip White. White was elected on a nonpartisan ticket last year, but is a former Cheyenne city attorney.

The Mothershead girl's father is Robert Mothershead, a former Democratic assistant State attorney general.

At Casper, Richard B. Lang was among those employed. He is the son of Casper Attorney Leonard Lang, a former Democratic candidate for Natrona county attorney.

TRIBUTE TO COL. RALPH E. VANDERVORT, JR.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, after 24 years of distinguished military service, Col. Ralph E. Vandervort, Jr., is retiring from the U.S. Army.

Bud, as he was called by Senators and their staffs, was assigned as military liaison officer with Congress 6 years ago—first for the Department of the Army and then last year for the Secretary of Defense.

He was one of the most effective and popular liaison officers, and I can testify personally to the effectiveness of his liaison services, for I have called on him for assistance on numerous occasions.

At all times, he responded speedily and efficiently to carry out assignments. I am sure my colleagues can similarly attest to the good work and friendly service rendered by this outstanding Army officer.

In his nearly 25 years of active duty with the Army, Colonel Vandervort served at Fort Shafter in Hawaii. He often spoke of retiring in my State which he and his family came to love during his two tours of duty there.

I hope that during his retirement he will have the opportunity to return to the Hawaiian Islands where he can be assured of a hearty and warm aloha from the many friends he has there.

It is a pleasure to pay a tribute to Bud Vandervort on this occasion, and I wish him good health, happiness, and abundant success in whatever endeavors he undertakes in the future.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights and a Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee will hold joint hearings in January on 18 bills which I have introduced to protect the constitutional rights of military personnel.

Mr. William A. Creech, chief counsel and staff director of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, wrote an article concerning these bills which appeared in the November 1963 edition of the American Bar Association Journal. In this article Mr. Creech discusses the background for this legislation as well as the provisions of the bills. More recently, on May 28 of this year, in a speech before the Armed Forces legal officers of the 5th Coast Guard District, at Norfolk, Va., he reviewed recent developments in connection with this legislation.

In view of the relevance of Mr. Creech's article and speech to legislation which is pending before the Senate, I commend them to the attention of my colleagues and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS LOOKS TO THE SERVICEMAN'S RIGHTS

(NOTE.—Justice under military law has advanced notably through the enactment in 1950 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. But now, for the first time in the Nation's history, a committee of Congress has made a comprehensive examination of the constitutional rights of servicemen. Mr. Creech describes the legislation that has been proposed as a result of that investigation.)

(By William A. Creech, of the North Carolina Bar (Smithfield))

During the early years of our Republic the lot of a soldier or sailor was, to say the least, not an enviable one. His living conditions poor, his pay low, and his rights nonexistent, the serviceman of that era conformed largely to Blackstone's description of English soldiers as occupying a "state of servitude in the midst of a nation of freemen." Since there was no draft and every man in uniform had volunteered, the public attitude was that he had assumed the risk and should therefore not complain about ill treatment or lack of rights.

Since that time many factors have contributed to the evolution of our present concepts of justice for the military. Although the most significant events have occurred during the post-World War II era, the basis for much of this progress was laid earlier in incidents arousing public indignation over military justice; such as the one at Brownsville prior to World War I when several soldiers were executed almost immediately after a court-martial conviction. The use of selective service during World Wars I and II produced a new approach toward the rights of servicemen—for the most part inducted civilians who had not bargained away their rights for an "indentured servitude." With the advent of selective service, both Congress and the courts began demonstrating greater concern for the protection of the rights of military personnel.

Especially important during the years that have followed has been the impact on military justice of the judicial expansion of due process concepts. Thus, the Supreme Court in *Burns* v. *Wilson,* 346 U.S. 137 (1953), seemed to recognize that service personnel were entitled to fundamental due process, even though Federal court review of court-martial action in this respect also would be even more limited than the review of State court action.

UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE ENACTED

Congress long ago implemented its constitutional power to "make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces" by enacting and amending Articles of War and Articles for the Government of the Navy. After first enacting the Elston Act in 1948 to broaden the rights of soldiers and airmen, Congress took its most important step to protect fundamental rights of all servicemen in 1950 when it enacted the Uniform Code of Military Justice, which superseded all previous legislation on the subject. Establishment of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals by the code provided for the first time in the history of military justice a specialized civilian court—roughly equivalent to a Federal court of appeals—to review court-martial convictions, thus guaranteeing the serviceman a recourse against infringement of his constitutional rights.

Among the substantial procedural guarantees the serviceman enjoys under the code are the privilege against self-incrimination, which, as construed by the Court of Military Appeals, extends far beyond that recognized in civilian courts; the assignment of qualified counsel to represent him in all cases tried by a general court-martial; the requirement that a free transcript of the trial record be furnished the accused in all courts-martial resulting in a punitive discharge; and automatic review of the case with respect to findings and sentence.

Despite substantial improvements in military justice effected by the code, Congress and the courts have continued to receive complaints about the administration of military justice. There still have been, for example, claims that the court members or the defense counsel in some cases were subjected to pressure from either the commanding officer who appointed the court or from some other high-ranking official.

More fundamental has been the criticism that in many instances the protections of the code are being circumvented administratively by the issuance of undesirable discharges which do not require court-martial action. Although lacking procedural safeguards, the undesirable discharge can be treated as a discharge "under other than honorable conditions" for purposes of denying veterans' benefits. It would, furthermore, have the same effect on the recipient's reputation and on his employability as a bad conduct discharge or probably even a dishonorable discharge. The public generally does not differentiate between an "other than honorable" discharge imposed by a court martial and an undesirable discharge—also under other than honorable conditions—issued administratively by the armed services. The Court of Military Appeals, in its annual report for 1960, expressly called attention to the fact that the armed services were apparently resorting to administrative discharges to circumvent the requirements of the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

CONGRESS TAKES A LOOK AT SERVICEMEN'S RIGHTS

Long the subject of piecemeal congressional enactment, the constitutional rights of military personnel have now become the subject of a comprehensive investigation by Congress for the first time in the Nation's history. Under the chairmanship of Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., of North Carolina, the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights in 1962 initiated an investigation of military justice to determine the extent to which the system had departed from the intent of Congress.

Senator ERVIN, who also is a ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, has repeatedly stated his belief that "No objective could be more important than to protect the constitutional rights of the men and women in uniform to whom we have entrusted the defense of country and our Constitution."

After initial research, the subcommittee sent lengthy questionnaires to the Defense Department for answer by each armed service. After evaluating the voluminous replies, the subcommittee proceeded with hearings. In 7 days of hearings during February and March 1962, the subcommittee heard a wide cross section of expert witnesses, including representatives of the Defense Department, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Court of Military Appeals, the Veterans' Administration, the American Bar Association, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, the New York County Lawyers' Association, the Bar Association of the District of Columbia, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans Committee, the American Civil Liberties Union, as well as several attorneys experienced in military law. Senator Ervin then addressed a questionnaire to more than 7,000 Reserve officers and others with experience in military law. Members of the subcommittee staff made a 17-day field study of military justice in Europe.

The study has culminated in a series of 18 proposals Senator Ervin introduced in the Senate on August 6, 1963. Joining him as cosponsors of some or all of these bills are Senators Birch Bayh, John Sherman Cooper, Hiram Fong, Hubert Humphrey, Roman Hruska, Edward V. Long, and Harrison A. Williams.

Based on the findings and recommendations of the subcommittee, the 18 bills propose substantial changes in the Uniform Code of Military Justice. They are not, however, as sweeping as some of the proposals made by witnesses at the 1962 hearings and by some military personnel, including former judge advocate officers, who have communicated with the subcommittee. For example, Senator Ervin has not proposed limiting the jurisdiction of courts-martial to such purely military offenses as unauthorized absence, desertion and disobedience of orders, or barring courts-martial from trying offenses such as murder, robbery, and arson. Nor does he adopt the proposal of one American Legion committee that command influence on courts-martial should be made a Federal crime, or the suggestion that civilians serve as trial judges for general courts-martial—the current English practice—or the idea that all military members of boards of review be replaced by civilians. Under the Ervin proposals, each service would still have substantial authority to keep its own house in order and solve its own particular problems.

PROPOSED CHANGES ARE OUTLINED

The 18 measures advocated by Senator Ervin were predicated upon some of the major complaints of injustice encountered by the subcommittee during its study.

The first bill concerns command influence, often called the endemic disease of military justice. While article 37 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice prohibits command influence, the prohibition is so narrowly limited that it is ineffectual in certain cases. For example, it only prohibits influence by certain specified persons, such as the commanding officer or the convening authority and does not apply to others who can, to the detriment of the accused, influence the court's decision. Second, it does not now apply to administrative proceedings. Without violating article 37, therefore, a commanding officer would be perfectly free to coerce an administrative discharge board. Third, the prohibition is not specifically geared to possibilities of subtle influence on court members or personnel through the threat of low ratings on fitness or efficiency reports—reports used to determine promotions and assignments. Fourth, according to the construction given article 37 by the Court of Military Appeals, a commanding officer is not prevented from indoctrinating members of a court-martial before they perform their duties. The proposed bill seeks to meet all of these deficiencies and thereby assure that the serviceman facing trial or administrative hearing will find a fair and impartial tribunal, as well as a defense counsel whose efforts will not be inhibited by threats of retaliation from higher authority when he vigorously represents his client.

The second measure relates to right to counsel, which for civilians, of course, extends to all Federal criminal proceedings and State criminal cases. The accused serviceman must under the code be provided with legally trained counsel in general courts-martial. In special courts-martial, a serviceman is provided counsel who is not required to be an attorney unless the Government is represented by legally trained counsel, notwithstanding the fact that a special court-martial is authorized to impose a bad conduct discharge. In the Air Force, legally trained counsel generally represent both the accused and the Government in all trials by special court-martial. In the Army, apparently, legally trained counsel are seldom furnished in such trials, but these courts, as a matter of policy, do not mete out bad conduct discharges. The Navy, however, seldom furnishes counsel to those being tried by special court-martial, although the court can impose a sentence which includes a bad conduct discharge.

In Senator Ervin's view: "The consequences of such a discharge are so serious that they should not be allowed except in a proceeding where the accused has been offered the assistance of legally trained counsel." His second bill would impose such a requirement; it also would require that, in a proceeding which might lead to an undesirable discharge, the serviceman be represented by legally trained counsel. This should limit considerably the use of administrative discharges to circumvent the protections provided by Congress in the code.

During the field study the subcommittee found confusion concerning the remedies available when, after initial review of a summary court-martial or special court-martial, not involving a discharge, it is learned that the accused is probably innocent of the offense. The code makes no provision for a petition for new trial in such cases; yet, because review of the case may be completed in a few days, it is not at all unlikely that evidence may be discovered later which would vindicate the accused.

Senator Ervin's third proposal broadens the remedy of petition for a new trial to include any conviction by court-martial, irrespective of the severity of the sentence imposed or the nature of the court-martial imposing it. This method of clearing the record is especially important today when the stigma of a conviction has such far-reaching adverse effects on the individual's opportunities for employment and for receiving various benefits. The bill also increases from 1 to 2 years the time for submitting the petition, thereby making military practice conform with the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

SUMMARY COURTS ARE SERVICES' POLICE COURTS

For most Americans, their experience with the criminal courts is limited to the magistrate or police courts. Awareness that it is in these courts that the citizen gains his impression of the entire judicial system has sparked recent efforts to improve them. The summary court-martial is the police court of military law—a one-man tribunal where a single officer serves as judge, jury, prosecuting attorney and defense counsel. Far more servicemen have contact with this court-martial than with any other. Case studies show that many of them have a low impression of military justice because of abuses in these courts. Although the summary court officer sometimes is a lawyer assigned to court duty, all too frequently he is not a lawyer. The recent expansion of authority of commanding officers under the code to mete out nonjudicial punishment has eliminated the necessity for this court.[1] The fourth bill, therefore, proposes the immediate abolition of the summary court-martial.

The fifth measure assures that a serviceman will not be discharged administratively under other than honorable conditions if he has requested in writing and been denied a court-martial for his alleged misconduct. It is, of course, far easier to secure an administrative separation in an action not subject to rules of evidence, right to counsel and procedural safeguards than it is to satisfy the degree of proof required for a conviction by a court-martial. Under the bill the accused who is not brought to trial need not be retained in the armed services; it merely requires the Government either to separate him under honorable conditions or to prove its case in a forum which guarantees traditional safeguards. It specifically provides that no restriction is placed on the authority of the Armed Forces to give a less-than-honorable administrative discharge for misconduct that has been the basis for a State or Federal court conviction. In that case it is assumed that the State or Federal court afforded constitutional safeguards.

The sixth bill broadens a serviceman's protection against double jeopardy by assuring that if he is tried and acquitted by a court-martial, he cannot be given a less-than-honorable discharge on the same grounds. The constitutional prohibition against double jeopardy, although implemented by the code, does not apply to administrative proceedings, and there is no protection against repeated administrative discharge hearings based on essentially the same charges. The bill contains the additional safeguard that when the penalty may be separation or reduction in grade and the evidence is substantially that previously presented, no administrative board can make findings or recommendations less favorable than those of an earlier board.

Justice delayed is often justice defeated—from the standpoint of either the Government or the defendant. The importance of developing efficient procedures for courts-martial cannot be overestimated. In civil cases there has been increased reliance on pretrial conferences in order to simplify the issues and speed up the trial. In Federal criminal cases certain matters of admissibility of evidence are disposed of prior to trial on motions to suppress. Proposals have been made to amend the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure to authorize pretrial conferences similar to those in civil trials.

Court-martial procedures are now unwieldy. Members of a court-martial frequently may have to spend hours or even days waiting for the law officer (the military trial judge) to resolve matters that under an ideal system would be disposed of before the court members were convened. Sometimes resentment of the delay may be reflected against the accused. The seventh proposal is designed to simplify and expedite court-martial procedure by allowing the law officer to hold pretrial conferences in which pleas by the accused could be entered, motions ruled on, and certain evidentiary matters disposed of.

The next bill guarantees that, except in time of war, no serviceman shall be discharged by a special court-martial under other than honorable conditions, unless the hearing is presided over by a law officer who can rule on issues of law.

Under the code only in a general court-martial is there an official who plays a role approximating that of a trial judge. In special courts-martial, which have the authority to impose a sentence including a bad conduct discharge, there is no legal authority to have a trained lawyer preside over the trial. In neither a general nor a special court-martial, moreover, is any provision made for waiver of trial by jury and submission of issues of fact to a skilled lawyer for determination.

This proposal also would authorize waiver of trial by "jury" when a law officer is present. Neither the Government nor the accused should have any complaint if the accused, on advice of counsel, elects to submit issues of fact and law, together with the sentence, to a "military judge." While this bill would impose additional requirements on the armed services, they do not seem unreasonable; as a matter of fact, the waiver of jury provision would probably result in a considerable saving of manpower.

---

[1] Public Law 87–648, 76 Stat. 447, 10 U.S.C. § 815 (supp. IV, 1962).

REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS PROPOSED

The right to judicial review of administrative proceedings is the subject of the ninth bill. The Supreme Court in *Harmon* v. *Brucker*, 355 U.S. 579 (1958), has ruled that administrative discharges are not completely immune from judicial review and that capricious or illegal action will be overturned by the courts. Indeed, a number of cases have been filed as a result of that decision. Congress, by extending the right to judicial review, should demonstrate that it is as concerned about disabilities accompanying an undesirable discharge as it is about stigmas imposed by bad conduct or dishonorable discharges. Moreover, from the standpoint of efficiency, it is desirable to concentrate judicial review of issues of law in a single forum rather than have it spread out as now among the district courts and the Court of Claims.

If judicial review of military administrative action is to be centralized, then it is logical to focus it in the Court of Military Appeals. There is sufficient relationship between the precepts of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, on the one hand, and military administrative law, on the other, to justify giving jurisdiction to the court which Congress originally established to assure that the mandate of the code was observed.

The subcommittee's study revealed that the needs for counsel in special courts-martial and for presiding law officers are equally acute in administrative proceedings. Testimony and complaints received by the subcommittee warrant the conclusion that in time of peace the additional burden on the services is justified by the severe consequences of receiving an undesirable administrative discharge. Another proposal, therefore, requires that servicemen be represented by qualified counsel in such hearings and that a qualified and impartial "military judge" preside over the board.

Another important problem is the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses and the right to obtain testimony by subpena in administrative proceedings. Despite the effect on his civilian life, the serviceman may be undesirably discharged without having the benefit of either confrontation or compulsory process. Even in cases where the board of officers considering the discharge would like to subpena witnesses, it has no statutory authority to do so. Moreover, in an article 32 investigation—a statutory prerequisite for trial by a general court-martial similar to a grand jury investigation—the investigating officer has no statutory authority to compel witnesses to testify.

Senator ERVIN's 11th bill seeks to remedy these omissions by giving the subpena power to military boards considering separations and to investigating officers acting under article 32 of the code. The proposed legislation would not give an absolute right to the accused or respondent serviceman to compel the attendance of witnesses, but by granting the subpena power to the board and investigator, it at least opens the possibility. Of course, the need for subpena power for administrative boards will be less significant if Congress enacts the fifth bill, permitting a member of the Armed Forces to elect trial by court-martial for alleged misconduct that is to be made the basis for an administrative discharge.

The 12th proposal is designed to eliminate a practice, described at the subcommittee's hearings, in which chairmen of Army and Air Force boards of review prepare the efficiency or fitness reports of junior members. A number of witnesses pointed out that the independence of members may be inhibited by this rating procedure. Soon after the hearings the Army changed its practice. The Air Force to date has not, but under the proposed legislation, it would be compelled to do so.

Another proposal corrects a jurisdictional gap in the law left by a Supreme Court decision. In *Toth* v. *Quarles*, 350 U.S. 11 (1955), the Supreme Court ruled that despite the express provisions of article 3a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice it was unconstitutional for a court-martial to try a former serviceman for crimes against military law committed when he was on active duty. The effect of the decision is that if a serviceman commits a crime overseas which is not discovered until he returns to the United States and is discharged, he cannot be prosecuted in any court. To close this jurisdictional loophole, the 13th bill would give Federal district courts jurisdiction over serious violations of the Uniform Code by former servicemen while they were on active status and for which otherwise they could not be prosecuted. Venue requirements in the district court would be the same as those governing Federal courts generally.

Another jurisdictional loophole was created when the Supreme Court held in a series of cases [2] that employees and military dependents accompanying the Armed Forces overseas in peacetime cannot constitutionally be made subject to trial by courts-martial. Consequently, no American tribunal, either military or civil, now has jurisdiction to try crimes committed by American civilians overseas. Their misdeeds must be tried, if at all, in foreign courts under foreign procedures.

While there has been little showing of unfairness by foreign tribunals in such cases, it is desirable for a variety of reasons to designate an American court in which those civilians can be prosecuted and where they will receive the benefit of safeguards provided by the U.S. Constitution. Short of a constitutional amendment, which is an impractical method of closing the jurisdictional loophole, the only alternative is to extend the extraterritorial jurisdiction of the Federal district courts. There is a convincing argument that if the reasoning of the Supreme Court is carried to a logical extreme, there may be grave constitutional doubts as to the power of Congress to grant this jurisdiction to the district courts; but there are persons who believe it would be constitutional.

To place the matter before Congress for further study, Senator ERVIN's 14th bill would authorize Federal district courts to try American civilian dependents and employees accompanying the Armed Forces overseas.

A separate Navy Judge Advocate General Corps would be established by one of the bills.

Another bill is intended to remedy complaints which the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee received about the military correction boards of the services. It was found that although these boards have considerable authority to rectify injustice, there is confusion as to the exact scope of the authority.

The subcommittee heard complaints that the correction boards sometimes do not furnish an adequate forum for the aggrieved serviceman, that the members serve only on a part-time basis and are distracted by their other duties, and that the correction boards of the different services follow varying and sometimes conflicting paths. In the interests of uniformity and greater efficiency of these boards, which are so important to the protection of the rights of the serviceman, the 16th bill would consolidate all correction boards under the Secretary of Defense and staff them with nine full-time members.

In meeting the demands set by Congress in the Uniform Code of Military Justice, the armed services have displayed considerable resourcefulness. The Air Force has developed an outstanding rehabilitation program; the Army and Navy has pioneered in a negotiated guilty plea procedure; the Navy has recently developed a procedure for suspending administrative discharges and placing the respondent sailor on a probationary status. Perhaps the most significant innovation introduced by any of the armed services, however, has been the Army's field judiciary systems.[3] The Navy has followed suit, but the Air Force apparently is unwilling to do so, despite the proved advantages of the Army program.

In short, the Army field judiciary program seeks to assure that law officers in general courts-martial will be independent, free of command influence and fully qualified to perform their task of providing both the Government and the accused a fair trial. A number of witnesses before the subcommittee testified to the success of the field judiciary program and recommended that it be given statutory basis. The 17th bill, therefore, is designed to give statutory recognition to the best features of the Army system and to apply them to all services.

Reform of the military boards of review is the subject of the last bill. The responsibilities of these boards, which would be renamed courts of military review under the bill, for the preservation of the rights of servicemen cannot be overestimated. Authorized under article 66 of the code, these boards review both the facts and the law in any court-martial case involving discharge or confinement for 1 year or more. Moreover, they review the sentence—a review not available in civilian jurisprudence. Servicemen have complained to the subcommittee that members of the board are rotated too frequently to develop a feel for their tasks and that they are hindered in their duties by pressures inherent in the system. By requiring minimum tenure for board members and by insisting that there be at least one civilian member of each three-man board, the 18th proposal would cure these problems.

LEGISLATION WILL IMPROVE SERVICES' EFFICIENCY

Senator ERVIN has summarized the problem:

> The public has a right to expect effective performance by the Armed Forces, whose primary mission is to defend this country against aggressors. Nothing can be allowed to impede performance of that primary mission; however, by assuring our servicemen the highest standards of military justice, Congress will only improve, not impair, military discipline, morale and efficiency.

Redefining, clarifying and extending as it does, the constitutional rights of military personnel, this legislation would establish a new landmark in the advance of military justice.

ARMED SERVICES PERSONNEL—CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

(By William A. Creech, Chief Counsel and Staff Director, Constitutional Rights Subcommittee)

No one scrutinizing the American scene today could fail to recognize the tremendous amount of pressure being generated in Congress to enact civil rights legislation, especially the current voting rights measure.

What is remarkable, however, is that most Americans are hardly aware of the large number of American citizens who every day are denied their constitutional rights, but whose problems are seldom covered by the press or other media. These are the American citizens who daily defend our form of government and our Constitution. As one serviceman said in a recent letter to the subcommittee, "If we are required to fight for the Constitution, why can't we also have its protections?"

---

[2] *Reid* v. *Covert*, 354 U.S. 1 (1957), *Kinsella* v. *Singleton*, 361 U.S. 234 (1960) and *McElroy* v. *Guagliardo*, 361 U.S. 281 (1960).

[3] See, Wiener, "The Army's Field Judiciary System: A Notable Advance," 46 A.B.A.J. 1178 (1960).

At one time in our history, as you know, our fighting forces were said to be without rights. In fact, Blackstone described them as being in a "state of servitude in a society of freemen." Later on, it was said that they were not entitled to due process of law, and that the sole test of the legality of a court-martial was whether the court had jurisdiction over the offender. This view has been properly discredited and discarded. Today, court-martial proceedings have been held to be subject to our fundamental concept of constitutional due process.

Indeed, with the passage of the Uniform Code of Military Justice in 1950, and the establishment of an independent Court of Military Appeals, great progress has been made in safeguarding the constitutional rights of our servicemen.

Despite this progress, however, there remains considerable room for improvement in the quality of military justice, both in courts-martial and in administrative proceedings.

The Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, under the able chairmanship of Senator SAM J. ERVIN, beginning in the fall of 1961 undertook an extensive and continuing study regarding the constitutional rights of our service men and women. This study vividly demonstrated numerous serious inadequacies in both the Uniform Code of Military Justice and the administrative discharge proceedings.

In conjunction with this far-reaching study—which, I might add included, a survey of military justice at overseas installations—hearings were held by the subcommittee in 1962 to determine the need for legislation to insure a more satisfactory and efficient means of safeguarding the constitutional rights of military personnel.

As a result of this study, Senator ERVIN introduced a package of 18 bills. It is noteworthy that Senator ERVIN is one of the most highly decorated Members of Congress and, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, one who fully appreciates the needs of the military.

For reasons more of convenience than of substance, I have divided my discussion of the legislative package of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights into three major categories.

The first category of bills fall mostly within the dynamic, and somewhat elastic and evolving, concept of constitutional due process. Due process is democracy's way of preserving an individual's rights; it constantly appraises the procedures established by government, which determine respective rights and duties of a citizen.

Under the fifth amendment to the Constitution, no citizen can be put in jeopardy of life or limb twice. This constitutional protection against double jeopardy is reflected in article 44 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Article 44 does not, however, apply to administrative discharge proceedings, even though these proceedings are often based on misconduct which could be the subject of a court-martial proceeding and carry the severe penalty of an administrative undesirable discharge.

As a consequence, numerous cases have been brought to the subcommittee's attention where an accused, after having been acquitted by a court-martial, is given administratively an undesirable discharge for the same misconduct. Also, there is nothing in the law to prevent the military from bringing repeated administrative discharge proceedings based on the same misconduct until, finally, the serviceman is separated.

Now, of course, the subcommittee does not seek to prohibit the services from administratively discharging a member of the armed services under honorable conditions for the convenience of the Government, or from holding more than one hearing with respect to the fitness of the serviceman if he is involved in additional incidents which demonstrate his unfitness.

The military should not, however, be permitted to harass a member of the services by repeated trials or administrative hearings on the same alleged misconduct. Such harassment certainly does not conform to the Constitution's prohibition against double jeopardy and to the requirements of due process of law which Daniel Webster defined as, "a law which hears before it condemns; which proceeds upon inquiry, and renders judgment only after trial."

As a result of cases where double jeopardy violations have been evident, Senator ERVIN has introduced legislation—S. 756—to broaden the protection against double jeopardy, so that no serviceman would be administratively discharged under less than honorable conditions, if the grounds for the administrative action are based upon misconduct for which the serviceman has been tried previously by court-martial and acquitted.

Further, this bill would prohibit the military from administratively separating a serviceman on findings or recommendations made during a previous administrative proceeding when the issue is substantially the same issue that was before the previous board.

During the subcommittee hearings, it was often pointed out that no authority exists for compelling witnesses to appear before field boards or before an officer conducting a pretrial investigation under article 32 of the UCMJ.

As a result, the vital constitutional right expressed in the sixth amendment to confront your accuser and compulsory process are vitiated. Moreover, and most important, it is highly conceivable that many field boards and investigating officers fail to reach the same conclusions—of guilt or innocence—that they would have reached had they been able to obtain the personal testimony of witnesses or other critical evidence.

Accordingly, Senator ERVIN introduced a bill—S. 760—which would authorize field boards, discharge review boards, correction boards and investigating officers, appointed under article 32, to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence deemed necessary to a fair trial or board proceeding.

As you know, in Federal courts, a criminal trial is presided over by a judge who rules on matters of law. Similarly, under the UCMJ, a law officer presides over general courts-martial.

In a special court-martial, however, there is no provision for a law officer to preside, even though this tribunal can impose the sentence of a bad conduct discharge. Accordingly, many members of the armed services have been given a BCD without the legal guidance and protections that would have been available in the civilian trial for the accused.

To avert this situation, Senator ERVIN introduced a bill—S. 752—which authorizes the appointment of a law officer to any special court-martial with authority to issue a bad-conduct discharge. The protections of this bill, however, would be suspended in time of war. Based on the analogy of the waiver of trial by jury authorized in the Federal court system, the accused, under this bill, may waive trial by members of a court-martial and be tried before the law officer alone.

As you know, an administrative proceeding often results in the issuance of an undesirable discharge, which imposes a serious stigma upon the person who receives it. Yet, in administrative proceedings, no law officer is available to rule on important matters of law. To remedy this defect, Senator ERVIN has introduced a bill—S. 754—which would require the presence of a legal officer, except in time of war, at administrative tribunals convened to separate a serviceman under less than honorable conditions. This legal adviser would have the same qualifications as a law officer in a general court-martial proceeding.

Through these two bills, the guarantee of due process will be made far more meaningful to our armed service personnel in both court-martial proceedings and field board proceedings.

The sixth amendment to the Constitution guarantees the right to counsel in criminal proceedings. This is the fundamental right which applies to all Federal district courts. Since the Gideon case, this right has been fully extended to the State court system. And although an accused in a general court-martial must be furnished a qualified lawyer to represent him, he may nevertheless be given a BCD by a special court-martial, without having been provided the assistance of legally trained counsel. Similarly, an enlisted man may be discharged as an undesirable without having had legally trained counsel to represent him.

Because of the serious stigma which the BCD or the undesirable discharge imposes upon the individual, it is the subcommittee's position that every serviceman should have the assistance of a qualified legal counsel in any proceeding which may result in a discharge under other than honorable conditions. Senator ERVIN has, therefore, introduced a bill—S. 750—which requires the assistance of legally trained counsel in any proceeding which might result in a discharge under other than honorable conditions.

The right to competent legally trained counsel would, of course, be a nullity if the tribunal before which the accused is tried is not impartial. The whole thrust of the sixth amendment to the Constitution is to foster an impartial and fair trial. To some extent, this goal of impartiality has been incorporated into the UCMJ. For instance, article 37 of the UCMJ prohibits unlawful influence on members of a court-martial. Despite this safeguard, however, the subcommittee has been presented with many complaints alleging the continued existence in command influence. Moreover, the Court of Military Appeals, by a 2-to-1 vote, has sanctioned pretrial instructions by commanding officers to members of courts-martial or military boards.

Because command influence can easily undermine the ends of justice and thereby bring serious damage to the career of military personnel, Senator ERVIN has introduced a bill—S. 749—which would extend the existing protections against command influence both in courts-martial and administrative proceedings. This proposal would expressly bar the consideration or evaluation of the performance of military personnel when acting as members of a military tribunal, court-martial or administrative proceeding, or when acting as counsel.

This last aspect of this measure is exceedingly important if the right to counsel is not to be made a mere fiction. Clearly, if there is any undisputed maxim in law, it is that a lawyer should not be barred from defending his client with all the proper skill and zeal at his disposal. Otherwise, the entire adversary concept of justice is reduced to a staged, but predetermined, formality.

A cognate consideration to the prohibition of the sixth amendment against impartial trials, is fairness and impartiality in the appeal processes under article 66 of the UCMJ.

During the subcommittee hearings many witnesses testified to instances of impartiality in the boards of review. The most obvious was the practice of the chairman of the three-member board being able to prepare the efficiency or fitness reports on the two junior members of the board. Since these reports influence future promotions and assignments of the board member, it is argued with much persuasion that this practice inhibits the junior members of the review boards from making the necessary unbiased, independent decisions in cases before them. Certainly, if the sixth amendment and the concept of due process are to be honored, we must make every effort to insulate the processes of deliberation in appeal cases from command considerations or other factors that are not germane to reaching a decision of guilt or innocence.

Accordingly, Senator ERVIN has introduced a measure—S. 755—to specifically prohibit the chairman of the review board from preparing any fitness reports or otherwise rating the junior members of the board. And, although this practice has been prohibited by regulation in the Army, we feel that this protection should be enacted into positive law.

An important consideration in the concept of due process is a speedy trial. When the parties to a civil dispute reach court, the focus of the proceedings has been narrowed to the critical issues and many irrelevances have been put aside. In the civil courts many time-consuming practices have been disposed of before a jury is impaneled. For instance, motions to suppress evidence or a plea of guilty may be received.

In contrast to the civil system, stands a general court-martial proceeding. Here, the law officer lacks authority to conduct pretrial proceedings. Thus, all the members of the court must be assembled before any proceedings can be conducted. In consequence, the court members often must sit idly by while many matters are disposed of by the law officer which, in the civil system, are disposed of prior to trial.

The necessity of assembling a panel of officers may often delay the trial and dilute the accused's right to a speedy trial. From the point of the military, too, once a panel is assembled, the law officer is reluctant to grant many continuances—however justifiable the grounds—and reconvene court at a later time. Thus, both the accused and the military organization suffer under the present system; it is neither consistent with due process nor efficiency.

To remedy this defect, Senator ERVIN has introduced a bill—S. 757—to authorize pretrial conferences in general courts-martial cases.

Considerations of due process are deeply involved with another measure introduced by Senator ERVIN—S. 758—which is designed to preserve to servicemen the right to trial by court-martial.

This measure developed out of many serious dissatisfactions expressed about the practice in some of the services of denying a serviceman a trial by court-martial and, instead, separating the serviceman with an undesirable discharge. Since an undesirable discharge carries a considerable stigma, affects the serviceman's eligibility for veteran's benefits, and seriously undermines his employment opportunities, every effort should be taken to see that such a discharge is not used to circumvent the rights and protections available to a citizen under the Constitution.

Of course, in cases where the defendant serviceman does not deny his culpability with the offense charged, then there may well be no need to provide the serviceman with a court-martial and its attendant protections. However, when the accused has denied, and continues to deny, his guilt and specifically requests a court-martial, it seems unfair for the military to deny him the court-martial. To do so is to presume the guilt—rather than the innocence—of the accused and to compound this fallacious, and perhaps unconstitutional presumption, by imposing the stigma of an undesirable discharge on the accused.

Of course, a qualified right to a court-martial does not mean that the military cannot separate persons from the service who are not brought to trial. Instead, the alleged offender could be separated under honorable conditions.

In this connection, it is worth reciting a typical response on the part of some of the military officials when confronted with a suggestion that the accused be provided a court-martial. Often, they have stated—in all seriousness—that "they wouldn't convene a court-martial proceeding precisely because they would not be able to convict the accused." To then conclude that they have a right to impose a punitive undesirable discharge merely because the accused won't have the protections of the Constitution and can be easily convicted stretches my sense of justice to the breaking point. Indeed, this is not the spirit or practice of criminal justice in America.

A subcommittee bill which most reflects an effort to insure due process of law to our servicemen is S. 759—which abolishes the summary court-martial. In the summary court-martial the judge—jury—the prosecuting attorney—and the defense counsel are one man. Having to combine the duties of these various offices is a difficult task, and it is understandable why on occasions he does not necessarily shine in his role as defense counsel. In fact, many argue that this combination of conflicting duties, required of a single officer in a summary court-martial proceeding, by itself, constitutes a violation of due process.

Further, the review of summary court-martial proceedings is rather limited in scope inasmuch as there is no requirement that the trial record contain a summary of the testimony.

The representation provided the subcommittee gives strong support for the need to abolish the summary court-martial. As you know, the summary court-martial is used primarily to try minor offenses and thus corresponds to the police court or recorder's court. This fact, when viewed in conjunction with the recent expansion of nonjudicial punishment authorized under article 15 of the Uniform Code, strongly indicates that it is unnecessary to retain the summary court-martial proceeding.

Therefore, by abolishing the summary court-martial, this bill will not only better protect the constitutional rights of our servicemen, but also bring military judicial proceedings more into harmony with nonjudicial procedures.

Another series of two bills concerns jurisdictional questions—namely, the proper tribunal to try discharged servicemen for offenses committed in the service and the proper tribunal to try civilians accompanying the military. I might add that Senator ERVIN has indicated that he is not wedded to the language of these two measures; he introduced them with the view of filling two vacuums in the law.

Prior to the enactment of the UCMJ, no American forum existed to try offenses against military law by servicemen who were discharged before charges could be brought against them. As a result, World War II produced several incidents where former servicemen who had allegedly committed serious crimes were immune from trial because they had been discharged and were no longer subject to trial by court-martial or subject to trial in an American civil court.

Congress closed this jurisdictional gap by enacting article 3 of the Code which provides that the termination of military status would not preclude trial by court-martial of persons accused of offenses perpetrated during military service. However, in *Toth* v. *Quarles*, 350 U.S. 11 (1955) the Supreme Court held that provision of the Code unconstitutional. Consequently, courts-martial still lack jurisdiction to try servicemen for predischarge offenses, and such persons may be tried only in foreign courts which often do not provide all of the procedural safeguards guaranteed by our Constitution.

The Supreme Court did not say in *Toth* v. *Quarles*, however, that persons like Toth could not be tried by Federal civil courts. Therefore, Senator ERVIN introduced a bill—S. 761—which grants jurisdiction to Federal district courts to try ex-servicemen for predischarge crimes who would not otherwise be subject to trial for the offense in an American court. In this way, the jurisdictional gap can be closed, and trial will take place in an American tribunal with all of the traditional constitutional safeguards.

Another jurisdictional gap exists with respect to civilian employees and military dependents who commit crimes while accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States.

These persons were not amenable to trial by court-martial and in most cases, were not subject to trial by American civil courts since, generally speaking, Federal criminal statutes do not extend extra-territorially.

To provide a tribunal for these two classes of offenders, article 2(11) of the Code provided jurisdiction over all persons serving with, employed by, or accompanying the Armed Forces outside the continental limits of the United States.

This coverage, too, was invalidated by the Supreme Court, with the result that, in most cases, there is now no American court—military or civil—with jurisdiction to try crimes allegedly committed by American civilian employees or dependents overseas.

Because of the relationship of the conduct of civilian employees and dependents to the maintenance of discipline and morale in the armed services, it is important to provide some forum to try such persons. Since the forum cannot be a court-martial, and should not be a foreign court which might not provide adequate procedural safeguards, the Federal district courts appear to be the proper forum. Accordingly, Senator ERVIN introduced a bill—S. 762—which grants jurisdiction to the Federal district courts with respect to serious crimes committed overseas by civilian dependents and employees. The usual venue provisions apply, and, generally speaking, the bill would make civilian employees or dependents punishable only for acts that would be punished under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Four of the subcommittee bills relate to appellate review of decisions and sentences of courts-martial and administration board proceedings.

Under article 66 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, boards of review examine the records of trial by courts-martial in serious cases. In addition to reviewing the legality of the conviction, these boards have the power, which the Court of Military Appeals does not have, to weigh the evidence and to evaluate the sentence imposed. In many instances, claims of deprivation of constitutional rights must stand or fall on the basis of factual determinations made by these boards.

The subcommittee's hearings revealed that the role of these boards in protecting the constitutional rights of servicemen, and insuring a fair and impartial appellate review of convictions, could be better fulfilled if some changes were made in the structure and designation of the boards. For example, while the Army and Air Force boards use only military officers, the Navy boards use both naval officers and civilian employees of the Navy Department.

In this connection, Senator Ervin has introduced a bill—S. 748—which provides that each three-judge panel of any board shall include a civilian. To assure that board members have an opportunity to develop some degree of expertise, this bill also requires officers be appointed to a board for a minimum 3-year term, and be eligible for reappointment.

Congress established the boards for the correction of military records to provide a remedy for servicemen who have been deprived of their constitutional rights by reason of actions taken by military authorities.

To promote a more unified approach, Senator Ervin has introduced a bill—S. 797—which discontinues the practice of having separate part-time boards for each service and establishes a single correction board for the military departments, the members of which board would have no other duties. The unified correction board, will have the authority to make binding determinations that records be corrected or to recommend action to the Secretary of the appropriate military department.

At present, the jurisdiction of the Court of Military Appeals extends only to cases tried by court-martial. However, this court would seem qualified in terms of experience to review legal issues that arise in administrative discharges or other administrative proceedings affecting the rights or status of members of the Armed Forces. As you know, many of the cases brought before an administrative board are cases that are fully cognizable under the UCMJ.

Further, there is need to provide a single forum to review legal issues arising in connection with applications to the discharge review boards and the correction boards, and in that connection, to protect the constitutional rights of the serviceman.

Accordingly, Senator Ervin has introduced a bill—S. 753—that amends article 67 of the Uniform Code. This measure extends the jurisdiction of the Court of Military Appeals to legal issues in matters before the discharge review boards or the correction boards. The review by the court is solely on matters of law and does not embrace review of factual issues.

Rounding out the legislative package before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights are three additional measures, which, since time is running short, I shall only briefly sketch.

First, to bring the time limits in which to petition for a new trial under the military system of justice into conformity with the practice of the Federal district courts, Senator Ervin has introduced a bill—S. 751—which would extend the time period for which the accused to petition for a new trial from 1 year to 2 years.

Second, Senator Ervin has introduced a measure—S. 746—to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps as a staff corps of the Navy. The creation of a separate JAG Corps for the Navy will make it easier to recruit and retain qualified lawyers and, thereby, improve the quality of the legal services available for the Navy and its personnel.

Third, Senator Ervin has introduced a measure—S. 745—to provide statutory basis for the present highly acclaimed field judiciary system which is designed to enhance the independency, impartiality, and efficiency of the military law offices.

The rights of our military personnel were aptly characterized some time ago by President Johnson, when he stated that as a nation we must make every effort to improve the status of our military service men and women and to make of them "first-class citizens in every respect."

This laudable goal carries with it far more than improved pay—far more than improved retirement policies—and far more than improved housing or other benefits. Basic to any concept of first-class citizenship is the need to insure that a person is accorded all of the rights, privileges, and immunities guaranteed a citizen under the Constitution.

The very vitality of our Nation depends upon providing every citizen his rights under the Constitution. Yet, many thousands of our citizens are denied its protections—ironically, the same citizens who must daily face dangers and death to protect our Constitution. True, we have made significant achievements in improving the quality of military justice. These achievements have a hollow, dissonant ring when we realize how often, and how unnecessarily our military personnel are denied the full protection of the Constitution. The needs of your military personnel should neither be forgotten nor ignored. It is therefore up to all of us—military and nonmilitary persons alike—to see to it that the progress of man in each century benefits all men. In a democracy we can expect no more than the equal protection and opportunity for all our citizens—in a democracy we must demand no less.

Thank you.

SENATOR TYDINGS ON TRAFFIC SAFETY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, we are making some progress in the war against the carnage on our highways. The introduction of some safety devices as standard equipment of the 1966 model cars is encouraging. But there is certainly no reason to rest on anyone's laurels.

We must all remember that this year automobile accidents will cost about $10 billion—the equivalent of more than $200 for every U.S. family or more than $50 for every man, woman, and child.

These are staggering statistics, shocking in their own way—but reflecting only the monetary loss to our society. The costs in flesh and blood are intolerable.

Just recently the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] delivered a thoughtful address on the problems of traffic safety at the 10th annual Highway Day program in Wilmington, Del. His analysis of the problem and his recommendations for constructive action deserve the attention of everyone concerned with this tragic situation. I commend my distinguished colleague for the contributions he is making to the cause of highway safety, and I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks Prepared for Delivery by Senator Tydings at the 10th Annual Highway Day Program, Hotel Dupont, Wilmington, Del.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am very grateful for the opportunity to be here with you tonight.

I am especially pleased to be in Delaware, for we are more than neighbors. We are good friends, with much in common. My own ties with your State run from coordinating the late President Kennedy's general election campaign here in 1960, to vacationing at Rehoboth Beach. I hope that the spirit of cooperation which has marked the excellent relations between your State and mine will continue far into the future.

One recent example of such cooperation is the linkage of the Maryland and Delaware portions of the John F. Kennedy Memorial Expressway. This road, whose opening allowed for continuous high-speed driving on limited access roads from Richmond through the Middle Atlantic States to New England, is one major cooperative achievement of which we are rightfully proud.

This road is an excellent symbol of the tremendous importance which we place on the automobile. If an archeologist in the 23d century were to unearth our civilization, he would surely conclude that the car was more important to 20th-century American than the horse and the buffalo were to the American Indian, or the camel to the Arab. He would find that we had devoted untold billions of dollars to the construction of endless ribbons of concrete, to the manufacture of ornate and glistening machines, and to massive parking facilities.

Perhaps, in some archive, he would unearth the startling fact that there is one car for every three people in this country: All America can ride in the front seat. Our mythical archeologist might well discover that when we traveled to work, we often took our car instead of a bus or subway—even though the car was often more expensive, slower, and in many cases, less convenient. Our archeologist would be shocked to find that often we drive to the mailbox or the corner store, perhaps one or two blocks away.

Last year, Americans drove over 800 billion miles or more than 4,000 miles for every man, woman and child. The mobility, freedom and independence which the automobile affords is of inestimable economic, social and psychic value. I campaigned for nearly an entire year, almost entirely by car, so I appreciate the value of good roads and highways.

But before we congratulate ourselves too heartily, let us remember that the cost of 800 billion miles of motor vehicle travel was paid not only in the price of roads and cars and gasoline, but in human lives.

Last year, more than 47,700 Americans died in auto accidents. Yes, 47,700 souls, twice as many people as live in Annapolis, Md., and nearly half the population of Wilmington. In addition to the 47,700 dead, over 3 million people—almost as many as live in the entire State of Maryland—were injured, and an estimated $8 billion in economic losses were sustained.

By and large these deaths and injuries passed unnoticed. Every once in a while we are conscious of a particularly serious accident or the gory figures of a holiday death toll. But for the most part we consider automobile accidents to be as inevitable as death and taxes.

We all decry the riots in Watts—where 35 people were killed. But who raised his voice in protest when 900 Americans were killed in auto accidents during the week of rioting in Los Angeles?

Every death of an American boy in the Vietnam conflict makes headlines all over the country. In over 4½ years of American involvement in Vietnam, 655 Americans have been killed. But in that same period, over 200,000 Americans died in auto accidents, most of them unnoticed save by a few safety-conscious officials and the bereaved families of the victims.

We are all conscious of plane crashes. The papers splash headlines about "40 killed," or "80 killed," or perhaps, "120 killed," and the Federal Government promptly sends a team of examiners. But last year nearly 50 times more people were killed in this country in car accidents as in plane accidents, and death in cars occurred 81 times more often than in trains.

The auto is, in fact, the greatest killer in this country of people aged 5 to 29. It is the fourth greatest killer of all Americans—behind only heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

Have we become so hardened to this destruction of life, limb, and property that we are not morally outraged? Are we going to hide and say "it can't happen to me," when in the next decade one out of every five of us will be injured in an auto accident, when one out of every three cars will be involved in an injury-producing accident? Have we become so callous that we can accept 50,000 highway deaths each year as inevitable?

I say "no." We must end this carnage. We have the ability to do it. The brains which can produce the technology to take men to the moon and to the bottom of the seas, to move us from continent to continent in hours and from city to city in minutes, must surely be able to help us end vehicular suicide.

We have the ability substantially to reduce highway deaths, but so far we seem to lack the will. The sad fact is that virtually all of us have failed to respond to the slaughter on our highways.

Many States have failed to meet their responsibility for traffic safety. Safe roads and modern motor vehicle laws are still the exception and not the rule.

The automotive industry has, to a large extent, also failed. How else could 7.9 percent of all tires checked by the National Safety Council in 1962, have been defective? Why else would the Congress have found it necessary to instruct the General Services Administration to set minimum safety standards for the 60,000 cars to be purchased by the Federal Government next year?

These shortcomings are directly traceable to the basic, underlying fact that the American public has abdicated its responsibility. How else can we explain the fact that cars with unnecessary horsepower sell better than cars with safety features? How else can we explain the fact that 5 million Americans appear in traffic court each year?

I do not suggest that nothing has been done about auto safety. Some of our States have made remarkable strides to reduce highway accidents. Many private organizations and individuals have worked untiringly to strengthen our safety laws and to generate public concern. More and more political leaders are speaking out on this issue. Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF of Connecticut and Senator GAYLORD NELSON of Wisconsin have been articulate and forthright in focusing attention on the need for traffic safety legislation.

I am proud of the safety record of my own State of Maryland. Last year, we together with one other State, received an award from the National Safety Council. Maryland has the fifth lowest death rate per 100 million miles. We were the first State to adopt, in its entirety, the vehicle equipment safety compact. We are actively considering large-scale revision of our State motor vehicle laws.

But even the relatively good record of States like Maryland is too little and too late to meet the basic problem. The fact is that motor vehicle safety is, in significant part, an interstate problem. No single State can prescribe mandatory safety standards for the manufacture of automobiles or tires. No single State can standardize our traffic laws and signals. No single State can keep from its highways dangerous vehicles and drivers who are duly licensed in some other State.

It is time we recognized highway safety as a national problem, requiring a national commitment of leadership and funds.

Is it not ironic that the Federal Government spends hundreds of millions each year to support basic research into the causes of cancer, stroke and other diseases, but less than $6 million on highway safety programs?

Is it not ironic that we regulate the interstate shipment of oleomargarine, flammable fabrics and lipstick, but have virtually no Federal controls over the Nation's fourth greatest killer—the automobile?

There can be no doubt that the Federal Government has a useful and legitimate role to play in highway and auto safety. For well over half a century we have regulated railroads, and established stringent Federal safety standards to protect lives of railroad crews and the traveling public. Today, the pilot of every plane, whether commercial or private, must have a Federal license, his plane must meet Federal standards of safety, and he must obey Federal safety rules.

Why should we meticulously regulate trains, trucks, and planes, but virtually ignore the mode of transportation that kills many more people each year?

We regulate an uncountable number of items sold in interstate commerce so that the consumer will not be overcharged, misled, or defrauded. We have pure food and drug law to protect the public from dangerous products. But we ignore the automobile.

Just last week, the Senate passed legislation to make our highways more beautiful. Is that more important than making them safe?

I find the lack of action particularly disturbing because experts and students of highway safety have recognized the need for action for many years. Forty years ago, Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover established the first National Conference on Street and Highway Safety. That conference's recommendations formed the backbone of the 10-point program which the President's Committee for Traffic Safety adopted in 1954.

But to date, Federal activity in the field of highway safety has been largely advisory and hortatory. While some progress has been made, it is for us to begin taking effective, regulatory steps to end the carnage on our roads.

There are five principal areas in which action is warranted.

1. Minimum standards for tires: Recent hearings have indicated that automobile manufacturers have equipped new cars with tires that are not adequate to carry a full load safely. A B. F. Goodrich representative explained how tires are chosen for new-car equipment. "For example," he said, "with a six-passenger sedan the weight of three passengers is added to curb weight of the vehicle to determine the load that is to be used for the selection of tires."

Is it unreasonable for the consumer to expect, when he buys a six-passenger sedan with a large trunk, that he can carry six-passengers and luggage without jeopardizing his life.

In addition, there are no uniform, intelligible standards of size or quality to guide someone who is buying replacement tires. A 7.50 by 14 tire may be larger than an 8.00 by 14 tire. The president of the Rubber Manufacturers Association testified: "The tire size is molded on the product as a nominal designation for purposes of easy identification by the customer. It is not intended to precisely define the physical dimensions of the tire or the wheel on which it is mounted."

The chief spokesman for the tire retailers association felt compelled to call the tire specifications, recently promulgated by the tire manufacturer's association, "inadequate to prevent the marketing of automobile tires and truck tires of undersized outside diameter, low quality, and questionable safety * * *."

I think the time has come to prescribe Federal minimum tire safety standards and to back them up with legislation that will prohibit the interstate shipment of any tire that does not meet these standards. Senator NELSON has introduced such a bill, which is now under active study by the Commerce Committee.

2. Minimum standards for automobile construction: Under congressional direction, the General Services Administration has established minimum safety standards for newly purchased Government cars. But the Federal Government buys only two-thirds of 1 percent of all cars sold in a given year. Its cars, safe as they may be, are vastly outnumbered by other cars which do not contain these safety features.

I see no reason why we should permit private automobile manufacturers to set safety standards any more than we allow private drug companies to set their own testing standards. Automobile safety is a matter of grave national policy. Just as war is too important a matter to leave to professional soldiers, auto safety standards are too important to be left to the sole discretion of the car manufacturers.

Earlier this year when the president of General Motors testified before Senator RIBICOFF's subcommittee, he could not answer Senator ROBERT KENNEDY's question: "How much do you spend on safety research?" The clear implication is very little.

Safety experts have recognized for years that the steering column is the most lethal device inside a car. Why is it that auto engineers can figure out how to build a steering column that will swivel in the interests of comfort, but cannot design a column that will telescope in the interests of safety?

Why is it that General Motors equips 170,000 Cadillacs with a dual braking system, but cannot provide this safety feature on 2¼ million Chevrolets? When asked why this was so, a General Motors spokesman told Senator RIBICOFF's subcommittee that it was "a matter of engineering opinion" whether dual brakes were a useful safety feature. It seems to me that if dual brakes are good for a Cadillac they should be good for a Chevrolet.

I believe we must take prompt and effective steps to build automobiles which are as safe as human ingenuity can reasonably make them. Senator NELSON has introduced two bills, both of which deserve support. The first would require all cars shipped in interstate commerce to meet the General Services Administration safety standards. The second would provide funds for research and development to design and build a prototype car in which safety, not style or horsepower, was the principal consideration.

3. Minimum highway standards: Our Interstate Highway System has done a remarkable job in reducing highway deaths. In 1964, the death toll for all auto traffic was 5.9 deaths per 100 million vehicle miles. On Federal Interstate roads the rate was less than half—2.6 deaths per million passenger miles.

Not all roads can be limited access, divided highways, but much more can and should be done on existing secondary, feeder and local roads to eliminate narrow lanes, sharp curves, and unsafe intersections. The Federal Government can take a leading role in this area by establishing minimum safety standards for all new road construction, whether or not financed with Federal funds, and by expanding and accelerating the spot improvement program, which now helps the States to finance needed changes and alterations in the existing Federal highway system.

In addition, we should extend the spot improvement program to State and local roads which are not part of the Federal highway system. It is on these roads that the great majority of highway deaths occur and where the need for corrective action is most urgent.

4. Uniform driver qualification, automobile inspection and motor vehicle regulations: Our States have been particularly deficient in not requiring realistic standards for driver qualification and automobile inspection. In my own State, any vehicle, no

matter how old and how unsafe, can roam the highways year after year, threatening the lives and property of every citizen. Also in my State, once having obtained a driver's license, a person can have that license renewed, without further examination, even though he may have advanced in years to the point that his failing eyesight or reflexes make him a potential killer of every passing motorist or pedestrian.

We must recognize that cars and human beings can wear out, that periodic inspection and testing of the driver and his vehicle are just as essential to public health as periodic inspections of slum housing or regular overhauls of airplane engines. Senator RIBICOFF has introduced a bill which would provide incentive grants to the States for motor vehicle inspection and for driver education and training programs.

We must also recognize the need for more uniform motor vehicle regulations. Some accidents are caused because out-of-State motorists, unfamiliar with local laws or traffic customs, fail to obey an unclear traffic signal or misconstrue an ambiguous road sign. As Senator RIBICOFF said in Congress this year, "If baseball rules changed each time a team entered a different stadium—if the bases were further apart or home plate were closer to the pitcher's mound—the players would be unable to function properly. Drivers are no different. But the rules they must follow as they move about the country change from one State to another."

We are truly a nation on wheels. I find it difficult to see how we can continue to have 50 different sets of laws governing the operation of motor vehicles.

Interstate compacts are one answer to this problem. I hope that needed uniformity can be created by the States themselves and not imposed upon them.

5. Expanded research into traffic safety: While we know a great deal more about traffic safety than we now put into practice, there is also a great deal more to be learned. We need more information about how accidents are caused and how they can be prevented. We need to know how competent a driver should be, and how that competence can be effectively tested. We need a great deal more research on how to make our roads and vehicles safe. Senator RIBICOFF's bill to which I refered earlier would provide Federal funds to the States for expanded research programs in all phases of traffic safety.

While I have stressed tonight the role of the Federal Government, I do not believe that the problems of traffic safety are exclusively or even primarily a Federal responsibility. Federal action is justified only where State and local action is inherently incapable of coping with the problem—such as requiring manufacturers to meet certain standards—or where a significant number of States have demonstrably failed to meet their responsibilities. In all other areas, the States can and should play the predominant role.

The field of motor vehicle safety is so vast, and the problems so challenging that there should be no jurisdictional bickering between the State and Federal Governments. Each should do what it is most capable of doing.

Together, we face the gravest challenge of all: That of arousing the conscience of America to the slaughter on our highways. Together we must educate the public so that it will demand, and not just tolerate, effective programs on the local, State, and Federal levels to eliminate this most unnecessary form of mass suicide.

HISTORY OF PROGRESS OF MILITARY MEDICINE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the fine dedicatory address by Lt. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton, Surgeon General of the U.S. Army, at the dedication of the Reynolds Army Hospital, Fort Sill, Okla. General Heaton's address traces the history of the progress of military medicine, as he dedicated this most modern of military medical facilities.

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. LEONARD D. HEATON, THE SURGEON GENERAL, U.S. ARMY, AT THE DEDICATION OF REYNOLDS ARMY HOSPITAL, FORT SILL, OKLA., OCTOBER 7, 1965

It is an honor and personal pleasure for me to participate in the dedication of Reynolds Army Hospital. I am delighted that so many of General Reynolds' family could be with us this morning. We are so highly honored that Senator MONRONEY could take time from his busy schedule to be with us also. I want all of you good people here to know, as also the people of Oklahoma, that Senator MONRONEY was of immeasurable assistance to us in the successful authorization, funding and eventual construction of this magnificent hospital. We are, indeed, grateful, Senator MONRONEY. I also want to thank General Critz and his staff, Colonel Reed and his staff and the chief of engineers for the very important roles that they have played in this construction. To a physician, the dedication of a hospital is a solemn, pleasant, and in a certain sense, personally rewarding experience. He is ever conscious of the limitations that inadequate facilities and equipment place upon the full utilization of his skill and experience. This is particularly true in this day of marked technological advances. He is also fully aware of the importance of cheerful, comfortable surroundings to the recovery of his patient, and is as concerned about the patient's physical environment as he is of the medicine he prescribes. I am sure that the nurse, the technician and everyone directly concerned with patient care experiences similar personal satisfaction in the dedication of a hospital. For we all know that the medical team depends not only upon the individual expertness and motivation of its members, and upon proper organization and leadership, but to be fully successful the team must be supported by facilities and equipment commensurate with its professional abilities. In short, we all know that modern medicine can be practiced adequately only in modern facilities.

The rapid expansion of World War II dictated the construction of temporary hospital facilities which were the best that could be made available under existing conditions, but leave much to be desired in terms of the modern practice of medicine, particularly in their current dilapidated condition. In most respects we have done remarkably well in recovering from the effects of World War II. We have reestablished our programs and rebuilt our professional staffs to a point where, in all modesty, we can state that the professional care of patients in Army hospitals is second to none in the world, military or civilian. The weakest link in our medical care armament at present is the status of our hospital facilities. Twenty years after the end of World War II we continue to practice medicine in hospitals built to meet a temporary situation, built under severe materiel limitations, and obviously lacking in the advantages offered by recent progress in the technology and concept of hospital construction.

My predecessors in office embarked on an ambitious program to replace these outworn facilities. Too much credit cannot be accorded them. I have done my utmost to carry on and will continue to do so in the days remaining to me. I am certain that my successors in office will continue in our efforts toward this replacement program to the end, and we may be able to say that all Army hospital facilities are the most modern design with the most modern equipment.

Fort Sill is one of the oldest and most venerable posts of the U.S. Army. Part of the hospital being replaced today dates back to 1870. Sherman, Custer, Lawton—and Geronimo—are no mere names here. First as a cavalry post and then as the home of artillery this fort and its illustrious men have played vital roles in the defense of our country and in meeting our military commitments, and the Army Medical Service has been part and parcel of this effort every step of the way.

It is particularly appropriate here and now, as we dedicate this magnificent medical facility and take leave of our old friend which has served us so nobly for almost a century, that we reflect for a moment on the contributions of the past and the promises of the future. Primitive as some of the facilities, some of the equipment, some of the procedures in the original hospital might seem to us now, the significant fact is—and history clearly tells us this—that from its inception it has provided the troops on this post the best medical service that could be made available at the time. This hospital, in conjunction with other Army hospitals, has always been at the forefront of medical knowledge and medical progress, constantly seeking and implementing newer and better ways to serve the men and women entrusted to its care.

A comparison of the old with the new is as startling in similarities as in contrasts. Then, as now, the mission of the Army medical service was to maintain the health of the Army and conserve its fighting strength. Effective manpower was the indispensable element of military operations in 1870 and remains so today. Then, as now, our concern was with the individual soldier, not only as a member of a fighting force but as a human being and as a citizen of a free society, one born with unalienable rights to health and happiness. Then, as now, the practice of military medicine was a total effort, a team effort, a melding of people, facilities, and equipment for the benefit of the patient.

The hospital we are dedicating today is quite different from the one that was dedicated here almost a hundred years ago—but not in its aims, nor in its spirit. While the mission, the dedication to patient, the singleness of purpose remain basically unchanged, its capabilities and effectiveness have grown very appreciably. The great advances in medical knowledge and techniques perforce place increased reliance on facilities and equipment. The modern doctor needs the modern laboratory and the modern surgical suite to be fully effective, and the patient needs air conditioning, the intercom, and even improved lighting for full and rapid recovery. I had a preview of the hospital and can assure you that it not only meets all of the requirements of a highly trained and demanding staff but has been built with an equal eye to the comforts and potential demands of the patient and even his visiting family.

It is this progress in our medical facilities, together with parallel advances in medical knowledge, in the Army and throughout the Nation, that brought about the phenomenal gains in health of the soldier and his family over the last hundred years. The figures are startling. In 1870, the admission rate to hospital and quarters for Army personnel was 2,069 per thousand per year, 1,777 for disease and 292 for injury. The corresponding admission rate today is 271 for disease and injury combined. To put it in more familiar terms, the American soldier in 1870 was confined to hospital or quarters, on the average, twice a year; today, he can expect to be hospitalized only once in every 4 years, and even then for a much shorter duration of time. Perhaps even more important is that his chances for recovery have been markedly improved. The death rate for Army personnel has been reduced from 17.3 per thousand per year, a 90-percent reduction in this literally vital factor. Life expectancy rates are available only from the beginning of the century. When the hospital on this post was 30 years old, the life expectancy of American citizens at birth was 47 years; today it is 70 years, an increase of 50 percent, an add-on of half a life. We are humbly grateful for this progress and proud of the contribution that the Army medical service, on this post and throughout the Army, has made to better health of our soldiers, their dependents, and all our citizens.

As for the future: As long as we remain a free Nation—and God grant this be forever—our mission and our concern for the citizen soldier will not change. Our efforts to improve health and eliminate disease and injury will not cease. Our devotion to patient will not slacken. Our progress, our capabilities, our effectiveness will be increased—of that I am sure, this ultramodern hospital and its sophisticated equipment will become obsolete much more quickly than the old hospital—at least, I hope so. The surge in professional and technical advancement of this age promises accelerated progress in medical knowledge and practice, and we intend to keep up with the times and to push them along whenever we can. These are our expectations and our commitments for the future.

To inspire and guide us in this never-ending fight for better health for the American soldier and his family, we are dedicating this hospital in the name of Maj. Gen. Charles Ransom Reynolds, the Surgeon General of the U.S. Army from June 1935 to June 1939. By this act we honor a medical officer of great stature, extremely lofty ideals, extraordinary professional and executive ability and unfailing devotion to the army medical service and its cause. I will cite his illustrious career, in detail, which should serve as a standard and inspiration for all who labor in this hospital in the coming years.

Charles Ransom Reynolds was born in Elmira, N.Y., July 28, 1877. He studied medicine at the University of Michigan and the University of Pennsylvania, receiving his M.D. degree from the latter in 1899. A military medical career was a natural choice for Dr. Reynolds. His brother, Col. Frederick P. Reynolds, Medical Corps, had already preceded him in service and another brother, Brig. Gen. Royal Reynolds, Medical Corps, was to follow him.

Dr. Reynolds entered the service on September 1, 1900, as a contract surgeon and soon after was commissioned into the Army. He began his military career in the Philippine Islands and for the first 13 years alternated between oversea assignments and the Washington, D.C. area. In 1901 Lieutenant Reynolds took an active part in two engagements with insurgent natives on Leyte. In 1906 Captain Reynolds earned the Silver Star for gallantry under fire in action against the Moros at Mount Dajo. In the Washington, D.C. area he served at Fort Washington and Washington barracks, and was instructor at the Army Medical School. He also helped develop the organization for Walter Reed General Hospital and was its first adjutant. On December 26, 1910 Major Reynolds was married to Miss Jane Boyd Hurd and established their permanent home in the Capital City.

In August 1913 Major Reynolds became commanding officer and the chief of surgical service at the base hospital, Fort Sam Houston, Tex. In June 1915 he again went overseas, this time to Hawaii, to serve first as chief of surgical service and later as assistant post surgeon.

When the United States entered World War I, Lieutenant Colonel Reynolds was ordered home. For 3 months he instructed medical officers at Fort Riley, Kans. In August 1917 he became surgeon of the 77th Division of the National Army and was advanced to the rank of colonel shortly thereafter. Following stateside training for 7 months the unit moved to France where it eventually participated in the Oise-Aisne operation.

On August 14, 1918 Colonel Reynolds was assigned as surgeon of the VI Corps. Less than 2 months later he was transferred to Toule, headquarters of the newly created 2d Army, to become chief surgeon. He was the only medical officer in World War I to be so honored in quick succession with these increasingly responsible positions. In these assignments he was with troops which sustained heavy casualties in the Meuse-Argonne operations. He won the Distinguished Service Medal for his outstanding performance of difficult tasks and for his contributions to the evacuation of the sick and wounded. After the 2d Army was disbanded in April 1919 Colonel Reynolds went to Bordeaux to supervise the medical examination of returning troops and the closing of numerous hospitals in that area.

Upon his return to this country, Colonel Reynolds undertook the duties of Chief of Personnel in the Office of the Surgeon General, becoming a close and esteemed friend of Surgeon General Merritte W. Ireland. He served as executive officer to General Ireland for the final 11 months of this tour.

In July 1923 Colonel Reynolds became commandant of the Medical Field Service School, Carlisle Barracks, Pa., and remained at this post for a total of 8 years. I attended the school as a young officer and can personally testify to his inspiring leadership. My great respect and esteem for him throughout the ensuing years has never waned. From September 1931 to June 1935 Colonel Reynolds was surgeon, Second Corps Area, Governors Island.

His appointment as the Surgeon General, U.S. Army, in June 1935 surprised no one. In the 4 years that he served in this position the Medical Department of the Army took many gigantic steps forward—organizationally, administratively, and professionally. He left us a legacy for which we shall always stand in his debt.

Following his retirement in 1939 General Reynolds became a member of the Pennsylvania Health Department and in 1944 he was appointed director of graduate training in surgery at the American College of Surgeons in Chicago. On December 2, 1961, Maj. Gen. Charles Ransom Reynolds died at Walter Reed General Hospital in Washington, D.C.

General Reynolds received many honors and awards in his distinguished career. In addition to the Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star, and other awards bestowed upon him by his own Government, he received three major awards from the French Government. General Reynolds was a fellow of the American College of Surgeons, the American College of Physicians, and the Association of Military Surgeons of the United States; honorary fellow of the International College of Surgeons and the International College of Dentists; president of the International Congress of Military Medicine and Pharmacy; honorary member of the Academy of Medicine of Washington, D.C., the Association of Military Surgeons of Mexico, and the Society of German Army Medical Officers. He was a member of the Nu Sigma Nu and Alpha Omega Alpha medical fraternities. General Reynolds was the author of numerous articles whose wide range was a reflection of the scope of his interests and proficiency.

The personal and professional qualities of the man and his outstanding achievements have been recognized in his lifetime not only through awards and responsible assignments but in the love and esteem of his colleagues and associates. The dedication of this hospital further perpetuates his memory and his record. But the greatest tribute, the greatest monument to Maj. Gen. Charles Ransom Reynolds is still to be established in the record of this hospital and its staff, serving the men and women on this post and the community of which it is a part. Let us pray that the record at all times be worthy of the name.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL VANDERVORT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it has come to my knowledge, as it has to the knowledge of many of my colleagues, that Colonel Vandervort, who has been one of the legislative liaison men for the U.S. Army, is soon to retire, in fact on October 28.

I have had occasion to have many dealings with him with respect to military matters, the rights of dependents, the rights of men in the military forces over the years, and I wish to take this moment to pay to him my personal tribute, and hope that he will find in his retirement full satisfaction throughout his future years. I am very appreciative, as I am sure all of my colleagues are, for the great help he has been to all of us during this time.

TRIBUTE TO LEONARD KAHAKUNUI FONG

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, with a sad and heavy heart, I rise to call attention to the passing of Leonard Kahakunui Fong, who died in his 65th year in Honolulu on October 14 after a brief illness.

He was the elder brother, political mentor, and close colleague of HIRAM L. FONG, senior Senator from our 50th State.

During my most recent visit to that lovely State, on the occasion of the Lincoln Day celebrations in 1964, I came to know Leonard Fong and to respect and appreciate him deeply. He was as warm, delightful, generous, and kind as the spirit of Hawaii. At the same time he was as American as the Fourth of July, possessed of an abiding faith in the future and the durability of the United States of America.

He was a greatly inspiring person to be with and a giant figure among his contemporaries in the Hawaiian community. A man of vast innate capabilities and great intelligence, he was above all a complete politician in its finest meanings. It has been said of him that if there had been no such thing as politics when he came along, he might have invented it himself.

Leonard always had a friendly handshake, a kind word or a greeting for everyone he met. It was well known that it took him at least three times as long as anyone else in Honolulu to negotiate a city block, because he loved to stop and chat with folks along the way.

He was a person of broad cosmopolitan outlook, particularly appropriate for the multiracial, culturally heterogeneous society of his Hawaii. Although he was an American of Chinese descent, he was thoroughly steeped in Polynesian lore and spoke the Hawaiian language. In fact, he even claimed to be of mixed Chinese-Hawaiian ancestry—though he freely confessed this was limited to a pint of blood given him in transfusion when he was critically ill as an infant.

He was a man of deep religious convictions, who practiced the preachments of his Christian faith, loved his fellow man, and was loved in return. No one who came to him for help was turned away empty-handed. Like the Good Samaritan, he crossed many streets to do good and to do justice.

Leonard was born in the Kalihi section of Honolulu on March 17, 1900, and attended Kalihi-waena School, a public school. He later attended a private Roman Catholic high school, St. Louis College, but he left school in his junior year to go to work and help support his family.

This, however, proved no obstacle. His native talents, his perseverance and hard work carried him to success in his vocation and success in politics. It was a mark of his ability and intellectual capacity that he grew in stature with each higher responsibility.

Ever seeking knowledge and learning, he returned to school 45 years later and earned his high school diploma. In May 1963, he was graduated from the Oahu Community School for Adults. At the commencement exercises he was quoted as saying, "My hardest subject was science. Now that I've got my diploma, I'm going to frame it and put it in my office." And he did.

After he had earned his high school diploma at the Community School for Adults, his alma mater, St. Louis, awarded him an honorary high school diploma.

Leonard did not formally attend college, but he took a number of accounting and law courses by mail and became an expert accountant.

He once explained that he became an accountant because he had six toes on his right foot, so he could count 21 while others had to stop at 20. "They used to call me 'Six Toes' when I was playing barefoot football," he once said.

As chief accountant and statistician of the Territory of Hawaii Auditing Department between 1924 and 1934, he helped prepare territorial budgets and install the accounting system in the territorial auditor's office.

Before that he was chief bookkeeper for the U.S. Naval Station at Pearl Harbor and accountant and cashier at the Laie Plantation on Oahu.

He said at one time that "Auditing and accounting are my vocation and avocation, especially governmental finance and accounts."

During the 1930's, Leonard set up business on South King Street, one of Honolulu's main streets, as auditor, consulting accountant, tax consultant and notary public. In 1938, he ran unsuccessfully as a Republican for city-county auditor against the incumbent, Edwin P. Murray. The mayor of Honolulu, Charles Crane, appointed him to the job on November 2, 1940, when Murray left to accept another post, and a few days later, Leonard won the office in his own right in the territorial general election.

The office of auditor, now an appointive position, was an elective office in those days. Leonard won reelection to that office seven times consecutively. Twice he was unopposed.

Leonard's career as city-county auditor, watchdog of millions of dollars in receipts and expenditures, was often a stormy one.

He refused on several occasions to pay salary increases voted by the city council. In his most celebrated case, he refused for many years to pay $79,000 claimed by a contractor, James W. Glover.

The Glover case is merely one of the more colorful incidents in the turbulent career of Leonard Fong, but it illustrates well Leonard's tenacity in fighting for what he believed was right.

"I believe in my case innately," he was quoted as saying at one point in the long dispute, "and I'm willing to sacrifice my whole political career if necessary."

He was, indeed, a firm and articulate apostle of his convictions.

In January 1961, Leonard was appointed Honolulu branch manager of the Small Business Administration, a post he held for a year. Upon his leaving that position, his superiors praised his performance in aiding small businessmen in the State.

Leonard retired from public office in 1962 to become assistant to the president of Finance Factors, Ltd., a family of companies headed by the Senator from Hawaii. He was a director of Finance Factors, Ltd., Finance Realty Co., Ltd., Finance Investment Co., Ltd., Grand Life Insurance Co., Ltd., and Ocean View Cemetery, Ltd.

He had also served as president of the Hawaii Chinese Civic Association, president of the Jack Sin Tong Association, president of the Toong Heung Oui and president of the Ocean View Cemetery.

Among the many honors he received during his lifetime, Leonard was named, only last month, Model Father of the Year by the Honolulu Chinese Community. And indeed he was a model father, who, together with a faithful wife, the former Frances Chang, raised and educated two delightful children. These children have now taken places of responsibility and leadership in Honolulu—Dr. Bernard W. D. Fong, one of the State's outstanding internists; and Mrs. Allan H. W. Young (Lenore), wife of a prominent Honolulu physician.

In recent months, Leonard retired from active participation in the companies' businesses, but he did not entirely leave the public scene. Nearly every day he could be seen driving down to Waikiki, as he explained, "to be with the boys who come from every walk of life." An old friend of Leonard's recently said of him, "He always made a business of getting around."

"Getting around" was Leonard's trademark in politics where his Kalihi background and robust personality stood him in good stead.

With his white suit, panama hat ringed with a feather lei, and his big cigar, he seemed to be in political conversations everywhere at once, and all the time.

Always regarded as a perceptive political figure, Leonard has played key roles in each of his younger brother's election campaigns, and he is widely credited with having played a major part in the Hawaii Senator's historic victory in the U.S. senatorial race last year—when Republican HIRAM FONG compiled a 53 percent margin as against 46 percent for his closest opponent, while Democratic President Lyndon B. Johnson was sweeping the State by a landslide.

He was a one-man Gallup poll and more than once was suspected as the source of some devastatingly effective political rumor. Newspapermen found him an invaluable news source, because he seemed to know everything about everybody.

He was, above all, a thoroughly ubiquitous and peripatetic individual, and these were two aspects of his strengths.

They were central in an epoch of Hawaiian politics when the emphasis was on individualism. Personality meant far more than party. Without being able to rely on a TV tube, politicians got out to meet the voters the year-round, but even more rigorously at campaign time. And voters came out to meet the candidates at one of four, five, or six rallies going on each night for most of September and October. Each rally drew several hundred people.

The rallies would be in different parts of the city, and the long roster of contending candidates would shuttle from park to park, staggering their appearances so that everywhere something was going on. Each in turn, the speakers would climb onto the back of a truck or a platform to receive a lei, watch a hula or listen to a Hawaiian tune in their honor, and then boom out strong words over bunting and incandescent bulbs for a few minutes.

The candidate who was waiting to speak or who had just finished, moved often with his retainers, through the crowd passing out his cards and literature. It was grassroots politics at its very best.

Leonard was a master at it. From the platform he would scorch his opponents with burning words. It was, after all, what the crowd had come to hear. But off the platform almost every man was a friend—even the man who might be next in line for the roasting or who had just received the last.

The campaign was rigorous, but no man could come through it and not know his constituents, their wishes and their ideas.

The new politics of today is more impersonal, better organized, probably more effective, and no doubt better suited to a faster paced, more tightly knit world. But the politics that Leonard knew was much more fun, as he liked to point out himself.

If it is true that Leonard Fong's political genre has been pretty well swept from the Hawaii political scene, it is also true that the political legacy of Leonard Kahakunui Fong is strong and all-pervasive, an indelible imprint in the life of the islands. His creative influence will be felt in Hawaiian politics long after his departure.

I know also, even as I mourn his passing, that his spirit and his life lives on in the lives of those who knew and loved him.

I take comfort, too, in the words of the Gospel of St. John:

> For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

And so, one last farewell, one final aloha to Leonard, who so nobly personified the spirit of Hawaii and whose untimely passing has left a profound void, both in his native State and in the Nation.

My wife and I convey to his beloved wife Frances, his daughter Leonore, his son Bernard, his brother HIRAM and to other members of his family our personal condolence.

We hope they may derive some solace from the knowledge of the universal esteem and affection we all hold for him.

MIGRATORY FARM LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have asked for time today to provide a reasoned and accurate analysis of the Nation's changing farm labor situation.

In particular, I want to cover what has transpired in America in the 10 months since the termination of Public Law 78, the so-called bracero law.

Since early this year, the public and the Congress have been supplied with a steady diet of misinformation concerning various aspects of the Nation's agricultural affairs.

Over and over, we have heard and read reports about the unwillingness of unemployed Americans to perform farmwork, the poor condition of crops, and the adverse effects of field labor on consumer prices of fresh fruits and vegetables.

It is most essential, I believe, that we clarify the farm labor record before this session adjourns.

As I see it, the basic issue is not whether we will continue to permit the mass importation of foreign seasonal agricultural workers. Congress settled that issue by allowing Public Law 78 to expire last December 31.

The basic question is simply whether or not this great nation's agricultural industry is to take its place with other American industries as a responsible and respected employer and as a full member of our economic society.

FARM WAGES HAVE LAGGED BEHIND NATIONAL AVERAGE

I will not take up your time with a detailed review of the history of farm labor in America. It is enough to note that seasonal harvest work has traditionally been held in low esteem and such jobs are taken by our citizens only when nothing else has been available.

There has been good reason for the reluctance of American workers to take seasonal farm jobs.

Statistics show that in 1964 most wage earners who performed agricultural work obtained an average of only 100 days of employment and earned an average of $698. This represents a daily wage of $6.98—only slightly more than the average hourly wage of some skilled tradesmen in this country and certainly well below the minimum poverty level.

To make matters worse, the gap between agricultural and nonagricultural earnings has widened during the post-World War II period. Between 1946 and 1962, hourly wages in agriculture increased only 56 percent, while they jumped 93 percent in retail trade, 96 percent in manufacturing, and 115 percent in contract construction.

On the other hand, in the last 40 years, agricultural productivity of each farmworker has increased 500 percent. One American farmworker feeds more than 2½ times the number of people he did 20 years ago. The increased productivity of U.S. industry has been outstripped by farming by 2½ times. Despite these advances, migrant farmworkers are, in fact, worse off, relative to workers in other industries, than they were when John Steinbeck wrote "Grapes of Wrath."

The existence of a program providing Government-guaranteed imported labor for agricultural employers has played a major part in depressing the wages and conditions of farm employment in this country.

Happily, that system has passed on and this year we have witnessed a historic start toward placing agriculture in line with other industries with respect to employment.

EMPLOYMENT OF AMERICAN FARMWORKERS HAS INCREASED

I now wish to review the substantial progress that has been forged this year on the farm labor front and then move on to what lies ahead.

On September 1, 1964, there were 92,800 foreign nationals working on American farms under terms of Public Laws 78 and 414. On this date in 1965, only 15,700 foreign workers—77,000 fewer than a year ago—had agricultural jobs in this country.

Throughout most of 1965 there has been an impressive rise in domestic employment and a sharp decline in foreign employment compared with the previous year.

On August 15, for example, domestic seasonal farm employment was 86,200 greater than the same time in 1964. It rose from 1,050,200 in 1964 to 1,136,400 this year. That is a lot more Americans at work.

FARM WAGES HAVE INCREASED

Certainly, one of the most encouraging aspects of this has been that improved wages and working conditions in 1965 made taxpayers out of many jobless persons who had been living on welfare.

Furthermore, the farm wages and general working conditions have improved in 1965 as a result of the termination of Public Law 78.

During the second quarter of 1965, the U.S. average hourly farm wage rate was $1.17 which represents an increase of 16 percent over the third quarter of 1964.

Because of the improved wages and the fact that American farm employment was up substantially this year, it is estimated that some $50 million will stay in the country instead of leaving it.

There is no question, that American farmworkers have enjoyed better job opportunities this year than during the 14-year history of the "bracero" program.

At the same time, American growers have enjoyed an excellent year despite anguished cries that labor shortages have triggered crop losses and caused produce prices to skyrocket.

ALL FOREIGN WORKERS AUTHORIZED HAVE NOT BEEN UTILIZED

The fact of the matter is that there never were any severe labor shortages on the farm front this year. In fact, employers in many instances failed to utilize all the foreign workers which had been certified. There are some examples of cases across the Nation: In New England, as of September 24, only 691 of the authorized 1,075 foreign apple pickers were on the job; in Maine, only 3,794 of the 4,500 foreign workers certified for potatoes were hired; and in California, 18,400 foreign workers were certified for the cannery tomato harvest but only 16,751 were used.

Staff members of the Migratory Labor Subcommittee have visited apple orchards in West Virginia and New Hampshire. They have reported that despite stories in the press, growers interviewed report no crop losses due to a lack of farm labor. In fact, according to an article appearing in the October 2, 1965, Packer, the newspaper of growers, shippers, receivers, distributors and retailers, the 1965 Virginia apple crop is 5 percent above that of last year at 10,300,000 bushels. This is a far cry from a national disaster.

I now ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIRGINIA CROP IS 5 PERCENT ABOVE LAST YEAR

RICHMOND, VA.—Apple production in commercial counties of Virginia was estimated at 10,300,000 bushels, based on September 1 conditions. This was unchanged from the forecast of a month earlier and is 5 percent above the 9,800,000 bushels produced in 1964.

Rainfall during August was below normal for most of the State, according to the Virginia Crop Reporting Service. Moisture supplies as of September 1 in the valley southward from Staunton and into the southwestern part of the State were adequate in most localities. Prospects for apples in this area continue exceptionally good. The situation in the valley from Staunton northward into the important Winchester area continued unusually dry, except for a few widely scattered local showers through the first 3 weeks of August. Sizing was slowed during this period but a weather front August 25 brought moderate to heavy showers over most of the area and southward in the valley. This was timely and helpful but more rain was needed for the crop to reach expected production. Color was slow to develop due to hot weather until the cool front of August 28. Temperatures since have favored coloring of fruit.

Spot picking of Red Delicious began in the Roanoke and southern Piedmont area in late August. In the lower valley and Rappahannock-Madison areas some light picking started around September 1. In the Frederick-Clarke Counties area light harvest of Red Delicious was expected about September 10 with starts becoming general the week of September 13. Harvest starts for Jonathan were expected to be earlier than normal and in some cases preceding Red Delicious. Grimes Golden was expected to start along with or just preceding Jonathan. Some Golden Delicious were expected in southern areas about September 13–15 with harvest in the valley and north expected to begin about September 20 to 25.

FOOD PRICES HAVE NOT RISEN

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in 1965, those crops which formerly used foreign field labor were, on the whole, priced lower at wholesale than during the corresponding periods of 1964.

This reveals, quite convincingly, that first, field labor exerts minimal impact on prices of farm products and, second, farm production has been high in 1965.

Throughout the year, most agricultural commodities have shown normal week-to-week price fluctuation, indicating that weather, disease, and market factors play a far greater role in determining prices than does the cost or quality of field labor.

In August, the average wholesale prices of fresh and dried vegetables showed a 14.2-percent decline over the same month in 1964. This represented the lowest average price level for August in the past 3 years. In addition, the average wholesale prices of canned fruits and vegetables were lower in August 1965 than at the same time a year ago due to abundant supplies from this year's crops.

It is significant to note that, during the week of October 11 of this year, the wholesale prices of five commodities that formerly used nondomestic labor were lower than at the same time in 1964 and only three products were priced higher. This has been the story for much of 1965.

On October 11, delicious apples, grapes, California oranges, lemons and snapbeans, all previous users of foreign labor, registered lower prices than the year before. Here's how the prices of these items differed over the year: delicious apples, 4 cents cheaper per wholesale unit; grapes, $1.11 cheaper; oranges, $1.67 cheaper; lemons, 54 cents cheaper, and snapbeans, $1.30 cheaper.

Interestingly, the prices of grapes were at a 5-year low, oranges at a 4-year low and snapbeans at a 3-year low.

This is not to say that the prices of some crops have not risen in some places at some times in 1965. The point is, I think, that neither the increased cost of field labor nor the lack of labor has been responsible for these rises. A well-coordinated barrage of propaganda in various parts of the Nation has erronously blamed an inadequate labor supply for price rises and other farm woes.

Often, the lies and distortions and misrepresentations of the facts have not been clarified and, as a consequence, the truth was held back from the Nation's housewives.

When the price of lettuce this year jumped in Eastern grocery stores to nearly 50 cents a head, 20 cents above normal, there were widespread cries that higher labor prices and a labor shortage caused the rise. This couldn't have been further from the truth. The basic reason for this quick jump in price was a temporary shortage of lettuce prompted by poor weather conditions in various regions. Any discerning observer could see this when lettuce prices dropped back to normal in a couple of weeks.

It was implied that the above-normal rise for a head of lettuce was pocketed by the higher-paid pickers. This, too, couldn't have been further from the fact. Field laborers earned this spring between 1 cent and 1½ cents for each head of lettuce they picked. The cost of increasing farm wages was equal, roughly, to 1 cent per unit for most commodities.

Furthermore, it should be pointed out that most of the higher consumer prices for produce in 1965 resulted from increased processing costs or factors other than those on the farm.

FARM INCOME UP

Let us turn to farm income for a moment. Although there were protests from coast to coast that growers would lose their shirts this year, the record shows that they had a pretty decent year.

.According to the September 24 Wall Street Journal, the annual net farm income for 1965 was estimated at $14.6 billion, a 13-year high. This is a fat 21 percent ahead of last year when Public Law 78 was in effect and foreign workers were in great use throughout the country.

This is again positive proof that crops are not rotting in the fields.

I now ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM PROFITS IN 1965 HEAD FOR 13-YEAR HIGH AFTER BIG DROP IN 1964—GOOD WEATHER PUSHES CROP PRODUCTION TOWARD RECORD; CATTLE AND HOG PRICES RISE—BUT RAIN COULD ALTER OUTLOOK

(By James P. Gannon)

WATSEKA, ILL.—Thanks largely to a phenomenal run of good luck, the Nation's farmers this year are finally drawing down their full share of prosperity.

Not since the war-inflated days of 1952 has the farm community enjoyed the profits it is reaping this year. With livestock prices running far ahead of 1964 and with growing weather the finest in years, net farm income in the second quarter shot up to an annual rate of $14.6 billion, a fat 21 percent ahead of the year earlier period. As a result, midsummer Government predictions that farm income this year would climb to $13.5 billion are being unofficially revised upward. Now one Government economist puts the total at closer to $14 billion, a 13-year high.

Harvesting of some major crops isn't finished yet, however, and a spell of bad weather could change the sunny outlook. Recent rains, for instance, have already disrupted harvest of the record soybean crop and corn and soybean prospects would suffer if the rains kept up. At present, though, forecasters are holding to their estimates of record output for the two crops.

This year's performance marks a sharp contrast to the farm picture last year when net income slid 8 percent to $12.1 billion. As a result, the highly industrialized American economy zipped through a third year of expansion while farm profits slumped to their 1960 level.

A BIG REVERSAL

The turnaround can be traced largely to a dramatic change in weather. Last year crop production withered away in the face of a summer-long drought and livestock prices skidded to the lowest levels in more than 5 years partly because parched pastures forced farmers to market cattle prematurely.

But this year—in the words of a Decorah, Iowa, farmer—"The horses are all pulling in the right direction." The weather, except for the dry northeast, has been all but perfect and crop output is heading for a record. Livestock prices also have bounced back to a 7-year high. On top of these cheerful developments, Government farm-program payments are showing a smart gain.

All around this eastern Illinois farm center—from the 10-foot-tall corn and thick soybeans on the countryside to the smiles of merchants in busy stores along Walnut Street—the signs of better times are unmistakable. They point to a rebound that has dollars-and-cents significance in many regions and in many segments of the economy. U.S. farmers spend some $30 billion yearly to keep their farms producing and another $12 billion on home and family expenses. And like their urban counterparts, the more money they make the more they usually spend. "The farmer has plenty of wants and when he has the money he satisfies them," says American Farm Bureau Economist W. E. Hamilton.

ALREADY SPENDING MORE

That farmers are already spending more freely is shown by a pickup in sales of farm machinery. Retail sales were slow this spring, partly because of bad weather and partly because of last year's profit drop. But they since have accelerated. Deere & Co. reports "exceptionally high" retail sales since midyear, outpacing its 6 percent factory-sales gain. International Harvester Co. also says current sales are brisk, with corn and soybean harvester sales up more than 10 percent and cotton pickers up 18 percent. Altogether, industry sales this year are running about 5 percent ahead of the 1964 pace.

Manufacturers confidently expect the sales pickup to extend well into next year. "We're looking for a good 1966," comments Morris Reid, marketing vice president of J. I. Case Co., who figures industry sales in 1966 will rise "up to 10 percent" from 1965. Oliver Corp., a White Motor Co. subsidiary, says it is budgeting a 12 percent sales gain. Other makers look for increases ranging from 3 to 10 percent.

Part of the optimism stems from an expanded Federal farm program which seems almost sure to go in effect next year. An omnibus farm plan calling for higher wheat-grower returns and a new farmland retirement scheme offering payments for nonproduction as well as extension of the basic price-support features of the current program is making its way through Congress. It's almost assured of passage, possibly within the next week or two.

IMPACT ALREADY BEING FELT

Meantime, though, the farm picture is brightening on its own and the impact is being felt most by the hundreds of small farm towns like Watseka. To appreciate what the new prosperity means to them, drive 85 miles south of Chicago on State Highway 1, a concrete swath through the $500-an-acre fields of Iroquois County. Just outside the city limits of Watseka (pop. 5,200), a long line of shiny, orange Allis-Chalmers tractors parked by the highway calls attention to the McCullough Implement Co.

Inside, ruddy-cheeked Levi McCullough flicks a long cigar ash onto the plain cement floor of his spartan office and smiles cheerfully in telling what's happened to farm equipment sales lately. "Things began to open up about the first of August and have been going good since," he says. Sales now are running ahead of the 1964 pace "and we've got more prospects looking at machinery than we've had in a long time," he adds.

A half-mile down the highway at Voigt-O'Brien Motor Sales, R. H. "Riney" Voigt tells how farmers are snapping up his last 1965 Fords, Mercurys and Lincolns. "Sales have picked up tremendously in the last few weeks," says fast-talking Mr. Voigt. "We sold 23 cars in August, compared with 15 last year." He says "there seems to be more money around. Just this morning a farmer ordered a fancy air-conditioned Mercury. I was sure it would be a long-financing deal but it was cash in the bucket."

The "downtown" merchants in the aging, two-story buildings along Walnut Street, are no less optimistic. Donald Davis, manager of the Sears, Roebuck & Co. catalog store, talks of a "notable increase in sales of big-ticket items such as washers and ranges and TV sets" since spring. One block away in the Gambles store, crew-cut Larry Davis is optimistic. "It looks like we'll have a good fall," says the store manager.

In the modern headquarters of the 3-year-old Watseka First National Bank, J. Gordon Bicket, a high school agriculture teacher turned banker, predicts that "farmers will cut down on their loans this year due to our good crops."

As Mr. Bicket suggests, the farmer's financial ledger is taking on a healthier look. Economist Roby Sloan of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago says savings deposits at rural banks in the Seventh Federal Reserve District (Iowa and parts of Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Michigan) are rising at a slightly faster rate this year than in 1964, and at midyear stood 14 percent above a year earlier. The amount of outstanding short-term farm loans in some areas, notably Iowa, is declining, Mr. Sloan notes. "Bankers can probably expect a high level of loan payoffs this fall," he comments.

Perhaps the most important reason for this year's farm gains is the spectacular rise in the prices of cattle and hogs, the Nation's two most important farm commodities.

Hog prices this year are averaging the highest since 1958. Top-quality hogs sell at $23.75 a hundred pounds in Chicago, up from $18 a year ago. The corn-hog ratio, a rough measure of the profitability of raising pigs, stood at 20.2 to 1 in mid-August, up from 14.6 to 1 a year earlier. That means 100 pounds of pork-on-the-hoof was worth about 20 bushels of corn, against 14 bushels a year ago. Farm economists figure an efficient producer needs a ratio of 12 to 1 to break even.

Cattle prices have shown strength nearly all year, too. Choice steers currently bring a top price of $29.25 a hundred pounds in Chicago, up $2 from a year ago.

A study by the Agriculture Department shows what the higher prices have meant to the profits of cattle feeders. Steers bought last fall at average prices and then fattened and sold this spring, when prices were higher, netted the feeder an average profit of $55.71 per head, according to the study. In contrast, a farmer following the same practice a year earlier would have suffered an average loss of $13.32 a head.

The crop picture is equally bright. The Government predicts production of all crops this year will hit a record 117 percent of the 1957–59 average, up from 109 percent in 1964. Corn Belt farmers are just beginning their largest harvest ever. The corn crop, projected at a record 4.1 billion bushels, is expected to be 17 percent larger than last year's, and the soybean harvest is estimated at a record 866 million bushels, 24 percent bigger. Most of the 5 percent larger wheat crop has already been gathered, and harvesting of a 35 percent larger grain sorghum crop is in full swing.

Cotton production this year is expected to reach last year's 15.1 million bales, despite removal of 428,000 acres from production. A 1-cent drop in cotton prices supports this year has been partly offset by higher payments for diverting these acres from production.

Uncle Sam is another force behind the farm income upswing. Direct Government payments to farmers in 1965 will be nearly 10 percent higher than last year's $2,169 million, the Agriculture Department says.

In general, the big crop production gains this year reflect an extraordinary weather turnabout. Important farming regions this year have had enough rain to rebuild depleted soil moisture reserves as well as provide good growing conditions.

Even in the drought-prone Plains States, rain has been abundant. Ray Doll, farm economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, remarks: "For the first time in the 15 years I've been with the bank, we have no major drought area in our district." The district includes all of Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado and Wyoming, and parts of Oklahoma, Missouri, and New Mexico.

Mr. Doll sees a bonus for landowning farmers in this year's income rebound. "This will tend to accelerate the increase in farmland values," he figures. Nationally, the average value of farm real estate rose to $146 an acre in the year ended March 1, up from $137 a year earlier.

As always, not all farmers are participating in the upturn. Drought continues to plague dairymen and others in the parched Northeast, flooding this spring washed out crops of some lowland farmers in the Mississippi Valley, and last week's Hurricane Betsy destroyed uncounted amounts of sugarcane, cotton, soybeans, and other crops in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Arkansas.

CALIFORNIA TOMATO GROWERS HAD GOOD YEAR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a high-placed spokesman for the California Tomato Growers Association said in a recent newspaper interview that "we had a pretty fair year, despite our screaming."

The association's representative stated that California growers would probably produce a tomato harvest approaching last year's record crop. He indicated that growers "will never again ask for braceros."

Yet, when California tomato growers in 1965 planted 27,000 fewer acres than last year's 143,000, this reduction was blamed on anticipated labor problems. This was a glowing distortion.

The honest to goodness truth is that the decision to plant fewer acres had been made before termination of the bracero law because the supply and demand of tomatoes and tomato products showed that acreage should be cut. Consequently, the manager of the California Tomato Growers Association, in his annual report to association members on February 10, 1965, said, in part:

> It is our considered opinion that the present indicators of supply and demand reflect that the acreage for 1965 should be cut approximately 25 percent, and that California should expect to harvest and market processed tomatoes from somewhere between 105,000 to 110,000 acres.

This is again a far cry from the predictions made by the prophets of doom and despair who throughout the year have predicted disaster for California's tomato crop.

FLORIDA PRODUCTION UP

In Florida, the predicted lack of labor did not materialize and production figures compared quite favorably with those of 1964.

In Florida, celery, for example, both acreage planted and the amount harvested were higher during the 1964–65 season than in 1963–64. Six million more crates of celery were harvested in 1964–65 than during the previous harvest season.

The State's citrus production figures look even better this year. In 1964–65, the Florida Growers Administrative Committee estimates that orange production at 86 million boxes, is up 28 million and grapefruit production, at 32 million boxes, is up 6 million over the previous year.

With planted acreage up 3,400 acres over 1964, the 1965 winter fresh tomatoes in Florida showed a rise of 3,200 in the number of acres harvested. Florida early spring fresh tomatoes this year showed more acres planted, 13,100 to 12,200, and more acres harvested, 12,900 to 12,000, than in the 1964 season.

The Fort Lauderdale, Fla., News, a paper which has constantly opposed the farm labor policy of Secretary of Labor Wirtz, recently published a series of four articles on the Florida farm labor situation which I am sure will be of great interest to all Members of this body. These articles were written by Howard Van Smith, a recognized authority on migrant farm labor problems. Mr. Smith, in addition to his other distinguished credentials has won a Pulitzer Prize for his accurate reporting on this subject.

Mr. Smith in his articles completely demolished the myth that crops have rotted in Florida due to the policies of Secretary of Labor Wirtz. He also refutes the argument that this year's farm labor policies have financially damaged the Florida farmer.

Mr. Smith, in his first article "Farmers Exaggerate Harvest Woes," claims:

> Despite cries of protest, Florida farmers are better off than they pretend to be in obtaining migrant labor to harvest their winter crops.
>
> This conclusion is based on a searching survey, completed today by the News (Fort Lauderdale), to study growers' protests.
>
> The result is that the hue and cry of grower interests is pure propaganda. It is also politically motivated on the part of politicians on the State and National level.
>
> It is, in conclusion, a premediated distortion.

Mr. Smith continues by stating that Secretary of Labor Wirtz is really attempting to protect Americans by providing them with gainful employment. He states:

> Secretary Wirtz has no intention of seeing crops left to rot where the grower has made an effort to use Americans (the term he prefers to "domestics") and cannot obtain them in sufficient numbers to harvest or where Americans do not possess the skill, usually muscular durability.

> The Wirtz viewpoint—agreed with by many responsible American farmers and growers—is that this labor market should not be flooded with foreigners who cause such a glut that wages are continuously kept extremely low.
>
> The crop of the honest farmer will not rot.
>
> The old slogan of "Buy American" has become "Employ American."

Mr. Smith goes on to state that the Fort Lauderdale News has completed a penetrating survey of all Florida-based claims that this winter Florida will undergo a catastrophic migrant shortage:

> This survey went from migrant to farmer to State official to national official, back and forth and back again.
>
> Conclusion: there is no plot on Wirtz' part to deprive Florida of its needed migrants.
>
> The politicians are said to be the real danger.

Mr. Smith quotes Fred Sikes, personnel director of the U.S. Sugar Corp., as stating:

> I have no fear of what Wirtz will do. We have made every effort to hire Americans and for this arduous work it has not worked out. We can say we've more than cooperated and therefore have no doubt the additional West Indians will come.

Mr. Smith concludes his articles by stating that in areas where adequate family housing has been provided such as in the Palm Beach area, there is no fear of a farm labor shortage. However, in areas where housing is poor and is limited to accommodation for single male workers it will be more difficult to recruit American farm laborers. He concludes by stating:

> There will undoubtedly be more stories next spring of crops gone to waste. This is part of the plan to discredit Wirtz. But every farmer knows unto himself that yearly a certain portion of all crops are left to rot in the field.

I now ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, Sept. 30, 1965]

FARMERS EXAGGERATE HARVEST WOES

(By Howard Van Smith)

Despite cries of protest, Florida farmers are better off than they pretend to be in obtaining migrant labor to harvest their winter's crops.

This conclusion is based on a searching survey, completed today by the News, to study growers' protests.

The result is that the hue and cry of grower interests is just propaganda. It is also politically motivated on the part of politicians on the State and national level.

It is, in conclusion, a premeditated distortion.

PROTECTION HIS AIM

On the other side, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, the culprit of the farmers, is trying to protect Americans. He is doing everything within his power to put unemployed Americans into gainful employment where he can do so rather than use foreign labor.

But he has no intention of seeing crops left to rot where the grower has made an effort to use Americans (the term he prefers to domestics) and cannot obtain them in sufficient numbers to harvest or where Americans do not possess the skill, usually muscular durability.

The Wirtz viewpoint—agreed with by many responsible American farmers and growers—is that this labor market should not be flooded with foreigners who cause such a glut that wages are continuously kept extremely low.

He does not look kindly on the stoop labor pay in vegetables of 60 and 70 cents an hour here even under a heralded guaranteed wage plan, inaugurated by the late Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, and, especially, that that rate, which is translated from piece work, in some midwestern States skids down to 40 cents hourly.

"The Department of Labor will continue to review the labor situation on a day-to-day basis, checking on progress of crops and recruitment efforts of the individual growers," Wirtz said.

Patrick Gannon, Department spokesman in Washington, further emphasized this edict:

"I've instructed the Bureau of Employment Security to continue the extensive recruitment program (of Americans in the southeastern States) now being conducted through the State agencies.

"AMERICANS FIRST

"It is vital that every effort be made to fill those jobs with unemployed Americans."

What does the Wirtz program—when reduced from these official words to the economic commonplace—mean as interpreted by his high echelon aids and responsible grower organizations?

It means those industries that make a full, determined effort to use Americans have nothing to fear. It means the farmer who sits back in his chair, holds America's 3 million member migrant harvesting force in contempt then suddenly shouts at harvest time that he needs help, from now on can go pick his own cabbage and not expect help.

This is the new philosophy. It is of high ethical standard, altruistic in meaning. Heretofore it has been shared by few farmers.

To these latter the migrant is truly the "excluded" American. By being held back on wages—the financial position—he remains uneducated generation unto generation, a self-perpetuating force of labor.

What does it mean to the economic picture of the State and to you and me?

First, agriculture with its allied industries is by far the largest industry in the State, so far ahead of tourism that the one-two comparison is misleading.

OVER $400 MILLION

The last figure of the retail value of Florida farm projects—4 years old—was $318.5 million. In projection, it is well past $400 million by now.

But this doesn't tell the picture as it affects the citizenry, except that the wealth of Florida is dependent upon it.

The retail value of all these crops does not disclose the number of migrants coming to Florida. This number last year was 85,000 workers. W. H. Anderson, manager of labor arrangements of the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, estimates an increase of 10,000 this year.

Add to these workers the family members and you get 250,000 to 300,000 people.

MONEY STAYS HERE

It is axiomatic that with the low pay the migrant and his family leave all the money they earn in the State in which they work—in Florida. This goes into the shops, stores, and groceries.

Business can get so bad in heavy migrant areas in summer that in Homestead a justice of the peace, Sylvester Adair, made a remark that still brings chuckles.

A merchants association was complaining about the forsaken look of Krome Avenue, Homestead's main and busiest street, in its summer stillness.

"What are you complaining about?" Adair said. "It looks like a scene out of 'Gunsmoke' to me."

DIFFERENT SITUATION

But—and this is not even part of Wirtz' argument—let us look at the foreign migrant. He comes in by international government contract and is assured so much work a week so that the term "underemployment" does not refer to him. His sanitation and food provisions at the labor camps are of a superior order.

And the money he makes goes back to the Bahamas and the British West Indies.

So we have reached the first financial impasse.

The second would be—should the breast-beating farmer be right and Wirtz wrong—the scarcity of winter vegetables would go straight to the housewife's pocketbook. That means her tomatoes, beans, corn, et cetera, would cost more.

This will not happen, Wirtz said.

HE'LL COOPERATE

He will hold off to the last to protect the American, but he will work with the American farmer who makes the effort to employ Americans and fails.

The crop of the honest farmer will not rot.

The old slogan of "Buy American" has become "Employ American."

This, says Wirtz, his aids, some State officials and even some growers, is humanitarianism at work. To the last, the determined Secretary of Labor will fight for his plan.

And a lot of farming people, who left things slip along so easily in the past, have found that this man does become fooled easily.

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, Oct. 1, 1965]

INTRADEPARTMENT CONFLICT IS THORN

(By Howard Van Smith)

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz has told Florida farmers they must make an honest, all-out effort to hire Americans rather than count on foreign labor this winter.

The farmers, politicians in Washington and Tallahassee and farm organizations have protested: "Cut off our foreign workers and Florida's No. 1 industry will be destroyed."

The News entered these troubled waters to conduct an exhaustive survey that reached from local sources to the highest in Washington, from the farmers' organizations to the so-called "supply States" which are the source of Wirtz' American labor.

SURPRISING DISCLOSURE

The result brought a sudden and surprising disclosure that has nothing to do with the uproar over foreign labor, yet threatens the entire program.

A formidable barrier has suddenly appeared in getting the workers here. Two parts of Wirtz' department are working against each other.

Bryan Page, Florida assistant chief of farm labor recruitment and one of the Nation's most knowledgeable men on the subject, has had a person-to-person encounter with this "fly in the ointment" while doing everything to aid the Wirtz antiforeign worker plan.

Here was all this argument about foreign labor, the plan to fill the hole—already showing a 25 to 40 percent increase according to Washington—but what about Public Law 582?

Page is a sagacious man. He put his finger on the real crux of the problem and held it there until all others concerned began noticing.

In Washington, William Gannon is in charge of the crew leader phase of Public Law 582 legislation that grew out of Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS' subcommittee on migratory labor. It became effective the first of this year.

BUS PROBLEMS

Gannon said his interest was in seeing that the crew leaders' buses were in proper shape. Also, that they held liability insurance on each worker carried in the buses.

As of July 2, he said, about 800 crew leaders had obtained the insurance, allowing them to cross State lines with their buses and pick up workers.

With so few crew leaders—there are more than 10,000 in the United States—meeting the insurance requirement, how are all these newly recruited workers to get to Florida?

From Washington, Wirtz sent word he was keenly aware of the problem. He has insurance experts working in the area. He is up against the fact that, at best, insurance companies don't like to insure migrants.

PROMISE MADE

Thus the fly spoiled—but not swatted—by Page. But with it is the Washington promise that, come what may, Florida will get its migrant harvesters.

Does this mean foreign labor filling a big gap? Washington isn't saying. It wants the chance to try to solve the insurance problem first.

The Wirtz plan is at the least controversial.

It has encountered opposition from Doyle Conner, Florida commissioner of agriculture, who has called it the "greatest disservice" and the "ruin" of this State's leading industry.

His words, in turn, have been echoed by Florida Senators Spessard Holland and George Smathers. They say Wirtz must be stopped and the man to do it is the President.

VISITED JOHNSON

An official visit by Holland to President Johnson was made last May 5. If anything ever came of it, except a few foreigners being allowed to remain a few weeks longer, no one knows anything about it.

Still concerned with the foreign labor problem, Wirtz visited the Lake Okeechobee area in April.

Wirtz said he was tired of what he called:

"Housing exploitation, or charging high rentals for miserably delapidated shacks.

"Exploitation of crews of workers by crew leaders, sometimes working in conjunction with the farmer.

"Discouragement of American (or domestic) labor for foreign labor in order to cause a glut and resultant low wages and work periods except for the foreigners who are protected in many ways by a country-to-country agreement."

RECRUITMENT HELPS

Adamantly, Wirtz said he would see that enough American workers, some taken from the ranks of the unemployed, would be obtained.

This is where Page comes in.

As assistant chief of Florida farm recruitment for the Florida State Employment Service, he is the right-hand man of Ralph Moss, the Florida chief.

It was Page and his boss who years ago started the program whereby "Atlantic Stream" workers who go north from here with the sun and harvests from the Carolinas to New York and the northern Midwest, are hired in advance by recruitment officials from these States who come to Florida en masse each April.

Last year Florida used 85,000 workers. According to W. H. Anderson, manager of labor arrangements of the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, this year we will need 5,000 to 10,000 more.

MANY CALL IT HOME

The 35,000 workers in the Atlantic Stream will return because they call Florida "home." The freewheelers—so-called because they do not operate through the State' cooperating agencies but on their own—will take up a lot more of the slack. Last year among the labor force there were 13,400 foreign workers.

Granted that the sugar cane industry has already proved to Wirtz that it has attempted to hire Americans, and has shown that they cannot perform the arduous work, this leaves a hole of 10,000 or so to fill.

Wirtz ordered a highly stepped-up recruitment campaign in the belt of 11 supply States running from Texas to the Carolinas.

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News and Sun-Sentinel, Oct. 2, 1965]

Moderates Seen Aid to State Agriculture

(by Howard Van Smith)

There are those who are busily purveying a self-exaggerated Florida migrant crisis. It makes good politics. Then there are those who work with Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz to see the State gets an adequate supply of harvesters this winter.

These are the moderates. They are the men who will save Florida agriculture.

Into this role, neatly and efficiently, fits the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, of Orlando, by far the largest farmers' representative group in the State.

The News has just completed a penetrating survey of all claims, Florida-based in origin, that this State this winter is going to undergo a catastrophic migrant harvester shortage.

WILL SUFFER

Because of this, it is said, Florida's foremost industry will suffer a horrible decline. All blame is cast on Wirtz.

This survey went from migrant to farmer to State official to national official, back and forth and back again.

Conclusion: there is no plot on Wirtz' part to deprive Florida of its needed migrants.

The politicians are said to be the real danger.

California's Senator George Murphy, recent Florida visitor on a misery-sharing trip, is probably the most outspoken of all because of Wirtz' crackdown on Mexican nationals (the braceros) who make mockery of wage levels because of their overwhelming swarm.

The money they make, incidentally, goes back to their staying here, the same as home country instead of with Florida's offshore labor.

If Florida suffers ills this winter—and no one can predict a yield in advance—from plethora to scarcity, and what it will do to the agricultural economy or number of migrants finally needed, then:

The type of farmer and growers' organization that speaks with the slow, careful, intelligent cadence is the one that will be heard by Wirtz.

"Look at it this way," said one of the highest members of his department, "we have to work with these people so the less said the better. Those scare statements are naturally on a political level. It's part of the game. You've got to accept it and live with it."

So if we listen to the calmer voices this is what we hear. Thusly from the FFVA: "We have been working closely with the Florida Industrial Commission's efforts to form a successful labor recruitment program.

"Crop estimates are being correlated with actual production figures from last year in an attempt to arrive at the number of workers needed this season.

"The FFVA's William Anderson, Jr., labor division manager, said that of the 13,600 foreign workers used here last year FFVA brought in about 8,000 through member growers.

"As soon as the official crop estimate is released by the FFVA October 11 its officials will be among those to sit down with State and Federal officials to estimate the labor outlook.

"Based on crop estimates from private industry sources and data from the Florida Industrial commission, the FFVA now estimates the labor shortage will total about 5,000 to 10,000 workers."

FAR DIFFERENT

The above is not an overwhelming figure. Nor is it one that cannot be overcome. It is far different from a 20-percent shortage erroneously attributed to Anderson by another publication.

But Anderson does add, hopefully and urgently: Let the Labor Department now act promptly to avoid any foreseen labor shortage.

William Allgood, of the Office of Employment Security, Atlanta, adds this note:

"There was a meeting at Atlanta yesterday of the sugar industry, with Fred Sikes and others meeting with Robert C. Goodwin, administrator of the bureau, and Frank A. (Todd) Potter, national administrator.

"They met to update each other about offshore labor needs for sugarcane."

Fred Sikes, personnel director of the gigantic U.S. Sugar Corp. at Clewiston, once that city's mayor, is another of the quiet voices. His job is to get foreign laborers into the 'cane fields. He now has a force of 500 West Indians in seeding operations. But by late October he will need many more at harvest's start.

He says: "I have no fear of what Wirtz will do. We have made every effort to hire Americans and for this arduous work it has not worked out. We can say we've more than cooperated and therefore have no doubt the additional West Indians will come."

But, like the first screaming winds of a hurricane, the fear generates. So another way to fill the gap is mechanical.

Most extraordinary—and yet so simple—is the new plastic ladder. Light, it has a chute down which oranges and other citrus can be sent into waiting boxes from three levels on the tree.

Robert Rumbley, also assistant chief of farm labor recruitment, a division of the Florida State Employment Service, says the new ladder may be the salvation but does not expect to see them in great use until next year.

"I think it will broaden the base of operations about 30 percent," he said.

He means that the objections to picking citrus have been objections to lugging heavy sacks up and down the ladders. Now, with this new method, he thinks even women migrants may be able to do the work.

Bryan Page, also an assistant chief but for the south Florida area, points to potatoes to show what mechanization can do.

A few years ago Dade County needed 1,500 to 1,600 migrants to "pick" potatoes from the ground and bag them. Now with the mechanical digger and picker in operation on nearly every farm the number is down to 350.

SPEND MONEY

The sugarcane and celery industries are spending money on research aimed toward cutting machines in the future.

Bean machines are appearing in the Pompano Beach area. First picking of high quality bush or ground beans is by hand, then on second picking a machine, destructive to the plant, takes over.

States like New York have so greatly reduced migrant needs by mechanical operations Florida officials had to add Michigan and Ohio to the April recruitment drive to provide labor for the Florida migrants working in the Northeast in the summer.

So the machine may in the future be the bigger threat to the migrant laborer than the lack of foreigners in the future to the farmer.

When it's known that a machine with an electric eye is being perfected to pick strawberries, then another cry goes up: "Look out, you horde of workers. Automation—not foreign labor—is taking your jobs away."

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News and Sun-Sentinel, Oct. 3, 1965]

WIRTZ PLAN ISN'T RUIN TO FARMS

(By Howard Van Smith)

Like all Gaul, Florida is divided into three parts in its production of farm products.

How these parts would make out should there be a migrant crisis is quite different.

To find these and other answers, the News conducted an intensive survey into charges by farmers, growers' organizations, and politicians that Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, by cracking down on foreign labor, is about to ruin the State's main industry.

The result of this survey is that this is not true. The answer to the Wirtz plan—the first revelation of his intentions toward Florida—appears at the end of this story.

AREAS DEFINED

But, first, it might be wise to turn our concern to south Florida. This gigantic district, the Nation's winter breadbasket, contains the big farming areas, of Dade, the "range line" starting in North Broward and running into Palm Beach County, the Lake Okeechobee country and Immokalee.

Another section, mid-Florida, is huge but the term "citrus" covers it. The State of Florida divides its deputy commissioners of farm recruitment from the Florida State Employment Service into these two areas.

The division into three is based on the big three of agricultural output regardless of section—citrus, vegetables, and sugar cane.

The different outlook between the two sectional areas is extremely significant.

Two men are assistants to Ralph Moss of Tallahassee, head of farm recruitment. Each covers a different section, and his job is to see his area gets an ample labor force.

Bryan Page looks after south Florida through a series of offices in farming sections. He was told that the head of the farmers market had said local "range line" farmers were worse than foolish to plant. They'd never get any migrants from Wirtz to harvest, this man said.

Replied Page:

"What does he know about it?

"Farm labor in south Florida and Broward County is adequate at present and the outlook is good," he said.

The reason, he further adds, is that the housing in this area—unlike the citrus area—is of the family type.

Families come together, mostly in beaten-up cars, but the registration that is causing so much trouble among crew leaders in the southeastern supply States does not apply.

Page, long an exponent of good housing, points out that in eastern Palm Beach County 14 new camps have been built this year to take care of 3,271 individuals of family groups.

The housing of the family type beckons the Texans of Spanish extraction, the Negro units of Tennessee and Mississippi, and even those Puerto Ricans who leave the solitary life for the hearth.

And, points out Page, the head of a family does not need a sticker on his car, as a crew-leader does on his bus, to approve his travel across State lines.

"This is why I believe we are all right south of the citrus belt," says Page.

RUMBLEY IN CITRUS

Page has traveled far and wide in the huge campaign Wirtz fostered to "hire Americans first." Page put his finger on the leak in the dike—the fact that most crew leaders who would carry these people cannot afford the liability insurance and vehicular requirements for their buses.

Robert Rumbley is another deputy chief, the one in charge of the citrus district.

He says citrus growers are considering the need of migrant harvesters so seriously that members of the Citrus Industrial Council have 30 to 45 members at each of the States meetings.

"They are worried and trying to get labor," he says.

"But," he adds, "that philosophy (of Wirtz) is pretty good. I think the person who does nothing is not looked on favorably."

This possibly, from all governmental indications, is the biggest understatement of the year.

The citrus grower is making a genuine effort. Rumbley thinks Wirtz will see and acknowledge this should they have to ask for foreign labor.

Rumbley sees hope in the new plastic ladder, which drops citrus down a chute into a basket. It will, he thinks broaden the base of workers 30 percent. It will end toting heavy sacks up and down the ladders.

SINGLES NEEDED

But Bob Rumbley has one problem that Page does not. His area is filled with housing for single males, though not entirely. Crew leaders or foreign laborers (who come as singles) are a good part of the answer.

As to the great cry that Florida citrus lost fruit last year, Rumbley isn't so sure.

"I can't say whether the loss was normal or not," he says. "Every crop loses a certain amount each year."

The sensitive crop is celery especially around Lake Okeechobee. Last year, stories of rotting celery caused an uproar.

For one answer we can go to Department of Agriculture figures. They are (pre-Wirtz) for the 1963–64 season: 11,205 acres planted, 10,680 harvested, or a loss of 510 acres.

For the 1964–65 season, 12,270 acres planted, 11,710 acres harvested, for a loss of 440 acres.

There are no doubt some local growers there and in the Sanford area who would disagree with this. It must at best remain a moot question.

There will undoubtedly be more stories next spring of crops gone to waste. This is part of the plan to discredit Wirtz. But every farmer knows unto himself that yearly a certain portion of all crops are left to rot in the field.

The market, running late into other production areas' competition, decides this.

But now for Wirtz' first direct statement to Florida farmers which should gladden their hearts—if that is possible:

"The premise of our policy toward farm labor in Florida and elsewhere is that U.S. workers have the right to the first chance at available jobs.

"This means that recruitment efforts, rates of pay, and conditions offered by growers must be adequate to attract and hold a domestic labor force.

"All-out efforts must be made by growers, in cooperation with State and Federal agencies, to obtain domestic labor.

"If these efforts are made in good faith and sufficient supply of American workers is still not available, then we will entertain requests for needed supplemental foreign labor."

AMERICAN AGRICULTURE IS NOT MOVING TO MEXICO

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we have heard every charge imaginable during this year of transition to the use of domestic farm labor. Many persons have made fallacious charges that American growers, and American capital are moving to Mexico as a result of the termination of the bracero program. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture: One, there has been little movement of U.S. farmers to Mexico. Members of some religious groups have become Mexican citizens and gone there to farm, but there is no evidence that larger growers have been moving out of this country. Two, within the past 2 or 3 years, there has been some movement of capital to Mexico for processing or freezing plants but there is no evidence directly linking this capital movement with the termination of the bracero program.

LESSONS LEARNED IN 1965

What has transpired in 1965 has been a vital start toward elevating the quality of domestic seasonal employment in America on the one hand; and certain special-interest groups trying to cling to stubborn attitudes of the past on the other hand. I think one of the most useful lessons learned so far has been that, as far as basic economics are concerned, the agricultural industry is no different than any other American industry. And, consequently, agricultural employers should compete for labor in the American economy just as employers in other industries have traditionally done. Another lesson we have all learned this year is that when adequate working conditions and decent wages are provided there will be a sufficient supply of labor.

For too many years now, field laborers have been America's forgotten workers. They have been kept outside our Federal and State laws regarding collective bargaining, minimum wages, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, health, and sanitation. Our great challenge is to extend protective coverage under these laws to our citizens who work the land for a living. It is, in short, to offer the farmworker the same opportunity for economic security and human dignity that other workers in other industries have long enjoyed in this country.

LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the first session of the 89th Congress has been a busy one for all of the committees of the Senate. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I can recall no other single session which produced such meaningful and important legislation in the national interest. My committee is charged with the primary legislative responsibility for the development and wise utilization of our Nation's natural resources. We have completed a most successful program in this area during this session. I wish to thank the members of my committee on both sides of the aisle who have cooperated with the chairman in the successful enactment of our program. The ranking minority member, Mr. KUCHEL, has been most helpful and cooperative as we have considered and acted upon the immense amount of legislation which has been before us.

Our committee probably handles more substantive public legislation than any other single committee of the Senate, and it requires the highest degree of cooperation and understanding on the part of our membership to face the numerous meetings, hearings, and executive sessions required to successfully complete our program.

I also want to thank the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] for their inestimable assistance in guiding our bills through the Senate once the committee has acted upon them.

Each of my subcommittee chairmen has contributed of his time and patience in conducting the sessions of the respective subcommittees during this session. Without their untiring assistance and leadership our committee program could not have been carried out.

Although this summary is not as detailed as that which will follow the close of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, I have listed all of the major measures which have been considered by our committee this year. Many of these have become law and many more will be enacted in the next session. The summary is broken down by the activities of the various subcommittees.

I ask unanimous consent that the summary may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PARKS AND RECREATION—SENATOR ALAN BIBLE, OF NEVADA, CHAIRMAN

On February 8, 1965, the President transmitted to the Congress "A Message on Natural Beauty of Our Country." This message provided the guidelines under which the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee has acted during the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

In his historymaking statement, the President said:

"In almost every part of the country citizens are rallying to save landmarks of beauty and history. The Government must also do its share to assist these local efforts which have an important national purpose. We will encourage and support the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States, chartered by Congress in 1949. I shall propose legislation to authorize supplementary grants to help local authorities acquire, develop, and manage private properties for such purposes.

"Our present system of parks, seashores, and recreation areas—monuments to the dedication and labor of farsighted men—do not meet the needs of a growing population.

"The full funding of the land and water conservation fund will be an important step in making this a Parks-for-America decade.

"I proposed to use this fund to acquire lands needed to establish:

"Assateague Island National Seashore, Md.-Va.

"Tocks Island National Recreation Area, N.J.-Pa.

"Cape Lookout National Seashore, N.C.

"Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Mich.

"Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, Ind.

"Oregon Dunes National Seashore, Oreg.

"Great Basin National Park, Nev.

"Guadalupe Mountains National Park, Tex.

"Spruce Knob, Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, W. Va.

"Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, Mont.-Wyo.

"Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area, Utah-Wyo.

"Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area, Calif.

"In addition, I have requested the Secretary of the Interior, working with interested groups, to conduct a study on the desirability of establishing a Redwood National Park in California.

"I will also recommend that we add prime outdoor recreation areas to our national forest system, particularly in the populous East; and proceed on schedule with studies required to define and enlarge the Wilderness System established by the 88th Congress. We will also continue progress on our refuge system for migratory waterfowl."

I am happy to be able to report to the Senate that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has acted on most of these requests, which were made only a few short months ago. In addition, other specific projects have also been approved. Bills to establish the Assateague Island National Seashore in Maryland and Virginia; the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area in Pennsylvania and New Jersey (Tocks Island); the Nez Perce National Historic Park in Idaho; and the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area in California will all have been signed into law during this session.

Following our committee's action, the Senate has passed the Cape Lookout National Seashore in North Carolina; the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Mich.; the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, Ind.; the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area in Montana and Wyoming; and the San Juan National Historical Park in Washington.

The subcommittee has conducted hearings on several other items included in the beauty message. They are the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in Oregon and the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in Texas. It is anticipated that final disposition of these areas will be made during the second session.

Many national monuments and historic sites have been added to the system through the efforts of the subcommittee. They include: The Golden Spike Historic Site in Utah; the Hubbell Trading Post in Arizona; the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in Nebraska; the Herbert Hoover National Monument in Iowa; the Pecos National Monument in New Mexico; the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument in Texas; the addition of Ellis Island to the Statue of Liberty National Monument; and the Roger Williams National Memorial in Rhode Island.

The bill, H.R. 2091, relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by the National Park Service, is designed to stimulate the development of better facilities for the tens of millions of Americans who enjoy our national parks each year. Its initial effect will permit the Service to enter into long-term contracts with concessioners, a practice that was suspended several years ago. This was signed into Public Law 89-249.

I think it important to call to the attention of the Senate that nearly all of the proposed additions to our national park and recreation system have occurred near the centers of population in the East and Middle West. For too many years, the great parks were carved out of the tremendous public domain lands that are federally owned and required no funds for acquisition. With the effective operation of the land and water conservation fund, created last year, moneys will be available to establish our recreation, seashore, and lakeshore areas where they will be accessible to Americans who need them most and who, without great expense in the past, have not had an opportunity to enjoy this type of public outdoor recreation.

FROM THE IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION SUBCOMMITTEE (WATER AND POWER RESOURCES)—SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON, CHAIRMAN

In the first session of the 89th Congress the responsibilities of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation became nationwide in scope as the knowledge and experience of its members were called upon to help meet the water crises in the Northeast and elsewhere, and to plan for water resource development throughout the country.

Early in the session, the subcommittee held hearings on and piloted through the Congress S. 21, the Water Resources Planning Act, which became Public Law 89-80. This measure established the National Water Resources Council, and authorized river basin planning commissions. It also provided for cooperation between the States and Federal Government, with financial aid to the States for water resource planning.

Thus, when the water shortage in New York, the Delaware Basin, and other areas of the East became acute, there was already in existence the organization and legal mechanisms for prompt action by the heads of the executive agencies concerned with water supplies.

Subsequently, the committee held an open hearing on the Northeast water crisis specifically, reviewing the action that already had been taken and participating in planning future development, thus assuring close cooperation between the legislative and executive branches.

Another bill of national and international importance with respect to potable water for our cities and industries was S. 24, which became Public Law 89-118. This measure, transmitted to Congress by President Johnson and sponsored by Senator ANDERSON, provided for expansion and acceleration of the saline water conversion program, and provided for a total of new authorized appropriations of up to $200 million to further research and development in making usable sea and brackish waters.

Another long-range water resource development measure which the committee reported favorably and the Senate passed after intensive study was S. 22, for promotion of a more adequate national program of water research. This amended the Water Research Act of the 88th Congress. This bill provides authorization for grant and loan funds to educational institutions and other centers of excellence, in addition to land grant colleges, for water research projects.

Development of the recreational potentialities of water projects, and for Federal-State cooperative planning for such purposes, was worked out in S. 1229, which became Public Law 89-72. A draft of the substance of this measure was submitted by the Secretary of the Interior. Its subject matter relates to the use and development of Federal water projects for recreation and for fish and wildlife enhancement. A significant feature is the provision for cost-sharing by the States in the construction of facilities for such purposes.

In the field of hydroelectric power, a bill of far-reaching importance to both the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest was reported favorably and passed the Senate. This was S. 1761, submitted to Congress by President Johnson and sponsored by Senators JACKSON and MAGNUSON. It provides for the construction of a third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia River Basin project, with a capacity of 3.6 million kilowatts. Added to the existing capacity of 2 million kilowatts, the new plant will give Grand Coulee a capacity of 5.6 million kilowatts, making it the largest hydroelectric installation in the world. As a result of the intertie legislation enacted in the 88th Congress, substantial blocs of peaking power between the Pacific Northwest and Southwest can be exchanged, and the third powerplant at Grand Coulee will help meet the needs of both areas for additional power for their expanding populations and economies. Water for the proposed plant will be available under the terms of the Columbia River Treaty with Canada. The $364,310,000 cost will be wholly repayable, with interest, and excess revenues will be returned to the Treasury. The benefit-cost ratio on this huge project is one of the most favorable ever to be considered on such a large development.

With respect to the use of revenues from Columbia River Basin power projects, the committee is conducting an intensive study of basin account proposals. An exploratory, informational hearing was held on the subject on September 1, 1965. These hearings are printed, and the information in them is available for study and consideration.

Other bills of major importance considered by the subcommittee in public hearings and executive sessions were:

S. 32, by Senators BIBLE and CANNON, to establish the Southern Nevada Water project. It will provide gravely needed municipal and industrial water for the rapidly developing region in southern Nevada of which Las Vegas is the center from Nevada's share of water of Colorado River water. Present supplies for the area depend upon ground water, which is inadequate even for immediate needs, and is being mined at a rate that threatens depletion. The measure became Public Law.

S. 34, by Senators BURDICK, YOUNG, MCGOVERN, and MUNDT, to provide for the Garrison Diversion Unit, Missouri Basin project. The measure was amended and reported to the Senate by Senator BURDICK, and its House counterpart substituted and passed to become Public Law 89–108. The Garrison diversion project will provide irrigation for some 250,000 acres of farmland, municipal and industrial water for 14 cities and towns, and make possible full development of one of the principal breeding grounds for waterfowl in the United States.

S. 254, by Senators NEUBERGER and MORSE, to authorize the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon. This measure was reported favorably with amendments by Senator JACKSON and passed the Senate on April 1, 1965. Tualatin is a multipurpose project for irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, and recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement. It will bring gravely needed water to a rapidly growing area near Metropolitan Portland.

S. 490, by Senators JACKSON and MAGNUSON, to construct the Manson Unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington. This measure was favorably reported by Senator JACKSON and passed the Senate on February 10, 1965. It would provide a new water collection and distribution system for some 5,770 acres of irrigated orchard lands in central Washington, now being farmed by small, independent farmers, to produce specialty crops. The benefit-cost ratio is the extremely favorable one of 6.5 to 1.

S. 355, by Senator YARBOROUGH, for construction of the Columbus Bend, Tex., reclamation project. Extensive public hearings were held on the bill, but further study is required.

S. 553, by Senators SIMPSON, HRUSKA, and CURTIS, and MCGEE, to grant the consent of Congress to the Upper Niobrara River compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska. At the public hearings, amendments insisted upon by the Department of Justice and the Bureau of the Budget were submitted and discussed. These amendments have met with opposition from the States, and further consideration of the bill appears necessary.

S. 599, by Senators KUCHEL and MURPHY, to authorize construction of the Auburn-Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California. The measure has become Public Law 89–161. It authorizes a huge multipurpose project for water, power, fish and wildlife preservation, and recreational facilities in the great, fertile Central Valley of California in the vicinity of Sacramento. It will meet urgent needs in the Nation's most populous State, and permit expansion and growth. In addition, it will provide flood control in an area gravely threatened by floods earlier this year. The substance of this legislation was recommended to Congress by President Truman in January 1948 and has been under consideration since then.

S. 602, by Senator MOSS for himself and 15 other Senators of both parties, to extend and broaden the Small Reclamation Projects Act. The measure was reported by Senator MOSS, amended on the floor, and sent to the House on July 1. The other body amended the bill substantially, and it is in conference. As approved by the Senate, S. 602 would provide additional funds for the successful small reclamation projects program, which assists and encourages action by State and local entities in solving their own irrigation problems. It would adjust the interest rate on future projects to the Water Supply Act formula and make other clarifying and broadening amendments to the act which experience has shown to be desirable.

S. 794, by Senators JACKSON and MAGNUSON, to provide for construction of the Kennewick Division extension, Yakima project, Wash. Reported, with amendments by Senator JACKSON and passed the Senate on February 10, 1965. It would bring an additional 6,300 acres under irrigation in southern Washington, making them especially suitable for fruits and row crops. Water for Kennewick extension is available from extra capacity built into the division's main canal, the construction of which was recognized as a deferred cost in the original authorizing legislation.

S. 1000 was submitted by the Secretary of the Interior. It is a technical measure to permit the Secretary of the Interior to transfer title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions. It became Public Law 89–48.

S. 1088, by Senators JACKSON and MAGNUSON, for construction and operation of the Touchet Division, Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington. Reported with amendments by Senator JACKSON and passed the Senate on July 29. Touchet, which is entirely in the State of Washington, is a multipurpose project, bringing some 10,000 acres under full irrigation in its initial stages, with deferred storage for another 7,000 acres, and providing municipal and industrial water for the city of Dayton. Expert testimony at the hearing shows that Touchet will reestablish the anadromous fish run, particularly of salmon, on a scale comparable to that of the days of Lewis and Clark, and the reservoir will form the only sizable lake in timbered surroundings in the entire Walla Walla Basin.

S. 1462, by Senator ANDERSON, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for payment and operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands. The measure has become Public Law 89–94. It authorizes continuance of payment by the Federal Government of assesments against lands farmed by Indians in very small tracts (10 acres, on the average). The amounts involved are small, totaling only about $40,000 a year, and payment by the Federal Government is in furtherance of our Indian policy.

S. 1478, by Senators CURTIS, HRUSKA, MUNDT and MCGOVERN, to grant the consent of Congress to the Lower Niobrara River and Ponca Creek compact between Nebraska and South Dakota. At hearings on this measure recommendations by the administrative agencies for amendment were submitted. Some of these proposed amendments have met with opposition by the States concerned, and further consideration appears necessary.

S. 1582, by Senator CHURCH, to authorize a necessary increase in appropriations for the Mann Creek reclamation project, Idaho. Reported by Senator CHURCH, with amendments. The House counterpart bill, H.R. 6032, was substituted, and became Public Law 89–60. The increase in appropriations, from $3,490,000 to $4,180,000, is necessary because of geologic problems at the damsite which could not have been foreseen at the time of the original authorization. Also, new legislation with respect to relocation of roads delayed construction, and the delay has resulted in higher prices than estimated.

S. 2310, by Senators JACKSON and MAGNUSON, to provide that certain pumping costs to maintain Banks Lake, Columbia Basin project, Washington, shall be nonreimbursable for a limited period of time. Hearings were held on the measure on August 30, and it was favorably reported to the full committee.

Senate Joint Resolution 33 by Senator SIMPSON, to cancel certain unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands. Hearings were held September 16, and the measure was reported favorably by the committee on October 20, 1965. It would quiet title and do equity to a group of small landholders who purchased the subject lands in good faith, as being clear, but subsequently were assessed costs, some running back for 40 years.

An identical measure, Senate Joint Resolution 9, was substituted on the floor of the Senate and passed. It was jointly sponsored by both Senator MCGEE and Senator SIMPSON, of Wyoming.

House Joint Resolution 95 commemorates the public service and devotion to water resource development of the late Alson Asa Meredith by naming in his honor the reservoir formed by the Sanford Dam, on the Canadian River project in his own State of Texas.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS—SENATOR FRANK CHURCH, OF IDAHO, CHAIRMAN

One of the great public responsibilities of the Federal Government is the proper management and stewardship of our national land assets. Our committee exercises jurisdiction over most of the public lands belonging to all Americans. The administration of these lands is becoming an increasingly complex problem, and our committee intends to carefully study the operations in connection with this public trust in the next session.

One of the most significant conservation and recreation measures to be reported by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee this year was S. 1446, the bill to establish a National Wild Rivers System. The President, in his natural beauty message to Congress, said that the time has come to identify and preserve free-flowing stretches of some of our great scenic rivers before growth and development combine to make the beauties of the unspoiled waterway only a memory.

The bill which the committee recommended contains an initial system of the segments of five magnificent wild rivers: The Salmon and Clearwater in Idaho, the Rogue in Oregon, the Rio Grande in New Mexico, and the Eleven Point in Missouri. Eleven other rivers are designated for study and possible future inclusion. No dams would be licensed on wild rivers, and pollution, commercialism, and other activities inconsistent with conserving the river in its natural setting would be prohibited. Provision is made for the addition of other wild rivers to the system, including those which could be managed by States.

This legislation was reported late in this session, and undoubtedly will pass the Senate early in January 1966.

Senate bill 1446 represents a major effort to save for future generations unspoiled rivers and river sections that will symbolize and perpetuate part of our original American landscape.

In accord with the wild rivers legislation, but considered separately because of unique problems, was the bill to create the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway, S. 897, which passed the Senate. The bill, introduced by Senator Nelson would preserve the St. Croix, beginning at the dam near Taylors Falls, Minn., upstream to the dam near Gordon, Wis., and its Namekagon tributary in Wisconsin, as a wild river, and promote broad recreational use of the portion of the St. Croix downstream from the dam near Taylors Falls to its confluence with the Mississippi.

Of historic and recreational importance to the National Capital area was the bill, S. 1065, which was enacted by the Congress to authorize the United States to acquire the scenic Great Falls tract on the Virginia side of the Potomac and administer it in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway. This will assure preservation of one of the Capital's beauty spots. It is of great geological interest, and contains the remains of the Potowmack Canal—a project in which George Washington was actively interested both before and after the American Revolution. The land had been under lease to the National Park Service, but the Government was without authority to place any permanent improvements upon it. Acquired by exchange, it will now be developed for the fullest public use. The remnants of the canal will be preserved as testimony to George Washington's great efforts to forge an early transportation and communications system which would lay the groundwork for a United States of America.

A bill, S. 435, to preserve in its natural setting one of the truly gem-like lakes of mountain West—Upper Priest Lake in the panhandle of northern Idaho—has been signed into law (Public Law 89-39). It authorizes the Department of Agriculture to acquire the few private holdings on the lakeshore and incorporate them into the Kaniksu National Forest. This lake has been referred to as one of the most beautiful in the world.

Approved by the Congress was another bill, S. 1764, which added land to a national forest, the Uinta in Utah, this time to save 10,000 acres of the drainage of the north fork of the Provo River to halt serious soil erosion and save the main source of the domestic water supply for the city of Provo.

The Senate passed a bill, S. 1285, from the Interior Committee which took cognizance of the tremendous recreation pressures on the greatly expanded southwestern cities of Phoenix, Tucson, and Albuquerque, and authorized special conveyance of land under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926 to answer these burgeoning needs.

Two widely separated State universities, Maryland and Alaska, were benefited by Senate bills 1988 and 1190 which were enacted into Public Law (Public Law 89-227 and Public Law 89-223). Fourteen acres of land on the Maryland campus originally donated to the United States in 1935 were authorized to be returned to the State of Maryland for the fair market value of the fixed improvements. The State of Alaska was authorized to negotiate a sale of 153 acres of patented land in dispute between the University of Alaska and a mining corporation, which now wishes to purchase the property.

S. 625, a bill to permit the purchase of lands in Wyoming that had, through doubt of ownership, been fenced in with private holdings, has passed the Senate. This would permit clearance of title along section lines of small parcels formerly managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

The Public Lands Subcommittee also considered legislation dealing with scrip and similar rights relating to interests in public lands, and the disposition of relicted lands surrounding the Great Salt Lake in Utah. Next year we hope to resolve the problems in connection with these bills.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINERALS, MATERIALS, AND FUELS—SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING, OF ALASKA, CHAIRMAN

The Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels has initial responsibility for measures referred to it concerning "mineral interests generally," in the words of the Legislative Reorganization Act, the mineral resources of the public lands, and mineral land laws and claims and entries thereunder.

During the 1st session of the 89th Congress, the subcommittee devoted a considerable amount of time and effort to finding ways and means to stimulate domestic production of gold, reopen closed mines, and put gold miners back to work.

Three measures dealing directly with gold mining were referred to the subcommittee. S. 1377, by Senator Gruening for himself and 8 other Senators; S. 2562, by Senator McGovern and 7 others; and Senate Resolution 83, by Senator Bartlett for himself and 14 others. All three measures have bipartisan cosponsorship.

S. 1377, which is based on Senator Gruening's S. 2125 of the 88th Congress as reported favorably to the Senate, provides for payment to domestic gold producers on an individual basis of amounts predicated on the differences between their cost of producing gold in the last quarter of 1939, our last period of normal production, and average costs as of the last quarter of 1963.

The measure carefully refrains from any suggestion for any increase in the $35 an ounce price for gold established as a depression measure in 1934.

S. 2562 was introduced by Senator McGovern with 7 cosigners for the purpose of aiding and stabilizing the gold mining industry of the United States by maintaining the rate of gold production from currently operating gold mines and by stimulating increased gold production through the reopening of mining properties which have ceased operations prior to January 1, 1965, and to encourage exploration, development, and commencement of new gold mining operations, the Gold Mines Assistance Commission is hereby directed to provide financial assistance to domestic producers of gold. It is the intent of this bill that financial assistance payments to domestic gold producers hereunder shall have no relation to the monetary price of gold paid by the Treasury Department of the United States.

Senate Resolution 83 would create a Select Committee of the Senate on Gold Production to study the problem in its entirety and report back to the Senate with recommendations.

While the subcommittee took no formal action on these measures directly, they formed the background for a series of informal conferences and discussions with Treasury officials held from time to time throughout the session. There is reason to hope that out of these conferences may come legislation which will have the acquiescence, at least, of the administration to ameliorate the plight of domestic gold producers, who have been put out of business, in a great number of instances, by the direct action of the Federal Government.

Other legislation considered and acted upon by the subcommittee included:

S. 1378, by Senator Moss and five other Senators, to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of 1961. The House companion measure, H.R. 5842, as amended, was substituted, and became Public Law 89-238. The law extends the lead-zinc small producers program for an additional 4 years, broadens the base for participation, and clarifies certain provisions of the parent act.

S. 1674, by Senator Bible, to authorize leasing by the Secretary of the Interior of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources on the public lands, was favorably reported, with amendments, by Senator Gruening and passed the Senate on September 7, 1965. The bill opens the way to development of a new natural resource of our publicly owned lands. The steam itself has been proven valuable for production of electric energy. In a number of localities the superheated brines or gases contain mineral required by industry and agriculture. The proposed legislation is a leasing act, providing the Secretary with authority, which he does not now have, to permit development by private enterprise of geothermal deposits, and setting forth conditions and standards of leasing.

S. 2358, by Senator Holland, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests in certain lands in Florida to the surface owners of said lands. The subcommittee held a hearing, in conjunction with consideration of H.R. 7378 (see below).

H.R. 7378, by Congressman Haley, to sell reserved phosphate rights in certain lands in Florida to the surface owners thereof. This measure and S. 2358 cover different tracts of land. At the hearing, the Department of the Interior urged amendment to require the surface owner to pay the costs of mineral survey, instead of the flat $200 fee provided in the bill as it passed the House. Since such a survey could be very costly, the proposed amendment met with objection and both measures were put over for further study by the subcommittee early in the second session.

In addition to its consideration of the gold problem and action on specific bills, the subcommittee conducted a study and held hearings, in Butte, Mont., and in Washington, D.C., on the administration and interpretation of Public Law 167, 84th Congress. This measure is popularly known as the "Common Varieties Act" or the "Materials Act." It provides that common varieties of sand, gravel, stone, and the like shall no longer be locatable under the mining law of 1872, but instead shall be subject to leasing by the Secretary of the Interior, on a competitive basis for limited periods of time. It also provides that the holder of a mining claim can use only as much of the surface, and surface resources, as are necessary for him to conduct actual mining operations.

Over the past several years the subcommittee has received vigorous protests from mine operators on the public lands that the act was being interpreted by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management in a manner inconsistent with the original intent of the bill, and that its administration was so harsh as to be inequitable and to discourage mineral development. At the Butte hearings, spokesmen for the mine operators cited specific instances to support such allegations.

Early in the next session, the subcommittee will pursue this matter further in an attempt to remedy the situation.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS—SENATOR LEE METCALF, MONTANA, CHAIRMAN

The Subcommittee on Indian Affairs has legislative responsibility over matters involving the relations of the Federal Government with approximately 500,000 Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts, about half of whom reside on reservations; over Indian landholdings and reservations which, subject to varying degrees of Federal control, total approximately 52 million acres in 29 States; and over the administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In addition, the Indian health and sanitation program supervised by the Division of Indian Health in the U.S. Public Health Service is of concern to the subcommittee, as is the Indian Claims Commission.

Of the 48 measures referred to the subcommittee, 13 were reported and 9 were enacted into law.

The following Indian bill of general applicability throughout Indian country was enacted during 1965:

H.R. 4778, Public Law 89–14: To increase the amounts authorized for Indian adult vocational education. The bill amends the act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986, 25 U.S.C. 309), entitled "An act relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations," by increasing the amount authorized to be appropriated for the program from $12 to $15 million annually. This legislation is necessary in order to accommodate the large number of Indians who are seeking enrollment under the 1956 act. The response of Indians to the opportunities afforded them in vocational courses and on-the-job training has been most favorable. From its inception through 1964, 10,000 persons have enrolled in various vocational programs throughout the United States. More and more of the younger Indians are completing high school and will become available for these training programs in the near future.

The following Indian bills relating to specific tribes, bands, or groups were enacted or passed by the Senate during 1965:

S. 664 (NEUBERGER, MORSE), Public Law 89– : To provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians, and for other purposes. The purpose of S. 664 is to provide for the distribution of $2,500,000 in judgment funds recovered by the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 100, and all other funds heretofore or hereafter deposited in the U.S. Treasury to the credit of the Klamath Tribe or any of its constituent parts or groups. The judgment in docket No. 100 was the result of a compromise settlement approved by members of the Klamath Tribe over which Federal supervision was terminated in accordance with the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 718), as amended.

S. 702 (JACKSON), Public Law 89–28: To provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Quinaielt Tribe of Indians. The Indian Claims Commission has awarded the Quinaielt Indians $250,172.40 in settlement of the claim in docket 242. The Quinaielt General Council, through its business committee, has proposed tribal programing, in consultation with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for the use of the judgment funds. Projects to be initiated through use of the funds include the establishment of community facilities in cooperation with the U.S. Public Health Service, the improvement of fisheries resources, and the development of tourism and recreation potential. The proposed legislation will permit the Quinaielt business committee, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to decide how the judgment funds will be programed.

S. 795 (JACKSON, MAGNUSON), Public Law 89–190: To provide for the assessing of Indian trust and restricted lands within the Lummi Indian diking project on the Lummi Indian Reservation in the State of Washington, through a drainage and diking district formed under the laws of the State. The purposes of this legislation are to permit lands within the Lummi diking district to be included in a new district under the laws of the State of Washington and to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cancel all outstanding charges for construction and operation and maintenance and to use previously collected assessments to pay for assessments in the future by the new State district. Under the law, the Federal Government would be relieved of any responsibility for further operation, maintenance, betterment, or construction of this Indian project.

S. 893 (MANSFIELD, GRUENING, BARTLETT), Public Law 89–130: To amend the act of June 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 388), as amended, relating to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska. The purpose of this legislation is to amend the 1935 act to define Tlingit and Haida Indians and to recognize a central council which would have authority to make plans for the use of judgment funds expected to be awarded the tribes in the very near future. It would also authorize the advancement and expenditure of any appropriation to satisfy the judgment for any purpose authorized by the official central council, including per capita payments, and for the preparation of a current roll of all Tlingit and Haida Indians. Under the law it is required that following appropriation of funds to satisfy the award, Tlingit and Haida Indians shall submit an additional legislative proposal providing for the use of their money based, upon approved plans and recommendations.

S. 1413 (JACKSON, by request): To provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Confederated Tribes of Colville Indians located in the State of Washington and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes. As a result of a directive in section 5 of Public Law 772, 84th Congress, the Business Council of the Confederated Tribes of Colville Indians submitted proposed legislation providing for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the tribes. After hearings on the proposed legislation in the 88th Congress, Senator JACKSON was requested to introduce S. 1413. As passed by the Senate, the bill provides for a referendum and the remaining provisions of the bill shall become effective only if a majority of the voting adult members of the tribes approve. The bill provides for the closing of the tribal rolls, the updating of all land records, and the appraisal by three qualified independent appraisers of all tribal assets. Thereafter, individual members of the tribes will be afforded a right to withdraw from the tribes and have their shares of tribal property converted to money and paid to them or to remain in the tribe and participate in a tribal management program. Such amounts of the tribes' timberlands as would be required to be sold would be purchased by the Secretary of Agriculture and designated as national forest lands. Other property would be sold on a competitive bid basis, except that property belonging to those remaining in the tribe shall be placed in the hands of a private corporation or trustee. This legislation is similar to the Klamath Termination Act of 1954. The bill passed the Senate on July 22, and it is understood that the House Interior Committee plans to hold further hearings on it during 1965.

S. 1904 (ANDERSON, MONTOYA): To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give to the Indians of the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands heretofore set aside for school or administrative purposes. The purpose of S. 1904 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to give in trust to the Pueblos of Acoma, Sandia, Santa Ana, and Zia in New Mexico the beneficial interest in certain federally owned lands and improvements when they are no longer needed. The lands (approximately 435 acres) were set aside for school or administrative use. The value of the lands and improvements is approximately $31,000. The bill also provides that the Indian Claims Commission shall consider the value of the property conveyed by the bill in connection with any claim which the named Pueblos may have before the Indian Claims Commission. The bill passed the Senate on July 22.

S. 1938 (BIBLE, CANNON): To amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act. The purpose of S. 1938 is to permit leases of Indian land on the Pyramid Lake Reservation in Nevada for business and other purposes to be made for a term of up to 99 years. Enactment of S. 1938 is needed to permit a lease with a term long enough to enable a prospective lessee to obtain financing for the recreational development that is contemplated. The 175-square-mile lake, located entirely within the reservation, offers excellent potential for water-oriented recreational development. The bill passed the Senate on July 22.

H.R. 70, Private Law 8925: To provide for the conveyance of approximately 80 acres of land to the heirs of Adam Jones, Creek Indian, not enrolled. The subject land upon the death of the allottee became part of the Creek Reservation, subject to reassignment to a cooperative group of Creeks or to an individual Indian. The Tribe, by resolution dated July 27, 1963, waived whatever rights the Creek Nation might have in the land and recommended that legislation be introduced conveying the property to the heirs of the original allottee.

H.R. 5860, Public Law 89–107: To amend the law relating to the final disposition of the property of the Choctaw Tribe. The purpose of the bill is to extend by 3 years the time within which certain provisions of the act of August 25, 1959, as amended, relating to the termination of Federal supervision and control over certain Choctaw lands, would be completed. Problems have arisen in connection with title to various lands owned by the Indians, and it is believed that additional time should be provided to enable the Tribe to complete several lawsuits in which it is now engaged with respect to tribal lands.

H.R. 9041, Private Law 89–30: To restore to the heirs of the Indian grantor certain tribal land of the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma. The purpose of H.R. 9041 is to grant a 2½-acre parcel of land to the heirs of Jack Small Lincoln, an Indian, who donated the same to the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma. Since the tribe has no further need for the site, its business committee requested legislation conveying the land to Mr. Lincoln's heirs.

In addition to the foregoing, the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs held hearings on S. 96, Senator ANDERSON's bill to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act; and S. 2196, to amend the law establishing the Indian revolving loan fund, and S. 2197, to provide for guaranty and insurance of loans to Indians and Indian organizations, sponsored by Senators METCALF, MCGOVERN, and BURDICK.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ACTION RELATING TO INDIAN AFFAIRS

On August 25, 1965, the Senate Interior Committee adopted a committee resolution concerning the Kalispel Tribe of Washington State.

The Indian Claims Commission awarded the Kalispels $2.7 million in compensation for lands taken by the United States; and by legislation enacted in the 88th Congress, the Tribe was authorized to use these funds for individual or tribal purposes with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. The Committee's report accompanying the 1964 legislation suggested that before the Tribe's proposed plan for use of the judgment was implemented that the Bureau of Indian Affairs investigate the practicality of placing the administration of the program in the hands of a private State-licensed trustee. Negotiations have been under way during the past year with private trustees.

The resolution adopted by the Senate Committee recommends the use of a part of the tribal funds for family housing plans and tribual projects but specifies that approximately $1,700,000 of the total judgment should be placed with a corporate trustee for management purposes. This will be the first instance in which a judgment awarded a tribe is placed with a non-Federal trustee, and it is expected that in the future similar recommendations will be made involving other tribes where that action would be appropriate. The committee has expressed itself as being anxious to protect these large judgment funds from dissipation and to preserve the funds and the income for the benefit of the individual Indians.

The Kalispel Tribe consists of about 155 members, and the reservation of approximately ten thousand acres is located in the northeast section of Washington State. It is believed that a private trustee in managing the Tribe's funds will be able to invest in diversified stocks and bonds, thus assuring steady income, and will also be in a position to advise the Tribe on any business opportunities that may become available in the area of the reservation.

Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs—Senator Henry M. Jackson, Chairman

The Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs has responsibility for measures relating to the insular possessions of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, except those measures affecting their revenue and appropriations.

Of the 8 bills referred to the subcommittee, 3 were reported and subsequently enacted into law. They are as follows:

S. 2154 (Jackson, Javits), Public Law 89–84: To amend the act establishing the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico. The purpose of S. 2154 is to amend the act of February 20, 1964, establishing the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico, by extending the date for the submission of the Commission's final report and increasing the funds authorized to be appropriated for the Commission's operation.

Public Law 88–271 established the United States-Puerto Rico Commission to study all factors which have a bearing on the future relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico. The 1964 act authorized an appropriation of $250,000 for the Commission to perform its task. The government of Puerto Rico appropriated an equal sum as its contribution to the Commission's work. The Commission's final report was to be submitted to the President, Congress, the Governor of Puerto Rico, and the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico not later than the opening day of the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

Because of the elections of 1964, both on the mainland and in Puerto Rico, the Commission was unable to begin its work as promptly as had been hoped. Following the elections there were 4 changes in the Commission's total membership of 13. While considerable work has been done in authorizing and preparing studies, these cannot be completed in the time authorized.

The additional funds are necessary in part because of the extension of time which the Commission requires to complete its work and because the studies authorized by the Commission are broader than originally envisioned.

S. 2154 would amend the existing law by authorizing a maximum appropriation of $465,000, an increase of $215,000. A similar increase in funds will also be authorized by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The bill extends the time for submission of the final report until September 30, 1966, a period of 9 months beyond the present requirement.

H.R. 8720, Public Law 89–100: To amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of Guam. The purpose of H.R. 8720 is to vest in the government of Guam the power to fix the salaries and allowances of members of its legislature and to provide for the payment of the same from local revenues rather than from Federal appropriations.

Subsection (e) of section 26 of the Organic Act of Guam (48 U.S.C. 1421d(e)) fixes the basic compensation of members of the Guam Legislature at $15 per day while the legislature is in session and provides for payment of the same by the United States. All other legislative expenses are paid by the government of Guam.

The Guam Legislature is composed of 21 members who serve 2-year terms. The legislature is charged with responsibility for enacting all local laws. Regular sessions are held annually and may not exceed 60 calendar days. Special sessions of not more than 14 days in length may be convened by the Governor.

Enactment of H.R. 8720 will permit the Legislature of Guam to determine and pay its own salaries and allowances. This will result in a modest saving to the Federal Government of approximately $23,000 a year.

H.R. 8721, Public Law 89–98: To amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the payment of legislative salaries and expenses by the government of the Virgin Islands. The purpose of H.R. 8721 is to vest in the government of the Virgin Islands the power to fix the salaries and allowances of members of its legislature and to provide for the payment of the same from local revenues rather than from Federal appropriations.

Subsection (e) of section 6 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 487, 499), as amended (14 U.S.C. 1572(e)), fixes the basic compensation of each of the 11 members of the Virgin Islands Legislature at $600 per annum and provides for payment thereof by the United States. In addition, each legislator who is away from the island of his residence receives $20 per diem while the legislature is actually in session. These allowances are also paid by the United States.

The legislature of the Virgin Islands is charged with responsibility for enacting all local laws. Its regular sessions may continue for 60 days per year. Special sessions not in excess of 30 days a year may be convened by the Governor.

Enactment of H.R. 8721 will permit the Virgin Islands Legislature to determine its own salaries and allowances subject, of course, to the usual veto power of the Governor. This will result in a modest savings to the Federal Government of about $14,000 a year.

THE NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I had the privilege of being chairman of the U.S. Delegation to the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference which was held in New York from October 4 through 8. The conference provided an excellent opportunity to exchange views on recent events and future prospects in Western Europe. Many delegates told me that they thought that the debate at this conference had been more provocative and profitable than in any previous year.

Two particularly excellent and vigorous speeches were given at the conference which I commend to the attention of my colleagues. One by Vice President Humphrey, and another by Mr. Manlio Brosio, Secretary General of NATO.

I ask unanimous consent that these two speeches be printed in the Record, along with an editorial from the New York Times of October 12, commending the Vice President, on his speech.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech by Vice President Hubert Humphrey at the 11th Annual Session, NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, New York, October 4 to 9, 1965

I am happy to be able to welcome you here today to the United States on behalf of the President. I am particularly happy to do so as a fellow NATO Parliamentarian who has attended your meetings in the past, has always followed your activities with the keenest interest, and is looking forward to conversations with a number of old friends in this distinguished group.

The tradition, in opening such international meetings, is for someone from the host country to greet the delegates with general be benign expressions of good will.

I would like to do more than that.

For you are leaders in developing political thinking in your countries. You are the men and women who provide legislation to back up needed policies. You are key figures in advancing the common interests of our Atlantic partnership.

I would like to share with you some thoughts about the future of that partnership.

Its object is to strengthen peace. This is surely the supreme task of our age. In the nuclear era, there can be no alternative.

Peace will not be secured merely by putting out fires, as they occur. We must build a world in which they will be less likely to break out in the first place.

This means trying to build the kind of world order envisaged in the U.N. Charter: one in which men everywhere can enjoy more of the good things of life, in which emerging countries can maintain and strengthen their freedom, in which aggression can be deterred and the root causes of tension and conflict can be effectively addressed.

The Atlantic countries have a unique responsibility in building such a world. Their resources and talents are essential to the task.

But even these resources and talents will only suffice if they are concerted. No one of us is strong enough to meet the needs of the day alone. That is the meaning of Atlantic partnership.

An effective partnership must be based on the concept of equality: equality of effort, and equality of responsibility.

It is to such a partnership that my country is dedicated. As President Johnson said a few months ago, "none of us has sought, or will seek, domination over others."

To fulfill the promise of this partnership, we must be ready to break new ground, as did the statesmen who first constructed the alliance.

They met the essential need in building a better world: They prevented war. Since NATO was created, the territorial integrity of such of its members has been maintained. For almost a generation, aggression in Europe has been deterred. But NATO has been more than a shield of protection. It has been a wellspring of confidence and security giving impetus to prosperity and progress, to economic growth and political cooperation.

We must make sure that it stays this way. We must maintain and strengthen NATO, in the face of a Soviet military presence which changes but does not wither. We must preserve the structure of joint defense on which NATO's success has rested. It is the close integration of effort that distinguishes NATO from all previous alliances. But we must adapt that structure to changing circumstances.

Other needs for common action also emerge as we move into the third decade of the post war era.

It is to three of these great needs that I would speak today.

We must concert about our actions in the great continents to the south: Latin America, Africa, and Asia. We must help these peoples achieve the peace, the freedom, and the progress that they seek.

This calls for action to coordinate and increase the Atlantic nations' aid to developing countries. In this task we must take full advantage of the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD.

It calls for action to expand world trade. This means that we cannot afford to let the Kennedy round fail.

It calls for action to enlarge world monetary reserves to meet the most pressing requirements of both developing and industrialized areas.

Whether action is taken in each of these fields will depend, in good part, on how seriously your countries and mine address these tasks. For it is our resources and our skills that are in good part involved.

The needs of emerging countries continue to grow. As in Europe after World War II, their security as well as their growth must be assured, if they are not to become a focus of ever-widening conflict.

All of us have a stake in that security. The Atlantic nations cannot survive as an island of stability in a world of chaos.

The threats to this security may be subtle or indirect; that does not make them any less real.

A better world cannot be built by turning away from the difficult and dangerous business of meeting these threats.

This is common business, because all our interests are at stake.

Political consultation should be the means of discharging common business—the means of arriving at common action.

Such consultation, in its quiet way, is gradually becoming a habit in the alliance. There are now few subjects of international importance which are not discussed, day in and day out, by the North Atlantic Council.

More needs to be done. The practice of bringing together the senior officials who have responsibility in home governments has been successful in the OECD. It may prove increasingly rewarding in NATO.

Intimate and continuing concert of action is also fostered by parliamentary meetings such as this. The proposal for an Atlantic Assembly, which has been approved by this group, looks to the same end. I hope it can be fulfilled.

But let us be clear: Consultation will not be assured by effective mechanisms alone.

The responsibilities and burdens of common effort go hand in hand. Consultation will be effective in the degree that it looks to action. Common decisions will come most readily to those countries willing to share in the effort that these decisions govern.

I turn now to a second area in which joint action is needed: averting spread of nuclear weapons under national control.

There will be no security for any of our countries if the authority to let loose these weapons proliferates.

There are three ways in which the Atlantic nations can—and must—act together to avert this peril.

First, we must assure that Atlantic nuclear arrangements offer our European partners an effective alternative to national systems of deterrence.

It is natural that European countries, with new strength and confidence, should wish to play a larger role in their own defense.

My country is ready to join with them in effective action to this end.

There will be continuing discussion of such action among interested nations in the period ahead.

We must also consider how best to meet the concerns of key nonnuclear countries outside the Atlantic area—concerns which might otherwise move these countries to consider national deterrence.

Last October President Johnson said, in speaking of the first Chinese Communist nuclear explosion: "The nations that do not seek nuclear weapons can be sure that if they need our sure support against some threat of nuclear blackmail, then they will have it."

I hope that interested Atlantic nations can work together—in the United Nations, in disarmament negotiations, and elsewhere—in seeking ways to fulfill this pledge.

We must also continue to seek a common approach to arms negotiations with the U.S.S.R.

In the recent Geneva Conference a large measure of Western agreement was reached on a proposed nonproliferation treaty. We hope that the Soviet Union will, over time, reconsider its abrupt rejection of this proposal.

At this same Conference, key nuclear capable countries made clear that reductions in existing nuclear armaments could play an important part in encouraging and insuring nonproliferation. Ambassador Goldberg has recently laid before the United Nations American proposals for freezing and reducing nuclear capabilities.

In seeking to reduce armaments, as in other areas of negotiation with the U.S.S.R., Western unity will be essential, if there is to be any chance of success. Atlantic nations that come together to share in nuclear defense should share, no less, in the search for prudent ways of limiting the burdens and dangers of that defense.

But defense of the status quo is not good enough as a purpose of Atlantic action. In trying to build a better world we must seek peacefully to erode the tragic and unnecessary division of Europe.

The nations of Eastern Europe are finding new paths. Closer contacts between these nations and the Atlantic world can best be sought on a basis of common understanding in the West.

The effort to develop such closer contacts is not directly against any nation, least of all the Soviet Union. We seek to end existing divisions in Europe, not to create new ones.

The most grevious of these existing divisions is the enforced partition of Germany. The German people, like any other, must be allowed to choose and shape its own future. The need is to afford the German people that choice, while meeting the security concerns of all with a stake in European peace.

I have spoken of fields in which action is required. There is the need, as well, for our alliance to more greatly develop our cooperation in such fields as outer space. For we must together insure that space will be a source of man's peaceful progress and not a threat to that progress.

In each of these things, the key to success will be common effort.

Atlantic nations which mount such effort will have done much to carry forward the purpose of their partnership: creating a better world.

If we fail and fall apart, future generations may well look back on our time as we look back on the period between the wars: an interlude in which men forgot the harsh lessons of disaster, and thus lost the chance to build anew.

The need is clear.

It is for each of us here to help decide whether it will be met.

ADDRESS BY MANLIO BROSIO, SECRETARY GENERAL OF NATO, TO THE NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE, NEW YORK, OCTOBER 4, 1965

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, for the second time, I have the honor and pleasure of addressing you; and I am delighted to be doing so in the United States, where for over 6 unforgettable years, I represented my country and made so many friends. The world in general and the Atlantic Alliance in particular present us with so many problems to discuss and so many causes for concern, that I will spare you any further words of introduction and plunge straight into my subject.

Nevertheless, it is fitting that I should recall that His Holiness Pope Paul the Sixth is here today in this city of New York on a mission of peace and good will which all of us, I am sure, support, and in which all of us wish him every good success. We, too, in NATO are working for peace and the defense of a civilization founded on the ideals and aspirations of which he, for millions all over the world, is the living symbol and embodiment. And this defense demands on the one hand good will, charity, and tolerance, and on the other, firmness and courage in facing the difficulties and dangers of this imperfect world.

In the Western World, it is universally accepted by the allied governments that the Atlantic Alliance is today as necessary as ever. At the same time, all of us are agreed that the world has changed since 1949, and that the alliance may have to change with it, though here, of course, is where the divergences start, in that all of us have our own ideas on why it should change and in what directions.

First of all, I think we should get our minds clear on one point; why, and for what purposes, is the alliance still necessary? Only thus can we assess the effects of new situations on the alliance itself and determine whether changes are necessary, and, if so, in what direction they should be.

The alliance came into being owing to the imperative need to defend Western Europe against Soviet threats and pressure. The Prague coup and the Berlin crisis were at once the determining cause of its establishment and the justification for it. The intention was to restore the balance of forces between the free world and Soviet communism; and this was achieved. Europe was not able to bring this about on her own. She needed the support of North America, and this support was decisive. At that time, the United States had a monopoly of nuclear weapons, and this in itself was sufficient to check Soviet expansionism.

It is true that American nuclear monopoly has been succeeded by a nuclear balance deterring both the Soviet Union and the United States from resorting to force. A Chinese nuclear capability has emerged. The commitments of the United States in Asia and South America have expanded, the outstanding example being the war in Vietnam. Europe has achieved a remarkable economic and political recovery, and has also made considerable progress in the military sphere. But none of these changes have affected the basic realities that made and still make the alliance a political and military necessity. A balance of forces is still necessary. Soviet threats and Soviet pressure are still with us.

From a military point of view, it is clear that if Soviet aggression, or threatened aggression, has been averted, this is due directly and entirely to American military support for Europe. If this support were to be removed, the danger would at once revive. We must face the fact that the recovery of Europe, remarkable though it may be as a political and economic achievement, has not reduced the disparity between the military strength, nuclear or conventional, of Europe, and that of the United States—or for that matter the Soviet Union. The gap, if anything, has increased, for the complication and cost of modern weapons have made it impossible for European nations to compete with America or the Soviets. The balance of force, therefore, both now and for an indefinite future, can be maintained only if the United States remain firmly committed at Europe's side.

But if the threat of military aggression has been averted by the balance of forces, political pressure continues, and the Soviet political danger to Europe is as strong as ever, though it may assume more subtle forms. The Soviet Union is still involved in a great political and diplomatic struggle with Western Europe, aimed at dividing, weakening, and if possible, destroying the Atlantic Alliance. Any disturbance of the military balance would have an immediate effect on the course of this great struggle. It is not that the free institutions of Western Europe rest on armed forces. On the contrary, it is the Communists who have never dared to expose their system to the free expression of the public will. The normal processes of democracy play no part in their calculations. Their weapons are political and military pressure from outside, coupled with subversion and penetration from within, demagogy, and violence.

The policy of the Soviet Union therefore may no longer be openly threatening, but it remains an aggressive one and offensive in the sense that it supports and exploits every opportunity to extend Soviet authority over Europe by undermining and dividing the Atlantic countries. Convincing evidence of Soviet intentions is afforded by their refusal to allow a solution of the political problems of Europe and in particular of the key issue of Germany. The allegation that the Soviet Union will not allow German reunification because it fears a war of revenge by Germany will not hold water. On the contrary, it is the Soviet Union's deliberate intention to exploit the persistent and understandable resentment which the war left behind it in order to keep Germany weak and divided, and foment discord and doubt in Europe over the German problem.

Responsible Soviet leaders are too intelligent and too well informed not to know that even a reunited Germany could never be strong enough to threaten the Soviet Union whose population, economic resources and military capability are so much greater. They also know perfectly well that it is pure fantasy to pretend that Germany, even if she wished to do so, could drag Europe or the United States into war against the Soviet Union. No state in Europe or America would be prepared to countenance, still less to support, any such supposed German revanchism.

On the other hand, it should be easy for the Soviets to understand that the best possible guarantee against any possibility, however hypothetical, of an isolated, lunatic, single-handed venture by Germany against them would be to encourage Germany either to merge into a united Europe or to strengthen still further her Atlantic ties. In either event, the influence of the alliance, and above all that of the United States, would be a guarantee of restraint. But the Soviets will have none of this—in public anyway—though I would not insult their intelligence by implying that they do not recognize it in private. They want a weak Germany. They want to divide, and ultimately to control, Europe; and they find propaganda about German revanchism and an illusory German threat extremely useful for the purpose.

In this situation two main tasks are incumbent on the alliance and will continue to be so for a long time to come. One is to maintain the military balance, which has deterred and will continue to deter aggression and blackmail; and the other is to preserve unity of political action between the European states themselves and between Europe, the United States, and Canada. If it fails in these, Soviet political maneuvering will in the long run find a weak spot of which it can take advantage in order to divide and ultimately to control us.

Of course, many people think this an oversimplified argument. They forget, however, that one of the essential virtues of political analysis is precisely to go to the heart of problems and reduce them to their simplest expression. In politics subtlety may engender doubt and inaction; and the analysis of a problem is not necessarily superficial because it is simple. There are, however, objections to my analysis and I refer to only one of them. It is said that quite apart from the Atlantic Alliance and its military forces, the Sino-Soviet conflict is in itself sufficient to inhibit the Soviet Union from pursuing a policy of expansion in Europe. The conclusion is drawn from this that a reduction in American commitments in Europe might reduce Soviet hostility or even bring about tacit cooperation in Asia. This is, however, a dangerous illusion for it implies that immediate results may be expected from a development which, if it comes at all, can only be a very long-term one. The Soviet Union is too strong to need to fear China; and it will remain so for many years to come. In the meantime it is to the Soviets' interest to strengthen their position vis-a-vis the West and they have plenty of time to do so. If the Soviet Union is resisted in Europe, it will have to come to a reasonable settlement sooner or later. If on the contrary it finds weakness and disunion those will be exploited. If the Soviet Union finds the way wide open before it in Europe, this will strengthen its position on the western front, and give it a stronger posture in confronting China in Asia. But if the Soviets find a solid Europe planted firmly in their path, they will have to come to an agreement with Europe in order to deal with China.

There is an equally dangerous illusion in some European countries which believe that under the protection of the Soviet-American nuclear stalemate, they can pursue a policy entirely independent of, and indeed contrary to, that of the other allies. In some cases, some of the policies they adopt indeed happen to be coincidental with those of the adversaries of the United States and the alliance. There is no doubt that the Atlantic Alliance is an alliance of sovereign and independent states, and it must remain so; but the policy of those states must take account of the fact that the alliance exists. If the alliance is not animated by a common spirit, it is in danger of becoming a dead letter. Moreover, no state in the alliance as it is today, and certainly no European state, is any longer in a position to conduct a world policy on its own and to act alone as a counterweight to the power of the Soviet Union—or, looking 20 years ahead, the power of China.

In quite another direction, there are those who fear the expansion of the commitments and responsibilities of the United States in Asia, Latin America and elsewhere. These critics hope that the United States will not extend their commitments any further, but that they will, on the contrary, withdraw from their existing commitments as soon as possible, in order to conserve their strength for the vital Atlantic and European sectors.

My answer to this is that it is true that the Atlantic sector should be for all of us, including the Americans, the decisive sector in the situation as it is today and is likely to be for some time to come. But it is also true that a setback for the United States in Asia, for example, in Vietnam, would also be a grave setback for the whole of the West. Not only this, but an American retreat or a humiliating compromise in Vietnam, far from ending U.S. commitments in Asia, would extend them on an even greater scale to all sorts of other areas, from Thailand to the Philippines.

All these causes for concern, all these subtleties of analysis, do not affect the validity of the essential argument, that the Soviet Union must continue to be held in check in Europe by the balance of armed force and by political solidarity. These two concepts remain the "raison d'être" and the essential function of the Atlantic Alliance.

Mr. Chairman, I think these observations of mine may serve as a useful starting point for the consideration of a problem with which you are closely concerned and which you have discussed very knowledgeably and very seriously. I refer to what has become known as the problem of the reform of the alliance. There has been a great deal of talk about this—perhaps too much. What I have to say is this: if we are really agreed on the necessity of the alliance on the terms and for the purposes I have outlined, then there is no danger in talking about reform. In that case, reform means modification or improvement in order the more effectively to pursue agreed aims. Sometimes, however, talk of reform derives from a certain degree of misunderstanding of the situation. It is said, for example, that the policy of blocs is obsolete and that we must think of something else. Such critics forget that it is precisely the policy of blocs, or rather alliances, which has kept the peace until now and may have to keep it in the future. Indeed, the dissolution of the Western bloc would once more throw the international situation into anarchy, thus endangering peace. Ideas of this nature lead to the conclusion that the alliance should no longer concern itself with the Soviet threat but should do something different. It should, for example, direct its attention to China, or the uncommitted world and its problems or try to solve economic and social problems all over the world, or transform itself into a genuine community, in which case it is suggested, it would be able to do all these things at once.

All these lines of argument are directed in reality not to the reform of the alliance but toward turning it into something which may be an alliance, which may be an association, but which would certainly be very different from what it is at present. My own feeling is that some of these ideas are based, as I have said, on a failure to realize the facts. Others may be admirable in themselves, but the time for them has probably not arrived yet. But all of them, it seems to me, are symptomatic of a state of uneasiness; and in some cases, they even contribute to the uneasiness itself. From time to time they receive encouragement from the action of allied states who, for one reason or another, take unilateral action not in consonance with the NATO system of political or military organization. All of these are effects of the changes in the political scene to which I have referred and of an inadequate and sometimes tendentious analysis of the nature of those changes.

For all of these reasons, when I speak of the reform of the alliance, I do so with great caution, not because I am frightened of either words or action; on the contrary, I am stimulated and encouraged by any attempt to bring about progress or improvement, and in this I know I am entirely in agreement with you. The fact is, however, that there is considerable disquiet about the future of the alliance and it is incumbent on us to disperse this disquiet with clear and precise ideas. Let us then welcome without reserve the discussion of any modification which might improve the alliance and its organization, while treating with more caution any proposals for radical reform which might jeopardize what we have already, without stating in precise terms what should be put in its place.

I have no intention, even if I had the time, of discussing here the various proposals for reform which have been put forward. There are a great many of them, and they merit serious consideration, covering as they do not only the military, political, economic, and scientific fields, but also the problem of coordinating all those activities within NATO. You have given serious and intensive consideration to a great many of them with concrete and instructive analysis; and I can only thank you for your efforts. Today I will confine myself to a few observations on the main categories of reform proposals and on their political origins and effects. In this way I hope I shall be able to help clarify some of our ideas.

Reform has been discussed in a number of contexts: the recovery and political future of Europe; the military, political, and organizational structure of NATO; nuclear arms and the necessity for better arrangements for sharing control and responsibility; finally, the geographical area in which the alliance operates and the possibility of extending it to cope with world tasks and world problems.

In regard to Europe, I have already said that the political and economic recovery of our continent has been both admirable and surprising. Here we should give full recognition to the initial impetus given by the Marshall plan. However, it cannot be said that the gap between the military capability of Europe and that of the United States has in any way narrowed. On the contrary, it has increased. No doubt European military forces have increased absolutely both in quantity and quality. I need only mention the considerable efforts France has made to develop a force de frappe—which may be a subject of controversy but is, nevertheless, a factor to be reckoned with—and the 12 divisions of the Bundeswehr. Relatively, however, American advances in the field of nuclear weapons, missiles, and space travel have been on such a scale that the disparity between America and Europe has increased and is still increasing. The states of Europe have not succeeded in achieving any measure of political solidarity in regard to their external policy and we cannot, therefore, regard them in any way a collective unit within the alliance. The alliance remains an alliance of 15 states of varying military and economic potentialities, each trying to pursue its own policies and to coordinate them with those of others for the common defense.

Of course, there would be a profound and, indeed, automatic change in the alliance if Europe or even a considerable number of European states were to achieve genuine political unity. The establishment of a United States of Europe, whether of 6 or 7 or 10 or 13 members, would in itself imply a substantial modification to the structure of the alliance. I firmly believe that it would be a change for the better and, indeed, perhaps the best change of all. I have already said many times in my speeches that I see no incompatibility between political union in Europe and the alliance. I have never shared, and do not share now, the doubts of those who fear that a united Europe may have a divisive effect in that united Europe may go its own way and break the political solidarity with the United States. This fear has made some observers anxious to come to some clear-cut definition of the limits of a possible partnership between Europe and the United States. It has also given rise to the theory of the "dumbbell." Now a dumbbell has two equal spheres at either end, but it cannot exist without a strong rigid handle to keep the two together. Great historical issues like this should be approached with less apprehension and more flexibility, less timidity and more confidence.

What, in such situations, really helps to maintain the existing links and solidarity? In my view, it is not so much the existence of formal commitments and of written obligations as the fact that the basic objectives and, indeed, the interests are the same. My own profound conviction is that even a united Europe will need the support of North America for a long time to come, not only in order to acquire military power commensurate with its area and its economic potential but even more because among all the dangers of a world in ferment the full and combined strength of both Europe and America will be barely sufficient to insure the preservation of our civilization and the extension of its benefits to the rest of a changing planet.

I do not believe that a third force, neutralistic Europe, is a likely development. On the other hand it is much more probable that individual European states in a divided Europe might yield to the temptation of taking up a position of would-be independence and neutrality, whether inside or outside the alliance. For me, therefore, European unity and the Atlantic Alliance are not only not incompatible but will remain complementary to one another; and if one day the Soviet danger were finally eliminated by peaceful means, agreement between Europe and America might be extended and transformed still further, assuming larger tasks on a worldwide scale.

But the hard reality of the moment is that for the present there is no European political unity and no common European policy within the alliance. There is therefore no basis for a reform of the alliance predicated on assumption of European recovery, at any rate until European states come to an agreement for the pursuit of a common purpose within the alliance. This seems unlikely in either the immediate or the foreseeable future, a reflection which is a painful realization for convinced Europeans. At the same time, it implies both a warning and a call to us to assume our responsibilities in matters of European political unity. We have talked too much and done too little. This is clearly an issue where responsibility lies with the governments and people of Europe. So far the Americans have always encouraged European unity, but it is for Europe itself to indicate the lines on which it should be pursued or the stages by which it should develop.

While reform through European unity cannot be considered as a live issue, there are a number of proposals for structural reforms, taking as their starting point the reality of the present situation in which we have 15 separate allies. These are reforms of the organization of the alliance, political and military; of the organs of decision, the commands and forces, relations between all these and the coordination of the economic, productive, and scientific activities of member countries. There is plenty of scope here for sensible, responsible proposals. But I will not detain you over this. There is indeed a "question préalable" which makes it difficult at present to put any of these proposals into effect in the absence of agreement in principle. So we are still concerned here with improving the organization, and making it operate more effectively, rationally, and fairly. This may involve adding something here or subtracting and simplifying there; but if we begin to draw theoretical distinctions between the alliance and the organization which had come into being to implement it; if we begin to argue about such abstractions as organization, integration, and subordination, the dialog will become difficult.

The fact of the matter is that, under modern conditions, you cannot have an effective military alliance without some kind of organization in peacetime. The material and strategic problems involved are too big. You cannot devise a nuclear strategy, an early warning system, or a pipeline network, overnight. Europe itself is too small. "We cannot afford in any future war to buy time by selling space. If we do not prepare for the moment of danger, there can be no effective defense when and if it comes. Not only this, but since our defenses must not only be effective, but be soon to be so, there can be no credible deterrent, to provide which is the alliance's essential function in time of peace. If there are no allied troops in Germany or elsewhere in Europe in peacetime, the credibility of the deterrent is gravely diminished. On the other hand, if allied troops are stationed on European soil, there must be some sort of organization for command and communications.

It is quite illogical to argue in one breath that alliances are no longer valid in the nuclear age because no country is going to risk annihilation to defend another, and in the next to refuse to accept that very military organization which, far more than any written agreement, guarantees that defense commitments will be honored. If this is correct, we should try to keep the question on a practical footing leaving aside theoretical discussions on integration and subordination. If some of us declared against any form of integration and others for more and better integration, the result will be a battle of words from which agreement is highly unlikely to emerge. If, however, we take the line that equality between allies is the basis of the alliance, and that we are concerned only with finding the best organization for it, agreement could be reached. What we have all got to do is to admit that in modern conditions a unified command must be prepared in time of peace; if this is accepted we can always discuss, and, if necessary, review the ways and means of insuring respect for the sovereignty of all the allies and a rational distribution of authority and functions.

I am convinced that commonsense will prevail and that dispute over words will give way to a practical discussion on the best course of action. If this does not happen, the consequences are difficult to foresee. What is certain is that all our countries consider the alliance necessary, and that most of them consider it necessary to have a command organization, albeit with major units remaining under national control and available if need be for the defense of vital national interests. This being so we have only to wait to hear the proposals of anybody who wishes to change the existing state of affairs. Any such proposals would certainly be considered with the seriousness, respect, and good will that they deserve. Thereafter, each of us will have to assume responsibility for whatever action he may take. Certainly, if on the one hand European unity is not realized and on the other there is no general agreement on the organization of the Atlantic Alliance, a number of European states would aim at even closer links with the United States. In that event, those who aspire to a greater degree of autonomy of Europe within the Atlantic framework—and there are not a few of them—would be disappointed and the net result would be exactly the opposite of what they had hoped.

The third aspect of the proposal for the reform of NATO derives from the necessity to improve our nuclear defense. This involves major issues of strategy, strategic planning, command, and the creation and organization of national or collective forces.

In essence the problem is one of satisfying the aspirations of certain European states; Germany in particular, but Italy, the Netherlands, and Belgium as well, who are not asking for national nuclear weapons, but wish to take part in the nuclear defense of the alliance. Here again, I do not intend to discuss the ideas and plans put forward by various parties. I will confine myself to emphasizing certain basic points.

The first one on which I think all the allies can and will agree, is that any nuclear understanding must be reached between allies themselves in a spirit of full equality without any discrimination and without any suspicion toward anyone. This condition applies primarily to Germany, which entered the alliance under the handicap that her status after the Second World War was still undecided. The Federal Government has repeatedly stated that it does not intend to obtain national nuclear weapons. On the basis of this statement, the way is open for an understanding between the allies which will meet not only the interests of the alliance—which is the most important consideration—but also the need for peace and an honorable solution of the German problem with the Soviet Union and other interested countries. Had Europe achieved political unity, which would in time have enabled her to produce a European deterrent, a solution might have been found on the European plane. In the absence of such a solution, the alternative of an Atlantic solution remains. We must seek to bring about one or the other, putting our trust in the new Germany and its democratic leaders and in the spirit of moderation and peace which nowadays animates the German people and its responsible leaders. The solution of today must not be overshadowed by tragic memories and understandable resentment at the events of former years.

Above all, the Allies must not allow themselves to be intimidated by the pressure and threats by which the Soviet Union is attempting at all costs to prevent any agreement permitting Germany to participate in Atlantic nuclear strategy or forces. Clearly, any such agreements must be inspired by a spirit of moderation and the desire not to close the door on an eventual agreement on Germany with the Communist countries. But the Allies, including Germany herself, must remain the judges of what is necessary in the way of agreements and for their own defense. If we had heeded the Soviet Union and its threats, there would never have been an Atlantic alliance in 1949; Greece and Turkey would not have been admitted in 1951, or Germany in 1954; and there would never even have been a European Economic Community. Agreements between the Atlantic powers on nuclear matters should therefore have political priority over any agreement with the Soviet Union.

It is for the allies or those of them who consider themselves directly concerned to decide on the expediency, the timing, and the limits of such agreements, having regard to the requirements of the defense of the alliance and of peace. Any other method carries the risk of reviving and reinforcing any nationalist or neutralist tendencies which may exist in Germany or elsewhere in the alliance. This would be serious, not of course, because Germany represents a real military threat, but because a nationalist or neutralist Germany would be a hotbed of agitation, unrest, and disorder in Europe. Not even the Communist countries would derive any real benefit from such a situation, but they might contribute to its creation.

In the past, nazism, the professed adversary of communism, became the involuntary instrument of Communist domination over a great part of Europe. Today, communism which paved the way for the advent of nazism by refusing to support German democracy and encouraged Hitler on the path of adventure with the pacts of 1939, might contribute to the revival of nationalist and neutralist agitation with its campaign of hate and calumny. We must prevent this with a policy and firmness and moderation, refusing any form of support to any supposed German revanchism, but defending to the last the right of the German people to choose freely their destiny. These principles must be reflected in the nuclear policy of the alliance and the Allied Nations. In the long run, the Soviet Union will acquiesce in this policy of firmness and peace, for as I said at the beginning, the Soviet leaders have too much sense not to realize that it is in their country's interest to keep Germany committed to the other Western countries whose peaceful intentions are obvious, and this will happen, provided that the Allies remember that they must remain united; in other words, that they must maintain solidarity throughout the alliance including Germany. Today, the danger comes not from Germany but from Communist Russia. The reversal of alliances which came about in 1949 and was consecrated by the agreements of 1954 remains a fact. To make any other assumption would be in contradiction of one of the essential purposes of the alliance. There is room for many opinions on the best way of improving nuclear defense within the alliance, but unless these essential basic assumptions are established, we shall find ourselves discussing not questions of organization, but the very substance and spirit of the alliance.

My second observation on the theme of nuclear problems in the alliance is that any proposed new agreement must be essentially positive in character. By that I mean it should not be based primarily on a system of vetos but on a positive system for the control and use of nuclear forces. Clearly, as long as the United States have an enormous preponderance of nuclear forces—and that is likely to be for a long time to come—it will be difficult to deny them an independent capability of decision, both positive and negative. But a multiplicity of national vetos would diminish the effectiveness of the Atlantic nuclear deterrent, and convince the Soviets that it would never be used. Even this would in the last resort be a system founded more on suspicion than on confidence, and it would, in consequence, not be a constructive one. The states of the alliance have enough sense of history and politics, and are responsible enough, to be able to collaborate positively in nuclear decisions in whatever manner they may in due course decide.

It is for states concerned to discuss and decide on the nature of these agreements—whether they will deal with the creation of new forces, the organization of existing ones or cooperation in nuclear strategy, or all these things at once. Even a partial agreement between a certain number of states without the participation of others, can only strengthen allied defense to the extent that it adds new forces or improves existing ones. Naturally, as I told you last year, it will be necessary for these forces to be linked to the alliance through the allied chain of command. They must also be linked to the political organs of NATO. The best means of doing this is open to discussion, but provided that there is a common political will to maintain and strengthen the alliance, this is essentially a technical problem. Without such a political will, no problem can be solved; but I am convinced that it will not be found wanting.

I would not wish to neglect the fourth and last aspect of reform in the alliance, namely, its evolution toward a genuine Atlantic community which would supersede and absorb the purely defensive alliance. I had some opportunity of discussing this with you last year, and I have thought about it a great deal since. The more I do so, the more I realize that the issue is an extremely important one. Obviously, the problem has not yet been clearly defined. In a sense, the Atlantic Community already exists as a community of history, civilization, ethics and basic political ideas. Community in this sense is the whole basis and justification of the alliance; and without such a community, the alliance would never have come into existence.

But ideas differ widely on the concept of a community when it is regarded not as a starting point, but as a developing concept and a goal to be attained. Some conceive of it as a full-blown political federation. That, as you know, is an idea which has been vigorously advocated here in the United States. Others again speak of partnership and association; but the character of the partnership and the conditions of the association remain vague.

My own view is that when people speak of a community they mean an association of states capable of facing all the great political problems of the world in common; defending Western civilization wherever it is threatened even outside the North Atlantic Treaty area. In this sense, the idea of a community joins up with that of the extension of the alliance's responsibilities beyond the area at present laid down in the treaty; and in this sense, the prospect of a community remains a noble, responsible and reasonable concept. All the same, I think it remains a distant one.

For the time being, the alliance remains what it was created to be; namely, an agreement between sovereign states for the military and political defense of the North Atlantic area. To extend the scope—geographically and otherwise—of the obligations the allied countries undertook in 1949 would not be easy. It would have to be very carefully considered and the pros and cons very cautiously weighed. In any event we must beware, lest in seeking to improve the alliance and strengthen our ties, we bring about precisely the opposite result and cause a split in it. In particular, we must at all costs avoid creating the impression that there is any conflict or competition between the idea of a European community and the idea of an Atlantic community; for this would be most dangerous to the unity and solidarity of the Western World. The idea of an Atlantic community must remain, as I am sure it can, on the one hand, an expression of a common civilization which is the very foundation of our alliance, and, on the other, a possibility of further development springing from the association of Europe and North America when and if Europe has achieved unity. It might, indeed, be a substitute for European unity, but only when and if Europe has tried every other means of obtaining unity, and failed. Fortunately, the moment for this has not yet come, and it does not look as if it is coming.

In conclusion, it might be said that the improvement, or the reform if you like to call it that, of NATO's organization and defenses depends more than anything else on clear ideas and firm conviction regarding the necessity of the alliance and its objectives in the face of Soviet political power and political pressure. If this clear concept and this firm determination exist, any improvements which may be necessary become relatively easy; if they are lacking, improvements will be extremely difficult. The years through which we are about to pass will show whether the will and the conviction exist. I am convinced that they do, and that frank discussion and objective analysis of our various opinions and proposals will only strengthen them. To obtain this result, we must go forward in a practical spirit and without preconceived ideas, avoiding theoretical questions of principle about integration and nonintegration, subordination and nonsubordination, and seeking together to establish what changes are necessary to make NATO stronger, simpler, and more equitable. We must therefore make every effort to insure that this exchange of ideas is useful and positive. Only if it proves manifestly impossible to proceed on this basis, should we resign ourselves to proceeding on any other.

The great majority of allied countries are convinced that the alliance should go on even if we should have to take such a course. I understand this, but it is my task to prevent us from being faced with the choice, and I fervently hope that I shall succeed in doing so. We must get ourselves past the present moment of uncertainty and uneasiness; for the alliance remains as necessary as ever in the sense I have attempted to explain to you.

I would add that, while the alliance depends on a realistic policy of firmness toward the Soviet Union and the Communist countries, this does not in any way imply a position of rigid hostility. Still less does it imply an aggressive or bellicose attitude. The function of the alliance remains defensive and peaceful. Its hand must remain outstretched toward the Soviet Union, always provided that the Soviet Union is genuinely willing to grasp it and embark on a frank and honest discussion of mutual interests. It is no part of the mission of our alliance to prevent agreement. On the contrary, its task is to promote agreement, and to achieve it in allied unity. Only thus can there be a just settlement serving the interests of all the parties concerned. This policy of union is, if you will, a policy of strength, but it is not, as Communist polemics misrepresent it, a policy of bullying and compulsion. A policy of strength in our Atlantic language means only one thing; the opposite of a policy of weakness. The strength we seek is the strength deriving from union for defense and the search for a just peace. Outside this union, there is no salvation for the free world. If we can maintain our unity, agreement with the Soviet Union will be less difficult; and peace will be secured.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 12, 1965]

THE ATLANTIC PURPOSE

As the world moves into the third decade of the postwar period it is becoming increasingly urgent to refocus an American foreign policy that essentially was shaped in the first.

The crucial need in the first postwar decade was defense against the Communist threat. But since 1962 the Soviet-Western relationship has evolved from cold war through a brief détente into a new era. Atlantic strength and Sino-Soviet disunity have opened a prospect of peace.

At present it is an uneasy peace, an armed peace, because the basic postwar settlement, delayed for 20 years, has yet to be made. Europe remains divided along a line that splits Germany in two. The task of gradually eroding that division and creating the conditions for a political settlement demands a joint approach by the United States and West Europe. Neither can achieve a settlement with Moscow on its own.

With détente encouraging centrifugal tendencies on both sides of the Atlantic, it is essential that American foreign policy be reshaped in an American-European dialog. Vice President HUMPHREY made an important contribution to that dialog in his speech to the NATO parliamentarians in New York last week.

The strengthening and reinvigoration of the Atlantic partnership, Mr. HUMPHREY emphasized, is the essential prerequisite if the East-West dividing line in Europe is to give way to a lasting settlement. As for the closer contacts that must be sought with East European nations as they reassert their national identities, the aim must not be to turn them against the Soviet Union, even if that were possible, but to meet the security concerns of all. Only in that context can a solution to the German problem be found. Meanwhile, there is pressing need to avert the spread of nuclear weapons under respective national controls. In Europe, new collective arrangements must be offered the NATO allies—West Germany in particular—as "an effective alternative to national systems of deterrence." Outside the Atlantic area, a way must be found to give nonnuclear nations—India first of all—multilateral guarantees against nuclear blackmail, preferably through the United Nations and in cooperation with Moscow. Agreement on a nonproliferation treaty with the Soviet Union must be sought at the same time.

Alongside control of nuclear weapons and the search for a European settlement, the third great task that confronts the Atlantic world is to help the emerging nations of Latin America, Africa, and Asia achieve security and economic growth. This means increased aid to the developing countries, expanded trade through a successful Kennedy round and an enlargement of world monetary reserves.

The political tasks facing the Atlantic partnership now are far more complex than the military tasks of the past. The most critical need is to achieve a common view of the world that is and the world that is to be.

The nations of the Atlantic Basin control 80 to 90 percent of the free world's industrial resources, trade, gold, and military power. Together—and in cooperation with the Soviet Union—they can shape a stable and prosperous world order. But they must first define a common Atlantic purpose.

THE UNSEEN SEARCH FOR PEACE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have just returned from a visit with American forces in the Far East. Much of my time was spent with our troops in Vietnam. In my years of service in the Pacific theater in World War II and in my continual contact with our servicemen as a Marine Reserve officer and a Member of the House and Senate Armed Services Committee I have never encountered a more dedicated or effective fighting team. These men understand better than anyone else the importance of the job they are doing. They understand their part in what Secretary Rusk recently described as "the unseen search for peace."

"The Unseen Search for Peace" was the title of Secretary Rusk's speech at Johns Hopkins University last Saturday. Our distinguished Secretary of State delivered the George Huntington Williams Memorial Lecture to an overflow audience. Those who could not be accommodated in the hall stood outside to listen to the Secretary on loudspeakers.

Mr. President, the Secretary's speech was a great one. The sacrifices which our men are making in Vietnam are great ones. The issue of peace to which both Secretary Rusk and each soldier address themselves is the greatest one of all.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that a small but vocal minority continues to embarrass policy and impede progress. I can tell you firsthand of the resentment of our troops in Vietnam toward the irresponsible demonstrations of young people at home.

I am glad to report that the speech by Secretary Rusk at Johns Hopkins on Saturday was enthusiastically received, that the protestors were few and that the small band of placard carriers were restrained and orderly in their behavior.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNSEEN SEARCH FOR PEACE

(George Huntington Williams memorial lecture, by the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, Johns Hopkins University, October 16, 1965)

I

The paramount imperative of our time is the search for world peace—genuine peace in which all men can live in dignity without fear of their neighbors. President Johnson has called the search for world peace "the assignment of the century." It is an assignment which springs from the deepest yearnings of our people and is dictated by the grim realities of modern weapons. It is one to which your Federal Government gives the highest priority.

Our goal is the sort of world community sketched in the preamble and articles 1 and 2 of the United Nations Charter—a world of independent nations, each with the institutions of its own choice but cooperating with one another to promote the mutual interests of their citizens, a world free of aggression, a world which moves toward the rule of law, a world in which human rights are secure, a world of better life for all of mankind.

That goal may seem distant. But it is a working guide to our foreign policy. Indeed, we dare not regard it as merely a dream. For unless it is actually achieved, the outlook for homo sapiens is dark indeed.

The citizen who skims the daily news summaries may wonder if we are making real progress toward peace. For the world is unruly and dangerous. A day in which only three or four crises make the front page—and only six or eight are mentioned in the news—is relatively quiet. The President and the Secretary of State enjoy the dubious advantage of knowing there are 10 or a dozen additional trouble spots which may erupt into crises at any moment. And always the President and his advisers have on their minds the awesome responsibilities for protecting peace and freedom against those who would impose their coercive systems on others.

We dare not let down our guard against aggression. The Soviet leadership appears to understand what a great war would cost. But it remains committed to the support of so-called wars of national liberation. And these, in the Communist lexicon, can include any war against any non-Communist government.

The Chinese Communists are blatant advocates of violence. Let anyone who doubts their militancy read the recent article by Marshal Lin Piao, their Defense Minister. It is as candid as Hitler's "Mein Kampf."

The militant Communists of Asia will have to learn that aggression does not pay. That is the issue involved in Vietnam. It is not without pain for us, as well as for the Vietnamese. But if the aggression there is not repelled, we would have to expect further and bigger aggressions in the future. And when it is defeated there, as it will be, the prospects for a stable peace in the Western Pacific and Asia will be vastly improved.

But while we do our share—and sometimes more—to deter or defeat aggression, we work unceasingly to build the kind of world envisioned in the United Nations Charter. Now and then a constructive event captures the headlines: The U.N. Security Council's action in regard to the hostilities between India and Pakistan, the visit of Pope Paul to the United Nations—with his great message, or, to go back further, the test ban treaty.

But there are myriads of constructive efforts which receive little public attention.

I shall use this occasion to direct attention to the unheadlined—and largely unseen and unheard—search for peace.

II

One rough gage of our involvement with the rest of the world is the number of international conferences we attend. At the beginning of the century, the U.S. Government took part in perhaps two or three multilateral conferences in an average year. In 1946, the first year after the Second World War, it took part in 141. This year we are taking part in approximately 650. Some last only a day or two, a few last for months. On an average working day, we are attending 15 to 20.

The list of this month, October 1965, numbers more than 60. It includes:

The International Conferences of the Red Cross in Vienna.

The International Symposium on Water Desalination, held in Washington. As the large-scale desalting of sea water becomes cheaper, immense benefits will begin to flow to many countries, including the United States. And one can envisage the time when vast deserts will be cultivated.

The Codex Alimentarius Commission of the Food and Agriculture Organization. This is concerned with food standards, which will not only make food products safer but enable American products in the categories involved to compete better in world markets.

The South Pacific Commission, in Noumea, New Caledonia. This is concerned with the welfare of the non-self-governing territories in the South Pacific.

Conference on Sanitary Regulations Affecting International Trade in Livestock and Meat, under the auspices of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, in Paris.

The World Meteorological Organization's Commission for Instruments and Methods of Observation, in Tokyo.

A GATT Working Party on Preferences, in Geneva.

The Plenipotentiary Conference of the International Telecommunications Union, in Montreux. This began in September and will run into November. It is designed to modernize the structure of this organization, which deals with wired and wireless communications—among other things, preventing chaos on the airwaves.

The International Atomic Energy Agency's meeting on radioisotopes in the development of natural resources, in Poland.

The Permanent Executive Committee of the Pan American Highway Congress, in Washington.

The preparatory meeting of the Asian Development Bank, under the auspices of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, in Bangkok.

These are just a few of the international conferences at which the U.S. Government is represented this month. And those in which we took part earlier in the year dealt with problems ranging from the preservation of polar bears to revision of the international rules for seed testing; from oil pollution of waters by tankers to radio signalling devices; from coconut products—the United States is the largest market for coconut oil—to patents.

We don't worry about other nations regarding our postage stamps as valid. That was not so a century ago—that is why Lincoln's Postmaster General, Montgomery Blair, was instrumental in calling the first international meeting on postal matters.

The steady and undramatic work of the International Civil Aviation Organization has made possible the safe and comfortable air travel which we so much take for granted. To cite only one example, the ICAO Special North Atlantic meeting held in Montreal earlier this year established a North Atlantic planning group to cooperate in further improving civil aviation in the area; reduced separation distance for planes flying the North Atlantic (without diminishing the safety factor), thus permitting an increase in traffic; recommended specific improvements in air-to-ground communication; and set up an area weather forecast system.

The cooperation brought about through the World Meteorological Organization has made possible the present integrated system of world weather reporting with obvious benefits to all nations.

We have come a long way in the prevention of communicable diseases since the invention of "quarantine" by the Venetians in the 12th century. At that time ships were required to wait offshore for 40 days to make certain that no disease symptoms would develop. Today this kind of waiting around is impractical. It is better to prevent diseases at the sources, or at least to prevent the transmission of diseases. There is now general agreement that international travelers should be immunized against certain diseases—especially smallpox—before they start their journeys. As proof, each traveler now carries a yellow cardboard form on which accurate records of vaccinations and other inoculations are kept. This form was worked out by the World Health Organization. The yellow color is traditional: the color of quarantine flags hung on ships.

The World Health Organization and its Western Hemisphere affiliate, the Pan American Health Organization, have conducted programs which have had direct, and at times spectacular, effects in reducing the incidence of disease and in improving health conditions in many parts of the world. At the WHO conference in Geneva in May of this year, steps were taken to embark on a program for the worldwide eradication of smallpox by 1975. The WHO has also proposed a center for the reporting from all over the world of adverse drug reaction to avoid the kind of tragedy related to the use of the drug thalidomide a few years ago, and the United States has informed the WHO that our Food and Drug Adminstration is prepared to provide facilities to process such worldwide information.

As may be inferred from the varied subjects of these conferences, they involve many departments and agencies of our Government. My Cabinet colleague, Secretary of the Interior Udall, is heading our delegation to the Inter-American Conference on Conservation of Renewable Natural Resources of the Americas, which convenes Monday in Mar del Plata, Argentina. He was also honorary Chairman of the International Symposium on Desalination of Water.

Our representative on the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization's Working Group on Carriage of Bulk Cargoes Other Than Grain is from the National Cargo Bureau in New York and his adviser is from our Coast Guard. A convention negotiated earlier this year under the auspices of the IMCO will drastically reduce paperwork and other redtape connected with maritime travel. The head of our delegation to that conference was a deputy commissioner of customs.

During the last fiscal year, we accredited more than 3,100 delegates to international conferences. Only about two-fifths of these came from the Department of State. Four hundred and seventy were drawn from private life; and the rest from other parts of the U.S. Government. For example: the Department of Agriculture provided 149 delegates, the Treasury Department 112, the Department of Commerce 176, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare 45, the Department of Labor 37, the Federal Communications Commission 21, the Atomic Energy Commission 51, the Weather Bureau 3, the Library of Congress 3, and the Geological Survey 1.

I have been speaking of multilateral interntaional conferences. We are also members of international institutions which operate continuously: for example, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Inter-American Bank, the Security Council of the United Nations, the OECD. The aggregate contributions of such institutions to the building of peace is beyond computation.

Last year we took part in and made financial contributions to 71 international organizations and programs. At the small end of the scale were sums of less than $1,000 each to the International Seed Testing Association and the International Whaling Commission. At the other end were $59 million to the United Nations and nine specialized agencies, plus $60 million for two of the U.N.'s economic development programs, the expanded program of technical assistance and the U.N. Special Fund. Americans are at work helping nearly all of these organizations. Most of them go unheralded and unsung. Yet, were they not hard at work, the road to peace would be a little longer and a little rougher.

We are a party to approximately 4,300 treaties and other international agreements in force. Some are old: the oldest is the Treaty of Paris of 1783 between ourselves and Britain, by which our independence was recognized. An original duplicate copy of that treaty is one of our most prized exhibits on the eighth floor of the Department of State building.

Three-fourths of the treaties and other international agreements to which we are a party were signed in the last 25 years. In the phrase of Wilfred Jenks, a "common law of mankind" is developing. And its rate of growth is rising at a steep angle.

The law of the sea, which first evolved slowly over the centuries, has been further developed and codified in recent years. International agreements to regulate aerial navigation have had to be worked out in a short generation. And within a few years of man's first thrusts outward from this planet, we are deeply involved in creating international regulations and institutions to govern activities in space.

Already the United Nations has developed a set of legal principles to govern the use of outer space and declared celestial bodies free from national appropriation. Already nations, including the United States and the Soviet Union, have agreed not to orbit weapons of mass destruction in outer space. The Legal Subcommittee of the United Nations Committee on Outer Space is in the process of formulating international agreements on liability for damage caused by the reentry of objects launched into outer space and on rescue and return of astronauts and space objects. Already the first international sounding rockets range has been established in India and is being offered for United Nations sponsorship.

To make orderly space exploration possible at this stage, the International Telecommunications Union had to allocate radio frequencies for the purpose.

To take advantage of the weather reporting and forecasting potential of observation satellites married to computer technology, the World Meteorological Organization plans to create a vast system of data acquisition, analysis, and distribution which depends entirely on international agreement, regulation, and standards.

And to start building a single global communications satellite system, we have created a novel international institution in which a private American corporation shares ownership with 45 governments.

Thus, discovery and invention force us to reach out for international agreement, to build international institutions, to do things in accordance with an expanding international and transnational law.

We work incessantly on many important international problems. And to none do we give more intensive and extensive study than disarmament. Four years ago we set up an agency especially to study and deal with this vital problem: The agency for Arms Control and Disarmament. Unhappily, it has not yet proved possible to make progress on international agreements to control and reduce armaments. But we will persist in our efforts, with every means within our reach.

And we shall of course continue to support and do all we can to strengthen that organization which, in the words of Pope Paul VI, "represents the obligatory path of modern civilization and of world peace"—the United Nations.

III

One of the basic policies of the United States is assistance to the less developed countries of the free world in advancing economically, socially, and politically. These comprise more than 80 nations, three-fourths of them new since the Second World War, covering most of Central and South America and Africa and much of Asia and containing nearly half of the world's population.

The American people have welcomed the rise of the former colonial peoples to the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of Nature's God entitle them. And we sympathize deeply with the aspirations of the less-developed nations, new and old, to modernize themselves and achieve a better life for their peoples. We would want to help them move forward even if there were no such thing as Communist imperialism.

These countries are at various stages of development. Some are at the beginning of the road; some are on the threshold of self-support. Some find themselves on a treadmill because their population is increasing as fast as their production. Some have good governments; others, including some with rich resources, are floundering under incompetent leadership. Some are plagued by internal disorder, often caused or aggravated by the Communists. Some are wasting energies and resources in quarrels with neighbors.

But, overall, the less-developed countries of the free world have been making economic gains. And in the Western Hemisphere, the great cooperative venture in social reform and economic progress, the Alliance for Progress, has been picking up momentum—although, as on other continents, the rate of advance varies from nation to nation.

Most of our development assistance now goes to countries which have instituted necessary reforms and are dedicated to self-help measures. Some countries, chiefly those in Africa, receive most of their aid from France and the United Kingdom, but we too are helping, especially with educational and technical assistance.

More and more we are funneling aid through multilateral institutions and arrangements. Currently we are helping to organize an Asian Development Bank as President Johnson proposed in his speech here last spring.

International cooperative efforts continue their attack on the literacy front. As President Johnson has pointed out more than 700 million adults—4 out of 10 of the world's population—today "dwell in darkness where they cannot read or write."

At Teheran, in Iran, last month 500 delegates from 86 countries agreed that multilateral and bilateral pilot-project efforts in the literacy field should now be undertaken. With multinational financial support, this action can advance the international literacy effort by demonstrating its place in national development.

The many facets of our help to developing nations include:

Our food-for-peace programs, made possible by our almost miraculously bountiful agriculture.

The Peace Corps, with more than 12,000 men and women at work in 46 countries.

The technical cooperation activities of American universities. Under AID contracts alone, 70 universities are engaged in these efforts in 39 countries.

The American colleges and schools overseas, under various programs of support, governmental and private.

The diverse activities of many American foundations.

The training programs of the American Institute for Free Labor Development, under the auspices of the AFL–CIO. It has trained nearly 400 Latin American labor leaders in its school in Washington and its 18 worker education programs in the field in Latin America have reached approximately 30,000 trainees. Several individual unions have overseas education and training programs.

The contribution of thousands of other Americans through the overseas aid programs of other voluntary groups.

The thousands of teachers, workers, officials, and students brought here for training and education. AID brought more than 6,000 trainees here last year. And many thousands more come under our Department of State exchanges or with the help of American voluntary organizations.

Just to list the programs through which American voluntary organizations are helping the developing nations would take longer than you would be willing to listen.

Let us not underestimate the effort that will be required to move all the developing nations into the modern world. By some measurements the gap between them and the economically more advanced nations is widening. But let us not regard the task as insoluble or as one which will require centuries. Many Americans, like myself, were born in underdeveloped parts of the United States. The transformation that has occurred in these areas in a few decades demonstrates that modernization under free institutions need not be a slow process.

IV

American business can contribute mightily to the economic advance of the developing nations. There is no substitute for private initiative and good management.

The more realistic leaders of developing nations realize this. They welcome foreign investment, with the technical and administrative skills it can provide. The contrast between the economic progress of these nations and the relative stagnation of those bound by more or less rigid Socialist doctrines is increasingly evident. Accordingly, leaders in many of the developing countries are moving away from old theories and fears. More and more, they see that the private sector, stimulated and helped by private foreign investment, is an instrument of unrivaled efficiency for organizing human energies.

And American companies have become increasingly imaginative and resourceful in operating abroad in ways that do not arouse fears of foreign economic domination—for example, by cooperation with local capital, management contracts, and training of local people for the higher managerial and technical jobs.

During the last few years, the U.S. Government has taken several further steps to help American business to expand its role in economic development. These include:

The organization of an International Executive Service Corps.

The negotiation of new Investment Guarantee Agreements with nine countries and expansion of previous agreements with five countries. Altogether, we now have such agreements with some 80 nations. Last year AID alone wrote contracts to protect more than $225,522,000 of new American private investment.

The continued growth of development banks and other credit institutions.

The provision of more information to concerns interested in investing abroad.

We are of course very actively engaged also in promoting trade. This is a continuing high-priority responsibility of our Embassies abroad.

Our trade has increased impressively—to an annual rate of more than $49 billion both ways—$21.6 billion in imports and $27.6 billion in exports. (These were the levels for the second quarter of 1965, seasonally adjusted.) But we want still more trade and shall do our best to increase the flow. The Kennedy round of trade negotiations, now underway in Geneva, can play a major role in achieving this. This is the most ambitious effort for trade liberalization ever undertaken, and we are fully committed to its success.

A rising volume of trade, with the mutual benefits it can bring, can help to produce a more stable and peaceful world.

V

I have spoken of some of the means by which we are helping to build a peaceful world.

Of the growth of international institutions;

Of the multiplication of useful international conferences;

Of the expansion of international law;

Of our assistance to the developing countries in moving forward economically, socially, and politically; and

Of the expansion of international trade and investment—the unseen.

The unseen—or at least the unheadlined—search for peace embraces also the immense and ever-growing flow of peoples and of publications and other communications across international boundaries.

I have alluded to this in connection with development assistance. We are equally interested in expanding and improving our relationships with the peoples of the economically advanced countries of the free world and with the peoples of the Communist world.

Earlier this month President Johnson transmitted to the Congress a report on the educational and cultural exchange programs conducted by the Department of State. These programs have become, he said, "an established part of our commitments to international understanding."

The Department's programs, now conducted under the Fulbright-Hays Act, are only a part of the total of exchanges which move people to and from this country. But during the last 16 years they have brought some 70,000 students, teachers, and specialists in various fields to this country and sent nearly 30,000 Americans abroad.

In all, 82,000 foreign students attended American colleges and universities last year; another 9,000 visitors came here as teachers or for research; and more than 9,000 were serving as interns or residents in our hospitals. Some 22,000 Americans went abroad for academic purposes. And, very important for many reasons among Americans abroad, are several hundred thousand members of our armed services and their families.

The statistics on passport and visas are worth noting.

In 1946 we issued passports to approximately 189,000 American citizens. In 1964 we issued more than 1,133,000.

In 1946 we issued 337,000 visas to foreigners. In 1964 we issued 1,317,000.

In both the sciences and the arts there are flourishing international communities. Thousands of professional people go abroad every year to attend meetings with their colleagues in other countries. Scientific information moves across international borders as rapidly as it is published. International sporting events are increasing by leaps and bounds. And so is the import and export of books, magazines, newspapers, and cultural activities from discotheque to ballet and from the Beatles to symphony orchestras.

Exchange programs encourage intercommunication among people in a broad variety of fields. Groups of foreign journalists and broadcasters attend study programs at Indiana and Syracuse Universities, and gain inside views of American newspaper and radio and television operations. Experts in cardiology go abroad to discuss current techniques in this field. Agricultural and home economics extension leaders from some 40 countries come for a special seminar at South Dakota State University. So runs the broad sweep of this two-way flow.

With both Government and private support, a program originated in Cleveland—and now embracing four additional cities—has brought more than 1,000 youth leaders and social workers from some 3-score countries to this country for 4 months of study, work, and observation, during the last 10 years.

Since 1947 the Salzburg Seminar in American Studies in Austria has been a center of intellectual communication in which some 5,000 Western Europeans and 400 Americans have participated, the latter as visiting faculty. This important institution completed its 100th sesson last month.

In this era of scientific discovery at an unprecedented pace, international communication among scientists is of great and growing importance. And, even more important, communication often leads to cooperation.

By a very rough estimate, 20,000 American scientists now join with some 80,000 of their foreign colleagues at approximately 2,000 international scientific meetings every year.

Several agencies of our Federal Government invest in scientific research performed by foreign investigators. This research is carried on in fields ranging from agriculture to zoology—and from nuclear physics to archeology—in countries on every continent. Hundreds of foreign scientists thus work in close cooperation with their American counterparts, to the mutual benefit of all. The Department of State necessarily works to see that the projects in substance and in their collaborative character are compatible with U.S. foreign objectives.

Examples of research include those supported by HEW's Vocational Rehabilitation Administration in such countries as Yugoslavia, India, Pakistan and Israel. These embrace methods of rehabilitating and fitting for useful work the blind and victims of leprosy, cardiac disorders and other diseases. In those countries and others, our National Institutes of Health assist with Public Law 480 funds projects relating to the prevention and eventual eradication of cholera, the study of cancer in particular situations, analysis of hypertension, and many other matters affecting the health of mankind.

Cooperative research in radiation sterilization technique has resulted in the elimination of the screwworm from the Island of Curacao. U.S. scientists are currently participating in studies in Central America in which irradiation techniques are being employed in the control of the Mediterranean fruit fly.

American and Japanese scientists, in general association, are measuring the age of rocks in the Pacific basin in order to understand the history of the earth, and are studying the Pacific volcanic "ring of fire." They are trying to predict the paths of hurricanes and typhoons, knowledge of which may save hundreds of lives and millions of dollars worth of property each year.

United States Government collaboration in, and support to, scientific research in Western Europe and Britain have been extensive, ranging from such subjects as aerodynamics through radiation for the preservation of food to meteorology.

Ranger photographs of the moon and Mariner photographs of Mars have been distributed to leading astronomers and other interested scientists, for their study and comment, in more than 40 countries, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, and are available to all for study and interpretation. Foreign scientists are invited to propose individual experiments for inclusion in the larger NASA satellites and in project Apollo. To help them in considering these opportunities, NASA has arranged for special briefings on various aspects of satellite flights. Many proposals have been made, and several selected for flight.

The AEC supplies depositary libraries in 62 foreign countries and in 5 international organizations with research and development reports and other important informational material. There are currently some 60,000 titles in the collections abroad, which are made readily available to the interested scientific workers. The AEC has initiated a sister laboratory program with foreign nuclear research centers. Several countries cooperating in the atoms for peace program are in the initial phases of nuclear energy development. A close relationship with a major U.S. research institute, such as that established between the Cekmece Center in Istanbul and the Brookhaven National Laboratory, or that between the Korean Atomic Energy Research Institute in Seoul and the Argonne National Laboratory, facilitates interaction in reactor research programs.

There are literally thousands of arrangements by U.S. agencies to exchange scientific and technical information with almost every nation in the world. The Department of Agriculture, for example, has some 7,000 such arrangements with more than 120 nations, colonies, and territories, including 112 arrangements with the U.S.S.R. and over 250 with Eastern Europe. That Department alone sends out some 200,000 items per year and receives some 216,000.

The little-known International Committee for Information Retrieval by Examining Patent Offices (ICIREPAT) is a tightly knit, small governmental organization of patent authorities from the United States and a score of other developed nations. In an atmosphere of friendship and smooth working relations, they share their professional experiences and attack common problems by regular meetings, exchanges of individuals for lengthy working visits, etc.

The U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey has agreed with sister agencies in Japan and the U.S.S.R. to implement a system for urgent exchange of warnings of impending tsunamis. The tsunami is a sea wave caused by earthquakes, which can reach huge proportions and has often caused extensive loss of life and property in the regions bordering the Pacific Ocean. For many years, the Coast and Geodetic Survey has been exchanging data on earthquakes with most nations of the earth. Exchanges of such data between the Soviet Union and the United States have continued without interruption through all the periods of political tension since the Second World War.

Sustained research cooperation with the Russians goes on in the Antarctic, where scientific bases of both countries have for several years had resident scientists of the other nationality. United States and Russian oceanographic vessels in Antarctic waters have exchanged data. The Antarctic Treaty, in force since 1961, has been the vehicle for increased mutual research enterprise involving also other Western nations, and, recently, Poland and Czechoslovakia.

These examples of international cooperation are only small waves in the great ocean of international affairs. Yet the cumulative effect is great. Cooperation is not only habit-forming in the specific fields in which it is practiced, it is also infectious. Once nations get used to working with each other, to seeking—together—practical answers to practical problems, it then seems natural to look to the art of international cooperation for the sensible solution of other problems. In some ways nations are like people: the one who is always looking for opportunity to work with others is more likely to be successful—and happy—than the one who goes around with chips on both shoulders.

For almost a year now—since International Cooperation Year began—private citizens and public officials here and abroad have been serving on committees to review activities that bring their countries into continuing cooperative association and to recommend further cooperative activities. The proposals of our own committees will be reviewed at a White House conference on International Cooperation called by President Johnson for late next month.

Contacts and exchanges in many areas of learning and cultural achievement are increasing by leaps and bounds.

I would be remiss as a guest if I did not mention the fine work of the Bologna Center of the Johns Hopkins University. In 10 years, some 500 students—American and European—have spent a year there in graduate study in international affairs. I understand approximately 100 of them are now in the foreign service of their respective countries; others are in business or teaching or in the service of international organizations.

And I would be remiss as a citizen if I did not pay tribute to the many thousands of American citizens who help to improve our international relations by providing hospitality and guidance to students and other foreign visitors to our shores.

Last month, at the bicentennial celebration at the Smithsonian Institution, President Johnson gave to scholars from 80 nations a view of the future of international education as he would like to see it. He announced the creation of a special task force "to recommend a broad and long-range plan of worldwide educational endeavor."

"We mean to show," he said, "that this Nation's dream of a Great Society does not stop at the water's edge. And that it is not just an American dream. All are welcome to share in it. All are invited to contribute to it.

"Together we must embark on a new and noble adventure:

"First, to assist the education effort of the developing nations and the developing regions.

"Second, to help our schools and universities increase their knowledge of the world and the people who inhabit it.

"Third, to advance the exchange of students and teachers who travel and work outside their native lands.

"Fourth, to increase the free flow of books and ideas and art, of works of science and imagination.

"And, fifth, to assemble meetings of men and women from every discipline and every culture to ponder the common problems of mankind."

And he added that:

"In all these endeavors, I pledge that the United States will play its full role.

"By January, I intend to present such a program to the Congress."

VI

Those are some of the major parts of the unheadlined, and largely unseen and unheard, search for peace; a search that is pursued day after day beneath the dangerous threats and crises of this turbulent world, a search to which the American people and Government are profoundly dedicated, to which they have devoted immense resources, and in which I am sure they will persevere. And, despite frustrations and setbacks, this search has made headway and is gathering momentum. The road ahead is long and rough. But we can push ahead with the confidence that comes from knowing that we are moving in the right direction and that the goal we seek is the goal of a great majority of mankind.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is anticipated that, when the session on the Bress nomination is concluded, the Senate will then turn to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 896, H.R. 10281, a bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes.

It is anticipated that the Senate will then turn to the consideration of Executive G, 89th Congress, 1st session, a supplementary income tax protocol with Belgium; and next to the consideration of Executive I, 89th Congress, 1st session, a tax protocol with the Federal Republic of Germany.

Both these treaties have been reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations. There will be a yea-and-nay vote on them.

Following the treaties, it is quite possible that the next matters to be considered will be Calendar No. 914, S. 2614, a bill to provide for U.S. participation in the statewide exposition to be held in Alaska during 1967; next, a bill on Interama if one is reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, as is anticipated.

If time allows, the Senate will next turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 850, H.R. 8126, a bill to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage, and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement.

I do not know whether we can get through with all these proposals. However, I thought I would make them known so that the Senate would be on notice as to what the possibilities are for the remainder of the session.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Friday, October 22, 1965, at 9 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 21, 1965:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant:

Edward L. Bailey
John P. Sanken
Donald L. Sherman
Frank E. Braman
John V. A. Thompson
Dick G. Taylor
Warren J. Frederick
Weymond Davis
Dale H. Huff
Gordon D. Crandall
Maurice V. Goodroe
Bruno A. Forsterer
Milton J. Thompson
Jack O'Donnell
Herman G. Pinter
Walter H. Riddle, Jr.
Floyd A. Rice
Edward V. Dempsey, Jr.
Charles H. Denmark
Charles B. Morrison
Russell D. Edens
Benjamin S. Beach, Jr.
James J. Gaughan
Albert D. Grantham
George T. Kulick
Roy E. Nichols, Jr.
Thomas D. Keith
Russell E. Sawyer
Richard N. Westcott
Richard J. Briggs
Wallace A. Herrington
Sanford H. Pierpoint
Samuel A. McDowell, Jr.
Vern R. Potter
Paul E. Peterson
Rea F. Fetzer
Aaron W. Rogers
Robert S. Cutler
Gene N. Cooper
Ronald G. Eastman
Robert O. Slade
Herbert D. McQuarrie, Jr.
Noel G. Ballinger
Mark W. Byrd
Robert H. Elkins
Donald P. Nachtwey
Theottis Wood
Duane P. Gatto
Jack W. Dunn
Luther "L" Barr
Ralph T. Martin
John R. Bosk
Alfred H. F. Marchant
Robert E. Hynds
Kenneth R. Ryder
Bruce E. Timmerman
Dorwin W. Newman
James D. Lombard
Franklin E. Thrall
James G. Lang
Galen B. Nielsen
John J. Janda, Jr.
William H. Dotson
Hugh T. Williams, Jr.
Philip R. Spiker
William L. Broadwell

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

James C. Carpenter
Derrill R. Kramer
Ruloff W. Whiteman
Kenneth L. Lambertson
John W. Keith
Frederick H. O. Mayr
Ralph E. Knorr
Jack A. Eckert
Francis W. J. Nicely
Hal M. Floyd
Leeland N. Gregg, Jr.
Roger T. Ostrom
Donald F. Kemner
David I. Tomlinson
George H. Martin
Joseph B. Donaldson
Jerald L. Rendall
Stanley E. Wood, Jr.
John L. Bailey
Ronald C. Addison
Patrick H. Cannon, Jr.
Frank R. Peasley
James K. Woodle
Edward R. Pusey, Jr.
Pat Murray
James R. Shontell
Richard E. Van Ry
Franklin E. Taylor
Donald C. Addison
James F. Sanders
Hugh W. Nabors
Francis J. Stadnicki
Bly R. Elder

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Ray M. Smith, Chunchula, Ala., in place of M. M. Davis, retired.

ARKANSAS

Janet L. Apple, Harrell, Ark., in place of Z. M. Parker, retired.

CALIFORNIA

William F. Walker, Gualala, Calif., in place of G. L. Cates, retired.

Anthony L. Zangri, Montclair, Calif. Office established March 1, 1965.

Dorothy E. Harrington, Taft, Calif., in place of C. H. Murley, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Edward W. Gray, Riverton, Conn., in place of E. G. Jordan, deceased.

GEORGIA

Lee T. Everett, Vienna, Ga., in place of R. D. Power, retired.

IDAHO

Phillip N. Hathaway, Driggs, Idaho, in place of S. H. Huff, retired.

INDIANA

Richard P. Gerhard, Kokomo, Ind., in place of W. W. Workman, retired.

IOWA

William H. Merkle, Fayette, Iowa, in place of E. A. Billings, retired.

Sharon M. Ageson, Lester, Iowa, in place of C. G. Bigelow, deceased.

Clarita F. Witham, Truesdale, Iowa, in place of L. B. Cave, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Mae B. Runyon, Pinsonfork, Ky., in place of Gertrude Scott, retired.

Victor D. Headrick, Tomkinsville, Ky., in place of B. L. Hope, retired.

LOUISIANA

Allen R. Bruhl, Covington, La., in place of R. N. Menetre, retired.

MAINE

Gertraut H. Walsh, Levant, Maine, in place of M. N. Bemis, retired.

MARYLAND

Ralph W. Hutchins, Prince Frederick, Md., in place of R. C. Williams, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Bernice E. Walker, East Wareham, Mass., in place of V. W. Humphrey, retired.

John F. Landry, Halifax, Mass., in place of R. O. Case, retired.

James H. Malonson, Jr., Sudbury, Mass., in place of F. D. Bradshaw, retired.

MICHIGAN

Elmer A. Behrend, Powers, Mich., in place of E. J. Shannon, retired.

MINNESOTA

Lawrence M. Fogarty, International Falls, Minn., in place of R. B. Sullivan, retired.

Alton E. Davis, Oakland, Minn., in place of M. W. Cole, transferred.

Stanley J. Hill, Tower, Minn., in place of I. M. Sovde, retired.

MISSOURI

Hobert E. Sheets, Eagleville, Mo., in place of O. G. Moore, retired.

NEBRASKA

Howard D. Clements, Hay Springs, Nebr., in place of H. M. Gilmore, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Frederick P. Rees, Lawrenceville, N.J., in place of F. B. Harker, retired.

Edna M. Coursen, Oak Ridge, N.J., in place of Peter Klapmuts, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Henrietta C. Turner, Atkinson, N.C., in place of H. W. Smith, retired.

OHIO

James J. McCoy, Jr., Niles, Ohio, in place of P. J. Ragazzo, resigned.

OREGON

Donald E. Tomlin, Mount Hood, Oreg., in place of G. J. Hanel, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

John F. Helm, Downington, Pa., in place of J. M. Welsh, retired.

Ernest P. Zseral, Jonestown, Pa., in place of D. H. Cope, retired.

Harry W. Stark, Manchester, Pa., in place of H. E. Bixler, retired.

George W. Brehm, Newtown Square, Pa., in place of H. J. Niemeyer, resigned.

William G. Cox, Thompsontown, Pa., in place of H. I. Haines, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Carlisle E. Hammett, Converse, S.C., in place of E. S. Drake, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Thomas R. Lyons, Brookings, S. Dak., in place of E. F. Minier, retired.

TENNESSEE

Malcolm A. Fults, Altamont, Tenn., in place of A. A. Scruggs, retired.

TEXAS

Jack P. Meredith, Teague, Tex., in place of H. W. Hawker, retired.

UTAH

Richard C. Stevenson, West Jordan, Utah, in place of E. M. Williams, deceased.

VERMONT

Donald A. Frail, Hartland, Vt., in place of O. M. Lobdell, retired.

VIRGINIA

Patsy T. Johnson, Baskerville, Va., in place of B. F. Gayle, retired.

Allie O. Tuck, Natural Bridge, Va., in place of L. P. Fainter, retired.

Virginia B. Bruce, Woodford, Va., in place of W. A. Duke, transferred.

WASHINGTON

Cleve R. Martin, Kettle Falls, Wash., in place of Janice Smith, retired.

Irma S. Nordquist, Lakebay, Wash., in place of A. J. Middlesworth, retired.

Robert A. Leadon, Yakima, Wash., in place of Thomas Stave, retired.

WISCONSIN

Joseph P. Wergin, McFarland, Wis., in place of C. A. Thompson, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 21, 1965:

U.S. District Judges

Marvin E. Frankel, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York.

John W. Reynolds, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

Health, Education, and Welfare

Dr. Philip Randolph Lee, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Office of Economic Opportunity

Bernard L. Boutin, of New Hampshire, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

District of Columbia Court of General Sessions

Charles W. Halleck, of Maryland, to be associate judge of the District of Columbia court of general sessions for the term of 10 years.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Salem Baptist Church 80th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on October 10, 1965, Salem Baptist Church of Chicago, Ill., celebrated its 80th anniversary. I believe it will be of interest not only to my colleagues but to the Nation to know the inspirational value and history of Salem Baptist Church.

Salem Baptist Church was organized as the Swedish Baptist Church of Englewood 80 years ago. When the Swedish language ceased to be used in the public services, the name was changed to Emerald Avenue Baptist Church in 1941, and to Salem Baptist Church in 1954. It is the sixth Baptist church of Swedish origin in what is now the city of Chicago.

The story of Salem really begins with the adventures of two carpenters, John Ost and Louis Johnson, members of the Third Baptist Church in South Chicago. One day they walked from South Chicago to Englewood in search of work. They prayed earnestly that God would guide them, and they were not disappointed, for they found both employment and shelter for themselves and their families. This was 3 years before any religious work had begun in this vicinity. These two carpenters felt that there was need of a Sunday school and a church in this locality and prayed that God would open the way.

It is very difficult to write a history and leave out the names of men and women who have given many years of devoted service to Salem Baptist Church and its organizations. There are those who are now working in the Sunday school with children, whose grandparents were in their classes years ago. Others are giving much of themselves as leaders of youth organizations. But if we began to mention names, we are sure we would miss some, so we will leave it with God who will satisfactorily reward every good and faithful servant.

I take pride in being able to present even a portion of the history of Salem Baptist Church to this great body.

I pay tribute to your spirit of dedication to fostering Christianity and learning in your community. The inspiration of Salem Baptist Church will be fulfilled and generations of our children will meet the world as the wisely intelligent, God-loving, and well-educated American citizens that we would have wanted—and we all earnestly desire them to be.

Many Not Falling for Plan To Build American Ships in Foreign Yards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Maritime Administration here in Washington has a new communication gimmick. Employees of this agency, or those who care to do so, dial the telephone number DU 6-5550, whereupon a recorded message can be heard, giving a late propaganda handout.

Yesterday, I dialed this number and heard a recorded voice say:

> This is Maritime Administrator Nick Johnson, with a message for all maritime employees.

Then it went on to say:

> The future of the American merchant marine has never been brighter, as a result of the interagency maritime task force report.

After summarizing this task force report in a few words, it concluded with:

> Now, if you have a message you would like to leave with me, you can do so at the sound of the beep. Thank you.

I left a brief message to the effect that I thoroughly disagreed with the interagency report.

Since this task force report was made public, the Maritime Administration has revealed that the American President Line has requested a Federal subsidy for building and operating four bulk carriers, or permission to build them abroad. This is part of the bright future of the maritime employees. The offer by this major American steamship line has been interpreted in shipping circles, according to the Baltimore Sun, as a response by a harried industry to this new task force suggestion—to the effect that ship construction in foreign shipyards will help solve America's maritime problem.

In the newspaper article, the Maritime Administration was quoted as claiming that maritime unions with which this company deals have expressed enthusiasm for the expansion of the merchant fleet into the bulk carrier field.

However, Mr. Speaker, a false impression is given by this newspaper article, based on the news release of the Maritime Administration. One key issue was completely left out, and I am sure deliberately so. Peter M. McGavin, executive secretary-treasurer of the maritime trades department, AFL-CIO, has pointed this out to me and also, what the position of the unions actually is. In a letter which enclosed the Baltimore Sun article, he said:

> It is true all maritime unions want new ships, but we do not want to pay for these ships being built in foreign yards. Government and industry have tried this on us before and we are not going to fall for it.

Mr. Speaker, no American steamship operators want to build these ships abroad, but, looking to the Federal Government for their very existence, the management of these companies think it prudent to remain silent.

In the national interest, they recognize, however, that American-flag ships and American shipyards with American labor are necessary for defense.

Let us not let any bureaucrat barnstormers try and kid us that the maritime employees have a bright future based on the task force report.

The people who know best—those who are in the business—strongly oppose the proposals in this report. I think the thing to do is to let the steamship people themselves—both management and labor—suggest solutions to improve this admittedly difficult problem.

Meanwhile, anyone who seriously suggests there is a bright future for maritime employees—in or out of Government—is completely blind to realities.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me concur with the President's 11-member Maritime Advisory Committee, in a statement released yesterday. I agree that a Maritime Administrator is supposed to carry out policy, and not to lobby by telephone, or any other way, to change it.

Congress should initiate maritime policy—not the Maritime Administrator.

Legislation To Raise the Personal Exemption to $1,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 21, 1965

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, we are apparently coming to the end of this session of the 89th Congress. It has been a very productive session, and action has been taken on many needed programs in our Nation. But there are two notable gaps in the legislative work of this session, and it is my hope that there will be action taken in the 2d session of the 89th Congress to fill those gaps.

Under the present income tax law, an exemption in the amount of $600 is permitted for an individual, for his wife, and for each of his children. When this provision was written into the law, there was some relationship between the $600 exemption and the cost of living for a year. Only the most naive, Mr. Speaker, would suggest that such a relationship exists today. Inflation has taken away so much of the buying power of the dollar that nothing less than a $1,000 personal exemption, with a like amount for each dependent, would begin to meet the problem realistically.

In both the 88th Congress and in this session of the 89th Congress I placed legislation before the House which would raise the personal exemption to $1,000. The administration, unfortunately, did not see fit to support such legislation. I think this to be serious short-sightedness. In an expanding economy, surely this would give tax relief precisely where it is needed in a form that would put new money flowing into the economy. It would put money into the hands of those people who would use the additional money for new purchases, and the stimulation for further economic growth should be notable.

The second serious gap in our legislative program is the failure of the Congress to grant special tax relief to those parents whose children are attending institutions of higher learning.

Again, both in this Congress and in the 88th Congress I placed legislation before the House which would have granted special tax credits for parents with children attending college or university. Again, unfortunately, the administration did not give this measure the support it deserved.

We have heard much about the need for an educated citizenry, and this is certainly a vital need in these times of crises. We know that the demands of our technology in America will require more and better education. We have passed legislation to aid in the development of this education. But we have failed to take that most necessary step, the step that would give parents the money with which to send their children to college. That step may be taken through the providing of tax credits.

This is a program which would give assistance to precisely those people we must reach. It would give principal help to those in the lower and middle income brackets, and the legislation was carefully framed to make sure that the extremely wealthy would not be included in the benefits. The very wealthy neither need nor want such help. From the beginning of time we have seen brilliant scholars who arose from the ranks of the poor and from those with only modest incomes. This legislation would guarantee that these same children would have an equal chance to rise intellectually in the future.

We will all be back here in January to work on the legislation in the 2d session of the 89th Congress. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that when the President comes before us to present his requests for legislation for the year 1966, he will make both of these items matters of the highest priority. They are realistic programs, cut to meet real needs. They both should be made part of the law of the land, and soon.

Toward the Great Society—Appalachia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. JONES
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 21, 1965

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, wedged between the rich east coast and the prosperous Middle West is Appalachia, the Nation's largest economically depressed area. In this 165,000-square-mile area, 16 million people live. One out of every three families lives on an annual income of $3,000 or less. Annual per capita income in Appalachia is 35 percent below that for the rest of the Nation. Unemployment is 50 percent higher than the national rate. The general low standard of living prevailing means poor educational opportunities, inadequate food, substandard housing, poor clothing, poor health and sanitation facilities. There is one overriding characteristic of the entire 11-State area—the burning desire of the young to get away and the diminishing hope of the older folks who stay behind.

At the request of the Governors of the Appalachian States, the Democratic administration proposed a program of revitalization for this economically starved area. The 89th Congress approved the Appalachia Regional Development Act to accelerate the economic development of the area in order to raise the standards of human existence in Appalachia to a level comparable to the rest of the United States. This new program is aimed at overcoming the basic deficiencies of the region—difficult access, uncontrolled water resources, poorly managed physical resources, and a general lack of the public facilities which stimulate economic growth.

The Federal-State-local effort to bring new economic life to this area is coordinated by the Appalachian Regional Commission composed of the 11 State Governors. Congress has authorized $1.1 billion to get Appalachia moving again—to open the doors of this economically isolated area to more tourists and to more industry.

Lying between two great population centers, the eastern seaboard and the Midwest, Appalachia represents a potential market and source of raw materials, as well as a major recreational area for these enormous concentrations of population. None of this potential can be realized until the isolation of the region is overcome. Over the next 5 years $840 million will be used to construct 2,350 miles of development highways and 1,000 miles of local access roads. The Federal share will be 70 percent and the State share 30 percent.

Another $41 million will go for the construction of health facilities, including hospitals, regional diagnostic and treatment centers, and $28 million will go for the operation of the health facilities. The Federal Government will pay 80 percent of the construction costs and 100 percent of the initial operating cost. After the first 2 years the Federal share of operating costs will be 50 percent.

Other millions of dollars will go into construction of vocational education schools, development of water resources, sewerage treatment plants, soil conservation and land improvement, improvement of timber production and marketing, and restoration of mine-scarred land.

The program is designed only to provide initial Federal assistance, until July 1971. By that time it is hoped that revitalization will be sufficiently underway, and the States will continue their cooperative effort to develop the full potential of the region.

This is but part of the overall effort to bring Appalachia out of the poverty straits. It is geared largely to economic needs. Other Federal efforts, such as the antipoverty program and the elementary and secondary education bill, are concentrating on human needs.

In the words of President Johnson:

> Giving a man a chance to work and feed his family and provide for his children does not destroy his initiative. Hunger destroys initiative. Hopelessness destroys initiative. Ignorance destroys initiative. A cold and indifferent government destroys initiative.

Come to Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 21, 1965

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, the high stately mountains of the pioneer country of east Tennessee, the bluegrass and walking horse region of middle Tennessee, and the cotton flatlands and riverboats of west Tennessee all contribute to make Tennessee the most beautiful and interesting State in our Nation.

I would like to invite all my colleagues to come to exciting and picturesque Tennessee during the adjournment period. You and your family will be met with the finest hospitality, the best facilities for recreation and pleasure, and spectacular beauty of the Volunteer State.

Culver To Work for Sound Implementation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1965

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, as we approach adjournment, I think we will all agree that the 1st session of the 89th Congress has been an unusually productive one. Many of the measures enacted during the past months represent historic legislative breakthroughs, and the far-reaching benefits from the programs authorized by this Congress will soon contribute importantly to the continued growth and prosperity of the Second District of Iowa.

One vital reason for the accomplishments of this Congress was the clear endorsement given by the American people to these programs in the 1964 election. I am extremely pleased that discussions with my constituents, as well as their response to my recent newsletter, confirm the interest which the people of northeast Iowa hold in this legislation, and indicate their general support for the goals of the programs which it has established. The views expressed in the returned questionnaires have served as one very helpful guideline in my consideration of the complex bills before the Congress this year, and in my determination of the measures which may best serve the interests of the Second District, the State, and the Nation.

Having successfully enacted this heavy volume of legislation, the Congress should now properly concentrate its efforts on the sound implementation and operation of these new programs to insure realization of the great promise which they hold. Since a most significant feature of much of the new legislation is the requirement that resulting programs be initiated and administered at the local level, I have in past months worked closely with local officials in district-wide conferences on such matters as the education bill, the economic opportunity act, and various flood control measures.

In the months ahead, I hope to hold similar meetings. Their purpose will be twofold: To obtain the best possible information regarding the successes and shortcomings of these programs from those who will administer them in the second district, and, at the same time, to insure the closest cooperation and coordination among all levels of Government.

I am going to Vietnam and other critical areas in southeast Asia this fall to conduct a special study for the Foreign Affairs Committee. Upon my return, I look forward to the opportunity of discussing these important matters with the people of the Second District.

I would at this time like to call to the attention of my colleagues the tabulated summary of the replies to the questionnaire which I mailed to my constituents in the Second District. The summary follows:

1. Vietnam: What approach do you think the United States should follow in Vietnam?

	Percent
Expand the war into North Vietnam and seek all-out victory	31.0
Support the government of South Vietnam, through retaliatory attacks on North Vietnam, until a satisfactory negotiated settlement is possible	33.6
Continue limited military efforts in South Vietnam and seek a negotiated settlement	15.1
Withdraw all troops and advisers from Vietnam immediately	8.7
No opinion	11.6

2. Voting rights: The administration has proposed legislation to insure that no voting qualification or procedure shall be imposed or applied to deny or abridge the right to vote on account of race or color. Do you favor:

	Percent
The administration's bill	38.0
An expanded bill including the elimination of the poll tax	35.3
Leaving control of voting entirely with the States	17.7
No opinion	9.0

3. Agriculture: What is your opinion of the voluntary feed grains program?

	Percent
Should be continued as is	19.5
Should be continued with modifications	20.9
Should not be continued	18.0
No opinion	41.6

4. Firearms: Several proposals have been made for more effective firearms regulation. Please indicate whether you favor one or more of these proposals:

	Percent
Bar gun ownership by criminals and the mentally deranged	60.0
Bar gun ownership by children under 18 lacking parent's consent	51.1
Bar mail-order gun sales except to authorized dealers	50.9
Require registration of all guns with local police	40.9
Impose heavier penalties for violation of present regulations	42.2
Oppose any change in present laws	10.4
No opinion	3.5

5. Immigration: The administration has proposed gradual elimination of the national origins quota system, and replacement with a system favoring skilled workers and relatives of people already in the United States. Do you favor:

	Percent
The administration's proposal	52.4
The present system	20.3
No limitations on immigration	2.5
No immigration	12.0
No opinion	12.8

6. United Nations: Indonesia's withdrawal and the assessments made to finance U.N. peacekeeping missions have brought the organization to a crisis point. Should the United States:

	Percent
Attempt to compromise the financial impasse over peacekeeping assessments	7.8
Follow a "hard line" regarding the payment of assessments	50.7
Expand the U.N. role as an eventual international peace force	23.9
No opinion	17.6

7. Daylight saving time: A bill has been introduced to standardize the applicable time period for daylight saving time in all those areas which elect to adopt this practice. Do you favor:

	Percent
This measure to provide greater uniformity throughout the Nation	68.7
Leaving determination of the applicable dates at the local or State level	21.8
No opinion	9.5

8. Housing and urban development: A bill has been introduced to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development. Do you favor:

	Percent
Passage of this bill	35.5
Separate administration of individual programs as is the current practice	33.1
No opinion	31.4

Surrender of Panama Canal Unwise at This Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1965

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, it was with regret I heard the President's announcement the 24th of September on the progress of Panama Canal treaty negotiations. It was evident from the manner in which the announcement was made that it was hastily conceived. It has been speculated that the purpose of the announcement was to aid President Robles of Panama, who desperately needed such a pronouncement to aid his domestic political position. Another theory is that it was to offset some unfavorable publicity that had resulted from the recent House Resolution 560 concerning communism in Latin America. Whatever the reason, whatever the rationale, I see little good that can come of it.

One could reach the conclusion that by rioting and murder, the United States can be forced to a conference table to concede what they would not surrender previously. Those who think they see in this treaty an end to such rioting are mistaken. With each new concession in Panama we have been faced with still more demands. One needs only to note that Castro's attacks on our base in Guantanamo and the challenges to our position in Panama seem to be well coordinated. Guantanamo is one of the key positions from which the canal is guarded, and if the United States leaves either the canal or Guantanamo, the Soviets will be in a much better position to cut this vital sealane of the free world.

One can also conclude that our policymakers are primarily concerned with our image rather than the hard facts of the cold war. We have given the Communists in this hemisphere, who will certainly take the major credit for our concessions, renewed hope of controlling this vital waterway. Our legal rights will now be vested in status of forces agreements. Communist agitators, trained and exported from Cuba, will now only have to concentrate on these "vestiges of Yankee imperialism" in their continuing campaign of subversion and terror against the United States. In a short while we will find that no Panamanian politician will be able to justify these vestiges. These in return will become an affront to their sovereignty—a target for riots and demonstrations.

Under the present treaty we can control riots in the Canal Zone. How will we control such riots under a status-of-forces agreement whereby our forces are stationed in Panamanian territory?

What new Panamanian Government will be able to resist pressures to ask us for more concessions?

What will prevent Panama from denouncing this new treaty once a new canal has been constructed? Based upon the precedent set in 1956 when Nasser seized the Suez Canal, the United States could be expelled from all rights and interest in the new canal, and most of the world would applaud. Our ships could be barred from use of the canal, and we would be right back to 1520 when Magellan discovered the straits that now carry his name. I would not wish to see that day come.

What should the United States do? We should not approve this proposed treaty as outlined by President Johnson on the 24th of September. We should continue with the conversion of the present canal to a sea level one, and retain our present rights in Panama until Castro communism has been liquidated in this hemisphere. Because, not until that day arrives can the Panama Canal problem be settled in a stable atmosphere. We can make concessions and bargain, but none of these concessions should compromise our control of the canal.

A. G. Dewey Co., of Enfield, N. H., Earns Defense Department Quality Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the A. G. Dewey Co., of Enfield, N.H., is proudly flying the Defense Department's "C" flag awarded recently for excellence in its performance on contracts with the Department. The high quality of this company's performance in manufacturing blankets for the military is in the highest tradition of Yankee craftsmanship and business integrity. This award is a source of continuing pride not only for the company but for the town of Enfield and, indeed, the whole State.

It is a great pleasure to draw the attention of the House to the Dewey Co.'s achievement and to congratulate company president, William T. Dewey, all members of the company management, and all employees who have earned this fine distinction for their company, town, and State.

The 20th Anniversary of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on the 24th of October, the United Nations will celebrate its 20th anniversary. This date marks an important historic occasion for all Americans, but for the citizens of Great Neck it has a certain sentimental significance as well.

Those of us from the Third District well remember the early years when the infant world forum had its headquarters in the old Sperry Gyroscope factory at Lake Success. In a sense, it seemed appropriate that this new instrument for world peace should have its first home in a building once devoted to the manufacture of the instruments of war.

The first delegates to the United Nations found this quiet little suburban village to be a welcome respite from the teeming confusion of New York City, a great metropolis in the process of dismantling the war effort and hastening back to normalcy.

The United Nations has changed a great deal since those early days at Lake Success. It has moved from its humble beginnings in the old factory building to its soaring $68 million headquarters in New York City. Its membership has more than doubled; and its activities have extended to cover almost every important human problem on earth—or outer space for that matter.

Nevertheless, despite the changing appearance of the United Nations, its purposes remain the same as those that motivated the original 51 members who met at Lake Success in 1946 to begin the work of the new organization for world peace. The United Nations still exists to continue what our late Ambassador Adlai Stevenson called the "patient, unspectacular and, if need be, lonely search for the interests which unite the nations, for the policies which draw them together, for the international instruments of law and security."

Today the immediate work of the Organization is the same as it was then, keeping the peace in a world of crisis and conflict, extending and protecting human rights around the globe and continuing the endless task of improving the economic and social conditions of man. Only the scope of the task has increased. United Nations peacekeeping was still part of a brave dream in the postwar atmosphere of 1946; today blue-bereted forces of the United Nations patrol the uneasy truce in Cyprus and along the Gaza Strip, while another team of U.N. observers begins the patient, unspectacular and lonely effort to establish a lasting ceasefire in Kashmir.

In 1946, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt was just beginning her work as the first Chairman of the Human Rights Commission. Since then the Universal Declaration of Human Rights has initiated a long series of human rights conventions ranging from the Convention on Genocide, Slavery and Servitude to Minimum Age for Marriage, and Conventions on the Consent to Marriage and the Political Rights of Women.

Twenty years ago, the United Nations was in the process of organizing a campaign to feed the homeless refugees of the last war. Today the United Nations devotes 80 percent of its regular budget and personnel to a worldwide campaign to promote international cooperation in solving the staggering economic and social problems faced by the underdeveloped world.

In the 20 years that have elapsed since the founders of the United Nations launched their brave enterprise and began their search for international instruments of law and security at Lake Success, the U.N. has known its ups and downs, its successes and failures. Above all, throughout those 20 years the scope of its activities and its importance to man's search for peace and well-being have continued to expand.

Today, as the recent crisis in Kashmir so graphically demonstrated, the United Nations has become indispensable. It is appropriate that as Americans, we take this opportunity on the 20th anniversary of the United Nations to renew our pledge to continue the long, patient, struggle to find the common policies which will enable us to build an international organization and individual sovereign states that perpetuates peace and justice in a world of diversity.

Veterans Are Short Changed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1965

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the problems faced by any retiree on a fixed income today are many. The cost of the things he needs—food, shelter, medical care—are all rising, but his income is not rising to keep up with them. He is caught in a terrible squeeze.

This Congress has been mindful of these facts and this year has provided those of its citizens on social security with a 7-percent increase and those of Federal retirement with from 6.1 to over 11 percent.

This we have done with one hand and with the other hand we have taken back benefits from thousands of those we were seeking to help.

How did it happen? Let us take a look at one of the retired disabled veterans in my district. His income from social security is $1,080 a year. He is allowed by law to exclude 10 percent of this in calculating his income for veterans pension purposes, bringing the amount to $972.

Because he was below the income limit of $1,000, he received from the Veterans' Administration a pension of $105 a month. This brought his total income to $195 a month, a little less than $2,400 a year.

This, I might mention, is $600 below the amount that the President has set for his definition of "poverty." But our veteran has lived modestly and made ends meet by stretching each month's check a little further to go around growing price tags.

Then we voted to increase his social security by 7 percent, giving him an extra $75 a year, or $6 a month. Not much, but a help.

Shortly after that, however, he got a letter from the Veterans' Administration reminding him that this $75 has made his annual income, even with the deduction, $1,040, over the $1,000 limit, so his pension was being reduced to the next level of $80 a month. He cannot, under present law, refuse the social security increase, so for a $6 raise, he must lose $25. He is left reading in his newspaper how Uncle Sam is helping him with a raise, while he is actually receiving $240 a year less than he did before Uncle Sam helped.

Now $200 or $300 may not seem like a lot of money to some, but you can be sure that to someone whose income is already over $600 a year below the President's poverty limits, $200 or $300 a year is a lot of money. It is the difference between paying the rent and not paying it. On that sort of income there are simply no corners left to be cut.

These men are not merely statistics in the VA files that we here in Washington can give to and take away from without considering the lives we are affecting. They are men who have worked a lifetime and who are unable to work any longer. Some of them walk on crutches or not at all because of a sacrifice they willingly made for this country. All they ask now is to be able to get the same benefits their neighbors who are also on social security get—and without having to lose a greater part of their income in the process.

Now I do not think that any of us who voted for the social security increase or for the raise in Federal retirement intended that the people we were trying to help would actually lose several hundred dollars a year when the bill was passed. I know I did not.

What can we do to make up for this oversight?

There has been considerable reluctance expressed by the House of Representatives to solve this by giving another 10 percent exclusion, on the grounds that it would add many more to the VA rolls and swell the cost of the program. Many others feel that simply excluding this year's social security increase is unfair to those who have received Federal retirement increases to bring their incomes up to a reasonable standard. That would be singling out one group for benefits and forgetting another—it would compound an existing injustice.

I have, therefore, introduced a bill, H.R. 11456, which deals with each man according to his individual case and costs the Government much less. The bill provides simply that a veteran may accept any portion of the 1965 or future social security or Federal retirement increase which would be to his benefit and refuse that portion which would put him over the pension limits. He could take advantage of increases without losing more in the long run.

What would this do for the veteran we talked about before who lost $240 a year by the social security increase? Under this bill he would be able to accept $30 of the $75 available. This would bring his income, for pension purposes, to $999 a year, and he would still be eligible for his pension of $105 a month. His increase would be small, but at least some increase, and of most importance, he would not be losing a big percentage of his income.

Since this would apply only to this year's and future increases there would be no additional people on the rolls. It would mean a saving in social security and retirement funds.

I am confident that this plan can provide us with a desperately needed solution to the plight of these people without increasing the cost of our veterans' programs significantly.

We made a mistake and created the problem. Here is our opportunity to correct our error and our responsibility to those we have unintentionally hurt.

The Individual Versus Big Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1965

Mr. **BROCK**. Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the constant struggle in our country today between the individual and the giants—big labor, big business, and big government. I am addressing myself to the latter problem today. It seems to me that one of the basic concepts of our society is the right of an individual to defend himself against unfair, arbitrary and capricious government action.

I would like to call the House's attention today to a case wherein a small individual corporation—Holiday Tours, Inc.—has been struggling over a number of years in an unsuccessful effort to achieve justice. The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Regulation Compact was authorized by Congress for the purpose of regulating transportation in the National Capital area. Article 12, paragraph 4(a) of the agreement clearly provides that operating certificates will be awarded to any person engaged in transportation on the effective date of the compact without requiring further proof that public convenience and necessity will be served. Nevertheless, even though Holiday Tours should have been protected under this provision, the Metropolitan Area Transit Commission refused to grant the sightseeing firm a certificate, and that is the genesis of the conflict.

This corporation spent 6 months in 1961 and 10 months of 1962 in redtape applications and prolonged hearings. Then, on October 15, 1962, the entire record of Holiday Tours, Inc., was expunged, and the organization had to start processing their application all over from the start again. Long litigation followed, and hearing after hearing after hearing held. Legal expenses piled up.

No stone was left unturned by the Transit Commission. During the summer of 1964, a number of bus-leasing companies, outside the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, were contacted by the Transit Commission, harassed, intimidated, and threatened with fines, having their buses impounded and ICC certificates cancelled if they continued to rent buses to Holiday Tours, Inc. Still, the small sightseeing company fought on even though its business has been seriously handicapped by the actions of the Transit Commission.

In an effort to drive it out of business, the Metropolitan Transit Commission on July 3, 1964, obtained a cease-and-desist order stopping the Holiday Tours from taking sightseers around the Nation's Capital. This nearly broke the back of Holiday Tours, but not quite. However, the U.S. court of appeals ruled in favor of Holiday Tours and a stay was granted pending decision by the court on the merits of the case. This case was heard on January 7, 1965, in the U.S. court of appeals. The court again decided in favor of Holiday Tours and remanded the case so the Transit Commission for further appropriate proceedings in accordance with its opinion. One would think that, in light of the court's decision, a certificate would have been issued immediately. But the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission has now reopened the case, and has called Holiday Tours before it for still another hearing set for October 25. The expense in such a drawn out legal fight can be, of course, disastrous to a small firm.

Mr. Speaker, Holiday Tours has proved time and time again before the Commission and courts of law that it has met the necessary requirements and should have been issued a certificate back in 1961. The Commission, I believe, has exceeded its authority in threatening bus-leasing companies with fines, confiscation, and withdrawal of their ICC certificates if they continued doing business with Holiday Tours. In addition, the Commission has knowingly permitted a competitor to leave its own authorized route and infringe upon the territory of Holiday Tours, Inc.

Holiday Tours has spent thousands of dollars in an effort to attain justice. This protracted litigation is unfair, unnecessary and, quite frankly, seems to be designed to destroy Holiday Tours, Inc. Mr. Speaker, there must be some protection for the little man and the small company against the colossus—whether it be a regulatory commission, Federal agency, big labor, or big business. There is serious question whether the intent of Congress in the transit compact is being followed, or if not, whether new legislation may be required to encourage free enterprise in the Washington metropolitan area rather than restrict it, whether new law may be needed to protect the rights of the individual against the power of big government.

How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues was kind enough to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 20, 1965, page 27165, a letter from the Honorable RICHARD ICHORD to me on the subject of Robert Scheer's pamphlet entitled "How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam." The letter was accompanied by an enclosure containing information on Mr. Scheer's background—taken from the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I am taking the liberty, therefore, of inserting in the RECORD my reply to Mr. ICHORD's letter.

The reply follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 21, 1965.

Hon. RICHARD ICHORD,
Longworth House Office Building.

DEAR DICK: I appreciate the fact that you took the trouble to read the pamphlet, "How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam," by Robert Scheer, and also took the trouble to give me your evaluation of it.

I should make it clear that I am not alleging the authenticity of everything Mr. Scheer says. However, this material is receiving widespread publication, not only through this pamphlet but in other publications, and deserves review and analysis by those concerned with our role in Vietnam. Only by such review and analysis, not just of this but of other pertinent material, can we reach an understanding of history and avoid some of the errors of the past. We all know how difficult it is to get reliable information on controversial issues such as Vietnam, sometimes even from Government sources. While I do not share the view of my Republican colleagues that "The figures that are fed to the press and the public by the administration contradict each other and surpass belief" (Vietnam—Some Neglected Aspects of the Historical Record—issued by the Republican Conference of the House of Representatives, Aug. 25, 1965), I do agree that adequate and accurate information is a problem.

As to Mr. Scheer's background, as revealed by the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I can understand how that would trouble you. I do not intend to defend his associations and activities, since I presume that he can do that more ably than I, if necessary. However, I am concerned about the two points which you take issue with in his pamphlet.

You state first that "the publication is filled with half-truths, distortions, implications, innuendos and inferences which lead one to believe that Ho Chi Minh is the George Washington of Vietnam * * *." Mr. Scheer is certainly not unique in thus representing Ho Chi Minh. Numerous prior writers have done so, of which I will cite only Robert Trumbull, who refers to him thus on page 204 of his book, "The Scrutable East," and Edgar Snow, on page 695 of his book, "The Other Side of the River." Your own Committee on Un-American Activities, in its biography of Ho Chi Minh published October 25, 1957, which obviously was not trying to be complimentary, said, "* * * the legendary figure of 'Uncle Ho' was entrenched in the minds of the Vietnamese people—not as a Communist but as a revered father of independence. The myth of the national liberator was so effectively instilled that not even the French risked a personal attack upon the name of Ho Chi Minh as they endeavored to bare the threat of communism."

If it is true that Ho Chi Minh has a public image as a "revered father of independence" or a "national liberator" as your committee states, then attacking Mr. Scheer for saying it may not be very logical. Perhaps we ought to deal with the fact, rather than attack Mr. Scheer.

Your other point of difference with the pamphlet was that it "* * * implies that our involvement in Vietnam was the result of a plot carried out by such distinguished Americans as * * *" and you name several names. I share your belief that such implications have very little foundation. Again, however, it is a position taken by other presumably well-informed people and needs to be dealt with. For example, Mr. Hilaire du Berrier, a former member of the French Resistance in Indochina, an employee of the O.S.S., an "aide" to a Diem delegate to Washington, and a frequent writer for conservative publications, is quoted as being "* * * in agreement with some liberal critics of our Vietnam policy in regarding the American Friends of Vietnam Committee as having functioned as a pro-Diem 'Lobby'."

The point I am trying to make, Dick, is that it is better to deal with the realities of whatever Scheer says rather than to attack his reputation or associations.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.,
Member of Congress.

Atlantic Union Convention Proposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a bipartisan group of Senators and Representatives—myself included—has introduced resolutions proposing an 18-member U.S. Delegation to an Atlantic Union Convention.

Hopefully the Delegation would convene with similar groups from other North Atlantic Treaty Organization nations in order to establish Atlantic Federal Union as the ultimate goal, fix a tentative timetable for achieving it and formulate the institutions needed to expedite the necessary stages.

Atlantic Federal Union would apply the genius of the U.S. constitutional system to the broader area encompassing the nations known as the Atlantic Community.

These resolutions vary slightly but all have the same central objectives. Together they constitute what is probably the most specific and forthright proposal for the unification of the Atlantic Community ever introduced to Congress.

Among the sponsors are Senator CARLSON of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Representatives ZABLOCKI and FRASER of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. This fact gives encouragement that the proposal may receive consideration early in the 2d session of the 89th Congress. Other sponsors are Representatives ELLSWORTH and QUIE, and Senator MCCARTHY.

If adopted, the resolutions could be a giant stride toward the peacekeeping and freedom-serving goal of Atlantic Union. And just beyond that goal could well begin the golden millenium of peace, prosperity, and progress of which mankind has dreamed since the day of the ancient Prophet Micah.

The short-term benefits to the United States and other free peoples are equally appealing. The simple act of authorizing the Delegation would put us in a positive position in the contest with communism, strengthen free world leadership, and put the Communists in a difficult defensive position.

Since World War II we have been hopping from one Communist-inspired crisis to another—Berlin, Lebanon, Quemoy, Cuba, Vietnam, Dominican Republic. It is high time we take the intiative and put the Communists on the defensive.

An Atlantic Union Convention would do just that. It is both powerful and peaceful, as American history itself attests.

The work our forefathers did in Philadelphia in 1787 in creating the U.S. Federal Union did more to strengthen freedom and extend peace than any other act in history. Under the Constitution, individual States which were beset with monetary, trade, and military problems—weakened by division—were brought together effectively and permanently. Union was achieved in a system that gives the central government the strength it needs but still protects the liberty of the individual citizen and the authority of local government.

The monetary, military, and trade problems confronting the free nations today parallel in many ways the problems the 13 original U.S. States faced in 1787. Today, as then, division weakens the forces of freedom and unnecessarily magnifies the problems—internal and external—which beset us.

In his farewell address on leaving the U.S. Presidency, George Washington warned against "entangling alliances" and added these significant words:

> To the efficacy and permanency of your (the United States) Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parties can be an adequate substitute. They must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which alliances in all times have experienced.

As presently organized in NATO, the Atlantic Community must be classified as one of the undependable entangling alliances about which Washington warned. Of course it is better than nothing. But certainly it is doing no better than did the Articles of Confederation which failed to meet the problems of the thirteen original U.S. States in the preconvention period.

In almost every respect the Articles of Confederation formed stronger bonds than does the present organization of NATO, but they proved hopelessly inadequate and were replaced by a Federal Union Government.

NATO's infractions and interruptions are apparent at every turn of the nuclear-age road. Must we limp along with an organization far weaker than one which failed to meet the requirements of the sailing ship era?

A government for the whole of NATO is just as indispensable today as it was for the thirteen original U.S. States in 1787.

Here is the text of Atlantic Union Delegation resolution:

H.J. Res. 769

Joint resolution to establish an Atlantic Union Delegation

Whereas in 1969 any party may withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty, which was ratified in 1949 as a first rather than a last step toward unity;

Whereas since 1949 revolutionizing scientific, technological and other advance has outstripped the treaty and made union of these allies imperative for prosperity, peace and freedom;

Whereas the fragmentation of the world into new nations at a time when the strongest democracies cannot live alone, requires these democracies to build the pilot union government needed to spread liberty and union both by example and by admitting to their union other nations willing and able to uphold its principles;

Whereas these allies need but unite their gold and other resources behind a common currency to assure their citizens and the developing nations, enduring monetary stability and liquidity, and to prevent another dictator-serving crash like the one of 1931;

Whereas our Original States, when beset with dangers caused by disunion under their confederation, sent delegates to the 1787 Convention, which traced their troubles to their confederal structure and invented federal union, which has enduringly safeguarded member States from domination by one another, equitably apportioned among their sovereign citizens voting power on common concerns—and the benefits and burdens of union—assured each State an independent government for State affairs, met other challenges similar to those facing the Atlantic allies, and thereby proved that free people thus united can work wonders;

Whereas distant though North Atlantic Treaty Organization's transformation may seem, these allies can greatly speed it now by officially declaring that federal union, within the framework of the United Nations, is their eventual goal, by setting a timetable—as we did for our moon target—and by providing democratic means for achieving the transition in safe time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, (1) the Congress hereby creates an Atlantic Union delegation, composed of eighteen eminent citizens, and authorized to organize and participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from such North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies as desire to join in this enterprise, to explore the possibility of agreement on:

(a) A declaration that the eventual goal of their peoples is to transform their present alliance into a federal union;

(b) A tentative timetable for the transition to this goal; and

(c) Democratic institutions to develop the ways and means for achieving the goal in time to save their citizens from another war, depression, or other manmade catastrophe, and let them enjoy, as soon as possible, the greater freedom and higher moral and material blessings which federation has brought to free people in the past.

(2) The Convention's recommendations shall be submitted to the Congress for action by constitutional procedure;

(3) Not more than half of the Delegation's members shall be from one political party, and all shall be citizens of high stature and wide influence, representing together a broad range of experience in the various major challenges facing this undertaking, and so conscious of its importance and urgency as to be willing to give it personally the necessary priority and time, in the spirit of 1787 which one member of that Convention thus expressed: "Inconvenient" as it was "to remain absent from his private affairs * * * he would bury his bones" in Philadelphia, if need be, to bring about the union;

(4) Eight of the delegation shall be named by the Congress and eight by the President of the United States, and all shall be as free to speak and vote as were the drafters of the United States Constitution;

(5) The Congress hereby requests former Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry S. Truman to serve as cochairmen of the delegation.

SENATE

Friday, October 22, 1965

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. Metcalf).

Father Baan Vitez, president, the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation, Barberton, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, we pray today for our brothers who 9 years ago sacrificed their lives in the streets of Budapest, Hungary, for the cause of justice and freedom. We pray to You from this place in which were found so many sympathetic hearts which were broken because of the impotence of their pleas.

In Your goodness, deign to console those still living under the bonds of godless communism. Give wisdom and strength to our leaders and enable them to follow Your will in helping their oppressed and suffering neighbors.

Accept, O Lord of All, the gratitude of those whom You have led into this great and beautiful, free country. Never let them forget that You alone are great, that You alone are the source of all happiness, success, and peace.

O Father Almighty, we offer You the sacrifices of the Hungarian heroes, the sacrifices of our own sons in Vietnam, the sacrifices of all peoples, everywhere, for the cause of justice and freedom, together with the infinite sacrifice of Your Son and our Redeemer, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 21, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On October 20, 1965:

S. 1516. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in federally owned buildings for periods not to exceed 3 years, and for other purposes;

S. 1715. An act to extend the penalty for assault on a police officer in the District of Columbia to assaults on employees of penal and correctional institutions and places of confinement of juveniles of the District of Columbia; and

S.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution to allow the showing in the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy—Year of Lightning, Day of Drums."

On October 21, 1965:

S. 1719. An act to authorize compensation for overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 619) for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request by Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, with reference to the printing of committee activity reports for the session, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, I remind the chairmen of all committees that the Joint Committee on Printing has very properly ruled that the printing of such reports, both as committee prints and in the Record, is duplication, the cost of which cannot be justified.

It is requested that committee chairmen decide whether they wish these reports printed as committee prints or in the Record, since the Government Printing Office will be directed not to print them both ways.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on October 21, 1965, the Vice President had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 2084. An act to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems;

H.R. 1317. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer which was imported during May 1963 for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.;

H.R. 1386. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Pomona College;

H.R. 1393. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Eduvigis Aran Heffernan;

H.R. 1781. An act to amend section 113(a) of title 28, United States Code, to provide that Federal District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina shall be held at Clinton;

H.R. 2565. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of the University of Chicago;

H.R. 2578. An act for the relief of Maxie L. Rupert;

H.R. 2762. An act for the relief of Manlio Massimiliani;

H.R. 2906. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lily Ning Sheehan;

H.R. 3126. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the University of Washington;

H.R. 3905. An act for the relief of Bibi Daljeet Kaur;

H.R. 4832. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectromter for the use of St. Louis University;

H.R. 5006. An act for the relief of Diosdado F. Almazan;

H.R. 5217. An act to permit the vessel *Little Nancy* to be documented for use in the coastwide trade;

H.R. 6312. An act for the relief of Mario Menna;

H.R. 6655. An act for the relief of Pieter Cornelis Metzelaar;

H.R. 6720. An act for the relief of Ping-Kwan Fong;

H.R. 6906. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer and one split pole spectrograph for the use of the University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.;

H.R. 7282. An act for the relief of Richard D. Walsh;

H.R. 7357. An act for the relief of Dr. Felipe V. Lavapies;

H.R. 7453. An act for the relief of Margaret Elizabeth and Frederick Henry Todd;

H.R. 7608. An act to provide for the free entry of one automatic steady state distribution machine for the use of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.;

H.R. 8135. An act for the relief of Jennifer Rebecca Siegel;

H.R. 8232. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer-gas chromatograph for the use of Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla.;

H.R. 8272. An act to provide for the free entry of an isotope separator for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.;

H.R. 8646. An act for the relief of Rifkin Textiles Corp.;

H.R. 9351. An act to provide for the free entry of one shadomaster measuring projector for the use of the University of South Dakota;

H.R. 9495. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9587. An act to provide for the free entry of a Craig countercurrent distribution apparatus for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.;

H.R. 9588. An act to provide for the free entry of an electrically driven rotating chair for the use of the Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, La.;

H.R. 10198. An act to amend the requirements relating to lumber under the Shipping Act, 1916.;

H.R. 10256. An act for the relief of James D. W. Blyth, his wife, Jean Mary Blyth, and their daughter, Penelope Jean Blyth;

H.R. 10292. An act for the relief of Hilda Shen Tsiang;

H.R. 11096. An act to authorize the disposal of graphite, quartz crystals, and lump steatite talc from the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both;

H.J. Res. 397. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District; and

H.J. Res. 597. Joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of rocketry.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Insurance and Guarantees on U.S. Exports to Yugoslavia

A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on insurance and guarantees on U.S. exports to Yugoslavia, for the month of September 1965; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Overobligation of an Appropriation

A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation within that Agency; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Increases in Annuities Payable From the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund

A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Acquisition of Certain Property as a Site for the Organization of American States

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the acquisition. transfer. conveyance, and lease of certain property in the District of Columbia for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States, as sites for other international organizations, and as sites for governments of foreign countries, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Reports of Acting Comptroller General

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unauthorized expenditures for the repair and reconstruction of a section of the Inter-American highway in the Republic of Costa Rica, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of procurement of fault locating indicators for the Nike-Hercules guided missile, Department of the Army, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on possible savings through purchasing rather than leasing certain copying machines, Atomic Energy Commission, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of financial statements for the Southwestern Power System and related activities, fiscal year 1964, Southwestern Power Administration, Department of the Interior and Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of causes for overpayments and underpayments of mileage reimbursements for travel of service members and their dependents, Department of the Army and Department of the Air Force, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings resulting from elimination of the requirement that general office desks be equipped with locks, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings by direct rather than indirect purchase of selected major subsystems for A–6A type of aircraft, Department of the Navy, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on questionable basis for approving loans for the construction of three motels, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need for strengthening controls over sick leave, Post Office Department, dated October 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Election of Governor of the Virgin Islands

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the popular election of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON NEGOTIATED CONTRACTS FOR DISPOSAL OF MATERIALS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on negotiated contracts for disposal of materials, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Administration, for the fiscal year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF LEGION OF VALOR

A letter from the National Corporation Agent, Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial statement of that organization, for the period August 1, 1964, to July 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 10878. An act for the relief of Anderson G. Matsler, senior master sergeant, U.S. Air Force, retired (Rept. No. 932).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

H. Con. Res. 509. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on crime in the District of Columbia and House Report No. 176, entitled "District of Columbia Crime"; (Rept. No. 933);

H. Con. Res. 512. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearing on home rule for the District of Columbia; (Rept. No. 934);

H. Con. Res. 513. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on "Lower Colorado River Basin Project", Eighty-ninth Congress, first session; (Rept. No. 935); and

H. Con. Res. 519. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on H.R. 2580 (Eighty-ninth Congress, first session), to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Represenatives; (Rept. No. 936).

INTERAMA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 937)

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations I report without recommendations and with amendments H.R. 30, to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed together with minority views of Senators LAUSCHE, FULBRIGHT, WILLIAMS of Delaware, and CLARK.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Iowa.

REPORT OF DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated October 20, 1965, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 2701. A bill to amend section 4554 of title 39, United States Code, so as to extend the postage rate provided therein for books to certain matter mailed with such books; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2702. A bill for the relief of Dr. Angel Montero-Novoa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2703. A bill to provide that the flag of the United States of America may be displayed for 24 hours of each day on Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 2704. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the Investment Company Act of 1940, to provide for the regulation of collective investment funds maintained by banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. McINTYRE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2705. A bill for the relief of James Kwang-Jong Koh and Rachel Young-He Koh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 2706. A bill for the relief of Tita Peralta Paragus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 2707. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Sue Crawford Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. METCALF):

S. 2708. A bill relating to the reduction of the public debt; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 2709. A bill to name the Veterans' Administration hospital located in Clarksburg, W. Va., the "Louis A. Johnson Memorial Veterans' Hospital"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 2710. A bill to authorize the acquisition, transfer, conveyance, and lease of certain property in the District of Columbia for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States, as sites for other international organizations, and as sites for governments of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 2711. A bill for the relief of Angeliki Tsipouras; and

S. 2712. A bill to amend section 206(a) of title II and section 213(a)(1) of title II of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2713. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to establish certain requirements with respect to the use of recording equipment for conveying messages by telephone; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 2714. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act to restrict certain authorization for free or reduced rate transportation of property or passengers; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART (for himself and Mr. BURDICK):

S. 2715. A bill to establish a uniform national policy concerning property rights in inventions made through the expenditure of public funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 2716. A bill for the relief of Alessandro Leccese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 2717. A bill to amend the act admitting the State of Alaska into the Union with respect to the lands which may be selected from the public lands by such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT (by request):

S. 2718. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment in the case of the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, against Daniel Agbaba, et al.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 2719. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 2720. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2721. A bill to establish a fact-reporting bail agency in courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 2722. A bill to amend chapter 235 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the appellate review of sentences imposed in criminal cases arising in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2723. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to improve visitor facilities in the park system of the Nation's Capital by providing a bridge to East Potomac Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 2724. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bievenida Brito Cambare; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS:

S. 2725. A bill for the relief of Izhak Gross and his wife, Bluma Gross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S.J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to designate the period beginning September 24, 1966, and ending September 30, 1966, as "National Square Dance Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

REVIEW OF THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT ABOVE HARLAN COUNTY RESERVOIR, NEBR.

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 155); which was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

S. RES. 155

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works shall request the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, created under section 3 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, approved June 13, 1902, to—

(1) review the appropriate reports on the Missouri River Basin project relating to the Republican River Watershed above the Harlan County Reservoir, Nebr., for the purpose of determining the advisability at this time of modifying such project in such watershed in order to permit an increase in the elevation of the Harlan County Reservoir conservation pool and to improve facilities for flood control, irrigation, and related purposes in such watershed; and

(2) report its findings and recommendations to the Committee on Public Works as soon as such review shall have been completed.

NOTIFICATION TO HOUSE OF THE SELECTION OF EMERY L. FRAZIER AS SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 156) to notify the House of Representatives of the election of Emery L. Frazier as Secretary of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

NOTIFICATION TO PRESIDENT OF THE SELECTION OF EMERY L. FRAZIER AS SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 157) to notify the President of the election of Emery L. Frazier as Secretary of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE TRIBUTES TO HON. FELTON M. JOHNSTON

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 158) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the tributes to the Honorable Felton M. Johnston to commemorate the occasion of his retirement as Secretary of the Senate; and providing for additional copies, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

ELIZABETH T. ANDERSON

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is with regret that I announce the retirement of Mrs. Elizabeth T. Anderson, a loyal friend, and a valued and competent employee of the Joint Committee on Printing for the past 21½ years. I will miss her very much, and I am sure I speak for many of her friends and associates on Capitol Hill as well as the executive agencies.

PROCLAMATION COMMEMORATING THE EFFORTS OF CERTAIN AMERICANS ABROAD

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 159) expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should issue a proclamation for the commemoration of the efforts of Americans abroad who are carrying forward the struggle for peace and freedom, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. SALTONSTALL, which appears under a separate heading.)

DISPLAY OF AMERICAN FLAG OVER INDEPENDENCE HALL, PHILADELPHIA, 24 HOURS A DAY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to permit our flag to be flown over Independence Hall in Philadelphia 24 hours a day except during inclement weather.

At present there are only two places in the United States where our flag is flown at night by specific authority. One is the Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine, and the other is Flag House, Flag House Square, Baltimore, Md.

There could be no more fitting addition to this list than the site of the signing of the Declaration of Independence in 1776 and the home of the Liberty Bell. Independence Hall is deep in history and rich in meaning for Americans today, and I believe that in authorizing the flying of the flag over this hallowed shrine during the long hours of the night as well as during the light of day, we are extending the same recognition to the site of freedom's birth as is now extended to the site of origin of our national anthem.

I intend to press for its enactment next year.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2703) to provide that the flag of the United States of America may be displayed for 24 hours of each day on Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BANK COLLECTIVE INVESTMENT ACT

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for a uniform statutory basis for the Federal regulation and supervision of certain categories of collective investment funds maintained by commercial banks and trust companies in the conduct of their fiduciary services. It is the objective of this legislation to provide a fair and rational solution to the jurisdictional conflict which has arisen between the Comptroller of the Currency and the Securities and Exchange Commission with respect to the Federal regulation of bank collective investment funds. Legislation dealing with the same subject area was introduced in the last Congress. I was a cosponsor of the Senate bill. Last year, partial hearings were held on that legislation by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; however, the pressure of business before the House Commerce Committee made it impossible to complete consideration of the legislation.

While the bill which I am introducing today has a similar objective to the legislation of the 88th Congress, it is the product of extensive redrafting and differs from its predecessor in two important areas. First, this bill gives new and stronger supervisory powers to the three Federal banking agencies which are designed to assure that these three agencies will have the legal capacity to supervise more effectively the collective investment funds of banks under their supervisory jurisdiction. Second, the present bill goes further than the legislation in the 88th Congress in the restrictions which it places on the operation of the collective investment fund for managing agency accounts. It is the managing-agency-type fund which has produced the greatest controversy, and this bill includes six operating limitations on a managing-agency fund, which are aimed at preventing commercial banks and trust companies from entering the mass investment market which is being served by the mutual fund industry.

I am satisfied that a very earnest effort has been made in the redrafting of this legislation to overcome many of the objections which had been raised to the predecessor legislation in the 88th Congress. Whether or not that effort has been successful can only be determined through the processes of discussion and legislative hearings. My purpose in introducing this legislation at this time is to make it possible for the affected Federal agencies—the Federal banking agencies and the Securities and Exchange Commission—and the interested private parties—the banking industry and the investment industry—to utilize the congressional adjournment period for meaningful discussion and consideration of the provisions of this legislation. I sincerely hope that such consultation and discussion will take place during the 2-month adjournment period and I further hope that such discussion will produce the groundwork for a satisfactory resolution of the problems related to the Federal regulation and supervision of bank collective investment funds.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a memorandum explaining its provisions be printed in the RECORD immediately following my introductory comments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2704) to amend the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the Investment Company Act of 1940, to provide for the regulation of collective investment funds maintained by banks, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MCINTYRE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2704

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECURITIES ACT OF 1933

SECTION 1. Paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77b(1)), is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding the following: "except that such term does not include any interest in a collective investment fund maintained by a qualified bank (as the terms 'collective investment fund' and 'qualified bank' are defined in the Bank Collective Investment Fund Act of 1965)."

SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

SEC. 2. Paragraph (10) of section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(10)), is amended by striking out "currency or" and inserting in lieu thereof "currency," and by changing the period at the end of such paragraph to a comma and adding the following: "or any interest in a collective investment fund maintained by a qualified bank (as the terms 'collective investment fund' and 'qualified bank' are defined in the Bank Collective Investment Fund Act of 1965)."

INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940

SEC. 3. Paragraph (3) of section 3(c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-3(c)(3)) is amended by inserting after "guardian;" the following: "any collective investment fund maintained by a qualified bank (as the terms 'collective investment fund' and 'qualified bank' are defined in the Bank Collective Investment Fund Act of 1965);".

WRITTEN PLANS

Contents of plan

SEC. 4. (a) A qualified bank shall file a written plan with the appropriate supervisory agency in accordance with this section for each collective investment fund operated by it. Any such plan shall contain appropriate provisions as to the manner in which the fund is to be operated, including provisions relating to—

(1) the general investment policies of the bank with respect to the fund,

(2) the auditing of accounts of the bank with respect to the fund,

(3) the allocation of income, profits, and losses,

(4) the terms and conditions governing the admission or withdrawal of participations in the fund,

(5) the basis and method of valuing assets in the fund;

(6) the minimum frequency for valuation of assets of the fund,

(7) the period following such valuation date during which the valuation must be made,

(8) the basis upon which the fund may be terminated, and

(9) such other matters (including provisions to define clearly the rights of participants in the fund) as may be required under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller of the Currency.

For the purposes of this section, the meaning of the term "plan" may include an amendment to a plan.

Requirement

(b) A qualified bank may make a contribution to a collective investment fund maintained by it only when—

(1) there exists a plan for such fund which is currently effective pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, or

(2) in the case of a fund which was in operation on the date of enactment of this Act, less than 200 days have elapsed since the initial promulgation of regulations by the Comptroller of the Currency pursuant to this Act.

Effectiveness

(c) A plan shall be effective only when—

(1) it has been approved in writing by the appropriate supervisory agency or more than twenty days (or such shorter period as the agency may allow) have elapsed since the filing of the plan with the appropriate supervisory agency, and

(2) the appropriate supervisory agency has not notified the sponsoring bank, by personal service or by confirmed telegraphic notice, of a provision of this Act or other applicable law or regulation with which such agency has not found the plan to be in compliance.

The effectiveness of any revised or amended plan filed in response to a notice described in clause (2) of the preceding sentence shall also be governed by the provisions of this subsection.

Public inspection

(d) Any plan filed with the appropriate supervisory agency shall be available for public inspection.

FINANCIAL REPORTS

Form and contents

SEC. 5. (a) At least once in every twelve months each qualified bank shall prepare a financial report for each collective investment fund maintained by it. The report shall be in such form as the Comptroller of the Currency shall by regulations requiro and shall contain—

(1) a detailed listing of all assets and liabilities of the collective investment fund, showing in the case of assets both cost and market value and concentration by major fields;

(2) a statement of increases or decreases in gross asset valuation since the last prior report;

(3) a statement of earnings;

(4) a statement of realized gains and losses;

(5) a statement of investments purchased, sold, or redeemed since the last prior report; and

(6) such other accounting or financial information as the Comptroller of the Currency shall by regulation require to furnish adequate information to persons having interests in participating accounts.

Filing, public inspection

(2) A copy of each report required by subsection (a) shall be filed with the appropriate supervisory agency within three months, or within such other time as the Comptroller of the Currency may by regulation prescribe, after the close of the accounting period covered thereby and when so filed shall be available for public inspection.

INFORMATION TO BE FURNISHED TO PARTICIPANTS

SEC. 6. (a) In the case of any collective investment fund with respect to which there exists a plan which is effective in accordance with section 4, no amount shall be initially contributed with respect to any participating account unless at or before the time the initial contribution is made a copy of the plan as currently in effect and a copy of the latest financial report is furnished (without charge) to—

(1) each cofiduciary for any trust or estate from which the amount is contributed,

(2) each person who, under the instruments pursuant to which the bank is acting for the participating account, has the right to be consulted about investments or to amend or revoke any of the terms of such instruments, and

(3) such other persons as the Comptroller of the Currency may by regulations prescribe. After an amount has been initially contributed, a copy of each financial report made after such time and a copy of any change in the plan after such time shall be furnished without charge (or a notice that such a copy will upon request be furnished without charge) to each such person.

(b) In the case of any collective investment fund in operation on the date of enactment of this Act, a copy of the plan for such fund shall be furnished (without charge) to each person who, on the date such plan becomes effective, is—

(1) a cofiduciary for any trust or estate having any interest in such fund,

(2) a person who, under the instruments pursuant to which the bank is acting for any account participating in such fund, has the right to be consulted about investments or to amend or revoke any of the terms of such instruments, or

(3) otherwise described in the regulations of the Comptroller as a person to whom a copy of such plan shall be furnished.

LIMITATIONS ON MANAGING AGENCY FUNDS

Advertising

SEC. 7. (a) No qualified bank shall advertise or publicize a collective investment fund described in section 11(a)(3)(B)(ii) (hereinafter in this section referred to as a "managing agency fund"), except that incidental reference to such funds may be made in the course of advertising or publicizing the scope of a bank's fiduciary services.

Commissions

(b) No qualified bank shall pay any commission to any person for the purpose of promoting or soliciting participations in any managing agency fund.

Valuation

(c) No qualified bank shall value any managing agency fund on a regular basis for the purpose of admissions to or withdrawals from the fund more frequently than once each month.

Charges

(d) No qualified bank shall make any charge of any kind against any managing agency fund except for expenses incurred—

(1) in the acquisition, conservation, protection, or liquidation of any asset of the fund;

(2) for any independent audit procured by the bank for the purposes of the annual financial report required by section 6; or

(3) for legal or other professional services and for filing fees or other court costs in connection with any annual fiduciary accounting for such fund which may be required by State law.

Certificates

(e) A participating interest in a managing agency fund shall not be evidenced by a certificate, and shall not be transferable or assignable.

Minimum initial participation

(f) No participation shall be initially admitted to a managing agency fund if on the date of admission the valuation of such initial participation is less than ten thousand dollars.

AUTHORITY OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Regulations

SEC. 8. (a) The Comptroller of the Currency shall prescribe such regulations as he may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act including, but not limited to, regulations governing—

(1) the manner in which a bank may advertise or publicize its collective investment funds;

(2) limitations on the interests that a bank may have, as a result of creditor relationships or otherwise, in its collective investment funds;

(3) the percentage of a collective investment fund that may be represented by any one participating account;

(4) limitations on the percentage of investment by a collective investment fund in the securities of any one issuer;

(5) maintenance of liquidity of collective investment funds; and

(6) the form of, and the time for filing, the written declaration referred to in section 11(a)(2).

For the purposes of section 584(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, regulations prescribed by the Comptroller of the Currency under this Act shall be deemed to be regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency pertaining to the collective investment of trust funds by national banks.

Exemptions

(b) The Comptroller of the Currency may conditionally or unconditionally exempt any class or classes of collective investment funds, participating accounts, or transactions from any provision of this Act or any regulation prescribed by him under authority of this Act, if and to the extent that such exemption—

(1) is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, and

(2) is consistent with protecting the parties to, and the beneficiaries under, the instruments pursuant to which banks are acting for the participating accounts, and with the purposes fairly intended by the policy and provisions of this Act.

Coordination with other agencies

(c) In order to facilitate the exercise by the Comptroller of the Currency of his authority to prescribe regulations under this Act, the other supervisory agencies shall furnish to the Comptroller of the Currency, for his information, copies of all documents required to be filed with them under this Act.

RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY OF SUPERVISORY AGENCIES

Responsibility

SEC. 9. (a) Enforcement of the provisions of this Act and of the regulations prescribed by the Comptroller of the Currency under authority of this Act shall, with respect to each collective investment fund, be the responsibility of the appropriate supervisory agency.

Authority

(b) In the case of any collective investment fund operated otherwise than in substantial conformity with the requirements of this Act, the applicable rules and regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the provisions of the plan for such fund, the appropriate supervisory agency may, by order—

(1) prohibit the sponsoring bank from making any contributions to such fund.

(2) direct the sponsoring bank to take any action necessary to bring the operation of such fund into conformity with this Act, the rules and regulations, and the plan for such fund.

(3) direct the placing of such fund under the investment management of a person or persons other than the sponsoring bank.

(4) vest control of such fund in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as receiver.

(5) direct the liquidation of such fund.

Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, no such order may be issued without appropriate notice and opportunity for hearing.

Emergency orders

(c) If the appropriate supervisory agency finds that such action is necessary for the protection of the public or of persons having interests in the fund involved, and so states in any order issued pursuant to subsection (b), such order may be made immediately effective, without prior notice or hearing, for a period not exceeding twenty-one days from its date of issuance. Any such immediately effective order shall by its terms fix a time and place for a hearing thereon, which shall be held within twenty-one days after the issuance of such order, in the same judicial district in which the sponsoring bank, or the office thereof involved, is located. Prior to the conclusion of such hearing, such order may be continued in force with or without amendment, in the discretion of the agency, for successive periods no one of which shall exceed twenty-one days. After the conclusion of such hearing, the agency may enter such further order as it may deem appropriate for the protection of the public and of persons having interests in such fund.

CRIMINAL PENALTY

SEC. 10. Any bank which willfully violates any provision of this Act, or any regulation prescribed by the Comptroller of the Currency under authority of this Act, or willfully, in a plan or revision thereof or in a financial report filed under this Act, makes any untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state any material fact required to be stated therein or necessary in order to prevent the statements made therein from being materially misleading in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, shall upon conviction be fined not more than $25,000.

DEFINITIONS AND RULES OF CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 11. (a) For the purposes of this Act—

Bank

(1) The term "bank" means a bank or trust company, whether incorporated or not—

(A) which is organized and doing business under the laws of the United States (including laws relating to the District of Columbia) or of any State,

(B) a substantial part of the business of which consists of receiving deposits and making loans and discounts or of exercising fiduciary powers of the character permitted to national banks under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller of the Currency under Public Law 87-722 (12 U.S.C. 92a), and

(C) which is subject by law to supervision and examination by Federal or State authority having supervision over banking institutions.

Such term also includes a receiver, conservator, or other liquidating agent of any organization which is a bank as defined in the preceding sentence.

Qualified bank

(2) The term "qualified bank" means—

(A) any bank whose deposits are insured in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and

(B) any bank which has filed with the Comptroller of the Currency a written declaration that it elects to maintain in accordance with this Act any collective investment fund established by it.

Collective investment fund

(3) The term "collective investment fund" means—

(A) a common trust fund or other pooled or collective fund maintained by a bank for the collective investment or reinvestment of assets contributed thereto by such bank in its capacity as trustee, executor, administrator, or guardian, and

(B) a fund maintained by a bank exclusively for the collective investment and reinvestment of (i) assets of qualified trusts (within the meaning of section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) which are exempt from income tax by reason of section 501(a) of such Code, or (ii) assets contributed to the fund by the bank as managing agent.

Appropriate supervisory agency

(4) The term "appropriate supervisory agency" means—

(A) In the case of a national bank, a bank operating under laws relating to the District of Columbia, or a bank which is a qualified bank only by reason of having filed the written declaration referred to in paragraph (2), the Comptroller of the Currency.

(B) In the case of a bank (other than a bank described in subparagraph (A)) which is a member of the Federal Reserve System, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(C) In the case of a bank (other than a bank described in subparagraph (A) or (B)) whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Operation of fund

(5) A collective investment fund shall be deemed to be in operation at any time when there is held in such fund any money or property contributed thereto by the sponsoring bank in any capacity described in paragraph (3), or any money or property derived from any money or property so contributed.

Limitation on managing agency funds

(b) For purposes of this Act, assets are contributed to a fund by a bank as managing agent only if the bank is acting as agent under a managing agency contract pursuant to which—

(1) the principal has delivered property to the bank for investment,

(2) the principal has appointed the bank as attorney-in-fact for the purpose of carrying out the terms of the contract with respect to the investment account, and

(3) the bank is authorized to exercise investment discretion with respect to all property at any time in the investment account.

Agency powers

(c) The powers conferred by this Act upon any supervisory agency shall be in addition to all other powers conferred upon such agency by other provisions of law, and such other powers may be employed by such agency in the administration and enforcement of this Act.

Limitation on liability

(d) No provision of this Act imposing any liability shall apply to any act done or omitted in good faith in conformity with any rule or regulation of the Comptroller of the Currency, notwithstanding that such rule or regulation may, after such act or omission, be amended or rescinded or be determined by judicial or other authority to be invalid for any reason.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 12. This Act may be cited as the "Bank Collective Investment Fund Act of 1965".

The memorandum presented by Mr. McINTYRE is as follows:

GENERAL EXPLANATION OF THE PURPOSES AND PROVISIONS OF THE BANK COLLECTIVE INVESTMENT FUND ACT

PURPOSE

The principal purpose of the legislation is to vest in the Federal banking agencies exclusive jurisdiction to regulate and supervise three specific types of pooled funds maintained by banks and trust companies in the management of fiduciary assets.

The three specific types of collective investment funds covered by the bill are:

1. Common trust funds, exempt from taxation under section 584 of the Internal Revenue Code, which are comprised of assets held by a bank as trustee, executor, administrator, or guardian.

2. Collective funds comprised of the assets of qualified trusts (within the meaning of sec. 401 of the Internal Revenue Code), which would include trusts established for employee pension, welfare, profit-sharing, and bonus plans, as well as trusts for self-employed retirement plans under the Smathers-Keogh Act.

3. Collective funds comprised of assets of managing agency accounts created by an agreement authorizing the bank (as agent) to exercise investment discretion in managing the assets of the principal.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

In April 1963 the Comptroller of the Currency, acting under the authority of Public Law 87–722 to regulate the trust activities and common trust funds of national banks, revised the regulations applicable to collective investment funds so as to permit national banks to utilize the mechanism of the pooled fund for the investment management of assets held by a bank under a Smathers-Keogh trust or a managing agency agreement. Thereafter the Securities and Exchange Commission announced that any pooling of assets held in Smathers-Keogh trusts would be subject to SEC regulation under the Securities Act of 1933 and any pooling of assets held in managing agency accounts would be subject to SEC regulation under the Securities Act of 1933 and the Investment Company Act of 1940. These pooled funds comprised of assets held by a bank in a fiduciary capacity must be examined and supervised by the Federal banking agencies, because they constitute a potential liability against a bank's capital structure. The asserted jurisdiction of the SEC would subject banks to duplicate Federal regulation. The proposed legislation is needed to establish a single body of statutory standards for the Federal regulation of these collective investment funds and to free banks from the potential threat of overlapping and conflicting regulation by two agencies of the Federal Government.

Type 1 and type 2 funds (with the exception of a fund comprised of Smathers-Keogh assets) are at present expressly exempt from SEC regulatory jurisdiction. Nevertheless, these two types of funds have been included in the legislation to assure that all bank collective investment funds are regulated under a uniform body of statutory standards.

KEY PROVISIONS OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Regulation and supervision of the act's provisions

Section 8 of the act would vest in the Comptroller of the Currency the sole and exclusive authority to promulgate the necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the act. The Comptroller is designated as the sole regulator under the act for two important reasons: (1) It assures that all insured banks maintaining collective investment funds will be subject to a single and uniform set of administrative regulations; (2) it follows the existing regulatory scheme for type 1 funds (common trust funds). These pooled funds are afforded exemption from income taxation under section 584 of the Internal Revenue Code only if the fund is operated in conformity with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Comptroller of the Currency for the common trust funds of national banks. Therefore, as a matter of actual practice, State-chartered banks, as well as national banks, operate their common trust funds (type 1) in compliance with the Comptroller's regulations.

The act (subsec. 9(a)) provides that the supervision of banks for the purpose of enforcing the provisions of the act and the regulations prescribed by the Comptroller of the Currency shall be divided among the three Federal bank supervisory agencies along traditional jurisdictional lines. Accordingly the Comptroller of the Currency will supervise national banks; the Federal Reserve Board will supervise State-chartered banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System; and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation will supervise the nonmember, State-chartered insured banks.

Special provision is made in the bill for the small number of uninsured, State-chartered trust companies, which at present are not subject to supervision by any of the three Federal bank supervisory agencies. For any of these institutions which desire to come under the coverage of this legislation, the bill provides that the institution must file with the Comptroller of the Currency a written declaration that it elects to maintain its collective investment funds in accordance wih the provisions of the act. Any institution so filing would, thereafter, be supervised by the Comptroller's Office for the purposes of this act.

Subsection 9(b) of the act grants to the three Federal bank supervisory agencies specific enforcement powers to assure that each collective investment fund is operated in conformity with the provisions of the Act, the regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the provisions of the plan governing the fund. Where a supervisory agency finds that a collective investment fund is not being operated in substantial conformity with the requirements of the act, regulations, or provisions of the plan for such fund, the agency (under the authority of this subsection) is empowered to issue an order to:

1. prohibit the sponsoring bank from making any further contributions to such fund;

2. direct the bank to take such action as may be necessary to bring the operation of the fund into conformity with the act, regulations, and the provisions of the plan for such fund;

3. place such fund under the investment management of a person or persons other than the sponsoring bank;

4. vest control of such fund in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as receiver;

5. direct the liquidation of such fund.

Enforcement orders for the five foregoing purposes could not, in general, be issued by a supervisory agency without first having given the sponsoring bank appropriate notice and an opportunity for a hearing. If, however, the agency finds that the enforcement action is necessary for the protection of the public or persons having an interest in a fund, the agency may (under subsec. 9(c)) issue its enforcement order immediately without prior notice or hearing. In the case of such an emergency order, the agency would be obliged to hold a hearing within a period of 21 days after the issuance of the order. Such hearing must be held in the same judicial district in which the sponsoring bank is located.

APPROVAL OF A FUND'S PLAN OF OPERATION

Under the act a bank is prohibited from commencing the operation of a collective investment fund, unless the bank has first filed with the appropriate bank supervisory agency a written plan describing in detail the proposed operation of the fund and such written plan has been approved by the supervisory agency. Any nonconforming plan would have to be properly amended before the bank could commence operation of the fund.

In the case of a collective investment fund, which is in operation on the date of enactment, the bank will be permitted to continue the operation of the fund. However, once the Comptroller of the Currency has promulgated his regulations under the act, the bank will have to obtain approval of its written plan within a period of 200 days in order to be able to continue to make contributions to that fund. If the plan is not approved within the requisite period, the bank will not be able to make any new contributions until such time as the plan is approved by the appropriate supervisory agency.

DISCLOSURE

The act specifies certain detailed information describing the manner in which a particular fund is to be operated, which must be contained in the aforementioned written plan. For example, the written plan must include information concerning the investment policies of the bank with respect to the fund, an explanation of the manner in which income, profits, and losses will be allocated, and a description of the terms and conditions governing the admission or withdrawal of participations in the fund.

The act also require that at least once in every 12 months the bank shall prepare a financial report for each fund. Again the act specifies the contents of the financial report, including such items as a statement of earnings, a statement of realized gains and losses, and a detailed listing of all assets and liabilities of the fund, showing in the case of assets both cost and market value and concentration of these holdings by major fields.

As with the written plan, a copy of the financial report must be filed with the appropriate bank supervisory agency. The act provides that these plans (and amendments thereto) and financial reports shall be available for public inspection.

Additionally, the bank is required, prior to participating any portion of the assets of a trust or agency account in a collective investment fund, to provide a copy of the written plan and the latest financial report for the fund to each person, who, with respect to the trust or agency account, has the right to be consulted about investments or to amend or revoke the agreement governing the account. The act further gives the Comptroller the authority to require that these documents be furnished to other persons. Thereafter, so long as an account is participated in the fund, the bank is required to furnish these same persons with each financial report and with all amendments to the written plan.

LIMITATIONS AND RESTRICTIONS ON COLLECTIVE FUNDS FOR MANAGING AGENCY ACCOUNTS

Because the Securities and Exchange Commission has expressed concern that a pooled fund created for the management and investment of assets held by a bank in managing agency accounts could evolve into a bank-operated mutual fund, special care has been taken to write into the act certain limitations as to the operation of such funds, which should effectively bar any bank from entering the mutual fund business via this route.

The limitations imposed on a managing agency fund are the following:

1. The bank is prohibited from advertising or publicizing such a fund, except for incidental reference to such a fund in the general text of advertising or publicity describing the scope of a bank's fiduciary services.
2. The bank is prohibited from paying any commission for the purpose of soliciting participations in any managing agency fund.
3. The bank is prohibited from making any charge against the fund, except for expenses incurred in the acquisition, conservation, protection, or liquidation of any asset of the fund; for any independent audit for the purpose of the annual financial report; or for legal or other professional services and incidental costs in connection with any fiduciary accounting required by State law. This prohibition obliges the bank to charge its fee for managing assets of fiduciary accounts directly to the individual accounts.
4. The bank is prohibited from making a valuation of its fund on a regular basis more frequently than monthly. This prohibition places a significant stricture on admissions and withdrawals, so important to a mutual fund.
5. The bank is prohibited from issuing any certificate evidencing an interest in a collective fund for managing agency accounts, and interests in such funds are not transferable or assignable.
6. Initial entry into a collective fund is limited to amounts of $10,000 or more for each participant.

EXEMPTION FROM SEC JURISDICTION

The bill provides that a fund (if of the types discussed in the opening section) maintained by a bank which is covered under the provisions of the act, shall be exempt from the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the Investment Company Act of 1940.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF A COLLECTIVE FUND FOR MANAGING AGENCY ACCOUNTS

At the present time common trust funds (type 1 funds) are exempt from Federal income taxation under section 584 of the Internal Revenue Code and collective investment funds for pension, profit-sharing and related plans (type 2 funds) are exempt under sections 401 and 501 of the Internal Revenue Code. Enactment of the proposed legislation would entitle collective investment funds for managing agency accounts to similar income tax treatment under section 851 of the Internal Revenue Code. The rationale for all of these exemptions is to avoid double taxation of the individual taxpayer.

CRIMINAL PENALTY

The act provides a criminal penalty for any bank willfully violating its provisions or the regulations promulgated thereunder.

A BILL TO RETIRE THE NATIONAL DEBT WITH ROYALTIES FROM PUBLICLY OWNED OIL SHALE LAND

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of myself and Senators Proxmire and Metcalf, a bill to retire the national debt of the United States through the income derived from federally owned oil shale lands.

More exactly, the bill I introduce would require that when the Federal oil shale lands are leased and developed, all money received thereby by the United States from sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals shall be paid into a special account in the Department of the Treasury and shall be used by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of reducing and retiring the public debt.

Mr. President, the February 1965 report of the Oil Shale Advisory Board and the hearings held by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in May have reminded us of the tremendous assets owned by the people of the United States in the oil shale lands located in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming.

Extraordinary as it may seem, Mr. President, there is every reason to believe that the oil shale lands owned by the people of the United States are so vast and so valuable as to provide royalties sufficient to pay off the entire present national debt of the United States when they are developed.

As the columnist Roscoe Fleming has pointed out in the Denver Post, the potential yield of the oil shale lands in the public domain was once reckoned at only 200 billion barrels. But more recent exploration has suggested that this resource may produce more than 1,000 billion barrels, with a market value approaching $3 trillion. If the United States permitted development of these lands, and received a one-eighth or 12½ percent royalty, which would be a reasonable average royalty based on past experience, although very likely the royalty should even be higher, this would yield between $300 to $400 billion, more than enough to completely pay off the national debt.

Mr. President, the extent of this resource owned by the people of the United States is so vast that it is difficult to grasp. According to the Department of the Interior witnesses before the Senate committee early this year, the most conservative estimate of the high-grade deposits of federally owned oil shale lands is that they would yield 600 billion barrels of high-quality oil. This is twice the known recoverable reserves of petroleum in the entire world. Another analysis of this resource indicates that there are, in the main area of shale oil in Colorado, an estimated total of 1.3 trillion barrels of petroleum. Of this, there are in private ownership an estimated 100 billion barrels on 380,000 acres of land; 100 billion barrels on 338,000 acres in disputed ownership either private or Federal; and 1.1 trillion barrels on 582,000 acres in Federal ownership.

It is difficult at this stage, Mr. President, to give an accurate estimate of the ultimate value of this resource. Nevertheless, witnesses at the Senate hearings stated that oil comparable to that which would be derived from the high-grade oil shale is delivered now in California at $2.85 a barrel. This figure applied to the 1.1 trillion barrels clearly in Federal ownership would yield $3.135 trillion. One-twelfth of this would be approximately $390 billion. Of course, this figure may not take account of the payment of transportation costs and other costs, if it proves necessary to subtract these from the Federal Government's royalties proportionate to its share. And, of course, costs will change before the time full development takes place which may be years or decades away.

As Senators know, the vast area containing oil shale deposits which is in the public domain is now withdrawn from any development. Executive Order No. 5327, issued on April 15, 1930, withdrew the Federal lands containing deposits of oil shale and reserved these shale oil lands "for the purpose of investigation, examination, and classification." That Executive order is still in effect, but the pressures are growing to reverse it and to begin the release of these lands to private companies for development.

The Oil Shale Advisory Board's report shows, and this has also been developed in the Senate hearings, that there are many problems connected with the development of this resource. I wish to make it very clear that the bill I introduce today does not in any way revoke the Executive order which withdrew these lands from development. The principle of my bill is that when the Congress and the executive branch have properly resolved these problems then the income received by the United States from the development of the oil shale will be deposited in the Treasury and be used solely for reducing the public debt. This bill does not develop or alter any rules which would apply to the leasing of this land, nor does it interfere in any way in the resolution of the conflicting claims to title over this land.

Let me emphatically state, however, Mr. President, it is my intention in introducing this bill to call to the attention of the people this vast resource which they own and to warn all parties, including the executive branch and the lobbyists who are sure to become actively involved in the questions surrounding the development of this wealth, that many of us in the Congress and among the public will be alert to any attempt to deprive the people of their rights to this national resource. This is so extraordinary a natural resource that in my opinion wholly new rules must apply to its development. For example, the repayment of the public debt which would result from an enactment of this bill is so universally important to the people of the United States that I see no reason for sharing the revenues from this Federal land in any way with the States or through reclamation funds.

In my judgment, the income from these lands should wholly be devoted to the retirement of the national debt. Moreover, we must exercise extreme care in developing the leasing policies so that the public is fairly treated. Some of the deposits are so rich, for example, that control over only a few acres is worth many millions of dollars. Leasing for private development, obviously, cannot take place until there has been a thorough investigation and inventory, until the exact extent of the resource at a given location is accurately understood, and until competitive bidding procedures and other leasing rules have been agreed to by the Congress.

But I repeat that this bill does not take any position directly on any of these questions, and has only the single purpose which I have stated.

Mr. President, I have frequently, in Senate speeches, tried to put in perspective the debt of the United States. As Senators know, the present debt of approximately $320 billion is, taking all factors into consideration, a conservative one. The growth of the national debt in comparison with other debt in the United States has been strikingly low. Taking the period from 1946 to the end of 1964, the national debt increased only by 0.22 times, while consumer debt increased by 9.7 times, mortgage debt by 7.4 times, corporate debt by 4.3 times, all private debt by 5.26 times and State-local debt by 6.3 times.

Moreover, if the national debt is compared to the gross national product—the total value of goods and services produced—we find that level of the debt has been going down. As of 1946, the national debt was 28 percent more than the gross national product. But by the end of 1964, we had so limited the national debt that it was only 50 percent of the gross national product. Or if we compare the amount of the Federal debt which each person in the country would owe if it was prorated, we find that this has gone down from $1,908.79 as of June 30, 1946, to $1,655.40 as of December 1964, or has decreased by $253.39 per person.

I have also pointed out, Mr. President, that the real and personal property assets held by the Federal Government, evaluated according to the most conservative of estimates, amounted to $315.2 billion or substantially more than the amount of the debt. This evaluation of the assets owned by the people of the United States through the Government, is based solely on the acquisition costs of these resources, obviously a conservative statement according to present values.

In the introduction of this bill to assign the income from the publicly owned oil shale deposits to the repayment of the national debt, I wish to illustrate again the fact that the publicly owned natural resources of this country far exceed the national debt in value.

The likely royalties from this single resource of oil shale alone apparently are close to exceeding the entire amount of the debt.

Mr. President we are truly a fortunate nation and we must rejoice in this. At the same time, we know that, in the history of the development of the natural resources owned by the people, there is a great need for vigilance. It is my hope that this principle of using the oil shale lands to retire the national debt will be enacted and that it will help to protect the public interest in this extensive resource owned by all the people.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2708) relating to the reduction of the public debt, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

THE 1965 ANTIDUMPING ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the problem of foreign products being dumped in this country at prices below those charged by the foreign producer in his home market is one which demands the attention of our Government. The able senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] is the principal sponsor of pending legislation to improve the operation of the Antidumping Act. I commend him for his efforts in this vital area. It was my privilege to be an early cosponsor of his Antidumping Act Amendment of 1965, and I shall continue my support of this measure.

An example of the domestic producers' concern in this matter is an open letter sent to all members of the West Virginia congressional delegation by the Morgantown, W. Va., Area Chamber of Commerce. In this correspondence a point is made which is of interest in connection with this country's pursuit of the Great Society and the alleviation of poverty. It is a point which is particularly timely now while there is talk of the possible need to cut back on domestic programs because of the pressure of appropriations to meet defense requirements. The chamber's letter states:

> The economic condition of this area is well known. Self-help is certainly to be encouraged, but our Federal Government in certain fields, without appropriations, can indeed aid the problems facing not only this area, but the Nation as a whole. We believe passage of this antidumping legislation is one of these fields in which our Government can be helpful.

The 1921 U.S. Antidumping Act was designed to curb the sale of imports at "less than fair value" whenever an industry in the United States is being or is likely to be injured, or is prevented from being established by such unfair pricing policies. Dumping remains a threat today to many industries in the United States. It is my genuine hope that S. 2045, the 1965 Antidumping Act Amendment, will receive the attention it so urgently deserves during the 2d session of the 89th Congress. Enactment of this measure would provide a real opportunity for the Government, without an appreciable expenditure of Federal funds, to help domestic industry and labor overcome the serious impact of international price discrimination.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that pertinent excerpts from the resolution of the Morgantown Area Chamber of Commerce be printed in the RECORD.

The excerpts presented by Mr. RANDOLPH are as follows:

> MORGANTOWN AREA
> CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
> *Morgantown, W. Va.*
>
> To: All Members of the West Virginia congressional delegation.
>
> Subject: Proposed antidumping legislation.
>
> The board of directors of the Morgantown Area Chamber of Commerce at its monthly board meeting discussed at length the proposed antidumping legislation to be considered by this session of the United States Congress. The Board members wholeheartedly endorse this proposed legislation and request that our State congressional delegation sponsor and vigorously support this legislation.
>
> The economic condition of this area is well known. Self help is certainly to be encouraged, but our Federal Government in certain fields, without appropriations, can indeed aid the problems facing not only this area, but the Nation as a whole. We believe passage of this antidumping legislation is one of these fields in which our Government can be helpful.
>
> As you doubtless realize, widespread discontent exists because of the ineffectiveness and unreliability in the present administration of the act. Treasury antidumping regulations were recently revised but are inadequate in scope. Additional statutory standards are required if we are to stop unfair price discrimination caused by dumped imports which disrupt our markets and injure U.S. industry and labor. Remedial action is necessary for the expansion of legitimate international trade.
>
> The over capacity of foreign industries, when coupled with the easy access to U.S. markets, has made this country a logical dumping ground for excess foreign production. Specifically, our area has become a major supplier of natural resources for the cement industry. Our area seeks to develop and grow, and when our fellow citizens' jobs are affected by unfair, unjust, and unequal foreign competition, the Morgantown Area Chamber of Commerce feels it should raise its voice in opposition.
>
> The enactment of moderate and constructive provisions to amend the U.S. Antidumping Act, would provide statutory guidelines to assure greater certainty and needed improvement in its administration by the Treasury Department and the U.S. Tariff Commission. We understand that the proposed 1965 Antidumping Act Amendment has the backing of many industries and labor organizations, in addition to the cement industry, and we feel that it would help to alleviate the unfair competition and economic depressants to which American enterprise is vulnerable when imports are dumped in U.S. markets at prices below those charged in the foreign supplier's home market.
>
> JAMES R. MCCARTNEY,
> *Managing Director.*

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL CENTER, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to create an international center in the northwest section of Washington. I am introducing the bill at the request of the Department of State.

Briefly, the proposal would authorize the acquisition of properties within a specified area for these uses:

First. A headquarters site for the Organization of American States;

Second. Sites for other international organizations; and

Third. Sites for governments of foreign countries.

I am encouraged to believe that the basic concept of an international center may be the answer to the growing problems of finding suitable locations for foreign governments and international activities generally. By introducing the bill at this time, it can be given careful study by interested persons and groups prior to the next session of Congress. I hope that it will be possible to hold hearings on the bill early in the session.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the transmittal letter to the Vice President, the text of the bill, and letter to me from the Secretary of State explaining the proposed plan.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2710) to authorize the acquisition, transfer, conveyance, and lease of certain property in the District of Columbia for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States, as sites for other international organizations, and as sites for governments of foreign countries, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2710

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to facilitate the conduct of foreign relations by the Department of State in Washington, D.C., through the creation of a more propitious atmosphere for the establishment of foreign government and international organization offices and other facilities, the Administrator of General Services is authorized to acquire by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise, of such lands and any buildings and improvements (including property owned by the District of Columbia) thereon within an area in the Northwest section of the District of Columbia bounded by the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, Pennsylvania Avenue, New Hampshire Avenue, Twenty-first Street, and O Street, as the Secretary of State shall determine to be necessary to provide (1) a headquarters building site for the Organization of American States, (2) sites for buildings for international organizations, and (3) sites for buildings for governments of foreign countries.

SEC. 2. (a) The Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to transfer or convey to the Organization of American States, without consideration, all right, title, and interest to not to exceed 3 acres of land acquired under Section 1 of this Act or otherwise owned by the United States within the area described in Section 1 of this Act subject to (1) such terms and conditions as the Secretary of State shall prescribe, and (2) commitment by the Organization of American States to transfer or convey, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the Organization of American States in the buildings and other improvements on the property known as Lot 802 in Square South of Square 147 in the District of Columbia to the United States as soon as such building and other improvements shall cease to be used by the Organization of American States for its purposes. The deed to the Organization of American States shall provide that the property transferred or conveyed to it under the authority of this section shall be used as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States.

(b) The Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to transfer or convey to the Organization of American States, without consideration, all right, title, and interest to the property known as Lot 800 in Square South of Square 173 in the District of Columbia and the buildings and other improvements on the property for use by the Organization of American States.

SEC. 3. If so requested by the Organization of American States and with funds provided in advance or to be provided as reimbursement from the Organization of American States, the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to design, construct, furnish, and equip the headquarters for the Organization of American States to be constructed on the property transferred or conveyed to the Organization of American States pursuant to Section 2(a) of this Act.

SEC. 4. (a) The Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to sell, lease, or otherwise transfer property acquired under Section 1 of this Act and other property owned by the United States within the area described in Section 1 of this Act to foreign governments and international organizations, including the Organization of American States, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of State, after consultation with the Administrator of General Services, shall prescribe. Every lease, contract of sale, deed, and other document of transfer shall provide (a) that the foreign government shall devote the property transferred to use for legation purposes, as defined under Section 1a(c) of the Act of December 24, 1942 as amended (District of Columbia Code, 1961 Edition, 47–801a(c)), or (b) that the international organization shall devote the property transferred to its official uses.

(b) The Administrator of General Services is also authorized with the concurrence of the Secretary of State to transfer title to or jurisdiction over any property or part thereof acquired pursuant to the first section of this Act to the District of Columbia for public purposes, including, but not limited to streets.

SEC. 5. (a) The Act of June 20, 1938, 52 Stat. 802 (District of Columbia Code, 1961 Edition, 5–413 to 5–428) shall not apply to buildings constructed on property transferred or conveyed to the Organization of American States or transferred to international organizations and governments of foreign countries pursuant to this Act: *Provided,* That plans showing the location, height, bulk, number of stories, and size of, and the provisions for open space and off-street parking in and around, such buildings shall be approved by the National Capital Planning Commission and plans showing the height and appearance, color, and texture of the materials of exterior construction of such buildings shall be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts prior to the construction thereof.

(b) Relocation costs made necessary by the exercise of authority by the Administrator of General Services under Section 1 of this Act shall be paid in accordance with the Act of October 6, 1964 (78 Stat. 1004). Individuals and families displaced shall be entitled to the same preference as is provided in section 8(b) of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (District of Columbia Code, 1961 Edition, 5–707(b)). Relocation costs incurred by the District of Columbia in carrying out this subsection shall be borne by the United States.

(c) The costs of rerouting, relocating and rebuilding public sewers and their appurtenances and water mains, fire hydrants, and other parts of the public water supply and distribution system which are occasioned in carrying out the provisions of this Act shall be without cost to the District of Columbia.

(d) The Administrator of General Services is authorized at the time he transfers or conveys property to the Organization of American States pursuant to Section 2 of this Act, or at the time he sells, leases, or otherwise transfers property acquired under Section 1 of this Act or sells, leases or otherwise transfers to a foreign government or to an international organization, other property owned by the United States within the area described in Section 1 of this Act, to incorporate, with the approval of the Secretary of State, in the document making such transfer or conveyance a covenant requiring the transferee or the grantee to conform to Federal Government standards and codes governing building construction and equipment therein, and requiring said transferee or grantee to maintain any building constructed on said property in accordance with said Federal standards and codes.

SEC. 6. The authority vested in the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire for public purposes, by purchase, condemnation or otherwise, property within the area described in the first section of this Act may not be exercised without the approval of the Secretary of State.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The letters presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT are as follows:

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the acquisition, transfer and conveyance of properties necessary to create an international center area in the Northwest section of the District of Columbia which would provide (1) a headquarters site for the Organization of American States, (2) sites for other international organizations, and (3) sites for governments of foreign countries.

This bill will be a tangible demonstration of the importance the U.S. Government gives to inter-American relations, a response to already urgent chancery site problems and an accommodation of other evolving space needs of foreign governments and international organizations.

THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES SITE

Headquarters offices of the Organization of American States are at present located in five buildings in Washington, D.C., in extremely crowded conditions, and requiring an expenditure of almost $450,000 annually for rental of office space.

Our Representative on the Council of the Organization of American States has made clear to the Organization the continuing interest of the United States in retaining the headquarters in Washington, and our sympathetic interest in locating and acquiring a suitable new site.

Providing a satisfactory new headquarters site in Washington for the Organization as quickly as possible would be in keeping with the U.S. policy of firm support for the Organization of American States and its specialized organizations. It would continue in a significant manner the long and mutually beneficial history of U.S. cooperation with the Organization of American States.

The proposed legislation provides that the present administration building of the Organization, located at 19th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., shall become the property of our Government when vacated by the Organization. The land on which that building is erected is now the property of the United States. The General Services Administration, in a letter dated May 14, 1965, addressed to the Pan American Union, has appraised the current fair market value of the building and improvements at $2,500,000.

In addition to the purchase and conveyance of a new site, the proposed bill would also convey to the Organization of American States, without consideration, title to the property on which the main building of the Pan American Union is situated at 17th and C Streets NW., together with all interest of the United States in the improvements thereon. Title to that property has been vested in the United States since May 6, 1907. It was paid for with funds appropriated June 30, 1906 in the Sundry Civil Appropriation Act "for the purchase of land and the entire contribution of the United States toward the erection of a building to be used as Government quarters in the city of Washington by the International Bureau of American Republics." However, it was determined in April 1907 that the International Bureau of American Republics (the predecessor of the Pan American Union) as an unincorporated association was incapable of taking and holding a legal or equitable title. The title deed therefore was drawn so as to vest a valid title to the United States of America. No additional sums were expended by the United States in connection with the construction of the headquarters building, the final cost of which, together with related construction was $930,835, not including the purchase of the land. Since the Pan American Union is capable of taking and holding legal and equitable title, it is felt that this would be a suitable occasion on which to complete the intention of Congress at the time the money was appropriated.

Provision is also made in the proposed bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to design, construct, furnish, and equip the new headquarters for the Organization of American States with funds advanced by or reimbursed by the Organization, if the Organization should so request. This provision would enable the Organization to benefit from General Service Administration expertise should it so desire.

CHANCERY AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS

The passage in 1964 of legislation barring new chancery locations from all residential areas except high density zones has restricted new chancery operations to areas where adequate sites are difficult and costly to acquire. Recent investigations have identified 27 foreign countries presently looking for chancery locations.

In addition the U.S. position in world affairs and the increased complexity of foreign relations have resulted in a continuing increase in personnel assigned to foreign missions and a growth in chancery and international organization space requirements.

The proposed legislation would provide a means for accommodating these present and prospective requirements within a planning concept fitting to the overall design for the Nation's Capital. The area acquired under authority of the bill could be sold, leased or otherwise transferred to foreign governments and international organizations upon terms and conditions set by the Secretary of State after consultation with the Administrator of General Services. Such transactions would provide that the property be used for legation purposes by the foreign governments or for official uses of international organizations.

All buildings to be constructed in the area by foreign governments and international organizations under the proposed legislation would need prior approval from the National Capital Planning Commission as to their location, height, bulk, number of stories, size, and open space and off-street parking. The Commission of Fine Arts would have to approve plans covering the height and appearance of the buildings and the color and texture of their materials of exterior construction. The Administrator of General Services would also be authorized, with the approval of the Secretary of State, to require that the buildings conform to U.S. Government standards and codes as regards building construction and equipment therein and as regards their maintenance afterwards.

Payment of relocation costs and resettlement of displaced individuals and families are provided for in accordance with existing statutes with all relocation costs incurred by the District of Columbia to be borne by the United States. The District also would not be liable for any costs resulting from required changes in the public sewer and water supply systems.

Finally, the proposed legislation states that the authority of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to purchase, condemn, or otherwise acquire for public purposes property in the area set out in the bill will not be exercised without the approval of the Secretary of State.

It is hoped that the Congress will be able to initiate action on this request during the current session.

A similar communication is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that the enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, October 20, 1965.

Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: My purpose in writing is to acquaint you with the Department's feeling with respect to the draft bill recently submitted to Congress by Assistant Secretary of State Douglas MacArthur. This proposed legislation would authorize the acquisition of certain land in the Northwest section of the District of Columbia for the purpose of establishing a headquarters site for the Organization of American States, sites for other international organizations, and sites upon which foreign governments may construct their chanceries and other related offices.

It has become increasingly apparent over the years that the acquisition of an enlarged and consolidated facility for use by the Organization of American States is essential. The Organization currently employs some 950 persons dispersed among five separate buildings in Washington, D.C. These separate locations have resulted in higher operating costs, lessened efficiency and difficulties of coordination within the Organization. Rental costs alone amount to $460,000 annually. For these reasons, the Council of the OAS decided in 1964 that construction of a new headquarters building would be desirable in order to bring together their scattered activities in the District of Columbia. Under the terms of the proposed legislation the U.S. Government would transfer to the OAS title to a portion of land not exceeding 3 acres. The actual cost of constructing and equipping a headquarters building would be borne by the OAS.

Precedent for this sort of action is well established. Just recently the U.S. Government purchased and conveyed to the Pan American Health Organization the land on which the newly constructed headquarters building stands. With respect to the OAS itself, the U.S. Government in 1907 and again in 1928 purchased land and made it available to the OAS for the construction of a main building and administration building respectively.

Foreign governments have taken similar action regarding the establishment of international organization headquarters overseas. The Italian Government has provided a building, including maintenance, to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. France furnished the land on which the headquarters of UNESCO is located. The Pan American Institute of Geography and History, a specialized organization of the OAS, is housed in a building made available by the Mexican Government. Finally, Costa Rica has donated a large tract of prime farmland for use by the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Services.

The proposed legislation also provides that a portion of the land acquired be set aside for the construction of chanceries by foreign governments. It is contemplated that the transfer of such property to foreign governments will be effected by sale or lease.

The desirability of providing suitable sites for foreign chanceries has been increasingly evident for some time now. Current legislation restricts the establishment of chanceries to high density, commercial and special purpose zones, which are normally undesirable for chancery purposes and very costly to acquire. In addition, those chanceries now located in residential areas are prohibited from expanding their present facilities. As a result, 27 countries are finding it increasingly difficult to function effectively due to expanded staff and responsibilities. We have found that our relations with foreign governments are somewhat strained at times due to our inability to provide suitable facilities in which to conduct official business. Then too, overcrowded conditions and lack of parking facilities has resulted, to some degree, in a deterioration of chancery-community relationships. Under the terms of the proposed legislation, chanceries would acquire sufficient land on which to construct a suitable chancery with adequate parking facilities. It should also be noted that buildings constructed by foreign governments and international organizations shall be approved by the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts and must conform to Federal Government standards and codes.

Finally, it should be understood that it is not the intent of this draft bill to preempt the entire area for chancery and international organization purposes. The acquisition of land will be effected on a need basis and with a minimum of inconvenience to property owners, business establishments and residents of the area. Those business establishments whose activities and physical appearance are not in conflict with the proposed development of the area would certainly be encouraged to remain. U.S. News & World Report and the Columbia Hospital, for example, would constitute a definite asset to the overall appearance and character of the neighborhood. Also, those recently constructed apartment buildings and private homes would blend well with the planned development of this area. However, in the event relocation becomes necessary, it will be accomplished with a minimum of inconveniences and at no cost to those relocated.

It is my personal opinion that many vital interests of the U.S. Government and the American people will be well served through the passage of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

DEAN RUSK.

ANGELIKI TSIPOURAS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Angeliki Tsipouras.

Mrs. Angeliki Tsipouras is a widow and is on a visitors visa to this country. She has lost all three of her sons and has a daughter in Greece who I understand is in no position to help.

Angeliki Tsipouras is staying with the brother of her deceased husband and his wife, Mr. and Mrs. Sam Chipouras in Washington, D.C. She has had several extensions of her visa but has been advised that she must prepare to leave the country within 30 days after November 10, 1965. She has no one to return to in Greece who can help her as stated above, but she is living with her relatives here who desire to help her. Congress just passed the Immigration Act of 1965 which helps in bringing families together. This appears to be the type of situation that needs a special bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2711) for the relief of Angeliki Tsipouras, introduced by Mr.

Dirksen, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REMOVAL OF ANONYMITY FROM SPONSORS OF RECORDED TELEPHONE "HATE" MESSAGES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to strip the cloak of anonymity from individuals and organizations who use telephone, tape-recorded messages to attack public figures or community organizations.

The bill requires disclosure through the maintenance of files available to the public by telephone companies of the names and addresses of individuals, or of a responsible officer of an organization, using tape devices. It also requires organizations using such messages to include in the messages the identity of the sponsor, or of a responsible officer of the sponsoring organization. This is similar to the procedure required in political advertising on radio and television. The bill also provides for fines up to $5,000 for each violation.

Since I first informed the Senate on October 2, 1964, of a nationwide, radical organization which uses recorded telephone messages to challenge the loyalty and integrity of scores of public officials, many prominent individuals and organizations have entered the fight. The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith has made a thorough investigation of this organization, which calls itself, Let Freedom Ring, and our former colleague, Senator Harry P. Cain, who is now a resident of Miami, Fla., has done extensive work on his own because of the group's attack on the University of Miami. Also, since that time Let Freedom Ring has made a concentrated attack on the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. This attack followed, in its use of innunendo and half truth, the style of the attacks, on grounds of Communist sympathy or orientation, made over the last 3 years against such dedicated and patriotic Americans as former Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, President Johnson, Chief Justice Earl Warren, and the late U.N. Ambassador, Adlai Stevenson.

The ADL, which has filed a formal complaint against the activities of this organization with the Federal Communications Commission, now estimates that Let Freedom Ring is active in at least 30 American cities. ADL also suggested a wide variety of legislative remedies to curb these abuses, and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., has now informed the FCC that because of the number of complaints centering on Let Freedom Ring activity, it will make available from company files to those who ask for it, the names and addresses of individuals or organizations using telephone recorded devices.

All these developments should be commended. But the legislation I introduce today, in my judgment, is the best way to proceed, consistent with civil liberties. It makes it mandatory for all telephone companies—including those not under the A.T. & T. standard—to make known the identity of local subscribers using such devices, and also requires these sponsors to identify themselves on the message itself. In my judgment, public disclosure is the best way, in our free society, to curb these vicious attacks. On many previous occasions, it has taken newspaper reporters weeks of hard work in local communities to find out the identity of the local sponsor of Let Freedom Ring messages. It has been virtually impossible for many citizens—without the means of uncovering information available to journalists—to find out who was making these attacks, even when the attacks were directed at them personally.

The bill I introduce today is particularly necessary because the method used by LFR makes it faceless, and anonymous. A voice on the telephone. Not even the written word where the inaccuracies and innuendoes can at least become apparent to reasonable people on considered reading—just the short message over the phone, which leaves you asking what exactly was said, but with just enough of the message to cause suspicion and doubt.

It is vital to make the identity of the sponsors of such messages known to anyone who hears these messages, so that they can better evaluate the content. It is also vital that those being attacked—especially those attacked in the local-oriented programs sponsored by Let Freedom Ring—have ready access to the identity of the sponsors in the event they elect to take legal action against them.

Unless the public can learn the identity of those paying for these messages and unless it understands that this sort of message depends on the use of innuendo, half-truth and invective to leave a nagging, if illogical, suspicion of Communist taint in the mind of the listener, it may underestimate the effectiveness of this sort of propaganda. Both the Communists and the Nazis understood only too well that the constant repetition of half-truths and outright lies over a long enough period could make suspicion of lawful, democratic authority commonplace.

I am pleased to say that a number of leading telephone companies are taking constructive and helpful steps to require greater disclosure of the identity of those sending these messages.

I hope the bill I introduced today will be the subject of full hearings by the Commerce Committee so that at long last, the full light of public scrutiny will be thrown on the operators of these "Dial-a-Hate" groups.

As everyone knows, I am an ardent advocate of civil liberties. Civil liberties are safeguarded under circumstances where if an organization wants to proceed as "Let Freedom Ring" does, we should be able to find out its identity and location and be able to answer them. That is what the bill provides. I sincerely hope it may have early action at the next session of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2713) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to establish certain requirements with respect to the use of recording equipment for conveying messages by telephone, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 22 OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the U.S. Government, the Nation's largest shipper, should set an example for other shippers to follow in the handling of freight traffic.

The U.S. Government, however, insists upon preferential treatment for its own shipments. Under section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, Government agencies negotiate with carriers for free and reduced rates. Such rate deals are not subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission or scrutiny by the Department of Justice or Federal Trade Commission. Under an exception to the antitrust laws, carriers may, through the medium of rate bureaus, decide what rates to charge the Government.

Government agencies claim that they save millions of dollars annually through these rate deals. If that is the case, then other shippers are paying rates that are higher than necessary, or the Government is being granted uneconomic rates which the shipping and consuming public is making up in the transportation cost of other commodities. If Government rates are too low, this is an unseen tax on shippers.

On August 20, 1963, I introduced S. 2075 to subject these Government deals to the scrutiny of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the limited purpose of determining if Government traffic is moving under discriminatory, preferential or prejudicial rates.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has the power to grant relief to citizens and areas that are being unreasonably prejudiced or unduly disadvantaged by unfair rates except on rates on which the U.S. Government moves its traffic.

On May 8 and 11, 1964, I presided over hearings of the Commerce Committee on S. 2075. The Government witnesses who appeared and testified at these hearings admitted that Government shipping agencies are neither competent nor appropriately staffed to weed out unfair section 22 rates, and stated that they had no objection in principle to S. 2075.

At these hearings, the witnesses for the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and the General Accounting Office all indicated that they would have no strong objection to ICC review of rates on Government traffic for the limited purpose of determining whether the rates produced undue geographical discrimination.

After the hearings, however, I was advised by a representative of the Bureau of the Budget that S. 2075 would be an unnecessary harassment of the Government because freight rate discrimination is not a problem any more. Furthermore, he informed me that the Government shipping agencies would not even themselves set up a committee to hear complaints.

These hearings demonstrated the widespread support for a change in section 22. Testifying or submitting statements in support of a change or complete repeal of section 22 were the Interstate Commerce Commission, National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, Transportation Association of America, American Trucking Associations, Air Transport Association, Common Carrier Conference of Domestic Water Carriers, American Association of Port Authorities, Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, National Counsel of Farmer Cooperatives, the Millers National Federation, the National Industrial Traffic League, and many others. In its statement to the committee, the National Industrial League, which is a nationwide organization of shippers, including in its membership chambers of commerce, boards of trade, and similar commercial organizations, pointed out:

> For 10 years the league has been urging legal and moral reform of practices which have appeared in the utilization of section 22.

In his transportation message to the Congress, President Kennedy called for a transportation system that means "equality of opportunity for all forms of transportation and their users and undue preference to none."

In its 78th annual report to the Congress, the Interstate Commerce Commission this year recommended that section 22 be amended to limit section 22 rate deals only to time of war, and to transportation which remains exempt from economic regulation under parts II and III of the act.

The Commission bill was introduced early this year in the Senate as S. 1726, and in the House as H.R. 5868. No hearings were scheduled on the bill during the first session of this Congress.

The special subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee to study Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway transportation recommended in its September 13, 1965, report that legislation should be considered to change section 22 to eliminate this preferential treatment accorded to the Government.

Congress, in recent years, has enacted legislation for a Great Society to protect all its citizens against discrimination.

I am today introducing proposed legislation to protect citizens and regions from discriminatory and unfair rates given the U.S. Government. This bill would repeal section 22 in its entirety, except in time of war or national emergency.

In addition, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, which I am honored to chair, may, if it proves necessary, look into the justification for exempting carriers quoting rates to the Government from the antitrust laws of this country. Under section 5a of the Interstate Commerce Act, where rates are regulated by the ICC, rate bureaus are allowed to function. On traffic that is exempt from ICC regulation, except for Government rates under section 22, there is no antitrust exemption and carriers may not agree upon rates through rate bureaus. It may be that if this antitrust exemption were lifted on Government traffic, carrier agreed-upon discriminatory rates could be alleviated.

I have long opposed discrimination in all its forms. I believe it undesirable that the Government should take part in freight rate discrimination against regions, ports, and shippers in the movement of its traffic.

As the 1961 report to the Committee on Commerce by its special study group on transportation policy—known as the Doyle report—aptly put it:

> The policy of the Government should be that its agencies pay fair and reasonable rates, not as determined by these agencies, but as determined by an impartial judge, the regulatory agency.

I believe Congress should take action to direct the transportation shipping policies of our Nation toward strengthening our regulated transport system, rather than tolerating discriminatory practices under section 22, which weaken all forms of transportation. I urge the repeal of section 22 and send to the desk for appropriate reference the bill to achieve this end.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2714) to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act to restrict certain authorization for free or reduced rate transportation of property or passengers, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

GOVERNMENT PATENT POLICY

Mr. HART. This year the Federal Government will spend more than $15 billion on research and development—a sum that exceeds the total spent by the Government for this purpose from the founding of the country to the beginning of World War II. Private sources once supported most of the Nation's research; today it is the Federal Government. This change occurred not because of some diabolical scheme to change the drive or purpose or nature of our economy. It was the demands of national defense, the harnessing of nuclear energy, the exploratory step into space, and the myriad of problems presented by an increasingly complex society which required the Government to increase substantially its support of scientific research. The results of the Government's massive commitment to science are many and good, though not without complications. One complication concerns the allocation of rights in inventions made in the course of Government research and development—R. & D. What is the most prudent response to this problem?

The first thing to do is establish the principal characteristics of contemporary research and development in the United States. In 1965 about $21 billion will be spent for research and development by all sources, both public and private. This is 50 percent greater than was spent for this purpose as late as 1961. Of particular significance is that more than two-thirds of this expenditure comes from the U.S. Treasury. In fiscal 1966 the Government will spend more than $15 billion on research, which means that Federal support now represents the backbone of the country's research effort.

The Government's role in research calls for considerable cooperation between the public and the private sectors. About 80 percent—$12 billion in fiscal 1966—of Federal research outlays will actually be spent by non-Government sources. Of this sum, $10 billion will be paid to private industry under contract. Another $2 billion will be turned over to the Government to be spent by the colleges and universities and by various nonprofit institutions, also working on Government projects.

It is this fact that most Federal money is actually spent by private industry which contributes to the serious debate over the allocation of rights in inventions made in the course of Government R. & D. In performing Government contracts, private contractors inevitably make inventions—running into the thousands annually. These inventions are not only sizable in number, but they are also often of considerable importance, judged both in commercial and technical terms.

The evidence vividly demonstrates that the Government's research undertakings yield a great many inventions. Between 1945 and 1962 Government-financed R. & D. produced more than 40,000 patentable inventions. Nearly one-third were patented in the 4-year period ending in 1962. The great bulk of these inventions were made by private contractors whose research efforts were supported by the Federal Government.

Each day the problem—judged in quantitative terms—is becoming more serious. Let me give an illustration. In January 1963 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—NASA—reported that its work, conducted both in Government laboratories and private facilities, has led to 786 inventions. By August 1964 that number had increased to 2,500. And by May 1965—in less than 9 months—the number had doubled to nearly 5,000.

While the number of inventions is relevant and is rising sharply, more important is whether these inventions are of major commercial and scientific significance. Frequently they are. One major contractor, Thompson-Ramo-Wooldridge, has testified to the importance of several of the inventions it made in the performance of Government contracts. Of the inventions it discovered, the company said that several were individually so important that they could justify the development of an entire new industry or an entirely new product line. This opinion is not surprising when we review the long list of products and processes that had their birth in Government research undertakings.

Federally supported R. & D. has continued to generate significant inventions, from the early days of World War II to this moment. The fact that much Government research now concerns highly sophisticated defense mechanisms and complex devices for outer space exploration has not curtailed the relevance of such work for the civilian sector of the economy. Take just a few examples: In medicine miniature instruments that were originally designed to monitor an astronaut's heart and breathing rate are now used as "electronic nurses" that watch over hospital patients by remote control. Pressurized space suits allow previously bedridden cardiac patients to move about. Infrared detection devices from missiles have appeared in traffic control devices. A lightweight brazing gun developed to repair sections of liquid-fuel rocket engines—it liquefies brazing alloy in less than 45 seconds—is in commercial sale. A paint developed for missiles is currently being used to cover auto mufflers. All of these are recent illustrations but the development during World War II of nuclear power, blood plasma substitutes, drugs, and a multiplicity of plastics further suggest the range of possibilities and show the close relationship that exists between the two sectors.

These examples demonstrate clearly that every citizen has a large interest in insuring that the fruits of Government research are thoroughly and promptly exploited for the public good. This is why the question of patents is such a crucial one.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, I am also concerned with the possibility that Government support for research could lead to an increase in industrial concentration. To the extent this occurs, it works at cross purposes with our antitrust laws. A former Republican Attorney General, Herbert Brownell, recognized the gravity of this trend some time ago. In 1956 he warned that Government expenditure for research may actually reinforce the trend to industrial concentration, saying:

> The disproportionate share of total industrial research and development in the largest firms may foreshadow a greater concentration of economic power in the future * * * (A) present concentration of such manpower and progress means that in the future an increasing share of anticipated improved technologies and new product lines will be introduced by the industrial giants.

Mr. Brownell's concern was well founded and the concern he expressed in 1956 is no less applicable today. The fact is that most of the Government's research funds go to a very small group of large industrial corporations. In fiscal 1964 the Defense Department, which accounts for half of all Federal research expenditure, gave approximately 60 percent of its research money to just 10 corporations, and 25 percent to only three. The degree of concentration in NASA spending is no less marked. With so much Government research money going into the hands of so few recipients, it seems to me vital that the inventions made by these contractors with public funds not become their exclusive property except in circumstances which for particular reasons would justify an exception.

When a contractor makes an invention while performing a Government research contract, it might seem obvious that the Government, since it has put up the money, should obtain title to the invention. Court decisions certainly would seem to support such a conclusion, for as the Supreme Court said in 1933 an implicit term of agreement "is that which he is paid to produce belongs to his paymaster."

However compelling such an approach might be, the reality is that the agencies of the Government have taken no consistent view of the matter. Nor has Congress until now attempted to spell out a uniform policy. Some agencies, like the AEC, take title to all inventions discovered in the course of their research. On the other hand, the Defense Department—the single most important source of research support—follows a completely opposite policy. It allows the contractor to acquire title to an invention even though the Government has paid for all of the research involved. Some agencies of the Government follow one or the other of these two approaches, and some fall in between. It is understandably difficult for the public to understand why there should be such different treatment of inventions by the agencies when all are paid for by the U.S. Treasury. Such widely varying policies in different Government agencies are puzzling, and we should do our best to make clear the course which best serves the public interest.

The senior Senator from Arkansas, Senator McCLELLAN, is to be commended for his interest and determination to clarify this situation. He has given many days of his busy time to hearings by the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights in an effort to perfect an appropriate bill in this very complicated and difficult field. We share a common interest in the somewhat related patent and monopoly problem for he is a member of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of which I am chairman, and I am privileged to be a member of his Patents Subcommittee.

Currently the Patents Subcommittee has before it four general patent policy bills: S. 1809, introduced by Senator McCLELLAN; S. 789, introduced by Senator SALTONSTALL; S. 1899, introduced by Senator LONG of Louisiana; S. 2326, introduced by Senator DIRKSEN.

At the conclusion of these remarks I shall send to the desk a fifth bill on behalf of Senator BURDICK and myself which presents still another possible solution to the problem which has been in consideration for these several months. It represents an effort to pull together into one legislative proposal the best features of the other bills, considered in the light of the hearings held by the Patents Subcommittee this year.

The staff has prepared at my request a comparison of the major provisions of the five bills, including the one we are offering today. This comparison may be useful to others and I ask unanimous consent that the chart and the text of the bill we are now introducing be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. As the chart indicates, the substantive provisions of Senator McCLELLAN's S. 1809 closely follow those contained in the statement of Government Patent Policy, issued by President Kennedy on October 10, 1963.

Let me briefly summarize the principal features of the bill we file today. It begins with the basic principle that where the Government pays for research, it should obtain title to any inventions made in the course of that research, with the contractor generally to have a nonexclusive license to use the invention. Section 3 embodies this approach. If the Government did not obtain title to an invention which its money has created, it would put contractors in a position where they could exploit the taxpayer. This would make no more sense than if the Government were to pay a contractor to build a bridge across a river and then, when the bridge was finished and the contractor was paid, give the bridge back to the contractor and allow him to set up toll booths for his own enrichment. The simple truth is that a patent confers the right to suppress an idea or make a product available on monopolistic terms. To avoid that result it must be made perfectly plain that where the Government pays for research it should be entitled to any inventions made in the course of that research. Only in this way can the Government insure that the invention is promptly and fully developed and made available to the public on reasonable terms.

It must be recognized, however, that there will be instances where special provisions must be made with respect to an invention, even though it is made while a Government research contract is being performed. For example, it may be that a substantial investment is required before a discovery can be put to use. In such a case no contractor may be willing to accept the risk unless he is given an exclusive license for a period of time. Where in fact this is the case, and where no contractor is willing to make use of the invention on a nonexclusive basis, section 5 of my bill would permit an exclusive license to be granted for a limited period of time. The fact is that a patent, a piece of paper, adds nothing to the public good unless it is put to practical use.

There may also be special circumstances which warrant a surrender of title to an invention by the Government. Where, for example, the evidence shows that an invention is attributable only insignificantly to Government support, a case may exist for giving up title to the contractor if the public interest would not otherwise be affected adversely. Section 4 of the bill spells out the conditions under which such a waiver may be granted. Such a waiver might only rarely be justifiable, but the possibility should be provided for.

If the Government is to have a uniform patent policy, some means must be devised to bring about a consistent expression of policy. Where final decisions are left in the hands of agency heads, a consistent interpretation of the law is unlikely. Past experience has shown this and understandably they are likely to view similar situations in a significantly different manner. They look from a different platform and may have assignments which would suggest different approaches. To deal with this problem this bill would create a Patent Review Board composed of appropriate Government officials, a Board that would review agency decisions involving the disposition of patent rights.

Throughout the bill every effort has been made to guarantee contractors fair and equitable protection of their rights. Hearings are required at critical points and the procedural safeguards of the Administrative Procedure Act are applicable. Ample provision is made for judicial review.

The bill we introduce today seeks to provide a sound policy to govern rights in the thousands of inventions sponsored by the Government's $15 billion annual support of R. & D.

This is an area which is complex and where oversimplification and emotionally charged shortcuts have had their day. But it is an area which bears importantly on the economic growth of America and demands equitable treatment of inventor, developer and taxpayer. I hope this bill may aid in the legislative effort to respond prudently to each of the interests involved. I send the bill to the desk and ask appropriate reference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and chart will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2715) to establish a uniform national policy concerning property rights in inventions made through the expenditure of public funds, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and Mr. BURDICK), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2715

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Inventions Act".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "government agency" includes any executive or military department of the United States, any other agency, independent commission, board, office administration, or authority of the Government, and any wholly owned government corporation.

(b) The term "agency head" means the head of any government agency, except that (1) the Secretary of Defense shall be the agency head of the Department of Defense and of each military department thereof, and (2) in the case of any authority, commission, or other agency, over which control is exercised by more than one individual, such term means the body exercising such control.

(c) The term "contract" means any contract, grant, agreement, commitment, understanding, or other arrangement entered into between any government agency and any other person. Such term includes any assignment, substitution of parties, or subcontract of any tier entered into or executed for or in connection with the performance of that contract.

(d) The term "contractor" means any individual and any public or private corporation, partnership, firm, association, institution, or other entity which is a party to the contract, any subcontractor of the contractor and any person employed by the contractor in the course of the contract.

(e) The term "invention" means any invention, discovery, innovation, or improvement.

(f) The term "disclosure", when used with respect to an invention, means a written statement sufficiently complete as to technical detail to convey to one skilled in the art to which the invention pertains a clear understanding of the nature, purpose, operation and, as the case may be, physical, chemical, or electrical characteristics of the invention, and the technical information and know-how necessary to bring the invention to the point of practical application.

(g) The term "made", when used in relation to any invention, means the conception or first actual reduction to practice of such invention.

(h) The term "to bring to the point of practical application", when used with respect to an invention, means to manufacture in the case of a composition or product, to practice in the case of a process, or to operate in the case of a machine or system and, in each case, under such conditions as to establish that the invention is being worked and that its benefits are reasonably accessible to the public.

RIGHTS OF UNITED STATES

SEC. 3. Whenever a government agency enters into any contract:

(a) The contractor shall make prompt and full disclosure to that agency of any invention made in the course of or in consequence of the contract.

(b) The United States, except as provided in paragraphs (c) and (d), shall have exclusive right and title throughout the world to any invention made by the contractor in the course of or in consequence of any research, development or exploration undertaken by the contractor for the performance of any obligation arising directly or indirectly from the contract.

(c) The contractor shall have not less than a nonexclusive transferable license for the practice throughout the world of each such invention, subject to revocation under section 5(b).

(d) In the event the head of that agency does not elect to secure on behalf of the United States a patent in a foreign country for any such invention the agency head may authorize the contractor to secure such patent on behalf of the United States and retain such greater foreign rights as the agency head determines to be in the best interest of the United States and as are consistent with sections 4 and 5 of this Act, subject to the reservation to the United States of the right to the practice throughout the world, by or on behalf of the United States or on behalf of a foreign government pursuant to any treaty or other agreement with the Government of the United States, of each such invention.

(e) In the event a patent application is filed with the Commissioner of Patents on any invention so made by the contractor, the applicant shall include within the first paragraph of the specification of such application and the Commissioner shall include in any patent issuing thereon, a statement specifying that the invention described therein is subject to the provisions of this Act, notwithstanding any provision in chapters 11 and 14 of title 35 of the United States Code inconsistent therewith.

(f) In the event the contractor does not make a prompt and full disclosure to that agency of any invention made in the course of or in consequence of the contract or fails to comply with paragraph (e) hereof the right to exclusive or nonexclusive license and all other rights of the contractor in such invention provided in this Act shall be void and such rights shall become the exclusive property of the head of that agency, on behalf of the United States, unless, after affording the contractor an opportunity, in a hearing applied for in writing, to show that he did not knowingly withhold rendering a prompt and full disclosure to the agency of such invention, the agency head determines that the contractor did not knowingly fail to comply with paragraph (a) of this section and such compliance had been made prior to the application for hearing or that the contractor did not willfully fail to comply with paragraph (e) of this section.

(g) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as requiring the granting to the United States of any right or interest duly acquired in or with respect to any patent issued for any invention not made in the course of or in consequence of the contract.

WAIVER OF PROPERTY RIGHT OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 4. (a) Except by license as hereinafter provided in this Act, the agency head shall not waive all or any part of the rights and title reserved to the United States in section 3 to any invention if that invention is determined by the agency head to be—

(1) a process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any improvement thereof, which has present or potential substantial commercial use by the general public, unless the contribution of funds, facilities, and proprietary information by the contractor to the making of the invention substantially exceeds the contribution made thereto by the United States Government;

(2) in a field which directly concerns the public health or safety;

(3) in a field of science or technology in which there has been little significant experience outside of work funded by the government, or where the government has been the sole, principal, or prime developer of the field; or

(4) an invention made under or in the course of a contract for services of the contractor in the operation of a government-owned research or production facility, or for coordinating and directing the work of others.

(b) Except as to any invention described in subsection (a) hereof, the agency head, on written application by the contractor, may waive all or any part of the exclusive rights of the United States under this Act to an invention, after disclosure under paragraph (a) of Section 3 has been made, if—

(1) the agency head determines that:

(A) the purpose of the contract is to build upon existing knowledge or technology to develop information, products, processes, or methods for use by the government, and the work called for by the contract is in a field of technology in which the contractor has acquired special technical competence directly related to an area in which he has an established nongovernmental commercial position, resulting from expenditure of nongovernmental funds, and such competence and position has been shown in writing to the agency head; and

(B) the contribution of funds, facilities, and proprietary information by the contractor to the making of the invention so far exceeds the contribution made thereto by the United States Government that equitable considerations favor the granting of such waiver; and

(C) there are such exceptional circumstances as clearly indicate that the public interest would be best served by waiving all or a part of the rights of the United States in the invention; and

(D) the agency head has received from the Attorney General an opinion in writing, after submission to him of such information as he may require for his review, as to the effect of the waiver on competition, setting forth his finding that the actual or potential detriment to competition is outweighed by the benefits of such waiver to the United States.

(2) Each such waiver shall contain such terms and conditions as shall be effective—

(A) to insure that the recipient thereof will at his own expense—

(i) promptly apply for such domestic and foreign patents as the agency head shall designate upon any patentable invention made in the course of or in consequence of activities undertaken pursuant to the research and development contract;

(ii) prosecute each such application diligently; and

(iii) take such action as the agency head shall determine to be required for the protection of each patent issued upon any such application and the interest retained by the United States therein;

(B) to permit the agency head, in the event of the failure of the recipient thereof to fulfill any obligation undertaken in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (A) hereinabove, to take such action, at the expense of the recipient of such waiver, as the agency head shall determine to be required for the fulfillment of such obligation;

(C) to reserve to the United States an irrevocable license for the practice of such invention, and the use of technical information relating thereto, throughout the world by or on behalf of the United States or any foreign government pursuant to any treaty or agreement with the United States;

(D) in the case of any invention having substantial present or potential commercial utility, to insure that—

(i) the recipient of such waiver within three years after the granting thereof will effectively bring to the point of practical application any embodiment or process of such invention and offer the benefits of such invention to the public on reasonable terms; and

(ii) the agency head shall revoke such waiver upon his determination, after hearing on the record, that the recipient has failed to fulfill in any substantial respect the conditions imposed upon the recipient of the waiver;

(E) to insure that the recipient thereof will take such other action as the agency head may determine to be required for the protection of the interests of the United States.

EXCLUSIVE LICENSES

SEC. 5. (a) The agency head may, upon written application, grant an exclusive license for the practice of an invention as defined in section 3(b) of this Act, of which disclosure has been made, if:

(1) After investigation he determines that such an expenditure of funds other than governmental funds is necessary to bring the invention to the point of practical application that existing circumstances indicate that a limited exclusive license is a prerequisite to such further development; and

(2) After six months following a public announcement of the invention by the agency head and the filing by him in the United States Patent Office of a certificate of the invention made, which shall be made a part of the public records of the Patent Office, no application for the granting of a nonexclusive license for the development and practice of the invention has been received by the agency head; and

(3) The agency head has received a written opinion by the Attorney General to the same effect as provided in paragraph (B) of section 4(b)(1) of this Act; and

(4) The applicant agrees that within three years after the granting of an exclusive license (except when prevented from so doing by law) he will diligently and effectively bring the invention to the point of practical application and make it available to the public on reasonable terms and report to the agency head on the expiration of the three years any failure to comply with this provision; and

(5) The agency head determines that the granting of an exclusive license will serve best the public interest.

(b) In the event there is more than one qualified applicant (including the contractor who made the invention) for an exclusive license pursuant to this section, the agency head shall grant an exclusive license to the best qualified applicant. If there is more than one equally best qualified applicant the agency head shall grant the exclusive license to the applicant who will accept such license for the shortest period of time, not in excess of five years.

(c) Whenever the agency head has determined that the granting of an exclusive license will serve best the public interest, the agency head, if he deems it necessary, may, following notice to the contractor who made the invention, revoke the nonexclusive license reserved under paragraph (c) of section 3 of this Act.

(d) Any applicant for an exclusive license shall include in his application such information as the agency head may deem necessary, by regulations or otherwise, to his determinations under this section and shall offer such assurances, in form and substance as the agency head may require.

(e) An exclusive license granted under this section shall extend over such period of time, not to exceed five years, as the agency head shall determine to be adequate to insure the bringing of the invention to the point of practical application and its availability to the public. No invention shall be the subject of exclusive license for a total period in excess of five years.

(f) The agency head, after an opportunity for an expedited hearing has been afforded to the contractor, shall revoke the exclusive license granted under this section if he determines that the contractor has failed to fulfill in any substantial respect the conditions provided in paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of this section.

OTHER DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY RIGHT OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 6. Whenever an agency head has not granted a waiver or an exclusive license under Sections 4 and 5 of this Act, he shall, upon written application, grant to any person who is a national of the United States, including any legal entity under the laws of the United States or any State or territory thereof or the District of Columbia, a nonexclusive license for the practice of an invention to which the United States possesses exclusive right and title pursuant to Section 3. If he determines that such action will best serve the public interest the head of an agency may dedicate an invention to which the United States possesses exclusive right and title pursuant to Section 3 to the public for public use without royalty or other charge.

CONDITION UPON WAIVERS AND LICENSES

SEC. 7. Whenever the agency head determines that a waiver or license shall be granted pursuant to this Act, the agency head may require as a condition to such waiver or license the payment by the recipient of such reasonable compensation to the inventor and to any educational or other nonprofit organization that has participated in the invention.

LIMITATION ON WAIVERS AND LICENSES

SEC. 8. The agency head shall not grant a waiver of all or any part of the rights of the United States in any invention nor grant an exclusive license for the practice of any invention to a contractor whenever another person, firm or corporation has offered to enter into the research contract before its execution in writing on terms and conditions as favorable to the Government as those offered by the contractors and without such a waiver or exclusive license: *Provided,* That the agency head determines at or before the time when the contract was executed that such other person, firm or corporation was qualified to perform effectively the obligations of the contract.

RESERVED RIGHTS OF UNITED STATES

SEC. 9. Regardless of any waiver or license granted by the agency head under the provisions of this Act, this Act shall be deemed to reserve to the United States the right to practice the invention throughout the world, by or on behalf of the United States or by a foreign government pursuant to any treaty or other agreement with the Government of the United States with respect to patents not expressly referred to in the Act.

AGENCY RECORDS AND REPORT TO CONGRESS

SEC. 10. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require the publication or other disclosure of information relating to the invention, patent, research and development, product or process, or scientific or technological information developed or used in connection with any contract whenever the agency head determines that such publication or other disclosure would not be consistent with the requirements of national security.

(b) Whenever an application is made to the agency head for the grant of a waiver or exclusive license under this Act, that agency head shall require the applicant to furnish in writing to him all information, facts and records which he may consider necessary to the making of his determinations required by this Act before the granting of a waiver or an exclusive license.

(c) No grant of a waiver or exclusive license shall be made unless the agency head has prepared a written report which shall contain an identification of the contract and the contractor, a description of the grant applied for and to be made, a statement of the objectives sought to be attained through the making of the grant, a recital of the basis for the determinations required by this Act to be made by him and his determination thereon, and the written opinion of the Attorney General where such opinion is required by this Act. A copy of the report so made with respect to each such grant and the information furnished by the applicant for the grant shall be retained by the agency head as a public record, except as otherwise provided in this Act, for the period during which the grant so made continues in effect and in no case less than five years.

(d) The agency head shall transmit to the Congress in January of each year a report which shall include:

(1) a description of the activities of that agency head during the preceding calendar year under this Act;

(2) a statement of each waiver or exclusive license made under authority of this Act, including an identification of the contract, the contractor, the invention, and the period of time for which any exclusive license was granted;

(3) a summary of his actions in granting any nonexclusive license and the dedication of any inventions to the public; and

(4) a summary of any review of his determinations by the Patent Review Board or the courts and their final decision thereon; and

(5) such recommendations for additional legislation with respect to inventions and scientific and technological information related to research and development contracts financed by the Government as he may deem necessary or desirable.

HEARINGS BY AGENCY HEAD

SEC. 11. Except for determinations made under paragraph (f) of Section 3, Section 4, and Section 5, the determinations made by the agency head under this Act shall be final, unless reviewed pursuant to Section 13(d). Whenever the agency head is required to make a determination under paragraph (f) of Section 3, Section 4, or Section 5, he shall cause to be published in the Federal Register the time and place of such determination at least thirty days before such time. Any person having a substantial interest in the determination to be made may file with the agency head prior to such time a statement of his interest and views relevant to the determination which shall be considered and made a part of the record if in the opinion of the agency head such a substantial interest is shown. The contractor, or the Attorney General, or any person having a substantial interest who is aggrieved by the determination, shall be afforded an opportunity for an expedited public hearing upon his written application setting forth the grounds therefor filed with the agency head within thirty days after the determination. A complete record of all matters filed with the agency head pertinent to his determination, the hearing and his determination thereon shall be made and kept by the agency head.

PATENTS REVIEW BOARD ESTABLISHED

SEC. 12. (a) There is hereby established a Patents Review Board (referred to hereinafter as the "Board") composed of three members, of whom one shall be designated by the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission from the officers and employees of the Commission, one shall be designated by the President from officers and employees of the United States who are specially qualified by training and experience in the field of science and technology, and one shall be designated by the Comptroller General from officers and employees of the General Accounting Office. Each member of the Board shall serve as such during the pleasure of the officer by whom he was designated. While so serving, each member of the Board whose compensation for services rendered as an officer or employee of the department or agency from which he was designated is fixed at a rate below that prescribed for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall receive from funds appropriated to the Board additional compensation at such rate as may be required to increase his aggregate compensation to that prescribed for that level.

(b) The Board shall select a chairman from among its members. Two members of the Board shall constitute a quorum thereof. A vacancy in the membership of the Board shall not affect its power to perform its functions.

(c) Subject to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the Board shall appoint and fix the compensation of an executive secretary and such other personnel as it shall determine to be required for the performance of its duties.

FUNCTION OF THE BOARD

SEC. 13. (a) Whenever any agency head determines under any provision of this Act that all or any part of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any invention as to which the United States possesses exclusive right, title, and interest should be assigned or otherwise transferred to any person, or that an exclusive license to make, use, or vend should be granted to any person with respect to any such invention, such agency head shall transmit to the Board and to the Attorney General a written report which shall contain (1) a recitation of the terms of the proposed disposition, (2) of a statement of the finding of fact relied upon in support thereof, and (3) all evidence upon which those findings are based, including a true and correct transcript of all evidence received in any hearings conducted by or on behalf of the agency head with respect to such transfer or grant.

(b) Upon the basis of such report, and upon the basis of evidence received at any hearing before the Board which it may determine in its discretion to be necessary, the Board may approve, disapprove, or modify the determination made by the agency head with respect to any such proposed transfer or grant. A record shall be kept of all hearings conducted by the Board. In any such hearing before the Board—

(1) the Attorney General shall be entitled to present evidence and argument with respect to the proposed transfer or grant which is before the Board for consideration; and

(2) any other person who would be affected by the determination of the Board, including any duly authorized representative of any State or any political subdivision thereof, shall be entitled to present such evidence and argument if the Board determines that such person has a substantial interest in the proposed transfer or grant.

(c) The determination made by the Board under this section with respect to each application for the transfer of title to any invention, or for the granting of an exclusive license with respect to any invention, shall be transmitted promptly in writing to the agency head concerned, and to the applicant for such transfer or grant, together with a copy of a written report of the Board which shall set forth the findings of fact and conclusions upon which the determination of the Board was based.

(d) The Board may, upon application received from any interested party, including the Attorney General, or upon its own motion, review any determination made by an agency head not otherwise subject to review under this Act.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 14. (a) Any applicant for the waiver of all or any part of the rights to any invention, or for the granting of an exclusive license with respect to any invention, pursuant to this Act who is aggrieved by a determination made thereon by an agency head or by the Board, or the Attorney General, shall be entitled to a judicial review of such determination upon the filing of a written petition for such review in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, or in the Court of Appeals of the United States for the judicial circuit in which such person resides, and serving a true copy of the petition upon the determining authority and upon the Attorney General (where the Attorney General is not the petitioner) within sixty days after receipt of notice of such determination. Such authority thereupon shall certify and file in the court a true and correct transcript of the entire record of the proceedings upon which the determination was based, including all evidence relied upon and the findings and conclusions made by such authority thereon. The court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine any such petition, and shall have power to affirm, modify, or set aside the determination of such authority. In any proceeding instituted under this section by any other person the Attorney General shall be entitled as of right to intervene in the proceeding.

(b) In any such review, the findings of fact made by the determining authority, if supported by evidence, shall be conclusive. If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken by the determining authority and to be considered in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the court may deem proper. The determining authority may modify his or its findings as to the facts by the reason of the additional evidence so taken. Such authority shall file with the court any such modified or new findings and recommendations which, if supported by evidence, shall be conclusive with respect to action in the matter under consideration. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, except that it shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court upon certiorari, as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

(c) Any determination made by a determining authority under Section 4, Section 5 or Section 12 after a hearing shall become final—

(1) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for judicial review, if no such petition has been duly filed within such time; or

(2) upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing a petition for certiorari if the determination of the determining authority has been affirmed or the petition for judicial review has been dismissed by a United States court of appeals, and no petition for certiorari has been duly filed; or

(3) upon the denial of a petition for certiorari, if the determination of the determining authority has been affirmed or the petition for review has been dismissed by a United States court of appeals; or

(4) upon the expiration of ten days from the date of issuance of the mandate of the Supreme Court, if such Court directs that the determination of the determining authority be affirmed or that the petition for review be dismissed.

(d) As used in this section the term "determining authority", when used in relation to an administrative determination made upon an application under this Act for the transfer of title to an invention means—

(1) the agency head, in the case of a determination by an agency head denying such application; or

(2) the Board, in the case of a determination by the Board approving, disapproving, or modifying action upon such application which has been proposed by an agency head in a report transmitted to the Board pursuant to section 13 of this Act or a determination reviewed by the Board pursuant to section 13(d).

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 15. (a) Section 10(a) of the Act of June 29, 1935, as added by section 101 of the Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1085, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 427i(a)) is amended by striking out the following language: "any contracts made pursuant to this authority shall contain requirements making the results of research and investigations available to the public through dedication, assignment to the Government, or such other means as the Secretary shall determine."

(b) The National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended by striking out section 12 thereof (42 U.S.C. 1871).

(c) The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 is amended by striking out section 152 thereof (42 U.S.C. 2182).

(d) The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 is amended by—

(1) striking out section 305 thereof (42 U.S.C. 2457); and

(2) by striking out section 306 thereof (42 U.S.C. 2458).

(e) The Coal Research and Development Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 336) is amended by striking out section 6.

(f) The Helium Act Amendments of 1960 (74 Stat. 918) is amended by striking out the following language in section 4: "*Provided, however,* That all research contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored, or authorized under authority of this Act shall be provided for in such a manner that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from such research developed by government expenditure will (with such exceptions and limitations, if any, as the Secretary may find to be necessary in the interest of national defense) be available to the general public: *And provided further,* That nothing contained herein shall be construed as to deprive the owner of any background patent relating thereto to such rights as he may have thereunder."

(g) The Saline Water Conversion Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 628) is amended by striking out section 4(b).

(h) The Arms Control and Disarmament Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 631) is amended by striking out section 32.

(i) The Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 329) is amended by striking out section 303.

(j) The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 20) is amended by striking out section 302(d).

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 16. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the fourth month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

The chart presented by Mr. HART is as follows.

Comparison of major provisions of patent policy bills

Topic	S. 2715 (Hart)	S. 789 (Saltonstall)	S. 1809 (McClellan)	S. 1899 (Long of Louisiana)	S. 2326 (Dirksen)
Disclosure of invention	Prompt and full disclosure required (sec. 3(a)).	Requires disclosure but leaves times to regulations by agency (sec. 4(a)).	Prompt and full disclosure required (sec. 3(b)(1)).	Not expressly required prior to filing of patent application by inventor (sec. 9(a)).	Prompt and full disclosure required (sec. 3(b)(1)).
Penalty for failure to disclose.	Knowing failure voids all patent rights under bill. Burden on contractor to show lack of knowledge (sec. 3(f)).	United States can gain title of an invention knowingly not disclosed by court proceeding. Burden on United States to prove knowledge (sec. 4(b)).	Knowing failure voids rights to invention. Burden on United States to prove knowledge (sec. 3(b)(8)).	United States may request Commissioner of Patents to assign title to patent to United States (sec. 9(d)). Criminal penalties (sec. 11(d)).	None provided.
Title to invention	In United States (sec. 3(b)) at time of contract.	In contractor (sec. 3) at time of contract.	In contractor (secs. 3 and 4) at time of contract.	In United States (sec. 3(b)) at time of contract.	In contractor (sec. 3(b)) at time of contract.
Exceptions to title policy	1. Nonexclusive worldwide license to contractor (sec. 3(c)), subject to modification (sec. 5(b)). 2. Waiver of title after disclosure in exceptional circumstances if contractor's contribution to the invention substantially exceeds the Government's contribution and if other conditions are met (sec. 4(b)). 3. Exclusive license after disclosure for limited time when necessary to insure making invention available to public, absent possibility of development on nonexclusive basis (sec. 5(a)). 4. Public dedication or nonexclusive licenses (sec. 6). 5. Patent in foreign country where United States does not file, subject to use by United States (sec. 3(d)).	1. Nonexclusive worldwide license to United States for use by it and by foreign government under agreement with United States (sec. 3). 2. United States may acquire greater interest if R. & D. contract is in field where United States is prime developer and is in security, public health, or safety and requires close control; United States is prime developer in field and provides all or substantially all funds; in field not likely to be developed except by Government; and other similar cases (sec. 3(a)), subject to worldwide nonexclusive license to contractor, and which greater interest shall be waived after invention is known by United States if invention is in 5 broad classes (sec. 3(e)) and if the public interest would not be affected adversely (sec. 3(f)).	1. Nonexclusive worldwide license for use by United States or foreign government under agreement with United States (sec. 3(b)(2)). 2. United States may require license to others if contractor has not exerted substantial effort to bring invention to use and public interest would be thereby served (sec. 3(b)(5)). 3. United States shall acquire principal or exclusive interest if R. & D. contract is to develop product intended for commercial use by public, concerns public health, welfare or safety, in field where United States is principal developer, or is for operating a Government facility or directing work of others (sec. 4(a)). At time of R. & D. contract may grant contractor principal rights where he has established nongovernmental position in that field of technology and public interest would not suffer thereby (sec. 4(b)). In all other cases, United States shall acquire only nonexclusive license after disclosure, unless public interest would suffer from contractor acquiring principal rights (sec. 4(c)). In exceptional circumstances agency may determine rights at time of contract if it deems in public interest (sec. 4(c)).	1. License to any person for such time, under such conditions and such royalty as Administrator determines (sec. 8). 2. Waiver of proprietary rights if private contribution so far exceeds Government's that equity favors applicant for waiver and waiver would affirmatively advance U.S. interests (sec. 10(a)) and Attorney General determines waiver would not facilitate growth or maintenance of monopoly control of any person in any product or concentration of economic power. 3. Public dedication (sec. 8(a)).	1. Nonexclusive worldwide license to United States in all cases (sec. 3(b)). 2. United States may require contractor to grant nonexclusive license on reasonable terms to an interested complainant if he shows contractor failed, without justifiable cause, to exploit invention in nongovernmental field within 3 years after patent issued and refused to license complainant and complainant is able and will exploit invention (sec. 3(a)). 3. Additional rights to United States not greater than needed to carry out governmental purposes recited in R. & D. contract (sec. 3(c)) if contract is: to produce end items use of which is or will be required by law or regulation for public health or safety and invention is such item; to operate Government facility and invention is in use in that or a related facility; or is in a field in which United States is sole developer or provided substantially all funds and invention is especially adapted for use in such field; or for research in new field without any significant commercial or private history and the invention is useful only in such field (sec. 4(a)), unless agency finds special circumstances indicate contractor should retain greater rights than nonexclusive license and public interest would not suffer therefrom.
Limitations or guidelines on exceptions.	1. No waiver if invention is: of an item of substantial commercial use by public and Government contribution to invention is substantial; concerns public health or safety; in field where U.S. is prime developer; or is made in operation of a Government facility or in directing work of others (sec. 4(a)). 2. Waiver in exceptional circumstances requires finding of Attorney General that benefit of waiver to public interest outweighs any detriment to competition; diligent prosecution of patents at expense of contractor; nonexclusive worldwide license to United States; and if invention has commercial utility to develop and offer it to public within 3 years on reasonable terms, revocable for failure to do so (sec. 4(b)). 3. Exclusive license limited to: where necessary to assure further development; no application for nonexclusive license received within 6 months after publication of invention; Attorney General finds public benefit outweighs any detriment to competition; licensee will make invention available to public within 3 years or have license revoked (sec. 5 (a) and (b)). Period of exclusivity not to exceed 5 years (sec. 5(d)).	When subsec. 3(a) requires agency to take an interest greater than a nonexclusive license it shall do so unless it finds special circumstances indicate contractor should receive all title and public interest would not be affected adversely. Criteria for this are: That the interest of the particular or other agency is not affected adversely, the invention has commercial value and public demand, and this demand can be reasonably satisfied by the inventor.	None in addition to the exceptions themselves.	Recipient of waiver shall at own expense apply for and prosecute patent. If invention has commercial utility recipient shall within 3 years after grant offer benefits of invention to public, subject to revocation for failure to so do.	None in addition to the exceptions themselves.

	4. No waiver or exclusive license permitted if anyone qualified to effectively perform R. & D. contract offers to do so without a waiver or exclusive license (sec. 8).				
Who makes exceptions	Agency head.	Agency head.	Agency head.	Administrator of Federal Inventions Administration.	Agency head.
Royalty	Recipient of waiver or license may be required by agency to pay inventor or a participating educational or nonprofit institution a reasonable royalty to promote invention (sec. 7).	None.	None.	Administrator shall require royalty except may grant royalty-free nonexclusive license in some cases (sec. 8(b)).	None.
Records and reports	Requires agency to keep full records of each waiver or license and to make full report to Congress in January of each year on actions under bill (sec. 10).	Requires semiannual reports to Congress on inventions on which agency has taken no greater right than nonexclusive license and those in which it has acquired a greater right (sec. 13).	Similar to S. 789 (sec. 9).	Reports to Congress in January similar to S. —— (sec. 5(i)). Record requirements more comprehensive as this is new agency.	Similar to S. 789.
New agency created	New agency created: 3-member Patents Review Board; 1 designated by Chairman of FTC from officers and employees of FTC; 1 by Comptroller General from employees of GAO; and 1 qualified in science designated by President from employees of United States. Function: to review determinations by agency heads (sec. 12).	None.	None.	Federal Inventions Administration to administer patent policy under R. & D. projects and all patent rights of United States; collect and disseminate scientific information; dispose of and protect proprietary rights of United States in inventions; and reward valuable invention (secs. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 12).	None.
Administrative review	Determinations of agency heads are reviewable by Patents Review Board (sec. 13).	None.	None.	None on actions relating to patent waivers or licenses.	None.
Judicial review	Final determinations of agency head or Board, as case may be, reviewable by court of appeals on petition of an aggrieved party (sec. 14).	Administrative hearings and judicial review in U.S. court of appeals in actions by agency on matters of rights in inventions (sec. 7 and sec. 8).	Similar to S. 789 (sec. 5 and sec. 6).	None provided with respect to Administrator's decision not to waive any rights or to license any applicant.	Provides for hearing and review by U.S. district court whenever agency exercises right to take a greater interest than a nonexclusive license (sec. 5 and sec. 6).

MINERAL SELECTION RIGHTS FOR ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Alaska Statehood Act (72 Stat. 339).

The Statehood Act allows Alaska to select 103,350,000 acres of public lands over the first 25 years of statehood. This selection is now underway. My bill would authorize as part of this program the selection of mineral rights to public land even though the surface rights to it had been withdrawn or reserved by the United States.

As the law now stands, Alaska may choose public lands so long as they are unappropriated and unreserved. In cases where the United States has disposed of land by patent to a homesteader and retained to itself the mineral rights to this land, the State is allowed to choose these mineral rights as part of its land selection program. This is authorized in the proviso at the end of section 6(a) of the Statehood Act which defines the term "public land" for the purposes of the section as including "the retained or reserved interests of the United States in lands which have been disposed of with a reservation to the United States of all minerals or any specific mineral or minerals." My bill amends this section to include the reversionary interests in mineral estates disposed of by the United States.

This would permit the State of Alaska to select the mineral rights of land upon which the Federal Government has placed a surface reservation. The Federal Government by leasing these lands for mineral development has already made clear that such development will do no harm to the purposes of the surface-reservation.

The argument is a simple one: If the United States sees fit to lease the mineral rights in withdrawn areas subject to surface restrictions, then Alaska should be able to select these same mineral interests to administer them subject to the same surface restrictions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the bill which I now introduce may be made a part of the Record at this point:

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2717

A bill to amend the Act admitting the State of Alaska into the Union with respect to the lands which may be selected from the public lands by such State

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 6 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union", approved July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339), as amended, is amended by striking out in the last proviso beginning with "or reserved" to the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and "reserved or reversionary interests in all lands or mineral estates disposed of by the United States".

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2717) to amend the act admitting the State of Alaska into the Union with respect to the lands which may be selected from the public lands by such State, introduced by Mr. Bartlett, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JURISDICTION OF U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA WITH RESPECT TO CLAIMS OF OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN LANDS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, has requested that I introduce legislation to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. district court for the district of Alaska for the purpose of resolving the conflicting claims of the United States, the city of Fairbanks, Alaska and others with respect to ownership of certain lands in the city of Fairbanks.

Several years ago the city of Fairbanks filed a civil action in the Superior Court for the State of Alaska, Fourth Judicial District to quiet title of the city of Fairbanks to a parcel of land known as Clay Street and the land between where Clay Street now runs and the Chena River, and other land accreted to the city of Fairbanks on First Avenue, including the municipal power and water plant, and also the land accreted to Griffith Park.

In a memorandum submitted to the Superior Court by the U.S. attorney in June of 1963, the United States took the position that title to the property involved is in the United States and that the United States was therefore a necessary party to the pending civil action. Since the United States cannot be sued without its consent, legislation such as that introduced by me today is necessary to confer jurisdiction on the Federal district court, according to the Fairbanks city attorney, Dallas L. Phillips.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill I introduce be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purpose of resolving the conflicting claims of the United States, the City of Fairbanks, Alaska, and others with respect to ownership of certain lands in the City of Fairbanks, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment on the cause of action involved in the case of the City of Fairbanks, Alaska, against Daniel Agbaba, and others, in the Fourth Judicial District of the Superior Court for the State of Alaska, any judgment rendered therein to be subject to appeal in the same manner as now provided by law for actions within the jurisdiction of said District Court.

Sec. 2. Upon enactment of this Act, the Fourth Judicial District of the Superior Court for the State of Alaska is requested to certify or remand the legal proceeding referred to in the first section to the United States District Court for the District of Alaska for trial on the merits.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2718) to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment in the case of the city of Fairbanks, Alaska, against Daniel Agbaba, et al., introduced by Mr. Bartlett (by request) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FISH PROTEIN CONCENTRATE, AND THE WAR ON HUNGER

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, for myself and the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production of fish protein concentrate by the commercial fishing industry.

The legislation would authorize the Secretary to contract with private firms for the construction and operation of large-scale experimental plants capable of producing fish protein concentrate on a commercial basis. Congress appropriated during the past 2 years several million dollars for the development of a sample fish protein concentrate product in a small-scale model plant capable of producing 100 pounds daily. The basic experimental work has been carried out by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries with the close cooperation of the National Academy of Sciences. One year ago, Dr. Floyd S. Daft, of the National Academy of Sciences, and representatives of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries testified in hearings held by the Senate Commerce Committee on the progress being made. At that time, Dr. Daft estimated that an acceptable product would be available in 1 year. Recent reports indicate that progress is being made on schedule.

The next step is to move toward commercial scale production with several types of larger experimental plants in operation using various stocks of coastal fishery resources. It has been estimated that the construction and operation of five plants the size required will involve approximately $5 million.

At a similar point in the saline water program, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Interior to contract with private industry for the construction and operation of several different types of plants to determine the economic feasibility of producing fresh water from sea water. This approach has been extremely successful and the United States today leads the world in developing economic means of producing fresh water from the ocean.

In the last 2 years, the United States has taken the lead in developing on a small scale an acceptable fish protein concentrate.

The next step is to prove its economic feasibility. This will depend in part on the process used and the type of fish used to supply the plant requirements. Several stocks of fish on the east coast, the gulf coast, the Pacific coast, including Alaska, and the Great Lakes may prove practical for this purpose.

President Johnson has declared that the United States is engaged at home and abroad in a war on poverty, disease, and malnutrition. These are not separate wars; there is really only one war and the battlelines intersect. We have long known that malnutrition invites disease. More recently we have realized that economic aid attacking poverty cannot be successful when the execution of the economic development project is dependent on undernourished people, no matter how proud or independent they may be. And scientists have recently reported that malnutrition in infants and pre-school-age children means permanent retardation of mind and body. Hunger and malnutrition to a child means more than an aching and bloated stomach; they mean a permanently retarded mind and weak back.

The best statement of this situation I have read was in a speech recently made by Richard W. Reuter, Special Assistant to the President and Director for the food for peace program, in which he said:

> It is hard for us to realize that up to 50 percent of children in much of the world die before they reach school age. This is an incredibly frightening fact of life * * *. These figures have been known for a number of years now. But what was not known until very recently was the relationship of malnutrition to these mortality statistics * * *. The kind of malnutrition we're speaking of is not the hunger that we have often thought of in the past—the hunger brought about by not having sufficient food to satisfy the hunger pangs of the stomach. No, we're now speaking of problems of protein malnutrition, of vitamin deficiencies, of mineral deficiencies * * *. We have known about physical retardation and its relationship to malnutrition. What has been recognized more recently, however, is that malnutrition in the early years also probably causes irreversible mental damage * * *. The first (requirement), of course, is to obtain higher-protein foods.

Fish protein concentrate has an 80 percent protein content compared with eggs—11 percent, chicken—15 percent, beef—12 percent, and nonfat dry milk—35 percent. From estimates made it appears that fish protein concentrate could be produced at a cost that would be half the cost of its nearest competitor and twice as rich in protein. The product has the distinct advantage of being in powder form, tasteless and odorless. This form of product can be conveniently purchased and stored for use as a supplement with any indigenous food such as soup, rice or breads.

Recognizing the relief that could be brought by developing an economical means of producing a rich protein supplement, we must initiate an accelerated program. It is my conviction that the time is near when every nation, including every developed nation, will have along its coast numerous plants extracting salt from sea water to produce fresh water and adjoining plants extracting protein from the sea. It is known that today the oceans contain a sufficient supply of animal protein to meet the daily requirements of every living human. It is also known that the ocean's resources are adequate to meet the animal protein needs on a sustained basis of a world population of 30 billion people, 10 times our present population.

The world is watching to see if the United States can successfully apply science and technology to this ancient human problem. My guess is that more eyes of the world will be brightened by the success of this program than by any announcement by us or anyone else that a human has spent his first restful night on the moon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2720) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AUTHORITY TO FILE AND PRINTING OF REPORT BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be authorized to file a report on interagency drug coordination during the adjournment of the Congress, and that it be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2658) to provide for the establishment of a commission to study and investigate problems relating to the export of beef from the United States and to consider ways and means of increasing the export of beef from the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 22, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2084) to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is said that political party platforms are frequently more honored in the breach than the observance. This contention is applied to both parties. And it is true that platforms are only too frequently put away in the file-and-forget department once an election is over.

I am happy to say that the story is different this time. Insofar as the 89th Congress is concerned, it has measured up to its responsibilities. As a result by the end of this first session we will have implemented approximately 85 percent of the specific legislative goals in the Democratic platform adopted in Atlantic City in August of 1964, with action in progress on all but three of the balance. Many similar goals, may I say, were also included in the Republican Party platform so that a salute to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle is also in order.

I have had prepared a 2-column table setting forth the specific pledge of the Democratic Party platform and the performance of this 1st session of the 89th Congress—the first session action on a 4-year platform.

I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM LEGISLATIVE GOALS—1964

Platform	*Legislation*
NATIONAL DEFENSE	
Continue supremacy of our strategic nuclear forces.	Defense appropriation. Public Law 89-213.
Strengthen further forces for discouraging limited wars and fighting subversion.	Do.
Maintain world's largest research and development effort to insure continued American leadership in weapons systems and equipment.	Military procurement authorization. Public Law 89-37. Defense appropriation. Public Law 89-213.
Continue civil defense program.	Defense appropriation. Public Law 89-213.
Attract to the military services the highest caliber of career men and women and make certain they are adequately paid and adequately housed.	Military pay increase. Public Law 89-132. Military construction authorization. Public Law 89-188.
BUILDING THE PEACE	
Help the people of developing nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.	Foreign aid authorization. Public Law 89-171. Foreign aid appropriation. Public Law 89-273.
Place increased priority on private enterprise and development loans.	Foreign aid authorization. Public Law 89-171. Foreign aid appropriation. Public Law 89-273.
Encourage arms reduction.	Disarmament Act amendments. Public Law 89-27.
Support the partnership of free American Republics in the Alliance for Progress.	Foreign aid authorization. Public Law 89-171. Foreign aid appropriation. Public Law 89-273.
Oppose aggression and the use of force or the threat of force against any nation.	Vietnam supplemental. Public Law 89-18. Defense appropriation. Public Law 89-213.
Expand the Peace Corps.	Authorizes $115,000,000 for fiscal 1966, Public Law 89-134.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM LEGISLATIVE GOALS, 1964—Continued

Platform	*Legislation*
CONQUEST OF SPACE	
Continue development of space technology for peaceful uses; and encourage private industry to increase its efforts in space research.	NASA authorization, $5,190,396,200 for fiscal 1966. Public Law 89-53. NASA appropriation, $5,175,000,000 for fiscal 1966. Public Law 89-128.
EDUCATION	
Demands on the inadequate sources of State and local revenues place a serious limitation on education. New methods of financial aid must be explored, including channeling federally collected revenues to all levels of education.	Authorizes $1,344,000,000 in fiscal 1966 for elementary and secondary school aid Public Law 89-10.
Expanded program of public scholarships, guaranteed loans and work-study grants.	Higher Education Act of 1965. Public Law 89-.
HEALTH	
Continue to fight to include hospital care for older Americans in the social security program.	Provide hospitalization for persons 65 and over and a voluntary medical care program Public Law 89-97.
Further expand our health facilities, especially medical schools, hospitals, and research laboratories.	Authorized a 3-year $340,000,000 program of grants for etablishing and operating regional medical complexes to combat heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases. Public Law 89-239.
Go forward into the causes and cures for mental illness and mental retardation.	Labor-HEW appropriations for fiscal 1966. Public Law 89-156. Supplemental appropriation for fiscal 1966. H.R. 11588. Public Law 89-
VETERANS	
Reopen national service life insurance program.	Reopened by Public Law 88-664. Funds for administrative expenses provided for in Public Law 89-40.
Veterans with service-connected injuries and disabilities must be insured an adequate standard of living.	Provided increases averaging about 10 percent. H.R. 168. Public Law 89-
DEMOCRACY OF OPPORTUNITY	
Immigration laws must be revised.	Repealed the national origin quota provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act and substituted a new system. Public Law 89-236.
Carry the war on poverty forward as a total war against the causes of human want.	Extended all economic opportunity programs to June 30, 1968, and authorized $1,785,000,000 for fiscal 1966. Public Law 89-253.
Move forward with programs to restore areas such as Appalachia.	Authorized $1,092,400,000 over a 5-year period for aid to the 11-State Appalachian area. Public Law 89-4.
Help the physically handicapped and mentally disadvantaged develop to the full limit of their capabilities.	Authorized $224,175,000 for fiscal years 1966-72 for staffing grants to community mental health centers and extended for 5 years the program for training teachers of mentally retarded and other handicapped children. Public Law 89-105.
Assist our Indian people to improve their standard of living and attain self-sufficiency.	Increased by $3,000,000, to $15,000,000 annually, the authorization for Indian adult vocational education. Public Law 89-14.
Enhance the security of older Americans by offering opportunities like those provided for the young under the Economic Opportunities Act of 1964.	Created an Administration on Aging within the Department of HEW and a 5-year program of grants to the States and $5,000,000 for fiscal 1966, $8,000,000 for fiscal 1967, and such sums as necessary for the 3 succeeding fiscal years. Public Law 89-73. Appropriated $7,000,000 for fiscal 1966. Public Law 89-156.
Adjust social security benefit levels.	Provided a 7 percent across-the-board increase effective Jan. 1, 1966. Public Law 89-97.
Expand decent housing which older citizens can afford.	Authorized an additional $150,000,000 and reduced the maximum interest rate to 3 percent for the direct loan program for the elderly and handicapped. Public Law 89-117.
Encourage further supports for the arts.	Established a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities and authorized $21,000,000 a year over the next 3 fiscal years as an endowment. Public Law 89-209.
THE ECONOMY	
Review all excise taxes and eliminate those that are obsolete.	Provided for a $4,700,000,000 excise tax reduction. Public Law 89-44.
Extend coverage of Fair Labor Standards Act.	H.R. 10518: House Calendar Senate labor hearings concluded.
Increase overtime pay requirements.	S. 1982: Senate labor hearings concluded.
Revise the unemployment insurance program.	House hearings concluded.
Expand manpower training programs.	Provided for a 3-year extension to June 30, 1969, and authorized $454,000,000 for fiscal 1966. Public Law 89-15.
Provide fast, safe, and economic modes of transportation.	Authorized a 3-year, $90,000,000 program for pilot demonstrations in high-speed intercity ground transportation. Public Law 89-220. Authorized a 25-mile rapid transit system for National Capital area. Public Law 89-173.
Repeal of 14(b) of Taft-Hartley Act.	Passed House; Senate debated motion to consider from Oct. 1-12.
Continue to insist that our drugs and medicines are safe and effective.	Enacted the Drug Abuse Control Act of 1965. Public Law 89-74.
Assure that merchandise is labeled and packaged honestly.	Truth in packaging. S. 985: Senate commerce hearings. concluded May 18.
Assure that the true cost of credit is disclosed.	Truth in lending. Bills introduced. No action.
RURAL AMERICA	
Strengthen the farm income structure.	Omnibus Agriculture Act of 1965. H.R. 9811: Public Law 89-
Expand food stamp and school lunch programs; accelerate research into new industrial uses of farm products.	Agriculture appropriation for fiscal 1966. H.R. 8370: Public Law 89-
Assure rural America decent housing.	Extended rural housing program to Oct. 1, 1969, and provided a new rural housing insured loan program authorizing $300,000,000 a year. Public Law 89-117.
Continue support of rural telephone program and Rural Electrification Administration.	Agriculture appropriation for fiscal 1966. Public Law 89-
THE NATION'S NATURAL RESOURCES	
Continue comprehensive development of river basins.	Water Resources Planning Act of 1965. Public Law 89-80.
Provide the people of this Nation a balanced outdoor recreation program.	Assateague Island National Seashore. Public Law 89-195. Delaware Water Gap Recreation Area. Public Law 89-158. Spruce Knob-Seneca Rock Recreation Area. Public Law 89-207.
Intensify our efforts to solve the critical water problems by desalinization.	Extended the saline water research and development program for 5 years. Public Law 89-118.
Continue the attack on polluted air.	Clean Air Act of 1965. Public Law 89-272.
Continue the attack on water pollution.	Water Quality Act of 1965. Public Law 89-234.
THE CITY	
A decent home for every American family.	Authorized a $7,800,000,000 housing program for low-income families, including the elderly, the handicapped, and the displaced; and a new program of rent supplements. Public Law 89-117.
Press the fight against narcotics.	Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1965. House Judiciary completed hearings.
Turn juvenile delinquents into good citizens.	Extended the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act to June 30, 1967, and authorized $6,500,000 for fiscal 1966 and $10,000,000 for fiscal 1967. Public Law 89-69.
Continue to assist broad community and regional development.	Authorized an annual $665,000,000 program of public works and economic development through 1970. Public Law 89-136.
Continue urban renewal.	Increased the authorization for urban renewal grants by $675,000,000 for fiscal 1966, $725,000,000 for fiscal 1967, $750,000,000 for fiscal 1968 and 1969. Public Law 89-117.
Continue open space program.	Authorized increase for open space grants from $75 to $310,000,000. Public Law 89-117.
Provide for a department devoted to urban affairs.	Created a Cabinet Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. Public 89-174.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM LEGISLATIVE GOALS, 1964—Continued

Platform	*Legislation*
THE GOVERNMENT	
Government's business is the people's business.	Closed loopholes in the Administrative Procedure Act and established a general philosophy of full agency disclosure. S. 1160 passed Senate, Oct. 13, 1965.
Revise rules and procedures to assure majority rule after reasonable debate and to guarantee that major legislative proposals of the President can be brought to a vote.	
Home rule for District of Columbia and a nonvoting delegate pending a constitutional amendment for a voting delegate.	Passed both Houses amended.
Support a constitutional amendment giving District of Columbia voting representation in Congress.	
Equal opportunity and equal treatment for all Americans regardless of race, creed, color or national origin.	Voting Rights Act of 1965. Public Law 89-110.

SANDY KOUFAX—AN EXAMPLE FOR THE YOUTH OF AMERICA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a friend of the Presiding Officer and myself, Red Welsh, of Billings, Mont., recently made an interesting commentary on radio station KOOK in that city. I was so much impressed by it, I should like to read it to the Senate. It is very short. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute to do so.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The title is, "An Example for the Youth of America."

The commentary is as follows:

The recently completed world series produced an outstanding example of what competitive sports is supposed to represent—unfortunately the incident seems to have escaped many of those who profess undying faith in athletics as a character-building program.

The hottest man in professional athletics today is Los Angeles Dodger southpaw, Sandy Koufax. He might well be the greatest pitcher who ever lived.

Koufax and his teammate, big Don Drysdale, literally pitched the Dodgers into the National League championship.

Along the way, this exceptionally talented young man pitched a perfect game—only the third time this has ever been done in the long history of professional baseball.

Heading into the annual classic—the world series—Koufax admittedly was the greatest of the great. Every boy in America knew who he was. With Sandy scheduled to pitch the opener, Los Angeles was an odds-on favorite.

Opening day of this year's classic coincided with the most solemn holiday observed in Judaism—Yom Kippur, the day of atonement.

Sandy Koufax is an American of Jewish faith. When the umpire yelled, "play ball." Koufax wasn't pitching for Los Angeles. He wasn't at the ball park. He wasn't even watching the game on television.

Sandy Koufax was where he should have been—at the synagogue, quietly observing Yom Kippur in meditation and prayer.

There was an example for the youth of this country. A great athlete, an American idol, putting first things first.

In the faith of his fathers—he was a believer.

By the standards of his country—he was a real citizen.

On the yardstick of genuineness—he measured up all man.

RETIREMENT OF RICHARD LANGHAM RIEDEL—LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, some days ago, we paid tribute to Mr. Richard Langham Riedel, who has so faithfully served the Senate for a great many years as press liaison.

The President of the United States also took occasion to send a letter commemorating the service of Richard Riedel.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 6, 1965.

MR. RICHARD LANGHAM RIEDEL,
14027 Braddock Road,
Centreville, Va.

DEAR RICHARD: I hear you are about to begin a new life. Yet, I can't imagine what the Senate will be like without you.

You have served so long and so faithfully that for me—and for so many of your friends—you seemed as much a part of the Senate as its marbled halls.

I well recall the many times when, as majority leader, I could not leave the floor, and you relayed questions and answers for reporters. You always served honestly and with good commonsense.

In a historic setting—that of the U.S. Senate—you wrote a history of your own. I believe that my good friend Gould Lincoln is the only member of the Senate Press Gallery who was a member when you came to the Senate in 1918.

You can be proud of having served as liaison between the press and the Senators longer than any other person in the history of the U.S. Senate.

Good luck in your new life, and in all your undertakings. When you go camping in the wilderness, don't forget to come back.

Meanwhile, your friends will remember you.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

LETTER FROM LINDA SAMPLES TO AMERICAN SERVICEMEN IN VIETNAM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Cleveland Press received this week a letter from Linda Samples, age 16, of Brunswick Center, Ohio, Medina County.

Brunswick Center is a rustic community about 25 miles from Cleveland.

Enclosed within her letter was another letter addressed to "American Servicemen in Vietnam." In the letter was also enclosed 50 cents.

Miss Samples requested that her letter to the servicemen be sent to them inasmuch as she did not know how to do this. She explained that the 50 cents was to cover postage costs.

Her letter is extraordinary. It comes at a time of disturbing protests by some Americans against U.S. policy in Vietnam.

The Cleveland Press reproduced her letter on page 1 on Thursday, October 21.

I read that letter to my colleagues here on the floor of the Senate. It reads:

To all Men in Vietnam:

Today is a beautiful fall day. The trees are changing color, the sky is deep blue. Many Americans are enjoying this Sunday. Why?

Because you are there in Vietnam, fighting; being wounded, and even dying for us—for our freedom.

You have said that you feel the people of the United States do not think you are fighting for a worthwhile cause. I can think of no better cause than freedom. Our God-given freedom is our most precious earthly possession. America could not be what she is without the freedom you are preserving.

I know that I am not the only person in the United States who prays for you daily and gives thanks that you are there protecting with your lives our freedom, our Nation, and our existence.

Thank you, every one and may God keep and bless you all.

Sincerely yours,

LINDA SAMPLES.

Mr. President, now finally I should tell that Miss Samples is an outstanding high school student, earns her own money cooking and cleaning, and is active in a number of worthwhile youth groups and as a church member.

Linda's letter has already gained national attention; it is in stories being distributed by NEA, a newspaper syndicate, to more than 700 newspapers. A copy has been forwarded to Gen. William C. Westmoreland, commander of the U.S. Military Assistance Command in Vietnam; also a copy is being sent to the Stars and Stripes, which is a military newspaper.

It brings a ray of restored confidence in the youth of our country. So many protests and demonstrations are being promoted, making it appear that the majority of the people of the United States are indifferent to the preservation of our freedom.

I believe that this 16-year-old girl, with her fine character, represents the thinking of the great majority of the citizens of our country. She stands rather conspicuously as a contradistinction from those wan, long-haired, oddly dressed beatniks who are demonstrating in front of the White House, on our school campuses, and other places in the Nation.

A lesson should be drawn from what this young girl has had to say.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Did the Senator see the significant article that appeared in this morning's press with respect to the students gathering their groups about them in protest against the demonstrators who seem to have little or no interest in our country? It was a heartening thing to see that in one Midwestern university 2,700 students voted to support the President's stand, as opposed to a much lesser group.

I believe that is significant. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is one of the tragedies of the days that those who demonstrate have been getting great attention on television, radio, newspapers, magazines, and journals.

Mr. SIMPSON. That is why I would like to point out the fact that this account should be played up.

These are the people who say little, the American people who are out there defending their country, as opposed to the group of people who have an aversion to soap and water and sit on people's steps.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it must be said now that the President has tried valiantly and vigorously to bring the Communists to the negotiating table.

Some time ago I enumerated 10 steps he has taken, practically begging, and in a measure surrendering the dignity of our country. But his aim has been to bring the Vietnamese difficulty to an end.

Yet, in many instances innocent groups frequently with Moscow and Peiping directed leaders, provoke demonstrations throughout the country.

The President is trying to bring about peace.

Some say, "Withdraw from South Vietnam."

My question in the past has been, and it is today: To what point shall we withdraw? to Thailand? to Burma? to Malaysia? If we withdraw to those points will that bring the end? Do we withdraw to California or to Hawaii? Do we bring the field of battle from 10,000 miles away to our immediate shores?

No one wants to be involved in the South Vietnamese shooting. But necessity compels us; the need to preserve freedom, as stated by this young girl, Linda Samples, requires it. Or shall we give up; shall we surrender all that we have sung about in the years past of our great heritage?

NORA ISABELLA SAMUELLI

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on the bill, S. 619, for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chief Clerk will read the message from the House of Representatives on S. 619.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, that the Clerk of the House be directed to return to the Senate the bill (S. 619) entitled "An act for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli," together with all accompanying papers, in compliance with the request by the Senate thereon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which it asked for a conference with the House of Representatives and appointed conferees on the part of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the action of the Senate is reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as passed by the Senate, the bill would have granted the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary, and have deemed her residence and physical presence in the United States since July 31, 1963, to meet the requirements for naturalization. As amended by the House of Representatives, the bill merely grants the status of permanent residence in the United States.

Granting the beneficiary permanent residence in the United States as of her prior date of admission on July 31, 1963, would be acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 619, with a further amendment to grant permanent residence as of July 31, 1963, rather than as of the date of enactment, and I send to the desk the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk. On page 1, line 6, after the word "of", it is proposed to strike out the words "the date of the enactment of this Act", and insert in lieu thereof "July 31, 1963".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment with the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 915, H.R. 4421.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE CITY OF CHEYENNE, WYO.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 4421, Calendar No. 915.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 4421) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 929), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

This bill proposes to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., without monetary consideration for park and recreational purposes, a tract of land of approximately 27 acres which is now portion of the reservation at the Veterans' Administration Center.

In 1932 the city of Cheyenne donated a tract of 600 acres of land on which was subsequently constructed a center which now consists of a regional office and a 133-bed hospital with a preponderance of general medical and surgical patients. Previously, under the acts of June 29, 1948, and June 15, 1956, approximately 431 acres of the original tract was conveyed without remuneration to the city of Cheyenne.

The bill provides that the deed of conveyance shall contain certain terms and conditions to protect the interests of the United States.

There will be no appropriation necessary to carry out the provisions of this legislation.

The office of Senator Wayne Morse has studied this measure and has extended assurance that neither H.R. 4421, nor S. 554 violate the so-called Morse formula for such land transfer. The subject bill calls for the gratuitous transfer of the property in question since the land was originally part of an entire tract of 600 acres of land gratuitously conveyed to the United States by the city of Cheyenne, Wyo. in the first instance. The report of the Veterans' Administration reveals that the Veterans' Administration does not have need of the property described in the bills and that it will have no objection to the transfer.

In cases of this type, a gratuitous conveyance is not objectionable under the Morse formula. Where land was originally donated, a reversion is implied in favor of the donor if the United States is willing to dispose of the property. The provisions of these bills are similar to the provisions of H.R. 2414 and S. 4608 which received the approval of the committee. H.R. 2414 received Senate approval in September 1965.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 4421) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I wish to state to my fellow Senators that I am very grateful for the passage of this legislation. Its passage makes it possible to proceed with an important piece of construction in the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., which has been held in abeyance pending the passage of the bill. Now construction may get underway. The Morse formula does not apply.

NOTICE OF INSTALLATION OF HON. EMERY FRAZIER AS SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate—under the rules it will be necessary, and it will be a real privilege—I wish to state that at approximately noon today, the distinguished Chief Clerk of the Senate, Hon. Emery Frazier, of Kentucky, will be sworn in as Secretary of the Senate, to assume his duties on the 1st of January, next year.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Philip H. Trezise, of Michigan, to be the representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Fifty-five postmaster nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

U.S. ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. William Henry Sterling Wright, Army of the United States, to be lieutenant general, U.S. Army.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of David G. Bress, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia for a term of 4 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. For the information of the Senate, I ask the attachés to call Senators on both sides of the aisle, because it will be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Proxmire in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 297 Ex.]

Cotton
Dirksen
Eastland
Fulbright
Hart
Holland
Hruska
Kuchel
Lausche
Mansfield
Metcalf
Murphy
Proxmire
Simpson
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], is detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. Aiken, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bass, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Case, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Harris, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Hill, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McClellan, Mr. McGee, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Mundt, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Russell of South Carolina, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Scott, Mr. Smathers, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Symington, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of North Dakota entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Mondale in the chair). A quorum is present. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David G. Bress to be U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senate is in a hurry to go home, and there are several pressing measures pending.

I said yesterday that I felt that this nomination should be returned to the committee, in order that they might really do the job properly. Therefore, in order to conserve the time of the Senate, I move that the nomination be referred back to the Committee on the Judiciary.

I call for a vote, and ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is called for. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] to recommit the nomination to the Committee on the Judiciary. As many as favor the motion will rise and stand until counted. (After a pause.) Those who oppose the motion will rise and stand until counted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 298 Ex.]

Aiken
Bible
Burdick
Clark
Curtis
Douglas
Eastland
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
Mondale
Montoya
Murphy
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe that what the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] has to say is most important. I believe that the viewpoint of the committee is also most important, and while I move at this time that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the presence of absent Senators, I would hope that Senators would have enough maturity to stay on hand themselves without being called all the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CASE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, not too many minutes ago the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] made a motion to recommit. There were probably about 10 Senators on the floor at the time, perhaps a few more. I would hope that Senators would stay pretty close to the floor today and tomorrow, and if they have any engagements out of town, cancel them. That does not mean we can finish the work by the end of this week, but perhaps by next week or the end of the month we can do our work if Senators will remain.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, can we get away by Thanksgiving?

Mr. MANSFIELD. With luck.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to recommit the nomination.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, since Senators do not seem to want to vote on it I withdraw my motion. I go back to the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I understand the chairman of the committee wants to speak, and I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the nomination. The motion to recommit has been withdrawn.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understood the chairman of the committee wished to make some remarks. Out of respect to the chairman, I believe I should yield to him. Surely he will want to endorse this nominee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to obtain the floor, I believe the Senator from Mississippi made his remarks yesterday. They were in some detail. He was joined by other members of the committee.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I care to say nothing at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, am I to understand that no Senator on the other side of the aisle has a good word for this nominee? Are we asked to confirm the nomination of a man for U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia without any Senator raising a voice for him?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I believe the Senate is prepared, at any time the Senator from Delaware wishes, to vote. I point out, if my recollection serves me correctly, that as recently as yesterday the Senator from Mississippi, chairman of the committee [Mr. EASTLAND], the ranking Democratic member of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and I believe the ranking Republican on the subcommittee, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], stated that they had looked into this case and were prepared to vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was ready to vote a few minutes ago, but the majority leader interrupted the vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Montana has had enough experience with the Senator from Delaware to understand what goes on on occasion.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, my opposition to this nomination is not based on what was said or not said before the Judiciary Committee or any subcommittee thereof. I do not pass judgment on whatever findings that committee might have made. I base my opposition to this nomination on the simple fact that I am growing sick and tired of having the Bobby Baker clique take over this Government.

A short while ago a nominee for the Supreme Court was before us. Who was it? Bobby Baker's attorney.

The Bobby Baker case was one of the greatest scandals that ever took place under the dome of this Capitol. He was a trusted employee of this body. By his own admission he accumulated over $2 million. The record is clear that he peddled influence. The record is clear that he accepted kickbacks.

I say to my dear friends on the Democratic side that the record indicates that he might have gotten his hands on campaign money intended for them.

Here in the Capitol, when a financial crisis would arise in Baker's business he would reach in the drawer of his desk and get $100 bills. On one occasion Mrs. Novak came to get some money to pay a bill involved in the enterprise of her late husband and Bobby Baker.

Mr. Novak is dead. So far as I know, he was an honorable man. He was a builder. Baker was a promoter.

The business needed $12,000. There were so many $100 bills in Bobby Baker's desk that he made a mistake and gave her $1,000 too much.

From pressures outside the Senate they were successful in preventing the calling of one of the witnesses needed very badly, Walter Jenkins. Instead of investigating Bobby Baker, they were almost successful in bringing in a shameful, damaging, malicious, and false report against the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware because he dared to speak out for honesty in Government.

I said that they should have called Walter Jenkins. That is true. When the issue arose as to whether or not there was a kickback required because Don Reynolds had sold some life insurance to a Member of this body, the one person who could fill in the picture and tell what happened, if he were placed under oath and told the truth, was Walter Jenkins.

Did we get him? We did not. A subpena was finally issued for him, and on the day he was to appear two psychiatrists appeared.

Mr. President, I cross-examined those psychiatrists for a full day. No one has ever seen the record, because the word went out, "Do not let that testimony out."

Walter Jenkins was an admitted security risk. He would be at the right hand of the President of the United States today if it had not been for the police of the District of Columbia. He was a repeater. He had access to all the military and diplomatic secrets, defense secrets, and everything else that the President had.

I believe Walter Jenkins when he said that he loved his country and would not betray it. But when someone has a weakness, the enemies of liberty do not ask him in one stroke to turn his back on his country, but little by little they apply the pressure and get a little information, and a little accommodation here and there, until they fill the picture they need.

Walter Jenkins was arrested. I raise no complaint against any man having a lawyer to defend him and maintain his presumption of innocence.

But what was the role of Abe Fortas? His immediate act was to suppress the news. It is a matter of public record that he went to the newspapers in the city of Washington to suppress the news. That is water over the dam, in a sense, but it is a part of the Bobby Baker picture. Mr. President, it is a part of the picture involved in this nomination.

I hold in my hand the Washington Post of Friday, October 15, 1965. It tells how the various groups tried to advance someone for U.S. attorney in the District of Columbia. There was rivalry and conflict, which often happens. There is nothing wrong with that.

But how did the name of Bress, the attorney for Serv-U Corp.—which after all, is nothing but Bobby Baker, incorporated—get into it? I will read the item.

> Abe Fortas, intimate adviser to the President, who is now a Justice of the Supreme Court, then recommended that Bress be substituted.

Mr. President, the Bobby Baker gang are taking over the Government. Let us call the roll—in the criminal division, in the tax department, on the court, and now, the chief prosecuting officer in the District of Columbia.

What does Mr. Bress say? He said in effect that Serv-U was merely another corporate client. That was to imply that he did not know anything about Bobby Baker.

Ordinarily that would have validity and would be true. The many lawyers in this body, in their days of practice, may have been called upon to try a case for a corporation, an insurance company, or something else. They did so diligently, honorably, and ethically. Perhaps what was going on in the faraway offices of the corporation might indicate that the officers were corrupt, and they would not know anything about that.

The Serv-U Corp. was no such corporation. The Serv-U Corp. was Bobby Baker, incorporated. It was conceived in his mind. It was a part of his network of accumulating wealth.

What is the record? The record is that when the official channels of Government awarded a contract for more than a billion dollars to North American Aviation—again, Mr. President, in my deep feeling about this I do not want to cast an unfair reflection on anyone, most of the people connected with North American Aviation were not involved—North American threw out a vending machine company that had served them well for years. It is a profitable business. It is an automated business that avoids the problem of having to keep employees on hand 24 hours a day. It is a quite new and growing thing.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CURTIS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator making the point that an attorney becomes a part of the misdemeanors or misconduct of a client whom he represents?

Mr. CURTIS. Not at all.

Mr. PASTORE. I was wondering what this has to do with Bress.

Mr. CURTIS. It has to do with Bress in that it is a part of a pattern of the whole Bobby Baker crowd taking over the Government; and he was recommended, according to Bress, by another Baker attorney.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. What does the Senator mean by "pattern"?

Mr. CURTIS. Pattern?

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator mean the client? The Senator from Nebraska is an attorney. I hope he does not feel in his own heart and conscience that he became responsible for the conduct of every client whom he ever represented, unless he was a party to the conduct.

Mr. CURTIS. Oh, no.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator trying to cast an odious, invidious shadow over this attorney? If there is any conduct for which this attorney himself is responsible, which would disqualify him for the position to which he is nominated, I should like to be told now, on the floor of the Senate, in 5 minutes, what it is, without having to listen, day in and day out, to all the talk about Bobby Baker, which is an entirely different matter, when we are considering the Bress nomination. That is all I would like to know. No one is pointing a finger at Bress to establish misconduct on his part.

Mr. CURTIS. The pattern is this: That everyone around Bobby Baker is being moved into high position in the Government.

Mr. PASTORE. There, again, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is not that a vicious innuendo?

Mr. CURTIS. No; it is true.

Mr. PASTORE. Is not the Senator actually saying that because Bress represented Baker and was around him, he is guilty of misconduct? I do not know how he was around him. I suppose Bobby Baker had to go to his office, if Bress was his attorney. Would that make him a part of Bobby Baker?

Mr. CURTIS. Not at all.

Mr. PASTORE. That is what the Senator is saying.

Mr. CURTIS. Bress' statement, according to the press, is that he did not even know that Bobby Baker owned Serv-U. That would be true as to an ordinary corporation; but this was a newly formed corporation that was a part of Bobby Baker's apparatus.

I suppose that before this debate is over, there will be read into the RECORD a list of persons who in one way or another ever represented Bobby Baker and who are already in high positions. The pressure of the Government has been all along to protect Bobby Baker, to withhold evidence, and to smear the man who brought it up.

It was not by accident that a report was prepared on the staff level, somewhere, by the Committee on Rules and Administration, which did not expose Baker, but was filled with innuendoes, falsities, and smears against the Senator who dared expose the corruption. If that is not a pattern, there is something wrong.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. It is the understanding of the Senator from Rhode Island that the Senator's distinguished colleague from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who heard all the evidence, feels differently from what the junior Senator from Nebraska is saying today.

Mr. CURTIS. I am happy that the Senator from Rhode Island has raised that point. I have said two or three times that what I am saying here is not based upon what was or was not presented to the Committee on the Judiciary or any conclusion the committee arrived at. This is based upon months of work on the Bobby Baker investigation.

I started to inquire into the question whether or not Bress must have known of Bobby Baker's role in Serv-U, because I was shocked by the press account that the implication was made that Serv-U was merely another corporate client, and that Bress did not know that Baker owned a part of it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. When Bobby Baker opened up his motel, he invited Members of the Senate to visit it. He even invited the senior Senator from Rhode Island. The senior Senator from Rhode Island did not go and did not care to go; but he knows that many distinguished Members of this body went. Does that put them in Bobby Baker's predicament?

Mr. CURTIS. Not at all.

Mr. PASTORE. Then what is the Senator saying?

Mr. CURTIS. What am I saying?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes. Is not the Senator saying that Bress is responsible because he should have known or must have known of these dealings merely because he represented Baker as his attorney; and that if Bobby Baker did anything wrong in any of the activities for which Mr. Bress represented him, Mr. Bress must account for it?

Mr. CURTIS. No, no.

Mr. PASTORE. Then I do not get the point of all these long speeches.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Bress' remarks to the press indicated that he did not even know that Baker had anything to do with Serv-U. That just could not be.

As I say, that was not just another corporation; that was Bobby Baker, incorporated.

A deposition was taken on September 21, 1964, of Fred B. Black, Jr., who is charged with not paying his taxes. Millions of people over the country do pay their taxes. Some of them have to borrow money to do it. The fact is that a majority of them lean over backward to pay their full share of taxes.

This is a part of the apparatus; it is a part of the Bobby Baker happenings. The deposition of Fred B. Black, Jr., was taken on September 21, 1964.

The record shows that David G. Bress, Esq., was present by Stanley Klavan, Esq., for the defendant Serv-U Corp. I am aware that a large law firm can have so much business going on that the business of one individual in the firm may not come to the knowledge of others. But the record does not show any such thing. The record shows, in substance, that an agent was present for Bress; that a man appeared for Bress. Here are some of the questions that were asked:

> Question. Did there come a time, Mr. Black, when you and Mr. Baker had any conversations with regard to the establishment of a business to conduct vending machine services?
>
> Answer. There did come such a time.
>
> Question. Could you tell us when that was?
>
> Answer. No, I couldn't tell you the date.
>
> Question. Could it have been in the year 1962? Would it refresh your recollection——
>
> Answer. No. It was before that, I'm sure.
>
> Question. 1961?
>
> Answer. I would imagine 1961 or 1962. I'm not positive.
>
> Question. Please tell us, sir, the nature of the conversations which you had with Mr. Baker regarding this matter.

I am not going to burden the RECORD with all this testimony. Here are other questions asked while Bress was represented in that deposition:

> Question. As well as you can, could you state the substance of the conversations between you and Mr. Baker on this subject?
>
> Question. On whose initiative was the conversation?
>
> Question. What was said about the vending machine business?
>
> Question. Was this before a corporation was organized which subsequently became the Serv-U Corp.?

> Question. Did you invest in the Serv-U Corp.?
>
> Question. Prior to the time that you actually put up money in the Serv-U Corp., did you have any conversations with Mr. Baker as to any services which you might render on behalf of the vending machine corporation?
>
> Question. Was there any understanding between you and Mr. Baker and the other persons who were investors in the Serv-U Corp. that you would try to gain entree for the vending business in those businesses?

The witness was asked:

> Did you have any relations with Mr. Tucker in connection with the Serv-U Corp.?

That is Tucker and Baker.

Other depositions were taken. The deposition of Carole Tyler was taken. Who was present? David G. Bress, Esq., by Stanley Klavan, Esq., for the defendant, Serv-U Corp.

Long before this, Bress had had a copy of the complaint wherein the plaintiff Hill, representing the Capitol Vending Co., had alleged all the skulduggery, including the kickbacks. The complaint brought out the fact that, at Baker's decision, a change was made in the vending machine contract at Melpar, here in the Washington area, Melpar was engaged in a business that was 99 percent with the Government. This is what happened in the deposition of Carole Tyler:

> QUESTION. Do you have any information as to any transactions between the Melpar Corp. and the Serv-U Corp.?

Here is an interesting answer:

> ANSWER. I refuse to answer on the constitutional ground that my answer might tend to incriminate me.

I read further from the testimony:

> QUESTION. Are you an employee of either corporation?
>
> ANSWER. I refuse to answer on the ground that my answer might tend to incriminate me.
>
> QUESTION. Do you have any knowledge as to the identity of the stockholders in the Serv-U Corp.?
>
> ANSWER. I refuse to answer on the constitutional ground that my answer might tend to incriminate me.

The Bress statement, as published in the press, carries the implication that when he took this job, he did not even know that Baker was a stockholder. Hill had made all these allegations that revealed the story. I continue to read the testimony:

> Question. Do you have any knowledge of the activities of Mr. Fred Black on behalf of the North American Aviation Corp. in the District of Columbia?
>
> Answer. I refuse to answer on the constitutional ground that my answer might tend to incriminate me.
>
> Question. Do you have any knowledge as to the business activities of Robert G. Baker during the years 1962, 1963?

She gave the same reply.

I take issue with the statement that the public and this Senate were led to believe that Serv-U was only an ordinary corporation, and that Mr. Bress was called in to defend it and that he knew nothing of Bobby Baker's connection with it.

We would have an entirely different picture here if Mr. Bress had, in a forthright manner, replied, "Yes. I represented Bobby Baker's interests." Then we would simplify the issue down to what the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island asked:

> Is it wrong for a lawyer to represent clients? Does the wrongdoing of clients imply wrongdoing on the part of the attorney?

There are two points involved. One is the failure by Bress to disclose that if he should have known of Bobby Baker's involvement in Serv-U, he would have known that it was not a long-established corporation that, in the due course of employment, he was called upon to represent, but that, in reality, it was a corporation that came into being after a Government contract was let. They got their first contract at a time when they did not own a single vending machine, not a sandwich, not a candy bar, not a bottle of pop. They had no employees.

Too many of those who were around Bobby Baker are being moved into places of great power in the Government. We cannot avoid taking account of the additional fact that the great power of this Government has been used to protect Bobby Baker and to smear and discredit the man who exposed the situation.

I am in sympathy with the problem that the Judiciary Committee had. In the closing days of Congress, such questions are raised about a nominee that the committee has to go back and hold a hearing to find out whether the nominee is guilty. Can we not have some nominees who are disassociated with men such as Baker, who do not represent businesses with Government connections, and have not given replies that raise all these questions?

Another deposition was taken earlier, on August 12, 1964, that of Edward M. Bostick. Who is Mr. Bostick? He was the head of Melpar. What is Melpar? Melpar is a concern that got 99 percent of its business from the Government.

Bobby Baker placed a vending machine business at Melpar. At one point the vending machine company needed a raise in its prices, and Melpar turned it down. It was reported to Bobby Baker. A few phone calls were made, and Melpar permitted them to raise their prices. He had great power.

Later, Capitol Vending was moved out and another concern put in there. A deposition was taken, because an allegation was made then that a new company, a Bobby Baker company, which ultimately turned out to be Serv-U, was buying and storing vending machine equipment in the Washington area.

At that deposition, who was present? "David G. Bress, Esq., by Stanley Klavan, Esq., for the defendant Serv-U Corp."

Mr. Bress, as in these other depositions, though he signed the pleadings and accepted service on notices, was not personally present; but the record does not indicate that this was a large law firm, and that one party appeared and nobody else knew about it. The record indicates that Bress' agent was there.

This was the deposition of Mr. Bostick. I will read a few questions from that, to see whether or not a competent lawyer would have any idea that Mr. Baker was involved in Serv-U Corp. According to the press, he said he did not know that Baker was a stockholder.

Here is a question:

> Question. Are you familiar with an allegation in this complaint that Mr. Black and Mr. Baker entered into a business relationship and that as part of their business relation, Baker was to help Black in connection with certain business activities and Black was to help Baker in connection with certain business activities?

The evidence before the Rules Committee indicated that Black worked both sides of the street. He represented North American. He represented Serv-U, was a part owner of it, and he did not disclose to North American that, when he was recommending a vending machine company, that it was his—his and Baker's. The two of them owned the majority stock.

Bress was represented at that deposition. Even if we narrow down Bress' statement to say that at the time he took the case, he did not know of Baker's involvement, and assuming the depositions came afterwards, it still does not stand up. The complaint, the first paper filed in the case, made all of these allegations that were pursued by the subsequent questions in the depositions.

Mr. Bostick was asked the further question:

> Question. My question is in the language which you yourself used before the Senate Rules Committee, and I leave it to you to answer it in any manner you see fit.
>
> Answer. My answer is that I don't go around asking generals and admirals what they're doing in their shop. It's very nice to know these men because, after all, ultimately sometimes up the line they've got to sign a contract which you may have won. But I didn't say in my testimony, which is at the top of this page, that I constantly circulated around listening to what Government employees stated. The sentence stands by itself.
>
> My job is constantly circulating and listening to hear what is going on in Washington, what is going on in defense.
>
> Many people know what is going on in Washington in defense, who aren't employees of the Government.
>
> Question. Yes, sir. My question—and I don't mean to restate it time and again——
>
> Answer. It's all right.
>
> Question. But it is whether you have ever listened or heard any of this information from an employee of the U.S. Government.

Who objected? Mr. Bress' agent, Mr. Klavan.

> Mr. KLAVAN. I object to the question on the ground it is too broad.

Baker was an employee of the Government. Again Mr. Klavan, Mr. Bress' representative:

> Mr. KLAVAN. Excuse me, Mr. Bostick. I would appreciate it, when I make an objection, if you would wait until I finish. I know you want to be helpful to Mr. Carliner, but I have to protect my client.

Serv-U, as a legal entity, was not an employee of the Government. Bobby Baker, who was really Serv-U Inc., was an employee of the Government. Bress' agent objected to the question—which is all right—and he said:

> I have to protect my client.

Who was his client? Bobby Baker.

My point is not that Mr. Bress defended individuals, and that the wrongdoing of the individuals can be appropriately attributed to the lawyer. My point is that Mr. Bress said he did not know of the involvement of Bobby Baker in Serv-U.

Here is something that might interest my friends on the other side:

> Question. Can you state whether any of the firms which you employ to perform services for you have given any funds to any Senator or to the Democratic senatorial campaign committee?
>
> Mr. Carliner. Have you ever had occasion to discuss with any of those Senators any legislation pending in the U.S. Senate which was of concern to Melpar?

Melpar was owned, incidentally, by North American.

Mr. President, I could go on and enumerate facts that would lead to the conclusion that employment as a lawyer for Serv-U was not merely employment for another corporation. From the very outset of this suit, Bobby Baker was the central figure. Again I object to Bress, not on the ground that he took the case, nor on the ground that anything unethical was done by him in the handling of the case, and not on the ground that Bobby Baker's guilt is attributed to his lawyer: I object to it on the ground that the impression, in putting this nomination over, was that he had no knowledge of the involvement of Bobby Baker, when he was attorney for Serv-U.

I further object to this nomination on the ground that there is too much infiltration of the Bobby Baker clan into positions of great authority in this Government. If he would not mind responding, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], who may be able to mention some of the people around Baker, who worked with him and for him, who are now in Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, such a list will be put in later. There is no question but that the Senator is correct. There has been entirely too much of a pattern of appointing Baker's crowd to key spots and this particular instance involves one of the most sensitive positions that there could possibly be in connection with the investigation of the Baker case.

As I pointed out to the committee when I was testifying, I most certainly was not objecting to Mr. Bress on the basis that he had been the attorney of record for either Baker's corporation or Mr. Baker. Under our system of Government any man is entitled to his day in court, and he is entitled to representation.

I did raise a point about the advisability of appointing at this particular time a man as a United States attorney in the District of Columbia, who had represented Mr. Baker on a charge which more than likely will be a part of any criminal indictment that may be handed down by the grand jury. Remember, the grand jury in the District of Columbia will come under the direction of this same man. I said it was too sensitive a position. Too much has been said before about a coverup by a congressional committee of the Baker case. I suggest that by any manner of reasoning the nomination should be held over, without prejudice, until January or until after the Baker grand jury has acted.

Are we now to promote Bobby Baker's attorney to the position where he will have charge of the prosecution of his former client?

Hoffa was entitled to his attorney's representation in court, but I do not believe that anyone for a moment would have suggested that the Senate confirm as a U.S. attorney the lawyer who was acting as counsel for Jimmy Hoffa, especially at a time when his trial was pending in a district into which he would be serving as a prosecuting attorney. We just do not do things like that. That is the point I am raising.

Or if the administration and the Senate together do wish to do so let it be with full knowledge as to what is happening.

If Hoffa's attorney was before us for confirmation it would raise questions in the minds of many persons as to its advisability. What is the difference?

The Attorney General states that the U.S. attorney would have nothing to do with the prosecution of Baker's criminal case in the District of Columbia. I am not a lawyer; but why are we confirming the nomination? What does he do? Who has charge of grand juries in the District of Columbia? Who has access to them? Who follows through on the prosecution after indictments have been returned? I raise this question: Could he, even if he wished to do so, disassociate himself? Could he do it in a manner satisfactory to the American people?

Mr. CURTIS. It might further be said that the great army of honest citizens who pay their taxes and obey the law and avoid the appearances of evil should have the proper representatives appointed in sensitive and powerful positions.

Mr. President, one of the issues is, did Mr. Bress know about Bobby Baker's real ownership and master minding of the Serv-U Corp., or did he not?

Before the suit was filed, either he was consulted, or he was not. If he was consulted, he had to know the basic facts.

But, if Mr. Bress did not know about the matter until the case was filed, what would be the first paper to come to his attention after the suit had been filed? Of course, it would be the complaint. This is the case: Civil Action No. 2249–63, filed September 9, 1963, United States District Court for the District of Columbia. *Capitol Vending Company, Incorporated, 23 Eye Street, Southeast, Washington, D.C., plaintiff;* v. *Robert G. Baker, Fred Black, Jr., Earnest C. Tucker, and Serv-U Corporation.*

The complaint alleges the whole mess. It alleges that Baker was the individual who did the maneuvering, and did all the things which were to the disadvantage of the plaintiff.

Let me read one of the allegations:

> Upon information, plaintiff believes that the defendants did interfere with the outstanding agreement between it and Melpar by reason of the following:
>
> (a) That defendant Robert G. Baker, as Secretary of the majority was able to, and did, represent to defendant Fred Black that he was in a position to assist in securing contracts for North American Aviation Corp.
>
> (b) That as partial return for the services performed by defendant Fred Black and defendant Robert G. Baker, North American Aviation Corp. entered into an agreement to permit Serv-U Corp. to install vending machines in its plants in California.

Mr. President, that is a part of the first paper filed in the case.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire complaint printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia—Civil action file No. 2249–63]

Capitol Vending Co., Inc., 23 Eye Street SE., Washington, D.C., Plaintiff *v.* Robert G. Baker, Room F–80, U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C.; Fred Black, Jr., 4054 62d Terrace, NW., Washington, D.C.; Ernest C. Tucker, Suite 605, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.; Serv-U Corp., Suite 605, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C., Defendants

COMPLAINT

Action for interference with contract

1. This court has jurisdiction over this complaint pursuant to title II, section 306, of the code of laws of the District of Columbia.

2. Plaintiff is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware and has its principal place of business in the District of Columbia at 23 Eye Street SE.

3. Defendant Robert G. Baker resides in the District of Columbia and is employed as the Secretary for the majority at the U.S. Capitol.

4. Defendant Fred Black resides in the District of Columbia and maintains offices in the said District at 1730 K Street NW.

5. Defendant Ernest Tucker maintains offices in the District of Columbia at 2000 P Street NW.

6. Defendant Serv-U Corp. is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of California and maintains an office in the District of Columbia at 2000 P Street NW.

7. On behalf of the plaintiff, defendant Robert G. Baker entered into negotiations with Melpar, Inc., in order to secure an agreement between the plaintiff and Melpar, Inc., under which plaintiff would furnish and install coin-operated vending machines on premises owned by Melpar, Inc., at 3000 Arlington Boulevard, Falls Church, Va.

8. As a result of the services performed by defendant Robert G. Baker, plaintiff and Melpar, Inc., entered into such an agreement on March 23, 1962, and on or about April 11, 1962, plaintiff installed approximately 130 vending machines on the Melpar premises in order to provide candies, gum, cigarettes, hot and cold beverages, dairy products, and other merchandise for Melpar's employees.

9. Defendant Robert G. Baker was paid by plaintiff the sum of $250 a month from April 1962, through March 1963, and the sum of $650 a month from April 1963, through July 1963, for his services in securing and retaining the contract between the plaintiff and Melpar, Inc.

10. At a time unknown to the plaintiff, defendant Robert G. Baker became a stockholder in Serv-U Corp., which is engaged in the coin-operating vending machine business principally in California, and which has a contract to provide vending machines for the plants operated by the North American Aviation Corp. at various locations in California.

11. Defendant Fred Black is a stockholder in and obtains earnings from Serv-U Corp. and is also employed in the District of Columbia for the purpose of securing contracts

from the U.S. Government on behalf of North American Aviation Corp.

12. Defendant Ernest C. Tucker is a stockholder in Serv-U Corp. and is chairman of the board of that corporation.

13. During March 1963, defendant Robert G. Baker advised plaintiff through its president, Ralph Hill, that Serv-U Corp. wished to purchase the outstanding stock of the Capitol Vending Co.; that unless such stock was sold to Serv-U Corp, he would arrange to terminate the outstanding agreement between plaintiff and Melpar, Inc.

14. That at that time, defendant Robert G. Baker knew that the plaintiff had incurred considerable indebtedness in order to finance the installation of vending machines at Melpar premises; knew that the period of time for running of vending machine agreements, as a matter of trade practice, extends from a minimum of 3 years to a period of 5 years; and knew that a termination of the contract between plaintiff and Melpar, Inc., would cause plaintiff a loss of its original investment together with a loss of expected profit from the operation of such vending machines.

15. Upon failure of the Serv-U Corp. to effect the purchase of the outstanding stock of Capitol Vending Co., Inc., defendant Robert G. Baker, defendant Fred Black, defendant Ernest C. Tucker, and defendant, Serv-U Corp., conspired maliciously to interfere with the outstanding agreement between plaintiff and Melpar, Inc., with the purpose in mind to secure the installation of vending machines on Melpar's premises by a corporation in which they had a financial interest.

Pursuant to such an arrangement defendants arranged for the purchase of approximately 100 vending machines from Bush International, Inc., and have stored such machines at 3414 52d Avenue, Bladensburg, Md., preparatory to installing them on the premises of Melpar, Inc.

16. Upon information, plaintiff believes that the defendants were able to interfere with the outstanding agreement between it and Melpar, Inc., by reason of the following:

(a) That defendant Robert G. Baker, as secretary of the majority was able to, and did, represent to defendant Fred Black that he was in a position to assist in securing contracts for North American Aviation Corp.

(b) That as partial return for the services performed by defendant Fred Black and defendant Robert G. Baker, North American Aviation Corp. entered into an agreement to permit Serv-U Corp. to install vending machines in its plants in California.

(c) That defendant Fred Black and defendant Robert G. Baker assisted in securing contracts between Melpar, Inc., and North American Aviation Corp.

(d) That in partial return for these services, Melpar, Inc., has agreed to enter into an agreement with a vending machine operation in which defendants Fred Black and Robert G. Baker have a financial interest.

17. That defendant Ernest C. Tucker, assisted and counseled in all of the foregoing activities, designed to interfere with the contract between Melpar, Inc., and the plaintiff.

18. That as a result of the actions of each of the defendants, Melpar, Inc., on August 28, 1963, advised the plaintiff that it would terminate the agreement of March 23, 1962, in 30 days.

19. That the actions of the defendants have resulted in damages to the Capitol Vending Co., Inc., in the sum of $200,000.

Wherefore, plaintiff prays:

(a) For judgment against the defendants, jointly and severally, awarding it compensatory damages in the sum of $200,000.

(b) For a judgment awarding it punitive damages for malicious interference with their contractual agreement in the sum of $100,000, and

(c) For such other and further relief as may seem proper to the court.

RALPH HILL,
President, Capitol Vending Co., Inc.

District of Columbia: s.s.

Ralph Hill, being first duly sworn on oath according to law, deposes and says that he has read the foregoing complaint by him subscribed and that the facts stated therein are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

RALPH HILL.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 4th day of September 1963.

H. EDWARD CHURCH,
Notary Public, District of Columbia.
DAVID CARLINER,
Wasserman & Carliner, Attorney for Plaintiff.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. CURTIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In connection with that same point, an answer was filed to that action under date of October 22, 1963, in the court of the District of Columbia. It was filed by the Capitol Vending Co., Inc., 23 Eye Street SE., Washington, D.C., against the same plaintiffs—Robert G. Baker, interestingly enough, he named his office in the Capitol as his business headquarters—Room F80, U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C.; Fred Black, Jr., Washington, D.C.; Ernest C. Tucker, Washington, D.C.; and Serv-U Corp.

This is entitled "Answer of Defendant Serv-U Corp."

I should like to read it. It is very short and very interesting.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like very much to have it read, but also ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD in full.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia—Civil action File No. 2249–63]

CAPITOL VENDING CO., INC., 23 I STREET SE., WASHINGTON, D.C., PLAINTIFF, *v.* ROBERT G. BAKER, ROOM F–80, U.S. CAPITOL, WASHINGTON, D.C.; FRED BLACK, JR., 4045—52D TERRACE NW., WASHINGTON, D.C.; ERNEST C. TUCKER, SUITE 605, 2000 P STREET NW., WASHINGTON, D.C.; SERV-U CORP., SUITE 605, 2000 P STREET NW., WASHINGTON, D.C.; DEFENDANTS

ANSWER OF DEFENDANT SERV-U CORP.

The defendant, Serv-U Corp., by its attorney, for its answer to the complaint says as follows:

First defense

The complaint fails to state a valid claim upon which relief can be granted.

Second defense

1. Defendant admits the jurisdiction of this court.

2. Defendant does not have sufficient information or knowledge to either admit or deny the averments of paragraph 2.

3.–5. Defendant admits the averments of paragraphs 3, 4, and 5.

6. Defendant denies that it is a corporation organized under the laws of California, but avers that it is a corporation organized under the laws of Delaware and has an office in the District of Columbia at 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

7.–9. Defendant does not have sufficient information or knowledge to either admit or deny the averments of paragraphs 7, 8, and 9.

10. Defendant admits that it is engaged in the coin-operated vending machine business in California and that it has contracts relating to the installation and operation of such machines in various plants in California, including certain plants of North American Aviation Corp., but this defendant denies that Robert G. Baker is a stockholder of record and is without sufficient information or knowledge to admit or deny any equitable interest.

11. Defendant denies the averments relating to this defendant but has not sufficient information or knowledge to admit or deny the remaining averments of paragraph 11.

12. Defendant admits that Ernest C. Tucker is a stockholder of record in defendant and that he is its chairman of the board.

13.–14. Defendant does not have sufficient knowledge or information to either admit or deny the averments of paragraphs 13 and 14.

15.–19. Defendant denies the averments of paragraphs 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19.

Wherefore, defendant, Serv-U Corp. prays that a judgment be entered herein in its favor and that the complaint herein be dismissed with costs and that this defendant be awarded attorneys' fees incurred by it herein.

DAVID G. BRESS (L.B.)
Attorney for Defendant.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this is the answer of the defendant, the Serv-U Corp., to the points that the Senator from Nebraska just made.

This document is signed by David G. Bress as the attorney. It was filed over his own signature. The point was raised, at least on October 22 in the press, was or was not Bobby Baker a stockholder?

Baker and his attorney were trying to withhold this knowledge which Mr. Ralph Hill was trying to find; he had petitioned the court for a complete list of the ownership.

Mr. Bress as Baker's attorney tried to withhold that knowledge. The information was filed. He stated:

> Defendants are entitled to examine Hill without divulging information as to the stockholders, bondholders, noteholders of the defendant Serv-U Corp.

He was asking the court to give him the right to examine Mr. Hill who was bringing the suit, but he was also asking the further right of the court to withhold from Mr. Hill the knowledge as to whether and to what extent Baker had any stock.

This does not say that Mr. Bress did not know that Baker was a stockholder. It just meant that as his attorney he was trying to conceal that fact.

In other words, they were jockeying around as to the legal procedure. This document was signed by David G. Bress, and yet he states to the press that he never had any idea, not even remotely that Baker was connected. That is absurd.

Within a 10-day range of all this happening, I appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which the junior Senator from Nebraska is a member and gave the committee—because I had read with some amusement Baker's feeble efforts to say that he did not know anything about it—the financial statement which Baker had filed with the Fidelity National Bank in Oklahoma City in support of a loan. This financial statement was filed February 1, 1963, so approximately 6 or 8 months prior to Mr. Bress' acting as Baker's attorney, Bobby Baker lists his assets in Serv-U Corp. as being 2,850 shares, with a valuation of $1 million. In this statement he pledged the 2,850 shares with Fidelity National Bank and Trust Co. in Oklahoma City, Okla., as security for a substantial loan. In addition, the press, with banner headlines, was printing stories connecting Baker with Serv-U Corp.

Now, Mr. Bress, the attorney who was representing the corporation, says, "I never knew he was in it." I do not believe he is that naive. If he is I shudder to think what would happen to the prosecution of criminal cases in the District of Columbia should he be confirmed.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. President, was the request I made for printing in the RECORD granted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it is not only clear that no competent lawyer could have undertaken this case without knowing the involvement of Bobby Baker and the allegation of the wrongdoing; something else is very clear in that answer. When a lawyer defends a corporation, if his allegiance is merely to the corporation as an entity, he is not going to go out of his way to protect a mere stockholder, because that is not the way things are done.

I call attention to the fact that in this case, filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action No. 2249-63, on October 22, 1963 there was filed a motion for the production of documents. The certificate of service states:

> I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing motion for production of documents and points and authorities in support of the motion were mailed, prepaid, this 22d day of October 1963 to the following:
>
> Arnold, Fortas, and Porter—

That is Judge Fortas—

> attorney for Robert G. Baker; Nicholas J. Chase, attorney for Ernest C. Tucker; Hans A. Nathan, attorney for Fred B. Black, Jr.; David G. Bress, attorney for Serv-U Corp.

Mr. President, there is a grand jury in session now considering and investigating the whole Baker matter. That grand jury will have to have directions and instructions from the U.S. attorney's office. If the grand jury returns a true bill, the U.S. attorney will have to prosecute.

I have read in the press that if that happens, the Department of Justice itself will prosecute. Is that not an admission that they know this man could not objectively do the job?

Mr. President, I rest my case on the fact that too many of the Bobby Baker gang are being placed in powerful positions in this Government. It is replay of the same forces that throttled the investigation by the Committee on Rules and Administration, that protected Baker, that denied the committee access to the testimony of Walter Jenkins. It is a reenactment by the same forces that tried to destroy one of God's noble men, the distinguished Senator from Delaware, because he uncovered the Baker matter.

Mr. President, I speak for no one else, but for my part I will vote against confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David Bress?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has just outlined his case. While there are enough Senators on the floor of the Senate I ask for the yeas and nays on final confirmation.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, when I was testifying before the committee I took the same position as the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] that my opposition against Mr. Bress was most certainly not based on the fact that he had served or acted as attorney for Mr. Baker.

I shall quote from my statement as presented to the Judiciary Committee:

I made this statement:

> I want to make it clear that my opposition to Mr. Bress is not on the basis that he acted as attorney for one of Mr. Baker's companies. In our system of justice he was entitled to his day in court and entitled to be represented by counsel. The fact that some attorney serves in the capacity as attorney for Mr. Baker does not bar him from eligibility to hold office.

I made a similar statement on the floor of the Senate. I repeat it here now because by no line of reasoning ought we to consider this as guilt by association.

I do, however, raise the question, as did the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], about the advisability of confirming Mr. Bress to this most sensitive position at this particular time while the Baker grand jury is now in session. This grand jury is now considering the question as to whether it will return an indictment against Mr. Baker for some of his activities—his influence peddling—most of which were conducted under the dome of the Capitol and just off the Senate chamber.

One of the points being considered for possible criminal action by this grand jury is the kickback referred to in the lawsuit by Mr. Hill of the Capitol Vending Co. against Baker and his Serv-U Corp. Mr. Bress represented the corporation. Mr. Baker was represented by Mr. Fortas, and Mr. Fred Black and Mr. Ernest Tucker were represented by their respective counsel.

This $650 per month kickback may be one of the points of contention before the grand jury. The charges were that Mr. Hill said he had been paying Baker, while he was serving as an employee of the U.S. Senate, $650 a month in cash and delivering it here to his Capitol office in return for the assistance he had rendered to help him get the contract. This kickback was dropped only after he refused to raise the ante to $1,000 per month.

The point I raise is that if in the investigation of this case that is being pursued the Department of Justice wanted some of the records—some of the records which may be in the possession of or known to Mr. Bress in his capacity as attorney for Mr. Baker—the relationship of attorney and client would enter into the picture.

I respect the right of an attorney not to be asked or expected to go into court and disclose the results of confidential information he has been given by his client.

But the situation would be that while a grand jury is sitting Mr. Bress could be in the possession of information which would be vital to the Department of Justice in developing the case. As U.S. attorney, should he withhold from the Department of Justice information which could very easily be pursued were it not for the client-attorney relationship? I think it is wrong to put Mr. Bress or any other man in such a position.

On the other hand, suppose this information is later developed by the Department of Justice, there then might be a suspicion on the part of the client that his attorney had betrayed his confidence.

I suggest to the committee that, as a matter of wisdom, the nomination should not be acted upon at this time. I think it should have been held up until the next session. The grand jury by that time will have made a decision; either it will be rendering an indictment against Mr. Baker or it will be disbanding as a grand jury, and we will know that so far as the Department of Justice is concerned the case is to be whitewashed.

It is a matter of record that the grand jury is operating on a time limit. I ask why, in the light of the many questions that have been raised and the slow procedure by which the Baker case has been handled, consideration of the nomination should not be postponed. That is why I strongly urged not only the committee but the leadership and the administration to hold the nomination back without prejudice.

If the grand jury returns a true bill of indictment and this particular payoff is not involved or if it is not returned in such a way that the documents which would be in the possession of Mr. Bress as attorney for Mr. Baker would not be needed, the nomination could be submitted for confirmation next year. That would be the more orderly procedure. I would have more confidence, and I am sure that 190 million Americans far removed from Washington and this immediate scene, would have more confidence if this were done. That could be done without any prejudice so far as this particular nominee is concerned.

I do not understand today why this nomination has been pushed so hard, why it is so important to the administration, why it is so important to some Members of the Senate, and why they are so determined that they must have as the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia the man who, only a few months ago, was defending Mr. Baker against the charge of criminal violation in accepting payoffs for helping to get a Government contract.

The suspicion is developing, and will continue to be discussed, as the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] mentoined earlier, why such a large number of Mr. Baker's associates are in key positions where, if they wished, they could help block prosecution. We cannot escape the fact that this is the District in which Mr. Baker is being investigated and in which if he is indicted he will be tried. He will not be tried in Cleveland or some other district. If he were, this point would not be raised, and I told the committee I would not raise it. Or if the nomination of Mr. Bress were to a post in another area in the country, other than the district where Baker would be prosecuted, I would have no objection.

That point should have been given more attention by the committee and Congress. We are caught now in an impossible situation. Far be it from me to sympathize with the administration if it gets itself into a position where if the nomination of Mr. Bress is confirmed, and no indictment returned, there will be a strong suspicion on the part of many people that this was the beginning of the fix.

For what other reason is such pressure behind this nomination?

On the other hand, if an indictment is returned and the prosecution is not so diligent as some persons think it should be, again the administration will have laid the groundwork for the charge of a fix.

I am a little suspicious. I am suspicious as to why it is so important to have in so strategic a position in the District of Columbia courts a man who was attorney for Mr. Baker. I do not care how much one dissociates himself he cannot escape the fact—and no one denies it—that those who will prosecute the case, those connected with the grand jury, will be working in and out of the U.S. attorney's office in the District of Columbia. They will be using the same employees. Certainly Mr. Bress could walk out of the room while the case is being discussed, but he cannot completely dissociate himself from it.

In all fairness to Mr. Bress, I question whether it is right to put him in a position in which he might well become a scapegoat for the administration coverup if there should be one. Any effort to thwart the pursuit of the investigation or the proper presentation of evidence to the grand jury will be most carefully watched.

Over the months I have said—and I say it again—that we should not discuss this case in detail now, because a grand jury is in session. I shall not go into the many ramifications of the Baker investigation. I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] that the nomination of Baker is not before us for confirmation. However, I am not too sure that we may not hear from him later if he is not indicted, because if the procedure continues we do not know what position to which Baker himself may be appointed. Someone has jokingly suggested that there is a vacancy in the position of the Office of Comptroller General of the United States. I hope Bobby Baker is not being considered for that position, but I cannot say I would be too surprised in the face of the recent trend.

But let us face it: Baker was an employee not merely of the Government; he was an employee of the U.S. Senate. He was an important part of this body. Every Member of this body, more or less, is on trial in the eyes of the American people.

How should we deal with this question? So far, I believe most Senators will admit that the investigation has not been dealt with too gracefully, to say the least. It has not been pursued with the same degree of diligence that an investigating committee of Congress pursues an investigation when it is after a culprit in the executive branch of the Government. The Baker investigation has not been pursued with the same enthusiasm an investigation is diligently pursued when the culprit is a person in private industry or is outside the Government. I do not believe any Member of the Senate will say that the Baker investigation has been pursued by the Senate committee with any degree of enthusiasm. I have said, rather, that it has been approached in the manner of a little boy who must take a dose of castor oil or a boy meeting Dad in the woodshed. The disclosures that have been made by the committee have been in spite of what they wanted to do, not as a result of any effort on the committee's part to get to the bottom of the matter. That investigation is a shocking indictment of the Senate.

Today we are asked to confirm the nomination of a man to a position of U.S. attorney, or prosecuting attorney, in the district where Mr. Baker will be prosecuted if he is indicted. Doubt will arise in the minds of many laymen, if they do not arise in the minds of the attorneys who are members of the Committee on the Judiciary. Can there be any dissociation by Mr. Bress from his activities as attorney for Mr. Baker?

That is no charge on Mr. Bress. No question is raised about his sincerity when he said, "I would disassociate myself from any connection with Baker's prosecution." The same applies to the Attorney General. I realize that Attorney General Katzenbach is an honorable man.

The chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] is an honorable man. It is gratifying to see the Senator from Mississippi and the Attorney General with their arms around each other, walking down the asile in support of nomination. It is rather interesting. I am glad to see these two great men so united on this question. I suppose that they will be pursuing their practice of walking down the hall, carrying the banner for many measures in the months to come.

I know of the tremendous respect that each has for the court, as they join hand in hand to back the confirmation of this nomination of Mr. Bress, the attorney for Mr. Baker. This nomination should be labeled the Katzenbach-Eastland choice. I suppose that they will both regret seeing this close relationship brought to an end, or perhaps, the excuse for it being brought to an end.

Mr. President, in all fairness to themselves, in fairness to Mr. Bress, and in fairness to all concerned I believe that this nomination should have been withheld.

As I said before, in making this statement, I do not question the good intentions of the men to disassociate themselves. However, I call to the attention of Senators who are lawyers the fact that on many occasions in selecting a jury they have challenged the most responsible men who have ever resided in their town or city. They may have had tremendous respect for those men, but they challenged them as jurors in a particular case. Why was that done? It was not because the lawyer questioned the character or integrity of the prospective juror, but because the lawyer knew of the prospective juror's previous relationship with a litigant and wondered if, in all fairness, he could disassociate himself from some preconceived opinion that he might have. The prospective jurors were challenged very properly.

I have served on petit juries. I have been challenged on such juries. I have never taken such a challenge as a token of disrespect. I know that the challenge was made because of a close relationship that I had with a party in the lawsuit and that the question in the minds of the attorney was: "Can John Williams disassociate himself from his previous knowledge of this defendant so that it will not be a factor in his making up his mind?"

Is not a similar question in order as we confirm Mr. Bress?

With all my respect for lawyers, I do not believe that they are supermen. They cannot pull the curtain down and say, "I will forget all my knowledge up to this point and proceed from here on." They cannot do it. They are human—I hope so, at least. Therefore, they are subject to all the frailties of human nature, and so is the prosecuting attorney.

I question whether Mr. Bress, as a man who formerly defended Mr. Baker, can proceed with enthusiasm to prosecute should there be an indictment against Mr. Baker.

I disagree completely, as did the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], with the flimsy excuse that Mr. Bress did not know that Mr. Baker was involved.

I will be frank. Had he said in the beginning, "Yes, I represented Serv-U Corp. and Mr. Baker, and that case is over. I will dissasociate myself from that," I would have had far more respect for him then.

When Mr. Bress states: "I represented Serv-U Corp., but I did not know that Bobby Baker was connected with it until it was all over," I believe that statement proves him to be unworthy of confirmation to such a post. If he did not know that Baker was connected with the corporation, if he is that naive, how is he to know where the dividing line is? What is he separating himself from?

I do not believe that in a closely held corporation one can possibly represent the corporation without knowing who negotiates the settlements and who does not.

As I said before, the documents which I am having printed in the Record today, signed by David G. Bress, representing Bobby Baker, Fred Black, and Ernest Tucker, presented them as being stockholders of Serv-U Corp. and the Serv-U Corp. itself.

He was trying to withhold the actual relationship and how much stock each held until the case was settled. He had a right to do that as a lawyer. However, that does not mean that he did not personally know. He said in the document, "I do not want to tell Mr. Hill because it would help him in his case." He was trying to withhold that information, but he was not trying to withhold it on the basis that he did not possess the information.

At the time that this information came out in the newspapers Mr. Baker was making his denial.

I appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration with a financial statement of February 1, 1963. That was 8 months prior to the time that Bress was hired. In filing for an application for a loan Mr. Baker had mentioned among his assets 2,850 shares of Serv–U Corp. stock, valued at $1 million.

He said it was pledged as collateral with the Fidelity National Bank & Trust Co. in Oklahoma City, Okla., for a loan that he had obtained for the purpose of buying the vending machines.

I raise that point with all due respect to the legal profession. I hope that they do not detract from themselves.

Certainly Mr. Bress knew something about this, because when I had this matter placed in the Record, although I did not release it to the press, under the established procedures the information was released within approximately 24 hours. Every newspaper in Washington had the information that the committee had knowledge of the fact that this had been done and that Baker was a partner.

I do not believe that there is any question about it. For him to come down to the Judiciary Committee or to make a statement to the press that: "I really did not know that he was a partner in the company," is difficult to believe. I shall not say that I do not believe it; however, I do say that if it is true he is a little too naive to handle this job and I do not believe that his nomination should be confirmed.

Mr. President, I wonder if it would be better to proceed with the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David G. Bress to be U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I move that the nomination be recommitted to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Mondale in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have outlined my basic reasons why I thought——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

I ask that Senators please remain in attendance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the cooperation of the majority leader, and I accept his statement as a compliment to my speaking ability, because he knows that what I have to say will be worth listening to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was so intended.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my statement and testimoney given before the Senate Judiciary Committee in support of this nomination be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Testimony of Senator John J. Williams Before the Senate Judiciary Committee Concerning the Nomination of Mr. David C. Bress for U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, September 21, 1965

I want to make it clear that my opposition to Mr. Bress is not on the basis that he acted as an attorney for one of Bobby Baker's companies. Under our system of justice Mr. Baker is entitled to his day in court and is entitled to be represented by counsel.

The fact that some attorney serves in the capacity as legal counsel for Mr. Baker most certainly does not bar that man from eligibility to hold public office, and had Mr. Bress been nominated for some other official position which was less sensitive than that of U.S. attorney in the district in which Mr. Baker's case is pending I would not be filing an objection.

I realize that the Department of Justice has stated that it is handling and will continue to handle Mr. Baker's case before the grand jury, and I realize that no doubt Mr. Bress will say that he intends to disassociate himself from this case; but can he?

The office of the U.S. attorney in the District of Columbia will undoubtedly become the headquarters for the prosecution of the Baker case should he be indicted by the grand jury. It would be impossible under such circumstances for Mr. Bress not to be aware of the progress being made in the preparation of the case.

In all fairness to Mr. Bress he should not be put in this position, and in all fairness to the American people, who have a right to insist that the Baker case be presented to the grand jury and pursued without favoritism, this element of doubt as to how it is being handled should not be ejected into the case.

As one of the former attorneys for Mr. Baker no doubt Mr. Bress through his client relationship has much information which would be of tremendous benefit to the Department of Justice in the development of its case against Mr. Baker.

For Mr. Bress to make available all of his knowledge thus obtained would be a violation of the attorney-client relationship. On the other hand, if Mr. Bress withheld his knowledge obtained through such client relationship (as he would be expected to do) it would result in this situation—an acting U.S. attorney withholding evidence from a grand jury which was directly under his jurisdiction.

It is common knowledge that a Federal grand jury is at work in the District of Columbia on the affairs of Mr. Robert G. Baker. Although Mr. Bress might disassociate himself from the work of the Baker grand jury I do not believe this is enough. Surely we all agree there must not only be an investigation that is thorough and aggressive but also one that appears to be thorough and aggressive in every respect.

The public must be shown that the activities of Mr. Baker will be investigated and prosecuted in the same manner as any other influence peddler. The appearances in the Baker case are particularly important because of the former influential position he held as secretary to the majority in the Senate and because of his past associations with some of the highest public figures in this Nation. The public must be shown that there is no double standard of justice.

Mr. Baker's case is particularly sensitive from the standpoint of the U.S. Senate by virtue of the fact that for many years he served as a top official of that body. To avoid further criticism of either the Senate or the courts either the nomination of Mr. Bress should be withdrawn by the administration or action on his confirmation held up until after this case has been disposed of.

If the administration did not know that Mr. Bress represented Serv-U in the civil suit that launched the Baker investigation then someone was lax in his preliminary study in recommending this nomination.

If the facts were known by the administration and others then the nomination can only be regarded as a complete disregard for normal ethical sensitivity and for public opinion.

I conclude my remarks by emphasizing once again that I am not appearing here today to raise any question concerning the personal integrity or capabilities of Mr. David C. Bress, but I am raising a serious question as to the propriety or advisability of his being appointed to the sensitive position as U.S. attorney in the District of Columbia during the time in which Mr. Baker's case is being presented to the grand jury and if indicted, during the time his case will be prosecuted in the District courts.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I make that request, because I wish to make it clear that I had no intention whatsoever of raising any other points. At that time, as I have said, I had never heard any questions raised in connection with Mr. Bress which would suggest any lack of integrity or lack of ability on his part to perform the job. As I have emphasized over and over again, my objection has not been based on the fact that he represented Bobby Baker, or that he represented a corporation. Bobby Baker was entitled to his counsel, and certainly we want nothing of guilt by association.

I did raise a queston as to the advisability of confirming, as the chief prosecuting attorney of the District of

Columbia, the nomination of a man who only a few months ago was defending Mr. Baker.

After the committee hearing and after the nomination had been reported by the committee the FBI started a special investigation. That is a highly unusual procedure. Until the last few weeks I had never heard of FBI investigations being conducted so freely after nominations were sent down, rather than before. Yesterday, there was an incident involving the case of a judge where the FBI investigation was performed after the fact, apparently in an effort to prove the propriety of the nomination, rather than, as one might have expected, to find out the facts before the nomination.

At any rate, shortly after the nomination of Mr. Bress had been reported to the Senate my attention was called to the fact that the FBI was scrambling all over Washington, apparently using all its resources to check something in connection with Mr. Bress. Being human I was somewhat curious. So, I, too, did a little checking.

I mentioned the investigation to the junior Senator from Nebraska, who was on the committee. He knew nothing about it. I mentioned it to the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]. He had not heard of it. Both of those gentlemen were members of the committee.

I mentioned it to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the chairman of the committee. Much to my surprise he had not heard of it either. I was certain he would have heard of it, considering the very close relationship which exists between the Attorney General and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the support of their man. Therefore, I was amazed to discover that he had not heard of the investigation. But he had not, and he said he would find out about it.

He did find out about it. A week ago Friday I mentioned it to him in his office. At that time, I still had not sent one word to the press, and I did not intend to.

On a Monday, when we were about to vote on the cloture motion, Mr. EASTLAND came over to this side of the aisle, approached the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who was sitting here, and stated that he had had an opportunity to read the FBI report, that it disturbed him, and that he thought there were features he had to go into.

I never asked for further investigation by the committee. He did it. Members of the committee proceeded with their investigation and issued their report. I have a copy of the hearings. I remind Senators that there was no nomination before them, but these were more or less unofficial hearings that were held by the subcommittee.

The committee reported back that it had found nothing wrong with the nomination, and it was scheduled to be brought up last Tuesday. I was ready to discuss it. The nomination was laid before the Senate, and suddenly, from some mysterious somewhere, a suspicion developed that it would be well for the committee to do a little more homework. I was standing here ready to discuss the nomination when for some reason, all of a sudden the nomination was pulled back, and I could not even say what I had to say. The Senate proceeded with other business.

Another set of hearings was held. I understand there have been two or three hearings since then. One was held yesterday. I do not believe there have been any hearings this morning. If so, I have not seen them. If any Senator knows of any he may say so.

I respect the fact that the committee has investigated this case—which was raised, I emphasize, not by me, but by the Department of Justice—and I understand that they see nothing at all wrong so far as that case is concerned. I wish to make it clear that we are discussing that case only, not the previous argument which I made and which I think was sufficient reason for question.

Perhaps these questions which have come to my mind have been answered fully by the committee. I read the testimony last night. I find that I still have a few questions. I wonder if we might get them cleared up here by following the chronology and making it a matter of record. I am not saying that this procedure is wrong; I am not saying it is right. I would not raise the questions if they did not exist in my own mind. That may be accepted as a fact. This may be the way the legal profession operates. It may be very proper. If it is and I have misunderstood, let us find it out.

I had always understood that there was a certain code of ethics and standards by which the judiciary and the legal profession operated. After reading the testimony, I obtained from the District Bar Association sections 15 and 16 from their Canon of Professional Ethics. I shall later ask that they be printed in the RECORD, but at this point I shall read section 16. I do not say this section was violated; I shall let the record speak for itself:

> A lawyer should use his best efforts to restrain and to prevent his clients from doing those things which the lawyer himself ought not to do, particularly with reference to their conduct toward courts, judicial officers, jurors, witnesses, and suitors. If a client persists in such wrong-doing the lawyer should terminate their relation.

That is section 16. I ask that section 15 be printed in the RECORD also, because it shows that, at least on paper, the bar association does have a standard of conduct of which we may all be proud.

There being no objection, the sections of the canon were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION CANON OF PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

SECTION 15. HOW FAR A LAWYER MAY GO IN SUPPORTING A CLIENT'S CAUSE

Nothing operates more certainly to create or to foster popular prejudice against lawyers as a class, and to deprive the profession of that full measure of public esteem and confidence which belongs to the proper discharge of its duties than does the false claim, often set up by the unscrupulous in defense of questionable transactions, that it is the duty of the lawyer to do whatever may enable him to succeed in winning his client's cause.

* * * * *

The lawyer owes "entire devotion to the interest of the client, warm zeal in the maintenance and defense of his rights and the exertion of his utmost learnings and ability," to the end that nothing be taken or be withheld from him, save by the rules of law, legally applied. No fear of judicial disfavor or public unpopularity should restrain him from the full discharge of his duty. In the judicial forum the client is entitled to the benefit of any and every remedy and defense that is authorized by the law of the land, and he may expect his lawyer to assert every such remedy or defense. But it is steadfastly to be borne in mind that the great trust of the lawyer is to be performed within and not without the bounds of the law. The office of attorney does not permit, much less does it demand of him for any client, violation of law or any manner of fraud or chicane. He must obey his own conscience and not that of his client.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But the questions that came to my mind I raise again, not having in mind any charges but merely as a layman who feels very humble as he approaches the bar of these great jurists on the Judiciary Committee. I almost feel that it is sacrilegious even to ask these questions, but I presume to dare to do it.

In the questioning, this point was raised:

> Senator HRUSKA. Mr. Newmyer, was there any offer made to Jean, the widow of Melvin, for a settlement of $90,000 or thereabouts as her husband's share of the Harry Viner estate?
>
> Mr. NEWMYER. I do not recall such.

Continuing reading, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] asked:

> In other words, if you will pardon me so I will understand, the $90,000 may have been an offer at a time when she—when his estate had less than its share of the outstanding stock in the company, and prior to the time that they undertook to equalize it so each would have an equal share.
>
> If they were trying to procure it then, they may have very well—what was in her name at that time or what was in the estate's name—offered the $90,000, but after it was equalized, it was worth——
>
> Senator HRUSKA. That is what I thought Mr. Newmyer said, that prior to the time that that long-range plan to equalize on a one-third basis for each third brother, maybe Melvin's estate had those shares, had only enough shares in it, to equalize $90,000 in value. I do not know that any offer was made.
>
> Senator MCCLELLAN. He says no offer there. I do not know.
>
> Senator HRUSKA. Would that have been true?
>
> Mr. BRESS. If I may interject, I have learned about this in the last few days because I am concerned. It is my impression, which is all hearsay, that there never was any $90,000 offer.

Mr. President, this was Mr. Bress' testimony before what we may call the Judiciary Committee hearings on October 12.

Now I read that, and then I examined a deposition which is on record in the district court, filed there December 5, 1955, under Civil Action No. 2805-55; and this question was asked by Mr. Sundlun, the attorney for the widow:

> Are you aware that the executors acting through your office, have filed a copy of an

inventory of his assets in which Melvin Viner's stock is roughly valued at about $183,000?

Mr. Bress. Would you let me see the document to which you refer?

It is correct that you were furnished with a list of assets of the estate of Melvin Viner by my office through Mr. Alvin L. Newmyer, which was a preliminary inventory as furnished to our firm by the accounting firm of Councilor, Buchanan, Mitchell & Hayes. And the figures $183,657.11, representing the book value as of December 31, 1954, of the 229 shares of stock in Arcade-Sunshine Co. which were in the name of Melvin Viner.

I will skip a little—perhaps I had better read it all. This is Mr. Sundlun again:

Now, as an officer and director of the corporation, do you know whether the book value of that stock changed markedly between December 31, 1954, and January 8, 1955?

Answer. I do not know, but I would not think that it changed at all.

Question. Then is this book value referred to in the management and survivorship agreement for the purposes of settling the price of any stock purchased under the management and survivorship agreement?

Answer. I believe so. I don't know of any other book value. The firm has had the same CPA's running their affairs for many, many years. They were there before December 1954, and they are still there.

Question. And one-half of this book value which is reported would be in the neighborhood of $91,000, would it not?

Answer. The arithmetic is right.

Question. And if the terms of the agreement are to require payment of one-third cash, this would require a payment of in the neighborhood of 30,000 and some odd dollars, would it not?

Answer. That is right.

Question. Do you know whether the directors of the corporation have taken any steps to make any such payment to the estate of Melvin A. Viner?

Answer. Yes, they did.

Question. What steps did they take?

Answer. Within the time provided for in the contract the corporation delivered to the executors a check for that amount, for the amount of the downpayment, and a note for the balance, payable in accordance with the terms of the contract.

Question. And that check was in the neighborhood of $30,000?

Answer. $30,000.

Question. And if the agreement is enforced and carried out, is it your understanding that the income from the $30,000 plus the annual payments required over a 15-year period would be the sole compensation payable to the estate of Melvin A. Viner from his interest in Arcade-Sunshine Co., Inc.

Mr. Newmyer. I think your question is objectionable. It calls for the witness to give a legal conclusion.

Mr. President, the witness was David G. Bress. David G. Bress was the one who was giving the deposition in which he said they had offered this $90,000. Now why did he say there was no such offer? How could the facts quoted above be reconciled with the following statement made by Mr. Bress to the committee.

If I may interject, I have learned about this in the last few days because I am concerned. It is my impression, which is all hearsay, that there never was any $90,000 offer.

This is the same Mr. Bress who did not know who his client was that he was representing.

I understand that this discrepancy in his testimony was read to Mr. Bress, and in his testimony yesterday he claimed that he had not understood the question at that time.

The question was clear.

I shall not put his explanation in the Record. As a layman I cannot understand it.

Those are not all the points raised concerning the $90,000 in the official record. We find references other than Mr. Bress' statement.

I read now from the court records filed January 15, 1957, in the final settlement. This statement is made by Mr. Sundlun:

The stock owned by the Melvin Viner family at the time of death was valued at $181,000. Subject to the management and survivorship agreement it would have been paid for at half of book value or roughly $90,000. The terms of the management and survivorship agreement required payment to be one-third cash and the balance in a 15-year unsecured note. So that payment would have been made of one $30,000 cash and the balance to be paid over 15 years at the rate of $4,000 a year, principal.

Yet Mr. Bress denies any knowledge of any such an offer as $90,000.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In just a moment. I hope that the Senator from Nebraska can enlighten us further on this question. Perhaps he can give us the benefit of a fifth hearing with Mr. Bress. Maybe there has been one.

It appears to me, as a layman, that those two statements cannot be reconciled. I believe that same position was taken by two members of the committee when they read it in the beginning. They felt that this required an answer. It is one of the points to consider because it shows the importance of the committee having gone into this matter; not that this is a major factor, let me make that clear. I do not say that it is a major factor, but I point it out to show the forgetfulness of Mr. Bress. This offer was made; and I am sure that is what the Senator from Nebraska had in mind when he asked the question, even though Mr. Bress or Mr. Newmyer may not have had it in mind when they answered the question. Nevertheless, I believe that it is this offer which the Senator from Nebraska had in mind, and I think he will admit that he did not feel he got a sufficient answer at that time.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Delaware has referred to a deposition of December 5, from which he read. The portion which he read he uses as a basis for saying an offer of $90,000 was made to the widow for settlement of her estate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; I merely read what he said.

Mr. HRUSKA. I respectfully differ with the statement of the Senator, because he has several times referred to an offer which was made. I should like to ask him to read any portion of that deposition which refers to an offer of settlement for $90,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will read it again.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator infers and tries to imply——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No.

Mr. HRUSKA. I want to say to him that the delivery of the check for $30,000 and a note of $60,000 was not an offer of settlement. It was the delivery of those documents to the survivor of the estate pursuant to the contract which had been entered into by the three brothers. It was done because there was a time limit within which the tender would have to be made in order that the terms of the contract should be fulfilled. It was not offered, nor were the documents offered, in the nature of a settlement to the widow of her estate. That question was fully settled in the testimony of Mr. Newmyer, Mr. Bress, and Mr. Philipson. Their testimony was that there was no offer of $90,000. The only thing that happened under the contract was the tendering of the check and note, in compliance with the agreement, and it was not given by way of an offer of full and final settlement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No one said it was a full and final settlement. I did say it was an offer of settlement, and it was. That was the question. All I can say is that if the Senator from Nebraska offered me a check for $30,000 and a note for $60,000, I would consider it an offer of settlement.

On another point I understand that in the testimony yesterday both Viner brothers admitted they had testified falsely in giving the deposition. I do not think there is any question about that.

I read from page 104, when the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] was questioning Leonard Viner:

Senator Hruska. Now, when your deposition was taken in December 1955, you answered that those stock certificates were signed as of the dates they bore. When did you first become aware that you were erroneous in that answer?

Mr. Viner. Senator, I will be honest with you, that I was very emotionally distraught, and I was very confused that day. I had lost a lot of sleep over my brother. That is no apology. When I found out later that I was in error, I immediately corrected it, sir.

When his brother was testifying yesterday before the committee, the Senator from Nebraska asked Robert Viner this question:

Senator Hruska. You also gave an answer in the deposition of December 5 that the certificates had been signed on the dates they bore, which was an incorrect answer. When did you first discover that it was an incorrect answer?

Mr. Viner. I knew it was incorrect when I gave it.

Senator Hruska. You did?

Mr. Viner. Yes, sir.

Both these men—clients of David Bress—admit they lied under oath, yet Mr. Bress disclaims any responsibility.

His firm did try to get the official reporter to make a change in the record without notifying either the widow's lawyer or the court.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. What relationship has Mr. Bress to the question whether the answers that were given were true or false? Will the Senator tell me what connection Mr. Bress had with the false answers?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. Bress was their attorney. I know that the Bar Association has a code of ethics with regard to the relationship of lawyer and client. He is not supposed to sit back and let his clients commit perjury.

Mr. HRUSKA. The record will show that as soon as the falsity of those answers was made known to Mr. Bress, he insisted that steps be taken immediately to have them corrected. He did what any lawyer would have done under the circumstances.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. How soon did he do it? That is the question.

Mr. HRUSKA. Shortly after the deposition had been given and written up. It was either Mr. Newmyer or Mr. Philipson, his associate, who pointed out that there were false answers in the testimony which they signed as to the date on the certificates they signed. Mr. Bress immediately said steps must be taken to correct those answers, so the canons of ethics to which the Senator has referred were complied with.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is the Senator sure? Since we are dealing with facts only—the Senator has no proof other than his statement. What was the date?

Mr. HRUSKA. I do not remember the exact date.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I believe Mr. Bress told the committee they were corrected 10 months before the settlement. The fact is the final agreement on the changes was not approved until about 4 weeks before settlement.

What was the understanding the Senator from Nebraska had, that it was cleared up quickly? The record does not show such to be the case.

Mr. HRUSKA. As I remember, the depositions were filed either in the latter part of January or the first part of February, and it was at that time that the corrections were made in the record.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Sure the corrections were made in the record; but they were not accepted by both sides until nearly a year later.

Mr. HRUSKA. A motion was filed pursuant to rule 30(e) of the court rules, and that was pending, as to acceptance by the court, before the changes had been made.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The changes had not been accepted by the court.

Mr. HRUSKA. Not by the court, but certainly, considering Mr. Bress' connection with the testimony, the Senator would agree that there had been compliance with the canons of ethics, and that Mr. Bress did the right thing, and did it promptly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Nebraska will admit that Bress was an attorney of record.

Yet he did not notify either the widow or her attorney that new stock certificates had been issued after the death of her husband and backdated 4 years to make it appear that they were issued while he was living. His two clients had lied about this point when asked about the transaction under oath and yet am I to understand that the committee sees nothing wrong and is willing to accept Mr. Bress' statement that—"well maybe it was wrong but I did not know about it." In my opinion had this fraudulent transaction not been discovered by the widow's attorney she would have been defrauded of her rightful estate.

Mr. Bress was giving a deposition the same day that the Viner brothers gave a deposition in which they admit they gave false testimony—and we might as well use the word "perjury." Mr. Bress was not in the room at that time. I believe he had left after he gave his deposition, but it was called to his attention promptly.

When he came back to the office, he was told about it, and we are told he took immediate steps to have it corrected.

Did he call to the attention of the widow or her attorney the fact that erroneous statements had been made? He did not. Did he advise the court at that time that his clients had made erroneous statements? He did not. Did he try to have this perjured statement corrected? He did. He tried to get the court reporter to change the records without notifying the court.

Would it not be a proper, normal step to notify the court and the widow's attorney?

Mr. HRUSKA. When the deposition is written up by the court reporter it is then submitted to the witness for his reading and signature. It is not a deposition until that occurs.

When the depositions were submitted to the witnesses, as I understand, both witnesses, it was testified—and the record so shows—changed those answers in the record, as filed in the court. The depositions were filed in court. That is a public record of the depositions. It is free to the world. It is a public record.

That is exactly what happened, and that is what is testified to in the deposition.

But I should like to come back to the question, What is the connection between the falsity of those answers and Mr. Bress?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that he let me outline the questions in my mind and then if he wishes he can rise and say, "I, as a practicing attorney in Nebraska, would handle the estate in exactly the same manner as did Mr. Bress; I see nothing wrong with it; and I would do it."

I point out to the Senator from Nebraska that Mr. Bress himself told the committee he thought they made a mistake in issuing these stock certificates without notifying the court.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Will the Senator yield on that point for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I realize the tremendous responsibility that the Senator from Nebraska has as spokesman for the committee.

I have a right to outline these questions, and the Senator from Nebraska, as counsel for the defense, can respond.

As I recall it the Senator from Nebraska, in my office said that he, too, had a question about the $90,000 and wanted to ask Mr. Bress about it. But now he is satisfied.

Mr. HRUSKA. If the Senator does not want to yield to the Senator from Nebraska after addressing a question to him——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, yes. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I do not think that is in order. But when the Senator refers to the Senator from Nebraska and says afterward to the Senator from Nebraska, "Would not he have done it that way?" the answer is that I would not have done it that way.

Show me a lawyer who has not made a mistake and I will show the Senator a lawyer who has not tried a case or practiced law.

Where is the culpability? Where is the connection of all of this with Mr. Bress? Where is the culpability?

I suggest that perhaps the Senator should proceed with his normal questions, and then I shall take the floor and try to answer them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator.

Mr. Viner died on January 8, 1955, and on January 24 of the same year, Mr. Bress filed a motion to probate the will.

On the same date he filed a document asking the court that he be appointed to represent both the brothers and the widow. He was representing both.

Mr. President, in order to preserve the correct chronology I ask unanimous consent that these documents be printed in the RECORD.

I ask, first, that the January 24, 1955, document be printed in the RECORD, when Mr. Bress filed the will for probate.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTAMENTARY

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, holding probate court]

PETITION FOR PROBATE OF WILL AND LETTERS

(In re estate of Melvin A. Viner, deceased—Administration No. 86960)

The petition of Leonard R. Viner and Robert L. Viner respectfully represents to this Honorable Court as follows:

1. That they are citizens of the United States and residents of the District of Columbia, of adult age, and not under any legal disability, and they make this application as the executors nominated in the last will and testament of the above-named decedent.

2. That Melvin A. Viner, late, an adult citizen of the United States, domiciled in the District of Columbia, died on the 8th day of January, 1955, leaving a paper in the nature of a last will and testament, bearing date the 9th day of September, 1953 in which these petitioners are named as executors,

which said will is now on file in the office of the Register of Wills for the District of Columbia; that no other paper in the nature of testamentary disposition of the decedent's estate has been found, although search has been made, and these petitioners believe that the above mentioned paper is in fact the last will and testament of said decedent.

3. That said testator was survived by his widow, Jeanne S. Viner, an adult, who resides in the District of Columbia, and by two minor children; a son Michael A. Viner, age 10 (born on February 27, 1944), and a daughter, Karen Viner, age 7 (born on September 9, 1947). Said two minor children reside in the District of Columbia with their mother at the Westchester Apartments, 4000 Cathedral Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. Said testator was also survived by his mother, Mrs. Ray Viner, 2480 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C., and by his two brothers, the petitioners herein.

4. At the time of his death, said testator was not seized of any real estate in the District of Columbia except a certain cooperative apartment designated as 645B, Westchester Apartments, 4000 Cathedral Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., purchased by him in December 1953, at a cost of $5,600 on account of which he has paid approximately $700, which represents his equity therein.

5. Said testator was possessed, at the time of his death, of personal property having a total estimated value of $300,000 and consisting of cash in bank, securities and notes receivable.

6. The debts of the decedent consist principally of the expenses of his last illness and funeral, estimated at $5,000.

Wherefore, petitioners pray, as follows:

1. That citation may issue against the above named heirs at law and next of kin.
2. That guardian ad litem be appointed to represent the minors, Michael A. Viner and Karen Viner at the hearing of the application to admit the will to probate.
3. That said paper writing, dated the 9th day of September 1953, be admitted to probate and record as the last will and testament of Melvin A. Viner, deceased, as to both real and personal property.
4. That letters testamentary issue to these petitioners as the executors named in the will.
5. And for such other and further relief as the nature of the case may require and to this Honorable Court shall seem proper.

Leonard R. Viner,
Robert L. Viner.
Newmyer & Bress,
David G. Bress,
Attorneys for Petitioners.

District of Columbia, SS:

We, the undersigned, Leonard R. Viner and Robert L. Viner, solemnly swear that we have read the foregoing and annexed petition by us subscribed and know the contents thereof; that the facts therein stated of our personal knowledge are true and those stated upon information and belief we believe to be true.

Leonard R. Viner.
Robert L. Viner.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 19th day of January 1955.

Hugh H. Creamer,
Notary Public, District of Columbia.

I personally guarantee the payment of costs amounted to $15.

David G. Bress,
Attorney.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask unanimous consent that the next document which Mr. Bress filed as the attorney for the widow and the brother be printed. This is under the date of January 24, 1955.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Holding Probate Court]

Consent To Probate and Nominal Special Undertaking

(In re estate of Melvin A. Viner, deceased—Administration No. 86960)

We, the undersigned, being adults and the only heirs at law and next of kin of Melvin A. Viner, deceased, having read and being fully acquainted with the contents of the Will of said decedent bearing date the 9th day of September, 1953, and having read and being fully acquainted with the contents of the petition of Leonard R. Viner and Robert L. Viner for the probate and record of said Will and for other purposes, bearing date the —th day of January, 1955, do hereby waive citation or notice by publication insofar as we are concerned and hereby expressly waive right to the file a caveat to said Will, and we do hereby consent and request as follows: That the said Will bearing date the 9th day of September, 1953, be admitted to probate and record as a Will of real and personal property; that letters testamentary be granted to Leonard R. Viner and Robert L. Viner as the executors nominated in said Will; and that said executors be permitted to qualify by giving a special undertaking, and that the penalty of said special undertaking be fixed by the Court in a nominal amount only, and without regard to protection of our several legacies or interests in said estate.

Dated at Washington, D.C., this —th day of January, 1955.

Jeanne S. Viner,
Widow.

Witness: David G. Bress

Ray Viner,
Mother.

Witness: David G. Bress

Leonard R. Viner,
Brother.

Witness: David G. Bress

Robert L. Viner,
Brother.

Witness: Hugh H. Cramer

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The following day the Bress law firm bought 100 blank stock certificates. They were still representing the widow.

I ask unanimous consent that the invoice for these stock certificates purchased by Newmyer & Bress be printed at this point.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Chas. G. Stott & Co., Inc.,
Stationers and Office Outfitters,
Washington, D.C.

Invoice number: 06625.
Date sold: January 25, 1955.
Sold by: Heinly.
Charge.
Sold to: Newmyer and Bress:
Deliver to Rust Building.
Quantity ordered: 100 No. 509 Goes certificates; $6 a hundred; sales tax, 12 cents; total $6.12.

Received the above items in good condition:

Newmyer & Bress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. These stock certificates were reissued and dated back 4 years without the knowledge of the widow. Remember these stocks were part of an estate. Mr. Bress admits now that she should have been notified.

It was at the end of February that Mr. Bress was removed as attorney for the widow and Mr. Sundlun was brought in.

Three days later, on March 10, 1955, the Bress law firm, through Mr. Philipson, wrote to the Goes Lithograph Co. in Chicago, asking whether there was any way that stock certificates purchased then could be distinguished from certificates purchased several years before. They had already issued the certificates, signed them in 1955, and dated back to 1950. Under oath both brothers denied that but later admitted they lied. Mr. Philipson sat there and knew about it while they gave their false statements. As Mr. Bress' partner, he was taking his place at the depositions.

The bar association says that a lawyer should use his best effort to restrain and prevent his client from giving false testimony, and if a client persists in such wrongdoing, the lawyer should terminate the relationship.

Yet the attorney taking the place of Mr. Bress sat there while this perjured statement was given and made no objection whatsoever.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter that Mr. Philipson, representing the Bress law firm, wrote to the Goes Lithograph Co. asking whether anybody who looked at the certificate could tell they did wrong, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Newmyer & Bress,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1955.

Goes Lithograph Co.,
Chicago, Ill.

Gentlemen: Enclosed is a stock certificate blank which I have purchased from a local stationery store. I have been using this particular form for several years.

I would like to know the year in which you first manufactured and sold in the Washington area this particular form Goes 509 in its present appearance. (If there has ever been any change in appearance.)

In addition, I would like to know, if possible, the date when this particular blank which is enclosed herewith was manufactured and sold in the Washington area.

Your cooperation in furnishing this information promptly will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,
Albert Philipson.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The lithograph company replied and stated in effect that they had been using this form since 1927 and there was no way anybody could tell it. I ask that their reply be printed in the Record.

With this letter the firm of Mr. Bress felt safe. They did not think they could be caught substituting certificates by backdating them.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

March 15, 1955.

Newmyer & Bress,
Washington, D.C.
(Attention: Albert Philipson.)

Dear Sir: We have received your letter of March 10 and are afraid that we cannot give you all of the information you have requested pertaining to our No. 509 certificate blank.

However, our records indicate that the certificates were published and copyrighted

April 1, 1927, and we received the copies from the Copyright Office April 4, 1927, under entry class KXXc No. 224845. However, we have no way of determining when these certificates were first sold in the Washington area.

In checking our records we do not find that the design has been changed in any shape or form since the date of publication.

Sincerely yours,

GOES LITHOGRAPHING CO.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Subsequently, the attorney for the widow was getting more suspicious of these documents. He suspicioned that they may have been printed or issued after the death of the man and that they may have been postdated.

Therefore, he checked further with the printing company to see if there was not some way that they could tell. At first they repeated what they had said before, that there was no way of telling. Then someone mentioned that they had changed their printing processes whereby it could be detected if the certificates had been printed since 1953.

Mr. Sundlun then came back and established that the Bress firm had bought some new stock certificates, and he had them examined by the lithograph company in Chicago. The manager of the company gave them an affidavit to the effect that the certificates, in question, which bore the date of 1951, before the date of death of Mr. Viner, were the new certificates and had been purchased by the Bress law firm. They had been dated back as though they had been issued prior to the death.

I ask unanimous consent that the affidavit be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the certificate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There being no objection, the certificate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFFIDAVIT

State of Illinois, County of Cook, ss:

Now comes Charles B. Goes III and, being duly sworn, deposes that:

He is the vice president and treasurer of the Goes Lithographing Co., 42 West 61st Street, Chicago, Ill., that the Goes Co. produces a blank stock certificate No. 509, that such certificate is green on its back and green with a black eagle, black description blanks and black lettering on its face; that on March 11, 1955, the Goes Co. received a letter addressed to the "Goes Lithograph Co.", dated March 10, 1955, written on the letterhead of Newmyer & Bress, 1001 15th Street, NW., Washington 5, D.C., signed by Albert Philipson, and stating:

"GENTLEMEN: Enclosed is a stock certificate blank which I have purchased from a local stationery store. I have been using this particular form for several years.

"I would like to know the year in which you first manufactured and sold in the Washington area this particular form Goes 509 in its present appearance (if there has ever been any change in appearance).

"In addition, I would like to know if possible the date when this particular blank which is enclosed herewith was manufactured and sold in the Washington area.

"Your cooperation in furnishing this information promptly will be appreciated."

That on March 15, 1955, the Goes Co. replied to said letter by writing Newmyer & Bress, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington 5, D.C., Attention: Albert Philipson, and stating that:

"DEAR SIR: We have received your letter of March 10 and are afraid that we cannot give you all of the information you have requested pertaining to our No. 509 certificate blank.

"However, our records indicate that the certificates were published and copyrighted April 1, 1927, and we received the copies from the copyright office April 4, 1927, under entry class KXXc No. 224845. However, we have no way of determining when these certificates were first sold in the Washington area.

"In checking our records we do not find that the design has been changed in any shape or form since the date of publication."

That while the Goes Co. has been producing said stock certificate 509 since 1927, the manufacturing process for such certificate was changed in 1952. That up until 1953 stock certificate No. 509 was produced by hand transfer press plate system that commencing in 1953 and since, stock certificate No. 509 has been produced by a photocomposed press plate system, that the two systems are quite different, and that it is possible to recognize stock certificates made under each system because of the differences existing between such certificates.

That according to the books and records of the Goes Co. the proof of stock certificate No. 509 for production under the photocomposed press plate system was not approved in the Goes Co. until March 12, 1952, that the first press plate for such certificate was not made up until March 13, 1952, and that the first photocomposed press plate certificates produced were not printed until March 6, 1953, and that it was therefore not possible for any Goes Co. stock certificates No. 509 manufactured by the photocomposed press plate system to be delivered from the Goes Co. plant prior to March 6, 1953.

That he has examined two Goes Co. stock certificates No. 509, filled out with a typewriter to represent, respectively, 84 shares owned by Michael A. Viner in the Arcade Sunshine Co., Inc., numbered N2, and 54 shares in the same company owned by Karen Viner, numbered N3; that both such certificates are dated the "26th day of December A.D. 1950," that both such stock certificates are signed by Leonard R. Viner, treasurer, and Rober L. Viner, vice president, that both such stock certificates bear the endorsement "transfer of this stock is subject to By-Laws and Agreement of August 17, 1949", that both such certificates bear the inked initials "KB" on the back thereof, and that he has put his own initials "CBG" also on the back thereof.

That careful inspection shows that both such certificates were manufactured by the Goes Co. under the photocomposed press plate system and therefore were produced on or after March 6, 1953, that neither of such certificates was therefore in existence on December 26, 1950, and that many obvious details make clear that such two certificates were manufactured under the photocomposed press plate system, including:

1. The imprint number on the Viner certificates is that which only appears on certificates manufactured under the photocomposed system,

2. The fine lines in the circle of the seal are broken on certificates produced by the hand transfer press plate system and unbroken on the certificates produced by the photocomposed press plate system, and the said lines on the Viner certificates are unbroken.

3. A defect appears on the upper left hand border on the certificates produced by the photocomposed press plate system which does not appear on the certificates produced by the hand transfer press plate system, and the Viner certificates have such a defect in said place,

4. The outside border line on the hand transfer press plate system is broken, and the tint does not register, whereas on the new photocomposed press plate system certificates the said border line is unbroken and the tint does register, and the border line on the Viner certificates is unbroken and the tint thereon does register,

5. The border on the back left hand upper corner is approximately one-sixteenth of an inch longer on certificates produced by the photocomposed press plate system, and the Viner certificates have such longer border,

6. The inside beading line on the back right hand border is broken on certificates produced by the hand transfer press plate system, and unbroken on certificates produced by the photocomposed press plate system, and the said beading line on the Viner certificates is unbroken,

7. The border of the back center panel right and left of the words "capital stock" is different in that the design on such border has been moved about one-quarter of an inch up or down on the certificates produced by the photocomposed press plate system, and the Viner certificates have such moved design on said border of said back center panel.

That, in conclusion, in his opinion, and as supported by the books and records of the Goes Co., the two certificates described above are certificates produced by the photocomposed press plate system, that as such they were produced after March 6, 1953, and that as such they were not in existence on December 26, 1950.

CHARLES B. GOES, III.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 8th day of September, 1955.

"FRED K. ROBUHAW, JR.,
Notary Public.

My commission expires August 23, 1958.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is being argued that no one lost anything by this fraudulent transaction because they were duplicate certificates. I believe the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] will agree that in the administration of an estate it is not legal to postdate certificates or records and put them in the estate file as though they had been signed prior to the death, particularly without telling the court. This should have been called to the attention of the court. They were not even marked duplicates.

Anyway, on December 5, a deposition of the two Viner brothers was taken. It was around the end of December that Mr. Sundlun said he notified the Bress firm that his clients had committed perjury and then suggested they consider settling the case. Figuratively speaking, he had them over a barrel. Their witnesses perjured themselves in their depositions. Now they would be more eager to sit down and settle.

I have overlooked one document which I should like to place in the RECORD. A statement has been made about the great efforts which Mr. Bress and his law firm made to clear up and straighten out the record on these incorrect statements in the depositions.

The fact is the first effort the law firm took to clear their clients of these possible perjury charges was to try to get the official reporter to change the records without the court's knowledge.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an affidavit made by Mr. Wayne Birdsell.

There being no objection, the affidavit was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

AFFIDAVIT OF WAYNE BIRDSELL

(*Leonard R. Viner, et al., plaintiffs* v. *Jeanne S. Viner, et al., defendants*—Civil action No. 2805-55)

Wayne Birdsell, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. That he is employed by Ward & Paul, as office manager;

2. That on December 5, 1955, Mr. Frank Shelburne, employed by Ward & Paul, was sent to 1032 Washington Building to take a deposition in the above-entitled cause;

3. That, after causing the notes taken at the deposition to be transcribed, Ward & Paul caused the typed transcription to be sent to Robert L. Viner and Leonard R. Viner, for their signatures;

4. That the said Robert L. Viner and Leonard R. Viner proffered certain proposed changes in the transcribed copy of the deposition;

5. That Ward & Paul never gave notice to Hahn & Sundlun, attorneys for Jeanne S. Viner, opposing party to Robert L. Viner and Leonard R. Viner of the proposed changes in the testimony they gave December 5, 1955, until after the deposition of Robert L. Viner and Leonard R. Viner, taken December 5, 1955, with proposed changes attached, had been filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

WAYNE BIRDSELL.

District of Columbia, ss:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 13th day of February 1956.

JESSE L. WARD, Jr.,
Notary Public.

My commission expires June 30, 1960.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The affidavit is signed by Mr. Birdsell, official reporter working for Ward & Paul who made the official transcript. The affidavit states that after the transcript had been made, he was approached by the Bress law firm with a request to change the testimony without the knowledge of the court or of counsel representing the widow. That was Mr. Bress' first step to try to correct the record of testimony in which his clients had perjured themselves. That was not a proper procedure to take. He should have promptly notified the court and counsel for the widow.

A question was raised as to various motions to suppress the changes. If changes could be made without objection, why the delay? Once these changes were approved by the court the clients of Mr. Bress' law firm would be taken off the hook; they would not be subject to the charge of having made perjured statements in a deposition.

But the widow's attorney properly saw a chance to use this leverage to get a better settlement for his client, the widow, and he took advantage of it.

The deceit of the Bress law firm in backdating these stock certificates had backfired.

To minimize this point Mr. Bress said the corrections were made 10 months before final settlement in December 1956. In committee this question was asked Mr. Bress:

> When did you first gain knowledge about it and the issuance of this stock?
>
> To the best of my recollection, I gained knowledge of it in December 1955 after a certain deposition was taken on December 5.

In his most recent testimony before the Judiciary Committee Mr. Bress insisted that this dispute over the perjured testimony had been cleared up 10 months before final settlement. The final settlement was in December, and therefore this indicated that this disputed point had been cleared and approved by the court in the early part of 1956.

I ask unanimous consent that his testimony, when he appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary on October 20, on this particular point, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator HRUSKA. There was opposition, wasn't there, to an effort to change the answer to that testimony advanced by the opposition, having been advanced by Mr. Sundlun?

Mr. BRESS. Not to my knowledge.

Senator HRUSKA. There are some who have reviewed this file and the court file and who have knowledge of this thing say that the disclosure, that the signing of these N series certificates occurring in January 1955 after Melvin's death rather than being signed on the dates which they bore, that that disclosure and that finding was a "a victory for Mrs. Viner whether the evidence of the fabrication of the stock certificate serving as a major lever, if not the total lever, in prying loose the settlement that Sundlun had said had a value of between $1,000,000 and $1,500,000. Then and only then were the brothers permitted to go into court and make changes in the testimony they had given on December 5, 1955."

Would you like to comment on that fact?

Mr. BRESS. That is not correct, from my knowledge, because one, the last sentence is patently wrong in connection with what you yourself just brought out, that they went into court and made the changes in January or February of 1956. The settlement wasn't agreed upon until the end of December of 1956, you see. And this was not—the settlement had nothing to do with the changes. Further than that——

Senator HRUSKA. The changes were made in February of 1956.

Mr. BRESS. Correct. But what you have said indicated that they were permitted to make the changes because they agreed to settle. That isn't so, they didn't settle until the end of 1956. The changes had been made 10 months before that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then he states the steps that were made to suppress the information and insist that this false document or the effort to suppress these perjurious charges had no effect on the settlement of the case. Mr. Bress says that the changes were approved 8 or 10 months prior to the time settlement was made. Actually, settlement was made December 28, 1956, and the changes in the depositions were not approved by the Court until November 21, 1956.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the agreement of November 21, 1956, of counsel for both sides to drop the charges or to drop objections to changing the record be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the agreement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

CONSENT ORDER DISMISSING MOTIONS

(*Robert L. Viner, et al., plaintiffs* v. *Jeanne S. Viner, et al., defendants*—civil action No. 2805-2855)

(1) Motion to suppress changes in deposition;

(2) Motion to quash subpena duces tecum.

This cause came on for hearing on (1) Defendants' Motion to Suppress Changes in Deposition and (2) on Plaintiffs' Motion To Quash Subpena Duces Tecum both filed herein; and the parties having agreed that both motions should be withdrawn and this Court being fully advised in the premises, it is, this 21st day of November, 1956,

Ordered: (1) that Defendants' Motion to Suppress Changes in Deposition be and the same is hereby dismissed: (2) and that Plaintiffs' Motion to Quash Subpena Duces Tecum be and the same is hereby dismissed.

BURNITA SHELDON MATTHEWS,
Judge.

Consent:

NEWMYER & BRESS,
By __. NEWMYER.
FOSTER WOOD.
HAHN & SUNDLUN,
By B. G. SUNDLUN.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Certainly this point was considered in the settlement, or at least it so appears. The changes were made about the same time. There is no question about it. These are the court records.

Later what did the court say in approving fees in the case? It said that counsel for the widow had done a good job for his clients. He had turned a case compared to a sow's ear into a silk purse.

Under the old agreement the widow would have gotten one-half of the book value of the stock, which would have been $90,000 of a $181,000 valuation. Instead under the new and final agreement she got $1½ million.

They signed an agreement restricting payments to dividends, distribution of their own earnings or any liquidation of collateral which secured the bonds issued. I do not think there is any question that the widow got an extremely favorable settlement, but the fact remains that had her attorney not caught the Bress law firm in its effort to issue fraudulent stock certificates she would have been deprived of her rightful estate.

If fraud had not been discovered and the court had proceeded without any objection on the part of the widow under the old agreement, there is no question, as the court records show, but that the widow would have collected, at the most, on a full basis, $180,000 of book value against her actual collection of about $1½ million. I did not make up the $1½ million figure; it appears in the court records themselves.

I will quote Mr. Newmyer. Mr. Newmyer said:

> The family of Melvin will receive approximately a million and a half dollars.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. Sundlun, the widow's attorney, to the court, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Mr. SUNDLUN. Under this settlement the family receives $30,000 for 20 years and $20,000 for 30 years thereafter; in short, as Mr. Philipson and Mr. Newmyer have said, a total sum of about $1,500,000 as compared to the $181,000 originally reported.
>
> On those figures we submit that this settlement is obviously for the benefit of the Melvin Viner family.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. These statements were by Mr. Sundlun, her lawyer. Mr. Newmyer and all agreed that the widow and her children in effect received a settlement worth about $1½ million instead of the $180,000 first considered. In the words of the court, Mr. Sundlun had converted a sow's ear into a silk purse.

The court did not discover this duplication of stock certificates as a result of the law firm of Mr. Bress telling the court about it. Not at all.

It was not discovered until the widow's attorney, through his research in Chicago, discovered it and established that the stock certificates had been predated. It was not until after this had been done, and after Mr. Bress' two clients had given perjured testimony that they decided that they would go ahead and make a more favorable settlement.

This more favorable settlement, contrary to the impression that Mr. Bress gave, was not negotiated 8 or 10 months after objections to make those changes official in court had been withdrawn. It was done in the same period of November–December 1956, when the final settlements were being agreed upon by the parties.

Is this the way that estates should be handled? I doubt if there is a single member of the Judiciary Committee who would stand on the floor and say that he would have done what this firm of Mr. Bress' did. Would they allow their clients to commit perjury or encourage them to prepare some backdated documents for an estate? Would they predate them to make it appear as though they had been issued during the lifetime of the deceased individual.

I have never heard before that it is considered ethical to permit clients to give perjured testimony. Mr. Philipson, Mr. Bress' partner, admits that he knew these clients were lying at the time.

I venture to say that Mr. Bress will not extend this same leniency to witnesses if they make perjured statements. Certainly a lawyer should not sit idly by and permit his client to make perjured statements.

I question whether any member of the Committee on the Judiciary will stand on the floor—whether it be the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Nebraska, or the Senator from any other State—and say that he would permit his clients to do such things.

Certainly a widow and her children should not have been defrauded of their rightful estate by any such tactics.

While the committee may go along with Mr. Bress in his statement that he knew nothing about it, I cannot accept it. They did call in as witnesses all of the members of the Bress law firm and his two clients. Certainly they would say they were innocent of any intentional errors.

I feel sure that if they had called in as witnesses the members of Mr. Bress' family they, too, would have said the same thing. But why did they not call some other witnesses?

I do not recall that any real testimony was taken from anyone on the other side, except the attorney for the widow. He frankly said that it was a fraudulent transaction.

I shall be interested in seeing whether the members of the Judiciary Committee say that this case has been handled properly or that in their own law firms they did things in this manner, or that they would do things in this manner hereafter.

I hope that those who respond will point out whether they feel that there was perhaps impropriety. If they do not believe that there was impropriety let us accept this as the standard for the legal profession, and that will be a sad day for justice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, there have been many times that this Senator has reluctantly taken the floor for the purpose of participating in discussion. I know of no time that I have been more reluctant to do so than I am now. I know of no time when I have felt as grievous about it as I do now.

My respect and admiration for the senior Senator from Delaware is of the highest degree. It is not by accident that he is known over the Nation as the conscience of the Senate.

I would give the senior Senator from Delaware every deference on the question of good faith. I would give him every deference on his efforts to do the right as he sees the right. Yet, some of his declarations and statements here today have been somewhat at variance with the record—not as he understands it, but with the record as it exists in the court records, as well as the testimony before the committee.

Before I comment on some of those aspects, I should like to say that my participation in the hearing on the Bress nomination was of a "pinch-hitting" nature.

The original hearing on Mr. Bress' nomination was held by a special committee, consisting of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I was not present nor was I a member of that special committee.

When a subsequent meeting of that special committee was called, it developed that the Senator from Illinois was participating in a hearing on the nomination for a district judge from the State of Massachusetts. It was considered quite an important hearing. The Senator from Illinois did not feel that he could excuse himself from that hearing.

The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary asked this Senator to sit in the place of the Senator from Illinois for the purpose of hearing a limited aspect of the consideration of the nomination of Mr. Bress to be U.S. attorney. That aspect concerned the Viner estate case and the part that Mr. Bress allegedly took therein.

When I make the remarks that I am about to make, it will not be because I love or respect or admire John Williams less. It will be because I want to bring to the attention of the Senate some of the things that I believe they should know in connection with this case.

Mr. President, the case is a very complicated and a very extended one. I have on the desk the original files, not in a single case, but in six actions that involved this entire matter. The files, measured by a foot rule, would be almost 12 inches in height. They are on legal size papers.

I pored over the pertinent parts of this record. I am familiar with the fashion in which it developed. I have also participated in examining at length the attorneys for both sides in the controversy.

I say advisedly and deliberately that, as a result of the study which I made and the consideration which I have given to the testimony, I have come to the conclusion that there is nothing of a derogatory nature in the handling of that case that can be imputed or assigned to Mr. Bress or that could even remotely reflect badly on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bress as U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

That is a very bald statement, but I make it in great sincerity and, I believe, with a fairly complete knowledge of the facts.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. Bress, Mr. Philipson, and Mr. Newmyer, all disclaim responsibility.

Will the Senator comment on the manner in which the Bress law firm as a whole handled the matter? Does the Senator make the same broad statement that it was all handled properly, considering, first, the issuance of the phony stock certificates and putting them in the estate, but dating them prior to the death of the man as though they had been issued before his death and doing this without telling the widow? They were representing both sides. Then there was a member of the law firm who sat by, at the time the false depositions were given, when his clients made perjured statements, statements which he knew of his own personal knowledge were false. Was this a proper procedure for any reputable law firm? Will the Senator comment further?

I admit that the other two gentlemen are not up for confirmation, but the case in question was handled under the registration of Mr. Bress, by his law firm.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is the purpose and the intent of this Senator to go into all those matters.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. I shall listen with interest.

Mr. HRUSKA. As I go along, if the Senator is prompted to ask for any particulars the lack of which bothers him, I shall be very happy to accommodate him.

Mr. President, I shall take the thing from the very beginning.

Comment has been made on the change of attorneys shortly after the probate was handled. This was a very complex affair. When Mr. Melvin Viner died, his widow, of course, had no place to turn except to the man who had represented the business since back in 1906. That was Mr. Newmyer, a partner of Mr. Bress at the time. A petition of probate was filed.

As matters went along, it was obvious, not only to the widow but to her father, that this would not do, because there were two surviving brothers who had claims in the estate, and she was the widow of a third brother, who was deceased.

The father of the widow went to Mr. Newmyer and said, "Mr. Newmyer, this won't do. There is going to be a conflict of interest here. My daughter is distressed. She knows that there is likely to be difference of opinion. Will you come with me and talk to her?"

That is exactly what happened. Mr. Newmyer, a man who has practiced law in the District of Columbia for 59 years and a very estimable and honorable man, went with the widow's father, and they called on the widow. He assured her that the thing for her to do was to employ counsel of her own, if she felt any misgivings about the matter.

That is what was done. She employed a good lawyer. Mr. Sundlun is a good lawyer. He is an aggressive lawyer. He did an excellent job—with that I will agree—and I shall comment in a little while as to why the job was excellent.

As to the attorney representation, Mr. Bress signed the petition for probate; he signed various documents more or less ministerial in character, in connection with the probate. He testified to that effect; and that is corroborated not only by his associates, but by the counsel for the widow. He was not in charge of any of the negotiations for settlement; he did not take part in the taking of the depositions, except to testify as a witness, and then was excused from the room; and the bulk of the work was taken care of by Mr. Philipson and by Mr. Newmyer himself.

As to attorney representation, it is true that when the petition was filed there was at least this situation: that the attorney for the estate, by acquiescence and not by express delegation, represented the estate, the executors, the two brothers, and the widow. I think all of that has been made clear by the explanation I have given.

Now we come to the point where——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am trying to get this straight. I know the Senator is up to the point now where Mr. Bress stops representing the widow and she employs Mr. Sundlun. But going back to my previous question: At the time Mr. Bress filed as attorney for both, before he found there was dissatisfaction, he was representing both the brothers and the widow. That paper was filed on January 24. It was the following day, January 25, that his law firm went out and bought the new stock certificates in order to substitute them for stock certificates which were supposed to have been lost. They dated them back to make it appear as though they had been issued prior to the death of the man.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is a subject upon which this Senator will comment in great detail, and I hope to the satisfaction of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I hope the Senator will. I just want to know, does the Senator consider it proper to slip those into the estate after the man is dead, and date them back as though it were done while he was living?

Mr. HRUSKA. I shall comment on that; and, as I say, I assure the Senator from Delaware I shall do it in as much detail as I can, and I hope to his satisfaction.

Mr. President, when Mr. Melvin Viner died, there was in force and effect a survivorship agreement having to do with the stock of this corporation. There was also an equalization agreement for the ownership among the three brothers of 1,250 outstanding shares of stock of the corporation.

That equalization agreement called for the ownership by each brother of one-third of these holdings. The survivorship agreement provided that if any of the brothers were to die, leaving male issue, the stock belonging to that deceased brother would be redeemed by the corporation for one-half of the book value, as shown on the books of the corporation as of the close of the next preceding fiscal year, and that the corporation would hold that stock until that male heir became 21 years of age, at which time he would be privileged, for the designated time, to redeem that stock for the same amount of money that the stock was originally redeemed.

That was a device that was entered into by all three brothers for the purpose of assuring a continuance of this corporation in the hands of the male heirs of the family.

That agreement was not made by the Senator from Delaware. It was not made by the Senator from Nebraska. It was made by the attorneys for the three brothers.

Pursuant to that agreement, the attorneys for the estate and for the corporation tendered to the executors of the estate of the deceased brother a check for $30,000—leaving off the odd amounts—and a note for $60,000, pursuant to the terms of the agreement.

That was done for the purpose of carrying out the wishes of the three brothers, to allow the male heir to come in when he was 21 years of age and redeem the stock at a very advantageous price, that price being the same price at which it was bought up by the corporation.

That was done. There was no other way to do it.

Shortly after the death of Melvin, the testimony shows, the two surviving brothers came to Mr. Philipson and said to him, "We cannot find the stock certificates in this corporation. We would like you to have the stock certificates reissued. Here is a chart by which we have gone, and this is the way the stock was held by the three brothers and the members of the family. Here also is this equalization agreement dated August 17, 1949, in which that arrangement was consummated in a duly executed contract." Under that agreement each brother received one-third of a number of shares.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the agreement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the agreement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUALIZATION AGREEMENT

This agreement made the 17th day of August 1949 between Melvin A. Viner, Leonard R. Viner, and Robert L. Viner, stockholders in Arcade Sunshine Co., Inc.

Witnesseth:

Whereas there are now outstanding 1,670 shares of the common capital stock of Arcade Sunshine Co., Inc., 420 shares of which are held by said corporation as treasury stock and 1,250 shares of which are held by the parties hereto and their respective families as follows:

	Shares
Melvin A. Viner	155
Jeanne Viner	45
Michael A. Viner	75
Karen Viner	45
Total	320
Leonard R. Viner	315
Muriel Viner	15
Total	330
Robert L. Viner	550
Harriet Viner	45
Total	600
Grand total	1,250

Whereas the parties hereto have mutually agreed to equalize their respective family holdings of said outstanding common capital stock so that each family shall eventually hold one-third thereof; and

Whereas in order to effect such equalization, it will be necessary for Robert L. Viner to transfer 96⅔ shares to Melvin A. Viner and 86⅔ shares to Leonard R. Viner so that each family will thereby own 416⅔ shares, and Robert L. Viner is willing to make such transfers, as hereinafter set forth: Now, therefore

For good and valuable consideration, including other agreements entered into between the parties hereto on this date, and the agreement of the parties hereto to continue in the employ of said Arcade Sunshine Co., Inc., it is hereby mutually agreed as follows:

1. Robert L. Viner will transfer to Melvin A. Viner 96⅔ shares of the common capital stock of Arcade Sunshine Co., Inc.

2. Robert L. Viner will transfer to Leonard R. Viner 86⅔ shares of the common capital stock of Arcade Sunshine Co., Inc.

(3). (a) In order to make the transfers required herein, Robert L. Viner agrees during the calendar year 1949, and during each calendar year hereafter, to make unconditional gifts to Melvin A. Viner and Leonard R. Viner, and to each of their respective wives and children of the maximum number of shares of such stock as may be given by him without incurring a Federal gift tax liability as "individual exclusions" under section 1003 of the Internal Revenue Code as it may be amended from time to time; it being understood that he shall not be required to use in carrying out this agreement the "specific exemption" allowed by section 1004 of the Internal Revenue Code, as it may be amended from time to time.

(b) In determining the maximum number of shares of stock which can be given tax free each year by Robert L. Viner (as "individual exclusions") the fair market value of the stock for tax purposes shall be determined by the unanimous decision of the parties hereto. If the parties disagree, the said value shall be determined by the firm of certified public accountants then retained to prepare the tax returns for Arcade Sunshine Co., Inc.

4. In order to accelerate the transfers required herein, Melvin A. Viner and Robert L. Viner, or either of them, shall have the option, rather than waiting for the gifts required to be made in paragraph 3, to purchase from time to time, from Robert L. Viner, such shares of stock as either may request, at the price of $100 per share, or at a price equal to one-half the then book value of such shares, whichever price is lower, payment to be made by the purchaser upon receipt of the shares so requested; it being understood that nothing contained in this paragraph or in paragraph 3 shall entitle Melvin A. Viner and his family to acquire from Robert L. Viner more than 96⅔ shares, nor entitle Leonard R. Viner and his family to acquire from Robert L. Viner more than 86⅔ shares.

5. Notwithstanding the present unequal distribution of the said common capital stock of said corporation and pending the completion of the transfers required to be made as provided for herein, it is mutually agreed that:

(a) each of the parties hereto shall, as a stockholder, have an equal vote at all meetings of the stockholders of Arcade Sunshine Co., Inc.

(b) the board of directors of Arcade Sunshine Co., Inc., shall consist of four persons, three of whom shall be the parties hereto and the fourth shall be a person elected only by the unanimous vote of the parties hereto.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have hereunto affixed their hands and seals on the day and year first above written.

MELVIN A. VINER,
LEONARD R. VINER,
ROBERT L. VINER,
DAVID KATY, *Witness.*

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, Mr. Philipson said, "Very well, I will issue those certificates as you say," and he did. There is no evidence in the record, and I know of no claim that will stand up in accordance with the records available in this case, including this agreement, that the reissuance of that stock was anything but what was called for by an equalization agreement and by the pattern of distribution of the stock as made by the three brothers; namely, 416⅔ shares in the Melvin estate of his children, and the second brother with 416⅔ shares and the third brother with 416⅔ shares, which makes a total of 1,250 shares.

Mr. President, a good deal has been said about the reissuance of the certificates in this fashion. Mr. Bress testified that he would not have done it that way. Here was an asset of the estate which should have come to the attention of the probate judge. A showing should have been made that the certificates could not be found and that they therefore should be reissued in this way. That would have been the proper way to do it, in my judgment. I would not have handled this matter in the manner that it was done. Certainly, from the standpoint of hindsight, things are made clear and easy. Yet, I believe that most lawyers would have gone about it in the way I have described because the assets of an estate were involved, but I say here——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Do I correctly understand that the Senator says most lawyers would have done it in this manner?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator misunderstood me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thought——

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator misunderstood me. I said I would not have done it that way, that most lawyers would have handled it in the same way; namely, in the way that I would have described, which was to go before the court and make a disclosure of the facts and say, "Let us do it this way."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is what I had hoped the Senator meant.

Mr. HRUSKA. I am grateful to the Senator for having brought up that point so that the RECORD will be clear.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I always thought that a man's estate was sacred to the point that no one would tinker with it or sit down in a back room and manufacture documents. Under no circumstances should this sort of thing be allowed. I am, therefore, very glad that the Senator has clarified his disagreement with such procedure. Even Mr. Sundlun admitted that that should not be done.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator means Mr. Bress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, Mr. Bress. Of course Mr. Sundlun also took a strong position against it. In fact, he was the one who detected the attempted fraud.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, there are two aspects about that situation—one is that no prejudice, no harm, no detriment was suffered by anyone, regardless of how careless or how criticizable the act might have been. The fact is, no one was harmed.

Item two, which to me is very important is: What connection has Mr. Bress with that?

It is all very well to say, "But he is a partner." Mr. Bress did not know about the reissuance of the certificates until December of that year, when the question of the deposition arose.

I believe that we should bear that in mind, because we are considering the qualifications of a man for the office of U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia. We cannot proceed on the basis of questions which are raised. We cannot proceed on suspicions, conjectures, or suppositions. If any effort is made to establish that Mr. Bress is not competent or fit in any way, or not possessed of integrity, or anything else, there must be proof. I repeat, there must be proof, not conjectures, not suspicions, and not suppositions.

In regard to the issuance of the certificates, I say that no harm, no detriment, no prejudice, no intent to deceive or defraud, nor any defrauding took place. If the question of the reissuance of the certificates had been challenged and had been brought before a court, and the court were to rescind the reissued certificates, the court would have a job on its hands.

What would that job be?

The job would be to determine how the 1,250 shares should be divided, to whom they should be issued, and to whom they should be delivered. The court would have consulted the equalization agreement, which stated that each brother should have a third. The court would then have ordered reissuance of the certificates to replace the lost certificates, in the same fashion that the two brothers had asked Mr. Philipson to do.

Accordingly, the facts I have just related should pretty well take care of the situation.

It has been suggested that the matter of discovery of the issuance of the certificates and the ordering of the certificate blanks, together with the darkness of the room when they were asked to be reissued, and all that sort of thing, were heavy factors in reaching a favorable settlement which the widow was able to obtain.

Let me suggest that here was a situation where the cause of the widow depended upon two things. One was the existence of the survivorship agreement, the terms of which I have already outlined; the other was the determination of the value of the corporation.

By a series of negotiations and court proceedings, the management contract, which had been drawn up by common consent of all the parties involved, was set aside and rescinded. That having been done, the avenue was then opened for the widow and her attorney to come in and say, "We wish as high a value placed upon the assets of the corporation as possible." Of course, it was to their interest that that be done. It was done. It came to the total amount of $1,125,000 or thereabouts, with all the assets considered. The estate was awarded stock worth $375,000 as a result of that settlement.

That stock was then redeemed, partly in cash and the balance in bonds payable by the corporation. The record so shows.

This was a good settlement. The judge who was called upon to pass on the amount of the fee which Mr. Sundlun was entitled to receive did say that he had read the transcript of the proceedings, that Mr. Sundlun had performed a masterful job of advocacy, that he obtained a good settlement. In effect he did turn a sow's ear into a silk purse. Nowhere in the comments of the judge was there any reference to fraud or deception; nor was fraud or deception in any way alleged to have taken place in regard to fixing the value of the property.

As to the value of the property, an independent and highly regarded company was called in, together with other experts, and the estate was valued at a sum three times its value; namely, $375,000. That is payable over a long period of time. I believe that much of it does not expire for some 50 years as to a part of the bonds, but it was an advantageous settlement for the widow as well as for the children.

Mr. President, that is about the whole story.

We now come to the proposition: What has Mr. Bress' nomination to do with this?

It is probably mystifying to a layman that a lawyer can be a member of a law firm and not have too much direct contact with any given case.

I know something about that. With the permission of the Senate, I should like to refer to my personal experience as a general practitioner of law for 25 years, before I became a Member of this body. That is not at all unusual, but perhaps some people can fan it into a serious question and state that they are possessed of many misgivings, many doubts, suspicions, conjectures, and suppositions regarding it.

However, that is not proof. The Senate should be governed only by proof. I suppose, there are as many as 65 lawyers in this body who might have differed as to how they would have handled this case. But, again, I say, that is not what is at issue here.

The issue here involves the integrity, the capability, and any wrongdoing on the part of Mr. Bress. The canons of ethics have been mentioned, particularly articles 15 and 16. They provide that no attorney shall suffer his client to do wrong. If he sees a wrong being done, he should caution him and make him redress it, and if the client persists, the attorney should withdraw from the case.

In the case of the deposition, the brothers testified why they gave the wrong answers to certain questions. As soon as Mr. Bress found out about them, and he was informed by either Mr. Newmyer or Mr. Philipson, his associate, he took the position—and that is testified to, and the events that followed corroborate it—that the mistake must be corrected. That is all the canons of ethics call for. That is what he did.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I raise the question considering that a number of these perjurious statements were made in the presence of the other two members of the firm. It is assumed that both of them knew their clients lied. It is admitted by Mr. Philipson that he knew about it because he bought the stock certificates and issued them without the knowledge of the widow and helped back date them. So here is an attorney representing the clients, sitting there while they are giving a deposition and committing perjury.

They did not object, nor did they admit this fraud until they found they were caught.

Mr. HRUSKA. That was brought out in the testimony. I shall be pleased to read the testimony.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Are they supposed to sit there and hope they will not be caught?

Mr. HRUSKA. Not at all. Let me suggest to the Senator from Delaware that I have been in countless depositions, countless times, as all lawyers have, when testimony was being given. I asked Mr. Philipson about the time when he was sitting in the room when the deposition was taken. I asked him:

> Senator Hruska. Now, when the incorrect answer was given with reference to the date the certificates were signed, did you—were you aware that the answer was incorrect?
>
> Mr. Philipson. Yes; sir.
>
> Senator Hruska. And you said nothing at the time?
>
> Mr. Philipson. I said nothing at the time, because the correct way to correct it, sir, is to have it typed out and have the witness read it, and make corrections, and then sign it and file it.

That is the way it should be done. If a lawyer would caution a witness, "Now, wait a minute. Do not testify that way. Testify this way," he would be thrown out of court. It is up to the witness to correct it later. If the attorney had butted in at that time, it would have been out of order, and he would have been disqualified.

That is the way it is done, notwithstanding the understanding of laymen about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not understand it particularly when there was an intermission between the testimony of the two brothers, and the other witness who was to testify could have been told not to lie under oath. Surely his lawyer could have said, "Your brother said things we had better straighten out." He made no such correction. Based on the affidavit that was put in the record he approached the court reporter and said, "Let us correct it without the other parties concerned knowing it." That is not the way to do it. The reporter insisted that he would make the notations as prescribed according to the rules so the court could be apprised that the notations had been made and then the court would decide whether they would accept them or not. The court reporter followed the proper procedure. What the Bress law firm tried to do, based on the affidavit, was to get the answers changed in a manner so no one would know the false answers were made. The senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] knows that is not the way it should be done.

Mr. HRUSKA. I respectfully disagree with my distinguished friend, the Senator from Delaware. They did not go to the court reporter surreptitiously. They did not do it secretly. They did not ask him to do anything they should not have done. When they were furnished the typewritten transcript—and this is the proper procedure—they read it. If there is any correction to be made, witnesses make it without erasing the other answers, and they sign the deposition. This was done. I have seen the original deposition in the court files. The answers were lined out and other answers were written in pen and ink as true and proper and accurate answers.

That document was not stuck in the trash pile or put in the deep freeze, or anything like that. It was filed with the court and became a public document, that being publication of the document. I would not consider it as sticking it away so no one can see it. Anybody interested in the case, including the attorney for the other side, could get it and read it. That is the way it is done.

I do not say that I condone the incorrect answers in the beginning, because I do not. But when answers are incorrect or the proprieties are violated, then they are corrected. But that still gets us down to the point, What did Bress have to do with it?

That is the question before the Senate. Bress did not give false answers. He did not make any effort to conceal them. He was not guilty of any malefaction. When it was brought to his attention, he asked that the mistakes be corrected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would like to have in the Record again the Senator's comments on the affidavit of the court reporter about this procedure of making corrections. I am asking, as a layman, if these changes do not mean anything——

Mr. HRUSKA. The implication is that these answers do not mean anything. I do not say that. I did not say that. In fact, I just said that I do not condone giving improper and untruthful answers. If the Senator wants to put it in a different way, that is different.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall be glad to put it in a different way.

If the correction of these untruthful answers were recognized as a routine matter to be accepted by the court as such, why was it necessary for the lawyers to go through all this devious process over the months, with one counsel asking the court to accept the corrections and the other counsel arguing against the changes? If this were such a routine matter why was it necessary to go through this process and through this dillydallying until after the settlement had been effected? To me perjury is a serious matter.

Mr. HRUSKA. I should like to explain how that is done, for the edification of the Senator from Delaware. I will explain the procedure and the practice. This is how these things work. The deposition was filed, with changes in it. The attorney for the widow came to court and filed a motion to suppress the deposition and the making of changes. He made the motion. It was up to him to bring it up. Apparently he did not think it was very important, because he repeatedly returned to court on motion day and filed a motion for an extension of time. Between the two attorneys they effected an extension of time until they had concluded the important business, which was the settlement of the estate.

Mrs. Melvin Viner had a time problem on her hands. She had to get the property in her name by the end of the second year after her husband had died, in order to be able to take advantage of the tax basis on which he had been operating.

In other words, they took care of first things first. When they had obtained the settlement, they then took care of the thing about which the Senator from Delaware is so concerned.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the point that I am making. Mr. Sundlun's agreement to the changes was held over their heads, and it was agreed in the settlement that these charges would be dropped if the brothers would withdraw as administrators of the estate, and they would withdraw as trustees and as guardians of the children. They agreed to a very substantial cash settlement to the widow and children.

It was agreed that the $375,000 in mortgages would bear 8 percent interest, that the company could not pay off the principal for 50 years, and that these people would have an income for 30 years at $20,000 a year before the company would be allowed to pay it off. In the meantime there would be a restriction on the payment of dividends and distribution of assets. The widow came out with a beautiful package.

Mr. HRUSKA. Instead of with a sow's ear.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Converted a sow's ear into a silk purse. Of course, it will show that they had tried to get a dirty pig in the poke.

Mr. HRUSKA. On that score, let it not be said that the two surviving brothers did not get something for the agreement. Did they do it out of the generosity of their hearts? Did they do it out of the milk of human kindness? I do not think so. They would have had the disadvantage of the survivorship agreement, had it remained in force. They would have been able to get the stock for $90,000 by placing that stock in the company safe.

When the male heir of Melvin Viner would reach 21—and he has since that time—settlement was to be made. He could have walked in and redeemed that stock for $90,000, which had a book value of $180,000. By this time, with appreciation, the value is probably much more than that. He could have had that for $90,000. That is what the father wanted him to do, and that is why the father had him sign that document.

They are not giving that out of their heart.

I would say, combining the efforts of their attorneys and Mrs. Viner's attorney, resulted in three things because each of those heirs was benefited by this.

I come back to make my point. If there is any point I would dwell upon it is: What has this to do with Mr. Bress and his capability to serve as U.S. attorney? I believe that is the question before the Senate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The only question which the Senator keeps asking is about these depositions. These perjured statements were admittedly made. And the Senator asks what it has to do with Mr. Bress. The answer is simple. Mr. Bress was the attorney of record. Why should he not be held at least partly responsible?

Mr. HRUSKA. He was one of the attorneys of record. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. And he was the one signing documents going to the court.

I realize that in a large law firm one man may not know about his partner's case, but surely he knows about his own case.

I do not believe that Mr. Bress can come here now and say that he does not know about all this "hanky-panky"—those were not my words. How can Mr. Bress say that he represented that case and yet did not know what was going on backstage?

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Delaware is questioning the part that Mr. Bress had in this matter. If he has any proof or knows of any evidence in the record that Mr. Bress had knowledge of the reissuance of those certificates, I believe he should furnish the Senate with the information on it so that we could all enjoy that type of evidence together.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Would it make a difference?

Mr. HRUSKA. He knew it later and immediately took steps to get it corrected and put it on file with the court.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But he did not tell the widow until after he had failed to cover it up.

Mr. HRUSKA. But it took the widow's lawyers 6 days to file a memorandum.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. They did know it. They were notified by the filing of the deposition.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The widow's lawyer knew he had them over a barrel. There is no question about that.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the evidence on that point is this: With regard to the statement of the Senator from Delaware that he had them over the barrel—had whom over the barrel? Mr. Newmyer testified that after the depositions were taken and the error was discovered, they had by that time been corrected.

The attorney for the widow marched in and said that he was unwilling to settle this case. He said, "I am going to file this petition."

What was the answer of Mr. Newmyer? The same answer any lawyer makes if there is nothing to the case.

The way to do it is, if it is believed something is wrong, to file the petition and meet the issue in court before the judge.

If they were so serious they should have persisted, and followed through because certainly an advantageous settlement would not erase the effect of an improper and irregular act on the part of anyone.

Again I say, had the issue been raised, had the court said, "We will rescind his note and this reissued stock certificate series," it would have been his duty to determine who was entitled to the stock. Under the equalization agreement the stock would have been equally divided among the brothers and the fathers, which is what the reissue did in the first place.

What has Mr. Bress to do with it?

I must take this position with respect to the contentions of my fine friend from Delaware. He is properly known as the conscience of the Senate. He is a man of deep conviction. He has gone into this matter as thoroughly as he could and he had some help in doing it.

He furnished the committee with the memorandum which I used for the purpose of interrogating witnesses earlier this week. It was a splendidly written memorandum. I followed it faithfully in propounding questions to the witnesses to get answers on the points raised in that memorandum.

The reading of the memorandum and the questions I asked in that statement and the testimony before the Senate will show that.

It troubles me to do this, but it is not that I love less or admire JOHN WILLIAMS less. The record that we have here—and it is a foot high—and the context of this entire matter should be brought to the attention of the Senate in fairness to all concerned, including the Senator from Delaware.

Again, I suggest that it is not enough to say that here is a man that admitted to this—and I have misgivings about this—that is not enough.

There should be affirmative and positive proof. I believe anyone who has had experience in handling lawsuits, either as lawyers or otherwise, will not find anything except efforts on the part of the widow for the lawyer to do as good a job as he could.

He pressed every point that he could make. He earned his fee. It was a generous fee, I presume. He indicated as much in informal discussion. He rendered a real service to the widow.

I submit that all attorneys in the case rendered a real service for all and it was that which resulted in the settlement of the case rather than the supposed pressure of some fraudulent charge which could not be substantiated and which had no detrimental or fraudulent effect upon anyone.

So with whatever other statements I might make, I would certainly return to the idea that my responsibility to the committee and the Senate and my conscience lead me to make the remarks that I have.

I have tried to do it in the most respectful and courteous fashion possible under the circumstances, regardless of whether I am in difference or in agreement with the Senator from Delaware.

I still value, highly respect, and deeply admire his conviction and sincerity. I say God bless him for it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall be brief. I respect the analysis of the Senator from Nebraska. I am still going to say, again, that I do not quite see how a man who serves as attorney for a client can so completely dissociate himself from the fact that his case was built primarily upon the backdating of some stock certificates which are referred to in the testimony before the committee by one attorney as fraudulent and by one as phony. There can be no question but that they were prepared without the knowledge of the widow and dated back 4 years to give the impression they had been issued during the man's lifetime.

It is significant to me that the blank certificates were bought 24 hours after Mr. Bress himself had filed as attorney for the widow. This was improper procedure to say the least. I am still convinced, in my own mind, that the final settlement was related to the fact that these clients of Mr. Bress had been caught with issuing phony stock certificates. They were over the barrel. There is no way of proving that Mr. Bress personally knew about it, but his law firm did. I do not know what Mr. Bress did to earn his money. He was the attorney of record. But I do not quite understand how any man can represent a client and know so little about what is going on. If he can he is too naive to hold the position for which we are asked to confirm his nomination.

Mr. President, I see no need to delay action on the nomination any longer. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to vote. I promised several Senators that I would suggest the absence of a quorum when I had concluded my speech. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that a motion to recommit is pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I withdraw that motion and ask that the Senate vote on the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to recommit is withdrawn.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I intend to support the Bress nomination and shall vote accordingly when the roll is called.

Based upon Mr. Bress' professional standing and the record, and the fact that I have heard some of the argument, I feel that his professional activities should not be a barrier or a bar to his assuming the office for which he is so eminently qualified, the office of U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I wish to notify Senators that it is the intention to have a quorum call, following which it is hoped that the Senate can immediately proceed to a vote on the Bress nomination.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David G. Bress to the office of U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia for a term of 4 years? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

On this vote, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from West Virignia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 14, as follows:

[No. 299 Ex.]

YEAS—49

Aiken
Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Harris
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Javits
Kuchel
Long, La.
McCarthy
McClellan
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—14

Allott
Curtis
Fannin
Hickenlooper
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McGee
Mundt
Murphy
Prouty
Simpson
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—37

Anderson
Bayh
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dominick
Ellender
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Inouye
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McGovern
McNamara
Miller
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pearson
Randolph
Russell, Ga.
Sparkman
Talmadge
Tydings
Young, Ohio

So the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. RANDOLPH subsequently said: Mr. President, had I been in the Chamber a few minutes ago, I would have voted to confirm the nomination of David G. Bress to be U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia. Although I have an explanation that would cover other Senators, I, of course, do not wish to speak for them. We were at the White House for the signing by the President of the significant legislation in which the Senate participated—the Highway Beautification and Scenic Development Act.

I have known Mr. Bress personally for many years. I believe that he will be a good and faithful U.S. attorney.

I believe that Mr. Bress will do what is right, rather than what is expedient.

I wish the RECORD to indicate my approval of the action taken by the Senate earlier today. I regret sincerely that I was not present to cast my vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bress. However, I have stated my approval of his nomination in this manner.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, it is true that a number of Senators, including the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia and the senior Senator from Montana were at the White House.

We had planned to get back in time to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bress.

I join with the statement of the senior Senator from West Virginia. Had I been present, Mr. Bress would have had my vote without question.

Mr. INOUYE subsequently said: Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. Had I been present, I, too, would have voted in favor of the confirmation of Mr. Bess. I was at the White House with other Senators.

Mr. MONTOYA subsequently said: Mr. President, I, too, was at the White House with the congressional delegation.

Had I been present, I would have voted for the confirmation.

POSTMASTERS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report the nominations of 55 postmasters and ask for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nominations.

The legislative clerk proceded to read sundry nominations of Postmasters.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MONRONEY, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2679) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of additional copies of the hearings held by the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs during the 89th Congress, 1st session, on S. 9, the cold war GI education bill:

S. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution providing additional copies of hearings on antitrust and monopoly; and

S. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution to authorize certain corrections in the enrollment of S. 919.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 65) to authorize the printing as a Senate document of 10,000 copies of a study entitled "The Anti-Vietnam Agitation and the Teach-In Movement," prepared for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 619) for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 5026. An act to authorize the Burt County Bridge Commission, a public body politic and corporate in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, to refund the outstanding revenue bonds of said Burt County Bridge Commission heretofore issued to finance the cost of the construction of a bridge, together with the necessary approaches and appurtenances therefor, from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebr., across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa; and

H.R. 9903. An act to provide for the free entry of one multigap magnetic spectrograph for the use of Yale University.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 448) to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating September 3, 1965, as Crusade for Safety Day.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8310) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9047) to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10305) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 124,200,000 pounds of nickel from the national stockpile.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 327. An act to amend section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6319. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recovery of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by governments of foreign countries;

H.R. 7723. An act to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on certain tropical hardwoods;

H.R. 8210. An act to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act with respect to the European Space Research Organization;

H.R. 8436. An act to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possessions of the United States;

H.R. 8445. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States;

H.R. 10625. An act relating to the tax treatment of certain amounts paid to certain members and former members of the uniformed services and to their survivors;

H.R. 11216. An act relating to the tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad of products of the United States; and

H.R. 11664. An act to confer additional jurisdiction upon the Superintendent of Insurance for the District of Columbia to regulate domestic stock insurance companies and to exempt such companies from section 12(g)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 509. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on crime in the District of Columbia and House Report No. 176, entitled "District of Columbia Crime";

H. Con. Res. 512. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearing on home rule for the District of Columbia;

H. Con. Res. 513. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on "Lower Colorado River Basin Project," 89th Congress, 1st session; and

H. Con. Res. 519. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on H.R. 2580, 89th Congress, 1st session, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

H.R. 2303. An act for the relief of Ernest J. Carlin;

H.R. 4170. An act to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system;

H.R. 8370. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9567. An act to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education;

H.R. 11539. An act to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane; and

H.J. Res. 671. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of November as "Water Conservation Month."

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 327. An act to amend section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6319. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for treatment of the recovery of losses arising from expropriation, intervention, or confiscation of properties by governments of foreign countries;

H.R. 7723. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on certain tropical hardwoods;

H.R. 8210. An act to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act with respect to the European Space Research Organization;

H.R. 8436. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possessions of the United States;

H.R. 8445. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States;

H.R. 10625. An act relating to the tax treatment of certain amounts paid to certain members and former members of the uniformed services and to their survivors; and

H.R. 11216. An act relating to the tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad of products of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 11664. An act to confer additional jurisdiction upon the Superintendent of Insurance for the District of Columbia to regulate domestic stock insurance companies and to exempt such companies from section 12 (g) (1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following concurrent resolutions were severally referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 509. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on crime in the District of Columbia and House Report No. 176, entitled "District of Columbia Crime";

H. Con. Res. 512. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearing on home rule for the District of Columbia;

H. Con. Res. 513. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on "Lower Colorado River Basin Project," 89th Congress, 1st session; and

H. Con. Res. 519. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on H.R. 2580, 89th Congress, 1st session, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

EXPOSITIONS AND FAIRS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, within the next 2 days there will come before the Senate two bills providing subsidies for what are known as expositions and fairs. One will be the Alaska subsidy of $4,800,000, to build 3 exposition halls, 1 in Sitka, which has a population of 5,000, 1 in Fairbanks, which has a population, I believe, of 32,000, and 1 in Anchorage, with a population of 50,000.

The purpose of constructing these fairs will be to provide convention halls in Alaska for the assembly of people who might come there for the purposes of business, cultural, or other types of meetings.

The second bill will involve the subsidization of what is known as Interama in Florida. That measure will come before the Senate without a favorable recommendation by the Foreign Relations Committee.

It was originally requested that $15 million be assigned for the presentation of a cultural and business exhibit in Florida. The argument has been that it would cement our international relations with the South American countries and will promote trade. The Budget Commission of the Americas recommends against Interama.

The State Department takes the position that it is not needed for the promotion of amicable relations in the Western Hemisphere.

With that premise, I call attention to what has been said by the Washington Post in its issue of this morning on these fairs.

The editorial is entitled, "Financing Fairs," and it is from the Washington Post:

FINANCING FAIRS

Robert Moses' gaudy, glamorous, glittering creation, the New York World's Fair, is gone. It ended as it began two summers ago, with acrimony and unfulfilled promises. In the last week the throngs finally arrived. They came too late to save the fair from financial disaster, but claims that it was a total fiasco are refuted by the excitement and enjoyment visitors found there and the many millions of dollars they spent at the Fair and in the New York area.

One lesson to be drawn from this exposition, the Seattle World's Fair that preceded it and even the legendary New York World's Fair of 1939 is that investment in projects of this type is very risky. This is worth noting because the aviation industry is willing to allow the Government to underwrite an international air show at Dulles Airport and a lobby from Florida has asked Congress to do the same for a Miami Beach boondoggle called the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center.

At this point I wish to clarify what is happening. In 1962 there was the Seattle Fair. We put $10 million into it. In 1964 and 1965 there was the New York Fair. It was originally requested that we put $25 million into that, but we put in $17.5 million.

Passed by the Senate is an authorization to study a proposed fair in San Antonio, Tex., for which $10 million is being asked. We shall have pending in the Senate today or tomorrow the Florida Exposition, for which $15 million is being asked. We shall also have pending the Alaska Exposition, for which $4,600,000 is being asked.

That means a total of $60 million in 5 years that has been requested for expositions and fairs.

I suggest to Senators that there are many better ways of spending $60 million than in this way.

I now read from the editorial of the Wall Street Journal of today: "New style in pork barrels":

NEW STYLE IN PORK BARRELS

There are so many ways enterprising Congressmen and their constituents can get the Federal Government to pump dollars into their home districts you might think no new ones were needed.

But man's ingenuity knows few bounds, as witness the efforts of the Florida congressional delegation and a number of that State's private citizens to siphon off at least $37 million in Federal funds into a 1,700-acre site, now mostly swampland, north of Miami Beach where it is proposed to locate an exposition of sorts.

To make such a project sufficiently attractive to get Congress to appropriate funds for it, you have to give it the right label. Preferably one suggesting culture or trade, and if the name has an international flavor, all the better. The Florida project's sponsors have touched all bases, proposing to call their exposition the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, or Interama for short. The permanent United States and Latin Americans exhibits there, they maintain, would bring about great cultural and economic benefits. Moreover, they add for good measure, the display would complement the Alliance for Progress.

Apparently impressed by all this, the House has authorized $11 million for building a U.S. exhibit and $1 million annually for 4 years' maintenance. In a happy afterthought the legislators decreed that $250,000 of construction funds should be spent on preparing a report on the "nature, extent and cost" of Federal participation in Interama.

Although the nature, extent and ultimate cost of the Government's participation are indeed a mystery, the Community Facilities Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency has tentatively approved a $22 million loan to the exposition. It is to be applied not only to the U.S. structures there, but in a good neighborly gesture to the Latin American pavilions as well.

Fortunately the Senate is taking a more businesslike look at these plans and indications are it will scale them down drastically or, better, lay them aside. The Nation is already suffering from an overproduction of pork barrels without Congress manufacturing transparent new ones.

The $37 million is composed of $22 million that is to be loaned by the Community Facilities Administration and $15 million to be provided in the grant that will be pending before the Senate either today or tomorrow. The $15 million has been reduced to $9.5 million.

We have here a rather paradoxical situation. The Washington Post and the Wall Street Journal make a unique combination. One is noted for its alleged extreme liberality; the other for its extreme conservatism. Yet both newspapers contend that we must bring to an end the siphoning of funds to promote domestic expositions. Unless that is done with regard to the Alaska Fair and the Interama of Florida, I submit that each year when a centennial or a sesquicentennial event occurs, States will be coming to Congress and asking for allocations of $10 or $15 million.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE AS SECRETARY TO HON. EMERY L. FRAZIER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I hope my good friend from Florida will forgive me, but I am about to fulfill a responsibility which I had anticipated doing about 12 o'clock.

On August 20, 1965, the Senate by Resolution 140 elected Emery L. Frazier as Secretary of the Senate for the period beginning January 1, 1966, through September 30, 1966. Under law, the Secretary of the Senate cannot assume the full responsibilities of his office until he has been duly sworn before the Senate.

Inasmuch as it is not anticipated that the Senate will be in session on January 1, 1966, and in order that there be no break in the continuity of occupancy in the Office of the Secretary, I ask that the oath of office be administered, in accordance with law, to Mr. Frazier at this time, subsequent to which I shall offer two resolutions for immediate consideration, in order to complete the legal requirements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the retiring Secretary of the Senate, Mr. Felton M. Johnston, will escort Mr. Emery L. Frazier to the rostrum, the Chair will administer his oath of office. His term will begin on January 1, 1966.

Mr. Emery L. Frazier, accompanied by Mr. Felton M. Johnston, advanced to the desk, where Mr. Frazier was administered his oath of office, as follows:

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Do you, Emery L. Frazier, solemnly swear that you will support the Constitution of the United States, and do you, Emery L. Frazier, Secretary of the Senate of the United States of America, solemnly swear that you will truly and faithfully discharge the duties of your said office, to the best of your knowledge and abilities?

Mr. FRAZIER. I do.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

NOTIFICATION TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF ELECTION OF EMERY L. FRAZIER AS SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 156) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Emery L. Frazier, of Kentucky, as Secretary of the Senate, effective January 1, 1966.

NOTIFICATION TO PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ELECTION OF EMERY L. FRAZIER AS SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 157) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of Emery L. Frazier, of Kentucky, as Secretary of the Senate, effective January 1, 1966.

AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT SPEECHES MADE ON THE OCCASION OF RETIREMENT OF FELTON M. JOHNSTON AS SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 158) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a compilation of tributes, together with other related material, delivered in the Halls of Congress to commemorate the occasion of the retirement as Secretary of the Senate of the Honorable Felton M. Johnston; and that five hundred additional copies be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

PRINTING CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of sundry concurrent resolutions dealing with printing which were adopted by the House of Representatives, and reported today from the Committee on Rules and Administration. The concurrent resolutions have been cleared by the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolutions will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 509) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on crime in the District of Columbia and House Report No. 176, entitled "District of Columbia Crime."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

The Legislative Clerk. Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 512) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearing on home rule for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

The Legislative Clerk. Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 513) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on "Lower Colorado River Basin Project," 89th Congress, 1st session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

The Legislative Clerk. Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 519) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hear-hearings on H.R. 2580 (89th Cong., 1st sess.), to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

PRESS CONFERENCE STATEMENTS OF JOINT HOUSE AND SENATE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is customary at the end of the session to make a record of the press conference statements made by the joint House and Senate Republican leadership which generally occur every week and cover the publicity in the form of a document.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, to have the report and its preface printed in the Record and a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CELEBRATION OF THE CENTENNIAL OF THE PURCHASE OF ALASKA FROM RUSSIA

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as we have just been reminded by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, the Senate will be asked to act upon a proposal to participate in the celebration marking the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska from Russia. In 1867, under the leadership of William H. Seward, who served with distinction in the Senate, the United States acquired Alaska from Russia for $7.2 million. This purchase added 20 percent to the land mass of this country, and at a point where we are rubbing shoulder to shoulder with Russia today. I doubt whether a comparable proposal will ever be presented to the Senate.

If we cannot underwrite a dramatic demonstration of the success of our society, memorializing that purchase in the particular corner of the world, I shall be gravely disappointed.

The Committee on Commerce, by a vote of 16 to 1, has recommended a bill that will be before the Senate. The senior Senator from Ohio eloquently dissented from that committee action.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have heard the remarks of the able Senator from Ohio with a great deal of interest. Before I reply to them, may I say that I appreciate the fact that he, the Senator from Delaware, and the Senator from

Arkansas, all of whom I know have doubts about the wisdom of the Interama project, nevertheless cooperated to the end that we might have a meeting this morning in the Committee on Foreign Relations to consider this legislation and report the measure.

Mr. President, I completely agree with what my distinguished friend, the Senator from Michigan has said.

It seems to me that, if we do not participate in the Alaskan celebration, we shall pass up a wonderful opportunity. Alaska, which is on the western shore of our country, recently emerged from the greatest cataclysm which the world has ever suffered. Alaska was purchased from Russia in 1867, almost 100 years ago.

Alaska is within a few miles of Soviet Russia at the closest place. We should express our jubilation over the fact that Seward's Folly has proved to be a very wise investment for this country.

With reference to the observations of my friend the Senator from Ohio relative to the Interama project, I expect to discuss that at some length later, when we get to the debate—although not at too great length.

The argument of the Senator from Ohio does not leave me too highly impressed when he tells me that he has on his side the Wall Street Journal, a superlatively conservative voice, and the Washington Post, a conservatively liberal voice.

I have always found through a great many years of observation of public matters that the sound position is generally between the extreme right and the extreme left.

I should hope that the majority of the Senators, when we reach the debate this afternoon, will find that that is the situation in which Interama lies.

I complete my statement by reminding Senators that Florida is celebrating the first quadricentennial celebration that has been possible in the United States, without the expenditure of a dime of Federal money. This has been made possible by substantial contributions from our State, from the Spanish Government, from the Catholic Church, and from numerous firms which do business with Latin America.

Mr. President, I shall have more to say later concerning the Interama project. We come here with very clean hands, showing a commitment or an expenditure already of something like $100 million of public or local funds in the Interama project.

I hope that we may debate this matter at not too great length, but to a conclusion, before we leave this evening.

I again express my thanks to the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations who were sufficiently considerate to agree to an early committee meeting this morning so that it would be possible to report the measure. We appreciate it.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I thank the junior Senator from Michigan and the senior Senator from Florida for their sound, enlightened, and helpful comments on the efforts of the people of Alaska and indeed of all America to celebrate the centennial of the purchase of Alaska.

I wonder how the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio would feel if the Russian bear still possessed Alaska, and if the rule of the Kremlin continued to be imposed on that large part of the American Continent. That, but for the great vision and wisdom of William Henry Seward, might well still be the situation. Of no other part of America could so great and so salutory a change be recorded.

They—the Russian Communists—would be very much closer and a greater menace to the Western World. It would then be the one part of America where its people did not enjoy freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of worship, freedom to travel, and indeed all the blessings we Americans enjoy and prize.

If there is one event in our history that deserves the fullest kind of appreciation, applause, and celebration, it is the centennial of this purchase which made possible the inclusion of an area one-fifth as large as the 48 older States in our free society and definitively removed the incubus of totalitarianism from the Western World. Alaska—but for William Henry Seward—might well be a police state.

I am amazed that anyone would question the wisdom of an inspired investment of that kind and could question the purpose of the American people to celebrate its hundredth anniversary. It is proposed to celebrate one of the great achievements of American history. It shows that the American people when they went through with the purchase of Alaska, and 6 years ago achieved statehood for our 49th State, proved that they were not declining, but that they were still young, still vigorous and on the march, and that our cherished principle of government by consent of the governed was still in full effect.

The proposed centennial celebration should justifiably receive the unanimous support of the Congress. The purchase of Alaska has altered the course of history—and it is scarcely arguable that it has not been altered for the better.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the senior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I subscribe to the celebration of this important event. However, I cannot approve spending $1,200,000 to build an auditorium for convention purposes in Sitka, with a population of 5,000 people. There are hundreds of places throughout the country which might ask for similar contributions.

Why did the Senator not ask to build something in Nome, further north, so that we might put $1 or $2 million there?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio what the population of Cincinnati and Cleveland were 5 years after the State was admitted to the Union.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, we are going to celebrate the 180th anniversary of the establishment of six States in the Northwest Territory. That will be in 1967.

I suppose that I ought to add an amendment to the bill of the Senator and provide that we should give $10 million each to the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio for the purpose of building an auditorium.

It would be the same principle. We have sesqui-centennials, and centennials every year. There would be no end to it.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, by the purchase of Alaska our country acquired an area one-fifth the size of all the existing and subsequently admitted 48 States of the United States. It extended the territory of the United States to the northernmost and westernmost parts of America. It acquired an area of inestimable strategic value, of vast resources, of unparalleled scenic beauty. Attracted to it have come a rugged pioneering and friendly breed of our fellow Americans—people who prize its freedoms and are determined to make of Alaska a State as great in quality as it is in area.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in answer to the inquiry of the distinguished Senator from Alaska as to the population of the State of Ohio on the date of its admission to the Union, on March 1, 1803, it was 41,915.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY ACT OF 1965

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 10281, the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10281) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

There being no objection the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Salary Act of 1965".

EMPLOYEES SUBJECT TO CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

SEC. 2. (a) Section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (78 Stat. 400; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows.

"Grade	Per annum rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,507	$3,626	$3,745	$3,864	$3,983	$4,102	$4,221	$4,340	$4,459	$4,578
GS-2	3,814	3,943	4,072	4,201	4,330	4,459	4,588	4,717	4,846	4,975
GS-3	4,149	4,289	4,429	4,569	4,709	4,849	4,989	5,129	5,269	5,409
GS-4	4,641	4,797	4,953	5,109	5,265	5,421	5,577	5,733	5,889	6,045
GS-5	5,181	5,352	5,523	5,694	5,865	6,036	6,207	6,378	6,549	6,720
GS-6	5,702	5,894	6,086	6,278	6,470	6,662	6,854	7,046	7,238	7,430
GS-7	6,269	6,476	6,683	6,890	7,097	7,304	7,511	7,718	7,925	8,132
GS-8	6,869	7,097	7,325	7,553	7,781	8,009	8,237	8,465	8,693	8,921
GS-9	7,479	7,733	7,987	8,241	8,495	8,749	9,003	9,257	9,511	9,765
GS-10	8,184	8,464	8,744	9,024	9,304	9,584	9,864	10,144	10,424	10,704
GS-11	8,961	9,267	9,573	9,879	10,185	10,491	10,797	11,103	11,409	11,715
GS-12	10,619	10,987	11,355	11,723	12,091	12,459	12,827	13,195	13,563	13,931
GS-13	12,510	12,945	13,380	13,815	14,250	14,685	15,120	15,555	15,990	16,425
GS-14	14,680	15,188	15,696	16,204	16,712	17,220	17,728	18,236	18,744	19,252
GS-15	17,055	17,645	18,235	18,825	19,415	20,005	20,595	21,185	21,775	22,365
GS-16	19,619	20,297	20,975	21,653	22,331	23,009	23,687	24,365	25,043	--------
GS-17	22,217	22,994	23,771	24,548	25,325	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
GS-18	25,382	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------".

(b) Except as provided in section 504(d) of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (78 Stat. 412; 5 U.S.C. 1173(d)), the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) of this section applies shall be initially adjusted as of the effective date of this section, as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding rate in effect on and after such date.

(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

(3) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate in excess of the maximum rate for his grade, he shall receive (A) the maximum rate for his grade in the new schedule, or (B) his existing rate of basic compensation if such existing rate is higher.

(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to section 2(b)(4) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111), plus subsequent increases authorized by law, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of his existing aggregate rate of compensation, on the day preceding the effective date of this section, plus the amount of increase made by this section in the maximum rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this Act or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purposes of section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing rate of compensation of the employee.

REDETERMINATIONS OF ACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF COMPETENCE

SEC. 3. Section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1121), is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(c) Whenever a determination is made under subsection (a) of this section that the work of an officer or employee is not of an acceptable level of competence, he shall be given prompt written notice of that determination and an opporunity for reconsideration of the determination within his department under uniform procedures established by the Commission. If the determination is affirmed upon reconsideration, the employee shall have a right of appeal to the Commission. If the reconsideration or appeal results in a reversal of the earlier determination, the new determination shall supersede the earlier determination and shall be deemed to have been made as of the date of the earlier determination. The authority of the Commission to establish procedures and the right of appeal by the officer or employee to the Commission shall not apply to determinations of acceptable level of competence made by the Librarian of Congress."

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE EMPLOYEES

SEC. 4. (a) Section 3542(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'PFS'. Except as provided in sections 3543 and 3544 of this title, basic compensation shall be paid to all employees in accordance with such schedule.

"POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE

"PFS	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	$4,086	$4,221	$4,356	$4,491	$4,626	$4,761	$4,896	$5,031	$5,166	$5,301	$5,436	$5,571
2	4,424	4,569	4,714	4,859	5,004	5,149	5,294	5,439	5,584	5,729	5,874	6,019
3	4,780	4,941	5,102	5,263	5,424	5,585	5,746	5,907	6,068	6,229	6,390	6,551
4	5,181	5,352	5,523	5,694	5,865	6,036	6,207	6,378	6,549	6,720	6,891	7,062
5	5,536	5,722	5,908	6,094	6,280	6,466	6,652	6,838	7,024	7,210	7,396	7,582
6	5,941	6,138	6,335	6,532	6,729	6,926	7,123	7,320	7,517	7,714	7,911	8,108
7	6,361	6,573	6,785	6,997	7,209	7,421	7,633	7,845	8,057	8,269	8,481	--------
8	6,888	7,116	7,344	7,572	7,800	8,028	8,256	8,484	8,712	8,940	--------	--------
9	7,449	7,697	7,945	8,193	8,441	8,689	8,937	9,185	9,433	9,681	--------	--------
10	8,110	8,385	8,660	8,935	9,210	9,485	9,760	10,035	10,310	10,585	--------	--------
11	8,961	9,267	9,573	9,879	10,185	10,491	10,797	11,103	11,409	11,715	--------	--------
12	9,914	10,251	10,588	10,925	11,262	11,599	11,936	12,273	12,610	12,947	--------	--------
13	10,956	11,334	11,712	12,090	12,468	12,846	13,224	13,602	13,980	14,358	--------	--------
14	12,077	12,497	12,917	13,337	13,757	14,177	14,597	15,017	15,437	15,857	--------	--------
15	13,349	13,810	14,271	14,732	15,193	15,654	16,115	16,576	17,037	17,498	--------	--------
16	14,751	15,264	15,777	16,290	16,803	17,316	17,829	18,342	18,855	19,368	--------	--------
17	16,320	16,890	17,460	18,030	18,600	19,170	19,740	20,310	20,880	21,450	--------	--------
18	18,078	18,710	19,342	19,974	20,606	21,238	21,870	22,502	23,134	23,766	--------	--------
19	20,042	20,741	21,440	22,139	22,838	23,537	24,236	24,935	--------	--------	--------	--------
20	22,217	22,994	23,771	24,548	25,325	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------".

(b) Section 3543(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'RCS'. Compensation shall be paid to rural carriers in accordance with this schedule.

"RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE

	"Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Carrier in rural delivery service: Fixed compensation per annum	$2,301	$2,412	$2,523	$2,634	$2,745	$2,856	$2,967	$3,078	$3,189	$3,300	$3,411	$3,522
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	86	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104	106	108
For each mile of route over 30 miles	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25".

(c) Section 3544(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Fourth Class Office Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'FOS', for postmasters in post offices of the fourth class which is based on the revenue units of the post office for the preceding fiscal year. Basic compensation shall be paid to postmasters in post offices of the fourth class in accordance with this schedule.

"FOURTH CLASS OFFICE SCHEDULE

"Revenue units	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
30 but fewer than 36	$3,906	$4,035	$4,164	$4,293	$4,422	$4,551	$4,680	$4,809	$4,938	$5,067	$5,196	$5,325
24 but fewer than 30	3,610	3,729	3,848	3,967	4,086	4,205	4,324	4,443	4,562	4,681	4,800	4,919
18 but fewer than 24	2,978	3,079	3,180	3,281	3,382	3,483	3,584	3,685	3,786	3,887	3,988	4,089
12 but fewer than 18	2,339	2,415	2,491	2,567	2,643	2,719	2,795	2,871	2,947	3,023	3,099	3,175
6 but fewer than 12	1,687	1,741	1,795	1,849	1,903	1,957	2,011	2,065	2,119	2,173	2,227	2,281
Fewer than 6	1,359	1,403	1,447	1,491	1,535	1,579	1,623	1,667	1,711	1,755	1,799	1,843".

(d) The basic compensation of each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or the Fourth Class Office Schedule immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall be determined as follows:

(1) Each employee shall be assigned to the same numerical step for his position which he had attained immediately prior to such effective date. If changes in levels or steps would otherwise occur on such effective date without regard to enactment of this Act, such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion.

(2) If the existing basic compensation is greater than the rate to which the employee is converted under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the employee shall be placed in the lowest step which exceeds his basic compensation. If the existing basic compensation exceeds the maximum step of his position, his existing basic compensation shall be established as his basic compensation.

POSTAL SERVICE OVERTIME AND HOLIDAY COMPENSATION

SEC. 5. (a) Section 3571 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3571. Maximum hours of work

"(a) A basic workweek is established for all postal field service employees consisting of five eight-hour days. The work schedule of employees shall be regulated so that the eight hours of service does not extend over a longer period than ten consecutive hours.

"(b) The Postmaster General shall establish work schedules in advance for annual rate regular employees consisting of five eight-hour days in each week.

"(c) Except for emergencies as determined by the Postmaster General, the hours of service of any employee shall not extend over a longer period than twelve consecutive hours, and no employee may be required to work more than twelve hours in one day.

"(d) To the maximum extent practicable, senior regular employees shall be assigned to a basic workweek Monday through Friday, inclusive, except for those who express a preference for another basic workweek."

(b) Section 3573 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3573. Compensatory time, overtime, and holidays

"(a) In emergencies or if the needs of the service require, the Postmaster General may require employees to perform overtime work or to work on holidays. Overtime work is any work officially ordered or approved which is performed by—

"(1) an annual rate regular employee in excess of his regular work schedule.

"(2) an hourly rate regular employee in excess of eight hours in a day or forty hours in a week, and

"(3) a substitute employee in excess of forty hours in a week.

The Postmaster General shall determine the day and week used in computing overtime work.

"(b) For each hour of overtime work the Postmaster General shall compensate an employee in the 'PFS' Schedule as follows:

"(1) He shall pay each employee in or below salary level PFS-7 compensation at the rate of 150 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by two thousand and eighty.

"(2) He shall grant each employee in or above salary level PFS-8 compensatory time equal to the overtime worked, or in his discretion in lieu thereof pay such employee compensation at the rate of 150 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation of the employee or of the hourly rate of the basic compensation for the highest step of salary level PFS-7, whichever is the lesser.

"(c) For officially ordered or approved time worked on a day referred to as a holiday in the Act of December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 862; 5 U.S.C. 87b), or on a day designated by Executive order as a holiday for Federal employees, under regulations, prescribed by the Postmaster General, an employee in the PFS schedule shall receive extra compensation, in addition to any other compensation provided for by law, as follows:

"(1) Each regular employee in or below salary level PFS-7 shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 100 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by two thousand and eighty.

"(2) Each regular employee in or above salary level PFS-8 shall be granted compensatory time in an amount equal to the time worked on such holiday within thirty working days thereafter or, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, in lieu thereof shall be paid extra compensation for the time so worked at the rate of 100 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by two thousand and eighty.

"(3) For work performed on Christmas Day (A) each regular employee shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 150 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step, computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by two thousand and eighty, and (B) each substitute employee shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 50 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step.

"(d) The Postmaster General shall establish conditions for the use of compensatory time earned and the payment of compensation for unused compensatory time.

"(e) Each regular employee whose regular work schedule includes an eight-hour period of service any part of which is within the period commencing at midnight Saturday and ending at midnight Sunday shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 25 per centum of his hourly rate of basic compensation for each hour of work performed during that eight-hour period of service.

"(f) If an employee is entitled under this section to unused compensatory time at the time of his death, the Postmaster General shall pay at the rate prescribed in this section, but not less than a sum equal to the employee's hourly basic compensation, for each hour of such unused compensatory time to the person or persons surviving at the date of such employee's death. Such payment shall be made in the order of precedence prescribed in the first section of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 61f), and shall be a bar to recovery by any other persons of amounts so paid.

"(g) Notwithstanding any provision of this section other than subsection (f), no employee shall be paid overtime or extra compensation for a pay period which when added to his basic compensation for the pay period exceeds one twenty-sixth of the annual rate of basic compensation for the highest step of salary level PFS-17.

"(h) For the purposes of this section and section 3571 of this title—

"(1) 'Annual rate regular employee' means an employee for whom the Postmaster General has established a regular work schedule consisting of five eight-hour days in accordance with section 3571 of this title.

"(2) 'Hourly rate regular employee' means an employee for whom the Postmaster General has established a regular work schedule consisting of not more than forty hours a week.

"(3) 'Substitute employee' means an employee for whom the Postmaster General has not established a regular work schedule."

(c) Section 3575 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3575. Exemptions

"(a) Sections 3571, 3573 and 3574 of this title do not apply to postmasters, rural carriers, postal inspectors, and employees in salary level PFS–15 and above.

"(b) Sections 3571 and 3573 of this title do not apply to employees referred to in section 3581 of this title.

"(c) Sections 3571 (a), (b), and (d), and 3573(e) of this title do not apply to substitute employees.

"(d) Section 3571(b) of this title does not apply to hourly rate regular employees."

POSTAL EMPLOYEES RELOCATION EXPENSES

SEC. 6. (a) That part of chapter 41 of title 39, United States Code, which precedes the center heading "Special Classes of Employees" and section 3111 thereof, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 3107. Postal employees relocation expenses

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each employee in the postal field service who is transferred or relocated from one official station to another shall, under regulations promulgated by the Postmaster General, be granted the following allowances and expenses:

"(1) Per diem allowance, in lieu of subsistence expenses, for each member of his immediate family while en route between his old and new official stations, not in excess of the maximum per diem rates prescribed by or pursuant to law for employees of the Federal Government.

"(2) Subsistence expenses of the employee and each member of his immediate family for a period of not to exceed thirty days while occupying temporary quarters at the place of his new official duty station, but not in excess of the maximum per diem rates prescribed by or pursuant to law for employees of the Federal Government.

"(3) Five days of leave with pay which shall not be charged to any other leave to which he is entitled under existing law."

(b) That part of the table of contents of such chapter 41 under the heading "Employees Generally" is amended by inserting

"3107. Postal employees relocation expenses."

immediately below

"3106. Special compensation rules.".

EMPLOYEES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 7. Section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, relating to grades and pay scales for certain positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"(a) The per annum full-pay scale or ranges for positions provided in section 4103 of this title, other than Chief Medical Director and Deputy Chief Medical Director, shall be as follows:

"SECTION 4103 SCHEDULE

"Assistant Chief Medical Director, $25,382.

"Medical Director, $22,217 minimum to $25,325 maximum.

"Director of Nursing Service, $17,055 minimum to $22,365 maximum.

"Director of Chaplain Service, $17,055 minimum to $22,365 maximum.

"Chief Pharmacist, $17,055 minimum to $22,365 maximum.

"Chief Dietitian, $17,055 minimum to $22,365 maximum.

"(b)(1) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"PHYSICIAN AND DENTIST SCHEDULE

"Director grade, $19,619 minimum to $25,043 maximum.

"Executive grade, $18,291 minimum to $24,024 maximum.

"Chief grade, $17,055 minimum to $22,365 maximum.

"Senior grade, $14,680 minimum to $19,252 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $12,510 minimum to $16,425 maximum.

"Full grade, $10,619 minimum to $13,931 maximum.

"Associate grade, $8,961 minimum to $11,715 maximum.

"NURSE SCHEDULE

"Assistant Director grade, $14,680 minimum to $19,252 maximum.

"Chief grade, $12,510 minimum to $16,425 maximum.

"Senior grade, $10,619 minimum to $13,931 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $8,961 minimum to $11,715 maximum.

"Full grade, $7,479 minimum to $9,765 maximum.

"Associate grade, $6,540 minimum to $8,502 maximum.

"Junior grade, $5,702 minimum to $7,430 maximum.

"(2) No person may hold the director grade unless he is serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, center, or outpatient clinic (independent). No person may hold the executive grade unless he holds the position of chief of staff at a hospital, center, or outpatient clinic (independent), or the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic, or comparable position."

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS; STAFF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

SEC. 8. (a) The fourth sentence of section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended to read as follows: "The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

"Class 1	$23,465	$24,284	$25,382	-----	-----	-----	-----
Class 2	18,954	19,612	20,270	$20,928	$21,586	$22,244	$22,902
Class 3	15,395	15,929	16,463	16,997	17,531	18,065	18,599
Class 4	12,510	12,945	13,380	13,815	14,250	14,685	15,120
Class 5	10,303	10,661	11,019	11,377	11,735	12,093	12,451
Class 6	8,594	8,889	9,184	9,479	9,774	10,069	10,364
Class 7	7,262	7,506	7,750	7,994	8,238	8,482	8,726
Class 8	6,269	6,476	6,683	6,890	7,097	7,304	7,511".

(b) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 415 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 870(a)) is amended to read as follows: "The per annum salaries of such staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

"Class 1	$15,395	$15,929	$16,463	$16,997	$17,531	$18,065	$18,599	$19,133	$19,667	$20,201
Class 2	12,510	12,945	13,380	13,815	14,250	14,685	15,120	15,555	15,990	16,425
Class 3	10,303	10,661	11,019	11,377	11,735	12,093	12,451	12,809	13,167	13,525
Class 4	8,594	8,889	9,184	9,479	9,774	10,069	10,364	10,659	10,954	11,249
Class 5	7,749	8,013	8,277	8,541	8,805	9,069	9,333	9,597	9,861	10,125
Class 6	6,998	7,231	7,464	7,697	7,930	8,163	8,396	8,629	8,862	9,095
Class 7	6,428	6,640	6,852	7,064	7,276	7,488	7,700	7,912	8,124	8,336
Class 8	5,688	5,880	6,072	6,264	6,456	6,648	6,840	7,032	7,224	7,416
Class 9	5,190	5,361	5,532	5,703	5,874	6,045	6,216	6,387	6,558	6,729
Class 10	4,641	4,797	4,953	5,109	5,265	5,421	5,577	5,733	5,889	6,045".

(c) Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates provided by section 412 or 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall receive basic compensation, on and after such effective date, at the rate of their class determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of State.

SEVERANCE PAY

SEC. 9. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, this section applies to each civilian officer or employee in or under—

(1) the executive branch of the Government of the United States, including each corporation wholly owned or controlled by the United States;

(2) the Library of Congress;

(3) the Government Printing Office;

(4) the General Accounting Office; or

(5) the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

This section also applies to person employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)), and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operations of the provisions of this section with respect to such persons.

(b) This section does not apply to—

(1) an officer or employee whose rate of basic compensation is fixed at a rate provided for one of the levels of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule or is in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

(2) an officer or employees serving under an appointment with a definite time limitation, except one so appointed for full-time employment, without a break in service or after a separation of three days or less, following service under an appointment without time limitation;

(3) an alien employee who occupies a position outside the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Canal Zone;

(4) an officer or employee who is subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, or any other retirement law or retirement system applicable to Federal officers or employees or members of the uniformed services, and who, at the time of separation from the service, has fulfilled the requirements for immediate annuity under any such law or system;

(5) an officer or employee who, at the time of separation from the service, is receiving compensation under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, except one receiving this compensation concurrently with salary or on account of the death of another person;

(6) an officer or employee who, at the time of separation from the service, is entitled to receive other severance pay from the Government;

(7) officers and employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority; and

(8) such other officers or employees as may be excluded by rules and regulations of the President or of such officer or agency as he may designate.

(c) An officer or employee to whom this section applies who is involuntarily separated from the service, on or after the effective date of this section, not by removal for cause on charges of misconduct, delinquency, or inefficiency, shall, under rules and regulations prescribed by the President or such officer or agency as he may designate, be paid severance pay in regular pay periods by the department, independent establishment, corporation, or other governmental unit, from which separated.

(d) Severance pay shall consist of two elements, a basic severance allowance and an age adjustment allowance. The basic severance allowance shall be computed on the basis of one week's basic compensation at the rate received immediately before separation for each year of civilian service up to and including ten years for which severance pay has not been received under this or any other authority and two weeks' basic compensation at such rate for each year of civilian service beyond ten years for which severance pay has not been received under this or any other authority. The age adjustment allowance shall be computed on the basis of 10 per centum of the total basic severance allowance for each year by which the age of the recipient exceeds forty years at the time of separation. Total severance pay received under this section shall not exceed one year's pay at the rate received immediately before separation.

(e) An officer or employee may be paid severance pay only after having been employed currently for a continuous period of at least twelve months.

(f) If an officer or employee is reemployed by the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia before the expiration of the period covered by payments of severance pay, the payments shall be discontinued beginning with the date of reemployment and the service represented by the unexpired portion of the period shall be recredited to the officer or employee for use in any subsequent computations of severance pay. For the purposes of subsection (e), reemployment which causes severance pay to be discontinued shall be considered as employment continuous with that serving as the basis for the severance pay.

(g) If the officer or employee dies before the expiration of the period covered by payments of severance pay, the payments of severance pay with respect to such officer or employee shall be continued as if such officer or employee were living and shall be paid on a pay period basis to the survivor or survivors of such officer or employee in accordance with the first section of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 61f).

(h) Severance pay under this section shall not be a basis for payment, nor be included in the basis for computation, of any other type of Federal or District of Columbia Government benefits and, any period covered by severance pay shall not be regarded as a period of Federal or District of Columbia Government service or employment.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION COUNTY COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

SEC. 10. The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act for corresponding rates of compensation.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SEC. 11. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government, whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 3.6 per centum of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law).

(b) The total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section of each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House and is not increased by reason of any other provision of this section, shall be increased by an amount which is equal to the amount of the increase provided by subsection (a) of this section; except that this section shall not apply to the compensation of student congressional interns authorized by H. Res. 416 of the Eighty-ninth Congress.

(c) The rates of compensation of employees of the House of Representatives whose compensation is fixed by the House Employees Schedule under the House Employees Position Classification Act (78 Stat. 1079; Public Law 88–652; 2 U.S.C. 291–303) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by subsection (a) of this section; except, that this section shall not apply to the compensation of those employees whose compensation is fixed by the House Wage Schedule of such Act.

(d) The additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 and the following).

(e) Section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 31), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $30,000 per annum each. The compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $43,000 per annum. The compensation of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $35,000 per annum each."

(f) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator is hereby adjusted, effective on the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act, to the lowest multiple of $60 which will provide a gross rate of compensation not less than the gross rate such employee was receiving immediately prior thereto, except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any employee if on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act, the Senator by whom such employee is employed notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he does not wish such provisions to apply to such employee. No employee whose basic compensation is adjusted under this subsection shall receive any additional compensation under subsection (a) for any period prior to the effective date of such adjustment during which such employee was employed in the office of the Senator by whom he is employed on the first day of the month following the enactment of this Act. No additional compensation shall be paid to any person under subsection (a) for any period prior to the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act during which such person was employed in the office of a Senator (other than a Senator by whom he is employed on such day) unless on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act such Senator notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he wishes such employee to receive such additional compensation for such period. In any case in which, at the expiration of the time within which a Senator may give notice under this section, such Senator is deceased, such notice shall be deemed to have been given.

(g) Notwithstanding the provision referred to in subsection (h), the rates of gross compensation of the Secretary for the Majority of the Senate, the Secretary for the Minority of the Senate, the Chief Reporter of Debates of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Senior Counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the Chief Clerk of the Senate, the Chaplain of the Senate, and the Postmaster and Assistant Postmaster of the Senate are hereby increased by 3.6 per centum.

(h) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading "SENATE" in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (74 Stat. 304; Public Law 86–568), is amended by striking out "$22,945" and inserting in lieu thereof "$23,770".

(i) The limitation on gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the Senate is hereby increased by 3.6 per centum. The amount of such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent. The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to employees whose compensation is subject to such limitation.

FEDERAL JUDICIAL SALARIES

SEC. 12. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a)(2)), section 3656 of title 18, United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, sections 671 to 675, inclusive, or section 604(a)(5), of title 28, United States Code, insofar as the latter section applies to graded positions, are hereby increased by amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees holding ungraded positions and whose salaries are fixed pursuant to such section 604(a)(5) may be increased by the amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by amounts which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) Section 753(e) of title 28, United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts), is amended by striking out the existing salary limitation contained therein and inserting a new limitation which reflects the respective applicable increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

INCREASED UNIFORM ALLOWANCE

SEC. 13. The Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, as amended (68 Stat. 1114; 5 U.S.C. 2131), is amended by striking out "$100" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$125".

MAXIMUM SALARY INCREASE LIMITATION

SEC. 14. Except as otherwise provided in section 11(e), no rate of salary shall be increased, by reason of the enactment of this title, to an amount in excess of the salary rate now or hereafter in effect for Level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARY RATES FIXED BY ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

SEC. 15. (a) The rates of basic compensation of assistant United States attorneys whose basic salaries are fixed pursuant to section 508 of title 28, United States Code, shall be increased by 3.6 per centum effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after October 1, 1965.

(b) Notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rates of compensation are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law and are not otherwise increased by this Act are hereby authorized to be increased effective on or after the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after October 1, 1965, by amounts not to exceed the increases provided by this Act for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to authorize any increase in the rates of compensation of officers and employees whose rates of compensation are fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates or practices.

(d) Nothing contained in this section shall affect the authority contained in any law pursuant to which rates of compensation may be fixed by administrative action.

TRAVEL ON OFFICIAL DUTY TIME

SEC. 16. Section 204 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (68 Stat. 1110; 5 U.S.C. 912b), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "To the maximum extent practicable, the head of any department, independent establishment, or agency, including Government-owned or controlled corporations, or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, or the head of any legislative or judicial agency to which this title applies, shall schedule the time to be spent by an officer or employee in a travel status away from his official duty station within the regularly scheduled workweek of such officer or employee.".

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 17. This title shall become effective as follows:

(1) This section and sections 1, 9, 13, 15, 16, and 18, and section 3107(3) of title 39, United States Code, as contained in the amendment made by section 6(a) of this Act, shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Section 5 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) Sections 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, and 14 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after October 1, 1965.

(4) Section 3 shall become effective on the ninetieth day following the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) Section 6(b), and section 3107 (1) and (2) of title 39, United States Code, as contained in the amendment made by section 6(a) of this Act, shall become effective as of July 1, 1965.

(6) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this Act shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of such enactment.

PAYMENT OF RETROACTIVE SALARY

SEC. 18. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or employee who retired during the period beginning on the effective date prescribed by section 17(3) and ending on the date of enactment of this Act for services rendered during such period and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, Eighty-first Congress), as amended (5 U.S.C. 61f–61k), for services rendered during the period beginning on the effective date prescribed by section 17(3) and ending on the date of enactment of this Act by an officer or employee who dies during such period. Such retroactive compensation or salary shall not be considered as basic salary for the purpose of the Civil Service Retirement Act in the case of any such retired or deceased officer or employee.

(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, after careful consideration of the proposals originally submitted to the Congress by the President on Federal salary legislation and the House-passed bill, H.R. 10281, has reported to the Senate and recommends enactment of its amendment to H.R. 10281, which varies considerably from the President's proposals and the House-passed bill.

The committee amendment does not grant to Federal employees all they desire or deserve or will eventually get when it is possible to make the full comparability policy of the 1962 Federal Salary Reform Act a reality. But it is a bill which gives a 3.6-percent, across-the-board increase to all Federal civilian employees—thus making the salaries paid to the lowest grades and levels of Government employees comparable with the salaries paid to their counterparts in private enterprise based on the latest available statistics and preventing the gap in the higher levels from widening further.

The amount of the increase—3.6 percent—goes beyond what the President originally recommended in salary and fringe benefits, but it is carefully designed to remain within the President's wage-price guideposts which have been so effective in maintaining price stability in this country and which have been accepted voluntarily by the leaders of private employee organizations as the basis for settlement of wage negotiations.

The committee amendment does not contain the procedural reforms recommended by the President, nor the automatic second-stage increases next year contained in the House-passed bill and implied in the President's original proposals. But it does give to Federal employees this year a substantial pay increase—certainly in terms of increase in employee productivity—and it reserves to the Congress and to the President the right to consider additional salary legislation next year with the latest figures on private enterprise salaries in hand and with the benefit of firm knowledge of the state of our economy and the requirements of our continuing struggle in Vietnam.

Above all, Mr. President, the bill recommended by the committee is a good bill. It is a responsible bill. It is an attainable bill. It is a noninflationary bill that will not be vetoed.

Before discussing in greater detail the committees reasons for eliminating the second stage automatic increase contained in the House-passed bill and reducing the 4 percent raise to 3.6, I want to point out the liberalizations in fringe benefits for employees which, although not as great as those in the House-passed bill, represents a change in the Government's official attitude toward fringe benefits and will put into the pockets of Government employees benefits long overdue.

The committee amendment—

Liberalizes the overtime pay for postal employees by paying them premium pay for work in excess of 40 hours a week at the rate of 150 percent of their basic pay;

Provides premium pay for Sunday work at the rate of 125 percent of basic compensation where Sunday is one of the employee's 5 regular workdays;

Makes mandatory the payment of premium pay for work on official holidays for postal employees in PFS–7 and below;

Provides special relocation expenses for postal employees who have been forced to move as a result of the modernization of postal operations, such as the introduction of the ZIP code and sectional center concepts;

Increases the uniform allowance for Federal employees by 25 percent from the current $100 a year to $125 a year;

Authorizes payment for the first time of severance pay to Federal employees who through no fault of their own and because of the dislocations resulting from technological innovations and improved governmental efficiency, have lost their jobs;

Amends the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 to give employees a right to appeal to the Civil Service Commission from adverse determinations of acceptable levels of competence;

Establishes a policy that to the maximum extent practicable Government employees' travel should be scheduled during the regular workweek; and

Gives preference to senior postal employees for a Monday through Friday work schedule.

One of the major differences between the House-passed bill and the committee amendment is the elimination of the automatic second-stage increase in Federal salaries in October 1966. The amount of the increase in the House bill would have depended upon evidence available to the Bureau of Labor Statistics at that time, but it was indicated that closing one-half of the comparability gap plus granting all of the anticipated 1965–66 percentage increase in private enterprise would have resulted in increases from perhaps 3 percent in the lower grades to as much as 8 percent in the higher grades. The estimated cost of the increase was $800 million.

The automatic increase had the advantages of being based on statistical evidence of rates being paid in the private sector and partially fulfilling the policy of comparability enacted in 1962. It had the disadvantages of anticipating differences in private and public pay which cannot be ascertained in advance and might not be ascertainable in October, 1966, and committing public funds in advance during a period when our needs in Vietnam are uncertain and when caution should be exercised in maintaining the delicate balance required to keep our economy from overheating or cooling off.

The committee has not concluded that Congress is unable to enact fair and equitable salary legislation. Indeed, by adhering to wage-price guide lines for 1965, the committee is deeply committed to undertake consideration of salary legislation early in the second session of the 89th Congress. The committee will make every effort to accelerate the achievement of comparability and reduce the 15- to 18-month lag which occurs between the date the Bureau of Labor Statistics report is available and the time Congress usually enacts salary legislation.

Before the end of calendar year 1965, the committee will have available the annual report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics on salary rates paid in private enterprise in the spring of 1965. The committee will give prompt consideration to this report at the earliest possible time next year. Congress has in the past few years enacted progressive and far-reaching compensation legislation. Next year and in the years to follow Congress will strive to make the policy of the 1962 act a reality in as short a time period as possible.

The other major difference between the House-passed bill and the committee amendment is the reduction of the increase from 4 to 3.6 percent. The reduction was based, not on the amount of money entailed, but on the President's strong recommendation and the committee's agreement that salary increases for Federal employees in 1965 should be within the wage-price guideposts which have been used in arriving at equitable wage settlements in private enterprise during the past few years.

The Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, which established comparability with private enterprise salaries as the Government's basic compensation policy, was a landmark in Federal salary legislation. The 1962 salary increases, in two stages which averaged more than 10 percent for all employees—and substantially more in the upper grades where the gap between private employment and Federal employment was greatest—did much to attain comparable rates. The 1964 salary legislation, which increased executive rates by about 30 percent and provided further adjustments for all employees averaging more than 4 percent, was another significant step toward attaining comparability.

No one believed that this goal would be easily or quickly achieved. President John F. Kennedy, in his proposals to the 87th Congress, suggested a three-staged increase in an effort to ease the budgetary implications of salary increases. President Johnson in 1965 proposed a 3-percent increase in an effort to close the gap of comparability at the lower levels of employment, and to keep pace with rising costs in annual salary increases at the upper levels.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from New York. I should like first to take up the amendments which I have sent to the desk, and ask that they be considered and agreed to en bloc.

On page 66, in respect to the maximum increase limitation, the language should be changed to read: "Act" instead of "title" and on page 68, where it sets out the effective dates in this act, the word should be "Act" rather than "title."

The second amendment is also technical and clarifying. It would provide for payment of retroactive compensation to employees who have been promoted between the effective date of this act, October 1, 1965, and the date of enactment of the act, which will probably be some time in the next week. Any employee who is promoted to a higher grade during that short period of time would be paid retroactive compensation at the rate of pay he was receiving during the period from the effective date of the act to the date of his promotion, and at the rate of pay he received after promotion from the date of his promotion until the date of the enactment of this act.

In other words, this amendment recognizes the rate of pay the employee received after promotion for this brief period of time. Inclusion of this provision in the legislation may thus prevent some employees, who have received promotions in the interim, from losing some of their pay to which they are entitled, and which they should receive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 66, line 11, in the committee amendment, strike out "title" and substitute "Act". On page 68, line 5, strike out "title" and substitute "Act".

And on page 41, after line 23, insert the following:

> (5) If the officer or employee, at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, was promoted from one grade under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to another such grade at a rate which is above the minimum rate thereof, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted retroactively from the effective date of this section to the date on which he was so promoted, on the basis of the rate which he was receiving during the period from such effective date to the date of such promotion and, from the date of such promotion, on the basis of the rate for that step of the appropriate grade of the General Schedule contained in this section which corresponds numerically to the step of the grade of the General Schedule for such officer or employee which was in effect (without regard to this Act) at the time of such promotion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the amendments of the Senator from Oklahoma to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of asking for the yeas and nays on the pending legislation?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator probably knows that we operate the biggest post office in the country in New York, and that thousands of postal workers are concerned. The Senator knows, too, how hard they have fought through the years for the idea of comparability, and how disappointed they are now that the increase which is contemplated being granted by Congress is not based, as the Senator has frankly and typically stated, on complete comparability, but on the overall economic situation in the country.

I feel, notwithstanding my deep concern and deep advocacy of what postal workers wish and what the law promises them in terms of its purposes, that undoubtedly considering the fact that this is near the end of a session, the committee has done what it could legitimately do, to consider that the national economy should observe the benefit and the impact of the guidelines. I feel that there is a rather special case to be made for justice to the postal workers, and I am glad to see the statement in the committee report, on page 4, that next year Congress will endeavor to make a reality of the comparability concept.

Knowing the Senator as well as I do, I am sure that he does not even have to give me any assurance that he will——

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me say to the Senator from New York that we intend to support the policy and to move closer toward it. I am afraid, however, that there will still be some gaps, because of the wide disparity in the grades under the comparability level. But it is our goal to try to close those gaps as fast as budgetarily possible.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator for that assurance. Let me emphasize the positive point that the severance-pay provision in section 9 of the bill is a most extraordinarily important one, especially in the closing of any governmental installation. For example, navy yard workers in New York would naturally hope for retroactivity. I believe that retroactivity would have been just. Again, I appreciate the need for empirical judgment and the fact that there is a provision for severance pay which involves $50 million, which is itself, notwithstanding that it falls short of the mark in its effective date, an important point, and I express my gratitude to the committee for it. It will be of substantial assistance to many workers affected by installation closings.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Postal workers, especially those with modest seniority rights, are deeply concerned about section 3571 (b), which vests in the Postmaster General the power to establish work schedules in advance for annual-rate regular employees consisting of five 8-hour days in each week. They have feared that this would result in the Postmaster General, possibly, in his own judgment—whatever that may be—imposing upon regular employees work on Sunday. They came to me with the idea of an amendment which would exclude Sunday from this provision.

I have discussed this matter with the distinguished chairman, especially in view of the attitude of the committee, which is set forth on pages 5 and 6 of the report, in which the committee states that it "has encouraged the Department to give preference to the maximum extent practicable to senior regular employees for a basic workweek of Monday through Friday."

I ask the Senator this question: If we left it solely at that, without any color, without any feeling of emphasis on the part of the committee for the maximum extent practicable—and the chairman has been in the Senate a long time, and he knows that the administrator can forget about it and do what he pleases—I do not say that he is going to do wrong, but he is going to do pretty much what he pleases—I believe it would be extremely helpful if the chairman of the committee, as a part of the legislative record, would give us some feeling as to two points: one, the basic feeling of the committee, which I understand from him is that they will look with disfavor upon the inclusion of Sundays, unless the employee himself wishes it, under the continuous workweek discretion given under the bill to the Postmaster General; and second, and equally important, it seems to me, that the committee will exercise its important oversight jurisdiction to see that the spirit in which it has written this provision, to give the Postmaster General more flexibility than the worker, is carried out in the way that the committee desires, consistent with its view on pages 5 and 6 of the report.

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me refer the Senator from New York to page 46 of the bill, on line 4.

The language reads:

> To the maximum extent practicable, senior regular employees shall be assigned to a basic workweek Monday through Friday, inclusive, except for those who express a preference for another basic work week.

This is to emphasize that the assignment of work as a matter of right will go to those who have seniority rights and will be entitled to those days which generally are considered choice in selection. It was impossible, as we had hearings and studied the situation, to make Saturdays and Sundays volunteer days on which only those regular clerks who would offer to serve on those two important days would work. It is true that only a small crew works on those days, but their work is so important to the efficient movement of the mail on a 7-day basis that, if we left the Post Office Department without the right to assign, on an equitable basis, some regulars to work with the substitutes, we could not guarantee the regular movement of the mail.

Mr. JAVITS. I am aware of this provision. This means with some system on a seniority basis, generally speaking.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is written into the bill "to the maximum extent practicable senior regular employees shall be assigned to the basic workweek Monday through Friday."

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator objects to the way I phrase it, he is a good enough friend of mine to correct me—but is it the desire of the committee, when the Postmaster General or his subordinates order a senior regular employee to work on a Saturday or a Sunday against his wishes, that they should consider it to be a situation which would have to be justified. That does not mean the committee will haul them up; but, prima facie, the Senator expects the Department not to do it, unless it has some particularly good reason for doing it, and the committee expects the Department not to do it; is that not correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. We must have some regular employees.

Mr. JAVITS. I agree.

Mr. MONRONEY. And we must not leave a great institution like the Post Office Department without the ability to have control over its clerical work on a Sunday. It would be unthinkable and an impediment to the efficient movement of the mail.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not say that.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure the Senator does not want that. I wish to make myself clear as to exactly how the committee felt on these requirements.

Mr. JAVITS. Of course.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do believe, however, that all senior regular employees should have preference in the choice of the workweek.

Mr. JAVITS. Good.

Mr. MONRONEY. Which is Monday through Friday.

Mr. JAVITS. It is the Senator's preference and he intends it to be a preference?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Good. That is the main point; so that the Department will have to bear in mind that it has to account for the fact that it may be going against this preference if Department officials feel strongly that they must do so, and they must fully justify their action.

Mr. MONRONEY. We feel that only the younger men who have less experience, and less seniority rights, would be involved in the Saturday and Sunday work, but there must be some.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand. I understand also the concept of preference, which is a good one.

I have one other question: Does the committee contemplate that, generally speaking, the size of the staffs that have to handle the weekend mail will continue, and is this drawn up in light of the fact that it is expected that the size of the staff which has handled weekend mail will continue? Is that going to be about the same?

Mr. MONRONEY. Perhaps a little less, because of the overtime provisions. The overtime provisions will be expensive. I would think such work as has been done on nonpriority mail on Saturdays and Sundays would be largely dispensed with, because of the higher cost of handling it.

Mr. JAVITS. But certainly the Senator does not expect an enlargement of it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would think the reverse.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. There are discrepancies in the present law as between both Houses of the Congress in the manner in which the chairman of each committee in each House and Members of each House may exercise their authority with respect to the compensation received by their respective staffs.

The distinguished Republican Senate leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and I have drafted a memorandum and amendment which would provide that the chairmen of the committees in the Senate might appoint as professional staff members those whom they considered qualified to receive salaries at the top of the present Classification Act. This, generally speaking, is what the law is with respect to the chairmen of House committees today.

In addition, our amendment would provide that a Senator, if he so desired, might place one individual on his own staff at compensation not to exceed the highest grade—GS–18—of the Classification Act, as amended, and two individuals at not to exceed the compensation received by a GS–17.

I ask my friend the floor manager of the bill, the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma, whether or not he would accept the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would have to decline, because the committee made a preliminary study of the amendment the distinguished Senator from California outlined and found it would complicate greatly the entire salary structure of the Senate. For that reason it was the unanimous view of the committee that we should give study to this matter next year, when we can have committee chairmen and Members of Congress before us to outline what they need and want. So I think that should be done so that the salary schedule may be kept consistent and well balanced throughout the range of the important positions in the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. Under the circumstances, I ask my friend the floor manager of the bill, if it is contemplated that in the beginning of the second session of this Congress exertions will be made with respect to holding early hearings which will be necessary to arrive at a just decision on this matter which is presently inequitable between the Senate and the House and between the Congress and the executive branch of our Government?

Mr. MONRONEY. We would like to have hearings as early as possible, because considerable study will be required. We found that out in going into some of the legislative employee salaries. We will take another look at the differences between the Senate and House in the payment of top legislative employees, while some House staff position grades are higher than those of the Senate, some of these House employees are not compensated at the highest rate. We would like to go into the whole matter.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois, the Republican leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], had not desired to press the amendment unless it were acceptable to the chairman. Under these circumstances, I shall not offer the amendment on his and my behalf, but I am also grateful for this colloquy as to what we may look forward to.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia, who has had such a great interest in the postal and classified workers over a period of many years, both in the House and in the Senate, and who has been interested in getting the maximum that can be given those workers consistent with the President's anti-inflationary program.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has tried to bring to the Senate a measure which would do justice and bring equity to Federal employees, keeping in mind the position of the President of the United States as publicly announced, and realizing that we must be both reasonable and realistic at this period in the final hours of the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

Although there are differences in degree between the House position and Senate position in respect to certain provisions, the discussions were weighed most carefully within the committee.

I would like the RECORD to reflect that there is no partisanship in this committee. I make that statement very firmly. I express my appreciation not only to the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], but I speak with equal commendation of the distinguished minority member of the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and I speak of the members of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, who attempted very sincerely to draft legislation which would receive the signature of the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I believe a motion which I had the opportunity and responsibility to make within the committee has, the endorsement of every Member of the Senate, regardless of party.

It is my belief that the distinguished majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, and the distinguished minority leader, EVERETT DIRKSEN, or the men who may in the future hold these positions, should receive $5,000 a year more than other Members of the Senate. There was a unanimous agreement with the motion that was presented. I am sure that in doing what we did and incorporating in the measure this provision, we acted in a manner which not only these two men would naturally be delighted to know about, but I believe we recognized in a responsible fashion the increased pressure which is upon these two leaders of the Senate. I speak of them not in any political sense. They are men whose initiative and industry must at all times be used for the Senate itself, the Senate as an institution of legislative leadership.

I feel that the explanation of the measure itself is, of course, in the capable hands of the chairman of our committee. It is not my desire to prolong the discussion. I do feel, however, that there is a constant cry in some quarters against what is known as so-called inefficiency of our Federal workers.

I become weary when these charges are made, because I am not thinking in terms of persons in the Federal structure who are Democrats or who are Republicans. By and large, those who are employed in the District of Columbia and the metropolitan area of our Capital City, including our effective and loyal personnel and committee staffs, those who labor in our home districts and States, are diligent and dedicated. In many instances they are not only capable, but courageous.

I think the action of Congress, reflected in increases in wages and salaries, is an action which is merited by these people, who not only work for themselves through the jobs they hold, but in a sense are representatives of the Federal Government in the communities all over the United States.

Mr. President, I am grateful for the opportunity to join in the discussion of this legislation, and I underscore the desire of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to bring to fruition legislation at this time, so that in a degree, if not in a complete and full degree, the Senate recognizes the outstanding services of the splendid men and women employed in our Federal system.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virgina.

The committee amendment recognizes the reality of budgetary problems, the increased costs pertaining to the Defense Department, and the costs of other programs of vital importance enacted in the 89th Congress. The committee amendment eliminates the gap in salaries between private and public employment, based on the most recent evidence available to Congress, for all employees in the first five grades of the Classification Act and the first four levels of the postal field service schedule. For those in higher levels of pay, the 3.6-percent increase will go a long way to bridge the gap.

The dollar difference between 3.6 and 4 percent is small when compared to the total Federal payroll. But the American economy and the guideposts for maintaining the purchase value of the dollar and avoiding the serious threat of inflation in the coming years requires Congress to take other factors into account. The importance of the wage-price guideposts must be recognized.

In reducing the increase from 4 to 3.6 percent, the committee has paid particular attention to the overall package of benefits included in H.R. 10281. Evidence presented to the committee indicated that the 4-percent salary increase—costing $545 million—coupled with $210 million in fringe benefits and other liberalizations would substantially exceed the guideposts which private enterprise employees and their elected union officials have agreed to in various labor-management negotiations in the past few years and in recent months.

The committee does not believe it would be in the best interests of the Government, the economy, or the Federal service to upset a policy which has resulted in the observance of 3.2-percent wage-price guideposts in the private sector of the economy by enacting Federal salary legislation amounting to a total increase of more than 5 percent. Nor does it believe that less stringent sacrifices should be asked of Federal employees than are asked of those in private enterprise.

The general guide for noninflationary wage policy has been that the rate of increase in wage rates—including fringe benefits—in each industry be equal to the trend rate of overall productivity increases. If the trend of annual increases in productivity for the whole economy has been 3 percent, the wage rates should rise on the average by 3 percent a year.

Under ideal conditions, the gain from increases in employee productivity throughout the economy would be shared between wage and nonwage incomes by allowing each to grow at the same percentage rate. Business and labor would share in the gains of the advancing economy and industrial productivity. But at the same time the average of all the unit labor costs in the economy would remain stable.

From 1962 until the present time, wage increases have stayed close to national productivity changes—about 3.2 percent each year. Most of the wage settlements negotiated in collective bargaining fell within the standards set by the guideposts. This, combined with satisfactory productivity gains, has led to a stability of unit labor costs and to the unusual degree of overall price stability in 56 months of uninterrupted progress that has brought many gains to labor and to industry.

The direct role of wage-price guideposts in contributing to this stability has been made clear in the recent contract negotiations in the steel industry. The Government surely must abide by those guideposts itself if it expects private industry to abide by them. How else could the Government request—and achieve—compliance with such principles by the leaders of labor and management?

The U.S. Government is not a business enterprise, and the measurement of productivity gains is difficult to ascertain. In the postal service, which is the largest

Government agency in the world, it is estimated that mail volume increases by about 3 percent each year and that employee productivity and additional manpower must absorb that 2-billion-piece increase. Because public pay is fixed by legislation rather than collective bargaining contracts of fixed duration, adjustments have to be made for the period between pay increases.

When allowance is made for the full 15-month period since the last adjustment of Federal salaries, the annual average rate of increase of employees' basic compensation is less than 3 percent. But the additional costs of fringe benefits and other cost items—which are considered part of compensation in the establishment of wage-price guideposts—raises the total cost of the committee amendment to a percentage compatible with the wage-price guideposts. Federal salaries should not exceed that point by a greater margin in 1965.

Of vital importance, the committee amendment of 3.6 percent can be enacted into law in 1965, while the House-passed bill cannot. It will provide the real gains in income which are, in the final analysis, the only way by which the living standards of 2½ million Federal employees and their families can improve.

The decision which the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee had to make last week and which we must make today is whether or not Federal civilian employees shall be granted a pay increase and substantial fringe benefits this year. The President has said that he could not accept the House-passed bill. The Senate committee has reported a bill which it believes the President can and will accept.

There are those on the committee, and I am sure there are others in the Senate, who are displeased that the President expressed his opinion on this bill. There are others who disagree with the committee's decision to adhere to the wage-price guideposts.

I personally believe that the arguments presented by the administration on the necessity of complying with the wage-price guideposts are wise, persuasive, and compelling. I also believe that the President, just as we, has constitutional duties and responsibilities among which are his right to make recommendations to the Congress, to take firm positions, and to refuse to sign into law bills enacted by the Congress which he does not believe are in the public interest. The strong expression of presidential opinion and intention prior to final enactment of legislation by Congress is certainly not unique. In fact, it is a tradition respected and previously exercised by Presidents of all parties.

I believe the President wants to give Federal employees a pay increase this year, as does the Senate committee. But it should be a pay raise in terms of real dollars. It would be a cruel hoax to pass a bill which could spark a widespread inflationary spiral that would erode the value of the dollar and leave Federal employees and other workers with less real benefits than they had before.

Before closing I want to express my profound gratitude and appreciation for the understanding and cooperation of the ranking minority members of the committee, the senior Senator from Kansas, all of the Senators on that side of the aisle, as well as Senators on my side of the aisle for their determination and understanding, and to the other members of the committee on both sides of the table.

We do nothing in this bill that would instigate in this country a widespread wage-price cycle that would destroy the constantly rising economy we have experienced in the past few years.

I also wish to express my deep appreciation and respect for the responsible attitude taken by the leaders of the Federal employee organizations.

I urge the Senate to approve the committee amendment as reported so that Federal employees will receive the benefits in their next paychecks.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. FONG. I commend the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for a fair statement. The statement was very comprehensive and covered the subject in great detail. He has set forth the many problems the members of the committee faced in this bill and has shown where the present bill differs from that which was passed by the House of Representatives.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has said that not everyone is pleased with the bill. I am not pleased with the bill, but I will support it. I would have preferred a 4-percent increase in base pay rather than the 3.6-percent increase contained in the bill before us. I feel certain that all Members of the minority would prefer a 4-percent increase rather than this 3.6-percent increase.

Much valid testimony was presented to the committee justifying the bill providing for a 4-percent increase, which came to the Senate from the House. The evidence presented in committee justified an increase even as high as 11 percent in some grades. But we were faced with the situation of either having a 3.6-percent bill this session or having no bill at all. We in the committee were faced with a Presidential edict that the President could not accept the House bill providing for a 4-percent increase. Therefore, the committee was forced to reduce the amount to 3.6 percent, which the President said he could accept.

We shall be back in session within two and a half months, and as stated by the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, we shall surely take up again the proposals of a new pay bill, to bring the salaries of Federal classified and postal employees into comparability with the pay of their counterparts in private industry. Therefore, at this time, although reluctantly, I shall support the chairman in the presentation of this bill. I voice the sentiment of my committee colleagues on this side of the aisle—the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson]—to go along with this bill. We urge all Senators to support this measure so that at least at this session we shall be able to provide a pay increase for Federal classified and postal employees. They deserve a salary increase, although we believe the increase should be more than 3.6 percent.

We are willing to go along with an increase of 3.6 percent this year. We hope that next year we shall be able to lessen the gap between the pay of statutory-salaried Federal employees and the pay of employees in private industry.

Again, I commend the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for his fine leadership, his painstaking study of the bill, and for granting to every member of the committee, especially those on this side of the aisle, every consideration in discussing the bill. He has done an excellent job and deserves the finest commendation.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, who has done so much to help in the formulation of this legislation, as he has of other legislation in the past.

Mr. President, I wish to return to a discussion I had with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] with respect to seniority preference on a Monday-through-Friday workweek and to make it absolutely clear in the Record that in the bill the Postmaster General retains the full and absolute authority to base his scheduling of employees on what is necessary to move the mail.

The preference contained in the language on page 46 refers to the senior regular employees' preference rights over junior regular employees and substitutes. We would expect that even though there preferences exist, they will be administered compassionately and with an understanding of the problems of the various employees, and thus make the act more just in its applicability.

If the mail volume requires many regular employees, senior or junior, to work on Sunday, the bill authorizes the Postmaster General to so require it. But that should be done, again, with a consideration for the employees and for their working period.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have always supported legislation to insure an adequate salary and pay scale for our civil service employees. Of the various groups, including the postal clerks and others, who have come to see me about the pay raise, I have assured them of my interest in their welfare and of my intention to support legislation which would assure them of a fair and equitable salary.

I am very much opposed to section 11 of this bill, which increases the salaries of employees of Congress. A large increase was granted last year both to Members of Congress and their employees. I opposed the legislation then as not being realistic with their responsibilities and duties. It was passed over my objections, even though there was no justification for such large increases. I am opposed to the increases for the legislative branch again this year, not only for the same reasons I expressed last year, but also because the large increases then make this year's provision entirely unconscionable. We cannot pretend to exercise economy in Government on the one hand and pass exorbitant pay increases on the other.

In spite of the fact that H.R. 10281 contains section 11 covering the legislative branch, I do support the bill and I wish to go on record as being in favor of its passage.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for me to be able to join in support of the Federal employees pay raise of 1965. Action on this bill this year demonstrates that Congress is working toward its obligation to provide pay for the Federal worker comparable to that received in similar jobs in private industry. This desirable policy was written into law in the Pay Act of 1962; by our pay bills of 1964 and 1965 we have shown that we are working to meet the obligation that we incurred, but we have not yet reached full comparability.

To get good competent employees the Federal Government has to pay salaries as good as people with comparable abilities can get in private industry. We demean our Government and the Federal employees if we fail to negate any idea that we intend to run this great Government with anything less than the most competent workers available. For a long period, Federal pay did lag far behind the salary raises being given by private business, but now we are catching up. The "comparability gap" has been cut down by these pay acts of 1962, 1964, and 1965, and we expect now to be able to go far toward liquidating the gap next year.

These gains for the Federal employee and the dignity of the Federal Government have been achieved through the leadership of the two chairmen of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee whom I have known. The late beloved Olin Johnston was the man who got this basic policy enacted into law in 1962; the Federal Government workers never had a more faithful friend.

However, the sad passing of Olin Johnston this spring brought to the chairmanship of our Committee another man who is destined to write a great record in his work on Federal employee matters. The senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has proved himself as an able and dedicated leader for our Post Office and Civil Service Committee. In the very difficult and trying circumstances that preceded the reporting of this bill from our committee, Senator MONRONEY used the utmost skill and patience to bring about the final result. The aim to which he adhered was to bring to the Senate floor the best bill possible in the interests of Federal employees. Although in the committee we had sharp differences of opinion as to the best means to obtain this end, there was no doubt of the sincerity of the Senator from Oklahoma, in using his best judgment to attain the desired goal. I salute him for his accomplishment.

I am hopeful that next year—1966—we will be able to close this comparability gap, and give the Federal workers equal treatment with workers in private employment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, for a private businessman the task of setting wages for his employees is not a particularly difficult one. He is bound by certain inexorable factors of the marketplace, including his balance sheet. He must pay his workers on a par with employees of other companies who are doing similar jobs to those done in his plant. He has, of course, certain factors to guide him.

But in the Federal Government, with certain market rules suspended, we are faced with a unique problem in determining fair and adequate compensation for Federal employees. We do not have the advantage of profit and loss to guide our actions.

In such a situation, the best we can do is to exercise discretion, study salary decisions as they are currently being made in private industry, and rely heavily on this evidence in drafting legislation.

H.R. 10281 was suggested to remedy the inequities which presently exist between the Federal salary structure and salaries being paid in private industry. We know that salaries paid Federal workers do lag behind those paid their counterparts who perform similar functions in private industry. In private industry, adjustments are more easily determined, but, as the Senate knows, we must enact special legislation for the adjustment to take place in the Government structure.

I believe, Mr. President, that wise discretion has been exercised by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in reporting H.R. 10281. This legislation goes a long way toward remedying the present inequities, and I feel the wage increases suggested in this legislation are most reasonable.

I am indeed satisfied, on the basis of the committee's report, that careful attention was paid to the status of wages and salaries in private industry. The committee relied heavily—as it properly should have—on the evidence of wage scales in private employment.

Too often, neither deserved personal credit nor adequate salary compensation is accorded our many thousands of dedicated Federal employees. Their task of running our national machinery is awesome, but seldom do they get the pat on the back which their meritorious service deserves.

Mr. President, we can today help to recognize at least in part such meritorious service. I support wholeheartedly the attempt which is being made to fairly adjust the rates of compensation for Federal employees. It shall be my pleasure to vote for H.R. 10281, doing so in the knowledge that it is a reasonable and just measure.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee I am very disappointed that the committee has recommended a pay increase of only 3.6 percent. There is substantial evidence indicating the need for a larger increase. If we are to pursue a policy of comparability in wages for Federal employees, we must increase their wages more than the 3.6 percent the President has said he would allow.

I resent the White House pressures that were applied on committee members and, thus, voted in opposition to reporting out a bill which I thought was inadequate.

It had been my intention to propose an amendment calling for the 4-percent increase which had been approved by the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, President Johnson is unwilling to back up a policy of comparability in pay for our civil servants at this time. Consequently, I am compelled to go along with the majority of the Senators in voting for this bill so that we can assure our Federal employees, both classified and postal, some sort of pay raise. I ask for unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, the individual views which I have prepared for the committee report on this bill, H.R. 10281.

There being no objection, the individual views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF MR. SIMPSON

I believe Government employees, both classified and post office, should receive wages as near as possible to those earned by persons working at comparable tasks in private industry. Both the House and Senate committees have compiled a great deal of evidence that indicates there is a real need for a substantial pay raise to obtain this objective. I believe that H.R. 10281, as passed by the House of Representatives, which granted Federal employees a 4-percent increase, across the board, was a good bill and with a few minor changes was prepared to support it and did support it in the committee. I plan to support, on the Senate floor, an amendment increasing the pay raise to the 4-percent level adopted by the House of Representatives.

In 1962 this committee adopted and the Congress passed legislation establishing the principle of comparability for salaries of Federal employees.

In each succeeding year in which a salary bill has been enacted, this committee has been working toward full comparability for our Federal employees.

The bill that is now reported by this committee does not bring about this desired comparability in pay.

In March of this year, President Johnson, in a letter to Speaker of the House JOHN MCCORMACK, said:

"It is false economy to offer salaries that will attract the mediocre but repel the talented. * * * I need your help in my program to get a dollar's worth of value for every dollar's worth of pay * * * and the dollars paid to attract brains and ability to the Federal service will come back to the American people many times over in more economical and effective government."

I support that statement fully and am sorry that the President is not willing to back it up.

The committee was forced by the threat of a Presidential veto to report a bill that doesn't begin to come close to enabling Federal employees to keep pace with their counterparts in private industry.

I resent the Presidential coercion that was used in the considerations of this needed pay raise bill.

The White House laid down the terms and we were told to take them or face a veto. I refuse to yield to such pressures. I believe our civil servants and postal employees deserve comparable pay and I will continue to work for it.

Our Federal employees, both in the classified service and in the postal service, are the backbone of our Government. Their talents, their dedication, their devotion to duty are responsible for bringing sound administration and effectiveness to the myriad of Government programs that aid our people.

They deserve more than they are getting in this bill and I intend to do all in my power to get early consideration of another pay bill next session that will carry out the principle of comparability enunciated time and time again by this committee and subscribed to by this administration.

Milward L. Simpson.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] had to leave for his home State last night to keep a longstanding speaking engagement. I do not believe Senator Cooper will be able to be back in time to vote on the Federal pay raise bill today, but before he left for Kentucky, he prepared a statement on his position on the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the following statement of Senator John Sherman Cooper be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Cooper

I will vote for H.R. 10281, as amended and reported by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I do not serve on this committee, but I have followed its hearings, and I have read the report made on this pay raise bill for postal and classified employees.

The provisions of this bill are reasonable, and they are in keeping with the guidelines indicated as helping to maintain a noninflationary policy among employees of the Government and in private industry. In the last Congress, I could not support the bill which provided large increases for Members of the Congress and for other high Federal officials, when so many people remained unemployed across the Nation and when the effect of the tax cut on the deficit was still not known.

I am glad this bill before the Senate today, which would provide increases averaging 3.6 percent, is basically limited to the Federal employees who need to be able to keep up with advances in the cost of living. I am for the bill, I will vote for it, and I hope it will become law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hart in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I observe the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. Carlson and Mr. Pearson], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper and Mr. Morton], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 300 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Mundt
Murphy
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—33

Anderson
Bayh
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dominick
Ellender
Gore
Hartke
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McClellan
McGovern
Miller
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Simpson
Sparkman
Talmadge
Tydings
Williams, Del.

So the bill (H.R. 10281) was passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

SUPPLEMENTAL INCOME TAX PROTOCOL WITH BELGIUM—TAX PROTOCOL WITH THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive G and Executive I on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in the Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the protocol, Executive G (89th Cong., 1st sess.), a supple-

mentary income tax proposal with Belgium; and Executive I (89th Cong., 1st sess.), a tax protocol with the Federal Republic of Germany, which were read the second time, as follows:

PROTOCOL

Modifying and supplementing the Convention between the United States of America and Belgium for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income signed at Washington on October 28, 1948, as amended by the supplementary conventions, signed at Washington on September 9, 1952, and on August 22, 1957

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND HIS MAJESTY THE KING OF THE BELGIANS,

Desiring to modify and supplement in certain respects the Convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on October 28, 1948, as amended by the supplementary conventions, signed at Washington on September 9, 1952 and on August 22, 1957,

Have decided, primarily for the purpose of permitting its application as soon as possible to the taxes instituted by the Belgian law of November 20, 1962, to conclude a protocol for that purpose and have appointed as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

John M. McSweeney,

Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the United States of America;

His Majesty the King of the Belgians:

Paul Henri Spaak,

Minister for Foreign Affairs;

Who, having communicated to each other their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

Article I

The provisions of the Convention between the United States of America and Belgium, signed at Washington on October 28, 1948, as previously amended, are hereby modified and supplemented as follows:

(1) In article I, paragraph (1)(b) is replaced by the following:

(b) In the case of Belgium:

(i) The individual income tax (l'impôt des personnes physiques);

(ii) The corporate income tax (l'impôt des sociétés);

(iii) The income tax on legal entities (l'impôt des personnes morales);

(iv) The income tax on nonresidents (l'impôt des nonrésidents);

(v) The prepayments (précomptes) and additional prepayments (compléments de précomptes) relating to the taxes referred to in (i) through (iv); and

(vi) The proportional taxes (centimes additionnels) supplementing each of the taxes referred to in (i) through (v) above including the communal supplement to the individual income tax (taxe comunale additionale à l'impôt des personnes physiques).

(2) In article II(1)(a), the following words are deleted: ", the Territories of Alaska and of Hawaii,".

(3) In article VIII, paragraph (2) is replaced by the following:

(2) The rate of Belgian tax on dividends derived from sources within Belgium by a resident, corporation or other entity of the United States not having a permanent establishment within Belgium with respect to shares held in registered form for the period of 12 months immediately preceding the date on which such dividends become payable (or for such portion of that period as the paying corporation has been in existence) shall not exceed 15 percent of the amount actually distributed. In all other cases, the rate of Belgian tax on dividends derived from sources within Belgium by a resident, corporation or other entity of the United States not having a permanent establishment within Belgium shall not exceed 15 percent of the taxable amount of such dividends determined in accordance with the Belgian law in force on the date of signature of the protocol inserting this provision in the Convention. In applying this paragraph, the term "dividends" shall include income from invested capital taxable as such to members of Belgian companies other than joint stock companies.

(4) After article VIII A, the following new Article is inserted:

Article VIII B.

(1) Dividends and interest paid to a resident, corporation or other entity of the United States not having a permanent establishment within Belgium shall be exempt from the Belgian additional personal property prepayment (complément de précompte mobilier) provided for in the Belgian law in force on the date of the signature of the protocol inserting this provision in the Convention.

(2) Dividends and interest paid by a Belgian corporation to a person other than a citizen, resident, corporation or other entity of the United States shall be exempt from United States tax.

(3) Dividends and interest paid by a United States corporation to a person other than a resident, corporation or other entity of Belgium shall be exempt from Belgian tax unless such income is collected in Belgium.

(5) In article IX (1) the words "on such income" are inserted in the second sentence after the word "tax" and before the word "as".

(6) In article XII, paragraphs (2) and (3) are replaced by the following:

(2) The United States agrees to allow as a credit against the Federal income taxes payable by a citizen, resident or corporation of the United States the appropriate amount of the taxes mentioned in article I, paragraph (1)(*b*) and paid to Belgium. Such appropriate amount shall be based on the total amount of such taxes paid to Belgium, but it shall not exceed that proportion of the United States taxes which net income from sources within Belgium bears to the total net income of such citizen, resident or corporation.

(3) Belgium shall grant relief from double taxation as follows:

(a) Dividends which are paid by a United States corporation to a Belgium corporation or other entity owning stock in the corporation paying the dividends and which are taxed by the United States in accordance with article VIII (1) shall be exempt from Belgian corporate income tax to the extent that such exemption would be granted in accordance with the Belgian law in force at the date of signature of the protocol inserting this provision in the Convention, if both corporations were Belgian corporations subject to Belgian corporate income tax.

(b) Dividends covered under subparagraph (*a*) which are received by a Belgian corporation or other entity subject to the Belgian corporate income tax (other than a corporation which has made a valid election to have its profits subject to the individual income tax), with respect to stock directly owned by that corporation or other entity for the period of six months immediately preceding the date on which the dividends become payable (or for such portion of that period as both the corporation or other entity receiving and the corporations paying the dividends have been in existence) shall be exempt from the Belgian personal property prepayment (précompte mobilier) ordinarily applicable thereto by reason of their collection by that Belgian corporation or other entity, provided that such corporation or other entity makes a written request for such exemption when filing its annual tax return or before the expiration of the period allowed for the filing of such return. Dividends accorded this exemption shall not be deducted for purposes of determining the personal property prepayment (précompte mobilier) applicable to dividends distributed by the recipient corporation or other entity to its shareholders or members.

(c) Where a resident of Belgium receives dividends taxed by the United States in accordance with article VIII (1), Belgium shall deduct from its tax attributable to that income, in addition to any prepayments which may be collected in Belgium, an amount which is intended to take account of the foreign tax and which shall not be less than 15 percent of the dividends after reduction by the United States tax.

(d) Where a Belgian resident, corporation or other entity receives interest taxed by the United States in accordance with article VIII A, Belgium shall deduct from its tax attributable to that income, in addition to any prepayments which may be collected in Belgium, an amount which is intended to take account of the foreign tax and which shall not be less than 15 percent of the interest after reduction by the United States tax.

(e) Where a resident of Belgium is a citizen of the United States, the amount of the Belgian individual income tax proportionately attributable to dividends, interests, pensions, annuities or royalties received by such individual from sources within the United States may not exceed, after allowance of the lump sum credit for foreign tax, 15 percent of such income.

(f) Where a Belgian resident, corporation or other entity derives any income described in articles III (1), IV, VI, IX (1), X (1), or XI (or other business or personal service income) which has been taxed by the United States in accordance with this Convention, Belgium shall exempt such income from tax; but it may, in order to compute the amount of its tax on the remainder of the income of such resident, corporation or other entity, apply the rate of its tax which would have applied if such income had not been exempt.

(g) The provisions of subparagraph (f) shall also apply to interest, dividends, and royalties which are taxed by the United States by reason of the fact that the Belgian resident, corporation, or other entity receiving such income has a permanent establishment in the United States.

(h) The amount of the income of any Belgian resident, corporation or other entity which is exempted, for any year, from Belgian tax in accordance with subparagraphs (f) and (g) shall be reduced by the amount of any net operating loss deducted in that year for United States tax purposes, but only to the extent that such loss has been deducted from the income subject to the Belgian taxes imposed on that taxpayer for any year.

(7) In the French text of article XV (1), the words "qui sont susceptibles d'être obtenus en vertu de leurs lois fiscales respectives et" are inserted after the words "tous renseignements".

(8) Article XXII is deleted.

Article II

(1) The present protocol shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

(2) The present protocol shall come into force on the date of exchange of instruments of ratification and shall be applicable:

(a) to income of the calendar year 1963 and subsequent calendar years, or of taxable years ending within 1963 and subsequent calendar years, which is subjected:

In Belgium, to the individual income tax or to the income tax on nonresidents applicable to individuals;

In the United States, to the Federal income tax applicable to individuals;

In both contracting states, to taxes accessory or related to the said taxes which are referred to in the amended article I of the Convention;

(b) to income of taxable years ending on December 31, 1962, or subsequent to that date, which is subjected:

In Belgium, to the corporate income tax applicable to corporations (sociétés anonymes), companies limited by shares (sociétés en commandite par actions), and other entities subjected to that tax and not mentioned under subparagraph (c), to the income tax on legal entities, or to the income tax on nonresidents applicable to corporations, associations, establishments, and organizations subjected to that tax;

In the United States, to the Federal income tax applicable to corporations and other entities;

In both contracting states, to taxes accessory or related to the said taxes which are referred to in the amended article I of the Convention;

(c) to income of taxable years ending on December 31, 1963, or subsequent to that date, which is subjected in Belgium to the corporate income tax applicable to companies other than joint stock companies;

(d) in Belgium, to the prepayments and additional prepayments;

(i) on real property income of the year 1963, and subsequent years,

(ii) on other income distributed or paid on or after January 1, 1963, by payors established in Belgium or paid on or after that date by payors established in the United States and collected by residents, corporations or other entities of Belgium;

(e) on and after June 30, 1960, with respect to article I(8) of this protocol.

(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (2) of this article, the provisions of paragraphs (2) and (3) of article VIII B, inserted in the Convention by article I(4) of this protocol, shall be applicable with respect to income paid during taxable years beginning on or after the first day of January following the calendar year in which the exchange of instruments of ratification takes place.

(4) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (2) of this article, where the recipient of the dividends described in article VIII(2), inserted in the Convention by article I(3) of this protocol, cannot, by reason of his taxable status in the United States, benefit, through reduction of his liability for United States income taxes, from the credit provided in article XII(2), inserted in the Convention by article I(6) of this protocol, with respect to Belgian taxes on such dividends (when such credit is applied without regard in income derived from, or taxes paid to, other foreign countries), the modification of said article VIII(2) effected by this protocol shall apply only to dividends paid on or after January 1, 1965.

(5) This protocol shall remain in effect with respect to income of calendar years or taxable years beginning (or in the case of taxes payable at the source, payments made) prior to January 1, 1968, or such subsequent date, not later than January 1, 1971, which may be agreed to by the contracting states through an exchange of diplomatic notes.

In witness whereof the undersigned Plenipotentiaries, being duly authorized thereto, have signed this protocol and have affixed thereto their seals.

Done in duplicate, in the English, French, and Dutch languages, the three texts being equally authentic, at Brussels this 21st day of May 1965.

For the President of the United States of America:

JOHN M. MCSWEENEY.

For his Majesty the King of the Belgians:

P. H. SPAAK.

PROTOCOL

Modifying the Convention of July 22, 1954, between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany for the Avoidance of Double Taxation with respect to Taxes on Income

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Desiring to modify the Convention between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany for the Avoidance of Double Taxation with respect to Taxes on Income, signed on July 22, 1954, and to extend it to certain other taxes, the Convention bearing the title "Convention between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income and to certain other taxes," have agreed as follows:

Article 1

Article I of the Convention shall be deleted and replaced by the following:

"ARTICLE I

"(1) The taxes referred to in this Convention are:

"(a) In the case of the United States of America: The Federal income taxes, including surtaxes (hereinafter referred to as 'United States tax');

"(b) In the case of the Federal Republic of Germany;

"The Einkommensteuer (income tax),

"the Korperschaftsteuer (corporation tax),

"the Gewerbesteuer (trade tax), and

"the Vermögensteuer (capital tax), hereinafter referred to as 'Federal Republic tax').

"(2) The present Convention shall also apply to any other tax of a substantially similar character which may be imposed by one of the contracting States after the date of signature of the present Convention.

"(3) The provisions of the present Convention in respect to the taxation of profits shall likewise apply to the Federal Republic trade tax (Gewerbesteuer) computed on a basis other than profits or capital."

Article 2

Article II(1)(c) of the Convention shall be deleted and replaced by:

"(c)(aa) The term 'permanent establishment' means a fixed place of business in which the business of an enterprise of one of the contracting States is wholly or partly carried on.

"(bb) A permanent establishment shall include especially:

"a place of management;

"a branch;

"an office;

"a store or other sales outlet;

"a factory;

"a workshop;

"a mine, quarry or other place of extraction of natural resources;

"a building site or construction or assembly project which exists for more than twelve months.

"(cc) Nothwithstanding subparagraph (c) (aa) of this paragraph a permanent establishment shall be deemed not to include one or more of the following activities:

"the use of facilities for the purpose of storage, display or delivery of goods or merchandise belonging to the enterprise;

"the maintenance of a stock of goods or merchandise belonging to the enterprise for the purpose of storage, display or delivery.

"the maintenance of a stock of goods or merchandise belonging to the enterprise for the purpose of processing by another enterprise;

"the maintenance of a fixed place of business for the purpose of purchasing goods or merchandise, or for collecting information, for the enterprise;

"the maintenance of a fixed place of business for the purpose of advertising, for the supply of information, for scientific research or for similar activities, if they have a preparatory or auxiliary character, for the enterprise.

"(dd) Even if an enterprise of one of the contracting states does not have a permanent establishment in the other state under subparagraph (c) (aa) to (cc) of this paragraph, nevertheless it shall be deemed to have a permanent establishment in the latter state if it is engaged in trade or business in that state through an agent who has an authority to conclude contracts in the name of the enterprise and regularly exercises that authority in that state, unless the exercise of authority is limited to the purchase of goods or merchandise for the account of the enterprise.

"(ee) An enterprise of one of the contracting states shall not be deemed to have a permanent establishment in the other state merely because it is engaged in trade or business in that other state through a broker, general commission agent or any other agent of an independent status, where such person is acting in the ordinary course of business.

"(ff) The fact that a resident or a corporation of one of the contracting states controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, (i) a corporation of the other state or (ii) a corporation which engages in trade or business in that other state (whether through a permanent establishment or otherwise) shall not be taken into account in determining whether such resident or corporation has a permanent establishment in that other state."

Article 3

Article III of the Convention shall be deleted and replaced by the following:

"ARTICLE III

"(1) Industrial or commercial profits of an enterprise of one of the contracting states shall be exempt from tax by the other state unless the enterprise is engaged in trade or business in such other state through a permanent establishment situated therein. If such enterprise is so engaged, tax may be imposed by such other state on the industrial or commercial profits of the enterprise but only on so much of them as are attributable to the permanent establishment or are derived from sources within such other state from sales of goods or merchandise of the same kind as those sold, or from other business transactions of the same kind as those effected, through the permanent establishment.

"(2) Where an enterprise of one of the contracting states is engaged in trade or business in the other state through a permanent establishment situated therein, there shall be attributed to such permanent establishment the industrial or commercial profits which it might be expected to derive if it were an independent enterprise engaged in the same or similar activities under the same or similar conditions and dealing at arm's length with the enterprise of which it is a permanent establishment. Where the enterprise, in addition to the profits derived through the permanent establishment, derives other profits of the kind referred to in paragraph (1), such other profits shall be treated as if they were derived through the permanent establishment.

"(3) In determining the industrial or commercial profits of an enterprise of one of the contracting states which are taxable in the other state in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2), there shall be allowed as deductions all expenses, wherever incurred, which are reasonably connected with the profits so taxable, including executive and general administrative expenses.

"(4) No profits shall be deemed to be derived from sources within one of the contracting states by an enterprise of the other state merely by reason of the purchase of goods or merchandise by a permanent establishment of the enterprise, or by the enterprise itself, for the account of the enterprise.

"(5) The term 'industrial or commercial profits' means income derived by an enterprise from the active conduct of a trade or business, including income derived by an enterprise from the furnishing of services of employees or other personnel, but does not include income dealt with in article VI paragraphs (1) to (6) (dividends), article VII paragraphs (1) and (2) (interest), article VIII paragraphs (1) to (3) (royalties), article IX (income from real property and natural resources), article IX A paragraphs (1), (2) and (4) (capital gains) and article X (labor and personal services)."

Article 4

Article VI of the Convention shall be deleted and replaced by the following:

"ARTICLE VI

"(1) Except as otherwise provided in this Article, United States tax on dividends received by a natural person resident in the Federal Republic or by a German company from a United States corporation shall not exceed 15 percent of the gross amount of the dividends.

"(2) Except as otherwise provided in this Article, Federal Republic tax on dividends received by a resident or corporation or other entity of the United States from a German company shall not exceed 15 percent of the gross amount of the dividends.

"(3) Notwithstanding paragraph (2) of this article, Federal Republic tax on dividends received by a United States corporation or other entity from a German company at least 10 percent of the voting shares of which are owned directly by the former corporation or entity may exceed 15 percent but shall not exceed 25 percent of that portion of any dividend which under paragraph (5) of this article, is deemed reinvested. The foregoing provision shall apply only if at the time the dividend is distributed the Federal Republic imposes a corporation tax on the distributed profits of the German company at a rate at least 20 percentage points lower than the corporation tax imposed upon its undistributed profits.

"(4) The provisions of paragraph (3) of this article shall apply, mutatis mutandis, to United States tax imposed on dividends received by a German company from a United States corporation.

"(5) For purposes of paragraph (3) of this article, if the United States corporation transfers money or other property directly or indirectly, to the German company as a loan or as an increase in the equity capital of the German company, or as any other form of investment in such company, and if the amount so transferred exceeds 7.5 percent of the dividends received by the United States corporation from the German company in the calendar year in which such transfer is made, then the entire amount transferred shall be deemed to be a reinvestment of dividends received from the German company

"(a) in the calendar year preceding the year in which the amount is transferred,

"(b) in the calendar year in which the amount is transferred, and

"(c) in the following calendar year,

in that order and to the extent of such dividends. With respect to dividends paid in any year there shall first be taken into account the amounts transferred in the preceding year to the extent that such amounts were deemed to be reinvestments and did not result in the imposition of tax under paragraph (3) of tihs article on any prior dividend.

"(6) Any reduction in withholding or refund of tax withheld on dividends to which paragraph (3) or paragraph (4) is applicable is subject to recapture if tax becomes due by reason of transfers that are deemed reinvestments under paragraph (5), the corporation receiving and that paying the dividend being jointly and severally liable for such recapture.

"(7) The foregoing provisions shall not apply, if the recipient of the dividends has a permanent establishment in the United States, for the purposes of paragraphs (1) and (4), or in the Federal Republic, for the purposes of paragraphs (2) and (3), and the holding giving rise to the dividends is effectively connected with such permanent establishment.

"(8) The term 'dividends' shall include in the case of the Federal Republic, in addition to distributions by an 'Aktiengesellschaft' (stock corporation), distributions with respect to shares in a 'Gesellschaft mit beschränkter Haftung' (private limited company), in a 'Kapitalanlagegesellschaft' (investment trust) or in a 'Kommanditgesellschaft auf Aktien' (partnership limited by shares) and income derived from 'Kuxe' (mining shares), from 'Genusscheine' (profit participation certificates), or by a 'stiller Gesellschafter' (sleeping partner) from his participation as such."

Article 5

Article VII of the Convention shall be deleted and replaced by the following:

"ARTICLE VII

"(1) Interest on bonds, notes, debentures, securities or on any other form of indebtedness (including debts secured by mortgages or other encumbrances on real property) derived by a natural person resident in the Federal Republic or by a German company shall be exempt from tax by the United States.

"(2) Interest on bonds, notes, debentures, securities or on any other form of indebtedness (including debts secured by mortgages or other encumbrances on real property) derived by a resident or corporation or other entity of the United States shall be exempt from tax by the Federal Republic.

"(3) Paragraph (1) or paragraph (2) of this article shall not apply if the recipient of the interest has a permanent establishment in the United States, for purposes of paragraph (1), or in the Federal Republic, for purposes of paragraph (2), and the debt-claim giving rise to the interest is effectively connected with such permanent establishment.

"(4) Where, owing to a special relationship between the payer and the recipient or between both of them and some other person, the amount of the interest paid, having regard to the debt-claim for which it is paid, exceeds the amount which would have been agreed upon by the payer and the recipient in the absence of such relationship, the provisions of this article shall apply only to the last-mentioned amount. In that case, the excess part of the payments shall remain taxable according to the law of each contracting State, due regard being had to the other provisions of this Convention."

Article 6

Article VIII of the Convention shall be deleted and replaced by the following:

"ARTICLE VIII

"(1) Royalties derived by a natural person resident in the Federal Republic or by a German company shall be exempt from tax by the United States.

"(2) Royalties derived by a resident or corporations or other entity of the United States shall be exempt from tax by the Federal Republic.

"(3) The term 'royalties', as used in this article,

"(a) means any royalties, rentals or other amounts paid as consideration for the use of, or the right to use, copyrights, artistic or scientific works (including motion picture films, or films or tapes for radio or television broadcasting), patents, designs, plans, secret processes or formulae, trademarks, or other like property or rights, or for industrial, commercial or scientific equipment, or for knowledge, experience or skill (know-how) and

"(b) shall include gains derived from the alienation of any right or property giving rise to such royalties.

"(4) Paragraph (1) or paragraph (2) of this article shall not apply if the recipient of the royalties has a permanent establishment in the United States, for purposes of paragraph (1), or in the Federal Republic, for purposes of paragraph (2), and the right or property giving rise to the royalties is effectively connected with such permanent establishment.

"(5) Where, owing to a special relationship between the payer and the recipient or between both of them and some other person, the amount of the royalties paid, having regard to the use, right or information for which they are paid, exceeds the amount which would have been agreed upon by the payer and the recipient in the absence of such relationship, the provisions of this article shall apply only to the last-mentioned amount. In that case, the excess part of the payments shall remain taxable according to the law of each contracting state, due regard being had to the other provisions of this Convention."

Article 7

Article IX of the Convention shall be deleted and replaced by the following:

"ARTICLE IX

"(1) Income from real property situated in one of the contracting states and royalties in respect of the operation of mines, quarries or other natural resources located within that state, including gains derived from the alienation of items of the aforementioned property, may be taxed by that state.

"(2) A natural person resident in the Federal Republic or a German Company subject to tax in the United States, or a resident or corporation or other entity of the United States subject to tax in the Federal Republic on any income mentioned in paragraph (1) of this article may elect for any taxable year to compute tax on such income on a net basis at the tax rates that would apply to a resident or company of the contracting state in which the property is situated."

Article 8

The following new article shall be inserted immediately after article IX of the Convention:

"ARTICLE IX–A

"(1) Gain derived by a natural person resident in the Federal Republic or by a German company from the alienation of a capital asset (other than gain from the alienation of property referred to in article IX of this Convention) shall be exempt from tax by the United States.

"(2) Gain derived by a resident or corporation or other entity of the United States from the alienation of a capital asset (other than gain from the alienation of property referred to in article IX of this Convention) shall be exempt from tax by the Federal Republic.

"(3) Paragraph (1) or paragraph (2) of this Article shall not apply if the person deriving the gain has a permanent establishment in the United States, for purposes of paragraph (1), or in the Federal Republic, for purposes of paragraph (2), and the gain is derived from the alienation of a capital asset which is effectively connected with such permanent establishment.

"(4) Paragraph (1) of this article shall not apply if:

"(a) the person deriving the gain is a natural person resident in the Federal Republic who is present in the United States for a period equal to or exceeding an aggregate of 183 days during the taxable year, and

"(b) the asset alienated was held by such person for six months or less."

Article 9

Article X of the Convention shall be deleted and replaced by the following:

"ARTICLE X

"(1) Compensation for labor or personal services (including compensation derived from the practice of a liberal profession and the rendition of services as a director) performed outside the United States by a natural person resident in the Federal Republic shall be exempt from tax by the United States.

"(2) Compensation for labor or personal services (including compensation derived from the practice of a liberal profession and the rendition of services as a director) performed in the United States by a natural person resident in the Federal Republic shall be exempt from tax by the United States if—

(a) he is present in the United States for a period or periods not exceeding a total of 183 days during a taxable year,

(b) such labor or personal services are performed as an employee of, or under contract with, a natural person resident in the Federal Republic or a German company, and such compensation is borne by such resident or company, and

(c) such compensation is not borne by a permanent establishment which such resident or company has in the United States.

"(3) Compensation for labor or personal services (including compensation derived from the practice of a liberal profession and the rendition of services as a director) performed outside the Federal Republic by a resident of the United States shall be exempt from tax by the Federal Republic.

"(4) Compensation for labor or personal services (including compensation derived from the practice of a liberal profession and the rendition of services as a director) performed in the Federal Republic by a resident of the United States shall be exempt from tax by the Federal Republic if—

"(a) he is present in the Federal Republic for a period or periods not exceeding a total of 183 days during a taxable year,

"(b) such labor or personal services are performed as an employee of, or under contract with, a resident or corporation or other entity of the United States and such compensation is borne by such resident or corporation or other entity, and

"(c) such compensation is not borne by a permanent establishment which such resident or corporation or other entity has in the Federal Republic."

Article 10

Article XI of the Convention shall be deleted and replaced by the following:

"ARTICLE XI

"(1)(a) Wages, salaries and similar compensation and pensions paid by the United States or by its states, territories or political subdivisions, to a natural person, other than a German citizen, shall be exempt from tax by the Federal Republic.

"(b) Wages, salaries and similar compensation and pensions paid by the Federal Republic or by its Laender or by municipalities, or by a public pension fund thereof, to a natural person, other than a citizen of the United States and other than an individual who has been admitted to the United States for permanent residence therein, shall be exempt from tax by the United States.

"(c) Pensions, annuities and other amounts paid by one of the contracting States or by a juridical person organized under the public laws of that State as compensation for an injury or damage sustained as a result of hostilities or political persecution shall be exempt from tax by the other State.

"(d) For the purposes of this paragraph the term 'pensions' shall be deemed to include annuities paid to a retired civilian government employee.

"(2) Private pensions and private life annuities which are derived from sources within one of the contracting states and are paid to a natural person resident in the other state shall be exempt from taxation by the former state.

"(3) The term 'pensions', as used in this article, means periodic payments made in consideration for services rendered or by way of compensation for injuries received.

"(4) The term 'life annuities,' as used in this article, means a stated sum payable periodically at stated times during life, or during a specified number of years, under an obligation to make the payments in return for adequate and full consideration in money or money's worth."

Article 11

The following new article shall be inserted immediately after Article XIV of the Convention:

"ARTICLE XIV–A

"With respect to taxes on capital, the following provisions shall apply:

"(1) Capital represented by property mentioned in article IX may be taxed in the contracting state in which such property is situated.

"(2) Subject to the provisions of paragraph (3) below, capital represented by assets, other than property referred to in paragraph (1), which are effectively connected with a permanent establishment of an enterprise of one of the contracting states may be taxed in the state in which the permanent establishment is situated.

"(3) Ships and aircraft of an enterprise of one of the contracting states and assets, other than property referred to in paragraph (1), pertaining to the operation of such ships or aircraft shall be exempt from tax by the other state.

"(4)(a) All other elements of capital of a natural person resident in the Federal Republic or of a German company shall be exempt from tax by the United States.

"(b) All other elements of capital of a resident or corporation or other entity of the United States shall be exempt from tax by the Federal Republic."

Article 12

Article XV(1) of the Convention shall be deleted and replaced by the following:

"(1) It is agreed that double taxation shall be avoided in the following manner:

"(a) The United States, in determining United States tax in the case of its citizens, residents or corporations, may, regardless of any other provision of this Convention, include in the basis upon which such tax is imposed all items of income taxable under the revenue laws of the United States as if this Convention had not come into effect. The United States shall, however, allow to a citizen, resident or corporation of the United States as a credit against United States tax the appropriate amount of Federal Republic tax paid, other than the Vermögensteuer (capital tax) and that portion of the Gewerbesteuer (trade tax) computed on a basis other than profits. Such appropriate amount shall be based upon the amount of Federal Republic tax paid but shall not exceed that portion of the United States tax which net income from sources within the Federal Republic bears to the entire net income. It is agreed, that, by virtue of the provisions of this Article, the Federal Republic satisfies the similar credit requirement of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to Federal Republic tax.

"(b) 1. Federal Republic tax shall be determined in the case of a natural person resident in the Federal Republic or of a German company as follows:

"(aa) Unless the provisions of subparagraph (bb) below apply, there shall be excluded from the basis upon which the Federal Republic tax is imposed, any item of income from sources within the United States or any item of capital situated within the United States which, according to this Convention, is not exempt from tax by the United States. The Federal Republic, however, retains the right to take into account in the determination of its rate of tax the items of income or capital so excluded. The first sentence shall, in the case of income from dividends, apply only to such dividends subject to tax under United States law as are paid to a German company limited by shares (Kapitalgesellschaft) by a United States corporation, at least 25 percent of the voting shares of which are owned directly by the first-mentioned company. There shall also be excluded from the basis upon which Federal Republic tax is imposed any participation the dividends on which are excluded, or if paid would be excluded, from the tax basis according to the foregoing sentence.

"(bb) United States tax payable under the laws of the United States and in accordance with this Convention on the following items of income shall be allowed as a credit against such Federal Republic tax on income as is payable in respect of the followings items of income:

"(i) dividends not dealt with in subparagraph (aa) above;

"(ii) wages, salaries, pensions and similar compensation paid by the United States or by its states, territories or political subdivisions, not being exempt from Federal Republic tax under article XI, paragraph (1), subparagraph (a) of this Convention.

such credit shall not exceed that portion of the Federal Republic tax which such items of income bear to the total amount of all items of income.

"2. Where a natural person subject to unlimited tax liability in the Federal Republic is also a resident of the United States for purposes of United States tax or a citizen of the United States, subparagraph 1(aa) shall apply to those items of income from sources within the United States and those items of capital situated within the United States which, according to that subparagraph, are exempt from Federal Republic tax when received or owned by a natural person who is not a resident of the United States for the purposes of United States tax nor a citizen of the United States. All other items of income and capital shall be included in the basis upon which Federal Republic tax is imposed as if this Convention had not come into force. There shall, however, subject to paragraph 34c of the German Income Tax Act, as amended, be allowed as a credit against Federal Republic income tax the United States tax on such other income from sources within the United States."

Article 13

The following new Article shall be inserted immediately after article XV of the Convention:

"ARTICLE XV–A

"(1) A German company or organization operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, educational or public purposes shall be exempt from tax by the United States, if and to the extent that—

"(a) such company or organization is exempt from tax in the Federal Republic, and

"(b) such company or organization would be exempt from tax in the United States if it were organized, and carried on all its activities, in the United States.

"(2) A United States corporation or organization operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, educational or public purposes shall be exempt from tax by the Federal Republic, if and to the extent that—

"(a) such corporation or organization is exempt from tax in the United States, and

"(b) such corporation or organization would be exempt from tax in the Federal Republic if it were a German company or organization and carried on all its activities in the Federal Republic."

Article 14

Article XVI paragraph (1) of the Convention shall be deleted and replaced by:

"(1) The competent authorities of the contracting states shall exchange such information (being information available under the respective taxation laws of the contracting states) as is necessary for carrying out the provisions of the present Convention or for the prevention of fraud or the like in relation to the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention. Any information so exchanged shall be treated as secret but may be disclosed to persons (including a court or administrative body) concerned with assessment, collection, enforcement or prosecution in respect of taxes which are the subject of the present Convention. No information shall be exchanged which would disclose any trade, business, industrial or professional secret or any trade process."

Article 15

Article XVII of the Convention shall be deleted and replaced by the following:

"ARTICLE XVII

"(1) Where a taxpayer shows proof that the action of the tax authorities of the contracting states has resulted or will result in double taxation contrary to the provisions of the present Convention, he shall be entitled to present his case to the state of which he is a citizen or a resident, or, if the taxpayer is a company or a corporation of one of the contracting states, to that state. Should the taxpayer's claim be deemed worthy of consideration, the competent authority of the state to which the claim is made shall endeavor to come to an agreement with the competent authority of the other state with a view to avoidance of double taxation.

"(2) The competent authorities of the contracting states may communicate with each other directly to implement the provisions of the present Convention. Should any difficulty or doubt arise as to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, or its relationship to conventions between one of the contracting states and any other state, the competent authorities shall endeavor to settle the question as quickly as possible by mutual agreement.

"(3) In particular, the competent authorities of the contracting states may consult together to endeavor to agree

"(a) to the same attribution of industrial or commercial profits to an enterprise of one of the contracting states and to its permanent establishment situated in the other state,

"(b) to the same allocation of profits between related enterprises as provided for in article IV, or

"(c) to the same determination of the source of particular items of income.

In the event that the competent authorities reach such an agreement taxes shall be imposed on such income, and refund or credit of taxes shall be allowed, by the contracting states in accordance with such agreement."

Article 16

This protocol shall also apply to Land Berlin, provided that the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has not delivered a contrary declaration to the Government of the United States of America within three months from the date of entry into force of this protocol.

Article 17

(1) The present protocol shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Bonn as soon as possible.

(2) The present protocol shall come into force on the date of the exchange of instruments of ratification; and the articles thereof shall have effect for taxable years beginning on or after the first day of January in the year in which such exchange takes place, except that

(a) Article 4 shall have effect with respect to dividends paid on or after January 1, 1965, and paragraph (3) thereof shall apply to investments made on or after that date,

(b) Article 6 shall have effect with respect to any payment made on or after January 1, 1963.

Article 18

(1) This protocol shall form an integral part of the Convention of July 22, 1954, and shall continue in force as long as that Convention remains effective.

(2) The competent authorities of the contracting states are authorized to publish the text of the Convention, as modified by this protocol, after this protocol comes into force.

Done at Bonn in four originals, two each in the English and German languages, all four texts being equally authentic, this seventeenth day of September 1965.

For the United States of America:

GEORGE C. MCGHEE

For the Federal Republic of Germany:

CARSTENS

GRUND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as Senators know, we are now in executive session, and we have before us Executive G and Executive I, which are very important protocols. They were reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I had announced yesterday that they would be taken up today.

I hope it will be possible, after the explanation by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations we may be able to vote on both at the same time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the main purpose of the supplementary income tax protocol with Belgium is to modify the provisions of the original 1948 convention, as amended by two protocols in 1952 and 1957, in order to adjust them to the new Belgian income tax law which was enacted on November 20, 1962.

The tax protocol with the Federal Republic of Germany, which is an outgrowth of discussions over a period of several years, is designed primarily to deal with problems which have arisen as a result of experience in the application of the basic 1954 convention between the United States and Germany and changes that have since been made in the tax laws of the two countries.

Mr. President, both of these protocols have been analyzed by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and Mr. L. N. Woodworth, the Chief of Staff of that committee recommended that they be approved. Also, a representative of the Treasury Department appeared before the committee in support of the protocols. They are highly technical in nature, dealing largely with the application of income tax law. The Committee on Foreign Relations has not received any objections to approval of either of the protocols, and I am informed that the American business community supports them.

There was no criticism or objection registered with the committee. I hope that the Senate will ratify them, and I would like, if there is no objection, for them to be ratified en bloc.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does it not require unanimous consent to have both of them voted upon in one rollcall?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask unanimous consent that the two protocols be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands there is no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did the Chair rule on the unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The inquiry was, as the Chair understands, whether both protocols are being considered en bloc. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They are. Without objection, the protocols will be considered as having passed through their various parliamentary stages up to the point of consideration of the resolutions of ratification which will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE G

Resolved, (two-third of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the protocol, signed at Brussels on May 21, 1965, modifying and supplementing the convention of October 28, 1948, between the United States and Belgium for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, as amended by supplementary conventions of September 9, 1952, and August 22, 1957. (Executive G, 89th Cong., 1st sess.)

EXECUTIVE I

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the protocol between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Bonn on September 17, 1965, modifying the convention of July 22, 1954, for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income. (Executive I, 89th Cong., 1st sess.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the resolutions of ratification of Executive G and I, 89th Congress, 1st session. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], the Senators from Kansas [Mr. Carlson and Mr. Pearson], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper and Mr. Morton], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson], would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 66, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 301 Ex.]

YEAS—66

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bass
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Mundt
Murphy
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—34

Anderson
Bayh
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dominick
Ellender
Ervin
Gore
Hartke
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McClellan
McGovern
Miller
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Robertson
Simpson
Smathers
Sparkman
Talmadge
Tydings

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 66 and the nays are 0. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolutions of ratification are agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the ratification of these protocols.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. Mansfield, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS TO COAST GUARD LAW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 897, Senate bill 2471.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 2471) to improve and clarify certain laws of the Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments, on page 6, after line 5, to strike out:

(20) By adding the following new section in chapter 11 following section 335:

"§ 336. United States Coast Guard Band; composition; director

"(a) The United States Coast Guard Band shall be composed of a director and other personnel in such numbers and grades as the Secretary determines to be necessary.

"(b) The Secretary shall designate the director from among qualified members of the Coast Guard. Upon the recommendation of the Secretary, a member so designated may be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to a commissioned grade in the Regular Coast Guard.

"(c) The initial appointment to a commissioned grade of a member designated as director of the Coast Guard Band shall be in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) or lieutenant.

"(d) A member who is designated and commissioned under this section shall not be included on the active duty promotion list. He shall be promoted under section 276 of this title. However, the grade of the director may not be higher than lieutenant commander.

"(e) The Secretary may revoke any designation as director of the Coast Guard Band. When a member's designation is revoked, his appointment to commissioned grade under this section terminates and he is entitled, at his option—

"(1) to be discharged from the Coast Guard; or

"(2) to revert to the grade and status he held at the time of his designation as director."

On page 7, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "(21)" and insert "(20)"; on page 9, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "(22)" and insert "(21)"; at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "(23)" and insert "(22)"; at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "(24)" and insert "(23)"; at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "(25)" and insert "(24)"; at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "(26)" and insert "(25)"; on page 10, after line 3, to strike out:

"336. United States Coast Guard Band; composition; director.

At the beginning of line 4, to strike out "(27)" and insert "(26)"; after line 7, to strike out:

(1) Section 207 is amended by adding a new subsection (f) at the end reading as follows:

"(f) The director of the Coast Guard Band is entitled to the basic pay of an officer in the grade in which he is serving. However, his basic pay may not be less than that to which he was entitled at the time of his appointment as director."

At the beginning of line 15, to strike out "(2)" and insert "(1)"; at the top of page 11, to strike out:

(3) Section 424 is amended by adding a new subsection (f) at the end reading as follows:

"(f) The director of the Coast Guard Band is entitled to the allowances of an officer in the grade in which he is serving. However, his allowances may not be less than those to which he was entitled at the time of his appointment as director."

And, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "(4)" and insert "(2)"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 14, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 4 is amended—

(A) by inserting the word "and" at the end of clause (d); and

(B) by striking out "; and" at the end of clause (e) and inserting a period in place thereof.

(2) Subsection (a) of section 42 is amended by striking out "three thousand five hundred" and inserting "four thousand" in place thereof so that the subsection will read as follows:

"(a) The total number of commissioned officers, excluding commissioned warrant officers, on active duty in the Coast Guard shall not exceed four thousand."

(3) Section 44 is amended by striking out "The position vacated by an officer appointed Commandant shall be filled by promotion according to law."

(4) Subsection (c) of section 46 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) An officer who is retired prior to the expiration of his term, while serving as Commandant, may, in the discretion of the President, be retired with the grade of admiral and retired pay computed at the highest rates of basic pay applicable to him while he served as Commandant."

(5) Subsection (d) of section 46 is repealed.

(6) Subsection (c) of section 47 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) An officer who is retired while serving as Assistant Commandant, or who, after serving at least two and one-half years as Assistant Commandant, is retired after completion of that service while serving in a lower rank or grade, may, in the discretion of the President, be retired with the grade and retired pay of vice admiral."

(7) Subsection (d) of section 47 is amended to read as follows:

"(d) An officer who, after serving less than two and one-half years as Assistant Commandant, is retired after completion of that service while serving in a lower rank or grade, shall be retired in his permanent grade and with the retired pay of that grade."

(8) Section 182 is amended by striking out "three" in the first sentence and inserting "four" in place thereof so that the sentence will read as follows:

"The number of cadets appointed annually to the Academy shall be as determined by the Secretary but the number appointed in any one year shall not exceed four hundred."

(9) Section 186 is amended—

(A) by striking the words "of the teaching staff" and the words "whose compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended" in the first sentence, by inserting the word "faculty" between "civilian" and "members" in the first sentence, and by inserting a period after the word "require" so that the first sentence will read as follows: "The Secretary may appoint in the Coast Guard such number of civilian faculty members at the Academy as the needs of the Service may require."

(B) by redesignating the amended section as subsection (a).

(C) by adding a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) The compensation of persons employed under this section is as prescribed by the Secretary."

(10) Section 190 is amended by inserting the following after the first sentence: "The Secretary may retire any member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff who has completed thirty years' active service."

(11) Subsection (a) of section 211 is amended by striking out "four" in paragraph (4) and inserting "two" in place thereof so that the paragraph will read as follows:

"(4) licensed officers of the United States merchant marine who have served two or more years aboard a vessel of the United States in the capacity of a licensed officer."

(12) Subsection (a) of section 214 is amended by striking out the period at the end of the sentence and adding ", and from licensed officers of the United States merchant marine."

(13) Subsection (b) of section 214 is amended by striking out the period at the end of the sentence and adding ", and from licensed officers of the United States merchant marine."

(14) Subsection (c) of section 214 is amended by striking out the period at the end of the sentence and adding ", and from licensed officers of the United States merchant marine."

(15) Subsection (a) of section 253 is amended by inserting "the officers eligible for consideration," after "to be considered,".

(16) Subsection (a) of section 256 is amended by inserting the words "who are eligible for consideration for promotion to the next higher grade and" before the words "who have not" in the second sentence.

(17) Clause (2) of section 258 is amended to read as follows: "the names and records of all officers who are eligible for consideration for promotion to the grade to which the board will recommend officers for promotion, with identification of those officers who are in the promotion zone."

(18) Subsection (b) of section 332 is amended by inserting the following sentence at the end thereof: "However, this limitation does not apply to retired officers of these grades recalled to serve as members of courts, boards, panels, surveys, or special projects for periods not to exceed one year."

(19) The catchline of section 334 is amended to read as follows: "§ 334. Grade on retirement".

(20) By adding the following new sections after section 370:

"§ 371. Aviation cadets; procurement; transfer

"(a) The grade of aviation cadet is established as a special enlisted grade in the Coast Guard. Under such regulations as the Secretary prescribes, male citizens in civil life may be enlisted as, and male enlisted members of the Coast Guard with their consent may be designated as, aviation cadets.

"(b) Except in time of war or national emergency declared by Congress, not less than 20 per centum of the aviation cadets procured in each fiscal year shall be procured from qualified enlisted members of the Coast Guard.

"(c) No person may be enlisted or designated as an aviation cadet unless—

"(1) he agrees in writing that, upon his successful completion of the course of training as an aviation cadet, he will accept a commission as an ensign in the Coast Guard Reserve and will serve on active duty as such for at least three years, unless sooner released; and

"(2) if under twenty-one years of age, he has the consent of his parent or guardian to his agreement.

"(d) Under such regulations as the Secretary prescribes, an aviation cadet may be transferred to another enlisted grade or rating in the Coast Guard, released from active duty, or discharged.

"§ 372. Aviation cadets; benefits

"Except as provided in section 402(c) of title 37, aviation cadets or their beneficiaries are entitled to the same allowances, pensions, gratuities, and other benefits as are provided for enlisted members in pay grade E-4. While on active duty, an aviation cadet is entitled to uniforms, clothing, and equipment at the expense of the United States.

"§ 373. Aviation cadets; appointment as Reserve officers

"(a) An aviation cadet who fulfills the eligibility requirements of section 6023(b) of title 10 for designation as a naval aviator may be appointed an ensign in the Coast Guard Reserve and designated a Coast Guard aviator.

"(b) Aviation cadets who complete their training at approximately the same time are considered for all purposes to have begun their commissioned service on the same date, and the decision of the Secretary in this regard is conclusive."

(21) Section 438 is amended by striking out "and section 438 of this title,".

(22) Section 654 is amended by inserting the following catchline immediately after the section number: "Public and commercial vessels and other watercraft; sale of fuel, supplies, and services".

(23) Subsection (b) of section 755 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The provisions of chapter 13 of this title, except for section 461, apply to members of the Reserve under the same conditions and limitations as are applicable to officers and enlisted men of the Regular Coast Guard."

(24) Section 771 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 771. Applicability of this subchapter

"(a) This chapter applies—

"(1) only to the Coast Guard Reserve;

"(2) equally to women members of the Reserve except where the context indicates otherwise.

"(b) This subchapter does not apply to temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve."

(25) The analysis of chapter 11 is amended—

(A) by striking out—

"334. Retirement in cases where higher grade has been held,"

and inserting in place thereof:

"334. Grade on retirement."

(B) by inserting the following new items:

"371. Aviation cadets; procurement; transfer.
"372. Aviation cadets; benefits.
"373. Aviation cadets; appointment as Reserve officers."

(26) The analysis of chapter 13 is amended by striking out the following items:

"462. Pay and allowances of rear admirals.
"464. Allotment of pay.
"465. Advance to officers ordered to and from sea or shore duty beyond the seas.
"466. Settlement of accounts of deceased officers and men.
"474. Compensation for travel tolls and fares.
"504. Disposition of remains of personnel.
"505. Escorts for deceased officers and enlisted men.
"506. Issue of national flag free of cost."

SEC. 2. Title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (e) of section 415 is amended by striking out "435" and inserting "214" in place thereof.

(2) The second sentence of section 402(c) is amended by deleting "or" between Air Force and Marine Corps in both places that it appears and by inserting ", or Coast Guard" after Marine Corps in both places where the latter appears so that the sentence will read as follows: "An aviation cadet of the Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard is entitled to the same basic allowance for subsistence as is provided for an officer of the Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, respectively."

SEC. 3. Subsection (e) of section 5 of the Act of September 24, 1963 (77 Stat. 193), is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "An officer of the Regular Coast Guard who was appointed as a permanent commissioned officer under any provision of law in effect prior to the effective date of this Act and who is serving on active duty shall be considered to have been appointed under section 211 of title 14, United States Code, and subject to the provisions thereof."

SEC. 4. Section 202 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1082), is further amended by adding the following paragraph:

"(36) civilian members of the faculty of the Coast Guard Academy whose compensation is fixed under section 186 of title 14, United States Code."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this bill has been cleared on both sides of the aisle. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 911), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to improve and clarify certain laws of the Coast Guard.

BACKGROUND OF LEGISLATION

This bill was introduced by the chairman at the request of the Treasury Department. Public hearings were held on the bill on September 28 with the Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard, Vice Adm. William D. Shields, testifying in support of the legislation. No opposition was expressed.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill proposes a number of relatively minor amendments to the present law relating to the Coast Guard. The bill would increase the maximum authorized number of commissioned Coast Guard officers on active duty from 3,500 to 4,000. The need for this addition is due to an increased burden placed on the Coast Guard in recent years in respect to search and rescue and international fishery patrols. In addition, the Coast Guard has been recently assigned the responsibility for manning and operating five icebreakers previously under the Department of Navy, and has undertaken coastal patrol missions in South Vietnam.

Several sections of the present law would be amended to provide an expanded source of supply of Coast Guard officers. The number of cadets to be appointed annually to the Coast Guard Academy is increased from 300 to 400. The transfer of licensed officers commissioned in the merchant marine is encouraged by reducing the required years of service from 4 to 2.

In addition, several sections are amended to bring the Coast Guard law into line with similar provisions in the law relating to other armed services. The number of years required to serve as Commandant or Assistant Commandant for full retirement compensation purposes is adjusted, as is the compensation schedules and regulations for civilian faculty members to the Coast Guard Academy. The bill will also authorize the establishment of the grade of aviation cadet for the Coast Guard similar to that of the Navy.

The bill has been amended to delete those provisions relating to the Coast Guard Band since this has become law through the enactment of Public Law 89–189.

COST OF LEGISLATION

Additional expenditures associated with the enactment of this legislation will depend, to a large measure, on the extent to which authority in certain of the provisions is implemented. The impact of one provision can be predicted with some certainty, that permitting the establishment of a compensation schedule for the civilian faculty at the Academy. It is estimated that the ultimate annual costs would not exceed $20,000 assuming that the compensation scales presently used at the Naval Academy are adopted for the Coast Guard Academy. With respect to other features, it is estimated that the maximum costs which would be incurred in any one year for recall of retired officers to active duty would be $15,000. For the increase in commissioned officer strength, it is estimated that the average annual cost for each 100 officers will be about $1 million. Finally, for the increase in the number of appointments to the Academy it is estimated that ultimate annual costs when the Academy reaches its maximum planned strength will be about $900,000. Since the Coast Guard is currently training enlisted men as aviators, the authority to establish the grade of aviation cadet will not incur additional costs.

RESOLUTION PROCLAIMING COMMEMORATING EFFORTS OF AMERICANS ABROAD

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of a resolution which is now at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation in commemoration of the efforts of Americans abroad who are carrying forward the struggle for peace and freedom.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be read in its entirety to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be read in its entirety for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 159) as follows:

Whereas American men and women are serving in distant lands of the world in support of the cause of peace and freedom; and

Whereas the overwhelming majority of Americans support the principles of this Republic and its efforts to maintain and secure peace and freedom; and

Whereas it would be fitting to set aside a national day of remembrance dedicated to, and in support of, those Americans who are committing their lives, blood, and energies in the defense of world peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should issue a proclamation (1) officially designating Saturday, November 27, 1965, as a national honor day for the commemoration of the efforts by American men and women abroad in Vietnam who are carrying forward the struggle to maintain and secure peace and freedom; and (2) inviting the governments of States and communities and the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities to the end that our people may reaffirm their support of the role of this Nation in securing the cause of peace and freedom.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have taken up this resolution with the majority leader and the minority leader. If the Senate so desires, I can go into more detail, but at this time I ask for its adoption.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE 1967 STATEWIDE CELEBRATION OF THE CENTENNIAL OF THE ALASKA PURCHASE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 914, Senate bill 2614.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2614) to provide for U.S. participation in the statewide exposition to be held in Alaska during 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "the", to insert "purpose of the"; in line 11, after the word "enduring", to insert "symbol of the significance to the United States of its purchase of Alaska in 1867 and a permanent"; on page 2, line 18, after the word "that", to insert "any"; in line 20, after the word "on", to insert "all construction"; in line 22, after the word "at", to insert "rates"; on page 3, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$7,200,000" and insert "$4,000,000"; in line 13, after the word "whenever", to strike out "the national or international significance of any event of the centennial celebration will be enhanced by such United States participation" and insert "he finds that such participation will be in the national interest"; and, on page 6, line 3, after the word "terminate", to insert "and all authority conferred by the provisions of this Act shall expire"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in recognition of the national and international significance of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia in 1867, the Congress hereby declares that it is the purpose of this Act to provide for appropriate United States participation in the statewide 1967 centennial celebration jointly with the State of Alaska, through industrial, agricultural, educational, research, or commercial projects, or facilities which contribute to the purpose of the celebration and result in an enduring symbol of the significance to the United States of its purchase of Alaska in 1867 and a permanent contribution to the economy of Alaska.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make grants to the State of Alaska for use by the State, its political subdivisions, municipalities, or public or private nonprofit corporations to defray no more than one-half the costs of projects planned to support initially the 1967 Alaska Centennial as an event of national interest. Such projects shall be eligible for grants only after they are approved by such department of the State of Alaska as shall be designated for such purpose by the Governor of the State of Alaska. In accord with the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall establish additional criteria to be met by such projects and shall promulgate regulations governing the submission and approval of applications.

(b) It shall be a condition of the receipt of any grant for a project that any recipient of such grant furnish adequate assurance to the Secretary of Labor that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects financed under this section shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this provision, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 276(c)).

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section not to exceed $4,000,000. Funds appropriated under this subsection shall remain available for expenditure until June 30, 1968.

Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary may provide for appropriate participation by the United States in ceremonies and exhibits which are a part of the centennial celebration, whenever he finds that such participation will be in the national interest.

(b) In carrying out the purposes of this section, the Secretary may—

(1) provide for the display of Federal exhibits at one or more sites in the State of Alaska in buildings or structures furnished to the United States, during the period of the centennial celebration, except that the Secretary may utilize United States owned mobile geodesic domed exhibition buildings or structures erected on land owned by the State of Alaska or any political subdivision thereof and furnished to the United States, without cost, during the period of the centennial celebration;

(2) incur such expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, including but not limited to expenditures involved in the selection, purchase, rental, construction, and other acquisition of exhibits and materials and equipment therefor and the actual display thereof, and including but not limited to related expenditures for costs of landscaping, transportation, insurance, installation, safekeeping, maintenance and operation, and dismantling;

(3) enter into such contracts as may be necessary to provide for United States participation in appropriate ceremonies and exhibits which are a part of the centennial celebration;

(4) appoint such persons as he deems to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, except that no person appointed under this paragraph shall receive compensation from the United States at a rate in excess of that received by persons under the Classification Act of 1949 for performing comparable duties;

(5) procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expense Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem when actually employed; and

(6) accept any gifts, donations, or devices, or loans other than of money, to be used in carrying out the purposes of this section.

(c) In determining the exhibits to be installed by the United States during the centennial celebration and in selecting the site or sites in the State of Alaska for such exhibits, the Secretary shall consult with the Alaska State Centennial Commission.

(d) The head of each department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government is authorized—

(1) to cooperate with the Secretary with respect to United States participation in the ceremonial aspects of the centennial celebration; and

(2) to make available to the Secretary from time to time, such personnel as may be necessary to assist the Secretary in carrying out his functions under this section.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section not to exceed $600,000.

Sec. 4. The Secretary shall report to the Congress within six months after the date of the official close of the centennial celebration concerning the activities of the Federal Government pursuant to this Act, including a detailed statement of expenditures. Upon transmission of such report to the Congress, all appointments made under this Act shall terminate and all authority conferred by the provisions of this Act shall expire.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the pending bill concern the centennial of the Alaska Purchase?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. HART. Mr. President——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, has the third reading of this bill been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The third reading has been ordered.

The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, by a vote of 16 to 1, the Committee on Commerce has brought a bill to the Senate—as we approach the conclusion of this session of Congress—which will be marked by many great achievements, an opportunity in dramatic fashion to demonstrate that the Senate has a deep appreciation for a sense of history.

The bill would propose that the Federal Government participate with the State of Alaska in celebrating in appropriate, and I hope dramatic, fashion the purchase by the United States of America from the Russian czar for the price of $7,200,000, which is approximately 2 cents an acre, what we now hail as the State of Alaska. That purchase was made on March 20, 1867.

The signature on the document bears the name of William H. Seward, who was Secretary of State under President Johnson at that time, a man who had served with considerable distinction in the Congress.

Mr. President, we fool ourselves badly if we think we could imagine history's course if 100 years ago that acquisition had not been made. No one here is so foolish as to suggest what might have happened, but we do know what has happened. We hail the decision of 100 years ago as a prudent and wise one, and we propose in this bill that the Federal Government, matching Alaska and communities in Alaska dollar for dollar, provide $4 million effectively to celebrate the occasion, and additionally provide $600,000 for exposition purposes by this Government to tell a lesson of history, which I, at least, as a committee member heard for the first time, of what Alaska means and what it will mean in the years ahead.

I believe that centennial will bring home to many Americans a lesson which all of us will be the better for.

I know of no more appropriate way in which to do it, nor a more timely occasion.

So far as I know, no precedent will be set. I do not know where else in this land there is a State that was purchased in the fashion in which Alaska was, which will be here asking for a similar celebration; but if I have overlooked any and the circumstances were those which were considered by our committee, I would favor it. But here we are rubbing shoulder to shoulder with the Russians in a tiny world. Let us make sure that the history and strength and traditions of this Nation are put in a showcase that is appropriate for what we believe them to be—the best in the whole world. We think this bill will do that.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I wish to express my deep personal appreciation, and indeed the appreciation of all the people of Alaska, for the effective leadership shown by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan in this great cause, and to say that he has stated the case for this bill logically and eloquently. There is nothing I care to add at this time.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. HART. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I join my colleague in his unqualified commendation of the leadership and solicitude which the junior Senator from Michigan has shown in bringing what is to us in Alaska, and to the Nation, an extremely important piece of legislation.

We need not go into details, but merely imagine the picture of what the world would be like but for the grace and vision of William Seward, if the Russian Bear, the ruler of the Kremlin, now still retained that part of the North American continent where, instead of the unlimited, vast freedoms of the American people which the people share in common with other Americans, there existed restrictions on the freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of worship, and all the other consequences of a totalitarian police state.

The liberation of that part of America and its inclusion in the American system is, as the distinguished Senator from Michigan has pointed out, a unique event in American history. There has been nothing like it.

I know of no other event in our history which deserves in greater degree celebration by the people of the United States and the people of Alaska than the centennial of the purchase.

I am grateful to the members of the committee and to the acting chairman of the committee, and I wish to express not only my appreciation but that of the people of Alaska.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. HART. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I should like to join my colleagues from Alaska in support of the bill.

I had the privilege of speaking three times on the floor of the Senate for admission of Alaska as a State. The admission of Alaska as a State has resulted in what has happened after the admission of every other State since the Original Thirteen States banded together.

That experience has been that the addition of a territory as a State has resulted in a great increase in population, in development, capital investment, and an influx of population. The population of Alaska has grown rapidly since statehood, but not as rapidly as some had hoped.

Last year when I was making an inspection of military installations, I was in Fort Richardson and spoke with the commanding general there. He said that one of the byproducts of the military installation in Alaska was that a number of members of the service had expressed, as a result of their experience in being stationed there, a desire to come back and settle in Alaska. Some have already settled there, and others intend to do so.

If that was a byproduct of the military establishments in Alaska—and he was a quite knowledgeable man, having served as a military aide to President Truman—he felt that the exposition, with many civilians going to Alaska, would bring a greater stimulation in the development of Alaska.

The strengthening of Alaska, as has been pointed out, is of importance to the entire country, it being the greatest bulwark we have against an Asiatic or any other potential enemy in that area. So this measure will be beneficial not only to the people of Alaska, but to the people of the entire Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I do not suppose it is necessary for me to say that I do not concur in the expressions that have just been made by several Senators with respect to the allocation of $4,600,000 to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska from Russia. I subscribe to the participation of the United States in the program, but I submit there is no justification for spending $4,600,000 in the construction of three auditoriums, one in Sitka, one in Anchorage, and one in Fairbanks, to be used for convention purposes—$4 million for buildings, $600,000 for ceremonies.

With the latter aspects of the program I might be induced to go along, but not $1,200,000 for a convention hall in Sitka. How many people are in Sitka? Less than 6,000—5,200.

How can one justify the argument that a $1-million auditorium, for which the U.S. Treasury will have to pay $500,000, shall be built in Alaska in a town of 5,000 people? How many towns are there in Illinois with 5,000 and more? In Wisconsin? In Indiana? In Illinois, in Michigan, in Minnesota? One cannot justify, on the basis of conscience or reason, the expenditure of that amount to build a convention hall at a cost of $1,200,000 in Sitka.

It has been stated here; and let us take a look at it. Three communities are begging the Federal Treasury for money. San Antonio, Tex., is asking for $10 million to celebrate the 250th anniversary of the establishment of San Antonio.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is vigorously supporting Alaska. Florida wants $15 million. It is vigorously supporting Alaska. Alaska is supporting Florida and Texas—the rubbing of each other's backs.

The fact is that each one is requesting an allocation of Federal funds, and to procure that allocation they are giving support to each other.

I would like to discuss briefly the genesis of the new public works program. When did it begin? How has it grown? What will it lead to in the course of time?

Its birth was in Seattle, Wash., in 1959, when Seattle conceived, and properly so, the celebration of a centennial of the establishment of the State of Washington. The program of Seattle, Wash., was to create a civic center. In the 100th celebration of Seattle, the State agreed to build a State office building. The city of Seattle agreed to install a transportation system and a city hall.

Through their Senators they came to Congress and said, "Give us $10 million to build a public auditorium." We gave them the $10 million. The United States Government is now leasing that $10 million building for $1 a year.

Madison, Wis., I suppose, has an auditorium and has a stadium. Who paid for them? Did they get the money out of the Federal Treasury, or did they pay for them themselves?

The State of Oklahoma likewise has auditoriums and stadiums. Did they ask the Federal Government to build them for them? And likewise the State of Minnesota and the State of Illinois.

The city of Cleveland has a stadium and an auditorium. Within the last 3 years it has expanded its exposition hall at a cost, I would say, of $10 million. We did not come to the Federal Treasury and ask that it construct our building.

From Seattle, we pass into the State of New York. New York had a world exposition which it claimed was an international exhibit.

There is an international agency that determines where international expositions will be had. That international agency lays down the rule that there shall be one international exposition every 10 years and that it shall last for only 1 year.

Senators might ask me: Why the rule? The reason for the rule is so that Honduras, Nicaragua, and Brazil will not be called upon to construct buildings every year for an international fair.

New York asked for $25 million. Through the fight of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and myself, the Senate reduced it to $17.5 million.

The New York Fair has been a failure in every sense, compared with the predictions made for it by those who came to the Federal Government asking for $25 million.

Now, we have Seattle and New York. Along comes San Antonio. It will have a 250th year celebration.

I wish Senators would pay attention to this.

They came to the Federal Government and said, "We are spending $36 million to promote the 250th anniversary of the establishment of San Antonio."

But how are they spending it? They voted $30 million for a bond issue to buy land to build a city hall and to build a stadium. The State of Texas is putting in $6 million to build a State office building. All of the $36 million will be expended in permanent, usable improvements for Texas.

Of course, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is supporting Florida and supporting Alaska. But what do they want of the U.S. Government? They want $10 million to build an auditorium. To whom will it belong when they are through with it? It will be the property of the city of San Antonio, with the U.S. taxpayers' money being used, including the people of Michigan, Oklahoma, and other States.

When San Antonio came in, I thought, "Here we have Seattle, New York, and San Antonio." Two months ago, while I was arguing against San Antonio, I learned that Alaska wanted $7.8 million.

Mr. BARTLETT. $4.6 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Originally it was $7.8 million. It is now $4.6 million.

Barely had I heard about Alaska when Florida came in; and Florida wants $15 million.

Alaska, as I already stated, wants $5 million, with matching money, to build a convention hall in Alaska, in Fairbanks; about $4 million for one in Anchorage; and $1.2 million for Sitka, with a population of 5,000 people.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. BASS. What about Nome?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Why not build an auditorium in Nome, or a stadium in Nome, so they may hold conventions up there?

Mr. BASS. Has there been a third reading of the bill?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, there has been a third reading of the bill, while I was being talked to. I do not know if it was done deliberately to distract my attention.

Mr. BASS. That would preclude an amendment, would it not?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Obviously it would, unless we obtain unanimous consent that the third reading be withdrawn. Maybe that ought to be done.

I believe the bells ought to ring, and the trumpets blow to call Members of Congress in assembly to tell them to begin pondering what celebration they can have in the coming years; and bring the ladle to the Federal Treasury, because it will build their stadiums and their auditoriums and other types of buildings that may be needed in the promotion of their local cultural, economic, and political affairs.

That is about what it amounts to. While this is not immediately pertinent to the issue before us, it has a relationship to it. I refer to the Interama, of Florida.

I wish the Republicans would begin to show some interest in this matter. They speak about guarding the Treasury. No one is to be found to speak up.

May I hear what the distinguished Senator from Illinois has to say?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I tried to get a word in edgewise, but the Senator from Ohio has taken all the time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall be glad to have a little assistance, because I confess that it is pretty hard to have Senators BARTLETT, HART, YARBOROUGH, SMATHERS, and HOLLAND surrounding me, and myself standing in the middle, being punched about like fire in a royal battle.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do not neglect Senator GRUENING.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Senator GRUENING gave me the most unkind cut of all.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee, because I know he is in sympathy with the argument I am making.

Mr. BASS. I am enjoying the argument. Is the Senator going to talk about Florida while Alaska is pending?

Mr. LAUSCHE. They are all of the same ilk, the same body; they cannot be separated. They are assembled. Look at them. They are like vicious tigers, waiting to attack.

Mr. BASS. The Senator from Tennessee is standing behind the Senator from Ohio, although not on the issue. He will not vote with the Senator from Ohio on the issue. But he is standing behind him. When they become too rough, the Senator may call on me.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish Senators would get in front of me when they make their attack.

If I may return to the beginning of my argument——

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I have the Senator's permission to go to my office for an interview with some constituents who have been waiting patiently for some period of time?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator may go back to his office; but while he is there, I wish he would ponder and come from there with the conclusion that he will give me some help.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall do more than that. I shall pray over it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, has the bill been read the third time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been read the third time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I had prepared an amendment to the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the action by which the bill was read the third time be rescinded.

Mr. BARTLETT. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, this procedure is not in keeping with the general protocol of the Senate. The Senator from Delaware announced that he did not know that the bill had been read the third time. I myself have been on and off the floor, and I did not know that the bill had come to third reading. I do not know when that happened. However, the Senator from Delaware in good faith desires to offer an amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was read the third time be rescinded, so that the Senator from Delaware may offer his amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have no objection to that, but if we open up the bill, we shall likely continue to discuss it all afternoon.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The debate may well go on all afternoon if we do not open it up.

Mr. BARTLETT. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa? The Chair hears none, and the vote by which the bill was read the third time is rescinded.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall offer the amendment later, after the Senator from Ohio has concluded his remarks.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator from Tennessee wishes to include an amendment to provide an auditorium for Nome, that may be done, and the amendment would be just as logical as an amendment to provide an auditorium for Sitka.

Mr. BASS. Originally, my inquiry was theoretical. I wanted to see what the parliamentary situation was, and then to let it be known that I was interested in the other cities of the State which our distinguished colleagues from Alaska represent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Earlier this afternoon, I read editorials published in the Washington Post and the Wall Street Journal, referring to the new technique of getting money for public works out of the Federal Government, in spite of the fact that there are many Federal programs to provide aid for local communities.

Earlier I stated that the whole batch of Federal aid programs, beginning with the one for Seattle, Wash., and continuing with those for New York; San Antonio, Tex.; Alaska; and Florida, would not constitute the end. It is now proposed to have a fair at Dulles Airport. California plans to have a fair at San Diego. How many more are to be proposed? It is quite possible that before the night is over, and at least before January 10, another bill will be in the hopper to provide Federal subsidization of a State-local fair.

Inasmuch as it is my belief that all these programs are predicated upon the same weakness, I should like to read, in part, an article entitled "The Miami Super Lobby," published in The Reporter.

On that subject, I have had a most peculiar experience about lobbying with respect to the Interama. No public officials have written. Bankers have been writing and telegraphing. My inference is that they bought bonds in the sum of $8 million and find that the Interama cannot be promoted on the basis originally contemplated.

They are now asking to be bailed out. From whom did I receive calls and telegrams? The day before yesterday a telegram came from Oakland, Calif., asking me to withdraw my objections to Interama. A half hour later I received a telephone call from the president of a Cleveland bank relating his views. He hoped that I would be able to carry them into effect here. His views were that I should give support to Interama. However, that was not enough.

I do not know who the person is—it was not the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] or the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]—but someone connected with Interama has contacted individuals and asked them to call me.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that the Senator from Florida now speaking to the Senator from Ohio did not approach him or this matter until the Senator from Ohio approached him the day before yesterday?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I must pay my deepest respect and admiration to the Senators from Florida. They never approached me about the matter until I spoke to the senior Senator from Florida about it. However, someone connected with Interama contacted different individuals asking them to call me.

This is a most interesting aspect of lobbying. I received a letter from a dear friend of mine in Cincinnati. I have known him for 20 years. He has been a noble and close friend. He sent me a letter that he had received from Florida. In the letter it was said:

> Talk to LAUSCHE. He is uninformed. Get him to support this measure.

I have now related three instances. But the instances were many more by way of telegrams.

This morning in the Committee on Foreign Relations hearing, it was revealed that a letter was received from the Connecticut Life Insurance Co. That letter told about a man from the life insurance company going down to Florida, making an appraisal of Interama, and then recommending to his client that the bonds be sold, I assume because the support for them was not sound.

I have mentioned that I want to read an article. The article is rather lengthy, and I am not going to read the entire article. However, I advise the Senators to look at the article and ascertain what is really happening. It is a most interesting article.

This article was published in the Reporter magazine of May 6, 1965. It is entitled "The Miami Super Lobby." I shall read parts of it. It reads:

> On January 4, the opening day of the 89th Congress, Representative CLAUDE D. PEPPER, of Miami, handed the Clerk of the House a bill "to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes."

I suppose that Dade County is stricken with poverty, that people are walking about Dade County and Miami in frayed clothes and begging for food.

I continue to read:

> It was given a number, H.R. 30, and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. There it sits, a testimonial to one of the most intensive and imaginative lobbying operations Washington has witnessed in this decade.
>
> Over the years, the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center—better known in Government circles as Interama—has engaged the interest, energy, and political concern of Presidents, Cabinet officers, and Congressmen from 50 States. It has been the object of a prolonged internal debate

> by members of the White House staff, one of whom, Richard K. Donahue, has had a dual interest in the matter—a public interest as a Presidential assistant until 1963, and, more recently, a private one as a lobbyist engaged to ease Interama's way in Congress and within the administration.
>
> Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY became an Interama missionary in the course of a bumpy helicopter ride over Miami Beach last spring. President Lyndon B. Johnson embraced the project one afternoon last fall in the East Room of the White House. The Commerce Department, the State Department, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency have been drawn into the affair. A sympathetic Congress has twice tailored laws to meet the needs of Interama lobbyists.
>
> Such widespread interest at such high levels of the Government is somewhat remarkable in view of the fact that there has been considerable confusion over what Interama is to be and why the Federal Government should be involved in it. On one occasion it was promoted as a worthy project for a $50 million investment by the Alliance for Progress.

I wish to repeat that:

> On one occasion, it was promoted as a worthy project for a $50 million investment by the Alliance for Progress.

I continue to read from the editorial:

> On another it was presented as an "antipoverty" program to be financed by the Area Redevelopment Administration. More recently it has been in the category of a "public works project" in which the Community Facilities Administration of HHFA has tentatively agreed to invest $22 million. Walt Disney envisions Interama as an east coast Disneyland with ideological overtones. Commercial promoters in Miami look on it as an economic catalyst that will add $1 billion a year to their revenue.

Let me analyze that a little. They went from one agency to another. They went to Area Redevelopment, Community Facilities, Public Works, and Antipoverty. They were seeking aid. They had been promised $22 million by the Community Facilities Administration.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. That would be upon a first mortgage loan, perfectly secured, would it not?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the community facilities program was originally intended to help depressed areas lift themselves out of their distress. However, here we would be granting to Dade County a loan of $22 million. Of course, I am not raising any particular objection because it is a loan. However, $22 million would be provided by Community Facilities on the basis of a loan, and $15 million would have been provided on the basis of a grant. However, that $15 million has now been reduced to $9,500,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is it not more or less one of the major purposes of those grants to help people secure loans which have been made by the Community Facilities Administration? The loans by the Government would, in effect, be second mortgages and it would more or less safeguard private investment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I cannot hear what the Senator has to say when other Senators are talking on the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is it not true that the grants which will be made would in effect help secure the loans which have been made, both by the private industries and by the governmental agencies, and in turn the community facility loan? My question is, Would that be a first mortgage, or would that be a second mortgage that would serve as additional insurance to the private investors?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not know how they are being handled. The sale of $21 million worth of bonds was authorized.

Mr. HOLLAND. Twenty-one million dollars. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LAUSCHE. They sold $8 million worth; $13 million worth remained unsold.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. They are having trouble paying their interest on the $8 million bonds. Whether they have worked out a program whereby the present bondholders will allow the Community Facilities Administration to occupy a similar priority position as the original $8 million bondholders, I do not know.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The question of the Senator from Delaware has a direct answer. The $7.5 million now embraced in the bill which is not before the Senate, but which I hope will be shortly—it is the bill to which the Senators are addressing their remarks—is solely for the purpose of financing the Federal exhibit, not the building in which it will be housed, because that will be built by Interama. This is for the financing of the exhibit; and the additional $2 million is for 2 years' operation of the exhibit. There is no connection between the enhancement of the property values by the construction of the buildings thereon and the matter embraced in the bill to which the Senator is addressing his remarks. That has to do solely with the construction and operation of a continuing Federal exhibit during at least 2 years after the time of the beginning of the exhibition.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This Government obligates itself to the extent of $10 million, in this bill, in this immediate area. It does increase the value of the property all around. But who will own this building when it reaches the end? Of what use will it be to the Government, except to turn over to the corporate entity that may be operating Interama?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Government will never own that building. The Government will merely occupy it for the purpose of exhibiting therein.

The major portion of the exhibit is largely built around an audiovisual display, with colored pictures and all the things that go with them, on a very elaborate scale. It has no reference to the building itself or to the increase of the value of the property upon which the mortgage will be given.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is another interesting facet of the Florida program. The building will cost $5 million. Florida is not asking us to finance the construction of the building. The accumulation of the exhibit, and the 4 years of operation of it at a million dollars a year, are estimated to cost $15 million.

So they very generously said to the U.S. Congress, "We will construct the building at $5 million, but we want you to put up $15 million to finance the exhibit and 5 years of operation at a million dollars a year."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I am perfectly willing to end this matter at the proper time. I think the proper thing for us to do now is to discuss and dispose of the pending proposal, which is a worthy matter.

I have stated already on the floor, a while ago, how I felt about the Alaska centennial. I shudder to think what this Nation would be confronted with if Seward had not perpetrated his so-called folly by the purchase of Alaska and the elimination of Russia from this Hemisphere almost 100 years ago.

Having been to Alaska, and having been one of the original cosponsors of the bill by which Alaska was admitted to statehood, I have a very great interest in that matter.

I am perfectly willing to defend our Florida situation, but I hope the distinguished Senator will allow that to come on at its proper time, and let us dispose of the Alaska bill, which deals with an entirely different situation, about 10,000 miles away from Interama.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida again places himself in the position of the backrubbers. "I will support Alaska providing Alaska supports Florida." The Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] says, "I will support the two of you, but impliedly I expect you to support me."

My principle is that I do not subscribe to logrolling and backrubbing. I have never done it in my political life, and I do not propose to do it here.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It would be simple for me, Mr. President, to say to Senators BARTLETT and GRUENING, "I will close my eyes, I shall subjugate my thinking and go along with you."

I love Senator HOLLAND. I respect him. But I say to him that I cannot, on the basis of my friendship, go along with him, nor can I do it with respect to Senator YARBOROUGH in Texas.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The sooner we stop this logrolling and back scratching, and consider individual matters on the basis of principle and virtue, the better.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point? I wish the RECORD to show that to the best of my knowledge, the Senator from Florida and I never discussed either of these bills until this afternoon.

Mr. LAUSCHE. This afternoon I have stood in the middle of a group like the prey of the pack. I was being struck at from every side, and I looked for help, and there I stood alone. I wondered what the occupants of the galleries thought of me, when all attacks were being made upon me. The three groups interested stood there, ready to make their plunges at me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The Legislative Clerk. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] proposes an amendment on page 3, line 9, to strike out the figure "$4,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$3,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on the amendment, may I, in behalf of the committee, reply very briefly?

The proposal initially was to appropriate $7,200,000, plus $600,000 for an appropriation for the exhibit on its own part; $7,200,000 is the figure which, 100 years ago, we paid Russia, and through which we acquired a resource to the total value of which I suppose no man alive could with any confidence now attach a figure. It is something in excess of $7,200,000; and nobody will be surrounded by any pack, if I may make that suggestion.

The committee considered the figure carefully, and there was symbolism and appeal in the figure.

The Senator from Ohio, a member of the Committee on Commerce, eloquently, as he is doing tonight, sought to reduce the figure; and as a result of his efforts, the committee reported, with the amendment that was agreed to and has now been reopened by the withdrawal of objection by the Senator from Alaska, the figure of $4 million.

In the light of the record that was made in the committee hearings, the setting which we seek to create in Alaska, and the purposes we seek to achieve there, that is a minimum figure, and I hope very much that the Senate will sustain the committee, and retain the figure of $4 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Delaware yield for a brief observation on this point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I could have blocked this measure from coming to the floor of the Senate, but I felt that it should have the opportunity to have its cause presented. I said that under no circumstances would I go beyond the $4,600,000, that the committee members should be polled as to whether to bring the matter to the floor, but that I also reserved to myself the right to oppose and to fight it.

Until this time, I have not made mention of the fact, that the bill originally went to the Committee on Public Works, which took testimony on it but took no action. It was then decided to introduce a new bill and arrange it so that it would go to the Committee on Commerce. It went to the Committee on Commerce and I blocked it as long as I could. Finally, I had to yield, because I felt that the Senate should have an opportunity to vote on it. I did the same thing on the Interama bill. I make this explanation so that the Senate will know there is a bill pending on this subject in the Committee on Public Works.

I was not on the floor when the second bill was introduced, and there was a unanimous consent request to refer it to the Committee on Commerce. On that score, I ask the question: Why was it desired that it go to the Committee on Commerce? Why was unanimous consent asked that it go to the Committee on Commerce?

The original bill involved the identical subject as the one which went to the Committee on Commerce, but some Senator came into the Chamber when most Senators, probably, were absent, and asked unanimous consent that it go to the Committee on Commerce.

It must have been felt that it could be put through the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I should like to make my part clear. I offered the new bill which went to the Committee on Commerce and I did so because it was my understanding that that was the committee to which it should be referred, in light of the greatly changed language between that bill and the one which had its initial hearing before the Committee on Public Works.

In the Committee on Commerce I said these words:

> It was the conclusion of Senator McNamara, of Michigan, chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, that the centennial bill should not be acted upon by his committee, and it was at the suggestion of Senator McNamara initially that it was decided to draw up a new bill incorporating the recommendations of the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of the Budget and introduce a new, clean bill.

This was all at the suggestion or with the acquiescence of the chairman of the Public Works Committee. It has not been mentioned, but it is correct to say that the bill is approved by the administration, by the Department of Commerce, and by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe that it must be said they have approved it and, Mr. President, they approved it on the basis that it is unique. By unique, I mean in effect that it is said that there is no other situation of a similar nature. However, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] is correct in his statement that the measure was approved. However, I still do not approve of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as the Senator from Ohio has pointed out, this seems to be almost a weekly occurrence. Bills on Interama, world's fairs, State fairs, one thing and another, are constantly coming up in many areas of the country, and bills are coming into the Chamber two at a time, in the closing days of the session.

Even if the bill were meritorious, it could be considered later because there is nothing urgent about it. I believe it is a proper request that the amount in the bill be cut down. I understand that the bill is very much desired in Alaska, that there are three auditoriums in different areas of Alaska which they wish to build. Even this step would allow $1 million each. If there was any merit to the bill and additional money were needed later, it could be provided. The very least that could be done would be to accept a cut at this time. I hope that the sponsors of the bill will be willing to do so and will accept it, in which event I would not press for a yea-and-nay vote. But I believe that perhaps in the interests of getting the proposed legislation enacted into law, if we are interested in it, it might be advisable to accept the cut. I believe that it is a proper suggestion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish the U.S. Government to participate in this celebration, but I wish to do it on a reasonable basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do, too; and I believe that if it came back later for real justification when we had time to consider the bill and an additional amount was found to be needed, it could be provided.

I agree with the Senator from Alaska that he has already made a few cuts in the bill. I realize how he feels about it. Still, by making those cuts, we admit that there is nothing sacred about the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the Senator from Delaware yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I fear that the Secretary may not be fully informed, which is quite understandable.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am sure I am not, but let me say to the Senator from Alaska that he does not have to apologize for making his statement. He is correct. That is the reason I suggest that we make this cut, because during the closing days of a session Senators cannot possibly be fully informed on the multitude of bills which are rammed through the Senate in its last hours. I believe that it is proper.

Mr. BARTLETT. I could not agree. The bill comes to the Senate after having had exhaustive hearings before the Committee on Public Works, and, thanks largely to the Senator from Ohio, before the Committee on Commerce. But the point I wish to make is that the State Centennial Commission was organized 2 or 3 years ago. It has been working diligently. There are not only 3 places which will hold celebrations in connection with the centennial, but there are also 22 communities throughout the State involved.

Last week, I was in Fairbanks, and the local group there took me out to its centennial site. The power shovels were already working, and men were engaged on the job anticipating 1967 and preparing for the fine celebrations which will take place.

Let me emphasize that the people of Alaska are doing their share. Already, Fairbanks has made available $1 million and they are spending that $1 million right now. The people of the little town of Sitka, which is a small town, have bonded themselves in the amount of $400,000, and they are ready to go even further if the need arises. This centennial is intended to be a cooperative project. It is not a question of three communities engaging in a centennial celebration.

Criteria have been established within the bill and, additionally, the Secretary of Commerce will establish others. There will be close scrutiny before either grants or allocations will be made out of Federal appropriations. This is not a gift that will go automatically to the State of Alaska or any community within it. The judgment of the Secretary of Commerce will prevail insofar as the Federal Government is concerned.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am hoping, in the interest of more orderly procedure, that the amendment will be accepted. However, if not, I believe it is a simple question as to whether we do or do not, and I am willing to proceed to a yea and nay vote, and therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter, in the brief period of the quorum call, with the distinguished Senator from Alaska. With his concurrence—and I hope I shall not disappoint the 16 Senators who voted favorably for it, and that they will be patient and understanding of the way in which we proceed at this moment—I recommend that the amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield for the purpose of passing the bill.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HART. What is the status of the Alaska Centennial bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on passage of the Alaska Centennial bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum——

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have the floor. I have a few speeches that will take 5 or 6 minutes. If there is any reason for not delivering them at this time——

Mr. SMATHERS. I did not understand the Senator had the floor. It was so quiet on that side and it was so quiet on this side that I did not realize the Senator from New York had the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Alaska desire me to yield or to speak?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HART. Is the pending question the passage of the Alaska centennial bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. That is the question. The third reading has been had.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 2614) was passed, as follows:

S. 2614

An act to provide for United States participation in the 1967 statewide celebration of the centennial of the Alaska Purchase.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in recognition of the national and international significance of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia in 1867, the Congress hereby declares that it is the purpose of this Act to provide for appropriate United States participation in the statewide 1967 centennial celebration jointly with the State of Alaska, through industrial, agricultural, educational, research, or commercial projects, or facilities which contribute to the purpose of the celebration and result in an enduring symbol of the significance to the United States of its purchase of Alaska in 1867 and a permanent contribution to the economy of Alaska.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make grants to the State of Alaska for use by the State, its political subdivisions, municipalities, or public or private nonprofit corporations to defray no more than one-half the costs of projects planned to support initially the 1967 Alaska Centennial as an event of national interest. Such projects shall be eligible for grants only after they are approved by such department of the State of Alaska as shall be designated for such purpose by the Governor of the State of Alaska. In accord with the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall establish additional criteria to be met by such projects and shall promulgate regulations governing the submission and approval of applications.

(b) It shall be a condition of the receipt of any grant for a project that any recipient of such grant furnish adequate assurance to the Secretary of Labor that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects financed under this section shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this provision, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 276(c)).

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section not to exceed $3,000,000. Funds appropriated under this subsection shall remain available for expenditure until June 30, 1968.

Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary may provide for appropriate participation by the United States in ceremonies and exhibits which are a part of the centennial celebration, whenever he finds that such participation will be in the national interest.

(b) In carrying out the purposes of this section, the Secretary may—

(1) provide for the display of Federal exhibits at one or more sites in the State of Alaska in buildings or structures furnished to the United States, during the period of the centennial celebration, except that the Secretary may utilize United States owned mobile geodesic domed exhibition buildings or structures erected on land owned by the State of Alaska or any political subdivision thereof and furnished to the United States, without cost, during the period of the centennial celebration;

(2) incur such expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, including but not limited to expenditures involved in the selection, purchase, rental, construction, and other acquisition of exhibits and materials and equipment therefor and the actual display thereof, and including but not limited to related expenditures for costs of landscaping, transportation, insurance, installation, safekeeping, maintenance and operation, and dismantling;

(3) enter into such contracts as may be necessary to provide for United States participation in appropriate ceremonies and exhibits which are a part of the centennial celebration;

(4) appoint such persons as he deems to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, except that no person appointed under this paragraph shall receive compensation from the United States at a rate in excess of that received by persons under the Classification Act of 1949 for performing comparable duties;

(5) procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem when actually employed; and

(6) accept any gifts, donations, or devices, or loans other than of money, to be used in carrying out the purposes of this section.

(c) In determining the exhibits to be installed by the United States during the centennial celebration and in selecting the site or sites in the State of Alaska for such exhibits, the Secretary shall consult with the Alaska State Centennial Commission.

(d) The head of each department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government is authorized—

(1) to cooperate with the Secretary with respect to United States participation in the ceremonial aspects of the centennial celebration; and

(2) to make available to the Secretary from time to time, such personnel as may be necessary to assist the Secretary in carrying out his functions under this section.

(e) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section not to exceed $600,000.

SEC. 4. The Secretary shall report to the Congress within six months after the date of the official close of the centennial celebration concerning the activities of the Federal Government pursuant to this Act, including a detailed statement of expenditures. Upon transmission of such report to the Congress, all appointments made under this Act shall terminate and all authority conferred by the provisions of this Act shall expire.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I merely wanted to say that I concurred in the amendment to the Alaska centennial bill, but with great reluctance. I am convinced that there is a need, which will be demonstrated, for more than $3 million; but there is a need also for at least action at this session of the Congress. It was with that understanding and the recognition of the need that I concurred.

I express my thanks once more to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], who has done a magnificent job in behalf of Alaska, who has worked many hours upon this measure. I am grateful to him.

I also express my thanks to the chairman of the full Commerce Committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who cannot be here at this moment, but who has helped in bringing this bill before the Senate.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I would like to join my colleague in expressing our thanks to the Senator from Michigan. The ability of the junior Senator from Michigan to get this bill through at this late hour of the session required a high degree of parliamentary skill and sympathetic support.

It is my hope that when this bill goes to conference in the coming session of Congress, the proper amount, for reasons which have been made clear, will be restored. The original purchase price of Alaska, $7.2 million, has already been returned to the Treasury a hundredfold or more. That is the original amount, requested for matching purposes which should be restored, and it is the appropriate amount that should be appropriated by the Federal Government as matching funds for the celebration of the centennial—that great historic event.

DEMONSTRATIONS ON VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to say a word during this interim about the demonstrations which have been taking place over the past weekends in opposition to U.S. policy in Vietnam and of the promise for the coming weekend of parades and demonstrations in support of our policy in Vietnam.

First, I support our policy in Vietnam, and I disagree thoroughly with the point made by the demonstrators against our Vietnam policy.

Second, I point out that the right to expose Communist influence in these demonstrations, which is compatible with the Bill of Rights and civil liberties, is entirely compatible with the policy of the United States, and I support that.

Third, and very important, we should be reminded of the French aphorism, that, "I disagree with every syllable you utter, but I will defend to the end your right to say it."

So whatever one may think of the objectives and policies of any of these demonstrations against the policy of the President in Vietnam—and I am for those policies—it is crucial that we remember that political protest is a vital part of American life, and a part of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution.

Let us remember, too, that it is necessary to say this at this moment when so recently many of us defended demonstrations by Negroes for equal opportunity and civil rights, the denial which bothered the consciences of so many of us, and which demonstrations were very effective in righting, at least in law, many of the injustices which had been practiced against Negro citizens.

So we must always remember that among the rights guaranteed our citizens is the right of every American to be heard in public on highly controversial subjects, no matter how many may be irritated, annoyed, or disturbed, or disagree. An American citizen still has the right to say his piece lawfully.

Let us note also that there are no demonstrations in Peiping or Hanoi in opposition to the policies of those governments. That is one of the best reasons in the world why the vast majority of Americans oppose communism, because of the very high value which Americans place—in many cases beyond life itself—on the right to speak out.

That is very important. I do not think it should be inhibited by painting with a Communist brush everybody who may differ with me or any one else on Vietnam. That is a tactic which we spurn, and which I fought against in the late 1940's and early 1950's. If a man or woman is a Communist, he or she should be exposed, and we have means to do that. But it does not necessarily follow that because a person who participates in protest demonstrations against our Vietnamese policy, or participates unwittingly in demonstrations fomented by Communists, that person is a Communist. Our law and traditions are that a person is innocent until he is proved guilty.

I support the President's policy in Vietnam. I also support the right of demonstrators to protest that policy. That is important. But it is also important for us to point out that a person who wishes to demonstrate must not be put in fear of being called a Communist unless he fits that description.

Further, let us remember that there are adequate laws on the books to deal with those who wish to interfere with troop trains, burn draft cards, engage in or counsel draft evasion, or participate in various other forms of unlawful protest against which our society has a right to protect itself.

I am confident that the laws governing conscientious objectors will be found ample for those who have feigned or illegitimate scruples against military service; so that anyone who wishes to engage in illegal activities outside the scope of the law must take the consequences of his actions. No orderly society can exist otherwise.

Anyone who is a Communist should be unrelentingly exposed so that other Americans who may feel the need to protest do not unwittingly join with Communists in protest to destroy and mar the very argument they are trying to make to the American people.

The fundamental right to protest remains. It is our duty to protect it so long as it is carried on in accordance with the laws of the United States, no matter how much we disagree with what is said.

I am not squeamish about the strong language said about the demonstrators. They use equally strong language about people who follow the President's policies, including myself. America is accustomed to strong language.

The point is twofold. We must enforce the laws in exposing Communists, but we must, at the same time, understand that the Bill of Rights assures the right to demonstrate and protest. We must not paint with a Communist brush indiscriminately those who would protest, except in accordance with our laws and ethics which have been developed at such great cost over the years.

I wish to finish by expressing my solidarity with the protests and demonstrations which will occur this coming weekend. The fact, which I believe to be the fact, is that the overwhelming majority of the American people are solidly with the President in his Vietnam policy. In my judgment, that is the only wise policy for the United States.

How we handle that policy in the days ahead in terms of what we insist on in negotiations and other moves which we might make to bring people to the conference table is something, of course, about which any of us may have differing views. The fundamental policy is that we must defend freedom in South Vietnam with armed force, and within limitations, the President has very wisely imposed, while clearly we show the willingness to negotiate with anyone at any time. This policy deserves the support of the American people, and I shall support it.

At the same time that I support it, I defend the right of those who demonstrate lawfully to demonstrate for the other point of view.

UNITED NATIONS DAY, 1965

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this Sunday, October 24, has been proclaimed United Nations Day in the United States. For over 20 years, the United Nations has weathered crisis, insolvency, and criticism. The United Nations has been—and remains—a reflection of the problems and struggles for international peace of the world as it is. In a period of tension and strain, of hopeful groping and rapid change, such as the 20 years behind us, it is not surprising that the world organization should have been sensitive to the times. Had it not been, we should have known it had lost touch with reality.

The United Nations has not become actively involved in every international crisis of the last 20 years, but it has dealt with many of the most critical. It has been cautious, but not overly cautious, about its involvement with crises. It has often not drawn back from putting its prestige on the line. And it has survived.

The U.N. faces dangers to its continued effectiveness, and to its very life, every time it is severely tested. But it should not therefore shun the tests to avoid the dangers, for this way lies impotence and paralysis. I am gratified that, on the contrary, the U.N. has in recent years begun to tackle ever more difficult problems of peace—problems which contain within them the distinct possibility of failure. The U.N. has become more bold, and that is good.

The U.N. rose up from its lowest point—the long Assembly deadlock over peacekeeping assessments—to confront the India-Pakistan conflict. It successfully defused that explosive situation so that an attempt could be made to fashion a substantive settlement in relative calm. The dispute still simmers dangerously, despite the cease-fire, and the U.N. now faces one of the most difficult tests in its history. It may fail—and that would be tragic for the U.N. and for the world. But it cannot avoid the issue—it cannot avoid completely any issue which threatens world peace. For it sharpens and strengthens itself as it takes on ever more delicate tasks. Even when it fails to achieve what it sets out to do, it grows in sophistication and it devises new methods and procedures, and it is generally the nation which refuses to comply with a U.N. mandate, which sabotages its efforts, or which frustrates its purposes, that suffers most in the opinion of mankind.

I would rather see a vigorous, courageous, strong, and active U.N. which sometimes fails, but never shuns its unique responsibilities to mankind, than a weak and cautious body, fearful even after 20 years that a single failure may destroy it. The U.N. should be given constantly new life and vigor and be encouraged to act as a more positive and vital force for international peace than ever before.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presidential proclamation of United Nations Day, 1965, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED NATIONS DAY, 1965

(A Proclamation by the President of the United States of America)

Whereas the year 1965 will mark the 20th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter in San Francisco; and

Whereas the year 1965 has been designated by the United Nations General Assembly as International Cooperation Year, and I have so proclaimed it for the United States; and

Whereas our own peace and prosperity is directly interwoven with the peace, prosperity, and development of the rest of mankind; and

Whereas our future is made more secure when we can share with other members of the United Nations the responsibility for keeping the peace and building a better world; and

Whereas the United Nations, despite many difficult problems, is the best organization yet devised in which nations can work together for world peace; for promotion of fundamental human rights, justice, and the rule of law among nations; and for social progress and better standards of living; and

Whereas it is essential in our democratic society to maintain informed public support for U.S. policies in the United Nations; and

Whereas enlightened public opinion in this regard requires accurate and timely information about the United Nations and its large family of agencies whose activities serve the United States and all other members; and

Whereas the General Assembly of the United Nations has resolved that October 24, the date of the coming into force of the United Nations Charter in 1945, should be dedicated each year to making known the purposes, principles, and accomplishments of the United Nations;

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim Sunday, October 24, 1965, as United Nations Day, and urge the citizens of this Nation to observe that day by means of community programs which will contribute to a realistic understanding of the aims, problems, and achievements of the United Nations and its associated organizations.

I also call upon officials of the Federal and State Governments and upon local officials to encourage citizen groups and agencies of communication—press, radio, television, and motion pictures—to engage in special and appropriate observance of United Nations Day this year in cooperation with the United Nations Association of the United States of America and other interested organizations.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this ninth day of April in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-ninth.

[SEAL] LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

DEMONSTRATIONS ON UNITED STATES VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to say to the Senator from New York that the last few days I believe some rather interesting developments have been going on all over the country.

I have noticed in the news stories in a number of our colleges, where a lot of people have alleged there was strong disruptive influence of one kind or another, attempting to tear down the American policy, that the students themselves have started to take care of this problem.

I am convinced that 99 percent of the students in our colleges are completely in accord with the vigorous promotion of American policy. But unfortunately the people who are satisfied with American policy, the 99 percent, are not the noisy demonstrators.

Most of them do not grow beards, or things of that kind. They have their laundry done regularly.

But I notice that in colleges the students are beginning to ban together to put down this irrational activity that occurs.

I received today, for instance, from a college in my State, which is a seminary for training of ministers, a resolution. The resolution was allegedly unanimous opinion of the student body. It was adopted unanimously by the student body of the seminary. It completely endorsed our policy in Vietnam and suggested that they did not want us to think that the students or the great majority of students were joining in these demonstrations and fanatical performances which are going on in some areas of the country.

I would not be surprised if these demonstrations get noiser, that is, these erratic demonstrations in opposition to American victory and success in Vietnam.

If the demonstrations continue I would not be surprised if the students did not take care of the matter themselves. At least from what has appeared in the last few days it is going to be a very interesting development.

I have seen this happen before. I remember after World War I we had a song, "I Didn't Raise My Boy To Be a Soldier" and Peace-at-any-price Troops; and they would not fight, and they would not do this, or that.

It is still a minority, hardly big enough to call a minority that were noisy, but it disappeared eventually.

I believe our students are really very sensible and very objective when they make up their minds. They will probably go a long way to take care of this situation themselves.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Iowa is a thoughtful man.

I believe one of the proudest things about the American citizen is his feeling for civil liberty. I have heard it expressed in colleges time and time again, and also here.

I agree with the Senator that the students will demonstrate overwhelming support for the basic policy of the Nation.

I might point out to the Senator, as to the 10,000 or 12,000 that demonstrated in New York City, that when one considers the size of our population and the size of the student population, that is not a great number.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not know too much about New York City. But I have seen a lot of student activities in my day. One way or another, it is my guess that the overwhelming number of students that participate in these demonstrations are going along for the ride and for the excitement. It is only a hard core that is dedicated to this world-saving purpose which they allege.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is corrrect. When there is exposure of those with whom they are associated in the purpose they are leading themselves, I do not want them to withdraw in stubbornness because everyone is calling them Communists.

I believe that as legislators it is our duty to hold clear to the basic policy of our Government, at the same time as we exhibit faith-backing confidence on the floor for the young people themselves.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I believe the youngsters will do a lot to take care of this matter.

The Senator mentioned something about conservative. I do not know whether these people are conservatives or the fringe elements. I believe we are all down the middle of the road in American policy.

I draw a distinction between the fundamental right to assemble, and even protest, which I believe is a basic right that must be protected and must be maintained, and rabble-rousing mobs that incite people to violate the law. There has been too much of that in this country in the last 2 or 3 years at various points. It goes clear beyond the objective right to peaceable assembly and to express oneself. Too often it has gone over into rabble rousing and mob incitement, resulting in injuries and sometimes death.

Mr. JAVITS. That is exactly our responsibility—to keep the channels clear and to enforce the law. That was the purpose of my statement today.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There are laws to take care of those things; but unfortunately, on so many occasions, the officials charged with the responsibility to enforce the law have not enforced it.

Mr. JAVITS. That is our job.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is an administrative responsibility, because the laws are already on the books.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand; nonetheless, we have legislative oversight. Our views are very important in the country. I spoke for the purpose of putting in focus support for law enforcement and also support for people who legitimately, honestly, and peaceably exercise their rights under the Constitution.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Do not misunderstand me. The Senator from New York presented his views succinctly and powerfully. I am not taking issue with them at all. Perhaps I am philosophizing a bit beyond the bounds of good judgment on the last day of the session.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Iowa is quite within his rights. He always makes an excellent contribution to debate.

CAIRO ASKS RECORD UNITED STATES HELP

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times indicates that President Nasser's United Arab Republic has made a record request for economic aid from the United States, and that President Johnson may well be waiting for Congress to adjourn before announcing his decision because of the long history of expressed congressional concern regarding Egyptian aid.

It would seem that the United States alternates between being the United Arab Republic's chief target for invective and the United Arab Republic's chief object for aid requests.

While, on the one hand, none of us wishes to see the Egyptian people reduced to starvation, on the other hand, there must be valid questions raised as to whether our aid will have the ultimate effect of bolstering President Nasser's international adventuring at the expense of world peace and security, and to the detriment of his own domestic economy, including the arms race in which he is now engaged.

We must have assurance that our aid will not strengthen the Nasserite effort to drive our British allies from South Arabia and Aden.

In the interest of keeping peace in the Middle East, all we have now is Nasser's pledge to the Arabs to build up his strength so that he can, as soon as possible, pursue his war of extermination with Israel.

Will our aid strengthen this resolve? Will the arms race continue and accelerate?

Will President Nasser again go back on his word to withdraw the troops which he has maintained at great cost in lives and fortune in the Yemen? Will United Arab Republic agents continue to stir up mischief against free governments and against the West in both Africa and in the Near East? Will the United States continue to be a major target of the Nasser propaganda machine both in the United Arab Republic and through its extensive networks abroad?

These questions must be answered. The administration must insist on an answer to these questions. The administration must be satisfied with the answers before extending aid. Otherwise, it will most likely seriously impair its relations with the Congress, if it attempts a post-adjournment end run on Egyptian economic aid.

The springtime smiles of the State Department, which earlier this year pleaded with the Congress not to tie its hands on aid to the United Arab Republic, have faded.

Mr. President, I urge that the administration delay no further in disclosing its intentions with regard to the United Arab Republic request, and to consult with the leaders of Congress and disclose its decision in this regard to the American people. It is about time that the game of tag on this question between the State Department and the public be brought to an end.

Congress has expressed itself very clearly on this subject.

I join in wanting to give aid to the people of Egypt, provided that we can do it without very seriously hurting ourselves. Hence, questions should be asked and there is an urgent need to have them answered in a satisfactory way and in accordance with the policy of the United States.

I hope that the administration and the State Department will ask these questions and get the right answers before they get their foot further into the trap by giving more aid to Nasser.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article, entitled "Cairo Said To Ask Record U.S. Help," written by Hedrick Smith, published in this morning's New York Times, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAIRO SAID TO ASK RECORD U.S. HELP—PUTS 1966 FOOD IMPORT NEEDS AS HIGH AS $300 MILLION

(By Hedrick Smith)

CAIRO, October 21.—The regime of President Gamal Abdel Nasser, with only 10 weeks supply of wheat and facing the pressures of a steadily expanding population, has asked the United States for a record level of economic aid for 1966, informed sources said today.

The Government of the United Arab Republic has dropped its request for a new 3-year aid agreement with Washington but according to well-placed sources it has told the United States that next year alone the Egyptians will need food imports worth $250 to $300 million and hope that the bulk of this will come from the United States.

Last year American surplus food shipments to Egypt under the Food for Peace program reached a peak of $175 million, but the aid program expired last June 30.

Since then, economic sources say, Egyptian needs, from wheat to tobacco and meat to cooking oil, have continued their sharp rise.

DELEGATION WAS ENCOURAGED

The Egyptian delegation, which returned from high-level talks in Washington last week was given encouragement on the prospects for a new aid agreement, which is expected to be signed soon. But officially U.S. spokesmen say that President Johnson has not yet given final approval to renewing aid to Egypt.

The time is getting short for the Egyptians. Foreign analysts estimate that Cairo now has enough wheat in hand or en route from other countries to last until the end of December or possibly mid-January.

Since it takes about 2 months to deliver American wheat to Egypt once the President gives the order, Egyptian officials want to sign a new deal with the United States by early next month.

Timing is touchy as well for President Johnson; only last Thursday he received legislation renewing the Food for Peace program. Because of the storm that aid to the United Arab Republic kicked up on Capitol Hill last spring, he presumably wants to wait until Congress adjourns before approving a new aid pact with President Nasser.

The massive list of food requirements that Egyptian officials presented in Washington last week was reported to include 2.7 million metric tons of wheat, compared with 1.9 million metric tons in 1964; 650,000 metric tons of corn compared with 425,000 last year; and 80,000 tons of vegetable oils, up from the 50,000 under the old agreement. A metric ton is 2,204 pounds.

LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7812) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The conference report was agreed to.

PARTICIPATION OF THE UNITED STATES IN INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER IN DADE COUNTY, FLA.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 30, to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes. The bill was reported with amendments and without recommendation by the Committee on Foreign Relations today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that this is the so-called Interama bill, which provides several million dollars for participation by the United States in a Florida fair?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, although the amount was reduced from $11 million to $7,500,000, and from $4 million to $2 million; and the period of time was reduced to 2 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This proposal has been advanced for a considerable number of months; in fact, I understand that the idea originated around 1941 or 1942. So it is not anything so world shaking that it must be acted on tonight.

I should certainly like to accommodate my two friends from Florida; but I do not believe enough Senators are present to give the bill sufficient attention at this particular time. Therefore, with great reluctance, I feel constrained to object.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I withhold the objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. It is true that the idea has been advanced since 1941. In 1950 Congress approved a resolution favoring the whole project.

The Senator from Delaware is well aware of the details; I shall not attempt to bore him or other Senators with them. It is evident that if we are to adjourn sine die tonight and do not get this bill before the Senate tonight, it will, of course, have to go over until next year. The real problem is that, as the Senator well knows, Interama has already issued some $8 million worth of revenue bonds. We have a commitment from the Community Facilities Administration for some $22 million.

As the Senator says, everyone knows about it. If everyone knows about it, it seems to me that we ought to be able to vote it up or down. I do not believe there is any new information that either the Senator from Florida or the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], or any other Member of this body, needs to know in order to make up his mind. I think every Senator is ready to vote on the bill, one way or the other. All we ask is that we be permitted to vote on it at this particular time, this being the last opportunity we shall have at this session to vote on the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I appreciate the position of the Senator from Florida, and would very much like to accommodate him. It is true, we hope, that we are approaching the end of the session, although I am wondering whether it would not be a good idea to have something for us to look forward to when we come back in January. We have done so much this year that I hardly know whether to say it has been for the people or to the people. I merely wonder if it is not a good time to close up shop and take a good breathing spell to consider many of the measures which we have passed.

I have not seen the final statistics, but I understand that while the President submitted a budget early this year calling for expenditures of $99.7 or $99.8 billion, we will have appropriated, when we adjourn tonight, more than $108 billion, plus a large amount of other approvals for back-door spending. I believe it can truthfully be said that it is time Congress went home. It is long past the time when we should have gone home. We have done enough to the American people for one Congress. Let us go home. Perhaps next year we shall be in a more conservative mood and can do something for them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think there are some facts which may not be known about this important matter. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that he and the Senator from Ohio have argued this subject in great detail on two or three occasions already. It is a matter of simple fairness to allow the bill to come up, to be debated on its merits, and then to be voted up or down by the Senate.

Since the Senator from Delaware has graciously yielded, I wish to place in the RECORD a few facts. The first one is that the State of Florida, the county of Dade, the city of Miami, the city of North Miami, and various utility interests there have donated, granted, or committed more than $100 million in one way or another to this project. They have committed themselves; and the agency created by State law has committed itself to build, at its own expense, a building for a Federal exhibit and a building for the exhibits of Latin American nations.

I wish to read one item from the bid of the Community Facilities Administration, which was accepted shortly thereafter. The bid from the Community Facilities Administration to the Inter-American Center Authority is dated February 9, 1965. It has to do with the financing of an exhibit of the Federal Government, which was understood to be an absolute necessity if the Latin American nations were to participate. They are to exhibit in buildings to be built by the authority and paid for by local money. I shall read provision J, on page 6 of this proposal dated in February 1965.

> The borrower—

That is the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center—

> shall covenant in the trust indenture that, in the event an appropriate agency of the U.S. Government does not provide exhibits in the U.S. Government building within a reasonable time after its completion and during any future period when no agency of the U.S. Government occupies said building, the authority itself shall occupy said building and provide therein exhibits appropriate to the designed characteristics of said building and to the concept of the Center.

Mr. President, I wish to make it completely clear that the thing being asked for in the legislation which is presented, and which so far has not been made the pending business, is a payment by the Federal Government for assembling the exhibits for our U.S. Government, and only for that, and for its maintenance during the 2 years after the Center becomes operative. It involves the financing of the Federal exhibit. The building is to be paid for by local people. The building for the other Latin American nations is to be paid for by the local people. The tract of land consists of 1,700 acres. It is worth approximately $16 million, and has been donated by the people of Miami.

The reclamation of 680 acres already reclaimed is paid for. The connection of the water and sewers is being paid for by the city of North Miami. The connection of all the various utilities, telephone, gas, electric, and other utility interests is being paid for by the utilities.

The State of Florida is paying between $6 and $7 million. All we are asking is that the Federal Government pay for the cost of its own exhibit in this fine, continuing symbol of friendship to bid for better understanding on a cultural and business basis between our country and our Latin American neighbors.

All this is to be done near the center geographically and from the population standpoint, of the Western Hemisphere. It is in the city of Miami.

I want the Senator to recall that our quadricentennial celebration, now underway, is the first in this Nation. It is the first that could take place. It is taking place without the expenditure of one dime by the Federal Government. It is being paid for by the State, by the Spanish Government, by the Catholic Church, and by numerous grants from firms in our Nation which do business in Latin America.

We have received no contribution of any sort from the Federal Government for this first quadricentennial celebration in this country.

In this particular center, an exhibit is designed to bring about greater contact, better friendship, and more cultural understanding between our country and Latin America, at the very place in which some 2 to 3 million Latin Americans come into our country and leave our country to go back home every year. The project has been approved by everyone. Our Federal Government will be represented there.

Is the Senator willing to let the measure come up for debate? The bill would provide for $9.5 million to be expended over a period of 3 years. This would be made available to carry on the Federal exhibit there. That is the sole purpose for which this legislation is intended.

I hope that the Senator, having argued at great length on the floor concerning what he regards to be the demerits of the bill, will allow the measure to come up and be passed upon.

I hope that he will be as fair in this case as he was in the case of the Alaskan enterprise which has just been voted on, and the other enterprise.

This project is the only one which I have ever heard of in which the local people have taken part as heavily as they have, and in which they have actually agreed to construct the building in which the Federal exhibit will be located.

I hope that the Senator will be gracious enough to let us call up this measure and work our will upon it.

Bonds have been issued and are outstanding. They had to be sold before the reclamation work could go on. The interest on those bonds is approximately $20,000 a month. Every month that this project continues to exist without being put upon a producing basis, there is just that much more expense.

I hope that the distinguished Senator will at least let us debate the measure. The Senator, and others who feel as he does, have argued so extensively today and yesterday, and, in fact, on several other occasions. I hope that he will change his mind.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I again implore the distinguished Senator from Delaware to at least give us an opportunity to vote. I do not propose at this time to set out all the reasons why we think the bill is a good one. The only thing that I wish to state to the able Senator from Delaware is that I think we are entitled to a vote. We have had World Fairs that Senators have voted for. There was one in New York, one in Seattle, Wash. We just voted for one in Alaska. There have been others in the past.

I believe that the people are entitled to have an opportunity to have this matter voted on.

This matter was held up in the Committee on Foreign Relations not by a majority, but by the opposition of two or three Senators. The measure was reported today by a vote of 10 to 4. Four members were opposed to it.

As a practical matter, we are sure that this is the last day on which we shall be discussing anything in this particular session. If we do not vote on Interama now, obviously we cannot consider this matter until next year. We ask that the Senator not change his mind about a single thing concerning the merits of Interama or backtrack on anything or withdraw one word. The Senator can say anything he wishes and vote as he desires and attempt to get anyone else to vote with him. However, we ask that the Senator give us an opportunity to have a vote on this particular bill, which we think is so meritorious.

We ask the Senator to cooperate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations discussed with me early this morning the matter concerning the interest of the two Senators from Florida and others in obtaining action on this measure in the committee.

I was engaged in the Senate in a little friendly discussion on another matter today. I was asked if there would be any objection to a committee meeting. I said that I would certainly not object, that the committee could meet. I said I would give my consent, and, even more than that, I said, "While I am going to vote against this measure, I will go down to help them make a quorum if you need to get action."

I recognized the right of a Senator to get a vote on a bill. However, as the Senator said, the bill came from the committee with a vote of 11 to 4, I believe. Four of us voted against the measure. We have asked for an opportunity to file our minority views. The minority views have been printed or are in the process of being printed.

At the time this request was made this morning, we had every reason to think that the Senate would be in session tomorrow. I was not trying to block the bill. In fact, I cooperated with the Senators in the interest of orderly procedure. However, in the interest of orderly procedure, when we discuss this bill, I should like to have the benefit and have all other Senators have the benefit of the eloquent minority views in which I have participated, and which are most persuasive. We cannot do that if we take the bill up this afternoon.

I realize the position that the Senator from Florida is in. I did not jockey him into that position. However, if it will help him any, in making my objection, I will make it a most reluctant and kind objection. However, I still feel constrained to object.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I withhold my objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, would the Senator agree that there will be more Senators present tonight than there would be tomorrow?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should hope so.

Mr. SMATHERS. If more Senators were to be present tonight than would be present tomorrow, then the Senator would have his wish of giving more Senators an opportunity to pass on the measure. It is the wish of most Senators that we can conclude tonight and that Senators can go home.

It might be possible, however, for the distinguished senior Senator from Florida and the junior Senator from Florida to keep the Senate in session and carry this thing over into tomorrow. There might be an adjournment and a quorum call tomorrow. However, that would inconvenience about 100 Senators.

All we ask, as I said a moment ago, is not that the Senator change his views. He can make his eloquent speech, and he is eloquent and persuasive in this matter. I know that the Senator will have a bigger audience tonight than he would have tomorrow. I am sure that the Senator can make a stronger case tonight than tomorrow. The Senator knows, and so do I, that Senators would rather listen to the Senator than read the minority report.

That being the case, I would think that the Senator would realize that it is only a matter of simple justice and fairness that we are entitled to a vote, and that he would go ahead and let us proceed tonight. If we have to postpone it for 3 or 4 hours, we shall be delighted to do it, until 11 o'clock or any other time. But give us an opportunity to get it up sometime tonight.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As the Senator well knows, the major business before the Senate is going to be to consider—and I suppose a rollcall vote will be taken on it—the sugar bill, and after that I do not know what, but I must say again that I think we have done both enough for and enough to the American people at this session, and I should like for them to have a chance——

Mr. SMATHERS. May I say one further thing on that point? What the Senator is doing to the people of Florida should not be done. The people of Florida feel that they are a part of the Union. We pay our taxes. We send our boys off to the service. We contribute like anybody else.

Alaska has had its fair; Seattle has had its fair; New York has had its fair; and it is about time, it seems to me, that Florida should have its fair. I do not care what it is called, but we should not be rejected. The position the Senator is taking tonight is, in effect, discriminating against the people of Florida, by not permitting them at least to have called up for consideration this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, my objection was not to this bill, it was to the 108 some odd billion dollars which we have appropriated in general. I realize the interest of the Senator from Florida, but as he knows, I am not only in a minority on the committee, I am in a minority in the Senate, and in the minority all around. The Senator from Florida, with his great eloquence and persuasion, perhaps——

Mr. SMATHERS. I hope can persuade the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. He can persuade me. I have said already that in making my objection, I shall make it the most kindhearted and reluctant objection I have ever made. But, with expressions of great reluctance to both Senators from Florida, it will have to be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Alabama, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF FREDERICK H. KELLOGG TO BE A MEMBER OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Frederick H. Kellogg to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frederick H. Kellogg to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the nomination is reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Works. It has been cleared by the majority and the minority leadership. I move that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and the President will be notified forthwith of the action of the Senate.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I express appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works for having action taken on this nomination today. The nominee is a distinguished American, a native of my State. I appreciate the fact that the Senate has seen fit to confirm his nomination.

EXECUTIVE NOMINATION OF WILLIAM D. BECHILL TO BE COMMISSIONER ON AGING

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I send to the desk the nomination of William D. Bechill, of California, to be Commissioner on Aging, and I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nomination may be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William D. Bechill, of California, to be Commissioner on Aging.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may submit later a statement concerning the nomination of Mr. Bechill as Commissioner on Aging.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I have an article published in the New York Times magazine section, and I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the rule, I be permitted to put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD after the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTENSIVE CAMPAIGN BY 1-MAN, 10-VOTES FORCES AHEAD

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the less than 16 months since the "one-man, one-vote" decisions of the Supreme Court, very substantial progress has been made in the restoration of fair apportionment and democratic government to the States of the Union. But let no one think that this substantial progress will go unchallenged by the 1-man, 10-vote group. In my judgment, malapportionment in the United States has been seriously wounded, but we can confidently expect to see in the next few months extraordinary efforts to restore this now discredited violation of democratic principles. We may expect to see, between now and the first months of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, a well-financed, nationwide campaign—which may include every sort of legislative magic and sorcery—to breathe life into the last hope of the forces which profit from minority control of the State legislatures.

That last hope for minority controlled and ineffective legislatures is the Dirksen 1-man, 10-votes amendment, now in its third or fourth revision following its latest defeat in the Congress. Senators will recall the unusual procedures used by the sponsors of this proposed constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court's restoration of representative legislatures in the States. First, only 2 months after the Court's decisions in June of 1964, the minority leader attempted to attach to a foreign aid authorization bill a moratorium on the carrying out of the reapportionment orders of the Court. When the Senate, by an overwhelming vote, rejected cloture on the amendment, a new campaign was set in motion to reverse the Court's decisions. This sought to secure proposal by the Congress of a constitutional amendment which would permit one house of a State legislature to be based on so-called factors other than population. After thorough hearings under the able chairmanship of Senator BAYH, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments reported a slightly revised version of the amendment to the full Judiciary Committee, but its sponsors were unable to secure a majority for the resolution and the committee refused to report it.

As expected, the sponsors again resorted to extraordinary procedures and out of order attached to another resolution authorizing a National American Legion Baseball Week a resolution proposing the constitutional amendment. The Senate rejected this attempted interference in fair apportionment of the State legislatures and defeated the resolution with a 7-vote margin on August 4 of this year.

Despite the clear defeat of August 4, the minority leader soon introduced an additional form of the resolution, slightly altered to give the appearance of meeting the objections raised to the earlier resolution. As I shall develop in a moment, this third or fourth version is decidedly no improvement and raises many more questions than the revisions answer. It is well understood and frankly admitted that when the Judiciary Committee again refused to support the resolution with a majority vote, the minority leader refused to permit action on another important bill pending before the committee, the Immigration Act and let it be known he would continue to block the favorable report on that bill until such time as sufficient votes were supplied to report to the Senate, without recommendation, the resolution proposing the 1-man, 10-votes constitutional amendment. One member of the committee who felt deeply about the need for the Immigration Act therefore changed his vote on the constitutional amendment and voted to report it, although he announced at that time that he would vote against the amendment on the Senate floor.

Mr. President, because this issue is of such immense and fundamental importance to the character of representative government in the United States, I predict that the "old guard" forces will not give up their effort to block the Court's decisions, even though they have been repeatedly defeated in the Congress. I predict that within the next few months we will see a campaign of very large proportion directed against individual Senators and Representatives in an effort to change their votes on this matter. It has been revealed in the press that the agent for the campaign on behalf of the constitutional amendment will be the well-known California public relations firm of Whittaker and Baxter which for years led the right against the medicare bill. We may expect this campaign to be well financed and I have been told that events to raise funds for this purpose are already underway. I do not wish here, Mr. President, to make any attack on any group for its support of the Dirksen 1-man, 10-votes amendment, nor do I wish to suggest there is anything sinister about the campaign on behalf of it. The previous debate in the Senate has spelled out in detail the reasons for the vehement opposition to the Supreme Court's decisions. In addition to the natural reluctance of State legislators to lose their seats through reapportionment, it is easily understood what a representative State government may mean to the very powerful interests which now have an alliance with the minority controlling the State legislatures and who would regret to see State legislatures represent the needs and views of the great majority of taxpayers and consumers.

I merely wish to call attention to the campaign which is certain to be waged for the 1-man, 10-vote principle. The very sophisticated and successful firm of Whittaker and Baxter, along with its allies in the State legislatures and in many conservative interest groups, will be able to muster a massive campaign compared to the resources of those who would defend the Court and the cause of representative government. We must be on our guard and we must continue to bring our arguments to the people in every way we can.

II. REVOLUTIONARY PROGRESS MADE IN STATE LEGISLATIVE APPORTIONMENT

Mr. President, when one considers the fact that nearly every State legislature in the United States was badly malapportioned in at least one house, and in both houses in most cases, only 2 years ago, the progress made in apportionment has been truly remarkable. The shackles of minority control forced upon the majority of the people over the last 50 years have been burst asunder and the future of viable State governments which may vigorously serve their proper partnership in the Federal system is indeed encouraging. Nevertheless, we must not forget that the forces of malapportionment have not been finally vanquished and the 1-man, 10-votes legislators in many States are still dragging their feet in the hope that they will be "bailed out" by the Dirksen amendment or something like it. I am sure Senators noticed only last week the comment of the Maryland senator who urged his colleagues to go slow on apportionment in the hope that the Dirksen amendment would be approved by the Congress and submitted to the States.

So that we should not count our chickens before they are hatched, Mr. President, we should also keep in mind that while reapportionment activity is going on in nearly every State of the Union, final and acceptable reapportionment has occurred so far only in slightly more than one-third of the States. Moreover, even that fair apportionment will not actually take effect until the fall of 1966 in most cases.

It is difficult to establish the exact situation in 50 States as of any particular day, but I think a summary of the apportionment activity will be of interest to the Congress and to other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have prepared such a summary, using as a basic document an article which appeared in the National Civic Review for September by Mr. William J. D. Boyd, editor. Using the reports of the Legislative Reference Service as a cross check, I have annotated Mr. Boyd's article in those cases where subsequent action in the States has come to my attention. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks this "National Summary: Apportionment Activity," by Mr. Boyd. The material in parenthesis is that added by me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this summary shows that in 19 States final reapportionment action has been taken which will bring both houses of the State legislature in substantial compliance with the Court's decisions by the fall of 1966. These States are: Alabama, Colorado, Connecticut, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. Of course, in several of these States, most notably my own State of Wisconsin and also in Massachusetts, the directives of the Federal courts were unnecessary to bring about the fair apportionment of both houses of the legislature.

In addition to these, 12 other States have taken legislative action or promulgated apportionment plans which bring both houses of the legislature in compliance with the Court decisions, but a final court review may be still pending. These are: Alaska, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, Texas, and Virginia.

Fourteen other States have worked toward reapportionment, but their action is less far along in that further legislative action, constitutional convention action, or court review is still pending. These States are: Arizona, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island. In several of these States temporary apportionment plans, much better than the old apportionments, are in effect but must be revised by the fall election of 1966.

In four other States the initial suits are now pending which challenge the apportionment of the legislatures. These are: Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina. In one other State, Maine, no action appears to have been taken.

Others may interpret the summary a little differently, Mr. President, but I think what I have said is a fair presentation of progress to date.

The conclusion we should draw from this is that the coming year is the crucial one if we are to protect the gains which democracy has made under the reapportionment decisions. Since the fair apportionment of the State legislatures of the United States, barring any interference, will be finally realized in the next 12 months in all but a half dozen States, we can expect an extraordinary effort in the early months of the coming year to turn back this progress.

APPORTIONMENT STATISTICS SHOW FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE

Mr. President, while we do get in the press reports of apportionment plans proposed and adopted, it is difficult to know whether these plans actually comply with the Court's standards or if they are mere token efforts at reapportionment. From the statistics available, it appears that there has been much more than token compliance.

The Legislative Reference Service has compiled several charts from available statistics which are used to measure the variation from the one-man, one-vote standard in apportionment. These tables show that while there may be some distortions in size between the largest and smallest districts, the plans which have been finally accepted come very close to the desired standard. Mr. President, I do not wish to examine this data in detail at this time, but I ask unanimous consent that a table I have compiled from two charts put out by the Legislative Reference Service be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

CAMPAIGN FOR CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION HAS FAILED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in my opinion the issue of whether or not we are to have viable and representative State governments will be fought out in the Congress, and in particular in the Senate, during the next few months. As Senators know, a parallel campaign to block the carrying out of the Supreme Court's State legislative apportionment decisions has been in progress. This campaign would have two-thirds of the State legislatures—the existing rotten borough legislatures to be precise—petition the Congress under article V to call a constitutional convention which would propose a constitutional amendment, similar to the Dirksen amendment, to reverse the Supreme Court decisions. The obvious intent of this campaign was to pressure the Congress to propose the Dirksen amendment. The importance of the entire effort to the forces of minority control is shown by the intense effort made to send forward the applications from the requisite number of States.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, in my opinion, this campaign has been a complete failure. Whatever claims may be made by the proponents of a convention, the fact is that these forces have lost their battle with time and their hope that two-thirds of the State legislatures would pass these applications for a convention has not been fulfilled.

The most important fact about the action taken by the State legislatures with respect to a convention is that 18 State legislatures have specifically rejected such a move and 2 others are expected to adjourn without requesting a convention. Therefore, 20 States, or 3 States more than the 17 States necessary to block such action, have rejected the effort to request a national convention on this question. The 18 States which have rejected this action are Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming. The two other States which probably will not take any action or will reject such action are Pennsylvania and Wisconsin.

It may also be clearly seen that a number of those State legislatures which have filed applications requesting the Congress to call a national convention have subsequently been fairly apportioned. It is possible that some of these State legislatures will reverse the action taken and it is certainly arguable that the Congress should not count as valid applications submitted by rotten borough legislatures which have now been fairly apportioned effective next fall. Of the 25 States which have requested the national convention on this question—these are: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New

Mexico, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, and Virginia—14 passed the application prior to reapportionment. In my opinion the applications from those States are now invalid.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print at the conclusion of my remarks a table prepared by Mr. William J. D. Boyd of the National Municipal League showing the status of the resolutions calling for a national constitutional convention on apportionment as of September 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this discussion of course does not imply that the applications for a constitutional convention had serious standing in any case. Many constitutional experts believe that these applications do not have weight under article V because they would limit the convention to the proposal of a specific amendment described in identical fashion in the applications. Article V permits a deliberative convention and there would be no purpose in a convention such as proposed in these applications. But it has been the understanding of many of us all along that this effort was not seriously directed toward achieving the calling of a national convention, but rather hoped to pressure the Congress into proposing the 1-man, 10-vote Dirksen amendment.

I recall one very able Republican who voted in favor of the Dirksen amendment on the ground that it was the only way, in his judgment, to stop the call for a constitutional convention. I hope this analysis, based on documentation from the Legislative Reference Service and elsewhere, will put this argument to rest.

NO COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF THIS SPECIFIC PROPOSAL

Mr. President, in interpreting this vital constitutional amendment, I think we should be aware of the unfortunate fact that there were no hearings on this specific amendment.

This is the third 1-man, 10-votes reapportionment measure we have had before this body in 2 years. It followed in the path of its predecessors by reaching the floor in a highly unorthodox fashion.

To be more specific, this legislative proposal, like the two that came before it, did not receive committee approval. In fact, like Senator DIRKSEN's rider to the 1964 foreign aid authorization bill, it was not even the subject of hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee. I think it is accurate to say that the resolution was pressured out of committee without hearings by the refusal of its supporters to act on a major immigration bill until the 1-man, 10-votes amendment had been reported from committee. The fact that the resolution was reported out without a recommendation indicates that its proponents were not entirely successful.

In interpreting this vital constitutional amendment all I have to go on, Mr. President, is the statement of the distinguished sponsor of this resolution which, I regret to say, did not answer the conspicuous questions about its interpretation. I intend to comment on this statement at a later point in my remarks. Senators DOUGLAS and TYDINGS have made excellent statements. These statements pointed up the proposal's vague and conttradictory nature.

ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO CHANGE

Mr. President, were this simply another piece of legislation, a simple bill, I would not be so intent in trying to pin down its precise meaning, the way in which it could be interpreted and applied. But this is a proposed constitutional amendment. It must be ratified by three-fourths of the States. If we decide after it has been so ratified that it is incorrectly worded, there is no easy way to change it. If we decide that it might have applied to conditions existing in 1965 but does not at all fit the circumstances of 1975 or 1985, we cannot change it by a majority vote of House and Senate. We must go through a long and complex amendment procedure which has been followed only 15 times in our Nation's history.

If there ever was a case for taking time for long committee hearings, and a probe of a proposal before the Senate, it seems to me it should be true in the case of a constitutional amendment; and this particular proposal has had no such consideration. It has not had a day, not an hour, not one minute of hearings.

The Dirksen 1-man, 10-votes amendment as a whole shares the weaknesses of its predecessors. It would permit State legislatures in conjunction with some of a State's citizens to deprive other groups in the State of the right to an equal voice at the polls. Senator DIRKSEN seems to have made some concessions, but these are no more than window dressing. They are slight. They have no real substance.

SERIOUS AMBIGUITIES

Senator DIRKSEN would require in his amendment that one house of a State legislature be apportioned on the basis of "substantial equality of population in accordance with the most recent enumeration provided for in section 2 of article I of the Constitution" before the amendment could be ratified by that State. This is a change, but not a significant change. It means that the 1-man, 10-votes amendment can be ratified by a legislature that is 50 percent malapportioned rather than 100 percent malapportioned. In either event, it is a malapportioned legislature. The malapportioned house can refuse to cooperate on legislation vital to the State's interests unless the fairly apportioned house agrees to ratify the amendment. And what do the members of the fairly apportioned house lose by agreeing to the Dirksen amendment? Little or nothing. For the Dirksen amendment would require that this house remain fairly apportioned. In other words, the status quo would remain. And anyone familiar with the reapportionment problem in State legislatures knows how very popular is the status quo. And little opposition to ratification is likely to come from this body of the State legislature.

This should be particularly underlined, because many Senators have argued that we can forget about opposing the Dirksen amendment because so much action will be taken before next January or February, when the proposal might come up. We should be aware of the fact that it is the status quo situation which persuades the State legislatures to fight like tigers for what they have and to put the pressures they have on Members of Congress to go along with them. And that status quo situation will continue to be the great source of power behind the Dirksen amendment.

The minority leader has not built in any significant protection for the one-man, one-vote principle here.

One of the first difficulties posed by the language of the 1-man, 10-vote amendment is the question of what constitutes "substantial equality of population in accordance with the most recent enumeration provided for in section 2 of article I." This equality, as I mentioned above, is a prerequiste for one house of a State legislature if the legislature is to ratify the proposed amendment. Let us assume that the courts would determine the question of "substantial equality" in this instance because the question would arise before the Dirksen amendment went into effect.

How are the courts to interpret the requirement that one house be apportioned in accordance with the most recent census? It is quite possible that a State legislature could decline to ratify the amendment until 1970 or 1971. If this were the case, would ratification by a State legislature in, say, January of 1971 be valid despite the fact that the State legislature had not reapportioned in accordance with the 1970 census? Exactly what is the cutoff date—the day the census begins, the day it ends, or the day on which a report is made to the President on the census results? The Dirksen 1-man, 10-vote amendment gives us no guidance on this question which could become extremely important as the 7 years for ratification allowed by this proposal draw to a close. The author of the amendment has made no legislative history on this point. There is no committee comment.

EMPTY GESTURE TO DEMOCRACY

Section 1 of the Dirksen amendment states that the legislature shall be appointed by the people of a State. This would require apportionment plans drawn up in accordance with the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision in the Reynolds against Sims case to be approved by the vote of the people even though no alternative plan were to be submitted. What an empty gesture. The people, of course, could either approve or disapprove the plan, but there is very little doubt as to what they would do. What point would there be in voting down a plan with no alternative plan to approve?

In fact, such a requirement might actually force the people to accept unequal representation until two years after a census had revealed a shift in population patterns within a State and a consequential malapportionment in the State legislature. Suppose, for example, that under its constitution a State reapportioned as soon as the census returns were in. Suppose further that they were required to reapportion in accordance with section 1 of the 1-man, 10-vote amendment at the general election for Representatives to Congress held "next following the year" in which the census takes place. That means that the State, in all likelihood, would put off reapportioning until the congressional elections of fall 1972 instead of late 1970 or the spring of 1971, when census data became public if the Dirksen amendment requirements were in effect. The alternative would be to reapportion in 1971 and again in 1972. This makes little sense.

Let us suppose that a State's governor with the help of an elections council were automatically required to reapportion the State's two legislative houses on a one-man, one-vote basis after each census. If this were the case, the State would have to go through a twofold procedure before this reapportionment were approved, even if it were in accordance with the Reynolds against Sims decision. First, the courts would have to approve the plan, since the Dirksen amendment states that if a plan is submitted other than by both houses of a State legislature it "shall be found by the courts—to be consistent with the provisions of this constitution."

Second, it would have to be approved by the people even if there were no alternative plan offered. Certainly the executive branch has no monopoly on bureaucratic procedures but this Dirksen rotten-borough amendment is a textbook example of redtape at its worst.

INADEQUATE REPRESENTATION IN ELECTION CAN FIX MALAPPORTIONMENT ON STATES

Another pitfall contained in the 1-man, 10-vote amendment is the section 1 requirement that a State be reapportioned each 10 years at a general election for Representatives for Congress as contrasted with the section 2 statement that a plan of apportionment shall become effective only after it has been submitted to a vote—at a statewide election. At first blush, the Dirksen 1-man, 10-votes amendment seems to meet the argument that a malapportionment plan could be held at an odd time of the year and thus be approved by that small portion of the population representing entrenched interest groups due to voter disinterest and a light turnout at the polls. Section 1 seems to say that a plan shall be approved on the day Members of the House of Representatives are elected, insuring a sizable turnout.

However, section 2 indicates that it is only the required 10 years reapportionment that must be held at the time of elections to the House. If a State legislature wishes to submit a malapportionment plan at some other time it is perfectly free to do so providing the election is statewide and in accordance with law and the Constitution. This means, in effect, that a very small proportion of a State's voters could perpetuate or institute a rotton-borrough legislature.

Of course, the proponents of the 1-man, 10-vote amendment point to the fact that population must be taken into account in apportioning both houses. Certainly the amendment names population as one of the bases on which the members of the second house may be apportioned. Nowhere, however, does the amendment say what weight is to be given to this factor, if indeed, the amendment requires that it be given any weight at all. After all, the amendment says population and two other stipulated factors "may" rather than "shall" be taken into account.

GEOGRAPHY: OR THE 1-MAN, 10-VOTE PRINCIPLE

The other two factors that may be taken into account are geography and political subdivisions. There is no reason to believe that one of these factors could not be used to the exclusion of the others.

Using a factor such as geography exclusively could result in representation by the acre. Such geographical representation would give Long Island, which has a land area of 1,401 square miles, almost four times the representation in one house of the New York State Legislature as New York City itself, which has an area of 365.4 square miles and far more people. How absurd and unfair this would be. But it would be possible under the geography standard of the Dirksen amendment.

Using the factor of political subdivisions has already gotten a great many States into trouble with the Supreme Court. Georgia's county unit system, for example, was used to disenfranchise the citizens of Atlanta by allowing them no more representation than other counties received in the Georgia Legislature. The Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision changed all that. The Dirksen 1-man, 10-vote amendment's political subdivision criterion could reinstate the county unit system in Georgia.

Since the 1-man, 10-vote amendment says that population, geography, and political subdivisions may be taken into account, there is no reason for me to believe that this list in inclusive. Presumably, other standards could be used to insure effective representation—of the various groups and interests making up the electorate. A list of some other possible factors, for example, real property ownership, degree of educational achievement, the amount of the State's taxload carried by a given community—makes it clear that the Dirksen amendment opens the door to any and every malapportionment possibility.

THE NUMBERS GAME

According to the language contained in the 1-man, 10-vote amendment, one house is to be apportioned on the basis of "numbers" while the second house may be apportioned on the basis of three factors, one of which is "population." What significance does the use of the term "numbers" in one place and "population" in another have? Perhaps, to quote playwright William Congreve, the Senator from Illinois determined that he would sway this body "by magic numbers and persuasive sound." But I am convinced that the use of "numbers" in one place and "population" in another is more than a literary pecadillo.

I strongly believe that by using the word "population" in conjunction with "geography, and political subdivisions" the Senator meant to refer to specific populations within a State as, for example, the Negro population, the Irish population, the business or labor population. I am reinforced in this view by the words that follow the three criteria for the makeup of one legislative house: "in order to insure effective representation * * * of the various groups and interests making up the electorate." Such group interest representation could be achieved by recognizing specific "populations" within the "numbers" making up the State and referred to earlier in the amendment.

The dangers of such special interest representation in legislative bodies have been outlined very ably by Senator DOUGLAS in his comments on the 1-man, 10-votes amendment. It works against compromise and toward the splintering of parties. It accentuates the differences between people rather than their similarities, their antagonisms rather than their mutual goals. It squares very poorly with our American concept of government.

How does Senator DIRKSEN propose that the special interest groups mentioned in his amendment achieve "effective" representation? We, as Members of Congress, are often praised for being effective or blamed for being ineffective by various groups within and outside our State. No one of us, simply by virtue of our being a member of this, the greatest deliberative body in the world, automatically becomes effective. I suppose the only way to make special interest groups completely effective in a State legislature is to give their elected representatives the power of the veto. I trust that Senator DIRKSEN would not propose to further accentuate the splintering effect his amendment would have on the American political scene by giving each special interest group the power of legislative veto.

WHO DESERVES REPRESENTATION?

The Dirksen 1-man, 10-votes amendment raises the basic question of what groups are to be represented, and in what proportions. Unfortunately, it does not answer these questions. Who deserves representation—Negroes, whites, Italians, Scandinavians, Catholics, Protestants, businessmen, wage earners, taxi drivers? If we do not use a one-man one-vote basis for this representation, what is to be the proportion of the vote given to these diverse groups? These are unanswerable questions and we should not pass the buck by saying "let the people decide."

Mr. President, if the people of Alabama had been able to decide what proportion of the vote should be given to the Negro population on the basis of the State legislature's recent reapportionment plan, they would have decided to give this segment of the population zero representation in the State legislature.

The reapportionment plan was recently stricken down by a three-judge Federal court as unconstitutional and discriminatory for this very reason. The plan would have "intentionally aggregated predominantly Negro counties with predominantly white counties for the sole purpose of preventing the election of Negroes to house membership" in the words of the court.

Under the Dirksen 1-man, 10-vote amendment, the plan could not have been challenged. It could have been submitted to the people of Alabama with no alternative choice since it apparently was based on substantial equality of population. If the people had approved it, and who would seriously say that they would have rejected it in an area where racial feelings run so high, it would be unchallengeable under the Dirksen 1-man, 10-vote amendment. For although the amendment talks of representing groups or interests, it makes no mention of equal rights for all men, regardless of color, or race, or creed. It leaves this choice up to the people—in this case the people of Alabama.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Birmingham Post-Herald of October 4, commenting on this court decision be included at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House Reapportionment Plan Rejected by Three-Judge Panel

(By James Bennett)

Montgomery, October 4.—A three-judge Federal panel, striking out at racial overtones in the recent reapportionment of the legislature by lawmakers, today declared their plan to reshuffle the house of representatives unconstitutional.

At the same time, the panel, which partially reapportioned both houses in 1962, upheld the legislature's reapportionment plan for the State senate.

In knocking out the house reapportionment plan, the judges charged lawmakers of deliberately discriminating against Negroes and rearranging legislative seats more along a court-ordered population basis.

SUBSTITUTES PLAN

Substituting a plan of its own, the court ruled the legislature's reapportionment of the lower house "is clearly unconstitutional."

No change was made, however in Jefferson County's new legislative lineup of 7 seats in the senate and 20 in the house.

The court charged that the legislature "intentionally aggregated predominantly white counties for the sole purpose of preventing the election of Negroes to house membership" in several south Alabama counties.

In handing down their ruling, Judges Daniel Thomas of Mobile and Frank Johnson and Richard Rives of Montgomery said the effect of the legislature's plans would be of "turning Negro majorities into minorities" in areas entitled to "their own representation."

The court apparently referred to sections of the bill which grouped counties with predominantly Negro populations large enough for house seats by themselves and with neighboring counties with white majorities to form multicounty districts with two or more representatives.

"It would be unfortunate if Alabama's Negroes were to find, just as they were about to achieve the right to vote, that that right had been abridged by racial gerrymandering," it added.

In declaring the House reapportionment plan approved by the legislature last month unconstitutional, the court charged it openly violated the 14th and 15th amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

Although it left the legislature's plan reshuffling the Senate intact, it warned that strong inferences concerning the race issue were involved but that population factors outweighed them.

It said the House reapportionment plan fell short on population standards as well as racial considerations.

It said the bill set up 15 districts which deviated from the average district size by more than 15 percent and 21 districts by more than 10 percent.

The judges said Mobile County was entitled by population to 10 seats instead of the 9 it got under the legislature's plan.

Making the adjustment, they also increased Madison County from four to five seats and Tuscaloosa County from three to four.

Most of the court's objections to the House plan however, centered around the race issue.

"The House plan adopted by the all-white Alabama legislature was not conceived in a vacuum," it said. "If this court ignores the long history of racial discrimination in Alabama, it will prove that justice is both blind and deaf."

"Systematic and intentional dilution of Negro voting power by racial gerrymandering is just as discriminatory as complete disenfranchisement or total segregation," it added.

In handing down its rulings, the court said its plan for the House and the legislature's plan for the Senate would remain in effect until changed by the legislature after the 1970 decennial census.

"If that session should fail in its primary responsibility to reapportion both houses on a population basis, the State's citizens whose right to vote may have been impaired will have a judicial remedy under the Constitution of the United States," it continued.

"Thus it will not be possible in the future for legislative malapportionment to continue for so long a period."

In handing down its ruling the panel marked the second time in 3 years it has thrown out portions of legislative reapportionment plans.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the basic questions to consider in examining the Dirksen 1-man, 10-votes resolution is what constitutes a reapportionment plan based "on substantial equality of population?" Before the amendment is ratified, the Supreme Court would make that decision. After it is ratified, we are told by the amendment that "the people of the State" will apportion the legislature by approving a plan submitted by the legislature. The courts would get into the picture if the plan were "otherwise submitted." But would the courts decide whether or not the requirement that the voters must have a chance to vote for a plan based on "substantial equality of population" is carried out? I do not know and the amendment does not tell me. Of course, if the courts were not permitted by the language of the amendment to make such a decision, the guarantee of a chance to vote for a plan based "on substantial equality of population" would be meaningless. It would not be upheld by the courts.

It is also impossible to tell from the 1-man, 10-vote amendment whether the requirement that a malapportionment plan must include "one house—apportioned among the people on the basis of their numbers" is to be enforced by the courts. Or for that matter, whether the requirement that one house be based on substantial equality of population before the State legislature approves a reapportionment plan for submission to the people is to be enforced by the courts. Surely these questions must be answered by a clarification of language. They should have been explored in hearings on the resolution.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, it is only too clear from this brief analysis of the myriad of questions raised by the Dirksen resolution that it can mean as much or as little as those applying and interpreting it wish it to mean. It gives full scope to whatever special interest group or groups have the most power in a State legislature at a particular time. Far from accepting the principle of proportional representation, it destroys it.

I would especially warn those who see some advantage for their special interest group in this legislation at the present time that in 10 years the tables may be turned. Although the 1-man, 10-vote amendment may have had its genesis in an attempt to help rural interests, it is a dangerous instrument which can be used with a disregard for democratic principles by any one or a combination of special interest groups.

I commend the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs] who recognized that and pointed out that the Dirksen amendment could have been turned against the farmer's interest and the rural interest, when he voted against the Dirksen amendment when it came up earlier this year.

As a State becomes more urbanized, the chances become stronger that a suburban dominated legislature will disenfranchise the very areas that now are attempting to disenfranchise suburban voters. We must not overlook the long-range implications of this 1-man, 10-vote amendment. We must not forget that only once in our Nation's history has a constitutional amendment been repealed. The Dirksen amendment, once passed and ratified, is here to stay.

Exhibit 1

[From the National Civic Review, September 1965]

National Summary: Apportionment Activity

The following is a State-by-State summary of the current status of apportionment:

Alabama: On June 15, 1964, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld Federal district court action originating in Alabama. That decision was in the famed *Reynolds* v. *Sims* case, establishing that both houses of a State legislature must be apportioned on the basis of population.

A legislative commission was established in Alabama which reported back to the 1965 special session. (On October 4 a three-judge district court rejected the Alabama Legislature's reapportionment plan for the Alabama House as unconstitutional and discriminatory against Negroes. The court issued its own plan for the house, but it accepted the legislature's senate plan. Both plans will take effect in the November 1966 elections.)

Alaska: Although no court case has been instituted in Alaska, a State advisory reapportionment board was convened and submitted its proposal to the Governor. He is responsible for reapportionment under the

Alaska Constitution and is expected to promulgate a new districting law early this month. (The Governor has now promulgated the new districting plan.)

Arizona: The case of *Klahr* v. *Fannin* (now *Klahr* v. *Goddard*) resulted in a Federal district court decision that senate districts were in violation of the U.S. Constitution but that it was too close to the 1964 general election for any changes to be made. In its regular 1965 session, the legislature postponed further consideration of the matter until a special session which was convened in mid-August. The court has refused to take further action until after the special session has had an opportunity to deal with the subject. (A senate plan has been submitted, but it is likely that it will be challenged since, by one test, 40 percent of the population may elect a majority of the senate under it.)

Arkansas: The case of *Yancey* v. *Fabus* forced both houses of the legislature to be reapportioned by the board of apportionment; it did this on July 14 of this year. (Under Arkansas law, reapportionment is not performed by the legislature.) Challenges to the new plan for the lower house have been filed with the Federal district court.

California: As a result of decisions in *Yorty* v. *Jordan* (California Supreme Court) and *Silver* v. *Jordan* (Federal district court), the State senate has been ordered to reapportion. The latter decision was appealed to the Supreme Court which on June 1, 1965, reaffirmed the lower court order.

The legislature has been unable to reach agreement on new plans and the matter is now back before the courts. (A special session of the legislature was convened to create new legislative districts for both houses. The State supreme court gave them until December 9 to take action. On October 21, the legislature passed plans reapportioning both houses on a population basis which the Governor said he would approve.)

Colorado: Due to the Supreme Court decision of June 15, 1964 (*Lucas* v. *Forty-fourth General Assembly*) the State was ordered to reapportion both houses. This was accomplished in time for the November 1964 election.

Subsequent litigation in both Federal and State courts led to a ruling that the subdistricting of multimember counties was in violation of the State constitution. The 1965 regular session of the legislature enacted a new apportionment plan eliminating the subdistricts. It will go into effect with the 1966 general election.

Connecticut: Connecticut's House of Representatives was reapportioned as a result of *Butterworth* v. *Dempsey*. A State constitutional convention was convened in early July to deal primarily with the problem of apportionment.

The temporary apportionment, which will go into effect with the special election this November, cuts the size of the Connecticut House of Representatives from 294 to 177 members.

Delaware: The case of *Roman* v. *Sincock* was part of the group of cases decided in June 1964. Both houses of the legislature were reapportioned in time for the 1964 election. A challenge has subsequently been brought in the Federal district court claiming that there is still inequality in the population of lower house districts and that gerrymandering is also present.

Florida: As a result of *Sobel* v. *Adams*, both houses of the legislature were to be reapportioned. The regular session of the 1965 legislature passed new plans and submitted them to the Federal district court, which has made no ruling at this time.

Georgia: Litigation dating back to 1962 resulted in the reapportionment first of the Georgia Senate (*Toombs* v. *Fortson*) and later the house of representatives, another Toombs decision. A Federal district court has ruled that the apportionments have not fully complied with the law but has allowed elections to take place. A new apportionment must be adopted in time for the 1968 election.

Hawaii: As a result of the case of *Holt* v. *Richardson*, both houses of the Hawaii Legislature must be reapportioned. The Federal district court, dissatisfied with action taken by the legislature, has ordered that a constitutional convention be called to deal with the subject in time for the November 1966 election.

Idaho: Both houses of the legislature have been reapportioned by the 1965 legislature due to *Hearne* v. *Smylie*. A challenge has been brought by the plaintiff in that case, claiming the apportionment does not conform to the requirements of the 14th amendment to the Federal Constitution..

Illinois: Under orders to reapportion both houses, the Illinois Legislature again reached a deadlock (see p. 417). The State court is expected to draw new senate lines. An at-large election for the house of representatives could result if a commission appointed to do the job fails to reach agreement, as happened in 1964. (The Illinois Supreme Court has drawn new senate lines.)

Indiana: A 1963 reapportionment act was held in violation of the Federal Constitution in the cases of *Stout* v. *Bottorff* and *Grills* v. *Branigin*. A new apportionment passed by the 1965 session of the legislature was challenged by the plaintiff in the Grills case. The court struck down the legislature's plans and a special session was convened in October. Little difficulty is expected in getting a new, acceptable plan.

Iowa: A temporary reapportionment plan was used in last November's election as a result of a decision in the case of *Davis* v. *Synhorst*. The court allowed the temporary plan for that election but ordered that a new one be adopted by the 1965 legislature.

Kansas: Although some reapportionment took place in the State during the early 1960's as a result of *Harris* v. *Shannihan*, the State constitutional provision guaranteeing each county at least one member in the house of representatives was still in effect. A challenge to this provision was brought in the case of *Long* v. *Anderson*, as yet undecided by the Federal district court.

Louisiana: Partial reapportionment took place during 1963 but a suit has recently been filed (*Bannister* v. *Davis*) to force reapportionment of the State senate.

Maine: No court case has been filed in this State but, minor adjustments were made in the house of representatives as a result of the adoption of a constitutional amendment in 1962. No action has been taken on senate redistricting.

Maryland: One of the supreme court decisions on June 15, 1964, was on *Maryland Committee for Fair Representation* v. *Tawes*. As a result, both houses in the Maryland Legislature must be reapportioned in time for the 1966 primary election. (In its regular 1965 session the general assembly considered a single bill proposing reapportionment plans for both the senate and the house of delegates. The house of delegates agreed to the bill, but the senate refused to approve a plan of reapportionment for the senate. So while the bill failed, only the senate lines are at issue. The Governor convened a special session of the general assembly for October 11 to again consider reapportionment. On October 21 the legislature, at the insistence of the senate, enacted two reapportionment plans and left the choice between them to the Governor or the courts. The State attorney general has stated that the second plan, increasing the membership from 29 to 53 and guaranteeing each county 1 senator, will not meet the court's standards, but that the other plan will.)

Massachusetts: Since both houses of the legislature were apportioned on the basis of population initially, Massachusetts has encountered no legal difficulties on this subject.

Michigan: Immediately following the Supreme Court's Reynolds decision, the State supreme court ruled that the newly adopted apportionment for the Senate was invalid. It had been challenged in the case of *Scholle* v. *Hare*. A new apportionment was adopted by the apportionment commission in time for use in the 1964 election. A subsequent suit has been filed and is now pending before the State supreme court on the issue of gerrymandering.

Minnesota: In a decision on *Honsey* v. *Donovan*, a Federal district court invalidated the legislative apportionment and ordered the next legislature to take action. The 1965 session passed new plans, which, however, were vetoed by the Governor. The entire issue is thus back in the courts once more.

Mississippi: Reapportionment took place as a result of the case of *Fortner* v. *Barnett*. Although it has not been legally challenged, it preceded the Reynolds decision, and there is some question as to whether it fully complies with the standards set forth in that ruling. (The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party filed a suit in mid-October challenging apportionment of legislative and U.S. House districts.)

Missouri: In response to a Federal court order in the case of *Jonas* v. *Hearnes*, the house of representatives has been reapportioned and action is being carried forward on redistricting the State senate. A constitutional amendment providing for an expansion of the lower house to 168 members was defeated last month in a special election. A new house apportionment plan must now be devised. (The situation is still fluid with the possibility of a special session strong. The Governor wants the legislature to empower the commission to create districts for the house. A commission has already created new senate districts.)

Montana: Both houses of the Montana Legislature have been declared invalidly apportioned (*Herweg* v. *Thirty-ninth Legislative Assembly*). This year's legislative session reapportioned both houses in July. The plans have been affirmed by the court and an order putting them into effect was issued August 8.

Nebraska: The only unicameral State legislature in the country was ordered to reapportion itself (*League of Nebraska Municipalities* v. *Marsh*) but the newly adopted apportionment, which had thus been declared invalid, was allowed to be used in last November's election. A new plan was adopted this year in late March which increased the size of the legislature to 50 members, with seats being apportioned on a population basis. County lines were rigidly observed, however, and population variations were declared to be still too large by the Federal district court so further action will be necessary. (A new statute was adopted in August apparently acceptable.)

Nevada: Although a committee has been appointed by the Governor to study reapportionment and a suit had been filed in the Federal district court (*Dungan* v. *Sawyer*), the State legislature adjourned without taking any action. (The Federal court has given the legislature to October 30 to act, and it convened on October 25.)

New Hampshire: A State constitutional convention revised the apportionment of both houses, removing a provision granting each town representation at least once every 10 years in the house of representatives; it also changed the senate apportionment from a basis of direct taxes paid to population. The 1965 legislature completed action on redistricting.

New Jersey: The New Jersey Supreme Court, in the case of *Jackman* v. *Bodine*, ruled that both houses of the State legislature were in violation of the U.S. Constitution. The apportionment of the lower house (the assembly) was allowed to stand for use in this November's election but a temporary plan was adopted for the State senate, expanding it from 21 to 29 members. A constitutional convention is to be held in March 1966 to create new provisions governing the apportionment of both houses.

New Mexico: As a result of *Cargo* v. *Campbell*, the house of representatives was apportioned prior to the Reynolds decision. An attempt to provide weighted voting at that time was declared invalid.

Further litigation in the Cargo case resulted in a ruling that apportionment of both houses of the legislature was invalid.

A new plan was adopted by the 1965 legislature. It would expand the senate from 32 to 37 members and use a weighted vote system that would provide a total of 509 votes, distributed among the senators according to the population of their districts. Membership in the house was reduced from 77 to 70 seats and districting was done on a population basis.

At the same time, a constitutional amendment was adopted which would permit the use of weighted voting; it will be voted upon in a special election later this month. Suit has been brought to invalidate the weighted voting proposal. (The voters rejected the constitutional amendment. The Court has voided the senate plan and has given the legislature until March 1, 1966, to act.)

New York: After much litigation, primarily in *WMCA* v. *Lomenzo*, reapportionment plans were passed by a special lame-duck session of the New York Legislature last December. One of the plans adopted will be utilized in a special legislative election to be held this November. After that, new districts must be created by the 1966 legislature.

North Carolina: No litigation has been instituted but, in November 1962, voters rejected a "little Federal plan" amendment regarding the State senate, which was then apportioned on the basis of population. (A suit has now been filed.)

North Dakota: As a result of long-standing litigation (*Lien* v. *Sathre* and *Paulson* v. *Meier*), North Dakota apportioned both houses of its legislature in the 1965 regular session. The senate was expanded in membership from 49 to 53 members while the house was reduced from 109 to 106 members. (On August 13, the Federal court invalidated the 1965 apportionment act and ordered into effect its own plan.)

Ohio: The consolidated case of *Nolan* v. *Rhodes* and *Sive* v. *Ellis* resulted in the invalidation of the Hanna amendment which provided that each county in Ohio was to receive at least one seat in the house of representatives. A special session of the legislature approved an apportionment amendment to the State constitution and submitted it to the voters; it, however, was defeated in a special election on May 4 of this year. The problem is now back before the legislature, with the Federal district court retaining jurisdiction if adequate relief is not obtained. (After defeat of the amendment the legislature was unable to come up with a new plan and the Federal court has now ordered all parties to submit plans for both houses and it will select a temporary plan. Previously this same court had held only that the house was malapportioned; now it says both plans are inadequate.)

Oklahoma: Scene of some of the most extensive litigation in the entire country (*Moss* v. *Burkhart*, *Williams* v. *Moss*, *Oklahoma Farm Bureau* v. *Moss* and *Baldwin* v. *Moss*), the Oklahoma Legislature was redistricted on orders of the Federal district court. It appointed a master who devised the plan used in the November 1964 election.

Pennsylvania: The legislature is under orders to reapportion in time for the 1966 general election (*Drew* v. *Scranton* and *Butcher* v. *Bloom*). The legislature is still in session and has yet to reach agreement. (The State supreme court has now indicated that it will reapportion the legislature.)

Rhode Island: A special census has been ordered and a 15-member legislature commission appointed to supervise the census and draft a temporary reapportionment plan for use in the 1966 election. A constitutional convention is in progress and is expected to recommend permanent apportionment standards.

South Carolina: No legal action has been filed but a special legislative commission has been appointed to study the apportionment problem.

South Dakota: Although no suit was filed, the 1965 legislature completed reapportionment of both houses of the legislature.

Tennessee: Site of the original reapportionment case, *Baker* v. *Carr*, its legislature passed several apportionment plans which were either struck down or modified by the Federal district court. A special session of the 1965 legislature was finally able to pass legislation reapportioning both houses. (These plans now before courts.)

Texas: As a result of the case, *Kilgarlin* v. *Martin*, the 1965 legislature was required to reapportion both houses. Its legislation is the subject of further litigation as a result of the manner in which Dallas County was made into a multimember district whereas Harris County (Houston) was allowed to be subdivided along congressional district lines. (Voters defeated a proposed constitutional amendment to increase senate membership from 31 to 39 on September 7. The proposal had been offered to preserve a number of rural seats lost in the 1965 districting.)

Utah: A Federal district court ordered reapportionment of the State legislature in *Petuskey* v. *Clyde*. During the regular 1965 session, the legislature enacted new plans, effective with the 1966 election.

Vermont: Both houses of the legislature were reapportioned as a result of *Parsons* v. *Buckley* and *Buckley* v. *Hoff*. Only minor adjustments were necessary in the senate but membership of the lower house was cut from 246 to 150.

Virginia: One of those States whose apportionments were declared invalid on June 15, 1964 (*Mann* v. *Davis*), Virginia has reapportioned both houses of its legislature. Further litigation is pending on the creation of multimember districts in Henrico County and Richmond. (The district court sustained legislature's plan with a minor change, but Henrico County voters have filed an appeal with the U.S. Supreme Court.)

Washington: As a result of court action in the case of *Meyers* v. *Thigpen*, both houses were ordered reapportioned and a new plan was enacted in February 1965; it was later approved by a Federal district court.

West Virginia: Following the 1962 Baker decision, litigation (*County Court of Kanawha County* v. *Carson*) was instituted which resulted in a court order requiring that the legislature comply with State constitutional provisions for a population-based apportionment for both houses. Action was completed in time for use of the new districts in the 1964 election.

Wisconsin: One month before the Supreme Court decided the Alabama case of *Reynolds* v. *Sims*, the Wisconsin Supreme Court decided *Reynolds* v. *Zimmerman* (there is no relationship between the two Reynolds). The State supreme court reapportioned both houses essentially along the lines of an apportionment plan passed by the legislature but vetoed by the Governor.

Wyoming: In response to a Federal district court decision in the consolidated case of *Schaefer* v. *Thomson* and *Whitehead* v. *Gage*, the house of representatives has been reapportioned on the basis of population. The senate apportionment, however, has been declared to be still unconstitutional, and the 1965 legislature adjourned without taking action to solve this problem. (The Federal court reapportioned the senate in October.)

EXHIBIT 2

PROGRESS IN STATE LEGISLATIVE APPORTIONMENT

[The measurements used are the 2 most favored by the courts and most commentators. The ratio of the most populated to least populated district (L:S (1)) is an expression of the figure obtained by dividing the population of the least populated district into the population of the most populated district, with the figure set down in relation to 1. The electoral percentage is derived by ranking the districts from least populated to most populated and totaling the population from the smallest end until there is included a number of legislators equal to 1 more than half of the legislative body, and dividing the total State population into it. This figure is then said to be the theoretical percentage able to elect a majority of the body. A perfectly apportioned body would theoretically have a ratio of 1:1 and an electoral percentage of 51 percent.]

TABLE A.—*Apportionment of State legislatures as of Jan. 1, 1965, and 1965 apportionments*

State	Ratio (L:S (1))		Electoral percentage		Ratio (L:S (1))		Electoral percentage	
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House
			Percent	*Percent*			*Percent*	*Percent*
Alabama	20.0	4.7	27.6	37.9			46.7	47.8
Alaska	19.1	2.4	35.3	47.3			51.0	
Arizona	85.8	5.3	12.8	46.0			40.0	
Arkansas	2.3	6.4	43.8	33.3				
California	422.5	4.2	10.7	44.7				
Colorado	1.4	1.7	50.0	50.0	1.40	1.63	47.5	46.8
Connecticut [1]	8.1	424.1	32.0	12.0	1.52	2.10	47.9	43.8
Delaware [2]	(3)	(3)	52.0	45.0				
Florida	26.4	23.3	15.2	26.9	1.53	4.00	46.4	41.6
Georgia [4]	1.8	98.8	48.2	22.2		2.00		42.3
Hawaii	7.5	4.7	18.1	38.4				
Idaho [5]	102.1	11.3	16.6	44.2	(3)	1.47	(3)	47.9
Illinois	10.6	4.7	28.7	39.9				

See footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT 2—Continued

PROGRESS IN STATE LEGISLATIVE APPORTIONMENT—Continued

[The measurements used are the 2 most favored by the courts and most commentators. The ratio of the most populated to least populated district (L:S (1)) is an expression of the figure obtained by dividing the population of the least populated district into the population of the most populated district, with the figure set down in relation to 1. The electoral percentage is derived by ranking the districts from least populated to most populated and totaling the population from the smallest end until there is included a number of legislators equal to 1 more than half of the legislative body, and dividing the total State population into it. This figure is then said to be the theoretical percentage able to elect a majority of the body. A perfectly apportioned body would theoretically have a ratio of 1:1 and an electoral percentage of 51 percent.]

TABLE A.—*Apportionment of State legislatures as of Jan. 1, 1965, and 1965 apportionments*—Continued

State	Ratio (L:S (1))		Electoral percentage		Ratio (L:S (1))		Electoral percentage	
	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House	Senate	House
			Percent	*Percent*			*Percent*	*Percent*
Indiana	2.6	2.2	40.5	47.6	1.38	1.41	49.4	48.1
Iowa	3.2	2.2	38.9	44.8	1.71	2.23	45.1	44.8
Kansas	1.2	28.7	50.1	19.4				
Kentucky	1.9	2.0	46.6	44.8				
Louisiana	8.0	8.3	33.0	33.1				
Maine	2.8	3.7	40.0	39.7				
Maryland	31.8	5.8	14.2	42.3				
Massachusetts	2.3	(3)	44.6	45.0				
Michigan	1.01	1.17	52.0	52.0				
Minnesota	3.8	11.9	40.1	34.5				
Mississippi	8.9	7.4	37.4	41.2				
Missouri [6]	1.7	13.5	47.8	20.3		1.34	52.0	48.2
Montana	88.4	14.0	16.1	36.6			46.0	46.0
Nebraska [7]	1.7		43.9		1.57		47.9	
Nevada	223.6	22.1	8.0	29.1				
New Hampshire	2.6	222.4	45.3	43.9	1.20	2.20	52.5	45.2
New Jersey [8]	19.0	3.0	19.0	46.5	1.61		47.0	
New Mexico [9]	139.9	8.6	14.0	42.0	30.80	1.74	19.9	47.4
New York [10]	3.9	20.9	36.9	34.7	1.15	1.21	49.4	49.3
North Carolina	2.3	18.0	47.6	27.1				
North Dakota [11]	8.9	3.2	31.9	40.9	1.39	1.39	47.1	47.1
Ohio	2.2	14.2	44.8	29.4				
Oklahoma	(3)	(3)	49.0	49.0				
Oregon	2.5	2.1	47.8	48.1				
Pennsylvania	2.7	18.0	43.4	42.7				
Rhode Island	96.9	39.0	18.1	46.5				
South Carolina	25.1	3.4	23.3	46.0				
South Dakota	4.3	4.7	38.4	38.6	1.39	1.40	47.1	46.7
Tennessee [12]	1.6	2.2	44.5	39.7	1.33	1.45	48.4	48.0
Texas	8.4	3.1	30.3	38.7	1.23	1.31	49.4	47.0
Utah [13]	6.9	27.8	25.0	38.0	1.75	1.55	44.5	47.6
Vermont [14]	5.5	1,480.4	47.0	11.9	1.60	1.30	48.8	48.7
Virginia [15]	2.6	4.4	41.1	40.5	1.40	1.76	48.0	47.7
Washington [16]	7.3	4.6	33.9	35.3	1.45	1.61	47.6	46.7
West Virginia	2.0	2.4	46.7	46.2				
Wisconsin	1.4	2.4	48.4	45.4				
Wyoming	9.8	2.6	24.1	46.5			50.6	

---

[1] Connecticut: Approved without challenge by Federal court.

[2] Delaware: Figures for Delaware are in dispute; it is expected that Federal court action will clarify matters.

[3] Not available.

[4] Georgia: Both house and senate invalid but may use for 1967 session; must reapportion before 1968. Elections have already been conducted under new house apportionment.

[5] Idaho: Senate apportionment still based on 1 member per county.

[6] Missouri: Senate will be apportioned by a commission; house plan dependent upon voter approval of constitutional amendment.

[7] Nebraska: Disapproved by Federal court.

[8] New Jersey: Approved as temporary measure for 1965 elections; must reapportion both houses in 1966.

[9] New Mexico: Weighting of senate votes dependent upon voter approval of a constitutional amendment.

[10] New York: Approved as temporary measure by Federal court; must reapportion in 1966.

[11] North Dakota: Disapproved by Federal court.

[12] Tennessee: Statistics based on population 21 years and older.

[13] Utah: Approved by Federal court.

[14] Vermont: Approved by Federal court; house statistics based on registered voters rather than total population.

[15] Virginia: Approved by Federal court.

[16] Washington: Approved without challenge by Federal court.

Source: Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, Aug. 12, 1965.

TABLE B.—*Apportionment of State senates, as of* Baker *v.* Carr

State	Year last apportioned	Average district	Largest district	Smallest district	Ratio L:S	Electoral percentage
Alabama	1906	993,278	634,864	15,417	41.2:1	25.1
Alaska	1961	11,308	88,021	4,603	19.1:1	35.3
Arizona	1953	46,506	331,755	3,868	85.8:1	12.8
Arkansas	1956	51,036	80,993	35,983	2.3:1	43.8
California	1930	392,930	6,038,771	14,294	422.5:1	10.7
Colorado	1953	50,113	127,520	17,481	7.3:1	29.8
Connecticut	1903	70,423	175,940	26,297	6.7:1	33.4
Delaware	1897	26,193	70,000	4,177	16.8:1	22.0
Florida	1945	130,304	935,047	9,543	98.0:1	12.0
Georgia	1946	73,021	556,326	13,050	42.6:1	22.6
Hawaii	1959	25,311	63,620	8,517	7.5:1	18.1
(Registered voters)		(8,082)	(14,796)	(3,396)	(4.4:1)	(23.4)
Idaho	1951	15,163	93,460	915	102.1:1	16.6
Illinois	1955	173,812	565,300	53,500	10.6:1	28.7
Indiana	1921	93,250	171,089	39,011	4.4:1	40.4
Iowa	1961	55,110	266,314	29,696	9.0:1	35.2
Kansas	1947	54,465	343,231	16,083	21.3:1	26.8
Kentucky	1942	79,951	131,906	45,122	2.9:1	42.0
Louisiana	1921	83,513	248,427	31,179	8.0:1	33.0
Maine	1961	28,508	45,687	16,146	2.8:1	40.0
Maryland	1867	106,920	492,428	15,481	31.8:1	14.2
Massachusetts	1960	128,714	199,107	86,355	2.3:1	44.6
(Legal voters)		(62,765)	(68,053)	(53,957)	(1.3:1)	(50.5)
Michigan	1953	200,682	690,259	55,806	12.4:1	29.0
Minnesota	1959	50,953	99,446	26,458	3.8:1	40.1
Mississippi	1916	44,452	126,502	14,314	8.8:1	34.6
Missouri	1961	127,053	155,683	96,477	1.6:1	47.7
Montana	1961	12,049	79,016	894	88.4:1	16.1
Nebraska	1935	32,822	51,757	18,824	2.7:1	36.6
Nevada	1961	16,781	127,016	568	223.6:1	8.0
New Hampshire	1961	25,288	41,457	15,829	2.6:1	45.3
New Jersey	1779	288,894	923,545	48,555	19.0:1	19.0
New Mexico	1955	29,719	262,199	1,874	139.9:1	14.0
New York	1953	287,626	425,276	190,343	2.2:1	36.9
North Carolina	1941	91,123	272,111	45,031	6.0:1	36.9
North Dakota	1960	12,907	42,041	4,698	8.9:1	31.9
Ohio	1961	288,073	439,000	228,000	1.9:1	41.0
Oklahoma	1961	52,916	346,038	13,125	26.4:1	24.5
Oregon	1961	58,956	73,962	29,917	2.5:1	47.8
Pennsylvania	1921	226,387	553,154	51,793	10.7:1	33.1
Rhode Island	1960	18,684	47,080	486	96.9:1	18.1
South Carolina	1895	51,796	216,382	8,629	25.1:1	23.3
South Dakota	1961	19,443	43,287	10,039	4.3:1	38.3
Tennessee	1901	108,093	237,905	39,727	6.0:1	26.9
Texas	1961	309,022	1,243,158	147,454	8.4:1	30.3
Utah	1955	35,625	64,760	9,408	6.9:1	21.3
Vermont	1941	12,996	18,606	2,927	6.4:1	47.0
Virginia	1952	99,124	285,194	51,637	5.5:1	37.7
Washington	1957	58,229	145,180	20,023	7.3:1	33.9
West Virginia	1951	58,138	252,925	74,384	3.4:1	46.7
Wisconsin	1951	119,780	208,343	74,293	2.8:1	45.0
Wyoming	1933	12,225	30,074	3,062	9.8:1	26.9

Source: Johnny H. Killian, Legislative Reference Service.

TABLE C.—*Apportionment of State houses, as of* Baker *v.* Carr

State	Year last apportioned	Average district	Largest district	Smallest district	Ratio L:S	Electoral percentage
Alabama	1906	30,818	104,767	6,731	15.6:1	25.7
Alaska	1961	5,645	6,605	2,945	2.2:1	47.7
Arizona	1953	16,277	30,438	5,754	5.3:1	46.0
Arkansas	1961	17,863	31,686	4,927	6.4:1	33.3
California	1961	196,465	306,191	72,105	4.2:1	44.7
Colorado	1953	26,984	63,760	7,867	8.1:1	32.1
Connecticut	1876	8,623	81,089	191	424.2:1	12.0
Delaware	1897	12,751	58,228	1,643	35.4:1	18.5
Florida	1955	52,122	311,682	2,868	108.7:1	14.7
Georgia	1953	19,235	185,442	1,876	98.8:1	22.2
Hawaii	1959	12,407	23,779	5,030	4.7:1	38.4
(Registered voters)		(3,962)	(4,679)	(2,257)	(2.1:1)	(46.5)
Idaho	1951	10,590	15,576	915	17.0:1	32.7
Illinois	1955	56,956	160,200	34,433	4.7:1	39.9
Indiana	1921	46,625	79,538	14,804	5.4:1	34.8
Iowa	1961	25,532	133,157	7,910	16.8:1	26.9
Kansas	1959	17,428	68,646	2,069	33.2:1	18.5
Kentucky	1942	30,382	67,789	11,364	6.0:1	34.1
Louisiana	1921	31,019	120,205	6,909	17.4:1	34.1
Maine	1961	6,418	13,102	2,394	5.5:1	39.7
Maryland	1943	29,290	82,071	6,541	12.5:1	25.3
Massachusetts	1947	21,452	49,478	3,559	13.9:1	45.3
(Legal voters, 1955)		(10,462)	(14,412)	(1,881)	(7.7:1)	(46.1)
Michigan	1953	71,120	135,268	34,006	4.0:1	44.0
Minnesota	1949	26,060	99,446	8,343	11.9:1	34.5
Mississippi	1914	15,558	59,542	3,576	16.7:1	29.1
Missouri	1961	26,502	52,970	3,960	13.4:1	20.3
Montana	1961	7,178	12,537	894	14.0:1	36.6
Nebraska						
Nevada	1961	7,710	12,525	568	22.1:1	35.0
New Hampshire	1961	1,517	4,330	3	1443.3:1	43.9
New Jersey	1961	101,113	143,913	48,555	3.0:1	46.5
New Mexico	1955	14,394	29,133	1,874	15.5:1	27.0
New York	1953	111,882	314,721	14,974	21.0:1	34.7
North Carolina	1961	37,968	82,059	4,520	18.2:1	27.1
North Dakota	1961	5,499	8,408	2,665	3.2:1	40.2
Ohio	1961	70,850	97,064	10,274	9.4:1	30.3
Oklahoma	1951	19,916	62,787	4,496	14.0:1	29.4
Oregon	1961	29,478	39,660	18,955	2.1:1	48.1
Pennsylvania	1953	53,902	139,293	4,485	31.1:1	37.7
Rhode Island	1930	8,594	18,977	486	39.0:1	46.5
South Carolina	1961	19,214	29,490	8,629	3.4:1	46.0
South Dakota	1961	9,074	16,688	3,531	4.7:1	38.5
Tennessee	1901	36,031	79,801	3,454	23.0:1	28.7
Texas	1961	63,864	105,725	33,987	3.1:1	38.6
Utah	1955	13,916	32,380	1,164	27.8:1	33.3
Vermont	1793	1,585	33,155	38	827.5:1	11.6
Virginia	1952	39,669	142,597	20,071	7.1:1	36.8
Washington	1957	28,820	57,648	12,399	4.6:1	35.3
West Virginia	1951	18,604	39,615	4,391	9.0:1	40.0
Wisconsin	1953	39,528	87,486	19,651	4.5:1	40.0
Wyoming	1933	5,894	10,024	2,930	3.4:1	35.8

Source: Johnny H. Killian, Legislative Reference Service.

EXHIBIT 3

Status of resolution for National Constitutional Convention on Apportionment, September 1965

State	Requested a National Convention [1]	Requested Congress to enact an amendment	Failed to pass any resolution or took other negative action	Action still pending	Not in session during 1965
Alabama	X				
Alaska		X			
Arizona	X				
Arkansas	X				
California		X			
Colorado			X		
Connecticut			X		
Delaware			X		
Florida	X				
Georgia	X				
Hawaii			X		
Idaho	X				
Illinois			X		
Indiana			X		
Iowa			X		
Kansas	X				
Kentucky	X				
Louisiana	X				
Maine			X		
Maryland	X				
Massachusetts			X		
Michigan			X		
Minnesota	X				
Mississippi					X
Missouri	X				
Montana	X				
Nebraska	X				
Nevada	X				
New Hampshire	X				
New Jersey			X		
New Mexico	X				
New York			X		
North Carolina	X				
North Dakota		X			
Ohio			X		
Oklahoma	X				
Oregon			X		
Pennsylvania				X	
Rhode Island		X			
South Carolina	X				
South Dakota	X				
Tennessee	X				
Texas	X				
Utah	X				
Vermont			X		
Virginia	X				
Washington			X		
West Virginia			X		
Wisconsin				X	
Wyoming			X		
Total	25	4	18	2	1

[1] Does not include Washington or Wyoming which passed a somewhat similar resolution and relayed it to the 88th Cong. In the 1965 legislatures of these States the "other factors" resolution failed passage and the resolution was not submitted to the 89th Cong.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for his extremely scholarly and incisive analysis of what the Dirksen amendment would do. It was only 15 months ago when my junior colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] first introduced the matter upon the floor of the Senate, and it seemed almost inevitable that he would prevail. At that time, as I recall, the Senator from Wisconsin and I were the only two open opponents of his proposal.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has taken the lead in this matter. He has been a brilliant leader. He is far more responsible than any other Senator for the fact that the amendment has not passed to date.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am merely one of the group. During this time, we have beaten off at least three efforts on the floor of the Senate to open the way for what the Senator from Wisconsin aptly terms the 1-man, 10-vote amendment. Senator CLARK, Senator TYDINGS, and I have called it the rotten-borough amendment, but the terms are equally and accurately descriptive.

By buying time in this fashion, we have enabled the judicial process to operate; and under the pressure of the judicial process a considerable number of State legislatures have reapportioned themselves, as the Senator from Wisconsin has described.

It now looks as though we are heading for a revival of this struggle in the 2d session of the 89th Congress, which will begin early in January. An effort will be made, of course, to put the Dirksen reapportionment proposal at the head of the list and to bring it up early in the session. I sincerely hope that that will not be done. I think we can safely say that if it is done, there will be strong resistance to its passage, because the decisions of the courts and the enabling legislation passed by State legislatures should be allowed to operate.

I hope very much that the analysis made by the Senator from Wisconsin may be scattered widespread over the country, so that people may realize more fully the dangers inherent in the 1-man, 10-vote amendment, or the rotten-borough amendment, and that more State legislatures may reapportion. As this happens, the people in the various States find that the change has not been objectionable, but, indeed, they have a feeling of relief. In other words, it is something that is dreaded more in anticipation than is justified in realization.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is very true. It has turned out to be a great improvement in a number of States. Michigan is an excellent example. Michigan was malapportioned for a good many years.

The State senate, representing rural areas, had blocked a series of constructive proposals which an overwhelming majority of the Michigan people seemed to favor. The Michigan Legislature was reapportioned this year, and virtually everybody has praised the results. The Michigan Legislature has been hailed, interestingly, by the Michigan Farm Bureau Federation for its progressive action and because it was able to move off dead center and pass legislation which it had not been possible to pass before. Mind you, the Farm Bureau has always been in the forefront in supporting the Dirksen malapportionment amendment.

This indicates to me, as the Senator from Illinois so well says, that once apportionment on the basis of population is adopted, the very groups which have been leading the opposition, find that they have nothing to fear, because the legislature moves on a far more efficient and progressive basis in the interest of all people. Those who favor progress but who recognize the conservative principle that government should operate as close to the people as possible should especially oppose the Dirksen amendment. This is because if the State government cannot act because it is badly apportioned and is often deadlocked, Washington has to move in and take over more strongly than before.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The experience of reapportionment reminds me of a line by Whittier:

> The blow most dreaded falls to break from off our limbs a chain.

The people feel freer and happier, as a result.

If we can only prevent the Senate and Congress as a whole from taking a retrogressive step in the next session which lies ahead, I believe the reform of our State governments will be thoroughly on its way.

But I am glad that the Senator from Wisconsin has sounded a note of caution. We should not accept the battle as won. The forces of malapportionment are dying, but they have much latent energy that is evident. They will make a last desperate effort to put this proposal high on the agenda for the coming session and to pass it, and will try to override any attempt at a serious discussion. It is somewhat ironical that many Senators who threatened to filibuster to prevent the repeal of section 14(b) will demand that there should not be discussion in depth of this constitutional amendment, which is so much more serious.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted to hear the Senator from Illinois make that statement. I believe Senators should be on notice and aware of the fact that he is determined to lead a strong fight against and a number of us stand ready to discuss and explain the amendment in detail. Many Senators will say, "After all, this proposal has been before us for a year and a half. We have discussed it and debated it at great length."

Mr. President, the answer is that no committee record has been made on this particular amendment. It is important that it be discussed in detail and that its effect on the 50 States be explored, because there have been recent changes in the States. This will take time. It will require discussion. So if the proposal comes up next year—and I agree with the Senator from Illinois that the forces that want malapportionment will make an all-out, last-ditch, desperate fight for it—they should be aware that they will be met by a determined struggle on our part.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Experience has shown that one malapportioned house in a State legislature can exercise veto power over legislation, and by exercising that veto power can prevent any legislation from being passed or can force highly inadequate compromises. There is no reason why both houses of a legislature should not be fairly apportioned.

But I wanted to congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin. I know he is an indefatigable worker and that in the next 2 months he will be cruising through Wisconsin, shaking hands with almost every resident of that State, and visiting every hamlet. I hope that the clear, pure air of the Northland will give him vigor and strength, so that when he returns to the floor of the Senate, his strength will be as the strength of 10.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I shall be delighted to return to the floor of the Senate to fight under his banner and follow his leadership.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has been patiently waiting. I beg his indulgence for 2 more minutes while I discuss another subject.

WAX MUSEUM AT HARPER'S FERRY TELLS EFFECTIVE STORY—MR. AND MRS. FRANK DENNIS DO WORTHWHILE WORK IN NATIONAL CAPITAL AND OTHER AREAS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Harper's Ferry, W. Va., has a most interesting museum which exemplifies how an ancient art has been adapted to a modern educational use.

The National Historical John Brown Wax Museum is focused on one absorbing theme: the story of John Brown, what he did, why he did it, and what effect did he have on the Nation.

The creators of the museum have told the story, using life-size, life-like figures in a sequence of tableaux, of John Brown's fanatic abolitionist activity, including the massacre in Kansas and the seizure of the Federal arsenal in Harper's Ferry. Just as is true to history, the museum visitor is left to decide for himself whether John Brown was a hero or a villain. Whatever the visitor decides, because of his visit to the museum he knows much more than when he entered of the tensions and trials—social, economic, political, moral—which brought about the Civil War, with the episode at Harper's Ferry being a catalyst of catastrophe.

An interesting facet of the Harper's Ferry museum is that its creators renovated—and saved—a historic building on High Street, to house the museum. The renovation of the building, along with the theme of the museum, complements the National Park Service's program for restoration and maintenance as a national park of the nearby historic river front, scene of the John Brown raid, locale of one of the great victories by Stonewall Jackson, and one of America's most scenic areas.

The museum in Harper's Ferry is a typical example of the new use of the ancient art of creating lifelike effigies. Once such figures were made of beeswax, and were used as funeral effigies. The figures at Harper's Ferry and associated historical museums are made of skin-like plastic, and the theme is educational, in contrast to the old-fashioned European style wax museum dominated by scenes of terror, causing the medium to be identified with a "chamber of horrors" notoriety.

The new kind of museum was envisioned by a Washington newspaperman and lawyer, Frank L. Dennis, who believed that the idea of a wax museum could be converted into a useful educational-entertainment medium in America. He felt that in Washington, especially, dramatic presentations of the country's history would be a service to the millions of tourists, and especially the students, who visit the National Capital annually. Historic Figures, Inc., was organized in 1957 with this in mind, and the idea has actually come into being. Visitors can see Benjamin Franklin actually conducting the experiment by which he proved that lightning is electricity; they can view the first use of ether on a human for medical purposes; they can look at the heroic chaplains who gave their lifebelts to troopers on a torpedoed troopship, and so forth.

The Washington museum, called the National Historical Wax Museum, was opened in 1958 and has led the way toward revitalization of two rundown areas of downtown Washington. The first location was in a one-time brewery stable in the Foggy Bottom area, on the riverfront. Renovation of the building and the cleaning of the area has helped to bring substantial changes for the better. The site is now to be the location of the John F. Kennedy Cultural Center, an enormous apartment house is being built nearby, and other vast changes are being made.

Forced to move from Foggy Bottom because the Cultural Center was given the site by the Federal Government, the National Historical Wax Museum relocated in the old Center City Market building, a block-long structure at 5th and K Streets NW., in midtown Washington. The building is 90 years old and is in an area that has been blighted by slum dwellings. By spending more than $400,000 in renovating and painting, the museum has actually changed the character of the neighborhood. Since the museum was opened February 23, 1965, scores of slum dwellings have been razed. What had been an area with a very high petty crime rate is now virtually a model neighborhood. To a block where few visitors ventured a year ago, more than 550,000 have gone so far this year. To further the educational emphasis, the management is planning to establish a planetarium as a further service to the hundreds of thousands of students who visit Washington each year. There also is a 500-seat cafeteria as part of the service to visitors, particularly groups, who have difficulty finding accommodations and parking.

This change has been done without the aid of public money. Instead of the Federal Government having to spend funds for urban renewal, as has become commonplace, the revitalization program pioneered by the National Historical Wax Museum has gone forward as the company has been paying more than $50,000 a year in Federal income taxes.

The development of this new—and imaginative—kind of wax museum—although the effigies are made of plastic, such exhibits have been called wax museums for generations—has resulted in a demand for their establishment elsewhere. Thus Historic Figures has established museums—besides those at Washington and Harper's Ferry—at Gettysburg, Pa.; Gatlinburg, Tenn.; Niagara Falls, Ontario; and Denver, Colo. On November 18, 1965, another will be opened in New York City at Rockefeller Center, and others are scheduled for Plymouth, Mass.; Williamsburg, Va.; Kansas City, Mo.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; and in Ohio. Each has a regional theme.

Well-known persons are directors of Historic Figures. Mr. Dennis was once the assistant managing editor of the Washington Post. Mrs. Dennis is an authority on early American antiques. Other directors are the Honorable George V. Allen, formerly Ambassador to India, Greece, Iran, and Yugoslavia, formerly head of the U.S. Information Agency, and now president of the Tobacco Institute; Joel Barlow, noted Washington attorney who is chairman of the tax committee of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Blake Clark, a Washington editor of the Reader's Digest; Warner Lewis, a Tulsa, Okla., industrialist; and Clement R. Hoopes, a Wilmington, Del., writer and financier.

PROTECTION OF PUBLIC INTEREST IN RESULTS OF RESEARCH PAID FOR BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, through grants and contracts, the Federal Government has spent billions of dollars to aid scientific research and development. Information gained from this research should be made freely available to the press, to scholars, to private enterprise, and to the public at large. We in Congress have provided in several bills authorizing research expenditures that "all information, copyrights, uses, processes, patents and other developments" resulting from Government research expenditures "will be freely available to the general public" by adding to these bills the so-called Long amendment. I wholly agree with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] that a provision of this type belongs on every bill authorizing research expenditures.

Although many agencies have resisted applying the Long amendment to their activities, support for this concept has been shown by the U.S. Office of Education, which published a statement of policy in the Federal Register of July 28 which will prohibit the copyrighting of any "material produced as a result of any research activity undertaken with any financial assistance" from that office. The statement of policy declared that:

> Material produced as a result of any research activity undertaken with any financial assistance through contract with or project grant from the Office of Education will be placed in the public domain. Materials so released will be available to conventional outlets of the private sector for their use.
>
> This policy is effectively immediately.

I congratulate the Commissioner of Education, Mr. Francis Keppel, for the outstanding leadership he has shown in adopting this policy for the Office of Education.

The Office of Education has declared that the main thrust of its policy is to assure competition in the production and dissemination of different versions of curricular materials. As Deputy Commissioner of Education Henry Loomis stated in a conference held with representatives of educational organizations after the policy statement was published:

> We want to make this material available to the maximum number of people, in the shortest time, with a minimum of restrictions.

The efforts of the Office of Education are endangered by proposed changes in the copyright laws. The Copyright Office has proposed an amendment to section 8 of the Copyright Act which would undermine the efforts of both those supporting the Long amendment as well as the new policy of the Office of Education.

Section 8 of the Copyright Act now provides that "No copyright shall subsist in any publication of the U.S. Government."

The Copyright Office amendment, which is contrary to present policy, and which would sanction extensive copyrighting by Government officials and Government research contractors, states as follows in a bill now before the Senate Judiciary Committee:

> Copyright protection under this title (sec. 105, Subject Matter of Copyright: U.S. Government Works) is not available for any work of the U.S. Government, but the U.S. Government is not precluded from receiving and holding copyrights transferred to it by assignment, or otherwise.
>
> A "work of the U.S. Government" is a work prepared by an officer or employee of the U.S. Government within the scope of his official duties or employment.

The American Newspaper Publishers Association and the National Newspaper Association, who stand firmly against copyright restrictions on Government-financed international material, oppose the change proposed by the Copyright Office.

The American Newspaper Publishers Association, a trade association of daily newspapers with more than 930 members, having more than 90 percent of the total U.S. daily newspaper circulation, stated as follows on May 10:

> While we are gratified to note that this bill does not contain the provision set forth in a prior version, which would have permitted copyright to be secured in a published work of the U.S. Government in appropriate cases as determined by heads of U.S. Government agencies, the present bill still leaves much to be desired.
>
> It establishes no standards whatever regarding the ownership of copyrighted material created in the course of performing contracts between private individuals or corporations and the U.S. Government.

The quoted section of the Copyright Office amendment would permit a person, not a Government employee, who performs research work financed either in whole or in substantial part by Federal funds, to secure a copyright on the published results of his research done with Government money.

I do not mean to say that there would not be instances in which equity would dictate that a copyright should be allowed for a limited term of years. Nor would I rule out the possibility of allowing a person to copyright a subsequent publication drawing on the results of his Government-financed research, so long as all the information contained therein has already been made public.

In this time when more and more research is being paid for by the Federal Government, we must be careful to safeguard the public's right of access to information which it has paid for.

In this connection, Mr. President, I would like to call the Senate's attention to the statement made by Senator LONG of Louisiana before the Education Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee on June 11, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, along with an editorial from the August 8, 1965, Washington Post, and an excerpt from a statement by Robert T. Jordan of the Council on Library Resources.

Senator LONG has been waging a great and noble fight for good government in this matter of the disposition of the results of publicly financed research, and I am proud to be associated with him in this effort.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RUSSELL B. LONG BEFORE THE EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE, LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE COMMITTEE, U.S. SENATE

Section 8 of the copyright law expressly stipulates that: "No copyright shall subsist in any publication of the U.S. Government or any reprint in whole or in part thereof * * *." The original and continuing purpose of this prohibition is to assure maximum availability and dissemination of informational material prepared by or for the

Government at the expense of the public. My amendment insures that knowledge developed by contractors and grantees at great public expense shall also be freely available to the press, to scholars, to private enterprise, and to the public at large. Since Federal outlays for research now total over $15 billion annually, this matter is of far-reaching importance.

The basic question involved is whether research financed by the Government should be subject to copyright control for as long as 56 years, or should such research be freely accessible to all segments of our society.

The present practices of many Government agencies permit research contractors and grantees to sell exclusive publishing rights to the fruits of publicly-financed research. This, in my judgment, is contrary to the public interest.

Since private book publishers have in the past reaped millions in profits from such practices, it is, of course, understandable that they should be raising objections to the Long amendment. This does not, however, justify the self-serving misrepresentations they have been making.

I refer especially to the misrepresentations in "Copyright Aspects of the Long Amendment on Government Research," a memorandum recently distributed among Members of Congress by the American Book Publishers Council and to the testimony by W. Bradford Wiley on behalf of the Council and the American Textbook Publishers Institute before the Senate Subcommittee on Education.

The position taken by these trade associations is that private publishers should be permitted to copyright Government-financed research because the Long amendment, they contend, will limit the audience for such research, "socialize" publication of such research, and increase the taxpayer's expenses. None of these self-serving representations have any basis in fact. Let us examine them.

1. The claim that prohibition of copyright restrictions over Government-financed material will discourage private publication and thereby reduce public accessibility of such material is patently fallacious.

For years noncopyrightable statements by Government officials, papers by Government scientists, and reports by Government agencies have been widely published by newspapers, popular magazines, and professional journals of all kinds. Even book houses have frequently published such noncopyrightable material when they felt there was a market.

According to the American Book Publishers Council, much of the material resulting from Government-financed research is of such limited interest that private publication is not feasible unless publishers are granted copyright control restrictions for 56 years. If, in fact, no publishing house could afford to share the market with others because the market is so small, why should any publisher of a work of narrow appeal fear a second publisher's competition or need a copyright monopoly?

Would not the second publisher know that he could not make a profit since someone else had preempted the market? Wouldn't the very fact of a limited market protect the initial publisher of Government research?

Where a substantial market exists, publishers have not hesitated to reprint works in the public domain without a copyright monopoly. As is evident in any bookstore, there are innumerable editions of works by well-known and unknown authors in the public domain. And judging by the large number of instances when Government publications in the public domain have been successfully reprinted by private publishers, it is evident that private publishing firms can issue Government materials without copyright monopoly, even in the face of and simultaneously with Government Printing Office editions. Significantly, at least five publishers reprinted, for example, the Warren Commission Report, and the Surgeon General's report on smoking was also widely published in competition with editions published by the Government Printing Office.

Moreover, it is ridiculous to contend that publications of the Government Printing Office enjoy meager distribution and promotion. If the contention were true, then private editions of such publications could be published with little concern about competition from the Government. If not true, that is, if the Government Printing Office publications do receive wide publicity and enjoy large-scale sales—then private copyrighting of Government-financed works is clearly unjustifiable. It happens to be a matter of record that some of the all-time American best sellers have been Government Printing Office publications.

Many of these publications have sales in the millions of copies and most of them in the hundreds of thousands. For example, over 13 million copies of "Infant Care" have been sold, over 7.6 million copies of "Your Federal Income Tax," over 7.4 million of "Prenatal Care," over 5.7 million of "Your Child From One to Six," and many others. It is my understanding that the book publishing industry regards as a best seller any book of which over 50,000 copies have been sold.

In brief, the "limited audience" argument fails both in logic and experience.

2. It is argued that publication by the Government costs the taxpayer money which could be saved if research works are issued privately under copyright. Yet, the fact is that many publications of the Government Printing Office are self-supporting. For years the Superintendent of Documents has operated at a budgetary profit because the net income from public purchases of Government Printing Office publications has generally been in excess of the cost of such publications.

What the publishers are seeking is privileged monopolies denying the public access to what it has already paid for unless it makes an additional payment to the publisher who happened to secure the copyright. They argue that the Federal Government should both finance the research and protect private profit in its publication through a copyright monopoly. This is tantamount to saying that the Government should finance the building of highways and then permit private companies to charge tolls.

In brief, the "expense" objection is a transparent argument and is not worthy of extended discussion. It is most unfortunate that Government agencies often—and improperly—as I understand it, subsidize private publication of Government research material, frequently at an expense far in excess of the cost involved if such material were published by the Government Printing Office.

3. In his statement before the Senate Subcommittee on Education on May 20, W. Bradford Wiley, the representative of the American Book Publishers Council and the American Textbook Publishers Institute declared that a copyright is not analogous to a patent. He is quite right.

Patent protection is limited to a period of 17 years. Under present law copyrights can run to 56 years and if a bill now before Congress is approved, they can remain in effect for more than 100 years. Moreover, a patent cannot be obtained without official scrutiny of its legitimacy and substantiation of the claims by the inventor. All that is necessary to secure a copyright is merely to make an assertion of ownership without providing any proof whatsoever.

By legal requirement all the ideas of a patent are supposed to be accessible to the public. The same is not true of a copyright The book publishers are not correct in stating that copyrighted material must be "published" and "made available to the public generally." Under the present law literally thousands of unpublished works are under copyright restrictions for 56 years even though they are not available to the public. All that is necessary to secure a copyright is to furnish two copies of an item, typed or photocopied, to the Copyright Office. Availability to the public is not required in actual practice.

Nor is it entirely correct that "everyone is * * * completely free to use the information and ideas" appearing in a copyrighted work. Publishers have initiated thousands of law suits on the grounds that use of similar words precludes the use of information and ideas even though similarity of phrasing is often unavoidable, particularly in the case of research material.

I have here an interesting publication of the American Council on Education, which is a primary research contractor for the Office of Education. Its members, practically all of the leading colleges and universities are the Government's major academic research contractors.

This report, which I am sure is available to your committee, is especially interesting because it was prepared under a grant from the Office of Education and was copyrighted as the private property of the council. What is ironic about this publicly financed work is that it recommends that schools and teachers should have the right to place copyright restrictions on research and instructional material funded by local, State, and Federal agencies.

In the past, as far as I am aware, it has not been the custom of public school systems or teachers to resort to copyrighting of educational materials. Although occasionally practiced, it was inconsequential or haphazard.

What we have now is a situation in which a report financed by the U.S. Office of Education is encouraging public school systems as well as teachers to place copyright restrictions on practically all types of instructional material which is now being financed by the Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, NASA, AEC, and others. That copyrighting happens to have all sorts of restrictive features is set forth in the report in great detail. The extent to which the report admits that copyrighting handicaps the educational process in all sorts of ways should also be noted.

On page 17, for example, it refers to the psychologically restricting effect of a copyright notice. In discussing educational broadcasting on page 4, it is stated that "* * * professors have had to discover how complex and frustrating can be the problem of tracing copyright ownership of the materials they wish to use in their broadcasts and of arranging for their release for educational uses." The same difficulty applies also in tracing copyright ownership of materials in other media. Yet, on page 3, it is stated that "if the maximum benefit from educational programs is to be achieved, provision should be made for the widest possible use of such programs." It appears to me that allowing restriction through copyrighting is inconsistent with our objective of seeking the widest possible dissemination of Government-financed knowledge.

We should not be surprised when any vested interest group resorts to misrepresentations for self-serving ends, but I trust that Members of Congress will recognize that such ends are diametrically opposed to the protection of the public interest sought by the Long amendment.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 8, 1965]

In the Public Domain

When the public pays for research, the research properly belongs to the public. The

Commissioner of Education, Mr. Keppel, has now adopted that rule without qualification. Since the Federal Office of Education is currently distributing nearly $100 million a year in research funds, the question of copyrights and patents is not wholly academic.

The most valuable research, in the commercial sense, will probably be that bearing on the development of new curricula and textbooks. The Office of Education anticipates that its policy will mean faster dissemination of new ideas; the authors and publishers of textbooks will be able to use the federally financed prototypes without fear of copyright infringement. However interesting the research reports may be to theorists, they will have practical effect only as they reach schools and children. They will be put to use more quickly, and more widely, because they will now lie in the public domain.

EXCERPT FROM STATEMENT (P. 2) BY ROBERT T. JORDAN OF THE COUNCIL ON LIBRARY RESOURCES AND ADVISOR TO THE COMMITTEE ON COPYRIGHT ISSUES OF THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION ON H.R. 4347, A BILL FOR GENERAL REVISION OF THE COPYRIGHT LAW, FEBRUARY 25, 1965

This section (sec. 8 of the Copyright Law) should be broadened to include publications resulting from contracts with the U.S. Government. There is no reason why an author should be paid twice, once by the U.S. Government, under contract, and a second time, from personal royalties. Also, if it is a valid principle to preclude copyright on work paid for by the U.S. Government, either by employees or under contract, it would seem equally valid to prohibit copyright on any work paid for by any governmental unit or nonprofit group. This would increase the amount of material in the public domain.

(NOTE.—This was appended to a statement by Charles Gosnell before the House Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 3. Mr. Gosnell is chairman of Committee on Copyrights of the American Library Association, director of the Library of New York University, and former assistant commissioner of education of New York State.)

BRACERO PROGRAM

(Mr. BYRD of West Virginia obtained the floor.)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, without losing my rights to the floor immediately following the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida, I yield to him at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate unduly since I have taken the floor of the Senate on a number of occasions during this session of the Congress to express my dissatisfaction with the actions of the Secretary of Labor in furnishing supplemental nonimmigrant farm labor on a timely basis and in an adequate number to assist in the harvesting of perishable agricultural crops.

I am glad to note that my distinguished colleagues, the junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] and the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], both of whom have been so active in this cause throughout the year, are present in the Chamber.

I wish prior to adjournment to give a report of the progress that is being made in this area so vital to the economy of many States.

I am sure all Senators are well aware of my position in this regard and the fact that I have previously gone into this subject in considerable detail.

Actions taken by the Senate and the House in recent weeks could leave no doubt in the mind of the administration that many of the members of this body and of the House are extremely dissatisfied with the non-immigrant farm labor policy as it has existed in 1965.

Mr. President, there is a light on the horizon. The Secretary of Labor has during 1965 since Public Law 78 expired certified some 50,459 supplemental nonimmigrant farm laborers under Public Law 414.

I have a tabulation based on data furnished me by the Labor Department showing by States the total number of non-immigrant farm laborers certified by the Secretary of Labor this year for agricultural crops in 18 different States and including the number of Canadian woodsmen and Basque sheepherders.

I ask unanimous consent that this tabulation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Foreign workers certified for farm employment—Jan. 1 to Oct. 18, 1965

Arizona	151
California	24, 370
Colorado	96
Connecticut	566
Florida	11, 060
Idaho	401
Maine	10, 321
Massachusetts	533
Nevada	163
New Hampshire	710
New York	400
Oregon	40
Rhode Island	60
Vermont	277
Virginia	775
Washington	59
West Virginia	300
Wyoming	177
Total	50, 459

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in addition, the Secretary of Labor has already approved some 4,560 British West Indies workers to be certified and to be admitted between November 1 and November 15 of this year for the sugarcane harvesting in Florida, making a grand total of 55,019 already approved for the Nation and a total of 15,620 already approved for Florida.

Mr. President, it is evident that the administration and the Secretary of Labor are growing more concerned with this problem. Earlier this year farm labor was not supplied on a timely basis and great losses resulted. However, I must say the actions taken by the Secretary of Labor in recent weeks and which I am most happy to report in regard to the potato crop in the New England area and the sugarcane seeding and harvesting in Florida in approving supplemental labor on a timely basis ahead of the actual date of need, leads me to feel somewhat optimistic that the Secretary of Labor will be more active in providing the necessary additional nonimmigrant farm labor for our citrus harvest in Florida and for other commodities throughout the Nation.

I am hopeful that this will be the case and I assure my colleagues that all of agriculture in America is anxiously watching this situation.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for yielding.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, my colleague, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and I thank the senior Senator from Florida on behalf of all the people of our State, for the effort which he has put forth to help us in our problems regarding farm labor this year.

I also thank the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], and all others who joined with us to try to work out this problem which has bothered our State so terribly.

One year ago today in San Diego, Calif., I predicted that if the Secretary of Labor did not find a way to assure the agricultural industry of my State of sufficient supplemental labor, it could well result in serious damage to our economy. I said that termination of the bracero program did not give the Secretary or anyone else, for that matter, a mandate or authority to arbitrarily discontinue the use of all supplemental labor needed at the peak of harvesttime not only in my State, but also in 28 other States of the Nation.

Unfortunately my predictions came true, although my predictions were confined to my own State, and many other States in the Nation have suffered this year.

Mr. President, it is with regret that once again I predict that, unless Secretary of Labor Wirtz offers a more sensible, realistic, and more practical program to answer the harvest demands of my State and of the Nation's farmers, the losses next year will continue to mount as they have this year.

I am very much pleased to note that the Senator from Florida in his remarks indicates that the Secretary of Labor has changed his position and that we have had so far 50,000 supplemental offshore laborers permitted to come into the country and that the indications are that the Secretary has foreseen the future need of Florida by promising and already making arrangements for Florida to have additional workers.

I hope that this is an indication that my State of California will receive the same consideration so that the farmers can plan their planting for next season at the proper time and with some assurance that their crops will be harvested.

The Secretary's hesitancy last year promptly to authorize the use of supplemental farm labor resulted in direct losses to the farmers.

ILLEGAL ENTRY

There is a condition which is now developing in my State which Public Law 78 was set up to cure some years ago. This was the illegal entry of the Mexico braceros, the so-called wetbacks.

I am sorry to say that the situation involving the wetbacks coming into the State illegally is frightfully bad.

I sincerely hope that we can find a way, since these people are needed, for them to come into our country legally and under the proper auspices, arrangements, guarantees, and protections.

Probably the most important result of the Secretary's hesitancy will be the loss to the housewives of the country because in the marketplace sooner or later they will have to pay the cost of the extra costs necessary in the production of the fruit and vegetable crops. The housewives will have to pay for the added cost of the domestic labor that was recruited and brought in at very high cost, the figures on which I have not been able to obtain at this time.

It is my sincere hope that, from the experience of this year, one of the first orders of business—and I know that my good friend, the senior Senator from Florida concurs in this, as does my colleague, the senior Senator from California—should be that we find a workable, feasible plan so that the farmers of my State and the farmers of the other States will have assurance that they can proceed with their business of planting and growing the finest crops of vegetables and fruits grown anywhere in the world at the best prices for our consumers.

Mr. President, I am pleased that the Secretary of Labor after reviewing the facts which we presented, saw fit to relax somewhat his adamant position. Unfortunately, his change of position came too late and too little to prevent losses to the farmers of California.

I sincerely hope that we will not have a recurrence of the experience which we had this year when we had a great loss in the citrus, asparagus, strawberry, melon, and berry crops. In tomatoes alone, planting decreased from nearly 145,000 acres a year ago to 116,000 acres this year.

These conditions have been caused by a shortsighted and unfortunate plan which has not worked.

I sincerely hope that the Secretary of Labor has taken stock of this. From the indication expressed by the senior Senator from Florida, that the Secretary of Labor has already begun to provide labor for next year, I hope that we will be able to find a feasible, workable, and practical solution to this problem so that the farmers of this Nation may have the necessary labor and be able to pass on to the consumer better fruits and vegetables at a lower cost.

I thank my esteemed friend, the senior Senator from Florida, for the excellent work that he has done on this program. I express to him the sincere thanks of all of the people in the State of California.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR ELLENDER

SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER ADDRESSES OHIO VALLEY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on October 20, Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER of Louisiana, chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, traveled to Cincinnati, Ohio, to address the annual meeting of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

This event was in keeping with his long and continuous interest in the protection and development of our inland waterways—an interest which he brought to the Congress from his hometown of Houma in Terrebonne Parish, La., almost 29 years ago. Fortunately for the Nation, Senator ELLENDER has been able to pursue this interest to good results through his chairmanship of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee.

In his remarks before the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Senator ELLENDER stated that:

> Starting in fiscal year 1967, we will move forward with an accelerated program designed to meet at least the immediately foreseeable water needs of this Nation.

At the same time, he warned against several dangers which are threatening not only the acceleration that he called for, but the continuing development of our Nation's waterways.

He referred to these dangers as "dark clouds along the horizon which threaten the continued economic development of the Ohio Valley and other water-oriented industrial complexes." Needless to say, Louisiana's senior Senator, who has served his State and Nation, this Senate, and our Appropriations Committee for so long and well, is in a position to have firsthand knowledge of the strengths and weaknesses of our waterways program. He brings to his work a wealth of wisdom and experience gained from years of living with our waterway problems, and his efforts to solve these problems for the benefit of all have been monumental.

This is appreciated not only by his own people in Louisiana, whose very lifeblood can be said to be water transportation; it is also appreciated by citizens in every river valley of our land.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Would the distinguished Senator from West Virginia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have been listening to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia with respect to the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana.

I associate myself with those remarks.

In my opinion no one in Congress has been more interested in the welfare of the people of this country, and especially the handling of water resources of the country, which, along with education, I believe to be the two most important elements incident to the future of our country, than has been the senior Senator from Louisiana.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me. I commend him for the remarks that he has made about a great statesman. I appreciate the fact that he is relating details about what this great man has done for his State and country.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri for his contribution; and I know that Senator ELLENDER will be very, very grateful.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am pleased that I have had an opportunity to be here to listen to the Members of this body who spoke of the work and the leadership supplied by the great senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I join with them in saying that one of the most enjoyable experiences in my short term in the Senate has been a chance to work with the senior Senator from Louisiana briefly and appear before his committee. I have come to know him as a very warm friend.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to the senior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am delighted to join the distinguished Senator from West Virginia in paying tribute to ALLEN ELLENDER. I have known Senator ELLENDER ever since I came to the Senate. I served under his chairmanship on the Senate Agriculture Committee for a number of years, and he has won my complete admiration. He is a most unusual man, 75 years old, and I do not know anybody who works harder, longer, or more effectively than does Senator ELLENDER.

He is the kind of man who can interrogate witnesses for 6, 7, or 8 hours without showing the slightest sign of fatigue. He is as persistent as anyone can be. He is deeply interested in the welfare of not only Louisiana farmers, but farmers all over the country.

Senator ELLENDER is a thorough gentleman. I am very happy to pay tribute to this man who has shown such understanding and made such an important contribution to the well-being of the American farmer.

I might also add that while, of course, I do not serve on the Public Works Subcommittee, I do serve on the Appropriations Committee, and there again I have seen the fantastic diligence and the care, attention to duty, and meticulous concern with detail of the Senator from Louisiana, his great fairness, and his interest, not only in seeing that every State is given thorough consideration, but also in seeing that the public's money is well and honestly spent.

So it is a great honor to join the distinguished Senator from West Virginia in paying tribute to ALLEN ELLENDER.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Wisconsin for his very pertinent remarks, and I am sure that Senator ELLENDER will be most appreciative.

I ask unanimous consent that I may now yield to the senior Senator from Nevada, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, every Senator who has had the privilege of working with the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana on the Appropriations Committee knows full well there is one glaring exception to the law against perpetual motion. **ALLEN ELLENDER's** guiding hand in the spending policies of our Nation is never still. If he is not the busiest and hardest working Member of the Senate he is certainly one of the busiest and hardest working members of the Appropriations Committee—and one of the most influential members too.

We are all familiar with the unprecedented record of work and accomplishments Senator **ELLENDER** has written during his illustrious 28-year Senate career—with his unstinting dedication to the complex problems of our Nation's food and fiber production as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee; with his profound concern for the advancement of education and labor during his 11-year tenure on that committee; with his remarkable capacity for action on all the issues and problems that have confronted the world's greatest nation.

But I would like to direct my remarks at the area where I know him best—the area of expenditures. It is in that area, I think, that Senator **ELLENDER** has exerted the greatest influence for his Nation's progress and welfare.

He is the Senate's acknowledged expert in the field of foreign aid appropriations. Yet his influence is perhaps even more profound in the vital field of public works. It spreads beyond the local and regional interest to encompass the flood control, water, and navigational needs of every section of the United States. During his 12 years as chairman of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee he has done more for the development of our Nation's rivers and harbors than probably any other individual Member of Congress.

Yet, while he has played such a significant role in directing Federal spending, he is the sharpest critic of Government expenditures whenever he feels they are excessive. As a member of the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, as well as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, he has been a leader in the never-ending campaign to see that there is a dollar's value received for every Federal dollar that is spent.

The man is more impressive than the Senator, however.

That perpetual motion I spoke of is exemplified in daily performance. He serves on six appropriation subcommittees and has established the best attendance record for both meetings and hearings. He has a part in all appropriation decisions, and it is a well-informed part. For Senator **ELLENDER's** memory is legend. It is not uncommon to see him recall a maze of year-old figures spontaneously during a hearing, a trait that often elicits chagrin as well as surprise from an unsuspecting witness.

His work is as thorough as his memory. He does such a complete job on public works appropriations each year that this complex money bill is unanimously accepted by the committee and the Senate as a matter of course.

While it is sometimes disconcerting to work with perpetual motion, I regard it as one of the rare honors of my own Senate career to have had the opportunity to become an associate—and a friend—of **ALLEN ELLENDER**.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for yielding to me, so that I could say a few words to show my deep devotion to this great public servant.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am grateful to the senior Senator from Nevada for his statement, which needed to be made, and which is highly deserved. I know that Senator **ELLENDER**, who is not present tonight, will be most grateful for the preparation and the sincere thought that went into the Senator's statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. **BYRD**] and my other colleagues who are taking the floor this evening to express their high regard and great respect for the senior Senator from Louisiana.

No Senator works harder at the job of being a Senator than does Senator **ELLENDER**. He has been able, year after year, to guide through some of the most difficult legislation in the field of agriculture that any chairman has ever been called upon to shoulder. He has attended to his duties with meticulous care. He has tried to see all points of view, and to give every point of view all possible consideration.

I am delighted that this year he was able, for example, to get away from the yearly grind associated with agricultural legislation, and to be able to achieve a 4-year program on cotton, wheat, feed grains, wool, and other areas in the field of our agricultural economy.

He has worked hard; he puts in long hours; he gives attention to every request by any Senator, regardless of whether he is sitting on one side or the other. He works equally hard in the field of appropriations where, as the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. **BIBLE**] has just said, he has set an outstanding record, an exemplary record in conducting the affairs of his particular subcommittee over the past 12 years.

He is a sympathetic man in listening to the needs of our respective States, and much of what has been done in the field of rivers and harbors development can be attributed to the personal interest and the desire to be of assistance and service shown by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

He is also a world traveler of some note. When he goes around the world or visits the various countries, he is meticulous in keeping notes of what he sees and observes. In this respect he performs a great service, and while we may disagree on occasion in the field of foreign relations, for example, and specifically AID, nevertheless he is to be commended because he keeps the AID administration on its toes. He comes back with very worthwhile suggestions. His criticism is valid, and he makes a great contribution in that field as well.

I am delighted that I have had the honor and privilege of serving for 13 years in this body with Senator **ELLENDER**; and I wish to express my gratitude to him for the many times he has helped me, and to express my respect for him for the fine work which he has done in this body.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his very fine remarks. I yield now to the junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. **BYRD**], for many things, but I especially wish to commend him for giving all of us the opportunity to comment on the outstanding public service of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. **ELLENDER**].

The Senator from Louisiana holds an honorary degree, I am proud to say, from the great university in Oklahoma City, the hometown of my colleague [Mr. **MONRONEY**] who is in the Chamber at the moment; namely, Oklahoma City University.

We in Oklahoma know well the name of **ALLEN ELLENDER**. We know of his great service to his country in the field of flood control, navigation, and multiplepurpose public works.

To me, it is rather strange that there are some in this country who feel that there is something good about coming in after a flood has occurred and rendering relief to flood victims, and that there are others who feel there is something good about coming in after a great crisis, in helping—say, in the New England States, New York, and others—to find the great sources of municipal water supply that they must have, after it has become a crisis, but who, on the other hand, feel that there is something bad about prevention—doing those things which will prevent floods from occurring in the first place, and which will provide reservoirs of municipal and industrial water supply in advance.

I am glad to say that the great Senator from Louisiana has shown the kind of foresight which the country must have if it is to meet the vexing problems which its exploding population is bringing about, and the need particularly for municipal and industrial water supply for the prevention of floods, for navigation wherever that great public resource is available, for recreation, and for all the other multiple purposes which are embodied in the omnibus appropriation this year, and in years prior, concerned with public works.

The Senator from Louisiana has recognized that this is not alone a problem for Oklahoma, for West Virginia, or for Louisiana, so much as it is a great national problem.

Here is a man who has risen above sectional, regional, or State interests to become a great national figure in the conservation of our natural resources.

Therefore, I am proud that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. **BYRD**] has given us this opportunity to pay tribute to a great American patriot, a man of great vision, who has recognized the problems in this country and who has been, in some instances, 20 years ahead of the problem, and who has helped us realize that we must do certain things if we are to conserve and use to maximum advantage our great water resources.

I am happy to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his foresight, his diligence, and his great vision.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for yielding to me.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for a very fine statement.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the wonderful tributes being paid to our leader in conservation and natural resource development, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

I also appreciate the tribute which the Senator from West Virginia is paying to him.

I have had the great honor to serve for many years with the Senator from Louisiana on the Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations. I have been literally amazed at the grasp, knowledge, and understanding that the Senator possesses of the widespread developments in the Corps of Engineers, and other resource development work.

The Senator from Louisiana is a tireless and indefatigable worker. He has boundless energy in visiting, inspecting, and understanding the situations in hundreds of areas where public works projects are being carried out for the benefit not only of one locality, but also for basin and entire river development concepts.

The Senator from Louisiana was one of the leaders in the river basin concept development, which has produced great results in navigation, water conservation, storage of water, prevention of floods, and items of that kind.

He has been helpful in Oklahoma in our great Arkansas River development program to where already—although we are still some 5 years away from our navigation goals in making the river navigable as a great artery of commerce—we have, in the process of multiple-purpose river development, been able to eliminate floods in that entire river basin by the construction of retention reservoirs which will retain the water for navigation, for the conservation of water, for municipal use, and for supply of river sanitation.

Therefore, when we observe the Senator from Louisiana at work in this committee, grinding away day after day and week after week, listening to the testimony not only of the experts of the Corps of Engineers but also of thousands of others who come to testify individually before him, when we observe the courtesy, the kindliness and the understanding that he has for their problems, and his ready willingness to cooperate, we get an idea of the scope and sweep of this man's mind and dedication in the field of conservation and natural resource, and particularly in making America's water development program an outstanding achievement.

Therefore, I am very glad to join my colleague [Mr. HARRIS] and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] in the salute which they so justly pay to a man who is the leader of the Senate in this great work.

I compliment the Senator from West Virginia for taking the floor on this occasion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his excellent remarks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am happy to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is now more than 30 years ago that the chairman of the comparable committee in the House on Rivers and Harbors had to attend sessions in a wheelchair. He was incurably crippled. Everyone remembers him—Representative Mansfield of Texas.

I used to appear frequently before that committee. I doubt whether we could name any obscure water course, whether it was a creek, stream, or river, anywhere in the United States, that he was not familiar with. This meant that if we made our case for navigation, or flood control, or for any other improvement, before Representative Mansfield, he never had to look in the book to identify the place.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], in my opinion, comes as close to that degree of omniscience with respect to our civil problems, including rivers and harbors, as any man I have ever seen.

We come by that knowledge only through study. We come by it only through application. The Senator from Louisiana works untiringly in order to be familiar with the whole range of subjects presented before him.

So first I compliment the Senator on his skill and knowledge, but I compliment him on something more. I doubt whether any Senator could appear before that committee, even if the Senator from Louisiana were sitting by himself, without getting the most courteous treatment. It is not one of those pleasurable things that one forgets when he leaves the committee, but it stays with him. I served for years on the Appropriations Committee in the Senate, and I served for many years on the House Appropriations Committee. I doubt whether I could name anyone in all those years of experience who has given such careful consideration to the requests on matters that are of interest to every Member of the Senate.

I want to add one thing further. Sitting at his elbow is a man who has been with the Senate for a long time. His name is Kenneth Bousquet. He is one of the most knowledgeable and at the same time most self-effacing people, but the various clerks in my office can call up Ken Bousquet at any time and ask, "What is the score on this item?" or that item, or some other item.

He can give the answer immediately. Nobody is brushed aside. Everybody receives attention.

The tributes which have been paid to the Senator from Louisiana are richly deserved, but let us not forget Kenneth Bousquet for his many years of faithful service to the Government and the U.S. Senate.

I take some pride in joining the Senator from West Virginia in saluting and paying tribute to a great Member of the Senate, who has done a remarkable job in this field.

It is tedious work to have Member after Member of the Senate come in with a list of projects—this little stream, that big stream, navigation, everything else under the sun.

Generally speaking, I think one would weaken under that day-by-day drudgery, because it is sheer drudgery, but he takes it in stride. He does the work cheerfully and exceptionally well.

I find it a great pleasure to join in these tributes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am most grateful for the remarks made by the minority leader. I am happy he mentioned the services that are rendered to the Senator from Louisiana and to every Member of the Senate by Ken Bousquet, that very faithful staff member of the Appropriations Committee.

I yield now to the senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for bringing to our attention the very notable services of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

I was impressed by the statement made by the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. The things he said about the Senator from Louisiana impressed me.

So often, Senators, including myself, present proposals to the Senator from Louisiana with regard to a river, canal, harbor, or channel. Without referring to notes, the Senator from Louisiana would say, "You have a 26-foot depth there now. What should it be deepened to?" Or he might say, "It is so wide. What do you think it should be widened to?" He would know the depth and the width and everything else about that particular locality. He has that information at his fingertips as well as in his mind. His knowledge is surpassing. I have never seen it equaled.

I was glad to hear the minority leader describe one man who was his equal, and that was the late Representative Joseph Jefferson Mansfield, of Texas. It was with great pleasure that I heard the reference to Representative Mansfield, who, although in a wheel chair, was the able chairman of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee.

While the Senator from West Virginia was leading in this tribute to the Senator from Louisiana, I was reminded of the fact that Representative Mansfield was born in West Virginia. His father was a Confederate soldier who lost his life when Mr. Mansfield was 4 or 5 years old. Although born in West Virginia, Representative Mansfield came to Texas, and became involved in politics there. He was elected to county office, and later to Congress, and he stayed in Congress the rest of his life. The minority leader mentioned his able work as chairman.

Now we have a successor on our side of the Capitol in the person of the able Senator from Louisiana, whose great knowledge has been described by so many Senators that I shall not repeat it.

I mention one phase that has not been mentioned, and that is the danger involved in and the damage caused by rising waters and the fact that there is no system of insurance in the United States under which a man can insure his property, be it home or business, against the damage caused by rising waters, whether he live on the seashore, or the coastline of a lake, or a river. In this aspect our Government and private industry have been remiss. The Senator from Louisiana has been very much interested in this matter.

A person should be able to have insurance against damage caused by rising waters just as he can have fire insurance. Those who live on the gulf coast, or the east Atlantic coast, or Florida, or other areas where there is danger from hurricanes or danger of potential hurricanes in the United States are fortunate that the man who heads the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee comes from a State which knows about hurricanes and what the vast forces of nature can do, inflicting damage in a day surpassing that which all the devices that man has invented can inflict. That is another phase of the Senator's knowledge which we should acclaim.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Texas. He has many times displayed his eminent knowledge of history. I am particularly grateful that now he has referred to Representative Mansfield's birthplace as having been in West Virginia.

I yield now to the senior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for yielding to me.

Some years ago, upon the very lamented and premature departure of our late colleague from Idaho, Henry Dworshak, this Senator succeeded to the ranking minority member post of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Public Works. That had been preceded by several years on the legislative level of the Public Works Committee.

It was from the vantage point of both those committees that I had an opportunity to observe and absorb the many characteristics and traits of which the Senator from Louisiana is possessed. Many of them have been mentioned here. His great diligence, in the course of every session, in hearing literally hundreds of witnesses, running to 600 or 700 witnesses, compiling thousands of pages of record, detailed and tortuous as they are, and technical as they are, would justify evidence of diligence.

There has been mention of the Senator's patience. It requires a good deal of patience to hear knowledgeable witnesses, let alone members of the public and laymen who became impatient with the legislative process and who storm into the committee room possessed of the desire to give short shrift to anybody who stands in the way of what they desire.

There has been mention of the understanding which Senator ELLENDER possesses. It is tremendous. All of us have been impressed by it. But there is one thing that has not been mentioned, and that is the characteristic and attribute of jealousy which the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works has. He is jealous of any attempt to dilute the high standards and his almost religious fervor to safeguard certain guidelines which must be satisfied before a project reaches that list and his creed that those guidelines must be followed for the purpose of appropriating money for planning, construction, or maintenance, as the case may be.

Again and again, in spite of stout protests, sometimes from his colleagues, sometimes from outside, I have seen him withstand temptation to depart from the standards which he has applied impartially and well. Even in the rigors of the conference and discussion in the conference between the other body and the Senate that has prevailed.

I am happy today to pay tribute to the Senator from Louisiana and commend the Senator from West Virginia for making this occasion possible to recognize the accomplishments and the attainments of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations and Public Works.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for yielding.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am most appreciative of the remarks made by the Senator from Nebraska. I know that the Senator from Louisiana will cherish them greatly.

I yield to the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE].

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I am pleased and proud to join my distinguished friend from West Virginia in paying just tribute to our chairman, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

There are few Senators in our midst privileged to walk on the highways and byways of our Nation and view their own monuments. In the State of Hawaii these Ellender monuments range from Honolulu to Kawaihae, from Waikiki to Kahului, and from Waimea to Hilo.

I hope that some day the distinguished chairman will be able to visit us in Hawaii to see his many gifts and accomplishments in Hawaii.

Therefore, I am pleased and happy to take this opportunity to thank the Senator from Louisiana for being such a great public servant and American.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Hawaii.

I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I regret that I have not had an opportunity of service over such a long period of time as many of the Senators have had with the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana.

However, in the short period of time I have been in this body, and as a former Government bureaucrat, and as a citizen, I have entertained for years the highest regard and inspiration for the character and ability of the senior Senator from Louisiana.

It was my privilege, when I came to the Senate a short time ago, to be placed on the Agriculture Committee. I came in contact at that time with the senior Senator from Louisiana.

I found him to be one who marked every courtesy, consideration, and greatness, especially for one who was a novice, as it were, in the Senate and on his committee. I developed for him the greatest affection because of that courtesy that he extended to me as a new member of his committee.

I also began to marvel at the tremendous grasp he had of agriculture, the minute knowledge that he had of every problem connected with all phases of agriculture, and with all of the problems with which we were concerned. I never knew anyone with more encyclopedic knowledge than he had in the field of agriculture.

I believe that while we may have had differences, his heart was always on the side of trying to develop for this country a sound program of agriculture that would benefit the farming interest in every phase of our agricultural life. I believe he labored unceasingly toward that goal.

I also marvel at the patience he showed as he extended every courtesy to any witness who appeared before his committee.

I have heard these tributes paid by others and I wish to join with them.

But I offer another tribute, not so much for his great diligence, patience, and tolerance, but his great political courage.

I served during the war in an administrative capacity at the White House with Justice Byrnes. I remember vividly probably the greatest battle we had involving the economic stabilization policy of this Government. It was the most difficult battle ever experienced by the administration in the entire war.

At that time one issue arose in the Senate in which all the political pressures were on one side. I cannot forget when that battle came, with all of those political pressures. There were only five Senators who stood up on one side. Among the five was the senior Senator from Louisiana.

From that day to this I have carried in my heart an image of great political courage exemplified by the senior Senator from Louisiana.

Nothing I have observed since I became a Member of this body has done anything to add to that image of great political courage.

I am happy that the Senator from West Virginia has afforded me an opportunity to offer my tributes to the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am very grateful for the statement that has been made by the Senator from South Carolina.

I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for bringing up this tribute to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, whom we all greatly admire, and for whom we all have such a great respect, not only for his character, but his ability, courage, and his willingness to listen to anything that a freshman Senator has to say when he comes on a committee.

I remember that when I came here only a few years ago I had the pleasure and privilege of being assigned to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. As we all know, when we first are assigned to committees there is little that we know about them.

There was never a time when one would go to him with a question that he was not patient and kind, in explaining it and helping in every way that he could.

I have had that pleasure, which other Senators have had, of serving on the committee connected with matters of great interest to this Nation.

We have not always agreed on all factors in these bills, but there was never a time when it was not genuine disagreement of mind, when we thought as one against the other.

There was never a question of his sincerity in what he believed. He stood up and fought for it, and that is to be admired.

As the Senator knows, being the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the appropriations for the committees are reported out early each year. All those recommendations come before the Senate, at which time there must be a justification for asking for the funds by the Senators who had these committees.

I do not believe there has ever been a time when the senior Senator from Louisiana did not ask me to justify the money we were asking the Senate to appropriate. There was always a genuine desire on his part to see that the public got its money's worth for what was being appropriated in the committees.

Many nice things have been said about the Senator. I wish to join in everything that has been said because he is deserving of every one of them.

I was particularly interested in what the Senator from Hawaii said about the Senator from Louisiana in connection with monuments.

In North Carolina there are monuments of dams and erosion projects on our coast that are monuments to his foresight and knowledge of these things. They must be there if the water is to be saved and in order to stop erosion. There are erosion projects which must be installed on our coast, and the coast of our country, or else the coast will be ruined.

I wish to pay the highest tribute possible for me to pay to the Senator from Louisiana, who is one of the greats of this great body.

I thank the Senator for recognizing me and permitting me to join in these remarks.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, it is part of the American folklore that when a Federal appropriation is made for a small port harbor or for the navigability of a river, that taxpayers' money has been advanced for pork barrel projects.

We read this in the newspapers all the time. We hear it all the time. How the phrase came into being I do not know.

There could be no greater misnomer because these projects, as the Senator from Hawaii said, strengthen America, build the economy, make this Nation better and greater than it has been. I know this because the harbors, coastlines, and rivers are so meaningful and important to my own State of Alaska, which has a coastline longer than that of the coastlines of the States to the south, on the Pacific, the Gulf, and the Atlantic States combined.

I have been before ALLEN ELLENDER for many years seeking appropriations for rivers and harbors projects in Alaska, particularly the latter. As the Senator from Nebraska said, the senior Senator from Louisiana is always fair, but he always is insistent, too, that the appropriate and proper guidelines be followed, so that there will be returned to the economy, by reason of the construction to be performed, more than was put into a particular project by the taxpayers.

When a small boat harbor is built, and fishing boats, for example, come into that harbor and berth where no boats could be placed before, and when an industry is built up that did not exist before, all of America is benefited.

I have found Senator ELLENDER to be not only the best cook in the Senate—which he is, by general admission—but also a man who is patriotic, who is dedicated, who is devoted, who will approve a request for an appropriation for one of the rivers and harbors projects if the standards have been met. He will not do it because of friendship for any Member of this body or any other body. He is hard, he is just, he is fair, and he is a great Senator. I am happy that I am in the Chamber at this time to join in paying my respects to a great Senator and a great American.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Alaska for his true statement.

In a tribute to the life and work of Senator ELLENDER, Mr. Harry Mack, chairman of the board of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, said:

> As chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee for the past 10 years, presiding day after day, week after week, year after year, studying countless reports on innumerable projects throughout the Nation, hearing and questioning hundreds of witnesses, probing for merits and weaknesses, with unsurpassed industry and dedication, moving always toward sound, economically justified improvement of our vitally important water resources, and guiding the evolution of policies and principles both sound and conservative and fully adequate for the great task at hand, he stands today in the very forefront of leadership so urgently called for by the impending water crisis which threatens the future growth and security of America.

Senator ELLENDER was presented a silver tray with the following inscription:

> In tribute to the Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Member for 28 consecutive years, the Senate of the United States of America, during which period he has performed outstanding services to the Nation through his leadership in the fields of public education, agriculture, and development of water and related land resources. Presented by the undersigned officers, trustees, and members of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association Inc., October 20, 1965.

Mr. President, I echo these sentiments, and I ask that the tribute of Mr. Mack be included at the conclusion of my remarks, together with the text of the address which Senator ELLENDER delivered to the annual meeting of Ohio Valley Improvement Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I would appreciate it if my distinguished colleague would yield to me for further commendation of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I gladly yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senators from West Virginia have cooperated in both the Public Works and Appropriations Committees in connection with several projects to further strengthen the economy of our State.

I am personally and officially grateful to the Senator from Louisiana for his help to me, as one of the Senators from West Virginia, and also an ex officio member of the Appropriations Committee for Public Works.

It is gratifying to speak in the most sincere terms of the assistance and understanding of Senator ELLENDER.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank my distinguished colleague. I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon, when the senior Senator from South Dakota was detained at another meeting, some of my colleagues rose to express their esteem for Senator ALLEN ELLENDER, of Louisiana. I should like to associate myself with those tributes to a great Senator.

The Senator from South Dakota has served on two committees with the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana. For many years, I served on the Agriculture Committee of the Senate, over which he presides so effectively, energetically, and impartially. I have always found him to be exceedingly fair. Every Senator who knows him recognizes his diligence and his devotion to the jobs at hand; and he always gives equal consideration to the viewpoints of all members of his committees, regardless of their party affiliation.

I have also served with him on at least two subcommittees of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and of course on that committee as a whole. Of one of those subcommittees, the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, he is the chairman, and I am, I believe, the second ranking Republican. On one of the subcommittees of which I am the ranking Republican, serving under Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona, Senator ELLENDER is a high-ranking member on the Democratic side. So I have sat with him for many years, discussing legislation or appropriations. I can bear testimony to the fact that he always informs himself thoroughly on the issues at hand, that he has the courage of his convictions, that he is willing, on occasion, to espouse an unpopular position, and that he is the type of Senator who never takes advantage of his position of authority as a longstanding Member of the Senate, with valuable seniority to his credit, but gives attention and fair consideration to projects or policies or proposals, regardless of whether they come from one side of the aisle or the other.

The State of Louisiana is to be commended on having kept as its servant here in Washington so able, objective and diligent a Senator as ALLEN ELLENDER; and I am happy to associate myself with the words of commendation which have been rightfully spoken in his respect from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am very grateful to the Senator from South Dakota for his statement.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to speak concerning the public service of the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. President, there are a number of things that stand out concerning the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. Much could be said about his hard work, his diligence, and all the other attributes that make him a good Senator.

It is evident, every time he comes to the floor of the Senate in charge of legislation, that he is the complete master of his subject. He has always done his homework, and has a broad and thorough knowledge of the legislation he presents. He is not only able to answer questions concerning the legislation that he sponsors, but to give a good reason why other related matters were not included in the bill.

Senator ELLENDER is indeed a diligent and effective public servant. Like the Senators, I have been the recipient of his consideration and his kindness. He is very helpful to his colleagues. One can go to him with a most difficult problem, and he will find that Senator ELLENDER is always helpful and exceedingly courteous to everyone with whom he deals. He has a long list of accomplishments in the field of legislation.

I am delighted that Senator ELLENDER has been honored in the manner that he has been. I am very pleased that the Senate, through the voices of so many different Senators, has paid tribute to him. We salute him on this occasion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, one of the most satisfying experiences I have had as a member of the Appropriations Committee is to see the fine way in which the chairman of that committee's Public Works Subcommittee, my good friend, Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, carries out his duties.

Not only is he efficient in analyzing a multiplicity of projects and proposals on their merits, but he has the necessary ability to put himself in the place of those who would be affected by them. While he is a most effective advocate for his State on matters affecting Louisiana, when he is acting as chairman of this subcommittee, he is an unbiased advocate of all America.

I am pleased to be able to salute him today.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to pay a well deserved tribute to one of the truly great Members of the U.S. Senate—our good friend, Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER.

The great State of Louisiana has made no mistake in electing him to the U.S. Senate for these more than 30 years. He has made the most of the seniority this long term of service has made possible. He not only is chairman of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee and chairman of the Public Works Appropriations Committee, but also holds key and vital positions on a great many other important committees.

Few Members of the Senate—no matter how long their terms of service—have successfully sponsored as much important legislation as Senator ELLENDER. This includes legislation to help people in almost every walk of life. One of his latest great achievements was that of sponsoring and securing passage of the omnibus farm bill.

True, it has some shortcomings but it is the very best that I believe was obtainable and will be of far-reaching importance and help not only to the farmers of this Nation but the entire economy. If it had not been for his unusual ability, his hard work, his patience and diligence, this legislation would never have been approved by Congress.

Senator ELLENDER as chairman of the Public Works Appropriations Committee has handled this huge appropriations bill with great honor and distinction. The fairness, the good sense, and superb judgment he has used in the handling of this bill have earned for him the complete confidence and respect of every Member of the Senate.

In years gone by this appropriations bill was often referred to—and probably with some justification—as the "pork barrel" bill. Senator ELLENDER has so carefully studied the need of every project and so strictly applied the benefit-cost ratio in every instance that this public works program now is looked upon as one of the most worthy of all Government undertakings.

Our good friend, Senator ELLENDER, is one person who finds more enjoyment in saving money than most people do in spending it. This is true in both his private life and where public funds are concerned. To his great credit, the taxpayers of this country have been saved literally hundreds of millions of dollars in useless and unnecessary spending because of his diligent and effective work.

Above all else, he has a down-to-earth way about him and his homespun, honest, and fair approach to all matters has won him the deep and abiding respect and affection of every Member of this body.

His contributions to his beloved State of Louisiana, the Senate of the United State, and the Nation as a whole have been immeasurable.

I count Senator ELLENDER as one of my closest and best friends and express the fond hope that I may be privileged to be associated with him for many more years.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am very grateful for the remarks made by the Senator from North Dakota.

I now yield to the gracious Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tributes to the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, the able senior Senator from Louisiana, for his outstanding leadership. His dedicated statesmanship has been inspiring as he has extended fair treatment to every region of the Nation and to every Senator regardless of political party.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and to all Senators who have joined in paying these justly deserved tributes to the senior Senator from Louisiana. I know that Senator ELLENDER will be happy to read in the RECORD what his colleagues have said. I am most thankful for the opportunity to serve on the Committee on Appropriations and to serve on the Subcommittee on Public Works appropriations under the leadership and direction of this great man.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] struck the right note when he said that Senator ELLENDER's monuments are all about him. It occurs to me that the great fire of London broke out in the year 1666. Before that fire was brought under control, it destroyed perhaps four-fifths of the city. The greatest architect of that period was Christopher Wren. He designed many of the buildings which replaced structures that had been destroyed by the great fire.

Five years ago when I visited in London, I went to St. Paul's Cathedral. On the floor, I noted an inscription:

> If you seek my monument, look about you.

I share the expression of Senator INOUYE that Senator ELLENDER can find his monuments as he travels around this country, as he views the rivers, the harbors, and the various water resources projects to which he has made a distinct contribution.

We in West Virginia are especially grateful to Senator ELLENDER. He has had the foresight and has put forth the effort to bring forth a modernization of the navigation system in the great Ohio River Basin. We are realizing the bene-

fits of his vision in an increased population and a growing industrial complex along the Ohio River, all of which has been made possible by improvements that have come about through the realization of the vision of this great Senator and his efforts to improve the navigation system on that river.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER

(By Harry M. Mack)

The distinguished career of ALLEN J. ELLENDER is eminently worthy of public recognition and acclaim in all its many aspects.

Scholar, lawyer, soldier, public servant in State and local government, a Member of the United States Senate for the State of Louisiana of 28 years continuous service and for 17 years its senior Senator, he has made significant contributions to the welfare of his community, his State, and his country.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry since 1937 and its chairman since 1955, he has played a major part in the development of legislation for the conservation and wise use of our land and forests; as well as for improvements in the production and quality of our foodstuffs.

He has dedicated himself wholeheartedly to the cause of education. He has traveled extensively throughout the world, carefully observing and reporting on local conditions, conferring with heads of state and other officials of foreign government, and providing invaluable intelligence to responsible officers of our Government, as well as to his congressional colleagues, concerning trends and developments abroad.

It has been in the cause of development of the Nation's water resources that this association and its members have been privileged to become most closely acquainted with the qualities of industry, dedication, and leadership which have earned for him the reverent regard of his colleagues and renown throughout the Nation.

As chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee for the past 10 years, presiding day after day, week after week, year after year, studying countless reports on innumerable projects throughout the Nation, hearing and questioning hundreds of witnesses, probing for merits and weaknesses, with unsurpassed industry and dedication, moving always toward sound, economically justified improvement of our vitally important water resources, and guiding the evolution of policies and principles both sound and conservative and fully adequate for the great task at hand, he stands today in the very forefront of leadership so urgently called for by the impending water crisis which threatens the future growth and security of America.

No words of ours could express the full extent of our gratitude to him for his vital role in the implementation of the comprehensive flood control plan for the Ohio River Basin and in the modernization of the Ohio River and its tributaries. Nor does it lie within our power to bestow upon him any recognition commensurate with his remarkable accomplishments. But with deepest respect, esteem, and affection we present to him this award for his courage, his dedication, his wisdom, and his foresight unstintingly applied for the welfare of all living Americans and of the generations to come.

Inscribed on this tray in lasting tribute are the words:

"In tribute to the Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Member for 28 consecutive years, the Senate of the United States of America, during which period he has performed outstanding services to the Nation through his leadership in the fields of public education, agriculture, and development of water and related land resources. Presented by the undersigned officers, trustees, and members of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., October 20, 1965."

EXHIBIT 2

STEWARDSHIP OF OUR SOIL AND WATER

(Address of Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, at the annual meeting of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., on Wednesday, October 20, 1965, Cincinnati, Ohio)

I am grateful to your former president, General Jack Person, for inviting me here this evening. It provides to me a forum for discussing some of the problems we shall face in the next decade in our efforts to protect and preserve, for generations yet unborn, two of our most precious resources—soil and water.

Having been born and brought up in the bayou country of south Louisiana, which is traversed by the famed Intracoastal Canal, it is entirely natural and understandable that I should have a deep-seated interest in water resource development. If a picture is worth a thousand words, experiencing a major flood or a hurricane is worth a thousand pictures.

I have been subjected to such experiences and, as many of you here today can testify, they are indelibly impressed upon one's mind, never to be forgotten. Louisiana is in the process of cleaning up and rebuilding after the devastating beating it took in mid-September from Miss Betsy. President Johnson invited members of the Louisiana delegation to accompany him on an inspection tour of some of the damaged area, where we had a firsthand view of the human misery and the unbelievable destruction wrought by a monstrous hurricane. Measures for storm protection are relatively new. Most of them have been authorized during the past 10 years and only a very few have actually been completed. One of these early projects, being built for the protection of the people of east Jefferson Parish in Louisiana, although only 80 percent complete, kept Lake Pontchartrain waters out of east Jefferson in the hurricanes of 1956, 1964, and again this year against Hurricane Betsy. I am hopeful that we will be able to authorize and construct hurricane barriers in all affected parts of our country, just as we have already provided flood protection for the areas subjected to major floods.

I am proud of the progress we have made toward the control of floods on the lower Mississippi. During the last major flood on that river—in 1927—an area of 23,000 square miles was inundated. This is almost equivalent to the combined area of the States of Vermont, New Hampshire, and Connecticut. Cities, towns, and farms were flooded, destroying crops and paralyzing industry. Scores of lives were lost. Property damage ran into hundreds of millions of dollars. Rail transportation suffered heavily, with only one east and west rail line operating for a time in the entire area below Cairo, Ill. Highways and bridges were unusable for weeks; and thousands of people were left homeless and destitute. With the industrial development that has taken place in the lower valley since 1927, you can well imagine the astronomical losses that would accompany a repetition of the 1927 flood. Such an event can never recur because of the man-made reservoirs in the tributary basins and the main stem control works constructed and now being built.

Even with our tremendous wealth the United States cannot afford to suffer the damages and devastations caused by uncontrolled floods on the Mississippi River system, including all of its tributaries. After listening to the oft-repeated comment, "Why don't they do something about it?" I got to wondering, Who are the "theys"? And the inescapable conclusion was that the theys were the composite voices of all the persons who lived in the valley or derived a portion of their worldly possessions from the economy of the valley. It was long before I was elected to the U.S. Senate that I resolved to devote some of my time and a good deal of my energies to the cause of protecting and preserving our water and land resources.

My concern for flood protection in the lower valley naturally led to studies in the broader field of water resource development. Today, my interest in the full development of our water resources stems from a personal conviction that such developments were an important factor in achieving our present standard of living. It follows that if we are to continue our march of progress we must not relent in protecting and preserving those resources. This conviction has been strengthened by my travels through Europe and Asia. I believe that unless we protect our greatest resource, water; unless we keep it inland and prevent it from flowing to the sea willy-nilly and unused, our great country may some day become as barren as the Gobi Desert, or as the lands I have seen on my travels in old Persia. About 500 years before Christ, the entire area of Persia could sustain the livelihood of over 100 million people. Today it can sustain barely 14 million.

I know we can get about as many estimates of the consumption of water by the American people as there are authorities making the estimates, and there certainly is justification for many of those estimates. Some tell us that in 1850, the average annual consumption of water per capita by the people of the United States was 50 gallons per day. They tell us that by 1950 it exceeded 1,000 gallons per day, and that by 1980 the per capita requirement for water in the United States will be 2,000 gallons per citizen per day. This is the kind of a dynamic economy in which we move. At any rate, on September 17, 1964, President Johnson stated that, "By the year 2000 more than 300 million Americans will need 10 times the power and 2½ times the water that we now consume."

This is particularly significant when we consider that it took this Nation 350 years to reach a population of 170 million people. Yet, at the present rate, the population will double in something less than 40 years. Using the projected population growths, and recognizing the fact that per capita increase in the use of water is even greater than the population explosion, the magnitude of the task that lies ahead staggers the imagination. Experience has shown that upward of 20 years is frequently required to bring a major water resource development from the survey and planning stage through the construction stage.

We are today experiencing a great water paradox. Major geographical areas are having unusual weather. The present drought in the Northeast is jarring the people in that area out of their former complacency about the adequacy of their water supply just as the hurricane floods of a decade ago finally awakened them to the need for construction of the flood control reservoirs that had been authorized for 20 years, but consistently rejected as being unnecessary.

In the Northeast, some of our most dense areas of population, with the heaviest concentration of industry, are faced with the stark reality that in all probability, without further curtailment of their present rate of water usage, they will be out of water by midwinter.

Today it is illegal in New York City to serve a glass of water in a restaurant unless the customer specifically requests it. In mid-August, severe restrictions were placed on the hours during which air conditioning in that great metropolis could operate in office buildings, factories, restaurants, et cetera. As I mentioned earlier, an experience is worth a thousand pictures. As serious as the situation is in the Northeast, if it has the effect of arousing this Nation to the vital necessity for increasing expenditures for water resource development on the Federal, State, and local levels, it will have been a blessing in disguise.

Today our President is engaged in the task of building a Great Society, but without the water to meet the requirements of industry, or the everyday needs of our people, not only will we fail to achieve our goal, but we will find our present standard of living crumbling away. Our Great Society will have followed the same road of every civilized nation that has failed to provide food and fiber for its people because of its failure to preserve and protect its land and water resources.

If we are to discharge our responsibilities as leaders in the local community, the State, and Nation, we must evaluate the present conditions of our lakes, our rivers, our streams, and our creeks. We must plan ahead so as to obtain the maximum use of every drop of water before it flows into the sea. This will involve the construction of many more reservoirs, which is the only practical means, as of today, of distributing the uneven water yield from precipitation, in order to meet the needs of an area during prolonged drought periods. But the task will involve much more than that. It will mean a whole new approach to the manner in which we utilize our streams. We can no longer look upon these streams as a cheap means of disposing of our domestic and sanitary wastes. We are going to have to insist on waste treatment plants and, in some cases, water purification and recirculation of the treated water. This concept of water utilization is not in some distant future—the new era is already here. We simply have no time to waste in getting about the business of adapting to this new era.

Just last month the Congress completed action on a water pollution bill. Under the compromise version of that law the States will be allowed until July 1, 1967, to establish standards to reduce pollution in their streams. If any State fails to promulgate standards by the deadline, or if any use criteria that do not meet the approval of Federal enforcement officials, the Federal Government will step in and set the standards. The bill also gives to cities and industrial firms the right to appeal what they consider to be too stringent control measures. A water conference would then be called to take testimony and render a decision in the matter as a result of the appeal.

As we enter this new era of community accountability where both industrial plants and city disposal plants will be forced to assume greater responsibility for the quality of the effluents they discharge into our streams, increased research effort can be expected toward more economical treatment processes. Indeed, earlier this month, considerable interest was shown in a new process disclosed by the Rand Development Corp. of Cleveland, using coal as the filtration and absorbent agent to treat sewage before it is dumped into a stream or lake. I think it is significant that the same coal used in the sewage treatment process can be reused to produce enough steam to provide 20 percent of the water needs of the average city in a desalting plant. At the same time, the solid refuse from the city treatment plant can also be burned in the steam generation incinerator to provide another 30 percent of the city's needs. In other words, using the dual process, the same coal that has been used to clean up sewage and the solid wastes and garbage collected in the city can provide fuel to desalt water equal to 50 percent of a city's needs, without any cost for fuel for the desalination plant. I mention this particular process because coal is so important to certain segments of the Ohio Valley economy. I believe that research by private enterprise will find more economical methods of treating our waste products, but such measures must be accompanied by an accelerated rate of expenditure by the Federal Government and local interests for the construction of control works to insure the maximum utilization of our water resources. I believe that in the next few years we are going to have to double our expenditures in this field if we are to keep ahead of catastrophe.

Oh, there are the alarmists who point to the ever increasing amounts being spent on water resource development. If we listen to them and if we consider only dollars, we can be led astray.

In 1940, the appropriation for the Corps of Engineers was $271,400,000. At that time we had a population of 132,594,000, and a budget of $11,447,634,000. In 1965, a quarter of a century later, with a population increase of 19.3 percent to 194,580,000, the Federal budget had risen to $99,700 million, but the budget estimate for the corps had increased to only $1,279,824,000. This means that in 1940, before the corps became heavily engaged in the construction of hydroelectric generating facilities, or water supply storage pursuant to the Water Supply Act of 1958, we were devoting 2.38 percent of our annual budget to the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers. Today, we are allocating only 1.29 percent of the annual budget to this purpose, even though the program has been expanded to include the fully reimbursable costs allocated to power and domestic water supply.

The President is well aware of the need to develop the water resources of the Nation. I well remember the days when he was majority leader, and he would make his annual requests for increases over the budget for projects located in Texas. Often I felt he was unreasonable in the number of unbudgeted requests he desired, but he would always drape his lanky arm over my shoulder and say, "ALLEN, we need all of them to provide for just the current needs of my people in Texas." The President has not changed since those days; except that his interests have broadened to national scope. He understands the absolute necessity of conserving our most precious inheritance—soil and water. I think he demonstrated that last May on the occasion of the dedication of the Sam Rayburn Dam. Although he could not physically be present for the dedication, speaking via telephone the President stated:

"No single resource is more important to us than water. Our management of America's water resources is basic to the success in meeting the many obligations and many opportunities of our growing population.

"Water has always been a first concern of the Western and Southwestern States. Today, no region of the Nation can afford to take water for granted because from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast, the urbanization and industrialization are creating a mighty and great thirst for water, and more water.

"If this thirst is not satisfied by positive and constructive and timely action, we could experience very great trouble in fulfilling the promises and the potentials of American life.

"I believe there are at least 10 objectives that we should set for ourselves and we should strive continuously to reach. If you will give me a moment, I would like to point them out:

"We must control flooding on our rivers and our streams.

"We must assure an ample supply of good water for domestic and industrial and agricultural use.

"We must purge our rivers and harbors of pollution.

"We must further develop our navigation systems.

"We must develop more fully our Nation's great hydroelectric power potential.

"We must provide increasingly for water-oriented outdoor recreation of all kinds.

"We must be good stewards of our irreplaceable fish and our wildlife heritage.

"We must conserve and enhance the grandeur of natural environments and make them more accessible to all of our families of this land.

"We must preserve and create beauty throughout the land.

"Finally, we cannot afford to approach any part of our overall water resources development program on a single-purpose, or a single-interest basis. If all the requirements that confront us are to be satisfied, none of us can afford to be selfish. We must all learn to share this limited resource to attain the greatest good of the greatest number of people."

Our country is most fortunate in having a "water-minded" President. I can say that it helps me immensely in my job as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The speed with which the President mobilized the Federal resources to meet the floods this year on the Pacific coast in January, the Upper Mississippi in April, the Arkansas in June, the drought in the Northeast this summer and, finally, the victims of hurricane Betsy last month, demonstrates his concern for the people that suffer these disasters. His experience tells him that in the long run it is cheaper in dollars and cents to build the permanent works than it is to continue with Federal aid to the stricken. But more important to the President than monetary considerations is the prevention of the human misery that accompanies these disasters.

The President made this very clear on September 2 when he signed the Auburn-Folsom South unit project of the Bureau of Reclamation. In referring to the accomplishments of the 89th Congress in the 8 months the Congress had been in session, he stated:

"Those months have been marked by some savage and tragic contrasts in our water problems across the Nation. In the West and Midwest, the raging floods have swept through town after town, claiming lives, destroying millions of dollars worth of property.

"And while this was happening in the West and Midwest in our great country, here in the East we were in the grip of an unprecedented and deepening drought. And when these emergencies arrive, the Government is pledged to do what has to be done and what can be done.

"Let me make it clear that I do not like emergencies:

"First, because they are expensive. In the past 12 months the flood damages in the United States alone have amounted to $1¼ billion.

"Second, because they are wasteful. Last years flood in northern California alone carried enough water into the sea to meet the domestic and municipal and complete industrial demands of the entire Nation for a whole year—16 trillion gallons.

"Third, because they are really unnecessary. We now have the capability to plan ahead and to build together so that these disasters can be prevented.

"Our generation is challenged to really make a steady, determined, and, I hope, successful effort to eliminate drought and flood from this land."

I suspect that the President's deep concern for economy has been misinterpreted by the Bureau of the Budget and other Presidential advisers who have consistently pared down the requests of the Corps of Engineers for sufficient funds to carry out their responsibilities in the field of water resource development. This suspicion is confirmed by an incident that occured last year. The original budget request for the continuation of the Arkansas River navigation project, amounting to $84 million, was inadequate to keep that project on its previously approved schedule for completion to Tulsa in 1970. When the facts were made known to the President, he sent up an amended budget calling for $99 million for the project, the full amount necessary to keep it on schedule. This is another manifestation of the President's determination to do what he can to develop the resources of the country and keep the economy moving. Once it was possible to break through the shield of advisers and the President was shown the need, decisive action followed. As I said earlier, it makes my task as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee a great deal easier, since I must no longer get down on bended knees to plead with the Budget Bureau for the funds I deem absolutely necessary.

I hope that starting in fiscal year 1967 we will move forward with an accelerated program designed to meet at least the immediately foreseeable water needs of this Nation.

Many of you, I know, are interested in navigation, and you can begin to see the results of your efforts. Soon after accepting the invitation to be with you today, I started to reflect on some of the accomplishments of your organization in the recent past.

You have seen the commerce on the Ohio River increase thirteenfold since 1930. I am told that traffic on the river has doubled on an average of once every 11 years since completion of the present system; and all indications are that this growth in traffic will continue for many years.

Great strides have been made in the planning and construction of flood control works—not only the large controversial reservoirs such as Allegheny, but also the smaller local protection projects that require substantial local financing. It is indeed an enviable record, but perhaps the most outstanding achievement has been the progress made toward the redevelopment of the navigation features of the Ohio River. The replacement of 46 old obsolete locks with 19 new ones means a great deal to the barge operator and the shipper, but most of all it means a great deal to the people of the valley and the Nation as a whole. The typical modern Ohio River tow requires two lockages. This means breaking up the tow and reassembling at each lock; so instead of 92 lockages through slow filling chambers we will have 19 lockages through modern fast filling chambers for a tow traversing the river from Cairo to Pittsburgh. The average tow, of course, does not traverse the entire distance.

It has been conservatively estimated that the reduction in the number of locks, in the time required for each lockage, and in the elimination of delays waiting access into the lock chambers, will amount to a saving of about 18 hours for the average 233-mile Ohio River haul. This, at the current cost of $120 per hour for delay time, will represent a saving of $2,160 on the average haul, or about 0.5 mills per ton mile. This represents a saving of 25 percent or more in the cost of transporting petroleum and petroleum products, and from 12½ to 16⅔ percent in the cost of carrying coal, grain, steel, and other vital commodities. All of this, of course, will be translated into lower costs to consumers of food, fuel, electricity, household appliances, and countless other items.

The savings in transportation costs along the inland waterways has been a major factor in dockside plant construction. In the Ohio Valley alone more than $22 billion have been invested in the past 15 years.

This redevelopment was resumed in fiscal year 1955 after the termination of the Korean conflict when the Congress provided two unbudgeted new starts—New Cumberland and Greenup. That was followed by unbudgeted construction starts on Markland, McAlpine, Captain Anthony Meldahl, Pike Island, Cannelton and Newburgh, together with unbudgeted planning starts on six projects. So, of the 12 locks and dams completed or under construction since resumption of the project in 1955, 8 were unbudgeted.

This year, the Congress added as an unbudgeted planning start the final replacement, that of Smithland, which will replace existing locks and dams 50 and 51. Recognizing the fact that you have a good, strong, effective association, there were three other important factors working in your favor. First, you have a good program that is economically sound, good for the country, and essential for the full development of the Ohio Valley. Second, you are fortunate in having an effective congressional delegation that understands the importance of this development, and one that knows how to make its wants known. Third, you have MIKE KIRWAN, who is the third ranking member of the House Committee on Appropriations and chairman of the subcommittee that handles the appropriations for rivers and harbors. Without in any way detracting from the great contribution made by the other members of your congressional delegation, I think that the work Mr. KIRWAN has done in the total field of resource development has been truly outstanding, and he has been a pillar of strength for the rest of us who have labored in this cause. These, my friends, are the real reasons for your success. My best advice to you is to work to conserve your resources—the human ones as well as your natural resources.

I regret that there are dark clouds along the horizon which threaten the continued economic development of the Ohio Valley and other water-oriented industrial complexes.

First, there is the almost perennial threat of a user tax or the imposition of tolls on our historically free waterways; second, the promulgation of new criteria for the evaluation of navigation benefits which, if unchallenged, will make it extremely difficult to justify any new navigation improvements; and third, legislation has been introduced in the Congress which, if enacted into law, would relieve the Corps of Engineers of their responsibility in water resource development.

When you consider the number of events that have happened in the past few years which have had the effect of eroding the authority and the jurisdiction of the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate, I cannot help but feel that the dangers I referred to above are part and parcel of an overall scheme to do violence to our inland navigation. I firmly believe that a loss on any one of these major fronts makes it just that much more difficult to withstand the onslaught of our foes on the remaining fronts.

Let us examine in some depth the question of user charges. For the past 3 years both President Kennedy and President Johnson have requested user charges. On August 25 last, the President announced plans to send Congress a special message next January on national transportation policy. The President gave no inkling of what the message would contain, except to say it would be "substantive." But, also last August, Treasury Secretary Fowler hinted that the administration was considering "the enactment of an omnibus user charge program." If that is what the President recommends to the Congress, I will at least be able to agree with him that the message was "substantive." And it will be up to your association, other river basin associations, and the National Waterways Conference to demonstrate just how "substantive" they consider the proposal.

While things are pretty quiet at the moment regarding the imposition of user charges on our inland waterways, the threat is always with us. In view of the fact that the President sent draft legislation to the Congress a few months ago, hearings can be expected early next session. If such hearings are held, I hope that the House Ways and Means Committee will hold them outside of the Capitol and in the areas most directly affected by the proposals under consideration. Only in this way can the committee grasp the full import of the proposals being made.

While it is difficult to discuss the effects of such a tax or user charge until we have seen the actual proposal, I have watched these recommendations come up year after year, and it is always the same basic proposal rehashed or warmed over, with the recommendations never meeting the criteria of good taxing principles.

While the 2 cents a gallon tax is advanced as a user tax, it does not meet the requirements of a user tax and, in effect, is more nearly an excise tax—and a poor one at that. In fact, a few years ago former Secretary Dillon virtually conceded that the waterway fuel tax he proposed would not be a user charge in his statement that, "Proceeds from the new tax would accrue to the general fund of the Treasury." In this respect, it would not differ from income and excise taxes.

Some years ago the people of my hometown, Houma, wanted a navigation channel connecting the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and Bayou Terrebonne with the Gulf of Mexico. Since early construction of that facility was an important factor in their consideration, I urged them to float a bond issue and build the project themselves. They did just that. We now find advocates of a user charge proposing a tax of 2 cents a gallon on fuel used in shallow draft navigation (15 feet or less) to recover the Federal cost of providing the waterway. Certainly a Federal tax on fuel used by shallow draft commercial vessels operating on this waterway will not repay the bonds issued by local interests to construct the facility; and, therefore, by no stretch of the imagination could a tax on the fuel used on this waterway be considered a user charge.

Let's look at another application of this so-called user charge. The Federal Government is currently engaged in widening and deepening the Hudson River Channel between New York and Albany from the existing 27-foot depth to 32 feet, at a cost of $25 million. Now, how would the previously proposed user charges be applied to this waterway to recover the cost of deepening the channel from 27 to 32 feet or, for that matter, the cost of maintaining either the 27-foot or the 32-foot channel? First, there would be a tax on the fuel used by vessels drawing 15 feet or less which do not require even the existing depths; and, second, for those vessels drawing over 15 feet, including those requiring depths in excess of 27 feet, no tax would be levied on the fuel used by those vessels traversing the same 128 miles of waterway which is actually being deepened to permit additional loading of these particular vessels.

These and many similar examples convince me that the proposals just do not stand up when measured against any acceptable standards for a user charge. I believe that these new taxes are more in the nature of an excise tax, and a poor one at that, as I will attempt to show you in a moment. Before I do that, I would like to pose one question: What happened to the theory advanced by the Treasury Department last year that a reduction in our excise taxes would stimulate the economy of the Nation and result in increased tax revenues to the Federal Government? Certainly the converse of that theory should also be true. There are sound arguments leading to the conclusion that any tax on fuels used in commercial inland water transportation would be a depressant to our economy.

For example, the proposed fuel tax would affect the competitive position of certain geographic areas of the country within an industry and, in my opinion, would be contrary to the provisions of the Northwest Ordinance as well as being in conflict with expressed provisions of the Organic acts of many of the States of our Nation.

Some measure of the impact such a tax would have on the competitive position of individual plants in such a basic industry as iron and steel can be visualized by examining certain statistics of that industry. As we all know, the steel industry is not only very dependent for economical operation on water transportation but is also a very dominant factor in the economy of the upper reaches of the Ohio River. The big steelmaking districts on the Atlantic coast and the Great Lakes rely heavily on deepwater transportation, particularly for receipt of hightonnage raw materials. However, the inland steel industries of the Ohio Valley, principally the greater Pittsburgh area, balance this competitive advantage of the coastal and lake ports by extensive use of the shallow-draft navigation afforded by our inland waterways. They barge high tonnages of both raw materials and finished products. It becomes immediately apparent that a tax on shallow-draft navigation on the Ohio River without a corresponding tax on deep-draft navigation on the Great Lakes would be a discriminatory tax and, in my judgment, might be unconstitutional, since section 8 of article I reads in part as follows:

"But all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

The steel industries of the Ohio Valley produce about 25 percent of the Nation's output. In 1963, a total of 25,722,040 tons of bituminous coal moved on the Monongahela River, principally downstream to the steel centers of the Pittsburgh area. That same year well over 2 million tons of finished steels were shipped from the Pittsburgh area alone by shallow-draft barges to markets widely distributed throughout the Mississippi River system and the Gulf coast. If a system of selected user charges, or economic sanctions, if you please, were applied to shallow-draft navigation, the present water compelled rate from Pittsburgh to St. Louis would no longer be offered by the railroads. If the railroads would then establish a rate between those points equivalent to the present rate from Cleveland, the freight charge between Pittsburgh and St. Louis would increase by about $6.64 per ton. This could and would have a marked effect on our overall economy which would be far greater than the hypothetical relief the proposed tax would afford the Federal Treasury. It would reduce the area in which the Pittsburgh steel is competitive, thereby reducing the production of the area resulting in increased unemployment, accompanied by fear complexes, which in turn result in delayed purchases by those employed due to uncertainty as to their future. The general depressant effect on the economy of the area would decrease the general tax revenue, as well as increase its welfare load—in fact, just the reverse of the economic stimulus proposed by the President in his message requesting a reduction in excise taxes, which was approved by the Congress during the past session.

A similar retardation of economic growth occurs at the receiving end where the cost of the steel products, their raw materials, is increased by $6.64 a ton. The price of their finished products increases and their relative competitive position in their field is adversely affected. In addition, we should not lose sight of the fact that freight charges are such a significant portion of the total cost of a product that substantial increases in freight costs could price U.S. products out of foreign markets. This would, in effect, hit us with a double whammy—one, an inflationary increase in the cost of certain products on the domestic market accompanied by, two, a further increase in our adverse balance of payments position in the world market, thereby increasing the pressure on the U.S. dollar.

Last November 20, the Chief of Engineers issued new criteria for the evaluation of navigation benefits. When the first rumors of this new order were brought to my attention, I immediately asked the Chief of Engineers for a copy of that directive, together with an explanation of the possible or probable effect of any such revised procedures on the navigation reports under consideration. I also discussed this matter with General Graham when he appeared before the committee. After careful reflection, I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that these new criteria for evaluating navigation projects have been forced upon the corps. In fact, General Wilson's letter to me states:

"You are aware, of course, that the Corps of Engineers with policy guidance from the Bureau of the Budget is constantly striving to improve its practices and procedures in carrying out its assigned responsibilities including the evaluation of proposed inland waterway projects."

Yes, I am becoming more and more aware of this policy guidance. Despite the protestations of the corps that the waterways users are misjudging the effect of these criteria, I cannot lose sight of the fact that not a single major navigation improvement has been recommended by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors since the new criteria were promulgated.

It is also apparent that the corps is not evaluating all of the benefits from a navigation project contemplated in Senate Document 97 and approved by President Kennedy in May of 1962. I pointed this out in the committee report on the 1966 appropriation bill, and I hope that both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget will take note of this fact. In this connection, let me point out that many of the comprehensive plans for the development of the water resource of our river valleys could not have been justified or built had it not been for the very conservative navigation benefits attributed to the comprehensive plan.

Another grave threat to the development of our rivers in the best interest of the areas involved and consistent with the desires and aspirations of the local interests would lie in the serious consideration of legislation recently introduced to redesignate the Department of the Interior as the Department of Natural Resources and to transfer certain agencies to and from such Department. In my humble opinion, the enactment of such legislation would, in effect, create a water czar who could dictate to the State and local communities how their waters will be developed and utilized. I think it would go a long way toward destroying the Federal recognition of the rights and interests of the States in the development of their water resources which was obtained through enactment of the bitterly fought O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment to the Flood Control Act of 1944. As you know, under that amendment the plans of a Federal agency for the development of a water resource must be submitted to the other interested Federal agencies and the affected States for comment. The States and agencies by law have a period of 90 days in which to comment, and such comments must by law accompany the report to Congress. If, as proposed in that legislation, there were just a single agency of the Federal Government designated to carry out the present functions of all the following agencies: the Tennessee Valley Authority; the Federal Power Commission; the Forest Service; the functions of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers; and all of the functions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Water Pollution Control Act; together with the present agencies in the Department of the Interior charged with water resource development, such as the Bureau of Reclamation, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Geological Survey, and the Office of Saline Water, it is easy to see how honest differences of opinion as to the adverse effect of the plans of one agency on the interests of another could be suppressed at the Department level on the premise that they were internal working papers. Under such circumstances, the individual States would be at a great disadvantage in seeking modification of a plan proposed by the Federal Government.

I have discussed some of the dark clouds on the horizon that will require our vigilance in the years ahead. Make no mistake about it, any reverses on any battlefront of our fight for sound water resources development make it just that much harder to resist the next onslaught. We must meet all problems head on and provide realistic solutions to those problems without delay. These are tasks we must perform within the next decade, if we are to be judged good stewards of our inheritance, and if we are truly concerned about the legacy we will leave our children.

POSTMASTERS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I report favorably from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on the nominations of seven postmasters.

All of these have been carefully checked. Cards have been returned by Senators, and the examinations have been forwarded to the Senate.

Mr. President, I have cleared these nominations with the majority leadership as well as with the minority.

I ask for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, as in executive session, the clerk will state the nominations.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN CRIMINAL LAWS APPLICABLE TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1320) to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes which was, on page 6, line 14, after "bond." insert "The provisions of the second, third, and fifth subparagraphs of paragraph (b) of the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to grant additional powers to the Commissioners, and for other purposes', approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 820; sec. 1–244(b), D.C. Code), shall be applicable to each bond authorized by this section as if it were the bond authorized by the first subparagraph of such paragraph (b): *Provided*, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed to impose upon the surety on any such bond a greater liability than the total amount thereof or the amount remaining unextinguished after any prior recovery or recoveries."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the amendment of the House is acceptable. I have cleared this with both sides.

The House amendment was suggested by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners in lieu of an amendment sought before the House committee by a segment of the insurance industry. The amendment conforms bonding procedures specified in S. 1320 to those of congressional acts of 1944 and 1960.

The amendment incorporates by reference certain provisions of an act approved December 20, 1944, relating to bonds given to the District in connection with various kinds of licenses. The act of December 20, 1944, contains provisions relating to notice required to be given the District of Columbia Commissioners by the surety before liability on the bond may be terminated, providing that persons aggrieved by violations of law or regulations by principals on the bond may bring an action against the principal or the surety, or both.

A similar procedure was followed when Congress enacted the act of September 6, 1960, relating to the bonding of home improvement contractors, and the act of April 22, 1960, relating to bonding of automobile dealers and automobile sales finance companies.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO FILE REPORT AFTER ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia be permitted to file its report on the activities of the committee for the 1st session of the 89th Congress, after the adjournment of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 796, H.R. 9830.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9830) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize reimbursement to a State or political subdivision thereof for sidewalk repair and replacement or to make other arrangements therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 811), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose and justification for the proposed legislation, including agency comments and recommendations, are set forth in House Report No. 994 as follows:

"H.R. 9830 would permit the Federal Government to reimburse a State or political subdivision for sidewalk repair and replacement. Under State laws and municipal ordinances, abutting property owners are generally assessed for sidewalk installation, repair, and replacement. The Federal Government, however, is immune from such assessments and, as a result, the sidewalks around Federal property often go unrepaired.

"It is important that the Federal Government be a good neighbor in the communities where its properties are located and be willing to assume and discharge the normal responsibilities incident to property ownership.

"DISCUSSION

"Repair and replacement of sidewalks around Federal buildings throughout the country has been a matter of concern for many years. The General Services Administration (GSA) maintains the position that under present law, it has no authority to repair or replace sidewalks adjacent to Federal property. GSA's position is that the sidewalks constitute a part of municipally owned streets and, therefore, their maintenance and repair become the responsibility of the municipality. Numerous legal opinions are cited to support this position.

"In the case of privately owned property, the abutting property owners are assessed the cost of keeping the sidewalks in repair. Under the constitutional doctrine of sovereign immunity, the Federal Government not only holds tax-free property, usually in a choice location, but contributes nothing to the upkeep of the sidewalks beside the buildings.

"The local governments have often been financially unable to perform the work without reimbursement and the sidewalks have deteriorated into a dangerous and unsightly condition.

"This bill would not permit assessments against the United States for the repairs, but would authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into agreements with the local governments under which they would be reimbursed for performance of the necessary repair work.

"The General Services Administration has stated that it is of the opinion that the Federal Government should contribute financially to sidewalk repairs but that it is without authority to do so. GSA, along with the Bureau of the Budget, urges the adoption of this legislation so that the Federal Government can fulfill its obligations to the municipalities in which it owns property. Enactment of the bill would enable the Administrator of GSA to repair or replace defective and dangerous sidewalks around certain Federal buildings, minimize accidents, and provide the means by which the sidewalks surrounding such properties could be kept in good repair.

"It is estimated, as far as buildings under the custody and control of GSA are concerned, that the additional expenditures necessitated by enactment of this legislation would average approximately $50,000 annually. According to the Administrator of GSA, the additional expenditures should be offset to some extent by reduction of Government tort liability resulting from elimination of hazardous sidewalk conditions.

"HOUSE AMENDMENT

"The bill, as introduced, would cover only those buildings for which GSA is responsible. This would include an estimated 1,700 of the approximately 4,900 federally owned buildings. The Bureau of the Budget recommended that the bill be amended to authorize the heads of all Government agencies to repair and replace sidewalks around federally owned building sites and installations. GSA concurred in the amendment.

"The bill as reported to the Senate contains the amendment as recommended by the administration and approved by the House of Representatives."

My BYRD of West Virginia subsequently said: Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill—H.R. 9830 was passed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

USE OF AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT BY FEDERAL DEPARTMENT AND AGENCIES

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk the report of the Committee on Government Operations on H.R. 4845, and ask unanimous consent that it be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4845) to provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the pending bill (H.R. 4845) would centralize the purchasing, leasing, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment, used by the Federal agencies, in the General Services Administration.

The purpose of this legislation is to bring about more efficient use of the data processing equipment that is now available in the various agencies of the Government. It is said that this legislation should save millions of dollars in costs to the Government by maximizing in a more efficient manner the use of the existing data processing equipment which has now proliferated through many if not all the executive agencies. Special provision, however, is made to take care of the situation in agencies that deal with the national security, such as the Department of Defense, NASA, and other necessary exceptions.

Mr. President, the bill passed the House on September 2, 1965. It has the support of the Government Operations Committee, and I ask for its passage.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Washington, who is the acting chairman of the Committee on Government Operations this evening, that before his departure for home, Senator McCLELLAN called me and asked me to try to round up the Republican Members to sign a poll, in order to be able to bring the bill out and report it on the floor. I am particularly allergic to the polling procedure for passing legislation. I had some reluctance in doing that, but was persuaded because it seems to me we should have a little better policy for dealing with new electronic and computing devices. I should therefore like to have reassurance from the acting chairman that I have a correct understanding of the bill.

First, does this proposal have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. Second, it does not mean that we are going automatically into the purchasing of a great many automatic computing machines, but will result in a careful study and survey which, at the end of the road, should enable us more intelligently to decide whether outright purchase or leasing is the best situation so far as the Government is concerned; is that not correct?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct. As I understand the situation, the Federal agencies have been managing, operating and handling their own data processing equipment. The result has been, in many instances, that Agency A will not make full use of its data processing equipment, whereas another agency may be overusing or taxing its available data process equipment, and then would have to obtain new equipment when there is already equipment within the executive agencies of the Government which could be utilized by that agency.

Therefore, the burden of the effort, as I understand, is that there is plenty of data processing equipment, but it seems to me that a great deal of the equipment is not being fully and efficiently utilized. Therefore, as it has been presented to us, it is estimated that this measure will save us approximately $60 to $100 million. Even if we saved only $5 million, it would be a worthwhile effort and one which we should certainly try to make.

Mr. MUNDT. If it would save any money at all, it would be a shocking exception to the rule, so far as Congress is concerned, and I certainly would applaud such economy.

Mr. JACKSON. We are not authorizing any additional expenditures here.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I sat at the conference in the Appropriations Committee where we had a rather sizable appropriation dealing with this whole area, and we substantially reduced it primarily because the so-called Brooks bill had not been acted upon. It was felt by many of the conferees that it should be acted upon and that we should have the information available. The studies which will ensue therefrom will guide us in knowing whether appropriations should be made for new equipment.

I would hope, Mr. President, and I should like the legislative history to so record, that out of this action would come a report to Congress, to the Appropriations Committee, and to Members generally, as to whether it is in the Government's interest primarily to purchase the equipment outright and then to hire the maintenance crews who would repair and maintain the equipment, or whether there would be more economy in leasing it from the companies which manufacture it and who in turn would provide for it maintenance.

Certainly, I do not know the answer. The committee does not know the answer. We are not going to find the answer merely by sitting here and waiting.

The proposed legislation, I believe, will move in the direction of providing us with answers of that kind. This is a fast developing field. Senators know that they have placed automatic equipment of one kind or another in their offices, and the next year someone invents something very much better, and they are stuck with the old equipment. That is another factor to be considered in deciding whether to purchase the equipment or lease it; but I believe I am correct in my assumption that out of the action we take in the Senate tonight, if we approve the legislation—and I have a feeling that we shall—we will get a report which can guide our actions in the future.

Mr. JACKSON. I should also like to suggest, and I know the distinguished Senator from South Dakota would agree, that we should be advised as to whether the proposed legislation—which centralizes the management and direction of the equipment in the hands of the General Services Administration—will result in full and better utilization of the machines, whether they are leased or purchased.

Mr. MUNDT. That is very good.

Mr. JACKSON. Therefore, it is not merely the leasing and selling alone, but I am sure the Senator would agree that we also wish to make sure there is no duplication involved, that full utilization is made within all the agencies of the Government before they go out and lease or purchase new quipment.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. It should be used. It is expensive equipment. It costs too much to have it sitting around not being used.

Mr. President, in that connection I have some happy news for Members of the Senate, in that when we were discussing this matter in the supplemental appropriation, I inquired of representatives of the GSA, who have custody of much of the equipment, whether this was something which was merely being provided for the executive agencies of the Government alone or whether, perhaps, congressional committees and even Senators and Representatives could also have access to all this "hifalutin" machinery.

I did not know whether it would create a situation where we would have jet age electronic machines for calculation purposes in the executive branch and Congress would still have its horse and buggy, pencil-eraser kind of procedure in the House and Senate. I was given encouragement to believe that reserve equipment was available in order to keep it busily in use.

As the Senator from Washington has pointed out, certainty this Government property should be open and available to committees of the Senate and to individual members who might have reason to use it. Therefore, I would hope that we keep the wheels turning busily, if we adopt the proposed legislation.

I am going to interpose no objection to the adoption of the proposed legislation, but merely wish to register this little "forensic pulp" as to the kind of procedure we have to follow in polling a committee. The Senate wishes to adjourn. The hour is late. The issue is important. I am not going to make any objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. As a member of the committee, I share the ideas of the Senator from South Dakota. As to polling the committees, I feel that this is a procedure which should be resorted to only in extreme emergency situations. However, along with the Senator from South Dakota, I acquiesce in adoption of the bill.

I should like to inform the Senator from South Dakota, and the Senate, that as a member of the Joint Committee for Legislative Reorganization, under the joint chairmanship of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the gentleman from Indiana, Representative MADDEN, we are going into this question of the use of electronic devices. I hope that early next year we will have an extensive report on the use of these devices which will save a good deal of money for the Senate and the House of Representatives, and at the same time will give us more information as to all problems with which Congress is concerned.

I signed the poll today, as did the Senator from South Dakota, because this is only the first step. Surely, next year, when the committee of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] makes its report, we will need to have many more electronic devices, computers, and so on, for the use of the Appropriations Committee, in order to have greater and additional information for the Senate and House of Representatives.

So I agree with the Senator from South Dakota that this matter should be taken care of at this time, and later we shall have further information about the use of these and other devices.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from South Dakota happily sits with the distinguished Senator from Montana on this Reorganization Committee and it was because of the testimony that we heard there that I was inspired to ask GSA about the use and availability of computer machines for people working in the Government, whether the legislative or executive branch, because I was surprised, as I am sure the Senator from Montana was surprised, to hear some of our colleagues in the House talk as if they had some of these computer machines in their own offices. This was a surprise to me. I have never seen them. I do not know how big or complicated they may be, or whether they have whirling wheels or flashing lights such as they have at Las Vegas, but apparently they have some that they are using, and I thought perhaps we could gain some information.

Mr. METCALF. With reference to the testimony about computers and the need for electronic computers, not only is there a need for this legislation before us now, but there is a need for other legislation so we can have computers and other machines in our committees to give us more information about appropriations.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure by the time we conclude our hearings and make our report we shall have information there upon which to make recommendations.

To sum up, I am happy to report that all the Republican Members have affixed their names to this procedure, proving that it is widely recognized that it is of importance. The White House is interested in it. I believe on the last day of Congress it cannot be said that by rubberstamping this legislation we will be establishing a dangerous precedent which will plague us in 1966.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Will the Senator say this was a bipartisan consensus?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I understood there were two bills before the committee, one that delegated almost unlimited power to GSA that virtually could not be controlled by the Congress, and that the committee did refine this bill so as to leave a measure of control here. I trust that is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct. The bill the distinguished minority leader referred to is the bill that was in the Congress at the last session. The bill we now have before us has been refined, restricted, and confined to meeting the problems we have discussed on the floor this evening.

I can assure the Senator it is my understanding this is simply an effort to try to give centralized control to prevent duplication, waste, and inefficiency that has occurred in the use of data processing equipment of which there has been a proliferation throughout the government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With that statement I am sure I am in agreement.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. While this subject is being discussed, I would like to refer to a related subject, that of communications within the Senate itself. I made the suggestion yesterday that we install in the office of the chief of pages a closed-circuit television system connected to our offices so when the bells ring we can see what it is for.

I have come to the conclusion that we do not need to have the vision part, but that if we just had what is commonly called "squawk boxes," when the bells ring we would be able to get in touch with the cloakroom and find out what the bells were for, rather than have Senators' offices tied up waiting to get in touch with the cloakroom.

This kind of system is used in the executive branch. There is no reason why we cannot put this kind of electronic communications system in the cloakroom and have it connected with an audio system so it will expedite matters.

Mr. MUNDT. Is the Senator proposing "squawk boxes" to be hooked up with the White House so those in the White House can communicate with the Senate or Congress?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. My reference was to an intercommunication system in this body.

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad it was confined to that. To the best of the knowledge of the Senator from South Dakota, communications between the White House and the Senate and Congress are pretty good—they are one way, but they are pretty good.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am interested only in getting a better communications system in this branch. I think it would expedite our business and prevent all the delays that are caused when we try to find out what the bells are all about.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that H.R. 4845 will in effect provide for efficient, businesslike, governmentwide, coordinated management of Federal automatic data processing equipment. I certainly support the move here tonight so that this measure may be enacted into law.

When similar legislation was passed by the House in 1963, there was some opposition to it. However, since that time, with the cooperation and assistance of the Bureau of the Budget I understand that H.R. 4845 has now been modified to meet the earlier objections.

This is a measure which the administration and the Bureau of the Budget strongly support. The Bureau is convinced that with the adoption of this measure, they will be able to do a much better job in the management of this costly equipment. GAO, as I understand, has recommended replacement of present automatic data processing management procedures for some 7 years.

I am advised that cost of the present management procedures now stands at some $3 billion annually. I am further advised that the Comptroller General has estimated that through the coordinated management program called for in H.R. 4845, possibly as much as $200 million annually can be saved.

I do indeed believe, Mr. President, that this legislation will prove most worthwhile, and I certainly support it. I am happy to note that this measure's passage is largely the result of much effort and hard work by the distinguished Congressman, JACK BROOKS, of Texas, chairman of the Government Activities Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 4845) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION

As in executive session,

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate, as in executive session, proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Philip H. Trezise, of Michigan, to be the representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip A. Trezise to be the representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and the President will be notified forthwith.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A STUDY ENTITLED "THE ANTI-VIETNAM AGITATION AND THE TEACH-IN MOVEMENT"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House on Senate Concurrent Resolution 65.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 65) to authorize the printing as a Senate document of 10,000 copies of a study entitled "The Anti-Vietnam Agitation and the Teach-in Movement," prepared for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which was, in line 7, strike out all after "printed" down through and including "Judiciary." in line 9, and insert "22,975 additional copies, of which 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 10,975 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and 2,000 copies shall be for the House Document Room."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

BENJAMIN A. RAMELB

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 149.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 149) for the relief of Benjamin A. Ramelb, which were, on page 1, line 5, strike out "legal" and insert "court-appointed"; on page 1, line 6, strike out "$68,240" and insert "$50,000"; on page 2, line 1, strike out "Act" and insert "section", and on page 2, after line 8, insert:

> SEC. 2. That, additionally, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Nicholas Ramelb, father of Benjamin A. Ramelb, the sum of $5,000 in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for expenses incurred in providing necessities for his son, Benjamin A. Ramelb, since the said Benjamin A. Ramelb attained his majority. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

KIM SUNG JIN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House on S. 1647.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1647) for the relief of Kim Sung Jin, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(2) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kim Sung Jin shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien son of Mr. and Mrs. Joe Sims, Junior, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on August 12, 1965, the Senate passed S. 1647, to deem the beneficiary to be an eligible orphan. On August 19, 1965, the House of Representatives passed S. 1647, with an amendment to grant the beneficiary second preference status as the natural-born alien son of U.S. citizens.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND STATISTICS FOR 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Democratic policy committee be permitted to print as a Senate document the yearend report of accomplishments and statistics for the 89th Congress, 1st session, together with a statement by me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO FILE REPORTS FOLLOWING THE ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be authorized to file reports with the Secretary of the Senate during the adjournment sine die of the 89th Congress, 1st session, and that they be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT OF THE LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Congress is about to conclude one of the most productive sessions in the history of this Republic. Historians may find it difficult to apply a one-word label to identify the Congress. It could be labeled the education Congress, because for the first time in history it was able to pass substantial Federal aid to cope with the grave educational situation which has become increasingly critical each year.

Or they may call it the civil rights Congress for its enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which at long last removed the century-old obstacles to the franchise promised to the Negroes in the 15th amendment to the Constitution.

Or the historians may consider it the medicare and health Congress for in this session action has been substituted for two decades of public debate and dialog on the way to solve the hospital and medical needs of our 19 million elderly citizens. That is not all that has been accomplished in the health field. This Congress has:

Enacted the Drug Abuse Control Act of 1965 designed to prevent both the misuse and the illicit traffic of potentially dangerous drugs, especially the sedatives and the stimulants, which are so important in the medicines used today;

Extended for 3 years the program of annual grants of $11 million for immunization against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and measles;

Extended the program of matching grants for health research facilities for 3 additional years and authorized $280 million for this period;

Authorized a total of $224.1 million through 1972 in staffing grants to community mental health centers;

Authorized a 3-year, $340-million program of grants to public and other nonprofit institutions and associations to assist them in planning, establishing, and operating regional medical complexes to combat heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases;

Established purity standards for interstate waters and authorized $150 million in new grants for each of the next 2 fiscal years to help States and localities control water pollution;

Established Federal regulation cigarette labeling and advertising; and

Authorized $404 million additional for fiscal years 1966–68 for the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in financing and administering State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in expanding and improving services and facilities provided under these programs, particularly for the mentally retarded.

Or it may be remembered as the Congress that found the way to remove more than $4 billion in excise taxes, a burden borne since the days of the Korean conflict and the Second World War.

Some will remember this Congress for immigration reform because it ended the discriminatory national origins quotas which has remained a constant irritant to so many millions of our citizens who had come to these shores to find the freedom and the economic opportunity denied them in the land of their birth.

Conservationists may acclaim this as the conservation Congress for it authorized a comprehensive long-range Federal-State program for the development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and land resources. And it also:

Authorized the Assateague, Spruce Knob, and Tocks Island national recreational areas;

Expanded the Federal program of research and development in the field of saline water conversion;

Reauthorized the Garrison reclamation project in the Missouri River Basin;

Provided an additional $944 million for 13 river basin plans;

Authorized the Federal construction of the $427.1 million Auburn-Folsom Central Valley project in California; and

Authorized a $2 billion, 143 project flood control and beach erosion program.

Or this session may be remembered as the one that enacted the $325,500,000 program of highway beautification and scenic development by the control of outdoor billboards and junkyards.

Whatever name ultimately is chosen to identify and describe this Congress, the appraisals of historians will not be limited to the accomplishments already mentioned.

They will tell how $1.1 billion in aid to Appalachia was voted by this session of Congress to an 11-State region in which proud American citizens have suffered because of a switch from a coal to a gas and oil economy. Since the midfifties the Governors of these States, representing both parties, had worked to develop a national plan for the rehabilitation of this area and the 89th Congress capped their efforts with this great trailblazing piece of legislation. They will tell how this session doubled the funds by authorizing $1.785 billion for fiscal 1966 for the antipoverty program to create new and expand existing opportunities for young people to obtain work, education, and training.

They will tell how the coffee agreement was implemented, thus providing economic underpinning for our relations with our neighbors to the South.

As the ghettos of today are replaced by the decent homes of tomorrow, historians may trace the beginning of a successful attack upon urban decay to the extraordinary and revolutionary rent subsidy program authorized by this session. And they will note that this was the session that took cognizance of the fact that more than 70 percent of all Americans live in cities and in recognizing this created a new Cabinet Department of Housing and Urban Development to cope with urban problems which our largely rural ancestors never imagined could exist.

Nor was it overlooked that this Nation requires an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable and stable prices. It was this session that enacted the omnibus farm bill designed to maintain farm income, stabilize prices, and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs, promote foreign trade, and afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas.

It was this session of Congress that extended the Sugar Act through December 31, 1971, established foreign quotas for 1966 and 1967, increased quotas for domestic producing areas, established quotas for foreign suppliers, and provided for temporary filling the quotas reserved for Cuba.

To alleviate this Nation's transportation difficulties, this session of Congress authorized the 3-year $90 million program of research and development for demonstrations in high-speed intercity ground transportation, improved the national transportation system by strengthening enforcement efforts against illegal trucking and by requiring motor carriers and freight forwarders to pay reparations for unreasonable or discriminatory rates. And this Congress, too, authorized construction of a 25-mile rail rapid transit for the Nation's Capital.

It was this session of Congress that approved and submitted to the States for ratification a proposed constitutional amendment to permit the Vice President to become Acting President if the President were unable to perform his duties and to provide for filling a vacancy in the office of the Vice-Presidency. And in this Congress, too, it was made a Federal crime to kill, kidnap, or assault the President, the President-elect, the Vice President, or, in case there is no Vice President, the officer next in the order of succession to the office of President.

It was this session that provided a 7-percent across-the-board increase in social security benefits; a 6- to 11-percent increase in Federal employees retirement benefits; a 3.6 percent across-the board pay increase for Federal employees; and a 10-percent increase in service-connected disability compensation.

Before appending the capsule of accomplishments, a few words must be said about how, in my judgment, they came about.

The Nation has had in the White House, during this extraordinary period, a President of great dedication with three decades of congressional experience behind him. President Johnson was given by the voters in November of 1964 an unprecedented mandate to tackle problems facing this Nation and huge majorities were elected in the 89th Congress to join in solving them.

Moreover, there has been the kind of cooperation from the minority which has reaffirmed the wisdom of the two-party system and demonstrated the meaning and significance of the loyal opposition. Posterity will recognize the outstanding contribution of the minority leadership and, notably, in extending voting rights to all citizens without discrimination.

In the field of foreign affairs, posterity will understand the role played by the Senate in support of and constructive advice to the President. The issues have been critical and difficult but their consideration in the Senate have been singularly free of partisanship.

It has been not only a productive but an interesting session. The following is the brief capsule by subject referred to above.

AGRICULTURE

Acreage reduction agreements: Makes it possible to pay farmers 1965 price-support payments or certificates for participating in the feed grain, wheat, and cotton programs where crop planting is prevented because of floods, drought, and other natural disasters. Public Law 89–112.

Farmers Home Administration—Insured loans: Provides for grants and increased loans for water facilities in rural agricultural areas; and expands the Farmers Home Administration insured loan authority from $200 million to $450 million. Public Law 89–240.

Federal Farm Loan Act amendments: Increases by $560 million the limit on amount of obligations Federal intermediate credit banks may have outstanding to aid producers and reduce need for new Government capital. Public Law 89–237.

Food and Agricultural Act of 1965: Provides a 4-year program for cotton, wheat, feed grains, rice and wool; to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices, and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, and to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas. H.R. 9811. Public Law 89- .

Food marketing: Extends for 1 year, to July 1, 1966, the date on which the National Commission on Food Marketing shall make its final report to the President. Public Law 89–20.

International Wheat Agreement—Implement: Makes effective U.S. participation in the extension of the International Wheat Agreement for 1 year to July 31, 1966. S. 2294 passed Senate July 23. House Calendar.

Sugar Act of 1965: Extends the Sugar Act through December 31, 1971; establishes foreign quotas for 1966 and 1967; increases quotas for domestic producing areas; establishes quotas for foreign suppliers; and provides for temporarily filling the quotas reserved for Cuba. H.R. 11135. Public Law 89- .

Tobacco acreage-poundage marketing quotas: Supplements acreage allotment program with establishment of poundage quotas for all farms producing Flue-cured tobacco to reduce surpluses in this commodity, improve quality and increase exports. Public Law 89–12.

Wheat referendum: Extend from August 1, 1965, until 30 days after the adjournment sine die of the 1st session of the 89th Congress the time within which the Secretary of Agriculture is required by law to conduct a marketing quota referendum with respect to the 1966 wheat crop. Public Law 89–82.

APPROPRIATIONS

Agricultural supplemental: Appropriates $1.6 billion for Commodity Credit Corporation; allowed the President final discretion in shipping surplus food to Egypt; and suspended until May 1 the planned closing of 11 VA hospitals, 4 domiciliaries, and the merger of 17 regional offices. Public Law 89–2.

Second supplemental, 1965: Appropriates a total of $2,227,563,977 with $349.7 million of the amount allocated for Appalachian aid. Public Law 89–16.

Vietnam supplemental: Appropriates $700 million for airfields, military installations, ammunition and aircraft. Public Law 89–18.

YEAR 1966

Agriculture and related agencies: Appropriates a total of $6,242,929,500 for fiscal 1966. H.R. 8370. Public Law 89- .

Defense: Appropriates a total of $46,887,163,000 for fiscal 1966. Public Law 89–213.

District of Columbia appropriations: Appropriates a total of $360,228,550 for fiscal 1966, with a Federal payment of $46,122,000. Public Law 89–75.

Foreign aid: Appropriates a total of $3,932,188,000 for foreign aid for fiscal 1966. Public Law 89–273.

Independent offices: Appropriates a total of $14,246,167,800 for fiscal 1966. Public Law 89–128.

Interior Department and related agencies: Appropriates a total of $1,212,739,070 for fiscal 1966. Public Law 89–52.

Labor-HEW: Appropriates a total of $8,011,311,500 for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. Public Law 89–156.

Labor-HEW supplemental: Appropriates a total of $1,223,181,500 for Manpower Development, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Vocational Rehabilitation, Public Health Service, Administration on Aging, and National Technical Institute for the Deaf. Public Law 89–199.

Legislative: Appropriates a total of $189,993,297 for fiscal 1966 for the legislative branch. Public Law 89–90.

Military construction: Appropriates a total of $1,756,635,000 for military construction of the Department of Defense. Public Law 89–202.

Public works: Appropriates a total of $4,292,866,500 for fiscal 1966. H.R. 9220. Public Law 89– .

State - Justice - Commerce - Judiciary: Appropriates a total of $2,057,597,150 for State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary and related agencies for fiscal 1966. Public Law 89–164.

Supplemental: Appropriated a total of $4,741,644,602 in supplemental funds for fiscal 1966, including funds for open space program, urban renewal, and the National Foundation on the Arts. H.R. 11588. Public Law 89– .

Treasury-Post Office: Appropriates a total of $7,669,444,000 for fiscal 1966 for Treasury and Post Office Departments. Public Law 89–57.

ATOMIC ENERGY

AEC amendments: Clarifies Atomic Energy Act to prevent interference with each other's rights by Federal, State, and local agencies in the nuclear power field. Public Law 89–135.

AEC authorization: Authorizes $2,555,521,000 for AEC appropriations for fiscal 1966 construction, operations, capital equipment; includes $704 million for weapons program and $2.5 million for merchant ship reactor program. Public Law 89–32.

Price-Anderson indemnity provisions: Extends for 10 years to August 1, 1977, the Government indemnity for firms which build and operate nuclear plants to generate electricity. Public Law 89–210.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Voting Rights Act of 1965: Guarantees Negroes their right to register and vote. Public Law 89–110.

CONGRESS

Arts and Antiquities Commission: Establishes a Commission on Arts and Antiquities of the Capitol and authorizes $15,000 for annual expenses. S.J. Res. 65 passed Senate May 24, 1965.

Joint Committee on the Budget: Establishes a 14-member Joint Committee on the Budget composed of 7 members from each Appropriations Committee, 4-to-3 ratio. The purpose of the joint committee is to serve the Appropriations Committees year round with the same expertise as the Bureau of the Budget for the Executive. S. 2 passed Senate January 27, 1965.

Joint Committee on Organization of Congress: Establishes a 12-member bipartisan Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to make a complete study of the organization and operation of Congress and to recommend improvement. Rules changes are not included in the study. Authorizes $150,000 through Jan. 31, 1966, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate. First report to be submitted 120 days following effective date of the resolution. S. Con. Res. 2 adopted by the Senate March 9; House, March 11, 1965.

DEFENSE

Active duty promotion opportunity: Permits the Air Force during fiscal 1966 to provide the following promotion opportunity for the officers newly placed in the promotion zones: To the grade of colonel, 45 percent; to the grade of lieutenant colonel, 75 percent; and to the grade of major, 85 percent. Public Law 89–157.

Air Force Reserve officers: Provides statutory authority for the promotion of qualified officers of the Air Force to the Reserve grade of brigadier general and major general. Public Law 89–172.

Armed Forces personnel—Payday: Permits military paydays as much as 3 days before the last day of a pay period when the last day of the pay period falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a legal holiday. Public Law 89–193.

Cash awards program for inventions—Military: Establishes a program of cash awards for suggestions, inventions, or scientific achievements by members of the Armed Forces which contribute to the efficiency, economy or other improvement of Government operations. Public Law 89–198.

Claims: Extends authority of Federal agencies to settle claims up to $10,000 for damage to or loss of personal property. Public Law 89–185.

Coast Guard Band: Permits the Coast Guard to select as the conductor of its band an officer and to accord statutory recognition to the Coast Guard Band. Public Law 89–189.

Coast Guard cutters: Authorizes $6,260,000 to replace 17 Coast Guard cutters taken from domestic service and sent to Vietnam. Public Law 89–21.

Coast Guard procurement: Authorizes $114.2 million for U.S. Coast Guard for fiscal 1966 for procurement of vessels, aircraft, and construction of shore and offshore installations. Public Law 89–13.

Coast Guard Reserve retirement: Permits Coast Guard reservists who have completed 20 years' service to voluntarily retire from active service with retired pay computed on the basis of 2½ percent of basic pay for each year of service. Public Law 89–200.

Combat servicemen insurance: Provides an automatic insurance plan of $10,000 or $5,000 for all members of the uniformed services on active duty on and after the effective date designated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Public Law 89–214.

Draft cards: Makes a person who knowingly destroys or knowingly mutilates a draft registration card subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both. Public Law 89–152.

Mailing privileges: Provides free airmail service for first-class letter mail, including cards, for members of the Armed Forces in an overseas combat area as designated by the President, or hospitalized as a result of such service. H.R. 11420. Public Law 89– .

Military dependents—Language training: Authorizes language training for dependents of members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in anticipation of assignment to permanent duty outside the United States. Public Law 89–160.

Military dependents—Medical care: Authorizes transportation at Government expense for dependents of members of the uniformed services who are accompanying members at posts of duty outside the United States where required medical care is not available locally. Public Law 89–140.

Military incentive pay: Authorizes incentive pay for personnel who perform hazardous duty on the flight decks of aircraft carriers. Public Law 89–149.

Military construction: Provides construction and other related authority for the military departments, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, within and outside the United States and authority for construction of facilities for the Reserve components in the total amount of $1,780,062,000 consisting of $1,739,749,000 in new authority, an increase in prior years' authorization of $9,823,000; and $30,490,000 for Reserve components. Public Law 89–188.

Military pay increase: Provides an average 10.4 percent basic pay increase for officers and enlisted members of the uniformed services; total $1 billion. Public Law 89–132.

Military procurement: Authorizes a total of $15,402,800,000 for fiscal 1966 with $8,958,300,000 allocated for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels and $6,444,500,000 for research, development, test, and evaluation. Public Law 89–37.

Military transportation: Broadens the authority for the sea transportation at Government expense of automobiles owned by military personnel to provide relief to members of the Armed Forces ordered to Vietnam from permanent duty stations outside the United States. Public Law 89–101.

Naval Reserve captains: Provides permanent authority under which Naval Reserve officers in the grade of captain shall be eligible for consideration for promotion when their running mates are eligible for consideration for promotion. Public Law 89–275.

ROTC: Extends the statute of limitations for filing claims for mustering-out payments to January 30, 1966, and repeals the authority for such payments on July 1, 1966. Public Law 89–50.

Special allowance to Armed Forces dependents: Authorizes payment of special allowances and dislocation allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services when the dependents are evacuated from an overseas danger area. Public Law 89–26.

Stockpile Act: Revises and consolidates laws governing management of national stockpiles of critical and strategic materials to provide Congress and the public with pertinent information; made procurement contracts subject to the Renegotiation Act and facilitated disposal of surpluses. S. 28 passed Senate February 9, 1965.

Submarine incentive pay: Clarifies the entitlement to incentive pay for submarine duty by providing for such pay if over a 3-month period an operational commander has served 144 hours on a submarine during underway operations. Public Law 89-278.

Surgeons general: Provides for the rank of lieutenant general or vice admiral of officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force while serving as Surgeon General. Public Law 89-288.

Zinc, lead, and copper: Authorizes the disposal of 200,000 tons each of zinc and lead and the sale of 100,000 short tons of copper to producers and processors. Public Law 89-9.

Zinc stockpile: Grants congressional consent for the disposal of approximately 200,000 short tons of zinc now held in the national stockpile, or the supplemental stockpile, or both. H.R. 9047. Public Law 89- .

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Assault: Extends the penalty for assault on District of Columbia police to employees of institutions for confinement of juveniles. Public Law 89-277.

Bethune Memorial: Extends for 2 years the existing authority for the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune, prominent Negro educator. Public Law 89-192.

Board of Parole: Authorizes the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia, subject to the approval of the Board of Commissioners, to promulgate rules and regulations under which the Board of Parole, in its discretion, may discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced. Public Law 89-24.

Bond requirements: Authorizes the court to set bond in an amount twice the value of the property being attached in the District of Columbia in any case in which the plaintiff states in his affidavit that the value of the property to be levied upon is less than the amount of his claim. Public Law 89-113.

Court functions: Transfers the following functions from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia court of general sessions, the Commissioners of the District and to the Recorder of Deeds. S. 1611 passed Senate August 25, 1965.

Crime bill: Amends the District of Columbia Criminal Code by revising rules of evidence, procedure, and increases minimum penalties for various offenses. H.R. 5688 in conference.

Deeds of trust: Provides for substitution of trustees under deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties. H.R. 647 passed Senate amended, September 2, 1965.

District of Columbia Code: Revises, codifies, and enacts into law part III of the District of Columbia Code. Public Law 89-183.

District of Columbia rapid transit: Authorizes construction of a 25-mile rail rapid transit for the National Capital area, to be operated through contracts with private concerns, at an estimated total cost of $431 million excluding an estimated $52 million in interest. The bill authorizes $150 million in grants for construction and equipment—$100 million from Federal funds and $50 million from District of Columbia funds. Public Law 89-173.

Divorce laws: Reduces residence requirement for divorce in the District of Columbia and makes other changes in its code relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment to bring them into line with neighboring jurisdictions. Public Law 89-217.

"Good Samaritan" relief: Relieves physicians and registered nurses of liability, if gross negligence is not involved, where they have rendered free and voluntary medical treatment at the scene of an accident or emergency. H.R. 5597. Public Law 89- .

Home rule: Provides for an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia. S. 1118 passed House, amended, September 29, 1965.

Injury reports: Requires mandatory reporting by physicians, hospitals or similar institutions of injuries in the District of Columbia caused by firearms or other dangerous weapons. H.R. 9985 passed Senate, amended, September 30, 1965.

Overtime for District of Columbia Police: Authorizes compensation for overtime work in excess of the basic authorized workweek performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the U.S. Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia. Public Law 89-282.

Physical injury reports: Requires mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of physical injury inflicted upon children by other than accidental means. H.R. 10304 passed Senate, amended, September 30, 1965.

Premarital examinations: Requires premarital examinations in the District of Columbia within 30 days prior to filing for the marriage license. H.R. 3314 passed Senate, amended, September 30, 1965.

Public day care services: Authorizes the District of Columbia Commissioners to establish and administer a plan to provide for the care and protection of children through public day care services and to provide public assistance in the form of foster home care to certain dependent children. S. 2212 passed Senate June 30, 1965.

Traffic Branch—District of Columbia Court of General Sessions: Authorizes expansion of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions from 15 to 20 associate judges and establishes a Traffic Branch in this court. S. 2263 passed Senate August 24, 1965.

Work-release program: Authorizes the District of Columbia courts to release selected offenders from prison confinement at specified hours of the day to obtain or engage in gainful employment. S. 1319 passed Senate May 11, 1965.

ECONOMY AND FINANCE

Aid to Appalachia: Authorizes $1.1 billion in aid to the 11-State Appalachian region and establishes the Appalachia Regional Commission; $840 million of this amount will be in form of Federal grants for a 5-year highway construction program and a 2-year authorization of $252.4 million for a variety of economic development projects. Public Law 89-4.

Balance of payments: Provides for exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance-of-payments position of the United States. Public Law 89-175.

Bank Merger Act Amendments, 1965: Amends the Bank Merger Act to require that future bank mergers should not be consummated until 30 days after the date of approval by the appropriate banking agency. S. 1698 passed Senate June 11, 1965. House Calendar.

Copyright office fees: Increases the fees payable to the copyright office to bring the cash receipts of the office more nearly in line with its expenditures. H.R. 2853. Public Law 89- .

Debt ceiling increase: Increases the temporary national debt ceiling to $328 billion through June 30, 1966. Public Law 89-49.

Destruction of currency: Authorizes the destruction of Federal Reserve notes which are unfit for circulation under procedures prescribed and at locations designated by the Secretary of Treasury. S. 1308 passed Senate August 3, 1965.

Disaster victims: Directs the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make an immediate study of alternative programs which could be established to help provide financial assistance to those suffering property losses in floods, earthquakes, and other natural disasters, including alternative methods of Federal insurance as well as the existing flood insurance program. S. 408 passed Senate January 28. House Calendar.

Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965: Extends all economic opportunity programs to June 30, 1968, and authorizes appropriations totaling $1,785 billion for fiscal 1966. Public Law 89-253.

Federal Reserve Board delegations: Authorizes the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to delegate any of its functions, other than those relating to rulemaking or pertaining principally to monetary and credit policies, to one or more hearing examiners, members or employees of the Board of Federal Reserve Banks. S. 1556 passed Senate August 3, 1965.

Foreign government obligations: Authorizes the Federal Reserve banks to invest in securities which are direct obligations of or fully guaranteed as to principal and interest by any foreign government or monetary authority and which have maturities from date of purchase not exceeding 12 months and are denominated payable in any convertible currency. S. 1557 passed Senate August 3, 1965.

Foreign official time deposits: Extends through October 15, 1968, the authority for commercial banks to pay on certain foreign time deposits higher rates of interest than those otherwise permitted by regulations issued by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Public Law 89-79.

Gold cover: Repeals the requirement of 25-percent gold backing of commercial bank deposits held by the Federal Reserve banks but retained the 25-percent requirement against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation. Public Law 89-3.

Lead-zinc program: Extends to December 31, 1969, the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of 1961, which provides a program of payments for assistance to small domestic producers of lead and zinc. Public Law 89-238.

Major disaster relief: Gives additional authority to REA, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Veterans' Administration to provide relief to individuals, groups, or businesses having direct loans with these agencies and having suffered losses to these mortgaged properties in a major natural disaster. Relief is in the form of refinancing, adjustment, or readjustment of principal and interest payment schedules and the extension of maturity dates where an impairment of the economic feasibility of the loan, or an extreme financial hardship would result without such relief. S. 1861 passed Senate July 22, 1965.

Manpower Act of 1965: Extends the Manpower Development and Training Act to June 30, 1969, authorized $454 million for fiscal 1966 and provides up to 2 years' training in classrooms or on-the-job for persons unemployed because they lack education or skills. Public Law 89-15.

Member bank loans: Amends the Federal Reserve Act to increase the limitation on loans by member banks to their executive officers. S. 1558 passed Senate August 3, 1965.

Pacific Northwest disaster relief: Provides assistance to the States of Oregon, Washington, California, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged in December 1964 and January and February 1965 as a result of catastrophic floods unprecedented in terms of high water and subsequent damage to roads, farms, residences, and industries. Public Law 89-41.

Patent Office fees: Increases fees payable to the Patent Office in connection with patents and registration of trademarks. Public Law 89-83.

Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965: Authorizes a total of $665 million in grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions. Public Law 89-136.

SBA disaster relief: Amends the Small Business Act to provide for an increase in the maturity of Small Business Administration disaster loans from 20 to 30 years; provides for a suspension of up to 5 years on the payment of principal and interest on disaster loans at the discretion of the Administrator; and increases SBA's revolving fund by $50 million. Public Law 89-59.

SBA revolving fund increase: Increases the authorization for appropriations to the Small Business Administration revolving fund by $120 million, from $1,721 to $1,841 million. S. 2542. Public Law 89- .

SEC registration fees. Doubles the registration fees collected under the Securities Act of 1933, by increasing the fee paid in connection with filing registration statements for security offerings from one-hundredth of 1 percent to one-fiftieth of 1 percent of the maximum aggregate price of the securities to be offered, and the minimum fee from $25 to $100. Public Law 89-289.

Silver coinage: Eliminates silver from quarters and dimes and cuts the proportion in half dollars from 90 to 40 percent. Public Law 89-81.

Small Business Act Amendments: Increases by $120 million the portion of the Small Business Administration's revolving fund which may be on loan to small business investment corporations and State and local development companies pursuant to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. Public Law 89-78.

Sports: Brings baseball, football, and other professional team sports under provisions of the antitrust laws, subject to certain exemptions. S. 950 passed Senate August 31, 1965.

State Technical Services Act of 1965: Authorizes a 3-year, $60 million program of matching grants to the States in a cooperative effort to promote wider diffusion and more effective application of the findings of science and technology throughout American commerce and industry. Public Law 89-182.

EDUCATION

Captioned films for the deaf: Expands the original act passed in the 85th Congress providing a loan service of captioned films for the deaf by permitting the use of all educational media, rather than films alone, and for the distribution of such media to parents of deaf children and other persons directly involved in work for the advancement of the deaf or who are actual or potential employers of the deaf. Public Law 89-258.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act: Authorizes $1.344 billion in Federal aid for elementary-secondary schools for fiscal 1966; a 3-year program of Federal grants to States for allocation to school districts with large numbers of children from low-income families; a 5-year program of grants for books and library materials; a 5-year program of grants for supplementary educational centers and services; a 5-year $100 million authorization for construction and operation of regional facilities for educational research; a 5-year program for grants to stimulate and assist States in strengthening the leadership resources of the State educational agencies; and a 2-year extension (through June 30, 1968), of Federal aid to impacted areas. Public Law 89-10.

Higher education: Authorizes a 3-year, $2.3 billion higher education program to provide Federal scholarships for needy students, funds to strengthen colleges, and to establish a 2-year National Teacher Corps whose members would serve in poverty-stricken areas to improve educational opportunities for disadvantaged youngsters. H.R. 9567. Public Law 89- .

Institute for Deaf: Establishes a National Technical Institute for the Deaf for the purpose of providing a residential facility for postsecondary technical training and education for persons who are deaf in order to prepare them for successful employment. Public Law 89-36.

Juvenile delinquency program extension: Extends the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 for an additional year to June 30, 1967, and authorizes $6.5 million for fiscal 1966 and $10 million for fiscal 1967. Public Law 89-69.

National arts and cultural development: Authorizes funds for national arts and cultural development. Public Law 89-125.

National Museum Act of 1965: Provides for cooperative and coordinated programs of museum training, research, surveys and publications, to be carried out by the Director of the National Museum under the direction of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. S. 1310 passed Senate September 10, 1965.

School construction: Amends Aid-for-School Construction Act to authorize help for building facilities in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, and Virgin Islands for children for whom local agencies cannot provide. Public Law 89-77.

School districts—Aid requisites: Provides financial assistance for construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster and closing of military bases. H.R. 9022. Public Law 89-313.

Vocational student loans: Provides insured, low-interest loans to students who attend vocational and trade schools above the secondary school level. Public Law 89-287.

Vocational rehabilitation: Authorized $404 million additional for fiscal years 1966-68 for the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in financing and administering State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in expanding and improving services and facilities provided under these programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems. H.R. 8310. Public Law 89- .

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Annuity increase: Clarifies the application of annuity increase in the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962. Public Law 89-17.

Civil service retirement annuity increases: Amends the Civil Retirement Act to provide an increase of 11 percent in all annuities having a commencing date prior to October 1, 1956, and a 6-percent increase for all having a commencing date after October 1, 1956. Public Law 89-205.

Conflict of interest—FCC: Removes the ban that members and employees of the Federal Communications Commission may not have any interest in companies making incidental use of radios. It continues prohibition against investing in broadcasting companies and other communications common carriers that would give rise to a conflict of interest. S. 1948 passed Senate August 3, 1965.

FAA Administrator: Authorizes the appointment of Gen. William F. McKee, U.S. Air Force, retired, as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and authorizes General McKee to retain the rank, grade and emoluments of his retired military status while holding the office of Administrator. Public Law 89-46.

Female clerkship appointments: Repeals an obsolete statute relating to the appointment of women to clerkships in the executive departments, which will strengthen Federal policy against discrimination in employment on the basis of sex. Public Law 89-261.

Former Lighthouse Service retired pay: Provides an increase of 6.5 percent in annuities for members of the former Lighthouse Service to place them on an equal status with recipients of civil service annuities. Public Law 89-201.

Government employment of aliens: Authorizes Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity. S. 905 passed Senate April 21, 1965.

Maritime Commission: Provides the Commissioner of the Federal Maritime Commission shall be appointed for a 5-year term. Public Law 89-56.

Pay comparability: Authorized a 3.6-percent across-the-board pay increase for classified, postal, legislative, judicial, and Foreign Service personnel. H.R. 10281. In conference.

Political Activity Commission: Creates a 12-member bipartisan commission to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of the Government. S. 1474 passed Senate August 25, 1965.

Postal field service: Eliminates statutory limitation on the number of permanent employees in the postal field service. Public Law 89-114.

Postmasters' workweek: Establishes a 5-day workweek for postmasters in offices of the first, second, and third class. Public Law 89-116.

Supergrades: Authorizes an additional 100 supergrades for new agencies and expanded functions. S. 2393 passed Senate September 1, 1965.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

American Academy of Actuaries: Confers a Federal charter on the American Academy of Actuaries, a profession largely responsible for the technical methods and framework leading to the economic protection against the hazards of death, disability, retirement, and property loss. S. 1154 passed Senate August 18, 1965.

Baseball: Designates the first week of September as National American Legion Baseball Week. Public Law 89-133.

Copyright protection extension: Continues to December 31, 1967, the renewal term of any copyright subsisting on the date of approval of this measure, including any renewal term extended by Public Law 87-668, where such term would otherwise expire prior to December 31, 1967. Public Law 89-142.

Construction in Guam and Virgin Islands: Improves facilities for enforcement officers of the Customs and Immigration and Naturalization Service on Guam and the Virgin Islands. Public Law 89-87.

Dr. Jonas Salk: Designates April 12, 1965, to honor Dr. Jonas Salk and the National Foundation March of Dimes on the 10th anniversary of the announcement of the world's first effective vaccine against polio. Senate Concurrent Resolution 30 adopted April 7; House adopted April 8, 1965.

Father Flanagan's Boys' Home: Authorizes the erection of a memorial to Father Edward J. Flanagan, founder of Father Flanagan's Boys' Town in Nebraska. House Joint Resolution 641. Public Law 89- .

Father Jacques Marquette: Establishes a tercentenary commission to commemorate the advent and history of Father Jacques Marquette in North America. Public Law 89-187.

Federal administrative agencies: Removes agency established bars for attorneys who appear before certain Federal administrative agencies. S. 1758. Public Law 89- .

FPC jurisdiction: Amends the Federal Power Act by adding any cooperative or nonprofit membership organization which is financed by the Rural Electrification Administration to the list of organizations expressly exempted from the regulatory jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. S. 1459 passed Senate August 26, 1965.

Guam Organic Act Amendments: Vests in the Guamanian Government the power to fix the salaries and allowances of members of its legislature and to provide for such payment from local revenues rather than Federal appropriations. Public Law 89-100.

Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965: Strengthens the intergovernmental relations by improving cooperation and the coordination of federally aided activities among the Federal, State, and local levels of government. S. 561 passed Senate August 5, 1965.

John F. Kennedy—USIA film: Authorizes USIA to transfer to the trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts six master copies of the film prepared by the United States Information Agency entitled "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," with a full reimbursement to the U.S. Treasury for the cost of the film. Public Law 89-274.

Movable Property Act: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to transfer title to movable property to municipalities which assume operation and maintenance responsibilities for project works serving municipal and industrial functions under the same conditions and on the same terms as title transfer to irrigation districts or water users' organizations which assume operation and maintenance responsibilities for project works serving irrigation functions. Public Law 89-48.

Postal rates for volunteer fire companies: Includes volunteer fire companies within the group of qualified nonprofit organizations entitled to use preferential second- and third-class postage rates for bulk mailings. S. 390 passed Senate March 29, 1965.

Safety Day: Authorizes the President to issue a proclamation designating November 26, 1965, as Crusade for Safety Day, and calling upon the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities designed to reduce traffic accidents. H. Con. Res. 448. Passed House August 12; passed Senate October 21, 1965.

"See the U.S.": Requests the President to extend through 1966 the period designated as a period to see the United States and its territories. Public Law 89-235.

South Pacific Commission: Authorizes the appropriation of up to $200,000 a year for payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the expenses of the South Pacific Commission and its auxiliary and subsidiary bodies. Public Law 89-91.

Textile Fiber Products Identification Act: Permits listing on labels certain fibers constituting less than 5 percent of a textile fiber product. Public Law 89-35.

United States-Puerto Rico Commission: Extend the date for final reporting of the Commission to September 30, 1966, and increases the authorization to $465,000. Public Law 89-84.

Virgin Islands Organic Act Amendments: Vests in the government of the Virgin Islands the power to fix salaries and allowances of members of its legislature and to provide for such payment from local revenues rather than Federal appropriations. Public Law 89-98.

Water Conservation Month: Authorizes the President to issue a proclamation designating the month of November 1965 as water conservation month, which will call attention to the public the importance of water conservation to the maintenance of public health and the national economy. H.J. Res. 671. Public Law 89- .

Wool Labeling Act: Authorizes FTC to exclude any headwear from the labeling requirement of the Wool Products Labeling Act if labeling is not necessary for the protection of the consumer. S. 836 passed Senate May 11, 1965.

HEALTH

Cigarette labeling: Requires that every package and carton of cigarettes display on the front or back panel in conspicuous and legible type the following: "Caution: Cigarette Smoking May Be Hazardous to Your Health." Prohibits any other warning requirement on the package or carton by any Federal, State, or local authority. Public Law 89-92.

Clean air: Requires standards and proposed regulations to control pollution from gasoline and diesel-powered vehicles. Establishes a Federal air pollution control laboratory. Authorizes grants for research to improve methods for disposal of solid waste. Public Law 89-272.

Community health services extension: Extends for 3 fiscal years, 1966-68, authority for grants to States and communities for mass immunization programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and adds measles. Extends for 1 year general and special health services, including those for migratory workers, chronically ill and aged, and grants for research to improve such services. Public Law 89–109.

Drug control: Provides for regulation and control of manufacturers of depressant and stimulant drugs. Public Law 89–74.

Gorgas Memorial Laboratory: Increases from $250,000 up to $500,000 the authorization of appropriations for the support of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory. Public Law 89–181.

Health professions educational assistance: Amends the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants to schools for scholarships to needy students, and extends the student loan and construction programs. Public Law 89–290.

Health Research Facilities Act: Extends this act to June 30, 1969, and authorizes an additional $280 million in matching grants for construction. Public Law 89–115.

Health science library aid: Authorizes a 5-year, $105 million program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services, facilities, training, and research. Public Law 89–291.

Hospital insurance program—social security amendments: Provides insurance for hospital and other medical expenses of persons 65 or older, increases social security benefits by 7 percent across the board with a $4 minimum increase for a worker who retired at age 65 or older, expands the Kerr-Mills program for medical assistance for the needy and medically needy aged, blind, disabled, and families with dependent children. Public Law 89–97.

Mental health centers: Authorize $224.1 million through fiscal 1972 for grants to aid in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers; $205.5 million for training teachers of handicapped and retarded children; and $80 million for research, demonstration projects, and construction of facilities through fiscal 1971. Public Law 89–105.

Regional medical complex: Authorizes $340 million through fiscal 1968 to assist in establishing and operating regionally coordinated medical complexes for heart disease, cancer, and stroke and other major diseases. Public Law 89–239.

Water Quality Act: Vests authority to establish purity standards for interstate water in States which fail to establish approved standards by June of 1967, and increases the authorizations for sewage treatment grants which include an increase to $150 million a year for the next 2 years in the total authorization and an increase to $1,200,000 in individual projects and $4,800,000 for multicommunity projects. Public Law 89–234.

Water pollution control: Federal installations: Provides for improved cooperation by Federal agencies to control water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities and to control automotive vehicle air pollution. S. 560 passed Senate March 25, 1965.

HOUSING

Distressed homeowners: Authorizes the Veterans' Administration to extend aid to distressed homeowners who, after relying on VA or FHA construction standards and inspection, find structural or other major defects in their properties purchased with GI mortgage loans which affect the livability of the property. S. 507 passed Senate January 27, 1965.

Housing Act of 1965: Authorizes a 4-year $7.8 billion housing program extending existing programs and provides for a new supplementary rent program for low-income families limited to $150 million in total new contract authority for fiscal years 1966–69. Public Law 89–117.

IMMIGRATION

Immigration reform: Abolishes national origins quota system in immigration effective July 1, 1968. Provides for admission of immediate relatives of American citizens. Fixes annual limit of 170,000 from all former quota countries, and 120,000 from Western Hemisphere, giving preference to persons with skills and professional abilities. Public Law 89–236.

INDIANS

Colville Indians: Provides for the termination of Federal supervision over the members and property of the Confederated Tribes of Colville Indians located in the State of Washington. S. 1413 passed Senate July 22, 1965.

Indian adult education: Increases by $3 million (to $15 million) the authorization for Indian adult vocational education. Public Law 89–14.

Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band: Provides for the distribution of $2,500,000 in judgment funds recovered by the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians. Public Law 89–224.

Pueblo Indian irrigation charges: Extends to 1975 the authority initially granted the Secretary of the Interior by the act of August 27, 1935, to enter into contracts with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, New Mexico, for payment of the operation and maintenance charges involved in the irrigation of some 11,000 acres of Pueblo Indian lands within the district. Public Law 89–94.

Quinaielt Tribe of Indians: Provides for the disposition of $205,172 awarded by the Indian Claims Commission to the Quinaielt Tribe of Indians in settlement of their claim. Public Law 89–28.

INTERNATIONAL

Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania claims: Permits return of indirect interests in certain enemy corporations vested under title II of the International Claims Settlement Act, or under the Trading With the Enemy Act, to persecutees normally barred from return by reason of being nationals of Bulgaria, Hungary, or Rumania, where countries were enemies of the United States during World War II. S. 2064 passed Senate September 7, 1965.

Canadian auto parts: Implements the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products between the United States and Canada, signed on January 16, 1965, by President Johnson and Canadian Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson, calling for removal of tariff duties on autos and parts for new vehicles. Public Law 89–283.

Coffee implementation: Implements the International Coffee Agreement ratified in 1963 and authorizes the President to require all coffee entering U.S. markets and all exports of coffee to be accompanied by a certificate of origin or a certificate of reexport. Limits imports of coffee from countries which have not joined in the agreement; and requires certain recordkeeping. Public Law 89–23.

Cuban claims: Amends the International Claims Settlement Act by striking the portion which provides for determination of claims against the Government of Cuba for merchandise and services furnished by nationals of the United States without regard to the date on which the merchandise was furnished or services were rendered. Public Law 89–262.

Disarmament Act amendments: Authorizes $30 million for fiscal years 1966–68 for the Disarmament Agency. Public Law 89–27.

Export Control Act extension: Extends for an additional 4 years to June 30, 1969, the Export Control Act of 1949, which authorizes the President to prohibit or to curtail exporting from the United States, its territories or possessions, to Communist nations any articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data. Public Law 89–63.

Foreign Agents Registration Act Amendments: Strengthens the basic purpose of the original act by requiring complete public disclosure by persons acting for or in the interests of foreign principals where their activities are political in nature or border on the political. Such public disclosures will permit the Government and the people of the United States to be informed as to the identities and activities of such persons. S. 693 passed Senate April 5, 1965.

Foreign aid authorization: Authorizes $3.36 billion for fiscal 1966 which includes $1.7 billion for military aid and $2.19 billion for economic and other nonmilitary programs. Public Law 89–171.

Foreign Service Annuity Adjustment Act: Provides for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system to correct an injustice arising from a wide discrepancy in benefits relating to widow survivor annuities received by annuitants who retired before October 16, 1960, and those who retired subsequently. H.R. 4170. Public Law 89– .

Greek loan: Provides for settlement of pre-World War II debt of Greece to the United States by annual payments to be used in educational and cultural exchange programs. S. 1760 passed Senate June 25. House Calendar.

HemisFair: Authorizes $125,000 to finance planning of a U.S. exhibit at the 1968 fair of Western Hemisphere nations to be held in San Antonio, Tex. Public Law 89-284.

IBRD-IFC Articles of Agreement: Authorizes the U.S. Governor (Secretary of the Treasury) of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to agree to an amendment to permit loans to the International Finance Corporation. Public Law 89-126.

IMF: Authorizes an increase of $1,035 million in U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund, from $4.125 to $5.16 billion. Public Law 89-31.

Inter-American Development Bank: Authorizes a $150 million increase in the U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank—over a 3-year period at the rate of $250 million a year. This represents the U.S. share of a planned $900 million increase in the Fund which will serve to strengthen multinational aid and the Alliance for Progress. Public Law 89-6.

International Claims Settlement Act Amendments: Provides for the determination of claims of American nationals which are covered by the United States-Polish Claims Agreement and for the disposition of funds received under the terms of en bloc claims settlement agreements concluded with the Governments of Bulgaria, Rumania, and Yugoslavia and the reopening of the Italian claims program in order to pay claims not previously compensable. S. 1935 passed Senate September 7, 1965.

International Committee of the Red Cross: Authorizes an annual appropriation of not to exceed $50,000 a year as a contribution toward the expenses incurred by the International Committee of the Red Cross. Public Law 89-230.

International Cooperation Year: Expresses the sense of Congress with respect to the 20th anniversary of the United Nations during International Cooperation Year. Senate Concurrent Resolution 36. Senate adopted June 16; House adopted June 22, 1965.

International Council of Scientific Unions: Raises the ceiling on U.S. contributions to the International Council of Scientific Unions and its associated unions from $65,000 to $100,000 a year. Public Law 89-104.

Peace Corps authorization: Authorizes an annual appropriation of $115 million for fiscal 1966 and provides two additional associate directors. Public Law 89-134.

Religious persecution: Expresses the sense of Congress against persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of religion. S. Con. Res. 17 adopted by Senate May 14; passed House amended July 12, 1965.

Saigon chancery: Authorizes $1 million for the construction of a chancery in Saigon. Public Law 89-22.

U.N. Participation Act: Grants the President wider discretion in appointing top-level personnel of the U.S. mission to the United Nations and gives the U.S. representative discretion to assign personnel to various organs of the U.N. in accordance with workload and other considerations; and authorizes the President to appoint a representative to the U.S. mission to the European office of the U.N. Public Law 89-206.

TREATIES

Belgium tax protocol: Modifies the 1948 convention to adjust the provisions to the new Belgian income tax law of November 20, 1962. Executive G ratified October 22, 1965.

German tax protocol: Modifies the 1954 convention to adjust the provisions to changes in the tax system of the Federal Republic of Germany. Executive I ratified October 22, 1965.

Gut Dam Claims Agreement: Establishes an International Arbitral Tribunal to dispose of U.S. claims relating to Gut Dam. Executive C ratified August 30, 1965.

United Nations Charter amendments: Increases the membership of the Security Council from 11 to 15 and the membership of the Economic and Social Council from 18 to 27, to be elected on a geographic basis. Executive A ratified June 3, 1965.

Vienna Convention: Establishes standards on diplomatic relations together with the optional protocol concerning the compulsory settlement of disputes. Executive H ratified September 14, 1965.

Wheat agreement extension: Extends the International Wheat Agreement to July 31, 1966. Executive B ratified June 15, 1965.

JUDICIAL

Additional circuit and district judges: Creates 10 additional circuit and 34 district judgeships throughout the United States where the need for such judgeships has been found to be most urgent. S. 1666 passed Senate June 30.

Alaska judges: Provides that service as a judge of the district court for the territory of Alaska shall be included in computing the aggregate years of judicial service of a U.S. district judge for the district of Alaska for retirement purposes. Public Law 89-70.

Assassination evidence: Authorizes preservation of evidence pertaining to the assassination of the late President Kennedy. H.R. 9545. Public Law 89- .

Bail reform: Revises bail procedures in Federal courts and in the courts of the District of Columbia. S. 1357 passed Senate September 21.

Canal Zone prisoners: Permits the transfer of persons convicted of offenses in the Canal Zone to the custody of the Attorney General for transfer to prisons within the United States. Public Law 89-267.

Correctional rehabilitation study: Authorizes $2.1 million for a 3-year nationwide study of the shortage of qualified manpower and the educational and training needs in the field of correctional rehabilitation. Public Law 89-178.

Court of Claims: Authorizes the President to appoint two additional judges for the U.S. Court of Claims, subject to Senate confirmation. S. 1804 passed Senate September 17, 1965.

False information: Reduces the existing penalty against pranksters and jokesters who falsely report the presence of bombs and the like, aboard aircraft, motor vehicles, railroads or vessels, but do so without malice or evil purpose, by substituting a civil penalty of not more than $1,000 to be recovered in a civil action brought in the name of the United States. Public Law 89-64.

Firearms: Amends the Federal Firearms Act to authorize the Secretary of Treasury to relieve applicants from certain provisions of the act if he determines the relief would not be contrary to public interest. Public Law 89-194.

Illicit traffic in child adoption: Imposes Federal criminal sanctions on persons engaged in interstate or foreign commerce in the illicit traffic of placing children for adoption or permanent free care. S. 624 passed Senate March 22, 1965.

Jury allowances: Increases attendance fees for grand and petit jurors from $7 to $10 a day and, where jurors are required to serve in one case for more than 30 days, to increase the allowable attendance fee from $10 to $14 a day. Increases the subsistence allowance from $7 to $10 a day. Public Law 89-165.

Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965: Authorizes the Attorney General to make grants to, or to contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies for training State and local law enforcement and correctional personnel and personnel employed in crime prevention programs. Public Law 89-197.

President's Crime Commission: Authorizes $1,500,000 for the expenses of the two Presidential Commissions on: Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, and the District of Columbia Commission on Crime and Law Enforcement, both established in July of 1965 by Executive order for crime studies and recommendations to reduce and prevent it. Public Law 89-196.

Prisoner work release: Facilitates the rehabilitation of persons convicted of offenses against the United States by authorizing the use of residential community treatment centers, emergency furloughs, and community employment or training. Public Law 89-176.

Recording of procedures: Provides for recording procedures in U.S. district courts by means of electronic equipment as well as by shorthand or mechanical means. Public Law 89-163.

Secret Service arrest authority: Authorizes members of the U.S. Secret Service to make arrests without warrants for any offense against the United States committed in their presence or for any felony cognizable under the laws of the United States if they have reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing a felony. Public Law 89-218.

Travel in aid of arson: Penalizes interstate travel and transportation in aid of arson, in the same manner as the existing antiracketeering law penalizes interstate travel and transportation in aid of other racketeering enterprises. Public Law 89-68.

Tucker Act Amendments: Increases from $10,000 to $50,000 the jurisdictional limitation of the Federal district courts, concurrent with the Court of Claims, in certain enumerated civil actions against the United States, including suits founded on any express or implied contract and claims for recovery of fees, salary or compensation. S. 1587 passed Senate August 18, 1965.

Witness fees: Authorizes payment of witness fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings on motion attacking the sentence. Public Law 89–162.

LABOR

Bonding provisions of Federal labor laws: Amends the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act by substituting a fraud or dishonesty bond for the existing requirement for a faithful discharge bond, and permits unions to obtain bonds through companies other than those specifically holding grants of authority from the Treasury Department, if approved by the Secretary of Labor. Public Law 89–216.

Railroad retirement: Amends the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit the spouse of a railroad employee to receive both her retirement annuity as a spouse and social security and railroad retirement benefits earned in her own right without a reduction in her annuity; increases the railroad retirement monthly maximum taxable compensation base to an amount equal to one-twelfth of the maximum annual social security taxable wage base; that is, from the present $450 a month to $550 which is one-twelfth of the maximum social security creditable and taxable base of $6,600 a year; and provides for a 1-percent reduction in the tax rate scaled up to the present level over a period of 3 years. Public Law 89–212.

Service Contract Act: Provides labor standards for protection of employees of contractors and subcontractors furnishing services to or performing maintenance service for Federal agencies. Public Law 89–286.

NATIONAL MONUMENTS AND PARKS

Agate Fossil Beds National Monument: Authorizes $315,000 for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in Nebraska. Public Law 89–33.

Ellis Island: Authorizes the appropriation of $6 million (but limits expenditures to $3 million during the first 5 years) to develop Ellis Island as a unit of the Statue of Liberty National Monument. Public Law 89–129.

Golden Spike National Monument: Authorizes $1,168,000 for the establishment of the Golden Spike National Monument at Promontory in Box Elder County, Utah, to commemorate the first transcontinental railroad across the United States and completed May 10, 1869. Public Law 89–102.

Hoover historical site: Authorizes the establishment of the Herbert Hoover National Monument in West Branch, Iowa. Public Law 89–119.

Hubbell Trading Post: Authorizes the acquisition of the Hubbell Trading Post, Ariz., including its valuable collection of Indian art and ethnological materials and provides for its administration by the Secretary of the Interior as a national historic site. Public Law 89–148.

Jefferson National Expansion Memorial: Authorizes an increase from $17,260,000 to $23,250,000 in the appropriations authorization for the completion of the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis, Mo., in commemoration of the concept of westward expansion, the Louisiana Purchase, and all it has meant to the growth of America. Public Law 89–269.

Kaniksu National Forest: Authorizes up to $500,000 from the land and water conservation fund to extend the Kaniksu National Forest to include lands necessary for the protection and conservation of the scenic values and natural environment of Upper Priest Lake in Idaho. Public Law 89–39.

Kansas historical events: Authorizes commemoration of certain historical events in Kansas with appropriate markets. Public Law 89–155.

Kings Canyon National Park, Calif.: Enlarges the boundaries of the park to include Cedar Grove and Tehipite Valley, a combined acreage addition of 5,620 acres. Public Law 89–111.

Nez Perce National Historical Park, Idaho: Authorizes $630,000 for the purchase of 1,500 acres of land to establish the Nez Perce National Historical Park to commemorate, preserve, and interpret the historic values in the early Nez Perce Indian culture, the tribes' war of 1877 with U.S. cavalry troops, the Lewis and Clark Expedition through the area early in the 19th century, subsequent fur trading, gold mining, logging, and missionary activity. Public Law 89–19.

Pecos National Monument, N. Mex.: Provides for the establishment of the Pecos National Monument in New Mexico to preserve the remains and artifacts of a 17th century Spanish mission and an ancient Indian pueblo. Public Law 89–54.

Pueblo Culture National Monument: Authorizes the establishment of the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument to commemorate the 12,000 years or more the Alibates Flint Quarries were worked by Indians living in the Panhandle area of Texas. Public Law 89–154.

Robert Williams National Memorial: Authorizes $700,000 for the establishment of the Roger Williams National Memorial at Providence, R.I., in commemoration of his outstanding contribution to religious freedom. H.R. 7919. Public Law 89– .

San Juan Island National Historical Park: Establishes a national historical park on San Juan Island in the State of Washington. S. 489 passed Senate July 29, 1965.

PRESIDENCY AND VICE-PRESIDENCY

Official Residence for the Vice President: Provides for the creation of a three-member Commission appointed by the President, one from the executive branch and two from private life, to select and furnish an official residence within the District of Columbia for the Vice President of the United States. S. 2394 passed Senate October 21, 1965.

Presidential archival depository: Authorizes the Administrator of General Services to enter into an agreement with the University of Texas for the Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Archival Depository. Public Law 89–169.

Presidential assassination: Makes it a Federal crime to kill, kidnap, or assault the President, the President-elect, the Vice President or if there is no Vice President, the officer next in the order of succession to the office of President, the Vice-President-elect, or any individual who is acting as President. Public Law 89–141.

Presidential succession: Proposed constitutional amendment fixing conditions and procedures for succession of Vice President to the Presidency in event of Chief Executive disability; provides for filling vacancy in the Vice-Presidency. S.J. Res. 1 cleared for ratification by States July 9, 1965.

Secret Service protection: Provides for continuing authority for Secret Service protection of former Presidents and their wives, or the person of a widow and minor children of a former President for a period of 4 years after he leaves or dies in office, unless such protection is denied. Public Law 89–186.

REORGANIZATION

Bureau of Customs: Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965 provides for modernizing the Customs Bureau by abolishing the offices of all Presidential appointees and establishing these positions on a career basis. Offices abolished are 45 collectors of customs; 6 comptrollers of customs; and 1 appraiser of merchandise and 1 surveyor of customs. Effective May 25, 1965.

Department of Housing and Urban Development: Creates a Department of Housing and Urban Development, headed by a Secretary appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, as would be an Under Secretary, four Assistant Secretaries, and a General Counsel. Public Law 89–174.

Environmental Science Services Administration: Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1965 consolidates the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Weather Bureau into a new agency in the Department of Commerce to be known as the Environmental Science Services Administration. Effective July 13, 1965.

ICC: Plan No. 3 provides for the reorganization of the locomotive inspection activities of certain personnel employed by or attached to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Effective July 27, 1965.

Interagency committees: Plan No. 4 reorganizes the management and control of interagency committees. Effective July 27, 1965.

Library of Congress: Authorizes $75 million for the Architect of the Capitol to construct in the District of Columbia a third Library of Congress building to be named the James Madison Memorial Building. Public Law 89–260.

National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities: Establishes a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities to develop and promote a broadly conceived national policy of support for the arts and humanities throughout the United States. Public Law 89–209.

National Science Foundation: Plan No. 5 reorganizes the National Science Foundation by abolishing all committees provided for in section 8 of the act and empowers the Director of the Foundation to delegate functions vested in him by law or delegated to him by the Board. Effective July 27, 1965.

Older Americans Act: Creates an Administration on Aging under direction of a Commissioner within the Department of HEW to be a coordinating center for information and service to State and local governments, administer grants, promote research, gather statistics, and prepare and publish other data. Public Law 89-73.

Reorganization Act extension: Extends to December 31, 1968, the authority of the President to transmit reorganization plans to Congress. Public Law 89-43.

RESOURCE AND RECREATION BUILDUP

Anadromous fish: Authorized the Secretary of Interior to initiate with the States a cooperative 5-year program, at a total cost not exceeding $25 million, for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish and the fish in the Great Lakes that ascend streams to spawn. H.R. 23. Public Law 89- .

Assateague Island National Seashore: Provides for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia. Public Law 89-195.

Auburn-Folsom: Authorizes $427,170,000 for the Federal construction of the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, for flood control. Public Law 89-161.

Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area: Authorizes $355,000 to establish the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area in Montana and Wyoming to provide for public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment of the proposed Yellowtail Reservoir and for the preservation of the scenic, scientific, and historic features of the area. S. 491 passed Senate February 10, 1965.

Cape Lookout: Authorizes $3,200,000 for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in North Carolina. S. 251 passed Senate July 27, 1965.

Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area: Authorizes the establishment of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Public Law 89-158.

Federal Water Project Recreation Act: Establishes prospective standard guidelines on the allocation and reimbursability of recreation, fish, and wildlife costs on Federal multiple purpose water resource projects. Public Law 89-72.

Fisheries Loan Act: Extends the fishery loan program for an additional 5 years; expands its scope to permit a loan to be made regardless of whether the vessel to be acquired will replace an existing vessel; and removes the present minimum annual interest rate of 3 percent and substitutes a formula for establishing it. Public Law 89-85.

Flood protection: Authorizes the Federal Government to bear up to 5 percent of costs of utility relocations on projects covered by the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act when the local organization is unable to bear such costs or cannot do so without undue hardship. S. 199 passed Senate May 25, 1965.

Garrison reclamation project: Reauthorizes Federal construction of the multipurpose Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin, which was originally authorized by the 1944 Flood Control Act. The unit will irrigate some 250,000 acres, supply industrial and municipal water for 14 towns and cities, and make possible full development of fish and wildlife and recreation potential. Estimated cost of initial stage is $248,234,000 and all but about $35 million is reimbursable. Public Law 89-108.

Grand Coule—Third powerplant: Authorizes $364,310,000 for Federal construction of a third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River in the State of Washington, which will add 3.6 million kilowatts of generating capacity to the 2 million kilowatts of the two existing plants, making it the largest single hydroelectric development in the world. S. 1761 passed Senate June 16, 1965.

Indiana Dunes: Authorizes $23 million for the acquisition of land for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Recreation Area. S. 360 passed Senate June 21, 1965.

Mann Creek reclamation project: Authorizes an additional $690,000 to complete the Mann Creek project in Idaho which, upon completion, will provide a supplemental water supply to 4,465 acres and a new water supply of 595 acres. Public Law 89-60.

Manson irrigation unit, Washington: Authorizes $12.3 million for the construction and operation of the Manson unit of the Chief Joseph Dam project. The Manson unit has an irrigation potential of 5,770 acres of land with half of the costs reimbursable. S. 490 passed Senate February 10, 1965.

Oceanography: Establishes a Cabinet-level National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development to further ocean engineering and exploration, expand marine science and technology, and intensify development and utilization of ocean, Continental Shelf and Great Lakes resources. S. 944 in conference.

Pesticides: Continues for another 3 years a study by the Secretary of Interior of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides on fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses to this resource. Public Law 89-232.

River basin authorization: Authorizes an additional $944 million for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for 13 river basin plans previously approved by Congress. Public Law 89-42.

River basin planning: Authorizes Federal grants of $5 million a year in matching funds to States for State project planning over a 10-year period; sets up a Cabinet-level Water Resources Council to coordinate river basin planning; and authorizes creation of river basin commissions for regional planning. Public Law 89-80.

Rivers-Harbor Flood Control Act: Authorizes Federal construction of 143 projects at an estimated cost of $2 billion for navigation improvement, beach erosion and flood control, and hydroelectric power projects. S. 2300. Public Law 89- .

Saline water: Extends for 5 years, to June 30, 1972, expanded research and development program for conversion of saline water; authorizes $185 million. Public Law 89-118.

Sleeping Bear Dunes: Authorizes the establishment of Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan. S. 936 passed Senate August 26, 1965.

Small reclamation projects: Broadens and strengthens the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, an act designed to encourage State and local participation in developing and improving reclamation projects in their own localities by increasing the authorization for funds available for the loan and grant program from $100 to $200 million; and raising the limitation on loans or grants for single projects to $7.5 million. S. 602 in conference.

Southern Nevada water project: Authorizes $81,003,000 for the Federal construction of the southern Nevada water supply project, a single-purpose municipal and industrial water supply development to furnish water from Lake Mead to municipalities and industrial centers in Clark County, Nev. S. 32. Public Law 89- .

Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks: Provides for the establishment of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in the State of West Virginia. Public Law 89-207.

St. Croix National Scenic Waterway: Establishes the St. Croix National Scenic Waterway in the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin to protect, develop, and make accessible the outdoor recreation resources of certain segments of the St. Croix and its Namekagon tributary. S. 897 passed Senate September 8, 1965.

Tualatin project, Oregon: Authorizes up to $23 million for Federal construction of the multipurpose Tualatin reclamation project in Washington County, Oreg. S. 254 passed Senate April 1, 1965.

Walla Walla project: Authorizes Federal construction and maintenance of the Touchet division, Walla Walla project, Oregon-Washington. S. 1088 passed Senate July 29, 1965.

Water Resources Research Act: Amends the 1964 Water Resources Research Act to authorize grant, matching, and contract funds for assistance to educational institutions in addition to State land-grant colleges, to competent private organizations and individuals and to local, State, and Federal agencies undertaking special research in water resource problems. Authorizes $5 million for fiscal 1966 and increases the authorization by $1 million annually until the level of $10 million is reached. The ceiling of $10 million will remain thereafter. S. 22 passed Senate March 25, 1965.

Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity: Established the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area in California. H.R. 797. Public Law 89— .

Yakima project, Washington: Authorizes $5.1 million for the extension, construction, and operation of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project with an irrigation potential of 7,000 additional acres (present irrigated acreage is 19,000). All but approximately $135,000 is reimbursable. S. 794 passed Senate February 10, 1965.

SPACE AND AERONAUTICS

NASA: Authorizes a total of $5,190,396,200 to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1966 as follows: Research and development, $4,536,971,000; construction of facilities, $62,376,350; administrative operations, $591,048,850. Public Law 89–53.

TAXES

Duty-free tourists limit: Limits to $100 retail value, the amount of duty-free goods U.S. residents may bring in from travel abroad, until July 1, 1967. Public Law 89–62.

Excise taxes: Reduces excise taxes by $4.7 billion. Repeals levies on furs, jewelry, other luxury items and radio, TV sets, cameras, household appliances, musical instruments, records, sporting goods, bowling alleys, and on cabarets and general admissions, effective July 1, 1965. Cuts 10-percent tax on automobiles gradually to 1 percent and eliminates communications tax effective January 1, 1969. Public Law 89–44.

Interest equalization: Extends the Interest Equalization Tax Act from December 31, 1965, to July 31, 1967, which fixes levies on purchases of foreign securities and on bank loans to foreign borrowers. Public Law 89–243.

Metal scrap extension: Continues to June 30, 1967, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap and the existing reduction of duties on copper waste and scrap. Public Law 89–61.

Motor fuels taxation compact: Grants the consent of Congress tc New Hampshire, Maine, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity. Public Law 89–11.

Motor fuels taxation compact extension: Grants the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become parties to the compact on taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and the agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity. H.R. 10369. Public Law 89– .

Nickel duty suspension: Suspends through June 30, 1967, the duties on ferronickel, unwrought nickel, and nickel powder imported from non-Communist countries. Public Law 89–204.

Silk yarn duty suspension: Continues for 3 years, until November 7, 1968, the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of spun silk yarn. Public Law 89–229.

Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act: Amends the Tariff Schedules of the United States to correct certain errors caused by the adoption of these schedules. Public Law 89–241.

TIME

Uniform time: Establishes uniform time dates for commencing and ending daylight saving times in the States and local jurisdictions where it is observed. S. 1404 passed Senate June 3, 1965.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION

Admeasurement of small vessels: Substitutes for the present intricate system of tonnage computation based on detailed physical measurements of the hull and deck structure a simplified method, at the owner's option and for pleasure vessels only, to permit the assignment of tonnage on the basis of the products of a vessel's length, breadth and depth and appropriate coefficients. S. 2142 passed Senate September 8, 1965.

Common carriers—Securities: Amends the Interstate Commerce Act to exempt securities issued by the Federal Government, States, municipalities, or other governmental bodies which acquire the status of common carriers from ICC jurisdiction. Public Law 89–86.

Customs measurement of shelter deck vessels: Implements recent recommendations made by the Maritime Safety Committee of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization regarding the tonnage measurement of vessels having two or more decks, to promote the safety standards of the fleet and provide a more equitable payment of charges and dues based on tonnage measurement. Public Law 89–219.

High-speed ground transport: Authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development and to contract for demonstrations in high-speed intercity ground transportation as well as to secure transportation data, statistics, and other information for the improvement of the national transportation system. Public Law 89–220.

Highway beautification and scenic development: Authorizes a $325,500,000 program of highway beautification and scenic development of the interstate and primary system for the control of outdoor billboards and junkyards. Public Law 89–285.

Highways: Authorizes an increase from $2.9 to $3 billion Federal aid for Interstate and Defense Highway System for fiscal year 1967; and authorizes apportionment to States; directs Secretary of Commerce to report highway needs January 1, 1968, and every 2 years thereafter. Public Law 89–139.

Inland-Great Lakes-western rivers rules: Amends the inland, Great Lakes, and western rivers rules to clarify the duties of small craft when operating in narrow channels in which large vessels are also navigating. S. 1349 passed Senate September 8, 1965.

Intercoastal Shipping Act: Changes the penalty provisions in the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933 to conform with similar penalty provisions in the Shipping Act of 1916, relating to requirements for water carriers to file tariffs with the Federal Maritime Commission. Public Law 89–71.

Merchant Marine Act Amendments: Permits empty vans and shipping tanks to be transported between points in the United States by vessels not qualified or permitted to engage in coastwise trade. Public Law 89–194.

Metric system study: Authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to make a 3-year study to determine the advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system of weights and measures in the United States. S. 774 passed Senate September 20. House Calendar.

Motor carrier mergers: Permits unification or merger of motor carriers without approval of the Interstate Commerce Commision if the aggregate annual gross operating revenues have not exceeded $300,000 for a period of 12 consecutive months preceding the date of the agreement. Public Law 89–93.

Navigable Waters Commission: Creates a joint commission of representatives of the United States and the State of Alaska to make administrative determinations of the navigability of inland nontidal waters in Alaska for purposes of State land selection. S. 945 passed Senate August 3, 1965.

Navigable waters obstructions: Provides that the primary obligation for marking all obstructions to navigation rests with the Coast Guard, thereby eliminating the overlapping functions of the Coast Guard and the Corps of Engineers. Public Law 89–191.

Navigation: Increases authorizations for the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of Congresses of Navigation. S. 1501 passed Senate April 21, 1965.

Oceanographic vessels: Exempts oceanographic research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws. Public Law 89–99.

Oil pipelines—safety regulations: Restores to the Interstate Commerce Commission specific statutory authority and responsibility for the safety regulations of all pipelines operating in interstate commerce other than those used for the transmission of water and gas. Public Law 89–95.

Public information: Closes loopholes in the Administrative Procedures Act which permits governmental agencies to deny legitimate information to the public and establishes a general philosophy of full agency disclosure unless information is exempted under clearly delineated statutory language. S. 1160 passed Senate October 13, 1965.

Radio towers: Requires that abandoned or unused radio towers must meet the same painting and lighting requirements that would be applicable if they were being used in connection with transmitting radio energy pursuant to a license issued by the FCC. Public Law 89–268.

Safety of life at sea—Implement: Amends the Communications Act of 1934 to give full and complete effect to the Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, formulated in London in 1960. The convention was ratified on April 12, 1962, and entered into force May 26, 1965. Public Law 89–121.

Transportation system: Improves the national transportation system by strengthening enforcement efforts against illegal trucking, and by requiring motor carriers and freight forwarders to pay reparations for unreasonable or discriminatory rates. Public Law 89–170.

Vessel construction differential: Extends to June 30, 1966, the present authority of the Secretary of Commerce to make construction-differential subsidy payments of a maximum of 55 percent on new merchant vessel construction and 60 percent on reconstruction or reconditioning of passenger ships. Public Law 89–127.

Vessel exchange program: Extends the vessel exchange program for 5 years and expands the program to permit, under limited conditions, tankers in the reserve fleet to be traded out and pre-World War II constructed vessels to be traded in. Public Law 89–254.

Vessel indebtedness: Clarifies the Shipping Act of 1916 and the Ship Mortgage Act of 1920 with regard to evidence of indebtedness on vessels. S. 2118. Public Law 89– .

War risk insurance: Extends to September 7, 1970, the existing authority of Secretary of Commerce to provide war risk insurance for merchant vessels, cargoes, and crews when commercial insurance cannot be obtained on reasonable terms. Public Law 89–89.

VETERANS

Disability compensation increases: Provides increases, averaging about 10 percent, in the rates of service-connected disability compensation payable to wartime and peacetime veterans, including a 10-percent increase in the additional allowances payable where the veteran is 50 percent or more disabled and has a wife, child, or dependent parents. H.R. 168. Public Law 89– .

Disabled veterans—vocational rehabilitation: Provides for a realistic cost-of-living increase in rates of subsistence allowances paid to disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation training. Public Law 89–137.

GI benefits: Provides readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967. These benefits are educational and vocational trainng assistance; guarantee and direct loan assistance for the purchase of homes, including homes on farms and farmlands, livestock and machinery to be used in farming operations by veterans. S. 9 passed Senate July 19.

Memorial certificates: Provides express statutory authority for the Veterans' Administration to mail to the next of kin a memorial certificate signed by the President, expressing appreciation for the service of the deceased in the armed services. Public Law 89–88.

Reopened insurance fund: Authorizes the Veterans' Administration to transfer up to $1,650,000 from the veterans' special term insurance fund for the purpose of providing administrative expenses in connection with the reopening of national service life insurance. Public Law 89–40.

VA hospitals: Expresses sense of Congress on increasing the authorized bed capacity for all Veterans' Administration hospitals. S. Con. Res. 13, adopted June 4, 1965.

Vocational rehabilitation training—time limits: Extends to all seriously disabled veterans entitled to vocational rehabilitation training the liberalization of time limits for pursuing such training which was authorized for blinded veterans previously. Public Law 89–138.

War orphans' benefits: Makes eligible for the benefits of the War Orphans Education Act the sons and daughters of veterans who died during peacetime periods after the Spanish-American War and prior to September 16, 1940. H.R. 227. Public Law 89– .

War orphans' educational assistance program: Increases the educational assistance allowances payable under the war orphans' educational assistance program. Public Law 89–222.

STATUS OF MAJOR PRESIDENTIAL LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, 1965

ACTION COMPLETED (69)

AEC authorization.
Appalachian aid.
ARA—Public works.
Assateague National Seashore.
Auburn-Folsom.
Balance of payments.
Bureau of Customs reorganization.
Canadian auto parts.
Clean air.
Coast Guard authorization.
Coffee Agreement implementation.
Community Health Services extension.
Community mental health centers.
District of Columbia Rapid Transit.
Debt ceiling increase.
Delaware Water Gap Recreation Area.
Disarmament Act extension.
Drug abuse control.
Duty reduction exemption.
Education—Elementary and secondary.
Excise tax reduction.
Farm bill.
Farm ownership loan authorization.
Food Marketing Commission extension.
Foreign aid authorization.
Garrison reclamation project.
Gold cover.
Health Professions Educational Assistance Act.
Health Research Facilities Act.
Health Science Library assistance.
High speed transportation.
Higher education.
Highway beautification.
Hospital insurance, social security.
Housing Act of 1965.
Immigration reform.
Inter-American Development Bank.
Interest equalization.
International Monetary Fund increase.
Juvenile delinquency extension.
Manpower Training Act expansion.
Military construction authorization.
Military pay.
Military procurement authorization.
Military requirements in Vietnam.
NASA authorization.
National Foundation on the Arts.
Older Americans Act.
Patent fee increase.
Pay comparability.
Peace Corps.
Poverty.
Presidential assassination.
Presidential inability.
Regional medical complex.
Reorganization authority extension.
River basin planning.
Saline water.
Silver coinage.
State and local law enforcement.
State technical services.
Tobacco acreage.
U.N. Charter amendments.
Urban Development Department.
Vocational rehabilitation.
Voting Rights Act of 1965.
Water Projects Recreation Act.
Water Quality Act.
Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity Recreation Area.

ACTION NOT COMPLETED THIS SESSION (3)

Home rule. Passed both Houses, amended.

Minimum wage. Pending on House Calendar; Senate hearings concluded.

Repeal of 14(b). Passed House; motion to consider debated from October 1 to October 12.

STATUS OF ALL PRESIDENTIAL LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

RECAP

Action completed, 105; passed both Houses, amended, 1; passed Senate, 8; Senate Calendar, 2; passed House, 2; House Calendar, 1; committee activity, 9; no action, 3.

Total, 131; legislative, 114; appropriations, 17.

ACTION COMPLETED (105)

Appropriations:

Agricultural supplemental. Public Law 89–2.

Second supplemental, 1965. Public Law 89–16.

Vietnam supplemental. Public Law 89–18.

YEAR 1966

Agriculture. H.R. 8370: Public Law 89– .

Defense. Public Law 89–213.

District of Columbia. Public Law 89–75.

Foreign aid. Public Law 89–273.

Independent offices. Public Law 89–128.

Interior. Public Law 89–52.

Labor-HEW. Public Law 89–156.

Labor-HEW supplemental. Public Law 89–199.

Legislative. Public Law 89–90.

Military construction. Public Law 89–202.

Public works. H.R. 9220, Public Law 89– .

State - Justice - Commerce - Judiciary. Public Law 89–164.

Supplemental. H.R. 11588, Public Law 89– .

Treasury-Post Office. Public Law 89–57.

Aid to Appalachia. Public Law 89–4.

AEC authorizations. Public Law 89–32.

Assateague Island National Seashore. Public Law 89–195.

Auburn-Folsom reclamation project. Public Law 89–161.

Balance of payments. Public Law 89–175.

Canadian auto parts. Public Law 89–283.

Chancery in Saigon. Public Law 89–22.

Clean air. Public Law 89–272.

Coast Guard authorization, $114.2 million. Public Law 89–13.

Coffee agreement implementation. Public Law 89–23.

Community Health Services extension. Public Law 89–109.

Community mental health services. Public Law 89–105.

District of Columbia Rapid Transit. Public Law 89–173.

Delaware Water Gap Recreation Area. Public Law 89–158.

Debt ceiling increase. Public Law 89–49.

Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. Public Law 89–174.

Disarmament Act, 3 years, $30 million. Public Law 89–27.

Drug Abuse Control Act. Public Law 89–74.

Duty reduction exemption. Public Law 89–62.

Education—elementary and secondary. Public Law 89–10.

Excise tax reduction. Public Law 89–44.

Export control extension. Public Law 89–63.

FAA Administrator. Public Law 89–46.

Farm bill. H.R. 9811, Public Law 89– .

Farm ownership loan authorization. Public Law 89–240.

Food Marketing Commission extension. Public Law 89–20.

Foreign aid authorization. Public Law 89–171.

Foreign official time deposits. Public Law 89–79.

Garrison reclamation project. Public Law 89–108.

Gold cover—repeals 25 percent backing. Public Law 89–3.

Guam Organic Act Amendments. Public Law 89–100.

Health Professions Education Act. H.R. 3141, Public Law 89–290.

Health Research Facilities Act. Public Law 89–115.

Health Sciences Library Act. S. 597, Public Law 89–291.

High speed transportation. Public Law 89–220.

Higher education. H.R. 9567, Public Law 89– .

Highway beautification. S. 2084, Public Law 89–285.

Hospital insurance, social security. Public Law 89–97.

Housing Act of 1965. Public Law 89–117.

Immigration reform. Public Law 89–236.

Inter-American Development Bank, additional contribution. Public Law 89–6.

Interest equalization. Public Law 89–243.

International Monetary Fund, quota increase. Public Law 89–31.

Juvenile delinquency program extension. Public Law 89–69.

Manpower Training Act expansion. Public Law 89–15.

Military construction authorization. Public Law 89–188.

Military pay. Public Law 89–132.

Military procurement authorization. Public Law 89–37.

NASA authorization. Public Law 89–53.

National Foundation on the Arts. Public Law 89–209.

Older Americans Act. Public Law 89–73.

Overtime for District of Columbia Police. Public Law 89–282.

Patent fee increase. Public Law 89–83.

Pay comparability. H.R. 10281.

Peace Corps. Public Law 89–134.

Poverty. Public Law 89–253.

Presidential assassination. Public Law 89–141.

Presidential disability. Senate Joint Resolution 1, cleared for ratification by States, July 9.

Public works and economic development. Public Law 89–136.

Regional medical complex. Public Law 89–239.

Reorganization authority extension. Public Law 89–43.

REORGANIZATION PLANS

Bureau of Customs. Effective May 25, 1965.

Environmental Science Services Administration. Effective July 13, 1965.

ICC, locomotive inspection activities. Effective July 27, 1965.

Interagency committees. Effective July 27, 1965.

National Science Foundation. Effective July 27, 1965.

River basin planning. Public Law 89–80.

Saline water. Public Law 89–118.

SEC fee increase. H.R. 7169, Public Law 89–289.

Secret Service arrest authorization. Public Law 89–218.

Silver coinage. Public Law 89–81.

Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks Recreation Area. Public Law 89–207.

State and local law enforcement. Public Law 89–197.

State technical services. Public Law 89–182.

Tobacco acreage-poundage marketing quotas. Public Law 89–12.

U.N. Participation Act Amendments. Public Law 89–206.

Vocational rehabilitation. H.R. 8310, Public Law 89– .

Virgin Islands Organic Act Amendments. Public Law 89–98.

Voting Rights Act of 1965. Public Law 89–110.

Water pollution control. Public law 89–234.

Water Projects Recreation Act. Public Law 89–72.

Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity Recreation Area. H.R. 797, Public Law 89– .

TREATIES

Belgium tax protocol. Executive G, ratified October 22, 1965.

German tax protocol. Executive I, ratified October 22, 1965.

Gut Dam claims with Canada. Executive C, ratified August 30, 1965.

U.N. Charter amendments. Executive A, ratified June 3, 1965.

Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. Executive H, ratified September 14, 1965.

Wheat agreement extension. Executive B, ratified June 15, 1965.

PASSED BOTH HOUSES AMENDED (1)

Home rule. S. 1118, September 29.

PASSED SENATE (8)

Bighorn Canyon Park. S. 491, February 10.

Cape Lookout National Seashore. S. 251, July 27.

International Claims Settlement Act Amendments. S. 1935, September 7.

Indiana Dunes. S. 360, June 21.

Sleeping Bear Dunes. S. 936, August 26.

St. Croix National Seashore. S. 897, September 8.

Third powerplant, Grand Coulee. S. 1761, June 16; House hearings September 9 and 10.

Water Research Act expansion. S. 22, March 25; H.R. 3606, House Interior.

SENATE CALENDAR (2)

Repeal of 14(b). H.R. 77, motion to consider debate October 1 to 12.

Wild rivers system. S. 1446.

PASSED HOUSE (2)

District of Columbia Revenue Act. H.R. 11487. Senate hearings October 20 and 21.

Foreign Service Act Amendments. H.R. 6277, September 9.

HOUSE CALENDAR (1)

Fair Labor Standards Act Amendments. H.R. 10518. Senate Labor hearings concluded.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITY (9)

District of Columbia firearms control. S. 1632, Senate District of Columbia hearings concluded; H.R. 6745, House District of Columbia.

Federal Firearms Act Amendments. S. 1592, Senate Judiciary subcommittee hearings concluded July 27; H.R. 6783, House Ways and Means hearings concluded July 28.

Guadalupe National Park, Tex. S. 295, Senate Interior Subcommittee hearings, July 21; H.R. 517 and 698, House subcommittee hearing, July 20.

Group practice facilities construction. S. 508, Senate Labor; H.R. 2987, House Interstate deferred action April 1.

Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1965. S. 2152; H.R. 9167, House Judiciary hearings concluded.

Oregon Dunes. S. 259, Senate Interior Subcommittee hearings, July 20; H.R. 7524, House Interior Subcommittee hearings, July 19.

Tax barriers to foreign investment in United States, remove. H.R. 11297, House Ways and Means, executives underway.

Truth in packaging. S. 985, Senate committee hearings concluded May 18; H.R. 1664, House Judiciary.

Unemployment insurance improvements. S. 1991, Senate Finance; H.R. 8282, House Ways and Means hearings concluded August 27.

NO ACTION (3)

District of Columbia higher education, two colleges. S. 1612, Senate District of Columbia; H.R. 7395, House District of Columbia.

Electoral college reform. Senate Joint Resolution 58, Senate Judiciary; House Joint Resolution 278, House Judiciary.

Florence Agreement, implement. H.R. 8664, House Ways and Means.

Mr. President, I wish to include the following table:

Summary of legislative record

SENATE ACTIVITY

	82d 1st	83d 1st	84th 1st	85th 1st	86th 1st	87th 1st	88th 1st	89th 1st
	Jan. 3-Oct. 20	Jan. 3-Aug. 3	Jan. 5-Aug. 2	Jan. 3-Aug. 30	Jan. 7-Sept. 15	Jan. 3-Sept. 27	Jan. 9-Dec. 30	Jan. 4-Oct. 22
Days in session	172	125	105	133	140	146	189	177
Hours in session	996:46	763:35	559:41	860:44	1,009:48	1,005:00	1,044:37	955:17
Total measures passed by Senate	1,060	848	1,325	1,210	1,052	1,133	861	950
Senate bills	411	342	574	612	434	459	333	367
House bills	429	320	566	346	375	433	294	380
Senate joint resolutions	14	22	22	22	21	25	21	25
House joint resolutions	29	21	20	54	32	27	25	24
Senate concurrent resolutions	23	25	25	24	34	23	26	23
House concurrent resolutions	10	14	21	28	24	23	22	32
Senate resolutions	135	104	97	124	132	143	140	96
Public laws	255	288	390	316	383	401	258	291
Confirmations	26,069	23,420	39,897	44,620	43,567	48,961	66,603	54,561

Mr. President, it is with a great amount of satisfaction that I place in the RECORD a table of the appropriation bills on which the Congress has acted during this 1st session of the 89th Congress.

It is with a great amount of pride that I call attention to the prudent savings of $2,410,508,000 over the budget estimates:

Appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 1st sess., as of Oct. 22, 1965

	Budget figure	Public law figure	Savings	Law No.
1965				
Agriculture supplemental	$1,742,209,000	$1,600,000,000	$142,209,000	89-2
2d supplemental	2,280,251,327	2,227,563,977	52,687,350	89-16
Vietnam supplemental	700,000,000	700,000,000	------------	89-18
1966				
Agriculture	6,282,634,000	6,242,929,500	39,704,500	89-
Defense	46,972,844,000	46,887,163,000	85,681,000	89-213
District of Columbia Federal payment	53,122,000	46,122,000	7,000,000	89-75
Foreign aid	4,188,923,000	3,932,188,000	256,735,000	89-273
Independent offices	14,566,023,000	14,246,167,800	319,855,200	89-128
Interior	1,241,549,500	1,212,739,070	28,810,430	89-52
Labor-HEW	8,293,814,000	8,011,331,500	282,482,500	89-156
Labor-HEW supplemental	1,553,918,000	1,223,181,500	330,736,500	89-199
Legislative	243,261,617	189,993,297	53,268,320	89-90
Military construction	2,049,000,000	1,756,635,000	292,365,000	89-202
Public works	4,387,616,000	4,292,866,500	94,749,500	89-
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary	2,171,935,600	2,057,597,150	114,338,450	89-164
Treasury, Post Office	7,749,770,000	7,669,444,000	80,326,000	89-57
Supplemental	4,971,203,852	4,741,644,602	229,559,250	89-
Total	109,448,074,896	107,037,566,896	2,410,508,000	-------

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the summary of activity of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, 1ST SESSION, 89TH CONGRESS

During the 1st session of the 89th Congress, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and its subcommittees conducted 96 days of public hearings and met in executive session on 49 days. The committee has met in conference with House committees on 11 days.

Two hundred and five bills and resolutions have been referred to the committee so far. Thirty-one bills and seven resolutions have been reported by the committee. Twenty-six bills have been enacted into law or are awaiting the President's signature; four are pending in the House; and one is on the Senate Calendar.

Fifteen of the eighteen legislative recommendations of the President referred to this committee have been enacted into law or are awaiting the President's signature. Among the bills of outstanding importance considered by the committee during this session were proposals relating to the Nation's health, education, labor-management relations, veterans benefits, manpower training, railroad retirement, the war on poverty, older Americans, juvenile delinquency, and the arts and humanities.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH—SENATOR HILL, CHAIRMAN

S. 597: The Heart Disease, Cancer and Stroke Act of 1966. Authorizes financial assistance to medical schools, hospitals, and other health facilities to combat heart disease, cancer and stroke through regional medical programs to bring the latest advances in prevention, care, and treatment to patients through demonstrations, consultations, research, and training. Became Public Law 89-239 on October 5, 1965.

H.R. 2985: The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1965. Authorizes grants in aid to assist in meeting the initial staffing costs of community mental health centers through their first 51 months of operations and extends and expands the program of financial assistance for training teachers of handicapped children and the program of research and demonstrations to improve the methods and techniques for the education of handicapped children. Became Public Law 89-105 on August 4, 1965.

H.R. 2984: The Health Research Facilities Amendments of 1965. Extends and expands the matching grant program of the Public Health Service for the construction of health research facilities, provides specific authority for the Public Health Service to enter into contracts, and authorizes three additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Became Public Law 89-115 on August 9, 1965.

S. 510: The Comunity Health Services Extension Amendments of 1965. Extends the program of financial assistance for immunization programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough and tetanus and adds measles as one of the diseases to be included; extends and expands the program for providing health services to migratory agricultural workers and their families; continues the program of formula grants for general health services at State and local public health departments; and extends the program of project grants to finance studies and demonstrations in the field of health services for the chronically ill. Became Public Law 89-109 on August 5, 1965.

H.R. 2: The Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965. Provides increased controls over barbiturate, amphetamine, and other depressant and stimulant drugs to combat the illegal traffic in these drugs outside the legitimate channels of commerce and provides for combating counterfeit drugs. Became Public Law 89-74 on July 15, 1965.

H.R. 7031: The National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act. Authorizes the construction and establishment of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf to provide a residential facility for postsecondary technical education and training for persons who are deaf. Became Public Law 89-36 on June 8, 1965.

S. 511: Increasing to $500,000 per year the authorization for Appropriations for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory. Became Public Law 89-181 on September 11, 1965.

H.R. 3141: The Health Professions Educational Assistance Amendments of 1965. Extends and expands the program of grants for construction assistance for medical, dental, optometry and other health profession schools and the program of student loans for physicians, dentists and other health students. In addition, the legislation authorizes a new program of scholarships for students in the health professions and a new program of improvement grants to strengthen the quality of educational programs at medical, dental, and other schools. Signed by the President, October 22, 1965.

S. 597. The Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965. Provides for grants in aid to assist in the construction of medical library facilities, in training medical librarians, in special scientific projects, in research and development in library science, in improving basic resources of medical libraries, in supporting biomedical publications, and in establishing regional medical libraries. Signed by the President, October 22, 1965.

H.R. 8310: The Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965. Authorizes several new programs of grants to expand vocational rehabilitation services so that as many as 200,000 individuals might be rehabilitated by 1968. In addition, the legislation authorizes a new program of grants for the construction and initial staffing assistance for rehabilitation facilities and sheltered workshops. The annual authorization for appropriations for the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped will be increased to $500,000. The legislation is awaiting the President's signature.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION—SENATOR MORSE, CHAIRMAN

H.R. 2362: The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Authorizes financial assistance to local educational agencies for education of children of low-income families; school library resources, textbooks and instructional materials; supplementary educational centers; educational research and training; and grants to strengthen State departments of education. Became Public Law 89–10 on April 11, 1965.

H.R. 9567: Higher Education Act of 1965. Authorizes financial assistance for community service and college and university extension programs; college library assistance and library training and research; student assistance in the form of educational opportunity grants, insured loans, work-study program, and amendments to the National Defense Education Act of 1958; teacher programs encompassing a National Teacher Corps and fellowship; financial assistance for the improvement of undergraduate instruction; and amendments to the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. Awaiting the President's signature.

H.R. 7743: National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965. Establishes a program of loan insurance and direct loans for students attending vocational schools. Awaiting the President's signature.

H.R. 9022: School disaster aid legislation. Amends Public Law 815 and 874 to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; eliminates inequities in the application of Public Law 815 in certain military base closings; makes uniform eligibility requirements for school districts in Public Law 874; makes State operated or supported schools for handicapped children eligible for assistance under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Awaiting the President's signature.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR—SENATOR M'NAMARA, CHAIRMAN

H.R. 5883: Amending the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. Became Public Law 89–216 on September 29, 1965.

H.R. 10238: Providing labor standards for certain persons employed by Federal contractors to furnish services to Federal agencies. Awaiting the President's signature.

H.R. 77: To repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act. This bill was reported from the committee on September 9, 1965; debated in the Senate; and was returned to the calendar after failure of a motion to close debate on the motion to consider the bill failed to obtain the necessary two-thirds vote.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND MANPOWER—SENATOR CLARK, CHAIRMAN

S. 974: Amending and extending the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. Providing an increased authorization for fiscal years 1966 and 1967, extending the act for an additional 2 years, and improving many of its provisions, including the following: retention of Federal financing; expansion of experimental and demonstration projects programs in service occupations; increasing the duration and eligibility provisions for training allowances; and strengthening eligibility provisions for training allowances. Also the Area Redevelopment Act was incorporated in Manpower Development Training Act. Became Public Law 89–15 on April 26, 1965.

H.R. 8131: Extension of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. The subcommittee reviewed the administration and progress of programs under this act. The Congress extended the Juvenile Delinquency Act for an additional 2 years with increased authorizations. Became Public Law 89–69 on July 8, 1965.

H.R. 2263: Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965. Amends the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to provide for a 3-year research and study program to provide for a nationwide analysis of the critical shortage of qualified manpower in the field of correctional rehabilitation; grants for carrying out a coordinated program of research and study of the personnel practices and personnel needs in the field of correctional rehabilitation; the availability and inadequacy of educational and training resources; and educational opportunities for persons in or preparing to enter the field; the adequacy of the existing curriculum and teaching methods and practices; the effectiveness of present methods of recruiting personnel; and the extent to which personnel in the field are utilized in the manner which makes the best use of their qualifications. Became Public Law 89–178, on September 10, 1965.

The subcommittee also conducted three sets of hearings, as follows:

Joint hearings with the House Select Committee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor to review the 1965 manpower report of the President. (Senator CLARK, chairman.)

Hearings on the "Impact of Research and Development Policies on Scientific and Technical Manpower." (Senator NELSON, chairman.)

Hearings have begun on Federal on-the-job training programs including an inquiry as to ways of providing additional incentives to employers to make greater use of on-the-job training as a method of helping resolve the unemployment problem. (Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts, chairman.)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MIGRATORY LABOR—SENATOR HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., CHAIRMAN

The subcommittee held hearings on S. 1864 through S. 1868 during this session of Congress. The record has been left open for additional hearings.

The subcommittee has made field trips to closely watch the farm labor situation during the first year after the termination of Public Law 78. The subcommittee staff has spoken to growers and workers in order to ascertain their problems during this year of transition.

The subcommittee has worked closely with the migrant branch of the Office of Economic Opportunity. In so doing, the subcommittee has suggested and reviewed OEO projects affecting migrant health, education, day-care, and housing.

The subcommittee has also worked closely with the appropriate governmental agencies on projects concerning migrant health and migrant housing.

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON POVERTY—SENATOR M'NAMARA, CHAIRMAN

H.R. 8283: The Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1965. Authorizes appropriations for the second year of the War on Poverty that will permit a doubling of the amounts expended in fiscal 1965; provides for enhanced employment opportunities for the chronically unemployed adult poor with poor employment prospects by making jobs available in community or area betterment or beautification projects, including conservation projects.

The bill also contained provisions which clarify the Director's authority to provide assistance, subject to certain notice requirements, to local community action programs not being carried on by community-wide agencies; provide better public information concerning local community action plans and programs, including local public hearings; assure consultation with appropriate State agencies in the development, conduct and administration of these programs; and make it clear that problems of the elderly poor are to be considered whenever feasible in connection with programs in the War on Poverty.

Among other provisions, the bill:

1. Extends all Economic Opportunity Act programs for an additional year.
2. Extends for 1 year 90 percent Federal assistance for work-training (Neighborhood Youth Corps), work-study, community action and adult basic education programs.
3. Modify Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps programs to permit acceptance of Cuban refugees.
4. Authorize waiver of certain maintenance of effort requirements for community action programs in communities (particularly depressed rural areas) where this would involve an unnecessary hardship.
5. Permit limited use of antipoverty funds for training of adult basic education teachers.
6. Expand the National Advisory Council from 14 to 20 members (in addition to the Director).

The bill became Public Law 89–253 on October 9, 1965.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS—SENATOR YARBOROUGH, CHAIRMAN

H.R. 205: Amendments to the war orphans' educational assistance program. Amends the war orphans' educational assistance program to authorize an increase in the amount of allowances paid to the sons and daughters of deceased or permanently and totally disabled service-connected veterans pursuing a program of education or special restorative training under the act. Became Public Law 89–22 on September 30, 1965.

H.R. 206: Providing a realistic cost-of-living increase in rents and subsistence allowances paid to disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation training. Became Public Law 89–137 on August 26, 1965.

H.R. 208: Authorizing the extension to seriously disabled veterans of the same liberalized time limits for pursuing vocational rehabilitation training as were authorized for blinded veterans. Became Public Law 89–138 on August 26, 1965.

S. 9: Cold War Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act. Providing readjustment assistance for veterans who serve in the Armed Forces for more than 180 days during the period January 31, 1955, to July 1, 1967. Eligible veterans would receive educational assistance and limited farm and home loans similar to the benefits under the Korean GI bill. Passed the Senate July 19, 1965, and presently pends before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 788: Melvin J. Maas Memorial Hospital. Designates the Veterans' Administration Hospital in the District of Columbia as the Melvin J. Maas Memorial Hospital. Passed the Senate August 11, 1965, and is pending before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 227: Entitles the children of certain veterans who served in the Armed Forces prior to September 16, 1940, to benefit under the war orphans' educational assistance program. Passed the Senate August 20, 1965, and is pending before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 13: Bed capacity for Veterans' Administration hospitals. Expresses the sense of the Congress on increasing the authorized bed capacity for all Veterans' Administration hospitals. Passed the Senate on June 4, 1965, and now is pending before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The subcommittee held 3 days of hearings, January 22, 25, and 28, 1965, on proposed closing of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON RAILROAD RETIREMENT—SENATOR PELL, CHAIRMAN

H.R. 3157: Amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. This bill, for which H.R. 10874 was substituted, amends the Railroad

Retirement Act of 1937 by eliminating the restriction which prevented spouses of railroad retirees from receiving benefits under both the Railroad Retirement Act and the Social Security Act; raises the taxable wage base from $450 to $550 per month effective January 1, 1966; lowers the tax rate on employers and employees from the present 8¼ to 7¼ effective October 1, 1965, and gradually increases the rate over the next 3 years to its present level. The bill became Public Law 89–212 on September 29, 1965.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGING—SENATOR M'NAMARA, CHAIRMAN

H.R. 3708: The Older Americans Act of 1965. Provides assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the Administration on Aging. Became Public Law 89–73 on July 14, 1965.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON ARTS AND HUMANITIES—SENATOR PELL, CHAIRMAN

S. 1483: Establishing the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. Provides grants to assist programs for the advancement of the arts and humanities by local, State, regional, and private agencies and organizations. The Foundation consists of the National Endowment for the Arts with a National Council on the Arts, a National Endowment for the Humanities with a National Council on the Humanities, and the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities which coordinates, by advice and consultation the policies and operations of the two Endowments. Became Public Law 89–209 on September 29, 1965.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE—SENATOR PELL, CHAIRMAN

S. 2232: Captioned films for the deaf. Extends and expands the captioned films for the deaf program; increases the funds available from $1,500,000 to $3 million, fiscal years 1966 and 1967; $5 million fiscal years 1968–69; $7 million fiscal year 1970 and thereafter; broadens the application to include all educational media; and allows the use of such materials and devices in the home and by employees in the training of workers. It also establishes a National Advisory Council on the Deaf. Became Public Law 89–258 on October 19, 1965.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the summary of activity of the Committee on Foreign Relations during the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
October 22, 1965.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: At the request of the Policy Committee, there is attached a list of measures reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations and acted upon favorably by the Senate.

Although the committee was not confronted with new programs and proposals, it mirrored the generally high level of activity of the 89th Congress thus far. For instance, the Senate has passed a total of 24 bills and joint resolutions reported by the committee in 1965 compared to 16 passed 2 years ago during a much longer session. It acted on nine concurrent and Senate resolutions this year in contrast to four in 1963. It filed 29 reports in the Senate as against 11 by this time 2 years ago. Only in the area of treaties was there less activity than 2 years ago; but then 19 treaties were submitted in 1963 and only 9 in 1965.

I hope you will find this information helpful.

Sincerely yours,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

SUMMARY

TREATIES ACTED ON

1. Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, together with the Optical Protocol Concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, signed at Vienna under date of April 18, 1961. Approved September 14, 1965, by a vote of 85 to 0.

2. Texts of amendments to the Charter of the United Nations adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 17, 1963. Approved June 3, 1965, by a vote of 71 to 0.

3. Protocol for the Extension of the International Wheat Agreement, 1962, open for signature in Washington from March 22 until and including April 23, 1965. Approved June 15, 1965, by a vote of 88 to 0.

4. Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada concerning the establishment of an International Arbitral Tribunal to dispose of U.S. claims relating to Gut Dam, signed at Ottawa, March 25, 1965. Approved August 30, 1965, by a vote of 74 to 0.

5. Protocol, signed at Brussels on May 21, 1965, modifying and supplementing the convention of October 28, 1948, between the United States and Belgium for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, as amended by supplementary conventions of September 9, 1952, and August 22, 1957. Approved October 22, 1965.

6. Protocol between the United States of America, and the Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Bonn on September 17, 1965, modifying the convention of July 22, 1954, for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income. Approved October 22, 1965.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

1. S. 693, to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended. Passed Senate April 5, 1965.

2. S. 1742, to authorize the U.S. Government to agree to amendments to the articles of agreement of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation, and for other purposes. Approved August 14, 1965. Public Law 89–126.

3. S. 1760, to authorize the acceptance of a settlement of certain indebtedness of Greece to the United States and to authorize the use of the payments resulting from the settlement for a cultural and educational exchange program. Passed Senate June 25, 1965.

4. S. 1903, to amend the United Nations Participation Act, as amended. Approved September 28, 1965. Public Law 89–206.

5. S. 1935, to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals settled by the United States-Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, and for other purposes. Passed Senate September 7, 1965.

6. S. 2054, to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, and for other purposes. Authorizes $115 million for fiscal year 1966. Approved August 24, 1965. Public Law 89–134.

7. S. 2064, to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, relative to the return of certain alien property interests. Passed Senate September 7, 1965.

8. H.R. 30, to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes.

9. H.R. 45, to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank. Authorizes $750 million without fiscal year limitation, in three annual installments of $250 million each beginning in fiscal year 1965. Approved March 24, 1965. Public Law 89–6.

10. H.R. 2998, to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations. Authorizes $30 million for fiscal years 1966 through 1968. Approved May 27, 1965. Public Law 89–27.

11. H.R. 4170, to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system. House agreed to Senate amendments October 20, 1965.

12. H.R. 6497, to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States. Authorizes an appropriation of $1,035 million to remain available until expended. Approved June 2, 1965. Public Law 89–31.

13. H.R. 7064, to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended. Authorizes additional $1 million for chancery in Saigon, South Vietnam. Approved May 21, 1965. Public Law 89–22.

14. H.R. 7750, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. Authorizes $3,360 million for fiscal year 1966. Approved September 6, 1965. Public Law 89–171.

15. H.R. 8715, to authorize a contribution by the United States to the International Committee of the Red Cross. Authorizes a contribution of $50,000 a year. Approved October 1, 1965. Public Law 89–230.

16. H.R. 8862, to amend the act of August 7, 1935, to increase the authorized annual share of the United States as an adhering member of the International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions. Authorizes an annual contribution of $100,000. Approved August 3, 1965. Public 89–104.

17. H.R. 9247, to provide for participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held at San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes. House agreed to Senate amendments October 6, 1965.

18. H.R. 9336, to amend title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 relating to certain claims against the Government of Cuba. Approved October 19, 1965. Public Law 89–262.

19. H.R. 10132, to authorize the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, former Speaker of the House of Representatives, to accept the award of the Military Order of Christ with the rank of grand officer. Approved September 1, 1965. Private Law 89–61.

20. H.R. 10342, to authorize the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, a Member of the House of Representatives, to accept the award of officer in the French National Order of the Legion of Honor. Approved September 11, 1965. Private Law 89–64.

21. H.R. 10779, to authorize the Pharr Municipal Bridge Corp., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Pharr, Tex. Amended (to substitute the International Bridge Act) and passed Senate October 13, 1965.

22. Senate Joint Resolution 32, to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury of persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952. Senate agreed to House amendments October 13, 1965.

23. Senate Joint Resolution 71, to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1949, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission. Approved July 27, 1965. Public Law 89-91.

24. Senate Joint Resolution 106, to allow the showing in the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums." Approved October 20, 1965. Public Law 89-274.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

1. Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion. Amended and passed House July 12, 1965.

2. Senate Concurrent Resolution 36, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the 20th anniversary of the United Nations during International Cooperation Year, and for other purposes. Passed House June 22, 1965.

3. Senate Concurrent Resolution 61, to allow the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film "Adlai Stevenson, the Ambassador" at the Auditorium Theater in Chicago, Ill., on or about October 24, 1965. Passed Senate without reference to Foreign Relations Committee October 13, 1965.

4. House Concurrent Resolution 282, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film entitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" at the dedication of the new Civic War Memorial Auditorium in Boston, Mass. Passed Senate without reference to Foreign Relations Committee February 11, 1965.

5. House Concurrent Resolution 426, expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the viewing of the U.S. Information Agency film "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," at the 25th class reunion of the Harvard class of 1940 in Cambridge, Mass. Passed Senate June 3, 1965.

6. House Concurrent Resolution 468, to recognize the World Law Day. Passed Senate without reference to Foreign Relations Committee, September 10, 1965.

SENATE RESOLUTIONS

1. Senate Resolution 28, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine and study the foreign policies of the United States. Agreed to February 8, 1965.

2. Senate Resolution 89, authorizing attendance at the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, to be held in Wellington, New Zealand. Agreed to March 29, 1965.

3. Senate Resolution 145, to provide for responding to invitations from foreign parliamentary bodies. Agreed to September 23, 1965.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS

As of October 22, 1965, 102 nominations for appointments as Ambassadors, officials in the State Department, and so forth have been confirmed as well as 1,930 nominations in the Foreign Service.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the summary of activity of the Committee on Commerce during the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTIVITIES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

(Prepared under the direction of Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Chairman)

INTRODUCTION

During the 1st session of the 89th Congress, the Commerce Committee bore its full share of responsibility in implementing the President's legislative program. But, as the accomplishments of this historic session are reviewed, it becomes clear that the contributions of the committee were equally great in pursuing on its own initiative its broad legislative responsibilities.

In response to Presidential requests, the committee developed and reported such legislation as the $90 million, 3-year high-speed ground transportation program to meet the crisis in transportation in interurban corridors, and the State Technical Services Act, to promote economic growth through the broader dissemination of science and technology to American enterprise—an act which the President, in signing, called the "sleeper" of the 89th Congress.

But the committee's activities ranged far beyond even the wide horizons of the Great Society; from smoking and health to olympic competition; from the chronic freight car shortages afflicting the West and Midwest to export financing; from automobile tire safety to the welfare of the inhabitants of the Pribilof Islands.

The committee had nearly as many bills passed by the Senate (56) as in the whole of the 88th Congress (64). Thus, 1965 was by any reckoning a vintage year for the committee, judged not only by the volume of the committee's labors and its work product but by the quality of its deliberations. Again, as in the past, the significance of the committee's work often lay as much in the legislation which it rejected or laid aside as in the positive legislation which it delivered to the Senate.

STATISTICAL SUMMARY—AS OF OCTOBER 19, 1965

Number of bills (Senate and House) and resolutions referred to committee	236
Number of bills reported and reports submitted by committee	53
Number of bills passed by Senate	56
Number of Senate bills pending in House committees	16
Number of Senate bills on Speaker's table in House	1
Number of Senate bills reported by House committees	7
Number of Senate bills passed House	13
Number of conference reports	4
Number of meetings of conference committees	7
Number of bills signed by President	30
Number of bills vetoed by President	0
Number of routine nominations referred to committee and confirmed	1, 848
Number of major nominations referred to committee	30
Number of major nominations confirmed	30
Number of executive meetings of full committee	16
Number of days of open hearings conducted by full committee	106
Number of days of open hearings conducted by subcommittees	42
Total number of full and subcommittee hearings	148
Number of House bills passed in lieu of Senate bills	2
Number of bills left on Senate Calendar	2

MERCHANT MARINE

The committee considered and Congress acted favorably upon several measures affecting the Federal Maritime Commission. The first measure changed the term of office of commissioners of the Federal Maritime Commission from 4 years to 5 years and provided that commissioners whose terms have expired will continue to serve until their successors have been nominated and approved with the advice and consent of the Senate. (Public Law 89-56). The second measure permits empty vans and shipping tanks to be transported between points in the United States by vessels not qualified or permitted to engage in the coastwise trade (Public Law 89-194). The third measure changed the penalty provision in the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, to conform with similar penalty provisions in the Shipping Act, 1916, relating to requirements for water carriers to file tariffs with the Federal Maritime Commission (Public Law 89-71).

The committee and Congress also acted on several measures affecting the maritime laws administered by the Maritime Administration. The first extended for 1 year the present authority of the Secretary of Commerce to make construction differential subsidy payments of a maximum of 55 percent on new merchant vessel construction and 60 percent on reconstruction or reconditioning of passenger ships (Public Law 89-127). The second concerned war risk insurance and extended for 5 years the existing authority for the Secretary of Commerce to provide this insurance for merchant vessels, cargo, and crew (Public Law 89-89). The third measure extended for 3 years the expiration date of the mobile trade fairs program administered by the Secretary of Commerce (Public Law 89-66). The fourth measure extended the present vessel exchange program for 5 years and expanded the program to permit—under limited conditions—tankers in the reserve fleet to be traded out and pre-World War II constructed vessels to be traded in (Public Law 89-254).

In addition to those bills enacted into law, the committee and the Senate acted favorably on several bills:

Elva L: directs the Secretary of Treasury to document as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges the 50-foot fishing vessel, the *Elva L,* (S. 1275), passed Senate May 18, 1965).

Tariff filing requirements for hardwood lumber: Restores the tariff filing requirements with respect to area shipments of hardwood lumber (H.R. 10198, passed Senate October 18, 1965).

Little Nancy: Restores the coastwise privileges to the 35-foot sport fishing vessel *Little Nancy* (H.R. 5217, passed Senate October 18, 1965).

Ship mortgage bonds: Clarifies the manner in which ship mortgage bonds can be sold to noncitizens and validating certain outstanding ship mortgage bonds not in litigation (S. 2118, passed Senate on Sept. 8, 1965).

COAST GUARD AND CUSTOMS

The committee considered and acted favorably upon several proposals introduced by request of the Secretary of the Treasury. They include the following:

Annual authorization: Authorizes appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard in an amount of $114 million (Public Law 89-13).

Special authorization: Authorizes an emergency appropriation for the procurement of 17 small patrol cutters for the Coast Guard to replace those vessels recently deployed to Vietnam (Public Law 89-21).

Anniversary: Authorizes the President to issue a proclamation commemorating the

175th anniversary of the Coast Guard on August 4, 1965 (Public Law 89-103).

Shelter deck vessels: Implements the recommendations made by the Maritime Safety Committee of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) regarding the tonnage measurement of vessels having two or more decks (Public Law 89-219).

Omnibus act: Clarifies several Coast Guard laws relating primarily to personnel and retirement policies (S. 2471).

Admeasurement of small vessels: Simplifies the admeasurement of small vessels for the purpose of expediting documentations (S. 2142, passed Senate September 8, 1965).

Duties of small craft: Amends the inland, Great Lakes, Western rivers rules to clarify the duties of small craft when operating in narrow channels (S. 1349, passed Senate, Sept. 8, 1965).

Clarifying responsibility for marking of obstructions in navigable waters: Places the primary responsibility for marking wrecks in navigable waters with the Coast Guard. Previous law produced conflict and lack of clarity, appearing to confer some responsibility on Coast Guard and some on Corps of Engineers (Public Law 89-191).

Provided for the administration of the Coast Guard Band: Accords statutory recognition to the Coast Guard Band, and provides that the director of the Coast Guard Band shall be an officer. This raises the Coast Guard Band to an equal status with the bands of the other armed services (Public Law 89-189).

Provided for the retirement of enlisted members of the Coast Guard Reserve: Provides the same retirement benefits to enlisted members of the Coast Guard Reserve who have served 20 years of active duty as has been provided to members of the Regular Coast Guard and Navy and Navy Fleet Reserve (Public Law 89-200).

FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

The committee reported legislation to provide a comprehensive fish program to accomplish restoration and development of anadromous fish resources in the coastal areas and streams and for other areas where fish ascend the streams to spawn.

Under the bill, the Secretary of the Interior will join with interested States, on a 50-50 matching basis, in a program to increase the populations of anadromous fish and the upstream migrant fish from the Great Lakes, through biological research, the construction of hatcheries, clearance and preservation of spawning areas, construction of fish ladders and fish passages facilities, and similar activities.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with one or more States for the purpose of conserving, developing, and enhancing these fish resources at a total cost not exceeding $25 million (Public Law).

S. 998, the bill to amend the Fish Vessel Loan Act of 1956 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to continue for a 5-year period to make loans for the financing and refinancing of new and used fishing vessels.

The act of 1956 provided authority for making loans for financing and refinancing of operations, maintenance, replacement, repair, and equipment of fishing gear and vessels, and for research into the basic problems of the fisheries.

Because of the hazardous nature of this industry, most lending institutions are either unwilling or unable to take the risk involved in long-term financing of fishing vessels and equipment.

The revolving fund, authorized by the 1956 act, was $10 million, but this was increased to $20 million in 1958. Through March 31, 1965, more than 1,600 applications for over $42 million had been received. Of that number, 849 applications for approximately $19 million were approved and 411 for approximately $9.6 million were declined. During the life of the program over $9 million of the principal amount of the loans has been repaid and accrued interest has totaled over $2 million. Bad debts have been less than 1 percent of the average outstanding balance of loans. (Public Law 89-85.)

S. 1734: The committee held hearings on S. 1734, the bill to conserve and protect U.S. domestic fishery resources. The bill provided that whenever the Secretary of the Interior determines that fishing vessels of a foreign country are being operated to the detriment of our domestic fishery conservation programs, the President may increase the duty—up to 50 percent of the July 1, 1934, level—on any fishery product, in any form, from the offending country.

Our salmon resources in certain areas of the North Pacific were being despoiled by a high seas fishery in direct contravention of our conservation practices. To protect this valuable resource, S. 1734 was introduced and hearings were held. The bill was reported by the committee and passed by the Senate May 19, 1965.

S. 1735: Hearings were held on S. 1735, a bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to reconvey certain lands to the University of California when these lands are no longer used or needed by the United States. The committee recommended the enactment of this proposal.

S. 1975: This bill to provide for the construction of a building on the campus of the University of Washington to house the Northern Pacific Halibut Commission was reported by the Committee on Commerce and enacted into law (Public Law 89-233).

S. 2217: Hearings were held on S. 2217, the bill to provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of native species of fish and wildlife, including migratory birds, that are threatened with extinction.

The measure is still under consideration by the committee.

The Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries prepared at the request of the chairman "A Compilation of Treaties and Other International Agreements Containing Provisions on Commercial Fisheries, Marine Resources, Sport Fisheries, and Wildlife to which the United States is party."

This volume, of 410 pages, is the first compilation of the treaties of the United States in the realm of fisheries and wildlife.

The second publication by the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, prepared at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, "A Compilation of Federal Laws Relating to the Conservation and Development of our Nation's Fish and Wildlife Resources."

MISCELLANEOUS

The committee reported favorably on a bill to create a commission of representatives of the United States and the State of Alaska to make administrative determinations on the navigability of inland, nontidal waters in Alaska for purposes of State land selection (S. 945, passed Senate Aug. 3, 1965).

The Senate committee commenced hearings on four other bills which will require further hearings next session. These include the following:

S. 2102: a bill to protect and conserve the North Pacific fur seals, and to administer the Pribilof Islands for the conservation of fur seals and other wildlife, and for other purposes. (Hearings were held on Sept. 9, 1965.)

S. 1054: a bill to make clear that fishermen's organizations, regardless of their technical legal status, have a voice in the exvessel sale of fish or other aquatic products on which the livelihood of their members depends. (Hearings were held on Aug. 5, 1965.)

S. 1858: a bill to promote the replacement and expansion of the U.S. nonsubsidized merchant and fishing fleets. (Hearings were held on June 24, 1965.)

S. 1875: a bill to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation laws. (Hearings were held on Aug. 11, 1965).

Hearings were held by the committee on the seamen's hospitalization problem (S. 1917) created by the announcement by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to close seven Public Health Service hospitals. The Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries filed a report to the chairman of the committee recommending corrective legislation amending the Public Health Service Act of which the Labor and Public Welfare Committee has predominant jurisdiction.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION

In the first session of the 89th Congress, the committee processed three important transportation measures, held hearings on the Northeastern passenger train service crisis and the administration of Public Law 88-108 (work rules dispute legislation), and considered most of the Interstate Commerce Commission's legislative recommendations.

Curbing illegal transportation: Illegal operators annually drain at least half a billion dollars from the regulated common carrier industry. The public pays more for goods, because freight moved illegally takes revenues from the lawful regulated carriers, causing their rates to be raised to pay the fixed operating costs of labor, maintenance and equipment. Illegal operators are far more prone to highway accidents than are lawful carriers, and often evade tax laws as well as transport laws, to the detriment of the public.

After 5 days of hearings before the Surface Transportation Subcommittee, the committee reported S. 1727, a bill designed to provide a cooperative, coordinated effort by the ICC, the State regulatory Commissions and private industry against illegal trucking.

The provisions of the bill enable the State regulatory Commissions to increase their efforts in cooperation with the Federal Government in fighting illegal carriage; put new muscle into ICC enforcement efforts; and permit injured persons, primarily regulated carriers, to obtain injunctive relief against persons clearly and patently violating the motor carrier and freight forwarder provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. The Commission was given the right to intervene in such private injunction suits, and to take jurisdiction over such matters from the courts.

Other provisions of the bill allow shippers to collect reparations from truckers and freight forwarders, and provide for revocation by the Commission, after hearing, of dormant water carrier certificates and permits. Public Law 89-170 was signed into law on September 6, 1965.

High-speed ground transportation

On March 4, 1965, President Johnson sent to the Congress a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation. In his communication to Congress, the President said:

"It is clear that we should explore the feasibility of an improved ground transportation system for such heavily traveled corridors. The program outlined by the Secretary of Commerce calls for research on materials, aerodynamics, vehicle power and control, and guideways. Information requirements for regional studies and evaluations are to be defined and the necessary data collected. We must learn about travel needs and preferences, in part through the use of large-scale demonstration projects. New methods of analyzing the problem will be developed to give adequate consideration to the large number of regional and local characteristics which influence the performance, acceptability, and cost of all kinds of systems."

Following 3 days of hearings by the Surface Transportation Subcommittee, the committee reported S. 1588. This bill authorized a 3-year, $90 million program for high-speed ground transportation: (1) research and development was authorized into different forms of high-speed ground transportation, including railroad; (2) demonstration projects were authorized with Federal participation to measure public response to improvements in intercity rail passenger service utilizing present technology (demonstrations are planned on the Pennsylvania Railroad between Washington and New York, and on the New Haven between Providence and Boston); and (3) a national program to improve the scope and availability of transportation statistics.

This bill was signed into law on September 30, as Public Law 89-220.

Freight car shortages

Chronic, perennial freight car shortages cause serious losses to grain, lumber, mining, and other industries vital to the Nation's economy through the inability of farmers, lumber interests, and mining enterprises to move their products.

These annual freight car shortages occur because in the last 20 years our railroads have retired nearly 300,000 more freight cars than they have built.

The Special Subcommittee on Freight Car Shortage held 3 days of hearings in Washington, D.C., and field hearings in Denver, Omaha, and Kansas City, Kans.

S. 1098, with an amendment, was unanimously reported by the committee and passed by the Senate on June 30, 1965.

This bill would insure an adequate national fleet of freight cars by providing incentives for increased car ownership. In practical effect, the bill states a series of objectives in the public interest, including the acquisition and maintenance of a car supply adequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense; recognizes the important influence exerted by daily rental or per diem charges on the adequacy of the national car supply; and directs the ICC, after hearing, to fix per diem charges upon any basis which, in its judgment, will tend to accomplish these objectives.

Hearings were held on S. 1098 by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, but no action was taken before adjournment.

Northeastern passenger train service crisis

On February 18, 1965, the trustees of the New Haven filed notice with the ICC that the New Haven would terminate certain of its commuter services by March 29, 1965, and announced that the remainder of its passenger services would also be soon eliminated.

Four bills motivated by the plight of the New Haven were considered by the committee in 4 days of hearings in Washington, D.C., and a New Haven field hearing. Two of the bills, S. 325 and S. 1289, provided for ICC supervised grants of direct Federal financial aid to passenger railroads. The sponsors of these bills indicated that Federal aid was contingent upon receipt of State and/or local aid for the balance of the determined need.

Two of the bills, S. 348 and S. 1234, were contingent upon interstate compacts in the Northeast to maintain passenger service. While S. 348 provided for Federal guarantees of bonds for capital acquisitions and improvements, S. 1234 committed the Federal Government, through the Secretary of Commerce, to pay one-third of any operating deficits.

These bills encountered the opposition of the Administration to Federal subsidy, and the reluctance of the necessary States to enter into such interstate compacts.

Administration of Public Law 88-108 (work rules dispute legislation)

On August 28, 1963, the Congress enacted Senate Joint Resolution 102, which became Public Law 88-108, establishing an arbitration board to make a binding award on the firemen (helper) dispute between certain railroad carriers and certain of their employees.

The Committee held 18 days of hearings in the exercise of its legislative oversight function on the charges of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen that that Public Law 88-108 had not been administered properly.

In its report of August of 1963, the Committee expressed its hope and desire that the parties could resolve their disputes by collective bargaining, noted the Committee's dislike for legislating solutions to labor-management disputes, and called attention to the obvious dangers of repeated congressional intervention in this field.

On October 8, 1965, the Committee adopted a resolution stating the sense of the committee that the public interest would be served by the brotherhood representatives of the firemen employees and the carriers undertaking collective bargaining, and requesting the Secretary of Labor and the National Mediation Board to make their offices available to the parties to the extent needed to aid the parties in reaching agreement.

Interstate Commerce Commission legislative recommendations

The Surface Transportation Subcommittee held hearings on most of the legislative recommendations contained in the Commission's 78th annual report. The recommendations of the Commission concerning strengthened enforcement efforts to combat illegal carriage, motor carrier and freight forwarder reparations, and revocation of dormant water carrier certificates were substantially incorporated in the provisions of Public Law 89-170.

Two of the Commission recommendations were separately enacted into law:

State securities: Public Law 89-86, exempted securities issued by governmental bodies which acquire the status of common carriers from the requirements of Commission approval and authorization.

Motor carrier mergers: Public Law 89-93, made gross operating revenues instead of the number of vehicles owned or operated, the basis for determining whether smaller trucking companies seeking to merge are exempt from the provisions of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

One of the Commission's recommendations, S. 1148, to enable the ICC to delegate relatively routine and specialized matters to individual employees, was reported by the committee, and passed by the Senate on July 20, 1965, but has not been acted upon by the House.

The committee also held hearings and reported a bill to restore to the Interstate Commerce Commission specific statutory authority and responsibility for the safety regulation of interstate oil pipelines. This bill, S. 1021, became Public Law 89-95, on July 27, 1965.

AVIATION

The committee's activities in the field of aviation during the past year were largely of an investigatory and oversight nature. The committee considered thoroughly all pending legislation affecting aviation. However, such measures were largely of a routine nature and, as a consequence of pressing demands in other vital areas which required the members' time, the committee concluded that further action be deferred until the second session. Of the measures considered, two were favorably reported and passed by the Senate.

Authorizing an appointment to the position of Federal Aviation Agency Administrator; Authorizes the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee, a retired military officer, to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. Absent passage of this measure, General McKee, in order to assume the position of Administrator, would have been required under existing law to resign his commission and incur substantial financial loss contrary to the intent and spirit of the Dual Compensation Act (Public Law 89-46).

Lease of Clarinda, Iowa, airport property: Authorizes the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to permit the city of Clarinda, Iowa, to lease certain real property, previously conveyed to Clarinda, for nonairport purposes. This authorization would be accomplished by treating the subject property as though it had originally been conveyed pursuant to the Surplus Property Act rather than the Federal Airport Act (S. 2434—passed Senate September 24, 1965).

An initial and exploratory review of the adequacy of air service was conducted through hearings over a 4-day period. This particular review focused attention on a limited aspect of the subject, i.e., trunkline air service to medium-sized intermediate cities. There is no question that certain cities are not receiving the magnitude and quality of air transportation contemplated by the Federal Aviation Act. While the committee is pleased to note that the air carriers, in enlightened self-interest, and as a result of their vast reequipment program as well as improved technology are taking constructive steps to meet the complaints submitted to the committee by various communities, it nevertheless remains firm in its conviction that the CAB must remain vigilant and take greater initiative to insure that every community receives the air transportation it deserves. Because of the complexity of the subject, the fact that time did not permit the committee to review the many other aspects of this problem, and the wide and often quite divergent proposed solutions, the committee did not feel that it should attempt a legislative solution during this session. The staff has been directed to gather substantial additional data on the subject for presentation to the committee at the next session. At that time, determination as to further action will be made.

As a result of the considerable controversy over, and in many quarters hostility to, the federally supported helicopter air carrier program, the committee held hearings on the program, whether alternatives to Federal subsidy were available and, in general, a review of the present and prospective role of vertical-type aircraft in the air transportation system. Without enumerating the many reasons, because of brevity called for in this report, the committee is thoroughly convinced that verticle-type aircraft offers one of the most practical, promising, and exciting modes of transportation of the future. While recognizing the many difficulties and problems of the past and present, it was the future toward which the committee looked in recommending to the Senate Appropriations Committee, which concurred by restoring the necessary funds, that the federally supported program be continued to insure the most orderly and efficient development of vertical air transportation. However, cognizant of the adamant position against this program by the House, other avenues of solution were explored including financial support by the airlines. A number of air carriers shared the committee's conviction as to the potential of vertical-type aircraft and, to their great credit, entered into agreements with existing helicopter carriers to underwrite substantial portions of their operating costs. The committee sincerely hopes that their efforts will prove effective in insuring the continuing progress of the helicopter transportation industry.

COMMUNICATIONS

A variety of actions were taken by the committee in the field of communications both in its legislative and oversight functions. Among the bills affecting communications considered and reported favorably by the committee were the following:

Safety of life at sea: The purpose of this legislation is to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to give full and complete effect to the Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea that was formulated in London in 1960 and ratified by the U.S. Senate on April 12, 1962, and entered into force on May 26, 1965 (Public Law 89-121). It generally modernizes compulsory ship-radio safety requirements:

1. Lower the minimum limit from 500 to 300 gross tons with regard to cargo ships which are required to carry radio installations;

2. Eliminate nuclear ships from the categories of ships with regard to which the Commission is authorized to make exemptions insofar as radio installations are concerned; and

3. Eliminate the compulsory radio requirements of the Communications Act for vessels which are navigated both in the open sea and on the Great Lakes during such time that such vessels are on the Great Lakes. Vessels operating on the Great Lakes are subject to the safety radio requirements of the Great Lakes Agreement between the United States and Canada.

Common carrier notices: This legislation modifies the Communications Act so as to substitute the Secretary of Defense rather than the Secretaries of the Army and Navy as the persons entitled to receive official notice of certain applications filed in the common carrier service (S. 1554 passed the Senate July 30, 1965, and is presently pending in the House of Representatives).

Painting and dismantling of radio towers: This legislation authorizes the Federal Communications Commission to require that abandoned or unused radio towers continue to meet the same painting and lighting requirements that would be applicable if such towers were being used in connection with the transmission of radio energy pursuant to a license issued by the FCC and empowers the Commission to direct the dismantling of such towers when the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency determines that there is a reasonable possibility that they may constitute a menace to air navigation (Public Law 89-268).

Conflict of interest: Amends the Communications Act dealing with the financial interests of FCC Commissioners and employees to bring the provisions of that act more closely in line with the current national policy on conflict-of-interest law enacted by Congress in 1962 (Public Law 87-849) and President Johnson's Executive Order No. 11222 of May 8, 1965, and to exempt from the provisions of section 4(b) of the Communications Act "special Government employees," i.e., the short-term consultant and persons serving in the Commission's executive reserve program. (S. 1948 passed the Senate on August 3, 1965, and is presently pending in the House of Representatives.)

Harmful interference to radio spectrum: Legislation (S. 1015) would authorize the FCC to make regulations covering the interference problem of radio communications of devices which in their operation are capable of emitting radio frequency energy, conduction, or other means. Numerous electronic or electrical devices because of improper design radiate frequency energy beyond that needed for their proper function. This radiation may cause interference with radio transmission and air regulation operations. Some examples of such devices are garage door openers, electric keys, high power industrial heaters, improperly designed receivers, diathermy machines, and various types of household appliances.

Hearings were held, various conferences conducted to establish appropriate procedures in the event legislation is enacted. The legislation is still pending in committee and action will probably be taken in the next session.

The committee has closely supervised the progress of the communications satellite program particularly the implementation of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962. The committee has voted to report favorably and the Senate has confirmed two public members to the board of the Communications Satellite Corp. during the past session.

The committee has been in close contact with the administration in regard to the establishment of an overall telecommunications policy. At present, a study is being conducted by the Stanford Research Institute from which it is to provide a data base from which a high-level interdepartmental committee headed by the director of telecommunications management, the FCC and the Departments of Defense, State, and Justice will submit recommendations to the Congress in the early part of the next session. These findings and recommendations will help establish and formulate an overall telecommunications policy. Extensive discussions have been and are being conducted.

Hearings were held on the nominations of two members of the FCC, James J. Wadsworth and Robert T. Bartley. These nominations were favorably reported and confirmed by the Senate in this session.

The committee held hearings on February 25 and 26, 1965, on the various policy problems in the FCC. This included the knotty problem of the regulation of community antenna television services, political broadcasting, and multiple ownership of television stations in the top 50 markets of the United States.

The committee made public a new program that has been developed over the past 2 years which involves a report from the FCC on the basic policy problems pending before the FCC. This report was published and sets forth in narrative form the status of each policy problem and the disposition of such a problem from year to year, or an explanation of why there is a delay in the resolvement. These reports were undertaken at the request of the committee and are used as a yardstick to determine how effectively and efficiently the FCC was acting in disposing of significant basic policy problems. The next report is due at the start of the next session.

The committee closely supervised the progress of the educational television program and particularly the implementation of the Educational Television Facilities Act of 1962. Progress reports and various discussions were held with the appropriate agencies involved in this program with an eye toward determining the effectiveness of this legislation. This study will continue as the Educational Television Facilities Act authorization expires in the 90th Congress.

TRADE EXPANSION

The adequacy and competitiveness of U.S. export credit facilities was subjected to scrutiny by the committee during 3 days of hearings in which the Nation's major exporting industries documented a series of inadequacies in the export financing available to them—inadequacies which were claimed to have caused the loss of substantial foreign sales. Shortly after the close of the hearings and following an exchange of letters between the chairman and the President of the Export-Import Bank, Eximbank agreed to liberalize credit policies to meet several objections raised during the hearings.

The committee staff also undertook, at the direction of the chairman, a long-range study of East-West trade policies. The committee was represented on the first official U.S. trade mission to Poland and Rumania, in September and October.

TRADE REGULATION

Responding to the evidence linking cigarette smoking and disease, the committee, following 8 days of hearings on this highly controversial subject, reported a bill to require warning on all cigarette packages. Following a Senate-House conference in which the Senate version substantially prevailed, the bill was signed by the President on July 27, 1965. It requires that the warning appear on all packages by January 1 of next year (Public Law 89-92).

In this Congress, the Commerce Committee has been assigned the task of examining packaging and labeling practices for consumer goods. This responsibility entailed 10 days of hearings on the proposed "fair packaging and labeling bill." As yet, no action has been taken on the legislation.

Three days of hearings were devoted to automobile tire safety and labeling. Following the hearings, a revised tire safety bill was prepared by the committee staff under the direction of the chairman. It was introduced toward the close of the session for the purpose of enlisting public and industry comments so that the committee could proceed early in the next session to consider the legislation.

The committee approved certain minor amendments to the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 and the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act—both designed to meet unanticipated hardships which had arisen in the administration of the acts (S. 836, passed Senate May 11, 1965); (S. 1129 (H.R. 806, Public Law 89-35), passed Senate April 13, 1965).

GAS AND POWER REGULATION

The committee undertook a comprehensive review of the Federal Power Commission's jurisdiction over electric power entities. After 3 days of hearings, the committee tabled a bill (S. 218) to terminate FPC jurisdiction over certain private electric utilities operating primarily within single States and voted to report favorably a bill to clarify the intent of Congress that the Federal Power Commission had no jurisdiction over nonprofit power cooperatives (S. 1459, passed the Senate Aug. 26, 1965).

Responding to a growing concern over the safety of interstate natural gas pipelines and the adequacy of present State safety regulation, the chairman initiated an extensive investigation of gas pipeline safety including solicitation of comprehensive accident and pipeline construction data from the industry and regulatory information from the various State utility commissions. This investigation, expected to be completed early next year, will enable the committee to determine the need for and appropriate form of additional legislation.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The committee held 3 days of hearings and unanimously voted to report the State Technical Services Act designed to promote economic growth through a program of matching grants to State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise (Public Law 89-192).

In recognition of the need for greater understanding of the effects of pesticides upon our environment, the committee voted to report legislation authorizing expanded research by the Secretary of the Interior on the effects of pesticides on fish and wildlife resources (S. 1623, passed the Senate Apr. 29, 1965).

MISCELLANEOUS

Uniform time legislation: To modernize and overhaul the 47-year old Standard Time Act, and to achieve a greater uniformity and consistency in timekeeping practices across the Nation. The bill would require States and local communities which observe daylight saving time to begin their observance of such time on the last Sunday in April of each year and end it on the last Sunday of October (S. 1404, reported in the Senate June 1, 1965, and passed the Senate June 3, 1965.)

Amateur athletic dispute: During the spring of 1965, the long standing feud between the NCAA and AAU deveolped into an impasse which jeopardized the Nation's athletic programs. The AAU refused to allow NCAA sanction of the AAU-sponsored meet where the U.S. team would be selected for competition against the Soviet athletes. As a result, the NCAA banned any of its student athletes from the meet, and these students were forced to choose between their schools and the U.S. team. At Kiev, Russia, the United States lost its first dual track meet with the Russian team, and many people blamed the athletic dispute for this defeat.

Realizing the serious consequences that his dispute could have on our Nation's athletes if allowed to continue, the Commerce Committee conducted 2 weeks of public hearings, at which all aspects of the controversy were intensively explored. Following these hearings, the committee unanimously recommended and the Senate unanimously passed a resolution establishing an independent arbitration panel to produce a final, conclusive settlement of the dispute (S. Res. 147).

Alaska centennial celebration: In 1967 the State of Alaska will commemorate the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska from Russia. Recognizing the national significance of this historic land acquisition, the Commerce Committee favorably reported S. 2614, a bill authorizing $4 million for U.S. participation in the Alaska Purchase Centennial.

Preservation of Morro Rock: In order to safeguard the beauty of Morro Rock, a historic and distinctive landmark at the entrance to Morro Bay Harbor, Calif., the bill would remove a restriction on the property, which was conveyed to California for park purposes, in 1935. Aim of the bill is to prevent Federal agencies from removing stone from Morro Rock, the stone quarrying having threatened its distinctive beauty. (H.R. 1582, reported to the Senate October 12, 1965.)

Study of the metric system: Recognizing that 90 percent of the world now employs the metric system of weights and measures, and that Great Britain is moving toward increased use of the metric system, the committee approved legislation authorizing a 3-year study of the advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the United States. (S. 774, reported September 16, 1965, passed the Senate September 1965.)

Technical amendments to the act creating the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission: Legislation was proposed to authorize compensation to the members of the Commission at a per diem rate of $100 plus traveling expenses, to permit the Commission to employ experts at rates not in excess of $100 per day, and to make authorized funds available without regard to fiscal year limitations. (S. 2469 passed the Senate on September 24, 1965.)

Economic conversion and diversification: Following the hearings held on a proposal to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission during the 88th Congress, the committee further considered the matter. However, action was deferred pending the report of the President's Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament. The President appointed the special interagency committee in December 1963, and ordered it to report in 1 year. The committee submitted its report in July 1965, and included a recommendation that its work be continued. It is clear, both from the committee's hearings and from the report of the President's special committee, that changing patterns of defense expenditures produce important effects in communities and regions that are dependent on defense-related firms and industries. The committee will continue to study the need for additional Federal action in this area.

FILING OF SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE INTERIM REPORT ON EXPANSION OF BEEF EXPORTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, since the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is necessarily absent from the city, I ask unanimous consent that his statement concerning the interim report of the Select Committee on Small Business on the subject of beef exports be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

I appreciate the willingness of the distinguished assistant majority leader, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], to submit the Small Business Committee's interim report entitled "Expansion of Beef Exports," since I must be absent from the Senate.

As the Members of this body are aware, beef is produced and processed primarily by small business, and is an important cash crop in every State, accounting for about 25 percent of farm income. More than one-half of our States border on the oceans and seaways and also one-half of the States are currently engaged in selling beef or beef products in export markets.

The movement of these commodities in international trade has concerned the industry and the Congress for the past 2 years. This was illustrated by the enactment of Public Law 482 of the 88th Congress, which fixed legislative quotas on the importation of foreign beef. This law was approved in August 1944, and I supported it in the interest of our domestic cattle industry.

In September 1964, our committee opened its inquiry into the potential export markets for beef. Public hearings of the full committee, under my chairmanship, were held in February of this year, during which particular attention was given to ocean freight rate disparities (a subject first brought to the attention of the Senate by the Joint Economic Committee). In September the Small Business Committee convened a further hearing, jointly with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on and to political barriers of the European Economic Community.

Your committee has found, and is submitting in this interim report, that the prospects are exciting, but that many barriers stand in the way of their full realization by the American beef industry.

The committee found that at the time of the hearings there were disparities in ocean freight rates favorable to South American ports over North American ports by 107 to 294 percent. It also appeared, on the basis of informaiton presently available to the committee, that the variable import levy system of the European Economic Community is a barrier to trade which is injurious, not only to the United States, but to the countries of the Common Market itself.

In the course of the investigation, other barriers to the beef trade were identified as follows:

1. The lack of market survey and development information.
2. Restrictive veterinary and sanitary regulations abroad.
3. The impact of certain domestic regulations.
4. Difficulties in communication between foreign buyers and American sellers.
5. Port barriers.
6. Gaps in financing and credit arrangements.
7. Unfamiliarity with the possibilities and practices of exporting.

As a result of these difficulties, the beef exports for the United States have been virtually nonexistent for the past 40 or 50 years. The United States, with 40 percent of the world's beef production, has been a dismal 12th among exporters. We export less than one-half of 1 percent of our beef products to foreign markets compared to two-thirds of our rice production and three-fourths of our wheat crop.

This posture is becoming increasingly unacceptable in view of the steep increases in demand which are accompanying rising prosperity in Western Europe and elsewhere in the world. The committee heard testimony that wholesale prices at some points on the European Continent are twice what they are in Chicago.

For the European Economic Community alone, officials estimate a demand level for imports of between one-quarter and one-third of a billion dollars by 1970, and the shortage in one non-EEC country, Spain, was recently described as tremendous. Other nations in the Mediterranean area and Middle East are actively in the market for increasing amounts of beef of all kinds—frozen, chilled, and on the hoof.

The United States has certain advantages in servicing these millions of consumers—more than twice as many as our own population. We have a high productive platform, many technological advantages, and are closest in distance. However, testimony at the hearings indicates that there are more than 30 nations actively seeking these markets. I shall place in the RECORD material showing that aggressive efforts are being made by such countries as Spain, the United Kingdom, Australia, Argentina, Italy, and France, to develop these markets for their own beef industries.

As a result, the United States must move faster if it wishes to gain ground in the competitive race. The committee has analyzed the data available and has prepared certain recommendations for the agencies involved, particularly, the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Maritime Commission. Where information did not appear to be available, or needed expert interpretation, the committee has called for the surveys and rigorous economic analyses that are required for full understanding. Further development of this kind is necessary because the committee found that the problems which exist are interlocking and interacting.

The establishment of long-term commercial markets for the American beef industry thus requires that all problems receive simultaneous and concerted action by the many segments of industry and Government which are concerned. This situation has impelled the committee to make some of its findings and recommendations early in interim form, in order that the Nation's best thoughts and efforts may continue to be applied to the solution of these problems.

Teamwork among industry groups, and between industry and Government, has already yielded results which may be helpful. Ocean freight rates have been reduced about 25 percent and airfreight rates about 25 to 30 percent. What is most important, in the judgment of your committee, further efforts are going forward in a spirit of constructive and practical cooperation.

The committee's work has benefited from the participation and counsel of its minority as well as its majority members. We have enjoyed the assistance of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry under the chairmanship of the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. Ellender, which joined in the sponsorship of our hearing on September 9. The Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Cooper, who has been active as a member of both committees has been particularly helpful. The support and interest of the distinguished majority and minority leaders, Senators Mansfield and Dirksen; the Senator from Georgia, Mr. Talmadge; the Senator from South Dakota, Mr. McGovern; the Senator from Texas, Mr. Tower; the Senator from Iowa, Mr. Miller; the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Mondale; the Senator from Vermont, Mr. Aiken; the Senator from Kansas, Mr. Pearson; and the Senator from Colorado, Mr. Allott, have encouraged the committee in its labors.

The atmosphere of cooperation was summarized by the chairman of the American Steamship Executives Traffic Committee, Mr. A. T. DeSmedt, as follows:

"As a result (of the Small Business Committee's inquiry) the shippers and the carriers have come closer together and are seeking solutions in concert rather than in acrimony. Already, some rate reductions and some proposed packaging improvements have been agreed upon. Even if these are not the whole answer to expanding meat sales abroad, they may well chart the course for Congress, the Federal Maritime Commission, small business and ocean carriers in the future."

It is hoped that the course which we, in the Senate, are attempting to lay out, will lead our industry, and its small business segment, to a participation in export markets commensurate with the productive capacity and superior quality of American beef products.

Your committee will be doing all that it can to be of help to the industry-government team in this regard. When the hearings are reconvened, the committee will focus upon the barriers and problems which cannot be resolved by ordinary means. On the basis of the advice and counsel of industry and Government at that time, the committee will, prior to the conclusion of the 89th Congress, make final recommendations for action which it deems to be appropriate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] has pointed out, the beef industry is important throughout the country, and more than half of our States border on the oceans and seaways. There would thus be widespread benefit in fulfilling export possibilities for high quality American beef products.

I might observe that the committee is proceeding in a thorough and expeditious manner to explore this potential and to help the industries and Government agencies involved to reduce artificial barriers standing in the way of long-term profitable markets abroad in this commodity.

I believe that this interim report will accordingly be helpful to all who have an interest in this subject.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] and the membership of the Select Committee on Small Business, I ask unanimous consent to submit our interim report on the "Expansion of Beef Exports," and request that it be duly printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXPANSION OF BEEF EXPORTS

(Interim report of the Select Committee on Small Business)

INTRODUCTION

For many years the Senate Small Business Committee has actively sought to expand export opportunities for American small businesses in international trade, as well as to provide for an adequate adjustment against the adverse effects of excessive imports.[1]

PRELIMINARY STUDIES

In furtherance of this interest, during December 1963 the chairman and other members of your committee expressed concern on the floor of the Senate over recently publicized disparities on ocean freight rates. The question was raised as to whether these disparities might be detrimental to American exporters, particularly small business exporters.[2]

As a result, your committee decided in July of 1964 to make an inquiry into the effect of ocean freight rate differentials and other related problems upon the expansion of exports by American small businesses.[3]

In the course of its investigation, the committee developed some general comparisons between the export trade of the United States and those of other nations. As illustrated by the following table, the United States exports approximately 5½ percent of its gross national product, while other nations having many common attributes of geography and economic structure export three to six times as high a proportion of their national products.[4]

Export trade as percentage of gross national product, 1963

[Table includes goods and services; native currency in millions]

	Gross national product	Exports	Exports as a percentage of GNP
Belgium	608,000 francs	208,000 francs	34
Canada	43,000 dollars	6,800 dollars	31
United Kingdom.	25,000 pounds	5,114 pounds	20
France	285,000 francs	43,000 francs	15
United States.	585,000 dollars	30,700 dollars	5.24

Although the amounts and values of U.S. exports are large compared to other nations, the volumes, as compared to economic potential, show a marked disproportion. In the opinion of your committee, these figures invited a thorough analysis.

In order to keep its inquiry within manageable boundaries, the committee attempted to isolate a particular commodity which might be studied in terms of concrete facts and circumstances. In this regard, the beef industry seemed promising for several reasons.

Beef production is characterized by small, family, and independent farm and ranch businesses. Similarly, livestock feeders and finishers tend to be small businesses. The committee was advised by the Department of Agriculture that more than two-thirds of the number of meatpackers, and most of the beef processors, were also small independent business firms.

Other data from the Department of Agriculture indicated that while the U.S. beef industry, domestically, was a success story (accounting for approximately 40 percent of world production), export trade had been virtually nonexistent since the early years of this century. The committee learned that, even though this country is the world's leading agricultural exporter, the United States ranked 12th among nations in meat exports.[5] It was found that export markets provide the U.S. farmer with an outlet for about three-fourths of the country's wheat production, two-thirds of our rice and nonfat dry milk, half of the dry edible peas, two-fifths of the soybeans and tallow, and about one-third of the cotton, rye, and prunes. In contrast, only about three-tenths of 1 percent of U.S. beef and veal production is shipped abroad in international trade.[6]

As the inquiry proceeded, there were reports of rapidly growing markets in Western Europe. One estimate of the potential was put at 50,000 to 200,000 tons of imported beef annually for West European nations alone, at their present stages of development.[7] An official of the Agricultural Research Service, after a trip to eight European continent countries, reported in July 1964 that:

---

[1] The committee's recent publications in this area are as follows:

(a) Hearings, "Impact of Imports on American Small Business," 86th Cong., 2d sess., June 16, 1960.

(b) S. Rept. 1044, 10th Annual Report of the Select Committee on Small Business, January 1960, p. 49.

(c) S. Rept. 1908, "Impact of Imports on Small Business," Aug. 23, 1960.

(d) Hearings, "Small Business Exports and the World Market," Nov. 17 and Dec. 9 and 14, 1960.

(e) S. Rept. 51, 11th Annual Report of the Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, together with supplemental views, Feb. 16, 1961.

(f) S. Rept. 89, "Small Business Exports and the World Market," report of the Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, on encouragement and expansion of exports by small business, Mar. 27, 1961.

(g) Committee print, "Going Abroad: The Profit Opportunities for the Smaller Company," an American Management Association seminar, July 31, 1961.

(h) Hearings, "World Trade—The Small Business Potential, 1962," opportunities for small business in world trade discussed by recipients of the President's E award for export expansion, 87th Cong., 2d sess., May 23, 1962.

(i) S. Rept. 1491, 12th Annual Report of the Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, "Small Business and World Trade," May 15, 1962, p. 40.

[2] Senator Sparkman discussed this question on Dec. 19, 1963, Congressional Record, vol. 109, pt. 19, p. 25163. Senators Bartlett and Morse also protested freight rate disparities in the Senate during December 1963. See Congressional Record, vol. 109, pt. 19, p. 25173. In mid-1963, the Joint Economic Committee had commenced hearings on "Discriminatory Ocean Freight Rates and the Balance of Payments." The committee subsequently reported its findings to the Congress, in January 1965 (S. Rept. No. 1, 89th Cong., 1st sess.).

[3] Agenda of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business for 1964, item 8, "Discriminatory Ocean Freight Rates," adopted Apr. 6, 1964.

[4] Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Income and Trade Analysis Divisions.

[5] "Meat," the monthly operating management magazine for meatpackers, October 1964, "Washington Wire," following p. 20.

[6] U.S. Department of Commerce, "U.S. Commodity Exports and Imports as Related to Output, 1961," updated to 1963. Also, "U.S. Agricultural Shares by Regions and States, Fiscal Year 1963–64", by Tontz and Angelidis, ERS—Foreign—106, reprinted from Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States, November–December 1964.

"The comment everywhere was that the price of U.S. beef was too high. However, if lower freight rates develop, the possibilities of trade will be increased." [8]

It was noted that these markets were of interest to the United States and that sufficient data might be available with respect to this area to support a study.

These developments were brought to the attention of the Senate by the chairman of the committee during the 2d session of the 88th Congress.[9]

PUBLIC HEARINGS

After consulting with representatives of meat and shipping organizations, and interested Government agencies, your committee determined to convene public hearings, which were announced early in 1965.[10]

It was the intention of the committee to bring together the interested parties in a positive atmosphere so that all might have an opportunity to contribute. It was thought that such a combined effort might not only identify and resolve problem situations, but that positive cooperation could be engendered. Under these circumstances, the committee hoped that a breakthrough in beef exports could be achieved.

The President's 1964 message on agriculture, which was transmitted to the Congress on the day your committee announced its hearings, recalled that the sale of livestock and meat animals accounted for one-third of all farm income,[11] and emphasized the importance of our agricultural exports in these terms:

"We will continue to cooperate with livestock farmers and ranchers so as to * * * build markets here and abroad. * * * The welfare of American agriculture is closely linked to foreign trade. Our 1968 goal of $6 billion farm product exports was reached in 1964. American farmers last year accounted for one-fourth of U.S. merchandise exports."

A week later, on February 11, the Presidential message on the balance of payments and the gold situation recognized the relationship between U.S. exports and the ocean freight rate situation in the following terms:

"We will strive to eliminate such artificial barriers to U.S. exports as discriminatory freight rates on ocean traffic." [12]

These events provided the background for the public sessions of the committee on the morning and afternoon of February 24 and 25, 1965.[13] The witnesses who appeared before the committee are:

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman.

Jay Taylor, chairman of the 1964 Presidential Beef Export Mission, and past president of the American National Cattlemen's Association.

Rear Adm. John Harllee, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission.

William Kuhfuss, member of the board of directors, American Farm Bureau Federation.

J. Russell Ives, director of the Department of Marketing, American Meat Institute.

Edwin H. Pewett, general counsel, National Independent Meat Packers Association, presenting the statement of Floyd Segel, past president of the National Independent Meat Packers Association.

Don F. Magdanz, executive director of the National Livestock Feeders Association.

R. W. Long, Rothchild & Co., meatpackers, Omaha, Nebr.

Ralph E. Casey, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute.

John H. Griffith, C. H. Betjamann, and W. James Amoss, Jr., representing the American Steamship Traffic Executives Committee.

John L. Eyre, senior traffic corporation consultant of Arthur D. Little, Inc.

F. J. Kellegher, manager of international air freight sales, Trans-World Airlines.

William I. Miller, Atlantic cargo sales manager of Pan American World Airways.

Statements and correspondence from other parties are incorporated in the hearing record, together with additional documents which your committee hopes will be helpful to those interested in the subject.[14]

REASONS FOR INTERIM REPORT

Efforts to reduce artificial barriers and to develop export markets for the American beef industry derive a special significance from current shifts in the patterns of world production, consumption, and trade in meat products. Also involved are the historic transition of six European nations into a common agricultural market, and the Kennedy round trade negotiations, which are beginning in 1965. These and other considerations, which are more fully described in the course of this report, have prompted the committee to make some of its findings available early, in interim form.

FINDINGS

I. The significance of beef exports

The committee's opening witness, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, informed the committee that:

"Export markets for tomorrow are going to be even more important to the farmer than they are today. We have reached a point in our own domestic markets where growth is primarily dependent on population increases. But very few other countries have achieved the level of consumption which prevails here at home. * * *

"And as the consumer grows more prosperous, his thoughts and desires turn increasingly to meat. This fact alone indicates that the export potential for cattle and beef * * * is as big as the world and as wide as our imagination can make it." [15]

This potential is illustrated by beef-consumption figures in Western Europe. In the European Economic Community, for instance, per capita consumption of beef increased 53 percent in the 8 years between 1955 and 1963.[16]

Despite these per capita increases, European consumption of beef is less than half that of the United States.[17] The uptrend is expected to continue, with a rise of another 36 percent predicted over the next 5 years.[18]

Western Europe is presently a market almost twice as large as the United States.[19] Its near-term population increases are expected to maintain a similar ratio.

The extent of European prosperity and the development of consumer taste for beef is indicated by wholesale and retail prices for average grades of beef in Europe, ranging up to double what they are in this country.[20] This price structure appears to leave a considerable margin for the absorption of extra costs of marketing U.S. beef abroad, and for ample profitability.

At the same time, traditional suppliers to the West European market are experiencing a general inability to keep pace with the rapid growth in demand for beef and beef products. Some of this shortfall results from temporary conditions, such as a recent drought in Argentina.[21] However, documents included in the record indicate that stringency among South American suppliers may continue for some time, as nations on that continent recapitulate consumption patterns similar to the United States and Western Europe.[22] If these observations are sound, desire and demand for beef and beef products should exceed supply for some time in the world, and particularly in Western Europe.

The U.S. beef industry possesses the largest, and what is reputed to be the most efficient, "productive platform" from which to expand output.[23] It should be thus in a favorable position to produce the increased quantities of beef which will be required. Your committee is convinced also that U.S. beef products are unsurpassed in quality. Available evidence indicates that foreign markets should grow substantially in the years ahead, and there will, accordingly, be opportunities in both quantity and quality markets. It appears to the committee that the U.S. beef industry has certain marked advantages in seeking to participate in this growth.

---

[7] Estimate by officials of Livestock and Meat Products Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, August 1964. An estimate of future demand in Western Europe was subsequently placed at 500,000 metric tons per year by an official of the E.E.C. See Congressional Record, Sept. 30, 1965, p. 25563.

[8] Summary report of C. E. Murphey after study of beef export survey of eight European countries, July 27, 1964. Included in "Expansion of Beef Exports," hearings before the Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, 89th Cong., 1st sess., Feb. 24 and 25, 1965, app. VIII, p. 251.

[9] "Ocean Freight Rates as a Barrier To Developing Our Maritime Commerce," Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 18, pp. 22040–22045.

[10] "Notice of Hearings on Ocean Freight Rates and Other Barriers to U.S. Beef Exports," daily Congressional Record, Feb. 4, 1965, Small Business Committee press release, SSBC No. 473, Feb. 4, 1965.

[11] The President's message is included in the committee's hearings, "Expansion of Beef Exports," as app. XXIV. See pp. 321 and 322.

[12] Message from the President of the United States relative to "Review of International Balance of Payments and our Gold Position," H. Doc. 83, 89th Cong., 1st sess., p. 8.

[13] "Expansion of Beef Exports," hearings on ocean freight rates and other barriers to expanding exports of U.S. beef and beef products before the Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, 89th Cong., 1st sess., 1965.

[14] See apps. I through XXIV, pp. 235–323, of the hearing record.

[15] Hearing, loc. cit., footnote 13, pp. 7 and 8.

[16] "Basic Facts of the Common Organization of the Market in Beef and Veal," European Communities Joint Information Service, October 1964. See hearing, app. II, p. 236.

[17] Statement of Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, hearings, loc. cit., footnote 13, p. 3.

[18] "Basic Facts of the Common Organization of the Market in Beef and Veal," loc. cit., footnote 16, p. 236 et seq.

[19] Compared to the current U.S. population of 193 million, the geographer of the State Department estimates the current population of the Western Europe market area (including Greece and Turkey) at about 370 million.

[20] Chart of wholesale beef prices in European markets, hearings, p. 12. Retail prices for beef in European markets, hearings, p. 232.

[21] "Argentina's Export Level Down 21 Percent, but Still High," hearings, app. VI, p. 244. See also Foreign Agricultural Service dispatch of Mar. 18, 1965, hearings, app. XXII, p. 309. For description of quotas and sailing schedules for oversea markets fixed by the Argentine National Meat Board, see "Meat and Poultry," Comtel Reuter, London, Feb. 8, 1965.

[22] "The World Meat Pool and Our Opportunities in It," speech by Herrell DeGraff, president of the American Meat Institute. Included in hearings, app. XVI, at p. 291 et seq. See especially section on "Argentine Supply," p. 293.

The method of participation in which the committee is most interested is through the expansion of exports from the United States. It was, therefore, appropriate that your committee examine the economics of this export trade, and, in particular, the factors which might constitute artificial barriers to its development.

II. OCEAN FREIGHT RATE DISPARITIES

According to Dr. Herrell DeGraff, president of the American Meat Institute, about 10 percent of the world's beef and beef products enter international trade.[24] For transportation, beef is divided into three categories: (1) chilled beef (as carcasses, sides, or quarters); (2) frozen beef products in cartons; and (3) live animals on the hoof. Because of the completely disparate nature of these forms, different transportation considerations, and thus ocean freight rate considerations, must be taken into account.

As to the order of importance, the committee is advised by the Department of Agriculture that about 95 percent of U.S. domestic trade is in the form of chilled beef. It appears that the premium cuts are contained in the sides and quarters, as compared with so-called variety cuts, which are more susceptible to shipment in boxes.

Turning first to chilled beef, the committee heard the following testimony from Jay Taylor, the past president of the American National Cattlemen's Association:

"The wide disparity between North Atlantic and South Atlantic freight rates emphasizes the competitive advantages (of) or neighbors to the south: * * * For example, from the Gulf Port States to the United Kingdom, to ship frozen beef carcasses wrapped would cost $108.64 per metric ton; and $140 per metric ton to Le Havre, Rotterdam, and Hamburg. A comparable charge for Argentina to these same ports would be $55.88 to Le Havre, $40.64 to Marseilles, $35.56 to Rotterdam, and $55.88 to Hamburg on a metric ton basis." [25]

The committee notes that these disparities amount to 150.5 percent for Le Havre and Hamburg and 293.7 percent for Rotterdam. Mr. Taylor continued:

"More expensive is the transshipment of chilled beef either in sides or quarters. * * *"

"It is obvious from these various comparisons that Argentina and other countries have a significant advantage in freight rates alone."

The following comparison of the ocean freight rates on chilled beef in sides and quarters, between North American and South American routes is drawn from material submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture.[26]

	North American	South American	Disparity per ton	Disparity per pound (cents)	Percentage difference
To London	$153.00	$73.82	$79.18	2.6	107.26
To Le Harve	180.00	69.96	110.04	4.9	157.28
To Antwerp	180.00	69.96	110.04	4.9	157.28
To Hamburg	198.00	74.64	123.36	5.5	165.27
To Genoa	191.25	50.85	140.40	6.2	276.10

Data submitted by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission also tended to indicate disparities of this magnitude with regard to Europe, and even suggested that some rates from Australia to Europe may be lower than U.S. North Atlantic and gulf rates, despite the vast difference in distances.[27]

An independent packer who had just returned from a sales trip in Europe testified that freight rates were "the main trouble we have had." [28] Don F. Magdanz, president of the National Livestock Feeders Association, stated that, in his opinion, "discrimination against American producers in current shipping rates is both factual and appalling." [29]

In addition, testimony and correspondence were received which showed that a specific contract for sale of 15,000 metric tons of beef to France was lost to U.S. industry by reason of a 100-percent differential between the ocean freight rates available to American exporters and those available to our competitors.[30]

There was also a report that a U.S. citizen directing a supermarket chain in Italy, which purchases 100 tons of carcass beef and 50 tons of veal per month, would prefer to place his orders in the United States but has been deterred by the differential in ocean freight rates.[31]

Based upon estimates by the geographer of the State Department that sea routes to Europe from producing nations of South America are 2,000 to 3,000 miles longer than those from the United States, these ocean freight rate structures for chilled beef have an even greater economic impact than the 107- to 294-percent disparities calculated above would indicate.

The second type of trade is in frozen beef products in cartons. In this area, differentials in favor of foreign shippers in recent years have been materially smaller and, particularly with the incorporation of recent reductions, are nearly comparable.[32]

It was noted that the U.S. exports in this trade "doubled in 1964," and "are flourishing." [33]

With the respect to live animals, correspondence included in the record states that "the main drawback [to such shipments aboard U.S. liners] is the excessively high ocean freight rate." [34] However, as to this third category, the committee heard testimony that liner rates, because of the configuration of these ships, "are not economical for slaughter cattle and not really intended for that purpose." [35]

An alternative method of transporting live animals is by charter carriage. This is also very expensive because of the specialized facilities required. Shipowners wish to amortize the cost of these facilities rapidly since the long-range prospects in this trade are considered uncertain.[36] A further barrier to this trade is that suitable vessels are sometimes unavailable at any price.[37] However, trade in live animals by sea is still taking place.[38] In addition, after a substantial air freight reduction in the summer of 1964, many thousands of calves were transported to Europe as aircargo.[39]

Indications are that this trade, by both sea and air, would be "a continuing profitable operation" in the years ahead, and would be facilitated "if cattlemen get the freight rates right." [40]

This evidence, while not exhaustive, is consistent, impressive, and uncontroverted. The record seems fairly to support the conclusion that under circumstances of heavy demand in Western Europe, where prices, quality, delivery terms, and other attributes for U.S. beef are assumed to be comparable with the competition, ocean-freight rates have constituted a barrier to the exporting of U.S. beef and beef products.

Your committee accordingly finds that the ocean-freight structure, with the large disparities in favor of the South American trade in effect at the time of the hearings, resulted in discrimination as against U.S. beef exporters in a practical economic sense.

Although there are other cost components which must be considered in arriving at selling prices of U.S. beef abroad, the evidence of loss of export sales on the sole ground of rate disparities would appear to place this conclusion beyond the realm of serious contention. Indeed, the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission conceded:

> * * * We think it must be honestly admitted that the relatively high freight rates on beef exports have been an impediment.[41]

The history of exports in frozen boxed beef and in transportation of calves by air may provide some indications of the extent to which these disparities are a factor. For these categories, U.S. and third country freight rates have been closer together, and our export trade appears to have developed in more orderly fashion.[42]

---

[23] Statement of Rear Adm. John Harllee, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, hearings, loc. cit., p. 48.

[24] Hearings, app. XVI, p. 292.

[27] Hearings, pp. 44, 52–81; re Australia and New Zealand, p. 40.

[28] The witness, Mr. Long, continued as follows:

"Our bids on beef to certain importers in Europe have been competitive, based on f.o.b. price in New York. After having several bids turned down, we made a special trip to Europe to discuss this with them and, as everyone here has testified during the day, it is the difference in freight rates between South American and North American ports." Hearings, loc. cit., p. 122.

[29] Hearings, p. 115.

[25] Hearings, pp. 25–26.

[26] Hearings, p. 13.

[30] Translation of letter from a French importer ascribing loss of contract to differences in ocean freight rates, app. XIII, p. 274.

[31] Hearings, p. 121.

[32] Hearings, pp. 168–169. It should be noted that charges attributable to the Argentine system of "free in" rates should be considered as set forth in the explanation of the chart on p. 169.

[33] Hearings, p. 161.

[34] App. XII, p. 273.

[35] Hearings, p. 160.

[36] A thorough discussion of the economics of transporting live cattle by sea is set forth on pp. 171–176 of the hearings.

[37] Hearings, p. 104, sec. e(3) (a).

[38] See illustrated article on largest live cattle shipment from the United States, hearings, p. 21.

[39] Nearly 8,000 calves were exported from the United States by air in the second half of 1964 according to Aviation Week and Space Technology magazine, June 28, 1965, p. 47. This trade is described in detail by witnesses representing TWA and Pan American World Airways, hearings, p. 226 et seq. The rate information is set forth on p. 230.

[40] Hearings, pp. 234, 24.

[41] Hearings, p. 49.

The relative impact of this among other barriers, or the extent to which specific monetary losses can be attributed to these barriers, have not, to the committee's knowledge, been formally assessed. In view of the fact that the largest ocean freight differentials applied to chilled beef, and the U.S. trade is accustomed to moving nearly all of its beef in that form, there is also the possibility that this rate structure constituted a psychological barrier to export trade in the other categories.

Whether these conditions constitute "discrimination in a regulatory sense" is a question that was discussed at the hearings.[43]

In an attempt to justify the disparities in rates, several witnesses presented testimony on cost elements involved in the higher U.S. outbound freight rates, such as port expenses,[44] differences in terminology,[45] and the inclusion or exclusion of fees for particular services.[46] Some of this testimony is summarized later in this report.

Your committee has limited its present findings to an identification of these rate disparities and an assessment of their economic impact. Nevertheless, the committee is pleased to be able to make such data available to the Government departments and agencies concerned which have the resources to go into the economic, legal, and regulatory aspects of these disparities in depth.

Indeed, your committee feels that detailed and comprehensive analysis of all the cost components of beef rates is essential before conclusions may be drawn, and, accordingly, recommends that such analyses be prepared for inclusion in the subsequent records of these proceedings. The Department of Agriculture and the Federal Maritime Commission would appear to be the appropriate agencies to bear the responsibility for perfecting these studies.

III. Other barriers

1. Market Survey and Development Barriers

There are two questions of cardinal importance to the businessmen who must plan ahead in order to produce, process, or transport beef for export markets: (1) what is the extent of current demand for beef and beef products in a particular area, and (2) what are the prospects for the future. Pragmatic consideration of these factors must be the forerunner of any programing where money must be invested or other business risks assumed. The lack of such information would, in the opinion of the committee, constitute a barrier to the expansion of this trade.

J. Russell Ives, director of marketing for the American Meat Institute, expressed such questions in the following manner:[47]

"How much can Western Europe be expected to increase its own production of livestock in response to rising demand?

"What are the capacities of other countries currently producing beef for export?

"How are consumer and trade preferences to be evaluated?"

The committee has not yet been informed of any progress toward reliable studies, projections, or materials upon which business judgments of this nature might be based.

With respect to higher quality meats, it might be feasible, as an example, to develop an estimate of the number of Americans residing abroad either under the auspices of the Government and private business, or individually as tourists, employees, dependents, and retired persons. It might be possible to estimate the volume of business done by hotels and high-quality restaurants in some of the nations which are accessible as export markets. The trends established for these items in past years could then be projected into the future. With respect to the average and variety grades of meat preferred in such areas as Western Europe, it would be helpful to have a survey of the competitiveness of American products, with attention given to each element of cost and price, and a compilation of data indicating the consumption of various types of beef products in these areas. The committee recommends preparation of such surveys and compilations.

Subsequent to the informational phase is the question of promotion or market development. In the words of the Chairman of the Presidential Beef Export Mission:

"Without question, however, it will take a concerted market development program to fully realize the European potential for American cattle and beef."[48]

The committee is pleased to note that some initial steps have been taken in market development by the Department of Agriculture. Other efforts have been made jointly by the Department and the American Meat Institute,[49] and still others by the American Farm Bureau Federation through its trade development corporation in Rotterdam.[50] As these projects progress, the committee will look forward to receiving the benefit of further information and counsel from the participants.

With respect to the financing of current and future market development projects, the committee notes that the Department of Agriculture has access to resources such as direct appropriations and contributions from cooperating organizations, as well as to counterpart foreign currency funds. Pursuant to Public Law 480, a certain percentage of these moneys are dedicated "to help develop new markets for U.S. agricultural commodities on a mutually benefiting basis."[51]

The committee feels, however, that from the evidence presently in the record, it is unable to make a clear determination of the financial resources that might be available for the survey and development of new markets in beef and veal, and the circumstances under which these resources should be further mobilized. It would seem that the Department of Agriculture, with its manifold resources,[52] is in a position to develop information and to make recommendations as to these questions, and your committee urges that this be done.

In the meantime, the committee has sought to be helpful by collecting, translating, and publishing some of the relevant documentary material as a part of its hearing record.[53]

2. Political Barriers

One of the most serious concerns of beef industry witnesses at the hearing was preserving access to markets which were subject to existing and potential political barriers. The United States is the world's leading agricultural trading Nation—the largest exporter and second largest importer.[54]

As pointed out in the President's February message, one-fourth of all this country's farm production is exported, and agricultural commodities constitute about one-fourth of all U.S. merchandise exports. Thus, the national interest is most directly involved in the invocation or threat of political obstacles to trade in agricultural commodities.

William Kuhfuss, spokesman for the American Farm Bureau Federation, informed the committee that:

One of the more serious threats to the future expansion of cattle and beef exports is the proposed EEC beef and cattle import regulations.[55]

Witnesses described three types of currently existing barriers:

1. The Common Market external tariff—as to which "the rates alone constitute substantial trade restrictions."[56]

2. The proposed quotas and import certifications—which "experience indicates * * * can be used as trade barriers."[57]

3. The variable import levies—which "are particularly disruptive of trade because the exporter does not even know the height of the hurdle he must overcome. * * * (A) trade agreement which * * * appears to give international approval to a system of ultimate variable fees would be contrary to the best interests of American agriculture."[58]

Mr. Kuhfuss voiced the opinion that the proposed agricultural trade policies "seem to be based on a concept of self-sufficiency which would lead to a serious misallocation of resources within the [European] community and to the disruption of trade."

This opinion is confirmed by a study by the Committee for Economic Development which found that Europe has a very high priced agriculture, with one-third as much agricultural land as the United States, but which is farmed by 2½ times as many people.[59] It thus appears that the Europeans would stand to suffer from political restrictions on beef and veal in the following ways: their consumers would pay higher prices, their internal resources would become committed to uneconomic uses, their labor shortages would be intensified, and the higher prices of food would be reflected in increased costs of manufactured goods and services across their whole economy.[60]

The committee notes also that quota, certification, and variable levy devices are in the area of nontariff barriers, and are administrative rather than statutory in nature.

---

[42] While a separate breakout of frozen beef figures is not maintained by the Department of Agriculture, it is the Department's considered opinion that these trades have been developing in such a manner.

[43] Hearings, pp. 37–38.

[44] Statement of John L. Eyre, hearings, p. 183 et seq.

[45] Loc. cit., footnote 31, supra.

[46] Hearings, pp. 100–103, 168, 170. Also see testimony of Mr. Eyre generally.

[47] Hearings, p. 98.

[48] Hearings, p. 26.

[49] Hearings, p. 95 et seq.

[50] Hearings, p. 178.

[51] Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Public Law 480, 83d Cong., sec. 104(a).

[52] See tabulation of employees of the Foreign Agricultural Service, hearings, app. XXI, p. 307.

[53] Loc. cit., footnote 14. See, especially, apps. II, XVII, and XIX.

[54] Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, March–April 1965, p. 4.

[55] Hearings, p. 180.

[56] Hearings, p. 181.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Hearings, pp. 181–182.

[59] "Trade Negotiations for a Better Free World Economy," Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development, May 1964, pp. 29–30.

[60] "Trade Negotiations for a Better Free World Economy," loc. cit., pp. 56–57.

The meaning of this characterization in terms of trade was discussed in the testimony of Floyd Segel, past president of the National Independent Meat Packers Association, in the following terms:

"Another shadow of doubt is raised by * * * the unpredictability of certain foreign governments with respect to inspection of product and import restrictions. I have in mind specifically a recent period when the West German Government suddenly suspended, without warning and without prior notice, all import licenses. This left a number of American packers 'holding the bag,' with substantial inventories of beef which they had been accumulating * * * in their freezers and coolers because it had been earmarked exclusively for this German trade." [61]

Another witness, the president of the National Livestock Feeders Association, commented as follows as to nontariff barriers:

"The U.S. trade negotiators in their relentless efforts during recent years to liberalize world trade, in our opinion, have failed to give sufficient emphasis to * * * American agriculture * * * [and] at least until recently, U.S. officials have viewed nontariff barriers with rather a closed eye. We are aware of no concerted attempt by our negotiators or by the administrative departments of our Government to reduce or cancel out nontariff obstacles." [62]

The principal nontariff barrier employed by the European Economic Community is the variable import levy. U.S. poultry exporters have already experienced the effects of this device, which raised the tariff from 9.7 to 17 cents a pound, and thereby cut U.S. poultry exports to the Common Market from $52.6 million in 1962 to about $12 million at present.[63]

The committee takes note of the opinion by the Joint Economic Committee in March 1965, that the variable levy system is contrary to the best interests of American agriculture.[64]

For the European Economic Community, the period between 1957 and 1970 is of historic importance. It is evolving into a true economic and agricultural common market. Its external policy on agriculture in general, and on beef and veal in particular, will shortly be tested during the Kennedy round trade negotiations which are scheduled to begin during the month of September 1965.[65] These negotiations will provide unparalleled opportunities to strengthen the bonds of trade, friendship, and alliance.

However, based upon existing and recently announced potential restrictions in beef and the curtailment of the trade in poultry which American exporters have experienced since 1962, a real and ugly possibility exists that political barriers may be used as a device for the exclusion of American beef products from the Common Market.

Such political decisions would foreclose possibilities of expanding long-term U.S. export markets, regardless of the relative efficiency of our production, transportation, and efforts at market development.

The responsibility for evaluating these possibilities falls upon the governments involved, for this is entirely a governmental matter.

This committee takes a very serious view of these matters and is presently looking into them further. Its session of September 9, held jointly with the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, was a part of this effort. The committee also invites private organizations and Government agencies concerned to assist in the gathering and analysis of relevant data and the communication of appropriate recommendations to the committee. The committee wishes to have the benefit of a wide spectrum of opinion upon which to base its ultimate findings and recommendations in this area.

3. Veterinary and Sanitary Regulations as Barriers

Regulations pertaining to public health should, ideally, have minimal effects on international trade.

However, the committee notes the recent statement by Raymond A. Ioanes, Administrator of the Foreign Agricultural Service, that:

"We often overlook food health laws and regulations [as trade barriers] or don't know that they also restrict agricultural trade. The current trend abroad is toward even more stringent food health controls.[66]

Mr. Ioanes points to differences in opinion over the use of chemicals and over administrative determinations of what is "safe," "necessary," or "desirable."

In this connection, the committee received evidence that certain veterinary and sanitary regulations already in effect in Western Europe, as well as regulations proposed to take effect in the European Economic Community this year, could threaten much of the U.S. beef export trade with these nations.

Under regulations in effect in February, it appeared that certain provisions could operate effectively to prohibit, in some countries, trade in entire categories of beef products which are fully acceptable in neighboring countries.[67] Subsequently, the Department of Agriculture dispatched a special mission to Europe to discuss the status of these regulations and the possibilities for improvement. The mission was composed of John Reisz, of the Livestock and Meat Products Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture; Dr. George Murray, Meat Inspection Division, USDA; and J. Russell Ives, director of marketing of the American Meat Institute. They visited five countries within the European Economic Community between March 29 and April 13, 1965.

While in Europe, the mission became aware of the regulations proposed in the EEC Council directive of June 26, 1964, which were scheduled to take effect on June 26, 1965. The provisions of this directive are being studied intensively by industry and Government at the present time. The committee recommends that the information of current value be made available by the mission when the hearings reconvene. Your committee prefers to be further advised by these authorities before making findings on this important subject.

4. Communications Barriers

Mr. Segel of NIMPA also testified as to what he called a communications gap caused by differences in terminology in describing United States and European grades and cuts of beef. The witness stated:

"Because of their lack of information about the nomenclature and specifications of U.S. beef, potential European buyers rarely know just what they are requesting. * * * [T]he American packer * * * simply cannot identify what the European buyer might define as 'top-quality beef,' and we know that in general this might actually be inferior beef according to American standards and specifications." [68]

Representatives of the Department of Agriculture in reporting on their visits to European markets have also noted differences in terminology and in specifications.[69]

The committee has been informed that this gap has been recognized as part of a worldwide problem in codifying food standards, with the formation of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The Codex is sponsored by the Food and Agriculture World Health Organizations of the United Nations. As of September 1964, the Export Committee on Meat and Processed Meat Products, under the chairmanship of the Federal Republic of Germany, is working to develop (1) proposals for the classification and grading for carcasses and cuts of beef, lamb, mutton, pork, and veal; and (2) definitions, labeling, and other requirements for certain processed meat products.[70]

Mr. Segel also pointed out the uncertainties that arise from use of different systems of measurement (metric versus English) and a variety of currencies. This testimony will be made available to those studying the possible applications of the metric system in this country.

The committee feels it would be appropriate to receive a progress report from the Department of Agriculture, when the hearings reconvene, on the status of the Codex in the fields of beef and beef products, together with any other measures which are believed to be promising in closing communication gaps in the beef trade.

5. Port Barriers

John Eyre, senior transportation consultant for Arthur D. Little, Inc., informed the committee that: "The cost of moving cargo through American ports is a massive barrier to exporters." [71]

He stated his opinion that the costs for American ports are generally two to three times as great as those incurred in European ports, and that the problem is worse for refrigerated cargoes such as meat and for dry freight.

Studies made by Mr. Eyre indicate that, for certain shipments of canned meat from Chicago to Dusseldorf, port costs consumed 49 percent of the total transportation charges.[72] Further studies refined the figures according to the size of the shipment and the form of inland transportation used, as follows: [73]

---

[61] Hearings, p. 91.

[62] Hearings, p. 115. See also table on "Proportion of Value of Domestic Production Protected Against Imports by Nontariff Barriers, Selected Countries," hearings, p. 116.

[63] "The Chicken War: What Part Did the Law Play?" Paper by L. G. Lemon, staff member of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, Ill., p. 2. See also Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, March–April 1965, table 21, p. 69.

[64] Report of the Joint Economic Committee, 1965, H. Rept. 175, 89th Cong., 1st sess., Mar. 17, 1965, pp. 17, 97.

[65] For the current status of these negotiations, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 5, 1965, p. 19543, "Progress Report on Current GATT Trade Negotiations," remarks by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS in the House of Representatives, June 2, 1965.

[66] "Foreign Food Laws Can Restrict Trade," Foreign Agriculture Magazine, Sept. 21, 1964, p. 5.

[67] Statement of J. Russell Ives of the American Meat Institute, hearings, p. 97.

[68] Hearings, p. 90.

[69] See summary report of C. E. Murphey, loc. cit., footnote 8, hearings, app. VIII, p. 247 et seq.

[70] Foreign Agriculture magazine, Sept. 21, 1964, p. 3.

[71] Hearings, p. 184.

[72] Hearings, p. 189, fig. B–2.

[73] Hearings, p. 211.

EXHIBIT 1-A.—*Export traffic cost breakdown*

	Total cost	U.S. inland		Ship bill of lading		European inland	
		Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of total
Canned meat, Chicago to Dusseldorf:							
Carload: Rail (40,000 pounds)	$1,469	$358	24	$922	63	$189	13
Less-than-carload lot: Rail	400	201	50	142	36	57	14
Truckload: Truck (30,000 pounds)	1,291	457	35	692	54	142	11
Less than truckload: Truck	360	161	45	142	39	57	16

Figures in the record on chilled beef tend to confirm these proportions. The representative of the American Steamship Traffic Executive Committee testified that costs of loading experimental shipments of chilled beef in New York ran between $30 and $40 a ton, and sometimes as high as $50 with the smallest lots.[74] There was other evidence that costs in Argentina ran about $18 a ton at public piers and perhaps as low as $10.80 a ton under special conditions at dockside packing plants.[75]

The committee feels that data of this sort should be utilized by the departments, agencies, and industry associations concerned as part of the economic analyses previously suggested.

Mr. Eyre's contentions that containerization would, as to beef and beef products, "cut the gross transportation cost in half—in some cases by as much as 75 percent," [76] should be included in these studies.

6. Financing and Credit Arrangements

Particularly important for the smaller businessman in the beef industry is the matter of financing the kind of transaction involved in exporting cattle, beef, or beef products.

Jay Taylor gave the committee the following testimony on that subject: [77]

"We have got to work out, on this shipment of live cattle particularly—and it does not apply to the packers [who] know how to handle [this aspect of the transaction]—but the average cowman, he does not have the working capital to handle this kind of a deal. It takes a lot of money to congregate a boatload of cattle. And I think somewhere along this line there is a room for some help to the small businessman * * * in Alabama and * * * Texas that want to market cattle abroad. It may be necessary [to provide for] credit. I think a lot of people in Europe that buy these cattle may need 60 days' credit. We need it in this country. A packer does not pay me for the cattle I sell out of my feedlot for, sometimes, 30 days.

"* * * [Oil producers in Texas don't get] checks from oil companies, sometimes, for 60 to 80 days. And they are the biggest companies in the world.

"So we need some kind of credit established. It is most important. I hope this committee can look into that problem."

In accordance with Mr. Taylor's recommendation, the committee is inquiring further into this area.

7. Domestic Regulations as Possible Barriers

During the course of the hearings [78] and thereafter,[79] the committee has been made aware of certain regulations of the U.S. Department of Agriculture that have been called into question by businessmen seeking to expand exports of beef and beef products. These include:

1. The spacing of live cattle aboard ships outbound from the United States.
2. The period of quarantine of calves traveling by air.
3. The form of certain export certificates.

The committee would be interested in hearing from the Department of Agriculture, when its hearings reconvene, on what effort is being made to reach mutually satisfactory solutions of these difficulties.

8. Unfamiliarity as a Barrier

It has been widely noted that many parts of the U.S. beef industry have been unfamiliar with the potential and the procedures for expanding beef exports to Western Europe and other foreign markets.

The Presidential Beef Export Mission report found that there was—

"Apparently little knowledge or at least little interest by some U.S. meat traders of European potential, and before the mission departure, apparently little serious exploration." [80]

Mr. Taylor testified at the hearing that "the U.S. cattle producer, until 1964, had been unaware of the expanding market for beef in many European countries." [81]

Floyd Segel further testified that efforts by the National Independent Meat Packers Association to interest smaller meatpackers in export markets did not result in a large-scale response.[82]

The committee believes that the four- or five-decade interval during which virtually no U.S. beef was exported probably had an influence upon the beef industry's posture in this regard.

It is hoped that the activities of your committee, bringing together reports from many sources, including the Department of Agriculture, the American Meat Institute, and the European Economic Community, testimony as to the American Farm Bureau Federation's efforts to "shorten the trade routes" [83] for the producer, and the experience of large [84] and small [85] meatpackers in gaining markets abroad, will serve to dispel this barrier to a large extent.

RESULTS OF THE INQUIRY AND SUBSEQUENT DEVELOPMENTS

1. Reductions in ocean freight rates

Although the period since the beginning of the committee's inquiry has been relatively short, the developments which are described in the following sections indicate the rapidity with which this area is changing. On March 15, your committee was pleased to report informally to the Senate a round of ocean freight rate reductions, averaging between 20 and 25 percent, and applying to most categories of beef products moving by sea to Britain, Western Europe, and the Mediterranean.[86] A brief chronology of these reductions is as follows:

1. February 18: Rates on boxed beef going to Britain were reduced by the gulf shipping lines by 13 percent (from $76.25 per ton to $66.50) until March 31.
2. February 24: Boxed beef to the Continent was reduced by two of the major conferences in the North Atlantic by 12 percent (from $75 per ton to $66) and 27 percent (from $96 per ton to $66).
3. March 3: Gulf port rates on boneless beef, bone-in beef, and ground beef were cut between 20 and 32 percent (from $76.25 or $94 per ton, depending upon temperature, to $63.75), with no termination date.
4. March 4: The Atlantic-French Conference reduced the rate on hanging, chilled beef by 25 percent (from $190 per ton to $142.50).
5. March 10: The North Atlantic-Continental Conference voted similar action, reducing rates from the United States to Antwerp by 19 percent (from $180 per ton to $142.50) and from the United States to German ports by 21 percent (from $198 per ton to $156.50).
6. March 15: Rates from the gulf ports followed suit, being reduced on hanging chilled beef to all French and German ports by 18 percent (from $190 to $156.50).
7. March 17: The North Atlantic-United Kingdom Freight Conference approved the new rate for hanging chilled carcasses of beef similar to that in effect in the French and Continental Conferences; i.e., $142.50 per 2,240 pounds.
8. March 26 and June 7: Reduced rate of $82.25 per ton on miscellaneous "not otherwise specified" meats frozen, in cases or cartons; and special lower rate of $49.25 per ton established on frozen packinghouse products of a value not exceeding 12 cents per pound f.o.b. the shipping plant.

Two conditions were attached to the Atlantic coast-rate reductions. They were put into effect as "experimental" and were, at first, scheduled to expire on September 30, 1965. The Atlantic conferences also set a minimum quantity requirement of 25 tons per shipment, based upon optimum use of refrigerated "reefer" space.

The representative of the American Steamship Traffic Executives Committee explained at the hearings that these qualifications were to allow the lines to gain experience in handling this cargo and assessing the costs involved.[87]

The gulf port rates, with the exception of item 1, were put forward as indefinite rather than temporary, with no minimum quantity requirement.

In announcing these reductions, the chairman of the committee cautioned that the lower rates were only an initial step. He pointed out that some are temporary and others tentative, in the sense that no cargo has actually moved over these routes. Also, in light of the labor situation in maritime affairs, the many cost pressures upon the steamship companies were recognized.

The committee was thus gratified to receive word on April 8 that general rate increases scheduled to take effect at that time would not apply to the new lower level of rates on beef and beef products.[88] Further, on September 17, the committee was advised that the lower rate levels would be extended beyond September 30.

---

[74] Hearings, pp. 103, 160–161.

[75] Hearings, pp. 102–103.

[76] Hearings, p. 190.

[77] Hearings, p. 28.

[78] Hearings, p. 27.

[79] "Export of Cattle May Fail by Refusal of Paper Work," by Helen Delich Bentley, Baltimore Sun, Mar. 15, 1965, p. 36. See also "Export Sales of Cattle to Italy," remarks by Senator ALLOTT, of Colorado, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 25, 1965, p. 5956.

[80] Excerpts from "Preliminary Summary Report of Presidential Beef Export Mission, May 1964," item 12, hearings, p. 32.

[81] Hearings, p. 25.

[82] Hearings, p. 92.

[83] Hearings, p. 178.

[84] "Export Sales Mount, Foreign Ventures Gain—Swift 'Beefs Up' Its Overseas Operations," hearings, app. XX, p. 305.

[85] See testimony of Mr. Segel, hearings, p. 89; and Mr. Long, hearings, p. 120.

[86] "Review of Small Business Committee Efforts To Reduce Barriers and Expand Beef Exports," statement by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 15, 1965, pp. 4917–4918.

[87] Hearings, p. 161.

[88] Letter to committee from J. H. Griffith, vice chairman, ASTEC, dated Apr. 6, 1965, is reprinted in the hearings, app. XVIII, p. 300.

These actions followed a letter from your committee chairman which expressed the hope that, in view of the efforts being made within industry and Government to expand the country's exports of these commodities, the shipping lines "would not feel it necessary to have rates * * * revert to their previous levels."

In reply, the vice chairman of the American Steamship Traffic Executives Committee, John H. Griffith, stated:[89]

"* * * Several conferences reduced [rates on chilled beef in February and March] by approximately 25 percent in an endeavor to stimulate exports. * * * We feel that the old rates should not be restored to their original level."

It was further explained that the Continental Conference had scheduled a general rate increase of 7 percent for November 1, with the French Conference taking similar action by January 1, and the English following suit at a later date. For beef, however, there will be a ceiling of $4 per freight ton which will limit the rise to about 2.7 percent. In the meantime, the rates will remain at the lower "experimental" level. Thereafter, according to Mr. Griffith—

"The modest increase of less than 3 percent on these particular rates will still result in transportation costs well below last year's level, should exporters find a European market. We hope that they will."

The chairman brought these developments to the attention of the Senate on September 30.[90]

The committee wishes specifically to commend the actions of the American Steamship Traffic Executives Committee, the Conferences, and the American Merchant Marine Institute for their responsive and responsible actions in this matter.

II. Reductions in airfreight rates on beef and live cattle

During this period, the American air carriers also proposed reductions of 25 to 30 percent in airfreight rates on beef and beef products. These were taken up at the meeting of the International Air Transport Association in Venice in May 1965. The proposals were approved by the member international lines and scheduled to go into effect on September 1, 1965.

This development was announced to the Senate on August 12,[91] and the following tabulation of reductions was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Airfreight reductions on beef as of Sept. 1, 1965

[Applies to movements of 2,200 pounds or more]

	Percent
Belgium	27.3
Denmark	25.4
Germany	25.4
France	27.3
Greece	30.9
Italy:	
Rome	24.6
Milan	25.4
Netherlands	27.3
Norway	21.1
Spain	27.3
Portugal	30.9
United Kingdom:	
Liverpool	29.1
Manchester	30.9
Edinburgh	29.8

To points in Africa the reductions are of even greater magnitude, by reason of the fact that beef previously traveled at the high general-commodity rate. Separate postings of beef rates resulted in decreases such as the following:

	Percent
Libya	52.4
Tunisia	49.7

As a result, aircargo rates on all forms of beef and beef products will drop to between 17 and 19 cents per pound for destinations throughout the United Kingdom and continental Europe.

Rates on live calves up to 90 days old, which were cut from $1.39 per pound to about 41 cents per pound in mid-1964, were further reduced to about 38 cents per pound for the heavier animals.

The ultimate test of both of these sets of rate reductions will be the course of sales of U.S. beef abroad. The state of these markets will surely depend upon many circumstances other than freight rates, some of which are discussed in this interim report. However, it appears that these initiatives by the steamship and airline companies, coming at critical moments, constitute not only material assistance, but excellent precedents and continuing stimulus in the cooperative effort to gain long-term commercial markets abroad for the American beef industry.

III. Increased interindustry cooperation

One objective of the committee was to further a cooperative atmosphere in which the various segments of the beef and transportation industries could gather to resolve mutual problems and advance common interests. The committee notes that the American Meat Institute has taken the initiative in representing the beef industry in discussions with the steamship organizations, on five occasions, in Chicago and New York. A typical list of those attending the discussions is found at page 84 of the hearings.

An indication of the nature of this effort is that subsequent meetings of this group have discussed technical and nontechnical matters in a businesslike and cordial atmosphere. One such meeting (in New York on March 19) involved a visit to a *Challenger II*-class vessel which was being loaded with beef sides and quarters, to see and discuss the practical problems of handling and stowage. The committee appreciates the fact that its representatives were invited to participate in this meeting as observers. The most recent meeting in Chicago provided an opportunity for shipping representatives to inspect packinghouses of different kinds. In addition, the Meat Institute has compiled a list of about 450 persons and organizations interested in expanding U.S. beef exports, to which it mails periodic bulletins on export developments. This appears to be a significant step in improving communications within the export community.

The following testimony on interindustry cooperation by the president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, Ralph Casey, is also germane:

"Last summer, when the first sides of exhibition beef in decades were to move from our shores to England, there was an urgent need for prompt and specialized handling in ocean transportation. For a time this service did not appear to be available, at least within a relatively short period. Aled Davies, vice president of the American Meat Institute, contacted Alvin Shapiro, executive vice president of the American Marine Institute in Washington. * * * With the greatest possible cooperation from one of our member lines, United States Lines Co., the meat was placed on board and was properly and timely delivered abroad.

"I am advised that it became obvious to Mr. Davies and Mr. Shapiro that the channels of communication between our two industries left much to be desired * * * as the drive for meat export promotion continued, both of the aforementioned gentlemen concluded that our respective interested members meet and open a better channel of communication and become more familiar with each other's problems. So forthright was the discussion at the first meeting in Washington, on January 22, 1965, that they have met twice subsequently with * * * very satisfactory results.

"It can be no secret, Mr. Chairman, that the protracted nature of their meetings in Chicago on February 3 and 17 were in no small part stimulated by [the Small Business Committee's] interest in these matters. For having stimulated both of us beyond what might otherwise have been the case, I want you to know we are grateful."[92]

The committee believes export prospects are brighter because of the patterns of cooperation thus established.

IV. Increasing beef exports

Preliminary figures for the first 4 months of 1965 indicate that beef exports increased substantially over the comparable period in 1964.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman graciously permitted the chairman of your committee to announce on the floor of the Senate the following gains tabulated by his Department for the first quarter of the year:

U.S. exports of beef and livestock products

	1st quarter, 1964	1st quarter, 1965	Percent change
Beef and veal	[1] 7,986	[1] 16,068	+101.2
Total red meat	[1] 65,183	[1] 32,398	−49.5
Variety meats	[1] 51,539	[1] 47,828	−7.2
Live cattle	[2] 6,528	[2] 10,985	+68.6

[1] Thousand pounds product weight.

[2] Number of head.

For the month of March, the new levels for beef and veal were 195.4 percent above those of last year, while the live cattle totals were 111.5 percent above those of March 1964. These developments were reported informally to the Senate on March 18, 1965.[93] Figures for the first 4 months showed beef and veal up 68.58 percent and live cattle up 66.96 percent over 1964 levels.[94]

Your committee was especially gratified by these increases, since they were compiled under generally unfavorable conditions. The publication Foreign Agriculture Trade of the United States for March–April 1965, reports that export totals for several agricultural commodities "toward the close of 1964, in anticipation of the longshoremen's strike, were larger than expected." Following this came the actual closure of ports in the northeast, until well into February; and at some gulf ports, into March. In fact, this reduced the combined level of all types of meat exports substantially below the level of the year before. An additional marine labor difficulty, involving 100 ships for more than 2½ months during the summer, further affected the picture.

---

[89] Letter from committee dated Sept. 10, 1965. Reply from Mr. Griffith dated Sept. 16, 1965. Correspondence retained in committee files.

[90] "Third Review of Small Business Committee's Efforts To Reduce Barriers and Expand Beef Exports," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 25563, Sept. 30, 1965.

[91] "Opportunities in Foreign Markets for Imaginative Small Business—Airfreight Rates on Beef Reduced 25 to 30 percent," statement by Senator SPARKMAN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 12, 1965, pp. 20170–20172.

[92] Hearings, pp. 129–130.

[93] "Second Review of Small Business Committee Efforts To Reduce Barriers and Expand Beef Exports," statement by Senator SPARKMAN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 18, 1965, p. 10831.

[94] Foreign Agriculture Magazine, July 19, 1965.

During the course of its inquiry, the committee undertakes to update and analyze the export figures as soon as new tabulations and breakdowns become available.[95]

V. Increasing cooperation between industry and Government

Your committee is charged with serving the interests of small business. In this field are found the 1.6 million family enterprises represented by the American Farm Bureau and upwards of two-thirds of the approximately 7,700 commercial meatpackers. However, in the course of inquiries such as this, there are problems which also affect the welfare of all of American business.

The beef industry, particularly as engaged in international trade, embraces many segments—production, processing, inland transportation, ocean carriage, financing, and marketing. Political as well as industry boundaries must be crossed.

It is apparent that no lasting progress can be made unless all elements of industry and government come together in an atmosphere where each can make a contribution.

For these reasons, a harmonious and effective working relationship between business organizations and the committee is of great importance. The attainment of such a relationship was one of the goals set forth in your committee's earliest releases and notices.[96]

One commentator, writing in Livestock Market Digest, viewed this matter as follows:

"Now would be the time to do these things, while Europe has a meat shortage * * * the Government-industry team in an export program of such vast potential requires recognition and mutual helpfulness [as to the respective roles of Government and industry]."[97]

The committee is gratified by the cooperation received from the steamship, airline, farm, livestock, and meatpacking associations and companies. This relationship is reflected in the comment by John H. Griffith, the witness for the American Steamship Traffic Executives Committee, that:

"[The] committee's interest has contributed to even more effective cooperation by industry and government in seeking ways and means of effectively developing the true potential for beef exports."[98]

In addition, A. T. DeSmedt, a leading steamship executive, made the following observation in a newspaper article:

"As a result [of the Senate Small Business Committee's hearing] the shippers and the carriers have come closer together and are seeking solutions in concert rather than in acrimony. Already some rate reductions and some proposed packaging improvements have been agreed upon. Even if these are not the whole answer to expanding meat sales abroad, they may well chart the course for Congress, the Federal Maritime Commission, small business and ocean carriers in the future."[99]

It appears to the committee that its goals in the area of promoting cooperative effort are being fulfilled. A salient reason for this is the leadership currently being displayed within the industries concerned, which reaches a high order of business statesmanship. In this regard, your committee commends the American Steamship Traffic Executives Committee, the American Merchant Marine Institute, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the American Meat Institute for their contributions.

FURTHER HEARINGS

The committee contemplates resuming its hearings on this subject prior to the adjournment of the 89th Congress.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that some additional material relating to the report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Journal of Commerce, Mar. 1, 1965]

ITALY

TO BUILD UP CATTLE HERDS—GOVERNMENT AIDS BEEF RAISERS

(Thousands of longhorn cattle roam the Tuscan range of Italy. Raised primarily for beef, the animals also are used for draft purposes on the farm. The national herd of dairy and beef cattle totals approximately 9 million head)

(*Rome* (*Italy*) *Bureau*)

ROME.—Short on meat, forage, and grazing land, Italy is trying to spur a buildup of cattle herds via live imports, subsidies, and better breeding.

This country's rising standard of living has been creating beefeaters at a pace cattle raisers can't match. Beef—on the hoof, frozen, and refrigerated—is Italy's biggest single food import.

A leading importer

Nearly $400 million was spent abroad for beef and cattle last year, and this import demand is expected to continue indefinitely. Italy now ranks with the United States and Britain as the world's biggest importers of beef.

The cattle population has gone down from nearly 10 to 9 million head in 4 years, and meat prices have shot up with demand.

The farm exodus, some poor forage crop years, and discouraged milk producers were among other factors helping cut down herds. Another is the Italian's preference for veal, leading to early slaughter.

Per capita beef consumption here is still low for industrialized countries, half that of France and two-thirds that of Britain. Still, the Italian average has risen one-third since 1959 to about 16 kilograms (26 pounds) a year.

Subsidies offered

To build up herds and to control rising meat purchases abroad, the Ministry of Agriculture is offering various incentives.

This includes subsidizing an experiment in flying in thousands of calves from the United States during the fall and winter, paying farmers and ranchers subsidies for converting calves into breeders instead of veal, and promoting better breeds.

This includes trying to win greater acceptance of artificial insemination for bettering strains. About $100 million has been made available altogether for improving breeding conditions.

The Government also offers a subsidy of 25,000 lire ($40) for every calf allowed to grow 6 months before slaughter and another 35,000 lire ($56) if the animal is segregated for breeding instead of slaughter.

Move brings results

These factors, plus a better year for forage crops in 1964, and higher milk prices, are resulting in cattle being held longer for feeding.

An indication of this is given by the Central Statistical Institute in reporting average dressed weight of cattle slaughtered in recent years: 1.76 quintals 1962, 1.81 quintals 1963, and 1.91 quintals (322 pounds) 1964.

The number of head butchered dropped nearly one-fourth from 1962 to 1964, to a monthly average of about 278,000 the Institute reported.

Beef prices continue rising meanwhile. Taking 1953 equals 100, the retail price index had risen to 160 by the end of 1964. This was 14 percent higher than in 1963.

FRANCE

See "Livestock Exports Booming for French Cattlemen," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 12, 1965, page 20174.

[From Foreign Agriculture Magazine, Aug. 23, 1965, p. 3]

AUSTRALIA—AUSTRALIA'S WESTERN FRONTIER IS TRANSFORMED INTO FARMLAND—NEW ROADS AND HARBORS, RESEARCH AND IRRIGATION ARE KEY FACTORS IN UTILIZING LAND POTENTIAL FOR FARMS AND PASTURES

(By Mary E. Long, Foreign Regional Analysis Division, Economic Research Service)

Many thousand acres of desolate, scrub wasteland of Western Australia have emerged in recent years as productive crop and pastureland. The realization of thousands of acres of potentially good soil in this last farwest frontier has virtually transformed the continent's "big country," and further development will continue into the 1970's. The state's 976,000 square miles, covering one-third of the continent, have been the target for a number of irrigation projects, technical advancement in farming, extensive research, and foreign and domestic land investments.

In the 1930's Western Australia, with 3.8 million acres, ranked fourth in Australia's total cultivated crop area. Now it ranks second. In 1963–64, more than 1.1 million acres of undeveloped land were brought into agricultural use as compared to an annual average of 750,000 acres in earlier years. Furthermore, the rate of increase in farm output from this State has consistently exceeded the national average.

MORE PEOPLE, ROADS, AND HARBORS

One reason for this dramatic surge in development is the Commonwealth's plan to expand funds for settlement and development of the northern part of the State. Although the population is small and is concentrated around the capital city of Perth, it is increasing at an average annual rate of 3 percent. In late 1964, there were an estimated 800,000 persons in Western Australia as compared to 500,000 in 1946.

More road and sea transport facilities are primary requisites for any worthwhile land improvement, and since 1962, a Government-sponsored $16 million road construction program has been underway in the Kimberleys. Scheduled for completion by 1966, the new roads will link the livestock-grazing area with the meatpacking centers, Derby and Wyndham. These routes should expedite the movement of cattle to market by truck in a matter of a few hours. Formerly, cattle were driven overland for weeks at a time, with an ensuing loss of weight of the animals. A further expansion of a road network throughout northern Australia is now being coordinated with the Commonwealth and Queensland Governments.

---

[95] Tabulations for January through August 1965, bearing the full impact of the two stoppages, show beef exports, including meat specialties, and variety meat exports almost exactly equal to last year's totals. In contrast, overall exports of red meats are down 51.3 percent from the same period in 1964.

[96] Loc. cit., footnote 10. See also Senate Small Business Committee press release SS BC No. 475, Feb. 24, 1965.

[97] Column by Durward Shields, Mar. 7, 1965.

[98] Hearings, p. 162.

[99] "Shipping Climate Seen Better," by A. Theodore DeSmedt, president of American Export-Isbrandtsen Lines, and chairman, American Steamship Traffic Executives Committee, the Journal of Commerce, Mar. 22, 1965, p. 19A.

Plans are also underway to establish deep-water port on the west side of the Kimberleys, in either King Sound or the Collier Bay area. This port will facilitate overseas shipments and relieve the routing of all exportable products of the north through Wyndham, the only port large enough for ocean liners. With shipping facilities extended, northwestern Australia will become an ideal location for trade development in agricultural commodities to the Far East. The port of Wyndham, for example, is closer to Singapore than to Perth and closer to Rangoon, Hong Kong, or Manila than to Melbourne.

AGRICULTURE IMPORTANT

Despite the attention currently being given to mining and mineral discoveries, agriculture continues as a basic component of the economies of both this State and the Commonwealth. The recent discovery of oil and mineral deposits in the western State has set off a bold program of industrial development, but it is paralleled by the equally extensive and far-reaching land improvement program.

The agricultural areas of Western Australia are scattered from the coastal regions of the south to the Kimberleys in the far north. Such a large expanse of land offers a wide variety of climates and agricultural activity. Year-round crops can be grown in the humid tropical climate of the north, while more seasonal produce comes from the south coastal temperate zone and the semitropical central region.

About 10 percent of Australia's agricultural output comes from the western State. Chief products are grain, livestock products (chiefly wool), dairy foods, hay, vegetables, and fruit.

For several years, Western Australia has led all the States in total acreage planted to grains. Sown pasture in the late 1930's totaled approximately 900,000 acres and by 1964 had increased to 9.5 million, or more than one-fifth of the sown pasture area of the entire continent. Aerial fertilizing and seeding have increased dramatically in the past 4 years. As a result, 1.4 million acres were treated last year as compared to 582,000 in 1961.

On an average, 23 percent of the entire continent's wheat originates in Western Australia. In contrast to wheat areas of New South Wales and Queensland which are experiencing a severe drought, this State's 1965–66 crop was sown under very good conditions. The area sown has been estimated at 5.9 million acres with an expected record harvest of over 90 million bushels.

ESPERANCE ATTRACTS INVESTORS

The area which has probably undergone the most extensive transformation is the Esperance, on the southern coast of the continent. This light-sand area, extending from Albany to the Israelite Bay, has been fertilized with certain trace elements, such as copper, zinc, and molybdenum, which give the soil an excellent base for clover pastures as well as for the growing of oats and flaxseed. The pastures will be stocked with beef cattle and fat lambs.

Worldwide attention was attracted to the Esperance in 1956 when large-scale capital investments for land development were made by U.S. interests. Poor planting techniques and an unfavorable season turned the project into failure. Nevertheless, the area benefited from the publicity and attracted the interest of both domestic and foreign investors.

U.S. investors have found Western Australia particularly attractive because this area offers a similar culture and language, favorable land laws, and the economic security of a politically sound government. Relative to other Australian States, Western Australia enjoys certain cost advantages in the production of cereal grains and sheep. Also, to stimulate land development and further investment, the government has given a tax allowance to both Australians and foreigners who hold land. As a result, most farm expenditures for mechanization, fertilizer, and pesticides are tax deductible.

The Esperance Land and Development Co., took over large portions of the land in 1960. By 1965, the area was reported as a thriving center of 600 farms, with 850,000 acres of cleared land under development, 5,000 sheep, 25,000 cattle, and a grain crop which was estimated at 1.2 million bushels for the 1964–65 season. Plans indicate that 500 more farms will be developed in the next few years.

IRRIGATION OPENS NORTHERN FARMLAND

Lack of natural rainfall for both crops and livestock is a prevalent problem throughout the State. As a result, plans for irrigation are being carried out in many parts of Western Australia, but most extensively in the extreme northern portion. Several large river systems flow through this area known as the Kimberleys, emptying great quantities of water into the Timor Sea. Two of the most important rivers are the Ord, near the border of Western Australia and the Northern Territory, and the Fitzroy to the southwest. Water availabilities in the Kimberleys have been reported equal to total water resources of the Snowy Mountain, Murrumbidgee, and Murray River systems combined.

The Ord River project, at an estimated cost of $70 million, when complete, is expected to irrigate about 150,000 to 200,000 acres of land in Western Australia and the Northern Territory. The first phase of the program called for a diversion dam at Baricoot Bar which is now complete. Several hundred acres of irrigated land have already been assigned to individual farmers under conditional purchase contracts. The second phase provides for construction of a larger dam, with the capacity of 3.5 million acre-feet of water, to generate hydroelectric power and also to provide for irrigation.

The soils in this northern area are fertile. Considerable advance experimentation and research have been performed in tropical agriculture, so that high yields and quality crops are expected. In addition to cotton and rice, sugar, peanuts, and flaxseed can be produced commercially.

The number of beef cattle in the East and West Kimberleys has not changed radically since the early 1900's, but scientists now believe a vast potential for beef cattle exists in the area. Previously, livestock growers were interested only in grass growing. A new emphasis on cultivated pasture and fertilizing, in connection with the irrigation projects, indicates that the number of cattle in the northern areas of the State will increase. Beef cattle interests are also expected to benefit from the protein-meal byproducts from cotton and the oilseed crops, both of which can be used for cattle feed.

Another smaller area which shows bright prospects is the Carnarvon District. Situated on the delta of the Gascoyne River, irrigated farming dates back to the 1930's. Vegetables can be produced the year around, and bananas are also grown for the Perth market. Although there is considerable potential for expansion of tropical fruit and vegetable production in Carnarvon, success will depend on transportation for shipping produce to marketing centers other than Perth.

Although it has a small population of only about 10 million and a relatively efficient agriculture, the Belgo-Luxembourg Economic Union (BLEU) is one of the traditionally important markets for U.S. agriculture exports.

In 1964 the United States exported $165 million worth of agricultural products to BLEU, making it the seventh largest dollar market for U.S. agricultural exports, surpassed only by Japan, Canada, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, West Germany, and Italy. Except for the Netherlands, BLEU's partner in the Benelux, all these countries have a much larger population than the Union.

BLEU is not only a relatively large market for U.S. farm exports, but also a growing market: U.S. agricultural exports to the area in 1964 were one-third higher than the annual average for 1959–61.

WHY OUR EXPORTS HAVE RISEN

Two major factors account for the recent growth in U.S. farm exports to BLEU: First, its continued economic expansion, and second, expansion of its livestock industries, including poultry.

Since 1959 the BLEU economy has expanded at an average annual rate of 4.5 percent. Almost no unemployment exists, and since mid-1963 there has been a strong upward pressure on consumer prices. However, the gain in real purchasing power has been large enough to permit BLEU consumers to change their buying habits for food. Today they are eating fewer cereal products and potatos, less butter and deciduous fruit, but more red meat, poultry, eggs, fluid milk, citrus, and vegetables. There is also an increasing trend toward the use of more ready-prepared and convenience-type foods.

The recent rise in BLEU's production of beef, pork, poultry, and eggs has increased the demand for livestock feed. The area is a deficit producer of feed grains, needing to import about 60 percent of its annual requirements. Consequently, it has become a growing market for U.S. corn, grain sorghums, soybeans, and soybean products. These four products account for approximately half of the U.S. agricultural exports to BLEU. Corn and grain sorghums by themselves account for nearly one-third of the total shipments made to the area.

PROSPECTS FOR FEED GRAINS

The European Economic Community's (EEC) grain marketing regulations have been in effect since 1962, but thus far, the variable import levies have not had as much of an impact on BLEU imports of U.S. feed grains as one might expect. The United States has been able to share in the recent growth in the feed grain market because the Belgians have set their threshold (minimum import) prices for corn and sorghums at lower levels than for barley, the principal feed grain grown domestically.

The Belgian Government has established its target, intervention, and threshold prices for grains during 1965–66, and the price spread between corn and sorghums relative to barley has been maintained. Therefore, for at least another year, prospects appear bright for U.S. feed grain exports. However, EEC grain prices are to be unified in July 1967, and it appears likely that the BLEU prices for corn and sorghums, to be put into effect at that time in accordance with the EEC grain price decision of December 15, 1964, will raise the threshold prices for these grains equal to or perhaps above that for barley. This is expected to somewhat reduce the demand for shipments of U.S. corn and sorghums.

OTHER PRODUCTS DOING WELL

Feed grains and soybeans are not the only important U.S. exports to the Union. Until recently, U.S. cotton had been accounting for about $20 million, unmanufactured tobacco for about $10 million, and fruits and vegetables for another $12 or $13 million. BLEU has been a growing market for U.S. citrus, canned fruits, rice, and turkey—partly because of market development programs for these products.

The United States has not been doing as well in the BLEU cotton market as a few years ago when half of these imports were U.S. cotton. The U.S. share has now declined to about 25 or 30 percent of the market.

Several factors are responsible for this drop, but price competition from other suppliers appears to have been important. Another reason is the smaller total BLEU market for cotton: cotton is facing strong competition from synthetic fibers. Cotton consumption in BLEU would have undoubtedly declined more if it were not for the intensive market development program for cotton being operated in Belgium by the Cotton Council International, in cooperation with the Belgian textile industry.

MARKET PROMOTION FOR FRUITS

A number of U.S. market development cooperators are working at developing the market for U.S. fruits. California lemons are gaining a good reputation; also, exports of U.S. canned fruit can be expected to grow as incomes continue to rise. The United States still does not have unrestricted access to the Belgian market for apples and pears. The Belgian Government continues to use import calendar restrictions which keep out North American apples and pears for most of the marketing season. There is little doubt, however, that this fruit would sell well in BLEU if given the opportunity.

INDIA HARVESTS ANOTHER RECORD RICE CROP

For the second successive year, India's rice crop has set a new record. The all-India final official estimate for 1964–65 (July–June), just released by the Ministry of Food and Agriculture's Directorate of Economics and Statistics, reports a 5-percent increase over last year—from 55,388,400 metric tons of rough rice to 58,156,800.

A major part of the increase in production is due to a 3.7-percent improvement in average yield per acre, from 1,387 pounds to 1,438. This is attributed partly to development measures and partly to favorable weather during the growing season.

Area increased also, but only by 1.3 percent, to 89,148,000 acres against 88,026,000. The increase came mostly in the States of West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh, and Madhya Pradesh (ranking second, third, and fifth in acreage), and in Assam and Punjab; all good weather for sowing. Bihar (No. 1 in acreage) and Andhra Pradesh (No. 6) had acreage declines but still raised output notably.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 14, 1965]

SPAIN

RECORD $35 MILLION FOOD-FOR-PEACE PACT WITH PRIVATE FOREIGN GROUP SET BY UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON.—U.S. officials plan to announce today by far the largest food-for-peace agreement involving dollars sales to a private foreign group.

The $35 million pact involves the U.S. Government-financed sale of feed grains, mostly corn and some grain sorghum, to a farm cooperative group in Spain. Those close to the negotiations say the agreement will allow Spain to build up a substantial beef industry. At the same time, they add, Spain will become a substantial commercial buyer of U.S. feed grains.

The agreement falls under title IV of Public Law 480, the statute that established the food-for-peace program in 1954 to help feed the hungry overseas and help the United States trim its hefty farm surpluses. Title IV, added in 1959, authorizes U.S. sales to overseas buyers for dollars on long-term credit, rather than for "soft" foreign currencies as authorized by title I.

The dollar-credit sales can be made to both foreign governments and private overseas groups, but until this year there hadn't been any pacts with private buyers. Earlier this year, U.S. officials announced two agreements with private groups, a gas company and a development bank, in Iran. However, those combined pacts totaled less than $4 million.

The purpose of title IV agreements generally is to increase U.S. dollar exports of farm commodities, enlarge overseas markets for these commodities and aid the economic growth of friendly nations.

Signing to buy U.S. feed grains, amounting to about 600,000 metric tons and to be delivered over 3 years, is a group calling itself Spanish Cooperatives for the Commercialization of Farm Products.

Rein Vander Zee, the organization's Washington attorney, said the group was organized about 3½ years ago by about 15 local farm cooperatives in Spain and currently has about 900 local groups representing some 250,000 Spanish farm families. The organization plans to distribute the grain to its members for sale to farmers and, pending payment of its obligation to the United States over the next decade, use the proceeds to finance a network of grain shipping and livestock marketing facilities. These will include grain elevators in ports, a truck fleet, livestock feeding centers and slaughterhouses in rural areas, and refrigeration plants.

Mr. Vander Zee said Spain has a "tremendous" meat deficit. It had to import in 1963, for example, 120,000 metric tons of beef, he said, and many low-income Spanish families get hardly any red meat in their normal diets. The attorney said an inefficient marketing system, in which cattle are bought by brokers at the farm and transported long distances to city slaughterhouses, has held down farm profits and discouraged production.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune of Sept. 20, 1965]

AFRICA AND SOUTH AMERICA

WE MAY NOT HAVE A BEEF COMING

(By Sylvia Porter)

NEW YORK, N.Y.—The automatic glass of water with a restaurant meal, any-old-time use of water for air conditioning and lawn sprinkling—it's well known that these amenities have been drastically curtailed by the drought which has plagued not only the Northeast but also many other areas of the world for 5 years. But there are two other potential "victims" of the drought which I'll wager you'd never spot: our beloved hamburgers and hot dogs.

"Supplies of the economy grades of beef and veal needed for these two favorites are down, and there is no relief in sight," said Ernest Bauer, president of B.N.S. International Sales Corp., of New York, 122-year-old firm of international commodity traders. "The reason is that the drought and other weather problems have slashed the availability of feed and range grass. The national average of range-feed conditions is 82 percent of normal."

As if these natural disasters were not enough, Bauer added, "Competition for the economy grades has been heightened, because cattlemen are concentrating on the production of better quality meats."

Today, we in the United States alone consume about 65 million tons of beef a year, up 20 percent since 1959. Today, the average American eats more than 100 pounds of beef each year, plus about 70 pounds of other meat. American consumption of hamburgers, hot dogs, and the like has been growing at a rate of about 5 percent a year.

Meanwhile, though, raising of the grades of cattle which go into the making of these products has been shrinking, and steeply stepped-up slaughtering of cattle has been depleting our herds.

The great offsetting grace has been our soaring imports. In 1958 we imported 909 million pounds of beef; in 1963 the total was up to 1.7 billion pounds; by now, imports are much higher.

But while we have been boosting our imports to satisfy our demand, we have been complicating the worldwide picture by exporting our "love affair" with all types of beef over the globe.

Oriental countries, such as Japan, are forsaking their traditional fish and rice to become significant importers of beef and bread cereals. Consumption of beef in the European Common Market has zoomed along with the climb in Europe's living standards.

Although in recent years, Britain, France, Italy, and West Germany have become important beef producers, they still must import large quantities. But Europe's largest source—Argentina, at one time the world's largest exporter of beef—has been hit by drought and other problems. In the face of skyrocketing demand, Argentina's beef production hasn't improved in 10 years. Brazil also has become a dormant beef exporter.

Within 5 years the major beef-consuming nations are expected to require an additional 250 million tons of beef to meet the demands of their expanding populations and rising standards.

What, then, are solutions? One, said Bauer, will lie in the adoption by other nations of American methods of beef production. Another will rest in the discovery of new areas for large-scale beef raising. International food experts are now surveying the uplands of Kenya, Ethiopia, and the Sudan, are re-examining such areas as Brazil. Still, Bauer reported, "Most experts expect the beef supply situation to get tighter before it eases."

[From the Economist, Oct. 2, 1965]

THE UNITED KINGDOM

THEY'RE NOT BEEFING

The National Plan put forward a program of "selective expansion" for British agriculture designed to grow at home most of the £200 million a year of extra food required by 1970. "Selective" means in the main more beef and milk—but not, significantly, all that much more.

"Agriculture," says the Government in the National Plan, "is one of the industries with a key role for faster growth." But any farmer who thinks this means just what it says is in for a shock. The targets set for 1970 call for a slower rate of growth in almost all products. Beef production—is top of the list for "selected expansion"—is required to grow 125,000 tons by 1970. Impressive? This is 23,000 tons less than the rise in beef production over the last 5 years (using estimates for 1964–65) and represents a growth of only 14.5 percent—two-thirds that of the last 5 years. Likewise mutton and lamb are set to grow 9.7 percent—i.e. slightly to slow down. Pork production, up 36.5 percent since 1960, is expected to grow only 21.3 percent between now and 1970. The target for poultry is 27½ percent, against its previous 41 percent. Only the dairy herd is definitely set for expansion; farmers have been turning antimilk, and their herds have fallen during the past 2 years to 1960 levels.

The Government is asking for another 420,000 cows, not solely for their milk, but for their calves. Up to 80 percent of all home-produced beef comes from dairy calves, and the object of increasing the dairy herd is to increase this supply of calves. The purpose of the 4¾ million extra tons of cereals written into the plan is to provide the home-grown wherewithal to feed them.

Since the war the percentage of home-produced beef and veal has increased steadily from 58 percent of Britain's consumption in 1947 to 73 percent last year. (It has since dropped to 71 percent this year.) Today consumption is running at 56 pounds of beef a head a year—still only two-thirds of what the Americans eat. Its price is low in Britain compared with the continent—average wholesale meat prices were 58 percent higher in some EEC countries than in Britain in June—but in the face of shortages of chilled meat from Argentina, and a shortage of store cattle (beef cattle up to 2 years old bought for local fattening) from Ireland, prices on the British market have risen sharply during the last 18 months. Last year, average beef prices at Smithfield were 25 percent (6d. per pound) up on 1963, and look like rising half that much again this year. They would have jumped further in the face of this year's even more acute shortage of beef, but for the switch of British consumption to pork, lamb and poultry.

Sales resistance might have brought down prices rather faster but for the willingness of continental buyers to pay high prices for the British beef on the hoof. Exports of live cattle to the Continent have almost doubled since 1963. Beef men exporting to the Continent have been on to a good thing, but they are in the minority. Most farmers are concerned solely with home sales, and to them the rise in home prices has not meant increased profits, but merely a reduction in the subsidy they get from the Government.

This, coupled with rising costs, is what many beef men are complaining about. The two most important subsidies they get (besides those on their feeding stuffs) are the £7 10s. they got last year for rearing a heifer for beef and the £9 15s. for a bullock (calf subsidies went up again this year)—and the guranteed price they get from the Government for their beef each year. This latter, worked out annually after a shouting match between the Ministry of Agriculture and representatives of the farmers' unions, bears no relation to the British, or any other, market price. It stands for a "fair return" to the farmer for "providing for the needs of the British housewife. The Government pays the farmer the difference between the British market price and the guaranteed price. Because British beef prices rose so sharply last year, the Government paid £30 million less to farmers than it anticipated in the 1964 annual price review. The hard truth is—and the less efficient beef farmers hate it—that, given all the rest of the perks like calf, food, and fertilizer subsidies, beef can be produced in this country at a price the housewife is willing to pay without the need for guaranteed prices at all, mainly because of changes in methods of beef rearing.

Intensive beef production in the shape of "barley beef" or "baby beef" started here in 1961. Dr. T. R. Preston of the Rowett Research Station was the first to suggest that good 800-pound beef animals could be produced in 12 months instead of the normal 2½ years' grazing, by keeping them penned under cover and cramming them full of barley and proteins instead of grass. It all looked so easy. Instead of acres of land to run the beef herd, all the farmer needed was cheap pens in barns and outhouses, filled with far more livestock than could have been handled under normal rearing conditions, and giving a quicker return on capital than farmers had ever dreamed of. The beef was pink, lean, tender, and often tasteless. But the market at first loved it. At the peak it is thought that 15 percent of the beef produced in Britain last year was reared in this way. Now a reaction has set in. Why? First, it wasn't quite as easy as it looked. Cattle reared intensively are disease prone. Much more important, barley beef depends on a plentiful supply of relatively cheap calves and cheap barley. The East Riding Institute of Agriculture—which pioneered much of the work on intensive beef rearing—pointed out recently that calf prices have risen from an average £10 per head in 1961 to over £20 in 1964–65. In this case, admittedly, averages are highly misleading. Barley costs have not risen much since 1961, but labor and other costs have squeezed barley-beef profits.

If the plan's beef target is to be met, and this really is the linchpin of the new pattern for farming, it will be mainly by other methods than this. Under pressure of competition from barley-beef (which, if carried to extremes, would have made huge reductions in grassland and in fertilizer sales), Imperial Chemical Industries, British Oil and Cake Mills and other fertlizer and cattle food manufacturers, accelerated experiments they had in hand to test whether good beef animals, weighing around 1,120 pounds, could be reared on grass in 15–18 months, as against 800-pound barley-fed animals in 12 months. Under the new semi-intensive method of beef production the cattle are fed on a mixture of compounds and silage during their first winter under cover; this is cheaper than pure barley. They graze intensively in summer on highly fertilized grass; and are then fattened under cover the next winter on silage, barley, and sugarbeet pulp. There are innumerable permutations, but the Grasslands Research Institute at Hurley has shown that 900-pound beef animals can be turned out in 13-15 months by even more intensive summer grazing on land even more heavily dosed with fertilizer. The choice lies between feeding the calf or feeding the grass. Both, however, presume that the supply of calves is there.

The Government has now extended its calf subsidies for the first time to heifer calves as well as bullocks, and put the subsidies up a bit. Yet farmers have already complained that they will not get the numbers of calves they need to meet the target. It is hard to believe they are right. Beef starts life either as a calf born of the traditional beef breeds, or as a cross between a dairy cow and a beef bull (beef plus milk), or as a purebred dairy calf. In the past, the calf of a pure dairy cow, unless she was a heifer and so a potential milk factory, was classed as a useless "bobby" calf fit only for veal. About 750,000 bobby calves were slaughtered annually until last year, when the number almost halved. It halved because the calves were being intensively reared to give an unbudgeted-for beef bonus; they should be in the butchers' shops next spring. The balance still slaughtered represents a reserve supply of calves: potentially, an extra 100,000 tons of meat a year if their dairy cow mothers are crossed with the French Charollais bull.

What about prices? In July, reasonably promising week-old calves were selling for between £3 12s. and £25 each; poorer quality ones less suitable for beef could be bought for £2 10s. and, in Scotland, despised Ayrshire heifers were as cheap as £2. The British beef factory farm at Stowmarket turns good Ayrshires into prime beef within the year. Not only is there no reason to believe that the beef business will fail to reach target because of shortage of calves, there is no reason either to believe that competition for calves will drive prices up to a point where rearing them will be uneconomic. Prices will drop if Irish store cattle reappear in English markets, as they probably will do next year. The Irish have held them back while building up their own subsidized beef herds. When the Irish are ready to reexport again, many beef farmers will prefer to use Irish cattle as their raw material rather than the calves they have been making do with when Irish exports stopped. This in turn will release those calves onto the market.

Many people still find it difficult to think of farming as an industry having some degree of interchangeability in its choice of raw materials. But beef farming has. There are several different sources of calves. There are at least three basically different methods of rearing them—either intensively feeding the calf, intensively feeding the grass it grazes on (both boosted by manufacturers seeking new and bigger feed and fertilizer markets), or leaving the whole thing to nature. The choice is wide enough to make the beef target in the plan seem wholly practical. And if the beef forecast can be realized, then the "selective" pattern of shifting from crops to meat will drop neatly into place.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AT THE ECONOMIC CLUB IN DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, Vice President HUMPHREY made an outstanding address before the Economic Club at Detroit, Mich., tonight. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, ECONOMIC CLUB, DETROIT, MICH., OCTOBER 22, 1965

There is one great all-important fact which faces us today. It is the fact of interdependence. Interdependence has been thrust on man, involuntarily, by the reality of his ability to destroy himself. Interdependence has been created by man, voluntarily, through his efforts toward more rapid communication, commercial and cultural exchange. There are very few things in this world which are not tied in some way to something else. We of our generation have certainly learned that during our lifetimes.

But it took us awhile to learn it. Take the world of economics.

I can remember how, in this country, there were once voices raised debating what was good for business or labor, producer or consumer as if they were separate, unrelated, independent units. There was talk about economic royalists and labor bosses.

There were those who thought that our economic prosperity was a pie of fixed size, with so much for one man, so much for the next, and who seldom thought in terms of a bigger pie for all.

There were those who said that we in America could enjoy prosperity and security with little or no concern about the rest of the world.

Yes, even in the business community there were far too many who believed that foreign trade was something that foreigners did, among themselves—and that trade was of little importance to America.

But, we have learned some hard lessons.

We learned lessons of recession and depression. We learned lessons of costly struggle and unresolved dispute within our own society. Most of all, we learned the lesson that a policy of "me first" is wasteful, costly and dangerous.

Today we seem to have learned those lessons—at least our domestic economic lessons.

We are in our 56th consecutive month of domestic economic expansion. Wages are up, profits are up, GNP is up, prices are relatively stable, unemployment is down.

We enjoy this expansion thanks to a creative burst of expression by our private-initiative economic system. We also enjoy it because people who used to be antagonists are today working in common cause—business, labor, Government, citizen.

We are agreed to an almost surprising degree on our economic goals and how to get there.

We know the lesson of interdependence in our domestic economy (and, I might add, in other parts of our American society).

But have we learned the lesson of economic interdependence in the world around us? I have my doubts.

I hear lots of talk about the need for a reformed monetary system, about foreign aid, about better credit terms for export, about foreign investment, about commercial negotiations with our Western partners, about trade with the East.

But I hear very little about the interdependence of these things.

What are the economic realities of the world?

First, there is the overwhelmingly reality that two-thirds of mankind is awakening to the fact that poverty is not written in the stars, that life can be better than it is.

Before World War II, there was no such thing as a "developing country."

Our Foreign Service officers—and those of other Western nations—were not in fact concerned with economic development. Their days were largely spent dealing with other Western diplomats and occasionally talking philosophy and political theory with the local elite. Now and then an anthropologist, or a student of language or literature, would make his appearance—but seldom someone so mundane as an economist or a businessman.

And, isolated from the world around them, the people in these places lived a miserable peasant life in a modern world. Some of them, in fact, lived literally outside history itself.

But in these past few years they have caught up with history and then some.

In the past 15 years alone, over 60 nations have entered the United Nations—nations many of which had previously not existed, except as colonial enclaves, or tribes, or protectorates.

Today they are the "developing," the "underdeveloped," the people who live in poverty and want out.

The unpleasant reality is that the rich nations of the world are getting richer, and the poor, poorer.

And there is an unfortunate but growing tendency among the developing nations to regard the three major international economic institutions—the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—as rich men's clubs, pitted against the poor.

What will be our answer to the demands of these people who see unshared affluence around them?

Second, we see the fact of an expanding world economy trying to exist on inadequate monetary reserves and credit.

The fact is that our present monetary system, as useful as it has been, could be a drag on the world economy unless it meets the legitimate need for added economic fuel.

The time will come when our own balance of payments will again come into equilibrium. The resulting shortage of new dollar balances in other places could stifle economic growth in the world.

There was a time for study. Now there is a time for negotiation. There will also be a time to act. We must act to modernize and expand the system which is so indispensable to the general welfare.

In the long run, the situation cannot be solved by restrictive trade policies which limit imports to reverse a balance-of-payments deficit, by emergency loans to prevent one country from foreclosing on another, by patchword adjustments of interest rates.

Third, we see the need for reduction of trade barriers in the rich, industrialized countries.

There was a time when tariffs produced revenue and protected young, infant industries.

But the rich Western world has long since learned that barriers to trade—both tariff and other barriers—often become excuses to protect uncompetitive domestic industries.

There is a good case to be made, in fact, that those nations which have most reduced their own tariffs have most benefited economically—by becoming more competitive and export minded.

Today we attack barriers to trade in the Kennedy round negotiations in Geneva.

But tariff reduction alone will not solve the problems of international commerce.

In fact, global reduction of tariffs, among developed and developing countries alike, would clearly not benefit the developing nations to the degree we would seek.

For they are, in the Biblical phrase, "hewers of wood and drawers of water," nations without strong and balanced economies.

Nor can trade liberalization be undertaken without appropriate monetary mechanisms to handle liberalized trade, without elimination of pernicious practices which mock tariff reduction, without the building of competitive industries in nations which yet lack those industries.

Fourth, we face the fact that the old economic alinement of the world is changing.

We used to talk about a world divided between those who lived by the rule of the marketplace and those who were so-called state traders.

But let us not fool ourselves. The world today is made up of many and varied complex national economies.

Even the Soviet economy has been making great strides toward adopting indeed a profit system—call it "revisionism," of "Libermanism," or whatever you will. And many Western nations today engage in trading practices which would hardly bear scrutiny by Adam Smith.

The world economy is in constant change.

And how would you classify those young nations where there is today hardly any monetized economy at all?

Can we adjust to this changing world economy by the sending of a few trade missions to previously unknown parts, by reminding ourselves every so often that there have been some changes in commercial regulations or investment policy, or by making speeches to the effect that we can transplant our own economic system, as is, to places whose needs and experiences are far different than our own? Of course not.

We must learn that the world economy is interdependent, too.

We must learn that, just as the answers to domestic prosperity are found in a thousand interrelated factors, so are the answers found to a more just and prospering world economy.

Let me give you one simple and concrete example of what I mean.

Earlier this week I addressed a meeting of the National Export Expansion Council in Washington. Some of you may be members of that council.

At that meeting I pointed out that our favorable trade balance this year will be almost $1½ to $2 billion less than it was in 1964. I further noted that had our trade surplus not been reduced, we would have achieved this year a surplus in our international accounts for the first time since 1957.

Now, we seek a balance in our payments accounts particularly because we wish to maintain world confidence in the dollar which underpins the world trading system.

A sound dollar will also facilitate discussions toward monetary reform.

We consider monetary reform to be of highest priority for developed and developing nations alike—for the developed so that they may expand their commerce; for the developing so that they may in turn have means to build competitive, self-sustaining economies of their own.

The strengthening of these young economies has a great deal to do, in turn, with the size of our commitments in foreign aid and technical assistance, with foreign investment, with creating markets for our own products.

I pointed out to the National Export Expansion Council that only 4 percent of our gross national product is devoted to foreign trade. For American business—with its efficiency, its skilled labor force, its mass production, its management, its capacity for growth—has today still not seriously entered the world market in a competitive manner. If the United States—as other nations—were fully alert to export opportunities, our trade surplus could today be doubly large.

And the fact is that a greater trade surplus would have an effect on all the interrelated matters I have mentioned.

I am not here this evening to preach any sermon of discontent. I am here to reaffirm, for the good of all of us, the fact that man is interdependent and that his economy is especially interdependent.

What can we do in this country to meet this era of international economic interdependence?

First—and most obviously—we must all realize that it is here.

Then, each of us who has responsibility in this society—and that includes all of us here tonight—must view this country's foreign economic policy in large perspective.

Let us cease asking: Is a high tariff on product X good or bad? Is monetary reform necessary? Is foreign aid worthwhile?

By now we should know the answers. Let us instead ask these questions:

How can striving, desperately poor young nations become members of a world society without being lost to totalitarianism along the way?

How can a freer world be built unless we have freer exchanges of peoples, goods and capital?

How can we benefit and our economy prosper if there are not others in the world with income enough to buy our goods?

How can we provide for the needs of a growing world population without a strong world economy to build upon?

Let us then devote ourselves to answering them with positive, forward-looking policies, both public and private.

Let us commit ourselves—as businessmen, as Government officials, as a Nation—to helping the young and weak nations become economically free and strong.

There are many ways: through private investment that may sometimes involve some risk, through fair commercial treatment for the products of the developing nations, through foreign aid and technical assistance, through private and public loans, through commitment to international and multilateral institutions devoted to economic development, through encouragement of common-market concepts where those concepts have value, through open consultation and spirit of cooperation among the rich and poor alike.

Let us commit ourselves to the maximum possible reductions of all barriers to trade among the developed nations.

This means full and determined commitment to the Kennedy round negotiation.

This means acceptance of the fact that, in any trade liberalization, there must be reciprocity and that we must give as well as get. This means patience and fortitude in finding solutions to the knotty problems of agricultural trade liberalization. This means—yes—the acceptance by those American industries not fully competitive that they must become competitive.

This means giving highest priority to the avoidance of inflation, for inflation could rob us of the growth and prosperity we have achieved. This means the examination by many nations of their policies of subsidy, price support, export financing, antitrust. This means moving ahead with sometimes painful changes in trading pattern. This means undertaking of measures by business, government, labor to ease impact of these changes.

Let us commit ourselves to the construction of a world monetary system with adequate liquidity.

This will involve the maximum of tact and restraint in difficult negotiation in the Group of Ten and with other members of the International Monetary Fund, the creation, perhaps, of a new reserve asset, the necessity for discipline in maintaining a strong position in our own international accounts, the recognition that not only the rich and industrialized must be taken into consideration in shaping that system.

The answers lie in the intelligent and sophisticated blending of trade, aid, investment, monetary and domestic economic policies of this Nation and our partners.

They lie in the increasing recognition by those who are not our partners that they cannot live in a closed economy.

They lie, most of all, in the realization by all of us that we have a common destiny on this planet, shared but a short time, and that man's interdependence need not be a proscribed necessity—it can be a means of extending the benefits of mankind to more of mankind.

FORMER REPRESENTATIVE ELIZABETH KEE HONORED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on October 16, the former Democratic Representative of the Fifth Congressional District of West Virginia, the Honorable Elizabeth Kee, was honored at a session of Democratic women conducted under the auspices of the Democratic executive committee of the Fifth Congressional District.

I wish to congratulate Representative Kee upon being so honored and to add my good wishes to those extended to her on that occasion. She is richly deserving of the accolades and appreciation of the citizens of our State, having given of her time and energies to advance their interests, throughout her life. Her service in the U.S. House of Representatives was in the worthy tradition of her distinguished predecessor, her husband, the late Representative John Kee, and provided a strong link in a family chain of congressional service, inasmuch as she was followed in office by her son, Representative JAMES KEE.

Her decision to retire upon the conclusion of the 88th Congress meant her retirement from the House of Representatives, but not from the affections of the voters of her district, whom she served well, nor from the affections of the citizens of the Mountain State, who are proud of her representation in their behalf.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AT THE NEW ENGLAND CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, yesterday Vice President HUMPHREY made an excellent, provocative, and thoughtful speech to the New England Conference of Mayors at New Haven, Conn. Because of the Vice President's previous experience as mayor of his own city of Minneapolis, and because of his continuing interest in urban affairs ever since, Vice President HUMPHREY is singularly qualified to make this speech.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech may be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, NEW ENGLAND CONFERENCE OF MAYORS, NEW HAVEN, CONN., OCTOBER 21, 1965

Several months ago the President asked me to act as his liaison with officials of local government. As one who has served in local government—as mayor of Minneapolis—I believe I have some appreciation of the important role played by local government in our Federal system. Because I know how distant and remote Washington can seem to the man with local responsibility, I have been trying, in these months, to make Washington less distant, less remote, more able to help. And that is why I invited you to meet with me here today.

If we are to meet the staggering problems of today, our Federal system must work, and work well.

New Haven is the best example I know of creative federalism at work in the city. New Haven stands today as an outstanding example of the physical and material resources of an urban area being used for the benefit of the people.

There are 10 urban renewal projects in New Haven, a record for a city this size. But this does not tell the whole story. New Haven has not only cleared slums, but has rehabilitated homes and buildings and neighborhoods so the city retains its traditional character and charm.

Historic buildings have not been torn down. They have been renovated.

People have not just been displaced. They have been relocated with attention to their needs and aspirations.

This city has received $75 million in Federal financing through the Housing and Home Finance Agency. But this is only part of the story. More than $400 million in local public and private investment have also been put to work in the job of renewal.

This is creative federalism—the coordinated programs of National, State and local governments aided by the efforts of business, labor and private interests.

And this success story is important. For major cities and smaller cities alike face tremendous problems.

We know that the world's population will double by the year 2000. Within 10 short years the United States alone will have 30 million more people.

We know there will be nearly 6 million more people living within the Boston-Washington corridor.

And we know that less than 20 percent of the population will live outside our urban areas.

This distribution of population will produce not only the growth of individual cities but also the expansion of sprawling urban areas—areas needing local services.

This administration is pledged to help meet this challenge.

But the future of our Nation lies not only with the Federal Government. It lies in our heartland—in individual American communities.

The Great Society will be an America made up of thousands of great communities.

It is your communities that will have good schools or bad ones.

It is your communities that will have decent homes or slums.

It is your communities that will have racial harmony or racial antagonism.

It is your communities that will either wage intelligent, coordinated drives on the causes of poverty—or will ignore this social cancer.

Our explosive population growth and rapid urbanization have combined to place unprecedented burdens on local government.

Today there are over 9 million American homes which should not be lived in, but are. Four million of those homes have no running water or plumbing.

There are water shortages.

There are millions of children who will, without a doubt, be on the welfare rolls a few years hence if something is not done. One out of every three children now in fifth grade will not finish high school, if the present dropout rate continues. Every mayor should have established task forces within his city so that each dropout or potential dropout can be personally contacted and helped.

There is a general shortage of clean, fresh air, of open space, of parkland, of the things that make life livable.

And small cities equally face the same converging forces of growth and decay that plague large cities—slums, blight, traffic and parking problems, badly platted blocks, demands for services are high and tax money is short.

No single community in this age of change can meet these demands alone and without help. That is why there are more than 50 major programs of Federal assistance to local governments. In fiscal 1966 there will be a total of $13.6 billion in Federal aid payments to State and local units.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, passed by this Congress and signed into law by President Johnson, is designed to help meet these problems.

The President has called this act "breakthrough legislation." And it is.

Under this act, the best of the old programs have been extended and expanded. The urban renewal program has loans and grants for rehabilitation of homes, buildings and neighborhoods.

Public Housing programs have been made more flexible so local authorities can buy or rent existing housing. This will help large families.

There are grants for building such things as youth and community centers in low-income neighborhoods. Park and playground land can be acquired and improved under another program. Streets can be beautified. Malls can be built.

The FHA mortgage insurance programs are extended and in many cases liberalized. There is a new "low down" program for veterans to buy homes. The ceiling has been raised on insured home mortgage money in outlying areas.

There is a new rent supplement program which will result in new housing for low-income families built by private builders with private money. Middle-income housing and college housing—housing for the elderly can be built with direct 3-percent loans.

This act also authorizes rural housing loans for purchase of previously occupied dwellings and structures. These loans can also be used to buy building sites and to build new homes. This is a program of the Farmers Home Administration.

All this should add greatly to the supply of housing for our smaller cities, particularly for those of low income and medium income.

A major addition to the legislation this year is a matching grant program for the construction of sewer and water facilities. There is also a grant program for the acquisition of land for future construction of public facilities.

These programs, except for rural housing, are administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which will soon become the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The establishment of this Department is in response to a longstanding need.

Not only will it now be possible to administer these wide-ranging programs more effectively, but there will now be a voice responsible to the wishes of urban people in the highest councils of Government—in the President's Cabinet.

I wish to speak briefly today of the rural areas as well as the smaller cities. You are linked inseparably to your neighbors in the surrounding countryside.

Dissatisfaction with rural life increases the exodus to the cities. Unemployment, poor housing, poor education combine to increase the movement to the cities—an exodus all too often composed of people unprepared for employment and participation in city life.

One-half the disadvantaged people of our Nation live outside urban areas. We hear so much about urban slums that we often forget that there are twice as many dilapidated houses in rural areas as in the cities. Forty-seven percent of the Nation's poverty exists in rural communities where only 30 percent of the Nation's people live.

But there is now more hope for the rural poor.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is now preparing a massive attack on the root causes of rural poverty. Rural towns and counties are joining in the war on poverty at a rapidly expanding rate.

The President has also acted to establish in the Department of Agriculture the Rural Community Development Service. The President named as the goal "parity of opportunity for rural America."

This expanded service to rural America will be carried out through the field offices of the Department of Agriculture. Men in the field will inform rural communities of all the Federal programs that can be applied in the countryside—these giving educational opportunity as well as housing.

But none of the Federal programs can be fully effective without a lot of help from you in this conference.

You know local conditions, you know local problems, you know your people.

It is our responsibility to inform you of Federal programs. From then on it will be a matter of local determination as to how these programs can be used, and how they can be implemented by local funds.

It is you who must supply the dedication, the talent and the leadership to carry these projects through.

Ours is an age of social tumult. This is the age where the phrase "human dignity" has taken on concrete meaning. People are on the march. They are no longer willing to be taken for granted, forgotten or used. The process is a disorderly one. There has not been time for people to gain any sense of perspective or orderly growth.

Can this tremendous force of movement and change be directed in constructive and democratic patterns?

The answer to this problem will depend upon the performance and cooperation of each level of government. Local, State, and National governments are all part of the Federal system. Each has a job to do. Each must work efficiently with the other if we are to progress together. Together we can break old barriers and see to it that all Americans share the bounty of our great country.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY BEFORE THE BUSINESS COUNCIL AT HOT SPRINGS, VA.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on October 15, the Vice President of the United States made a speech before the Business Council in Hot Springs, Va. I believe that it is a most provocative speech. It is worthy of the attention of every Member of the U.S. Congress.

The speech points out the extent to which our Government is participating with business in general management and other business conditions in the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks made by Vice President Humphrey at the Business Council at Hot Springs, Va., be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, THE BUSINESS COUNCIL, HOT SPRINGS, VA., OCTOBER 15, 1965

Today we are casting aside old economic myths. All of us know them too well:

That the only way to overcome a Federal budget deficit is to raise taxes.

That in times of budget surplus we should cut taxes due to unexpected wealth.

That sound economic growth can be effectively achieved by pump-priming.

That the economic problems of the poor can be solved to large degree by welfare and unemployment payments.

We are also dispelling today such myths as the inevitable clash between government and business, business and labor, and government and labor.

How long has it been since we've heard the terms "economic royalist" and "labor boss" in common usage?

All of us—government, business, labor—are united today in a positive partnership for prosperity. And we are united, to an almost surprising degree, on four basic economic goals for America: Maximum employment, steady economic growth, price stability, equilibrium in our balance of payments.

And we are in agreement, too, as to the means of accomplishing these objectives—means entirely consistent with the free enterprise system.

These means are sophisticated blends of fiscal and budgetary policy, monetary and manpower policy, all aimed at unleashing the full productivity of our private, profit system.

The proof is in the pudding: We are now in our 56th month of economic expansion.

We have seen an increase in our gross national product of $173 billion from the beginning of 1961 to today. Our American gross national product is today approximately half of total world gross national product.

And during this expansion, we have had a remarkable record of price and cost stability. Consumer prices have risen only 6 percent in 4½ years. The wholesale price index has risen from 101.0 in February of 1961 to 103.0 in September of this year.

This expansion has meant a great deal to the labor force. It has provided a net of nearly 6 million jobs between February of 1961 and September 1965, and unemployment has declined from 7 percent to 4½ percent—the lowest rate since 1957.

We have seen, too, a decline in unemployment both for teenagers and Negro workers, although these are still unemployment trouble areas.

Wages and personal income are up.

This has provided fuel to bring consumption up.

The American consumer has done a remarkable job in taking up the output of our great economic machine. In the past year and a half he has, in fact, contributed 72 percent of our $73 billion rise in GNP. Part of this increased consumption has been stimulated by tax cuts which—to the old way of thinking—would have been heresy.

Then there is the story of profits.

The latest statistics show a rise in corporate profits after taxes of over 80 percent from the first quarter of 1961 to the second quarter of 1965—an increase of $20 billion. And these profits, in turn, are being reinvested in the economy to the benefit of us all. And here I point to the investment tax credit and the reform of depreciation guidelines as measures which have been of positive help.

Yes, we are building today, in partnership, a strong and prosperous America. We must be strong and prosperous if we are to remain safe and free. We have world responsibilities that we have not sought but that are ours to bear.

Today, with our present commitment in Vietnam, I hear the question: Can we have both guns and butter?

Can we keep our commitments abroad and still undertake great tasks at home?

Can we have prosperity without inflation and still commit necessary resources to national security and to oversea obligations?

My answer is that we can, and must.

I have heard Vietnam compared with Korea. I would warn against any such comparison.

During the Korean conflict, defense expenditures rose sharply from about $13 billion in fiscal 1950 to $22½ billion in fiscal 1951, $44 billion in fiscal 1952 and $50½ billion in fiscal 1953. Defense expenditures, as a proportion of GNP, almost tripled—rising from a little less than 5 percent in fiscal 1950 to almost 14 percent in fiscal 1953.

Today we start from a base of a strong defense establishment brought to a peak of efficiency over these past several years by Secretary McNamara. During the past fiscal year, national defense expenditures were $50 billion—or about 7½ percent of gross national product.

But the amounts can be provided without inflationary strain or the curtailment of essential domestic programs.

We will and must provide for whatever expansion in our defense expenditures the situation requires. But we see no present likelihood that expenditures will rise enough to bring threat of inflation. If they did, President Johnson would take appropriate fiscal and financial action, I can assure you.

Today our economy is much larger and stronger than at the time of Korea. In fact our gross national product at mid-1950 was only some $275 billion. It is now over $675 billion.

Not only will we be able to press ahead with the programs of our Great Society. But these programs in themselves will promote the strength necessary to meet long-term world responsibilities.

These are programs of self help—programs providing opportunity to people; programs of education for children and of job training for adolescents and adults; programs to create better housing; programs to promote the health of our people; programs of research to increase our knowledge.

No nation need fear bankruptcy because of expenditures on education. You, more than anyone, are aware of our national need for highly-trained people.

That is why business has invested millions of dollars in the past few years in American educational institutions and in individual American students. That is why business establishes new plants and facilities in communities which invest in education, where citizens are well-trained and productive.

Our Nation cannot tolerate the projected 750,000 young people who will drop out of school this year—young people headed surely for the welfare rolls, unless we invest time and money so that they can become taxpayers instead.

You, more than anyone, know the importance of investment in health.

Your businesses—our country—cannot afford the loss of human talent and energy to disease which might have been prevented.

Before this year is over, more than a million productive citizens will have been lost to heart disease, cancer, and stroke alone.

That is why this Congress has passed important legislation not only to give older Americans better medical care, but also to find medical answers which will avert the loss of men and women in prime-of-life to preventable disease and premature death.

You, more than anyone, know the importance of research.

This year the amount spent for research in the United States will approach $20 billion. Of this the U.S. Government will pay for almost 75 percent.

Federal research grants and contracts account for almost two-thirds of the total research expenditures of our American colleges and universities. Over 25,000 graduate students in engineering, mathematics, physical, and life sciences are supported by employment under these grants and contracts.

In this Congress we have passed important new legislation—the State Technical Services Act—which will do for American business what the Agricultural Extension Service has done for the American farmer. This act—President Johnson has called it the "sleeper" of the 89th Congress—will put into the hands of private enterprise the latest fruits of research and development.

This new information will be made available to private business through 250 colleges and technical schools throughout the country.

This program will be administered by State and local officials close to the problems of their own areas.

As the President has said, if we had passed this legislation 25 or 30 years ago, we might have prevented the economic problems of Appalachia today.

Are these new programs worth it? I think that they are.

I think that all the national investments we make today—investment in productivity, in opportunity, in enterprise, in greater social justice, in self-help—are worth it.

These are investments in America. These are investments which aim at full development of the most important resources we have: our people.

Vast new programs initiated by this 89th Congress will place a heavy administrative and management burden on Government agencies. Legislative authorization and appropriations alone will not assure maximum impact of these policies and programs. The indispensable ingredient will be trained and dedicated administrators utilizing the best in modern management techniques.

As these programs get under way, we ask: Will these investments be well managed?

This is the challenge we face. This is the challenge we will meet.

President Johnson has already written an impressive record of economy and efficiency in Government.

President Johnson hates waste—waste of the taxpayers' dollars, waste of material and human resources.

The President reviews every single item in the Federal budget with his Budget Director. Each Cabinet member, in turn, is required to justify every single item in his department budget to the Bureau of the Budget.

Every single Government official with spending responsibility must account, in turn, to his superior for each requested budget item.

Not many weeks ago the President directed a memorandum to the head of each Government department and agency. Many of you are familiar with that memorandum. In summary, it set out guidelines for management of Government programs—management similar to that already in effect in the Department of Defense and, I might add, in well-managed American business.

Basically, two techniques are involved. One is the cost-effectiveness measure, which requires that every item of expenditure justify itself in terms of other expenditures.

For instance—and I cite a hypothetical example—a new extension service for farmers may be important, but is it more important than a program to retrain jobless workers?

The whole purpose of such item-by-item analysis is to select those expenditures from which the greatest benefits are derived and to weed out those items which are least necessary. This cost-effectiveness measure requires that every item be truly important to our national interest.

The second technique that is now coming into general use is the systems analysis technique. Under this technique, all separate operations of Government are analyzed so that, wherever possible, they can be placed under unified direction or supervision. This not only eliminates duplication of services, but also institutes new and more efficient means of overall Government operation.

In this regard, I call your attention particularly to a bill introduced in this Congress by Representative JACK BROOKS, of Texas. Under terms of this bill—supported by this administration—purchase, lease, and utilization of computers by the Government will be more greatly coordinated, with the aim of saving up to $200 million or more in equipment and operational costs each year.

Every single department of Government has been required, as part of its present budget preparation program, to list all its agencies and activities and—this is the important part—to rank them in order of priority.

This organizing process requires Cabinet members to provide the Budget Bureau and the President with a readymade blueprint for cutting their own budgets. This is really the sharpest tool of all. It provides the cutting edge for the entire cost-effectiveness program.

These are the lists the Budget Director will refer to when the President asks him—as he has promised he will—where budget cuts can be made.

These are the lists the President was thinking of when he said recently: "I have instructed the Budget Director, in reviewing your 1967 budget requests with me, to present me with a list of possible saving through greater efficiency in operation, elimination or reduction of obsolete programs, and substitution of private for public credit totaling at least $3 billion."

Furthermore, this aggressive approach to economy in Government does more than merely show where budget cuts can be made. It provides a sound systematic basis for intelligent and responsible planning. A budget thus becomes not merely a column of figures, but a series of choices, and with each choice the alternative is clearly stated.

My message then is this: To meet our responsibilities at home and in the world, we must build a strong and prospering America. Toward that end, we are today making great national investments in our resources, both human and material.

I pledge to you that these investments, now and tomorrow, will be efficiently managed. Your Government will save wherever it can to spend wherever it must.

Finally, I will add one further thought.

In the atmosphere of mutual respect and confidence which now exists in our American society, I would hope that business and labor would—as they have so well to date—continue to exercise the utmost judgment so that we may all avoid the danger which could wipe out the gains we have made: I mean the danger of inflation.

Particularly, I would hope that price stability could be maintained—price stability to keep us competitive in world markets, to help us in our balance of payments, to protect the purchasing power of fixed dollar earnings, retirement benefits and insurance payments.

Both business and labor know that short-term advantages become meaningless if they bring about a wage-price spiral.

Thus it is that I hope that increases in wages and fringe benefits can be kept within the guidepost recommended limits of 3.2 percent, as in the recent steel settlement.

Thus it is that I hope that prices may be kept down, as in the auto industry, and even lowered where possible.

The potential rewards are great.

Together, in a free society, we can achieve what man has always sought: A better life, a greater opportunity, a security from fear. Our productivity and energy can prove in history that freemen can accomplish what totalitarians can never do.

Our expanding economy can continue to expand. We can make tomorrow better than today.

Working together, we will succeed.

TRIBUTE TO HON. FELTON M. JOHNSTON, SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it is with regret that the Senate will lose the services of its distinguished and capable Secretary, the Honorable Felton M. Johnston.

For 10 years he has served with distinction and dedication as Secretary of the Senate. His splendid services will be missed very much. As a personal friend, I take special pride in joining with other Senators who have commended him. He has been a credit to the Nation and to the State in which he was reared as he has performed the duties of Secretary of the Senate. He has filled this post effectively and impartially.

Although he was born in the neighboring State of Louisiana, he was educated in the public schools of Clarksdale, Miss., and was graduated from the University of Mississippi. After graduation he immediately began service in the Senate as a stenographer in the office of the late Senator Pat Harrison of Mississippi. From that assignment he advanced to assistant clerk on the Committee on Finance, and then to clerk of that committee, until his service on the Senate staff was interrupted by his call to military duty.

After the war he was elected secretary for the Senate majority in 1945, and served very ably as secretary for the Senate majority and minority until he was given the very serious responsibility of Secretary of the Senate.

As he leaves this post, it is reassuring to know that he will be followed by capable men, Mr. Emery L. Frazier, and beginning in October of next year, Mr. Francis R. Valeo, who now serves as secretary for the majority.

I commend my very warm and personal friend, Felton Johnston, for the excellent job he has done, and wish him every happiness on his retirement.

I also state that it is my privilege to know and to count as a very warm friend Skeeter's wonderful wife Wanda. My good wishes and those of the entire Senate go with them and their wonderful family.

TRIBUTE TO THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, before we close this session, I wish to make one or two observations about our very fine majority leader.

In many ways, the greatest asset that the Senate as an institution has, is the majority leader.

As the Senator from Montana, and as the majority leader, he represents the Senate in its very best tradition.

I have voted contrary to him many times. I still have the most profound respect for him and for the way in which he handles his office and the power entrusted to him.

I believe that this feeling is shared by all of us.

I did not like to hear him recently refer to a vote that had been taken as "a defeat for the majority leader." He was entirely mistaken in this. Our majority leader is never defeated.

He has a dedication in his heart, and the will to serve. He has the respect, the esteem, and the appreciation of every other Senator.

It is a very difficult role to fill the important and difficult job of majority leader and at the same time stand up in all particulars for the Senator's home State.

The Senator from Montana does this in an unusual and effective way, and with fairness and impartiality, but never forgetting or neglecting in any way the interest of his wonderful State and its fine people.

I commend the majority leader. I do not ask special favors of him and he does not ask special favors of me. However, I appreciate him greatly for his wonderful qualities and for his competence and for the gentlemanly manner in which he conducts the affairs of the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should very much like to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi with respect to the majority leader, whom he has commended most highly. In my judgment the majority leader deserves every generous statement that has been made about him. I also join the Senator from Mississippi in his statements made concerning the Secretary of the Senate, Felton M. Johnston, who is departing, and whom we shall miss greatly.

Mr. President, we have achieved a great record this year. I cannot help feeling that there have been many who are responsible for that record. However, if we had to pick out one single individual more than any other whom we could state has had most to do with this very excellent record of achievement, I think we would have to all agree that it is the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

I am happy to join the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida very much. I am happy to have him join me in any expression of appreciation, including this one, of course.

TRIBUTE TO MINORITY LEADER

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am not merely in a lovable mood at this time. However, I have great appreciation for the minority leader and the unusual and very splendid way and manner in which he carries on his duties.

The minority leader, in addition to his duties as minority leader, is also a very fine representative of his great State of Illinois.

TRIBUTE TO THE MAJORITY WHIP

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, we have here on our side of the aisle the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who has always been a favorite of mine. He has had a very active and fine year here as our new assistant leader.

On the other side of the aisle, we have the distinguished assistant minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], whom I have always enjoyed immensely. I have enjoyed watching him perform his duties here, and appreciate the attention which he gives to his duties.

One of the greatest blessings that the Senate has is the presence of these four men.

The junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] comes in for some credit, too, as the secretary of our caucus.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, up to this point the Senator has done splendidly.

Mr. President, I associate myself specifically with the remarks of the Senator with respect to the other Senators mentioned by the Senator from Mississippi.

I do not know of anyone who is a more lovable, respected, and able U.S. Senator, irrespective of politics, than the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I am happy to join the Senator. I should also like to associate myself with the remarks he made concerning the junior Senator from Louisiana, who is my dear and close personal friend.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida.

HUGH LAWSON WHITE—GOVERNOR OF MISSISSIPPI FOR TWO TERMS AND FATHER OF ITS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, Mississippians mourn the passing of Hugh Lawson White, industrial pioneer, great humanitarian, a leader of men, and twice Governor of Mississippi.

Governor White had a remarkable career, and the people of Mississippi will benefit for generations to come from his vision, leadership, and accomplishments, not only during his two 4-year terms as Governor, but from his civic endeavors as a private citizen as well.

It was my privilege to know and to admire Governor White for nearly 35 years. He was my friend, and I treasure the memory of that friendship and of all the good which he accomplished for Mississippi and its citizens.

He was born in Whitestown, now a part of McComb, Miss., on August 19, 1881, where his father operated a sawmill. He attended the McComb schools and the University of Mississippi, leaving school to enter the family lumber business. He rapidly became one of the business leaders of his community. Later, he moved his lumber business to Columbia, Miss., where he made his home for many years.

Hugh White learned on the hard rock of experience that agriculture alone could not continue to sustain the economy of Mississippi. While mayor of Columbia he realized the need for industrial development of that area and was successful in establishing industry in that community.

As a result of his success in the development of his own community, Hugh White was encouraged to become a candidate for the office of Governor of Mississippi.

I remember so well when I first met Hugh White in 1931. He was a candidate for Governor at that time. I remember how impressed I was in listening to him outline his plan and his program for Mississippi. His plan and his solid enthusiasm was an inspiration to all. When he was elected Governor, he fulfilled those plans. Every Mississippian today is receiving a direct benefit from the programs of Gov. Hugh White and are indebted to him for his leadership, inspiration, and willingness, and determination to work to put those plans into effect.

He was first elected Governor in 1935 and assumed office in January 1936 for a 4-year term. During his first administration he sponsored his industrial development plan which was the first of its kind in the Nation. His program, known as "Balance Agriculture with Industry Act," authorized communities to issue bonds to build buildings to house industries seeking a location in Mississippi, thus providing employment and payrolls for its citizens. This was during the depression, of course, and over the years hundreds of plants, large and small, were located in communities all over Mississippi. These towns had not dreamed of industrial development prior to that time. This program is still in existence and only recently Gov. Paul B. Johnson was able to announce that the goal of Governor White's program had been realized and that agriculture had indeed been balanced with industry.

After the adoption of Mississippi's BAWI plan, under the inspirational leadership of Governor White, many other States adopted similar industrial programs patterned after the plan he so successfully pioneered. Governor White also implemented our first modern highway system.

When Governor White's first term expired, he was not content to retire from public service nor were the people of Mississippi content to let him retire. Under the Mississippi constitution, a Governor is not eligible to serve succeeding terms. However, he continued to serve his State and his people as a private citizen and later as a member of the State legislature from his county. His advice and counsel to business and government leaders was invaluable.

Again, in 1951 the people of Mississippi called on Hugh White to serve as Governor. He was elected Governor again, 12 years after the end of his first term, and gave Mississippi another 4 years of exemplary leadership from 1952–56.

During his second 4-year term as Governor, our school system was vastly improved and completely reorganized with new buildings and a guaranteed 9-month school year. Our highways were further improved, and many other strides taken to improve the standard of living of the people of our State. Throughout, Governor White emphasized the importance of industrial development and he worked tirelessly to accomplish this. He made countless visits to the industrial centers of the Nation, talked with the business leaders, and was highly successful in attracting industry to Mississippi.

Even after his second term as Governor expired, Hugh White answered the call of his successor and served with distinction as vice chairman of the Agricultural and Industrial Board.

Governor White was a generous man. He gave freely of his time to public service, and gave strong financial support to his church, college building programs, and other worthy causes, public and private. Some of his most worthy philanthrophies were never publicly known.

Mr. President, it is impossible for me today to adequately describe the life and the constructive public service of Gov. Hugh White and to pay full tribute to his memory. It would take much more than the time allotted to me to even list his many accomplishments. I have often referred to Governor White in both public speeches and private discussions, through the years, as the man who had done the most for Mississippi of any person then living.

Governor White was a grand man, one whose real accomplishments stand out as a vast tower on the plains.

Hugh Lawson White died on September 19, 1965, at Jackson, Miss., at the age of 84. Early in life he had married Miss Judith Sugg, of Providence, Ky., who died in 1960. Later he married Mrs. Maxine Banister, who survives as his widow.

The fine example of honorable and constructive public service to his State and its people will live for generations as a lasting monument to his life and service.

The people of Mississippi gave him opportunities of leadership and were blessed in return. They mourn his passing; they honor his memory and are grateful for his achievements. May God rest his big soul.

INTERNAL WARFARE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, "What is wrong with the people back home?" Thus wrote A2c Albert Blanton of the 6314th Support Wing, U.S. Air Force, from the Osan Air Force Base in Korea. Like his comrades in the Far East in general, and especially those in Vietnam, Airman Blanton is surprised and hurt by the actions of those few in the United States whose deeds and whose words give aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States. He finds it difficult to understand how those who call themselves Americans could be so mischievous, so misguided, or so duped by Communist propaganda that they would engage in demonstrations against our President and our Armed Forces, would publicly urge our people to resist the call to their country's service, and would heap abuse on this great country of ours. For whether the draft card burners, the demonstrators, and the organizers of so-called "peace" marches are innocents who are being exploited by Communists or Communist fronts, or whether they are knowing participants in Communist or Communist-inspired front activity, they are serving—wittingly or unwittingly—the Communist grand design. That this is so is indicated by a New York Times dispatch of October 20, 1965 from Hong Kong. The Times indicates:

> Asian Communists say they are "profoundly thankful" for the series of demonstrations in the United States against the American military effort in Vietnam.

And well might the Asian Communist rejoice. For the war in Vietnam has begun to turn against the Vietcong. For the first time in many, many months the Communists are losing ground and the Americans, Australian, New Zealand, South Korean, and South Vietnamese forces are gaining ground. Now when the possibility of victory over the Communists can be seen—even though dimly—on the horizon, any suggestion that Americans will stab the anti-Communist forces in the back could be a powerful psychological shot in the arm for the Communist Vietcong. As the New York Times, October 20, 1965 goes on to point out:

> The demonstrations have taken place at a critical psychological juncture for the Vietnamese Communists. Confronted by the U.S. military buildup in South Vietnam, their propaganda media and political cadres have been given the task of preparing Vietcong fighters and civilian supporters for a "protracted war."

But the Asian Communists are not alone in wishing to hinder the American system of government through internal war by propaganda and political warfare. The official Soviet news agency, Tass, on October 10, 1965, hailed the action of the Italian Communist Party in publishing a manifesto comparing the U.S. actions in Vietnam with the Nazis and told of a planned demonstration by students and faculty members of the University of Rome on October 16 to coincide with demonstrations elsewhere around the world. And the East German Communist propaganda apparatus took note not only of the demonstrations in the United States in October but looked forward to the confusion which would be caused by the plans for a march on Washington on November 27. Said the East Berlin radio on October 5, 1965:

> Within the framework of this campaign, prominent U.S. figures have proclaimed November 27, among other dates, for a march to Washington for peace in Vietnam. Among the initiators are Congressman GEORGE BROWN, Writers Arthur Miller, Saul Bellow, Michael Harrington, and John Hersey, as well as a leader of the Congress for Racial Equality, James Farmer, and Professor Flemming of Vanderbilt University. Also participating is the leader of the "Women Strike for Peace" movement, Dagmar Wilson.

From Washington, the Chicago Tribune reported that even while President Johnson and Senate leaders were deploring the disgraceful demonstrations in the United States over the weekend of October 15 and 16, preparations were being made for the November 27 march and that a Sanford Gottlieb was acting as coordinator of the march. Said the Tribune on October 19, 1965:

> At a press conference here, Gottlieb teamed up with Representative GEORGE BROWN, JR., Democrat, of California, Joseph M. Duffy, Jr., associate professor of English at the University of Notre Dame, and Ruby Dee, a Negro actress, to explain the march as necessary to encourage negotiations and to stop the administration from turning to brute force to end the war.

The Tribune went on to state:

> Gottlieb, the march coordinator, disclosed that he had met last July in Algiers and Paris with representatives of the National Liberation Front, the political apparatus of the Vietcong. The front claims to operate only in South Vietnam but in the opinion of American officials it is directed by the North Vietnamese.

But the projected march on Washington of November 27 is by no means the only project which aims at producing a continuing effect of protest, of exerting pressure to halt the present American effort of defending South Vietnam from Communist aggression. The New York Times, on October 20, 1965, reports that an organization which calls itself Students for a Democratic Society has—despite the possibility of prosecution—repeated its determination to step up a program of resistance to the Government's call for military service which will go "far beyond college campuses to neighborhood and draft induction centers." The Times reported that Paul Booth, the national secretary of Students for a Democratic Society had said of the President that "Johnson is trigger happy" and that Booth predicted that "the first places where a new master plan sent out yesterday to the organization's 88 chapters for ratification, would be put into practice would be San Francisco and Ann Arbor, Mich." Two other spokesmen for the organization, Richard Rothstein and Jeff Shero, claimed that Students for a Democratic Society now had 8,000 to 10,000 members, including at least 300 professors.

Whether wittingly or unwittingly, those who are taking part in the planning, the organization, and the staging of the demonstrations, the marches, and the resistance to military service, are engaged in an internal war in the United States. Even though such people represent but a tiny fraction of the American people, their militant posture, their organizational apparatus, and their very vocal presentations make them—in effect, if not in name—auxiliaries of the Communist psychological warfare effort. How such internal warfare techniques could give aid and comfort to Communist policy was spelled out in the Washington Report of the American Security Council as early as June 28, 1965. This form of warfare was analyzed by four of America's leading authorities in the field of psychological warfare, Prof. James D. Atkinson, Prof. Anthony Bouscaren, Dr. Stefan T. Possony, and Mr. Anthony Harrigan. Their analysis is so applicable to the present situation that it deserves to be cited in extenso. They indicated that Communist tactics called for the exploitation of pacifists and other innocent groups, of infiltration of student organizations, of the use of existing Communist fronts, and of the organization of new front or fellow-traveling groups. The objective was to set up bases on college campuses around the Nation and to attempt to build a bridge which would link the leftwing intelligentsia of some universities with the revolutionary groups now found or in process of organization in some of the urban areas of the United States.

And in a prescient forecast of the present situation analysts Atkinson, Bouscaren, Possony, and Harrigan wrote:

> The anarcho-Communist alliance intends to move out from those campuses where it is free to operate. Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), which directed the anti-Vietnam protest in Washington this April, has indicated the next target: manufacturing plants which produce military material. A spokesman for SDS declared that letters have been sent to each chapter, urging sit-ins at such factories. Specific targets include plants which produce helicopters, jets, and nonlethal gas.
>
> In dealing with this new breed of nihilist, the U.S. Government should enforce applicable laws. For example, the Committee for Non-Violent Action has issued a "declaration of conscience" which states: "We encourage those who can conscientiously do so to refuse to serve in the Armed Forces." The committee also stated: "We shall encourage the development of other nonviolent acts, including acts which involve civil disobedience, in order to stop the flow of American soldiers and munitions to Vietnam." It would seem that such statements constitute violations of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, which prohibits advising persons facing the draft from refusing to serve their country. Prosecutions under this act are rare, but the time is at hand when the Department of Justice should take action.
>
> It would be a mistake for Americans to dismiss the campus anarchists as a new species of crank. Anyone familiar with Russian history knows that the Communists reap what the nihilists and anarchists sow. These latter had prepared the ground in Russia by destroying public values and introducing lawlessness, agitation and terror. It was on this foundation that the disciplined Bolsheviks were able to build their regime of totalitarian control. The rioters of the 1960's cannot be dismissed as being in the same class as the goldfish swallowers or other pranksters of the 1920's and 1930's.
>
> The underlying philosophy of the anarcho-Communist coalition bears a resemblance to the philosophy enunciated by the Chinese Communists. Many of the campus strategists of the revolutionary coalition in this country have a hard line outlook and, like the ChiComs, they seek the psychological stimulation of various key groups to more militant action.
>
> In this connection, one of their prime objectives seems to be to build an axis from campus centers to the depressed areas of our great urban complexes. This summer undoubtedly will find many of the campus revolutionaries at work in extreme leftist groups in the Nation's big cities. A number of organizations already have been created for giving support to those who take part in riots. In New York, the Progressive Labor Movement, which follows the Peiping line, has a suborganization in the Committee to Defend Resistance to Ghetto Life (CERGE). The chairman of this committee has been convicted of criminal contempt for refusing to testify before the grand jury investigating the Harlem riots.
>
> In South Vietnam, the Communist Vietcong specialize in development of what they call "combat hamlets"—local centers of resistance to regular government administration. The same pattern seems to be emerging in the United States: an attempt is being made to form combat hamlets, as it were, in the depressed areas of big cities. The aim is to neutralize the local police and to force them to abandon attempts to maintain lawful authority in an urban area. Indeed the plan in the United States seems to be to create in the big cities a network of interlocking political action groups staffed by revolutionaries trained on our college campuses. The end in view is the substitution of a new, synthetic, anarcho-Communist political authority for the legitimate authority of city and State. Observers with vision and understanding of Communist methods in other countries grasp the overall trend of this development—the step-by-step establishment of a Communist state within a State inside this Nation. It is to this end that the revolutionaries seek initial power bases on the campuses and from these to build a bridge to the urban centers.[1]

Even though the present agitators and demonstrators represent but a tiny minority of the American people, it would be foolish, indeed, ultimately, it might be fatal to ignore them. They constitute a potential for mischiefmaking, for harassment of our President and other lawful authorities far beyond their numbers.

Mr. President, following the recent protests against our policy in Vietnam, many of our national leaders have expressed themselves as being indignant at those protests. They have objected strenuously to the protests. But I was opposed to demonstrations from the beginning. Two or three years ago, the demonstrations which then occurred were not in protest to our activity in Vietnam, but they were nevertheless protests and demonstrations against civil authority. They operated under the innocuous name of civil disobedience. All along I have felt that it was a mistake to countenance them. I believe the old common law which taught us that a criminal act which followed the intent to commit that act constituted a crime.

I feel that the so-called acts of civil disobedience were in reality acts of criminal disobedience. They were crimes, and I think they should have been prosecuted as crimes. I think this should have been done from the beginning. I felt from the beginning that this would plague us and the day would not be far off when any individual who had a complaint would take to the streets with his complaint.

I have always taken pride in the knowledge that this is a nation in which those who seek redress for their wrongs can have their wrongs redressed; a nation operating under a constitutional form of government, where those who do not agree with the laws have constitutional procedures whereby they can work to have those laws repealed or amended.

A long time ago I spoke out against taking the law into one's own hands. I spoke out against the sit-ins, and the wade-ins, and the lie-ins last year when we were debating the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I indicated at that time that I had received bundles of letters urging me to vote for the civil rights bill in order that we might get the demonstrators out of the streets.

I stated on the floor of the Senate then that the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act would not get the demonstrators off the streets; that they would be back on the streets. I saw this come to pass in the early months of this year when the demonstrators indeed were back on the streets.

When the so-called voting rights bill this year was being debated, we heard the same cry—that we should enact the law in order to get the demonstrators out of the streets.

The demonstrators are not out of the streets, and they will not be out of the streets next month or next year.

---

[1] American Security Council, Washington Report, June 28, 1965, pp. 3–4.

We have been overly tolerant of these so-called acts of civil disobedience, and many of those in high places have not had the courage to speak out against so-called street demonstrations—blocking of streets, forming of human lines in front of public places of business, exhorting schoolchildren to remain out of schools and participate in the demonstrations.

Mr. President, these things have been bad for the country. We have sown the wind and now we are reaping the whirlwind in the form of demonstrations against our policy in Vietnam.

The American people, through their representatives, should have spoken out against the demonstrations when these demonstrations were in the bud 2 years ago, 3 years ago.

It was utter supineness on the part of the leaders of this country to stand by and watch these demonstrations, and in fact encourage them. Now the chickens have come home to roost.

The demonstrations we are now witnessing and that we are going to see in the near future constitute a potential for mischief making, for harassment of our President and other lawful authorities, far beyond the numbers of those who participate. Whether these agitators and demonstrators are malicious or merely being exploited by Communists and Communist fronts, they should be dealt a sharp rebuff by the American people. Not only that; they should be dealt with severely by the courts of this Nation.

There are encouraging signs that the American people's attitude is stiffening. I see signs that such a movement is already underway. Petitions in support of our American fighting men are being widely circulated throughout the country at various colleges. They are being circulated at West Virginia State College, and student council President Glen Knapp has stated that he aims to get 1,800 signers—The Washington Evening Star, October 20, 1965.

Elsewhere across this great land the true voice at the American people may yet be heard.

Mr. President, praise God that people will yet arise from their apathy and see clearly those who would sell the American heritage for a mess of propaganda pottage.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I commend very highly the Senator from West Virginia for his very forceful and timely remarks, in which he has analyzed the problem and given us the only solution.

The Senator from West Virginia is a valuable member of our Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, which is in close touch with our fighting men in Vietnam. He has seen many letters we have received, and he himself personally has received letters. He expresses a fine sentiment, which our fighting men richly deserve.

It is not only right, but a patriotic duty on our part to support these men to the limit. They are carrying our flag. They are representing us in trouble spots where blood is being shed and life being lost virtually every hour, certainly every day.

I commend him for his vigilance and his understanding of the problem and his splendid summary. I believe he is sound and thorough in his presentation.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I deem it a privilege and high honor to serve on the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, the chairman of which is the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I cherish the remarks he has made in my behalf. I know that he shares my concern, as does every other member of that subcommittee, and as does every member of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10779) to authorize the Pharr Municipal Bridge Corp. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Pharr, Tex.; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SELDEN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. McVICKER, Mr. MAILLIARD, and Mr. GROSS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7812) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10281) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes.

ARMY READINESS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the readiness of our military forces continues to be a matter of utmost importance.

While the current situation in Vietnam has shown some improvement the fact remains we will commit many more new forces and send much more equipment there before the war is stopped or even significantly scaled down.

For that reason it is imperative that we maintain a constant and searching review of our military posture not only in Vietnam but in this country and in all parts of the world where we have men and arms.

Since January, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has been making a special study of Army readiness. We will continue this study on a stepped-up basis as more of our men are sent to Vietnam and others begin accelerated preparation for possible commitment or call-up. On June 25 of this year I reported for the subcommittee the progress of this study to the Senate. Again on July 14 and on August 2, I commented on some of the more important points that had developed from our work. On the 27th of July, the subcommittee unanimously adopted a classified interim report. A heavily censored version of the transcript of our hearings up to that time was released on September 6.

Since the interim report was adopted and the hearing transcript released, we have continued our inquiry. The staff has now visited 15 of the 16 U.S. Army divisions and many of the other major units of the Army. At this time, staff members are in Vietnam following up on our inquiry. The subcommittee has taken extensive testimony during its hearings and has had access to a mass of classified Army documents.

I want to stress here that all of our information is coming from the Army itself. We accepted and used the readiness rating system established by the Army at the direction of the Secretary of Defense. We have not established our own yardstick to measure readiness but have only used the one the Army developed. The purpose of their readiness rating system was clearly explained by Gen. Harold K. Johnson, Chief of Staff of the Army, when he appeared before the Committee on Armed Services and the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, on March 3, 1965, and stated:

> During the past year the Army has developed a system of reporting combat readiness in terms of equipment and other factors which is the best we have ever had.

For emphasis, I repeat what General Johnson said about this system of measuring combat readiness. He said:

> It is the best we have ever had.

I continue to quote from his description:

> This readiness reporting system is a major part of the Army's effort to refine its operations and to improve its techniques. This is an evaluation of the balance of people, training, equipment, and organization in terms of combat readiness against the complex threats we face, the hard facts of resources available, and the diversity of effort expected of the Army.

The Preparedness Subcommittee accepted that definition and made their judgments on the actual conditions of readiness of our Army units on the reports developed under that system. I might add here, staff visits to the units in the field, both before and after the filing of our report, have verified the accuracy of the reporting system.

I recognize that substantial progress has been made since 1961 in modernizing the Army and in increasing the Army divisions both in number and combat readiness.

I am proud of that development. The present Secretary of Defense, his staff, and the members of the military staff are entitled to credit therefor.

However, this was done under a peacetime program and under tight peacetime budgetary restrictions. Events, in the form of hostilities in Vietnam, simply overtook the program. While we have made some progress we still have not met all of the requirements.

Therefore, it is no answer to the problem to simply say that we have the best prepared peacetime Army in our history. This is no longer peacetime and disaster may lay around the corner if we continue to conduct a war under peacetime policies and funding. We must have forces that are responsive to the needs of the Vietnam war without having to strip equipment and manpower from the rest of the Army units. However, at this time, it is still necessary to borrow equipment from units in the United States and elsewhere in order to supply units now in or going to Vietnam. Further, steps must be taken immediately to procure and replace this loaned equipment and to meet the expanding needs of the war in Vietnam.

Since we started our inquiry and after we had made our interim findings, we were told the rating system being used by the Army had no bearing whatsoever on the combat readiness of the Army. I think the general's definition and description of the rating system speaks for itself and believe it is a reasonable yardstick against which to actually measure Army readiness. At least the Army says so.

On the basis of this rating system our investigations revealed some rather serious deficiencies. These facts are presented in our classified interim report and the accuracy of the lists of shortages presented in that report is unchallenged since they were extracted from Army reports. The significance of the shortages as they affect readiness has been disputed. In spite of the Defense Department denial that there were any significant or critical shortages of Army equipment, spare parts, and so forth, the Secretary of Defense allocated over $600 million out of the two recent Defense supplemental appropriations to the Army to buy equipment and ammunition for use in Vietnam and elsewhere. I want to make it very clear that the Army has acted promptly and effectively once they have received the money and the authorization to go ahead in starting procurement of the needed items. Procurement of large amounts of much-needed equipment, such as helicopters and vehicles, is now underway. Entire ammunition production plants are being taken out of mothballs and put back into production. While the Army is working to solve these problems, and has made some headway, much remains to be done. The simple fact is, there is not enough equipment to go around and meet the full requirements of the drain of Vietnam and other programed requirements elsewhere.

The continued stepped-up supplies must continue to move.

We will continue our inquiry to insure that it is factual, complete, and thorough and so the Senate and the Nation can be kept informed.

I commend the Secretary of Defense for filling the gaps and I strongly urge the Secretary of Defense to continue at an even greater rate effective action to bring all of our defense forces up to the readiness they must have to meet their commitments and contingencies.

Mr. President, I wish to thank and also commend the membership of our subcommittee, the Preparedness Subcommittee. The subcommittee has the following membership: The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

I have the privilege of being the chairman.

My fellow members have worked hard and have given a great deal of their time and talent to our hearings and deliberations during the entire calendar year. They are knowledgeable, and have long experience in the subject matter; they exercise discretion and have sound judgment. Further, this is not a one-person committee, or a chairman's committee, by any means. Our actions represent the considered judgment of all members. We are not wedded to unanimity, but seldom have a divided vote on final conclusions.

I do not evaluate my own work, of course, but the work of the other members of this committee and the work of the staff this year has covered many major matters in our military departments. The studies and reports on Army readiness have been of tremendous benefit and have hastened the time when these deficiencies are being overcome.

Certainly the Congress has a positive and continuing duty and responsibility concerning the readiness of all of our Armed Forces.

Further, we are not only constitutional officers, but we are positively and expressly charged by article I, section 8 of the Constitution, which provides:

> The Congress shall have power * * * to raise and support armies * * * and provide for the common defense.

As one of the agencies of the Senate, we expect to carry out this mission to the best of our ability. Nothing shall deter us from this course.

We are most grateful for the opportunity and the encouragement given us by the parent body of which we are Members, the U.S. Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reconvened at 9 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair).

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Senate has just received this conference report. It was approved by the House by a vote of 174 to 88.

The Senate passed the Sugar bill on Tuesday by a vote of 69 to 16. The most important features of the House bill involve the distribution of foreign quotas. The Senate made a substantial number of changes in this distribution before approving the bill.

The conferees also made a substantial number of changes. Thirty-one countries were involved in the quota distribution. The quotas for six of these countries were not at issue in the conference since both the House and Senate bill provided the same amounts. The House conferees accepted the quotas set by the Senate for four countries. The Senate agreed to the amounts fixed by the House for four countries, and we compromised the rest of the quotas.

Under the conference agreement, Mexico, the Dominican Republic, Brazil, and Peru are to be our largest suppliers of sugar in that order. For the information of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the distribution of the foreign quotas under the House bill, the Senate amendment, and under the conference agreement.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Basic quotas and participation in the Cuban reserve for foreign countries at sugar requirements level of 9,700,000 tons

[In short tons, raw value]

Countries	Conference agreement	House bill	Senate bill
A. For countries in the Western Hemisphere:			
Mexico	348, 501	340, 925	390, 135
Dominican Republic	340, 925	340, 925	422, 512
Peru	272, 013	272, 013	272, 013
Brazil	340, 925	340, 925	272, 013
British West Indies	136, 000	150, 397	122, 017
Ecuador	49, 770	50, 267	49, 770
Colombia	36, 000	42, 970	27, 829
Costa Rica	40, 000	42, 159	34, 786
Nicaragua	40, 000	38, 511	40, 672
Guatemala	34, 000	32, 836	35, 321
Venezuela	17, 000	30, 809	2, 676
El Salvador	25, 000	30, 403	17, 125
Haiti	18, 731	28, 782	18, 731
Panama	25, 134	25, 134	14, 449
Argentina	42, 000	21, 485	63, 685
British Honduras	10, 000	19, 864	4, 281
Bolivia	4, 054	4, 054	1, 000
Honduras	4, 054	4, 054	1, 000
French West Indies	42, 970	42, 970	42, 970
Subtotal	1, 827, 077	1, 859, 483	1, 832, 985
B. For other countries:			
Australia	162, 152	162, 152	162, 152
China, Republic of	67, 431	67, 293	67, 431
India	64, 861	64, 861	64, 861
South Africa	48, 000	29, 593	66, 584
Fiji Islands	35, 489	24, 323	35, 489
Thailand	15, 000	19, 864	----------
Mauritius	14, 985	14, 188	14, 985
Swaziland	6, 081	6, 081	6, 081
Southern Rhodesia	6, 081	6, 081	6, 081
Malagasy Republic	7, 492	6, 081	7, 492
Ireland	5, 351	----------	2, 141
Belgium	----------	----------	1, 605
Turkey	----------	----------	1, 605
Subtotal	432, 923	400. 517	436. 507
Total	2, 260, 000	2, 260, 000	2, 260, 000

Mr. SMATHERS. I might state, for the benefit of the Senators, that we have copies of the table here on the desk, if they care to see it.

Considerable interest was expressed in the Senate and elsewhere as to comparative treatment of two of our foreign suppliers, one of which employed a lawyer to advance their cause while the other did not. The two countries are Argentina and Venezuela. The administration had recommended a quota for Argentina of 63,000 tons. This recommendation was cut to 21,000 tons by the House. The Argentina quota was restored to 63,000 tons by the Senate, thus, conforming to the administration's recommendation. Because the House was adamant in its recommendation, and because the Senate conferees did not feel they could accept the House position, the conferees split the difference and fixed the Argentina quota at 42,000 tons. The other country, Venezuela, would have had a quota of 2,600 tons under the administration's recommendation. Venezuela received a quota of more than 30,000 tons under the House bill. The increase was interpreted by some to be the result of that country's foresight in hiring a good lawyer to advance their cause. The Senate fixed the Venezuela quota at 2,600 tons conforming to the administration's recommendation.

Because the House conferees were again adamant in their position, and because the Senate conferees believed that we needed a bill, and we would not accept the House position, we again split the difference. Under the conference agreement the Venezuelan quota is to be 17,000 tons. I can say categorically that no lobbyist had anything to do with the final determination of these quotas by the conferees.

Another compromise worked out by the conferees dealt with the amount of the Cuban reserve. Under the House bill, 44.25 percent of our foreign sugar requirements is reserved for Cuba in the event she rejoins the free countries of the world. The Senate bill reserved 57.77 percent for this purpose. The conferees have decided to reserve 50 percent for Cuba. This correspondingly means that each country's permanent quota is larger, and that one-half of the amount presently allocated to each foreign country comes out of the Cuban reserve. The House conferees also insisted on their amendment, which provides a quota after 1967 of 10,000 tons for the Bahamas. Except for Mexico, this country will be our nearest off-shore supplier. However, they will be required to demonstrate that they are a sugar-producing country for 2 years before they are entitled to any quota whatsoever.

Under the conference agreement, growth in our sugar market would be shared proportionately by all the countries of the world. Deficits in any country's quota would be allocated within the Western Hemisphere if the country involved is a Western Hemisphere country and it would be allocated to non-Western Hemisphere countries if the country involved is located outside of the Western Hemisphere. These are rules that were contained in the House bill, but are substantially similar to rules which we had in the Senate bill. In allocating deficits, the Secretary of Agriculture is to favor countries which agree to buy U.S. agricultural products. He is also urged by the conferees to allocate a share of any deficit which might occur to the Dominican Republic, Bolivia, and Venezuela.

The House accepted the Senate amendments which require advance assurance by foreign countries that they will fill the quotas authorized by the bill for them. The House conferees also accepted the Senate amendments authorizing quarterly limitations on imports in the first two quarters of each year. This will assure orderly marketing of sugar in the early part of the year when the domestic price is substantially higher than the world price and will thereby protect domestic sugar producers from a price decline. The House conferees also accepted the Senate amendment relating to industrial alcohol. This amendment was offered in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Both the House and Senate bills reserved 25,000 tons to provide relief from hardship for certain small beet sugar processors.

That was known in the Senate as the Carlson amendment. This issue was not in conflict. The House bill provided relief for certain cane processors and growers but these features of the House bill were deleted by the Finance Committee. That was known as the Morrison amendment. In conference, the House conferees insisted that hardship cases in the cane area, just as in the beet producing area, should be dealt with. Under a compromise worked out by your conferees, 16,000 tons is to be available for this purpose. The restrictive language of the House amendment has been modified, however, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to allocate acreage or marketing allotments, as the case may be, to relieve hardships in his discretion.

One of the most important amendments in the House bill related to the duration of foreign quotas. The House bill extended foreign quotas through 1971 just as it did domestic quotas. The Senate, while agreeing to the 6-year period for domestic quotas, cut the term of foreign quotas down so that they would apply only in 1966 and 1967. The House conferees flatly and utterly refused to compromise this Senate amendment. They insisted on their version of the bill. A number of the House conferees did advise us that personally they preferred a shorter period, but the 6-year extension was part of the industrywide agreement on which the whole sugar program this year is based.

That is the agreement between the cane producers, the beet producers, the processors, the refiners, and everybody who was involved in this bill.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Utah, who was a member of the conference committee.

Mr. BENNETT. This is probably the most important single point in the conference, and when the Senate conferees gave up and agreed with the House on the proposition, it was with the understanding that the question involved the security of the refiners operating on the Atlantic coast. They felt that they were entitled to the secure knowledge that they would have a firm supply of sugar for this length of time.

This had no effect on the domestic industry because, with the exception of some of the cane sugar from Florida and Louisiana, these people refine no sugar produced on the mainland, so their chief reliance is on foreign trade. They took the position—with which I cannot quarrel too much—that they were entitled to the same assurance of a continued source of supply as are the domestic producers.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator from Utah. I believe everyone who is knowledgeable on the problem would agree that without the cooperation of the refineries, frankly, we would not have been able to obtain a sugar bill at all.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. FONG. The quotas go up to 1971; is that not correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct, and they will be at the same rate as the domestic quota, limitations, and allocations.

Mr. FONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I note in the conference report that Mexico, for which the administration requested 390,135 tons, and for which the House allowed 340,975 tons in its version, but for which the Senate in turn, earlier this week, when it considered the bill, allowed 390,135 tons, has now been reduced in conference from 390,135 tons, which is the administration and Senate figure, to 348,501 tons.

The Senator is aware, of course, that there is an imbalance of trade between Mexico and the United States, and that the trade itself is very much in favor of this country, I believe to the extent of $800 million. Mexico has been a good friend of ours. This is one of the problems which was discussed—as was the problem of cotton—at the time of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference which had its fifth meeting in La Paz, Baja California, earlier this year.

Could the Senator give the Senate an explanation as to why the administration figure and the Senate figure was reduced to the figure agreed to in the conference report?

Mr. SMATHERS. I shall be happy to try to do that for the benefit of the able majority leader.

First, we had arrived at a split figure of 365,000 tons which was a 50-percent break—the House gave 50 percent and the Senate gave 50 percent. For the better part of the morning we thought that that was the figure on which we would finally agree. However, several members of the House conferees felt—and I must be candid about this—that Mexico had not been as helpful with respect to the Cuban problem, with respect to the Dominican Republic problem, and with respect to cooperation in the Alliance for Progress, as Mexico might have been. They stated that they could not vote and would not vote for it, and did not feel they could explain a larger quota for Mexico than what we report here tonight. However, I personally agree very much with the statement just made by the Senator from Montana.

They refused to yield on this particular point. It was then pointed out that there is, customarily, a deficit in the Puerto Rican allocation. It runs up to 200,000 tons a year. The President has authority, under the provisions of this bill, to give to Mexico that amount of the deficit which the President thought Mexico should be and would be entitled to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Do I correctly understand, then, that on the basis of the 150,000 to 200,000 set-aside tons which are under the control of the President, it would be possible for him, if he so desired, to allocate to Mexico or any other country a portion of that set-aside, if he thought it was in the national interest?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator has stated it exactly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then I would assume that the President would keep in mind the fact that, so far as the balance of trade is concerned with Mexico to the South, it is very much in our favor.

Mr. SMATHERS. I agree with the Senator from Montana. Obviously, it is in our favor. As an individual conferee, let me say that I share the views now being expressed so ably by the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I point out that the Senate has two standing parliamentary groups which operate each year. There is the Canadian-United States group, which meets twice a year, I believe, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]; and there is the Mexican-United States group, which has now been in operation for 5 years—not quite so long as the Canadian group—usually under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

We have been endeavoring, through the Interparliamentary groups, to bring about a better understanding of one another's needs so that we could develop a closer relationship. We believe that on the whole, we have been fairly successful. Thus, I would hope that the President would give serious consideration to the figures which the administration advanced, of 390,135 tons, and also the Senate recommendation, a recommendation which won approval in this body, the figure being the same as that advanced by the administration, and consider making up the difference—insofar as it is possible in relation to Mexico, on the basis of good relations and in the national interest—between 348,501 tons agreed to in conference, and the Senate and administration figures. I would hope that the committee would see fit to recommend that, and I hope that the Senator from Florida could give me some assurance that it could be accomplished.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Montana. Certainly, I can speak only for myself as one of the individual conferees. I personally would recommend it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I join the Senator from Montana in expressing the very earnest hope that the President, in allocating the 150,200 tons, will give consideration to Mexico, not only because Mexico is one of our best customers—and we have a balance of trade amounting to several hundreds of millions of dollars a year, as we do with Canada—but also because it is worth something to the United States to have a border north and south between two countries where we do not have to keep large contingents of troops all the time.

If we were to add up the cost of what it would take to maintain security with some other country bordering us on the north and south, and add that to the balance of trade in our favor, I believe that it would be found we are very fortunate to have Canada as a neighbor on the north, and Mexico on the south.

It may be that Mexico does not wish to go to war with everyone, whenever someone in this country asserts that we should go to war with them. It may be that they are using fully as good judgment as we are, in some respects. But I earnestly hope that the President will take care of this deficiency in the Mexican quota.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator from Vermont. I feel reasonably certain that he will, particularly when the administration itself recommended for Mexico 390,000 tons, whereas the conference recommends specifically giving only 340,000 tons.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me ask the Senator from Florida whether the amount available to the President for an additional allocation will be sufficient so that he can make up the amount which was deducted from the 390,000 tons.

Mr. SMATHERS. Using our experience in the past, we think we can safely say that there will be a deficit in some quotas. The President has the authority to take that deficit and give it to whatever country he wishes to give it to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What the Senator has said about Mexico reinforces the suggestion I made that the bill should have been referred to the Foreign Relations Committee for consultation and revision, because the Senator has said that this sugar bill is to be used to pressure Mexico to conform to our policies in regard to other Latin American countries. Is that not what the Senator said?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senate passed a bill and the House passed a bill. What we are doing is the best we can do, in the light of our own judgment.

Insofar as it affects our foreign policy, the Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has said that some conferees thought that in view of the fact that Mexico had not agreed with our policy in Cuba, and I assume the Dominican Republic, they did not think they should give Mexico a sugar quota. It strikes me that that is an irrelevant consideration if this is a sugar bill, an economic bill. If it is a political bill to use sugar to pressure other countries to conform to our policies, it should go to the Foreign Relations Committee and we should have a look at what these policies are.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not totally disagree with what the Senator has said. I have previously so expressed myself. It is a question of whether one group of Senators looks at this matter or another group does. Insofar as it pertains to foreign policy, perhaps it would be better if it went to the Foreign Relations Committee.

The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is a member of the Finance Committee, as are about seven members of the Foreign Relations Committee. Those two committees have joint membership to a greater extent than any other committee in the United States Senate. So the Senator might say that the Finance Committee is not totally lacking in knowledge of what goes on in the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think it is proper to use the sugar bill to try to pursue an irrelevant aim. The Senator from Illinois made this same argument with respect to the aid bill. He offered an amendment to the aid bill. It had a laudable purpose, but it was not pertinent to that bill.

I do not like to see us use the sugar bill to do what we want certain countries to do in the political field. I think in many cases those countries are right, and we should listen to them. We ought to try to persuade them rather than force them to do what we want them to do.

Is the Bahamas quota included in the British West Indies quota?

Mr. SMATHERS. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not see it here.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Bahamas will not get a quota until 1968, until they have demonstrated that they are a sugar-producing country and are able to fill their quota.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a British possession. We have difficulty in foreign exchange. I thought one of the justifications for awarding sugar quotas was to reward those countries which gave us sugar in 1963 and 1964.

Mr. SMATHERS. As the Senator knows, he sometimes goes to conference and wants the House to agree to something in the foreign aid bill. Sometimes he comes back and he says he could not get the House to agree. We are in very much the same situation in which the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has found himself on such occasions. We cannot get the House to accept everything we want. As a matter of fact, the Bahamas do not now produce sugar and do not have any allocation. Therefore, we are not going to give them one next year or the year after. We have to be satisfied that they have some kind of history of production before they are entitled to any quota.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am in sympathy with anyone who goes to conference with the House, but I assume the House conferees gave us some reason with respect to this 10,000 tons. I presume they had a reason. I have not the faintest idea what it is.

Mr. SMATHERS. One of the reasons why they wanted to do it—while I did not vote for it—was that the Bahamas were no longer technically a British possession. They are an independent country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They are in the sterling bloc.

Mr. SMATHERS. They are in the sterling bloc, but they are independent, as are Jamaica, Trinidad, and other areas in the Caribbean. They are 50 miles from the United States. They have 150 military installations on those islands, for which they charge us nothing. They have no income. They have no industry. We have recently passed a tariff bill which will curtail their income. They made a request that the least that could be done, if they cannot take care of their income through tourists, is to let them produce sugar. That was one of the reasons the Members of the House gave us.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Since the Senator says they are friendly, I do not see why, in view of Mr. De Gaulle's difficult actions with regard to our gold and dollar balance, we should continue to give him money and a premium for sugar from Guadeloupe and Martinique.

It seems inexcusable. I am thoroughly in accord with what the majority leader said about Mexico, but here is the reverse case. Here is a country which does everything it can to thwart us directly, and makes no bones about it. Yet we have given that country a premium of $3 million, approximately.

What about Venezuela?

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me reply first to the French question. The distinguished Senator from Illinois in committee made a very sound argument, which has been presented by the Senator from Arkansas. It used to be, speaking of the French West Indies, that there was a quota given to France itself. France itself did grow and send sugar to us.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That was when the French were friendly.

Mr. SMATHERS. This was in 1964.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That recently?

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes. So we took that away, and left in only the West Indies. The reason for some of this is that when there was a scarcity of sugar it was the areas south of us that supplied us sugar at the price we were paying, when they could have sold that sugar on the world market and made more money. The theory of the administration bill was to give the quota to those countries which had had a history of selling sugar to us when it was not to their advantage to do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I do not understand is that it is only stated in some instances. For example, in the case of Argentina it is given to them and then it is cut. It is only stated where it suits the purpose; that is, the House of Representatives, instead of what the House wanted to do. They are very tough people. I do not believe it is very justifiable.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish the Senator had been in my place in the conference.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I have had enough of that.

Mr. SMATHERS. I could have told him this. He has been to meetings with the House. He knows how the House conferees act. They are very jealous of their prerogatives. It is difficult to negotiate with them about many of these things.

No doubt it would have made more sense had we picked out one specific principle and struck with it all the way through. But we were unable to do that.

They agreed with respect to several countries, and then they said that they were not going to agree. Then, they would advance their reasons, some of which we agreed with and some we did not.

That is what conferences are for; to exhaust the differences of both Houses.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Usually, even in foreign aid, they gave reasons for their past actions.

I think they attempt to make a case, even though I do not agree.

I do not want to delay the Senate. But there was the Venezuelan quota, and the Senate had to take it.

Mr. SMATHERS. We took the Venezuelan quota and again I think it is a good amendment.

The best customer we have in South America is Venezuela.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And we are their best customer also.

Mr. SMATHERS. They buy from us $600 million worth of goods and about $100 million of that is agricultural products.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And how much do we buy from them?

Mr. SMATHERS. A substantial amount—mostly in oil.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Do they not have a favorable balance with us? In other words, do we not buy more from them than they from us; oil in particular?

Mr. SMATHERS. I suspect that is not true.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, yes.

Mr. SMATHERS. We buy offshore oil from them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not like Mexico. The Senator cannot make a case. I do not see that we have a favorable balance of trade with them. We have an unfavorable balance of trade, I believe, with Venezuela.

One last thing. The hearings which came out—which I had not seen, presented a picture that is erroneous and embarrassing to me, because I made a complaint the other day that I was not given an opportunity to question certain of the representatives of foreign countries.

The way the hearings were prepared is unique because they are made to appear on the first day of the hearings, when I was in attendance and the hearings show who was present. Among them was me. Then there is inserted in the hearings the testimony that was handed in in written form. It was made to appear as if it were verbal testimony, and that I had an opportunity to question the witness.

I maintain that this is not the fact and it makes me appear as if I had misrepresented the case. I was there the first day. I came the second day just after the hearing was over.

But if the Senator would look at these hearings it would appear that a number of these representatives came before the committee. They were introduced and they said the usual thing.

On page 242 it is stated:

> Our next witness is Mr. Charles Patrick Clark, who appears in behalf of the Venezuelan Sugar Distribution Association.

Mr. Clark read this statement and for all practical purposes it appears that he came there and delivered it. He did not at all. I was present that day. I think this is a peculiar way to prepare hearings.

Mr. SMATHERS. I agree with the able Senator from Arkansas, and I agree with what the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is going to say.

Both of them are members of the Committee on Finance. All we need to do is get the committee together and say that we do not like this sort of thing and that it should not happen.

The Senator will get one vote from the Senator from Florida on that. I know that what the Senator says is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I never heard of this before. On Friday, the 15th, which is the second day, when they might have appeared and did not, because I did not appear there until 10 o'clock and the hearing opened at 9 o'clock, it does not show that I was present.

If they are going to show them, why was it not done on the day when I was not there, instead of when I was there?

It is embarrassing to me because I did not question the witness. People will say, "Why did you not ask questions of the witnesses that were called before the committee?"

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not disagree with the Senator.

We never get into this bill until late in the session.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is customary.

Mr. SMATHERS. We resent it, but there is nothing that can be done about it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We can turn it down. We do not have to pass it at all.

Mr. SMATHERS. Those who think we should turn it down will have that privilege in a moment.

What happened on that occasion was in order to shorten the hearings? The presiding officer suggested to those people who were going to testify that they submit their statements and they would be incorporated in the record in full. That is the way they appeared.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It should have been put in the appendix.

Mr. SMATHERS. I believe the committee may very well want to discuss this practice.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will there be a yea-and-nay vote? If so, I wish to announce that I oppose this. Will there be a yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. SMATHERS. I had not intended to ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have not finished counting the seconds.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wish to make a statement with respect to which the Senator from Florida has already expressed his agreement in answer to the question raised by the Senator from Arkansas as to why all this fancy language was put in the hearings to make it appear that the lobbyists appeared in person.

I understand the reason was that the lobbyists were all collecting fat fees from $40,000 to $50,000 to appear before the committee. They developed the slick trick of closing the hearing and filing statements.

Then, they wake up to the fact, "How can we tell our people that we pleaded so hard to the Finance Committee. We will not be able to send our bill in and get our money."

Somebody somewhere developed the brilliant idea to have the hearings show that they were being properly introduced and congratulated, which enabled them to collect fat fees they were collecting from these people for doing nothing but sleeping that morning.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not want to become involved in an argument as to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am glad that the Senator from Florida agreed to that in advance.

Mr. SMATHERS. I did agree. I would say that if possible we ought to look at the lobbies who represent other organizations. We ought to look into the lobby of the American Banking Association, of the American Bar Association, of the American Medical Association, of the American Rice Institute, of the American Chicken Institute, or whatever the organization is called. Perhaps we ought to do something about all of them.

However, we should not decide to pass or not pass a bill with respect to a country depending on whether or not it hires a lobbyist.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is what we were trying to do, but they all disappeared. We could not find them. They never showed up.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I remember very well the morning to which the distinguished Senator from Arkansas alludes. He was in the committee room, and I showed up at about the same time. I said, "Where is the hearing?"

The hearing had been called off. It was agreed that these statements should go into the record. That is not an uncommon practice in any committee. That happens all the time, largely because the time is so short and witnesses are so many, and if witnesses come with 30 or 40 minutes, or an hour's statement, the committee will never get to the end of the furrow, and we shall never get a bill. Therefore, since the witnesses were not there, the Senator and I fell to talking about pleasanter things, like Federal judges and that sort of thing.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe the Senator understands. I believe he is talking about Friday, October 15.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The meeting was adjourned before I got there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I got there a little later.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They did not insert the statements in the record on that day. They inserted them as if they had been presented on the previous day. That makes it appear that I had an opportunity to inquire into these activities. That is the major difference. They do not appear as insertions, in other words.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The reason I alluded to it is that we know the difficulty of getting sugar legislation at the end of a session. On one occasion, a few years ago, the House sent us a bill. We made the mistake of first adopting the adjournment resolution. The House adjourned, and we were stuck with a bill. The reason I alluded to what my friend the Senator from Arkansas said is that I do not want to see any kind of disparagement cast on that very distinguished and genteel clerk of the committee, Mrs. Springer. She does the best she can under really difficult circumstances. If it is agreed in one way or another that witnesses will submit their statements, that is done. That has happened countless times.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have never seen statements of witnesses appear in the record as though the witnesses had appeared in person. We accept statements in all committees, including the Committee on Foreign Relations, but they appear as statements, not as oral testimony. Certainly that is not the practice in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to commend the conferees, and for a reason. It is not possible to seat three persons around a table and get them to agree on sugar quotas.

The Senator was wondering about the British West Indies. I am inclined to agree with him. The Senator spoke about British Honduras, and perhaps we have no obligation. To a degree, I can agree with them—likewise with respect to the French West Indies.

On the other hand, I put up a little protest about Haiti. It was said, "Oh, they have a lifetime dictator."

I said, "So what? It is the peasants in Haiti who will starve if they do not have sugar out of which to eke a little exchange in a country where the annual per capita income is only $100. If you want to convert a country to communism, that is the way to do it."

I thought we could have done a little better by the Dominican Republic. Our former Ambassador to Mexico, who was also our Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, said, "You had better raise your quota, or you will have a Castro country on your hands."

It is not possible to get people wholly to agree on how to cut up a 10-million-ton sugar bowl. Under the circumstances, knowing the difficulties at the other end of the Capitol, I believe the conferees are to be commended.

Now I shall make a suggestion to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I am inclined to agree with him that we should start a sugar bill. Suppose we add the processing tax and then initiate a sugar bill in the Senator's committee; and the processing tax can be added at the other end of the avenue. Then we shall not be in the clutches of time or of hardheaded House Members, who have sat there resolutely and said, "This is it, or nothing."

The Senate had three excellent conferees around the table, two representing cane, so to speak, and one who knows the beet sugar industry inside and out the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett].

Three better Senators could not have been picked out of the whole Senate than the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. If they could not do it, no Member of the Senate could. So I commend the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the distinguished minority leader and I totally agree with him.

I stated to the Senate during the debate that the refiners were more ably represented in the House than in the Senate and this demonstrated it. Without the refiners cooperation there could be no sugar bill. Without extending foreign quotas through 1971 there could be no refiners cooperation. Under the circumstances, the Senate conferees were compelled to yield on this difference. However, I hasten to point out that if it developed that foreign quotas in the future fail to reflect our best national interest, the President can terminate any of them. If he does not, then Congress can act to change any foreign quota it sees fit.

I move that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I support the sugar bill, not because I favor all of its provisions. The situation is such with the domestic industry that we must have a sugar bill and it must be completed in this session of the Congress. There are such large inventories of sugar that unless we increase the marketing quotas, our sugarbeet farmers will face further acreage cuts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a portion of the hearings showing my interrogation of representatives of the Department of Agriculture when the sugar bill was before the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Curtis. Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Let us see. I think—yes, Senator Curtis.

Senator Curtis. I will try to be very brief, Mr. Chairman.

I want to say for the record that I think we must have a Sugar Act, so far as the domestic end of it is concerned, and it should be one for a reasonable period of years.

What is the price of the sugar obtained domestically?

Mr. Schnittker. About 6 or 7 cents per pound.

Senator Curtis. That is a fair price to the consumers, is it not—considering our wage scale and the standard of living and the cost of everything else?

Mr. Schnittker. This is a raw sugar price which I quoted.

Senator Curtis. Yes. But I mean what it ultimately ends up across the counter, it is a fair price, is it not?

Mr. Schnittker. About 11.6 cents per pound is the retail price of refined sugar in the United States.

Senator Curtis. Well, compared to other prices it has had less inflation than most any other article that the Americans buy; is that not right?

Mr. Schnittker. This has been very stable over the years.

Senator Curtis. In other words, there is no segment of our society that has any just complaint that it is being overcharged for domestic sugar; is that right?

Mr. Schnittker. I have not heard any particular complaints about the price of sugar.

Senator Curtis. No. As a matter of fact, it is one of the lowest prices of anything that people can buy, compared to past years. Is that right?

Mr. Schnittker. Well, compared with a number of years ago, before the Second World War, yes.

Senator Curtis. The world price is kind of an elusive term, is it not?

Mr. Schnittker. Excuse me?

Senator Curtis. When they talk about the world price, that is rather an illusive term. There is not too much sugar ever moves in the world price, is there? Is not most of the sugar that is consumed involved one way or another in some regulated program of some country?

Mr. Schnittker. That is correct. Nonetheless, in certain markets, New York, London, there are organized sugar markets which quote a world price.

Senator Curtis. They quote a world price. But the volume of sugar consumed by the world, other than the Communist world, only a small portion of it——

Mr. Schnittker. Only about 10 percent of the world production will move through those markets.

Senator Curtis. Based upon the bill you recommend, percentagewise, what portion will the domestic producers have?

Mr. Schnittker. The domestic producers, not including the offshore areas?

Senator Curtis. State it both ways, please.

Mr. Schnittker. About 65 percent including the offshore areas, and about 40 percent including just the mainland areas.

Senator Curtis. The 40-percent mainland areas—has it ever been higher than that?

Mr. Schnittker. It has not.

Senator Curtis. What about the increased consumption due to the growth factor?

Mr. Schnittker. The domestic areas would not share in the growth between total requirements of 9.7 and 10.4 million tons. But above 10.4, and below 9.7, the domestic areas will share in the increase or the decrease according to a factor of 65 percent.

Senator Curtis. Sixty-five percent?

Mr. Schnittker. To the domestic producers.

Senator Curtis. That is offshore included.

Mr. Schnittker. Yes, sir?

Senator Curtis. That includes offshore?

Mr. Schnittker. Just the mainland in this case.

Senator Curtis. After we reach 10.4, the mainland will receive 65 percent of the growth factor?

Mr. Schnittker. That is correct.

Senator Curtis. When do you expect to reach 10.4?

Mr. Schnittker. About 1971.

Senator Curtis. How much will the growth factor be after that?

Mr. Schnittker. About 100,000 tons per year, which would be about 1 percent.

Senator Curtis. 100,000 tons per year. How many acres of beets is that?

Mr. Schnittker. About 40,000 acres of beets.

Senator Curtis. If it all went to beets?

Mr. Schnittker. Yes.

Senator Curtis. How many acres of cane does it take to make a hundred thousand tons?

Mr. Schnittker. About the same in the U.S. mainland.

Senator Curtis. Where were the six factories located, pursuant to the new area reserve in the 1962 act?

Mr. Schnittker. One in New York, one in Texas, one in the Red River Valley—and I am not sure what State that is—North Dakota, I mentioned Maine, New York——

Senator Curtis. One in Maine?

Mr. Schnittker. One in Maine.

Mr. Murphy. California, Arizona, North Dakota, Maine, New York, and Texas.

Senator Curtis. Have Maine and New York been producing?

Mr. Murphy. No, sir. New York will start this year, and Maine will be ready next year.

Senator Curtis. Now, if the bill is enacted, as you recommend, and after this period of leveling out of inventory is over what beet-growers will have to take an acreage cut?

Mr. Schnittker. I believe all the beet-growers in the country would be liable to an acreage cut in the event that yields per acre and consumption combine to require an acreage cut.

Senator Curtis. The——

Mr. Schnittker. Including the new areas.

Senator Curtis. In other words, the growth factor is not enough to prevent an acreage cut?

Mr. Schnittker. No. I am saying that in the event yields were to go up very rapidly, it is at least possible that the growth factor would not be enough to prevent an acreage cut.

Senator Curtis. Then you have not provided enough growth factor to take care of the technological advances that might occur in increased production.

Mr. Schnittker. I would not say that. I only mention the possibility that this may be the case.

Senator Curtis. Now, what you propose that we buy from foreign countries, percentagewise, how much of that will come from the Western Hemisphere? A percent of the total foreign purchase.

Mr. Schnittker. About three-quarters, not counting the 1 million tons from the Philippines.

Senator Curtis. Would come from the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. Schnittker. Yes.

Senator Curtis. The table on page 40 of the committee print looks like the administration recommended purchase of 1,720,555—I assume that is tons—from the Western Hemisphere, from countries outside, 2,260,000. Are those figures correct?

Mr. Schnittker. The ratio is more like three-fourths than two-thirds.

Senator Curtis. Three-fourths. It looks like to me that you are going to purchase more outside the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Schnittker. The 1,720,000 tons is from the Western Hemisphere, 2,260,000 is total—with the difference of about 540,000 tons coming from outside the Western Hemisphere.

Senator Curtis. Since we have had a Sugar Act, and excluding emergency situations, when did we start buying outside the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. Schnittker. In any quantity, only in 1961 or 1962. Except for the Philippines, of course.

Senator Curtis. We did buy prior to the act of 1962?

Mr. Schnittker. I believe it is correct that we had small quantities from Formosa and possibly some other.

Senator Curtis. Small quantities. We are buying about 500,000 tons now—you are recommending.

Mr. Schnittker. We would recommend about 500,000 tons.

Senator Curtis. And that has all come about since we went on the global quota.

Mr. Schnittker. And particularly since the departure of Cuba from the U.S. sugar market.

Senator Curtis. Now, when Cuba comes back into the world of free nations, who is going to get that?

Mr. Schnittker. Well, under the administration bill, when Cuba is back among the free nations, she could have 57 percent of the authorization for foreign countries, apart, I believe, from the amount authorized for the Philippines. And this would, of course——

Senator Curtis. But it will not reduce the domestic.

Mr. Schnittker. It would not, under the act, reduce the domestic. It would fall upon the other suppliers who now get part of the basic Cuban quota, according to their basic quota under the proposed act.

Senator Curtis. It looks like we are making a permanent guarantee, or launching our program to become permanent, of 500,000 tons outside the Western Hemisphere, and not too long ago it was negligible.

Mr. Schnittker. That is correct.

Senator Curtis. Yet you state in your statement:

"In view of the acreage cutbacks to which long-term growers have been and will be subjected, additional factories in new localities are not advisable during the term of this extension."

Now, what acreage cutbacks do you anticipate, say, in the last 4 or 5 years of this extension?

Mr. Schnittker. I am going to ask Mr. Murphy if he can respond to that, sir.

Mr. Murphy. Yes, Senator. In 1960 I believe there was 900-and-some-odd thousand acres of sugarbeets growing. And in 1964 there was 1,450,000 acres.

There are restrictions in effect this year. The level of those restrictions is 1,375,000 acres. There has been a hearing held with respect to the recommendations of growers for next year's crop, and they have recommended a further small reduction for 1966. Beyond that, it is going to depend a great deal on the weather and the yields. Nobody can really say which way it will go.

Senator Curtis. It is figured so close that there may be cuts throughout the life of this extension?

Mr. Murphy. There may be a cut in 1966. I would suspect that that would be the last cut.

Senator Curtis. Now——

Mr. Murphy. That is from the much higher level that had been achieved by 1964.

Senator Curtis. How about this going outside the Western Hemisphere? Is that going to be cut?

Mr. Murphy. It will not be cut. In other words, the domestic——

Senator Curtis. The only way it will be cut is if Cuba comes back into the picture.

Mr. Murphy. That is right. The domestic areas would get a big immediate increase in marketing allotments, and then for a period of years the foreign countries would get whatever market increases are available to bring about a reestablishment of the present balance between domestic and foreign sources.

Senator Curtis. As I said earlier, we have to have a Sugar Act, and we have to have it this year, and it should be for a reasonable period of years so the domestic producers, both cane and beet, can rely upon it, and we can have order in the industry.

But I must say that I disagreed with the global quota. I think the results were bad. I think that it caused frantic buying all over the world, and a great many producers outside the Western Hemisphere now have gotten what was predicted would happen—a permanent place in our sugar market at a time that we are still beset with a multitude of agricultural problems. Is that right?

Mr. Schnittker. Well, we are certainly beset with many agricultural problems. But at the same time U.S. producers would have the biggest share of the U.S. sugar market that they ever had, even though the beet acreage would be somewhat smaller.

Senator Curtis. Well, of course, we are not talking about something that they should not have, are we?

Mr. Schnittker. No, we are not. We are talking, I think, of a sugar supply situation where we produce enough in the right areas at home so that we can have a stable supply, and where we have a diversified and assured group of foreign suppliers.

Senator Curtis. Do you anticipate that these new areas will be successful?

Mr. Schnittker. I think we have every reason to believe that they have been picked carefully, and that they will be successful.

Senator Curtis. Reliable companies are involved?

Mr. Schnittker. Reliable companies, and a great deal of pilot study and research going into the character of the sugarbeets grown in the areas.

Senator Curtis. But it is the policy of the Department of Agriculture to bring such expansion to a close.

Mr. Schnittker. It is, and it is made necessary.

Senator Curtis. Why?

Mr. Schnittker. By virtue of the fact that it is simply inconsistent to cut back sugar growers in Nebraska and Colorado and North Dakota, at the same time we are authorizing new plants——

Senator Curtis. I am not suggesting that. I am not suggesting you take away from one group of domestic people and give it to another one. Not in the least. My primary obligation is to the people in the sugar business now, that they not be destroyed, and not give it to somebody else.

But you have developed here the last 4 years, and you are recommending a program of going clear outside the Western Hemisphere for very substantial amounts of sugar, and taking a position, as announced in your paper here, opposed to any part of domestic agriculture sharing this.

Mr. Schnittker. Well, I would argue that domestic agriculture has shared in this by virtue of the expansion in sugar acreage in this country over the past few years when there were no restrictions. But we have struck a balance here between——

Senator Curtis. Who decided that balance?

Mr. Schnittker. The administration in recommending a bill has urged the Congress to consider enacting certain balances laid out in the bill.

Senator Curtis. Well, has the Department of Agriculture, that is supposed to be representing the American farmers—do they fully agree with this, with this big purchase of sugar outside the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. Schnittker. We are fully agreed with it, sir.

Senator Curtis. And you are fully agreed with the statement that the long-term growers will be subjected to further cuts, and that new localities are out.

Mr. Schnittker. I believe——

Senator Curtis. That is what you said in here.

Mr. Schnittker. There is the prospect that old areas may continue to be subject to acreage cuts, and we recommend that no new areas be brought in.

Senator Curtis. Is there any dollar shortage among American farmers?

Mr. Schnittker. Well, there is a dollar shortage among American farmers, as everywhere else. But they have a billion dollars more net income this year than last year, and $2 billion more than 5 years ago. So the dollar shortage is improving.

Senator Curtis. That is counting direct Government payments.

Mr. Schnittker. Yes, sir.

Senator Curtis. And it is a little less than it used to be in the marketplace; is that right?

Mr. Schnittker. I think——

Senator Curtis. In 1964, it was about three-quarters of a billion dollars less that the American farmers derived in the marketplace than, say, 4 years ago.

Mr. Schnittker. The value of farm products marketed—I think that is correct.

Senator Curtis. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, that part of the bill dealing with the foreign allocations for the purchase of sugar is most unsatisfactory. I do not approve at all of the type of lobbying that has taken place, nor do I approve of that part of the bill. I am supporting the bill because of the necessities of the domestic industry.

The reason why I supported a 5-year extension of the domestic part of our sugar program and only a 2-year extension of the foreign part of our sugar bill was so that we could soon hold hearings and take another look at the foreign part. It was my hope that at that time we could further increase the domestic allocations so that new areas could raise sugarbeets; so that present sugarbeet growers could increase their acreages instead of having their acreages cut; and so that more new sugarbeet factories could be built.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have no fault to find with the conferees on the part of the Senate. They were faced with a difficult situation, with very tough bargainers on the other side, and with the guillotine of time working against them constantly. So what I shall say is in no sense a criticism of them.

But I would not like to have the bill passed without a quorum of the Senate present to consider the real weaknesses in the whole program. Granted that we have the present program or the lack of a program in dealing with sugar, it is inevitable that these weaknesses should develop. In spite of the fact that we tried to make a complete record in the early part of the week, the facts are not clearly known by all Members of the Senate, and certainly not by the country.

Basically what has happened has been that over the years—and this goes back to the beginning of the century—we have drawn into production in this country high-cost and high-priced cane and high-cost and high-priced beet sugar, and have kept out low-cost, low-priced Caribbean sugar. This was done, first, by tariffs; then in the Jones-Costigan Act of 1935 it was done by quotas.

A solution was reached for a time that approximately half was produced in this country from cane and beet sugar, and half imported. But the practice was followed of paying for imported sugar the same price as the high-priced, high-cost domestic sugar, thereby giving big bonuses to the sugar producers in the Caribbean, notably in Cuba. We went into that matter once, and it looked as though we were paying to Cuban sugar producers something like $30 or $40 a ton more than they could realize in the open world market. It is true that from three-eighths to about two-fifths of the sugar in Cuba at that time was produced by American companies, but the remainder was not produced by American companies, and we therefore paid to Cuba a big bonus. Castro was therefore wrong when he charged that we had exploited Cuba from the standpoint of sugar. We were not exploiting Cuba; we were giving Cuba a big bonus over the world price that she could obtain elsewhere.

Then Castro declared his hostility to the United States, and we distributed the Cuban bonus partly to domestic producers, partly to foreign producers inside the the Western Hemisphere, and partly to those outside the Western Hemisphere; and it has been a rich plum to the foreign producers. The present facts with respect to the prices of sugar, which I have sought to place in the Record from time to time, clearly indicate this. Let me repeat them.

The price of raw sugar in New York is 6.85 cents a pound. The price of raw sugar in the Caribbean is 2.1 cents a pound. To deliver that sugar to New York will require shipping and insurance costs of about half a cent a pound, and a tariff cost of five-eighths of a cent a pound.

This would make a total transportation and tariff cost of approximately 1.1 cents a pound, Caribbean sugar can be delivered in New York for 3.2 cents a pound, or perhaps for 3.25 cents a pound.

Therefore, a bonus of 3.6 cents a pound is paid on that sugar. That amounts to $72 a ton.

On the basis of an import of approximately 2¼ million tons of sugar, based on the world price, we are paying a bonus of approximately $170 million a year to producers of sugar outside this country.

Even if we reject 2.1 cents a pound as being unduly low, and take, as I have suggested, a 15-year moving average world price of sugar of 4.2 cents, that, with the transportation and tariff costs of 1.1 cents would give us a price in New York on Caribbean sugar of 5.3 cents, or approximately 1.5 cents a pound less than the domestic price which is being paid or $30 a ton.

On the basis of 2¼ million tons, this would amount to $67.5 million. That is the enormous bonus to rich foreigners inherent in the bill. It gives rise to bad economic effects and bad political effects.

On the economic side, it is resulting in a gouging of the American consumer. It is the poor people of the country who largely use sugar in their coffee, in their tea, in their cheap candies, and in the cakes and cookies which they eat.

This is a tax on low-income Americans for the benefit of well-to-do foreigners. It is indeed a tax primarily for the benefit of wealthy foreigners. It is a share-the-wealth program in reverse—from the poor here to the well-to-do there.

It is this practice which the American Congress year after year cemented and to which it has given its approval. I believe that the system is wrong and that ultimately we shall have to revise it.

Great Britain has got itself into much the same mess, and I think it will have to make a change.

The world has plunged itself into this extraordinary series of mistakes on sugar. The American Congress seems doomed to perpetuate this practice.

I had hoped that we could deal with the domestic situation this year, which is probably impossible to change politically at the moment, and that we could therefore pass the quotas for the domestic production, including, of course, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, and the distribution between cane and beet, but that we could leave the foreign allocation to the future.

That was voted down in the Finance Committee. Then, our effort to have a 2-year instead of a full 5-year extension for foreign distribution was given up by our conferees, in the face of opposition, I am certain. We are saddled with a 5-year program, and the payment of many millions of dollars a year in bonuses to the foreign producers.

I notice that what I am saying is rapidly depopulating the Senate, and I have no complaint about that except that I believe Senators should take seriously to heart what we are involved in.

I hope that we can have an 11th hour and 59th minute repentance, which sometimes happens in life. I hope it may occur now, although it is improbable.

What are the bad effects of this? There are certainly bad economic effects, as I have indicated. There are extremely bad political effects. These countries are naturally anxious to get in on the excess and highly subsidized payments. They want to get as large a quota as possible. They hire lobbyists, or people whom they believe to have influence.

It is financially worth while to these countries to get as big a quota as possible. Therefore, their influence reaches into the deliberations of Congress and into the fixing of quotas. The results are not good for the reputation of Congress or for the level of congressional decision.

There is also the very interesting point that, if the quota of any country is cut, or if it does not get the quota to which it thinks it is entitled, that country immediately threatens the United States and declares that it is a reason for bad international relations. This is true even though many of us have pointed out time and again that they have no inherent right to such quotas.

I noticed, I believe it was yesterday, that the Colombian Parliament issued a very bitter statement against us because its quota had been reduced by the Senate from the House figure.

We are going to have more of this in the days to come. Each country will question the quota that it has received and will treat its maximum as a right and not as a gratuity.

We were able a few years back in the Finance Committee to get the State Department to promise that it would notify the various countries that these quotas were not rights, but they were given at the will of Congress and could be discontinued at the will of Congress, and that countries should not regard them as being permanently their possession.

The representative of the State Depart informed us that that warning has been automatically given, but it has had no effect. The countries treat these quotas as a right and criticize the United States if there is the slightest reduction from the claims which they make. Instead of improving international relations, it worsens them. Whereas, if we were to buy the sugar on the open market, the purchases would be impersonal. The temptation to corruption would be reduced, and international friction would be much less.

While I speak about the international market, let me correct a statement made by my good friend the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. In the debate earlier in the week, he implied that the international market really covered only about 10 percent of the world's production of sugar. That, in a sense, is true. However, included in the world's production of sugar was the production of beet sugar in the various countries which is highly protected by tariffs, and which does not enter into the international trade. Only some 17 million tons, of the total of the world's production does enter into the international trade. Six million tons are in the so-called free market. The remaining 11 million tons constitute a colonial empire relationship of sugar, notably France and Great Britain.

Approximately 40 percent of the world's production of sugar which is traded internationally is in the open market. I can say that there are strong elements inside the British Government and within the population of Great Britain which would like to be relieved of the high price of sugar which they are paying and would like to reestablish a wider world market, if they could get us to cooperate with them and increase the tonnage which would be open to the forces of supply and demand.

There is very little to be said for the highly subsidized international program from a political point of view, and the situation with respect to Castro makes the matter worse.

Castro is in power temporarily. We hope that he will be overthrown by domestic revolution, or the outraged public opinion of his country or of the world. However, what will happen if Castro is overthrown and if we have the democratic Cuba which we hope for?

Immediately the quotas of all these countries will be automatically reduced, so that they will lose financially if Castro is overthrown. Therefore, it is to their economic advantage to see that Castro is kept in power, and by continuing this quota system, Congress is really—although it does not intend to do so—making it possible for Castro to last longer.

So we might as well know what we are doing. I suppose Senators and the leadership of both parties are resolved to pass this measure. I do not think, however, that they should do so until the American public knows something of what is involved.

I wonder if it would not be better if we had a quorum call, so that a larger group of Senators could listen to the debate and become more fully aware of what the issues are. It would seem to me that this would be highly beneficial for a more accurate discussion of the matter, and would lead to much wiser conclusions.

So, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, no, please do not do it. There is a reason, believe me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the parliamentary situation? Are further proceedings under the quorum call to be suspended, or did I hear an objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They were suspended.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought I heard an objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not hear an objection.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How was it possible for the Chair not to hear the objection, and for me to hear the objection? I certainly heard the Senator from Missouri raise an objection to my request that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair repeated the question twice. The second time he heard no objection whatsoever.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Could not his reply the first time count? Does a man have to swear twice? Is not the statement given once to be believed, from so honorable and strong-minded a gentleman as the Senator from Missouri?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has ruled. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceed to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a point of order. Has there been any business since the last call of a quorum? Is a quorum call in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in the process of a quorum call.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 38, nays 11, as follows:

[No. 302 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Fannin
Fong
Hayden
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Mansfield
McGee
Metcalf
Montoya
Mundt
Murphy
Randolph
Russell, S.C.
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—11

Bartlett
Cotton
Douglas
Fulbright
McIntyre
McNamara
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—51

Anderson
Bass
Bayh
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Tydings

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum did not participate in the vote. The Chair directs the clerk to call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The Senate will come to order. Attachés who do not have business in the Chamber will please leave the Chamber. The Chair will ask the Sergeant at Arms to inquire of the attachés who are in the Chamber to ascertain if they have business here; and if they do not have business, the Sergeant at Arms is instructed to ask them to leave the Chamber.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of absent Senators.

The Senate will be in order. Attachés will take seats or leave the Chamber. The clerk will not resume the call of the roll until attachés who are standing have taken seats or have left the Chamber.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 303 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Douglas
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Hayden
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Mundt
Murphy
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the

Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea" and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Also, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would each vote "yea".

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay".

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay".

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 10, as follows:

[No. 304 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Curtis
Dirksen
Fannin
Fong
Hayden
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Mansfield
McGee
Metcalf
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Mundt
Murphy
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell, S.C.
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—10

Bartlett
Cotton
Douglas
McIntyre
McNamara
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—49

Anderson
Bass
Bayh
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Javits
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGovern
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Robertson
Russell, Ga.
Saltonstall
Simpson
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Tydings

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

The message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 788) establishing that the 2d regular session of the 89th Congress convene at noon on Monday, January 10, 1966, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 527. Concurrent resolution establishing that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, October 22, 1965, they stand adjourned sine die; and

H. Con. Res. 528. Concurrent resolution providing for the authorization of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President of the Senate to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, October 22, 1965, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 597. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities; and

S. 2084. An act to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems.

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 309)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

To the Congress of the United States:

This report to the Congress describes a 6-month period of impressive accomplishment by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In a larger sense, however, this report describes America on the move.

The story of man's advancement through the ages is the story of man's victory over the forces of nature. The health and comfort he enjoys, the leisure he possesses, and the abundance of the food he eats are all the result of his unending determination to probe the secrets of the world around him.

In 1958, it was my privilege to introduce the legislation to create the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I stated then: "I confidently believe that the developments of the space age will bring the beginning of the longest and greatest boom of abundance and prosperity in the history of man."

Time is bearing out that belief.

And so I take pleasure in submitting this report to Congress. It chronicles a great and exciting period of accomplishment and foreshadows an even greater one. In commending this record, I also commend the men principally responsible for making it possible. Dr. James Webb and Dr. Hugh Dryden have guided and directed our Nation's space program for nearly 5 years—and they have a grateful Nation in their debt.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 22, 1965.*

REPORT OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Housing Act of 1954 directs that I transmit to Congress the annual report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, covering activities for calendar year 1964.

This report confirms the wisdom of 15 Congresses and 5 administrations going back to 1934. The great Franklin D. Roosevelt first pleaded with the Congress to approve housing measures for the good of all Americans.

Consider what has been done for America by the U.S. Government's housing programs:

$100 billion of FHA mortgage insurance loans has been written, covering more than 7 million homes and more than 1 million rental units.

700,000 public housing units have been constructed since the start of that program in 1937. Two million people are living in those units in more than 2,000 communities.

More than 600,000 college students are living in dormitories made possible by Government loans.

$1.3 billion has been made available for urban renewal.

4,500 communities—mostly small towns—have received urban planning assistance.

$300 million of Government credit has gone into smalltown water and sewer facilities.

These programs were not easily begun. Cries of "socialism" and "waste" surrounded them at their birth. False propaganda and misrepresentation were used to discredit those who were to administer them. Cynicism and self-interest preyed on fear of the new and the imaginative.

But without these programs we would never have been able to push back the frontiers of blight, disease, and ugliness that thirty years ago afflicted one-third of a nation. Without them the task of building a clean and safe America would have been impossible.

Today our people accept these programs. Private enterprise and public well-being depend on them. We know now that these programs—and new approaches demanded by logic and vision—are needed to meet the challenges that confront us as hour by hour we become a more urban nation.

In 1965 I requested authority for a new means of housing low-income families. We proposed to encourage private organizations to build thousands of new apartments and houses for poor people who could not afford safe or decent housing. We proposed to help these private builders provide housing for the elderly, the poor, and the handicapped, so that they might live with safety and dignity.

Congress accepted this proposal.

Yet when the time came to provide the funds for this program, the old voices of doubt and misunderstanding were raised once more. Allegations were made that had no basis in fact. Insinuations were raised that obscured the basic purposes of the act.

For the time being, those voices have prevailed. No program funds were granted.

The national interest demands that the matter not stop there. Thousands of American families need this housing now—today. Thousands of poor children who should grow up in a world of safety and decency and promise are being treated with indifference by an affluent nation.

Next January I shall once more ask for the initial $30 million necessary to make bricks and mortar out of a promise. I am confident that the Congress will cut through the propaganda of fear and mistrust to provide shelter for the families who need it now—today. We who have raised up hopes have a duty to bring them to tangible reality.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 22, 1965.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 619. An act for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli;

S. 919. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force (retired);

S. 1004. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and services by executive agencies, and for other purposes;

S. 2118. An act to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920;

S. 2150. An act to discontinue or modify certain reporting requirements of law;

S. 2542. An act to amend the Small Business Act;

S. 2679. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; and

H.R. 11588. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

ADDITIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO PLACE ON A SELF-SUPPORTING BASIS THE SPECIAL BENEFIT PORTION OF CERTAIN SERVICES

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain acts relating to the inspection, classification, certification, testing, and identification of cotton, tobacco, and grain; and the examination of warehouses licensed under the United States Warehouse Act; and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

COLLECTION AND DEPOSIT OF CERTAIN FEES AND CHARGES FOR INSPECTION AND SERVICES UNDER LAWS RELATING TO FEDERAL INSPECTION OF POULTRY AND POULTRY PRODUCTS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the collection and deposit of fees and charges for inspection and services under laws relating to Federal inspection of poultry and poultry products, meat and meat-food products, humane slaughter of animals, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following additional report of a committee was submitted:

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

H.R. 4845. An act to provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies (Rept. No. 938).

ADDITIONAL EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following additional executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works:

Frederic H. Kellogg, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

William D. Bechill, of California, to be Commissioner on Aging.

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Seven postmaster nominations.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Philip H. Trezise, of Michigan, to be the representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 2726. A bill for the relief of Paolo Giglio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 2727. A bill to provide for the relief of certain refugees from the Dominican Republic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 2728. A bill for the relief of Jose Isidro Rodriquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. McINTYRE):

S. 2729. A bill to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT (by request):

S. 2730. A bill to amend section 6409(b)(1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2731. A bill providing for fuller disclosure of corporate equity ownership of securities under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT CONCERNING THE PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT OF THE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 160) appointing a committee to notify the President concerning the proposed adjournment of the session, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

AUTHORITY FOR PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE TO MAKE CERTAIN APPOINTMENTS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 161) authorizing the President of the Senate to make certain appointments after the sine die adjournment of the present session, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

TENDERING THE THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 162) tendering the thanks of the Senate to the Vice President for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over the deliberations of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

TENDERING THE THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 163) tendering the thanks of the Senate to the President pro tempore for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over the deliberations of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

TENDERING THE THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 164) tendering the thanks of the Senate to the Acting President pro tempore for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over the deliberations of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4(c) OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, for myself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Small Business Act.

During the last several years this country has suffered a series of extreme natural disasters. The earthquake in Alaska, the Mississippi River floods in the Midwest, and more recently Hurricane Betsy in the southeastern part of the country.

Under the Small Business Act the Small Business Administration is authorized to make disaster loans to victims of disasters. The SBA has done a good job in providing this aid. However, these disasters have caused a serious drain on the financial resources of the Small Business Administration. This has caused money and personnel ordinarily used for other lending programs administered by SBA to be used mainly for disaster loan purposes.

The SBA during this present Hurricane Betsy disaster period has been forced to the extreme of not accepting applications for loans for regular business loans and loans under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This naturally has caused severe hardship for small businesses all over the country whose only recourse to financing in the Small Business Administration.

In order to avoid as much as possible the disruption of the lending processes of SBA during these disaster crises, I am introducing this bill.

The bill would extablish three separate revolving funds rather than the one that is now provided in the Small Business Act. It provides for a revolving fund for regular business loans under section 7(a) and prime contract authority under section 8(a) of the Small Business Act, and title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in the amount of $1,075 million. It provides for a revolving fund for disaster loans under section 7(b) and section 7(b)(2) of the Small Business Act in an amount of $300 million, and also a separate revolving fund for the programs under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, with the exception of title IV of that act, in an amount of $461 million. The bill sets the amounts of loans, guarantees, and commitments that may be outstanding at any one time under each fund.

It is, of course, too late in the session for any action on the bill now. However, as chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, I plan to hold hearings on the bill as early as possible in the next session of the Congress.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2729) to amend section 4(c) of the Small Business Act, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. MCINTYRE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PAYMENT OF OCEAN TRANSPORTATION CHARGES BY POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, for appropriate reference, a bill which relates to the transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General. The purpose of the bill is to make certain that the Postmaster General will not be required by law to pay higher transportation rates to foreign-flag water carriers than is paid to American-flag carriers. I understand that several inequities have recently arisen out of the present ceiling and the purpose of the legislation is to correct these inequities. I hope that this matter can be considered early next session for action.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2730) to amend section 6409(b)(1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PROTECTION AGAINST CORPORATE RAIDERS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York Jersey. Mr. President, I am sure we are all aware of the increasing stake of the average American in our industrial economy. Nowhere is this more evident than in the investment community where more than 20 million individual Americans today own some 18 billion shares of stock with an aggregate value of $650 billion.

Most of these stocks represent shares in some 6,724 publicly held corporations, which are subject to the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the Securities Acts Amendments of 1964, the most recent act of legislation on securities regulations to be passed by Congress.

We have come a long way in the last 30 years since the Securities and Exchange Commission was established. We have seen numerous safeguards provided to protect the welfare of the individual investor from self-seeking promoters, slick manipulators, and others who would fleece the public through various stock selling schemes or corporate shennanigans related to the purchase or sale of securities.

The day of the Jay Goulds, Daniel Drews, the Ivar Kreugers, and the Charles Ponzis is indeed past. We now have laws to curb manipulations in the stock market and teeth in these laws to make them effective. Today the stock exchanges regulate themselves with strict systems of rules to protect the public.

The exchanges are in turn regulated by the SEC which also polices all other aspects of the securities business including full disclosure requirements with respect to the corporations themselves whose shares are traded on these exchanges or in the open market.

Nevertheless, despite these great advances, the Federal securities laws remain inadequate in one notable respect. They fail to take proper cognizance of the activities of corporate raiders.

In recent years we have seen proud old companies reduced to corporate shells after white-collar pirates have seized control with funds from sources which are unknown in many cases, then sold or traded away the best assets, later to split up most of the loot among themselves. Classic examples of this type of conduct have received much notoriety in the reports of criminal cases involving such persons as Alexander Guterma and Peter Crosby; in SEC reports relating to such as Lowell M. Birrell, and in the public press. The SEC has reported these and similar cases to the Congress in the past.

The ultimate responsibility for preventing this kind of industrial sabotage lies with the management and the shareholders of the corporation that is so threatened. But the leniency of our laws places management and shareholders at a distinct disadvantage in coming to grips with the enemy.

A group of corporate raiders, collusively joined together, can buy up enough shares of a corporation's stock virtually to guarantee victory in a proxy fight without management or shareholders having any knowledge of these acquisitions. The purchases can be made in so-called street names or, even more furtively, by Swiss banks for an undisclosed account number. There is no way of telling in all cases whether the funds for these purchases are coming from legitimate businessmen who seek to take over a corporation, or from persons who have untaxed profits realized through illegal activities.

The biggest loophole open to the corporate raider is this cloak of secrecy under which he is permitted to operate while obtaining the shares needed to put him on the road to successful capture of a company.

Under current law, the take-over specialist need not publicly reveal his program until after he acquires more than 10 percent of the outstanding shares. Moreover, the raider need not reveal the names of individuals with whom he may be acting in concert to seize control of the company. As a result, corporate management is often unable to protect itself from such inroads, because in most instances, it is possible to wrest control of a corporation by buying up considerably less than 51 percent of the outstanding stock.

In some companies, management control may be won by control of as little as 10 percent. Yet by this time, the market may have been substantially affected—and much of the harm done—well in advance of the disclosure point. The price of the shares may have been manipulated enough to drive shareholders to sell their stock below its true value. Even if these shareholders do not sell their stock, it is subject to large capital losses at a later time, if and when the raiders decide to dump their shares on the open market, or they have depressed the shares through mismanagement or some other means. The result is that investors cannot exercise informed judgments and the enforcement agency charged by the Congress with the responsibility for achieving orderly and honest markets is frustrated in its endeavor to fulfill that responsibility.

That is just one reason why I am introducing a bill to amend the current ownership reporting requirement contained in section 16(a) of the 1934 act. I propose that the stock ownership reporting rule be cut to 5 percent from 10 percent. I am confident that my measure calling for full reporting requirements to the SEC by any person with 5 percent of the outstanding shares will provide a much stronger safeguard for the American investor.

This is not the first time such a change has been recommended. The SEC noted in its 23d annual report that Senator Homer Capehart, of Indiana, had introduced a bill in 1957 to change the reporting requirement from 10 percent to 5 percent. It is also interesting to recall that in supporting Senator Capehart's bill, that the then Chairman of the SEC pointed out that the original securities legislation of 1934 called for a reporting requirement of 5 percent. This was later raised by the Senate to 10 percent when the legislation was finally passed as the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Thus, it should be made clear that the 10-percent rule is not something that must be regarded as sacred and inviolable. The need for stockholder safeguards has grown much greater, because it is now much easier for would-be corporate raiders to locate the required financing.

In fact, stockholders find themselves the target of cash tender offers made by bidders who plan to take over the assets of the corporation by using the stockholders' assets to finance the takeover. Unfortunately the present regulations do not require that tender offers to be accompanied by a disclosure statement of who is seeking control, what their purposes are, and how they plan to carry out their program. Yet almost daily the financial press contains notice of another tender offer for shares of an established public concern—and quite often the stockholders are confronted with competing bids.

I am also proposing a further safeguard by amending the 1934 act so as to make the definition of "person" include a group of two persons or more who act in concert for the purpose of holding, acquiring, or disposing of securities. This redefining would successfully close the loophole that now exists which allows a syndicate, where no member owns more than 10 percent, to file no report at all with the SEC.

This means that a group of five individuals could conceivably buy up ownership of nearly 50 percent of the outstanding shares without being subject to any SEC reporting requirements. Granted, such an instance would be an extreme case. But, as we have too often seen, it is possible to win control of a corporation with a relatively small degree of ownership.

This proposal would not—to any significant degree—interfere with the orderly procedures of legitimate business. A tighter disclosure rule would penalize the raider, rather than the legitimate businessman who would have nothing to fear from full disclosure. It would also allow the corporations, their shareholders, and their employees to protect their rightful interests before it might otherwise be too late. Incidentally, I should point out that employees not only have their jobs endangered when corporate raiders move in, but often their savings. The New York Stock Exchange has estimated that three-quarters of the shareowners of public corporations own stock in the companies they work for.

The fuller disclosure provisions of this amendment would obviously work to the disadvantage of any corporate takeover specialists who could not stand the full glare of a public spotlight. So, too, would the additional provisions that I am introducing to remove another source of danger and unfairness to stockholders—the current inadequate disclosure system in regard to cash tender offers.

Where one who seeks control of a corporation makes an exchange offer of stock to obtain the control, the offer must be registered under the Securities Act of 1933 and full disclosure is made under scrutiny of the SEC. Similarly, where control is sought through a proxy contest, schedule 14B information must be filed which tells shareholders the identity of the participants and their associates, their stockholdings and when they acquired them, the extent to which the shares were purchased with borrowed funds and the identity of the lender if obtained otherwise than through a bank loan or margin account, and details as to any arrangements they have with anyone as to employment by, or other future transactions with, the issuer. Intelligent decisions cannot be made by stockholders without such information.

But no information need be filed where a cash tender offer is made to stockholders. Such an offer can be made on the most minimal disclosure; yet the salient facts are important to the corporation, the stockholder, and to the marketplace.

It can be argued that a cash tender offer is a straightforward business proposition which can be rejected by a stockholder or accepted by him, usually at a profit. If the stockholder sells and can establish at a later time that he fell victim to fraud or misstatements, he would obviously have recourse to the courts.

But many stockholders are either unable or unwilling to go to court even though they believe they have a sound case. Litigation generally occurs after the fact, it is expensive and time consuming, and it lacks the prophylaxis that results from advance filing of the facts for the public record. Often it is too easy for a raider to make a cash tender offer and pressure the stockholders into selling him enough shares to gain control. The fact that the control-seeker may ultimately put up the corporate assets as collateral for his loans to finance the tender offer is seldom made known to the shareholders. It is indeed intriguing to speculate how much money has been lent to corporate raiders who use as collateral the very assets of the corporations they sought to take over.

What then, must the stockholder know to protect himself against the corporate raider?

The first thing the stockholder must know is, of course, the identity and the background of the person, or group, making the tender offer.

The stockholder must also be informed promptly as to:

The size of the holdings by the person or group involved.

The source of the funds used or to be used to acquire shares.

The financing arrangements made for these funds, and how will these arrangements be liquidated.

Any side agreements that have been made with respect to the stock.

The purpose of the tender offer.

The plans of the tenderer if he wins control of the company.

The legislation I propose as an amendment to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 would provide that any cash tender offers and, indeed, any substantial accumulation of shares of a company registered under that act must be preceded by the filing of public information that provides answers to all of these questions. This is the only way that corporations, their stockholders, and employees can be adequately prepared in advance to meet the threat of the takeover specialist.

For this reason, I am proposing these measures as an amendment:

First. That a person, or group acting in concert, be required to notify the corporation and file a public statement with the SEC containing essential information at least 20 days before he makes any cash tender offer that would result in his owning, or would increase his ownership to, more than 5 percent of a class of security registered under the act.

Exemption would be provided for transactions which are submitted to stockholders under the SEC proxy rules or as to which a filing has been made under the Securities Act of 1933 since full disclosure will be provided to stockholders thereby.

Second. Although the dangers and abuses that I wish to cure are most graphically presented in the case of cash tender offers, limitation of the requirements to tender offers would result in gaps in the disclosure protections that the marketplace and the stockholders should have. Substantial open market or negotiated accumulations of shares may precede or accompany a tender offer or may otherwise relate to shifts in control of which investors should be aware. Where these accumulations are made in the open market there are real dangers of manipulation to the prejudice of investors, and in any case, the public is entitled to the protection resulting from advance disclosure of large-scale acquisitions. Therefore, to complete the picture, the same notice and disclosure provisions also would apply to any person or group before he or it can acquire or increase ownership of such a security to more than 5 percent of the class by means other than a cash tender offer.

Obviously, casual purchases and acquisitions which are not substantial should not be hindered. Therefore, an exemption from the advance notice and filing requirement is provided for any acquisition or proposed acquisition which, together with all other acquisitions effected during the preceding 12 months by that person or group, does not exceed 2 percent of the outstanding shares in question.

I am also including a provision giving the Commission authority to grant a requested exemption if it appears that the particular transaction will not in any way change or influence the ultimate control of the corporation. This exemption will, I believe, further protect the legitimate buyer who may be acquiring 5 percent of a corporation strictly for investment purposes and with absolutely no interest in affecting management policy.

Third. The advance filing that would have to be made in such cases would contain such information as the SEC prescribes in the public interest including specifically:

The background and identity of all persons by whom or on whose behalf the purchases are being made;

The source of the funds used or being used to make the purchase, including the fact whether they are borrowed funds or not; and

The purpose of the offer, and if for corporate control, the plans of such person with regard to conduct and continuation of the business in question.

I also propose that stockholders be notified of the number of shares owned directly or indirectly by each such person and associates, how, when and from whom acquired, for what price, and the identity of the broker or securities dealer. Information also would be required as to dates and amount of any short sales, and as to any contracts or agreements concerning these securities.

Finally, the proposed legislation also grants the Commission authority to deal with another aspect of this issue. Various problems have arisen with respect to the acquisition by a corporation of its own outstanding shares. To date, the SEC has not entered this field of regulation. Yet there is a growing need to examine carefully the effects of such insider purchases.

For that reason, this legislation will enable the Commission to step into the situation where a corporation is buying substantial blocks of its own outstanding shares. Again, my purpose is to provide full and adequate disclosure to present and potential stockholders in order to prevent any questionable practices on the part of the corporation's management.

Experience has shown that these proposed amendments are not only needed but that they have a sound precedent. Let us consider the experience of British authorities with the evils that can attend a corporate takeover bid and what they have done to limit abuses in this area.

Although our Federal regulations on securities offerings are stricter than those in Great Britain, it is pertinent to note that the British have found it necessary to adopt far tougher rules on takeover bids than we have in the United States up to now.

Triggered by a spree of takeovers in the decade following World War II, the British have evolved a comprehensive set of regulations governing such bids. These are contained in the Licensed Dealers—Conduct of Business—Rules, 1960, which were adopted by the Board of Trade pursuant to the Prevention of Fraud—Investments—Act, 1958. The rules define a takeover offer very broadly as "an offer to acquire securities of a corporation made to more than one holder of those securities calculated to result in any person acquiring or becoming entitled to acquire, control of that corporation." They set down various procedural requirements regarding takeover offers and also require disclosure of certain information in any circular making the offer or making a recommendation by the directors of the offeree company to accept the offer. As a technical statutory matter the rules apply only to licensed dealers, but the recognized stock exchanges and other authorized dealers in securities comply with them. Moreover, any other person than a dealer who uses such a circular first must obtain the approval of the Board of Trade which insists that the Rules be followed with respect thereto.

In terms of disclosure, the British rules require that any such document must reveal, among other things, the name of the principal making the offer; the amount of the securities held by him; the specific terms and conditions of the offer; information as to the value of the shares and details as to arrangements with, or any special treatment that is to be given, to the directors of the company. Also whether to the knowledge of the bidder, there has been any material change in the company's financial condition since the date of its last balance sheet; and whether the bidder intends to transfer any of the securities acquired to any other person.

The British regulations go well beyond mere disclosure. For example, not only must the company be given advance notice before the offer is sent to stockholders—which I also propose—but a minimum time during which the offer must remain open is established, and provisions are included to insure that all persons accepting the offer will be treated equally on a pro rata basis.

The problem of takeover bids was reexamined in England more recently by the Jenkins committee whose 1962 report is referred to above. That committee recommended that as a matter of statutory law the rules be made applicable to everyone making such an offer, that all takeover circulars be registered with the Registrar of Companies before circulation, subject to sanctions in the event of fraud or noncompliance with the rules, and that the rules be made stricter in certain respects—for example, that the offeror must state the steps he has taken to assure that he will have the funds to buy the shares, and that no statement purporting to be made by an expert should be permitted without the consent of the expert. The recommendations of the Jenkins committee have not yet been implemented.

The problem of tender offers or takeover bids also has been scrutinized carefully in Canada. Thus, the 1964 record of the Royal Commission recommends that legislation be adopted to require specified disclosures and various procedural and other requirements in connection with takeover bids.

Neither our regulatory philosophy nor our experience to date appear to require that we go quite as far as the British have gone. But it is clear, and I recommend, that the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 be amended, as outlined previously, so that all material facts as to a cash tender offer, and as to important open market accumulations, be disclosed in a document that is put on the public record, and that the corporation and its stockholders be put on notice in all such cases.

The proposed amendment will represent important legislation which is essential in the interest of the public, but will place no obstacles in the way of honest and fairly conducted transactions.

In some instances, a change of management will prove a welcome boon for both shareholder and employee. There are many cases where a new management can perform much more efficiently than the old one. Moreover, many corporate situations require almost immediate management changes if the company is to survive.

But these changes must be accompanied by full disclosure if we are to have true corporate democracy as well as an efficient, orderly, and sound economy. Individuals seeking to take control of corporations and who have nothing to fear from full disclosure of their methods and intentions have nothing to fear from these amendments. Tighter controls will penalize the raiders, not the legitimate businessman with legitimate methods and legitimate goals.

It is the millions of legitimate businessmen as well as the more than 20 million American shareholders who have the most to gain from this proposed legislation. Our securities markets have blossomed and thrived under 30-plus years of Federal regulation. Despite the sneers of a few cynics back in 1934 and 1935, full disclosure has proved a strong stimulus to the American investor. Now is the time to eliminate the few areas where full disclosure is not available. I believe these proposals will go a long way to correcting this vital situation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2731) providing for fuller disclosure of corporate equity ownership of securities under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next printing of the bill S. 2596, with regard to percentage depletion allowance for gold and silver, the names of my colleagues, Senator MURPHY and Senator FANNIN, be added as cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS TO GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS BY ELIAS TSIRIMOKOS, DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER OF GREECE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to draw the attention of the Senate to an address delivered before the General Assembly of the United Nations on Tuesday, October 12, 1965, by His Excellency Elias Tsirimokos, Deputy Prime Minister and Acting Foreign Minister of the Kingdom of Greece.

In a time when there are trouble spots and conflicts in almost every part of the world, it is heartening to hear a clear-cut and unqualified pledge from the government of a sovereign nation, one long respected as a member of the peace-loving community of nations, that it will definitely "remain in line with the principles governing the United Nations and respect its decisions," with regard to problems relating to international boundaries and the equitable treatment of ethnic minority citizen groups in Greece and her neighboring countries.

Mr. Tsirimokos summed up the posture of his Government when he said, and I quote:

> I would like to stress that for Greece there is no other way to settle a difference than peaceful means.

That expression embodies the key to peace throughout the world, could it only be adopted and adhered to in the settlement of all points of disagreement among all countries. It does the Prime Minister great credit and indicates a sound policy and performance that we may expect from the Government he represents.

The Government for which Mr. Tsirimokos spoke is only a month or so old.

But if it will follow a policy based on the principles of the U.N. Charter, as he strongly indicated it would during the course of his U.N. speech on October 12, we can look forward to stable leadership, leadership from Greece in the months ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this interesting address printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Address by His Excellency the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Greece, Mr. Elias Tsirimokos, to the General Assembly of the United Nations, Tuesday, October 12, 1965

Mr. President, the Greek delegation wishes to associate itself with the well-deserved praise and congratulations addressed to Mr. Fanfani on his election to the Presidency of this Assembly. The Greek Government is deeply gratified to see this high office entrusted to an eminent statesman from a country with which Greece is bound by so many ties. May I extend to our President the best wishes of the Greek Government and delegation for his speedy recovery.

I also wish to pay tribute to the President of the 19th session, His Excellency Mr. Quaison-Sackey, whose patient efforts contributed so much to overcoming the constitutional crisis of our Organization.

Finally, I would like to welcome the new members of our family, Gambia, Singapore and the Maldive Islands. Their admission marks another step toward the aim of universality of the United Nations.

After the frustrations of the 19th Assembly, our Organization managed to avoid an obstacle on which it almost foundered. But having escaped shipwreck, we should not allow ourselves to be carried adrift. After all, we only achieved an accommodation and not a solution. The principles about which the crisis arose must be redefined and reaffirmed, for they are fundamental and cannot be ignored without damage to the efficiency and prestige of the United Nations.

More than anything, the ability to undertake peacekeeping operations is what distinguishes our Organization from its predecessor and makes the decisive difference between an impotent body, doomed to failure, and an effective organization in which an anguished humanity can put its hopes.

The question of peacekeeping operations and their financing may now be approached in a less alarming atmosphere but with an undiminished sense of urgency. Two points are already agreed upon; namely, that assessment on developing countries should be reduced and that the responsibility of the permanent members of the Security Council for the preservation of peace implies special obligations with regard to the financial burden. The general acceptance of these two points and the expectation of voluntary contributions, render possible a variety of formulas. However, in our eagerness for an agreement, we could not deviate too far from the basic principle of solidary financial responsibility of all members for the activities of the Organization, without jeopardizing the very foundations of our charter.

Greece, who always put its trust in the United Nations and resorted to its procedures whenever she was involved in a dispute, reaffirmed this trust by making to the United Nations Force in Cyprus the highest financial contribution of all member states, considering her resources and her rate of assessment for the ordinary budget. That notwithstanding and in spite of current financial difficulties, Greece was among the first countries to pledge a voluntary contribution toward bringing the Organization to solvency.

The ratification of the charter amendments within the time limit prescribed by the resolution of the 18th Assembly is an auspicious development. It demonstrates on the part of the Great Powers a unanimous recognition of new present political realities. At the same time, the enlargement of the Security Council makes it more representative of the whole membership and should render more easily acceptable its predominant role in matters of peacekeeping and their financial aspects.

Similarly, the enlargement of the Economic and Social Council will enable it to discharge with renewed vigor a task whose importance is in no way diminished by the creation of UNCTAD.

The United Nations have not neglected their duty prescribed by the charter to promote and encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms. The Universal Declaration of 1948 has been the historical milestone on this road. From then on we toil to give human rights a legal and contractual form, which alone can insure their observance. In spite of inevitable delays we feel entitled to hope that an agreement will be reached on implementation clauses and that our efforts will soon be rewarded by the adoption of final texts of human rights covenants, which in itself should go a long way toward insuring the respect of these rights. It is high time to make such progress.

While it is natural that any conflict or risk of conflagration calls for the United Nations immediate attention, there is another problem, longstanding but no less urgent for that, to which we are called upon to dedicate sustained efforts. Disarmament cannot wait for the settlement of all disputes. It is true that in an atmosphere of relative calm, progress on disarmament is easier to achieve. But it is no less true that any agreement on a collateral measure greatly contributes to the lessening of international tensions.

A resolution adopted here this summer by the Disarmament Committee clearly indicated that, in spite of the joint declaration on the principles of general and complete disarmament agreed upon 4 years ago, at the present stage the best chances of progress lie in the field of collateral measures, specifically on the question of underground explosions and nondissemination of nuclear weapons.

The Geneva Committee had little time to carry out the mandate contained in this resolution. It would therefore be useful if the Committee resumed its work at the earliest, with the encouragement and guidelines to be provided by this assembly. We do not underestimate the difficulties it will have to face and will subscribe to any measure capable of promoting its task.

Having attained independence at the cost of a long and bloody war and fought in each generation to defend it, the Greeks, can understand the impatience of non-self-governed peoples better than anyone.

The task awaiting newly liberated peoples would be much easier if the resources now wasted to contain emancipation movements were used to better and mutual advantage in order to help the new states.

But if decolonization is nearing completion, the struggle toward a standard of living, education and health compatible with human dignity is only beginning.

A developing country may receive assistance from a single country, which will then often appear to seek a predominant influence. Help may be granted by two countries or more, and then a struggle for influence is hard to avoid. Or help can be granted within the framework of international cooperation, and this is the form which we advocate unhesitatingly. Our preference is not dictated by political considerations alone. Direct assistance is but temporary and auxiliary. What developing countries need above all is a consolidation of commodity markets. Only by relying on its own resources can a nation hope to attain a real equality in its international relations.

Since the depression of the thirties, countries exporting basic commodities have made scant progress in establishing control over the sales of their products, while industrial countries have had more success in limiting the fluctuations of their economies.

Although the 19th General Assembly had a limited scope, it managed as its main achievement to adopt the resolution 1995 (XIX) institutionalizing the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. This new permanent organ of the General Assembly has recently begun functioning and is of major importance to the common task of economic and social development.

But we are aware that there is no wonder cure for underdevelopment, only collective and simultaneous efforts in the economic, commercial, social, technical, and cultural fields. The importance and complexity of matters within the ambit of the Conference and the variety of tasks to be undertaken is shown by the program of meetings for the remaining months of this year.

Developed nations should expand their role in the common task. For, as stated by the Secretary General and by ECOSOC, the results of the first half of the U.N. Development Decade fall short of solving the more pressing problems. In fact these problems become more acute. But we trust the international organizations and especially UNCTAD to pave the way for the necessary political decisions.

Mr. President, the question of economic development is closely linked to the demographic problems, the study of which received a new stimulus when it was raised in the 16th General Assembly, 4 years ago. The study of the political, social, moral, and technical aspects of this problem will long continue. Meanwhile, the statistical projections which have been computed by new scientific methods and instruments enable the countries, where the raise of population growth is particularly high and where the need for raising the standard of living is pressing, to evaluate, as from now, the incidences of demographic pressures on their long-term development plans. It is incumbent on each country, each Government, freely to choose, according to its own social structure; the policy it will adopt. The role of the United Nations and of their most developed members should consist in providing the developing countries, if they choose to ask for it, the assistance they may require, either for a more advanced study of their particular problems or for the implementation of a specific program. To be able to do so the competent organs of our organizations must be endowed, as soon as possible, with adequate means.

However important peacetime problems and however useful one's assistance in solving them, let us remember that a specific if modest duty rests upon each of us for the maintenance and consolidation of peace. We must not only contribute to regional agreements, but also cultivate good relations with the greatest number of nations, beginning with immediate neighbors, and prevent the outbreak of local conflicts which might endanger peace. In this respect my country has ceaselessly striven to improve its relations with all nations, especially its neighbors, both those contiguous and those with whom our common border is the Mediterranean. In the Balkans Greece was able to achieve a friendly climate with the collaboration of other countries of the area. With Yugoslavia Greece has had for a long time close relations. Those with Rumania have much developed. Recently, relations with Bulgaria show substantial progress. In this connection Greece cannot but deeply deplore the deterioration, of the last 2 years in its relations with Republic of Turkey, her neighbor and ally.

This deterioration is caused less by the question of Cyprus itself than by the reprisals resorted to by Turkey against innocents.

These deplorable initiatives, began with the arbitrary expulsions of dozens of Greek citizens, longtime residents of Turkey. The deportations became massive after Turkey, under a futile pretext, denounced the Greco-Turkish Treaty of Commerce, Navigation and Establishment. Thousands of Greek citizens are being banished from the place where their homes have been for many generations. These measures and vexations of every kind caused, through anguish and intimidation, the exodus of thousands of other Greeks who were Turkish citizens and not liable to legal deportation. Under the slightest pretext, Greeks in Turkey are exposed to chicanery, intimidation, boycott. Police and law courts fail to protect them against wrongdoers. Teachers in minority schools are under constant threats and often removed from their posts. On the islands of Imbros and Tenedos, whose population has remained overwhelmingly Greek, Greek schools were closed in spite of the special status of the island; farmland and town property has been extensively expropriated under various arbitrary pretexts, with the sole purpose of despoiling the Greeks and altering the ethnic character of the population.

The Ecumenical Patriarchate established in Constantinople for 17 centuries and its venerable head did not escape persecution.

The plant of the Patriarchate for printing religious publications of the Supreme See of the Orthodox Church has been sequestrated. The patriarchal orphanage has been closed. Two bishops have been deprived of their Turkish citizenship and expelled. A priest, defrocked and excommunicated 40 years ago and his sons, ordained by himself, and who claim to represent a so-called Turkish Orthodox Church dared with the encouragement of Turkish authorities to substitute themselves to the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Under the tolerant eye of the Turkish police, they have seized two important churches of the Istanbul diocese on the strength of abusive title deeds obtained through the complaisance of public authorities. Meanwhile, the See of the Ecumenical Patriarchate is put under police guard; all callers must identify themselves and explain the purpose of their visit; his holiness the patriarch was warned not to communicate with other churches in the exercise of his ecumenical apostolate. This persecution is accompanied by a vitriolic press campaign. Everything Greek or Orthodox is presented as a peril for Turkey.

The climate of tension is maintained by border incidents and frequent violations of Greek airspace which cannot be explained by navigational errors.

Under such provocations, which are so many violations of the spirit and often the letter of the treaty of Lausanne—cornerstone of Greco-Turkish relations—the Hellenic Government retained its composure. It confined itself to making representations in Ankara and bringing regularly the facts to the attention of the Security Council. In a spirit of moderation Greece refrained till now from countermeasures against Turks residing on her territory. This however instead of restraining the leaders of Ankara, seems to have convinced them that they can persecute with impunity the Greeks of Turkey. We are faced with an absurd situation in which Turkey multiplies hostile actions against Greece, puts forward preposterous demands and at the same time affects a desire to pursue talks to facilitate the solution of the Cyprus question.

I deeply regret that before examining this question, I had to denounce the aforementioned facts to the world conscience which you represent. These facts by themselves deserve your attention. They do it even more because the question of Cyprus, which is before you suffers from them, since any peaceful solution which we pursue presupposes a general detente between the interested countries.

I was struck by the fact that my distinguished colleague the Foreign Minister of Turkey insisted on the need for a dialog between Turkey and Greece. I would not question his sincerity; but those who in his country order anti-Greek measures would be better advised to further good intentions by an appropriate behavior. Before proceeding, I would like to stress that for Greece there is no other way to settle a difference than peaceful means, that is, discussions. It is essential for the interested parties to know who discusses with whom and about what. This means that one should always seek out for each case, the "valid interlocutor", and debate with him the points on which it would be possible to reach an understanding.

Another fact which struck me in the address of my colleague is his almost total silence on the results of the U.N. action in Cyprus. It is true that he has expressed his country's thanks to the powers which have contributed to the setting up of UNFYCYP. I wish, for my part, to express the gratitude of Greece to all these countries. But the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Turkey omitted even to mention the mediator, Mr. Galo Plaza, although the latter was appointed by our Secretary General, in pursuance of a Security Council resolution, in order to submit a report as complete and objective as possible.

Greece wishes to pay tribute to the whole U.N. action in this matter, to our Secretary General who once again proved himself so highly worthy of his office and so conscious of the mission of our Organization, as well as to the mediator, Mr. Plaza, whose efforts were commensurate to the seriousness of the problem.

No doubt observations can be made on the report of any mediator, whatever its merits. Eventual errors might be spotted; but to reject the whole report, as Turkey has done, and to go as far as to blame the person of the mediator amounts to an attack against the very principle of mediation. Mediation is one of the most effective means the United Nations may use in a conflict such as the one under consideration.

The distinguished Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom has even proposed the setting up of a standing group of mediators. I will not go into this proposal. I mention it only to show the extent to which mediation seems appropriate to the aims of the U.N. It is obviously the duty of everyone to respect such an effort and not to treat it with contempt.

As far as Greece is concerned, she has endeavored to comply with all the decisions of the organs of the United Nations. Wishing to prove her respect for these decisions, she accepted, in the spirit of the mediator's recommendations, to open discussions with Turkey on the basis of U.N. principles.

I do not have to analyze Mr. Plaza's report. It is in your hands. Nor do I have to substitute myself to my colleague of Cyprus who will doubtless present the point of view of his country. I shall briefly describe the attitude of the Greek Government, stressing that most of our statements and arguments are borne out by the report of the mediator who very conscientiously has set out the real facts and in so doing may have failed to please everybody.

1. We believe there is no need to touch upon the principle of the validity of treaties. This principle has always existed, which did not save a great many treaties from a slow or a sudden death. As for the constitutional regime erected on the treaties of Zurich and London, Mr. Plaza observes that it was a "constitutional oddity".

The eminent Equartorian Statesman uses here the moderate language of a mediator. In fact it was a legal monster who like most monsters could not survive for long.

My colleague Mr. Ishik says that in principle he is not against the revision of these treaties. Whether we say that these treaties are defunct or, that they must be revised we recognize that a new reality has emerged and must be faced.

2. To speak of two communities instead of a majority and a minority, does not alter the fact that there is in Cyprus a large Greek majority and a small Turkish minority. The fact takes on another aspect when one speaks of partition or coadministration of the island. For there is only a minority scattered over the whole territory of the country and not confined to any one area. As for the coadministration it would only be a way to revive the monster, the absurd system whereby the minority can defeat the will of the majority. May I submit to the Assembly that if such peculiar notions of constitutional or international law were to prevail one would have to accept the idea of completely changing the map of the world and the constitutions of a great many countries, since almost everywhere there are minorities which could demand either the partition of these countries or their coadministration. Mankind has long struggled for the recognition of minority rights. If the Turkish thesis were adopted we would enter a new historic era: that of the struggle for majority rights.

3. On the other hand, I wish to proclaim that we definitely favor the granting of every possible guarantee of the rights of the Turkish minority in Cyprus. This should raise no problem since the people of Cyprus are ready to accept even international guarantees of minority rights. In this connection I am sure that you will have noted with satisfaction a document just circulated. I refer to the declaration of the President of the Republic of Cyprus on the rights which he recognizes and wishes to see guaranteed to Turkish minority.

4. I come now to another thesis of the Greek Government. A great deal is being said with much solicitude about the independence of the Republic of Cyprus. Some allude to annexionist tendencies which are allegedly entertained by Greece. My country has never had, has not and cannot have expansionist tendencies. The liberation of its territory has been accomplished through long struggles over a hundred and twenty years. Greece could not now become an expansionist country. Nor could she accept under any pretext that Cyprus be reduced to a curtailed independence. There cannot be two kinds of sovereign states. Those who fully enjoy all attributes of independence and those who do not. The Republic of Cyprus is entitled to an unfettered independence, like any other free and sovereign state.

I believe that I have proved that Greece intends to remain in line with the principles governing the United Nations and to respect its decisions. She will do so to the end. For this reason she wishes to express her satisfaction because the Secretary General of our organization in the introduction to his annual report stresses his intention to pursue the mediation effort in the spirit of the Security Council resolution of March 4, 1964, and that his hope that the countries concerned will meet together in the search of a peaceful solution of the Cyprus problem.

We accept this conclusion as it stands. As for the discussions recommended under this resolution, we would like to make the following point: Having placed this problem upon the basis of the principles of the United Nations, its decision, the spirit of the resolution of the Security Council and the mediation it decided upon, we have set the framework of our future action. As concerns Turkey in particular, Greece considers herself as an "interlocuteur valable" to the extent Greek-Turkish relations in general and aspects of the Cyprus question connected with these relations are involved.

But inasmuch as the question of independence and the future of the Republic of Cyprus is concerned, Greece does not claim the right to make decisions against the will or without the knowledge of the people of Cyprus. The Cypriots alone have the right to make decisions concerning their own fate. No equitable and lasting solution is possible without the consent of the Cypriot people.

In stating this basic truth, in further proclaiming her will to continue her contribution toward every mediation effort and to comply with the recommendations of the United Nations organs, Greece is conscious of serving the cause of a people that wants to be free, the cause of Greek-Turkish relations, the cause of peace in the eastern Mediterranean as well as the cause of the United Nations.

This is the reason why Greece considers herself entitled to address an appeal to the effect that the General Assembly make a necessary move in order to bring closer the moment of a peaceful solution. This solution should not be unduly delayed, because the crisis of Cyprus and certain actions by the Government of Turkey have repeatedly endangered the peace that the United Nations have the mission to preserve.

Thank you, Mr. President.

TRIBUTE TO THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. HART. Mr. President, a great deal has been written in recent years about how this institution—the Senate—operates. In fact, every week it is dissected in a hundred typewriters as the analysts—with varying degrees of accuracy—assess its moods, its actions, its motivations.

Yet this body harbors a mainspring that is at once obvious and unobstrusive, a man who for my money never gets half the credit he deserves.

The reason, I think, is simple: In this business praise often fails to find those who do not actively seek it. And the man I am talking about—by now you have all guessed that it is the distinguished majority leader—seems to cling to the notion that results are more important than publicity.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD manages firm persuasion with such gentleness, handles legislation with such quiet efficiency that the Nation has never become fully aware of his importance in the Senate. Sometimes I think it possible that we, his colleagues, are not fully aware of it.

He is certainly not a man to shoulder his way into the spotlight. I wish I had a count on the times I have seen picture captions that noted, "Half hidden in the background is Senator MIKE MANSFIELD."

As long as the job gets done, the majority leader is indifferent about where the credit goes.

How would we measure that credit, anyway? By the superb legislative record that his leadership has helped achieve? Certainly. But he adds a grace to this Chamber that cannot be measured by the written record alone, not even the amazing record amassed during this 1st session of the 89th Congress.

He contributes an intellect of the highest order, he sets a superb example of succinctness and clarity, his sense of duty is never put on parade but is nevertheless unmatched, and his respect for this body and its Members has a way of bringing out the most responsible in each of us.

I would like to go on and list the many reasons the Senate and the Nation owe him a debt of gratitude but I know he would be disapproving of such a speech. I suspect he would signal me to wind it up so we could get on with what he considers more important business.

So I will merely express my personal—and very sincere—thanks for his honest, quiet, and effective leadership.

And I would add this: If some official from a foreign country were to ask me "Who are your most thoughtful leaders, the men who most responsibly guide your country's decisions?" I would reply: "First, of all, there is one right here in the Senate. I want you to meet MIKE MANSFIELD."

EFFECT OF FAILURE OF "RIGHT-TO-WORK" REPEAL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, with Congress about to adjourn, it occurs to me I might be derelict in my duty if I failed to introduce in the Record a news story which appeared in the October 15 issue of the Wall Street Journal.

This story carried the caption, "Failure of Right-To-Work Repeal May Cool Labor's Political Fervor, Democrats Fear."

Needless to say, it is clear and obvious to every Member of this body just why labor has been so tremendously active in working to effect the repeal of the right-to-work law.

But what some of my friends in this body may not be so well informed about—and certainly most of their constituents—is the overpowering interest of the labor bosses in defeating any and every effort to give citizens an opportunity to vote on the question of whether or not they should have some say in how seats in one house of their State legislatures should be filled.

I am therefore indebted to John Grimes of the staff of the Wall Street Journal who wrote a news story that appeared in the October 15 issue of the Wall Street Journal. I ask unanimous consent that the article appear in the Record following my remarks. In it he quoted AFL–CIO men as saying:

> We were the main force in stopping his (Dirksen's) amendment on the reapportionment of State legislatures.

Just why have the labor bosses gone all out to deny to the citizens of our country the right, as well as the opportunity, to express—as provided for in article V of our Constitution—their individual convictions on this particular issue?

The reason is, of course, they are well aware of the fact that if the people had an opportunity to vote on this issue they would vote overwhelmingly in favor of a constitutional amendment.

The facts are that if the Constitution is not amended to maintain the checks and balances written into it by the Founding Fathers—if it is not amended to provide for some kind of representation of varied geographic and economic interests in one house of our State legislatures, our Federal-State system is sure to suffer irreparable damage.

I therefore hope that before we meet again in January you will give this issue additional thought. I hope you will visit with some of your best informed constituents and discuss this issue.

And if you do, I feel confident many of you who have advocated the one-man, one-vote principle but who have voted to deny your constituents an opportunity to vote on this issue, will come back here in January prepared to reconsider your position.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Failure of Right-To-Work Repeal May Cool Labor's Political Fervor, Democrats Fear," written by John A. Grimes and published in the Wall Street Journal of October 15, 1965, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Failure of Right-To-Work Repeal May Cool Labor's Political Fervor, Democrats Fear

(By John A. Grimes)

Washington.—The real casualty of Congress' failure to pass legislation nullifying State "right-to-work" laws may be organized labor's ability and desire to lend maximum support to the Democratic Party in next year's congressional elections and to President Johnson's future Great Society ambitions.

This is the message being beamed to Democratic chieftains and the White House in the wake of Monday's 47-to-45 Senate vote killing for this session the AFL–CIO's once-high hopes for repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This provision permits States to bar union shop labor contracts, under which workers must, in effect, join unions within 30 days to keep their jobs.

The unspoken part of the message is that unless Mr. Johnson and the Democratic leadership in Congress help turn this session's defeat into next session's victory, their once-eager union allies may turn coldly apathetic. George Meany, AFL–CIO president, in a New York speech shortly after the vote, came close to saying it openly: The Democratic Party in its 1964 platform pledged the repeal of section 14(b) and "we expect the Democratic Party to honor that pledge."

Some Democratic Party officials are openly concerned. One aid, remarking that the situation "isn't a disaster yet," concedes that if the move to repeal 14(b) isn't rescued next session the resulting drain on the AFL–CIO's political energy could prove highly troublesome.

LABOR'S POLITICAL POWER STAKED

The reason is that repeal of 14(b) has acquired political overtones far removed from its actual merits. For years, the AFL–CIO has been urging its affiliated unions to intensify their efforts to help elect a Congress with a liberal majority large enough to win approval of labor-oriented measures. The symbol of success has been a Congress that could repeal 14(b).

Last fall's election of President Johnson swept in 40 new House Democrats, established a heavy liberal majority in Congress, and seemed, at the time, the attainment of labor's goal. In addition, the AFL–CIO had a commitment from the President to help pass legislation to kill the right-to-work laws.

But by employing the 14(b) issue to help whip up its troops, the AFL–CIO was putting itself into something of a box. To justify the expectations generated by its success in helping the Democrats, the federation had to show that the political power its unions had helped muster at the polls could be used as a lever on the administration and Congress to deliver repeal of 14(b).

The failure to win the repeal, AFL–CIO officials fear, will be taken by the lower level leadership—upon which they depend to help produce rank-and-file members at the polls—as convincing evidence that labor can't get what it really wants, regardless of its success in helping Democrats get elected. "We wouldn't immediately start sitting on our hands, but enough of our guys would tell us to go to hell to make a real difference in our effectiveness," says one AFL–CIO official.

EARLY START TO DEBATE URGED

With a reduced ability to turn out votes, the AFL–CIO's bargaining power would diminish at the White House and in Congress.

At present, federation officials are trying to prevent some angry union officers from publicly blaming President Johnson and Senate Majority Leader Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana, for the defeat of the repeal measure. They argue that to stand a chance of success in repealing 14(b) next session, the Senate will have to schedule an early start to debate on the measure, counting on enough time to wear down the filibuster with which Senator Minority Leader Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois, blocked the move this year and which he has promised to resume next year. To do this will require the support of both President Johnson and Mr. Mansfield.

The circumstances that brought defeat in this session make it questionable whether labor could win its battle next year without the help of Mr. Johnson. Federation officials concede their position will be weaker, for a variety of reasons.

A major problem is that repeal of 14(b) is a narrow issue, of direct benefit to unions alone. Further, its reputation as a roadblock to union organization in States that have right-to-work laws, mainly in the South, is conceded to have doubtful validity, even by union men; labor's troubles in these areas stem from far deeper forces.

"We have no real friends on this one," says one union official. "We couldn't win any popularity contest." An administration man adds: "There's just no broad public support for repeal."

Atop this, AFL–CIO officials this session had to go along with the timing of President Johnson to a large degree on moving some key administration measures through congressional troublespots. A maritime strike, the election scandal over the presidency of the International Union of Electrical Workers and the threat of a steel strike also made the early part of the year a dangerous time to talk of repealing 14(b).

It wasn't until midsummer that the repeal measure was pushed through the House by a 221–203 vote under tightly controlled conditions to prevent any crippling amendments. By then, time began to become a crucial factor, and Republicans on the Senate Labor Committee succeeded in delaying the House-passed bill on its way to the Senate floor. Meanwhile, though Mr. Johnson appeared to be speaking freely on every other measure he sought from Congress, his limited utterances on repeal of 14(b) kept alive rumors that he was losing interest in the measure.

Then a new, and by some accounts, unexpected factor was introduced: Senator Dirksen's plan to filibuster. "I think this was the President's one mistake" say a federation official. "I think he got caught with his legislative pants down in believing that Dirksen wouldn't start a filibuster." To AFL–CIO men, the reason for Mr. Dirksen's decision is clear: "We were a main force in stopping his amendment on the reapportionment of State legislatures and he's had it in for us."

THE FATAL BLOW

Mr. Dirksen's move, as it turned out, dealt the fatal blow. AFL–CIO officials claimed a majority of Senators were ready to vote for the repeal bill with the "hard" count most often quoted at 55 votes. But they hadn't any chance of ever getting the two-thirds approval required to gag a filibuster.

But even if the unions had mustered the necessary votes to stop Mr. Dirksen's filibuster against consideration of the bill, the wily Illinois Senator and his allies would have resumed the filibuster on the bill itself.

The prospect of a double-headed filibuster added extra pressure to the "let's-go-home mood of Congress, and when Majority Leader Mansfield moved, after only a few days of debate, for a vote on closing off the filibuster, "we knew that was the end," says one union official. The subsequent vote put labor's strength in the poorest possible light. AFL–CIO men assert that at least five, and perhaps more, Senators who would have voted for the repeal bill itself cast ballots, for varying reasons, against the filibuster gag.

In view of this vote, it was useless for AFL–CIO leaders to demand that supporters of the bill stay in session to break the filibuster.

Unhappily for federation officials, most of the pressures that operated against repeal of 14(b) this session will also be present next year, plus some new ones. Many of their supporters will be up for reelection and more hesitant about voting for such a sticky measure in an election year. There's also the possibility that labor will have to accept some amendments to the repeal bill, and AFL–CIO men concede that once this happens it is easy to lose control and get stuck with damaging provisions. While union men are hopeful they can hold the majority vote they currently have in both Chambers of Congress, they aren't at all sure what might happen if they were forced to take an amended repeal bill back through the House. Too many Members might decide that two votes for an unpopular measure is one more than their reelection hopes can stand.

TRIBUTE TO COL. RALPH E. VANDERVORT, JR.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that Col. Ralph E. Vandervort, Jr., congressional liaison officer for Army and the Defense Department and the Congress is about to retire after 24 years of active military service.

In my service in the Congress both House and Senate, for more than 30 years, I doubt that we have ever had a more devoted, cooperative, and diligent liaison officer who with the greatest of courtesy has undertaken to process military problems and so relieve Members of a great many time-consuming chores.

He has always been extremely courteous and ever did his very best to contrive a successful solution to any problem consonant, of course, with the law and the rules and regulations under which our armed services operate. His departure from the service leaves a great void. We are sorry to see him go but whatever line of endeavor he will pursue in future years we wish him every success.

HEARING AIDS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Monopoly and Antitrust, of which I happen to be a member, had rather long hearings on the matter of hearing aids.

This came at a time when the late Senator Kefauver was still the chairman of that committee.

Since that time there have been a good many statements and articles with respect to hearing aids. Some of them have reflected upon the integrity of the companies manufacturing hearing aids, which companies have a record of integrity and performance. Obviously, these rather derogatory statements do not do the industry very much good.

Mr. President, the September 16, 1965 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contained an article dealing with hearing aids which makes use of the isolated case in the purchase of hearing aids but has a resounding impact upon that sector of the public who are in a great need of purchasing a hearing aid but are most reluctant to do so. During the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee hearings on hearing aids in 1962, the testimony revealed that of the 15 million Americans who have hearing difficulties it is believed only 1½ million, or 10 percent, actually use a hearing aid. It should be further noted that a minimum of 6 million have a hearing loss sufficiently severe to warrant a hearing aid and 9 million more persons with indeterminate hearing loss which should place those persons on notice to have their hearing status examined by competent medical attention to determine what form of hearing aid would be necessary, if any. The insertion in the RECORD of September 16 would discourage not only the 1½ million hearing aid users but also the potential 13½ million people who might need some form of a hearing aid instrument. After the hearings in 1962 a report was issued with minority and individual views written jointly by Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA and myself. From the Report and from the printed hearings I shall quote passages which I believe should be made available to the general public in refutation of the comments made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 16.

The late Eleanor Roosevelt, a great lady, was the opening witness during the hearings and she had the following to say regarding the reluctance of people with hearing difficulties to purchase a hearing aid—page 4:

> Thank you very much, Senator. I am very glad of the opportunity to testify to the value of a hearing aid. I think one of the difficulties is that people who need a hearing aid would like not to acknowledge the fact that they really do not hear as clearly as they once did.
>
> Now, if they once knew what a relief it is to find that you can hear easily, I think this attitude would change. I was interested just a short while ago, when a young man asked me, after I had spoken somewhere, if I would call his mother on the telephone and tell her that I wore a hearing aid, because she was as old as, or older than I was, and refused to wear it because she disliked being seen with a hearing aid.
>
> Well, actually, this is really an attitude that affects the whole family and affects your whole life, because you are handicapped. You are really, if you do not hear what goes on around you, you are barred from the flow of life and the ease of contact with other people.
>
> So I think it is important, but I would always stress the fact that a person buying the hearing aid should go to a doctor or a clinic and find out the type of help they need, because hearing aids must vary. You have many different kinds of deafness which come from different causes. Some hearing aid that might be excellent for my particular needs would not be good at all for somebody else who had a different difficulty.
>
> There are many different reasons why you become deaf. So I think this is something that we should emphasize to anyone who is willing to buy a hearing aid.

She continues on page 5:

> Senator KEFAUVER. I am just thinking of some other very distinguished citizens besides yourself who have been able to carry on very actively and energetically and without embarrassment because of hearing aids.
>
> Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Oh, yes.
>
> Senator KEFAUVER. I think about Mr. Barney Baruch and Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., who have them.
>
> Mrs. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Baruch, of course, uses his very selectively. He is quite open with it. He does not mind it showing at all. But when he is not interested, he turns it off, which, of course, is quite delightful but the rest of us do not dare to do that.

On page 7 she states:

> Could I add one thing? I think one of the important things that you perhaps will be able to bring out is the fact that children, and many children, are slightly deaf and it is not at once discovered and they are supposed to be dull, simply for no reason in the world except that they are not hearing what has been told to them in the school. The result is that sometimes this comes late to them. This is not the child that has the quite evident difficulty and who is found immediately and great care is then taken to train that child. But this is the child that may not have a very serious impairment, but a slight impairment, and who will seem dull in class.
>
> It will be nothing in the world but inability to hear, and if there is some way of really seeing that every child is tested, not just once, but more frequently, do you see, as they went up, let's say once every 6 months or once every year, I think we would save many children who waste time in school for the simple reason that nobody finds out that they are really not hearing completely well. They may catch words here and there, but they do not hear the whole thing. So that is one thing I would like to urge you to have on your mind, because I think it would make quite a difference in the development of children and the value of their school years.
>
> Senator KEFAUVER. Mrs. Roosevelt, in that connection, I know a great many school systems provide for dental examination for children and perhaps examinations to see if their vision is impaired and if they need glasses, but are not there only a very few that provide examinations to see if hearing is impaired?
>
> Mrs. ROOSEVELT. I would not be sure of that. Some of them may occasionally have it. But this is something which ought to be done just as your teeth are done or your eyes are done, at regular intervals.
>
> But people just do not seem to have thought about it enough to have made it a regular thing, that you do as you would do the other things.

Mr. Eugene M. Kinney, now the president of Zenith Hearing Aid Sales Corp., testified at the hearings and on the point of education of the general public on the impact of medical assistance and stated at page 176 of the printed hearings:

> The very important and obvious fact that the hard of hearing require medical assistance in connection with their efforts to find relief has also been the subject of much questioning during the course of these hearings.
>
> We have always zealously urged that hearing aid users—particularly first-time users—should consult a medical expert before purchasing a hearing aid. Zenith has frequently taken this position in its national and local advertising. In one program alone involving the advertising and dissemination of a well-known article by Dr. Aram Glorig—he is an otolaryngologist who is in charge of the subcommittee on noise in industry for the American Medical Association—entitled "Hearing Loss and the Family Doctor," Zenith expended over $165,000.
>
> If I may, I would like to show you this booklet, sir.
>
> Senator KEFAUVER. Bring it up here, please.
>
> Mr. KINNEY. This book, "Hearing Loss and the Family Doctor," we have distributed 230,000 copies of this, sir, at that cost of $165,000, as I pointed out.

Mr. David Barnow, executive vice president, Beltone Hearing Aid Co., Chicago, Ill., in discussing the show of reluctance of people in purchasing hearing aids and the impact that it has on our general economy stated as follows, pages 116, 117, and 118:

> Thank you. We welcome this opportunity to discuss with you our role in the hearing aid industry, and we hope that, as a result of these hearings, we will have contributed toward broadening the general knowledge about hearing aids and how they help many thousands of hard-of-hearing persons to a life of greater fulfillment. Also, we hope that these hearings will serve to dispel existing misconceptions and misinformation about the hearing aid industry, its products, services, prices, and accomplishments.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It appears that this committee is primarily interested in the pricing of hearing aids. We wish to go on record at the outset that it has always been Beltone's primary objective to supply the hard of hearing with the finest quality hearing aids with the fullest measure of needed and appropriate services at the lowest possible price. We will address ourselves to this price question directly. Before we do this, however, we feel it is essential that we first provide this committee with the relevant background of the problems of hearing loss and the contributions by our industry to their solution.
>
> To cite the recent study on health statistics by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, there are slightly less than 6 million people in the United States with hearing impairment. This same study reports that during the year July 1958, to June 1959, approximately 1,161,000 persons in the civilian noninstitutional population of the United States possessed hearing aids. We can reasonably assume that this number has increased since the date of the study.

The condition of deafness can be defined as a loss of hearing. It varies from partial to total. There are many causes. Some hearing losses cannot be corrected. Others respond to medical treatment, surgery, or prosthetic devices. But the loss is not only in medical terms:

> As pointed out by Dr. Otto S. Menzel, "hearing impairment is among the most handicapping of all physical ailments, not because the body suffers, but because the mind does." Persons who suffer from hearing loss cannot fully participate in the world in which they live. They cannot enjoy relaxed conversation, music, and the many other wondrous sounds we take for granted.
>
> Hard-of-hearing people tend to withdraw within themselves. They become progressively more isolated. Often they are hostile to even the kindliest attentions. References to their impairment are resented and they invert the problem by complaining that people mumble too much or that they are unwanted and unloved. Loneliness breeds even more loneliness and, what is worse, they come to resist every well-intentioned effort to help them. The loss in human fulfillment and productivity is immeasurable.
>
> Dr. Norton Canfield has said this:
>
> "Impairment of hearing for conversations results in comparative isolation of the individual from his business and social contacts. Diminished sociability and communication keep the perceptiveness of brain and psyche of an individual at a lower activity level. The potential for a happy and useful life is depleted."
>
> The problems of hearing loss are not only medical and psychological in nature, but they are historical, as well. It was not until the middle of the 16th century that our civilization was able to produce some hope for the deaf and hard of hearing. Prior to the studies of Girolamo Cardano of Padua, the deaf and hard of hearing were deprived of citizen's rights; they were regarded as fools; and they were commonly the butt of cruel and unfeeling jokes.
>
> This tragic history, combined with the obvious medical and psychological complications, adds further to the problem. It is no wonder that hard-of-hearing persons fail to seek and accept help, since they must overcome a psychological introversion before they can be emotionally free to do so.
>
> This state of mind requires that a faith be established in the hard-of-hearing person that he can be helped; and, therefore, one of the necessary functions of the hearing aid industry is to earn this faith and keep it. The industry is devoting much of its time to acquiring the understanding and supplying the compassion to help these people return to the world of sound.
>
> While hearing loss has its obvious impact on reducing the effectiveness of the afflicted persons, hearing correction goes a long way toward reestablishing them into a more useful and productive life.
>
> As pointed out in the committee release last week, and in a public affairs pamphlet, "You and Your Hearing," Mr. Canfield writes:
>
> "Convincing evidence of the economic value of auditory rehabilitation comes from the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A recent report shows that 1,200 deaf people had a combined annual earning capacity before rehabilitation of $308,200. During the first year after rehabilitation, they earned $2,743,000, an increase of 790 percent.
>
> "Another group of 2,500 hard-of-hearing workers earned $1,610,000 before rehabilitation. During the first year thereafter, their incomes jumped to $5,684,000, an increase of 250 percent."
>
> One would think that, because of the scope of the problems of deafness and the human suffering and unhappiness it creates, the hard-of-hearing population would be actively seeking alleviation of their hearing problems. However, this is not the case. Quite to the contrary, the hard of hearing fight against taking action on their hearing problems, sometimes for years. And in our judgment this is not because of high prices.
>
> In our free and competitive market, hearing aids are available at a wide range of prices. Medical opinion and examination can be obtained with or without charge. Yet it is one of the most paradoxical characteristics of the hard of hearing that they, on the whole, are not inclined to seek the help that they need. Our advertising, our training programs, and our public statements are persistently aimed, first, at making hard-of-hearing people aware of their problem, and secondly, at suggesting that they do something about it.

Mr. President, much attention was given during the hearings as to the price of hearing aids. It is a well stated principle of economics that in any product with a limited source of demand by the public it has an impact on the price. A businessman must charge a price that will bring a fair profit return in order to stay in business. That is the American free competitive system of doing business. Dr. William G. Hardy of Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, Md., was asked to comment on the cost and price of hearing aids. His testimony is on page 31 of the printed hearings, and it is as follows:

> I suppose there are innumerable reasons that must come into it. As well as I know, and this is not precise fact but again an impression from years of talking it over with people, it has not been my impression that the hearing aid manufacturers make an undue amount of money. Most of the markup of major proportion comes at the level of dealers; and yet I must say that I am not acquainted with very well-to-do hearing aid dealers. I think the general point at stake here is probably that there aren't enough hearing aids sold in volume to be able to reduce the prices and make up for the differences.
>
> I feel firmly that three or four times as many aids as are presently sold should be sold, and I am quite convinced that this could come about more rapidly with a combination of whatever pressures need to be brought to bear. Basically, I suppose, from public education and information, prices can come down, and I wouldn't expect the competent hearing aid dealers to suffer from this. I wouldn't want them to, because I don't believe they make any great amount of money.

Both Mr. Kinney of Zenith Hearing Aid Sales Corp., and Mr. David Barnow of Beltone Hearing Aid Co. pointed out that there are varying prices of hearing aids to meet the specific desires or the specific needs of the user of hearing aids.

Mr. President, it would be appropriate if I quote from the minority views on the "Report on Price of Hearing Aids," issued October 4, 1962. The minority views reflect testimony from table 5A in the printed hearings at page 267 which shows:

> Of 11 companies manufacturing hearing aids the suggested retail price for the last expensive monaural hearing aid, only 2 of the 11 companies have a retail price over $250, 1 being $259 and the other being $281; with 3 companies charging $50, $99.50, and $99.50 respectively; and on the conventional body-type hearing aids the prices are even lower than the monaural hearing aids. It is not for Congress to tell the hearing-aid purchasing public that they must buy a hearing aid retailed at $50 or $99.50. It is important that our American competitive system provides a hearing aid that can retail at $50 or $99.50, a price much, much lower than reflected in the majority report. If the majority is interested in educating the public on hearing aids it should emphasize that hearing aids can be purchased at the low price rather than mislead them as we have pointed out above.

Also, Mr. President, I quote from our position on "prices and profits" in said minority report beginning at page 113 to 119:

II. PRICES AND PROFITS

> One of the favorite topics of the majority in its investigations and hearings has been prices and profits. When asked pointblank, the majority will deny that it believes in price controls or placing a ceiling on profits. However, Members are always making use of such terms as "excessive prices," "exorbitant prices," and the term "unconscionable profits." They are inconsistent in this report because on page 160 they come to this conclusion:
>
> "In 1954 and 1955, no Zenith hearing aid sold for more than $125. Its net hearing aid profits for those 2 years were $495,000 and $625,000, respectively. In contrast, in 1960, 80 percent of Zenith's hearing aids retailed for between $175 and $550, yet its net profits were less than $92,000. Between 1955 and 1960, Zenith's unit volume fell from 113,000 to below 68,000."
>
> In discussing the reasons of the change in the Zenith policy as to the price of its hearing aids and its loss of net profits, the majority report refuses to acknowledge the change in public acceptance of hearing aids. It says there is no economic explanation for Zenith giving up its crusade for low prices. However, the witness of Zenith Corp. clearly stated the price policy of his company.

CRUSADE FOR LOW PRICES

On pages 424 through 432 of the transcript of the hearings he stated:

"Mr. KINNEY. * * * From the introduction of our first hearing aid in 1943 to the present time, we have crusaded for low prices and we intend to continue that crusade. Zenith's first hearing aids in 1943 sold for $40. The average price of competitive hearing aids at that time was in excess of $150. We have had a long uphill fight because so often people believe that a low price indicates low quality. Our units have always been of the highest quality, no matter how low the price.

"Although the purchasing power of the dollar has decreased tremendously since 1943, we today have in our line a $50 hearing aid that is incomparably superior to our initial high quality $40 model.

"Of the total volume of Zenith hearing aid sales, approximately 20 percent is of instruments with suggested retail prices below $120.

"Prior to 1954, the industry was able to make only what today are called conventional body worn aids. But with the advent of the transistor, the maufacturer of totally new and different hearing aid products became possible.

"The development of the transistor permitted us to create new highly miniaturized cosmetic types of hearing aid which are inconspicuous and appealing to the majority of customers who feel self-conscious about their hearing loss, and stubbornly refuse to wear conventional aids for that reason. Of course, at-the-ear aids also provide certain other advantages. These miniaturized units are completely self-contained in eyeglass temple bars or in tiny capsules conveniently worn behind or in the ear.

INCREASED COSTS

"Such delicate, highly miniaturized hearing aids are more costly to manufacture and more costly to distribute. The costs of doing business for the dealer have also increased substantially. Desirable dealers must now spend more time in training. They must spend more time both before and after sale, in guiding customers in the use of these new products. The business has also tended to go to dealers who have attractive, more costly, ground floor locations, where only hearing aids are sold.

"As these hearings have shown, the total volume of industry sales is still very low. A dealer may expend a large amount on 10 different prospective customers before making a single sale. Much time must be expended in home demonstrations, and advertising to locate those who may need the help of a hearing aid which is also quite expensive. Many people who need hearing aids are reluctant to buy them. They feel that a hearing aid is a badge of old age or infirmity or that it detracts from their appearance. These attitudes keep many from seeking the help that a hearing aid will bring them.

"Zenith first came on the market with hearing aids in a crusade to bring these needed instruments to the many hard of hearing who could not afford to buy competing aids then available."

CHANGE IN DISTRIBUTION AND COSTS

"We distributed through regular appliance channels in an endeavor to cut the high cost of distribution to the lowest possible level and enable the hard-of-hearing public to benefit by these savings. To effect further savings we later went to a combination of mail order and retail over-the-counter methods of sale. Thousands of the hard of hearing who could never have afforded a hearing aid before were able to buy a quality aid for the first time as a result of Zenith's crusade.

"In 1956 and 1957, however, when the new, more sophisticated cosmetic-type hearing aids became available, the retail business began rapidly to gravitate toward the well appointed, ground floor dealerships whose better trained personnel devoted their full time to the sale of hearing aids. The public began to reject over-the-counter distribution despite the savings involved and, to stay in the market, Zenith found it necessary to revise its distribution methods and to attempt to market its products through the best of these specialized hearing aid dealerships.

"Senator DIRKSEN. Do you still sell by mail order?

"Mr. KINNEY. No, sir.

"Senator DIRKSEN. Not at all?

"Mr. KINNEY. I think I can safely say no. If there are 10 a year it will be a lot.

"We found, however, that these specialized dealers were not interested in handling our line at the suggested retail prices which we then had. They insisted that because of their high overhead and low volume, our suggested markup was inadequate to permit them to remain in business, much less make a profit. Therefore, in 1957 and 1958, in order to get first-class hearing aid dealers to distribute our product lines, it was necessary to raise some of our suggested retail prices although we continued to provide our famous, high-quality conventional aids at suggested prices from $50 to $100. There were and are today, many desirable hearing aid dealers throughout the country, who refuse to distribute our hearing aids because they claim that our suggested retail prices are still too low to make it possible for them to sell Zenith hearing aids. Although we have never attempted to control the retail prices charged by our dealers, our advertising of suggested retail prices, as a practical matter, discourages prospective customers from doing business with any dealer who charges more than the manufacturer's suggested retail prices."

Thus, the majority, in its report, completely disregards Mr. Kinney's (of the Zenith Radio Corp.) testimony and tries to make it appear all that Zenith is interested in is charging higher prices, ignoring, of course, that Zenith had to make these changes, as explained by Mr. Kinney, resulting in a net profit of only $92,000 in comparison to the half-million-dollar profit that Zenith was making under previous plan. If there is an error in the managerial decision of the corporation, the American free competitive system gives them that right to do it and it is not for Congress to say how much a man should charge for his product or place a limit on how much profit he should make. We have previously discussed the great difference in retail prices to show that it is a competitive business pricewise.

MANUFACTURING PRICES VERSUS RETAIL PRICES

One of the misleading aspects of the majority report is that it deals primarily with its investigation of the manufacturer but always talks in terms of suggested retail price. For example, the majority report pointed out that a typical hearing aid, which has a manufacturing cost of approximately $50, is sold by the manufacturer to the dealer for about $100. Generally, relatively little of the $50 remainder is acounted for by manufacturer profit, because most of it is being spent on other costs, such as selling, advertising, general and administrative expenses, taxes, etc., and the manufacturer is lucky to make $5 net profit on the hearing aid. As a matter of fact, Mr. Peter M. Moffitt, president, Dictograph Products, Inc., in his testimony, pointed out that his corporation has been in the red for the last 5 years even though it has both the higher price and lower price hearing aid. In the above example of the hearing aid that was sold to the dealer for $100, that hearing aid may be retailed for $300, but again the majority report states: "Dealer markups are excessive, but average dealer net profits are not."

In effect, what the majority is saying is that dealer markups are not necessarily excessive but are high enough to cover whatever costs they may have since the average dealer's net profits are not high. I believe the testimony of all of the witnesses—industry and nonindustry—is that neither the manufacturer nor the dealer is making much money in the hearing aid business and when you talk about high prices and excessive and high profits those adjectives are carelessly and loosely used. (See Dr. William Hardy, p. 31, printed hearings.) We surely realize that hearing aids are used by people who are elderly and who may not be in a good financial position to pay for them, but there are companies that still sell hearing aids for as low as $50 to $99, even though they may not be as fancy and as cosmetically acceptable as some of the other hearing aids at a higher price. When you consider the statement in the majority report that in 1932 prices of major brands for hearing aids were as low as $25 and today they are as low as $50 to $99, and you consider in comparison the price of food, clothing, housing, at the 1932 level in comparison to today's level, you probably would come to the conclusion that not only are you getting a better instrument today than in 1932, but at a lower price, relatively speaking.

COMPETITION, PRICES, AND THE OREGON LAW

One of the principal hearing aid companies called to testify was the Beltone Hearing Aid Co., represented by David Barnow, executive vice president; Chester Barnow, general manager; and George Snyder, counsel. Mr. David Barnow had this to say:

"A recent report shows that 1,200 deaf people had a combined annual earning capacity before rehabilitation of $308,200. During the first year after rehabilitation, they earned $2,743,000, an increase of 790 percent.

* * * * *

"One would think that because of the scope of the problems of deafness and the human suffering and unhappiness it creates, the hard-of-hearing population would be actively seeking alleviation of their hearing problems. However, this is not the case. Quite to the contrary, the hard of hearing fight against taking action on their hearing problems, sometimes for years. And in our judgment this is not because of high prices.

"In our free and competitive market, hearing aids are available at a wide range of prices. Medical opinion and examination can be obtained with or without charge. Yet it is one of the most paradoxical characteristics of the hard of hearing that they, on the whole, are not inclined to seek the help that they need. Our advertising, our training programs, and our public statements are persistently aimed, first at making hard-of-hearing people aware of their problem, and, second, at suggesting that they do something about it.

* * * * *

"The manufacturers' prices of hearing aids must vary substantially, if such prices can be deduced from the prices at which hearing aids are advertised for sale to the consumer at retail.

"In view of the number of companies engaged in the manufacture of hearing aids and the wide range of their prices, this is obviously a free and competitive market. In a free economy, competition regulates prices. If one company attempts to charge its customers excessive prices, others can take away the business with lower prices. The law of supply and demand determine the prices at which hearing aids are sold by manufacturers and retailers. Naturally, the differences in product quality, essential distribution services, individual fitting, and postsale personal services have a bearing on the value of the commodity and hence on the differences in prices.

"As is true in product differences, there also are great differences in the manner in which hearing aids are sold and later serviced. This can vary from the simple selling of a product across a counter to a complete testing, fitting, and postsale service program, which we believe is essential for proper hearing correction.

"Beltone's policy of establishing its prices has always been to determine its costs and add a markup thereto for its profit. In the decade here in question, its average annual net profit from all sources, after provision for Federal incomes taxes, has been 6.53 percent of net sales. Considering the fact that Beltone is engaged in the manufacture and sale of a specialty prosthetic device having many lines and many models in each line, and considering the limited quantity of sales, the fact that the products are manufactured in relatively short runs with high unit tooling costs, and the fact that the selling costs per unit are high because of the resistance of the ultimate consumers, this average annual net profit is most reasonable.

* * * * *

"Because we are a rapidly advancing industry, obsolescence of instruments is to be expected. Hearing aids are constantly becoming smaller and more efficient. Improvements in the electroacoustical arts and sciences and more rigid inspection standards assure higher quality and greater reliability in performance."

THE RETAILER AND RETAILER PRICES

"We now would like to turn to the sphere of the retailer and retailer prices. We feel it would be helpful to this committee to present the remarks by Maurice A. Berkey, a hearing-aid dealer and immediate past president of the California Hearing Aid Dealers Association, to the California Citizens' Advisory Committee on Aging:

" 'Primarily the hearing-aid dealer sells hearing, not hearing aids; while he cannot give the client better hearing, more importantly, he can make him hear better. Yet, little is known or at least understood of the hearing-aid dealer's function in relation to the hearing aid and its user.

" 'Unforunately for the layman, he believes that by merely putting on a hearing aid, by some miracle unknown to him his loss of long years' standing is fully and completely restored from that moment on.

" 'Nothing could be further from the truth. Thus, the responsibility of the hearing-aid dealer becomes apparent. The hearing-aid dealer—within the concept of good service, and in a practical sense—must be an electronics expert, family counselor, psychologist, and father confessor, all rolled into one. For we are in a business predicated on trouble—a personal problem—and we are looked to for help.

" 'With this in mind, we can now begin to properly equate the cost of the hearing aid and the servicing problems involved. Let us point out here that CHADA is already on record as feeling that the cost of a hearing instrument does not merely include the instrument itself, but that much of the type of servicing, that is necessary over long, long periods of time, is done without additional charge to the client.

" 'It has been conservatively estimated that the responsible hearing-aid dealer, intent on doing his job well, will spend, on an average, some 30 hours annually with each purchaser of a hearing aid, for which he receives not one single penny. And many of these hours are spent on service calls in the very home of the client.' "

Thus spoke Mr. Berkey, a distributor of years' experience.

Mr. President, I conclude my remarks with the conclusion that we had on our minority report:

We respectfully submit that the 15 million people in the United States who have a hearing impairment, many of whom would require some hearing-aid instrument to aid them in their hearing, should be encouraged to make use of a hearing aid just as those who have faulty sight or any other defect should be encouraged to obtain proper treatment and correction of their impairment. We do not say that is the legislative purpose of a congressional committee such as the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. But, we do say that once the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee insisted on conducting an investigation and hearings, it should have prepared and presented it in such a manner so as to encourage and enlighten these people rather than create a record that is misleading and confusing and one that will do more harm than good to the very people it was intended to reach.

EULOGY OF ROBERT HUMPHREYS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at the risk of being self-serving, and I prefer not to thrust this upon any of my colleagues, one of the finest people I ever knew, and one of the most self-effacing public servants that I ever knew was Robert Humphreys, who served the Joint Senate-House Republican Committee.

He was a man possessed of wide experience in the publication, the newspaper, and public relations field.

Robert Humphreys passed away last week. I was with him just a short while before he died.

His last request was that I deliver a little testament to him at the funeral services in the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church.

I ask unanimous consent that the eulogy delivered on that occasion be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EULOGY TO ROBERT HUMPHREYS, NEW YORK AVENUE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, OCTOBER 20, 1965

What mortal being, standing on the threshold of infinity, has not pondered what lies beyond the veil which separates the seen from the unseen?

What mortal being, responding to that mystical instinct that earthly dissolution is at hand, has not contemplated what lies beyond the grave?

What mortal being upon whom has descended that strange and serene resignation that life's journey is about at an end has not thought about that eternal destination and what might be there?

Centuries ago, the man Job, so long blessed with every material blessing, only to find himself sorely afflicted by all that can befall a human being, sat with his companions and uttered the timeless, ageless question, "If a man die, shall he live again?" In the Easter season, when all Christendom observes the resurrection and seeks answers to many question, there in the forefront is the question raised by Job, "If a man die, shall he live again?"

If there be a design in this universe and in this world in which we live, there must be a designer. Who can behold the inexplicable mysteries of the universe without believing that there is a design for all mankind and also a designer.

Consider what is recorded in the book of Genesis.

First the Designer created Heaven and Earth, void and formless. There was darkness on the deep. Only darkness and ocean and no light. Let there be light said the Grand Designer of the Universe and there was light. Let there be a firmament, said He and there was a firmament. Let there be grass said He and herb, yielding seed. How could an earth continue without the seed of continuity. And there was.

Two lights He made, sun and moon. Came the stars by His design. He called for living creatures in the water and fowls to fly above the earth. And it was so, ever as it is now. He called for earthbound life—cattle, beasts and creeping things. The design was nearly complete but not quite.

He created man with dominion over all other living things. And then this seemingly incredible thing—every green herb for meat. Yet, it is every green thing which sustains all living things from the day of the first man until this very moment.

Man alone, of all living things received intelligence—a brain, a mind, and a soul. He alone with these attributes had the capacity for faith and hope, for inspiration and ambition, nobility and dignity, and the capacity to remember and to forget.

In a world of scientific wonders and achievements, no atom with all its force to destroy, to frighten, and annihilate could conceive an idea, build a structure, write a document, utter a spoken word, entertain compassion or charity or hope. Only to man came this endowment of intelligence, dignity, divinity, and dominion over all living things.

Who would persuasively contend, that this work of the Great Designer could only end in oblivion, in destruction without a trace? Who will contend that this—the noblest work of the Great Designer—man, with dominion over all living things, man, with a brain and a will, with a mind and a soul, man with intelligence and divinity should come to an end when the spirit forsake its earthly temple?

Except for the handiwork of the Great Designer, nothing in this world is created and nothing is destroyed.

The Eiffel tower is but the fashioning, forming and shaping of materials already here.

The pyramids which have stood for centuries are but the craftsmanship of men on stone already here.

The atom—author of both joy and misery was always here. It remained only for time and intelligence to isolate it and lay bare its awesome power.

The glory and beauty of the Nation's Capitol is but the work of gifted men upon materials already here. All this from the hand and grace of the Great Designer, whose handiwork is everywhere.

How could His work be destroyed? Not by fire for that but transmutes what man put together into other forms such as light, heat, energy, and gasses. Not by earthquakes which but tumble man's work but do not destroy the elemental substance. Not by storms and tidal waves which only rearrange what the Great Designer placed here. The gaily colored leaves fall so gently to earth in this autumn season, not to be destroyed, but to be embraced by Nature for future use.

The falling leaves are a reminder that winter will soon be here to embrace the earth in wintry sleep. Comes the inevitable caress of spring, also from the hand of the Great Designer to bring life and color, fragrance and beauty to the eager earth. It is the resurrection of spring. It is an answer to the ageless question of Job, "If a man die, shall he live again?" Surely he shall, as surely as day follows night, as surely as the stars follow their courses, as surely as the crest of every wave brings its trough.

Five hours before Bob Humphrey's spirit left its earthly, pain-wracked temple, I shook his hand. Somehow I knew that the Great Designer would spare him until I could return to the Capitol and say goodby. We spoke but little. It was not necessary. His last word to me was his request that I make this testament to him. There were no tears. I was borne up and comforted by the unquenchable faith and belief that even as the hands of Heaven already reached out to embrace him, he would soon be in a higher, nobler, realm where neither pain nor anguish could touch him.

I admired him. I respected him. I loved him. In him were those glorious attributes which I have seen so often—a fidelity that one can scarcely put in words—a devotion to his country unsurpassed by that of any patriot whose name glows from the pages of history—a sense of perfectionism that impelled him ever to find perfection—an affection for her who was his devoted companion and who was the force that sustained him in his hours of agony—a faith that could move mountains—an inextinguishable belief that man's course must be ever onward and upward. He will be long remembered because he is enshrined in so many hearts.

And now, he has gone to labor in the larger vineyard of eternal life. All this is because the Great Designer made it a part of the grand design for life on earth and in heaven. Farewell Bob.

PROGRESS MADE IN CIVIL RIGHTS DURING THE PAST YEAR

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the disturbing, dramatic news of racial crisis tends to overshadow some of the real progress that has been made during the past year in civil rights. In hundreds of communities across the land, and especially in the South, compliance with many of the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has gone quite smoothly; in fact, much better than had been predicted.

Of course, there is a long way to go before there is full compliance with the law, and many people are justifiably impatient. Yet, we can take considerable pride in the way that most American citizens have demonstrated their willingness to obey the law without attempting to frustrate justice.

A recent editorial in the Huntsville, Ala., Times calls attention to the lessening of racial tension and gives considerable credit for this achievement to the Community Relations Service, an agency that Congress created when it passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It states:

> One of the great but unsung efforts in the interracial field, the Community Relations Service, headed by former Governor LeRoy Collins of Florida until he became Under Secretary of Commerce, had done heroic work behind the scenes to break down barriers of prejudice, and to head off tension before it develops.
>
> Because of the effective work at the community level, thousands, perhaps tens of thousands, of jobs have been opened for Negroes in stores, banks, and offices where the traditional curtain of discrimination had previously barred them.

The idea of the Community Relations Service was first proposed in Congress on January 20, 1959, by Lyndon B. Johnson when he was Senate majority leader. As he introduced a bill (S. 499) calling for formation of the service, Mr. Johnson said:

> [Civil rights] involve the idea of human acceptance, of human understanding, and of human dignity. The outward manifestations of tolerance can be enforced by guns, clubs, and bayonets. But understanding does not exist until the people themselves will it to exist.
>
> Controversies involving civil rights have reached a point where they can be paralyzing to whole communities * * *
>
> But somehow life must go on. People must be fed. The implements of transportation must move. The channels of commerce must flow uninterrupted.
>
> There are compulsions upon both sides to find a just settlement. And a just settlement can be found—if only people will talk to each other.
>
> At this point, a conciliator would be worth his weight in gold. A man who could be trusted and who could * * * break the log jam in communications * * *.
>
> I do not even pretend that the measure I am proposing solves the civil rights issue. But it is a step in the right direction which I believe will ultimately solve it. And I hope the bill will be enacted into law.

Legislation establishing a Community Relations Service was enacted into law as part of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and Mr. Johnson's predictions about the value of voluntary efforts to achieve compliance has been borne out in the brief history of the Community Relations Service.

It is difficult to use statistics to measure the performance or worth of an organization that deals in race relations and the chemistry of human behavior, but a look at the record of CRS is nevertheless impressive. The Service has been operating in 190 communities in 33 States since it began operations in July 1964. Where the immediate need in 64 communities was to establish a regular means of communication between Negroes and whites, CRS was successful in all but 5 communities.

CRS is often called in initially to help a community to resolve what appears to be a single problem—that is, differences between whites and Negroes over an antipoverty program. Soon, however, CRS is called upon to work on additional problems causing tension, such as law enforcement, voter registration, school desegregation, and employment. So common is this experience, that CRS conciliators are still actively working in 155 of the 190 communities. Further, communities near the crisis community often contain building tensions that require assistance.

In short, Mr. President, CRS has helped many communities resolve complex minority-group problems in tense situations where there had been a complete breakdown in communications.

The efforts of this small full-time professional staff of 12 conciliators have been augmented by the work of the 450 distinguished citizens appointed by President Johnson to CRS National Citizens Committee.

CRS has worked quietly and effectively, following the requirement placed by Congress in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that "conciliation assistance shall be conducted in confidence and without publicity." Often CRS conciliators have worked side by side with local and State community relations officials, as well as with representatives of other Federal agencies.

During this past summer, CRS fieldmen worked in the nine large northern cities which accepted the offer of assistance from the task force on urban problems of the President's Council on Equal Opportunity. These nine cites—Boston, Rochester, New York, Gary, Philadelphia, Newark, Oakland, Detroit, and Cleveland—contained many of the elements that lead to explosive violence, but all nine cities escaped disastrous rioting.

The staff of the Community Relations Service has learned that crisis can be headed off if a community will take the initiative early to begin solving its own problems. One of the best tools available to a community is an effective, professionally-staffed human relations commission, either appointed by the mayor or set up by ordinance. About half of our cities now have official human relations commissions, and the CRS is encouraging more communities to form these commissions.

This emphasis on community effort at the local level is vital to the battle against racial discrimination, because these problems must be solved where people live and work. The demands for CRS assistance continue to grow. In any given month, CRS field conciliators are able to be in only half the troubled communities that are seeking help. Furthermore, demands from communities already at the crisis stage frequently prevent CRS from instituting the type of positive, precrisis assistance that would minimize the need for emergency assistance. These precrisis efforts include such activities as helping to improve the effectiveness of existing human relations commissions; assisting communities to utilize Federal programs that bear on minority-group tensions; providing local police forces with community relations techniques; opening up communication between the white and Negro communities; and conducting seminars for the press and media on the use of voluntary guidelines for covering racial incidents to avoid heightening their explosive nature.

Experience of the past year and a half has demonstrated that the idea behind the Community Relations Service is a good one. No one can say how many lives have been saved or how much damage avoided because the Community Relations Service was on the job. Undoubtedly the country has proceeded much more rapidly and calmly toward the solution of the problems surrounding racial tension because of the work of this agency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Huntsville, Ala., Times, August 5, 1965, entitled "Report (With Afterthought)" and the editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of September 29, 1965, entitled, "Almost A Good Plan" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Huntsville (Ala.) Times, Aug. 5, 1965]

REPORT (WITH AFTERTHOUGHT)

Assuming that the roof will not cave in while this copy of your newspaper is en route from pressroom to you, we would like to point out that racial tension this summer is certainly down from what it was at this time last year.

There have been big strides made.

One of the great, but unsung efforts in the interracial field, the Community Relations Service, headed by former Gov. Leroy Collins of Florida until he became Undersecretary of Commerce, has done heroic work behind the scenes to break down barriers of prejudice, and to head off tension before it develops.

Because of the effective work at the community level, thousands, perhaps tens of thousands, of jobs have been opened for Negroes in stores, banks and offices where the traditional curtain of discrimination had previously barred them.

The anti-poverty campaign, which has reached into the ghettos of the North to offer new opportunities to Negroes, also has contributed greatly to the reduction of tension in 1965. The antipoverty program is reaching about 1,300,000 people this year. Since a vast number of the beneficiaries are Negroes, this also helps explain why the climate this summer is much better than it has been.

In one year, then, it is apparent that tremendous steps have been made to revamp the status of the American Negro.

The far-out militants in civil rights would argue the matter. And there is a long road still to go in social acceptance.

Afterthought: If the oligarchs in Latin American—for example—had shown in recent years the same concern for their social problems as the "imperialists" of the United States have shown for ours, the Alliance for Progress today would be regarded as a sensational success.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette, Sept. 29, 1965]

ALMOST A GOOD PLAN

The administration's plan for reorganizing the executive branch machinery with which Federal civil rights programs are implemented is timely and, with one important exception, should help to fulfill the spirit as well as to enforce the letter of the various laws involved.

The succession of civil rights laws passed since 1957 has created a variety of agencies with differing responsibilities for this or that aspect of the equal opportunity movement. In addition, the White House has set up commissions to promote legislation or to fill gaps in the absence of legislative action.

In the aggregate, however—and especially after passage of the sweeping Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965—some of these agencies are outdated while others overlap each other in their duties.

President Johnson, therefore, assigned Vice President Humphrey the task of suggesting ways to cut out the bureaucratic deadwood, to consolidate both the old and the new Federal responsibilities under the broad umbrella of civil rights policy, and to pinpoint those responsibilities in the appropriate departments.

Mr. Humphrey's proposal is by and large a sound one. It will abolish two superseded presidential commissions. The assignments in the fields of Federal employment, Government contracting, private hiring, and information gathering are logical ones.

The recommendation to which we take exception—because it would seriously flaw the Government's role of leadership in achieving the essence of equal citizenship—is the one to transfer to the Justice Department control of the Community Relations Service.

This agency was set up in the Commerce Department under the 1964 act to work for racial harmony through understanding, conciliation, and mediation. Its function is in distinct contrast to the combative role of the Justice Department against flagrant discrimination and violation of the law. It was devised in the hope that much progress toward genuinely amicable race relations could be made without having always to resort to the legal and judicial weapons otherwise provided in the law.

To place this agency under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General would be akin to putting Pittsburgh's Human Relations Commission under the direction of a prosecutor in the law department. It would make the Attorney General at one and the same time a present or potential party to a court suit and the mediator expected to resolve the dispute in a fair and detached manner. It would convert the conciliator's gentle persuasion into an advocate's lead pipe.

Besides the fallacy of the concept itself, the recommended transfer would create administrative and legal problems that would undermine the credibility of both the Community Relations Service and the Justice Department lawyers who handle civil rights cases in court. The 1964 act says that the Service's conciliation assistance is to be conducted in confidence—a key factor in such negotiations—and forbids any officer or employee of the Service from betraying this confidence in litigation arising from a dispute on which the Service has worked.

Who could or would believe that this provision was being obeyed if the Service were under the same roof and management as the Government's prosecutors?

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS RELEASES SPENDING PREDICTIONS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, one of the biggest problems confronting the next session of Congress when we reconvene in January is a problem which we have done much to aggravate and little to cure during the 10 long months that the present session of Congress has worked and wrangled.

That problem involves the perils confronting all Americans if we continue to run this country on a credit card economy whereby today's generation wants the best of all worlds by buying benefits and programs for themselves which they callously charge to their grandchildren.

It is always easy to be a good fellow with the other fellow's money, but somebody has to foot the bill and this generation of political leaders is likely to earn the ugly designation of being a "generation of moochers" unless we face up to the serious Federal fiscal problems we are so recklessly and deliberately creating by constantly initiating new spending programs which we deliberately plan to finance with borrowed money.

Now the fires of inflation are beginning to burn, and the grim dividends of balance-of-payments problem and a continuing decrease in the value of the dollar here at home are catching up with the gay spenders who seek today's votes with the funds of tomorrow's taxpayers.

In an effort to bring some accurate information to the Congress and the country concerning the dangerous goals which we are approaching, some time ago, as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I asked the Library of Congress to prepare an objective estimate of the impact of the spending spree engaged in by this session of Congress is likely to have on the national budget for fiscal years 1967, 1968, 1969, and 1970. The results are a little short of startling.

In addition, the study which I am about to submit to the Congress for the first time is very definitely and deliberately on the cautious and conservative side, since it assumes no new spending programs will be initiated next year, and that only the very minimal requirements will be provided for the spending programs already authorized. I do not believe there is a single Member of the Senate who believes these prudent and conservative spending limitations will prevail, and so each Member can add to the predictions and presentation of the Library of Congress his own knowledgeable estimate of the additional billions which will be requested in the President's next budgetary message, plus the additions to be provided through congressional action.

This Senator believes, on the basis of his research and study, that our spending budget for next year is likely to be in the area of the astronomical and astounding total of at least $120 billion. Unless both the administration and the Congress adopt new and untried methods of belt-tightening, it might be even more excessive and alarming.

Serious students of our country's growing budgetary problems will find the Library of Congress estimates a base from which to work, and by studying the newly published Bureau of the Budget report requested and issued by our Senate Committee on Government Operations on September 29 of this year, the full impact of the spending Frankenstein which we have set in motion can begin to be realized. This September 29 report—which places between two covers all of the authorizing legislation for future expenditures plus our country's commitments in revolving funds and backdoor spending—is the first time in American history such a comprehensive and revealing study has been prepared and published. It can be obtained from the Senate Committee on Government Operations, and readers of the Congressional Record can secure a copy by writing to their own Senator or Congressman.

Only last week, we had a resolution passed providing for the printing and distribution of an additional 5,000 copies of this report, because people are demanding it as a basis on which to make an analysis of the fiscal problems of the future. The mere fact that the listing of potential and probable expenditures already legally authorized but not yet funded requires a report of more than 100 pages is in itself a sobering fact to those who look and read below the headlines.

Mr. President, this Congress, which started its life in an atmosphere of indicated economy, symbolized by turning off the lights in the White House, is ending its session, after a carnival of spending and a plethora of legislative authorizing programs, with expenditures so prodigious in future years, that it indicates we have switched rapidly from turning off the lights to stepping on the gas insofar as Federal extravagance is concerned.

Most of the new programs which this Congress has authorized have started in low gear, with a minimum initial payment on the costs, but with the costs for them in succeeding years expanding in geometrical proportions. The down payments are sometimes small, but the annual payments in the years ahead grow and grow and grow, at a scheduled rate which carries its own highly ominous warning.

Thus as we conclude the first session of the 89th Congress, let us all resolve, when we return, to dedicate our best efforts to protecting the financial structure of America. I emphatically agree with our distinguished majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, when he recommended that the next session of this Congress devote itself primarily to a refinement of the many programs initiated this year, rather than beginning a new series of spending programs carrying us even further into the red seas of deficit spending.

I am hopeful that the report which has been prepared by the Library of Congress, and which I am presenting to the Congress today, will help to provide us with some navigational charts as we initiate next year's congressional journey. Let me emphasize again that in requesting this report, I suggested that it be prepared so as to demonstrate the minimum rather than the maximum expectations in terms of next year's basic budget. This the Library of Congress has precisely and properly done. But those who read it and study and analyze it should know now that there are many funding programs not even alluded to or remotely included in this report, since the report by the Library of Congress considered the activities of Congress and its spending programs and authorizations only up until March of this year. Every Senator knows that hundreds of millions of dollars of expenditures have been added by legislation enacted since March. The multibillion-dollar supplemental appropriation approved by Congress this week is not included.

Hence, to the footings on the chart, as we will find them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, must already be added several billion dollars of known expenditures, which we now know about but which the Library's fiscal experts could know nothing about when they did the work required to bring the predictions up to the facts as they existed last March. The spending program has gone on since March. That is why we must add to these total figures 4, 5, 8, or more billions of dollars in each House.

Also to be added, to really grasp the full magnitude of our future fiscal challenges, are the inevitable expenditures to be required by any new programs adopted next year, and by any acceleration of the funding of existing programs—some of which were rejected out of hand by our Appropriations Committee conference over in the Supreme Court chamber on Wednesday of this week, which are certain to be requested again next year.

Does anybody believe that the tens of millions of dollars the appropriations conference refused to provide for the program to subsidize the rents of people in big cities, up to the extent of families with a $25,000 resource will not be requested again next year?

Does anyone believe that it is not going to be requested again next year, or that the funds for the Teacher Corps which the conference committee turned down flat will not be requested again?

The Senate, when analyzing what lies ahead, must take a realistic look at the situation. Thus, the time, in my opinion, is abundantly here to review the programs and to resolve to dedicate next year's session of Congress to putting America's fiscal house back in order.

It was for that reason that I asked the Library of Congress to undertake this thoroughly objective report, a prodigious task it was, requiring several months.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter of transmittal received from the Library of Congress and the table which accompanied it.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
September 15, 1965.

To: The Honorable KARL E. MUNDT.
From: Economics Division.
Subject: Future Federal appropriations requests.

At your request we have made some calculations to suggest the possible size of appropriations requests in the next 4 years.

In making these calculations we have not been influenced by the 4-year advance estimates which department and agencies are required to supply to the Budget Bureau; these estimates are not published. Nor have we undertaken the task of estimating how much of services will be required of the Government and the reasonable cost of providing them in the next 4 years.

Our calculations were made without trying to guess whether purposes of the Government will be sought through the alternative means of regular appropriations and expenditures, trust fund expenditures, loans, tax incentives, or other means. Nor was any careful attempt made to allow for agency overestimates which are "asking prices" that anticipate a 2 or 5 or some other percentage reduction by the Congress.

The calculations were based on trends in appropriations and expenditures in recent years. The fluctuations from year to year in the rate of growth or decline in expenditures of particular bureaus and entire departments and branches of the Government make it very unlikely that a "straight line" computation of amounts will fit the actual estimates presented for any future year. Patterns of change were reviewed in some detail for a number of past years' appropriations, but the review offers no basis for confident year to year projections into the future.

The figures that have been tabulated are intended only to illustrate what the totals would be for appropriation requests which approximated some of the numerous trends that can be found in figures for past years. For most major agencies a range of appropriation estimates was more meaningful than a single figure for a given year.

JOHN C. JACKSON,
Specialist in Fiscal and Financial Economics.

Projection of trends in appropriations for Federal departments and agencies, fiscal years 1967–70

[Trust funds and smaller independent offices are excluded]

[In millions of dollars]

Branch, department, or agency	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970
Legislative	195–210	215–225	240–245	260–265
Judiciary	96–100	103–110	110–120	119–135
Executive Office	27	28	29	31
Funds appropriated to the President (including foreign assistance and economic opportunity)	5,700–6,200	7,000–7,200	8,000–8,400	9,200–10,000
Department of Agriculture (including food-for-peace and food stamps,	6,600–6,900	6,800–6,900	6,500–7,200	6,300–7,400
Department of Commerce	870–880	950–970	1,020–1,060	1,100–1,175
Department of Defense, Military	49,600–49,900	51,000–51,700	52,600–52,900	54,000–55,000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	8,900–11,400	10,600–13,000	12,100–14,500	14,000–16,000
Department of the Interior	1,290–1,550	1,400–1,650	1,500–1,850	1,700–2,000
Department of Justice	400–420	420–440	450–470	480–500
Department of Labor	600–800	610–860	620–920	630–980
Post Office	760	810	860	920
Department of State	430–460	460–500	480–550	520–600
Treasury Department (largely interest on the public debt—a permanent appropriation)	13,400–13,600	13,800–14,250	14,100–15,000	14,500–15,8
Atomic Energy Commission	2,600	2,620	2,640	2,660
Federal Aviation Agency	810	870	930	1,000
General Services Administration	660	720	780	850
Housing and Home Finance	490	520	560	600
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	5,400	5,700	6,100	6,400
Veterans' Administration	4,300	4,350	4,500	4,700
Total	103,128–107,464	108,976–113,423	114,119–119,614	119,970–127,016

AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEETING IN CHICAGO, OCTOBER 4, 1965

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on October 4, it was my privilege to speak before the annual meeting of the State Bank Division of the American Bankers Association in Chicago. That meeting was also addressed by Mr. William E. Nuesse, president of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, and by Mr. K. A. Randall, Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

I was very much impressed with the speeches of both of these distinguished men, and I feel that all of us could benefit from the information contained in them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have each of these speeches printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Address of William E. Nuesse, President, National Association of Supervisors of State Banks

I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today. It is an honor to participate in this program and I am happy to bring greetings from the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks. This is a double honor since it is my first opportunity to speak as president of that association.

In the brief time allotted, I would like to discuss three phases of our association program: (1) the goals of NASSB; (2) progress achieved to date; and (3) action taken at our recent Detroit convention.

NASSB and the State Bank Division of the ABA have a common goal. Your interests are our interests. We both want stronger State banking—vital, alert, imaginative State banking as one segment of an aggressive dual banking system. I am sure that your National Bank Division will likewise support this goal.

The primary step in achieving this goal is that of strengthening and improving the quality and efficiency of State banking departments. Tremendous progress has already been achieved by many States. Our job is to provide ready assistance to those States who have not achieved a high degree of proficiency. This must have our first priority—top claim over any other program we undertake. When we fail to keep this goal uppermost, we fail our primary responsibility.

Secondarily, our goal at the national level is the attainment through legislation, litigation, and improved coordination between State and Federal agencies to create an operating climate whereby banks functioning under State charter have equal opportunity for profitable operation in serving the financial needs of the public.

Reiteration of these goals and discussion of how to achieve them was the major theme of our Detroit meeting. Change is the order of the day. As you well know, the Washington financial scene is quite different from what it was a week ago.

Naturally, this compounds our difficulties. It forces us to make certain—absolutely certain—that the steps we take are appropriate, not only for today but, more importantly, for the long-range good of our association, the State banking industry, and the general public.

So that the picture be completely clear, and, to set the stage for the action taken in Detroit, let me briefly review the progress already achieved over the past few months.

NASSB is continually reviewing, restating and revitalizing the principles for which it stands. Here are three examples:

1. The second annual session of the NASSB school for State bank examining personnel was held July 18 through July 23 at the University of Illinois. Forty-nine student-examiners from 30 States attended—a substantial increase over the previous year.

Our concern with this school is twofold. First, the school program is designed to improve the professional skill of State bank examiners, thereby fulfilling our dedication to sound, progressive banking. The hallmark of good banking is good supervision. Second, we are concerned with developing and training men who will follow us in the continuing struggle to maintain a strong, vigorous State banking system. These students are committed to a career in State banking; we must nourish this career with as much care as the banker does when he spots a bright young man in his shop.

2. In August, the association published "A Profile of State-Chartered Banking." In my judgment, it represents an important contribution toward your goal—our goal—of a strong, competitively vital, and community-serving State banking system. What is the profile? It is facts and figures explaining what State banking is all about. Simple, to the point, easy to use, a reference. But this, I believe, is its value. It is designed to help communicate our strengths and our weaknesses to those with a responsibility for maintaining, preserving and improving our respective State banking systems. It is designed to serve as a bond, a bridge of understanding between the supervisor and the supervised.

3. A review of four major cases involving the dual banking system during 1965 shows a series of significant decisions striking down efforts of the Comptroller to avoid provisions of State law made applicable to national banks in the National Bank Act. This is of great importance. Here we have judicial recognition of the basic tenet underlying our dual banking system—that Congress intended competitive equality between national and State banks based upon State law enacted by the various State legislatures to reflect the variant economic conditions of the 50 States.

Our general counsel filed an amicus curiae brief or furnished legal memorandum in each of the above cases.

Let's look at one of these cases. In the *Bank of Dearborn* v. *Saxon*, a national bank frustrated by State law in establishing a new branch in the city of Dearborn, Mich., devised a two-step plan whereby it established a new branch outside of the city line, located a short distance from an existing branch in Dearborn, thereby enabling it to continue to serve the customers of the existing branch. It then "moved" the existing branch to the new shopping center.

The court excoriated the new proposal as follows:

"Maybe the laws should be amended to permit the utmost flexibility in branch banking. Maybe they should not. Congressional debate on this issue has gone on for years. But it is not for defendant Saxon and defendant bank to amend our "antiquated" laws by clever devices of evasion, covered by a broad grant of discretion and cloaked under the privileges of the executive branch of Government."

And later:

"It will be observed in the above statutory enactment that the law of the State involved is to be determinative as to the problem of branching. National banks were given the same opportunity for branching as State banks, thus perpetuating the dual banking system."

The court also denied the Comptroller's defense of what was tantamount to uncontrolled discretion and privilege. It said:

"The Comptroller, it is true, has a broad discretion with respect to the matters committed to his charge, including moves of branch banks. In this regard, he urges that the exercise of his discretion under these facts is not subject to judicial review, nor, in fact, are his files subject to scrutiny. Actually, what he is arguing for is the complete invulnerability of his decisions. If, indeed, it were true that his admittedly broad discretion were combined with his doctrine of unreviewability of the exercise of his discretion, plus the complete secrecy of his files relating thereto, a constitutional question of the first magnitude would be presented, since the possessor of such powers would be unassailable in any court by any process. We are aware of no such sanctuary in American constitutional law, nor do we believe that the Congress ever sought to confer it."

The Dearborn case is similar in many respects to the decision of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in the Whitney Bank case. Inasmuch as it was reversed by the Supreme Court on other grounds, procedural in nature, the decision still stands. The court there held that the creation of a bank holding company by the Whitney National Bank of New Orleans was, under the circumstances of that case, merely a device to evade State branch law, and, therefore, was unlawful.

Time does not permit me to review our Detroit deliberations. Let me sum up our action at that meeting by sharing with you two resolutions that were adopted by the convention:

First, we resolved to cooperate through our association with respect to the modernizing and improving in any manner desired and requested by any State bank commissioner the laws and budgetary provisions governing his particular department with the objective of improving the quality and efficiency of State bank supervision in that State.

Second, whereas the supervision, examination, chartering, and branching of national banks by the Comptroller of the Currency is accepted by the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, we resolved that our association establish the goal of obtaining comparable recognition to the respective State banking departments with regard to operations of State banks.

I want to make one point crystal clear: We at NASSB welcome the cooperation of the American Bankers Association in a positive program designed to improve the climate and conditions under which State banks operate. If personal experience has taught me anything, it has convinced me that teamwork is essential.

Our task is to devote our efforts to solving the very real problems facing State banking. We must cease to talk of what is wrong, and do what is right. Let us concern ourselves today with sound banking—soundly structured, soundly managed and dedicated to a sound future.

Draft of Remarks To Accompany Address of K. A. Randall, Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

I should like to discuss with you this morning some very recent events affecting banking. (These remarks have not been incorporated in the speech being distributed, which carries, I think, a significant message on the Corporation's views on interest-rate regulation.) I hope you will find time to read the message.

This year has been a momentous one for the bank supervisory agencies. The implications of various developments in banking and in the economy over the past several years have seemingly converged on the same point in time. And we are finding ourselves in an environment where banking is being subject to more intense scrutiny perhaps than at any other time since the midthirties. We have been able to respond quickly and effectively to some of these challenges, but others will take a little more time to find lasting solutions. Perhaps we can review briefly some of these events to obtain a perspective of where we are and where we might go from here.

First, I would like to pay tribute to a man that I have come to know this past year and with whom I have been privileged to associate—Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN. He has conducted an investigation of a most difficult situation—an investigation of recent bank failures and abuses of certificate of deposit activity. The hearings were conducted with dignity, fairness, and impartiality worthy of the highest traditions of banking. Each of us who has been under the harsh and unblinking spotlight have not found his position comfortable. But we need not fear the spotlight. From these experiences and lessons, we can learn and we can grow. The findings of Senator MCCLELLAN's committee are, and can continue to be, of great value to banking and to bank supervision.

The winds of change are blowing in banking and in bank supervision. These changes demand new methods, new ideas, and new solutions—and the people to carry them out. Change has come about as a result of the postwar growth of this country, our Nation's growing international role, the new dimensions in the economy, and population growth and shifts. And the focus has been largely determined by legislation such as the Employment Act of 1946.

The situation may be unfamiliar—and even uncomfortable. But banking has shown itself to be a great and a viable industry—an industry that can respond to change, one that can grow, and one that will advance in the proper direction.

In the past few years, we have been concerned with the important issues of our day, such as the competitive balance between large and small, between unit and branch, and between State and national banks. As important as these issues are, challenges to the structural diversity and broad base of our banking system and to the exercise of independent judgment within that system should take precedence. In this area, the bank supervisory agencies and the banks share common objectives.

The role of bank supervision, in my view, is to define tolerable limits of performance. Within these limits, bank management should be permitted freedom of decision. Beyond the tolerable limits, banks would be in danger of failure—or at least difficulty. The definition of "tolerable" should be the responsibility of the bank supervisor, who is protecting the public interest.

I believe there is a parallel between the free exercise of decision by bank management and by bank supervisors, whether State or Federal. Freedom of decision and of action, as in a good, sound, well-run bank, is also essential to effective bank supervision—within the limits imposed by the regulatory agencies' statutory authority.

A certain degree of freedom in bank supervision is necessary for the preservation of the concept of freedom within the banking industry. Flexibility and adaptability, coupled with the necessary self-discipline, contribute importantly to the effectiveness with which banks can assist economic growth. We might keep these points in mind in considering recent legislative proposals.

Some of these proposals could, in effect, weaken banking supervision at the Federal level. I might mention two specific proposals. One would subject the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Reserve to audits by the General Accounting Office as presently conducted at the FDIC; the other would bring the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve, and the FDIC within the congressional appropriation process.

Let's take each one of these proposals separately and look at them together.

The FDIC currently is subject to GAO audits, but the audit is confined to our financial transactions. Although this type of audit serves a useful purpose, such audits could be easily expanded to apply to all operations of the Corporation and could endanger the confidentiality of the reports that we receive from the banks under our supervision or from our examiners in the field.

We believe that any violation of the rule of confidentiality can erode the effectiveness of bank examination. Extension of present procedures beyond the FDIC to the Comptroller of the Currency's office and to the Federal Reserve also might inhibit the independent action of these supervisory agencies.

The second proposal deals with the financing of the operations of the supervisory agencies. This question might be considered in relation to the FDIC to give you some idea how it could apply to other supervisory agencies.

First, may I emphasize that the Corporation was created by Congress and derives its powers from Congress. We report regularly to the Congress, and we benefit from their overall supervision and recommendations. The nature of our operations, however, and the importance of maintaining public confidence in our banking system, makes the appropriation process an inappropriate means of financing for the bank supervisory agencies. Requests for additional examiners or for programs anticipating future contingencies, for example, might well be misinterpreted and disturbing to public confidence and disruptive of effective bank supervision.

Under present procedures, the insurance fund in the FDIC, now totaling about $3 billion, has not come from taxes but from assessment fees paid by the banks of this great Nation. This does not mean that we are captives of the banks or subject to their every wish and whim. It symbolizes instead the close relationship between the banks and the supervisory agencies and their joint concern in promoting and preserving a sound and profitable banking system serving the public interest.

I think some of the problems arising from current legislative proposals should not be underestimated. I think each one of you should consider the ramifications of these proposals carefully.

The independence of your supervisory agencies within their statutory authority is fundamental to the fredom that you must have as bank managers. It is basic to the preservation of a free and a vital banking system. Freedom in banking and independent supervision go hand in hand, and 150 years of tradition and experience support this conclusion. This independence is being challenged. And the challenge faces not only us, but the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve, and the State bank supervisors.

I might mention briefly here a few of the activities that can be, and are being, fostered and developed in a free and an independent agency such as the FDIC.

In a way, this might be considered a brief report on the FDIC and its activities since a young and green team by the name of Barr and Randall took over the FDIC about 18 months ago. I don't mean to imply that we provided all of the answers, but I do believe that some of the activities that were initiated then are starting to blossom, aided and abetted by our inheritance of a fine staff and good minds.

A week ago last Friday we completed negotiations for major sophisticated computer hardware for the Corporation, after 3 years' planning and intensive work over the past year. We feel that we are on the verge of major breakthroughs in the analysis of banking itself. We believe that we can, through this equipment, provide promptly the statistical information so needed by the banking industry and contribute to a better understanding of banking.

We are working on new ways to aid banks in developing satisfactory internal routines and audits. We are pioneering in the area of audit teams to aid all insured banks in establishment of better internal operations procedures, in cooperation with NABAC, and are also considering the use of resident auditors in each of our 12 districts for this purpose. In four of our FDIC districts, we are also experimenting with auditing teams in conjunction with examinations.

A few months ago, we appointed a distinguished committee to review our role as a liquidator. Our record in bank liquidation over the years has been good. But we believe that no matter how good you are, there is always room for improvement. The assignment given to this committee is to make sure that the FDIC conducts its operations with the best techniques and the best talent available and to make recommendations for the future.

This committee is headed by the distinguished banker, Frank King, chairman of the board of the United California Bank and chairman of the board of Western Bancorporation. A broadly based and highly competent committee is working with him, from many areas of our country and many fields of activity.

This then is part of our program—part of what we are trying to do. How do we do the job? How do we get it done?

First of all, it takes manpower, and we have needs and demands, as you do, and we are working on them. The Corporation has just finished the finest year of recruiting in our history. We have been able to get good men, able men, interested in developing a career in bank supervision. We have a responsibility for getting the best possible men in our operation so that we may give you, as bank managers, the support that you should expect from supervision. Enlightened supervision by a capable staff is a first-class management tool and the best protector of the public interest.

A good staff is strengthened by training and experience. We participate in major training programs both within and outside the Corporation. We have within the Corporation a program for seeking out and developing the best people possible. The 12 supervising examiners in the field, for example, are able men that have my complete confidence. They represent the highest standards of bank supervision and the highest goals of banking.

In closing, I would like to stress my conviction that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation can best fulfill its responsibilities and best serve the public interest by helping to make good banks better and stronger banks. All of us at the FDIC are dedicated to this objective. Thank you.

DEATH OF A. M. PIPER, EDITOR OF COUNCIL BLUFFS NONPAREIL

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to indulge the Senate for a moment, to sadly announce the death—which I learned about an hour or so ago—of Mr. A. M. Piper, who for many years was the editor of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil.

One of the characteristics of Mr. Piper's life was that every year he would spend 2 or 3 weeks in Washington, D.C., and over the past 30 to 40 years became acquainted well and intimately with scores of legislators of both parties, and officials of the Government, from Presidents on down.

Mr. Piper was one of the grand gentlemen of the press, especially the editorial section of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil. He died in the 8th decade of his life. He leaves a great void in the press fraternity of our State—in fact, throughout the Nation.

As I stated a moment ago, he was a gentleman of the press in the highest desirable tradition of the American free press.

He was objective. He was factual. He was fair. He always informed himself beforehand on the subject matter about which he wrote.

There was nothing mean or vindictive about his character. There was power in his words.

Those of us who have known him and who have had great affection for him over the last 30 to 35 years will greatly miss him.

His colleagues will miss him. I merely wish to make this announcement for Senators here who have known him for so many years and who, I know, will be saddened to learn of his passing.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it was my happy privilege to have known Mr. Piper for approximately 20 years. He paid a weekly visit to the Nebraska congressional delegation breakfasts for the past 12 years, steadily that I know of, and had attended the meetings of the Association of Newspaper Editors, I believe, for some 40 to 42 years with only one break—I believe at that time he was either ill, or it was during the war.

Mr. Piper was everything that the Senator from Iowa has described him to be. He was courtly, polite, and always pronounced in his views which were never stated on any other basis except with full information.

He was always fair in his treatment of those around him.

Surely, he will constitute a brilliant chapter in the history of American journalism and in the civic life generally of the Middle West.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I join in the tribute which the Senator from Iowa has so rightfully paid to Mr. Piper, a long time editor of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil, which is published in a State adjacent to South Dakota. I suspect that there are not many persons, outside Mr. Piper's area, or those who work in the fourth estate, who read his newspaper. But I have read many reprints of his constructive thinking as reflected and exemplified in his editorials which popped up time and again in the weekly and daily press in South Dakota.

More than anything, Mr. Piper was a grand old man who believed with every single, pulsating movement of his body that the American system of government was the greatest system in the world. He was an unabashed patriot in the finest sense of the word.

I remember a few years ago he invited me to speak to a chamber of commerce membership meeting in Council Bluffs, Iowa, his hometown, and in his introduction he spent some time, on his own, pointing out to those who were younger—he had then reached an advanced age—the advantages of the American system of government, a government which had solved every problem since the birth of the Republic and he believed was capable of solving every new problem which would come down the trail, without changing its form.

Mr. Piper's passing will be a real loss to America. It is sad to lose a man who enunciated so clearly and consistently the qualities which have made America great.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Nebraska for their kind remarks.

Let me recite an instance—I hope, at a later date, to develop some of the history of Mr. Piper, because his life was very colorful—but approximately 34 years ago, he became editor of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil, and according to his own story, and that of others, at that time he was offered the right or the opportunity to purchase stock in the newspaper and also to become an editor. In his own inimitable way, he said no, that under no circumstances would he purchase even one single share of stock in that newspaper because he said that if he were to become an editor and write editorials, he was going to be free to express his own, unhampered judgment. Further, that if at any time they did not like his work, they could fire him, and by the same token, that if any time he did not like the situation under which he was working, he could resign, that he would have no freedom of any kind except the general interests of his employment in the newspaper and complete freedom of movement and action, that marked him throughout his life. He kept his impartiality which contributed so much to his objectivity.

I did not mean to make a second speech, but I thank the Chair for its indulgence.

NATIONAL WINE WEEK

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, next week—October 23–30—is National Wine Week. In California, winemaking is one of our oldest, most distinguished, yet most efficient, industries. Grape and wine growing is California's oldest and most important fruit growing industry. It has been made so by generations of farm families who have built this mighty prop to the California economy.

The vineyard industry tops all others in capital investment, in acreage, in value of products, and in the annual total of taxes paid to local, State, and Federal Governments. The California wine industry pays an average of $75 million in direct taxes every year.

In California, grapes which are used to make these wines are grown on some 470,000 acres and the annual value of the total grape production is around $170 million. These grapes are grown in 48 counties of the 58 in my State.

Let us go back to the beginning, and trace, for a moment, the long path the industry has had to travel to reach its present position.

Wine growing spread from Mexico northward into California. The Jesuit fathers carried Spanish colonization up the western coast into the Mexican peninsula of lower California, and their successors, the Franciscans, advanced into what now is the State of California. As each new settlement or mission was established, vines were planted as one of the first steps in transforming a savage wilderness into a state of civilization.

It was the Franciscans, and their leader, Padre Junipero Serra, who upon establishing Mission San Diego in 1769 and planting wine grapes there, discovered that California was a land especially favored for wine growing.

Padre Serra's Franciscan missionaries built a chain of 21 missions from San Diego to Sonoma, the northermost terminus of their El Camino Real, or "King's Highway." At nearly all these missions they planted vineyards and made wine. Descendants of the vines they planted are still growing.

The Franciscan Fathers were the only wine growers in California until 1824 and they had not attempted production on a commercial scale. Their wines were grown for religious services, for table use, for treating the sick, and for hospitable entertainment of the travelers who visited the missions. Some of their wines, and also their brandies, were sold in small lots, and their fame began to spread.

Later in the 19th century, the missions began to deteriorate as a result of civil turmoil. Their wine-growing activities were suffering accordingly. Commercial winegrowers began to come into their own and another development of even greater significance began. A vital change in the grape varieties used for California wine was taking place.

The vines the mission fathers planted were descendants of the Spanish wine grapes that had come from Spain to Mexico over a period of three centuries. They were true wine grapes of the vitis vinifera family of Europe—the family of which nearly all California wine, raisin, and table grapes are members—but they were of limited winemaking value.

The Spanish grape variety the missionaries planted never has been clearly identified but was called the mission grape because it first was grown around the missions.

It was this grape that was planted in the earliest commercial vineyards, first in southern, then in northern California.

The great change from the mission grape to the finer, pedigreed European varieties in California was brought about by Agoston Haraszthy, a Hungarian nobleman, since called the father of modern California viticulture.

Haraszthy, a pioneer who founded Sauk City, Wis., came to California for his health, settling in San Diego in 1849. He imported and planted new European grape varieties there, including one he knew in Hungary as Zinfandel and which has become one of California's great wine varieties. He was successful at San Diego, but nevertheless pushed northward and experimented with wine growing in other districts.

In 1857, he acquired land for a vineyard in Sonoma, north of San Francisco, from Gen. Mariano Vallejo, last Mexican military commandant in California.

Haraszthy was convinced that wines equal to Europe's best could never be made without an assortment of fine grape varieties. A man of great vision, Haraszthy realized the full significance of the mission fathers' discovery that California was a wine land of great possibilities. He recognized the wide range of climates and soils which permit the grower to produce virtually every wine type produced elsewhere.

Haraszthy approached officials of the new State and prevailed upon Gov. John G. Downey in 1861 to commission him to seek better wine grapes. Haraszthy went to Europe to select the widest possible variety of cuttings for experimentation. He spent 5 months there, visiting every important wine district, and purchased more than 100,000 cuttings of about 300 varieties. Many of these were planted in his vineyard at Sonoma, where experiments were conducted. The bulk of the cuttings was sold to growers in all sections of the State.

It was Haraszthy's spectacular activity that caused the extensive planting of the best European grape varieties. His exploits were followed immediately by the great modern expansion of the industry.

As early as 1860 California wine firms had established agencies in New York and shipped their wines around Cape Horn to the Eastern States. The first transcontinental railroad opened the remainder of the U.S. market to them.

Soon California wine growers were shipping their wines to Europe, Latin America and Australia. There are records indicating that Germany, Denmark, England and Canada were buying California port in 1867.

Before the turn of the century California wines had been winning awards in international expositions, and California was competing with the wine lands of Europe for world export markets. Central and South America, Mexico, Canada, Hawaii, the Orient, and several European countries were among the young industry's customers. In direct competition with the wine of France, Italy, Spain and Portugal, California wines brought premium prices in the British Isles.

The annual vintage swelled from 4,245,000 gallons in 1869 to nearly 28 million in 1900 and 58 million in 1911. The raisin industry, which began to develop in the 1870's further expanded viticulture. By 1914 grapes and wine in California were valued at $150 million. There were 330,000 acres of California land planted in vineyards, representing a land value of $66 million. The industry's facilities, including some 700 wineries as well as grape-handling establishments, with inventories and equipment, accounted for another $84 million. The wine produced in 1913 had a commercial value of close to $15 million.

The importance and scope of wine growing in California had reached an even higher level when national prohibition struck in 1920.

Prohibition dealt a hard blow to California viticulture, but it was not a knockout blow. Hundreds of wineries closed and wine district communities suffered severely. But winemaking in the individual citizen's home was exempt from the dry laws to the extent of 200 gallons per family annually. Thus prohibition brought into being thousands of little wineries in basements throughout the country. A vast, nationwide market for fresh wine grapes was created almost overnight to supply the amateur winemakers. This demand kept the vineyards busy, and they even experienced a boom for a time until the grape market collapsed in the early 1920's and bankruptcy overtook the vineyard areas.

The dry laws also permitted continued production of wines for medicinal, sacramental, and cooking use, and this enabled part of the commercial wine industry to remain alive. As a consequence approximately 100 of California's wineries kept on making wine for the clergy and other legal purchasers throughout the prohibition period, and most of the State's great vineyard acreage was maintained.

Consequently, when the 21st amendment was adopted, repealing the 18th amendment, in 1933, those winegrowers who had clung to their vineyards and wineries were able to resume full-scale production almost immediately.

Despite their difficulties the growers managed to rehabilitate their oldtime wineries rapidly. In 1932, when repeal appeared imminent, they had begun building up stocks of wine for aging. Planting of new vineyards and replanting of old ones were started. This was general throughout the Nation's winegrowing areas. It was not long before well-matured wines again were being shipped to national and foreign markets.

By 1937, the annual production of California wineries had climbed back and reached a new high of 85⅓ million gallons. Several California wineries were ready for international competition once more, and entered their wines in the Paris Exposition of that year. Their wines won diplomas of honor, awards higher than gold medals. Each year since, with new plantings of choice grape varieties coming into bearing and with aging stocks increasing, the quality of California wines has improved steadily and earned the praise of international connoisseurs.

Once quality had been assured, California's vintners took new interest in marketing problems.

They discovered that even though they had recovered their former markets, only an extremely small segment of Americans used wine in any way.

America never had known or used wine extensively. The industry perceived that if Americans could be informed of the nature and uses of wines, millions would recognize and consume this oldest of natural mealtime beverages.

Therefore, in 1938, the winegrowers enlisted the assistance of the California Department of Agriculture and approved the first of the wine marketing orders which have been renewed continually.

The marketing order for wine is issued under the California Marketing Act, a law enabling agricultural industries to adopt marketing programs under State sponsorship.

The marketing order for wine is financed entirely by per-gallon assessments on California wines prepared for market. Funds are administered by the wine advisory board, composed of representative growers.

The wine advisory board conducts national educational, medical research, promotional, advertising, and general merchandising programs for the wines of California. Research and national publicity are carried out by the wine institute under contract to the wine advisory board.

During the past year indications were even more pronounced that the national promotion and publicity program were accomplishing their goals.

The evidence could be found in the increasing natural acceptance of wines as part of the American scene and wine's frequent, often matter of fact, use in mass media, films, books, advertisements and in the lives of those who mold the Nation's public opinion.

This everyday approach to wine is a significant stride toward the goal of the industry's public relations program.

Another yardstick to the success of the industry's public relations program is the ever-increasing consumption of California wine by the American public.

Though last year was a record year in shipments of California wine to market, indications point to 1965 being another banner year for California wines.

Wine has become so popular a beverage of moderation because at the bulk wine level the increment in prices has not kept pace with other common foods at the bulk level. The public can still buy wine without feeling a pinch in the budget.

The vintners of California have been able to increase their production while at the same time improving the quality of their wine. By degrees the American public is familiarizing itself with wine and is developing an educated palate. And our wine people know that production can only be maintained and increased through public demand.

There still remains a large untapped home market for wine, and efforts will be continued to expand this market. There is belief, too, that a market abroad could be stimulated in the years ahead, if current trade barriers can be removed.

In some areas of California there appears to be a necessity to search out and establish new acreages in those sections where population increases have been significant. This is particularly true where subdivisions and freeways have made inroads on once lush vineyards. Several wineries have purchased acreage in less-populated areas of the State and are planting vineyards. Soil and agricultural analysts are continually seeking new land suitable for planting of wine grapes to replace vineyards destined for freeways and homes.

Several of us in the Senate have long been concerned with the discriminatory rates levied against naturally sparkling and artificially carbonated wines. The present rates have been in effect since 1951 and are $3.40 per gallon for the naturally sparkling wines and $2.40 per gallon for the artificially carbonated wines, provided both contain not more than 14 percent of alcohol by volume. The $3.40 rate is 20 times the 17 cents per gallon rate which is levied on the same wine without the bubbles in it. This completely unreasonable formula goes back to the original levies in 1940 and has nothing to do with the excise taxes levied during the Korean war. The "20 times" formula has merely been continued with each successive tax increase with the resulting astronomical rate.

The wine industry, which is primarily located in California and New York, asks that these rates be reduced from $3.40 to $1 per gallon for the naturally sparkling wines and from $2.40 to $0.50 per gallon for the artificially carbonated wines. In testimony before the House

Committee on Ways and Means on July 31, 1964, Mr. Greyton H. Taylor, vice president of the Taylor Wine Co., in New York and then chairman of the Wine Conference of America, stated that the imposition of the $3.40 per gallon tax for naturally sparkling wines prevented normal sales growth, accounted for between one-third and one-half the price paid by the consumer for each bottle, exceeded the actual production cost by most producers, amounted to over five times the price the grower gets for his grapes and, as I have noted before, is 20 times the tax on light table wine which is substantially the same wine without carbonation. Sparkling wine sales represent less than 3 percent of the total United States wine sales. Mr. Taylor assured the House Committee on Ways and Means that:

> If Congress sees fit to reduce the present tax of $3.40 to $1 as we are suggesting, the retail price per bottle could be reduced by approximately $1.

On June 1, 1965, my colleague from California [Mr. MURPHY] and my colleagues from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KENNEDY] joined me in writing Senator BYRD regarding this arbitrary tax. I ask consent that this letter be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: It has come to our attention that the bill now pending in the House for general reduction of excise taxes does not, and will not, provide for any tax adjustments with regard to sparkling wines. These are nothing more than light table wines that have been made effervescent by natural or artificial carbonation.

The present rates on these products, in effect since 1951, are $3.40 per gallon for the naturally sparkling wines, and $2.40 per gallon for the artificially carbonated. The $3.40 rate is 20 times the 17 cents per gallon rate which is levied on the same wine without the bubbles in it.

The historical inequity of this wholly arbitrary "20 times" formula for sparkling wines has nothing to do with the Korean war excise tax levies. It goes back to the original levies in 1940. This discriminatory differential was merely continued when the special Korean war excise taxes were later placed on many commodities. This formula, repeatedly applied from 1940 through 1951, in successive tax increases, resulted in the present astronomical rates which are far higher than those of any other wine producing country, and exceed the cost of grapes, cellaring, packaging, and other production costs of these wines in this country.

The industry has proposed that the rates be reduced from $3.40 to $1 per gallon for the naturally sparkling wines, and from $2.40 to 50 cents per gallon for the artificially carbonated. We endorse this proposal for the following reasons:

1. The reduction would enable retail prices to be reduced by about $1 a bottle, resulting in a reasonable price structure of $1.50 to $2.50 per bottle for most brands instead of the presently prohibitive prices of $2.50 to $3.75 and even higher.

2. The new price structure will result in increased sales of a substantial amount and increased revenue to the Government. West Germany reduced its postwar sparkling wine tax of $3.60 per gallon down to $1.20 per gallon in 1952. Their revenue intake was completely restored in 2 years and by 1963 they were receiving more than four times the revenue they were getting in 1951. Thus the West German Government allowed its wine industry to create a new market for wine as well as a source of revenue for itself. Currently, sparkling wine accounts for between 15 and 20 percent of the sales of all wine in West Germany. The retail prices of sparkling wine there are about $1.50 to $2.50 a bottle.

3. In the United States, sparkling wine sales run only about 3 percent of the total. While they have increased to approximately 6 million gallons, this is only a fraction of their potential if the tax deterrent is removed. Retailer surveys here show that if the price of sparkling wine could be dropped by $1 per bottle (as the industry proposes) sales increases would restore the revenue in about 2 years. Since the sales in the United States for still light wines are definitely on the increase, this chance to allow the winegrowers to make a freer economic choice and to put a really substantial portion of their production into sparkling wines would shortly result in greater revenue to our Government.

The West German experience showed that by reducing the tax deterrent on these wines, the market for them was greatly expanded and any revenue loss which temporarily ensued was more than regained in a short period of time. The past and current tax policy of our country is an obvious deterrent to market expansion by our domestic wine industry in this particular area. Thus, we believe that the U.S. tax policy for naturally sparkling and artificially carbonated wines should be revised along the lines we have indicated and along the lines already taken with such success by West Germany. We, therefore, repectfully urge you and the members of the Senate Committee on Finance to give this problem your careful consideration during the hearings which will soon begin on excise tax revision.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,

THOMAS H. KUCHEL.
JACOB K. JAVITS.
ROBERT F. KENNEDY.
GEORGE MURPHY.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, today modern medical men and scientists recognize the values of alcoholic beverages and the dangers of their abuse. They are aware of the difference among these beverages. There is general agreement with Abraham Lincoln, who said:

> It has always been felt that the injury did not come from the use of a bad thing, but from the abuse of a good thing.

Last year some 144 million gallons of California wine were enjoyed by Americans. This represented about 80 percent of all wine consumed in the United States. In other words, four of every five bottles of wine which brightened a table in America, came from California and each carried a familiar county, city, or regional name. Each bottle, in other words, was an ambassador of good will for California.

Most people drink wine because they like it. They enjoy the taste and the way it makes their meals and parties more sociable and pleasurable. They are to some degree aware of the great historical significance and civilized acceptance of wine.

But there is more. Wine not only is enjoyable; under proper conditions it can be beneficial. Wine has been prescribed by physicians since before St. Paul wrote Timothy to "Drink no longer water but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake."

For all of these reasons I am sure my associates will want to join with me and the people of California to observe National Wine Week.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, when Padre Junipero Serra planted grapevines at Mission San Diego 200 years ago, he could not have known he was beginning what was to become California's leading fruit-growing industry.

Padre Serra and his Franciscan missionaries built a chain of 21 missions from San Diego northward to Sonoma in the famed Valley of the Moon, planting vines as they went. The wine produced from these vines was used to celebrate the mass and as a table beverage for the clerics and their guests.

The fathers were the first to discover California was a land especially favored for growing the classic vinifera wine grapes of the Old World. The first commercial wine growers learned from them and began planting their own vines in 1824. California's soil and sun prompted these commercial pioneers to send to Europe for cuttings of choice wine grapevines.

During the gold rush of 1849 many who found no nuggets turned instead to viticulture. The fortunate few who did discover gold helped create a demand for the wines produced by these new Californians.

In the second half of the 19th century some of California's most famous men were vintners. Builders of the west such as Gen. Mariano Vallejo, last Mexican military commandant of northern California; Leland Stanford, Governor, Senator and founder of Stanford University; Senator George Hearst, financier, publisher, and father of William Randolph Hearst; Senator James G. Fair and Judge John A. Stanly were proud producers of California wines.

With the completion of the first transcontinental railroad in 1869, California wines were shipped throughout the United States, and shortly thereafter were being exported. Before the turn of the century, California wines were winning awards in international competitions in this country and Europe.

By the beginning of World War I, grapes and wine in California were valued at $150 million. There were 330,000 acres of vineyards representing a land value of $66 million. The war, 14 years of prohibition, and World War II first cut back the industry, then limited growth, but wine production now is larger and growing faster than ever.

The California grape and wine industry represents an investment of more than $700 million. It has a peak employment each year of more than 110,000 persons, and is currently paying more than $75 million in excise taxes at the Federal and State levels.

California's half-million acres of vineyards produce an annual return to farmers of approximately $177 million. An average of more than 180 million gallons of wine is produced by more than 230 bonded wineries and wine cellars.

Approximately 80 percent of American wine is made in California.

The wines of California are grown in nine districts, four of which surround San Francisco, wine capital of America. They are the Sonoma-Mendocino, Napa Valley-Solano, Livermore Valley-Alameda and Santa Clara-San Benito districts. These relatively cool parts of the San Francisco Bay area are noted for red and white dinner wines and sparkling wines.

Just south of Santa Clara is the Santa Cruz-Monterey wine district. To the east, the Lodi district is the beginning of the central valley area which produces particularly fine dessert and appetizer wines. Below Lodi are the Modesto-Ripon-Escalon and Fresno-San Joaquin-Kern districts. Farthest south is the Cucamonga District, in a valley just east of Los Angeles. New grapes and techniques make it possible for vintners in these warmer areas to produce quality dinner wines in addition to their famous sweet wines and brandies.

More and more Americans are learning the pleasures of these wines of which California vintners have been so proud for eight generations—wines that have proven their quality in comparative tastings against more expensive foreign counterparts.

Mr. President, the California wine industry can, indeed, look ahead to a bright future as the citizens across our Nation and our friends in foreign countries more and more discover the quality of wine produced in the Golden State. California's wine is unexcelled anywhere. So with these thoughts in mind it is my pleasure to join my senior colleague Senator Kuchel in saluting National Wine Week, October 23–30, 1965.

PRIME MINISTER KY OF VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, when Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky took over as Prime Minister of Vietnam earlier this year, there were many who expressed grave doubts about the ability of this dashing young soldier to convert himself into the statesman-leader which Vietnam so desperately needs in this hour of crisis. No one doubted his intelligence and dedication or his courage. Their doubts were, rather, founded on his youth, his lack of political experience, and the fact that he was a military man rather than a civilian.

I therefore think it important to note that many of those on the spot who were skeptical about Ky as Prime Minister, are now beginning to have second thoughts and that some of them even concede the possibility that Ky may be the revolutionary leader the South Vietnamese people have been looking for.

On October 1, 1965, Prime Minister Ky made a remarkable speech, which in my opinion did not receive anything like the attention it merited.

I would like to quote a few paragraphs from this speech to my colleagues:

> After reviewing the situation I now present our policies for waging the revolutionary struggle and for building peace.
>
> We must ask ourselves, what the real character of the peace is which we are fighting to achieve, what kind of a society we must build. We must have a clear conception of the future of our country and not merely worry about the coming hundred days. We have to think about the thousand days ahead.
>
> During the next 1,000 days this land will have to be completely controlled by free men. We want to decide everything ourselves, to have friendly relations with neighboring countries, to live peacefully in the country which we have inherited from our fathers, in a nation where there is justice, on a land which is governed by men of integrity whose only ambition is to serve the people honestly and efficiently.
>
> The revolution which we are determined to carry out is a social revolution. Therefore in the next 1,000 days we have to create a big change in every field of activity of the people. We have to create a new life in the countryside, a new life in the cities, a promising new life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record at the conclusion of my remarks the complete text of Prime Minister Ky's speech of October 1, 1965.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech by Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, Prime Minister of the Republic of Vietnam

My fellow Vietnamese, my comrades in arms, the June 14, 1965, declaration of the armed forces clearly stated the reasons why the armed forces had to accept once again, the responsibility of leading the nation.

"Together," the declaration said, "we will renovate this society and build a new Vietnam. Together, we will lead the people toward progress in all fields to keep the pace with the progress of mankind. We have the duty of bequeathing to the future generations glorious pages of history and solid constitution, based on freedom, justice, and brotherhood love."

Today, Tohmwr, on the occasion of our 3-month leadership tenure, with the agreement of the directory, as the commissioner in charge of the executive, I present to our fellow Vietnamese and comrades in arms a report on the general policy of the government concerning the current problems facing our nation.

My fellow Vietnamese, my comrades in arms, on November 1, 1963, the armed forces of the Republic of Vietnam overthrew the Ngo Dinh Diem regime, starting a revolution which the people entire have been longing for. The collapse of the Ngo Dinh Diem regime, was the inevitable consequence of the long treason of a regime deeply engaged in the path of dictatorship, corruption and brutality. The armed forces could not tolerate the Diem regime, the more so because this regime was deliberately using while already on the decline, the armed forces as a tool, not to protect national freedom and independence against foreign invasion but only to suppress the people's just aspirations.

The revolution sparked on November 1, 1963, was a spontaneous revolution. This revolution was ignited not by any individual or group or representatives of any political doctrine, social class or economic force, but was a revolution of the people of which the armed forces are the vanguard elements.

The whole people rose up to start the revolution, in order to oust a reactionary regime, in the hope of building a new regime capable of preserving and developing the innate rights of human beings, the rights to live to be free and to enjoy happiness. These rights are the very force that motivated the November 1, 1963, revolution and drove the Vietnamese people to fight against the Communist aggressors.

Because the November 1, 1963, revolution was a self-sparking one, it had the advantage of tolerating no other dictatorial trend to thrive and inherit the Ngo Dinh Diem regime. It neither tolerated the opportunist elements, who were self-styled "revolutionists" and wanted to usurp high-ranking positions in the government to only enjoy privileges. It is also because the November 1, 1963, revolution was a self-sparking one, that it entailed bad consequence, that was the creation of a state of laxity quickly turned into a state of confusion interfering in all branches of national activities. Those who were in power in the wake of the revolution could not live up to their responsibilities. What is worse, most of them dared not assume responsibilities because of the moral handicap resulting from their "close connections with the ousted regime." Instead of guiding the mass toward order to help stabilize the situation, they indulged in demagogy and promptly surrendered to pressure from the masses.

The result was that not only the dictator was overthrown along with the elimination of all of his close assistants, but the entire administrative machinery from the central government down to the regional administration was shaken and a number of agencies dislocated. Even the armed forces—an organization bound by the strongest discipline—would have been dislocated had the general officers commanding the different armed services, corps and large units not shown a strong will or made extraordinary efforts to preserve its integrity.

In the ensuing protracted disorder, the subsequent governments were overthrown by the people although some of these governments were headed by statesmen with good will and who enjoyed the confidence of people from one group or another.

In the face of this internal situation of the Republic of Vietnam, how did the Red imperialists and their lackeys in Hanoi regard us? What maneuvers did they carry out in an attempt to conquer this free land?

My fellow Vietnamese, comrades in arms, be calm while I tell you the assessments made by the lackeys of the Red imperialism in Hanoi on our situation and their maneuvers to exploit this situation.

In his report made early this year of the situation in the south, Nguyen Van Vinh, an honorary brigadier general of the North Vietnamese armed forces, who holds the functions of the chairman of a committee in charge of the aggression against the south, assessed our military and political situations as follows:

About the military situation, Nguyen Van Vinh reported that our rear "shrunk in proportion with the dislocation of thousands of strategic hamlets and outposts"; our military strength became "more and more insufficient, the morale of our troops but at the same time we had to use about 45 percent of our regular troops to defend Saigon and Cholon"; our strategic reserve forces are "almost insignificant" and for this reason their defensive as well as offensive potentials are hardly used. In his conclusion, the chairman of the Aggressive Committee Against the South affirmed that (I quote his words): "Decidedly unavoidably there will be a wretched collapse of the morale and of the organization of the South Vietnamese armed forces when the striking force of our troops (Communist aggressors) becomes more aggressive."

About our political situation, the chairman of the Aggressive Committee reported that the November 1, 1963, revolution was but a "trick" and, "internal conflicts in the south are spreading fast and developing in a very intricate way." The report reads: "In the political field, the tricky democratic revolution of the enemy (the North Vietnamese Communists consider our entire armed forces and people as their enemy) after the overthrow of Ngo Dinh Diem had to end briefly after the replacement of Minh by Khanh. Faced with our fighting strength and their own internal conflicts, several coups d'etat succeeded. This situation reflects itself in the division of the various groups in the south into indifferent and most extremist groups. The latter group is represented by the young generals. Furthermore this situation also showed disaccord in questions about personal interests and positions, about parties, religions, Buddhism, Catholicism, about regions of the country, the north, the center and the south and about personal hatred."

With such an assessment of our situation it is obvious that the Red imperialists and their lackeys in Hanoi had to order the Vietcong in the south to strive to exploit this situation. In fact, during the past 2 years and till now, the Red imperialists have been sending troops from the north into the south to help the Vietcong to move from guerrilla warfare to mobile warfare in order to carry out large scale attacks. The Communist imperialists had been and are striving to make use of all wicked maneuvers to sow dissension among us and to aggravate this dissension.

Along with military offensive waves, and political upsettings, the Communist imperialists also conducted severe sabotage against our economy. They ordered their henchmen to destroy bridges, cut off roads, and lay mines to prevent the transport of supplies from the cities to rural areas, and to strive to grab agricultural products from the tillers, and from farmers and fishermen money derived from the sales of fowl and fish. The ultimate aim of the Communist imperialists was to use every means to lift the price of rice in Saigon in the middle of this year from VN$700 to VN$5,000 a quintal, to make the cost of living in the cities to soar fivefold, even tenfold. They hoped that with the soar of the living cost, the anger of the people, especially of the poor, at the government would increase drastically, thus leading the society to the awful disintegrating state such as they have always longed for.

Simultaneously with their offensive waves against the Republic of Vietnam in the military, political, and economic fields inside our national territory, the Communist imperialists also attacked us on the international scene through the propaganda. Propaganda machineries from 81 Communist Parties throughout the world, along with thousands of their agencies, doubled their venomous efforts with the hope of severing the Republic of Vietnam from its allies, and misrepresenting our struggle for the safeguard of freedom and national independence. Their propaganda offensive on the international scene against the Republic of Vietnam has achieved a certain influence in a small number of countries which are under the pressure of Communist imperialists, but this Communist offensive, was indeed also, a powerful stimulation for the civilized world, which help us to be more determined than ever to assist our country.

Facing the danger, that is, the Republic of Vietnam could be engulfed by the Communist imperialisms aggressive machinery, all the friendly countries together increased their aid for us, both morally and materially. At the request of the Republic of Vietnam, the Governments of the United States, the Republic of Korea, Australia, and New Zealand have sent their military units to help us. Following a legitimate self-defense plan, and very moderately, the Vietnam Air Force and the U.S. Air Force have successfully bombed enemy military bases, staging areas, army barracks and supply depots in North Vietnam.

Until the middle of this year, the presence of military units from friendly countries, along with the bombing of a number of military bases and logistical means of the Communists on both sides of the demarcation line, have not helped us to drive off the Red imperialists' aggression yet. The strikes, however, prevented the Communists—despite the large troops from the north equipped with great firepower—from changing the balance of forces.

Since last June, the situation would have been more consolidated if the Republic of Vietnam had not, once again, met with internal difficulties. On June 11, politicians, temporarily in charge of administering national institutions, were unable to find appropriate measures to solve their differences. So, they handed their powers to the armed forces. In accepting these responsibilities, the armed forces clearly defined the reasons and objectives of the military government which were the organization of the struggle against the Communist aggression until final victory and the implementation of a social revolution.

A provisional convention, establishing basic structures for the national organization, was promulgated by the national leadership committee.

Entrusted with the task of organizing the administrative machinery and implementing the policy of the NIC, the Government immediately at the setting up of the war cabinet, announced a program including 26 points on urgent tasks covering all fields: War and politics, economy and finance, social welfare, education and culture, foreign affairs.

The war and revolutionary policies of the national leadership committee and the program of the Government are basically correct. That is why they brought forth a great enthusiasm among the entire population. During the past 100 days, the implementation of the policy and the implementation of the program have progressed and recorded a number of tangible results.

In the military domain, we have warded off the Vietcong monsoon offensive; in simpler words, we have smashed all offensive attempts which the Vietcong had carefully prepared long in advance, with the hope of launching them on their commemorative days in August and September.

The Vietcong, hidden in their most solid dens from Ba Long in Quang Tri Province, through the zone "D," to the Duoc Forest in Ca Mau, have throughly been swept out by our forces. Meantime, nearly 2 Communist battalions, mostly infiltrated from the north, and lying near Chu Lai in Quang Tin Province left behind over 600 bodies following attacks by units of the Vietnamese and U.S. forces.

That week, the Communist invasion troops Moqukuri A divisioned force for a new attack in Binh Dinh Province with the hope of rebuilding their pressure in the region. However, the Government forces, with the courageous cooperation of local population, launched an operation that killed 1,350 of them.

With the gallant cooperation of navy, army, air, artillery and engineer units of the United States, Republic of Korea, Australia and New Zealand, not only have we preserved all important bases along the coast of central Vietnam, extended government-controlled areas, guarded our frontier-defense network within which Duc Co is is an isolated outpost; not only we launch many attacks to destroy the enemy strongholds, and retake initiative in every battlefront, we also cleared many strategic communication axes which were closed for many years. All these decisive victories emphasize the outstanding efforts of the armed forces and have turned the tide of the war in a very short time. What is this driving power that has enabled us to score such lightning military feats?

My dear fellow countrymen and comrades in arms, it is the new incentive of the revolution spirit which is burning in the hearts of our people and our armed forces, which are backed by the entire free world.

In the economic and financial fields, a number of measures have been carried out in the framework of an urgent action program. These measures aimed at laying foundations for real social revolution which includes:

The elimination of dishonest businessmen.

The stabilization of market prices.

The supply of food goods from rural areas to the cities and vice versa, so as to supply the villagers with first necessity goods in their daily life.

The setting up of security stocks to prevent shortage of foodstuffs.

The establishment of agencies responsible for the purchase, storage and distribution of rice.

The implementation of the housing policy, to improve the housing situation of the needy.

The construction of 1,000 low-cost houses, each house costing $20,000 and to be distributed to the working class. The purchase of vacant plots of land to resell them to the needy people who will themselves build their houses, after providing such basic structures as roads, sewers, water and electricity. The promulgation of the right to stay and priority to purchase house and land. The import of 100 cars, 200 trilambrettas, other kinds of vehicles and spare parts for taxicabs in order to make owners a number of taxi drivers and at the same time give them appropriate means for the exercise of their profession. The interruption of export of some products necessary for consumption needs of the population at home. The improvement of education, by building more schools, and abolishing noon shifts at primary schools to protect the pupils health. The improvement of wage status by increasing the salary of low-income employees, including the troops, and reducing that of a number of other government employees, with the view of mitigating somehow the differences among peoples of various social strata. The setting up of military dependent quarters, etc.

Concerning the promulgating of a new customs tariff, the government aims at levying heavy taxes on luxury goods to increase the national income, thus enabling the government to carry out social welfare programs to help the poor, and at the same time avoiding all shortages of goods for other classes having great consumption abilities.

Along with the above-mentioned objective, the life of the rural population also receive particular attention from the government which has decided to:

Much forward the improvement of living standards in rural areas.

Modify the status of farmers' associations.

Improve the land policy by amending the agrarian reform decree-law aiming at assisting farmers and making tillers owners of their lands.

Grant full ownership to the farmers immediately after the distribution of land plots instead of provisional certificates as previously.

Besides, farmers are exempted from land taxes during whole period they have to pay for the purchase of their ricefield—within a maximum period of 12 years—and at the same time, authorized to postpone the payment of their first installment for 1 year.

More than that, public lands and ricefields will be from now on distributed directly to farmers instead of renting them on bid as previously.

Ricefields, bought from French proprietors according to the September 10, 1958, totaling about 224,647 hectares, and scatterings in 27 provinces, will be sold to farmers on the same basis.

Other intellectuals and experts and even some statesmen—either those who had learned bitter experiences in the political arena or those who had long waited for occasions to cooperate with the Government—have given signs of impatience. The attitude of these intellectuals, experts, and statesmen has more or less influenced the mass that had, in the past, recourse to pressure.

I deem it necessary to tell to the entire people and my comrades in arms that the National Leadership Committee, although being busy with many problems, has always paid appropriate attention to all diverging views, either moderate or violent. I also deem it necessary to make it clear once again that state affairs are not the monopoly of any individual or group and that the destiny of the nation needs the moral and material contribution of all people actively engaged in the struggle and constructive works.

In brief, the general situation has been greatly improved. Three months ago, while accepting the power we had said we envisaged a new dawn for the people, we, at that time, only expressed a feeling. Now, in reviewing the obstacles we have surmounted, certainly our compatriots and comrades-in-arms agree with us that this brighter dawn for our people is not a mere utopia but a reality awaiting us. All the past difficulties are not liquidated, and more serious new ones may appear, because the nearer it is approaching final defeat, the more dangerous the enemy prove to be. However, we are confident that our compatriots, military and civilian, have all the necessary energy and determination to overcome these difficulties and, will be able to conduct step by step, our people toward this dawn.

In the land reforms policy, the legalization of the ownership rights on the lands put under cultivation and the distribution of ownership certificates to the peasants in accordance with the policy of making the laborers the owners of the lands they till, have been achieved. The above certificates have been distributed for the first time in Lac Nghiep (Tuyen Duc) on September 18, 1965, to 349 families of lowland and Montagnard peasants and in Dau Bong (Tay Nih) to 200 other families. Other certificates will be distributed in the future.

It is worth recalling that the land reform policy is being extended to all ethnic minorities living on the national territory and there is no discrimination between the lowland people and the tribesmen. To promulgate many measures and implement a policy based on justice, and reason, and aimed at achieving the objective of national union and collective social progress.

All the aforesaid measures and decisions certainly are not routine administrative ones.

Furthermore, they will not be demagogy measures.

The fact that the war cabinet has decided to take social revolution as the motto of the struggle, and has realized that the people in both urban and rural areas have equal responsibilities and are entitled to equal privileges, proves that the above-mentioned decisions and measures are constant with the overall national policy.

Of course, we need time to assess the results of these measures and to see whether they will be useful to the social revolution which constitutes the very objective of our struggle.

Nevertheless, if we commonly realize that these are things that should be done, to lay lasting foundations to the social revolution, we must first be animated with confidence and faith.

In the political field, the implementation of our action program has yielded clear results in the rural areas. In many western provinces in the southern area, the working people now can easily move from an area to another even in nighttime. In I corps area provinces, people who, a year ago were forced by the Vietcong terrorism and oppression to abandon all their properties and move elsewhere for security, are now actively planning a back-home movement to liberate their own villages from the Vietcong and rebuild them. The "return to village" campaign instigated by the anti-Communist refugees in Quang Ngai gathered has about 400 cadres and fighters in the first formation stage and has begun action since late August, in other areas, especially in the valley of the Mekong, the people are nurturing the same aspiration and are ready to launch similar campaigns.

All told, the results in the political field are still of a limited scale because of the too cautious and unbalanced way of implementing the program. The major institutions planned in the provisional charter such as the economic and social councils, and the high magistrate council, have not been set up yet. This has caused a number of intellectuals in the cities to conceive deep concern and the suspicion that the Armed Forces wanted to establish a military dictatorship. Another segment of people may have have been induced to think that the military administration contented itself with trumpeting over revolution without seeking to materialize it or with realizing it only in part.

After reviewing the situation I now present our policies for waging the revolutionary struggle and for building peace.

We must ask ourselves what the real character of the peace is which we are fighting to achieve, what kind of a society we must build. We must have a clear conception of the future of our country and not merely worry about the coming 100 days. We have to think about the 1,000 days ahead.

During the next 1,000 days this land will have to be completely controlled by freemen. We want to decide everything ourselves, to have friendly relations with neighboring countries, to live peacefully in the country which we have inherited from our fathers, in a nation where there is justice, on a land which is governed by men of integrity whose only ambition is to serve the people honestly and efficiently.

The revolution which we are determined to carry out is a social revolution. Therefore in the next 1,000 days we have to create a big change in every field of activity of the people. We have to create a new life in the countryside, a new life in the cities, a promising new life.

Many multistoried buildings have been built not only in the capital, but also in Can Tho, Nha Trang, Da Nang, and are being built in many other cities. In the capital, Le Loi Boulevard is filled with cars. But not far from the big buildings, there are still many slums, there are still thousands of homes where parents and children are crowded into a dark and damp area of barely 10 square meters. And further away, outside the cities, there are tens of thousands of families who all year long labor in the black mud and yet have as their only shelter a rundown hut to protect them from rain and sun. They do not have enough to eat, they have no decent clothing and neither doctor nor medicines when they are sick. On top of all that, these people are afraid of arrogant officials on our side and also of the Communist enemy.

We have the duty not to allow the children who are today without clothes, who are today illiterate, to grow up and continue to live for ever a dark life, in misery, in oppression, in injustice. That is why, within the greater framework of the social revolution, we have to start first with the realization of the living standard revolution.

Unlike the Communists whose policy is to bring all those having unequal living standards down to the lowest level, we are striving to carry out a social revolution which never stops aiming at raising the living standard of all the people, starting with the poorest. Looking at reality, even if we accept as the standard wage the minimum guaranteed salary of the worker recently fixed by the war cabinet at 1,070 piasters per month for areas where the cost of living is lowest, there are still millions of people living under that standard. These are the peasants who do not have enough land to till and would not have enough to eat if they sold part of their produce to buy clothes or medicine. These are also the ambulant merchants on the pavements of the cities and towns.

It was within the framework of the living standard revolution that the war cabinet based the pay and family allowances of the soldiers. We are reviewing the pay scale of all those who are serving in other branches of activities. We have yet to review the price of farm products. We also have to adequately provide for the housing, health, and educational needs of all, especially those living in the cities. In short, if we begin to carry out the living standard revolution today, with concrete projects and step-by-step preparation, 1,000 days from today, we shall certainly be able to create a big change for the better on this land.

That is why I believe that every 100 days we have to make up a list of realizations in which we shall not only enumerate what we have done, but above all we must review our achievements, and even more important, we shall have to review what we have not done and do it at all costs.

As of today, I put emphasis on the governmental activities aiming at fighting corruption and at reviving the good Vietnamese traditions of government based on moral foundations, in respect of the law and justice. First of all, in the coming 100 days I shall personally look for people whose experiences and integrity are beyond reproach to for a central corps of inspectors in charge of investigating all complaints on injustices as to help the government take timely corrective measures. I solemnly promise that, as of today, those who are responsible for serving the people will have to pay for their crimes if they commit the crime of betraying the confidence of the people. For a long time, on this land, the honest little man has been oppressed by those detaining authority. A Nation cannot exist if there is no justice for everyone.

For a long time, no consideration has been given to the aspiration of the peasants who make up the backbone of the country. (Our peasants have always lived in insecurity because they have been exploited, terrorized.) Our peasants have to live utter misery because they are the first victims of the utterly unequal distribution of wealth, of profiteering, and of inflation. The peasants lack all the basic necessities of a worthy life. The war has disturbed their peaceful life, and their labor has not been adequately rewarded. The war and its instigators—the Vietcong—have upset the moral norms, have destroyed the law and justice. Many people in the countryside have lost faith in the Government and lost faith in themselves. I prescribe that this Government has the responsibility to regain the people's confidence and support.

As I have made clear earlier, at present the armed forces, with the limitless assistance of friendly countries, have realized important changes in the military field. We are destroying the aggressive machinery of the Communists on this and the other side of the parallel. Continuing to take advantage of these successes, we shall completely destroy the entire apparatus of aggression of the Communists. Victory is on our side. Militarily, we shall certainly have victory in a not distant future.

But it is not enough to militarily defeat the Communists. We must do so that on this land the Communists do not have any reason to be among the people, especially among the people of the countryside. This is the task of pacification and rural reconstruction. Emphasizing the importance of this task in a very short sentence: The countryside is the decisive factor in the entire battlefield. Consequently I mobilize all the existing cadres to serve in the pacification and rural reconstruction programs. These cadres will go to the countryside and together with the peasants they will fight to defend the villages, they will help the peasants to till the land and increase production, improve agricultural techniques, raise the living standard of the peasant in every way. They will help the peasants to reorganize the village administration, to realize a democratic way of life at the village level and lay the solid foundations for a free and democratic regime in the future. The pacification and rural reconstruction not only require many facilities and many cadres, it also demands that those cadres have determination and ability. I truthfully say that in the existing administration there are not yet such cadres in sufficient numbers. That is why I earnestly hope that all the fighters in all the patriotic movements who are rich in experience will actively participate in this big and meaningful task. Pacification and rural reconstruction which bring a new organized life to 80 percent of our people, should in my opinion be the responsibility of all of you, the revolutionary fighters. And now you have the favorable conditions, the facilities that are more abundant than ever before, to successfully carry out this responsibility.

Meanwhile, the government has in mind another program of another kind, a program aiming to restore the citizenship to those who took the wrong direction, considering their own self more important than the nation. I will give them a certain time so they can get aid of the responsibility which they realize is not worthwhile. After self-criticism, they will be employed according to their capacity.

As before I used to say, we, Vietnamese people, tend to forgive. Let us forgive those who went the wrong way, give them the opportunity to become new human beings. On the contrary, to those who do not admit this opportunity, I pity them, because to me, they are mentally deranged by birth, but forming obstacles to the development of the nation.

During my visits to rural areas, it was heart rending to see that my compatriots there became victims of the increasing cost of living and were suffering from being in short of the the first necessities. If this situation was created by goods hoarders, the government will bring the convicts before the court which surely will punish them severely. Besides, the shortage of goods will undoubtedly be solved satisfactorily, thanks to the government efforts and the timely assistance of friendly countries.

The Government will find out efficient means to stabilize the market prices, the most important of them is the method of uniting producers and consumers into relationships benefiting to both of them. In the transportation field, the Government is always ready to provide necessary means, and if this still cannot meet the needs, it will request assistance from allied countries at the proper time. In brief, all necessary steps for the normalization of supplies so that people throughout the country could buy goods and materials at a reasonable price, have always been a great concern for the Government.

Finally, we must affirm once again the struggle of people against the Communist aggressors. My dear compatriots and comrades-in-arms are certainly aware that if this country falls under the Communist yoke, our nation would be annihilated. The Vietcong, like any other Communist groups, are acting on the international Communist organization's orders which is, in fact, the most fearful imperialism of human history. Communist imperialism disseminates a doctrine using hatred as driving power which creates dissension inside a government as well as inside every family. The most important aspect of communism is that it is antinatural and atheist.

That is why I appeal to my compatriots from all faiths to unite closely and, along with the whole people and Armed Forces, fight against that foreign sophism which destroy the family and exterminate the nation at the same time with the most sacred confidence of our people.

The sooner the entire population is united, the sooner we restore peace in this land, and the more closely we unite, the stronger our national force will be.

United, we will create a lasting bulwark insuring justice for the society, freedom for the people, and democracy throughout the country.

My best regards to you all my dear compatriots and comrades-in-arms.

SCOUTING AWARD TO JUDGE C. C. CHAMBERS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, an editorial in the Saturday Evening Post in November 1960, commemorated the golden anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America, the organization granted a Federal charter by Congress, by pointing out that the Boy Scout movement is one of America's most effective—as well as oldest—forces against juvenile delinquency.

The long service with the Boy Scouts of America by Judge C. C. Chambers of Logan, W. Va., is testimony to his belief in their program to strengthen America, and testimony that scouting can make the difference between a Nation with many youths of strong character and a Nation indifferent to a constant rise in juvenile delinquency. For this service, he has recently been honored by the award of the Silver Antelope. An account of the ceremonies at which this volunteer scouting award was presented to Judge Chambers was published in the Friday, October 15, issue of the Logan Banner.

I ask unanimous consent to have this newspaper article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL JUDGE GIVEN HIGH SCOUT HONOR

Judge C. C. Chambers, a veteran Scouter of more than 30 years, was awarded the Silver Antelope at noon today during region four ceremonies in the Netherland Hilton Hotel in Cincinnati, Ohio.

The Silver Antelope is the highest volunteer award a Scouter may receive within the region. Judge Chambers is the first Scouter from the Chief Cornstalk Council ever to be presented with the Scouting honor. The region includes West Virginia, Ohio, and Kentucky.

A life member of the region four committee, Judge Chambers has served many years as a national council representative. He has traveled through the entire region inspecting camps and camping facilities and performing other Scouting chores. He rarely has missed a national council meeting, to which he pays his own expenses.

Chambers has served as judge of the Seventh Judicial Circuit of West Virginia since 1936. He is a member of the Logan County Bar Association, West Virginia Bar Association, West Virginia Bar, Juvenile Court Judges Association, West Virginia Judicial Association, and is a past president of the latter organization.

A trustee and member of the board of stewards at Neighborhood Memorial Methodist Church in Logan, Judge Chambers has been a Bible class teacher for 20 years. He is a member of all Masonic bodies and was coronetted an inspector general honorary 33d degree Mason.

Chambers has served Scouting in many ways during the past 30 years. Among the positions he has held are merit badge counselor, Logan district committee chairman, member of the council executive board, member of the region four committee, national council representative, served as president of the council for 5 years, holder of the Silver Beaver Award, and is presently finance chairman of the council, a member of the camp development committee, and chairman of the new service center building committee.

In addition to Judge Chambers, those attending the region four conference are Council President Alfred Newland of Man, and Mrs. Newland; C. B. Kelly, Logan district commissioner; Council Finance Chairman J. T. Fish and Mrs. Fish; Scout Executive Robert Justice and Mrs. Justice; and Mrs. C. C. Chambers.

STUDENT PAYS TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DIRKSEN OF ILLINOIS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, a unique tribute to our capable minority leader has been written by an admirer who has never met Senator DIRKSEN personally but, like us, his colleagues, has grown to admire and respect him.

This young lady is Mrs. Sandy Flint who was born in Chicago and who grew up in California. She has attended the University of California at Los Angeles where she was a member of the staff of the student newspaper, appeared in school plays and was accepted into membership in the Original Writing Club.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that her tribute to Senator DIRKSEN be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FORBEARING IMAGE OF EVERETT DIRKSEN

(By Sandy Flint)

INTRODUCTION TO A GREAT MAN—EVERETT DIRKSEN

Funny, but still conservative in his morals of right from wrong is just a mere phase of the vivid personality of EVERETT DIRKSEN.

His humorous approaches to complex items of importance secludes the drastic force with which the item is.

Hide not, for DIRKSEN in his manner of sweet forbearance will strike softly and still leave an air of sweetness in the background.

Attired in contemporary but sophisticated dress, DIRKSEN storms through the Senate as if all is in an uproar, but still furtively at peace.

Rise, oh rise my dear ones, for a strong and compassionate being has made his unforgettable debut. Seek not to understand his mores, but hasten to improve upon yours. For he will always shine gloriously among all humanity.

His intentness to accomplish engulfs one in an array of astonishment. Failing to comprehend his intent emotions, one fails to obtain and visualize the true adversities of life.

DIRKSEN, DIRKSEN, my foe, all is yet to be gained. Stick adamantly to the principles and mores given to you and all will sing in praise, the forbearing image of Everett Dirksen.

SENATOR TOWER'S DEFENSE OF THE RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Tyler Courier-Times-Telegraph, of Tyler, Tex., in an excellent recently published editorial, called attention to the very effective participation by the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] in defense of the right to work.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Senator Tower Helped Save the Freedom-To-Work Law," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Tower Helped Save the Freedom-To-Work Law

The Senate's action to shelve for this year a bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act has been described as a " major victory" for the people of the United States.

This description would seem especially appropriate for the people of Texas who have clearly expressed the desire to see section 14(b), which gives inidvidual States the right to outlaw compulsory union membership, retained.

It also would seem especially appropriate for Senator John Tower of Texas who has been among the leaders in the fight to retain this vital section of the Taft-Hartley Act.

All Texas right-to-work regulations have been arrived at in such a manner that every action taken on the matter by the legislature has been with a great deal of consideration and developed to reflect the total opinion of the people.

Ever since last November, the Washington union bosses have stated over and over again that repeal of section 14(b) was their No. 1 legislative objective for 1965. An administration sympathetic to their aims continually referred to the repeal bill as "must" legislation, despite a clear expression from most States in the Union, including States which do not have right-to-work laws, that a majority of the people favored retention of the section.

This attitude of the administration reflected a complete reversal in the thinking of President Lyndon Johnson on this matter since he had many times in the past been one of the most vocal defenders of the Taft-Hartley law.

Since he has done it once on the Taft-Hartley matter, perhaps the President might reconsider again and return to his former views which are shared by a clear majority of the people.

Senator Tower, in his leadership on this subject, has been an able spokesman for a majority of Texans as they have expressed their views on right to work laws.

Here are some of the things he has had to say on the matter:

"I agree with some who say the words 'right to work' are perhaps a misnomer. It should be, in my opinion, 'freedom to work.' Freedom to work without being forced to join a union or pay tribute to a union, or to any other organization of working men with which the individual worker does not happen to agree;

"Freedom to secure a job on his own ability and to hold that job by virtue of his capacity to perform; freedom to work with a measure of happiness fully realizing that his future depends entirely upon his own capacity.

"This is what right to work means. It is the freedom to work as rapidly or as slowly as one wishes and to go the extra mile if desired in an effort to advance. It means the freedom to choose one's employer, to secure a job, and to hold that job by virtue of one's own ability.

"If I were a laboring man in industry, I would want the privilege of joining, and I probably would join, a labor union. But, I would not want to be compelled to do so. I would want the right to join, if I thought it were in my interest to do so. I would also want the right to refrain from joining, or to resign my membership, should I believe the union was failing to represent my best interests."

Senator Tower added that "our Government should not change from one based upon the principle of government 'of the people by the people and for the people' to one based on the concept of government of the favored few, by the favored few and for the favored few."

Our conclusion from the thoughtful views which he readily exresses on this and on all other subjects of vital interest to our country and our people is that the majority of Texans, regardless of party brands or hard party lines, are being extremely well represented on all legislative subjects at the national level by Senator John Tower.

This brings to mind the Senator's statement when he visited in Tyler recently that he has not decided on whether or not to run for reelection.

Since Senator Tower has not announced his intentions as yet, it might be a good idea for the people interested in the issues and interested in having continued the competent legislative leadership he has exhibited in Congress, to urge him to run again.

Senator Tower has provided a majority of Texans with the type of representation they desire. This should be the uppermost consideration of any candidate when voting time comes regardless of the party label he may wear.

Texans should respond by letting Senator Tower know they are interested in seeing his type of representation continued.

GPO SITE SELECTION SHOULD BE DENIED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last year and again this summer I objected strongly to the construction of a new Government Printing Office at a cost to the taxpayer of at least $50 million and perhaps a great deal more.

A thorough investigation has convinced me that the plans for the proposed new building were hastily slapped together and inadequately justified. Furthermore, these plans completely overlooked the possibility of saving substantial sums of money by contracting out more of the Government's printing needs to private industry. I am glad to say my colleagues on the Legislative Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee agreed with me and decided to postpone any appropriation of funds for a new Government Printing Office for at least 1 year.

One of the facts that led me to believe this proposal had not been given sufficient study was the game of musical chairs being played in determining the site of the proposed new Printing Office. At first GPO stated, before the House Appropriations Committee, that the Government-owned Bolling-Anacostia site was an ideal location for the building. When it turned out that the Defense Department would not release the site, GPO did a quick about-face and decided to justify the building of a new Government Printing Office on the site of the National Training School for Boys. I want to emphasize that it took GPO only 1 month to change their plans to the second site.

The foolishness of such hasty action was demonstrated clearly by a recent editorial in the Washington Post which states in no uncertain terms that, and I quote:

> Washington cannot afford 85 acres of open land for a new Government Printing Office.

The editorial goes on to point out that the land at the training school site is too precious to use for a spread-out one-level operation. The savings which GPO claims for a one-level site, the editorial points out, does not take into account the high value of this urban land. Again in the words of the editorial.

> If a true value is put on the land for the Printing Office, the case for an 85-acre tract vanishes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, which also points out the problem of slippery subsurface clay and a costly railroad overpass at the training school site, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Keep Looking

Washington cannot afford 85 acres of open land for a new Government Printing Office. The land is needed desperately for housing, schools and parks. The National Training School site is unique. There is no other undeveloped tract in the city large enough for an entire new town with all of the facilities that it requires.

But there are other places where the Printing Office might be put equally well. Mr. Louchheim and his subcommittee are altogether right in advising their colleagues on the Planning Commission to continue their search for an alternative.

Each succeeding week has brought new reasons against building the Printing Office on the Training School site. Now it appears that a peculiarly slippery subsurface clay would require any industrial plant to have elaborate and very expensive foundations. Earlier it had developed that the price of the railroad overpass is not accounted in the cost estimates. Economy no longer argues for the Training School site.

The Printing Office belongs in the city, close to Congress and to the executive agencies that it serves. Like any other industry in the heart of a large city, it cannot be built on one level, with unlimited parking for its employees. The Printing Office claims that a one-level operation will save money; but the savings appear only through the accountant's trick of valuing federally owned land at nothing. Land is not valueless simply because the Government owns it. If a true value is put on the land for the Printing Office, the case for an 85-acre tract vanishes. At the Training School, a great many other public purposes take precedence over parking lots for the Printing Office.

THE KENNEDY ROUND NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, there has been a good deal of talk within the past 2 weeks that the United States may negotiate with the major trading nations other than the members of the European Economic Community in the Kennedy round trade talks now taking place in Geneva. According to the rumors, the United States would negotiate seriously with the Common Market countries only after their own internal policy debates have been settled.

According to my colleague on the Joint Economic Committee, Representative Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri, no such change in the U.S. position has taken place. Congressman Curtis is a member of the team of congressional negotiators for the GATT talks and has kept in close touch with the progress of the negotiations.

An article in the St. Louis Globe Democrat of October 14, 1965, gives Congressman Curtis' views on the matter as well as his opinion that the outlook for the talks are not as bleak as many persons in Washington seem to think. I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to be included in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Globe, Oct. 14, 1965]

Ignore France? No Easy Task—Vital in Trade Talks

(By Peter B. Greenough)

Europe has been chewing on a hot rumor these last few days—that the United States may be contemplating an end-run around France in the Kennedy round trade talks at Geneva.

The Washington Post started it. The idea, as the Post postulated things, is that we would go ahead and negotiate with other major trading nations and leave the door ajar for the European Economic Community (Common Market) countries to hop aboard later on, once their own internal scrapping had been settled.

Intriguing cocktail talk notion, except for a couple of practical realities.

First, in all our trade relationships there is a key item called the "most favored nation" clause. What it means is that the duties we apply on goods from one major exporting nation apply equally to imports from other sources.

By law, therefore, any two-tiered tariff arrangement would be illegal.

Then, too, the basic aim of the Kennedy round is to knock down Common Market trade barriers. A strange way it would indeed be to let EEC's duties rise and others fall; the whole ball of wax might unravel.

Moreover, any such move—altogether too crass a piece of diplomatic pressure for any civilized nation—would also represent a major shift in U.S. trade strategy.

No such change has been made, and the authority for this is Congressman Thomas B. Curtis, Republican of Missouri, the one Member of Congress who has kept a constant grasp on the Kennedy round's pulse.

Curtis took to the House floor yesterday to knock down the notion anyone is trying to bypass Paris.

To illustrate how ridiculous this notion is in the first place, consider a remark made to the Globe recently by Otmar Emminger, member of the governing board of West Germany's Central Bank.

In view of the fact that Germany, the United States, and other members of the so-called Group of Ten managed to establish a prop for the British pound without France's help, we asked Emminger if it might be carried further, to the point that a new international monetary setup could be arranged without France's presence?

Emminger vigorously denied it.

By like token, you can apply this same reasoning to the Kennedy Round. Increasing of trade and provision for more liquidity (or funds to support trade, in this case) are like Mike 'n Ike. Nothing meaningful could possibly be achieved without France.

Representative Curtis presently is less optimistic about the Kennedy round's successful outcome than he was last May while visiting Geneva. Nevertheless, he has not reached the degree of despair we have detected here and there.

The first order of business, he suggests, is for everyone to bend themselves toward a successful ending at Geneva. After that we should begin worrying about getting a new trade bill through Congress in 1967.

Conceivably the Congressman is pushing the wrong cart. The way Kennedy round talks drag, it looks as if authority for the United States to be a continuing part of them will be directly up to Congress in another year.

While trade promoters in Washington are about it, they also might start serious thinking on lumping all such efforts under one tent.

State Department (and the Executive) snatched away Congress' prerogative in connection with the Canadian auto parts pact.

Ambassador Christian Herter's office, created specifically to push the Kennedy round, seems to have lost some of its zip (conceivably due to Mr. Herter's ill health).

In any case, the thing now seems to sit in a bit of vacuum. And we as a nation cannot afford it. Tom Curtis is one of the few, all too few, in Congress who appreciate the big chips in the trade game.

TEXAS SENATE MEMORIALIZES LATE J. FRANK DOBIE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Thursday, May 27, 1965, Texas State Senator Don Kennard of Fort Worth introduced in the Texas State Senate a memorial resolution to J. Frank Dobie, the outstanding historian, writer, and authority on the Southwest, who died on September 18, 1964.

Because of the outstanding life of this great Texan and the many memorable thoughts and recorded historical events which he left for us, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the proceedings as printed in the Texas State Journal of May 27, 1965, as well as the memorial which was offered in the form of a Senate resolution, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Memorial Services for J. Frank Dobie

The President recognized Senator Kennard and by unanimous consent, Senator Kennard introduced a memorial resolution for J. Frank Dobie. Senator Schwartz as a close friend was requested to proceed to reading clerk's desk and read the resolution.

Senator Kennard announced that Mrs. Dobie was present and the President appointed Senators Kennard, Herring, Hardeman, Hightower and Spears as a committee to escort Mrs. Dobie to the president's rostrum.

The committee escorted Mrs. Dobie to the president's rostrum.

Senator Schwartz proceeded to the reading clerk's desk and read S.R. No. 787 (which is printed in full in the memorial resolutions of today's Journal) to the guests and members of the senate.

The President presented Senator Kennard and he presented Mrs. Dobie to the members of the senate.

Mrs. Dobie expressed her appreciation for the resolution and stated that it "really expressed his character" and then thanked the senate for the honor of being present.

In Memory of J. Frank Dobie

Senator Kennard offered the following resolution (S. Res. 787):

"Whereas, a pioneer who walked among us is gone; we scarcely knew he was a history-maker when he was alive; he was so warm and open and simple, so ready to laugh and tell a story; but the time has come to take note of the mark left in Texas by J. Frank Dobie, who died in his Austin home on September 18, 1964, 8 days before his 76th birthday; and it is fitting for us to commemorate the era and the man who worked hard and long to mine from his native State the stuff of history.

"Dobie studied books and documents, but went where very few had gone before—to the people themselves—to make his records of this State, this region; he listened to those who had been up the trail to Kansas, to those who had ridden the brush and fought the drought and hunted the gold in this land; and he listened to the rememberers, who handed down the lore and the legends told them by their forefathers. Then he put down what he had learned, and Texans and the world began to better understand this State and the great Southwest.

"Dobie breathed life into history; he put it in the tongue of the common man; he put in the colors of the sunset, the bite of the wind, and the mystery of a campfire tale; the pulse in a Dobie chronicle was what bridged the gap between the humanity of the past and humanity of the present.

"We shall have to do with Dobie's writing now, and the memory of this honest man; while he was alive, Dobie not only wrote the story of the people and animals and weather and soil of the land; but he told it, too—in the company of friends and in the lecture room; writing was a chore for him; talking was a pleasure; he became one of the greatest teachers the Southwest has known; he brought the Southwest into the classroom and made it come alive for thousands of students at the University of Texas, where he served over a span of 33 years. But Dobie was a scholarly man and a scrupulous craftsman in the art of writing and he became Texas' leading man of letters, known throughout the world for his books and articles and newspaper stories.

"While he dealt with everyday speech, Dobie's writing had the grace and substance that marks the maker of literature; his prose was muscular and granite hard, befitting his subject matter, and standing as an example to the writer who would seek and find the right word before cluttering his page with approximations.

"J. Frank Dobie saw the history of his State with a clear eye. He showed valor and fortitude and enterprise where it existed, but he did not distort nor glamorize; he showed us that the world can respect a region, even be entranced by it, without that region's being pictured with melodrama and sentimentality; J. Frank Dobie gave us, and the world, an honest view of Texas; he made heroes of its men, and men of its heroes.

"In the land of the cowboy, the pioneer, and the Alamo, J. Frank Dobie resisted the temptations to romanticize; he brought a maturity to his work forged out of a scholarly grasp of not only his region's history, but the history of mankind—a maturity fibered with the training he received from his parents at his ranch home in Live Oak County, where he grew up loving the land and the good books which surrounded him.

"We are indebted to J. Frank Dobie—not only because he invested the plain man of Texas with a dignity, and found the true human dignity that lay beneath the scarlet mantles of our heroes; not only because he established a true and lasting image of Texas that will shine when more glamorous projections have faded and gone.

We are in his debt because of the legacy he leaves us of a man who discovered the art of living, and spread this genial knowledge to those around him, and who infused his works with a human warmth that will kindle other hearts through generations.

"We owe him gratitude for the charm and splendor he brought the legendry of our culture—for his was not a grim and solemn recording of fact, but also a chronicling of man's dreams and laughter.

"We are in his debt because of the memory of a man whose face grew florid and his voice thunderous when he was confronted with pomposity; with bigotry, or with the trammelling of any freedom—intellectual, economic, political, or spiritual.

"We are in his debt because he fought, sometimes singlehandedly, to preserve the Texas heritage in writings, art, museums, statuary, and buildings; he fought, likewise, against the spurious, false, impure, and ill-suited, whether it be in a monument or school building or history book—the shady, man-benefiting gallery of a Southwestern ranch house had more value to him than a transplanted Grecian temple of finest marble—but J. Frank Dobie could also say: 'I think it is more important that a dweller in the Southwest read "The Life and Death of Socrates" than all the books extant on killings by Billy the Kid.'

"We are in debt to J. Frank Dobie because of the ground he has broken and the paths he has cleared for writers who came after him, and who were benefited thus benefiting all of us, by this trailblazer of our culture.

"Dobie was a strong conscience in our midst.

"Writers and nonwriters alike could well paste in their hats his dictum: 'It is better to have a just sense of values unsatisfied than to have a cheap sense of values fulfilled * * *' So wrote Dobie in telling why he left a Texas folk character, Judge Roy Bean, out of a book. '* * * he was essentially a publicity-hunting imposter and vulgarian,' Dobie wrote, 'and striving to make a hero out of him only adds to the hardupness of Texas for heroes possessing the elements of nobility.'

"We are, finally, indebted to one who stands among us still. Throughout her husband's entire professional writing career, Bertha McKee Dobie was an informed and sustaining helper in his vast literary undertakings, and as no one else could, she now carries on her husband's work: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate of Texas*, That this resolution stand in memory of J. Frank Dobie, and that copies, under the seal of the senate, be prepared and forwarded to Mrs. Dobie and other members of his family, and that when the senate adjourns this day that it do so in honor of this great citizen of Texas.

"Kennard."

Signed: Lieutenant Governor Preston Smith; Aikin, Bates, Blanchard, Calhoun, Cole, Colson, Creighton, Crump, Dies, Hall, Hardeman, Harrington, Hazlewood, Herring, Hightower, Kazen, Krueger, Moore, Parkhouse, Patman, Ratliff, Reagan, Richter, Rogers, Schwartz, Snelson, Spears, Strong, Watson, Word.

The resolution was read.

On motion of Senator Kazen and by unanimous consent, the names of the Lieutenant Governor and senators were added to the resolution as signers thereof.

The resolution was then unanimously adopted by a rising vote of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAY 29 IN NEBRASKA

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have introduced a bill relating to the Inter-State Highway. My bill is numbered S. 2685. This is a small bill from the standpoint of our National Highways System. It is, however, very important to many Nebraskans in northeast Nebraska.

U.S. Interstate No. 29 is a north and south highway on the very west edge of Iowa in the vicinity of Sioux City, Iowa. This highway should be accessible to the people of northeast Nebraska because it is a national highway and 90 percent of the cost thereof has been paid by Federal taxpayers.

Northeast Nebraska is to a large extent denied access to this highway because of a bridge situation. At the present time there is only one bridge between South Sioux City, Nebr., and Sioux City, Iowa. This bridge is over 100 years old. It is totally inadequate to handle the traffic.

The immediate area in Nebraska which is involved is Dakota County. This is one of the fastest growing counties in Nebraska. The population has increased more than 63 percent in the last few years. A great deal of industry is moving in.

There will soon be opened a large meatpacking plant on the Nebraska side which will bring more people and will call for the accommodation of more traffic. Many of the feeders who will be selling their livestock to this new packing plant live on the Iowa side.

In the past Sioux City, Iowa, has been the metropolis and South Sioux City, Nebr., and Dakota County generally have been regarded as nearby rural areas. All of the hospital facilities in that area are located in Sioux City, Iowa. From the standpoint of reaching the hospital, from the standpoint of the local traffic, from the standpoint of the commercial traffic that is increasing daily, and from the standpoint of civil defense, and all other public purposes—something must be done about this traffic situation in this area.

The proposal which I have made in my bill, S. 2685, is that we add to the total Interstate System the sum of 2.4 miles. This would permit an additional turnout from U.S. Interstate 29 on the Iowa side and would extend the interstate westward for 2.4 miles across the Missouri River including the construction of a bridge to U.S. Highway 77. The location of this new strip of interstate highway, or this new spur of the interstate, whichever you call it, would be south of Sioux City, Nebr., at a point where it would meet U.S. Highway 20 when its relocation is completed.

The purpose of my bill is to make this short strip of highway including the bridge and the cost thereof, a part of the Interstate Highway System and financed as such.

I believe that this approach is thoroughly justified. Northeast Nebraska is a growing, thriving area. The taxpayers there are paying their share of the cost of interstate highways all over the United States, yet they have no practical access to an interstate highway even though one is right in their midst. The building of this strip of highway including the cost of the bridge is absolutely essential to do justice to the taxpayers of that area involved. It is absolutely necessary in order to take care of the growing population of that area and the heavy traffic load.

I hope that my proposal can soon be a reality and that if the engineers have to make any changes in it, those changes will be such that it will still meet the objective and the need which I have discussed here.

WEST VIRGINIA MEMORIES OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I would like to draw the attention of the Senate to an outstanding booklet prepared by Representative Ken Hechler, of West Virginia. It is entitled "West Virginia Memories of President Kennedy," and is most deserving of praise by Congress. It recounts the sincere interest in West Virginia as expressed by the late President and it includes a number of excellent photographs showing President Kennedy in West Virginia. It is an outstanding historical record and I hope it is read by each Member of the Senate.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] who is necessarily absent, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record for him a brief statement followed by an article by the Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Mr. Charles Frankel.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator McGovern

One of the most stimulating articles I have read in recent years appears in the current issue of Foreign Affairs and is entitled "The Scribblers and International Relations." The article is authored by Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Charles Frankel.

It is obvious from reading this essay that Mr. Frankel brings unusual qualifications to the important post he has recently assumed.

The Scribblers and International Relations

(By Charles Frankel)

The large-scale entrance of the U.S. Government into the field of international cultural relations is a relatively recent phenomenon, dating only from World War II. Much has been said in this brief period about the importance of cultural relations for the resolution of international conflicts and the achievement of American foreign-policy objectives. However, there has been relatively little discussion of cultural relations that has attempted to cut beneath the widely accepted conventions that it is good for people in different countries to know one another personally, and good for the United

States if other nations realize that we do indeed have a culture. In particular, one special purpose of cultural relations, and one peculiar and troublesome set of problems which they present, have been given less attention than they merit. These have to do with the role of intellectuals in international affairs, and with some of the special characteristics of the relation between American intellectuals and intellectuals elsewhere.

It would hopelessly simplify the harsh complexity of most international conflicts, and it would ascribe more influence to intellectuals than they have, to say that international conflict has its source in the quarrels of intellectuals. Nevertheless, there is a kind of devious truth in this statement. The influence over international affairs of "the scribbling set," as the Duke of Wellington once called the intellectuals with less than complete affection, is greater than is commonly thought—greater, certainly, than one would suppose from the frequent complaints of intellectuals themselves that people in power are suspicious of them and adverse to listening to them.

There are a number of ways in which this influence is exercised. One of the most obvious is the relation of intellectuals to the language of international conflict and acomodation. International affairs are peculiarly susceptible to galloping abstractions—"Communism," "Africa," "Imperialism," "the Free World." Nowhere else do massive sterotypes and personified ideas play a larger role; nowhere do they do more to rigidify disagreement, to give it a quality of necessity and higher nobility, and to turn otherwise manageable conflicts into unmanageable ones. And intellectuals, more than most other groups, have the power to create, dignify, inflate, criticize, moderate or puncture these abstractions. The character of international life is influenced by the language that comes to be used in public to explain what is going on, to justify the positions that are taken, or to negotiate disputes. The quality of this language is something which intellectuals do much to affect.

There are some other even more apparent ways in which intellectuals exercise influence over international affairs. The pivotal audiences abroad to whom U.S. educational and cultural programs are addressed, for example, are composed of intellectuals.[1] The effect which these programs have on our relations with other countries depends decisively on the the reactions of intellectuals to them. This is true even when educational and cultural programs have other audiences in mind. The target for an educational project of the Agency for International Development may be primary- or secondary-school students, but without the understanding and cooperation of local teachers, school administrators and officials of education ministries, it is not likely to succeed. Some of the State Department's cultural presentations—for example, a jazz band or a touring movie star—may be aimed at a mass audience, but their reception depends to a considerable extent on the amount and kind of attention they receive from editors, critics, and broadcasters. Of all U.S. agencies conducting large educational programs abroad, probably only the Peace Corps can achieve its purposes without major reliance on the good will of foreign intellectuals; and even its programs can be compromised by these groups if they wish to do so.

These aspects of the influence of intellectuals are reflections of a deeper role that intellectuals play in contemporary societies. As a consequence of the growing practical importance of such fields as law, medicine, science, economics, education, and journalism, and, to a larger extent, as a consequence of the secularization of society, an outstanding feature of modern history has been the rise of intellectuals to positions of pivotal importance in society. Indeed, as the role played by intellectuals in most of the emerging nations illustrates, this trend is an essential part of what we mean by the modernization of a society. And the role of intellectuals has not been simply that of giving practical counsel or supplying technical know-how. It has been that of serving as a "censor class" for the community. Located in the universities, the press, the theater, and the arts, the intellectuals in almost all societies are a major group from whom members of the educated and semieducated publics draw their opinions about the character and moral quality of their society.

The attitudes which the individual members of a society hold toward its reigning institutions do not depend simply on their judgment of the efficiency of these institutions. Such attitudes depend also on whether individuals find these institutions congruent with their general "Weltanschauung," and can justify them in a language which they regard as appropriate for discussing such matters. Thus, relatively few Americans or foreigners find fault with American institutions on the ground of their inefficiency. The more usual denunciation is that America is "materialistic." In other words, the stability and strength of social and political institutions depend not only on their practical performance but on their symbolic legitimacy. And to a considerable extent, the secular intellectuals of modern nations have supplanted the clergy as the principal suppliers and endorsers of the symbols of legitimacy. Capitalism, socialism, freedom, justice, exploitation, alienation, etc., with the special reverberations they now carry, are intellectuals' terms.

The significance of this for foreign policy is as great as it is for domestic affairs. Over the long run, a major nation's foreign policy is unlikely to succeed, or will, at any rate, become more costly and more completely dependent on violence and the threat of violence, if it loses the understanding and sympathy of intellectuals in other countries and at home. It is against this background that we may turn to consider certain curious features of the relation between American and foreign intellectuals. For the attitudes of intellectual groups abroad are peculiarly relevant to an understanding of the nature and difficulties of the tasks that are somewhat loosely and happily lumped together under the heading of "Cultural Relations."

II

It is tempting, and only too common, when describing the attitudes of foreign intellectuals, to label them with the generic term "anti-American." But this is almost certainly misleading. The attitudes to which this label is applied are not infrequently accompanied by great courtesy and friendship toward individual Americans, by avid interest in American intellectual, literary, and artistic achievements, and even by basic sympathy with the long-range objectives of American foreign policy. "Anti-Americanism," so-called, is in fact a complex and elusive phenomenon composed of many separate strands, a good number of which have little to do intrinsically with American culture as such. Instead of concentrating on anti-Americanism, which begs many questions, it is preferable to try to unravel these strands and to see what they imply with regard to the problem of communication between articulate representatives of American and foreign cultures.

Obviously, there are grave dangers of oversimplification in any attempt to characterize the intellectuals of the United States or of other countries in a few broad strokes. The ethnic, social, and political differences between the intellectuals of different countries are frequently very great, and, within individual countries, intellectual groups are commonly divided into subgroups and factions that are in sharp disagreement with one another. So far as the remarks that are about to be made are concerned, it should be borne in mind that they describe, on the whole, the attitudes of the most vocal and visible members of intellectual groups, and that they apply with least force to the English-speaking and Scandinavian countries, and probably with greatest force to the intellectuals of the emerging countries. It should also be stressed that we are discussing differences between American intellectuals and others that are differences in degree, and not absolute, categorical contrasts. Within the framework of such reservations, however, a number of generalizations may be hazarded.

To begin with, the basic intellectual perspective of the dominant groups in the intellectual circles of most foreign countries tends to be different from that which prevails among most leading representatives of American scholarship and intellectual life. Setting specialists in the physical sciences aside, the education and mental formation of most foreign intellectuals is literary in character, and their approach to social issues is marked by a high degree of reliance on broad and abstract theories and ideals. In contrast, American scholars, particularly those in the social sciences, tend to be more empirical, more concerned with refined problems of methodology, and more anti-ideological. Where foreign intellectuals enjoy using comprehensive intellectual schemes, often carrying heavy philosophical and metaphysical overtones, to explain and interpret specific trends, American scholars and social observers tend to be skeptical, perhaps overly skeptical, of broad generalizations and value-judgments.

---

[1] It would take us far afield to define the phrase "the intellectuals" with the thoroughness it deserves. Briefly, however, it refers to a social category. As I am using it here, it says nothing about the inner capacities (or incapacities) of mind of the people who belong to this category. First of all, an intellectual is simply a man whose principal occupation involves dealing with words or symbols at a fairly high level of complexity. He is, in this broad sense, a "scribbler." (Of course, the idea of what is "complex" is a relative matter. It depends on the surrounding educational and cultural context. In countries where educational levels are low, the notions of "complexity" are naturally more relaxed. Merely being a university student, or even a high school graduate, can be enough to qualify an individual as an intellectual—a significant factor that affects the political influence of students in countries marked by low literacy.) Secondly, an intellectual is a man who, in addition to his specialized knowledge or with the help of such knowledge, concerns himself with issues of general public importance, and addresses himself to people outside his own professional field. Specialized knowledge in itself is not enough to make a man an intellectual. The late Norbert Wiener, for example, was an intellectual, in this meaning of the term, not because he made technical contributions to cybernetics but because he also discussed "the human use of human beings." Finally, it should be noted that to be an intellectual is not entirely a matter of self-election. In every society, there are associations, clubs, cliques, cafes, and periodicals that are identified as "intellectual." Admission to them may be a wholly informal affair, but the fact that an individual has been admitted to them is part of what is meant by calling him an intellectual. In this sense, intellectuals compose a reasonably definite social category, even though, just as in the case of businessmen, doctors or criminals, there are a fairly large number of borderline cases that cannot be classified one way or the other.

This difference in basic intellectual outlook leads to other differences, sometimes more apparent than real, but important nonetheless because they are felt to be real. Thus, to a considerable extent, intellectuals abroad are likely to be leftist in their political sentiments. In contrast, American scholars and intellectuals, although in fact they may be anything but conservative, are nevertheless frequently perceived by their foreign colleagues as adherents of the status quo. The reason has less to do with their explicit political sentiments than with their intellectual style. By and large, they tend to be problem-oriented." That is to say, they generally shun sweeping verdicts on the state of society, and prefer, by training and inclination, to break down large issues into their smaller parts, formulating these as limited problems which manageable programs of inquiry or reform may reasonably be expected to solve. Accordingly, to others with different traditions, American scholars are likely to seem at best mildly reformist or meliorist. Their concern to deal with limited problems one by one suggests that they are merely tinkering with a social system with whose fundamental aspects they are in sympathy.

Moreover, this impression which foreign intellectuals have of American intellectual culture is complemented and complicated by another impression which they are also likely to have. Leftist though they may be in their political sentiments, many foreign intellectuals also tend to be aristocratic in their educational, esthetic and cultural ideals. Although American intellectuals may often share the foreigner's disdain for "leveling-downwards" and mass culture, they are less often as stringent and uncompromising in their declarations of principle. They are likely to be more tolerant of the theory and practice of American mass education. They are less prone to see inherent conflicts between democracy and excellence, or industrial society and individual freedom. And while they may recognize a conflict between the sciences and the humanities, they do not so often draw the absolute line between these two spheres that intellectuals in other parts of the world do. In sum, although an antagonism between the two cultures exists in the United States, it is probably less pronounced in this country than in any other. In consequence, if American intellectuals strike others as too conservative from one point of view, they often seem too modernist, too supinely afloat on the wave of the future, from another point of view.[2]

The issue is practical, indeed economic and political, as well as moral and theoretical. In the United States itself, the introduction of new intellectual materials that require new intellectual skills if they are to be mastered, and particularly the introduction of methods of social inquiry marked by indifference to traditional ideological positions, have encountered resistance on many occasions and in many places. This resistance is likely to be all the greater when, in a given country, such materials and methods appear to be an import from abroad. A revision of secondary school curricula, the return of students trained in the United States in American methods of empirical social inquiry, the introduction by visiting American scholars of the American style in sociology and political science, can all imply or seem to imply the upsetting of established learning in a host country. Without intending to do so, American programs of educational and cultural exchange can thus threaten the established system of status and prestige in academic and intellectual circles abroad.

To this must be added other sources of potential misunderstanding. The labels that American and foreign intellectuals use to discuss social systems are different. Discussions by most foreign intellectuals still turn on words like "socialism" and "capitalism," the former being almost invariably a eulogistic term, the latter almost invariably pejorative. It is difficult for foreign intellectuals to join issue with intellectuals like those from the United States, who seem so often to be indifferent to the distinction intended by these words, and who tend to suggest, indeed, that the words are misleading.

There are allied difficulties in connection with attitudes toward religion. In many countries, the intellectuals, particularly the younger ones, are predominantly not religious or are militantly antireligious. At the very least, they are not usually Protestant Christians, and are therefore likely to be puzzled or put off by the special religious rhetoric that characterizes many American political statements. And even if American scholars and intellectuals do not echo this rhetoric, they may still puzzle foreign counterparts. For there is little in the experience of the latter to prepare them to understand attitudes toward religion—ranging from ingenious reconstructions of traditional religious thought through cheerful tolerance of all religion to indifference to the question—which are likely to characterize intellectuals who have grown up in a society where religious pluralism is well established.

Such differences in outlook are sharpened by differences in the history and in the social position and function of intellectual groups in the United States and other countries. Students, scholars, writers and artists abroad tend to be discriminable and visible groups in their society. Often they have relatively little active contact with other social groups. Indeed, they often perceive themselves, and are perceived, as a separate social class, with a distinct outlook and a special social mission. They are the vanguard of the forces of enlightenment, the spokesmen for modernization or freedom or the emerging national culture, the keepers of the national conscience. American intellectuals, in comparison, have less ambitious conceptions of their role, and less consciousness of themselves as a class, just as American businessmen, workers and government functionaries also tend to have less class consciousness.

This difference between American intellectuals and intellectuals abroad runs parallel to another. By and large, foreign intellectuals think of themselves as performing their special functions precisely when they keep their distance from the centers of power governing their society. They are prepared to identify themselves with the powers-that-be only when, in turn, they can identify these powers-that-be with themselves—only when they believe, that is to say, that government, the economy and the social structure are being systematically rebuilt in accordance with the principles which they hold. From such a point of view, it is one thing to take the use power for "revolutionary" purposes, it is quite another thing to serve those who have power, and who use it merely to keep things going or to patch things up. Accordingly, for many foreign intellectuals, to advise government, to counsel industry, to bring technical expertise to bear on specific social problems, seems to be equivalent to the renunciation of one's status as an intellectual. American scholars, in contrast, are less inclined to regard a close identification with power as inherently contaminating. They find it easier to think of practical service to government, industry or the community in neutral, nonpolitical terms.

It is worth saying again that we are speaking here only of differences in degree. There are a number of American scholars and intellectuals who regard any form of close association with government or industry as an abandonment of their intellectual independence. And there are many scholars and intellectuals not only in Western Europe, but in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, who have undertaken practical tasks of leadership and counseling, and have moved back and forth between the universities, the professions and Government service. But to some extent this reflects the tempo of development and the shortage of manpower in the emerging countries; and to some extent it reflects the congruence of the official revolutionary ideologies of these countries with the principles of the scholars and intellectuals concerned. Broadly speaking, even though the difference between American and foreign intellectuals may be a matter of degree, it remains a significant difference. Fewer American scholars and students think of themselves as generalized intellectuals; they think of their social role simply as that of men possessing special knowledge, like doctors or engineers. More foreign scholars and students are self-consciously intellectuals, and think of their social role as that of secular priests—general guides, critics and judges of their society.

Behind these different attitudes toward identification with power there are often, of course, objective differences in the social situation and political realities of different countries. In some countries in Latin America, for example, the people who hold power in government or the economy are deeply hostile both to intellectuals and to social reform. It is not a mistake or a dogmatic ideological illusion for an intellectual in such circumstances to view an alliance with power as a defection from principle. But behind such attitudes toward identification with power there are also certain pervasive attitudes toward power itself. The notion that political practice inescapably involves moral compromise goes back to Plato, pervades Western philosophy and Western commonsense, and has become part of the heritage of intellectuals in most countries in the world. In the West, it is reinforced by traditional suspicions of worldly pomp and power inherited from prophetic and Christian teachings. In many other civilizations, it is reinforced by religious and philosophical ideas that condemn the material world as the scene of illusion and temptation. And just as in the West, people may hold these views and yet proclaim themselves philosophical materialists. The obvious fact should perhaps also be mentioned that the objective experience of most human beings in relation to the wielders of political power has been a bitter one. This is easily forgotten by many Americans, including intellectuals, but it separates American history from the history of most other nations in the world.

---

[2] Although we are not discussing established facts about American intellectuals, but only the views which intellectuals elsewhere tend to hold of them, some apparently important exceptions to these generalizations may nevertheless come to mind. Men like Robert Oppenheimer or Linus Pauling are obviously not perceived either as conservatives or as apologists for technocracy by intellectuals abroad. Again, the activities of many American professors with regard to civil rights or Vietnam would seem to fall into the pattern of political activity characteristic of the most visible and vocal intellectual circles abroad. And there are, of course, well-known intellectual journals of opinion in the United States, usually literary in their focus, whose tone of alienation from contemporary American culture resembles the tone of similar journals abroad.

Nevertheless, while these examples indicate that the contrast we are drawing must be carefully shaded, they also underscore its basic truth. Dr. Pauling, for example, has been a radical critic of American military policy, and Dr. Oppenheimer has gained fame not only as a physicist but as a social philosopher concerned about the relation of science to humanistic civilization. Yet neither can be identified as the spokesman of a general political position that can be given systematic formulation. Again, there is no evidence that the great majority of professors who have taken part in Vietnam demonstrations are critics of the American political or social system in general, or even that they are opposed to the major aspects of American foreign policy such as NATO or foreign aid. And when we turn to literary journals of opinion, we find in them not only ideology, but also a high content of anti-ideology. To many foreign intellectuals, all this is likely to suggest that American intellectuals are strangely indifferent, or perhaps even hostile, to questions of first principles.

In any case, whatever the sources of such views, they are widespread, and they have considerable influence in many parts of the world on intellectual attitudes toward power, and, indeed, toward the very nature of politics, government, and social authority. And given such inherited attitudes toward power and identification with it, it should not be surprising that intellectual groups abroad—or, at any rate, some of the most articulate and influential elements among them—should be negatively predisposed toward American society and American policy. To be critical of power almost automatically entails that one be critical of the country that, above all others, possesses and epitomizes worldly success, wealth and influence. Needless to say, actual American deeds and pronouncements also have much to do with the attitudes toward the United States of intellectuals abroad. But it is naive to imagine, so long as the United States occupies the position in the world that it does, and so long as the intellectuals of most other societies retain their traditional cast of mind with regard to their social mission and their relation to power, that American policy will not have to contend with an undertow of suspicion against it on the part of intellectuals in other countries.

Finally, major historical trends affect and complicate the relationship of American culture to other cultures. In the emerging societies, intellectuals are usually deeply committed to the modernization of their society, and resent any implication that they are less "progressive" in their thinking than their fellow intellectuals in the West. In practical terms, this means that they are eager to show themselves to be, in significant respects, westernized. At the same time, they cannot help but associate Western culture with a memory of injustice and of the subordination of their own native culture. In consequence, they very often have equivocal feelings toward Western culture, including its American version. This is one reason for the appeal of Marxism, a philosophy which, at one and the same time, offers both a convenient synthesis of Western tradition and a radical critique of that tradition. Marxism allows the intellectual of non-Western societies to feel that he is taking advantage of Western thought without being taken in by it. In contrast, any U.S. program of educational or cultural exchange with a developing country, much as it may be to the interest of both sides, almost inevitably raises the specter of "cultural imperialism."

In the emerging nations, Americans may hear their country accused of playing a devious and self-interested game. In the more developed nations they may hear American policy condemned for its innocence and optimism. Nevertheless, while the difficulties that appear in relations with the intellectuals of the developed countries are not quite the same as those that affect relations with the underdeveloped countries, they are in certain respects analogous. Feelings of national pride, American and foreign, play a role in the process of cultural communication between the United States and other economically advanced societies, and the events of the last quarter century have exacerbated these feelings. In Japan it cannot help but be difficult for intellectuals to separate their response to American culture from their memory of defeat, occupation and tutelage by the Americans. In Western Europe the American presence is a standing reminder of a war in which everybody in the West but the Americans suffered a major loss of status. Under the circumstances, an emphasis on America's unfitness for leadership—on the incongruence between America's economic and military power and her cultural immaturity—is perhaps to be expected.

Moreover, underneath these feelings there is a deeper one, akin to the feelings of those in the emerging countries who fear "cultural imperialism." It is anger at the destruction of hereditary standards and amenities by the advance of technology and the mass market. The jukebox, the snackbar, the traffic jam, the supermarket, and the patterns of aspiration and emulation they symbolize, have become universal phenomena in developed nations. They suggest the coming of a homogenized international civilization which people who like their own native idiosyncrasies are bound to resent and resist. When they do so, there is a natural tendency for them to resent and resist American culture. For these phenomena have been carried to their most extreme form in the United States, and are associated with a process known around the world as "Americanization."

The association is in fact largely adventitious. The United States is undoubtedly the most conspicuous example of a country that has plunged heavily into the process variously known as "modernization" or "industrialization." But other countries have now also plunged heavily into this process, and their changing style of life reflects the changed opportunities and aspirations of their own populations rather than American pressure or propaganda. As has often been observed, there are no laws forcing people elsewhere to queue up to see Hollywood movies, to leave domestic service for work in factories, to import American slang into their language, or to strive to obtain the products of mass production, American style. They seem to have made such choices of their own free will. Nevertheless, even though the United States may simply be a convenient scapegoat on whom these revolutionary changes can be blamed, the fact remains that there are special overtones in the relationship of foreign intellectuals to American culture. For American culture, or what is thought to be American culture, is a lively and painful domestic issue in their own societies—not a piece of exotica, or simply another country's way of life, but a living example and option for their own country in which they must acquiesce or against which they must struggle.

III

Is the moral of this tale that there are insurmountable obstacles in the path of good cultural relations between the United States and other nations? Under any circumstances, communication between members of different cultures is a difficult and delicate affair. This question can be answered only if we are clear about what we mean by "good cultural relations" and what the functions of such relations are. If we think that it is a function of such relations to effect a grand international ideological merger, the problems that have been mentioned are very probably insuperable. And if we think that it is an object of cultural relations to "sell" a point of view, we are probably asking for what is equally impossible, and for what destroys the power of exchange programs to do what they are peculiarly capable of doing. On the other hand, the problems that have been mentioned help us to focus more precisely on some of the central and proper functions of such programs. And when these functions are fixed clearly in mind, these problems are not necessarily barriers to communication. On the contrary, they are potential ties, if approached with realistic objectives in mind, between articulate Americans and the articulate citizens of other countries.

The overhanging problem of using technological progress to enhance rather than destroy humane values and the esthetic quality of life is only one among many examples that might be given. With regard to this problem, Americans are certainly in no position to give instruction to others; but neither are others in a position to point the finger of scorn at us. It is a problem for all industrial civilizations, and for all societies moving toward industrialization, and it invites not the exchange of invidious comparisons but joint concern and inquiry. A sense of community can be developed not only by the announcement of common values but by the discovery of problems that are shared. And it is against this background that we can understand why the emergence of habits of disciplined and responsive discourse between the intellectuals of different nations can have much to do with the chances for the rational resolution of international conflicts.

What, then, are the functions of programs for improving and intensifying the process of communication between intellectuals of different countries? There are many, but among them is the tempering and subverting of stereotypes, and the creation of opportunities for discourse that will encourage intellectuals in different countries to speak to each other rather than past each other. For stereotypes, and the habit of talking about different things at different levels of discourse, block the process of locating and defining the problems around which a sense of intellectual community might be developed.

Needless to say, personal and continuing contact between intellectuals from different nations may not lead to agreement among them or even to sympathy. But the evidence is considerable that such contact tends to undermine the organized fantasies that grow up, and that intellectuals themselves often nurture, when close and personal contacts are missing. Cultural exchange encourages the qualifying of rigid generalizations and the tempering of stereotypes about people in other nations, and it exercises a countervailing pressure against both intellectual and political inertia. As the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union over the last decade illustrate, there is a notable tendency in international affairs to persist in analyses and policies that do not fit new facts or fit them only inexactly. Vested interests, intellectual and practical, which have piled up around the old analyses, conspire to produce this result. A vigorous program to facilitate communication, particularly personal communication, between the intellectuals of different countries is a way of preventing the hardening of the arteries of international communication in general. It can discipline international discourse in the simple sense that it can help bring it closer to the complex and changing facts.

More than this, cultural exchange, if it is conducted with such a purpose in mind, can help at once to limit and enlarge the process of international intellectual communication. On one side, it can lead to the discovery and localization of questions that provide promising themes for joint discussion and study outside a context of political negotiation or competing national interests. City planning, the relation of the mass media to education or to inherited cultural traditions, the advantages and the limits of new methods of social inquiry, are only a few examples. This localization of issues by intellectuals can help in the gradual development of a vocabulary for international communication that avoids the great conflicts of ideologies, and that paves the way for more effective forms of international communication.

But the process of international communication among intellectuals also needs to be enlarged. The character and moral significance of the radical changes taking place in 20th-century civilizations are any civilized man's concern. Given a reasonable effort on the part of intellectuals to listen to each other and to try to make sense to each other, direct intellectual confrontations may contribute to a kind of international discourse that exists now only fitfully and precariously. If there is a point in avoiding angry forms of high ideological recrimination, there is no point in avoiding the discussion of high intellectual themes. It is particularly important for American intellectuals, with their sophisticated methodologies, their love of concrete problems and their suspicion of broad abstractions, to remember this. What the much used and much abused word "democracy" means, what the relation is between individual freedom and the emergence of massive forms of social organization, what the function of intellect itself is in a technical and specialized society—these are questions with roots that go far back in the history of intellectual discussion. It is clear that even men of thorough reasonableness and good will not come to the same conclusions about them. But it is equally clear that if men do not talk to each other about such questions at all, they are not likely to understand each other very well. And this causes trouble when they turn to the more practical matters on which international accommodation depends.

YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I recently had the pleasure of appearing as a guest in a new series of "Youth Wants to Know" television programs presented on WETA–TV, the educational television station in Washington. These programs are made available as a public service through grants from International Correspondence Schools, Scranton, Pa.—the worldwide educational and training organization—and its international division, Human Resources Development, Washington, D.C.—dedicated to manpower training for developing nations.

International Correspondence Schools and Human Resources Development, in cooperation with a man whom many Members of Congress know, admire, and respect, Theodore Granik, a distinguished attorney who is the producer of "Youth Wants to Know," have pioneered in making the time-honored, award-winning "Youth Wants To Know" program available to the Metropolitan Washington, D.C., public during a regularly scheduled evening hour on a weekday night, when the largest potential viewing and listening audience is available. This move is to be highly commended.

The superb public service being performed by International Correspondence Schools and Human Resources Development in making these programs available is a unique innovation and provides the opportunity to present the important issues by leading authorities in their fields.

This splendid public service sponsorship of International Correspondence Schools and Human Resources Development will, I trust, auger well for renewed interest in more and more programs of the same type, to elicit public interest and support in these vital questions about issues concerning all thinking Americans.

Some of the guests International Correspondence Schools and Human Resources Development have presented on "Youth Wants To Know" include: Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York; William S. Gaud, Deputy Administrator of AID; Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury; Senator BIRCH BAYH, of Indiana; Jack H. Vaughn, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs; Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho; Gustave Rosenberg, chairman, board of higher education in New York City; Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission; Warren W. Wiggins, Deputy Director, Peace Corps.

In these crucial times when the need for public affairs programs is so essential, Dr. John C. Villaume, president of International Correspondence Schools, and its international division, Human Resources Development, of Washington, D.C., is to be congratulated for adopting this unique approach to provide for a better informed public. Dr. Villaume's educational experience includes teaching and directing public relations at Gettysburg College and a 5-year association with the University of Scranton, Pennsylvania, teaching business management, personnel, office and industrial management, and public relations. Dr. Villaume joined ICS in 1946.

The untiring efforts of Mr. Granik for over 30 years in the radio-television industry deserve the highest praise from all segments of our society, for keeping public service programs exciting, alive, and informative. It goes without saying that I am doubly proud of this tremendous public service since it is being performed by one of the outstanding adult-business organizations from my own State of Pennsylvania. International Correspondence Schools, of Scranton, Pa., is the oldest and largest home-study school in America. ICS, founded in 1890, is a unique adult institution and has grown to have more than seven and a half million alumni, making it the largest in the world. ICS is currently training more than 250,000 people in 61 countries with every student receiving his lessons, guidance, grades, and diploma through home study.

ICS is one of the world's most versatile schools. Students regardless of age, background or geographic location are able to keep their basic schooling, increase their earning power and develop latent talents through spare time study. In addition, industries, unions and government use job-related ICS courses to help solve their most acute manpower problems. The school systems, both public and private, employ ICS facilities to help solve critical teacher and classroom shortages. The 250 standard courses covering training in every occupation field are just the beginning of ICS educational service. Thousands of additional courses can be "tailor-made" to meet an individual's exact educational and training needs. The ICS faculty is represented by an instruction staff composed of 14 distinct schools, each with its own director, principal, and instructors.

The changing complexion of ICS services is most dramatically reflected in its introduction of "educasting," a revolutionary audio-visual instruction system which marks a breakthrough in the effective application of mass communications media to the training job. This exciting new method of instruction, "educasting," may be accomplished via FM radio or closed circuit television.

I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks a copy of the transcript of the program on which I appeared be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW

(Created and produced by Theodore Granik)

"Youth Wants To Know" presents Republican Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.

Question. Why do you think that the Senate has passed the home rule bill and the House hasn't?

Senator SCOTT. Well, the House has always been more foot dragging, more reluctant about home rule. It's been more dominated by the southern Democratic chairmen.

MODERATOR. Our discussion today on "Youth Wants To Know" is with Republican Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania. We're talking about home rule for the District of Columbia. We'll continue our questioning in just 1 minute.

Senator SCOTT is now in his 23d year in Washington. He is now serving his eighth term in Congress—16 of those years were spent in the House, and he's been in the Senate since 1959. He is the former chairman of the National Republican Committee. He is now on the Committees of Commerce and Judiciary, and he also serves on the Rules Committee, which recently heard the Bobby Baker case in Washington. He is a champion of civil rights legislation. Senator SCOTT is the cosponsor of the recently passed voting rights bill, and he is also sponsor of the yet to be decided high speed ground transportation bill. Senator SCOTT, it's a pleasure, sir, to welcome you again to "Youth Wants To Know."

Senator SCOTT. Thank you. I'm glad to be here as always.

MODERATOR. Thank you, sir. Now let's begin our questioning with Greg.

Question. Senator, who establishes the policy for the Republican Party?

Senator SCOTT. Well, in Congress it is always popular to say that the Congress Republican leadership establishes policy. They do, but they do to the extent only of establishing the constructive alternatives to the majority program as it is now, or opposition to the spending involved, to the waste, or to the nature of the program, or in what we all call justly, loyal opposition, whereby the Republican position is often a guideline for the President in foreign policy. But policy in being, that is, live, going, active, everyday policy, is made principally by our 17 Republican Governors. And the record of those Governors is so good that it is my opinion that the policy that we have made successfully in the States warrants people entrusting the Republican Party as a responsible party to be given the franchise in greater numbers in the Federal Government—that is, to send more people to Congress.

Question. Senator, do you think that the Republican Party can reunite itself—splinter groups and other factions—to put on a strong campaign in 1966?

Senator Scott. Well, I think, behind the scenes much of that is already going on. The odd thing is the current interest in the Republican so-called splinter groups, and that's because it's news. It's man bites dog. The Democrats have had splinter parties since 1801—that's 164 years. I don't hear people say that the ADA is another splinter group or that the Democratic Advisory Council of recent years is a splinter group. I believe the difference is between in groups and out groups. An in group is like the Republicans for progress, let us say, where they are interested only in electing Republicans. But they're not interested in electing all Republicans. They concentrate on those whom they believe will keep the party in the middle of the road. Now an out group is like Barry Goldwater's and Denison Kitchel's free society that's not interested in electing Republicans primarily. It's interested in electing conservatives. It is pursuing the support of people who believe as they do. It's a group—an out group—pushing an ideology, and planning to raise $2 million, which could hurt the fund-raising activities and fracture both political parties. So the in group is a group that works with Ray Bliss, the national chairman, that doesn't bleed the party with large demands for funds, that seeks to elect Republicans, but doesn't undertake the national committee's job of electing all Republicans.

Question. Sir, do you think that the Republican Party has gotten this tremendous urge for conservation out of its system?

Senator Scott. Well, I think the Republican Party by the normal course of events, is a party which is more conservative than one of the splinter groups of the Democratic Party known as the northern liberals. The essence of conservatism is fiscal responsibility, it's meeting your bills, it's trying to have enough money to keep going for another month, it's concerned about the national debt, about inflation, and those things. To that extent, the Republican Party will always have more of a conservative coloration than the northern Democratic liberal. But the Republican Party's record in moderation is better than the Democratic Party in civil rights, where a much higher percentage of Republicans in both House and Senate supported civil rights than Democrats. Interestingly enough, it's better in immigration. In the recent House vote, only 25 Republicans voted against the new broad immigration bill—70 Democrats voted against. So we're outnumbered 2 to 1, but we did 3 to 1 better than the Democrats.

Question. What about the future of the Republican Party? How can they rebuild the public's confidence and respect?

Senator Scott. Well, this is about the time of a visit President Eisenhower is making to his birthplace, Dennison, Tex. In 1948, he was going to Dennison before the convention that nominated him for President. He was writing a speech, and his friends said to me, "Will you put a line in this speech?" And I said, "Put this line in: For the Republicans to win, they must deserve to win." Well, that's the one way in which they can come back. They've got to deserve to win by being responsible, by being constructive. by being what former Governor Landon of Kansas said, being practical progressives. I wish we had time on this program, I could tell you the tragedy of Republicanism is we once choose a liberal named Landon to run and he only carried two States, because he made one mistake. He let the conservatives write his speeches.

Question. Sir——

Senator Scott. He still wouldn't have been elected, because Roosevelt was too popular.

Question. Sir, can we see a realinement in political parties in the future along the lines of conservative and liberal rather than Democratic and Republican?

Senator Scott. No; and I don't think we should, any more than we should aline the Supreme Court that way. It sounds awfully easy. People are always suggesting it. But I wouldn't make the parties two monoliths, both as rigid as the Washington Monument. In the first place, it wouldn't be 3 months, if you made the Democratic Party the liberal party and the Republicans the conservatives, it wouldn't be 3 months before the Republicans were divided into progressive conservatives, natural conservatives, home-grown conservatives, conservative liberals, conservative moderates. The Democrats, in turn, would divide as they already have. They've gone much farther with this splintering. They'd divide between northern liberals, progressive liberals, conservative southerners, and we'd have the radicals and they'd have the leftists. And I think it's much better if both parties, as Governor Scranton said, allow the far left and the far right to wither on the vine, their ideologies are destructive, and many of them are poisonous, and let the two parties both pursue the general 85-percent area of sanity. And then let them divide, not severely like some Central American countries do, where they have to settle the whole thing by coup d'etat, let us divide only reasonably so that the American people who are essentially moderate can always be sure that the Government won't shift 180 degrees, or as an old Navy man, let it shift 10 degrees right rudder, 10 degrees left rudder, but that keeps you mainly on the course.

Question. Senator Scott, who do you envision as party leader in 1968?

Senator Scott. Whoever gets the nomination at wherever the convention is held. I don't think the party has a leader today—a political leader. It has a national leader in General Eisenhower. General Eisenhower is not a political specialist, as we all know. He is terribly interested, but he does not take daily partisan leadership. Barry Goldwater has the support of far less than 20 percent of the people of the country. Those people who say 27 million can't be wrong ought to go down to the White House and say good morning to President Goldwater for that matter. He's a very fine and delightful man, but he does not carry the leadership. I think the leadership as near as we can put it is in the Republican Coordinating Committee, which represents the national committee, the Governors, and the congressional House and Senate leadership.

Question. Senator, on the issue of policy, President Johnson's tactics have been criticized severely in some of the ways that he has pushed through bills. Is there any basis for this criticism?

Senator Scott. Yes. The President is not only one of the strongest Executives of modern times, he is the strongest willed and the strongest minded. He can't abide variance from consensus. And he is really enacting the old Truman program. That's the saying around town. That at last the Truman program is getting enacted. And because they are 2 to 1 in the majority, and because they were led by a driving man, who wants everybody to love him, and who wants to accomplish everything at once. I don't know what he's going to have for next year, because by next year he'll want to adopt the millenium.

Question. Sir, does the Republican Party plan to go into the South and actively aid the newly enfranchised Negroes in registering to vote?

Senator Scott. Yes; there are groups in the Republican Party who are committed to that program and are working on it. The Republican Negro Council, among others. There are activities among Republican white groups; in the city of Atlanta, for example, three Republican moderates were elected to the legislature, and they are leading this move toward equality for everyone in the South.

Question. Will this move toward—the Republican help with this move toward equality in the South—will this help Republican chances for the next election?

Senator Scott. Well, the Republicans are in an odd position. The more Negroes they register, the more likely they are that the Negroes will vote Democratic. We've got to overcome that because we have to show that, through conviction and through compassion and through fairness our record indicates that Negroes will have an excellent chance to progress within the Republican Party and to progress through the efforts of the Republican Party, and in places like my city of Philadelphia, or the city of Pittsburgh, where Negro candidates consistently run on the Republican ticket, we do make some progress.

Question. Sir, the Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, has said that the colleges and universities which do not have control over the membership policies and internal activities of such fraternal organizations as the sororities and fraternities on campus, such universities may not be receiving aid within the next 3 or 4 years. Can the Federal Government really take this position in the light of the 1964 civil rights bill?

Senator Scott. I think that the antidiscrimination contemplated in that bill ought to be applied all the way around the clock to prevent Federal control over the internal operations of universities and colleges.

Question. In other words, I'm not quite sure I understand you, you think that the Federal Government should stay out of this and let the fraternities and sororities go their own way?

Senator Scott. Well, I think that the fraternity, sorority, and independent situations ought to be left up to the colleges. I belong to a national college fraternity. I was national president of it for 4 years. We have no discrimination policy whatever. And this was achieved the hard way, but it was achieved. In my judgment, that's the way it will be solved. The fraternities and sororities and those who do not want to belong—some members of my family choose not to be members of fraternities and sororities—all of them should be sure that they represent groups that are dedicated to an idealistic purpose, to making better citizens, to making people who can work better together, people who understand each other. There is nothing wrong in group association, whether you call it a fraternity or whether you call it community action. What's wrong is if the group gets the idea that it is better than some other group.

Question. What do you think was the cause of the riots in Los Angeles?

Senator Scott. A number of things. One of the oddest things was the freeway that passed overhead and the Negroes down in Watts looked up and said, they won't notice this. And this is an odd thing. The feeling that they were abandoned. They were not noticed. The long hot summer. None of these justified what happened. What happened in Watts, I couldn't condemn more severely than I do now, and I think it was wrong, it was violent, it had no excuse. It arose out of a sense of injustice, real or imagined. It rose out of neglect. It rose out of the failure of the State administration, perhaps of the city administration, to do everything to anticipate. But at the same time, the existence of a social wrong does not in itself create a civil right. The civil right arises by law, and where a social wrong exists, we change the law, which we must and should, and then the civil right arises. But a social wrong is never cured by civil wrong, and so those who rioted were dead wrong.

Question. Senator, was Los Angeles a unique situation or could similar riots break out in any major city?

Senator Scott. They could break out in any major city in the country almost any time.

Question. Could we expect them in Washington?

Senator Scott. We could expect them in any major city, including Washington.

Moderator. I think an obvious question here is, Can they be prevented from happening?

Senator Scott. They can only be prevented, as I see it, through wise community action, and through the Federal and local governments doing everything they can to legitimately improve a sense of responsibility, to create leadership, and this is where the Negro community can do a lot for itself. The Negro who is a lawyer, an insurance man, a doctor, or a judge, can't walk by on the other side of the street, and say, "It's not my business." We're all involved. We've got to answer to the second chapter in Genesis, whether we like it or not, we're all our brother's keeper. And this is the answer, I think. The individual must meet it; the Government must meet it. But the Government must not take sides to weight the balance against white or Negro.

Question. Senator, in Philadelphia, there is the race problem at Girard College. How can this be legally solved?

Senator Scott. In my judgment, the Girard College matter can be legally solved by an agreement between the trustees and the legal arm of the Government—the Attorney General and the Philadelphia legal arm—to take a new test case into court. In other words, if the trustees will go so far as to ask the court for freedom to integrate, and if that case will be taken into court through the aid of the State and municipal legal arms, the court can then make a judgment, which would be a different set of facts from the old legal case, because before the trustees did not join in the request. They opposed it.

Question. It has been said that civil rights is progressing too rapidly for the Nation, and recent surveys proved this point. Most of the people feel that civil rights is proceeding too rapidly. Is this your view, and the view of Congress?

Senator Scott. No, I don't think so. I think that a hundred years is long enough to wait for the correction of any civil wrong. What is wrong is not that we are moving too fast, but that the communities are perhaps not as wise as they should be in trying to ward off the worst of the dangers. The compliance in the South is a tremendously significant fact. Southerners generally are law abiding, and it ought to be said on this program that now that the law is there, we will have faster integration in the schools, and we will get the voting privileges extended. And when that is done, the right to vote will correct many other evils.

Question. Sir, in view of your stand on civil rights, why are you supporting the Dirksen amendment?

Senator Scott. Because I think it's the greatest of all civil rights to protect the minorities in the States. And what happens here is that people who seek to oppose any constitutional amendment are saying that the only way in which you can run a government is one man, one vote. If that were true, then we should run the government of the United States in one magnificent forum, and we could do it by national television, or national referendum. Certainly one man, one vote doesn't require two houses of the legislature in the States. You could do it with a unicameral body. What you do forget are the rights of minorities here. And the so-called knee jerk liberals ought to be the first ones to favor a constitutional amendment which permits one house to be chosen one man, one vote, which permits the other house to be chosen with such other factors as the people of the State in a referendum every 10 years, at least, shall decide they want. In other words, the one man, one vote ought to be left to the States. Let them say how they want the other chamber to be composed. How would it be composed? Under the amendment, you would have to consider one factor of population, but you could also consider geography, economic considerations, natural resources. And I'll give you an illustration why you need an amendment. Two good illustrations. The first is the Hawaiian Islands. Under one man, one vote, the city of Honolulu completely would dominate both houses and Hawaii, and all the other islands would be left virtually without anything to say—a complete denial of the right of these minority islands to be heard. In Pennsylvania, the right of the anthracite mine worker, bituminous mine worker would be diluted, because natural resources are considered. In Michigan, the right of the copper country, and of the Finnish-American minority—one of the only Finish-American minorities in the country—would be denied because they'd have virtually no representation in Michigan. The second reason that there ought to be an amendment, and I supported not just the Dirksen amendment, but the Javits amendment. I'll support any amendment that's reasonable that will get this to the people. The second reason is that if we don't do it, the States are going to call a constitutional convention. We haven't had that since the first constitutional convention. Once they're called, they can destroy every right which the liberals of this country say they want to preserve. A constitutional convention needs only four more States according to one computation. Seven more by another. Thirty-four States can call it. Thirty-eight States would ratify what they did. They could abolish the 14th amendment. They could abolish the present system of income tax. They could abolish the Supreme Court. These seem very stern statements, but remember the only constitutional convention we ever had abolished the Articles of Confereration and wrote the new Constitution. A new convention could write another one.

Moderator. Unfortunately your time is up. It always happens, but its been a most interesting program, and our pleasure to have you, Senator Scott. Thank you for being our guest. And panelists, our thanks to you for your very fine questions. We hope you will return to the program. And to our audience for being with us. This is Bob Johnson inviting you to join us again next week for "Youth Wants To Know."

THE SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the chairman of the Senate conferees, for having brought back to us an agriculture appropriation bill which provides $2 million for distribution to needy schools under section 11 of the School Lunch Act.

Section 11 of the National School Lunch Act authorizes the appropriation of funds to assist especially needy schools that draw a large part of their attendance from areas of poor economic conditions. Its purpose is to enable such schools to serve lunches without charge or at reduced cost to children unable to pay the full cost of their lunch. Section 11 was enacted in October 1962 but thus far Congress had not provided any funds under this authority.

The conference report which we adopted yesterday specifies that this $2 million is to be considered as an experimental program for the next year only and that it "should not be considered a part of the regular permanent school lunch program."

Experimental, yes. Hopefully with these funds we are going to try to find ways of furnishing a mid-day lunch to the Nation's neediest children.

Section 11 is an integral part of the School Lunch Act having been added to the act by the Congress in 1962. The Congress went on record as favoring a stepping up of the school lunch program in the low-income areas of our metropolitan centers and poorest rural areas. I hope that this experiment will be a successful one and that in future years this section of the act will continue to be funded along with the others. I urge all who will have administrative direction of this experiment to realize that lives of many children can be strengthened by proof in practice that this program should be basic in our weapons against poverty and ignorance. And, again, I thank Senator Holland and his conference colleagues for having made this possible.

MRS. KATHRINE ROBINSON EVERETT

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the October 16 edition of the Durham Sun, in an article entitled "Woman Attorney Has Combined Many Roles in Varied and Active Life," briefly discusses the career of one of North Carolina's most distinguished citizens, Mrs. Kathrine Robinson Everett.

As one will discover from reading the article, Mrs. Everett is a most unique individual. She is a great lady, possessed of rare intellect, charm and ability. She has made a fine contribution to the law and public service in North Carolina.

Mrs. Everett's career is both interesting and inspirational and I commend this article to my colleagues as an introduction to one of the Nation's outstanding women.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be placed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Woman Attorney Had Combined Many Roles in Varied and Active Life

(By Carolyn Satterfield)

Mrs. R. O. Everett, who has successfully combined the roles of mother, housewife, lawyer, and community leader, has this advice to offer any young woman who might be considering such a future—"You must like people, you must be interested in public affairs, and you must be willing to work very hard.

"More is still expected of women when they are in comparable jobs to men, though the opportunities are improved," states this outstanding resident of Durham.

Born Kathrine Robinson in Fayetteville, she was indoctrinated early into the jargon of law by her lawyer father, who was dean of the Fayetteville bar, a member of the State legislature and former mayor of Fayetteville.

After graduating from the Woman's College, University of North Carolina, in Greensboro, Mrs. Everett received her law degree at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill. Two sessions of summer school at Columbia University, one at Cornell University, and 1 year of study at Washington College of Law preceded her successful bar exam in 1920.

The following fall, she argued and won a case in the North Carolina Supreme Court, having the distinction of being the first woman to present and win a case before this body. Mrs. Everett's favorite phases of law are tax and estate laws.

While attending a State bar convention in Pinehurst, she first met R. O. Everett, a practicing attorney in Durham and a member of the State legislature. They met again while attending a meeting of the American Bar Association in London, and were married in 1926.

She and Mr. Everett have one son, Robinson Oscar, who resides with them at 119 North Dillard Street, and practices law with his parents in their offices at Wachovie Bank Building. He also teaches at Duke University School of Law.

Mrs. Everett is justifiably proud of the fact that her son graduated fourth in a law class of more than 500 at Harvard Law School, where he had won the Wendel Scholarship as the outstanding member of his freshman class.

Mrs. Everett's contributions to the civic and religious life of Durham have been numerous and outstanding. In 1951 she was elected to the city council and she has served in this capacity since that time.

When asked if her law training had helped her in her duties as a council member, she stated that it had assisted her in appraising situations, and had helped her to know what things contributed to better living.

In response to a question of the changes she has noticed in Durham in her lengthy association with this community, she was high in her praise for the continued progress of Durham. She added that her "admiration for the people of the city is great, for various difficulties have arisen, but the leaders and the residents have overcome these things and have never given up." She states that this attitude is reaping benefits, and adds that the "future of the city is wonderful."

This versatile person has traveled very extensively, having visited in most of the States in the United States, Canada, Cuba, Mexico, and South America. She has traveled to Europe three times.

She relates a fascinating history of her family. Her ancestors founded Bennington, Vt., during the French and Indian wars. She is a direct descendant of Dr. Benjamin Robinson, who migrated to Fayetteville from Vermont in 1805. He was a friend of Thomas Jefferson and named his Fayetteville home Monticello in honor of the famous Virginian's estate. Mr. Jefferson gave Dr. Robinson some chestnut trees from his home, and these trees still thrive on the site of the Robinson homeplace, though the home has burned.

Mrs. Everett is a member of the First Presbyterian Church, and is a past president of the Women of the Church. She is a member of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Colonial Dames, United Daughters of the Confederacy, Daughters of the Founders and Patriots of America, and a play reading club. She has served as local and State president of many of these organizations, is a former PTA president and was Durham and State president of the North Carolina Federation of Business and Professional Woman's Club.

In addition, she is a former vice president for North Carolina of the American Bar Association, a former trustee of Queen's College in Charlotte, and former trustee of Stonewall Jackson Training School.

HAGUE PROTOCOL SHOULD BE RATIFIED—INTERNATIONAL AIR CARRIERS DESERVE UNDERSTANDING, NOT UNDERCUTTING

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was a source of much concern to me to read that the Department of State has decided to serve notice of denunciation of the Warsaw Convention on November 15, unless "by that time a satisfactory interim arrangement for the protection of international air passengers" has been worked out. This unilateral action by the Department of State is untimely and ill advised and could cause resentment among our foreign friends. It appears to be a clear effort of the State Department to pressure other governments and foreign, as well as U.S.-flag, carriers into a position satisfactory to the Department of State. This precipitant action is all the more surprising since the United States has not yet ratified the Hague protocol to the Warsaw Convention which would double the limit of liability provided by Warsaw. The announced course of the State Department in this matter would first, place American passengers under the authority of widely differing laws of the various countries; second, be wholly inconsistent with the President's proclamation of International Cooperation Year; third, be inconsistent with our announced support of the movement of world peace through law; and fourth, do irreparable damage to the efforts of this Nation to assume leadership in the field of international aviation.

We should ratify the Hague protocol and give all possible support to efforts by the carriers and the International Civil Aviation Organization to increase the liability limits still higher.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial, "Hiatus in the Air," from the Journal of Commerce.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIATUS IN THE AIR

American denunciation of the 1929 Warsaw Convention may give a temporary form of satisfaction to those State Department officials who feel vexed at the way foreign governments have been dragging their feet on international airline liability coverage, but the best it can do is solve one problem at the cost of creating another.

Currently, American international airlines are governed by a liability limit of $8,300 per passenger. That is the limit established by the Warsaw Convention. Everyone knows this is not enough. Among the more advanced nations there has been a consensus on this for many years. Ten years ago, in fact, most signatories of the Warsaw Convention agreed to double this limit via the so-called Hague protocol.

The 1955 agreement was achieved chiefly under the prodding of U.S. authorities, who wanted a much higher limit—probably on the order of $50,000. Today Washington's goals are higher still; they range from $75,000 to $100,000 but while over 30 nations now respect the $16,600 liability limit established by the Hague protocol, the United States does not. It does not for the reason that the U.S. Senate never got around to ratifying the Hague protocol. So while insisting that a liability limit of $16,600 is entirely inadequate, the United States for the most of past decade has been observing a limit of half that figure—the original limit of the Warsaw Convention in 1929.

By denouncing the original treaty effective November 15, the United States is able to free itself of the figure set in Warsaw and order unilaterally whatever figure its authorities are convinced is adequate, whether it is $75,000 per passenger, $100,000, or some other figure.

True, the door has not been entirely shut on the possibility of a compromise. Signatories of the Warsaw convention and the Hague protocol are now seeking at meetings in Montreal a new and higher limit. Many nations, especially the more advanced nations, would probably accept a significantly higher figure, especially since it now develops that only by this means can the United States be kept within the original Warsaw agreement.

But the poorer nations with established airlines of their own are balking. It is not within their traditions to accept the high valuations that American courts and legislatures place on life, on claims for injuries in accident cases, on claims for damage to property, on claims of divorced women for alimony and the like. So there are big differences in Montreal. That the search to compromise then goes on apace is attributable to the widespread desire for a semblance of uniformity in the liability limits of all international airlines.

Because the Senate failed to ratify the Hague protocol all these years there is, of course, no real uniformity today. If Washington does go ahead and scrap the Warsaw convention there won't be any in the future, either. The United States itself will jump from a limit lower than that accepted by most other airlines outside the Soviet sphere to another much higher than other nations now accept.

But it will do so—as we indicated earlier—at a price. Nothing that Congress can do will force on foreign international carriers the liability limits considered proper by Washington. By denouncing the Warsaw convention, however, Washington may well deprive American citizens traveling on foreign airlines the relatively little protection they are now accorded.

The reason is this: So long as the United States remains a signatory its citizens traveling abroad on the airlines of other signatories are assured at least of the admittedly inadequate protection provided by the Warsaw Convention, even though that is only half the protection to which they would be entitled if the Senate had ratified The Hague protocol.

Of course, the recurrent hassle over airline liability does not affect policies which an individual passenger might take out before a trip. Such a policy is between the passenger and the insurance company and does not directly involve the airlines.

When the United States is finally out of the 1929 agreement, whatever claims its citizens may have against foreign airlines will probably be adjudicated by foreign courts, often according to local standards. Only in cases where the claimant can prove "willful misconduct" on the part of the carrier can this limit be breached. This is as difficult to do in most cases as it is, in others, to get any satisfactory judgment from many foreign courts, especially in countries where living standards are relatively low.

So it is one thing to agree, as we surely do, that the present liability limits are too low, and another to applaud denunciation of the Warsaw Convention at a time when the signatories are still trying to work out a compromise. The State Department will doubtless reason that this is an effective way of putting heat on the delegates now in Montreal to agree on a figure acceptable to the United States. But if the price of this is

to be collapse of the whole system established in Warsaw and improved at The Hague, we feel it will prove to be quite a high price indeed.

THE EFFECT OF TELEVISION ON CHILDREN

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have here a penetrating series of articles entitled "What Television Is Doing to Your Child," which was recently published in the New York Journal-American.

The quality and perceptiveness of the articles reflect the long months of research by the author, Joan Hanauer, and I would add the publication of this detailed analysis on such a highly controversial subject as the impact of crime and violence on young television viewers is in the grand tradition of American journalism.

The Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, as my colleagues well know, has devoted a large part of its investigative effort exploring the deplorable programing practices of the television industry. We have shown that industry leaders have repeatedly and knowingly ordered the injection of more "sex and violence" into television programs which were aimed at capturing the young viewing audience. Anything goes to win a rating battle. That is clear to all but the disinterested.

It is a fact that many young children spend as much time before a television set as they do in school, and much more than they spend at church. And in our hearings we had testimony from some of our most outstanding scholars and researchers which indicated that the repeated exposure of young minds to the violent, sick, senselessly brutal television shows takes its toll on young minds.

Mr. President, our volumes of hearings and the extensive report on those hearings clearly lay bare for all to see the faults of television programing. We have made it clear for all to see and it shows that to date, and for more than 10 years, the television industry's pleas for self-imposed regulation have been nothing more than a self-serving gesture that has allowed them to continue to do just as they please with their virtual monopoly on the television channels.

They promised to spearhead a study of the impact of violent programing on children.

But nothing has come of it.

They promised to tighten up their own code of good conduct for broadcasters. But nothing has come of it.

To date, not one station has had the Seal of Good Television Practice lifted or suspended for violating the code, though in the course of any day most stations violate it many times.

Indeed, they have asked for much, but have given little.

Perhaps they have some master plan, quietly developing, which they intend to spring on us one day.

Perhaps eventually they will recognize the viewers want quality, not artificially injected violence, senseless sex, and sick plots.

When the bulk of this type of programing is weighed against the brilliant reporting of news and public service shows, the latter is too light and too little to tip the scales favorably.

At the conclusion of hearings by the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency in 1964, I announced my intention of keeping an eye on the developments in television programing.

Monitoring of programs in the new 1965 television season convinces me that the repeated promises of reform made by the television executives have not been kept.

When next the industry asks for grace and again pleads for self-regulation, I am afraid that plea will fall on deaf ears.

Mr. President, I believe my colleagues will find these articles both interesting and informative. I know the parents of America will. I ask unanimous consent they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Oct. 11, 1965]

WHAT TV IS DOING TO YOUR CHILD—A NEW SERIES

(By Joan Hanauer)

It happened in Colorado, but it could have been in New York or any other place.

The victim was a 32-year-old housewife, but she could have been anybody. There was no logic, no sense to the crime.

She was walking down the street in broad daylight, bothering no one.

Suddenly she was confronted by her attacker. He wanted her money and demanded she hand over her pocketbook.

The housewife couldn't believe it was happening to her; couldn't take her assailant seriously. He had a gun, but she thought it was a toy instead.

She refused to comply.

Her attacker shot her right there on the street, then looked at her uncomprehendingly as she fell to the sidewalk, seriously wounded.

"My God," she gasped, "he's only a child." And she was right. Her attacker was barely 10 years old.

Later, the boy explained to authorities what had happened.

"I didn't mean to hurt her," he said.

"I was doing it like they do on TV."

The story related here is documented in a report drafted by Senator DODD's Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency.

In another of these shocking cases uncovered by the Dodd committee, Long Island police were hot on the trail of thieves who made a habit of breaking into homes and stealing cash and valuables.

LEARNED ROBBERY TECHNIQUE ON TV

The burglaries appeared to be professional jobs and baffled police for awhile.

Finally, they were able to trap the burglars.

The leader was an 11-year-old boy.

He said that he and his accomplice, who had stolen more than $1,000 in cash and loot, learned their criminal technique on television.

His accomplice was 7 years old.

These and other cases are responsible for alarming parents, educators, law enforcement authorities, psychologists, and sociologists throughout the country.

The question they want answered is this: "What is television doing to our children?"

The importance of the question is underlined by these statistics:

During the average day television reaches 20.7 million teenagers, or 89 percent of the population between 12 and 18 years of age.

Approximately 31.6 million children watch television daily—99 percent of the population between 4 and 11 years of age.

Studies have shown that children begin watching as early as 3 years old.

Prof. Wilbur Schramm, director of the Institute of Communication Research at Stanford University, wrote in a report on "The Effects of Television on Children and Adolescents" for UNESCO:

"In the United States, where the most extensive measurements of viewing by children of different ages have been made, it is estimated that a child of 3 is already averaging about 45 minutes a day on television.

"By the time the child is in the first grade (age 5 or 6) he is spending about 2 hours a day in front of the television set.

"The time spent watching TV slowly increases with age and with later bedtimes, until a peak is reached at the age of 12 or 13 when the average child is viewing about 3 hours a day.

"During the high school years (13 to 16) the viewing time decreases to about 2 hours a day."

Professor Schramm estimates that the average child spends between 500 to 1,000 hours a year in front of the picture tube. This figures out to 6,000 to 12,000 hours during the 12 school years.

"The larger of these figures," Professor Schramm adds, "is not far different from the amount of time an average child spends in school during those same years, taking into account vacations and holidays."

What are children watching all that time and what effect does it have on them?

THERE'S VARIETY OF VIOLENCE

One thing they see is violence—from the gun duels of westerns to the fist fights of detective epics, from the booming guns of war stories to the real life and incredible violence of the assassination of a President and the nationally televised gunning down of his assassin.

There are those who watch the watchers in fear and they cite cases—real-life cases—such as these:

Two brothers, 12 and 10, terrorized an Oklahoma town in a shooting spree that left one man dead and two others wounded. They told police they were motivated by television and movie crime stories.

A mentally retarded boy of 15 kidnaped a 6-year-old girl and left her tied up for 3 days with practically no food or water. When apprehended he said he copied the idea from a television program he had seen.

A boy who had beaten up a girl said he had fantasies of doing this for a long time but decided to turn his nightmarish daydreams into reality after seeing a girl beaten on the screen.

It was cases like these that led FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover to warn against the "dangerous trend" in movies and television—a trend that he said is glorying crime and violence.

It was dealing with delinquent and disturbed children which led Dr. Arthur R. Timme to warn:

"My experience as a child psychiatrist over a period of years leads me to the conclusion that television crime programs have a very deleterious effect on the mind of growing children.

"DISAGREE ON TV INFLUENCE

"I have seen their ideation so colored by witnessing violence, killing, shooting, cheating, outwitting, conniving, etc., that they grow up with a completely distorted sense of what is right and wrong in human social behavior."

Opinion is by no means unanimous. Dr. Bertrand New, clinical director of the Brooklyn Psychiatric Centers, Inc., with eight clinics in Brooklyn treating thousands of children a year, said:

"I think the effect of television on children's violent or aggressive behavior has been far overrated. In my experience in dealing with children, I could consider television, at most, a minor contributory factor.

"It is possible that television could teach children some techniques of violence, aggression or antisocial behavior, but it does not cause this behavior.

"All children have violent fantasies and television might help crystalize them, but it could not make the crucial difference. In everyone there is a balance between desires and conscience.

"The child's moral values come from his parents. If his home teaches him good moral values, his conscience will quell his desires. If his home teaches poor moral values, he may feel an impulse to action.

"If a child has a good solid family, television morality has no significance.

"REVEALS GIRLS UNAFFECTED

"One has only to watch a little brother and sister together to observe the violence in children. Parents provide the control. I found from my experience at Bellevue that when children yield to impulses to violence they usually are much worse than anything on television."

A study performed in a small Hudson River Valley community indicated there is a tie-in between aggressive children and the viewing of violent television programs. But the study did not pinpoint whether the violent programs created aggressiveness in children, or whether the aggressive child turns toward violence on the TV screen.

In the study, third graders rated their peers on aggressiveness. The childrens' parents were asked to indicate their youngster's favorite TV programs, and the amount of time spent televiewing.

Prof. Leonard D. Eron then with the Rip Van Winkle Foundation but now at the State University of Iowa, concluded:

"There is a strong positive relationship between the violence rating of favorite programs * * * and aggression of boys as rated by their peers in the classroom. There is also a significant negative relationship between the amount of time spent in viewing TV as reported by mothers and aggression of boys. * * * There were no significant relationships when TV habits of girls were reported."

SOCIAL DANGER PROVED IN TEST

Psychologists have gone beyond theorizing the effects of viewed violence by conducting laboratory tests.

This is what Dr. Leonard Berkowitz, a psychologist who conducted tests at the University of Wisconsin, with the support of the National Science Foundation, did.

Individuals were intentionally angered or frustrated, exposed to a violent film clip then given a chance to vent their aggression. They did so.

The film clip did not produce a cathartic release for their hostility. Those who were frustrated but did not see the film clip were less likely to react aggressively.

Dr. Berkowitz commented:

"In the absence of any strong inhibitions against aggression, people who have recently been angered and have then seen filmed aggression will be more likely to act aggressively than people who have not had those experiences."

Dr. Berkowitz said such media-stimulated aggressiveness would be short lived, but that children were more likely to be affected than adults. He warned:

"As I see it, the major social danger inherent in filmed violence has to do with the temporary affects produced in a fairly short period immediately following the film.

"For that period, at least, a person, whether an adult or a child, who had just seen filmed violence, might conclude that he was warranted in attacking those people in his own life who had recently frustrated him.

"Further, the film might activate his aggressive habits so that for the period of which I speak he would be primed to act aggressively. Should he then encounter people with appropriate stimulus qualities, people he dislikes or connects psychologically with the film, his predisposition could lead to open aggression."

One of the most impressive series of experiments were conducted by Dr. Albert Bandura, a Stanford University psychologist, who used 96 children, mostly all 4 year olds, to test the extent to which children will copy aggressive patterns of behavior.

The children were divided into four groups, one of which was a control group for whom the vital element of aggressive behavior was eliminated.

AGGRESSIVENESS IS MEASURED

In the first group each child, one by one, was brought into a room and settled in one corner with play materials. In another corner was an adult with a set of tinker toys, a mallet, and a large inflated Bobo clown doll.

Once the child was acclimated to his surroundings, the adult began to violently attack the doll in a manner typical of a child, such as hitting it over the head with a mallet. The adult also encouraged violence upon the doll, saying, "Kick him." "Hit him down." "Sock him in the nose," and "Throw him in the air."

The second group saw the same aggression, but on film instead of acted out by a live adult.

The third group saw a film, also, but projected through a mock TV set and with the adult dressed as a cartoon cat.

The fourth group saw no adult violence but just sat in the room and played with toys.

The next stage was for each child, again individually, to be led to another room.

On the way, the children, including those in the central group which had seen no violence, were mildly annoyed.

The children now sat in observation rooms where they found such aggressive toys as Bobo dolls and mallets, and nonaggressive toys, including a tea set, plastic farm animals, crayons, and coloring paper.

The children in the first three groups—those that had witnessed violence—proceeded to exhibit twice as much aggressiveness as the children unexposed to violence in the central group.

Dr. Bandura summed up:

"Most of the children from the first three groups sat on the Bobo doll and punched its nose, beat it on the head with a mallet, tossed it into the air and kicked it around the room.

"And they used the familiar hostile remarks, 'Hit him down.' 'Kick him,' and so forth. This kind of conduct was rare among the children in the central groups."

Dr. Bandura included among the conclusions the children's experience with adult aggression tended to reduce their own inhibitions against such behavior and helped form the child's own aggressive behavior. He added:

"A person displaying violence on film is as influential as one displaying it in real life. The children were not too inclined to give precise imitations of the cartoon character, but many of them behaved like carbon copies of both real life and film models."

He stressed that his conclusions should not be overweighted because there is a difference between a child learning and doing.

A child seldom has access to the weapons that would allow him to do what he has learned. Parents also are quick to suppress any learning that conflicts with what they consider desirable conduct. Dr. Bandura said:

"No one should forget that television is but one of several important influences on children's attitudes and social behavior, and other factors undoubtedly heighten or surpress its effects."

But his main object lesson was:

"A child who watches violence on a screen is not necessarily going to attack the first person he sees * * * but if provoked on some future occasion, he may * * * copy aggressive patterns of behavior * * * learned from a pictorial medium like television."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Oct. 12, 1965]

WHAT TV IS DOING TO YOUR CHILD—THE PARENT'S ROLE

(The second of a penetrating series by Joan Hanauer)

The 4-year-old girl was told that her grandfather had died.

"Who shot him?" was the child's reaction.

The little story was a favorite of Newton Minow's when he was Federal Communications Commissioner and campaigning to cultivate television's "vast wasteland."

It is typical of the fears of many that television gives to children a distorted view of life.

This is stressed in one of the classic studies in the field of television's impact on the young mind, "Television and the Child," a socio-psychological survey undertaken for England's Nuffield Foundation, by Hilde T. Himmelweit, A. N. Oppenheim, and Pamela Vince.

The Himmelweit study is quoted throughout the world as the outstanding authoritative survey in the field.

Here is the way in which "Television and the Child" describes television from the child's view:

"The world of television drama tends to be that of upper middle class urban society. The occupations of people of this social level are depicted as worthwhile, while manual work is presented as uninteresting.

"Television plays teach that self-confidence and toughness are needed to achieve success—goodness of character is not enough; that life is difficult, especially for women; that marriages are frequently unhappy, and parent-child relationships often strained.

"Events rarely turn out satisfactorily and virtue seldom brings happiness in its train. Violence is an inevitable part of life, and good people often resort to it.

"For the adult observer a hackneyed view of life emerges, similar in many ways to that offered in films or in the theater; for the child television may afford a glimpse of adult life which he would otherwise gain less often and only at a later time."

TREND DANGEROUS, FBI HEAD WARNS

Actually two areas are involved—one is the distorted sense of values concerning violence, sex, crime, and other sensational aspects of life, and the other is the distortion of day-to-day commonplaces, such as the importance of wealth and certain types of possessions, the concept of self in relation to society and family.

It is the problem of values applied to crime and violence which has alarmed not only professors, who may be accused of living in ivory towers, but also such a hard-headed, down-to-earth person as J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who said:

"As a law enforcement officer and as an American citizen, I feel dutybound to speak out against a dangerous trend which is manifesting itself in the field of film and television entertainment.

"In the face of the Nation's terrifying juvenile crime wave, we are threatened with a flood of movies and television presentations which flaunt indecency and applaud lawlessness.

"Not since the days when thousands filed past the bier of the infamous John Dillinger and made his home a virtual shrine have we witnessed such a brazen affront to our national conscience."

Another warning comes from Dr. Raymond Sobel, head of the Division of Child Psychiatry, School of Medicine, Washington University, who says that "the television crime program gives children an erroneous view of life." He recounted:

"In one evening recently I watched several programs in which prostitutes were really noble creatures, gamblers were extolled, and their gambling considered to be a high caliber of occupation, and finally shooting in cold blood was passed over in an extremely light-hearted fashion.

"I do not believe that this promotes adequate conscience or appraisal of reality."

DIFFERENT VIEW OF THE WORLD

Weighing the exact effect of any specific program or televised incident on children in general is impossible. Children and adults look at the world differently. This is illustrated by the following examples.

During an interview conducted with a professional man on how television affects his three boys, he told of visiting the circus several years ago with a son.

A bloody fight ensued in one of the rings between two animals, and the father related:

"It appalled and sickened me, and I was frightened about the effect it would have on my son. We lived in Brooklyn at the time, and when we got on the subway for the ride home, I could see he was upset.

"I was amazed to discover that it wasn't the animals fighting or the blood or anything that related to the incident that disturbed him, however. He wanted to know what happened to the head of the headless man on stilts.

"I explained that his head was hidden under his overcoat, and for the rest of the trip home, while other subway riders stared, I had to keep putting my coat over my head to show how the trick was done."

STRANGE REACTION TO AWFUL DEED

The story produced a knowing smile from Dr. Bertrand New, clinical director of the Brooklyn Psychiatric Centers, who termed it "almost a classic case" and added:

"A boy of 4 or 5, particularly, is sometimes worried at the thought of physical injury. If he sees a vivid thing, either in life or on television, it can make him terribly anxious. Of course, the parents in the proper family situation can allay that—and there is no way of knowing what will be vivid to him.

"Perhaps one of the most famous cases along this line was related by Anna Freud, the daughter of Sigmund Freud.

"It concerned a child who was in treatment after seeing her mother killed by her father in front of her very eyes.

"In treatment an attempt was made to find out just what aspect of this awful thing most upset the child. Was it the death of her mother? The violence of her father?

"Finally the answer was discovered. Apparently the mother, aware that the child was in the room, tried to spare her by yelling at her to get out.

"This was the thing—the little girl's most traumatic residual of seeing her father kill her mother before her eyes was the fact that her mother yelled at her to get out.

"One never knows how they will react."

The Himmelweit study in England does give some clues, however. The study is considered important because it could never again be duplicated. It was performed in the mid-1950's at a time when Britain still had a considerable number of households without television, where in some communities there was only one station, the BBC, and in others the Government-owned BBC had been joined by a commercial channel.

There is no area of our society today, on either side of the Atlantic, where television has not made too large an invasion to leave sizable numbers of children untouched by it.

It is estimated that there are 52,600,000 television households in the United States today—9 out of every 10. That makes the vital control group—the group not touched by the TV antenna—impossible to obtain.

And according to the Himmelweit study:

"All in all, the values of television can make an impact if they are consistently presented in dramatic form, and if they touch on ideas or values for which the child is emotionally ready."

An area of concern here is less with the violence of boys as with the emotional turbulence of girls when they reach a troubled and troublesome age.

"Adolescent girl viewers," the survey said, "proved more concerned than their controls (nonviewers) about growing up and marrying—possibly a reaction to the difficulties of adult life of which television made them aware at an age when they are much in need of reassurance."

In what areas of television could this happen?

One answer is the daytime soap operas, which today are very different from their relatively innocent radio ancestors. They abound in adultery, alcoholism, illicit relationships, unwed mothers (usually teenage) and divorce.

Of the six CBS daytime serials, for example, five have had unwed girls "in trouble" and the sixth had a girl who came close.

In the evening there is a new development—a nighttime, thrice-a-week spin-off of a daytime soap opera; in which one of the characters of the daytime program had been turned into the leading lady of the nighttime show.

In addition, there is the scandal-scented "Peyton Place," also on 3 nights a week and in essence a soap opera.

The Himmelweit study indicates that television's message has more impact on adolescent girls than on any other group.

Because of the difficulties in making generalizations about children's reactions, it is impossible to pinpoint at what age watching adult programs begins to affect a child's thinking.

But it is possible to know when they begin taking an interest in adult programs.

Prof. Wilbur Schramm of Stanford University estimates that this viewing of adult programs begins in the early elementary years.

And he added:

"In the United States, it has been noted that as much as two-thirds of children's viewing was of programs in which adults make up the majority of the audience."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Oct. 13, 1965]

WHAT TV IS DOING TO YOUR CHILD—THE ABUSES

(The third of a penetrating series by Joan Hanauer)

Is your child a television addict?

Does he suffer from the "tired child syndrome"? Has your television set become an electronic babysitter; a mechanical mother substitute?

If the answer to these questions is yes, then you are abusing instead of using television in the upbringing of your child.

While experts and parents alike have shown great concern over violence and crime as portrayed on television, less attention has been placed by parents on the amount of time children watch TV and the effect this has on them.

At the University of Chicago, Robert D. Hess and Harriet Goldman interviewed 99 mothers in the Chicago metropolitan area who had both children between ages 5 and 10 living in the home and television sets.

The mothers were surveyed to discover what image they had of television and its influences on children; the extent to which they supervised TV watching as to content and hours watched; and the sources of social norms on these two topics.

The importance of parents' attitudes and actions toward television was underlined in the study's introduction:

"In urban America there are three major sources of external stimulation to the developing mental faculties of the preadolescent child—the family, the school, and the television set.

"Evidence available from an increasing number of studies shows that children below the age of 12 spend roughly 22 hours per week, on the average, facing the small screen.

"It is evident that over the course of a calendar year children spend more time viewing television programs than they spend in school.

"It seems likely that no other single activity, except sleep, is allocated so much time per year as this instrument of mass media commands."

The survey indicated that, in about half the families, the child was at liberty to turn on the television set at will. The survey added:

"For mothers of small children, babysitting is one of the most important functions served by television."

In the area of mothers' attitudes toward television, the survey concluded that the mothers believed the "responsible, good parent" supervises both content and the amount of time spent viewing.

Another attitude of interest was the mothers' feeling that supervision of content meant helping the child "avoid programs showing physical violence"—a negative attitude which ignores responsibility toward pointing the child in the direction of possibly beneficial programs.

The mothers' responses on TV control were particularly interesting when pitted against the survey's conclusions on what actually happened in the home.

"1. In the majority of the families, the young child watches almost as much as he wishes and for the most part, views programs of his own choice.

"2. In the majority of the families, mothers make little effort to supervise either program selection by the child or the total amount he watches.

"3. In most families, the father has little voice in determining the television behavior of his child."

An informal survey of New York area families by the Journal-American brought out one reason for the discrepancy between what parents think of TV control and what they do about it.

Mother after mother said that her child did not watch television excessively, but when asked to estimate total number of viewing hours was shocked at the high rate.

When this newspaper asked the Independent Bronx Consultation Center, a low-cost psychiatric clinic at 941 Burke Avenue, its view, the staff prepared this answer, after terming the 22 hours a week "excessive":

"The easy accessibility of TV causes concern about the effect on children of the violence, overstimulation, and sheer stupidity of so many programs. In addition many experts deplore the passivity and lack of imagination required in young viewers.

"Both radio and reading offer stimulation to only one sense, so that active participation of the audience is promoted. The lack of activity required by TV caused Philip Wylie to call it a 'mechanical beast.' ". Anyone who has seen children or adults hypnotized before the set must agree that this figure of speech is appropriate.

"It has often been recommended that TV viewing be rationed and controlled. Surely this is a reasonable attitude. Many pleasures that gratify us in moderation are harmful in excess. In addition it seems appropriate to encourage children to exercise some selectivity in the type of program watched.

"But limiting TV viewing is not the whole story. Attention must be paid to individual needs.

"Some young people seem able to watch an enormous number of programs and still lead active social lives and do their homework. Such children may be deriving benefit from this form of relaxation. There are other children, however, for whom TV seems to represent their only gratification."

How, then, is a parent to decide?

To Dr. Bertrand New, clinical director of the Brooklyn Psychiatric Centers, the answer revolves around the use to which television is put in the home.

"It is the role that television plays that is important," Dr. New said.

"The maximum damage that television may do to children is not encountered in the fantasies it may breed but in the way it is used in the household.

"If television becomes a substitute babysitter; if parents are with their children less because of television; if parents use television to escape from their children—then it is definitely not a constructive thing.

"The fault lies not with the television industry in these cases, but with the parents.

"Television is so convenient. Parents know if they put on the TV, the children will be quiet, they won't throw things. Too often young adolescents are left home with TV as a babysitter when their parents want to go out in the evening.

"But anything that separates the parent from the child, that interferes with their relationship, is bad for the child. And excessive misuse of television can do that."

Dr. New said that children receive their basis for morality from their parents—both what their parents tell them and what they observe. If the parents aren't around, television or even more likely their peers could fill the vacuum.

Another area over which Dr. New expressed concern was that television could, to use a contradictory phrase, stimulate passivity.

"Television is watched excessively if it interferes with the doing of other things, if it is used as a simple substitute for action. People from middle-class families tend to fight this, but it is not always possible to do so in poorer families, where alternatives are too expensive or troublesome.

"Television tends to develop a passive attitude in children—very often they show the most regression while watching, things such as thumbsucking in a child who has outgrown it.

"While I may deplore the quality of so much of television, which seems based on the lowest common denominator, that is not where the danger lies. I don't believe there is anything intrinsically wrong with TV, but we haven't learned to live with it yet."

This is certainly true of the children found by two Air Force pediatricians to be suffering from what they called the "tired child syndrome."

Capts. Richard M. Narkewicz and Stanley N. Graven studied 30 children—26 between the ages of five and nine—who were brought to them by parents concerned over the children's "nervousness, chronic fatigue, abdominal pains, and sleep and appetite disturbances."

The doctors discovered that the children watched television from 3 to 6 hours daily, and averaged 6 to 10 hours per day during weekends—higher than the TV-watching habits of children without these symptoms.

"The viewing time," the doctors said, "seemed to increase with progression of fatigue and sleep disturbances because the majority of the children became too tired to do anything else."

Captain Narkewicz said that he felt he and his colleague had come up "with fairly good evidence on paper that excessive viewing of television contributed to anxiety in children."

He pointed out that young children find it difficult to distinguish reality from television and added:

"And so the events which produce anxiety are observed on the screen.

"The cycle is vicious. The anxiety produced by the television viewing inhibits sleep. Thus, the child is too tired to play. So he watches more television, and it continues."

A simple test of whether or not your child is overly dependent on television was suggested by the father of an almost 14-year-old:

"I don't entirely approve of the fact that sometimes my youngster watches television for an hour and an hour and a half at a time.

"But I don't worry because if he is watching and I ask if he wants me to read to him, he's delighted and the TV is forgotten. When he seems to prefer television to his mother and me, I'll worry in earnest."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal American, Oct. 14, 1965]

WHAT TV IS DOING TO YOUR CHILD—THE BENEFITS

(By Joan Hanauer)

Astronauts blasting off into orbit.

The inauguration of the President of the United States.

Panel discussion programs, documentaries, white papers.

These are among the benefits that come readily to mind when one attempts to conjure up the ways in which television benefits our children.

Missing from the list are great drama, great music, poetry readings, and other cultural might-have-been benefits that too rarely grace the small screen.

And what benefits can there be in a new TV season that ranges from the teenage inanity of "Gidget" to the slick escapism of "I Spy?" That during prime time schedules only two network public affairs programs a week for a not very grand total of an hour and a half?

The surprising answer is that for a child there is a great deal to be learned even from television at its least inspiring.

Dr. Bertrand New, clinical director of the Brooklyn Psychiatric Centers, commented:

"While television could be much better utilized than it is today, television can be very broadening even as it is now.

"Children learn about the world and about things outside their personal existence from television at prereading ages, when otherwise in other times they would have had to wait until they had reading skills.

"This is particularly true of poorer children—and in New York that has become almost synonymous with minority group children.

"From television, these children learn about the whole world that surrounds their constricted one. They learn not only about the world and the culture outside of their block or small neighborhood, but what world capitals look like, about the National Government, about so many things.

"Television also is a big help when children start to read because it teaches them to know what more words, things look like. The translation of visual pictures into imagined picture—as we all do when we read—can be confusing to a child and television helps."

The same point was brought out by a pair of librarians. They are Margaret C. Scoggin, coordinator of young adult services at the New York Public Library, and Mrs. Augusta Baker, in charge of children's services.

Both deplored certain aspects of television—the concentration on violence, brutality, and sex, the mutilation of some books in their dramatization (they said movies were guilty of this, too), the overcoyness and talking down of some children's comedy and the programing by ratings instead of quality which produced too much similarity of shows.

But both had high praise for other aspects of the medium.

They pointed out that a child's world becomes broader via television. A child who sees even a badly done "when knighthood was in flower" epic learns what armor looks like, what a lance is, what life was like in a medieval castle.

A child who sees "A Tale of Two Cities" on television discovers what a tumbril is and what it looks like—when he reads the book he will draw more from it.

They summed up by saying that television is here to stay and children can learn from it.

The two librarians dispelled one worry about television that has worried parents—that it will make the book as obsolete as papyrus, to be hauled out and read only on ritual occasions.

Miss Scoggin said that worry started during the first year of really nationwide television, when reading dropped off.

In that year, 1949–50, circulation of books from the children's rooms of the library's branches was 2,810,255. The following year it was 2,696,096, a drop of 161,402.

But that was a 1-year phenomenon and circulation has been on the increase every year since.

Miss Scoggin pointed to some startling statistics.

A spot check of the library's 79 branches showed that in 1964 teenagers between the ages of 13 and 18 were responsible for 16.5 percent of the adult circulation figures—a percentage much greater than their share of the population.

And in 25 of those branches the teenager represented 45 percent of the adult circulation.

The effects in the long run of television on reading also showed that duller children who watched television read more than did children of the same capacity in the nonviewing group.

Another aspect of television viewing may come as a big surprise.

A physician who discussed his children's viewing habits with the Journal-American said that under ordinary conditions he and his wife observed certain cautions about what their children might watch.

But for a 4-day period beginning November 22, 1963, all thought of the children were drowned in the tears that followed John F. Kennedy's assassination.

For 4 days the doctor and his wife watched hour after hour of the dreadful period following the President's death. That period included, of course, the gunning down of Lee Harvey Oswald by Jack Ruby, the only nationally televised murder in history.

"My wife and I were glued to the set," he said. "My children saw Oswald killed right before their eyes. What effect did the whole 4 days have on them?

"It registered, but it didn't seem to have any effect. You worry about violence in television stories, but what about violence in life?"

Dr. New discussed the story, a common one across the country as parents understandably watched television with little thought to their children at a time of tragedy to their President, their country, their world.

"Oddly enough, it probably was good for children," Dr. New said. "This was brought up at Albert Einstein College and the consensus was that it was a healthy thing.

"Children follow their parents, and if their parents grieved, the children probably did also in sympathy. Of course, if the parents panicked, the children would also, and this might not be good.

"But on the plus side were two things. One is the fact that death is at best a difficult concept for children, and it is one that many parents are embarrassed or afraid to discuss with their children.

"Here was death presented on television and it was sad—but it also had a kind of beauty to it, something that children well might not get from their parents.

"Since there was no panic on television during the 4 days, no such sense reached out at them from the screen.

"But more important, it taught them something. When children worry about death, it often involves the terrifying concept that mommy and daddy could die.

"Here the President of the United States died and the country and life went on.

"To a child, that also would indicate that if the dread thing were to happen and daddy died, life would still go on."

Television has come a long way, technologically speaking, since 1948 when it had captured a million homes and was composed of 9 inches of glass screen, bolted to a mahogany box.

Where it goes from today's streamlined, 27-inch screen, in color, in the nontechnological sense is a question everybody is asking—and the answer is up to everybody.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, Oct. 15, 1965]

WHAT TV DOES TO YOUR CHILD—AN ANSWER

(By Joan Hanauer)

A Congressman was flooded with complaints from a constituent who said her youngster was watching what she considered harmful programs.

"Madam," was the lawmaker's answer, "did you ever think of turning the darn thing off?"

In the long run, that's the answer to the troubling problem of possible harm to your child through viewing television.

The Federal Communications Commission has regulatory powers over the broadcasting industry. The industry itself and the sponsors together control what is aired, but it is the public that has the absolute power—the power to turn the dial to another channel or to "off."

Advice from experts vary. At one extreme is Erich Fromm, psychiatrist, social philosopher, and author, who said:

"I find the violence we see in the movies or on television just disgusting. No pornographic film could possibly be as harmful as the films that portray violence and sadism and that our children look at 5, 6 hours a day."

He went on to tell an interviewer for a national magazine:

"Now if I had children, I would not permit them to look at most of what television offers. I might not even have a television set.

"I would consider it like a vice, like eating pounds of candy, which I wouldn't permit, either.

"I would, however, try to give the children enough stimulation so they wouldn't have any urge to look at that fool thing."

Less extreme is Dr. Benjamin Spock, whose books on baby care have been the bibles for mothers.

"For a child who is reasonably secure," Dr. Spock advises, "and whose parents use good sense about what he sees and what he shouldn't see, there is no reason to refrain from watching television.

"An apprehensive child, on the other hand, doesn't always have sense enough to refrain from watching what will prove frightening to him. In this case, a parent should keep a much closer watch on what the child sees and how much."

He also said he would "encourage those who are dissatisfied with some of the fare offered in broadcasting movies and comics, to stick by their guns, not let themselves be bullied by their children or by neighborhood opinion."

This leaves the decisionmaking up to the individual parent, but there are some guidelines that can be followed.

Dr. Spock points to one of them—very young children cannot differentiate easily between fact and fiction, so the younger the child, the more carefully his TV fare must be screened.

This means that parents must watch programs themselves, since some titles can be misleading.

For example, the National Association for Better Radio and Television, known as NAFBRAT, discovered in a survey that one episode of "Roy Rogers" contained "three attempted murders, two jailbreaks, one abduction, lots of shooting, lots of fighting, the sheriff was tricked twice and locked in a cell. Police were ineffective and stupid."

On the other hand, it was brought out in the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency hearings that in 6 years of weekly "Wyatt Earp" shows, the hero of this "adult" western killed only one man, and that was an accident.

"Television and the Child," a study made in England for the Nuffield Foundation, gives some guides which parents may find helpful in regulating their children's viewing. Under the heading "Reactions of Fear and Anxiety," the report states:

"Westerns tended to frighten only the very young or the insecure; it is likely that the majority of children can enjoy them without fear by the time they are about 7.

"On the other hand, detective, murder and crime thrillers were often mentioned as frightening by adolescents as well as by the 10 to 11 year olds.

"Where children mentioned incidents that had frightened them, they often spoke of nightmares and of difficulty in falling asleep. It is in such effects as these that the disturbance caused by frightening programs can best be seen.

"Children tended to be more readily frightened when viewing in the dark, and when watching programs in the evening without an adult present. Television insofar as it is more of a family activity than radio listening is likely to arouse less fear, but television's visual impact in darkened rooms could well make up for this."

The Independent Bronx Consultation Center warns parents that it is not enough to remove youngsters from the set. The center advises:

"They must be offered attractive substitutes in the form of conversation, games, and activities in which the parents participate. Children need hobbies, playmates, and development of their own potential talents as well as family experience."

In Washington, the Federal Communications Commission is attempting to lift the quality of television programing by demanding that the networks relinquish to the sponsors half the programing responsibility during prime time evening hours. Networks produced, or had a hand in producing 93 percent of their prime time programs last year.

The networks are fighting the FCC, and no resolution is expected until spring.

One cynic suggested that the broadcasters are more daring on both ends of the spectrum than advertisers or their agencies. He said broadcasters probably will provide the high spots of worthwhile documentaries and dramatizations and the low points of pandering to a taste for violence and sex.

The advertisers, he said, will lean toward the safe middleground, producing a more bland product designed to appeal to the widest possible audience while offending no one.

One of the frontline fighters in the television battle is Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, whose Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency evaluated the impact of programs featuring crime and violence on young people.

Senator DODD believes that overly-aggressive children can have such attitudes reinforced by televised violence.

His committee has brought forth five basic recommendations, and Chairman DODD said that when its study is complete it also may propose legislation. The recommendations are:

Networks should work together to develop prime time programing each week specifically designed for youngsters.

The FCC and TV industry should come to early agreement on revising the FCC's licensing application so that realistic standards in the public interests are laid out.

The National Association of Broadcasters should revise its code—with teeth in it. There should be effective sanctions applied by the TV industry itself against code violators. The code's seal of approval has never been revoked from a broadcaster for programing infractions, no matter how many existed.

A system of communication and complaint should be developed to enable the community to express its views on local programing—for good or bad—and make its views felt by the broadcaster.

A coordinated large-scale program should be launched to develop more information as to the impact of television on juvenile behavior.

The individual also can be active in policing television programing.

You can write your Congressmen and Senators, expressing your interest and your views.

You can write broadcasters. If you do, don't just indicate what you don't like. Also be generous with praise for the programs you want to support. Despite the vastness of the networks, they are very sensitive to individual expressions of public opinion.

You can make use of television at its best to benefit your youngster by being watchful for programs that would be educational or culturally broadening, and encouraging viewing of these.

You can stir up interest in your community in what's happening in television; encourage your neighbors to write letters; organize TV study groups to determine what is being shown and how it affects the children in the community.

The networks put on the air what they think you want to watch—if you feel they are failing at this, it's up to you to educate them.

TRIBUTE TO COL. RALPH E. VANDERVORT, JR.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in making this brief comment about the retirement of Col. Ralph E. Vandervort, Jr., on October 31.

Colonel Vandervort has served his country with honor and distinction the past 24 years. I know of no liaison representative that I have enjoyed knowing and working with more. His work has been outstanding and deeply appreciated by all of us.

Colonel Vandervort is a 1941 graduate of Oregon State College. He participated in both the Second World War and the Korean conflict. His military record is most commendable. He was awarded the Purple Heart and the Croix de Guerre with Gold Star by the Government of France in 1945.

He has also distinguished himself as a professor of military science at Ohio State University and at Loyola College in Baltimore.

In recognition of his accomplishments as an Army liaison officer, he was assigned the duties of liaison officer between the Senate and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

But Colonel Vandervort has been more than a public servant, he has been a good friend and that friendship has been something special to all of us.

There is much more that I could say about Bud Vandervort, but a good deal of it has already been said by my distinguished colleagues. He has done his job and done it well, and we are deeply indebted.

While we regret his loss, we know he has earned his retirement and wish Colonel Vandervort and his family best wishes for a happy and rewarding future.

THE SPACE AGE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, Prof. James G. Allen, a distinguished member of the University of Colorado faculty, recently delivered an address before the American Astronautical Society on the "Impact of Space Exploration on Society." This is a relatively new field of research which is most worthy of detailed consideration and thoughtful analysis. Certainly the space and underwater fields of industry and research will be the most rapidly growing sources of endeavor for the future decades. Very little thought has previously been given to the total impact of the space age on our society and, as a consequence, this paper and its proposals are unique and deserving of attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this paper be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL BACKGROUND OF THE SPACE AGE

(By James G. Allen, University of Colorado)

The social implications of space exploration and of the space age, therefore, not only meet but demand the most detailed consideration and study.

The space revolution of the mid-20th century must be regarded as the most significant of all those great revolutions of history which have affected the fate of man. By definition, a revolution does produce a series of pyramiding effects, one building up on another. But, in the last analysis, these effects focus upon, and culminate in truly significant changes in the social and economic relationships which shape one society.

Tremendous changes were wrought by those previous great historical forces: the territorial revolution of the 15th century; the scientific revolutions of the 13th and 18th centuries; the revolution in religion in the 16th century; and the commercial, social, and industrial revolutions of the 18th century.

The vital transformations induced by each of these, in its own course and at its own time, have long been studied in the several disciplines of knowledge, especially in relation to the physical realm of the earth's surface and also as they affected the attitudes of individuals and of government. Important as were all these revolutionary epochs of the historical past, there was, when viewed from modern concepts, one great limiting factor. This factor was that none of them was of immediate effect on the entire population of the whole world.

The space revolution of the mid-twentieth century thus is unique, as its course and direction will affect every individual on each of the five continents. Moreover, its effects will lie in an entirely new dimension—beyond the physical realm of man's earthly existence and into the boundless areas of space itself. The space revolution of our day has resulted from the theories, hypotheses and observations of the scientists as their conclusions were tested and applied by the engineers and technicians.

Historically, this has always been the procedure. Ever since the late 18th century, an age of science and technology has continuously been evident. Technological developments, resulting from discoveries of myriad kinds, have affected society and even influenced the decisions of government. When viewed by modern standards, these technological developments came rather slowly. Society was able to assess their value and to absorb their application with, again in present day contexts, relatively little dislocation.

For example, more than 50 years elapsed after John Kay developed the flying shuttle in 1733 until the automated, steam-powered loom was invented by Edmund Cartwright in 1785. John Kay's invention doubled the amount of cloth a man could weave in one day. This early type of automation did away with the weaver's assistant, hitherto needed to throw the shuttle by hand. Moreover, the balance between weaving and spinning was upset. James Hargreave's spinning Jenny of 1767 could produce more yarn than the existing looms could use. An equilibrium was restored by the power loom of 1785.

Possibly, the most startling aspects of the space revolution has been the amazing rate of progress of its technological developments. The frontiers of knowledge of physical cosmology have been pushed outward so rapidly that we approach a great intellectual revolution. The Moon has been photographed from a short distance, and last month the planet Mars. Man has walked in space. These tremendous achievements of modern technology have occurred this year, crowded together in a few months. Quite truly, the imaginative processes of science fiction have been surpassed by the feats of scientific reality. Indeed the modern scientists could be regarded as the genii of Arabian lore rather than the geniuses of the present.

All these things, and so many more, have taken place in a very short time, so brief it would be difficult for us to grasp were it not for the amount of information made available by the agencies which direct our national space program.

Let me give a direct example of this brief time and of this great advance of knowledge. In 1946 Dr. Lee DuBridge spoke at the University of Colorado. His subject then was atomic power and all the possibilities this new source of energy presented, for it was the great topic of that day. On July 12, this year, he again addressed an audience at Colorado. His talk this time dealt exclusively with the development and importance of the Ranger VII mission to the moon and Mariner IV to Mars. When Lee and I discussed his previous subject and all the marvels that had come into being since 1946, he said, "Yes indeed, and none of us really had any idea of all this at that time." And it is all much shorter than the few years since 1946 for the satellite program was not officially announced until 1955 and NASA itself was not founded until 1958. And, even more astonishingly in this time sequence, only 15 years ago, on July 24, 1950, the first rocket fired from a little sandy spit area on the east coast of Florida, then known locally as Cape Canaveral, was a leftover German V-2. It went upwards into space for a distance of 50 miles.

I may add that Lee was most optimistic about the success of the Mariner mission, although he spoke 2 days before the spacecraft had completed its 228-day, 325-million-mile journey through space to its appointed rendezvous with Mars. His optimism has now been fully justified, possibly indicating an inside exchange of information between JPL and Cal-Tech.

Now I want to examine, even though quite briefly, certain historical, and philosophical situations which form a background to the space age.

May I first establish a few basic concepts and principles? It is well known, but not so well understood, that science as an intellectual activity differs markedly from other imaginative efforts of man. Science seeks an exact knowledge of reality. The scientific objective, therefore, is focused upon observable facts of nature. Conclusions and deductions from such facts are the contributions of science.

The social scientist and the humanist must establish his procedure of assumptions. His objectives and conclusions relate to the unpredictable actions of individual man, or groups of men, which we call society.

There is, indeed, a close relationship among all the various disciplines of knowledge. To a great degree all are founded on two fundamental procedures: historical relationships and the importance of the theoretical.

First, historical relationships, or the historical perspective. This approach is particularly indicated in the development of knowledge of the physical realm of the earth's surface. Discovery, exploration, observation resulted in the vast body of knowledge we have today. Not content with knowledge of observable fact, man began almost from the very first to speculate on what lay beyond the earth's surface: the heavens, the universe, space itself. As Lucretius, Roman poet and philosopher of the first century B.C., wrote: "Our age cannot look back to earlier things except where reasoning reveals their traces."

This history of space became, and is today, a proper subject of study. The historical aspects of the space age are quite definite and most revealing. There is an almost exact parallel between the expansion of Europe during the great age of discovery in the 15th century and the exploration and expansion into space of the present day.

In the 15th century, western Europe was emerging from the somewhat limiting, inhibiting factors of the medieval period. To medieval man, most of the world appeared as a God-made mystery to be regarded with fear and concern. The earth was flat; somewhere over the ocean was the end. Fear of the ocean of darkness, the ocean of boiling water, the great winds and storms which no ship could survive, dominated and inhibited even those who dreamed and speculated on what lay beyond.

The rise of humanism, the beginnings of a scientific spirit, and the development of more precise instruments of navigation made possible a more positive, aggressive and adventurous attitude. The world came to be regarded as a reality to be explored rather than as a mystery to be feared.

It is not fantastic to compare those few early navigators who crossed the oceans in flimsy and insecure wooden boats some 500 years ago, to those astronauts of today who have made the first manned flights in space capsules into the realm of the sky. Certainly, as those of the 15th century conquered inhibiting factors of their day, we can, and indeed have, overcome technical barriers of space.

The second fundamental approach is the importance of the theoretical. The development of a theory, of the hypothesis, preceded many of the great basic facts of science. This was the approach of Kepler in reaching in 1604 his basic law of the elliptical nature of planetary orbits, for which he tested and discarded some 70 hypotheses. Kepler's particular ability appeared to lie in advancing such hypotheses for he said, "I have much stores of fantasy." Even Newton's great laws of motion, so fundamental in our modern space program, were deductions from the theoretical speculations of those who had worked before, and especially Galileo. As Newton himself phrased it, "If I have seen farther than others, it is because I have stood on the shoulders of giants."

I hesitate to pursue this subject, of the value of the theoretical approach in scientific procedure, much farther for fear I may tread fields beyond my ken, especially before an audience of distinguished scientists. However, I must present a theory of my own and in reference to an area of study in which I profess a certain degree of competence.

My theory is that in the realm of the social sciences, as in he more exact sciences, there is great value in the theoretical approach.

I have noted earlier that the social scientist or the philosopher must establish his procedure on the basis of an assumption. May I note only a few brief examples. Voltaire (1694–1778) in the opening line of "Candide" (1759) says, "Man was born free but everywhere he is in chains." Do we know this is a fact? Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679), writing earlier (1651) in the "Leviathan," maintains the exact opposite: that compulsion is a natural factor of man. John Locke (1632–1704) in his "Treatise of Civil Government" (1690) proclaims the legislative body to be the supreme power in the state. We have accepted the Lockian interpretation and have established our entire system of government and society on this principle.

I can indicate some practical values of the theoretical procedure toward the problem of government and society, or actual legislation resulting from this approach.

The revolutionary aspect of technology is quite well known. Its effects are clearly evident in England during the late 18th and early 19th centuries. The historic Industrial Revolution transformed, relatively rapidly for that day, predominantly rural country into an expanding urbanized nation. Social, economic, and political results were extensive and many problems arose. The Government could not deal with these because it had no experience with such problems. The rise of factories, crowding people together in confined areas; the development of new industrial centers and towns, with large populations and no representatives in Parliament; problems of health; of safety and working conditions in factories; and even problems of government itself. All these combined to bring England to the verge of revolution.

These problems, vast as they were to the men of that day and overwhelming as they appeared to the Government, were solved by the rise of the great English reformers. Nowhere in the pages of history did so many individuals consider the problems of government and society within so short a space of time. Adam Smith outlined the basis of a new economic system, the classical as opposed to the prevailing doctrine of mercantilism. Classic economic concepts endured for some 150 years, until the modern revolutionary doctrines of J. M. Keynes. Because Keynes' economic principles have been so widely absorbed by contemporary government, I must add his own interpretation. In a letter to G. B. Shaw in 1935, he said, "I believe myself to be writing a book on economic theory which will largely revolutionize * * * the way the world thinks about economic problems."

And Jeremy Bentham surveyed the new challenges of an industrialized society on such a broad scale that significant legal and factory reforms were enacted. He also imparted a slogan and a basic philosophy to the entire period of reform. And there were many more who contributed by their theoretical consideration of these problems to the practical solution by legislation.

It is, obviously, not desirable to survey these procedures much further nor present additional examples. However, I must note that nowhere is the contributions of the English reformers more completely indicated than in their consideration of and agitation for the political reform of the Parliament. They all combined to demand such a reform. In the early 19th century the English Parliament was a medieval instrument of government. Voting qualifications for its borough representation had not been changed for 400 years; some 267 landlords controlled by direct nomination 490 seats in a house of 658 members. Parliament was so modified that the power in the state was swept from the hands of an 18th century landed gentry into those of the electorate. The day of the common man appeared.

And all this was the work of the English reformers and of their theoretical approach. It was the impact of philosophic thought and the changes so induced through legislation.

I trust that this brief presentation will indicate the significance of these two fundamental procedures: the role of historical relationships and the practical values of the theoretical approach.

And now, may I make a few specific observations on the impact of the space age on the broad field of government and society. And this is the principal theme of session I of our program.

The space age, even in its infancy, is having a profound impact on all of us, as individuals, on our national economy and national policy, and on the conduct of our international affairs. Moreover, the space age will affect the philsopohical principles upon which our concept of government and society is based. And, above all, it will require a reinterpretation of these philosophical concepts to adjust them to the complications of the modern world.

How will it do this? And just what will its impact be? There are many definite answers to these questions. I shall indicate only five.

First. The space age will require a leadership in America and in the countries of the democratic world far beyond that generally assumed. Herein lies a great challenge to our system of government and society.

Second. It will require a definite tightening of our national purpose and of individual effort and outlook. This new knowledge, these new technological advances, must be absorbed without dislocations. And this is already being done; we are already experiencing it, principally because of the marvelous adaptability man has acquired and which has so often been demonstrated.

Third. The space age will require an increasing interference by Government in society and into the lives and fortunes of those individuals who compose society. Historically, it has always been that the more complex a society becomes and the more demands made upon it, the more regulation and supervision by Government are necessary.

Fourth. It will require a new legal and judicial process and approach to the problems of international law; even, possibly, a new kind of law itself.

Our legal system developed from the English common law which evolved, over hundreds of years and at a leisurely pace, from innumerable situations of fact. Moreover, the common law, in its development, never really anticipated situations. In a broad historical sense, the present day is not normal. The pressures of the contemporary world will not permit space law to develop by slow, evolutionary procedures. Space law must come into being by anticipating situations.

Possibly a new type of international relations will emerge. For where are the boundaries in space? International law realtive to flight, in the air above a nation, is quite clear and definitely recognized. But how far does national sovereignty extend beyond the narrow band of atmosphere? These problems, arising because of the space age, are even now receiving serious attention, through studies and international conferences.

Fifth. The impact of the space age will require a reexamination and a reinterpretation of the democratic processes of government and society as conceived by the 17th and 18th century English philosophers, especially John Locke. I do believe this most definitely. And I hasten to admit that I do not know how this can be or will be done. Maybe it is already being accomplished, through the adjustment and adaptability of society to modifying conditions. Maybe this process is more desirable and more realistic than the formulation of a definitely conceived body of principles as those formed in preceding centuries by men who attempted to fathom the mysteries of government and society and to explain their mutual relationships, contributions and advantages.

Through whatever procedures such a reinterpretation may come, I believe it is necessary. It is vital, if we and our concepts of government and society are to survive in the contest with aggressive, highly controlled, foreign ideologies.

These are only a few, the more obvious, areas on which the space age will have an impact. There are others, not so obvious, which challenge the imagination.

In a very famous volume, "The Challenges of Space," published in 1962 and edited by Hugh Odishaw, these challenges are presented principally from the technical standpoint. George Morgenthaler, in a speech in Boulder, Colo., 1 year ago in August 1964, said, "Almost everything in space is technically possible. Technically, we can land a man on the moon. The problem is the human, not the technical, factor."

I maintain that the principal challenges of space lie in the broad field of government and society. It is there that its effects will be felt, as have all technical progress of the historical past. And all these things, all these spectacular development, must be considered in their historical relationships. Because the most changeless fact of history is the fact of change.

Let me note this aspect of change by referring to the rise of Newton's idea of the rigidity of physical nature.

Through critical attitudes mainly induced by the religious revolution of the 16th century, more objective opinions toward the physical world began to emerge. Those principally responsible for these changed opinions were Francis Bacon (1561–1626) and Rene Descartes (1596–1650). Descartes, leader among the French humanists, ranged widely and speculated on a more dynamic interpretation of physical nature. Although he accepted an infinite universe, he concluded it was arranged on mathematical principle. With Sir Issac Newton (1642–1727), the mechanical certainties of physical nature and of a fixed universe were firmly established. And this static concept remained the dominant basis of thought until modern times.

The rigid historical form of Newton's physical world was extended in the 19th century. James Clerk Maxwell (1831–79) expressed this concept in his address to the British Association in 1873. He said, "The foundation stones of the material universe remain unbroken and unworn. They continue this day as they were created—perfect in number and measure and weight." The basic tools of the physical universe, physics and chemistry, remained immobilized in 18th century rigidity. And this was at the same time in which Darwin transformed biological concepts in his "Origin of Species" (1859). Even then the president of the British Linnean Society said in his annual address in December 1859, "I regret to report that no significant contribution in biology has been made this year."

During the 20th century, especially in the early 1920's, our attitude toward the fundamental laws of physical cosmology and their constants has been profoundly modified. In the words of Stephen Toulmin, director of the Nuffield Foundation, "We may yet be on the threshold of the greatest of all intellectual revolutions."

This revolution may be so extensive and so challenging as to require the fullest cooperation between the scientists, who evolve these principles; the technicians, who apply them; and the social scientists or sociologists, who interpret their effects.

This revolution of the immediate future is not only challenging, it is exciting. Its full compass is best expressed by the modern poet, Angela Morgan.

> To be alive in such an age
> With every year a lightening page
> When miracles are everywhere
> And every inch of common air
> Throbs a tremendous prophecy
> Of greater marvels yet to be.
> A challenge to the very sky,
> Where endless realms of conquest lie.

All of this, with its vision of marvels yet to be, has been immeasurably accelerated by the space age. The impact of the space age on government and society is only beginning. We proceed rapidly toward the exploration of space with few concepts of just what this vast national effort really implies to man. Great agencies have been developed to promote the scientific aspects of space technology. Nowhere does there exist a formal organization to study the effects of this vast program. A correlation of the impact of the space age is required because the space revolution will certainly be the most significant of all these great revolutions of the historical past.

TRIBUTE TO COL. RALPH E. VANDERVORT, JR.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am privileged to associate myself with the fine remarks given yesterday by the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], Idaho [Mr. Church], Utah [Mr. Moss], Ohio [Mr. Young], Nevada [Mr. Cannon], South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], and Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] commending Col. Ralph E. Vandervort, Jr. Colonel Vandervort's retirement from the Army after a distinguished 24-year career means the loss of not only a top-notch officer but of an unusually effective liaison between the Army and Secretary of Defense and the U.S. Senate.

Bud Vandervort actually went far beyond his expected service as a communicator between the Senate and the Pentagon. He established a knowledgeable, friendly and personally responsible service that cannot be surpassed. Only a deep and dedicated interest in the welfare of his Nation could support such a performance.

Bud Vandervort will be sorely missed, by those he has served in the Senate and the Pentagon who know him well and by a Nation that does not know of him but has benefited because of him.

I join in wishing him continued success. I know every Senator endorses this wish.

WYOMING STATE SENATE IS REAPPORTIONED

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, a three-man Federal court has reapportioned the Wyoming State Senate.

The court enlarged the senate from 25 to 30 members and split and created new senatorial districts from Wyoming's 23 counties.

For the benefit of the Senate in future debate on legislation to counter the Supreme Court's decision which made such reapportioning necessary in Wyoming, I ask that a press dispatch from the October 12 Wyoming State Tribune be printed in the Record, together with an October 19 editorial from KTWO Radio & Television in Casper, Wyo.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wyoming State Tribune, Oct. 12, 1965]

Apportionment Rule Reactions: Uncertainty

(By James M. Flinchum)

Some were mad, some were sad, and some glad. But by and large, the chief reaction to the decision handed down by a special three-judge Federal court reapportioning the Wyoming State Senate as reflected by those it affects most—the State's 25 senators—appeared today to be one of uncertainty.

Only two of nine members of the present senate polled today, all of whom must stand reelection next year under the terms of reapportionment decree filed with the U.S. district court of Wyoming here last Friday, were sure they would seek the voters' blessings once more.

One was Earl Kinnaman, veteran Carbon County legislator who served as Democratic leader of the senate in the 38th legislature earlier this year and who would have been up for reelection anyway next year regardless of the court's decision that all senators must seek election in 1966 despite the status of their current terms.

The other was Bill Rector, also a Democrat, of Laramie County, who said he would run "as things stand now."

Asked if he intended to run next year, Kinnaman, a Rawlins businessman, said: "I think so. I have a chance of being president of the senate if the Democrats get a majority, so I think I will run."

As to the reapportionment plan hammered out by the three-judge court, Kinnaman said: "I think it's pretty fair. The only objection I have is a minor one. They (the judges) left us with an even number of senators; if they had decided on 29 or 31, then it would have eliminated the possibility of a tie. The way it is set up now it is very possible to have a tie."

Kinnaman, now rounding out his third 4-year term in the senate, which was preceded by seven terms in the house, said he believed the senate would be "very evenly divided" in the next session. Had the apportionment decree preceded the 1964 election, he said, "we (the Democrats) would have gotten it."

Charles G. Irwin, Converse County Republican, who has served the same period of time in the senate as Kinnaman, said he could "find no fault with the judges as they were obliged to make a decision and I am sure they intended the best possible solution."

Irwin said, however, that giving Laramie County 5 senators in addition to 11 house members, made selection of legislators in the State's largest county "little better than a guessing game.

"To those who believe areas and minorities are now to be ignored," said Irwin, "I say they should let their consciences call out for a revision of the U.S. Senate.

"I've never felt the people of Cheyenne are any better than those in Orrin Junction nor those in Washington any better than those in Cheyenne," said Irwin. "However, when five U.S. Supreme Court Justices in Washington can upset the majority vote of a legislature of 86 members, or a statewide vote as in Colorado, one must conclude that they have not only a concentration of power, but a belief in their own wisdom that should make the rest of us feel mentally retarded," Irwin said.

Irwin said he was "not saying I'm not" going to run in 1966 for another term in the senate. Another senator in his newly combined district is Andrew McMaster of Niobrara County who was president of the senate in the 28th legislature. McMaster could not be reached today by telephone.

Veteran Senator R. L. Greene, another Republican, from Johnson County, said the three-judge court "didn't do too badly a job." Greene thought, however, that the court should have implemented subdistricting in the multimember counties such as Laramie and Natrona Counties.

"I don't think we (the Republicans) got too bad a deal out of it," he said, although he added that he believed it would have been "more logical" to place Hot Springs with either Washakie or Park Counties than with Fremont County.

A Democrat who was plainly unhappy was Carl Robinson of Lincoln County, which was split in two by the court decision, with the north half in which Robinson resides being joined to Teton and Sublette Counties, both heavily Republican.

Robinson, who in the last session favored and sponsored a proposed amendment to the U.S. Constitution overturning the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote apportionment decree, said he did not see any chance of changing the present Court ruling even the proposed Dirksen amendment should be adopted.

"I have no idea how it can be changed even if we got a constitutional amendment," Robinson said.

Asked if he intended to seek election in the new 2½-county district, Robinson said: "I doubt it. I'll have to see what the tempo is in the three counties."

Dick Tobin, a Natrona County Republican, said he would was undecided on running next year. He would have been up for election anyway since his present term expires in January 1967.

Tobin said the legislature could not complain about the judicial reapportionment decision "since they (the lawmakers) couldn't agree among themselves." Tobin said he felt Hot Springs could have been placed with better logic with Washakie County. He also said he felt that multimember counties should be subdistricted.

Mrs. Willa Wales Corbitt, a Fremont County Democrat serving her first term, said she hadn't made up her mind about running again but observed: "I rather imagine (I will)." I have the time and the interest and I think that's important."

As to the reapportionment decision, she said it appeared to her "like it is pretty well divided. The only thing that surprised me was joining Hot Springs to Fremont County. I had expected Hot Springs to be joined with Washakie, but to put it with Fremont County rather surprised me."

Don Jewett, Sublette County Republican serving his first term, to which he was elected in 1964, said his county now had been joined to Teton and the north half of Lincoln County representing a population of 11,245.

"But are we truly exemplifying the one-man, one-vote principle?" he asked. "A person in Sublette County can vote for one senator compared with a person in Laramie County who can vote for five senators, so his (the Laramie County resident's) vote is five times more important than ours," Jewett said. "Is this truly what the Supreme Court had in mind?"

Earl Christensen, Weston County Republican and rancher whose county has been joined to Crook County to form one district, said he didn't "think it's a very good deal to put these small counties together without dividing up the larger ones." He said he "presumed" he will run for another term but added: "It's going to take an extra set of horses to cover the entire district."

Rector said he favored the reapportionment decision saying the new decision "finally has brought the State of Wyoming over the political watershed that divides control of the legislature from special interest groups to control by the people themselves."

KTWO Radio & Television Editorial, October 19, 1965

Three Federal judges have handed down one of the most important court decisions in Wyoming's history—a milestone order reapportioning the State senate.

It's a decision that will be discussed—and cussed—for years. But the last legal words may not have been spoken yet. It's likely that it will be appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Legislative reapportionment is a tricky, controversial question that will never be resolved to the satisfaction of all. Several obvious inequities are contained in their decision, but overall, the three Federal judges should be commended for their honest effort to come up with the best solution possible. There are many facets of their decision that should be lauded. Unfortunately there are other portions of the order that will create new problems.

The splitting of Lincoln County—putting the southern part with Uinta County for a senatorial district and putting the Star Valley area with Teton and Sublette Counties—is a sound, logical move. The Star Valley area is more closely linked to the dude ranching and tourist economies of the Jackson and Pinedale areas than it is with the coal mining and industrial economy of the Kemmerer area.

The court also showed good judgment in keeping the senate membership relatively small.

Its decision to place Johnson County in the same senatorial district with Campbell rather than Sheridan County is also commended. KTWO believes that if more than one county is placed in a senatorial district they should have approximately the same population and similar economic interests. Placing a small county like Johnson into the same senatorial district as a larger one, such as Sheridan, would have been basically unfair. The smaller county will forever be devoid of influence and self-determination.

Unfortunately, the court decision created one of these basically unfair situations in consolidating Fremont and Hot Springs Counties into a single senatorial district with three State senators elected at large. It meets the population formula—but it is not a practical solution. Hot Springs County has approximately 6,000 people. Fremont County has 26,000. The practical effect of this arrangement is to virtually disenfranchise Hot Springs County as far as the senate is concerned.

KTWO hopes this arrangement may turn out to be a blessing in disguise. It points up vividly the need for dividing counties or senatorial districts with more than one State senator into smaller districts. Hot Springs County will become an area just like eastern Laramie County or north Casper—disenfranchised in the senate by the mechanics of elections. Pointing out this serious injustice to Hot Springs County may swing a few votes in the legislature toward support of a subdistricting plan. KTWO believes that subdistricting is a means of providing equal representation to all areas in Wyoming and urges the next session of the legislature, regular or special, to adopt a subdistricting plan.

NINE UNADOPTABLE CHILDREN JOINED BY LOVE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish my colleagues could see the moving photographs that appeared in the Look magazine of October 19, 1965. In an article "Nine Unadoptable Children Joined by Love" Look described in words and pictures the wonderful family of Kurt and Julie Lerke of White House, N.J. Over the years they have adopted nine children of varied backgrounds and races, but united by one common denominator, tragic abandonment. To these children they have given warmth and love and a life with meaning, but as Mrs. Lerke says:

> We are doing nothing we don't want to do. This is a family, not a project.

I was happy and proud to have been able to help the Lerke family in adopting one of their children. I think my colleagues will find the article in Look magazine describing their life together a moving description of what basic human decency can accomplish, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Nine "Unadoptable" Children Joined by Love

Nine of the 10 children in the photograph at left (not printed in the Record), were born into emptiness. Each was abandoned at birth or soon after. And for each, a nightmarish existence followed. One lived alone on the streets of Korea for 3 years, until she was picked up at 8 and taken to a settlement house. Another, a victim of 17 foster homes in her first 5 years of life, finally gave up and simply stopped talking to adults. A third child, of Ecuadorian-Indian parents, but taken for Negro, had acid thrown at her face during a southern racial incident. For 3 days, city officials hid her in hotel rooms while they feverishly tried to get her out of town. Finally, they shipped her north alone on a cargo plane. The pasts of the other six children match these. Each had another thing in common as well: No grownups wanted them. None but Julie and Kurt Lerke of Whitehouse, N.J., already parents of two, who found themselves unable to deny a child a chance at life.

The next time someone says kids are the same the world over, tell him about these nine children:

Sarah: She hid in a field at 5 and watched Communist soldiers shoot her parents. For the next 3 years, she lived in the streets of Korea, sometimes with a gang of other homeless children, but usually alone. She was finally picked up by a U.S. Army nurse and started on the journey that brought her to New Jersey. It was 2 years before her nightmares stopped, and she could have an uninterrupted night's sleep.

John: He was adopted from a Korean orphanage when he was 10 months old. He weighed 10 pounds, about right for a 6-week-old infant. He screamed day and night for the first month. Mrs. Lerke spent most of her days holding him in her arms. He pressed himself to her so violently that, by evening, her face had the imprint of his.

Charles: He was so pitifully weak an Army doctor advised that he be left in Korea to die. He was flown across the Pacific in a box intended to be his coffin if he did not survive the trip.

Mary Jane: After 5 years in 17 different foster homes in 3 States, she was placed in 2 homes for adoption and rejected both times. Once extremely affectionate, she had already stopped talking to adults. Her eyes never left the ground. (She expressed herself in other ways. During her first hour with the Lerkes, she shoved Charley off the top of a bunk bed, shearing off two of his teeth.)

Amanda: She had been settled in a white foster home in a southern city. White racists, interpreting the presence of this dark-skinned Ecuadorian-Indian, 7 years old, as an attempt to integrate the neighborhood, forced her out of three different foster homes in 3 days. The acid was thrown during their last successful eviction. It missed by inches. When Amanda reached Whitehouse 3 days later, Mrs. Lerke found "fear still running out of her eyes."

Michael: Son of a Korean mother unable to care for him and, probably, of a Negro father, he had been virtually on his own in this country since he was 5. En route to Newark (N.J.) Airport to meet the Lerkes, he told the social worker accompanying him, "No one will be there."

Edith: She was in the care of welfare officials in the same southern city where Amanda lived. When the Lerkes asked to adopt her, they were turned down. A white child, they were told, could not be sent to a home housing colored children. Edith went to an all-white family in the north. When this family was unable to cope with her truculence after 3 weeks, they asked that she be removed. Welcome House, the adoption agency that had taken responsibility for Edith, called and told the Lerkes about her.

Margaret: Born to a Korean mother and father, she was adopted with Charley. She was 7 months old and weighed 5 pounds.

Susan: She was so tanned from exposure that she was thought to be Negro. Her mother was Korean and her father, white. Her scalp was covered with mange and lice.

The children came to the Lerkes within a relatively short span of time: two in 1957, two in 1958 and five in a rush during a 20-month period ending in September 1963. Adjustment was torturous. For a long time, all Julie and Kurt Lerke and their natural children—Katherine, now 19, married and living nearby, and Todd, 14—could do was be patient. (Mike spent the first 3 months slamming doors.) The previously adopted children, with their special understanding of each newcomer's torments, helped. Edith, shaken after her dismissal by prospective parents, and moody in her fears that it would happen again, found John, 7, waiting for her one morning as she left for school. "Don't worry," he told her. "Anyone who comes to this house never has to leave."

The Lerkes could have become foster parents and accepted child-support checks. Receiving would have been the easier way. Instead, they chose adoption and paid fees and expenses averaging $800 to get each child. The year the first child came, Lerke, a stock room supervisor in an electronics plant, began to supplement his modest income with part-time work. A large vegetable garden was started behind the 8-room house and laying hens were purchased to reduce food bills.

To a recent guest who expressed awe at the adoption of nine children, considered by many to be unadoptable, Mrs. Lerke, a former teacher, replied matter-of-factly, "We are doing nothing we don't want to do. This is a family, not a project." A family it is. The nightmares and dark moods have been replaced by a serenity rarely seen in children. Each of the adopted Lerkes has seemingly developed a calm tolerance for the trivia that beset most youngsters. They are children and still cry, but not over a snapped kite string or a misappropriated baseball. Each has been accepted into the community without reservation. The entire family, with the exception of 4-year-old Suzy, joins vigorously in every activity Whitehouse offers, from choir in the century-old Methodist Church to the PTA.

As this story was being written, the Lerkes were called by an adoption agency about an 11-month-old mulatto girl. No home could be found for her, and an orphanage seemed the only answer. Would the Lerkes adopt a 10th child? Kurt Lerke asked the agency to keep trying, but added, "If you can't find anyone, please call us back." When he hung up, he turned to his wife, "How can we tell a child we have no more room here?"

THE FRUSTRATION OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY BY THE LONGSHOREMEN'S UNION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from Mr. D. R. Jawitz, president of the Catz American Co. of New York City, concerning his company's efforts to import 1,000 bags of Russian poppy seed in a normal commercial transaction. The longshoremen's union refused to unload the cargo and there was no alternative but to send it back to Europe on the same ship on which it arrived.

An official of the company wrote to Secretary Rusk on September 28 advising him of the problem and requesting the Department's assistance. In the reply from the Department, Mr. Walter J. Stoessel, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, stated:

> We have made representations to labor officials asking for their cooperation and support of the policy of carrying on peaceful trade with the Soviet Union. So far, our efforts have not been productive. The International Longshoremen's Association has apparently taken a public position favoring boycott of all Soviet shipments. We will continue to seek for the active support of labor officials for our trade policy with the Soviet Union, and we hope that we will be successful so that occurrences such as you experienced will not take place.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Jawitz' letter and the exchange of correspondence with the Department of State printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The International Longshoremen's Association has taken upon itself the job of regulating trade with the Communist world. It is most unfortunate that the union leaders continue to thwart the established policies of their Government, but our form of government is based on the premise that citizens will act responsibly in the use of power, such as that possessed by this union. Our established policy is to conduct trade in nonstrategic goods with the Soviet Union on a normal basis, but actions of the longshoremen's union prevent that policy from being implemented. The union not only boycotts the importation of goods from the Soviet Union, such as the poppy seed involved in this instance, but its president has publicly threatened that it would take the U.S. marines to load any wheat sold to the Soviet Union if the 50 percent shipping restriction is removed. The union may not be guilty of an illegal act by thumbing its nose at the public interest, but it is deliberately frustrating the Nation's foreign policy. I do not believe that the President will be intimidated by such threats in reaching a decision on the shipping restriction matter.

In the past I have been critical of what I considered to be a failure of the Department of State to back firmly and publicly its policies of encouraging trade with Eastern Europe in the case of pressures brought to bear by self-appointed vigilante groups. I was pleased that the administration recently came out strongly in condemnation of a budding boycott directed at companies using Yugoslavian tobacco. I ask unanimous consent to have printed following my remarks a letter signed by the Secretaries of State, Defense, and Commerce dealing with this problem and several editorials commenting on this affair.

I am hopeful that the administration officials will take as forceful a position with the longshoremen's union leadership if it continues to frustrate our foreign policy toward Eastern Europe.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1965.

Hon. SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK,
Department of State, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY RUSK: We recently sold for account of principals in Holland a total of 1,000 bags of Russian poppy seed for shipment from Rotterdam to New York City. This sale was divided among three local importers. The merchandise was shipped on the Holland-American Line steamer *Sloterdyk*, which has now arrived in New York City.

To our extreme surprise and dismay we have now been advised by the Holland-America Line that the longshoremen in New York City refuse to handle the cargo. The Holland-American Line further tells us that there is simply nothing they can do in such a case and that the poppy seed will simply have to remain in the steamer and be returned to Europe. We find this situation incredible.

This was a normal commercial transaction, there being no restriction other than a duty on the importation of Russian poppy seed. As far as we can see it simply means that the Longshoreman's Union has the authority to decide which merchandise may or may not enter into this country, regardless of Government decisions to the contrary.

May we ask for your intercession on our behalf?

The steamer is sailing tomorrow from New York for Philadelphia, where it is going to load cargo before returning to New York and thence to Europe. The Holland-America Line tells us there is simply nothing they can do, as far as they are concerned the matter is a shut case. We ourselves feel that it is inconceivable that our Government can't do something in order to alleviate this blatant restraint of trade.

We would respectfully request that prompt action is needed as the vessel is due back in New York sometime the middle of next week. We certainly hope that something can be done because it is obvious that if the merchandise has to be returned to Europe innocent parties, who on both sides entered into a commercial contract in good faith, will incur substantial expenses through no fault of their own.

We would also think that the ramifications whereby a union can willfully make their own decision as to what merchandise may or may not enter this country regardless of the wishes of our Government is one on which you would want to act.

We respectfully remain,
Very truly yours,
JOHN L. WEZENAAR.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., October 5, 1965.

Mr. JOHN L. WEZENAAR,
Catz American Co., Inc.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WEZENAAR: Your letter of September 28, 1965, has been referred to this office for reply.

In your letter, you describe how New York longshoremen refused to unload 1,000 bags of Russian poppy seed which you were importing via the Holland-American Line steamer *Sloterdyk*. The Holland-American Line has advised you that there is nothing which they can do in such a case, and that the poppy seed will have to remain in the ship and be returned to Europe. You advise that the ship has sailed for Philadelphia, and will return about the middle of this week to New York, sailing thence to Europe.

The Department of State has been asked to help in situations such as you have described on a number of occasions. Yours is the last in a lengthy list of examples which have come to our attention of boycotts by longshoremen against Soviet cargoes.

We fully agree that your importation of Russian poppy seed is a normal commercial transaction. It is consistent with our policy of encouraging the development of peaceful trade between this country and the Soviet Union. In engaging in such trade, your company is supporting U.S. policy.

We have made representations to labor officials asking for their cooperation and support of the policy of carrying on peaceful trade with the Soviet Union. So far, our efforts have not been productive. The International Longshoremen's Association has apparently taken a public position favoring boycott of all Soviet shipments. We will continue to seek for the active support of labor officials for our trade policy with the Soviet Union, and we hope that we will be successful so that occurrences such as you experienced will not take place.

I regret that I cannot give you further encouragement at this time. I also apologize for the delay in replying. Your letter was apparently misrouted on arrival in the Department.

Yours very truly,
WALTER J. STOESSEL,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for European Affairs.

STATEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Secretaries of State, Defense, and Commerce today released the following letter to the six major American cigarette manufacturers. The letter is in response to the statement of the manufacturers attached below:

OCTOBER 11, 1965.

THE AMERICAN TOBACCO CO.
BROWN & WILLIAMSON TOBACCO CORP.
LIGGETT & MYERS TOBACCO CO.
P. LORILLARD CO.
PHILIP MORRIS INC.
R. J. REYNOLDS TOBACCO CO.

DEAR SIRS: It has been called to our attention that certain organized pressure groups are seeking, by economic intimidation, to compel American cigarette companies to discontinue the purchase of Yugoslav tobacco. This incident is the most recent in a series of similar attempts by such groups to frustrate peaceful private trade with Eastern European countries. We feel it important that you understand the views of the U.S. Government on this subject, and that these views be given the widest dissemination.

Under our American system, trade is governed by the individual economic interests of the trading parties. Congress and the executive branch have provided laws and regulations to assure that nothing is traded with any Communist country that will be detrimental to our national security and welfare. In the case of certain countries, such as Communist China, Cuba, North Korea, and North Vietnam, trade is—with minor humanitarian exceptions—prohibited.

On the other hand, your Government regards commerce in peaceful goods with the countries of Eastern Europe, including the Soviet Union, as completely compatible with our national interest. No American business enterprise should be penalized for purchasing or selling such goods. In fact, any individuals or groups that seek to intimidate, boycott, blacklist, use or threaten economic reprisals against such American enterprises for carrying on lawful trade with Eastern European countries act harmfully and irresponsibly. To yield to such groups is to encourage capricious interference with the vital processes of our constitutional government—interference that could at the end of the road make it impossible for our country to conduct a coherent foreign policy.

Americans know that there are recognized and responsible ways by which they may object to any governmental policy with which they disagree. Every citizen has the constitutional right to speak freely, to petition his government for redress of grievances, and to exercise the franchise. But it is the Federal Government that must direct the relations of the United States with other nations. Our Constitution entrusts the President and the Congress with the conduct of U.S. foreign affairs.

These principles directly apply to the campaign of economic intimidation now being mounted against your industry. The importation of Yugoslav tobacco, which constitutes less than 1 percent of all tobacco used in American cigarettes, is entirely consistent with our national security. The right of American business enterprises to purchase this tobacco on the basis of their freely exercised judgment as to the economic desirability of such a course—without fear of reprisals—should be fully preserved if the objectives of our foreign policy are not to be undermined by the whim or prejudice of any organized pressure group.

We are advised that the cigarette industry, after consultation with the U.S. Government, has condemned these threats of intimidation and has announced its intention to continue to purchase or not to purchase Yugoslav tobacco on the basis of individual judgments. We commend your industry for refusing to submit to such intimidation, which would have the effect of substituting private opinions and prejudices for the declared foreign policy of the United States.

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.
ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense.
JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Oct. 13, 1965]

SMOKE DREAMS

Mix a little oriental leaf from Yugoslavia with a lot of burley and Flue-cured from Kentucky and Carolina, wrap it in clean white paper and add, perhaps, a filter, and what have you get? A threat to the Republic. It's that little bit of oriental leaf that does it. The rest will only kill you, but the oriental leaf is subversive. Yugoslavia is Red.

The rightwing kooks are at it again. Something called the Committee to Warn of Communist Merchandise on the Local Business Scene is boycotting American tobacco manufacturers. Five of the big six use oriental leaf from Yugoslavia. All six, and the State Department, have told the committee to go blow a smoke ring, or something.

The boycott is an old and sometimes honorable tactic, but this is silly. In the first place the tobacco industry has handled the American Medical Association and the Surgeon General, and it isn't about to give in to the committee. In the second place, American trade with Yugoslavia is important for more than one reason. Tito is a Communist, but he's a maverick Communist, and it's a plus for the West if he can be kept so. Greece might not be free today if Tito hadn't closed the border during the Communist guerrilla revolt there in the late forties. Right now the United States has a favorable balance of trade with Yugoslavia. We bought $7 million worth of tobacco and $33 million worth of other things there this year. They bought $148 million worth of goods here. That $108 million difference means jobs and profits in this country.

Advice to the tobacco companies: Keep it up. Advice to the Committee to Warn: Quit smoking. (If an extremist can't, who can?)

[From the New York Times, Oct. 14, 1965]

EAST-WEST TRADE BOYCOTTS

The administration has had the courage to condemn private groups that attempt to organize boycotts against American companies trading with Communist countries.

The occasion for a forceful letter from the Secretaries of State, Defense, and Commerce was an appeal by six major American cigarette companies for backing, against rightwing criticism of their purchases of Yugoslav tobacco. The letter makes it clear that the U.S. Government regards commerce in peaceful goods with the countries of Eastern Europe, including the Soviet Union, as completely compatible with our national interest. And it characterizes the efforts of irresponsible groups to penalize such traders as capricious interference with the vital processes of our constitutional Government which could prevent a coherent foreign policy.

The administration has been negligent in the past, as this newspaper has previously pointed out, in remaining silent while pressure groups, including some labor unions, have intimidated companies cooperating with Washington's stated policy of promoting East-West trade. In one of the most shameful cases to occur, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. evidently took part in a campaign that led a competitor, the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., to call off negotiations to sell a synthetic rubber plant to Rumania.

The administration's action in the Yugoslav tobacco case now makes it clear that all American companies engaged in lawful trade with the East can obtain full public backing against intimidation simply by asking for it. At last.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, Oct. 15, 1965]

THE TRADE-WITH-THE-REDS OPPONENTS ARE SET BACK

The administration finally has given the ban-the-ham-boys a well-deserved boot.

Tobacco from Yugoslavia rather than ham from Poland was the issue this time. But, of course, the product doesn't matter to right wing extremists. They oppose all trade with all Communist nations—period. The culprits, in their eyes, are six major American cigarette companies which buy an oriental tobacco from Yugoslavia to add to the taste and aroma of American cigarettes.

Along with due assurances that the Government does not permit exporting of strategic materials, the administration condemned intimidation of companies trading with Communist nations as an interference with foreign policy.

Credit for the administration's taking a stand likely can be attributed to Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, who criticized the Government for not stepping in when Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. was threatened with economic reprisals by right wingers after proposing the sale of a $50 million synthetic rubber plant to Rumania. The pressure was blamed for Firestone's breaking off the deal.

Taking a stand was the only sensible thing for the administration to have done. If it believes regulated trade with Communist countries is advisable from the standpoint of the economy and international relations, it must be ready to defend that policy when it is challenged.

By not taking a stand, the administration would only play into the hands of the radical right. Not many of us are infected with the crisis mentality which believes that our Nation's only hope for survival is to break off all contact with Communist nations; the radical right is small in numbers. By being so clamorous and vociferous, however, it can give a distorted impression of its size and strength and cause a timorous industry to buckle to its will. Hence, the administration's new policy serves the valuable purpose of lending moral support to American business.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Herald, Oct. 13, 1965]

SMOKING YUGOSLAV TOBACCO

The refusal of six major American cigarette companies to yield to a rightwing threat of a boycott of their products because of the use of Yugoslav tobacco should not go unnoticed. It is encouraging that none of the firms sought to turn the situation to its own advantage by identifying itself with this form of pseudo-Americanism.

Last spring when the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. dropped plans for a synthetic rubber plant in Rumania because of the activities of the Young Americans for Freedom, the Johnson administration, which had previously announced a more active policy toward trade with Eastern Europe, remained silent.

This time in a strongly-worded letter to the cigarette companies from the Secretaries of State, Defense, and Commerce, the administration attacked rightwing boycotting and blacklisting of Eastern European products as harmful and irresponsible. The companies responded by holding their ground.

Yet the administration only gave its support when the companies requested it. It gave no support in the rubber deal because Firestone did not request it.

Recently the administration has grown more active in its "building bridges" policy toward Eastern Europe. Only last month a trade mission was dispatched to Poland and Rumania. But rightwing groups in this country have been growing increasingly active in organizing boycotts against goods produced in Communist nations.

If the administration is to be successful in promoting increased trade with Eastern Europe, it must speak out on its own and not wait for American companies to appeal for help.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, Oct. 13, 1965]

MORE VOLUNTEER TRADE EXPERTS EVOKE A WASHINGTON PROTEST

A new, more forthright attitude on the part of the administration has greeted the latest effrontery of self-styled foreign policy makers.

Six major American tobacco companies which buy Yugoslav tobacco were threatened with a boycott by right-wing groups led by a handily named outfit called the Committee To Warn of the Arrival of Communist Merchandise on the Local Business Scene. Tobacco spokesmen wrote the State Department asking for advice and received in return a letter signed by the Secretaries of Commerce, Defense and State. The letter strongly denounced this threat and all attempts to organize demonstrations against American firms trading with Communist countries.

Some such policy statement should have been made much earlier. The Government has largely left the defense of our trade policies to such courageous but unofficial speakers as Senator Fulbright. The result has been a series of petty successes for right-wing opponents of all trade with Communist nations and one major coup, when the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., in response to threats of boycott, called off its plan to sell a synthetic rubber plant to Rumania.

The Government remained silent about the Firestone case, a State Department spokesman has said, because Firestone did not ask for a statement of policy and the tobacco companies did. Since the Government had encouraged Firestone, and since all such deals are made only after explicit permits have been granted, statements of policy ought to be routine every time officious busybodies threaten one of these transactions.

All of the threats, moreover, do not come from the myopic right. Seamen's unions refuse to load shipments of wheat and other commodities from time to time, although their objections are based on the more pragmatic line that the purchasers do not always want to use the expensively subsidized U.S. ships whose privileges the unions fight to retain.

As for the Yugoslavian tobacco, small quantities of it are mixed with American leaf to improve the taste and aroma of cigarettes. It forms part of a mere $40 million in Yugoslavian exports to us, in return for U.S. imports of $148 million last year. The main commodity we sell is surplus wheat, which is paid for in dollars, under the food-for-peace program.

We are dealing, moreover, with a country which has almost entirely emancipated itself from Soviet dominance, which has put its currency on a sound basis, which is absorbed in building "Yugoslavia for the Yugoslavians," rather than in expansion or aggression at the expense of its neighbors. To do business with such a country is to encourage its independent growth, its steady detachment from Soviet overlordship.

The tobacco companies, moreover, can take cheer from more mundane considerations. If all the warnings, all the chills, all the dismal diagrams of cancer-ridden lungs we have encountered in the past few years are not enough to deter the American from his cigarettes, is the possibility of smoking a smidgen of Communist tobacco likely to scare him off?

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 16, 1965]

Show of Courage

The cigarette makers have not been having an easy time of late. But the six major companies which have defined a threatened consumer boycott if they continue to buy tobacco from Yugoslavia merit a hearty salute.

The threat has come from a group which calls itself the Committee to Warn of the Arrival of Communist Merchandise on the Local Business Scene. This may sound like something from "Alice in Wonderland," and perhaps it is. But similar self-appointed pressure groups, or perhaps it was the same group, tried to stop the importation of Polish hams and Czech beer. And as an item of evidence suggesting that this sort of coercion sometimes brings results, a rubber company recently backed away from selling a synthetic rubber plant to Rumania. So it is not only interesting but perhaps of some importance that the cigarette companies have flicked their ashes on the CTWOTAOCMOTLBS.

The companies, in taking this stand, have been strongly backed by the Secretaries of State, Defense, and Commerce. The spokesmen for these Departments denounced the efforts of "certain pressure groups to substitute their private opinions and prejudices for the declared foreign policy of the United States." They also said that "commerce in peaceful goods with the countries of Eastern Europe, including the Soviet Union, is completely compatible with our national interest."

This also is a stand which deserves a warm salute. But it should be pointed out that commerce in peaceful goods works two ways. It applies both to the purchase from and the sale to of peaceful goods. So perhaps the day will come when the Secretaries of State, Defense, and Commerce will lower the boom on maritime unions which refuse to load wheat on ships bound for the Soviet Union. We should live so long.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 16, 1965]

High Marks for Courage

It requires courage to resist the hysterical cabal that sees treason in any kind of trade with Communist countries. Recently several of the major cigarette manufacturers were threatened with a boycott unless they agreed to stop using Yugoslav tobacco. Instead of submitting to blackmail, the six leading companies—not all of which import Yugoslav tobacco—stood their ground. They refused "to be influenced by any effort by any group to affect the foreign policy of the United States by economic sanctions, including boycott."

When one considers how important the public image is in the cigarette business, it will be evident that the six manufacturers deserve high marks for courage. It is also fitting to bestow praise on the Secretaries of State, Defense, and Commerce. In an eloquent letter to the cigarette manufacturers, they reaffirmed the right of American enterprise to engage in legal foreign trade without the threat of economic reprisal from self-styled patriots.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post Dispatch, Oct. 13, 1965]

Defying a Boycott

The decision of six American tobacco companies to defy boycott threats by rightwing organizations ought to be a wholesome influence on the implementation of U.S. foreign trade policies. The companies use tobacco from Yugoslavia, an independent Communist nation, for cigarette flavoring and aroma, and there is no reason why they should not.

But an organization called the Committee To Warn of the Arrival of Communist Merchandise on the Local Business Scene, with the support of John Birch Society publications and a few members of the American Legion, has been working against the tobacco manufacturers on the issue. A subsidiary of the committee was active in Alton, Ill., 3 years ago promoting a boycott of stores that sold goods from Communist countries.

It is difficult to give the cigarette companies credit for any great amount of courage in taking their stand; we cannot imagine a boycott that would be effective against their combined products. Nevertheless, they have moved in the right direction, and they are strongly supported by the State, Defense, and Commerce Departments. This has not always been the case, sad to say.

Earlier this year the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. announced a $50 million project to build a synthetic rubber plant in Communist Rumania. The plan had State Department backing, in furtherance of President Johnson's policy of "building bridges" to eastern European countries. But a minor vigilante group, Young Americans for Freedom, attacked the deal, and Firestone, fearing a loss of business in the United States, backed off. Chairman Fulbright, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, assailed the Department for timidity in supporting its own position.

This time it was different. Secretary of State Rusk, Secretary of Defense McNamara, and Secretary of Commerce Connor sent a letter to the companies stating: "We commend your industry for refusing to submit to such intimidation, which would have the effect of substituting private opinions and prejudices for the declared foreign policy of the United States."

We hope this will stimulate Mr. Johnson to modify the requirement, imposed by the maritime unions in 1963, that 50 percent of the wheat sold to the Soviet Union must be carried in U.S.-flag vessels. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, acting on a resolution cosponsored by Senator Symington, of Missouri, recently recommended elimination of the provision as "a self-defeating device which has hurt the interests of the maritime industry, farmers and taxpayers."

Economic and ideological groups have the privilege of working through democratic channels to change or modify foreign policies to which they object. Intimidation and pressure tactics are something else, and we hope the firm stand of the tobacco companies and the administration serves to put misguided saboteurs in their place.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin, Oct. 13, 1965]

The Yugoslav Blend

The administration has apparently learned a lesson from the abortive attempt of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. to sell a synthetic rubber plant to Rumania. The lesson is: silence in the face of opposition to national trade policy invites defeat of the policy.

Firestone abondoned plans last summer for the sale after a right-wing group named Young Americans for Freedom and others, including a competitor (Goodyear), objected on grounds that it gave aid to communism. The administration, which favors trade of unclassified goods with satellite nations, kept mum and the $40 million deal went up in smoke. The Department was rebuked for "timidity" by Senator Fulbright.

Now the purchase of Yugoslavian tobacco by six American firms has run into the same sore of right-wing static. But this time the Departments of State, Defense, and Commerce in unison have come out swinging.

"To yield to such groups is to encourage capricious interference with the vital processes of our constitutional government—interference that could at the end of the road make it impossible for our country to conduct a coherent foreign policy," they said.

They are so right. The question is whether the government sets the policy or, say, a Miami chiropractor (who happens to head one of the principal objecting groups). Citizens, of course, have the right to object to any government policy. But they can only change it in the voting booth.

The existing policy, moreover, is defensible on its own merits. With the satellites, the general experience has been (allowing for some exceptions) the more trade, the more affluence and independence; the more affluence and independence, the more responsibility in foreign affairs.

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Oct. 13, 1965]

TRADE WITH COMMUNISTS

Building bridges to Eastern Europe is an important part of U.S. foreign policy. The United States still bans export of arms and military supplies to the Communist-controlled governments there, but it positively encourages trade in other items (subject to Government license in each case). It encourages also human and cultural contacts, with both the Soviet Union and its now somewhat unreliable satellites.

Trade and contacts are justified in spite of some small risks because they serve the U.S. interest. In the long run, their most important effect may be the subtle one of opening the eyes of people in Communist lands to the falseness of the Communist propaganda picture of non-Communist world. This is already visibly taking place among important groups of people in the Soviet Union and still more in certain of the East European Communist countries, notably Poland, Rumania, Hungary and Yugoslavia—each in its own quite different way.

Some Americans do not agree with the U.S. policy of encouraging trade and contacts. They have every right to advocate their own view, that the United States is at war with all these countries and that any trade is trading with the enemy. This is nonsense in law and fact, but the right to advocate nonsense is a precious part of the American heritage of freedom.

Some of these Americans go beyond advocacy and try to do-it-yourself foreign policy in competition with the official one, by bringing pressure to bear on American firms which serve their own interest and the Nation's in trading with Eastern Europe.

Boycott threats earlier this year led Firestone Rubber Co., to drop its negotiations to sell a synthetic rubber plant to Communist Rumania—a project that had U.S. Government approval. At that time, the Johnson administration did not put up much of a fight, for which it drew a rebuke from Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Now boycott threats are being used against six U.S. cigarette manufacturers because they import small amounts of distinctively-flavored tobacco from Yugoslavia for use in blending. This time the administration wheeled up its big guns. Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and Commerce Secretary John Connor spoke up in a joint statement supporting the tobacco firms for refusing to submit to such intimidation and charging the boycotters with substituting private opinions and prejudices for the declared foreign policy of the United States.

Only Congress has the constitutional power to regulate foreign trade by law, and only the official executive branch has the right to apply the law.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States, in refusing to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, has performed one of the greatest services in years to the working people of this country and to the maintenance of favorable industrial relations. The basic principle underlying the issue involved is that of individual liberty. This fact was brought home clearly to the people of the United States and the overwhelming response favoring the Senate's action is most encouraging that individual liberty is still dear to the hearts of a vast majority of the people in our country.

On the other hand, some advocates of union power and compulsory unionism have complained that this vote indicates a promanagement bias on the part of Congress. A look at the record proves that any such accusation is completely unfounded, and in fact, more often than not, the exact opposite is true. A recent series of hearings held by the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives will furnish a good example.

The Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, and the IUD, which is the organizing arm of the AFL–CIO, appeared through its witnesses at one of these hearings, presumably at the invitation of the committee. These witnesses utilized that hearing as a sounding board for some intemperate and unrestrained attacks upon at least one of the leading textile companies of the Nation. The company to which I refer is J. P. Stevens and Co., Inc., which has a number of plants in South Carolina, and in various other States as well.

J. P. Stevens and Co. had no prior knowledge that such a hearing would be held, and no notice whatever that the hearing would be used to level such charges and accusations against it. There was no opportunity provided for the company to have representatives at this particular hearing and offer clarifying or rebuttal testimony to the charges against it. After learning of what had taken place at the hearing, Mr. Robert T. Stevens, the president of the company, wrote a letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. In this letter, Mr. Stevens described what had occurred and took strong exception to the injustice which had been done to his company in the committee hearing. Since the testimony of the union officers received such widespread attention and public notice and it is obvious that Mr. Stevens' letter will be largely unpublicized, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Mr. Stevens' letter be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

J. P. STEVENS & CO., INC.,
New York, N.Y., September 28, 1965.

THE CHAIRMAN,
Committee on Education and Labor,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have just returned to my office after a trip, and learn with astonishment that your committee has recently held a hearing in which J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., was one of the principal, if not the principal, subject of discussion on the part of witnesses representing the union. I am hastening to communicate with you in the hope that our company will be afforded the opportunity of showing you that it has been done a gross injustice in the proceedings which have thus far taken place, in this matter, before your committee.

There are two aspects of the situation which are especially astounding to me. In the first place, it is obvious that arrangements with respect to this hearing have been underway for some time. It seems clear that officials of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO and of the Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO made deliberate and rather elaborate preparation to try to use this hearing before your committee as a base for an unrestrained attack upon our company.

The time of preparation on the part of the union is to some extent illustrated by the 30½-page statement by Mr. J. M. Pierce, coordinator, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, and dated September 16. Further, we now know that at least one investigator for your committee has, entirely unknown to us, for some time, been making investigations among the employees in some of our plants, as well as elsewhere in the southern textile industry. This was apparently at the request of the union. We assume the purpose of this was to prepare and to make a report to your committee.

Yet, so far as I am able to determine through diligent inquiry, no word of notification of the forthcoming hearing came to us from your committee. I am informed, however, that several days after the appearance of the union witnesses, Mr. Odell Clark, of your committee staff, talked with Mr. J. W. Jelks of our company.

It should be borne in mind that at the time of Mr. Clark's call, Mr. Jelks was busily engaged in preparation for a NLRB proceeding which started the very next day in Greenville, S.C. Mr. Clark indicated that our company could make a statement on the matter to your committee. While we were grateful for such an opportunity, it was obvious that a reasonable amount of time would be necessary for preparation. A diligent effort has now been made in the form of this letter to submit a statement for inclusion in the record of the committee's hearing on this subject. As president of our company, I have made a special trip to Washington for the purpose of submitting this letter to the chief clerk of the committee, and will appreciate it being accepted for inclusion in the official record of the hearing.

The second aspect of this matter which astounds me is that officials of the unions would be permitted to use an open hearing before your committee for such slanderous and libelous attacks upon our company as is set forth in the portions of the record which I have thus far been able to obtain. Incidentally, Mr. James Franklin, a member of my staff, came to Washington on Tuesday, September 21, and called the committee to obtain copies of the record as then available. This material was received on Thursday—only one day before the presumed conclusion of the hearing. My concern in regard to this whole matter is that the public, and the esteemd members of your committee as well, will not realize how completely distorted and false is the picture of our company which has thus far been presented to you.

If this letter is not accepted for the record, then there will be no indication of the company's position for Members of Congress and others who may have occasion to examine the record. In this connection, Mr. Pierce was not content to confine his attack to the Stevens Co. He went much further on page 16 of his statement in attacking our country's judiciary. His language in the record is as follows: * * * "they (referring to employees) have witnessed denial and defeat at the hands of Federal judges * * *" Such an attack on the judiciary could have far-reaching implications.

For the information of your committee, in the course of these matters we have been before two U.S. district courts, and the U.S. Court of Appeals. They decided in favor of the company in each instance. Further litigation in these matters is currently in process, and we have great confidence in the workings of the American judicial system.

Instead of being an employer who abuses and browbeats its employees on all sides, we yield to no one in respect to our diligent and constant efforts to maintain sound and constructive relations with our people and to provide for them steady jobs, good working conditions, and desirable wages and benefits, on a continually rising scale.

Nevertheless, our company has been selected by the unions as the main target of their present organizing efforts in the South. And because we do not surrender to their pressure, there is no end to the reckless accusations they make against us and no limit to the harassment which they seek to bring to bear upon us from every direction. For more than 2 years, scores of professional union organizers have been subjecting our employees to continuous and intensive pressure.

But despite all this, in every plant, now some eight in number, involving more than 5,000 employees, where the union has called for a decision, the employees after hearing fully from both sides have voted decisively against the union in Government-conducted secret ballot elections. Evidently, the unions are dissatisfied with the rules used in the elections and are seeking changes both at the congressional level and at the NLRB level.

It appears that what the unions are really seeking is to try to get the Federal Government to set them up in our plants, as representatives of our employees, whether our employees want them or not.

As I stated earlier in this letter, I trust that you will accept this, for the present, as a statement of our company's position in this matter, and that you will include this statement in the printed record of the proceedings of your hearing. I will greatly appreciate it if you will let me know that this will be done.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,

President, J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc.

GROUP RESEARCH AND ITS MATERIAL—"BLACK LIST" CHARGES UNFOUNDED

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as one who had found the fact sheets published by Group Research, Inc., to be useful reference materials on occasion, I feel that I should take a few minutes to comment on the remarks made yesterday in criticism of that organization.

A few basic points need to be made clear at the outset. I am not familiar with the advertising material which was mentioned, and it may be that in stressing those aspects of the Group Research materials which were expected to arouse the most interest among potential subscribers, the advertising copy inadvertently conveys an incomplete picture of the materials. It is a fault not unknown in the advertising profession.

I am familiar with the cumulative collection of fact sheets themselves, which are usually referred to informally as a "directory," and I can assure you—as can anyone who takes time to study them—that they make clear throughout that they are intended to cover a very wide spectrum of groups, individuals, and publications—all alike in only one way: that they are concerned with public policy and with political and economic issues. Let me repeat: a study of the full range of materials shows that it is intended to cover a wide spectrum and it does so.

Second, it has been charged that it does not cover a complete spectrum and this is quite true—in fact, it is admittedly true. The fact is—and has been—that, by and large, the left side of the political spectrum has long been researched and publicized—by committees of this body and of our companion body, by Government agencies at the State and Federal level, by the various media of the press, and—I might add—by a substantial number of private organizations themselves falling at various points along what is loosely termed the "right" or "conservative" side of the political-economic spectrum.

Now, in 1961 and 1962, at the time that Group Research was set up, it had—rather suddenly, I would remind you—become clear that a number of new organizations were increasingly active on the political scene. I think, in all honesty, most of us will admit that we found ourselves wondering just who and what group it was that we found voicing opinions and stimulating mail to us, bringing speakers into our States to talk about public issues, and generally adding to the debate on the issues of the day. None of us—I would hope—wanted to see these groups and publications silenced, but we were curious about them. We wondered who they were, what they stood for, how they operated, where their money came from, and so on. All legitimate questions it would seem to me.

Group Research was set up to answer those questions and—in my experience—that is what it has been doing.

I would stress again, that in the period when Group Research was set up, the overwhelming interest was in groups to the right of center—this was true in terms of the news media as well as here in the Halls of Congress, as my colleagues will readily recall. I would also stress again that it was this part of the political spectrum which was not only most active, but which was least researched. Again, for answers to questions about who's who on the left, there were both public and private agencies with plenty of answers. As far as I know, prior to the organization of Group Research, there was no comparable job being done on the other side. I know that I welcomed this sort of information and I know that I have not been alone in this feeling, either here or across the country, or within the bounds of one party. On that point, I would only state again my agreement with the remarks made recently by my friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

This brings me to another point of fundamental importance. If Group Research had set itself up as an arbiter and judge, and had confined itself—as its critics now seem to be erroneously charging—to research only on those groups or publications that it wanted to dub with some sort of classification—"rightwing" or "extremist" or whatever, it would obviously have been treading on highly dubious grounds. Instead, it seems to me, it had to cover a broad spectrum and let the record speak for itself. This is what it has done, admittedly focusing its attention on that part of the spectrum which it felt was not being covered by other groups—a sort of division of labor, if you will.

Let me illustrate the point. Instead of setting itself up as a judge, to say that a given organization was "rightwing" or "conservative" or "ultraconservative" or what have you—Group Research prepares a fact sheet which quotes from the organization itself as to its purposes and principles, it lists all of the officers and staff that it can determine. It describes the program of the organization, it quotes its position on as many issues as possible, and—where it can—it gives data on size and finances. In short, it makes every effort to give a complete picture of the organization and its activities. And—as any study of the materials will show—it indicates its sources. Again, this is extremely valuable since it not only lets the reader judge the type of sources used, but it enables him to check the facts against the cited sources. I might add, parenthetically, that these sources seem overwhelmingly to be either what we in the academic field call "primary" sources—the publications and materials of the organizations themselves—or such "secondary" sources as standard newspapers and books published by reputable publishing houses. There are no "faceless informers" here, as far as I can determine, and no reporting of rumors by unnamed sources.

If there is one thing which has characterized the recent attacks on Group Research it is that they have avoided a discussion of the materials themselves. It is the critics themselves who refer to acceptance of an award from Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge as a crime. The materials of Group Research make no such charge, and any reading of their report on Freedoms Foundation makes it clear that they make no such charge.

But, instead of citing instances of misstatement of facts in the research materials, recent critics of Group Research have seized upon the index to these materials. Now—if I may again cite my credentials as a member of the academic community—I would say that an index is an essential part of any research volume worthy of the name. And to try and claim that an index constitutes some sort of a blacklist is to create a strawman of staggering proportions—there is just no other way to describe it. Group Research itself has prepared a lengthy statement commenting on that particular strawman and it was made available to the press and public yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at the close of my remarks. I think it speaks for itself.

(See exhibit 1.)

However, I would like to make three additional points. First, if Group Research, in its report on Freedoms Foundation, for example, had given only the names of those connected with it who are conservatives—or had listed only those receiving awards who might be considered conservatives—it would be unfair to Freedoms Foundation. But the report in question—like all the reports in the "Directory"—is clearly dated. It happens to be dated January 28, 1963, and I think a careful check will disclose that the people assertedly not listed were not connected with Freedoms Foundation at that time.

Second, critics have also charged that Group Research refused to sell its materials to a staff member of the office of one of our colleagues. I would only note that this is in direct conflict with Group Research's statement that as far as it knows, "No one from the critic's office has ever called GRI for anything."

Third, I would point out that the attempt to call Group Research a "blacklisting operation" is not new. Virtually from its beginnings it has been publicly attacked—and by various points along the rightwing spectrum—with this same charge, which, as I have said, completely ignores the merits or demerits of the research materials themselves. I am disappointed to find the speechwriters for the critics once more echoing charges which are "old hat" on the right wing, without carefully checking into the facts of the case.

I would hope that no person would pretend to review a book about the Senate or any other subject solely on the basis of that book's index and an advertisement for the book. Yet, it seems to me that this is essentially what has been done in this case. I refer the critics across the political aisle and elsewhere to the material itself—let us discuss the accuracy of that. This would represent a reasoned approach, rather than to use partial material to charge Group Research with sins of which it is not guilty and the Democratic National Committee with endorsing those nonexistent sins.

And I might add, Mr. President, that the Democratic National Committee's activities in behalf of Group Research have been completely in the open. No attempt was made to conceal anything. This is in sharp contrast to recent happenings in the ranks of our opposite numbers in the other party as reported by the press several months ago. Perhaps my colleagues will recall the howls of anguish from some politicians when it was discovered that official GOP National Committee mailing lists had somehow found their way into the hands of rightwing groups, including Liberty Lobby. In spite of some office break-ins, there was no breakthrough as far as the public knowledge was concerned.

Incidentally, if my colleagues are interested in a factual analysis of Liberty Lobby, I can recommend a report prepared by an organization known as Group Research.

I ask unanimous consent that the analysis be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1—ANALYSIS

1. Group Research, Inc., publishes no blacklist—or any other list—and has made this clear from the beginning.

(a) It is not capable of blacklisting, even if it wanted to, because it has no power, direct or indirect, to enforce its findings. Group Research, Inc., cannot hire, fire, or discriminate against anyone; it has never suggested such treatment; and it knows of no subscriber to its services who is interested in such misuse of its research material.

(b) On the contrary, the director of Group Research, Inc., has stated many times that one's feelings against any group or person must never be allowed to take the form of suppressing the expression of opinion. The entire emphasis has been on identification, as opposed to suppression.

In a similar vein, Group Research, Inc., has often been called upon to tell inquirers that Hunt's tomato paste is not the product of H. L. Hunt, the famous operator of "Life Line," and that Welch's grapejuice is not the product of Robert Welch, founder of the John Birch Society.

(c) What our critics are apparently referring to is not a list but an index, and there is a very big difference. To make our 2,500-page directory more usable, we include an index of individuals whose names appear anywhere in the material. Not only is it clearly labeled an index, but the following paragraph has appeared on the cover page of each annual revision:

"Remember that the mention of a person or organization in this directory has no editorial significance of itself. As stated in the original instructions to the user, 'the range is broad and the inclusion of any organization, individual, or publication implies no more than can be concluded from the facts set forth. The user must draw his own conclusions in each instance.' It is comparable to the index of a book."

To use any index as a list—black, white, or any shading—is not only a complete misuse of research material but leads to serious mistakes and/or ridiculous conclusions. For instance, the index in Barry Goldwater's book, "Why Not Victory?", lumps together Eisenhower and Khrushchev. Hundreds of similar examples can be found in books on public affairs.

(d) To say that the Group Research, Inc., directory itself constitutes a blacklist is even more erroneous. As a matter of general principle, the first page of each directory for more than 3 years has begun with the following "instructions to the user:"

"This is a directory, not an encyclopedia. The information contained in it does not purport to be complete but its accuracy has been carefully checked. It is designed for journalists, organization leaders, public officials and others who have need for a ready reference on groups attempting to influence governmental and economic affairs.

"Although the current emphasis is on rightwing groups, the range is broad and the inclusion of any organization, individual, or publication implies no more than can be concluded from the facts set forth. The user must draw his own conclusions in each instance.

"When new information on any item is received, the older material should be deleted to avoid the possibility of the use of information which is outdated and no longer accurate. We will retain any information still useful."

2. The specific examples cited by Senator MORTON and Governor Hatfield illustrate the falsity of the black listing charge, as well as some ridiculous results.

For instance, the reference to Senator DIRKSEN, if pursued by anyone interested, shows that he is not a member of an organization which published his name without authority. (Group Research, Inc., feels that reporting such denials is a useful service but hopes that no one refers to it as a "white list.")

Neither critic gave his audience or the press the actual citations to be found in the Group Research, Inc., directory by pursuing the pages given in the index—both merely mentioned some names found in the index along with acknowledged extremists. Here is each of the names mentioned by them, together with the Group Research, Inc., directory reference which anyone can find by turning the pages:

GEN. DWIGHT EISENHOWER

1. In a page about William J. Grede, Milwaukee industrialist and member of the National Council of the John Birch Society, the following reference is included: "Appointed management representative at labor-management 'summit' meetings sponsored by President Eisenhower in 1960. Upon learning he was a Bircher, Eisenhower threatened to fire him, but was dissuaded."

2. In a report on Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, it is noted that General Eisenhower is honorary chairman of the organization (photographed from a letterhead), that he was a top award winner in 1951, and that he won another award in 1950. (Since the report was prepared, Col. John Eisenhower has become executive vice president of the foundation. The organization is discussed further below.)

DR. MILTON EISENHOWER

In the Freedoms Foundation report, it was noted that he had once been a trustee and that he had also been a member of the awards jury. He was identified as having been president of Pennsylvania State University and currently president of Johns Hopkins University.

SENATOR EVERETT DIRKSEN, REPUBLICAN, OF ILLINOIS

1. He was cosponsor with the late Senator Reed of an old proposal to amend the Constitution so as to limit the income tax rate to 25 percent.

2. In a report on the American Committee for Aid to Katanga Freedom Fighters (in November of 1962), the following appeared as a separate paragraph:

"Note.—At least one person named in the original ad as a sponsor denied that the listing had been authorized. Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Republican leader of the Senate, announced after a phone call from President John F. Kennedy, that he had not seen the ad which was published and did not think the U.N. action was illegal. However, he did call for a truce in the Congo and said his sympathies were with the committee's aims."

SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD, DEMOCRAT, OF CONNECTICUT

In the Freedoms Foundation report, DODD was listed among 1961 award winners and the following quotes were presented as excerpts from his prize-winning material:

"What Americanism Means to Me: 'Americanism' is not a boastful affectation * * * a brash nationalism. Our people have no common past. A set of unique concepts and ideas about freedom are our national patrimony. They are the heart of Americanism. Americanism was not just for home consumption. It was for export."

SENATOR PAUL DOUGLAS, DEMOCRAT, OF ILLINOIS

The next paragraph on that page reads as follows: "DOUGLAS, Senator PAUL H., Democrat of Illinois, 1951 magazine award, 'Help Wanted * * * in Washington' (American, October 1951). Steering Committee, The Committee of One Million (letterhead May 30, 1962); cosponsored Freedom Academy bill, 1961; Organizing Committee, Emergency Committee for Chinese Refugees (New York Times ad June 7, 1962)."

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

The late Secretary of State in the Eisenhower Cabinet won a Freedoms Foundation award in 1949 and was mentioned in passing on page 21 of the Group Research, Inc., report on this subject, which is reproduced as an attachment to show the careful explanation made of the wide variety of awardees.

SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, DEMOCRAT, OF TENNESSEE

The late Senator and Vice-Presidential candidate won a Freedoms Foundation award in 1951 for a public address entitled "Education and Public Morals," delivered at Scarritt College for Christian Workers.

HERBERT HOOVER

Until his death, the former President was honorary president of Freedoms Foundation, as shown on its letterhead.

SENATOR JOHN M'CLELLAN, DEMOCRAT, OF ARKANSAS

1. In a report about Ronald Reagan, then an active speaker around the country and now reported to be a candidate for Governor of California, it was noted that Reagan was introduced by Senator MCCLELLAN at a 1960 joint meeting of the Arkansas Chamber of Commerce and the Associated Industries of Arkansas.

2. In the Freedoms Foundation report there are four references to the Senator, beginning with his being a member of the board of directors and including the fact that he received the highest award in 1959. It was noted that the Senator returned the award money of $5,000 to the Foundation for use in other awards.

BROOKS HAYS

The former Congressman, Democrat, of Arkansas, received an award in 1951 from Freedoms Foundation for a magazine article on "Freedom of Religion" and another award in 1965. The Group Research, Inc., report noted that Hays was "defeated as a result of his moderate views on race and his attempt to settle the Little Rock crisis peaceably. It identified him as having been a director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations in 1961, a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations General Assembly, and then a Presidential assistant.

CARDINAL CUSHING

In a report on the Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation, it is noted that this organization distributes material against communism by numerous authors, including Cardinal Cushing and the American Bar Association. (It does not mention the Cardinal's early letter to Robert Welch in support of the John Birch Society or his later apparent criticism of that group.)

JACKIE ROBINSON

The famous Negro baseball player and business executive is mentioned in the Freedoms Foundation report as a former trustee and as having received an award for testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

DAVE GARROWAY

Received a Freedoms Foundation award "for acts, deeds, and words in building national understanding of the American Republic," 1960.

ARTHUR GODFREY

Received a Freedoms Foundation award "for his joyous spirit of responsible citizenship," 1960.

REV. THEODORE HESBURGH

Besides being a trustee of Freedoms Foundation, Father Hesburgh, of Notre Dame, once served on the awards jury.

JAMES A. FARLEY

The former Postmaster General and chairman of the Democratic National Committee appears on the Freedoms Foundation letterhead as a member of the board of directors. (He has since been elevated to vice chairman.)

OZZIE AND HARRIET NELSON

This man-and-wife team was among a group of Hollywood entertainers on the stage at the 1961 Hollywood rally of Dr. Fred Schwarz' Christian anticommunism crusade. A Group Research, Inc., report on that subject noted their presence, along with numerous other personalities mentioned in a press release from Warner Bros.

None of this factual information was presented in a derogatory way and has never been disputed. It is as much a part of the identification process as is used above and regularly by news media in labeling Congressmen as to political party and home State. To call such information "irresponsible extremism," as done by Governor Hatfield, or "addle-pated black listing," as done by Senator MORTON, shows unfairness as well as ignorance of research material.

3. Several miscellaneous observations may help clarify the real issue.

The numerous references to Freedoms Foundation, which gives hundreds of awards every year, make a case worth developing a little further. Group Research, Inc., does not characterize this organization as "far right" or "extremist" and never has. On the contrary, the Group Research, Inc., directory report on the organization starts with these two paragraphs from the foundation itself:

Summary, from 1963 brochure

"Founded in 1949 'to undergird our constitutional Republic and combat the increasing threat of socialistic communism to the American way of life.' Dwight D. Eisenhower is honorary chairman and Herbert Hoover is honorary president. * * * Since the inception of the national awards program in 1949, over 1 million entries have been received * * *. During this period over 12,000 individuals, companies, organizations, and communities have received Freedoms Foundation awards.

"There exists in America today a great and urgent need for a patriotic center to serve as a marshaling point for the active forces of freedom. Accordingly, the trustees of Freedoms Foundation have set aside 40 beautiful acres at the national headquarters at Valley Forge for the site of the American Freedom Center and have undertaken to raise $1,500,000 to construct and equip the building."

This is a very restrained reference in relation to those of several authorities on the subject. Janson and Eismann in "The Far Right" (McGraw-Hill, 1963; p. 139) refer to it as "another" of the "foundations on the far right." Richard Dudman in "Men of the Far Right" (Pyramid Books, 1962; p. 153) calls it "a dignified backer of efforts on the far right." And Mark Sherwin in "The Extremists" (St. Martin's Press, 1963; p. 117) refers to Kenneth Wells, head of Freedoms Foundation from the beginning, as "president of an extremist group." Along the same line, Life magazine (February 9, 1962) cited Wells' remarks at a Project Alert as an example of the way in which "lecturers in some schools occasionally make startling deviations from the solemn role of the educator." (The other example was Col. Mitchell Paige's remark at the same Project Alert that Chief Justice Warren should be hanged.) The Group Research, Inc., directory makes no such reference.

The Morton and Hatfield charges, both delivered at partisan dinners, were preceded by very similar charges of "blacklisting" a few days earlier from three rightwing spokesmen: a column by Ralph de Toledano, a column by Edith Kermit Roosevelt, and an article by Walter Trohan in the Chicago Tribune. The latter stated frankly that his information came from Edward Hunter, best known as an authority on "brainwashing" but also chairman of the Anti-Communist Liaison, which came out of a meeting called by Billy James Hargis, and a frequent speaker on Hargis platforms. Hunter has written a pamphlet calling Group Research a "fascist/communistic—Nazi-type—organization."

MORTON's assistant told the Associated Press that he did not know whether MORTON had seen the Group Research, Inc., list, adding: "I've been trying to get hold of one for several days." No one from MORTON's office has ever called Group Research, Inc., for anything.

Hatfield said he studied Group Research, Inc., material (in a public library), then charged that Group Research, Inc., had withdrawn publication after his attack. The library has been a subscriber for several years and still is. Group Research, Inc., has not withdrawn anything; nor has it ever been contacted by Hatfield's office.

Although Group Research, Inc., has been attacked by rightwingers almost weekly, not all rightwing spokesmen are entirely critical. For instance, M. Stanton Evans wrote in the National Review Bulletin (June 11, 1963), as part of an article critical of Group Research, Inc.: "It should be stressed that Group Research, Inc., makes every effort to be factual, and seldom includes its own evaluations in its reports." And Karl Hess, Goldwater's chief speechwriter, being interviewed by the New Republic, pulled out a copy of the Group Research, Inc., report on himself and said: "A lot of people think Group Research is a smear group, but this piece is better than my memory, and it will help me answer."

Hatfield asked in a followup press release of October 15, distributed by the Republican Governors Association: "How is the reader—of Group Research, Inc., directory—to delineate between the dangerous and the patriot?" One might better ask how the nonreader is to make such a delineation? Group Research, Inc., tries to collect the information necessary for this process.

Group Research, Inc.'s index is not complete, unfortunately. Two omissions are of particular significance in this context.

First, it does not include in Eisenhower's reference the fact that Robert Welch called him a "dedicated conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy."

Second, the index does not include the name of Senator MORTON, although he is mentioned twice in the directory. In the report on Americans for Constitutional Action, an important rightwing group, it is pointed out at page 8 that MORTON rejected an award from ACA in 1961. However, on page 16, it is pointed out that he accepted such an award in 1963.

WESLEY MCCUNE,
Director, Group Research, Inc.,
Washington, D.C.

AWARD WINNERS

Since Freedoms Foundation gives around 800 awards a year, it is impractical to list all of the award winners. Known rightwingers are scattered among fairly orthodox respectable conservatives, schoolchildren, and the politically naive. A housewife who baked "freedom cookies" won a top award the same year that awards were also granted to the American Legion, the NAM, James F. Byrnes, John Foster Dulles, Dr. James W. Fifield, Jr., and "Little Orphan Annie," among others. Jackie Robinson won an award, not for race relations work, but for testimony before the HUAC—also an award winner.

TOP AWARD WINNERS HAVE BEEN

In 1949: Judge Medina, Bishop Publishing Co., economic education posters, Cluett Peabody.

In 1951: Dwight D. Eisenhower.

In 1952: Colorado Public Service Co., Chamber of Commerce of Oskaloosa, Iowa, Chamber of Commerce of Weirton, W. Va.

In 1953: Bishop Fulton Sheen, Cecil B. deMille (who gave his $1,000 to DeMille Foundation for Political Freedom and the Right to Work), Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, Howard Kershner.

In 1954: All-American Conference to Combat Communism, Hawaiian Residents Association, Inc., Kiwanis International.

In 1956: J. Edgar Hoover.

In 1957: Herbert Hoover.

In 1958: Arthur Schuck of the Boy Scouts.

In 1959: Senator McCLELLAN.

In 1961: J. Edgar Hoover again.

Among those who have received at least 10 awards in the foundaiton's 13 years are:

Rockford Chamber of Commerce, Rockford, Ill.

VFW, Patton Crosswhite Post, Bristol, Va.-Tenn.

Directorate for Armed Forces Information and Education, Washington.

National Association of Manufacturers, N.Y.

American Legion, Indianapolis.

Kiwanis International, Chicago.

Veterans of Foreign Wars, Kansas City.

Warner & Swasey Co., Cleveland.

Weirton Steel Co., Weirton, W. Va., and others.

EDITORIAL SUPPORT FOR THE HUMAN INVESTMENT ACT

Mr. PROUTY. One of the Nation's leading newspapers, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, has voiced its support of the Human Investment Act. In doing so it has rightfully recognized the leadership provided by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS of Missouri, who is the principal sponsor of the Human Investment Act in the House.

The editorial makes a trenchant point, Mr. President, when it says that the Human Investment Act would "put the responsibility for developing the Nation's human resources back where it belongs—with private business and industry."

I commend this editorial to the attention of my Senate colleagues, 20 of whom have joined me in cosponsoring S. 2509. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Sept. 20, 1965]

PUT JOB TRAINING WHERE IT BELONGS

Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS of Missouri has introduced a bill that would not only spur job training but put the responsibility for developing the Nation's human resources back where it belongs—with private business and industry.

Titled "The Human Investment Act," the Curtis measure provides a 7-percent tax credit to employers for certain expenses incurred in training employees for new job skills. Forty-one Republican Congressmen have joined CURTIS in sponsoring this important bill.

Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY of Vermont, who conceived an earlier version of "The Human Investment Act" in 1964, introduced the new and improved bill in the Senate.

As Representative CURTIS points out, 3 years ago Congress voted a 7-percent tax credit to spur investment in modern plant machinery and equipment.

"What the Congress failed to realize at that time," says CURTIS, "is the fact that the most important kind of capital a nation has is its human capital—the skills, experience, and intelligence of its working men and women."

Congressman CURTIS anticipates that, if the bill is passed, it will mean a great step up in job training by the "Nation's greatest job trainer, our private enterprise system."

As those who are now employed move up to better jobs through training, men and women now unemployed because of insufficient skills can be hired to take their places.

The Curtis-Prouty approach appears to be by far the more efficient way to handle the job training program now being attempted by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

- It eliminates the need for new government bureaus and red tape, and bypasses politics and waste that result from inexperienced, unqualified agencies attempting to do a job that can best be done by free enterprise.

It also is in the American tradition, something that cannot be said for many of the social experiments in progress under the OEO.

THE CAPITAL EXPANSION PROGRAM OF BROWN CO., OF BERLIN, N.H.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, as this session draws to an end and the record of the past year is subjected to analysis, one of the main trends of Federal action will be seen to have been close cooperation between Government, industry, and labor for the national interest.

This cooperation is by no means restricted to Federal policies in Washington. Earlier this week I was in the city of Berlin, N.H., where this sort of cooperation has been responsible for dramatic economic gains.

On October 19, Mr. Frank Peterson, president of the Brown Co., announced a capital expansion program which will more than double the company's present pulp and papermaking capacity. The management of the Brown Co., the employees of the Brown Co., and the city of Berlin have established a record of working together which has resulted in this great spur to the region's economy. Their willingness to cooperate for mutual benefit is a trait which, reproduced on a national scale, is responsible for the record gains in our Nation's economy during the past year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news story describing the Brown Co.'s expansion be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERLIN, N.H., October 19.—The board of directors of Brown Co. has approved a capital expansion program which will more than double the company's present pulp and papermaking capacity, President Frank T. Peterson revealed last night.

Speaking at the annual dinner meeting of the Berlin Chamber of Commerce, which was attended by more than 300 persons, including many Brown Co. directors, Mr. Peterson estimated the program would cost in excess of $20 million upon its completion.

He said the capacity increase will result in an additional sales volume of approximately $21 million annually, and will bring Brown Co.'s total annual sales to about $90 million.

In commenting on this favorable ratio of dollars of capital expenditure to dollars of sales—less than the industry average—Peterson stated that Brown Co.'s ability to get maximum effective utilization out of idle plant capacity resulting from the sulfite pulpmill shutdown 3 years ago was a major factor in this culmination.

Reflection in the company's earnings of this investment will start in latter 1966, with maximum effect being realized in 1967, he said.

The Berlin-Gorham Division of Brown Co. has been picked for Brown's initial investment since it is mandatory that maximum utilization of its Maine and New Hampshire timber resources be exploited together with the need for higher pulp and paper productivity. This will efficiently absorb a present unfavorable fixed cost to productive volume ratio which prevails at the company's existing capacity.

This is only a step in the company's future program, Mr. Peterson told the chamber of commerce members.

Several studies are already underway to establish Brown Co. manufacturing facilities in other locations, through an acquisition program now under development. This acquisition program will be tied into certain absorptions of its capacity both at home and in the export market.

Governor John King, Senators NORRIS COTTON and THOMAS McINTYRE, and Congressman JAMES CLEVELAND were guests of Brown Co. at the dinner. Mr. Peterson expressed to them the deep appreciation of the company's board of directors and management for the intense interest which they have evidenced in the matter of the company operations in New Hampshire, and the cooperation of government officials at both State and Federal levels.

Mr. Peterson then proceeded to outline in detail his company's plans for expansion of the Berlin-Gorham pulp and paper operations.

The company's present kraft pulp mill, built in 1947, will be enlarged from its current capacity of 330 tons per day, to an output of 700 tons per day. Installation of a new chemical recovery boiler, already ordered from Babcock & Wilcox Co., additional digesters and a new lime kiln will be required in this program which will result in production of approximately 245,000 tons of kraft pulp annually when the new facilities come into full operation.

The company's kraft bleachery, built in 1956 with present capacity of 250 tons per day, will be more than doubled in size to permit the bleaching of the full output of the enlarged kraft pulp mill, amounting to 700 tons per day at capacity operation. Additional pulp storage facilities to handle this much larger volume of bleached pulp will also be required.

The new kraft pulp mill and bleachery will be located adjacent to the present mill and bleachery installations at Berlin, N.H., according to Mr. Peterson.

Another major expansion of Brown Co.'s fiber-making facilities in Berlin will be the immediate construction of an entirely new pulp mill and paper machine for the manufacture of corrugating material used in shipping containers.

This new pulp mill will be equipped with a continuous digester, already on order, and will have a designed capacity of 200 tons of neutral sulfite and semichemical pulp per day.

The paper machine will be located in a portion of the former sulfite pulpmill, which was shut down on March 30, 1963. It will be integrated in its operations with the entire output of corrugating medium being sold to manufacturers of shipping containers.

The operations of the enlarged kraft pulpmill and the neutral sulfite semichemical pulpmill will be coordinated so that rejected screenings and other fiber materials from the kraft mill will be an important source of raw material used in the semichemical pulpmill. At the same time, cooking acids used in the semichemical pulpmill will be burned in the kraft mill chemical recovery furnace.

Both mills will be supplied from the existing wood-handling facilities which were designed and built in the mid-1950's and are capable of handling more than 1,000 cords of wood daily. They have operated at only 50 percent of capacity for the past 3 years due to the shutdown of the sulfite pulpmill.

Steam required in the pulpmill operations will be supplied from existing coal-burning boilers in the central steamplant, along with steam generated in the kraft mill boilers as a byproduct of chemical recovery from pulpmill waste products.

To obtain maximum utilization of this increased volume of high-pressure steam, the company will install additional steam generating facilities to produce needed electric power, Mr. Peterson said. Locations for the steam turbine and generator have not been established but will be in or near the kraft mill or central steamplant.

The greatly increased daily tonnages of kraft pulp from the new mill will be utilized on company paper machines and by sale to other paper manufacturers, according to Mr. Peterson.

The capital building program includes drastic speed-ups of present paper machines located at the Cascade papermill in nearby Gorham, N.H. Rebuilding of these machines to increase their output by from 25 to 40 percent is an important part of the program to place the Berlin-Gorham Division operations on a sound economic basis for the long range future. Among the five paper machines to be modernized are Mister Nibroc, which produces the paper used in Nibroc towels, and Miss Nibroc, a paper machine used for making facial grade tissues. Three other paper machines producing kraft converting and printing papers at the Cascade Mill will also be modernized.

The final item of the expansion program outlined by the Brown Co. president is the reestablishment of pulp drying facilities, including the startup of No. 2 dryer at the sulfite pulpmill which has not operated since the mill was closed down in 1963. Kraft pulp not used on company paper machines will be passed over this dryer, cut and baled, and sold to other paper manufacturers or to companies in which Brown now has or may in the future acquire an interest.

The company's major stockholders, Michele Sindona of Fasco Investment Co., and Ira Guilden of Baldwin Securities Co. also joined the more than 300 persons, including government officials, at the Chamber of Commerce dinner.

TRIBUTE TO HERBERT J. KRAMER, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS FOR THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, Mr. Sargent Shriver has made a very wise choice in appointing Herbert J. Kramer of Hartford, Conn., to be Assistant Director for Public Affairs for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Herbert Kramer is an outstanding citizen of Connecticut. He has distinguished himself in school, in military service, in business, and in public service to his community.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a press release by the Office of Economic Opportunity and articles from the Hartford Times and the Hartford Courant, all of which discuss Mr. Kramer, his new appointment, and his outstanding background.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sargent Shriver today named Herbert J. Kramer, a vice president of the Travelers Insurance Cos., to the key post of assistant director for Public Affairs of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

"Once again a leading American businessman has given up a lucrative position in private industry to join the war on poverty," Shriver said. "His predecessor, Holmes Brown, was yesterday elected vice president of American Airlines and I am delighted that Herb Kramer will immediately continue the very special tradition of public service we have established at OEO.

"Here we make a special point of attracting the very top leaders of the business community, the labor movement, and the academic world to top positions where their special talents will benefit this program and serve the Nation."

Kramer has been granted a leave of absence by the Travelers where he headed public information and advertising. He was named to the vice-presidency in March of last year after filling various jobs of major responsibility since 1951.

A native of New York City, Kramer, 43, was a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Harvard University, magna cum laude in 1942. Following wartime service as an army lieutenant in the China-Burma-India theater, he received master's and doctorate degrees in English literature from Harvard, and in 1956 completed a 4-year course in law, studying at nights at the University of Connecticut Law School. He was admitted to the Connecticut bar in 1957.

Prior to his joining the Travelers, Kramer was an instructor in the English department at Harvard University and the University of California at Santa Barbara.

He brings to his new post a substantial background in local community affairs essential to public understanding of the community-action programs, Job Corps training, and the efforts of VISTA, the domestic Peace Corps, the major programs administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Kramer currently serves as a member of the Hartford community renewal team, the local community-action agency administering that city's programs for the war on poverty. He serves as a member of boards of the Hartford YMCA, Urban League, and National Conference of Christians and Jews, is a cofounder and board member of the Greater Hartford People-to-People Council, and for 6 years served as secretary for the West Hartford Board of Education.

As State chairman of the United Nations Association, he has been Connecticut chairman for United Nations Day by appointment of Gov. John Dempsey for the last 3 years. Kramer is a member of the board of trustees of Hartford College of Music of the University of Hartford, and is vice president and member of the executive committee of the Symphony Society of Greater Hartford and the Hartford Stage Co.

Presently, Kramer serves on the public affairs policy committee of the Insurance Information Institute and the Institute of Life Insurance. He is a member of the Public Relations Society of America and coordinator of the National Advertising Council's program on mental retardation.

Presently living in West Hartford, Conn., Kramer is married to the former Karyl Kern, of Newton Center, Mass. They are the parents of seven children.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, Sept. 17, 1965]

TRAVELERS OFFICIAL NAMED TO U.S. POVERTY POST

A second vice president of Travelers Insurance Co. was named an Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity for Public Affairs, Thursday.

Herbert J. Kramer, who joined the Travelers in 1951 and was made a vice president last year, has been given a 2 years' leave of absence by the company. He will succeed Holmes Brown, who this week was elected a vice president of American Airlines.

GOTHAM NATIVE

A native of New York City, Kramer was graduated from Harvard in 1942 magna cum laude and Phi Beta Kappa. He received his master's and Ph. D degrees from Harvard and a law degree from the University of Connecticut Law School.

He has taught at Harvard and the University of California.

He is president of the Foreign Policy Association of Greater Hartford and has done much public service in this area, including serving 6 years on the West Hartford Board of Education.

FOUNDED COUNCIL

He was cofounder of the Greater Hartford People-to-People Council, and has served various posts with the Community Council, Community Chest, YMCA World Service Committee, and other civic and business associations.

He and his wife and their seven children live at 26 Westland Avenue, West Hartford. The family will remain at that address.

Kramer will start in his new post a couple of days a week, until he can complete his duties at Travelers, then after about 6 weeks will be in Washington full time, coming home weekends.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times, Sept. 17, 1965]

A GOOD MAN LEAVING

The Office of Economic Opportunity is to be congratulated on getting Herbert J. Kramer as its Assistant Director for Public Affairs, but the congratulations from the Greater Hartford community will have a wry inflection. The Nation's gain is Connecticut's considerable loss.

Mr. Kramer is a sparkplug. He is remarkable for his intellectual brilliance, his administrative skill, and his willingness to accept responsibility for community affairs. Those characteristics are badly needed in the job to which he is going, but we shall miss him in Hartford. The Travelers Insurance Cos., of which he is second vice president, have given him a 2-year leave of absence. We hope that will be enough time for him to do what the Nation wants him for and that he will return to our community when the time is up.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times, Sept. 16, 1965]

KRAMER GIVEN OEO POST

Herbert J. Kramer, second vice president of Travelers Insurance Cos. today was named an Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity for Public Affairs.

"Once again, a leading American businessman has given up a lucrative position in private industry to join the war on poverty," said R. Sargent Shriver, director of the agency.

"His predecessor, Holmes Brown, was yesterday elected vice president of American Airlines, and I am delighted that Herb Kramer will immediately continue the very special tradition of public service we have established at the Office of Economic Opportunity.

"Here we make a very special point of attracting the top leaders of business and industry, the labor movement and the academic world to top positions where their special talents will benefit this program and serve the Nation," Mr. Shriver added.

J. Doyle DeWitt, board Chairman of the Travelers Insurance Cos., said:

"It is with mixed feelings that we are going to see Mr. Kramer go to Washington. He has been a tremendous asset within the Travelers organization—a man dedicated to the ideals of improving this company's ability to fill the public's need for financial protection through insurance. His leadership in civic and community affairs has earned him an outstanding reputation for public service."

However, we recognize the talents which Herb Kramer brings to his new position and know that in this capacity he is continuing the tradition through which American business leaders can serve this country.

Mr. Kramer flew to Washington today to begin his new duties. He will commute back and forth for a few weeks to conclude his responsibilities here.

Travelers has given Mr. Kramer a 2-year leave of absence to allow him to accept the Federal post.

A native of New York City, Mr. Kramer graduated Phi Beta Kappa, magna cum laude from Harvard in 1942, and received his master's degree in 1946 and his Ph. D. in 1949, both from Harvard. In 1956, he was graduated from the University of Connecticut Law School and was admitted to the Connecticut Bar.

He joined the Travelers in the public information and advertising department in 1951.

He became assistant manager in 1952, and in 1959 was named director of public information and advertising. He was made second vice president in March, 1964.

Mr. Kramer's public service included 6 years on the West Hartford Board of Education; cofounder and vice chairman of the Greater Hartford People-to-People Council; chairman of the Greater Hartford Community Ambassador Association; various posts with the Community Council, Community Chest, Social Legal Council, and YMCA World Service Committee. He is president of the Foreign Policy Association of Greater Hartford.

In 1959, he was named Father of the Year by the Retail Trade Board. He and his wife have seven children, and live at 26 Westland Avenue, West Hartford.

AMENDMENTS TO THE BANK MERGER ACT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I regret that we have not been able to enact during the 1st session of the 89th Congress legislation to eliminate the present confusion and controversy with respect to bank mergers. However, the Senate has acted on my bill, S. 1698, and the House Banking and Currency Committee has reported an amended version of that bill. I expect that early next session legislation will be enacted by the Congress which will clarify this situation.

All of the proposals which have been suggested in the field of bank mergers have included some measure of relief, partial or complete, for the six bank mergers now under attack by the Department of Justice. In at least two of these cases final action in the way of divestiture is imminent. It is possible that these cases might be brought to a final conclusion and final divestiture accomplished before the relief proposed could be enacted early next session.

Accordingly, a letter has been sent to the Attorney General requesting him to refrain from prosecuting these cases further, particularly the two in the final stages of divestiture, until the Congress has had an opportunity during the coming session to conclude its consideration of the pending bank merger legislation. This letter was signed by Senator Mansfield, the majority leader, by Senator Eastland, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and by me as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. In addition, it was signed by Senator Dirksen, the minority leader and ranking Republican member of the Judiciary Committee, and by Senator Bennett, ranking Republican member of the Banking and Currency Committee.

In view of the fact that these cases are pending in the judicial branch, the Attorney General is requested to bring our views to the attention of the courts having jurisdiction over the six pending cases.

In view of the unusual nature of the letter and particularly the request that our views be brought to the attention of the judicial branch by the Attorney General, I believe it is appropriate to make the request public, and, accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
October 22, 1965.

Hon. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Attorney General: It had been our earnest hope and expectation that by the conclusion of the first session of this Congress action would have been completed on a measure clarifying the existing confusion with regard to bank mergers. Such a bill, S. 1698, passed the Senate without dissent last June, and a somewhat different but equally effective measure was reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee just this week—but not in time for final floor action by the House and Senate.

It is our expectation that we will have enacted such a measure in the early days of the forthcoming session of Congress. This being so, we are deeply concerned that during this interim period, action might be taken with regard to several of the bank mergers now challenged by your Department which might prejudice the application of the new law. As you know, two such merger cases are now in the final stages of settlement by divestiture, and the four others are in various pretrial or trial stages. All of these cases will be basically affected by new legislation which, as we have noted, we expect to be enacted shortly. For example, the bill passed by the Senate would terminate all six pending cases; all versions of the bill considered by the House Banking and Currency Committee would terminate the three mergers consummated before the decision of the Supreme Court in the Philadelphia case; and the bill reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee would also provide new standards to be applied in the cases involving the three mergers consummated after the Philadelphia decision.

We take this occasion to express our concern lest what seems clearly to be the sense of Congress in the area of bank mergers be frustrated by action taken in any of the six pending cases.

Accordingly, we urge that you refrain from any further steps in these cases, particularly the two which are now in the final stages of divestiture, until the Congress has had an opportunity during the coming session to conclude its consideration of the pending bank merger legislation.

In addition, in view of the fact that these cases are pending in the judicial branch, we request that on our behalf you respectfully bring our views to the attention of the several courts having jurisdiction over these six pending cases.

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Mansfield,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate.
James O. Eastland,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.
A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency.
Everett McKinley Dirksen,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate.
Wallace F. Bennett.

WHO NOW SHALL SPEAK FOR AMERICA?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as the world was shocked and saddened, especially were North Carolinians by the untimely death of America's foremost statesman, Adlai Ewing Stevenson.

But ours was a particular loss, for an empathy existed between our people and Ambassador Stevenson that no others could claim.

Much of Ambassador Stevenson's origins stemmed from our State. His ancestors were among our early settlers and were numbered among our first leaders.

It was not surprising that North Carolina held the Illinois Governor in such high esteem that twice we gave him our electoral vote for the Presidency.

His sister, Mrs. Ernest Ives, calls North Carolina home. As Governor and United Nations Ambassador, he frequently visited the Old North State.

America's most eloquent voice will be heard no more and sadness fills the land for that great spirit that gave meaning to our highest values, for that intellect which was brought to bear so effectively on the problems of our times.

No man has had a greater or more lasting impact for good upon American life. Through him we felt a vicarious contribution to world peace as he labored in the United Nations to produce a better world for us and yet unborn generations. We owe to him, above all, the quickened tempo of our intellectual life, the improved quality of our political life, and the heightened dialog between man and society, between citizen and government, between this Nation and the rest of the world.

He expressed as none other America's dreams for a better world for all mankind. Renown for his intellect and wit, Adlai Stevenson's was a many-faceted personality. A noble man, a selfless man, a humble man, a man of peace, a man possessed of tremendous diversity of talent and interests—truly he was a renaissance man in the 20th century.

There is a special stillness in our longleaf pines as we pause to contemplate what he meant to North Carolinians—and indeed to all men—and a peculiar sense of loneliness as we ask again that question—which first came to mind upon learning of his death—Who now can speak for America? And, a particular sadness as we acknowledge—no one—so well as he.

Future history books, I believe, will accord him a unique place in the constellation of statesmen of our country in the councils of the world. For, like the evening star, he shed the brightest light.

To his family, we extend a grateful Nation's sympathy for a loss which we truly feel and share.

Many tributes have been paid Ambassador Stevenson by North Carolinians. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a few representative ones.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Morganton (N.C.) News-Herald, July 16, 1965]

HE SERVED HIS COUNTRY WELL

A few days before he died, Adlai E. Stevenson was rated by a writer as being among a select few men who had contributed substantially to shaping the course of this Nation's history without ever serving in the White House.

That will stand as an accurate appraisal.

After two unsuccessful bids for the Presidency, doomed to failure by the very nature of things, he went on to serve the United States well as Ambassador to the United Nations.

He was an eloquent spokesman of U.S. policy in the councils of the world, and in that important role he won for himself admirers among his fellow countrymen who earlier held reservations about his qualifications when he ran for the Presidency.

Adlai Stevenson probably could not have won the Presidency if he had been the near-perfect image of a candidate, because in both campaigns he faced Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, whose vote-getting appeal made him unbeatable. While the former Governor of Illinois possessed qualities which drew unto him a segment of the populace, it was not enough.

Mr. Stevenson was an articulate intellectual, and Americans generally have been a bit leery about sending an intellectual into the White House. He was urbane and witty, and the American voter is not sure he wants too much humor from his President. In his campaigns he called upon the citizens of the United States to make a self-analysis in the light of long-range problems which this country faced, but the American voter does not want to be bothered with too much thinking about distant problems, preferring instead for his leaders to make the decisions, right or wrong.

But his service as chief representative to the United Nations was something else. When, for example, he pushed the Soviet representative for a direct answer about Russian involvement and said he was prepared to wait for his answer "till hell freezes over" that was a firmness and a posture which the American people, watching proceedings on television, knew and understood and applauded.

In numerous, less dramatic ways he represented the United States in the often frustrating task of negotiations and persuasion among the world's diplomats. It is not surprising that, during an especially difficult period of crisis in 1961, he said with wry, Stevenson humor: "What with Cuba, Congo, Korea, and now Laos, I sometimes yearn for the simple brutalities of bipartisan politics."

He will long be remembered for his eloquence and for many of the statements he uttered, such as the comment about the United Nations during a critical period: "There is really one item on our agenda—the survival of the human race."

But when his statements, grave or sparklingly witty, are forgotten, he will be remembered as a distinctive personality who served his country well.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, July 15, 1965]

CLOSE, BUT GENTLY, ANOTHER DOOR

Even in a crowd, he was one of the lonely ones—affable, you understand; articuate; brilliantly urbane. But you sort of got a notion that here was a man whose spirit wandered a quieter path, away from the lights and laughter and the frantic gaiety of a tinseled society.

And yet he was, for much of his life, a public figure—active in the making of international policy, Governor of Illinois, twice a candidate for President, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations since 1961.

Can such a man be lonely?

Adlai Stevenson cherished a dream of a better world and a richer human society and a more rewarding destiny for all mankind. He was, his critics said, a starry-eyed intellectual—and he was at least that. He walked with heartbreak, and he walked mostly alone, but he walked with determination toward goals that were unachievable in a cynical culture.

He wasn't a saint; he would have despised the label. He did what he needed to do, often ruthlessly, always with surface zeal, sometimes in sorrow. By the very nature of his mission, he espoused principles that were not to his liking in order to serve a Nation that needed his wisdom, exploited his talent, and often mocked his ideals.

No real matter; it's over. Adlai Stevenson is dead, at 65, and men will mourn him—even men who jeered. And somewhere other men will weep for the lonely, the lost, the disinherited who wandered briefly among us—making small jokes to mask a restless soul.

STEVENSONS SETTLED IN STATESVILLE

The family tree of Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations who died Wednesday in London, is traced back more than 200 years to North Carolina.

His earliest Stevenson ancestor in America was William (Little Gabriel) Stevenson, an Irish immigrant, who brought his wife Mary McClelland Stevenson, from Pennsylvania to North Carolina in 1762.

They settled near the present site of the State experimental farm at Statesville. William is buried in the graveyard of the First Presbyterian Church there.

They lived in the Scotch-Irish community of Mount Mourne, located today on Highway 21, halfway between Charlotte and Statesville.

Their son, James Stevenson, married Nancy Brevard, the granddaughter of John Brevard, sheriff of Rowan County and niece of Dr. Ephraim Brevard, who helped frame the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence, whereby Mecklenburg County asserted its independence of the British Crown before the Thirteen Colonies did.

From this marriage came a son, John Turner Stevenson, who married Eliza Ann Ewing, daughter of Adlai Osborne Ewing. From these sources Adlai Ewing Stevenson derived his name.

Adlai Ewing's grandfather, Adlai Osborne, was one of the original trustees of the University of North Carolina and a clerk of court for Rowan County.

John and Eliza Ewing Stevenson left North Carolina in 1814 with a company of friends and relatives, settling for a while in Christian County, Ky.

It was from there that their son, the first Adlai Ewing Stevenson, the grandfather of the Ambassador, set out for Illinois, arriving in 1852.

He ran for public office many times. He served two terms in Congress and was appointed assistant postmaster general by President Grover Cleveland in 1884. In 1892, during Cleveland's second term, he became Vice President of the United States.

From his generation on, the Stevenson clan centered in Illinois.

In 1951, the year before the first of his two unsuccessful bids for the Presidency, Adlai E. Stevenson, then Governor of Illinois, visited North Carolina. He was anxious to visit the early homeland of his ancestors. He was escorted about the countryside by William D. Kizziah of Salisbury, U.S. marshal for the U.S. middle district.

Stevenson's sister, Mrs. Elizabeth Stevenson Ives, has maintained a winter home for many years in Southern Pines.

[From the Wilmington (N.C.) Morning Star, July 15, 1965]

STEVENSON: TRUE STATESMAN

The unexpected death of Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson in London yesterday has removed from the world's stage one of the most dedicated statesmen and persuasive spokesmen for freedom of our times.

His more than 30 years of public service have earned him an indelible place in American history, for he not only has been the voice of American policy before the United Nations, as the U.S. Ambassador there, but also he helped to shape foreign policy geared to halt aggression by communism.

Such a distinguished career had many highlights. Over the years from his beginning of public service in an unobtrusive post in Washington to the pinnacle of his popularity as a politician and statesman, it is noteworthy that he was admired and respected by both major political parties.

His high mark in politics certainly would be the two times he was chosen by the Democratic Party as its presidential nominee. If there was misfortune in his political life, it came when the fates cast him as the opponent of General Eisenhower in the presidential race. That was the only mismatch of his long and successful career in public service.

Mr. Stevenson gave new interest to the spoken word. His intellectualism gave him an oratorical elegance and perceptiveness that proved a formidable combination in the U.N. in his handling the adroit Communist effort to use the U.N. as a propaganda agency.

He had the rare talent to be liked by people in all walks of life. He was not without critics, but it can be well said he served his country with devotion and unswerving faithfulness. He symbolized the good American.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal, July 15, 1965]

STEVENSON FOUND LITTLE REST IN NORTH CAROLINA

(By J. Patrick Kelly)

He came hurrying out of the sprawling log house and stood there on the porch a moment, blinking at the sunshine of a North Carolina spring day.

He apologized to the dozen or so newspapermen for keeping us waiting.

His sister explained that he had been dictating letters that morning * * * which would have seemed an unlikely occupation on that gleaming March day in a faraway farm in the Sandhills * * * if the man hadn't been Adlai Stevenson.

This was 1954. Stevenson was making one of what would be a series of visits to North Carolina. The next year he even stopped at Winston-Salem, but only briefly. The private plane of Richard S. Reynolds, head of Reynolds Mining Co., put down at Smith Reynolds Airport for servicing during a flight that would take Stevenson to Miami and Haiti.

In 1954 and twice in 1956 he went to Paint Hill Farm near Southern Pines, the home of his sister and brother-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest Ives.

Earlier—in 1952—he visited the Loray community near Statesville to see his many cousins in Iredell and Rowan Counties, and he campaigned elsewhere in the State during his presidential battles of 1952 and 1956.

He came back in 1960 (to Durham) to campaign for another candidate, John F. Kennedy. And in 1954 he went to Charlotte to help Democrats in their bid to unseat Republican Representative CHARLES R. JONAS.

That was after his first trip to Paint Hill Farm. Then—as was true for all the visits he made to the pleasant Sandhills hideaway—he was seeking rest. He didn't find it.

He had been through the 1952 campaign and election—in which he received more votes than any other presidential candidate in history, except one, Dwight Eisenhower—and he was working, although not openly, for the 1956 Democratic nomination.

Recognizing all this, he'd approved an invitation—put out by his sister—to North Carolina newspapers to send photographers for a morning of picture taking.

The Winston-Salem Journal assigned photographer Jim Keith and me to go.

We were among that dozen that greeted Adlai Stevenson on the porch of the Ives' wonderfully weather-beaten log house. I don't recall whether we were among those who spotted the small hole in his gray slacks.

Stevenson mumbled something about "an old pair of pants," then gave a wry grin and said: "I was hoping you wouldn't notice that. I had trouble with a shoe one time."

Soon he was chatting comfortably with all of us while he posed for pictures.

Though he had no title—he'd resigned as Governor of Illinois to run for President and had been beaten—we all felt he deserved one, commanded one. We called him Governor.

He had gained weight and confessed to it airily. "It comes and goes," he said. Campaign trips put it on, he said. "Too many banquets."

He wanted to get in a lot of golf on the famed Southern Pines and Pinehurst courses, but he was discouraged: "I was awful yesterday."

Pictures ("Just one more") and more questions, a lunch of sandwiches, then handshakes all around. Through it all, a warm man, with the much-discussed wit breaking through again and again. A visitor himself, he made the visitors feel at home.

But he would get little rest on that trip. Through it all, the man matched the spring day—warm, often sparkling, perhaps soft, as his critics claimed, big certainly as the Sandhills sky.

He was in 1954, as reporter Tom Wicker noted about a trip to Paint Hill Farm in 1956, still "the Candidate." And he couldn't stop running. Then.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.), Journal, July 15, 1965]

ADLAI STEVENSON

Adlai Stevenson may have been, by the measures we ordinarily use to judge such things, one of life's losers.

He lost the Presidency twice, in 1952 and 1956, he suffered an unhappy marriage and a painful divorce, and in 1960 he was denied, not only his party's nomination for President, but the job of Secretary of State, which he greatly wanted.

But it is difficult, remembering the 1952 presidential campaign, to think of Adlai Stevenson as a loser.

In that year, confronted by the challenge of the returning war hero, selected very much against his will to be his party's candidate, he tried to "talk sense to the American people." It was a memorable process—a process that might have succeeded had not so many factors outside his control conspired against him.

Many Republicans, their memories marked indelibly by that emotional campaign, have never been able to understand what in Mr. Stevenson's character inspired such devotion among his fellow Democrats. They saw him as ineffectual, as indecisive, as lacking courage and patriotism.

The man who accepted the Democratic nomination in 1952, however—who bore the burdens of the stalemated war in Korea, of "soft on communism," of the "loss" of China—this was no indecisive or ineffectual man. Mr. Stevenson had inherited a confused and demoralized party in 1952; the dust of history had not settled enough for the achievements of Harry Truman's administration to be visible in any kind of perspective. And always there was General Eisenhower's popularity, the almost mystical popularity of the man who had led the crusade in Europe.

To this unpromising situation, Mr. Stevenson brought a wit and a sweet reasonableness that won him the permanent devotion of a great many Democrats, even if they could not win him the Presidency. He rearticulated the ideals of the Democratic Party and the American Republic; he reminded his fellow partisans what they were and why.

Always it was in terms of the individual, the individual who needed help with the crippling problems of age, the terrible frustrations of urban life, the depressing limitations of race, the bitter restrictions of poor education.

In foreign policy he foreshadowed, by a good 10 years, John Kennedy's assault on the myths that dictate so many of our decisions.

The Democratic Party never belonged to Adlai Stevenson except in exile, and yet those were among its best years. Those were the years that saw the party's aspirations revitalized, that gave it such strength in Congress and that, in the end, made a John F. Kennedy possible. A whole generation of Democrats must count the campaign of 1952 as the most important primer in its political education.

After 1952, anything else had to be anticlimax for Mr. Stevenson. The hurly-burly of the 1956 campaign certainly was. And Mr. Stevenson's role as Ambassador to the United Nations was so subordinate that it was too.

Yet there were moments in the Security Council, like the confrontation with the Russians over the Cuban missile crisis, when the old wit shone and the flint that was in him struck against something solid. There were moments that caused a lot of Americans to remember what might have been and to savor the quality of Stevenson's lost cause.

It was a lost cause, all right, and it had all the ingredients that lost causes usually have.

But who can say now that the Adlai Stevenson of 1952 was one of life's losers? Our subsequent history, it would seem, demands another label for him. Like "prophet."

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, July 16, 1965]

THE VOICE OF CONSCIENCE

It is not an irony of history but a measure of the man himself that Adlai Stevenson, who aspired to but never won the "bully pulpit" of the presidency, spoke to his fellow countrymen with greater force and influence than most men who have held that office. For, in fact, Adlai Stevenson did not require that formal pulpit; he had a special place in the hearts and minds of Americans into which he could enter freely, to address the conscience of a nation.

And with what import he spoke. No public man in this century, perhaps, cut so close to the marrow of American life as he did. For 8 years, from 1952 to 1960, he goaded and cajoled us to a higher vision of ourselves and our national purpose, reminding us over and again of our uniqueness and our responsibility: "We are the freemen of this universe, the children of liberty, the beneficiaries of unequaled abundance, and heirs of the highest, proudest political tradition ever known to man."

He was a gentle, self-effacing man who could mock his greatest talent. "I sometimes marvel," he said 15 years ago, "at the extraordinary docility with which Americans submit to speeches." He had the quality of laughter, balanced with a fine sense of the order of things; he could, as Governor of Illinois, veto a bill to provide protection to insectivorous birds by restraining cats by noting: "The problem of the cat versus bird is as old as time. If we attempt to resolve it by legislation who knows but what we may be called upon to take sides as well in the age-old problems of dog versus cat, bird versus bird, or even bird versus worm. In my opinion * * * local governing bodies in Illinois already have enough to do without trying to control feline delinquency."

But it was not by his gentle manner or humorous outlook that Adlai Stevenson won his national audience—though both helped. Rather, it was because he eloquently and passionately spoke to and for the American conscience. He did so in an era when that conscience was troubled by domestic acrimony and international uncertainty. Like Wordsworth's England, America was a "fen of stagnant waters." "A voice whose sound was like the sea" was needed; Adlai Stevenson provided it.

He came to national prominence at the height of McCarthyism. The fear that swept the country was real and, to many, terrifying, but he struck forthrightly at the source: "The anatomy of patriotism is complex. But surely intolerance and public irresponsibility cannot be cloaked in the shining armor of rectitude and self-righteousness. Nor can the denial of the right to hold ideas that are different—the freedom of man to think as he pleases. To strike freedom of the mind with the fist of patriotism is an old and ugly subtlety."

In campaigns and between them, while the national administration temporized on civil rights, Adlai Stevenson spoke out: "So long as man remains a little lower than the angels, I suppose that human character will never free itself entirely from the blemish of prejudice, religious or racial. * * * But I do not attempt to justify the unjustifiable, whether it is anti-Negroism in one place, anti-Semitism in another—or, for that matter, anti-Southernism in many places. Let none of us be smug on this score, for nowhere in the Nation have we come to that state of harmonious amity between racial and religious groups to which we aspire."

And in 1956, as the world trembled under nuclear proliferation, he proposed a bold departure: "I believe we should give prompt and earnest consideration to stopping further tests of the hydrogen bomb * * * this is a step which, it seems to me, we might now take, a step which would reflect our determination never to plunge the world into nuclear holocaust, a step which would reaffirm our purpose to act with humility and a decent concern for world opinion."

It was often said of Adlai Stevenson that he was indecisive and weak, that he was too humble to assert presidential leadership, that he preferred contemplation to action. But that was true only on the surface. Bombast was not his nature. His was a greater courage, to face the hard realities, to walk the narrow path, to grasp a star. Courage—strange stuff for political rhetoric—was his counsel:

"How are we to defend freedom if, for the tyranny of external control we substitute the

> clattering, cluttering tyranny of internal aimlessness and fuss? This freedom for our souls, freedom at the profoundest level of our being, is not a gift to us by our contemporary way of life. * * * If we cannot—by a certain discipline, by readiness for reflection and quiet, by determination to do the difficult and aim at a lasting good—rediscover the real purpose and direction of our existence, we shall not be free. * * * Outer tyranny with purpose may well triumph over the inner, purposeless tyranny of a confused and aimless way of life."

Adlai Stevenson's legacy was to point us toward that purpose and direction. He is dead, and his place in our hearts and minds is suddenly, shatteringly empty; but the way he charted for us is open.

AS SENATE COMMITTEE REQUESTS, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ESTABLISHES INFORMATION CENTER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a recent announcement by the Office of Economic Opportunity provides a heartening sign that, at least in one significant respect, the administration has taken note of and has acted upon a concern about the war on poverty expressed by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I have the honor to be the ranking minority member. I therefore speak with the pardonable pride of the minority in bringing about this much-needed reform.

On August 13, in reporting to the Senate the measure extending the program, the committee noted some basic evidence of disorganization at Office of Economic Opportunity and urged that it be remedied promptly. At page 7 of the report—Senate Report No. 599—the committee stated:

> The committee has noted criticism that the dispersion of programs under the act among various Federal agencies and departments has resulted in a practical difficulty for communities and Members of Congress in obtaining factual information about the status of applications. It is expected that the Office of Economic Opportunity will undertake, pursuant to its coordinating obligation under section 611 of the act, to establish a procedure for assembling such information so that public information may be complete and readily available.

I am pleased to note that on September 23, the Office of Economic Opportunity announced that it was establishing an information center, which will use computers and other modern techniques "to bring together all the data required to wage the war on poverty." It was described as a means for assembling "current data on how funds are spent, whether local agencies are conducting effective programs, how many people they are serving, and so on."

Section 613 of the original act, passed in 1964, had required the establishment of such an information center. But in the first year of operation, the section was ignored. The Senate committee, at my urging, prompted the agency to remedy that failure. I am much pleased that it has now been complied with. I hope that this will reflect an increased sensitivity in the agency to the expectations of Congress in overseeing this important, but sprawling, program.

UNEMPLOYMENT HIGH AMONG COLD WAR GI'S

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, earlier this session I placed in the Record a letter which I received from Mr. H. E. Summers, Chief, Bureau of Readjustment Education, State of California, indicating that 5 percent of the overall employable population in that State is now unemployed and that of the personnel who have been released from military service since February 1, 1955, 10 percent are unemployed. In testimony before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on last September 15, 1965, Mr. Sidney Zagri, legislative counsel for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers, presented thought-provoking evidence of the large number of cold war veterans who are on the unemployment rolls in every area of this Nation and provided a most compelling argument for the immediate enactment of the cold war GI education bill (S. 9).

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from Mr. Zagri's fine statement before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpt From Statement of Mr. Sidney Zagri, Legislative Counsel, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers, Before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, September 14, 1965

Draftees have been entering the service at a rate of 300,000 a year.

Intake of draftees is expected to be raised to 400,000 a year. This was declared in a recent speech by General Hershey of Selective Service.

Output of servicemen from the armed services has been averaging around 500,000 men a year for the past few years.

The indicated unemployment rate of these Armed Forces dischargees is somewhere around 50 percent. This compares to an unemployment rate of 7.4 percent for nonveteran white male persons of 20–24 years. (Source: table A–13, statistical tables on manpower.) The 50-percent-unemployed figure for young veterans is substantiated by the examination of the figures of the unemployment compensation for ex-servicemen program. (See exhibit I.) With roughly 50,000 men leaving the service each month and roughly 25,000 registering initial unemployment claims, the 50-percent ratio is substantiated. A more detailed substantiation of the 50-percent figure can be obtained by counting the number of control cards (form ES 971) of the unemployment compensation for ex-servicemen program. In fiscal 1964 there were 267,417 control cards issued. This means that 267,417 ex-servicemen were either fully or partially unemployed. No names are duplicated on these control cards. If a veteran made two unemployment claims in the same year, he would be still under one control card. No joint claims are included here. For example, if a veteran obtained some unemployment which was covered under a State program, he would have a claim both against the State program and the unemployment compensation for ex-servicemen's program. Such joint claims are excluded from the control cards count. With some 550,000 dischargees from the armed services in fiscal 1964, to figure out 276,417 persons claiming their unemployment compensation benefits gives an indicated rate of 50 percent.

If we count draftees and volunteers, we see an input into the armed services of roughly 600,000 men a year over the last few years. We see an output of roughly 500,000 men. We find roughly 250,000 men, or half the output of the armed services, drawing unemployment compensation benefits for some period.

This 50-percent-unemployment figure is an ever more remarkable figure when we consider that veterans of the armed services are protected in their reemployment rights. Veterans are protected by the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights in the Department of Labor. The Supreme Court has protected veterans by establishing the fact that an escalator principle prevails insofar as their reemployment rights are concerned.

In other words, a veteran has the right to step back upon the promotion escalator at a point where he would have found himself had he not departed to do national service in the Armed Forces. In some cases, this may mean that the veteran may require some training to reach the place which he would have achieved had he remained with the company. Many companies cooperate most actively with the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights in establishing such training programs. When we consider that many veterans exercise these rights and return to previous employment, the 50-percent unemployment rate of veterans is even more astonishing. It exposes very completely the recruiting poster myth that service in the Armed Forces results in a man acquiring an up-to-date set of skills which he can easily transfer into a civilian occupation. As Gen. Omar Bradley testified years ago, the soldier who is taught civilian skills in the Army is a very rare bird indeed. He is usually the very long-term enlistee. Today, even the most talented young soldier is not likely to learn a civilian skill. Even if he is engaged in electronics work in the service, the state of technology in the Armed Forces is so advanced and substantially different from civilian work that his skills are not transferable. This is the rare case.

About 50 percent of dischargees from the armed services draw unemployment pay of around $35 a week for a period averaging 12 weeks.

Any young person today without a high school diploma is virtually unemployable. A part-time, dead-end job may be from time to time available, but the opportunity to obtain a job where a lifetime skill can be learned is out of the question for a person who has not obtained a high school diploma.

The educational opportunities offered to World War II veterans and Korean war veterans resulted in some 44 percent of World War II veterans and 34 percent of Korean war veterans using these opportunities to complete high school education. While the average draftee probably has about 10 grades of schooling, some of them do complete high school education while in the armed services. Many, of course, do not. Therefore, they emerge from their period of national service handicapped unless remedial action is taken to complete their high school education. One of the best arguments that can be made for the present bill is that it will offer an opportunity for young veterans to complete their high school education and remove themselves from the ranks of the unemployable.

Many, of course, will go on and tackle college training. But the chances are that about one in four persons who would seek education and training allowances would be completing high school. This, in effect, puts them into a position where they can modestly compete in the labor market's lower levels.

EXHIBIT I

Unemployment compensation for ex-servicemen program, initial and continued claims filed in fiscal years 1964 and 1965

	Fiscal year 1964		Fiscal year 1965	
	Initial claims	Continued claims	Initial claims	Continued claims
July	31, 133	197, 722	31, 572	194, 899
August	29, 111	196, 630	25, 896	184, 894
September	27, 699	183, 052	24, 754	168, 842
October	30, 528	190, 325	25, 209	150, 505
November	28, 532	190, 103	26, 723	163, 908
December	38, 655	255, 330	31, 837	212, 169
January	38, 932	320, 767	29, 758	224, 289
February	29, 245	295, 838	24, 658	222, 411
March	27, 946	303, 343	25, 503	227, 200
April	26, 878	260, 493	21, 215	187, 917
May	20, 489	202, 467	17, 058	142, 970
June	25, 022	185, 942	22, 005	139, 513
Total	354, 170	2, 782, 012	306, 188	2, 219, 517

THE SUPREME COURT DECISION IN UNITED STATES AGAINST ARCHIE BROWN ON OCTOBER 22, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on June 7, 1965, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision in the case of the United States against Archie Brown. Archie Brown was convicted of violation of section 504 of the Landrum-Griffin Act, 29 U.S. Code, section 504, which provides, in pertinent part:

> (a) No person who is or has been a member of the Communist Party * * * shall serve—"(1) as an officer, director, trustee, member of any executive board or similar governing body, business agent, manager, organizer or other employee (other than as an employee performing exclusively clerical or custodial duties) of any labor organization* * *.
>
> "During or for five years after the termination of his membership in the Communist Party* * *.
>
> "(b) Any person who willfully violates this section shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both."

The Supreme Court, in a 5 to 4 decision, held that this statute constituted a "Bill of Attainder," and was, therefore, unconstitutional. Archie Brown's conviction was overturned.

As Justice White so ably pointed out in his dissenting opinion, the majority of the Court is wrong. Section 504 is regulatory, not punitive. The majority opinion is in conflict with numerous prior decisions.

The effect of this opinion is far reaching. It virtually paralyzes the ability of Congress to deal with the threat of the Communist Party. The decision denies the power of Congress to prevent members of the Communist Party from holding office in labor unions, but by implication, it does far more. It impugns the power of Congress to prohibit members of the Communist Party from holding public office, or even from holding sensitive positions in such security agencies as the Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of Defense and the National Security Agency.

Evaluations of the impact of this decision should be made in conjunction with the testimony of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, given earlier this year and before the decision of the Supreme Court in the Archie Brown case. Mr. Hoover testified on March 4, 1965:

> Encouraged by recent court decisions which the party considers major victories in its efforts to nullify the Internal Security Act of 1950, and convinced that a large segment of the population is ready to accept some form of socialism as a cure for domestic problems, such as civil rights and poverty, the party has streamlined its structure in preparation for operating more openly. Through its stepped-up programs, the party, of course, hopes that numerous Americans will become lulled by the mass of high-sounding Communist propaganda and eventually lose perspective of the issues involved and gravitate to the party.

If the Communist Party was encouraged by the decisions which preceded the Archie Brown case, they must be positively jubilant at the latest Court favor.

The Supreme Court added insult to injury by invoking the doctrine of separation of powers among the three branches of the National Government as an element of the rationale by which the legislative prohibition against members of the Communist Party holding office in labor unions was declared unconstitutional. The decisions of the Supreme Court in recent years have demonstrated an unparalleled series of breaches of the doctrine of separation of powers by the Supreme Court.

One might reason, of course, that the Warren Court can speak with unsurpassed authority on unconstitutional actions, for it has been the pace setter among the three branches of the National Government in taking unconstitutional actions.

Members of the Supreme Court itself substantiate this charge. I ask unanimous consent that an article by Paul C. Bartholomew, entitled "The Warren Court by the Warren Court," which appeared in the February 23, 1965, edition of National Review, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this article contains some of the comments of seven members of the Supreme Court, itself, on majority opinions of the Warren court. The Warren court stands convicted by its own members of unmatched abuse of the Constitution.

The opinion of the majority of the Warren court in United States against Archie Brown is but one of a long line of decisions which hamstring efforts to deal with the threat of Communists to our internal security. This decision will prove to be the most disastrous yet to our security, for it virtually ties the hands of the Congress, from a practical standpoint, from preventing the Communist Party, U.S.A., from carrying out its Soviet Union-directed subversive activities against the security of the United States from official and quasi-official positions of special influence.

In this case, the majority opinion has earned a red star.

EXHIBIT NO. 1

THE WARREN COURT BY THE WARREN COURT

(By Paul C. Bartholomew)

We know what Robert Welch and Prof. Henry Steele Commager think about the Warren court, but what does the Warren court think about itself?

Continuously refueled by provocative new decisions, debate continues over whether to impeach, hang, or sanctify the Warren court. It occurred to Prof. Paul C. Bartholomew of the University of Notre Dame to appeal the question all the way up to the Nation's highest and final tribunal: that is, to the Warren court itself. He has here assembled the considered judgment, delivered formally from the bench from 1961 to December 1964, of the Court's own members on the Court. Seven of the nine Justices—Messrs. Black, Clark, Frankfurter, Harlan, Stewart, White, and Whittaker—concurring, the verdict of the lower instance is upheld: the Warren court is guilty of murdering the Constitution of the United States. The verdict thus stands, and condign sentence will forthwith be carried out.

Mr. Justice Harlan, joined by Mr. Justice Frankfurter and Mr. Justice Whittaker in *Mapp* v. *Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643 (1961): "* * * The Court, in my opinion has forgotten the sense of judicial restraint which, with due regard for stare decisis, is one element that should enter into deciding whether a past decision of this Court should be overruled. * * * The action of the Court finds no support in the rule that decision of constitutional issues should be avoided wherever possible. * * * The unwisdom of overruling Wolf without full-dress argument is aggravated by the circumstance that that decision is a comparatively recent one (1949) to which three members of the present majority have at one time or another expressly subscribed, one to be sure with explicit misgivings. I would think that our obligation to the States, on whom we impose this new rule, as well as the obligation of orderly adherence to our own processes would demand that we seek that aid which adequate briefing and argument lends to the determination of an important issue. It certainly has never been a postulate of judicial power that mere altered disposition, or subsequent membership on the Court, is sufficient warrant for overturning a deliberately decided rule of constitutional law."

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, joined by Mr. Justice Harlan, in *Baker* v. *Carr*, 369 U.S. 186 (1962): "The Court today reverses a uniform course of decision established by a dozen cases, including one by which the very claim now sustained was unanimously rejected only 5 years ago. * * * Such a massive repudiation of the experience of our whole past in asserting destructively novel judicial power demands a detailed analysis of the role of this Court in our constitutional scheme. * * * In effect, today's decision empowers the courts of the country to devise what should constitute the proper composition of the legislatures of the 50 States. If State courts should for one reason or another find themselves unable to discharge this task, the duty of doing so is put on the Federal courts or on this Court. * * * There is nothing judicially more unseemly nor more self-defeating than for this Court to make in terrorem pronouncements, to indulge in merely empty rhetoric, sounding a word of promise to the ear, sure to be disappointing to the hope. * * * To find such a political conception legally enforcible in the broad and unspecific guarantee of equal protection is to rewrite the Constitution. * * * The notion that representation proportioned to the geographic spread of population is so universally accepted as a necessary element of equality between man and man that it must be taken to be the standard of a political equality preserved by the 14th amendment—that it is, in appellants' words 'the basic principle of representative government'—is, to put it bluntly, not true. However desirable and however desired by some among the great political thinkers and framers of our Government, it has never been generally practiced, today or in the past."

Mr. Justice Harlan, joined by Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in *Baker* v. *Carr:* "I can find nothing in the equal protection clause or elsewhere in the Federal Constitution which expressly or impliedly supports the view that State legislatures must be so structured as to reflect with approximate equality the voice of every voter. Not only is that proposition refuted by history, as shown by my Brother Frankfurter, but it strikes deep into the heart of our Federal system. Its acceptance would require us to turn our backs on the regard which this Court has always shown for the judgment of State legislatures and courts on matters of basically local concern."

Mr. Justice Stewart in *Engel* v. *Vitale,* 370 U.S. 421 (1962): "With all respect, I think the Court has misapplied a great constitutional principle. I cannot see how an 'official religion' is established by letting those who want to say a prayer say it."

Mr. Justice Stewart in *Escobedo* v. *State of Illinois,* 378 U.S. 478 (1964): "The Court says that what happened during this investigation 'affected' the trial. I had always supposed that the whole purpose of a police investigation of a murder was to 'affect' the trial of the murderer, and that it would be only an incompetent, unsuccessful, or corrupt investigation which would not do so.

"Supported by no stronger authority than its own rhetoric, the Court today converts a routine police investigation of an unsolved murder into a distorted analog of a judicial trial. It imports into this investigation constitutional concepts historically applicable only after the onset of formal prosecutorial proceedings. By doing so, I think the Court perverts those precious constitutional guarantees and frustrates the vital interests of society in preserving the legitimate and proper function of honest and purposeful police investigation."

Mr. Justice White, joined by Mr. Justice Clark and Mr. Justice Stewart, in *Escobedo* v. *State of Illinois:* "The decision is thus another major step in the direction of the goal which the Court seemingly has in mind—to bar from evidence all admissions obtained from an individual suspected of crime, whether involuntarily made or not * * * I would not abandon the Court's prior cases defining with some care and analyses the circumstances requiring the presence or aid of counsel and substitute the amorphous and wholly unworkable principle that counsel is constitutionally required whenever he would or could be helpful. Until now there simply has been no right guaranteed by the Federal Constitution to be free from the use at trial of a voluntary admission made prior to indictment. * * * Today's decision cannot be squared with other provisions of the Constitution which, in my view, define the system of criminal justice this Court is empowered to administer."

Mr. Justice Black, joined by Mr. Justice Clark, in *Jackson* v. *Denno,* 378 U.S. 368 (1964): "* * * My wide difference with the Court is in its apparent holding that it has constitutional power to change trial procedures because of its belief that they are not fair. There is no constitutional provision which gives this Court any such lawmaking power. * * * I think that the New York law here held invalid is in full accord with all the guarantees of the Federal Constitution and that it should not be held invalid by this Court because of a belief that the Court can improve on the Constitution."

Mr. Justice Harlan in *Wesberry* v. *Sanders,* 376 U.S. 1 (1964): "The Court's holding that the Constitution requires States to select Representatives either by elections at large or by elections in districts composed 'as nearly as is practicable' of equal population places in jeopardy the seats of almost all the Members of the present House of Representatives. * * * Only a demonstration which could not be avoided would justify this Court in rendering a decision the effect of which, inescapably as I see it, is to declare constitutionally defective the very composition of a coordinate branch of the Federal Government. The Court's opinion not only fails to make such a demonstration. It is unsound logically on its face and demonstrably unsound historically. * * * The Court's talk about 'debasement' and 'dilution' of the vote is a model of circular reasoning, in which the premises of the argument feed on the conclusion.

"Today's decision has portents for our society and the Court itself which should be recognized. This is not a case in which the Court vindicates the kind of individual rights that are assured by the due process clause of the 14th amendment. * * * The claim for judicial relief in this case strikes at one of the fundamental doctrines of our system of government, the separation of powers. In upholding that claim, the Court attempts to effect reforms in a field which the Constitution, as plainly as can be, has committed exclusively to the political process.

"This Court, no less than all other branches of the Government, is bound by the Constitution. The Constitution does not confer on the Court blanket authority to step into every situation where the political branch may be thought to have fallen short. The stability of this institution ultimately depends not only upon its being alert to keep the other branches of government within constitutional bounds, but equally upon recognition of the limitations on the Court's own functions in the constitutional system.

"What is done today saps the political process. The promise of judicial intervention in matters of this sort cannot but encourage popular inertia in efforts for political reform through the political process, with the inevitable result that the process is itself weakened. By yielding to the demand for a judicial remedy in this instance, the Court in my view does a disservice both to itself and to the broader values of our system of government."

Mr. Justice Harlan in *Reynolds* v. *Sims,* 377 U.S. 533 (1964): "Today's holding is that the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment requires every State to structure its legislature so that all the members of each house represent substantially the same number of people. * * * I think it demonstrable that the 14th amendment does not impose this political tenet on the States or authorize this Court to do so * * * It is meaningless to speak of constitutional 'development' when both the language and history of the controlling provisions of the Constitution are wholly ignored. Since it can, I think, be shown beyond doubt that State legislative apportionments, as such, are wholly free of constitutional limitations, save such as may be imposed by the republican form of government clause (Constitution, art. IV, sec. 4), the Court's action now bringing them within the purview of the 14th amendment amounts to nothing less than an exercise of the amending power by this Court * * *

"Even if one were to accept the majority's belief that it is proper entirely to disregard the unmistakable implications of the second section of the amendment in construing the first section, one is confounded by its disregard of all this history. There is here none of the difficulty which may attend the application of basic principles to situations not contemplated or understood when the principles were framed. The problems which concern the Court now were problems when the amendment was adopted. By the deliberate choice of those responsible for the amendment, it left those problems untouched. * * * In my judgment, today's decisions are refuted by the language of the amendment which they construe and by the inference fairly to be drawn from subsequently enacted amendments. They are unequivocally refuted by history and by consistent theory and practice from the time of the adoption of the 14th amendment until today.

"The Court's elaboration of its new 'constitutional' doctrine indicates how far—and how unwisely—it has strayed from the appropriate bounds of its authority. The consequences of today's decision is that in all but the handful of States which may already satisfy the new requirements of the local district court or, it may be, the State courts, are given blanket authority and the constitutional duty to supervise apportionment of the State legislatures. It is difficult to imagine a more intolerable and inappropriate interference by the judiciary with the independent legislatures of the States. * * *

"I know of no principle of logic or practical or theoretical politics, still less any constitutional principle, which establishes all or any of these exclusions. Certain it is that the Court's opinion does not establish them. * * *

"* * * What is done today deepens my conviction that judicial entry into this realm is profoundly ill-advised and constitutionally impermissible.

"* * * Nevertheless, no thinking person can fail to recognize that the aftermath of these cases, however desirable it may be thought in itself, will have been achieved at the cost of a radical alteration in the relationship between the States and the Federal Government, more particularly the Federal judiciary. Only one who has an overbearing impatience with the Federal system and its political processes will believe that the cost was not too high or was inevitable.

"Finally, these decisions give support to a current mistaken view of the Constitution and the constitutional function of this Court. This view, in a nutshell, is that every major social ill in this country can find its cure in some constitutional principle, and that this Court should take the lead in promoting reform when other branches of government fail to act. The Constitution is not a panacea for every blot upon the public welfare, nor should this Court, ordained as a judicial body, be thought of as a general haven for reform movements. The Constitution is an instrument of government, fundamental to which is the premise that in a diffusion of government authority lies the greatest promise that this Nation will realize liberty for all its citizens. This Court, limited in function in accordance with that premise, does not serve its high purpose when it exceeds its authority, even to satisfy justified impatience with the slow workings of the political process. For when, in the name of constitutional interpretation, the Court adds something to the Constitution that was deliberately excluded from it, the Court in reality substitutes its view of what should be so for the amending process."

Mr. Justice Harlan, joined by Mr. Justice Clark, in *Malloy* v. *Hogan,* 378 U.S. 1 (1964): "* * * The Court should have fulfilled its responsibility under the due process clause by inquiring whether the proceedings below met the demands of fundamental fairness which due process embodies. Such an approach may not satisfy those who see in the 14th amendment a set of easily applied absolutes which can afford a haven from unsettling doubt. It is, however, truer to the spirit which requires this Court constantly to reexamine fundamental principles and at the same time enjoins it from reading its own preferences into the Constitution."

Mr. Justice Harlan in *Hamm* v. *Rock Hill* (1964): "The Court holds that these State trespass convictions, occurring before the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 must be set aside by virtue of the Federal doctrine of criminal abatement. This remarkable conclusion finds no support in reason or authority. * * * I know of no case which suggests that the doctrine of abatement can be applied to affect the existing legislation of another jurisdiction. Until today the doctrine has always been applied only with respect to legislation of the same sovereignty * * * there is not a scintilla of evidence which remotely suggests that Congress had any such revolutionary course in mind."

Mr. Justice White in *Hamm* v. *Rock Hill* (1964): "* * * And if Congress had the power to abate these convictions I am confident it had no intent of exercising it by passing the new law. There is nothing but silence to indicate that Congress meant to void outstanding judgments of State courts. * * * The truth is that it is only judicial rhetoric to blame this result upon Congress. Given a discernible congressional decision, I would be happy to follow it, as it is our task to do, absent constitutional limitations. But without it we have another case. Whether persons or groups should engage in nonviolent disobedience to laws with which they disagree perhaps defies any categorical answer for the guidance of every individual in every circumstance. But whether a court should give it wholesale sanction is a wholly different question which calls for only one answer."

Mr. Justice Black in *Hamm* v. *Rock Hill* (1964): "Nothing in the language or history of the 1964 act makes the Court's reading into it of a purpose to interfere with State laws 'inevitable' or even supportable, nor in any way justifies the Court's offhand assertion that it is carrying out the 'legislative purpose.' For I do not find one paragraph, one sentence, one clause, or one word in the 1964 act on which the most strained efforts of the most fertile imagination could support such a conclusion. And in what is perhaps the most extensive and careful legislative history ever compiled, dealing with one of the most thoroughly discussed and debated bills ever passed by Congress, a history including millions and millions of words written on tens of thousands of pages contained in volumes weighing well over half a hundred pounds, in which every conceivable aspect and application of the 1964 act were discussed ad infinitum, not even once did a single sponsor, proponent, or opponent of the act intimate a hope or express a fear that the act was intended to have the effect which the Court gives it today."

WYOMING VFW AND AMERICAN LEGION SUPPORT VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, loyal Americans throughout the Nation who understand the reasons for the American presence in Vietnam are shocked at the irresponsibility of students who permitted themselves last weekend to be manipulated by Communists and other leftists in demonstrations against all that we are fighting for in Asia.

It is a tragedy that our universities which produce the thinkers who must lead this Nation in the decades ahead also produce students who are too bound up in abstract ideology to understand the relationship of forces in the so-called cold war.

The actions of these students could be likened to the Oxford Union which in 1933 gave Hitler the psychological shot in the arm he needed by voting against fighting for king and country.

The students and those Communists who manipulate them may have succeeded in creating the impression that the United States is too divided to fight; that there are deep psychological differences pertaining to the war in Vietnam when, in fact, all the polls and surveys indicate that now more than ever before the American people are united behind their President in the conflict in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the Record at this point a telegram expressing articulately the views of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 2281 in Thermopolis, Wyo. These veterans feel, as do I, that "the rights of free speech and assembly are being used to embarrass the United States in the eyes of the world. These demonstrators do not represent the beliefs and ideals of Americans."

In addition to the Thermopolis VFW wire, I should like to have printed a brief message from the Lander, Wyo., American Legion Post No. 33.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Thermopolis, Wyo.,
October 22, 1965.

Senator Milward Simpson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Seven hundred members of VFW Post 2281, Thermopolis, Wyo., deplore not only the actions of last weekend demonstrations but also the undue publicity given to them. In a resolution adopted last evening the members went on record again as being in wholehearted support of our Government's policies in Vietnam and southeast Asia and ask your continued demonstrations of the solidarity of Wyoming citizens as true Americans committed to fulfillment of our obligations among nations as well as our personal obligations to serve our country when called upon to do so we feel that these demonstrators are not just exercising the rights of free speech and assembly but are being used to embarrass the United States in the eyes of the world. These demonstrators do not represent the beliefs and ideals of Americans but in reality are a small minority of individuals with misguided beliefs, rebelling against authority, law, and order.

Joe Haratyk,
Adjutant Post 2281.

Lander, Wyo.,
October 22, 1965.

Hon. Milward L. Simpson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Resolution unanimously passed by our post backs our Government's stand against communism in southeast Asia.

Blair D. Meyers,
Commander, Don Stough Post No. 33, the American Legion.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL VANDERVORT

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of many of my colleagues in tribute to Col. Ralph E. Vandervort, who is retiring with a distinguished military career at the end of the month, after serving as Army liaison here in the Senate.

During my 3 years in the Senate, it has been a real pleasure for me to rely upon Bud for aid in coordinating the many requests for services from my constituents relating to military matters. I also remember his very able assistance in 1963 in handling arrangements for the third meeting of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group when he accompanied the members of our senatorial delegation to Guanajuato, Mexico.

I am sure I am but echoing the sentiments of my colleagues when I say that we shall certainly miss Bud's cheerful disposition and efficient manner in handling our military cases, but we wish him well in all his future endeavors.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS MEAN NEW PROFIT OPPORTUNITIES FOR CATTLE INDUSTRY

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of this body to several recent developments which illustrate the new and modern opportunities for profit in our traditional American cattle industry.

The Senate Small Business Committee, of which I am a member, has, under the able leadership of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], been looking into the potential for exporting cattle and beef to Europe and other increasingly prosperous foreign markets. Following its hearings on freight rate and other barriers in February, ocean freight charges were reduced 20 to 25 percent and, subsequently, air freight rates were decreased 25 to 30 percent on September 1.

On September 9, our committee, in a joint session with the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, considered potential political obstacles to trade which will be involved with the trade negotiations at Geneva.

The distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] pointed out that although export markets provide an outlet for three-fourths of the wheat crop, one-half of our rice, two-fifths of our soybeans, and indeed 1 acre out of every 4 harvested in this country, we export less than one-half of our beef production.

The importance of the beef cattle industry in Oklahoma is indicated by the fact that my State ranks sixth in the number of beef animals on farms and ranks second behind Texas in the number of beef cows. As of January 1, 1965, there were 3,854,000 beef cattle on farms in Oklahoma. The value for all cattle and calves on Oklahoma farms totaled $406.4 million, and cash receipts for all Oklahoma cattle and calves marketed last year amounted to $279 million.

The Small Business Committee hearings indicated that new methods and new approaches are needed and are being undertaken to break through the barriers to our cattle and beef trade.

One of these developments, the trading of future contracts in cattle, is described in two recent articles from the Wall Street Journal and the New York Journal of Commerce.

Sale of these futures, as they are called, enables the cattle industry to plan ahead with the certainty that the prices of the cattle to be delivered in the future will be based on firm contract prices. Mr. Lloyd Bergsma, an official of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, which numbers 13,000 members, has said that a live cattle contract was "badly needed—fills an economic void, and provides insurance for the cattle feeders." The force of Mr. Bergsma's statement is indicated by the fact that since trading of these contracts was inaugurated in Chicago in November of last year, more than 36,000 transactions have taken place. In the words of E. B. Harris, president of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange:

> This is the most auspicious start of any new contract we've ever begun.

In my judgment, developments such as this will add increased scope and profit opportunities for the cattle industry both at home and abroad. I shall certainly be doing all I can to advance these opportunities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles to which I referred be printed in the Record following my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 3, 1965]

Mercantile Exchange, Board of Trade Vying in Livestock Futures—Both Chicago Units Plan To Add West Coast Cattle Contract to Other Similar Activities

(By S. Laverne Jervis)

Chicago.—The Chicago Mercantile Exchange and the Chicago Board of Trade stepped up their competition for trading in future deliveries of livestock and dressed meat.

Directors of the merchantile exchange approved a proposal to list a live-cattle contract for animals produced on the west coast for delivery in Los Angeles. The exchange already conducts trading in futures contracts for cattle to be delivered at Chicago and Omaha.

Also under consideration by the exchange is a contract covering live hogs.

Last weekend, the board of trade leaked news that it also plans a contract for west coast cattle.

The two exchanges already trade in similar contracts for dressed beef, but total volume is hardly enough to provide a pound of hamburger.

Although trading in live animals or dressed meat began only 4 years ago, five contracts for these commodities are currently traded on the two exchanges. The new actions will bring the total to eight.

Glenn H. Andersen, chairman of the mercantile exchange's beef committee, which drew up contracts for beef and cattle, angrily accuses the board of trade of wrecking the futures market in beef.

TWO CONTRACTS CALLED CONFUSING

"They impaired, retarded and hurt beef futures by copying our contract," Mr. Andersen charges. "Two contracts on two exchanges make it confusing to brokers and the public."

A spokesman for the board of trade scoffs at the suggestion of a battle for markets with its smaller rival. "We don't give much thought to the Merc," he says.

The mercantile exchange also trades in pork bellies futures, which started slowly 4 years ago but now makes up the bulk of its trading volume, and in skinned ham futures, which have never been actively traded.

But live cattle futures have been a different story, and exchange members are concerned that the board of trade is stepping in to compete in what has been a successful market and shows promise of becoming more so.

Despite opposition of the influential packers' trade group, the American Meat Institute, trading in live cattle has totaled more than 36,000 contracts since it began November 30. E. B. Harris, Mercantile Exchange president, says: "This is the most auspicious start of any new contract we've ever begun."

Lloyd Bergsma, director of the feeders' division of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, whose 13,000 members produce more than 4 million cattle a year, says a live cattle contract was "badly needed. It fills an economic void and provides insurance for the cattle feeders."

HOW SPECULATORS SHARE RISK

Producers who buy young cattle and fatten them about 6 months before selling them to packers run the risk of prices falling during that period. But by hedging, through the futures market, they can often reduce the risk. When they buy young cattle they can sell a contract for delivery of some fattened cattle 6 months hence.

If the price falls in the interim, their profit on the futures contract could at least partially offset their loss on the live cattle. That way a speculator who buys the futures contract shoulders some of the risk during the time the feeder is holding the cattle.

Dene H. Pruett, an analyst for Longstreet-Abbott & Co., St. Louis commodity research concern, cites the "romance of the cattle industry" as a factor in attracting public speculative money into the futures market. "Everyone pictures cattlemen as millionaires who wear cowboy boots and silver belt buckles and drive Cadillacs. And buying into cattle futures provides a small chance to get into the business," he says.

Col. Herman E. Lacy, a stocky, broad-shouldered McHenry, Ill., cattlefeeder, who does wear cowboy boots along with his brown tweed suit, says he was able to "substantially increase cattle feeding profits" in the past year through use of futures.

The action on the Mercantile Exchange is guiding his buying of new feeder stock. "I haven't bought one feeder this year because the futures prices are too low in relation to feeder prices to insure a profit," he declares.

Although the packers' trade group has condemned futures trading as an invitation to Government intervention, many packers are using it. "When we have pork bellies to store, we hedge them in the futures market to protect us against a price drop," one Midwestern packer says. "Last spring when it looked like a shortage of pork bellies would develop in the summer, we bought futures contracts, so we were protected in that way, too," he adds.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce]

MercEx to Trade Live Cattle for Los Angeles Delivery

Chicago, September 6.—"The Chicago Mercantile Exchange's live cattle contract for west coast delivery is part of our exchange's long-range program in cattle futures," president Everette B. Harris said.

The exchange's board of directors voted late Thursday to open a live cattle contract for delivery in Los Angeles, in addition to the existing Chicago Mercantile Exchange contract which calls for Chicago and Omaha deliveries.

MONTHS OF RESEARCH

"Our decision is no hasty thing, but backed by months of research by our own people at the exchange, and industry experts," Mr. Harris emphasized. "When we first were drawing up specifications for the live cattle contract early in 1964 we delayed launching a west coast delivery until we felt the live cattle contract had a good start," Mr. Harris said.

"After the opening," Mercantile board chairman Stephen Greenberg pointed out, "West coast cattle industry and financial institutions emphasized they wanted a western delivery because of existing price differentials. They told us they wanted to take part in futures trading on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange. Now they'll have the opportunity."

The decision to institute a separate west coast live beef contract followed closely the announcement by the Chicago Board of Trade late last month of plans to establish a similar contract, and clearly uncovers a long-smoldering competition between the two exchanges.

Since the duplicate dressed beef trading began, neither exchange has been particularly overjoyed with the results. Commodity traders attribute much of the lack of activity in the dressed beef futures to confusion among brokers and the industry about the terms and delivery aspects of the various contracts.

In addition, some traders hold the view that a futures market should be centralized rather than regionalized and thereby reflect a cross section of the entire industry instead of local interests. It is pointed out that this is the way the grain exchanges function, and futures markets are traditionally structured in this manner.

It is further noted that regional grain exchanges geared to a local market are largely unsuccessful. The action of the Board of Trade, however, appears to have made all these arguments academic.

YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, during the week of October 11, the Young Democratic Clubs of America held their 15th biennial convention in New York City. I was honored to be invited to give the keynote speech to that convention, and my brief visit there gave me new confidence about the men and women who will soon be shaping the course of our Democratic Party.

The Young Democrats left New York richer than they came, for they were fortunate to listen to speeches from some of the top leaders of our party and our Nation. Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, an orator without equal, gave a magnificent inspirational address. John M. Bailey, our eminent national chairman, delivered a fine speech highlighting our party's continuing concern for youth. Among other notable speakers were Congressman John Brademas, who delivered the Adali Stevenson memorial address, and my fellow Minnesotan Philip H. Des Marais, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who spoke on "Youth in the Great Society."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of these four fine Democrats be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey

My fellow young Democrats, tonight we meet to talk about tomorrow.

We meet to measure where we stand and to chart the path to where we're going.

We meet to face tomorrow's realities, not yesterday's delusions.

We meet to talk about the future of our party, of our country, of the cause of mankind in the world.

We meet to talk about the capacity for greatness and goodness in man, and not his meanness.

We meet to talk.

There was a crusty old farm leader in Washington during the early days of the New Deal. His name was George Peek. George Peek said: "The common characteristic of all uplifters is an unquenchable thirst for conversation. They are all chain talkers."

So be it. Let us talk. Let us think. Let us agree and disagree. Then, my fellow young Democrats, let us act.

We Democrats are uplifters. We do talk. But we also know the value of ideas and of action. We are not, as Judge Learned Hand once said of our opposition, "Old Tories—intellectually moribund—emiting dreary sounds."

Tonight, speaking to this young audience in this young Nation, I want to talk about maturity.

Earlier this week I addressed in this city the annual Al Smith Memorial Dinner. At that time I remarked on the pride Al Smith would feel today in seeing us accomplish what he worked for—and was often vilified for—two generations ago.

In these two generations we Americans have grown, matured a great deal.

For in Al Smith's time our country passed through one of its periodic and unfortunate recurrences of smugness, of self-indulgence, of Me First.

You cannot remember, but I can, Al Smith's campaign for the Presidency.

I can remember the abuse and ridicule heaped on my father because he had the temerity to actually work for Al Smith's candidacy in a rural, Republican part of our country. I can remember the crosses burning and the men hiding behind hoods in our small South Dakota town. I can remember the story, widely believed, that Al Smith, if elected to the Presidency, planned to build an underground, underwater tunnel directly from the White House to the Vatican. I can remember some uglier stories than that.

I can remember, too, what followed our period of national smugness and self-indulgence. We closed our eyes, we closed our hearts.

It was: No more immigration, no more foreign trade, no more involvement with our fellow man.

And then we found ourselves closing not only our eyes, but our banks and businesses as well. We found ourselves in worldwide depression.

And we discovered ourselves to be part of a world where hate was having a field day.

What a price we paid.

Today, thank God, we are reaching a greater maturity.

If nothing else, this nuclear age has taught us that man cannot be separated from his fellow man. It has taught us that one more adventure in national irresponsibility—by any nation—could well be our last.

What is the reality of our time?

It is this: For the first time in human history, man possesses the power to totally destroy himself.

It is equally this: For the first time in human history, man possesses the wealth and knowledge to extend mankind's benefits to all mankind.

What a crossroads we face. Which route shall we take? The answer lies within ourselves.

Today our Nation is led by a great American President who is determined that our answer to the future shall be "Yes." Today our Nation is united in a peacetime consensus unknown in our previous history. Today our Nation stirs to tasks undone, to wrongs unrighted, to dreams too long postponed.

In 9 short months an American Congress has made into law the hopes and ideas of 40 years. And we have only begun.

What have we done in these 9 months?

We have built a base from which America can move forward.

The bill says voting rights, but it means "You shall be given full citizenship, no matter what the color of your skin, after promises broken for a hundred years."

The bill says immigration, but it means "You shall be judged by your skill and talent, not by your last name or national origin."

The bill says education, but it means "You shall receive the tools with which to make the most of your future."

The bill says poverty, but it means "You shall have hope where there has been no hope, you shall have a chance to break the cycle of ignorance and unemployment * * * to be a full and productive member of our society."

The bill says medicare, but it means "You shall have adequate care in your older years; you are not forgotten by your children."

The bill says Housing and Urban Development, but it means "You can live in something more than concrete and carbon monoxide, you can walk the streets in safety and health."

The bill says arts and humanities, but it means "You can find more in life than material satisfaction, you can touch new fountains of creativity and expression."

Yes, Mr. Peek, we are doing quite a bit of uplifting these days and there is more coming.

We are creating in America not a welfare state, but a state of opportunity—a society in which each child will have an equal chance to make something better for himself, for his children after him, and for all mankind.

For the fact is that as rich as we can become, as powerful as we can become, that richness and power will count for nothing if we fail in our responsibility to our fellow man. We cannot live secure within the walls of our glittering city while two-thirds of the world festers in poverty, injustice, and ignorance outside.

I return to the quality of maturity.

It is this quality we must possess if we are to maintain our national momentum, if we are to survive and master the future. Today we are filled with a faith in ourselves. It is exhilarating. But that self-faith, without constant vigilance, can easily become self-satisfaction. And that exhilaration, without a sense of balance, can easily become irresponsibility.

There is only one way to insure the survival and progress we seek: It is through the personal involvement and commitment of each citizen.

And that, my fellow young Democrats, is where you come in.

Today there are clear and obvious outlets for the energies of young Americans—the Peace Corps; the civil rights movement; VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America; Government service, civilian and military.

But there is another, and perhaps even more important, role to be played toward our long-term good.

I mean the role of young Americans in the exercise of self-government.

We need only to look back 1 year to be reminded of what can happen if that role is abdicated.

We saw a great American political party, because of the indolence and division of its majority, seized by an unrepresentative minority. We saw that party deeply defeated in a national election. We see it today still unrecovered from internecine stress. We see major figures of that party who disassociate themselves from its leadership and, indeed, their party affiliation itself.

I do not mean this in any way as an attack on or a mocking of that party. The two-party system is too precious to our scheme of government. All of us lose when one of those two parties is not in good health.

I wish only to emphasize the importance of each American citizen's caring deeply about where the policies and institutions of his country are going, and of his becoming directly involved in the processes in our society which affect those policies and institutions.

This can mean becoming a candidate for Vice President of the United States. It can mean working door-to-door to encourage voter registration. It can mean writing a letter to the editor. It can mean reading a book.

It cannot mean complacency.

In an America coming-of-age in a dangerous time, you bear special responsibilities.

Yours is the responsibility to continue our Nation on its path toward creation of a society of true justice and full opportunity.

Yours is the responsibility to, increasingly, extend to our fellow men the helping hand which will lift them, too, toward a life of choice and of abundance.

Yours is the responsibility, above all, to pursue the peace.

For, today and tomorrow, peace is synonymous with life. The pursuit of peace is a task for generations.

The pursuit of peace means aiding the victim against the aggressor, lest that aggressor feed his ambition and take a fatal second step.

The pursuit of peace means magnanimity in thought and action, even in face of provocation and ingratitude.

The pursuit of peace means practicing democracy as well as preaching it.

Tonight these are the things we young Democrats, we uplifters, have to talk about.

Eleven years ago, at Harvard University, Adlai Stevenson gave a series of remarkable lectures. One was entitled "America's Burden." I will quote from that lecture:

"To act coolly, intelligently, and prudently in perilous circumstances is the test of a man or nation. The ordeal of our times is a challenge to American maturity and American responsibility * * * America's life story is the record of a marvelous growth of body, mind, and character. Now at maturity we shoulder the heaviest burdens of greatness, for in the last analysis the epic struggle for our civilization, for government by consent of the governed, will be determined by what we Americans are capable of. In bearing burdens, in ennobling new duties of citizenship, is the greatness of men and nations measured, not in pomp and circumstance."

We must bear our burdens. We must ennoble the duties of citizenship.

We must meet the measure of greatness.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY SERVES YOUTH, LISTENS TO YOUTH, AND OFFERS THE GREATEST OPPORTUNITIES TO YOUTH

(Excerpts from remarks by Democratic National Chairman John M. Bailey)

Few things can be more disconcerting to a Democratic national chairman than addressing a gathering of young Democrats.

Every Democrat, by definition, thinks he is a young Democrat. And every time I meet a group of young Democrats I recognize young men and young women who have been active in the party for so long I thought they were old Democrats.

I guess there really aren't any old Democrats. No matter how old you get, if you are a Democrat you're a young Democrat. And when you get old, you're a Republican. That's why there's no such thing as a young

Republican. Young Republicans are just youngsters who are old before their time.

The Democratic Party is the oldest political party in the world.

But it's a young party—a party of young people, young ideas; young in its heart and young in its energies.

It's a young party because it has grown and developed as the political life of our country has grown and developed. Other political parties have come and gone because they feared change, fought change, and died when the conditions that created them changed.

The Democratic Party has never feared change. It has consistently fought for the changes that were necessary if our country was to remain strong and prosperous in a changing world.

The Democratic Party is a party where the voices of young men and women can be heard, and where their influence can be felt.

It is a party that has been consistently supported by the young voters—by over 70 percent in the last presidential election.

It is a party that has repeatedly turned to youth for its candidates—and last year elected some outstanding young Congressmen to show for it.

It is a party where youth has always participated in its highest councils—and if you doubt it you need only to look around the White House today.

As Democrats we take pride in our record of responsibility. But we have never fallen prey to the illusion that responsibility and good sense come only with age. There is such a thing as maturity and judgment in youth—and this Democrats recognize and encourage.

I suppose it is trite to say the future belongs to the youth of America.

But that is no longer just a commencement-day cliche.

When President Kennedy was elected, half the people in this country were under 29 years of age. When President Johnson was elected half of them were under the age of 28. By 1970—the middle of what I hope will be President Johnson's next term—half of our population will be under 26 years old.

We are a young country. We are growing younger. And increasingly we must be concerned with opening the doors to young people to assume more and more responsibility in the affairs of our Nation.

President Johnson expressed his concern, and the concern of all Democrats, when he said: "I wish to see an America in which no young person, whatever the circumstances, shall reach the age of 21 without the health, education and skills that will give him an opportunity to be an effective citizen and a self-supporting individual."

This is no easy task.

Today there are 7 million young people, between the ages of 16 and 21, who are out of school—3 million of them high school dropouts, and a million with only an elementary school education or less.

Almost a million young people quit school every year. One out of every three students now in the fifth grade will drop out before finishing high school.

Unemployment among young people with an eighth grade education or less is four times the national average. Jobs for those with less than a high school education decreased by nearly 10 percent in the last 10 years.

The 1st session of the 89th Congress, which is just now drawing to a close, has achieved what is probably the greatest legislative record of any Congress in history.

But in no area is its record greater than that of concern with the youth of our Nation.

That concern began with children still too young for school—with Project Head Start which last summer helped over half a million preschool children from needy families.

It extended through elementary and secondary school—with the first general elementary and secondary school aid bill in our Nation's history—a bill that authorizes grants to schools in 95 percent of our Nation's counties.

And it extended to the colleges and graduate schools with the Higher Education Act of 1965, designed to help bring a college education within the reach of every qualified student.

Education alone is not enough, however. There must also be jobs.

Under the Neighborhood Youth Corps more than 200,000 young men and women, from 16 to 21 years of age, have found jobs to help them stay in school, return to school, or qualify for better jobs.

Under the college work-study program over 80,000 students have found part-time jobs to help them work their way through college.

Under the Job Corps and the job opportunity programs young men and women have been able to get training to help them qualify for jobs.

Soon Congress will be winding up this session and its members will be returning to their home States and districts.

Their first task will be to get reacquainted with their constituents—to find out what has been going on while they have been away, and to sense the temper of the country.

But they will also have the task of explaining to their constituents what they have done while they were in Washington.

The vast accomplishments of this Congress will, in time, mean a better life for virtually every American. At the moment, however, the story of what has been done and what it means has only begun to be told to the American people.

Every Congressman—every Democratic Congressman, at least—will be spending a good part of his time in the weeks and months ahead helping to tell this story to the American people.

And I hope you will help him to tell that story.

In your schools and colleges, on your jobs, in the clubs and organizations to which you belong, the most important thing you can do now to help the President and the Democratic Party is to tell this story.

Let the people you study with, work with, and relax with know that the Democratic Party is a party for young people—no matter how old they are.

Let them know what the Democratic Party—the President, the Members of the 89th Congress and all who helped elect them—have done for young people, and for all the people of this country.

And, above all, let them know that the Democratic Party takes its promises and its mandate seriously.

Last summer at Atlantic City the Democrat Party wrote a strong platform—a prudent and progressive platform—designed to meet the needs of a young and growing America.

It nominated a great leader, with the wisdom and skill to carry that platform to the American people and win the trust, the confidence and the votes to be elected President.

This year President Johnson and the Congress, working together, have translated the promises of that platform into the realities of legislation and administration.

Now we must move on to the next task—the task of making those accomplishments meaningful to all Americans.

It is a task for all Democrats, and a task in which I hope each of you will join.

Brademas Delivers Stevenson Memorial Address at National Young Democrats Convention

In an address at the 15th biennial convention of the Young Democrats of America here today, Congressman John Brademas, Democrat, of Indiana, said:

"Adlai E. Stevenson elevated the process of politics in the United States in two significant ways."

Brademas, who served as executive assistant to Stevenson during 1955–56, gave the address in tribute to the former United Nations Ambassador and two-time Democratic presidential nominee.

Said Brademas, "First, Adlai Stevenson insisted that a candidate for public office had the obligation to discuss the most serious issues facing the country no matter how controversial they were or the effect on his candidacy. Stevenson suffered at the polls from his 1956 call for a nuclear test ban treaty, but his courageous initiative bore fruit for President Kennedy in 1963.

"Where Senator Dirksen suggests that a politician's responsibility is to recognize an idea whose time has come, as with civil rights, Stevenson insisted that the highest mission of a politician is to recognize the significance of the idea whose time has not yet come and to try to hasten the day.

"Second, Stevenson had a profound concern for the quality of American politics and politicians. Adlai Stevenson, more than most people realize, made possible the public acceptance of a young and highly intelligent presidential candidate like John F. Kennedy.

"And Stevenson's deep commitment to lifting the quality of American life helped pave the way for Lyndon Johnson's Great Society programs—support for education, the arts and humanities, health research and medicare and many more.

"Adlai Stevenson has left his imprint on an entire generation of American political leaders. Equally important, the courage and intelligence which he brought to public life have inspired increasing numbers of young Americans to enter politics during the last decade.

"Finally, of course, Adlai Stevenson, during both his presidential campaigns and through his splendid service at the United Nations won for himself the respect and affection of peoples throughout the world as an eloquent champion of peace with freedom for all men."

Brademas, a four-term Congressman from South Bend, Ind., was in charge of research on issues on the Stevenson staff in the 1955–56 campaign.

The Young Democrats Convention, which began Monday, concludes tonight. It is being held at the Hotel New Yorker.

Youth in the Great Society

(By Philip H. Des Marais, Deputy Assistant Secretary (for Legislation) Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

I deeply appreciate this opportunity to speak briefly at this 15th biennial convention of the Young Democratic Clubs of America on the subject of the youth of America in the Great Society.

The 89th Congress, in its 1st session, has legislated the most significant program for the youth of America of any Congress in our history.

Before I report to you on some of the highlights of this program, I would like to salute this organization for its past achievements and the leadership it is giving to our youth. As a college teacher of political science prior to my service in the Federal Government, I always encouraged my students to seek valuable, practical experience in politics by becoming affiliated with the youth division of either of our two great political parties.

The young Democrats of America have provided an unparalleled opportunity for our young people to become responsible participants in the political life of our democracy. Participation in political parties is vital to the success of democratic government. When I think of the thousands of young people who have begun their active political citizenship in this organization, I realize how important it is to our country and to our government on all levels: local, State, and Federal.

In 1953, I had the honor to serve as arrangements chairman for the eighth biennial convention held in St. Paul, Minn. When I think back on those days, I recall some of my close friends and associates in the Young Democrats who are now holding significant and responsible positions in Washington. We all know and admire the work of Dick Murphy, Assistant Postmaster General and former national executive director.

Outstanding leaders of the Young Democrats back in Minnesota in the early fifties were Gene Foley, now Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Charles Schultz, Director of the Budget Bureau. We elected NEAL SMITH, now Congressman from Iowa, president of the Young Democrats at the 1953 meeting. His successor, Dave Bunn from Colorado, is now serving as Staff Assistant to the President. Jane Mahady McIntyre, who was on the National Board of the Young Democrats at our eighth biennial convention, is an assistant counsel of the Small Business Administration. Over in my Department at Health, Education, and Welfare, Jim Clarke, who served as a leader of the Young Democrats in Missouri, is Special Assistant to the Under Secretary for Manpower Training. Clarence Martin, who was one of our most effective Young Democrat leaders in the late fifties in Louisiana, is now the congressional liaison officer at AID. These are just a few of the many outstanding young people with distinguished positions in State and National Government who began their political careers by serving with the Young Democrats.

We hear a great deal in Washington about a talent search for outstanding people to be appointed to responsible positions in government. I suggest to those who are looking for talent that a good place to look is among the youth leadership of our political parties.

But let us get down to the business of this report. President Johnson announced that "the first work of these times is education." A former schoolteacher and Director of the National Youth Administration, President Johnson has established as the first priority of his administration a concern for the education and welfare of all the youth of America. He put it very directly in his education message of January 12, 1965:

"In the life of this Nation, the advancement of education is a continuing challenge.

"Every child must be encouraged to get as much education as he has the ability to take.

"Nothing matters more to the future of our country: not our military preparedness, for armed might is worthless if we lack the brainpower to build a world of peace; not our productive economy, for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government, for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant."

I can report to you today that every recommendation President Johnson made in his education message has been favorably acted upon by the 89th Congress. The new investment by the Federal Government in the education of our youth represents a total of $4.1 billion. But, as President Johnson said, this expenditure is a small price to pay for developing our Nation's most priceless resource.

First, there was the preschool program which was carried out this summer through Operation Head Start. Over half a million young children from disadvantaged homes received a special educational opportunity to prepare them to take better advantage of school when they enrolled this fall.

Second, there is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. This is, indeed, a landmark legislative enactment. It is the first broad-scale program of Federal aid to elementary and secondary education in the history of this country. It includes:

1. Grants to local school districts for improving the educational program for the children of low-income families. There are 5 million pupils who will benefit directly from this part of the bill.

2. There are grants to the States to assist in the purchase of books for school libraries and for student use to be made available to all children in public and private, nonprofit elementary and secondary schools.

3. There will be a program for supplementary educational centers and services to bring the latest developments in education to the classrooms and laboratories for all ages—from preschool to adult education.

4. We will establish regional educational laboratories, strategically located throughout the Nation. These will undertake research, train teachers, and implement tested research findings. They will assist in the development of new curriculums and their dissemination.

5. The Office of Education will make grants to strengthen the State departments of education. These key agencies have the responsibility for organizing and administering elementary and secondary education in the United States.

Now let us turn to higher education. This September for the first time in our history we find 50 percent of all our high school graduates enrolling in institutions of higher education. This is the highest average of any nation in the world. It demonstrates the historic aspiration of our country to provide an opportunity for higher education to every young man and woman who is interested and capable of benefiting from it.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 has been passed by both the House and the Senate. Yesterday the conferees concluded their work and next week the Congress will act on the conference report and clear it for the President's signature.

Here again we have legislation that is unprecedented in its scope.

For the first time we will have Federal aid for university extension and continuing education.

For the first time, we will have a program of Federal scholarships. This will provide tuition grants to needy and worthy young men and women to help pay college expenses. In addition to the grants, there will be insured, low-interest loans and grants for college work-study programs. These three programs of student financial assistance, along with the presently existing national defense loan program, should guarantee a higher educational opportunity to every young man and woman in this Nation whatever their personal financial resources.

The higher education bill will provide grants to aid smaller colleges. Many of our smaller colleges are struggling to survive. About 10 percent lack proper accreditation. Many are isolated from the main currents of college and university life in this country. We do not want to let these colleges go under and this program will support the development of projects to link smaller colleges with our larger institutions in a program of exchange of faculty and technical assistance to the smaller institution.

Title II of the higher education bill provides a comprehensive program of support to college and university libraries. Under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, we are building new college and university libraries all over the country. This new program of support grants will enable the institution to put the necessary books and other library materials onto the shelves.

Finally, we will be able to start a National Teacher Corps. The higher education bill authorizes funds to enroll 5,000 teachers. These specially trained, highly motivated teachers will be formed into teams to go into the schools in the urban slums and isolated rural areas to bring the best in teaching to those young people who need it the most.

Under the Health Professions Act Amendments of 1965, we are launching a new program of scholarships to train doctors and dentists and other medical care professionals. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will also be able to continue its program of construction grants and provide basic support grants for the operating costs of these important institutions. Medical school education is the most costly form of professional education—both to the student and to the school. But, no longer will qualified young persons be denied an opportunity to go to medical school because they did not have the financial resources.

One of the most significant, but unpublicized, parts of the medicare bill are the child health and welfare amendments. They expand the services for maternal and child health, crippled children, child welfare, and the mentally retarded. The medicare program establishes a new 5-year program of grants to provide comprehensive health care and services for needy children of school and preschool age.

America is more than ever a nation of young people. In the age group of 19 years of age and under alone, there are 76 million youth totaling almost 40 percent of our entire population. If we raise the age to 24, we go up to 50 percent of our population. It is vital that the needs of youth in this country be fully met. It is necessary that our young people assume the responsible role in the political life of their country.

I thank the members of the Young Democratic Clubs of America for the opportunity to bring to their attention these matters so important to the youth of our Nation.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR McINTYRE'S STAFF

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, with final adjournment upon us, I would like to take a few moments to pay tribute to a member of my staff here in Washington who will soon be leaving public service.

Jane Harris, my research assistant, has served on my senatorial staff since I first arrived in Washington. Her cheerful disposition, her ability to produce work of the highest quality, and her obvious desire to be of assistance have endeared her to hundreds of my New Hampshire constituents.

When Jane Harris leaves Washington next month she will not be traveling alone. The very best wishes of everyone who has ever worked with her, including Mrs. McIntyre and me and my entire staff, will be going with her.

RETIREMENT OF COL. RALPH E. VANDERVORT, JR.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in a short time a fine Army officer, Col. Ralph E. Vandervort, Jr., will end a distinguished career of service in the Army. Colonel Vandervort's nearly 25 years of service took him to every part of the world, and he fought in World War II, in which he won the Purple Heart and the Croix de Guerre.

Over the past 6 years, many of us in the Senate have had the good fortune to know and to work with this able officer in his capacity as liaison officer, first for the Department of the Army and then for the Secretary of Defense. He has shown himself as adept in the thickets of combat between the executive and the congressional branches as he was on the field of battle. With efficiency and charm he has handled the many requests that have come to him from Members of the Senate, and while always being helpful to the Senate, he has faithfully explained and maintained the point of view of the Army and the Defense Department. It is a tribute to his qualities as a man that while performing this difficult task, "Bud" Vandervort has become a personal friend of many of us.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate him on the completion of a fine career and to wish him well in his future endeavors. Although I am sad to see him leave the Capitol, I know that in the future he will be ever ready to serve his country with the devotion and skill he has shown in the past.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AT THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EQUAL BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of Vice President HUMPHREY at the National Conference on Equal Business Opportunity. As always, the message of the Vice President was clear, timely, imaginative, and well received. I commend it to the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EQUAL BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 29, 1965

A little more than a year ago, this Nation declared war on poverty. Through the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 we made known our determination to help each American citizen—and each American community—become full and productive partners in our American prosperity.

Through these past months we have made a great deal of progress toward that goal. Literally hundreds of thousands of Americans have volunteered their services to help defeat poverty. And hundreds of thousands of others have, for the first time, gained hope and help for the future. Our country has been mobilized. Our work has begun.

But before success is reached in this long, hard effort—and it will take many months and years, let me assure you—we will especially need two things.

First, we will need the continuing concern of our Nation, in its wealth and economic well-being, for those among us who are on the outside—whose daily concerns are not a second car or 2-week vacation, but shelter, clothing, and food.

Second, we will need the energy and resoucefulness of the American businessman.

Poverty is not merely economic—it is an acute spiritual and psychological problem.

Poverty's most ominous result—and its strongest ally—is hopelessness. Hopelessness kills a man's spirit. It perpetuates itself. It passed on from one generation to the next. Thus it is that the heart of the antipoverty effort is the raising of the level of man's expectations.

By now it is trite to say that poverty has created another America, but it is true. Economically deprived, cut off from the mainstream of American life and sharing few social or cultural experiences with the rest of us, many of these other Americans do not know what opportunity is. They simply have no stake in our society, in our communities.

Not the only unhappy situation, but a uniquely distressing plight, is that of the American Negro. There are today a growing number of Negroes who have made successful careers in business or the professions. But the fact is that the American Negro historically has been told, has been conditioned to the idea, that there is not enough room for him to make a decent living, to win recognition for himself, to hope for something better for his children.

Today our Nation must be committed to reversing this state of affairs.

You are here today to discuss the specific problem of inequality of business opportunity and to see what you, as concerned businessmen, can do about it in your own cities and communities.

You are being asked to help with a specific Federal program, the Small Business Administration's economic opportunity loan program under title IV of the Economic Oppor-Act of 1964.

The idea is a good one: Federal loans, under relatively liberal credit standards, made through Small Business Development Centers, operated locally.

This is no give-away program. It is a loan program.

We are making loans to people, not because we like them, not because we feel sorry for them, but because we think they can put the money to good use to increase their own incomes, to employ others, and that they will be able to pay back the loans with interest.

We expect the Small Business Development Centers to deliver effective management counseling to their clients.

To provide this counseling, on an individual basis, the Small Business Development Centers must draw upon the businessmen of their own communities as volunteer counselors.

This is where you are needed.

You can take your own ability and experience and apply them directly to the business problems of a man who wants a chance to follow the same road you have followed.

Here is a Government program that is devoted to fostering individual enterprise.

Why should you be asked to do this, and why should you do it?

We are asking you to do this because we believe it has to be done and you are the only people who can do it.

This is not an easy task. It will be demanding in terms of time, of energy, of patience. I know that it will often be frustrating. There will be disappointments, setbacks, and failures.

But, just as surely, this program is in the interest of all of us.

Why, then, should you do it? It is in your self-interest, collectively and as individuals, that the job be done, and done well.

Anything that promotes individual enterprise, creates jobs, and adds to social stability is in your interest just as much as it is in the interest of those who need your help.

Anything that does these things is good economics. And, I might add, it is good citizenship as well.

John F. Kennedy said—and we all remember what he said—"Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country."

Today you have the opportunity to do something for your country and for your community. You have the chance to help others stand on their own feet, just as you have done, and become productive, enterprising businessmen in their own right.

And, in giving of yourself, I think you will find you have gained something too.

We ask your help.

GOLD MEDAL OF THE NORTHERN TEXTILE ASSOCIATION

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the Northern Textile Association is a trade association within the textile industry with an outstanding record of substantial contributions to the economy of many of the States, such as my own, which depend on the manufacture of textiles as a major source of employment.

Each year the association awards a silver medal to an individual who has made an outstanding contribution for the benefit of the textile industry. This year, in recognition of the truly outstanding contributions of our late President, John F. Kennedy, a gold medal, the first in the association's history, was presented to our colleague from Massachusetts, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY.

Mr. Gordon Osborne, the chairman of the Northern Textile Association, made the presentation to Senator KENNEDY. I feel that his speech deserves the wide circulation which comes from publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech by Mr. Gordon Osborne delivered in Portsmouth, N.H., be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GORDON OSBORNE, CHAIRMAN, NORTHERN TEXTILE ASSOCIATION, ON THE OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION OF THE GOLD MEDAL HONORING PRESIDENT KENNEDY TO SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY, SEPTEMBER 15, 1965, PORTSMOUTH, N.H.

As you know, we are the oldest association of our type in the United States, and this is our 111th annual meeting. Going back to the turn of the century, it has been our custom to award a silver medal to an individual for an outstanding contribution for the benefit of the industry. This has not been awarded on an annual basis, but only when the events seemed justified to the board of government.

It has not been confined to millmen, but to a diverse group who have each made unique contributions. May I recall some of the distinguished men who have received this award? There were the great mill engineers like Stuart Cramer and Charles T. Main, the textile technologists like Fred Hoxie and Dean Walen, members of the faculty of our institutions, such as Prof. Melvin Copeland of the Harvard Business School, and my old chief at M.I.T., Prof. George B. Haven.

Here in this room in 1959 the award was made to that great public servant, Senator JOHN PASTORE, to whom everyone in this industry owes such a debt of gratitude.

Tonight we deviate from this custom. I have in my hand a medal especially struck for this occasion—the one and only gold medal this association has ever presented. Our sorrow is only that it cannot be presented to the man we honor—a man who gave his life in a greater cause.

But let me review quickly the last decade of textile history that brings forth this special occasion.

After the pent-up demands of the war years were satisfied, we began to feel the effects of several adverse influences. Throughout this period our industry was generally stagnant. There were liquidations, curtailments, and short-time operations. Employment was irregular. Investment, and the return in investment declined. Exports shrank and imports from foreign countries increased enormously with their advantage lying in their low wages and cheap raw materials. Thus, our industry, despite a general level of economic prosperity, was depressed.

During the period John F. Kennedy was the junior Senator from Massachusetts, with hindsight it is prophetic to recall his maiden speech concerned the problems of the textile industry. This concern for the health and general condition of textiles was an important part of the 1960 presidential campaign, and after President Kennedy assumed office, from the White House came the Kennedy program for the U.S. textile industry. You will all remember its seven points, the most important of which are

1. To arrange for an orderly flow of textile products in international trade, and

2. To remove the penalty of two-price cotton from American cotton mills.

There is no doubt that history will record this program as important to our industry as the invention of the ring spindle and the automatic loom.

Although the program is not yet complete, two major fields are missing—wool and synthetics—it has been sufficiently effective to completely change the overall picture.

We are once again, as I said this morning, a confident industry with initiative and vigor restored. All the indices are up—wages and employment, sales and production, profits and investment. New machinery, new mills, new developments are all active. Our customers, our employees, and our owners face a future as bright as any other major segment of our economy.

It is redundant for me to say how much we owe to President Kennedy. We all know. Others have helped—none more so than the officers of this association—but the ability to see and know the problem, to cut through to the heart of it, to devise and effectuate a plan and to keep it moving forward despite setbacks and opposition until it began to actually provide the desired results, took the creativity, the sagacity, and the courage of the President.

Therefore, in appreciation, and with admiration and affectionate respect for his memory, we have asked his distinguished brother, the Senator from Massachusetts, to accept our gold medal inscribed simply "John F. Kennedy" as a mark of our grateful recognition of his contribution to our industry, and our present ability to once again play a useful part as one of the great and important factors in our society.

I would like to close by reading the vote passed by the board of government of the association. Please rise while I read it.

"Four years ago President John F. Kennedy raised to the level of national policy a program for textiles on an industrywide basis. Designed to take into account its importance to the Nation's economy, its wide dispersion and range of products, his program undertook to strengthen the industry, to expand consumption, investment and employment, and to encourage orderly international trade.

"Notable progress has been accomplished and the work of full implementation continues. The industry has responded to the understanding and courage of John F. Kennedy and shares again in an expanding national economy, proving that free enterprise, like a free society, succeeds.

"We cannot add to the honor of the memory of John F. Kennedy. In some measure we wish to acknowledge the debt of our industry to him whose vision, understanding, and action infused us with new hope and confidence.

"Be it resolved, therefore, that the association medal of gold be presented to the Honorable EDWARD M. KENNEDY as a sign of our respect and affection for his brother, President John F. Kennedy."

A CHANGED U.S. POLICY OF SUBSIDIZING EGYPT'S DICTATOR IS LONG OVERDUE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times carries a story datelined Cairo to the effect that negotiations are underway between the United States and Egypt looking toward the signing of an agreement for the shipment to Egypt of $250 to $300 million worth of food-for-peace products for the next year.

The dispatch mentions that Egypt has asked the United States "for a record level of economic aid for 1966" but mentions only the food-for-peace segment of the economic aid requested.

Since U.S. economic aid to Egypt through fiscal year 1964 amounted to $943.1 million, the request for aid from Egypt amounts for 1 year alone to approximately one-third of the total amount of economic aid given to Egypt in the previous 18 years.

When the Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act was before the Senate this year, I offered an amendment which was accepted by the Senate and the conference committee and which provided:

> None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, shall be available for assistance to the United Arab Republic, unless the President determines that such availability is essential to the national interest of the United States.

The proviso attached to this provision is very pertinent to the negotiations now going on with respect to further economic aid to Egypt.

The President, if he wishes to conclude the proposed agreement with Egypt must make the positive finding that it is "essential to the national interest of the United States."

I submit that under the present circumstances—and in the light of Egypt's past and present actions and attitudes—it would be extremely difficult for the President to make the requisite finding that further economic aid is "essential" to the national interest of the United States.

I submit further that unless such actions and attitudes on the part of Egypt change, it is far easier to find that further economic aid to Egypt is not essential to United States national interest.

Let me review briefly the actions on the part of Egypt which I deem inimical to the national interest of the United States.

First, since his advent to power in 1952, President Nasser of Egypt has been the foremost thorn in the side of the Middle East.

His propaganda apparatus—the finest in that area, outfitted in part with U.S. dollars—has been sowing hatred and preaching violence against one country after another.

Thousands of Egyptian troops marched into Yemen and have been there for 3 years now—their ability to go and to remain there made possible by the relief given Nasser's budget by the grain given to him by the United States.

More important, in the last 13 years, President Nasser has carried on a virulent campaign looking to the violent overthrow of Israel—the one bastion of democracy in the entire area. The hatred he has preached has been mainly directed against Israel and its destruction, although he has not, at times, been adverse to urging the violent overthrow of some of his neighboring Arab "brothers."

President Nasser and a number of other Arab countries through the years have carried on an on-again, off-again romance with Communist nations. But Israel has steadfastly remained loyal to the West, despite the buildup given to its worst enemy, Egypt.

How can the President of the United States find that the following actions by Egypt over the years are, in the words of the law, "essential to the national interest of the United States":

Pressure on Libya to force the United States to close our airbase there;

Provision of Communist arms to the Congolese rebels, even while they were slaughtering innocent whites and Negroes and indulging in cannibalism;

Waging war in Yemen with 50,000 troops for 2½ years at a cost of over $2 billion to date;

Hurling constant anti-Western propaganda into the Aden area;

Constant undermining of our prestige in Africa;

Supplying Communist missiles to the Greek Cypriots;

Continuing a barrage of anti-American propaganda in the Egyptian-controlled press and on the Egyptian-controlled radio;

Recognizing East Germany and pressuring the other Arab nations to do likewise;

Taking the leadership in seeking to divert the headwaters of the Jordan from peaceful uses.

Permitting his police to stand idly by as raging mobs burned the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library in Cairo.

This is not an all-inclusive list of actions and incidents instigated by President Nasser designed to thwart, disrupt, and put in disarray U.S. foreign policy all over the world.

Surely providing President Nasser with the means of continuing these anti-American policies cannot be said to be "essential to the national interest of the United States."

On June 28, 1965, I pointed out on the floor of the Senate that Egypt was diverting wheat to other countries.

I stated in part:

> Last year, the United Arab Republic shipped 62,710 metric tons of rice to Cuba. As can readily be seen from the table, the United Arab Republic also shipped 31,398 metric tons of rice to the U.S.S.R., 13,451 tons to Eastern Germany, 6,350 tons of rice to Hungary, almost 5,000 tons to Bulgaria, almost 17,000 tons to Poland, and over 52,000 tons to Sukarno, in Indonesia.
>
> Thus it is obvious that foreign aid from the United States is bolstering Communist economies throughout the world. Not only is it contributing to the economic well-being of the Communist empire in Russia and the satellite countries, but our foreign aid program enables Castro to devote more of his resources to armaments, instead of to food. The U.S. taxpayers are being forced,

through the foreign aid program, to support the economy of a Communist dictatorship 90 miles from our shores.

I ask unanimous consent that the news item from the New York Times this morning, referred to previously, as well as my remarks on the violations of Egypt of the provisions of the Food for Peace Act made on June 23, 1965, and July 30, 1965, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I urge the President that, before concluding any economic aid agreement with Egypt, firm commitment will be received from Egypt that it will forthwith desist from following a course of action harmful to United States foreign policies and dangerous to the peace of the world.

Those commitments should include at least the following:

First. Immediate withdrawal of Egyptian troops from Yemen—the unfulfilled condition of United States recognition of Yemen;

Second. Cessation of its constant propaganda against Israel and its Arab neighbors and of its boycott of Israel;

Third. Assertion of leadership in coming to a peace table with Israel—against which the Arab States still maintain a state of war.

These and other commitments should be obtained from Egypt before any economic aid agreement is signed. In addition, to make certain that these commitments are kept, any agreement should be negotiated only on a 6-month basis.

This would not be interference in the internal affairs of another county. It is my opinion that through the incorporation of the Gruening amendment in the Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act, the President could well come to the conclusion that such commitments—and others as well—are needed before he can make the finding that making economic aid available to Egypt is—in the words of the act—"essential to the national security of the United States."

Exhibit I

[From the New York Times, Oct. 22, 1965]

Cairo Said To Ask Record U.S. Help—Puts '66 Food Import Needs as High as $300 Million

(By Hedrick Smith)

Cairo, October 21—The regime of President Gamal Abdel Nasser, with only 10 weeks supply of wheat and facing the pressures of a steadily expanding population, has asked the United States for a record level of economic aid for 1966, informed sources said today.

The Government of the United Arab Republic has dropped its request for a new 3-year aid agreement with Washington, but according to well-placed sources it has told the United States that next year alone the Egyptians will need food imports worth $250 million to $300 million and hope that the bulk of this will come from the United States.

Last year American surplus food shipments to Egypt under the food-for-peace program reached a peak of $175 million, but the aid program expired last June 30.

Since then, economic sources say, Egyptian needs, from wheat to tobacco and meat to cooking oil, have continued their sharp rise.

DELEGATION WAS ENCOURAGED

The Egyptian delegation, which returned from high-level talks in Washington last week was given encouragement on the prospects for a new aid agreement, which is expected to be signed soon. But officially U.S. spokesmen say that President Johnson has not yet given final approval to renewing aid to Egypt.

The time is getting short for the Egyptians. Foreign analysts estimate that Cairo now has enough wheat in hand or enroute from other countries to last until the end of December or possibly mid-January.

Since it takes about 2 months to deliver American wheat to Egypt once the President gives the order, Egyptian officials want to sign a new deal with the United States by early next month.

Timing is touchy as well for President Johnson; only last Thursday he received legislation renewing the food-for-peace program. Because of the storm that aid to the United Arab Republic kicked up on Capitol Hill last spring, he presumably wants to wait until Congress adjourns before approving a new aid pact with President Nasser.

The massive list of food requirements that Egyptian officials presented in Washington last week was reported to include 2.7 million metric tons of wheat, compared with 1.9 million metric tons in 1964; 650,000 metric tons of corn compared with 425,000 last year; and 80,000 tons of vegetable oils, up from the 50,000 under the old agreement. A metric ton is 2,204 pounds.

[From the Congressional Record, June 23, 1965]

Egypt's Violations of Public Law 480 Hurt U.S. Balance of Payments and Aid Cuba

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, the basic purpose of the foreign aid program of the United States is to promote peace throughout the world. In keeping with this purpose, it was gratifying to see that the Senate voted 73 to 13 for an amendment—proposed by the able and distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris] to this year's foreign aid bill—that will prohibit any kind of aid to Indonesia or the United Arab Republic "so long as they continue to commit aggression."

In 1963, I proposed to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 an amendment which provided that no further assistance and no further sales under Public Law 480 should be made to any nation found by the President to be "engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts against any country" receiving assistance from the United States. That amendment was adopted, and is now the law of the land.

Since that time, despite the United Arab Republic's continued aggression in Yemen, its active support through the furnishing of arms to the rebels in the Congo, its supplying of arms to Cyprus to promote strife there, its continuing threats to destroy the independent nation of Israel, and its continuing boycott of that country and the perpetuation of a declaration of war against it, our President has not made the necessary finding that the United Arab Republic was an aggressor within the meaning of my amendment.

The Harris amendment refines my amendment.

Without binding the hands of the President, under the Harris amendment, if adopted, Congress would be making the finding that both the United Arab Republic and Indonesia are aggressors within the meaning of the law. This would still leave the President perfectly free to find, whenever he feels that the facts so justify, that either or both of these countries are no longer aggressors, and thereby are again eligible to receive U.S. foreign assistance and to purchase grain and fiber under Public Law 480.

Recently, there have come to my attention facts indicating a serious and illegal misuse of wheat sold to the United Arab Republic under title I of Public Law 480.

The figures show clearly that wheat sold to the United Arab Republic has been utilized by the country in violation of the provision of Public Law 480 which requires that wheat sold under title I of that law should not be used so as to cut down normal purchases in the commercial market. This safeguard has been flouted by the United Arab Republic. The result is that the United Arab Republic has improved its foreign-exchange position; and the foreign exchange, which Nasser has thus freed, at the expense of the U.S. foreign-exchange position, has been used by him to support his aggressions.

The figures also show clearly that wheat sold to the United Arab Republic has been used, not to increase the food supply to the people of that country, but, rather, to free rice, which otherwise would be consumed within Egypt, for sale to such Iron Curtain countries as Cuba, the U.S.S.R., East Germany, and Bulgaria, and to such countries as Indonesia. Thus, Egypt's violation of its agreement with the United States under Public Law 480 enabled Egypt to ship more than 60,000 metric tons of rice to Cuba in 1964.

Senator Harris' amendment should be retained in conference, if we are to show the world that we will not permit our food-for-peace program to be used as fuel for carrying on wars or to harm the United States own vital interests.

Since 1952, U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East has been vacillating, weak, and ineffectual. U.S. persistent efforts to appease President Nasser have, in fact, been poorly concealed attempts to bribe a ruthless dictator who wants to spread his influence throughout the Middle East, and who seeks to thwart U.S. foreign policy at every turn.

Our appeasement of Nasser, by sending him food and funds for economic development, has enabled him to divert more and more of Egypt's resources to the development of a war-making machine.

In the last 2½ years, Nasser has deprived Egyptian people of the economic benefits of $2 billion, by diverting that sum from economic goals, so that he could fight an aggressive war in Yemen. No development loans have been made to Egypt, and we have continued our technical assistance to Egypt, by the sale of grain and fiber to Egypt, under Public Law 480. Under title I of this program, we have shipped $365 million worth of commodities to Egypt since 1962. These commodities are sold for Egyptian currency; and, because of the excess currency situation in Egypt, they are, in effect, grants to Egypt.

In this connection, a few sentences of the testimony of the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, when he testified before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on March 12, 1965, are pertinent:

"Mr. Bell. Senator, the title I sales have run in recent years from $130 to $150 million annually; the value of wheat at world prices.

"Senator Hickenlooper. You are talking about sales, you mean for local currencies.

Mr. Bell. Yes, sir; title I sales for local currencies.

"Senator Hickenlooper. Which is a gift, as a matter of fact.

"Mr. Bell. In the Egyptian case, yes, because we have excess currencies. In addition to that, Senator, we have a technical cooperation program, technical assistance and training, which has been running at about between $1.5 and $2.5 million, $2.8 million in 1965, $1.4 million in fiscal 1964."

The Public Law 480 program reflects the compassion of the people of the United States for the starving peoples of the world. One of its goals is to assure that our surplus food is distributed to hungry people in countries where there is a wide gap between the extremely rich and the extremely poor.

For this reason, and for reasons of our own enlightened self-interest, Public Law 480 contains provisions which are intended to effect wide distribution of our surplus food within the countries aided. One method of insuring that the hungry people in the country for which our food is destined receive the food is to ask the recipient government to agree that it will not increase its food exports as a direct result of the food that we supply. This forces the recipient government to distribute the food to its own starving population before it fills its coffers with foreign exchange earned by exporting food.

Thus, section 101(a) of Public Law 480 provides:

"In negotiating such agreements the President shall (a) take reasonable precaution to safeguard usual marketings of the United States and to assure that sales under this act will not unduly disrupt world prices of agricultural commodities or normal patterns of commercial trade with friendly countries."

By obtaining with recipient nations agreements that they will continue to buy from the United States the amounts of commodities that they have always bought, this provision insures that U.S. commercial interests will not lose foreign markets. Otherwise, our balance-of-payments position would be adversely affected.

At the same time, it effects a wider distribution of our agricultural surplus within the recipient nation, because this provision simply states that the commodities shipped should be in addition to our normal commercial shipments.

This provision of the law has been violated by the United Arab Republic since the initiation of our Public Law 480 program in that country in 1955.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing U.S. commercial exports of wheat and/or wheat flour to the United Arab Republic from 1952 to 1963 be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Schedule of U.S. commercial exports, Egypt, wheat

[Metric tons of wheat]

BEFORE PUBLIC LAW 480	
Fiscal year:	
1952	306,000
1953	339,000
1954	242,000
AFTER PUBLIC LAW 480	
1955	23,000
1956	48,000
1957	14,000
1958	10,000
1959	52,000
1960	40,000
1961	100,000
1962	2,000
1963	50,000

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, as this table clearly indicates, from an annual average commercial export of 295,000 metric tons of wheat in the years before the inception of the Public Law 480 program in 1955, the average rate of commercial exports has dropped to 37,667 metric tons of wheat a year. This represents a hidden grant to the United Arab Republic at the rate of more than $15 million a year, over and above our other AID programs for that country, or approximately an additional $135 million since 1955.

It represents a decrease in the U.S. favorable trade balance at the rate of more than $15 million a year, or approximately $135 million since 1955.

It represents an increase in Egypt's foreign exchange expendable in countries other than the United States at the rate of more than $15 million a year, or approximately $135 million since 1955.

Moreover, at the expense of the economic welfare of the Egyptian people, it has enabled Nasser to expand his own brand of economic and political socialism and to continue his attempts toward the violent overthrow of neighboring governments. Mr. President, this diversion of U.S. foreign exchange by Egypt, in violation of the explicit provisions of Public Law 480, should be stopped.

Egypt has, in addition, violated section 304 of Public Law 480, which provides:

"The President shall exercise the authority contained in title I of this Act * * * (2) to assure that agricultural commodities sold or transferred thereunder do not result in increased availability of those or like commodities to unfriendly nations."

The latest agreement under title I of the Public Law 480 program was signed by the United States and the United Arab Republic in October 1962. That agreement provides for the shipment of $132 million worth of commodities to the United Arab Republic through June 30, 1965, under certain conditions.

One of those conditions is that the imports of wheat and wheat flour from the United States will not increase the availability of rice for export by the United Arab Republic. This condition was meant to preclude the possibility of substituting wheat for rice in the United Arab Republic, and then shipping rice abroad. In other words, the United States was attempting to make sure that the commodities shipped to Egypt were used for the benefit of the Egyptian people. Under the food-for-peace program, the United States has no interest in helping a foreign exchange—at the expense of its own people and the American taxpayers—so that it can carry on unjust wars with its neighbors.

This condition was stated in the following way in a letter dated October 1962 and signed by His Excellency, Dr. M. Nostafa Kamel, Ambassador of the United Arab Republic, to the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State of the United States of America:

Further, the Government of the United Arab Republic assures the Government of the United States of America that imports of wheat and wheat flour in this agreement will not increase the availability of rice for export by the United Arab Republic. It is accordingly agreed, that, on an assumed milled rice production totaling 1.3 million metric tons in the current year, rice exports in the 12 months beginning November 1, 1962, will not exceed 400,000 metric tons. Exports of rice in excess of 400,000 metric tons would be affected during this period only to the extent that final production figures for milled rice exceed 1.3 million metric tons. Levels for rice export for the second and third years of the agreement, will be considered during the annual review."

On December 9, 1963, the U.S. Government received a communication which was signed by Dr. Hadi Maghrad, Under Secretary of the Ministry Supply, of the United Arab Republic. The communication was an understanding on United Arab Republic rice exports for the period from November 1, 1963, to October 31, 1964. The following is an excerpt from that communication:

"This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated December 4, 1963.

"I have the honor to inform you of my Government's understanding of the following:

"The Government of the United Arab Republic agrees that based on an assumed milled rice production totaling 1.4 million metric tons in the current year, rice exports in the 12 months beginning November 1, 1963, will not exceed 455,000 metric tons. Exports of rice in excess of 455,000 metric tons would be effected during this period only to the extent that final agreed production figures for milled rice exceed 1.4 million tons."

Mr. President, the United Arab Republic has violated this agreement. The United Arab Republic exported more than 455,000 metric tons of rice in 1964, and it exported hundreds of thousands of metric tons of that rice to Cuba, Russia, and other countries behind the Iron Curtain and the Bamboo Curtain.

The wheat which we have shipped to Egypt has been substituted for rice. The food-for-peace program, which is paid for by American taxpayers, is being used by the United Arab Republic to help the economies of Communist nations.

I ask unanimous consent that a table which shows United Arab Republic rice exports from January 1, 1964, to December 1964, be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks as additional support for the statement Senator Harris made last Wednesday.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Table showing United Arab Republic rice exports by amount and country of destination for the period Jan. 1, 1964, to Dec. 31, 1964

	Amount in metric tons
Syria	20,000
Jordan	1,823
Iraq	4,000
Sudan	650
Palestine (Gaza strip)	3,573
Lebanon	13,400
Lybia	3,300
U.S.S.R.	131,398
East Germany	13,451
Hungary	6,350
Greece	1,752
Bulgaria	4,850
Poland	16,995
Czechoslovakia	24,919
Rumania	17,127
Finland	9,923
Cyprus	1,966
Yugoslavia	16,145
Austria	3,450
Sweden	100
United Kingdom	8,853
Italy	1,500
Belgium	1,500
The Federal Republic of Germany	29,687
Switzerland	1,000
France	2,500
Netherlands	2,000
China	20,000
India	29,022
Kuwait	3,000
Indonesia	52,245
Cameroon	2,050
Senegal	15,000
Cuba	62,710
Somalia	430
Ship stores	22
Total	526,693

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, this table was compiled by the Food and Agriculture organization of the United Nations. Although there is a slight overlap in time between the dates in the United Nations table and the dates contained in the agreement between the United States and the United Arab Republic, which I have cited previously, it is perfectly obvious that the total of 526,693 metric tons of rice exported from the United Arab Republic during the calendar year of 1964 is far in excess of the amount of 455,000 metric tons which is the limit which the United Arab Republic promised to hold in its agreement for the period from November 1, 1963, to October 31, 1964.

Last year, the United Arab Republic shipped 62,710 metric tons of rice to Cuba. As can readily be seen from the table, the United Arab Republic also shipped 31,398 metric tons of rice to the U.S.S.R., 13,451 tons to Eastern Germany, 6,350 tons of rice to Hungary, almost 5,000 tons to Bulgaria, almost 17,000 tons to Poland, and over 52,000 tons to Sukarno, in Indonesia.

Thus, it is obvious that foreign aid from the United States is bolstering Communist economies throughout the world. Not only is it contributing to the economic well-being of the Communist empire in Russia and the satellite countries, but our foreign aid program enables Castro to devote more of his resources to armaments, instead of to food. The U.S. taxpayers are being forced, through the foreign aid program, to support the economy of a Communist dictatorship 90 miles from our shores.

At the same time, by not holding Nasser to the limits for exports, both under section 101(a) of Public Law 480 and under our agreements with the United Arab Republic, we are permitting Nasser to restrict the market distribution of food to the people of Egypt. Instead of negotiating with Nasser, the State Department has appeased him. Instead of promoting peace in the Middle East, we have been financing war and ruthless violations of the rights of man.

In addition to all of this, our aid program in Egypt is contributing to the deficit in our balance of payments.

We must cut through the redtape which is permitting a continuation of U.S. support of a tyrannical dictatorship. I believe it is mandatory that the Harris amendment, which would cut off all aid to Egypt, be maintained in conference.

Mr. President, this morning, there was published in the Washington Post an Associated Press dispatch to the effect that a 6-month-old suspension of food aid which resulted from a series of United States-Egyptian disputes would be ended, and that a shipment of $37 million worth of surplus food would go to Egypt. I ask unanimous consent that the entire item, as it appeared in the Washington Post of June 23, 1965, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, according to this news story, the State Department stated:

"There has been a definite improvement in our relations with the United Arab Republic (Egypt) since aid was suspended 6 months ago."

This action is again indicative of the appeasing attitude of the State Department toward Nasser.

It is also illustrative of Nasser's astute handling of the State Department, and of his blackmailing tactics. Whenever a new largesse from the United States appears possible, he becomes a cooing dove.

While there is in force a firm agreement with the United States for the shipment of Public Law 480 food and fiber to Egypt, to be purchased with local currencies, the sky is the limit for Nasser's misbehavior. The John F. Kennedy Memorial Library can be burned and ransacked; the government-controlled Egyptian press and radio can be as vitriolic against the United States as possible; President Nasser, with Russian Communist leaders at his side, can publicly tell the United States to jump in the lake with its aid; Egypt can supply arms to the Congolese rebels; Egypt can supply Communist arms to Cyprus; Egypt can continue its aggressive war in Yemen, can continue to threaten the destruction of Israel, and can build up a fantastic arsenal of sophisticated weapons, which can be intended only for aggression; and, in general, Egypt can continue its tactics of thwarting U.S. policy at every turn.

But when Congress expresses its disapproval of such treatment—as the Senate did recently, by an overwhelming vote—and when the time for renewal of the agreement looms, Nasser quiets down, and gives the State Department an opportunity to say he has reformed.

These tactics should fool no one. Nasser has used them in the past. He has quieted down only in comparison with his previous outrageous behavior toward the United States. He has quieted down only long enough to get a renewal of his agreement with the United States for Public Law 480 food and fiber. Once he has that agreement safely signed, he will again seek to work in every way against the U.S. foreign policies.

Congress should show that it is not fooled by these tactics, and should keep, in conference, the Harris amendment, which denies all aid to Nasser and to Sukarno.

EXHIBIT 1

"[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 23, 1965]

"U.S. FOOD AID TO EGYPT IS ORDERED RESUMED

"President Johnson has approved the shipment of $37 million worth of surplus food to Egypt, ending a 6-month-old suspension of food aid which resulted from a series of United States-Egyptian disputes.

"A State Department spokesman, questioned about the President's decision, said last night:

" 'There has been a definite improvement in our relations with the United Arab Republic (Egypt) since aid was suspended 6 months ago.'

"Officials said that in mid-April the United Arab Republic stopped giving assistance to Communist-backed rebels in the Congo. The delivery of aid to the rebels was one of the reasons for friction with the United States at the end of last year.

"Officials said they had also noted recent statements and actions by the Egyptian Government which seemed designed to avoid adding to tensions in the Arab-Israel dispute.

"A statement issued by the State Department announcing Mr. Johnson's decision said in part:

" 'The President has determined that it is in U.S. interest to fulfill remaining commitments under Public Law 480 entered into with the United Arab Republic in October 1962 and which ends June 30, 1965.

" 'Accordingly the Department of Agriculture is proceeding with the issuance of purchase authorizations totaling approximately $37 million.

" 'In connection with the agreement the United Arab Republic Government has undertaken to enter into discussion with us on any outstanding differences and to resolve these to our mutual satisfaction.'

"The only specific difference for a discussion which was identified by State Department officials is one involving an Egyptian agreement with the United States, linked to the aid program, to control exports of Egyptian rice according to a quota system.

"The State Department about a week ago confirmed reports that United Arab Republic rice shipments, presumably in excess of the quota, had gone to Communist China and Cuba. This situation is under discussion between Cairo and Washington now, officials said."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 30, 1965]

FURTHER UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC VIOLATIONS OF FOOD FOR PEACE PROVISIONS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in the course of the past 2 weeks the Comptroller General of the United States has released two reports that are significant contributions to the long list of violations of aid agreements that have been committed by the United Arab Republic.

In addition to pointing out violations of aid agreements by the United Arab Republic, the reports reconfirm all of our fears concerning the bungling, vacillating, and totally inadequate policy of the State Department in the Middle East.

These reports are further evidence of why the Harris amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965, which would cut off aid to Sukarno's Indonesia and to Nasser's United Arab Republic, should be retained in conference.

In 1963, the Senate adopted an amendment, which I proposed, to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 which provided that no further assistance and no further sales under Public Law 480 should be made to any nations found by the President to be engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts against any country receiving assistance from the United States. That amendment was adopted and is now the law of the land.

Since that time, despite the United Arab Republic's continued aggression in Yemen, its active support through the furnishing of arms to the rebels in the Congo, its supplying of arms to Cyprus to promote strife there, its continuing threats to destroy the independent nation of Israel, and its continuing boycott of that country and the perpetuation of a declaration of war against it, our President has not made the necessary finding that the United Arab Republic is an aggressor within the meaning of my amendment.

This year the Senate voted 73 to 13 for an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965—proposed by the able and distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS]—that would prohibit any kind of aid to Indonesia or the United Arab Republic so long as they continue to commit aggression.

The Harris amendment refines my amendment. It improved on it.

Without binding the hands of the President, under the Harris amendment, if adopted, Congress would be making the finding that both the United Arab Republic and Indonesia are aggressors within the meaning of the law. This would still leave the President perfectly free to find, whenever he feels that the facts so justify, that either or both of these countries are no longer aggressors, and thereby are again eligible to receive U.S. foreign assistance and to purchase grain and fiber under Public Law 480.

On June 23, 1965, I inserted into the RECORD facts that had come to my attention which indicated a serious and illegal misuse of wheat sold to the United Arab Republic under title I of Public Law 480.

In my speech on June 23 I showed how violations of her agreements with the United States and disregard of section 101(a) and section 304 of Public Law 480 have enabled Egypt to:

Support the economies of countries behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains;

Support the Cuban economy by shipping more than 62,000 metric tons of rice to Cuba in 1964 alone;

Adversely affect the U.S. balance of payments at the rate of more than $15 million a year;

Expand Nasser's brand of economic and political socialism;

Deprive the people in Egypt of food intended for them; and

Carry on an aggressive war in Yemen at a cost of over $2 billion to date.

The recent reports issued by the Comptroller General of the United States shed further light on our maladministered aid program in Egypt.

The first report to which I refer is titled: "Displacement of Commercial Dollar Sales of Tallow to the United Arab Republic." The report clearly demonstrates that about $5.5 million in commercial sales of tallow were displaced by sales for local currency carried out under title I of Public Law 480, our food-for-peace program, between 1962 and 1964.

This was done by the United Arab Republic in direct violation of section 101(a) of

Public Law 480 which states that in negotiating agreements by which surplus agricultural commodities of the United States are exchanged for local currency:

"The President shall (a) take reasonable precaution to safeguard usual marketings of the United States and to assure that sales under this Act will not unduly disrupt world prices of agricultural commodities or normal patterns of commercial trade with friendly countries."

Due to the present excess currency situation in Egypt, this means that the United States made an outright gift of $5.5 million to President Nasser's foreign exchange coffers to spend in any way he wanted, including the carrying on of aggressive wars in the Middle East and aiding rebels in the Congo.

It means that $5.5 million was subtracted from the U.S. balance of payments during a period when we were having serious balance-of-payments difficulties.

It also means that to the extent that the supply of tallow was not increased in the United Arab Republic, the people who use tallow in the United Arab Republic had to pay a higher price for the tallow they used.

Due to the importance of this report, issued by the Comptroller General, I ask unanimous consent to have substantial portions of the report printed in the Congressional Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, the second report recently issued by the Comptroller General of the United States to which I refer is entitled "Questionable Grant of Corn to the United Arab Republic Under Title II, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954."

This report discloses one of the most disgraceful acts of international chicanery ever perpetrated in connection with our foreign assistance programs.

Under title II of Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program, the President is enabled "to furnish emergency assistance on behalf of the people of the United States to friendly peoples in meeting famine or other urgent or extraordinary relief requirements."

Title II of Public Law 480 thus authorizes the shipment of surplus agricultural commodities to people beset by famine or in need of relief for other reasons. It is a clear indication of the compassion of the people of the United States for the starving peoples of the world.

On October 19, 1961, the United Arab Republic requested the United States to grant 200,000 tons of corn to the people of the United Arab Republic to meet an emergency crop failure.

On November 19, 1961, the United Arab Republic stated that its 1961 corn crop had suffered an estimated loss from insect infestation and floods of about 350,000 tons, or about 20 percent of its average annual corn crop.

On December 28, 1961, the Agency for International Development, in Washington, authorized the shipment of up to 200,000 tons of corn to the United Arab Republic to be distributed free to famine victims who had suffered food shortages as a result of insect infestation of crops and who could not purchase necessary food.

Between February 12 and July 22, 1962, 186,000 tons of granted corn valued at $23,700,000 arrived in the United Arab Republic.

An official United Arab Republic Ministry of Agriculture Yearbook, published subsequent to the grant of corn, shows that the United Arab Republic's 1961 corn crop actually had not failed. In fact, in 1961, the United Arab Republic actually had a bumper corn crop for the area planted.

On November 29, 1961, the United Arab Republic had agreed that it would distribute the corn it received from the United States to needy famine victims from January to May 1962.

On April 26, 1962, only 266 tons of corn had been distributed in Sharkia Governorate—province—although the United Arab Republic had stated on November 19, 1961, that especially heavy losses of the corn crop had occurred in that province.

On April 26, 1962, auditors from the Agency for International Development reported that no corn had been distributed in six other provinces they visited.

On July 1, 1962, auditors from the Agency for International Development observed that weevils had begun to infest granted corn that had been at a distribution center since March 3, 1962.

Previously, on November 29, 1961, the United Arab Republic had agreed that it would distribute the corn which the United States granted free to the people of Egypt.

In the course of their visits to distribution centers from April to October 1962, U.S. mission auditors found that 6,000 tons of the granted corn had been sold. Subsequently, the Agency for International Development's mission in Egypt was informed that an additional 8,500 tons of granted corn had been sold. Still later checks disclosed that more than 80,000 tons of corn had been sold.

What happened to the remainder of the 186,000 tons of corn valued in excess of $23 million remains a mystery.

I seriously doubt that the portion which was not infested with weevils or did not rot on the docks was distributed without charge to the hungry people of Egypt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have substantial portions of the Comptroller General's report on the misuse of title II famine relief printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, in my speech on June 23, I showed that section 101(a) of Public Law 480 had been violated in the execution of wheat agreements with the United Arab Republic. Those violations have had an adverse effect on the U.S. balance of payments of at least $135 million.

In addition, I showed where violations of section 304 of Public Law 480 had enabled the Egyptian Government to substitute wheat for rice and to ship hundreds of thousands of metric tons of rice behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains—at a great cost to U.S. taxpayers and the people of Egypt.

One of the Comptroller General's reports which I have cited above shows how violations of section 101(a) of Public Law 480 have enabled the United Arab Republic to displace $5.5 million worth of commercial exports of tallow with tallow acquired under title I of Public Law 480.

The other report cited above demonstrates the illegal acquisition of $23 million worth of agricultural commodities by the United Arab Republic. My conservative estimate of the damages done by all of these violations of Public Law 480 places the dollar amount in excess of $160 million. This implies an adverse affect on the balance of payments of $160 million. It implies an increase in foreign exchange of the United Arab Republic in excess of $160 million.

But dollar costs are of less significance than the tremendous human cost that must be considered in assessing the damage done by these violations of Public Law 480. It is not simply a case of pouring the American taxpayer's money down a rathole. For then the money would be lost, but there would be no repercussion.

The fact is that the surplus agricultural commodities which we have shipped to the United Arab Republic have been used by the Government of Egypt to accomplish goals that are in diametric opposition to the goals of U.S. foreign policy.

For some nebulous reason it appears that the State Department thinks that by continuing to throw away the money of the American taxpayers this way, Nasser will eventually stop his nefarious undertakings.

Not only is Nasser exploiting the food-for-peace program, for the purpose of carrying on aggressive wars in Yemen, and for supporting rebels in the Congo, but he is also misusing the food-for-peace program domestically in a fashion which results in a widening of the gap between the extremely rich and the extremely poor in Egypt. Thus, surplus agricultural commodities intended by the people of the United States for the less fortunate people in Egypt are being used instead to fill government coffers.

Retention of the Harris amendment in conference would result in the cessation of aid to Nasser so long as he continues to make war. It is a necessary first step in preventing further misappropriation of foreign aid. It is one of the prerequisites to the building of a constructive Middle East policy based on just principles.

EXHIBIT 1

REPORT BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES ON DISPLACEMENT OF COMMERCIAL DOLLAR SALES OF TALLOW TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC, JULY 1965

INTRODUCTION

The General Accounting Office has reviewed selected aspects of surplus tallow sales to the United Arab Republic, as part of an overall review of surplus agricultural sales activities in the United Arab Republic under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (commonly known as Public Law 480).

This report covers the part of our review that primarily was concerned with U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and Agency for International Development (AID) policies and procedures in support of the decision to sell tallow to the United Arab Republic for Egyptian currency. We also evaluated this decision in the light of past U.S. commercial sales of tallow for dollars and the amount of Egyptian currency on hand for U.S. uses. Our review was made pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67). Our examination was directed primarily to those aspects of the activity which appeared to be in particular need of attention.

BACKGROUND

Title I of Public Law 480 authorizes the President to negotiate and carry out agreements with friendly nations or organizations of friendly nations to provide for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities, with payments to be made in local currency of the recipient country.

Public Law 480 states in pertinent part that it is the policy of the Congress to:

"* * * Stimulate and facilitate the expansion of foreign trade in agricultural commodities produced in the United States by providing a means whereby surplus agricultural commodities in excess of the usual marketings of such commodities may be sold through private trade channels, and foreign currencies accepted in payment therefor."

Title I of Public Law 480, which provides for such sales, requires the President to take reasonable precautions to safeguard the usual marketings of the United States and to assure that such sales do not unduly disrupt world prices of agricultural commodities or normal patterns of commercial trade with friendly countries. This is done by requiring recipient countries to procure with their own resources a stipulated quantity of the commodities from free-world sources and/or from the United States. USDA, in determining a country's usual marketings, considers such matters as the country's commodity requirements and production, its average imports of the commodities over a 3- to 5-year period, its balance-of-payments situation, the U.S. dollar sales of the commodities, and the Public Law 480 program in the country.

At the time of the initial title I sale of tallow to the United Arab Republic on November 11, 1961, the United States owned a substantial quantity of Egyptian currency. Also, at that time it was known that additional Egyptian currency would become available from loan repayments and from the title I program for fiscal year 1962 and following years. At June 30, 1964, the United States owned or was scheduled to receive from loan repayments about $500 million in Egyptian pounds of which about $61 million worth was available for immediate expenditure. The $500 million represents about 50 years' supply for U.S. uses at the current rate of expenditure.

Section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, provided that funds would be made available annually to finance the export and sale for foreign currencies, or the grant of surplus agricultural commodities or products thereof produced in the United States, in addition to surplus agricultural commodities or products transferred pursuant to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and in accordance with the standards as to pricing and the use of private trade channels expressed in section 101 of said act.

FINDINGS

Displacement of commercial dollar sales of tallow to the United Arab Republic

U.S. commercial dollar sales of tallow to the United Arab Republic have been displaced by sales of surplus tallow for foreign currency under title I, Public Law 480, programs. We estimate that commercial sales totaling about $5.5 million were displaced between 1962 and 1964 and that under existing agreements additional sales are likely to be displaced in 1965. This situation resulted because U.S. agencies made increasing amounts of title I surplus tallow available without establishing realistic commercial import requirements for the United Arab Republic. Commercial import requirements are specified in each Public Law 480 sales agreement as a means of insuring that title I sales do not displace normal commercial sales.

In 1958 the United Arab Republic's imports of tallow amounted to about 32,000 metric tons, which were obtained from U.S. exporters for dollars. In 1964 the United Arab Republic's imports increased to about 56,000 metric tons, but U.S. commercial dollar sales decreased to 21,600 metric tons.

The following schedule shows the commercial sales and Public Law 480 sales of edible and inedible tallow from 1956 to 1964, according to the Department of Agriculture records we examined.

Tallow exported to the United Arab Republic from the United States, 1956–64

[In metric tons]

Calendar year	Total exports	Financing		Public Law 480 exports
		Commercial	Sec. 402	
1956	22,400	22,400	----------	----------
1957	30,930	30,930	----------	----------
1958	32,336	32,336	----------	----------
1959	24,510	11,710	12,800	----------
1960	30,006	13,806	16,200	----------
1961	26,667	26,667	----------	----------
1962	43,669	20,161	----------	23,508
1963	53,344	7,097	----------	46,247
1964	56,475	21,637	----------	34,838

As can be seen from the above table, during the period 1956 through 1958 commercial dollar sales averaged 28,555 metric tons a year (a metric ton equals 2,204 pounds). In 1959 and 1960, however, with the introduction of imports financed under section 402, U.S. commercial sales dropped to an annual average of only 12,758 metric tons, while total imports from the United States held at an average of 27,258 metric tons. In 1961, in the absence of a section 402 program, commercial sales returned to a high of 26,667 metric tons. It should be noted that the United States is virtually the only supplier of tallow to the United Arab Republic.

The decrease in U.S. commercial tallow exports in 1962 through 1964 was due to (1) the establishment of unrealistically low usual marketing requirements as part of the title I, Public Law 480, agreements and (2) serious delinquencies on the part of the United Arab Republic in complying with these reduced import requirements.

Public Law 480, title I, sales of tallow started in fiscal year 1962 and continued under subsequent title I agreements for the United Arab Republic. These agreements specified specific quantities which the United Arab Republic was required to purchase commercially from the United States (i.e., "usual marketings"). However, our review disclosed that the usual marketings established for tallow were understated, principally because they were based on the average commercial imports by the United Arab Republic during a preceding 5-year period, excluding sales financed under section 402.

We believe that the establishment of more realistic usual marketing requirements would have made possible a substantially higher level of U.S. commercial tallow exports. The requirements should have been set on the basis of the level of established imports by the United Arab Republic from the United States during the period from 1956 through 1960 and the United Arab Republic's willingness to utilize its foreign exchange in 1961 to import tallow at a level in line with imports of previous years. Using these criteria, the establishment of usual marketing requirements of 28,000 metric tons would have been arrived at to protect U.S. commercial sales. Instead, responsible U.S. agencies set substantially lower usual marketing requirements with the resultant loss in dollar sales, as shown in the following table.

[In thousands of metric tons]

	Fiscal year			Total
	1962	1963	1964	
Title I sales agreement	20	30	37.5	87.5
Average historical level of imports from the United States, per our calculation	28	28	28.0	84.0
Usual marketing requirement in title I sales agreements	20	20	22.5	62.5
Loss of U.S. dollar sales	8	8	5.5	21.5

The foregoing computation of lost U.S. commercial sales has as its basis the fact that the United Arab Republic imported from the United States a total of 140,182 metric tons of tallow in calendar years 1956 to 1960, including those financed under section 402. Based on these data it seems reasonable that a minimum expectation, and consequent usual marketing requirements, for U.S. tallow should have been at least 28,000 metric tons which is the average of the imports for the 5-year base period used by USDA in its calculation of usual marketing requirements.

We also noted that the United Arab Republic was seriously delinquent in complying with the reduced usual marketing requirements that had been established throughout the period of the title I, Public Law 480, sales of tallow. Under the Public Law 480 sales agreements, the usual marketing requirements must be met by the United Arab Republic's importing, with its own resources, the specified quantity of tallow in the fiscal year for which the requirement was established. The cumulative shortfall, by fiscal years from 1962, was as follows (in metric tons):

Fiscal year	Usual marketings		Commercial imports	Shortfall
	For fiscal year	Cumulative		
1962	20,000	20,000	18,249	1,751
1963	20,000	21,751	12,505	9,246
1964	22,500	31,746	23,606	8,140
1965 (as of Apr. 30, 1965)	25,000	33,140	[1] 13,754	-------

[1] Most current available data.

At an average price of about $193 a metric ton, the shortfall in complying with usual marketings at April 30, 1965, amounted to $3.7 million.

The establishment of unrealistic usual marketing requirements and the delinquency of the United Arab Republic in meeting even these reduced import requirements led to a reduction in commercial imports from the historical level of about 28,000 metric tons annually to an average of only 16,300 metric tons annually between 1962 and 1964. We estimate that, at world market prices in effect during these years, commercial dollar sales of tallow to the United Arab Republic amounting to $5.5 million were displaced between 1962 and 1964, as shown below:

	Calendar year			Total
	1962	1963	1964	
Average historical level of imports from the United States, per our calculation (metric tons)	28,000	28,000	28,000	84,000
Actual imports by the UAR from the United States (metric tons)	20,200	7,100	21,600	48,900
Loss of commercial dollar sales (metric tons)	7,800	20,900	6,400	35,100
Average world market price (per metric ton)	$156	$149	$187	-------
Estimated value of lost commercial sales (in millions of dollars)	$1.2	$3.1	$1.2	$5.5

Under existing agreements, additional sales are likely to be displaced in 1965.

Unrealistic usual marketings established

Tallow was added to the list of commodities sold to the United Arab Republic for Egyptian currency because of a United Arab Republic request submitted to the USDA in September 1961 for 34,000 metric tons of the inedible tallow and 6,000 metric tons of edible tallow.

The Department of State negotiated an amendment on November 11, 1961, to the September 2, 1961, title I sales agreement on the basis of a sale of 20,000 metric tons of tallow with a 20,000-metric-ton usual marketing requirement. In an exchange of notes accompanying the agreement, the United Arab Republic agreed to purchase 20,000 metric tons of tallow with its own resources from the United States during fiscal year 1962, in addition to the quantity being provided under title I.

The usual marketing requirement for tallow under the title I sales agreement remained at 20,000 metric tons for fiscal year

1963 but was increased to 22,500 metric tons for fiscal year 1964 and to 25,000 metric tons for fiscal year 1965. The Department of State stated that these gradual increases in the usual marketing requirement took into account the increases in consumption envisaged in the multiyear agreement for fiscal year 1963 through 1965. The established amounts of usual marketings, however, are still less than the average annual amounts of tallow imported from the United States by the United Arab Republic prior to the title I sales of this commodity. Moreover, the United Arab Republic has not imported commercially all of the reduced amounts.

As shown elsewhere in this report, a number of factors are considered in determining a country's usual marketings. In this case, however, we have ascertained that only historical sales were used in making this determination. We were informed by a USDA official that only United Arab Republic-financed commercial imports of inedible tallow were included and that imports financed under section 402 were excluded because they were considered to be noncommercial transactions. The 5-year period 1956 to 1960 was used to arrive at the usual marketing requirement of 20,000 metric tons included in this amendment.

In regard to how section 402 commodity assistance is to be considered in setting usual marketing requirements, our review of the Public Law 480 legislation disclosed that no criteria for determining "usual marketings" were specified in the legislation. Although the act requires the President to take reasonable precautions to safeguard the usual marketings of the United States, the manner in which such precautions are to be taken is not specified.

Nevertheless, we do not believe that the usual marketing requirements of 20,000 metric tons were realistic. The United Arab Republic had imported substantially higher quantities from the United States prior to 1962 despite its limited foreign exchange reserves. Thus in 1961, when neither section 402 or Public Law 480 commodity assistance was available, the United Arab Republic imported over 26,000 metric tons of tallow on a commercial basis from the United States, and these purchases, which were made in dollars, occurred during a period when the UAR's foreign exchange difficulties were most severe.

With regard to the exclusion of commodities imported in 1959 and 1960 by the United Arab Republic under section 402 on the ground that such imports were noncommercial, our review showed instances where section 402 imports were considered as commercial transactions in setting usual marketing requirements for other countries. The Department of Agriculture agrees that this has been true in the past and may occur again for particular economic or foreign policy reasons.

Agency comments and our evaluation

We received comments on the foregoing findings from the Departments of State and Agriculture and from the Agency for International Development. The Department of State classified its comments as confidential, and, as stated, they are contained in the classified supplement of this report. AID advised us that it concurred in the comments of the Department of Agriculture concerning consideration of section 402 sales in determining usual marketing requirements. The comments by the Department of Agriculture are summarized below.

Department of Agriculture comments

The Department did not agree that local currency sales under title I, Public Law 480, agreements resulted in a reduction of U.S. commercial exports. The Department stated that, in retrospect, it may be an open question as to whether or not the correct decision was made on the quantity of tallow that would be purchased commercially in the absence of a Public Law 480 agreement but that this was not the result of an improper procedure in determining usual marketing requirements. The Department advised us that it is most difficult to say with any degree of certainty what quantity of tallow the United Arab Republic would in fact have purchased in the absence of a Public Law 480 agreement, given its deteriorating foreign exchange position.

The Department made the following additional points:

In determining usual marketing requirements, the Department attempts to judge what a country would be likely to purchase with its own resources in the absence of a Public Law 480 agreement. Since section 402 imports were financed with foreign aid funds, they were noncommercial imports and should not be regarded as having been purchased through a country's own resources.

The assumption that the United Arab Republic would not have purchased the amounts of tallow provided under section 402 with its own resources appears to be borne out by the financial situation of that country. Beginning in 1958, the external financial condition of the United Arab Republic underwent a precipitous decline that reached its lowest point in the third quarter of 1962; that is, reserves fell steadily from $429 million at the end of 1958 to $195 million in September 1962.

Evaluation

The comments of the Department of Agriculture contain major inconsistencies in regard to the method of determining usual marketing requirements.

1. The Department stated that in determining usual marketings it considers the balance-of-payments situation of countries receiving title I, Public Law 480, assistance, but this is explicitly omitted in another part of the Department's comments, as follows:

"The usual marketing requirement established represented a judgment of what the United Arab Republic could be expected to procure commercially in the absence of a Public Law 480 agreement. This judgment was based on available data of past commercial imports."

Our review confirmed the last sentence. We ascertained, through discussions with agency personnel and review of available documents, that only historical sales were used in determining the commercial imports which the United Arab Republic would be required to make and that foreign exchange shortages were not a consideration.

Further, we do not believe that it is realistic or in the best interests of the United States to forgo commercial sales which the United States could make, solely because the importing country has experienced declines in its foreign exchange holdings. If the country has developed a pattern of commercial imports from the United States in past years and needs the commodities for its industries, it is likely to continue such commercial purchases regardless of the decline in its foreign exchange reserves. This is indicated by the fact that the United Arab Republic purchased 26,667 metric tons of tallow from the United States in 1961 with dollars when it could not obtain the commodity through AID financing or through Public Law 480, and these purchases were made at a time when the United Arab Republic was experiencing sharp declines in its foreign exchange.

2. The Department states, in one part of its reply, that since section 402 imports were financed with foreign aid funds they are non-commercial imports and should not be regarded as being purchased through a country's own resources. In another part of the Department's reply, however, it is stated that:

"There have been cases in the past, as there may be in the future, where particular economic or foreign policy reasons require negotiations and agreements in which imports financed under section 402 or under other types of AID financing were or may be characterized as part of usual marketing requirement (i.e., commercial imports requirements) in reaching agreement with a foreign country."

It is evident that in the case of the United Arab Republic, tallow imports financed by AID under section 402 displaced commercial sales of tallow. Although there was no requirement to protect U.S. commercial exports under section 402, such requirement does exist as regards Public Law 480 surplus sales. Reasonable efforts to carry out this requirement would, in our opinion, have involved recognition of the fact that commercial tallow imports in 1959 and 1960 were reduced because the United Arab Republic was able to meet its needs through AID-financed imports. Adequate recognition of this factor would have resulted in usual marketing requirements for tallow being set at a considerably higher level.

Recent decisions of the Interagency Staff Committee indicate that, in the future, country commodity imports financed by the United States, such as those financed under section 402, will be considered in establishing usual marketing requirements in light of the overall capability of the country to import commodities commercially and in a manner which will protect normal commercial markets.

3. The Department stated that it agreed with our proposal that the Secretary of Agriculture establish procedures which will fully protect United States commercial sales by requiring that transactions previously financed by section 402 be considered in establishing the level of title I sales and in negotiating the quantities which countries are required to import from the United States on a commercial basis. The Department advised us that its policy is to take reasonable precautions to safeguard usual marketings of the United States and that this policy had recently been reinforced in an effort to assure that displacement of commercial sales was not taking place.

The main thrust of the Department's reply, however, is that the policies and procedures in effect at the time the Public Law 480 tallow agreements were made with the United Arab Republic were proper and that local currency sales under title I, Public Law 480, did not result in a reduction of U.S. commercial exports. This discrepancy, as well as the discrepancy between the Department's comments and the recently adopted policies of the Interagency Staff Committee described above, leads us to conclude that there is need for the Department to reappraise its thinking on this matter and to establish a firm definitive policy which will assure the maximizing of U.S. commercial sales abroad. It should be noted that one of the objectives of Public Law 480 legislation is to develop increased dollar markets for U.S. agricultural commodities through the use of title I sales.

The need for such policy is evidenced by the facts related in this report. U.S. commercial dollar sales of tallow have been displaced by Public Law 480 sales, but this displacement could have been avoided, in our opinion, had the Department of Agriculture and other responsible agencies established, and required adherence to, realistic usual marketing requirements in light of the United Arab Republic's historical commercial purchases of tallow and its need for that commodity. The record of United Arab Republic's tallow imports from 1956 through 1961 clearly shows that the United Arab Republic was importing its tallow requirements from the United States and that if it could not obtain such imports with U.S. financing it was prepared to use its own limited foreign exchange to do so.

4. Our report also notes that, at the time of the initial title I sales of tallow to the United Arab Republic, the United States owned a substantial quantity of Egyptian currency. These amounts accrued to the United States from the proceeds of title I commodity sales. Although most of the sales proceeds are granted or loaned to the United Arab Republic for economic development or other purposes described in Public Law 480 legislation, specified amounts are reserved for the United States and are available to pay its administrative expenses in the United Arab Republic.

The Department makes point that it does attempt to avoid building up an excess of local currencies under the program and that:

"In the case of the United Arab Republic, the multiyear title I, Public Law 480 agreement covering fiscal years 1963, 1964, and 1965 provides for 10 percent for U.S. uses as compared with previous agreements providing for 20 percent or more."

We do not see how this provision avoids building up excessive holdings of foreign currency. Obviously if the United States receives for its own needs a lesser amount of local currency and gives away or writes off the remainder, as has been done in some countries, there will be less excess currency. In the case of the United Arab Republic, however, the sales agreements for tallow make increased quantities of Public Law 480 local currency proceeds available to the United Arab Republic in loans which, as they are repaid, may eventually result in further accumulation of Egyptian currency surplus to United States needs in the foreseeable future.

It is equally apparent that the most effective way of avoiding a buildup of excess currency is to maximize U.S. commercial sales, with the concomitant increase in dollar earnings which would assist in alleviating U.S. balance-of-payments deficits.

CONCLUSIONS

It is evident that sales of tallow for local currency under Public Law 480 have displaced commercial U.S. dollar exports to the United Arab Republic. This occurred because responsible U.S. agencies provided the United Arab Republic with title I surplus tallow without requiring the United Arab Republic to import tallow commercially at a level in line with its past commercial imports. In setting the level of required commercial imports, the responsible U.S. agencies did not, in our opinion, make a realistic assessment of the established pattern of the United Arab Republic's tallow imports from the United States, the United Arab Republic's need for tallow, and the country's willingness to utilize its foreign exchange holdings to purchase tallow through commercial channels.

We believe that the real reason for the unrealistic assessment by the U.S. agencies involved in this matter, and the consequent failure to protect U.S. commercial exports, is the overriding consideration by the Department of State of the foreign policy aspects and implications of Public Law 480 programs, and the administration of these programs in a manner which focuses primarily on this consideration rather than on the safeguarding of U.S. commercial exports. It is evident that this center of focus results in the following adverse effects.

1. One of the objectives of Public Law 480 legislation—to develop increased dollar markets for U.S. agricultural commodities through the use of title I foreign currency sales—is not achieved at least so far as tallow is concerned.

2. The loss of dollar sales in the United Arab Republic has impaired efforts to improve the critical balance-of-payments problem.

3. The reduction of the requirement for the United Arab Republic to purchase tallow commercially from the United States with dollars has permitted that country to conserve a substantial amount of its foreign exchange or to use it for different purposes, which, in effect, is a form of economic assistance. However, unlike normal economic assistance, it has not been approved by the Congress nor is it subject to the administrative controls imposed by U.S. agencies on the more usual forms of economic assistance which are designed to insure that such assistance is used to further U.S. interests.

SCOPE OF EXAMINATION

Our examination of Public Law 480, title I, sales of tallow to the United Arab Republic consisted of a review of the reasonableness of, and the compliance by the United Arab Republic with, the usual marketing requirements established for this commodity. We reviewed correspondence, reports, and other pertinent material available to us at the AID mission, the U.S. Embassy, and the office of the agricultural attaché in the United Arab Republic. We also discussed the matters in this report with responsible officials of the AID mission, the Embassy, AID/Washington, and U.S. Department of Agriculture.

EXHIBIT 2

REPORT BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES ON QUESTIONABLE GRANT OF CORN TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC UNDER TITLE II, AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954 (COMMONLY KNOWN AS PUBLIC LAW 480), JULY 1965

INTRODUCTION

The General Accounting Office has examined the grant of corn costing over $23,700,000 made to the United Arab Republic in December 1961 by the Agency for International Development (AID) under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended. Our examination was directed primarily toward an evaluation of the basis on which the Agency for International Development and the Department of State determined that an emergency need existed in the United Arab Republic for a grant of corn under title II. We also examined the adequacy of the actions taken by these agencies to insure that foodstuffs were properly distributed and utilized. Our review was confined to the title II program in the United Arab Republic, and the findings in this report are not necessarily indicative of the administration of title II programs in other countries. Our examination was made pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67) and was made at AID's overseas mission in the United Arab Republic (referred to in this report as the mission).

GENERAL COMMENTS

Title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480) (7 U.S.C. 1691) authorizes the grant of surplus agricultural commodities to other nations for diaster relief. Section 201, as amended, of Public Law 480 (7 U.S.C. 1721) provides, quoting from the code, that—

"In order to enable the President to furnish emergency assistance on behalf of the people of the United States to friendly peoples in meeting famine or other urgent or extraordinary relief requirements, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available to the President out of its stocks such surplus agricultural commodities (as defined in sec. 1706 of this title) as he may request, for transfer (1) to any nation friendly to the United States in order to meet famine or other urgent or extraordinary relief requirements of such nation, and (2) to friendly but needy populations without regard to the friendliness of their government" (7 U.S.C. 1721).

Title II also authorizes the payment of ocean freight charges from U.S. ports to designated ports of entry abroad upon a determination by the President that it is necessary to accomplish the purposes of that title.

The President delegated the functions conferred upon him by title II of Public Law 480 to the Secretary of State by section 2 of Executive Order 10900, as amended, dated January 6, 1961 (7 U.S.C. 1691, note). The Secretary of State redelegated responsibility for title II functions to the Administrator of AID by State Department Delegation Order No. 104, effective September 30, 1961.

In addition to the commodities delivered under title II, commodities valued at over $70 million have been delivered to the United Arab Republic through June 30, 1964, under other titles of Public Law 480.

FINDINGS

Questionable grant of corn to the United Arab Republic

The Agency for International Development granted about 186,000 metric tons of corn costing over $23,700,000 to the United Arab Republic in December of 1961 under title II of Public Law 480 on the basis of representations made by the United Arab Republic that a famine would occur as a result of crop failures. The grant was made without adequate verification of the actual need for the requested assistance. Official statistics of the United Arab Republic, which were subsequently accepted by U.S. agencies, showed that the corn crop had not failed and most of the corn was undelivered many months after it arrived in Egypt.

In addition, responsible U.S. agencies did not check on the distribution of 85 percent of the corn and do not know whether this quantity of corn ever reached intended recipients. The limited distribution checks which were made disclosed that substantial quantities, which the United Arab Republic had agreed to give to needy people, were sold commercially. The Agency for International Development took no action to determine the extent of actual corn sales and to initiate a claim against the country until we suggested that this be done. A subsequent audit of the records of agencies of the United Arab Republic disclosed that over 80,000 tons had been sold.

Most of the United Arab Republic's corn crop is harvested in November and December of each year; therefore, AID should have discovered that the losses had not materialized before it accepted the United Arab Republic's representations on November 30, 1961.

The United Arab Republic on October 19, 1961, requested the United States to grant 200,000 tons of corn for human consumption under the provisions of title II of Public Law 480 to meet an emergency crop failure. On November 19, 1961, the United Arab Republic stated that its 1961 corn crop had suffered an estimated loss from insect infestation and floods of about 350,000 tons, or about 20 percent of its average annual corn crop of about 1,700,000 tons. The United Arab Republic stated also that the small farmers' ability to buy corn was greatly diminished because their cash crop, cotton, was also seriously damaged by insect infestation. The mission informed AID/Washington on November 30, 1961, that the United Arab Republic's November 19 statements substantially explained and justified the need for 200,000 tons of corn as emergency assistance under title II and recommended that the United Arab Republic's request be approved. On December 28, 1961, AID/Washington authorized the shipment of up to 200,000 tons of corn to the United Arab Republic, to be distributed free to famine victims who had suffered food shortages as a result of insect infestation of crops and who could not purchase necessary food. One hundred and eighty-six thousand tons of granted corn arrived in the United Arab Republic between February 12 and July 22, 1962.

Estimated losses in the 1961 corn crop did not materialize

According to official United Arab Republic statistics, the United Arab Republic's 1961 corn crop actually had not failed. It was harvested during the period when the corn grant was approved; therefore, the mission could have discovered that the estimated losses had not materialized if the proper verification had been performed or a decision had been made to defer approval until adequate verification was made. The mission had time to verify the United Arab Republic's representations, since the corn was not granted to relieve an immediate emergency.

The United Arab Republic's 1961 corn crop was within the range of the United Arab Republic's 1955–60 corn crops. A United Arab Republic Ministry of Agriculture yearbook published subsequently to the grant of corn stated that the United Arab Republic's 1961 corn production was 1,617,000 tons. The agricultural attaché of the U.S. Embassy in the United Arab Republic also reported after the grant of corn that the United Arab Republic's 1961 corn production was 1,617,000 tons. The agricultural attaché's reports and the United Arab Republic's yearbook showed that the 1960 corn production was 1,691,000 tons and that the 1955–59 average production was 1,624,000 tons with a range from 1,495,000 tons in 1957 to 1,758,000 tons in 1958.

In 1961 the United Arab Republic actually had a bumper corn crop for the area planted—a yield of 1,009 tons per feddan (1.038 acres)—but had reduced the acreage planted with corn. The United Arab Republic's yearbook and the agricultural attaché's reports showed that the area planted with corn dropped from 1,821,000 feddans in 1960 to 1,603,000 feddans in 1961. However, these sources also showed that the yield increased from 0.929 ton per feddan in 1960 to 1.009 tons per feddan in 1961. The average yield from 1955 to 1959 was 0.878 ton per feddan, ranging from 0.807 ton in 1959 to 0.935 ton in 1955.

The agricultural attaché reported during 1959, 1960, and 1961 that a small part of the United Arab Republic's corn was produced in the summer crop and harvested in September and October and that most of its corn was produced in the fall crop which was harvested in November and December. The mission recommended approval of the grant on November 30, 1961. If the crop was harvested by that time, the mission should have discovered by physical inspection and other verification of the United Arab Republic's representations that the crop was a bumper crop for the acreage planted with corn and that the total corn production would, therefore, be within the normal quantity range of preceding years. Were it not possible to make a complete verification on November 30, 1961, because the entire crop had not been harvested, the approval of the grant of corn should have been deferred until such determination was made.

The feasibility of such a deferral is indicated by the mission's recognition that the emergency need for famine relief was anticipated rather than immediate at the time it recommended approval of the United Arab Republic's request. The Chargé d'Affaires of the U.S. Embassy in the United Arab Republic told us that the mission did not recommend approval of the United Arab Republic's request in order to relieve a famine situation of pressing urgency. As indicated above, the United Arab Republic estimated that its 1961 corn crop would be 80 percent of normal, or 1,350,000 tons. A crop that was 80 percent of normal should have been large enough to meet the needs of the United Arab Republic for about 10 months, or from the beginning of the harvest season in September 1961 through June 1962. Thus, the mission had sufficient time in which to verify the United Arab Republic's representations that a shortage of corn existed before recommending approval of the United Arab Republic's request and had time to consider alternatives to granting corn if assistance was actually needed.

The lack of urgency is further shown in the total quantity of corn scheduled for delivery to the United Arab Republic under other Public Law 480 programs. Enough corn was programed for delivery to the United Arab Republic under titles I and III of Public Law 480 to avert the anticipated famine. A total of 327,000 tons of corn were programed for delivery to the United Arab Republic at the time the mission recommended approval of the grant of corn. At June 30, 1961, 27,000 tons of corn were programed for delivery during fiscal year 1962 under title III. The title I sales agreement of September 2, 1961, made 100,000 tons of corn available to the United Arab Republic, and the November 11, 1961, amendment to that sales agreement made another 200,000 tons of corn available. The agricultural attaché reported that the United Arab Republic's average annual corn imports for fiscal years 1957 through 1961 was 65,000 tons, with the maximum imports during that period being 80,000 tons in 1960, and that these imports were almost entirely consumed in the cities. Thus, the corn imports programed under Public Law 480 provided about 262,000 tons (327,000 tons less than anual average imports of 65,000 tons) more than had previously been normally consumed in the cities. These programed 262,000 tons plus the Embassy's estimate of 1961 corn production of 1,350,000 tons amounted to a total of 1,612,000 tons of corn available to avert famine in rural areas. The United Arab Republic's corn production, which was consumed by the rural population according to the reports of the agricultural attaché amounted to 1,691,000 tons in 1960 and averaged 1,624,000 tons from 1955 to 1959 with a range in those years from 1,495,000 to 1,758,000 tons. Thus, the available 1,612,000 tons of corn were sufficient to meet the normal needs of the United Arab Republic's rural population.

United Arab Republic's actions to alleviate losses by purchasing power caused by crop failure not considered

The mission recommended approval of the United Arab Republic's request partly on the basis that farmers had insufficient purchasing power to buy corn, even though the United Arab Republic had taken, and was considering taking additional, measures to alleviate losses of purchasing power. The United Arab Republic requested the corn on the basis that losses in cotton crop due to insect infestation had greatly diminished the farmers' ability to buy corn, as well as on the basis that the corn crop had suffered serious losses. The mission recommended approval of the United Arab Republic's request on November 30, 1961, on the basis of both reasons. However, the United Arab Republic had stated on October 19, 1961, that it had waived land taxes and postponed repayment of agricultural debts to alleviate the hardship resulting from the crop losses. The United Arab Republic stated on October 19 and November 19, 1961, that it was considering distributing corn free or at a nominal price to further alleviate the problem. Thus, not only was sufficient corn available to meet the United Arab Republic's normal needs, but the United Arab Republic had taken, and was considering taking additional, measures to alleviate any losses of purchasing power that might have resulted from losses in the cotton crop. We found no evidence that the mission considered the effects of the United Arab Republic's relief measures before recommending approval of the United Arab Republic's request.

United Arab Republic's representations of crop losses not verified

The mission did not verify the United Arab Republic's representations that the 1961 corn crop had suffered serious losses. We found no evidence that the mission verified the existence of the estimated losses in the 1961 corn crop by determining exactly where the insect infestation and floods had occurred, or by physical inspections of the damaged areas or interviews with farmers suffering crop losses, or by other means. We found no indication that the mission ascertained what evidence the United Arab Republic's representations of serious corn crop losses were based upon.

The chargé d'affaires told us that mission personnel and the agricultural attaché made field inspections in which they viewed the damage to the 1961 corn crop before the mission recommended approval of the grant. He also told us that the mission director discussed the crop damage with the United Arab Republic Minister of Supply who, he said, had letters from various governors regarding damage in their governorates (provinces) before recommending approval of the grant. He said that the mission director talked with farmers regarding damage to their crops after recommending approval of the grant. However, the mission director was unable to give us any documentary evidence as to the existence and nature of these field inspections and discussions and the information obtained thereby.

Although the mission based its recommendation for approval of the grant on the representations made by the United Arab Republic in its November 19, 1961, request, it did so without resolving the contradictory information contained in this letter concerning the required quantity of corn needed to feed the United Arab Republic's rural population. The request stated that the estimated annual per capita corn consumption of the United Arab Republic's 16 million rural population was 120 kilograms, which would mean a total annual consumption of about 1,920,000 tons. The request stated, also, that the average annual corn production was about 1,700,000 tons. The former figure is far in excess of the United Arab Republic's annual corn production, which averages 1,624,000 tons.

Imported corn could not have made up the difference, since corn imports never exceeded 80,000 tons in the prior 5 years, and imported corn is almost entirely consumed by the urban population. Thus, although the United Arab Republic indicated that its rural population, which it stated was in need of assistance, normally consumed about 1,920,000 tons of corn per year, in reality it consumed only that amount within the United Arab Republic, which was far less than this quantity. The mission did not resolve this conflicting information as to the quantity of corn normally consumed by the United Arab Republic's rural population.

Inadequate supervision by AID/Washington

AID/Washington did not require the mission to verify the United Arab Republic's representations or to consider alternatives to granting corn. The U.S. Ambassador to the United Arab Republic informed the Department of State on October 13, 1961, that the United Arab Republic would shortly request, under title II, 200,000 tons of corn for human consumption. AID/Washington knew at least as early as November 17, 1961, that the United Arab Republic had requested 200,000 tons of corn under title II. AID/Washington did not grant the 200,000 tons of corn until December 28, 1961. We found no evidence that AID/Washington required the mission either to verify the United Arab Republic's representations that a serious crop loss had occurred or to consider alternatives to granting corn under title II if assistance was actually needed.

Final disposition of granted corn not ascertained

The Mission did not ascertain how the United Arab Republic disposed of over 85 percent of the granted corn, even though it was aware that the United Arab Republic did not distribute the corn within the stated distribution period and had sold part of the corn although all the corn was to have been distributed free.

On November 29, 1961, the United Arab Republic agreed that it would distribute the corn to needy famine victims from January to May 1962. However, very little corn was distributed through July 11, 1962. On March 15, 1962, a Mission official reported that the United Arab Republic did not plan to distribute the granted corn until the summer of 1962. Mission auditors repeatedly reported from April to June 1962 that very little granted corn was being distributed to recipients. For example, on April 26, 1962, they reported that only 266 tons had been distributed in Sharkia Governorate (province), although the United Arab Republic had stated on November 19, 1961, that especially heavy losses of corn had occurred in that province.

The auditors also reported on April 26, 1962, that they found no distribution going on in the other six provinces visited. They observed on July 1, 1962, that weevils had begun to infest granted corn that had been at a distribution center since March 3, 1962. They reported that no granted corn had been distributed by any of the 17 distribution centers visited in April 1962 and that only 4 of the 42 distribution centers visited in June and July 1962 had commenced distribution. They reported that United Arab Republic officials attributed the delay in distributing the corn to needy famine victims to the amount of time required to select recipients, prepare distribution lists, and print the coupons used in identifying the recipients. They also reported that the unloading of four ships was delayed temporarily because the United Arab Republic had blacklisted the ships due to calls at Israeli ports.

The Mission found initially that the United Arab Republic sold 14,500 tons of the granted corn, although all the corn was to have been distributed free. The United Arab Republic agreed on November 29, 1961, that it would distribute the corn free, and AID specified on December 28, 1961, that the corn was to be distributed free. The Mission auditors found during their visits to distribution centers from April to October 1962 that 6,000 tons of the granted corn had been sold. Subsequently, the Mission was informed that an additional 8,500 tons of granted corn had been sold. The Mission took no action on this matter until we uncovered the situation and proposed to AID that it determine the extent of the corn sales and initiate a claim against the United Arab Republic for the value of the corn improperly sold. A subsequent audit by the Mission of the records of agencies of the United Arab Republic disclosed that over 80,000 tons of corn had been sold.

The Mission took no action to prevent further deliveries of granted corn after it discovered this lack of distribution, although delivery of granted corn worth millions of dollars could have been avoided by terminating further shipments. For example, on April 26, 1962, about 87,000 tons of granted corn had not yet arrived in the United Arab Republic. At the average cost of the granted corn of approximately $127 per ton ($23,700,000 divided by 186,000 tons), this undelivered corn was valued at about $11,049,000. As late as June 1, 1962, about 62,000 tons of granted corn valued at about $7,874,000 had still not arrived in the United Arab Republic. We found no indication that the Mission recommended discontinuance of further deliveries of granted corn after it discovered that the delivered corn was not being distributed.

The Mission did not ascertain how the United Arab Republic disposed of most of the granted corn. The Mission auditors found that the distribution centers had distributed free 12,000 tons in addition to the 6,000 tons that had been sold and had 24,000 tons on hand. They also found in their October 1962 visits that the remaining 144,000 tons of granted corn had been merged with other corn obtained from the United States upon orders of the United Arab Republic Government and that a single set of accounting records was being maintained for both. The Mission did not ascertain the final disposition of the corn granted to the United Arab Republic, apart from the 12,000 tons identified as having been distributed free and the 14,500 tons verified as having been sold. Since the title II corn had been merged with other U.S.-furnished corn, the Mission was not in a position to trace specific shipments of title II corn to individual recipients. Action should have been taken, however, to insure that the quantity of corn given to the United Arab Republic for emergency relief purposes, i.e., 186,000 metric tons, actually reached needy recipients.

On July 26, 1964, 2 years after the last of the granted corn arrived in the United Arab Republic, the Mission obtained information showing which provinces received the granted corn. The Mission took this action as the result of our inquiries. The Mission did not ascertain what quantity of the granted corn was distributed free and how much was sold or otherwise disposed of. AID regulations assign responsibility for end-use audits and investigations to overseas missions which are staffed with internal auditors to carry out this function. We discussed this deficiency with responsible Mission personnel but were unable to obtain any explanation on this matter.

Agency comments and evaluations

The AID and Department of State comments are detailed below together with our evaluation.

1. AID's comments

Approval of the title II program was based on a major shortfall in the corn and cotton crops. This approval was based not only on representations of the United Arab Republic Government, but also on the observations and estimates of United States officials then stationed in the United Arab Republic, particularly those of the agricultural attaché in Cairo. His report, dated November 9, 1962, considered the Ministry of Agriculture's estimate of 1,617,000 tons as unrealistically high and placed the 1961 crop production at 1,360,000 tons.

Evaluation: The agricultural attaché's report was made nearly a year after the grant; it therefore reflects an ex post facto attempt to establish that which should have been established prior to the making of the grant.

Analysis of the report discloses that it is predicated on opinion rather than on substantiated facts, as follows:

(a) After citing the Yearbook data, the report states a supposition that "a record average yield is highly unlikely in a poor year of bad climatic and growing conditions together with the prevalence of diseases and insects that severely infested most of the crop." Yet the mission was unable to produce at our request any evidence whatsoever in the form of documents or facts ascertained by field visits before the grant was made to show that the crop conditions were in any way unusual.

(b) The report states that "Many believe that an average yield of 0.848 tons per feddan last year is quite reasonable. This would place the total crop production in 1961 at 1,360,000 tons instead of 1,617,000 tons presented by the Ministry of Agriculture." There was no evidence of who were the "many," their qualification, or the basis of their belief.

(c) The report stated that this lower production estimate is substantiated by the fact that the largest corn imports in the United Arab Republic's history were made in 1961–62 in order to cover up the crop deficit. It thus attempted to justify the existence of the need by the actions taken to fulfill it.

Subsequent to the agricultural attaché's report, the Agricultural Yearbook 1961 crop estimate of 1,617,000 tons was used without qualification by the same agricultural attaché in his May 11, 1963, report as his revised estimate of the 1961 United Arab Republic corn crop, and it was also used in a report of an acting agricultural attaché and by the current agricultural attaché. The American Embassy also used this estimate in its airgram No. 615, dated February 14, 1964, in statistics supporting its justification for a Public Law 480 sale to the United Arab Republic of 400,000 tons. The Embassy stated that the statistics presented were the best available.

AID also contends that there is no indication that we cross-checked the United Arab Republic Agriculture Ministry report with other published data available for the same year; for example, the official report of the United Arab Republic Ministry of Supply. AID further states that, "The records of the Ministry of Supply indicate an unusually high figure for corn imports over the period 1961–63," and cite the same total corn import tonnage data as that given in the agriculture attaché's November 1962 report. It was also noted that, since there is no evidence that stocks increased in the 1961–63 period, it must mean that consumption increased.

We have cross-checked the United Arab Republic official estimate of the 1961 corn crop with all available documentation. In addition to the documents cited above, the only other documents available that contain statistics pertaining to the size of the United Arab Republic's 1961 corn crop are the United Arab Republic's "Statistical Pocket Book" published by the United Arab Republic Administration of Public Mobilization; the "International Monetary Fund's Staff Report and Recommendations—1963 Consultations," dated April 10, 1964; and a publication entitled "The Agricultural Economy of the United Arab Republic" (Foreign Agricultural Economy Report No. 21) published in November 1964 by the Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. All of these documents state that the size of the crop in question was 1,617,000 tons.

With regard to the contention that the high imports in 1961–63 indicate increased consumption, no evidence was furnished us to support this position. There was no evidence in the agency files to indicate that the mission knew whether the increased corn imports went into inventory, were consumed, or were exported. The fact remains that the actual need for the grant of corn had not been established at the time the grant was made. We see no reason why approval of the grant could not have been deferred until it could be established definitely whether there was a crop failure and the degree of such failure, if any. The feasibility of deferring approval of the title II grant of corn is indicated by the mission's recognition that the emergency need for famine relief was anticipated rather than immediate at the time it recommended approval of the United Arab Republic's request.

2. AID's comments

Information received from the mission indicates that, though the audit team discussed numerous matters concerning the title II program, there is no record that it ever requested comments as to the existence or nature of field inspections which are customarily made by mission personnel concerned with agriculture in the United Arab Republic.

A study of reports filed by the agricultural attaché reveals numerous references during the period September to November 1961 of infestation of both the cotton and the corn crops as well as losses due to floods.

United States personnel constantly traveled throughout the United Arab Republic, and those expert in agriculture identified areas where infestation occurred and so reported at staff meetings of the Embassy and USAID. With U.S. Government cooperation, but with all costs paid by the United Arab Republic from limited foreign exchange, insecticides were airlifted urgently to Egypt in August–September 1961 in an effort to halt the damage to crops from the leafworm infestation affecting both corn and cotton.

Evaluation: We asked the Mission for evidence as to the existence and nature of the actions taken to verify the alleged crop failure. Contrary to the Agency's statement, the Mission was unable to furnish us with documentary evidence or concrete factual data ascertained by specific observation concerning the estimate of damage to the growing crop that was used as the basis for concluding that the losses had in fact occurred.

The information furnished, including the numerous references to infestation of both the cotton and the corn crops as well as to losses due to floods, was completely devoid of specific facts. The information consisted of broad generalities based on information said to have been furnished by the people concerned in the Ministry of Supply, by appropriate people in the Ministry of Agriculture, and statements made to us that the Nile flood conditions were observed daily by Embassy officials. There was no evidence available in the Mission to substantiate such reports nor is any now provided. The Agency response gives no clue to the rationale of accepting as valid the Ministry of Agriculture forecasts of future events while rejecting the Ministry's Yearbook reports on those that had occurred.

It appears to us therefore that the present insistence that such verification was made is not only unsupported by facts or the record but is contradicted by the best available information as to the actual crop results for 1961. Further doubt is cast on the reliability of AID's position by certain other considerations, which, while of only general bearing, nevertheless should have shown the need to ascertain the true crop conditions. For example, insect infestation and flooding are relatively normal conditions in Egypt. They are known to be aggravated by the fact that effective crop spraying is impracticable because of the practice of sowing corn by indiscriminately scattering seed and the common practice of small farmers' refusing to spray disinfectants in order to salvage the leaves from the stalks to feed their cattle.

One of the bases for AID's rejecting the crop statistics shown in the United Arab Republic Ministry of Agriculture Yearbook is that reports are frequently inaccurate or misleading. AID stated that this is particularly true with respect to agricultural statistics, since in many countries a high percentage of agricultural production fails to reach the commercial market and thus is not easily captured by the material statistical system. This would seem to suggest that actual production probably was greater rather than less than that shown by the agriculture yearbook.

A further indication that the alleged shortfall did not occur and that the title II grant was not needed exists in the fact that substantial quantities of title II corn were not distributed from January to May 1962, the period in which the supposed need existed. In fact there is no evidence that 85 percent of it ever was distributed for the purpose intended. The United Arab Republic had agreed on, November 29, 1961, to distribute the corn to needy famine victims from January to May 1962. However, very little corn was distributed through July 11, 1962. For example, Mission auditors reported that only 4 of the 42 distribution centers visited in June and July 1962 had commenced distributions.

3. *AID's comments*

The Mission was fully aware of relief measures being taken by the United Arab Republic but concluded that these measures would not prove adequate. While the United Arab Republic in October and November 1961 was considering distributing corn free or at a nominal price to further alleviate the problem, it would not be an erroneous deduction to state that the possibility of taking such measures was a result of the hope that title II corn would become available, thus permitting free distribution to needy farmers. Corn programed under titles I and III could not be shifted to avert the anticipated famine. Title I corn could not be used in this manner since the requirement for the United Arab Republic to pay for additional corn would have produced an undue burden on the already strained economy of the United Arab Republic. Title III corn had been earmarked for specific feeding programs and was required for this purpose.

Evaluation: We found no evidence to support AID's contention that it was aware of the relief measures being taken and that the United Arab Republic's actions had been evaluated and found to be inadequate. Public Law 480, titles I and III, agreements consummated before the title II grant was made assured the United Arab Republic of an increase of 262,000 tons over and above prior years' imports. Even had the alleged shortfall in the United Arab Republic crop occurred, the total thus available for consumption would have been 1,612,000 metric tons (1,350,000 metric tons plus 262,000 metric tons) or approximately the same as the average annual United Arab Republic crop.

These facts, as well as the other alleviation measures by the United Arab Republic, were known over a month before the title II grant and show that the threatened shortfall, if it occurred, could have been substantially offset from the United Arab Republic's own resources and those which it could expect to receive. Nevertheless, we found no evidence that the mission actually considered these facts in connection with the title II request or of the basis for the conclusion that the Agency now says was reached at that time that these partial measures would not prove adequate.

With regard to AID's reasons as to why title I corn could not be used, audits by the mission disclosed that in fact quantities of title I corn were commingled with title II corn and distributions were made from the total quantity. With regard to title III corn, our review showed that large quantities of such corn were not specifically earmarked for feeding programs and were used outside the title III program.

4. *AID's comments*

AID/Washington specifically requested the mission to investigate the crop situation and outlined to the mission the detailed information needed to justify the program. Verification was made by the mission of the United Arab Republic's representation on the crop loss. In addition, verification was made by review of reports of the agricultural attaché and the mission agricultural officer.

Evaluation: The AID message that allegedly specifically required the mission to investigate the situation asked them to investigate the drought situation including the United Arab Republic's desire for title II program. The mission's response did not in any way indicate that it had verified the need for the program; it merely stated that in the mission's judgment the United Arab Republic's request substantially explained and justified the requirement.

AID's contention that verification was made by review of reports of the agricultural attaché and the mission agricultural officer also has no substance since, as noted above, such reports as were made stated that they were based on unverified information received from the United Arab Republic. The mission agricultural officer, in response to our request, told us that he issued no written reports concerning the extent of damage to the United Arab Republic 1961 corn crop.

5. *AID's comments*

Although it is true that final disposition of all corn granted under the title II program was not confirmed by audit, the General Accounting Office (GAO) draft report does indicate that 15 percent was accounted for. Further, as of April 1963 the AID mission reported that 186,000 metric tons of corn had arrived in the country and that records had been examined in the United Arab Republic Ministry of Supply to show the total allocation and distribution of corn to the several governorates. In addition, some 42,000 tons of corn, or 23 percent of the total corn shipped, was traced by audit to distribution centers. Although end-use checks were limited because only a small quantity had been distributed to recipients, the mission audit report concluded that "storage facilities, records, and methods of receipt and distribution are considered satisfactory." Although some problems were indicated—such as delays in distribution beyond the emergency period, the use of unmarked bags, and the need for more publicity—no specific recommendations were set out in the report.

The mission obtained information listing Provinces which had received the granted corn. Review of the data furnished by the GAO disclosed that this listing was checked with the United Arab Republic Ministry of Supply records showing actual distribution to the 25 governorates. This was in addition to the above-mentioned 42,000 tons (23 percent) of the total corn shipped which was traced to distribution centers, of which 12,000 tons were identified as having been distributed free. Further, all records covering distribution to end users were kept (and are still available) in the agriculture banks. The draft report does not indicate whether the audit team availed itself of these existing United Arab Republic records. With regard to the 14,500 tons of corn sold, the mission has instituted measures for repayment although no deposits have yet been received from the United Arab Republic.

Evaluation: Mission verification that the United Arab Republic records showed the total allocation and distribution of corn to the several governorates is not evidence that the corn actually was distributed to those for whom intended by the grant, since the governorates represented merely central distribution points. That would be true even had the wholesale distribution been verified, which had been done only to the extent of the 42,000 metric tons described in our report as having been traced to that point by the mission auditors.

As shown in our report, the mission auditors found that 24,000 metric tons of that 42,000 metric tons remained at the distribution centers still undistributed to consumers as late as October 1962, that only 12,000 metric tons had been distributed free, and that 6,000 metric tons were sold; the mission was also subsequently told by United Arab Republic that an additional 8,500 metric tons had been sold, or a total of 14,500 metric tons. The mission had not ascertained the disposition of the remaining 159,500 metric tons (186,000 metric tons less the 26,500 metric tons sold and distributed free) despite the clear evidence that over half of the known dispositions were improperly made by sale. It was not until July 1964, and then only as a result of our review, that the mission obtained information showing which provinces received the granted corn, and it did not even then know the final disposition.

The Agency's statement that its review of data we furnished disclosed a listing that had been checked with United Arab Republic records showing actual distribution to the 25 governorates, and that this was in addition to the above-mentioned 42,000 tons, improperly implies that this evidences actual distribution of the entire 186,000 metric tons. Such is not the case. We found no evidence that these quantities were actually delivered to needy individuals or even shipped to the distribution centers. In any event, determinations in respect to the title II program could not have been made from those particular records since both title I and title II transactions were merged in the single set of records with the commodities under both titles being treated as fungible goods. Nor, in our opinion, could review of such records without independent verification be considered as fulfilling the agency responsibility.

Department of State comments

The Department of State advised us that it concurred in the AID comments. The Department also stated that:

"Our willingness to consider a title II program had an important psychological effect. It coincided with a conscious effort to improve United States-United Arab Republic political relations. Because of the United Arab Republic leadership role in the Near East, its geo-political importance, the part it played in assuring peace and stability in the Near East, * * * a determination had been made at the highest levels of our Government to carry out an action program designed to build a broad and useful relationship. Because there was a mutuality of interest in orderly economic development, much of our interest was focused in this field. For a country with limited resources and no foreign exchange resources to fall back on, it was clear that an agricultural failure would have an adverse effect on the overall economy and could cause its burgeoning economic development program to falter. Thus it appeared desirable for humanitarian and political reasons to be associated with measures to alleviate the economic consequences of this agricultural short-fall on the masses of Egyptian farmers who had suffered."

Evaluation: Our study of title II, Public Law 480, discloses no specific authorization for the executive agencies to grant commodities to foreign countries under section 201 of the act in order to improve political relations with these countries. Section 201, under which the grant of corn was made, permits emergency assistance to be furnished to friendly people in meeting famine or other urgent or extraordinary relief requirements by the transfer of surplus agricultural commodities. While "famine or other urgent or extraordinary relief requirements" are not defined in the legislation or in the legislative history, we find nothing in title II which would authorize the donation of corn to the United Arab Republic for the reasons cited by the Department of State. However, section 2 of Public Law 480 states it to be the policy of the Congress "to make maximum efficient use of surplus agricultural commodities in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States." Presumably the grant of corn to the United Arab Republic for political reasons cited by the Department of State was made under the Department's responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs.

CONCLUSION

We believe that the underlying reasons for granting corn to the United Arab Republic without adequate verification of the need for the commodity are to be found in the policies of the Department of State. The Department advised us that the willingness to consider a title II program coincided with a conscious effort to improve relations with the United Arab Republic, the country's geopolitical importance, and the part it played in assuring peace and stability in the Near East.

We have found no specific authorization in title II, Public Law 480, or in the legislative history of the act, which permits the grant of corn to achieve foreign policy objectives. However, the act does contain a general statement of policy of the Congress to make maximum efficient use of surplus agricultural commodities in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States.

Under these conditions, we believe that there is a need to clarify, in existing legislation, the conditions under which the executive branch can donate surplus agricultural commodities to achieve foreign political objectives. Public Law 480, as presently written, makes no specific provision for such donations.

We also believe that there is a need to identify more specifically the agencies responsible for the decisions made relating to Public Law 480 programs. Under present arrangements, the Department of State carries out those functions relating to the Public Law 480 programs in advancing the foreign policy interests of the United States. However, there are no procedures involving title II grants requiring that the decisions of the Department in this area, which override other considerations, be explicitly stated and justified by the Department to the Congress. Further, the cost of title II programs which are motivated primarily by Department of State foreign policy considerations is shown in the Department of Agriculture's budget and defended before the Congress by the Department of Agriculture. We believe identification of agency responsibility in the decisionmaking process and presentation of program justification by the responsible agency would enable the Congress to better evaluate the purpose of the programs and to make better informed judgments relating to appropriations of funds necessary to carry out these purposes.

Matters for consideration by the Congress

The Congress may wish to consider enacting legislation which would require that commodities be donated under title II of Public Law 480 only upon a certification by the U.S. Chief of Mission that he has verified the need for such commodities or upon the determination by the Secretary of State that such food donations are in the interests of the United States.

The Congress may also wish to consider whether it would be more appropriate to require that the expense of providing surplus agricultural commodities to foreign governments to meet U.S. foreign policy objectives be met from appropriations made available to the Department of State or the Agency for International Development rather than from Department of Agriculture appropriations.

SCOPE OF EXAMINATION

Our examination of this grant of corn to the United Arab Republic consisted of a review of the justification of the grant and its subsequent administration. We reviewed in the United Arab Republic, correspondence, reports, and other pertinent material available to us at the AID mission, the U.S. Embassy, and the office of the agricultural attaché. We also discussed the grant with responsible officials of the AID mission and the Embassy and with the agricultural attaché.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Alaska for the statement which he has made in the Senate today concerning aid to the United Arab Republic. The distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] serves as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Government Operations Committee.

I commend to all Senators the report which has previously been made by his Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures in certain Middle East countries. There are 10 of those countries which were included in that report.

I have had an opportunity in recent days to read the report of the Comptroller General on misuse of foreign assistance in the United Arab Republic, the report of the Comptroller General which has been referred to by the Senator from Alaska, portions of which have been made part of the RECORD.

I commend to the attention of all Senators, particularly those who are serving as conferees on the foreign aid bill, those portions of the Comptroller General's report and the statement made today by the Senator from Alaska, which again is a significant contribution in this field.

I associate myself with his remarks and commend him for having made them.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. His amendment to the foreign aid bill, which was an improvement on the amendment which was in the Senate bill but is still in conference, is absolutely essential if we are to deserve the respect of foreign nations. It is disgraceful that we have ladled out funds of the American taxpayers to a dictator whose every move has been in opposition to the interests of the United States, who has denounced and insulted the American people, who has permitted the burning of the Kennedy Library, who shot down an unarmed American plane, and who has conducted a campaign of vilification and hostility to the United States.

Not that alone, but he has moved into Libya and urged its rulers to throw out Wheelus Air Force Base which we established there, and produces great economic benefits to that country. If the Harris amendment is dropped by the conferees it will be a shocking betrayal of what the Senate adopted by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the Senator for his comments on the amendment, which is, in truth, an extension of the broader concept already included in the Foreign Assistance Act which the Senator from Alaska authored and which, if followed, would take care of this problem without any additional laws or amendments. Inasmuch as the amendment was adopted to the Foreign Assistance Act by the Senate, I join with the Senator in the hope that the conferees will keep it in the bill.

Mr. GRUENING. If it is not kept in the bill, the conference report should be rejected.

ACTIVITIES OF THE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE IN 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of committee bills which became law or were otherwise acted on, together with a list of nominations considered by the committee during the 1st session of the 89th Congress:

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR BILLS CONSIDERED BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY DURING THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

GOLD RESERVE REQUIREMENTS

H.R. 3818 (S. 797), to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities. Senate hearings February 2, 3, 4, 9, and 10, 1965; House Report 14, February 3, 1965; Senate Report 65, February 10, 1965; passed Senate February 18, 1965; Public Law 89-3, March 3, 1965.

U.S. COINAGE

S. 2080, to provide for the coinage of the United States. Senate hearing June 9, 1965; Senate Report 317, June 11, 1965; passed Senate June 24, 1965; H.R. 8926 reported from House Banking and Currency Committee June 11, 1965, House Report 509; passed House July 14, 1965; Senate concurred in House amendment July 15, 1965; Public Law 89–81, July 23, 1965.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

S. 1648, to provide grants for public works and development facilities. Titles II and IV informally referred to the Banking and Currency Committee; hearings May 4, 5, 6, and 7, 1965, reported from Senate Public Works May 14, 1965, Senate Report 193; passed Senate June 1, 1965; House Report 539, June 22, 1965; passed House August 12, 1965; Senate concurred in House amendments August 16, 1965; Public Law 89–136, August 26, 1965.

BANK MERGERS

S. 1698, to amend the Bank Merger Act of 1960. Hearings May 19, 20, 21, and 27, 1965; Senate Report 299, June 8, 1965; passed Senate June 11, 1965; referred to House Banking and Currency Committee; reported in House October 19, 1965 (H. Rept. 1179).

HOUSING

H.R. 7984 (S. 1354), to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families. Senate hearings on S. 1354, March 29, 30, 31, April 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, 1965; H.R. 7984 reported May 6, 1965 (H. Rept. 365); S. 2213 reported June 28, 1965 (S. Rept. 378); H.R. 7984 passed House June 30, 1965; passed Senate July 15, 1965; conference report filed July 23, 1965 (H. Rept. 679); Senate agrees to conference report July 26, 1965; House agrees to conference report July 27, 1965; Public Law 89–117, August 10, 1965.

OTHER BILLS CONSIDERED BY THE COMMITTEE DURING THIS SESSION

S. 408, to authorize a study of methods to help provide assistance to victims of future flood disasters. Senate Report 11, January 27, 1965; passed Senate January 28, 1965; reported from House Banking and Currency Committee July 21, 1965 (H. Rept. 632); included as part of H.R. 11539; which passed the House October 18, 1965 and the Senate October 21, 1965.

S. 507, to authorize Veterans' Administration to extend aid on account of defects in properties purchased with financing assistance under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code, Senate Report 7, January 6, 1965; passed Senate January 27, 1965; referred to House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

S. 948, to amend section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949. Referred to Subcommittee on International Finance; hearings May 24 and 25, 1965 (see H.R. 7105 below).

S. 1308, to revise procedures for the destruction of unfit Federal Reserve notes. Hearing July 21, 1965; Senate Report 531, August 2, 1965; passed Senate August 3, 1965; referred to House Banking and Currency.

S. 1309, to authorize checks to be drawn in favor of banking organizations. Hearing July 21, 1965; Senate Report 532, August 2, 1965; passed Senate August 3, 1965; reported from House Government Operations Committee on August 2, 1965 (H. Rept. 703); passed House August 16, 1965; Public Law 89–145, August 28, 1965.

S. 1556, to authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to delegate certain functions. Hearing July 21, 1965; Senate Report No. 533, August 2, 1965; passed Senate August 3, 1965; referred to House Banking and Currency Committee.

S. 1557, to enable Federal Reserve banks to invest in certain obligations of foreign governments. Hearing July 21, 1965; Senate Report No. 534, August 2, 1965; passed Senate August 3, 1965; referred to House Banking and Currency Committee.

S. 1558, to amend the Federal Reserve Act relating to loans to executive officers by member banks of the Federal Reserve System. Hearing July 21, 1965; Senate Report No. 535, August 2, 1965; passed Senate August 3, 1965; referred to House Banking and Currency Committee.

S. 1559, to enable Federal Reserve banks to extend credit to member banks and others in accordance with current economic conditions. Hearing July 21, 1965; Senate Report No. 539, August 5, 1965; passed Senate August 6, 1965; referred to House Banking and Currency Committee.

H.R. 7169 (S. 1707), to increase SEC registration fees. House Report 1015, September 16, 1965; Senate hearing September 22, 1965; Senate Report 812, October 1, 1965; H.R. 7169 passed House October 5, 1965; S. 1707 passed Senate October 5, 1965; Senate agreed to H.R. 7169 on October 6, 1965, and S. 1707 was indefinitely posponed.

S. 1796, to amend the Small Business Act to provide additional assistance for disaster victims. Hearing April 27, 1965; Senate Report 177, May 6, 1965; passed Senate May 7, 1965; House Report 354, May 19, 1965; passed House June 21, 1965; Public Law 89–59, June 30, 1965.

S. 1896, to amend section 3 of the Export Control Act of 1949. Hearing June 16, 1949.

S. 2499, to authorize sale of participations in SBA loans. Hearings October 7 and 11, 1965; reported to the full committee, October 20, 1965.

S. 2542, to amend the Small Business Act, Senate Report 794, September 29, 1965; passed Senate October 1, 1965; reported October 21, 1965 (H. Rept. 1188), and passed by the House October 21, 1965.

H.R. 5306, to continue the authority of domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign governments at rates differing from those applicable to domestic depositors. House Report 336, May 11, 1965; passed House June 10, 1965; Senate Report 385, June 30, 1965; passed Senate July 7, 1965; Public Law 89–79, July 21, 1965.

H.R. 7105, to provide for continuation of authority for regulations of exports. House Report 434, May 29, 1965; passed House June 8, 1965; hearing June 16, 1965; Senate Report 363, June 23, 1965; passed Senate amended, June 30, 1965; House concurred in Senate amendment June 30, 1965; Public Law 89–63, June 30, 1965.

H.R. 7847, to amend the Small Business Act. House Report 353, May 19, 1965; passed House June 10, 1965; Hearing June 18, 1965; Senate Report 382, June 30, 1965; passed Senate July 7, 1965; Public Law 89–78, July 21, 1965.

Nominations referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, 89th Cong., 1st sess.

Date	Name and office	Hearing	Reported in Senate	Confirmed
Jan. 6, 1965	Arthur M. Okun, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.	Jan. 26, 1965	Jan. 26, 1965	Jan. 27, 1965
Feb. 8, 1965	Frank Gasparro, of Pennsylvania, to be engraver in the mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.	Feb. 10, 1965	Feb. 10, 1965	Feb. 11, 1965
Mar. 1, 1965	Michael Greenebaum, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1965, vice Joseph P. McMurray.	Mar. 15, 1965	Mar. 15, 1965	Mar. 16, 1965
Mar. 1, 1965	Michael Greenebaum, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1969.	Mar. 15, 1965	Mar. 15, 1965	Mar. 16, 1965
Apr. 1, 1965	Sherman J. Maisel, of California, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of 14 years from Feb. 1, 1958.	Apr. 15, 1965	Apr. 21, 1965	Apr. 22, 1965
May 3, 1965	Hugh F. Owens, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 5, 1970. (Reappointment.)	May 6, 1965	May 6, 1965	May 7, 1965
Aug. 26, 1965	Hobart Taylor, Jr., of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.	Sept. 2, 1965	Sept. 2, 1965	Sept. 7, 1965
Sept. 16, 1965	Tom Lilley, of West Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.	Sept. 23, 1965	Oct. 15, 1965	Oct. 18, 1965

THE OIL IMPORT CONTROL PROGRAM AND THE PETROCHEMICAL INDUSTRY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in recent months I have received a good deal of comment on various decisions which are pending regarding the relationship of the petrochemical industry and the oil import control program managed by the Department of the Interior.

From Michigan, a group concerned with the future of the Dow Chemical petrochemical plant at Bay City has had pending proposals for the establishment of a free trade zone at Bay City to permit the increased importation of feedstock for this plant which is so important to the economy of the area.

Others have discussed with me the overall problem of providing special allotments within the framework of the oil import control program for the petrochemical industry.

And finally, I have had an opportunity to review in some detail the pending proposal for the special petrochemical complex to be built in Puerto Rico. There has been comment that this latter proposal represents special treatment for one firm to the detriment of other parts of the U.S. petrochemical industry. I have had prepared for me various materials outlining the background of some of these problems. I take note of the fact that next week the Department of the Interior has set hearings on the long-term relationship of the U.S. petrochemical industry to the mandatory oil import control program. It is my belief that these hearings will result in a clearer and more acceptable policy for the petrochemical industry within the framework of a sound oil import policy.

With regard to the Bay City trade zone proposal, I have been basically sympathetic to finding a good solution to their problem of obtaining an increased and competitive supply of raw materials.

The trade zone approach has some good justifications. But, hopefully, there can be evolved a broader solution within the framework of the oil import program and avoiding the trade zone approach except as a last resort.

In reviewing the material available to me on the Puerto Rico proposal for a very sizable investment in the industrial economy of that island, I have come to the conclusion that in balance there is much to be said in support of the proposal when one considers the ramifications for the economic growth and well-being of the island's economy. I asked my staff to review this situation and prepare a memorandum on the proposal. It seems to be a useful document for those concerned with this proposal.

Hopefully, the President will act favorably on this proposal, and, in addition, I believe that the Secretary of the Interior should move expeditiously, following the completion of the hearings next week, to develop a sound and reasonable policy that will assure the availability of adequate feedstocks to the U.S. petrochemical industry which is contributing so substantially today to the economic growth of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the memorandum on the Puerto Rican petrochemical proposal, the press release announcing the Department of the Interior's hearings on the relations of the petrochemical industry to the oil import program, and a memorandum supporting the proposal for a free trade zone at Bay City, Mich., together with an exchange of correspondence, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON PROPOSED PHILLIPS PETROLEUM PETROCHEMICAL COMPLEX FOR PUERTO RICO

To appreciate the significance of the proposed construction of the $600 million petrochemical complex in Puerto Rico, it is necessary to understand the many aspects of the situation.

Puerto Rico is a remarkable island that has made some remarkable progress. But poverty persists and unemployment remains high.

In 1960, median per capita income was $800, about one-third the average income on the mainland. At the present time, the income of a family in Puerto Rico averages only one-half that of a family in the poorest State of the Union.

Full-time unemployment runs at a rate of 11 percent. In the southern part of the island, where the complex is to be located, unemployment is running 13 percent.

If underemployment were taken into consideration, the situation would be even more troublesome. According to one account, if employment by those working less than 35 hours a week is allowed for, the combined rate of unemployment and underemployment would reach about 24 percent.

So far, the Office of Economic Opportunity has committed more than $8 million for the alleviation of poverty on the island.

Great progress has been made, however. The Puerto Rican is better off than many of his Latin neighbors and it is important to our international status that he remain that way inasmuch as this island's development is under the auspices of the United States.

A new factor being added to this picture is the proposed construction of a $45 million Phillips refinery near Las Mareas that is to be the core facility of an eventual $600 million complex of petrochemical plants and consumer goods factories.

If construction of the refinery begins according to plan—in a matter of weeks—it will be completed in about 20 months. By the time it goes into operation, related petrochemical plants will be under construction. Later, the consumer goods plants will be built. The entire complex will be functioning in about 6 years.

It will go far toward meeting the needs of the Puerto Rican economy. The core factory will use naphtha for the production of chemical raw materials. These materials will, in turn, be used by so-called satellite plants formed around the initial chemical facility. In turn, those plants will produce such intermediate chemicals as ammonia, styrene, ethylene, rubber, and polyester, along with related products. At some future date, other factories will be built which will use these intermediate chemicals in the production of various consumer goods.

It has been estimated that when the complex is completed, it will provide direct employment for about 33,000 persons. Experts from the Commonwealth's Economic Development Administration note that approximately two indirect employment opportunities will be provided for each direct job that is created. The total employment potential for the project would thus amount to approximately 100,000 jobs.

While the undertaking would mean much in the way of employment, it would also permit private business investment by citizens of the Commonwealth. For example, the consumer goods factories that are to be built will be owned by Puerto Ricans. As well, Phillips is required to offer equity participation to Puerto Rican investors in the initial core facility and also in any satellite plants which it constructs. By encouraging private investments, the project is thoroughly consistent with the best principles of free enterprise. Involving participation of a large corporation, many small private investors, and the Commonwealth, the planned complex represents an experiment in private economic development that stands in marked contrast to the dictatorial regime in Cuba, located only miles away. To our friends in Central and South America, this project should be a good example of what can be done by private enterprise working in harmony with a government that is concerned with the dignity and welfare of each of its citizens.

Many critics of the project have overlooked the sizable advantages it will mean for Puerto Rico and have focused their attention on the effects it may have in the United States. It is not easy to see how this undertaking will have any undesirable effects on the mainland. Indeed, it may very well offer important benefits quite apart from the obvious gains to the residents of Puerto Rico who, after all, are citizens of the United States. When the refinery goes into operation, it will produce gasoline, most of which will probably be imported into the United States along the east coast. Some commentators have taken the position that this will be disastrous. The facts, however, do not indicate that there is any serious basis for alarm. For one thing, the refinery can generate an additional inflow of gasoline into the United States of only about 12,000 barrels a day when it begins to function 2 years distant. Not for approximately 6 years will it produce the 25,000 barrels of gasoline per day which have been suggested. It should be emphasized that in the market for gasoline consumption, this is hardly a drop. Each day Americans consume about 4 million barrels of gasoline. Not only is the amount insignificant, but it will be phased into the market gradually over a period of years because gasoline consumption increases by roughly 36 million barrels a year.

Certainly the company is not receiving a "gift" or "special treatment." In permitting Phillips to establish its facility the island's Economic Development Administration imposed a number of very stringent terms, so stringent that the few major oil companies which expressed an interest declined to pursue the matter. Actually very considerable risks are being assumed in view of the conditions upon which the Puerto Rican government and the Department of the Interior have insisted.

Phillips is obligated to invest at least $45 million in the initial core facility. The corporation has also agreed to invest in satellite plants all profits from the initial facility for a period of 10 years after it begins operations. These satellite plants must be acceptable to the Puerto Rican Government, which contemplates insisting that they offer a large proportion of jobs relative to capital investment. Although Phillips is limited to an equity participation of 25 percent in the satellite plants, it must, if others have not invested at least $10 million in these satellite plants within 6 months of the effective date of its license to import into Puerto Rico, provide an amount that brings the investment to $10 million. Likewise, it must commit up to $30 million if that sum has not been invested in satellite plants within 21 months of the date of its license. Moreover, the company is obligated to invest an amount sufficient to bring the total investment in satellite plants up to $55 million within 10 years of the date the core chemical facility begins operations. In all, combining the initial investment of $45 million in the refinery and a possible addition of $55 million for satellite plants, this undertaking in Puerto Rico involves a prospective investment of as much as $100 million. And even if investment exceeds that sum, the company cannot withdraw its profits for a period of 10 years.

These restrictions and commitments impose very great demands. The fact is that the company is willing to accept these stringent restrictions and to anticipate making an investment of as much as $100 million in the island. If there is a "gift" it is to the people of Puerto Rico—not the company. No doubt Phillips anticipates that it will inure to the advantage of its shareholders but the Interior Department and the Government of Puerto Rico have also fully protected the interests of the citizens of Puerto Rico and, inferentially, of the United States.

It should be emphasized that other oil companies were given an opportunity to make an investment of this type. The administrator of the Commonwealth's Economic Development Administration has said that actual discussions and negotiations for a petrochemical complex were initiated for the first time in mid-1961 with a company other than Phillips. Thereafter discussions were held with 12 petroleum or petrochemical companies, but Phillips alone ultimately agreed on conditions that the Commonwealth felt were important to the fulfillment of its development plan. Rival oil companies were aware of what was going on. When Phillips acceded to the demands imposed by Puerto Rico and sought an import oil quota sufficient to permit it to operate the new refinery, the Interior Department, following appropriate notice, held a hearing on July 31, 1964, in which other companies were allowed to participate and file objections. Although at that time other companies might have come forward and offered to make an investment similar to that agreed to by Phillips, none did so. On February 11, 1965, Secretary Udall made known his intention to approve a petrochemical complex for Puerto Rico and announced that negotiations would begin with Phillips. Even then, the other major oil companies gave no sign that they might be willing to make an equivalent investment in the Commonwealth. Finally, as the Secretary of the Interior was about to grant official approval of the Phillips plant—literally at the very last minute—the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey submitted a proposal, phrased only in the most general terms.

While Phillips is not entitled to any special or exclusive treatment, in this instance, it has apparently been the only firm willing to make the investment required on terms that the Commonwealth feels are essential to its overall economic development. If the planned Phillips investment in the petrochemical complex in Puerto Rico is delayed, the company might simply decide to build the facility outside of the United States, probably in Europe. American citizens would then be denied the substantial employment and business opportunities that would be their's if this investment were made in Puerto Rico. Moreover, if the refinery was built abroad, it could well necessitate some outflow of private capital from the United States. While our balance-of-payments position has improved considerably since the beginning of the year—with a surplus recorded in the second quarter—the situation is still serious, as Treasury Secretary Fowler has warned, and certainly it would be better on this count if such a large investment were made in Puerto Rico rather than in a foreign country.

This undertaking offers substantial benefits to the people of Puerto Rico and promises to work no significant harm—in fact, it could provide direct benefits—to the people of the United States. All factors considered, approval of the recommendation of Secretary Udall would appear to be consistent with the best interests of this country.

PETROCHEMICAL HEARINGS ANNOUNCED

The Department of the Interior announced today that public hearings will be held October 28, 1965, to give interested persons an opportunity to express their views regarding the long-term relationship of the U.S. petrochemical industry to the mandatory oil import control program.

The Department will be assisted in conducting the hearings by a representative of the Department of Commerce. Hearings will be in the Department of the Interior Auditorium, 18th and C Streets NW., Washington, D.C., beginning at 10 a.m.

Hearings have been scheduled to obtain information concerning probable trends in supply, demand, and investment affecting the domestic petrochemical industry. Of particular interest are data regarding probable trends in imports and exports of petrochemicals and the implications of trade and investment trends for the U.S. balance of payments.

Hearings will provide material for consideration by an Interior-Commerce study group established to develop information to determine the need for actions in the context of the oil import control program to maintain the contribution to the United States balance of payments made by the petrochemical industry. The working group, established under an agreement between Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall and Commerce Secretary John T. Connor, is expected to file its report before the end of this year.

Those who wish to testify at the hearings should notify the Administrator, Oil Import Administration, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., 20240, by October 14. Twenty copies of each written presentation will be required by the Department.

A press table will be provided for the hearing, and persons wishing to provide copies of their statements to the press should supply an additional 50 copies of each statement on the opening day of the hearing.

Official notice of the hearings is being published in the Federal Register.

SEPTEMBER 23, 1965.

MEMORANDUM OF DOW CHEMICAL, BAY CITY, MICH.—PETROCHEMICAL PLANT

1. Dow contacted the Oil Import Administration in the spring of 1964 and requested assistance in obtaining feedstock for their Bay City petrochemical plant. They advised us that Imperial Oil (Canada), their supplier, had told them of their termination of Canadian condensate supply as of a certain date. The OIA immediately contacted the Canadian Embassy in Washington and in less than 48 hours' time, Dow was advised that Imperial was not cutting off their supply of Canadian condensate.

2. We are advised that after the above problem, Dow started researching ways and means of obtaining foreign petrochemical plant feedstock sources from other than Canada. In July 1964, Dow advised OIA that they were planning on asking the Foreign Trade Zone Board for the establishment of a foreign trade zone in Bay City, Mich.

3. The Secretary of the Interior made several public statements during the early fall of 1964, to the effect that the establishment of foreign trade zones for using foreign feedstocks for petrochemical plants located in zones was a circumvention of the intent of the oil import program.

4. In December 1964, the Foreign Trade Zone Board held a hearing in New Orleans for the purpose of obtaining testimony concerning the establishment of a foreign trade zone by Union Carbide at Taft, La. Union Carbide was proposing to build a petrochemical plant in the zone and using imported naphtha. At the hearing there was much opposition for the establishing of the trade zone—this opposition came from independent producers organizations and many of the leading oil companies.

NOTE.—No decision as of this date had been rendered by the Trade Zone Board.

5. On February 19, 1965, the Bay County Board of Supervisors filed an application for the establishment of a foreign trade zone at Bay City, Mich. This zone would be used by Dow for their present petrochemical plant.

6. Hearings were held by the Foreign Trade Zone Board on June 8, 1965, at Bay City, Mich. There was considerable opposition to the zone's establishment by the same persons who had opposed the Union Carbide application in Louisiana.

NOTE.—No decision has yet been rendered by the Board.

7. Public hearings were held by the Secretary of the Interior in March 1965, for allowing interested persons to testify on all aspects of the oil import control program. One of the aspects that drew a large amount of opposition at this hearing was for the establishment of foreign trade zones for the purpose of evading the oil import program.

8. The Secretary of the Interior has made several public announcements that he was attempting to find ways and means of granting import quotas to petrochemical companies.

9. The Department of the Interior has announced the holding of public hearings on October 28, 1965, to give interested persons an opportunity to express their views regarding the long-term relationship of the U.S. petrochemical industry to the mandatory oil import control program.

10. Presently, Dow Chemical has an import quota of 1,403 barrels per day of crude oil. In addition, Dow is importing from Canada to Bay City approximately 10,000 barrels per day of condensate and crude which does not require the use of an import quota as this oil is exempt from controls.

THE DOW CHEMICAL CO.,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1965.

Mr. J. CORDELL MOORE,
Administrator, Oil Import Administration, U.S. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MOORE: As you requested we are pleased to submit the enclosed outline of this company's petrochemical operations at Bay City, Mich. We hope that it meets your needs and that it will enable you and the Interior Department to take a favorable view of the Bay County Foreign Trade Zone application which among other things, seeks the inclusion of this plant in a manufacturing subzone.

Let me add that we are delighted to hear of your considering an import quota for the petrochemical industry. We support this program because we feel it will enable a vital U.S. industry to meet the ever-increasing world competition on more nearly even terms.

We do not feel, however, that a quota will solve the unique problems we face in our Bay City plant, and we shall try to demonstrate why this is so. Those problems are so severe that unless we can lower our raw material costs we shall have no alternative to closing this plant. That would certainly be unfortunate not only for our company but also, we think, for the State of Michigan and the whole Nation.

Let me here add that we do support and endorse the oil import program. We think it essential to the preservation of a healthy domestic industry. We have a vital stake in that industry. We honestly, however, feel that the Bay County request is not inconsistent with that program.

Finally may I point out that the Presidential proclamation, as implemented by your regulations, provides for adjustment or revision in cases of hardship. This is such a case. We feel that the only solution is one which will permit us to meet our needs with imported materials. The trade zone concept appears to us to do that.

Very truly yours,

W. M. CAVISTON,
Attorney.

STATEMENT

The Dow Chemical Co.'s home office and its main production point is located at Midland, Mich., a community of 30,000 people located 150 miles north of Detroit and halfway up Michigan's Lower Peninsula. The Midland plant is one of this country's largest chemical complexes representing an investment of more than $500 million employing 6,500 production workers alone.

Long before the mid-1950's it was apparent that the future of this plant was in jeopardy by reason of the nonavailability of a local source of ethylene. Ethylene was unavailable because no crude or other suitable material could be obtained from which to produce it.

A solution presented itself, however, when the Canadian Inter-Provincial pipeline was constructed to carry crude from the Western Provinces to the Canadian refining center at Sarnia, Ontario, located 125 miles southeast of Midland.

In this regard it is worth pointing out that Michigan was then, and is now, a crude-deficit State. Currently, total production is only 42,000 barrels per day. Of that, the Dow Chemical Co. purchases 3,500 barrels—the entire quantity available to it in Michigan.

In addition the only substantial production now is in the Albion-Scipio area located in the southwestern part of the State. Even this is in decline. That production, furthermore, like most in Michigan, is controlled by integrated major oil companies who use it to supply their own needs. It does not go onto the open market.

All this becomes relevant only in that it establishes that the decision to purchase Canadian crude was made not because foreign oil was preferred or because it enjoyed a price advantage over domestic crude. The hard fact is that only this was available.

Accordingly when it was learned that the Canadian pipeline was going to bisect Michigan and pass through Bay City, immediate interest developed in the purchase of a quantity of the Canadian crude. Negotiations with Imperial Oil of Canada led to an agreement for their supplying the needed oil.

A small independent refinery, located at Bay City, became available for purchase at nearly the same time. This was the Bay Refining Co., established in 1937 and having a capacity of 15,000 bpd. This was significant because the crude, as crude, was not suited for direct charge to the then-proposed petrochemical plant.

As a result, the refinery was purchased in 1956 in the expectation that it would be used in the preliminary processing of the crude so as to extract the bottom of the barrel leaving the light ends for shipment to the petrochemical plant. These heavier cuts then would be further refined to produce gasoline and fuel oils for sale through service stations and distributors in Michigan. This was, and is today, the most economic use of that portion of the barrel.

Digressing for a moment, it is worth mentioning that Bay Refining markets about 50 million gallons of gasoline per year. This is marketed entirely within Michigan, most of it in the outstate (i.e., outside Detroit) area.

With the acquisition of the refinery the commitment to build the petrochemical plant was made. Construction started in 1957 with completion in 1959. The plant, as it stands today, cost $50 million. It employs directly about 350 people.

Much more than this, though, is its paramount importance to the Midland plant to which its entire production is shipped by way of a closed pipeline laid in a 100-foot right-of-way owned by Dow and covering the entire 20 miles between the two plants. Four products are thus shipped to Midland. They are, first and foremost, ethylene, plus butadiene, benzene, and propylene.

We shall discuss those products and their uses in detail later. It is important to remember, however, that they are chemical intermediates used entirely and completely in the production of chemicals for the domestic and foreign market. Not any of those items are blended into gasoline pools nor are any used as an energy source. In short, they do not compete with or displace any domestic petroleum or petroleum products or contribute to the oversupply of those materials in the domestic market.

It should also be pointed out here that there is no intent to include the refinery in the proposed subzone. It is physically separated by about 500 yards from the plant and the proposed zone. Since the Venezuelan naphtha will be ideally suited for direct charge to the petrochemical plant, there will be no need to have the refinery.

This is not, however, to suggest the refinery will immediately be sold. That may happen, or it may not. It is a decision which cannot be made now while the situation is so fluid.

On the one hand there is the inclination to dispose of it, since the Dow Chemical Co. is really not interested in long range or on a large scale, in the retail marketing of gasoline and fuel oil. It is to dispose of what is really a byproduct that the marketing organization exists now.

On the other hand, the existence of the refinery means having a small oil import quota so that, if desirable, it would be possible to remove from the zone certain materials which clearly require an import license. In mind, for example, is a stream of C–5 and C–7 plus hydrocarbons produced in very small quantities. If, however, the removal of these quantities, even with a license, presents a problem to the Oil Import Administration. The Dow Chemical Co. will guarantee that no quota-restricted material of any kind will move out of the proposed zone, with or without an import license. Any economic penalty imposed by using these cuts as process fuel inside the zone would be negligible.

This is perhaps a good time to point out the intention of the Dow Chemical Co. with regard to its Canadian imports if the zone is approved. Those imports will be halted—reduced to zero.

The present Canadian imports of 5,050 barrels per day of Canadian condensate and 5,080 barrels per day of Canadian crude will be replaced entirely by 7,000 barrels per day (plus or minus 10 percent) of Venezuelan naphtha. This will replace the present petrochemical run of about 8,500 barrels per day composed of the Canadian condensate, plus the light ends extracted in the refinery from the mixture of Canadian and Michigan crudes. It is for this reason that it will be possible to cut off the Canadian imports.

This means that thereafter the refinery will be operated exclusively on Michigan crude. This is possible because without the necessity of devoting the light end of the barrel to petrochemical use, production of gasoline and fuel oil can be maximized so as to meet present marketing commitments exclusively with the 3,500 barrels per day of Michigan crude now being purchased.

An additional incentive to continue the Michigan crude purchases is again the short supply. Once relinquished the crude is probably gone for the foreseeable future. In a situation such as this where change appears to be the only constant it would be foolhardy to conclude that this Michigan oil might never again be needed.

The result of this would be that if the zone is approved all the gasoline and fuel oils marketed in Michigan would thereafter be of domestic origin as opposed to the present situation wherein approximately half of Bay Refining's 50 million gallons annual volume originates from Canadian crude. This is a significant point since it appears to be in line with the oil import program which is, after all, the promotion of the use of domestic crude or, stated alternatively, the limited exclusion of foreign materials from the domestic market.

This is the background of the problem. It is given in this detail so as to clarify why the problem exists. Stated most succinctly, the feedstocks now in use are so expensive that the plant cannot compete with the Dow Chemical Co.'s other ethylene units in Texas or Louisiana. It is certainly not competitive with other producers, either here in the United States or abroad.

The logical question at this point would appear to be why the plant was built at Bay City. The answer is that in 1957, when the decision was made, the United States had 85 percent of the world's ethylene capacity. Foreign competition was nearly nonexistent. Prices were firm. Add to this the existence of the Midland plant worth hundreds of millions and the very severe need for ethylene there and the decision is understandable.

In 1965 the only unchanged condition is the existence of the Midland plant and its continued need for ethylene. Today the U.S. share of ethylene capacity is estimated to have been 61.5 percent[1] at the United States, foreign producers will have added about 2,035,000 metric tons per year to world capacity and will, by the end of 1967, have reduced the U.S. share to about 50 percent.

Another factor to remember is that 10 years ago, and even much more recently, U.S. producers enjoyed the advantages of relatively large scale production (vis-a-vis foreign producers), better technology and more efficient plants. That is no longer the case. When those former advantages are wiped out, as they have been, raw materials now assume the dominant role in the cost equation. When the foreign producers, therefore, has ready access to the best and lowest cost feedstocks, his advantage over the domestic industry is nearly insurmountable.

It is suggested then that these changes in the ethylene picture since the decision was made to build at Bay City in 1957 makes what was then a reasonable business judgment appear suspect.

Further the Venezuelan naphtha would not lower the cost of Bay City ethylene to the level enjoyed by gulf coast producers including Dow's plants in Louisiana and Texas. It would lower the costs to a very acceptable, profitable level. Additionally, it is not only cost which influences a decision such as this.

The problem is similar to a thirsty man stranded on the desert. He will pay more for a gallon of water than one standing on the bank of the Niagara River. This point is made only to show that the Venezuelan material will not give the Dow Chemical Co. any unfair advantage in the sense of lowering its costs to a point below other producers. Bay City ethylene will still be produced at a cost disadvantage, albeit a much reduced and tolerable one. The Dow Chemical Co. expects to pay, and will pay, a premium for ethylene at Bay City.

The point was made earlier that the Canadian material now used enjoyed no price advantage over domestic. Specifically on this point is in order. In 1964 the Michigan crude purchased cost $3.12 per barrel. The Canadian crude cost $3.22 per barrel. The Canadian condensate cost $3.21 per barrel. These are actual cost figures for the respective materials and include all factors such as transportation, duty, and rates of exchange.

The cost of the Venezuelan naphtha is substantially below this. The Dow Chemical Co. will, if it is considered important reveal the actual cost of the Venezuelan naphtha to the Oil Import Administrator in a separate communication. This is probably unnecessary since the Oil Import Administrator no doubt has this information.

Next a description of the operation is worthwhile. To start with, the Canadian crude, Canadian condensate, and Michigan crude are fractionated in the refinery to produce straight run gasoline, kerosene, and distillates down to a 650°+ (fahrenheit) end-point. These are fed to the ethylene plant. The balance of the barrel is fed to a TCC unit where it is processed following normal refinery practice. The refinery in this case operates as a purification and feed preparation unit for the ethylene plant.

Under the present method of operation the gasoline, kerosene, and distillates are moved to the ethylene plant (volume in 1964 was 8,200 barrels per calendar day). They are mixed with steam and subjected to high temperatures. They are thus cracked to produce fuel gas, hydrogen, ethylene, propylene, butadiene, benzene, ethane, propane, toluene, xylene, and heavier components.

These products from the furnaces are quenched with oil and then water. They are thereafter fed through a standard, low-temperature distillation train and separated into the following components in the amounts shown:

1. Ethylene: 440,000 pounds per calendar day.

---

[1] European Chemical News Supplement; June 19, 1964, Temple Press, Bowling Green Lane, London, E. C. 1.

2. Propylene: 200,000 pounds per calendar day.

3. Butadiene: 75,000 pounds per calendar day.

4. Butenes: 92,000 pounds per calendar day.

5. C_5 plus hydrocarbons: 700,000 pounds per calendar day.

The C_5 plus stream is further processed to produce approximately 600 bpd of C_6 concentrate which is exported to Imperial Oil at Sarnia. That C_5 plus stream also produces 1,000 bpd of unrefined gasoline which is then shipped across the street and blended into the gasoline pool of the refinery.

Under the proposed Foreign Trade Zone operation 7,200 bpd of Venezuelan naphtha would be fed directly to the ethylene crackers without ever having to go through the refinery. From this feedstock 440,000 pounds of ethylene would be produced. The byproduct mix would be as follows: (all figures being on a calendar day base)

1. 167,000 pounds of propylene.
2. 73,000 pounds of butadiene.
3. 62,000 pounds of butenes.
4. 526,000 pounds of C_5 plus hydrocarbons.

Of the C_5 plus hydrocarbons, 770 bpd of a C_6 concentrate would be exported to Imperial Oil at Sarnia. Approximately, 1,000 bpd of unrefined gasoline would be recracked in the ethylene furnaces instead of being blended into a gasoline pool and thus adding, to that small extent, to the oversupply of gasoline in the domestic market.

Here it should be mentioned that the above specific figures are actual ones carefully averaged over calendar 1964. In the general discussion at the beginning of this treatise the figures quoted were rounded-off averages. This is mentioned so as to reconcile any apparent discrepancies. For example, included in the refinery runs are about 1,000 bpd of locally purchased odds and ends (all of domestic origin) not mentioned specifically since they change so rapidly. The average cost of those materials in 1964 was $3.78 per barrel. In addition, the benzene shipped to Midland, as the Oil Import Administrator recognizes, is derived from the C_5 plus stream after that has been put through a Hydeal unit.

To continue, the products shipped to Midland are entirely consumed in the production of chemicals. The total value of the production at Midland in 1964 was $341 million. Of this total materials attributable to Bay City petrochemicals amounted to $151,690,000. Products exported from the United States and directly derived from the Bay City petrochemical plant amounted to a value of $18,200,000. The value added to these feedstocks by American capital and American labor at Bay City and Midland is certainly a significant positive factor in the balance-of-payments dilemma facing the Nation.

The products exported from the United States, and directly derived from the petrochemical production at Bay City include, among others, the following:

1. Phenol.
2. Polystyrene.
3. Ethel benzene.
4. Polyethylene.
5. Glycol ethers.
6. Styrene latices.
7. Propylene glycol.
8. Isopropyl amines.
9. Propylene oxide.
10. Aniline.
11. Monochlorbenzene.
12. Benzene concentrate.

Finally it should be firmly stated that proposed quota system will not solve the Bay City problem. The quotas are of course welcomed. The economics of the overall problem, however, simply will not allow Dow to use its entire quota at Bay City.

This would mean, if done, that Dow's competitors on the gulf coast, who would not have to make an uneconomic use of their quotas, would have a competitive edge as regards Dow's plants there. Further if the books were kept honestly it would be necessary to give a credit to the Texas and Louisiana plants since they generate the lion's share of the quota. It would not make sense to move the material to the northern tier of the United States when plants exist on the gulf coast with a need for it and which plants would face competitors favored with a naphtha quota. Accordingly, the Dow Chemical simply cannot and will not use a quota generated by its three plants to support one uneconomic location.

Accordingly, then, the decision about to be made directly and inevitably will determine whether the plant stays in operation or is closed. The latter alternative is a bleak one indeed—particularly for the people involved. The economic disruption that would be wrought in the Bay City area would be severe. Bay City is an area of chronic unemployment and is so recognized by the Department of Labor. It cannot afford to lose this plant.

The Dow Chemical Co., however, cannot continue the economic penalty of producing ethylene in a plant where the ethylene produced is three times the cost of gulf coast ethylene. This is not in exaggeration; it is a fact.

The problem can easily be solved. If the foreign trade zone is approved, one foreign material, Venezuelan naphtha will be substituted for another, Canadian crude and condensate.

What is now a doomed operation will immediately be restored to vigor. An important producing plant located not on the gulf coast but in a relatively secure interior point will have been saved.

INTERPROVINCIAL PIPE LINE CO.,
Toronto, Ontario, May 18, 1965.

Mr. J. E. CHARTERS,
Research and Development Department,
Dow Chemical Co.,
Midland, Mich.

DEAR MR. CHARTERS: The May 11 issue of Platt's Oilgram carried an article datelined Washington, D.C., May 10, which referred to the forthcoming hearing in Bay City by the Department of Commerce Foreign Trade Zones Board concerning Dow's application to set up a free trade zone at Bay City to process foreign naphthas and condensate for its petrochemical complex. Reference is made in the seventh paragraph of this article in a rather ambiguous way to Canadian supply and our pipeline capacity as follows:

"Although reasons for replacing Canadian oil aren't mentioned in application, sources said indications are that Canadian exports to Bay City may be cut off because of insufficient use of existing 30-inch pipeline."

In order to clarify the record, we wish to review the position of interprovincial and Lakehead pipelines with regard to deliveries of Canadian condensate from our 30-inch pipeline to your refinery at Bay City. For some time we have jointly discussed deliveries from our line at Bay City on a full stream basis which would allow delivery of a complete batch to your refinery without the limitation that a portion of each batch must be consigned to a delivery point downstream from Bay City, as is our current practice.

During the month of March, two 65,000-barrel batches of condensate were delivered at full-stream rate. This was on a trial basis and could only be accomplished during a period of offpeak capacity. Delivery of these two batches was accomplished entirely satisfactorily and it is our understanding that refinery personnel were also quite satisfied with the quality of condensate delivered under this arrangement. However, this was a trial only and existing facilities will not permit full stream deliveries on a continuing basis.

As you know, full-stream deliveries at Bay City on a continuing basis would require some modification in pipeline delivery facilities. Because of the hydraulic considerations involved in the shutting down and restarting of high-flow rates in the Bay City-Sarnia section of our 30-inch line which would be associated with full-stream Bay City deliveries, an outside engineering consultant was engaged to assist in evaluating these problems. These studies have been completed and a design developed for the required delivery and pipeline control facilities.

In short, we have already made full-stream delivery of several batches of Canadian condensate to Bay City and under the proper conditions we are prepared to consider installation of the facilities to allow full-stream deliveries on a continuing basis. From the standpoint of pipeline facilities, there should be no restrictive limitations to a long-term supply commitment from Canadian sources.

We trust the above clarifies the picture with regard to full-stream deliveries from our pipeline at Bay City. Should you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours very truly,

R. K. HEULE.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD E. KENNEDY, RESEARCH DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL UNION OF DISTRICT 50, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE EXAMINERS COMMITTEE, FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARD, JUNE 8, 1965

Mr. Chairman and members of the Examiners Committee, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, my name is Edward E. Kennedy. I am research director of the International Union of District 50, United Mine Workers of America. My office is located at our international headquarters—1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

I am appearing here today along with our international vice president, Mr. Angelo J. Cefalo, on behalf of the International Union of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, in support of the application for a foreign-trade zone submitted by the Bay County Board of Supervisors, Bay County, Mich.

In what has been referred to in the application as a primary market area to the proposed Bay County Foreign-Trade Zone, our international union has a total of more than 13,000 members, who are employed by some 70-odd companies and whose employment opportunities would, we believe, be favorably influenced by the establishment of the proposed foreign-trade zone.

In Bay City and the adjacent Midland area Dow Chemical operates a giant chemical complex and employs some 6,500 production and maintenance workers who are members of our union and for collective bargaining purposes represented by the International Union of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, on behalf of local union 12075 at Midland and local union 14055 here at Bay City.

The Dow Chemical Co. in accordance with the application would operate both of the proposed subzones under a lease arrangement with the Bay County Board of Supervisors. It is one of America's largest in the chemical industry. It represents an investment approaching one-half billion dollars, and in the area adjacent to Bay City a substantial portion, nearly one-quarter of its production, is dependent on feedstocks processed at their petrochemical plant located in Bay County, Mich.

Being a petrochemical unit its raw materials are petroleum and petroleum products and because this plant is in an oil-deficient area raw material costs put these operations at somewhat of a competitive disadvantage with locations in other sections of the United States and in world markets.

We have been in general agreement that certain restrictions on the import of oil into our market, for fuel and energy, was necessary in order to avoid the adverse economic effects of dislocation and unemployment here at home among the producers and employees engaged in the domestic production of fuel and energy. The establishment of the proposed free port or foreign trade zone would not disturb this arrangement or be affected by it.

It seems to us that the establishment of the proposed foreign trade zone would provide the opportunity for business to acquire feedstocks competitively. This would enable Dow Chemical Co. to expand its domestic operations in this area. Such expansion would undoubtedly result in increased capital outlays for plant and equipment; and, importantly, increased employment for people in this area. Such expansion of business and employment would necessarily result in increased tax revenues to our Government at all levels. To the extent there is an expansion in foreign sales there would be a corresponding improvement in our balance-of-payments deficit, which has been of troublesome concern to the United States for many years.

In our opinion it would be unfortunate if this application for a foreign trade zone were disapproved and Dow Chemical Co., or any other company in this area, would thus be encouraged, for economic reasons, to locate their expanding operations on foreign soil, in order to secure competitive opportunities for expansion, which the foreign trade zone is intended to provide for companies operating on U.S. soil.

When a domestic company locates a plant operation on foreign soil it requires the transfer abroad of substantial sums of money for investment in plants and equipment-money that was generated here in the United States. This capital would be used to employ workers who are not citizens of the United States. The costs of production, including wages and taxes, would be fed into and support the economy of a country other than our own. Our unemployment problem would be worsened and our balance of international payments deficit would be increased.

On the national level the number of workers expected to enter the civilian labor force, after subtracting those who will retire, is expected to average between 2,500,000 and 2,600,000 during the last half of the 1960's. Employment opportunities in the private sector for this large number of new entrants into our civilian labor force comes from capital expenditures for expansion—for new plants and equipment by U.S. business. These capital expenditures for all industries is now estimated to run well over $50 billion for the year 1965.

If we use the rule of thumb that it takes some $22,500 of such capital investment to provide a job for one worker, we would be providing jobs for some 2,225,000 workers from this source this year.

In this general area of Michigan the rate of nonagricultural unemployment is high, relative to the State as a whole, and to the rest of the United States.

A substantial portion of Michigan manufacturing is concentrated in the southeastern counties of Michigan and a corresponding portion of the population of the State is concentrated there also.

If steps can be taken here which will contribute toward the development of additional manufacturing in this area of Michigan it will automatically result in an increase in employment and improve the economy of this area of Michigan and in turn the State as a whole.

A free port or foreign trade zone may well serve the needs of commerce in overcoming many of the numerous obstacles to the handling and movement of goods between us and the nations of the free world.

Because of the many business functions that can be performed in a foreign trade zone, its usefulness and competitive opportunities would be available to nearly all manufacturers and businesses in the primary market area, and beyond, that have an interest in or are engaged in foreign trade.

It would seem that the weight of expansion in foreign trade, resulting from the competitive opportunities of this foreign trade zone, would be in favor of export sales. To the extent this is true, the best interests of the workers in this area, the community, the State, and the Nation would be served.

Referring again to my earlier statement that Dow Chemical Co. is among the larger employers in this area and, I believe, the largest in the chemical industry, and that it will operate both of the proposed subzones if the foreign trade zone is approved.

Our membership in this area are a part of this community and their future employment and employment opportunities coincide with the development and expansion of Dow Chemical Co. and other industries in this Michigan area. From information available to us, the foreign trade zone would provide Dow Chemical Co. with the opportunity to acquire its primary feedstocks competitively and that their tricounty operation can continue and expand in Michigan.

We have tested our position in this matter on the basis of the best interests, including employment opportunities, of the membership we represent that are employed by Dow Chemical Co. here at Bay City and at Midland. We believe that our position in this matter will serve the best interests of the membership we represent who are employed by the 70-odd companies in the primary market area referred to above.

We believe that the proposed foreign trade zone will help the economy in this section of Michigan as well as the State as a whole and contribute toward improving our foreign trade balance and contribute in an important way toward improving our overall balance-of-payments deficit.

It is for these essential reasons that the International Union of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, respectfully recommends that the application for a foreign trade zone and subzones, submitted by the Bay County Board of Supervisors, be approved.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, early in 1961, our excellent Republican colleague, Senator MILTON YOUNG of North Dakota, was the first Member of this body to denounce the extremist tactics and position engaged in by the John Birch Society and its self-appointed leader, Robert Welch. Senator YOUNG, a Republican, was soon joined by the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], a Democrat, and myself. All of us had experienced the strange and singular antics of this group in our own States. Over the years other colleagues in both parties have come to realize the dangers that extremists of both the right and the left do to the body politic. Indeed, these extremists undermine the very fabric of American society, not simply by the positions they take—absurd though they may be—but also by the tactics which they use. They do not welcome differences of opinion. They exclude all who disagree. They harass and intimidate all who oppose their narrow views.

I am proud to observe that our Republican leader, Senator DIRKSEN, has commented with reference to the John Birch Society that "They are not a part of the Republican Party, they never have been and they never will be." Senator DIRKSEN was one of the leading authors of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In the strange world of the John Birch Society, that act is Communist inspired.

House Republican Leader GERALD R. FORD has commented in a similar vein and, noting that the John Birch Society is a monolithic organization that takes orders from the top, he declared, "There is no place for it in the Republican Party."

Our colleague, Senator MORTON, chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, has called for the ouster of any John Birch Society influence in the Republican Party. He observed that the John Birch Society's idea of taking over a party is to bat the Republican incumbent. He added that the danger of the Birchers is that they demand complete ideological conformity. If they take over a precinct organization, persons who do not agree with them are out. Senator MORTON is absolutely correct in his conclusion that the John Birch Society is as dangerous as the Ku Klux Klan and the Communist Party and that Republicans should join in kicking the society right square in the tail.

Former Senator Barry Goldwater has written in the National Review for October 19, 1965, repeating his call that the present leadership of the John Birch Society withdraw. He notes that the leader of that organization, Mr. Welch, has made statements which "have generally been wrong, ill-advised and, at times, ill-tempered." While Senator Goldwater does not agree with those who say that the John Birch Society is about to take over the Republican Party, he states: "I do believe that the type of people generally who I know as members of the group, could add effective weight and work to the Republican Party if they cared to, but they should resign from the society, since Mr. Welch has declined to do so."

Senator Goldwater at a news conference in Hollywood, Calif., on October 14, 1965, as reported in the New York Times of the following day, stated that "he now believed that the 1964 Republican National Convention should have adopted a resolution denouncing political extremism."

Former Vice President Richard Nixon has recently reaffirmed his statements made during the 1962 gubernatorial campaign in California when he fought the John Birch Society throughout the campaign. He noted in a letter to the New York Herald Tribune on October 5, 1965, "that many observers believe that Birch opposition was one of the major factors causing my defeat."

Many able Republican leaders in my own State have unequivocally repudiated the antics of the John Birch Society. Former Gov. Goodwin Knight, an excellent chief executive of our State, has consistently denounced it, has stood up and fought it, and continues to be a clear voice for reason in our party and our State.

Former San Francisco Mayor George Christopher, an outstanding leader in his city and his State, said on October 4, 1965, that he did not want the support of members of the John Birch Society and that "I would not accept any financial support from them. If the decision on whether to win or lose an election depended upon embracing the Birch Society, I would rather lose." There, Mr. President, is an unequivocal, courageous statement of a fine, decent American.

Earlier, on September 30, 1965, Republican assembly leader Robert T. Monagan stated that the Republican Party should repudiate the John Birch Society. Monagan is one of the vigorous, highly capable, forward-looking Republican leaders in my State. He said that if he ran for statewide office he "would not accept a campaign contribution from a John Birch Society member." He noted that, in his judgment, the philosophy of Robert Welch and the John Birch Society "are part and parcel—the same. If anyone has read Welch's statements and agrees with them, he's a nut."

That is fairly strong language but not too strong, when one realizes that basic to the ideology of the John Birch Society, are Mr. Welch's conclusions that the last Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, was "a conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy" and that the great Republican Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, was a Communist since 1919. Such absurdities. How any semi-self-respecting human being with more than a fifth grade education can believe such nonsense and lend financial support and active participation to an organization whose leader advocates such positions is beyond comprehension.

Former U.S. Attorney Laughlin Waters, now an announced candidate for the Republican nomination for Governor of California, has denounced Robert Welch and criticized the secret nature of the John Birch Society. He has repudiated the support of anyone who subscribes to beliefs such as those Mr. Welch expresses on General Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles, as well as the many other equally ludicrous propositions currently being advocated by the society.

Mr. President, on October 12, 1965, my friend and able colleague, Congressman CHARLES GUBSER, who represents Santa Clara County, recently helped lead the Santa Clara County Republican Central Committee to an overwhelming repudiation of the John Birch Society. He noted that "the Republican Party is not dominated by the John Birch or any other group, and it is unfortunate that its true leaders are compelled by circumstances to repeatedly renounce them. In a sense the renouncements lend credibility to the charge which is unwarranted. It is time that we quit taking the bait. Let us put this issued to rest early. I hope you will join with Senators DIRKSEN and MORTON, Congressman FORD and me in repudiating the methods of the John Birch Society. Then let us start to attack."

The Santa Clara County Republican Central Committee agreed with Congressman GUBSER by a 17 to 2 vote. Congressman GUBSER aptly stated on that occasion that "Extremism, to me, is a point of view which admits no rebuttal, entertains no dissent, repudiates honest debate and differences of opinion, and tolerates no compromise."

Other of my fellow Republicans in Congress in California and throughout the Nation have joined in the growing chorus of reason against the radicals.

Mr. President, any group in America—left, right, or middle—is free to take any position they desire on matters of public policy, so long as they do not advocate overthrow of American Government by force or violence. Americans are free to disagree with any or all of such positions. But it is not just the extreme untenable dogma that most Republicans object to. What we object to is the organized, conspiratorial attempt to take over local units of the Republican Party and pervert them to the ends of this weird ideology.

Recently, the president of the Orange County Young Republicans engaged in some correspondence with me on a related matter. Under previous consent I insert this correspondence in the RECORD at this point:

OCTOBER 21, 1965.

MR. CLAY GATCHELL,
County Chairman, Orange County Young Republicans, Orange, Calif.

DEAR MR. GATCHELL: I have your resolution and letter of October 4. You desire information on neo-Fascist influences and the infiltration of the Republican Party. Mr. Gatchell, I do not know how long you have been a Young Republican but certainly if you have been one in our State since 1961, I would assume you have witnessed the steady takeover of the Young Republicans by an organized, conspiratorial, willful group of zealots of the right based not on issues or a rational discussion of the party philosophy, but rather on intimidation, threats, bullying, and other tactics of harassment which have long been engaged in by extremists of the left and the right whether they be Communists or Nazis. If you are not aware of this, I would suggest a day reviewing the newspaper columns of the Los Angeles Times during the last 5 years as they pertain to the Young Republicans would be an interesting educational endeavor.

An essential of fascism, nazism, communism, and, indeed, any totalitarian movement, is autocratic, centralized leadership and the systematic exclusion or purge of all who disagree with that leadership. This is exactly what has happened within various volunteer groups of the Republican Party in our State, especially in the Young Republicans.

I would be the first to recognize that good men can disagree with each other on the fundamental issues of our time. That is the American way. I am not opposed to individuals voicing their opinion even though I might think that some of their views are uninformed and extreme, such as wanting to kick the U.N. out of the United States and get the United States out of the U.N., wanting to repeal the income tax, wanting to impeach Chief Justice Earl Warren, opposing equal opportunity for all our citizens regardless of their race, color, or origin, calling the last Republican President "a conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy," and labeling Republican Secretary of State John Foster Dulles as a Communist since 1919. Mr. Welch, the John Birch Society, or the California Young Republicans have a right, as Americans, to support any or all of these positions. As an elected Republican Senator and citizen, I reserve the right to disagree with such absurdities which are completely contrary to what the Republican Party has stood for over the last century and what elected Republican officeholders have voted for in our times.

While such positions contain the elements of setting race against race and class against class—aspects of nazism—as well as plain stupidity, even that could be ignored were it not that such antics are directly related to the takeover of Republican organizations and the Republican Party when they are combined with individual intimidation, harassment, and bully-boy tactics. The Communist Party in this country by its extreme un-American antics and tactics attempted in like manner to take over various units of the Democratic Party in the 1930's and 1940's. Today, extremists of a different time are trying to do exactly that with the Republican Party. I am hopeful that Republicans will repudiate this threat as did the Democrats, and that you will join in that repudiation.

An example, or two, will suffice. Mrs. Bernice Wilson, for 25 years an active Republican, was president of the Oakland Republican Assembly in December 1963, when the Rightwing in her words "almost broke down the doors of the hotel dining room we had rented. Many of them weren't even residents of Oakland which is a requirement for membership in the assembly. I held them off for 5½ hours. It was like facing a howling mob. Then they moved to unseat me. I turned the gavel over to another officer who didn't fight them. In later weeks they moved on the same way, the same people, to take control of the Berkeley Republican Assembly and then the Eden Township Republican Assembly. Perhaps I should have been a stronger chairman. But I did hold them off for 5½ hours."

That is just one incident which has been well publicized. There are dozens of others as anyone who is familiar with the attempted statewide takeover of the Young Republicans and the Republican assembly knows. Of course, if one had been active in the 1964 Republican primary in California, as I was, one could have witnessed dozens of bomb threats and midnight phone calls each day in the closing week before the primary. Rockefller delegates were shoved and harassed and one even had his arm broken by such "bully boy" antics.

So much for individual harassment which I am sure is known to you if you but look around you.

No one objects to good reasonable people disagreeing on issues or over the means to reach a given end or even on the goals of the party itself. What I do object to, and I believe the results of the 1964 election show that the overwhelming majority of American people object to, is the tendency for exclusion and autocratic leadership which exists within some of the volunteer groups of the Republican Party. In some parts of the South Republicans who for 100 years welcomed Negroes to their ranks, while the Democratic Party systematically discriminated against them, now seek to make our party a "white man's party." In South Dakota and in New York City, extremists following the "rule or ruin" philosophy have entered candidates against Senator KARL MUNDT and Congressman JOHN LINDSAY.

I will grant you, Mr. Gatchell, that instead of fighting, many decent Republicans, to the advantage of the extremists, have either washed their hands of the whole affair or decided that the Republican Party no longer represents their beliefs and have joined the Democratic Party or have registered as independents. This, of course, is exactly what the zealous handful wants. But, I am hopeful that the vast majority of Republicans who oppose these antics will stay and fight.

Mr. Gatchell, unless Republicans are willing to welcome to their ranks men and women of good will from all walks of life, of all races, and of all religions and creeds, then they will not secure a majority to permit them to assume the responsibilities of government and they will not deserve to assume those responsibilities. I enclose some comments which I have made on the future of the party, as well as on the antics of the extremists of the left and of the right which I hope you will find of interest. I also enclose an exchange of correspondence with a Republican assembly unit in our State which, similar to other groups in the Republican Party in California, seems to spend more of its time attacking Republican officeholders, in this case Senator Dirksen, than in working to promote what the Republican Party has historically stood for. So I hope, Mr. Gatchell, that you will but look around you and I think the answers you seek in your letter to me will become self-evident.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas H. Kuchel, *U.S. Senator.*

Orange County
Young Republicans,
Orange, Calif., October 4, 1965.

Senator Thomas Kuchel,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: The Orange County Young Republicans will support your charge of neo-Fascist influences in the Republican Party as you can see by the enclosed copy of the resolution which was passed at our last meeting. Please send us the information you have on this Fascist influence.

Resolution passed by Orange County Young Republicans:

"Whereas, Senator Kuchel, on a number of occasions in the past, has made reference to Fascist influences in his party; and

"Whereas in Senator Kuchel's recent withdrawal speech he again mentioned neo-Fascist influences, and again failed to cite specific instances of such neo-Fascists having sucessfully penetrated the party; and

"Whereas such charges, unless proven, do great harm to the Republican Party, and play into the hands of the Democrat propagandists: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the Orange County Young Republicans share Senator Kuchel's concern, provided that he has information regarding neo-Fascist influences, and call upon Senator Kuchel to publicly disclose any information he has in his possession."

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter. We will appreciate hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Orange County Young Republicans,
Clay Gatchell, *County Chairman.*

July 27, 1965.

Miss Martha Weber,
Secretary, Garden Grove Republican Assembly, Post Office Box 644, Garden Grove, Calif.

Dear Miss Weber: I have your resolution of June 7, 1965, requesting the Republican senatorial caucus "to remove Senator Everett M. Dirksen from his position as Senate minority leader and replace him with a true Republican who will support the principles and platform of the 1964 Republican National Convention and restore the time-honored two-party system to our Nation."

You charge Senator Dirksen as supporting "Democrat-proposed legislation" and thus robbing the "rank-and-file Republican of the very principles upon which our party was founded."

Your charge and your resolution are sheer poppycock. I sometimes wonder about self-styled Republicans who put unnamed principles ahead of what is good for their country and accuse everybody who disagrees with their unnamed principles of being Socialists, Communists, and everything else. I think the members of the Garden Grove Republican Assembly prior to passing such an absurd resolution would do well to spend a little time in studying the history of the Republican Party of the last century from the time of Lincoln through Theodore Roosevelt and Dwight D. Eisenhower. Everett McKinley Dirksen personifies that history. It is a history dedicated to individual freedom, to equality of opportunity, to a vigorous Federal system and states responsibilities not merely states rights, to an economic climate in which the private sector of our economy can grow and prosper, and to unselfish patriotism in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

On the great issues of our time, all of which were endorsed by the 1960 Republican Platform, which I commend to your group for a very careful reading, Everett McKinley Dirksen, the Republican leader, Bourke B. Hickenlooper, the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, Leverett Saltonstall, the chairman of the Senate Republican Conference, and myself as assistant Republican leader, were united 100 percent with a majority of Republican Senators in our support for that platform and these issues. These issues included support for the United Nations, the establishment of the Arms Control Agency whose inception occurred during the last Republican administration, ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty, ratification of the Antarctic Treaty, extension of educational and cultural exchanges, approval of our foreign aid program, and endorsement of the Economic Cooperation Agreement (OECD) concluded by the Eisenhower administration.

I think it is time that some self-styled Republicans decided whether they are Republicans or not and I would suggest that if they do not agree with a majority of Republican Senators, the elected Republican leadership, and the platform, which reflected 8 years of a Republican administration, that they either ought to start studying the history of the Republican Party and what it stands for or find themselves another home.

I enclose some comments which I have made on the future of our party which I hope you will find of interest.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senator.

Garden Grove Republican Assembly,
Garden Grove, Calif.

Whereas Senator Everett M. Dirksen is the Republican leader in the U.S. Senate, and as such has the responsibility of leading the Republican Members of the Senate in opposition to the socialistic schemes put forth by the Democrat administration; and

Whereas Senator Dirksen has not led his colleagues in such opposition and has in fact supported and voted for every administration-proposed bill and urged his fellow Republican Senators to do likewise; and

Whereas Senator Dirksen's support for this Democrat-proposed legislation has robbed the rank-and-file Republican of the very principles upon which our party was founded: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Garden Grove Republican Assembly request the Republican senatorial caucus to remove Senator Everett M. Dirksen from his position as Senate minority leader and replace him with a true Republican who will support the principles and platform of the 1964 Republican National Convention and restore the time-honored two-party system to our Nation; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to both U.S. Senators from California, CRA State and county officers and to all local communication media.

Martha Weber, *Secretary.*

June 7, 1965.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. JOSEPH RAMSAY, III

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I commend the Order of Ahepa for their resolution of appreciation to Mrs. Joseph Ramsay, III, of Minneapolis and Mrs. Ramsay for her generosity in providing the care for these Greek children.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be included in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution of 43d Supreme Convention, Order of Ahepa, Athens, Greece, August 7–13, 1965

APPRECIATION TO MRS. JOSEPH RAMSAY, III

Whereas, Mrs. Joseph Gale Ramsay, III, of Minneapolis, Minn., has taken upon herself to bring to the United States 18 Greek children for open heart surgery at the University Hospital in Minneapolis; and

Whereas Mrs. Ramsay has provided all the necessary funds, such as transportation, medical, hospital care, and posttherapy care of both child and mother involved; and

Whereas Mrs. Ramsay has shown the motherly affection, plus an unusual interest in the welfare of the child and mother and continues her interest in the patient and mother after recovery: Be it, therefore,

Resolved, That Mrs. Ramsay's humanitarian deeds be recognized by this body of the Supreme Convention of the Order of Ahepa and a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Mrs. Ramsay with an appropriate letter of thanks from this convention.

DEMONSTRATIONS AGAINST U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, most thoughtful Americans have been shocked by the activities of peaceniks who have been burning their draft cards, expressing open contempt for our draft laws, and comporting themselves in a manner which indicates their inability to comprehend the meaning of democracy and its responsibilities.

Two viewpoints have been expressed recently on this subject that I commend to the attention of my colleagues. One was expressed by cartoonist Al Capp on the NBC Monitor show of October 16. Mr. Capp expressed in a few cogent words the sentiments of the majority of thinking Americans. The other view was expressed in an editorial which appeared in the Miami Herald of October 20, when writer Bert Collier drew some parallels with the draft riots of 1863.

Inasmuch as I think every American must bear the responsibilities of his Nation in order to receive its benefits, I commend these statements to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that the statement of Al Capp and the article by Bert Collier be inserted in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the NBC's "Monitor," Oct. 16, 1965]

Education

(By Al Capp)

"Education" is the magic word today. You can get bigger amounts of money faster by using that one word than the old-fashioned phrase, "Stick 'em up"—and it means the same thing.

A 20-year-old who's mastered the art of repairing automobile engines and who's of genuine use to his community—supporting himself and paying taxes—is considered expendable enough to send to a Vietnam rice paddy, but a 20-year-old who's taking a college course in Latvian literature is considered too valuable a national asset to be risked.

The noncollege kid, who has learned to do something his community needed to have done—such as repair a carburetor or build a house—is considered uneducated. It's his duty to risk his life to protect the kid who is at college learning something nobody has any interest in but himself and which his community can very well get along without. He's protected by our respect for any nonsense whatever labeled education and our ludicrous failure to understand who are the genuinely, usefully educated young people among us.

In the name of education, hundreds of thousands of young frauds, dilettantes, poseurs, and phonys are being excused from military service, the military service that is compulsory for hundreds of thousands of the sort of kids who are the true and irreplaceable greatness of this country.

This is Al Capp, speaking to you on NBC's "Monitor."

LINCOLN'S ANSWER STILL IS BEST—RETURN OF BURNING ISSUE: THE DRAFT

(By Bert Collier)

The President's dismay over the growing antidraft movement, part of the protest against the war in Vietnam, is shared by many Americans.

Senator Majority Leader MANSFIELD says its promoters show a sense of utter irresponsibility. Minority Leader DIRKSEN says it is enough to make any person loyal to his country weep.

The FBI has begun an investigation of possible Communist influence behind the campaign whose leaders now say it will be extended to include high school students.

It is deplorable but it has happened before. The Civil War draft was also the target of protest, and resulted in one of the bloodiest riots in the history of the country.

The New York riots of July 13–15, 1863, were, however, a vastly different matter from the public burning of draft cards today.

The draft of that day was full of loopholes that favored the rich and politically influential. Draftees could buy exemption for $300. They would hire substitutes to take their place. They could get their names dropped if they knew the right people.

Of 294,441 men whose names were drawn from the lottery wheel, only 88,170 survived the original elimination. Of these, 52,288 paid the Government $15,686,400 for exemptions. Another 26,002 hired stand-ins. Only 9,880 were left who "either lacked political pull or seemed to want to join the Army and fight," as Abe Lincoln recalled.

These inequities were partly responsible for the New York riots. But there was also a driving force that was never fully identified. Carl Sandburg, in his biography of Lincoln, says:

"The mobs were not driven in their work by blind wrath. Somebody had done some thinking, somebody had chosen a time when all the State guards the Governor could scrape together had gone to Gettysburg. The only organized force against the first riots was a police department of 1,500 members. With club and revolver they had fought night and day and their dead lay in scores, their wounded by the hundreds."

The riots began on the very day President Lincoln issued a proclamation of thanksgiving for successes in the war. "It has pleased Almighty God to harken to the supplication and prayers of an afflicted people," said the President, "and to vouchsafe to the Army and Navy victories on land and on the sea so signal and effective as to furnish reasonable ground for augmented confidence."

As if on that signal the mobs gathered in New York. Draftees and friends assembled in vacant lots, "with clubs, staves, cart rungs, pieces of iron, and moved as if by agreement to a lot near Central Park."

They attacked draft offices and police installations, killed and beat casual passersby. They burned and sacked the home of the mayor and postmaster. They burned ferry houses, drug and clothing stores, factories, saloons, churches, missions and orphanages. One gang drove police and armed guards from the State arsenal and seized weapons.

But, as usually happens, criminals and organized gangs moved in and took over. The draft riots turned to simple looting and senseless destruction.

President Lincoln prepared an appeal to the mobs, but withheld it when he realized it was too late to urge reason. Instead he scraped up what troops were available. The first contingents were forced to fire on rioters, killing and wounding scores. To frightened officials who demanded that Lincoln suspend the draft, the embattled President replied that the foundation of free government was at stake and must be preserved at all cost.

The riots were ended, although at the terrific cost in lives estimated between 400 and 2,000. The draft continued, the armies were filled out, and the Union was preserved.

Long after, Lincoln's reasoned appeal that was not issued came to light. It is still one of the best explanations of why a nation in peril has to find the manpower it needs for the security of all the people.

"There can be no army without men," said Mr. Lincoln. "Men can be had voluntarily or involuntarily. If you declare that men can still be had voluntarily in sufficient numbers, prove the assertion by yourselves volunteering in such numbers, and I shall gladly give up the draft.

"Or if not a sufficient number, but any one of you will volunteer, and will thereby do only what each one of at least 1 million of his manly brethren have already done. Their toil and blood have been given as much for you as for themselves. Shall it be lost rather than that you, too, will bear your part?"

It was written a hundred years ago but it could still apply to those who burn their draft cards before television cameras and publicly declare they will not fulfill their obligations as Americans even if their country is shamed by defeat.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE A. PARKER

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, George A. Parker, a lifelong Washington Republican worker and the only Negro member of the platform committee at last year's Republican Convention in San Francisco, died this past Wednesday of a cerebral hemorrhage. I knew and admired Mr. Parker, and he had my full support when he challenged the then Senator Goldwater in the platform committee, on which I also served, on the issue of civil rights.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a portion of a story concerning Mr. Parker which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOLDWATER CHALLENGER GEORGE A. PARKER DIES

George A. Parker, lifelong Washington Republican worker and founder of the old Robert H. Terrell Law School, died yesterday at Freedmen's Hospital after a cerebral hemorrhage. He was 79.

Mr. Parker achieved national prominence at the 1964 Republican National Convention in San Francisco when he openly challenged candidate Barry Goldwater about his stand on civil rights.

Mr. Parker, the only Negro member of the platform committee, asked Goldwater, "How, if elected, could you use the power and prestige of the office to enforce the civil rights bill?"

Goldwater said his honesty was being questioned and Mr. Parker replied, "I am not questioning your integrity. I am questioning your frankness."

After the convention, Mr. Parker, who also had been a delegate to the 1944 and 1948 Republican conventions, helped form a splinter movement away from Goldwater. He served as vice chairman of the District of Columbia Committee for Forward Looking Republicans. He was also a member of the Republican State Central Committee and a director of the Lincoln Republican Club of the District of Columbia.

Edward Burling, Jr., chairman of the Forward Looking Republicans, said last night: "He was always a leader. He was a man with vision and courage—a man of dignity and conviction—and with all, a lovable, gentle man. I was proud to call him friend. We all will mourn his passing, but we know Washington is a better place for his having lived here."

Mr. Parker's son, Barrington D. Parker, who was also his law partner, said his father had remained a Republican at a time when many Negroes had drifted away from the party.

His son said that Mr. Parker was proud of the mark that graduates of the Robert H. Terrell Law School had made in Washington life. The school was an evening training ground for Negro lawyers from 1931 to 1951.

Among graduates of the school are General Sessions Court Judge Austin L. Fickling, District of Columbia Commissioner John B. Duncan, and Recorder of Deeds Peter Ridley.

Mr. Parker was a graduate of the old M Street High School, now Dunbar. He received a bachelor of divinity and a bachelor's degree in law from Howard University. While in school he worked as a mail carrier for the old Georgetown Post Office. He opened his first law office on M Street in Georgetown near Key Bridge.

Mr. Parker practiced law until his death. He was for a time the assistant minister of the 19th Street Baptist Church.

Mr. Parker was a former national president of the Howard University Alumni Association, former national president of the Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, former president of the Washington Bar Association and former president of the Federation of Parent Teachers Associations of District of Columbia.

He is survived by his wife, Emma A., of the home address at 1504 Varnum Street NW.; two sons, Barrington D. of 4919 16th Street NW. and Sherman E. of Louisville, Ky.; a daughter, Mrs. George Thomas, 4604 Kane place NE., two brothers, William, of Kansas City, Kans., and John C., of 4616 Clay Street NE.; two grandsons and an aunt, Maggie Iverson of 1226 G Street NE.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MINORITY LEADER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, near the conclusion of each session of the Congress it is customary for each party floor leader to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his observations and comments on the activities of the Congress for the past year, and I ask unanimous consent that this be placed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks and the customary number of copies be printed as a Senate document according to the rules.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

THE REPUBLICAN REPORT OF U.S. SENATOR EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, OF ILLINOIS, MINORITY LEADER FOR THE 1ST SESSION, 89TH CONGRESS

INTRODUCTION

When this report reaches print, the 1st session of the 89th Congress will have adjourned, one session in the continuous, unending procession of Congresses since the beginning of the Republic.

Through six wars and six major depressions, through strife and violence, through marches and demonstrations, the Congress has continued to function without interruption. This fact in itself is testimony to the viability and vitality of the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

It was no accident that the very first article of the Constitution should be devoted to the creation of the legislative branch of Government. It was clothed with exclusive legislative powers and with exclusive power over the public purse.

President Monroe put it well when he said, "The whole system of the National Government may be said to rest essentially on the powers granted to this branch. They mark the limit within which, with few exceptions, all branches must move in the discharge of their respective functions."

And so the 1st session of the 89th Congress comes to an end. Doubtless it will be hailed in some quarters as a spectacular Congress, a do something Congress, an adventurous Congress because of the vast volume of grist which has gone through the legislative mill. The claim is not without substance. In fact it has been a breathless session because of the unending parade of Executive messages to accompany bills which were regarded as a part of the administration program. Both the messages and the bills dealt with an endless variety of subjects.

During this session, we have considered medicare and social security, excise taxes and the public debt, culture and agriculture, primary education and higher education, foreign aid and immigration, treaties and nominations, Appalachia and the war on poverty, the humanities and the performing arts, peace and the Peace Corps, defense and armament control, rapid transit and water resources, air pollution and stream pollution, reapportionment and right-to-work, desalinization and tariff reform, housing and health, coffee and crime, veterans and Vietnam, aeronautics and orbits, voting rights, home rule, and home economics. The list is endless.

The number of bills and resolutions introduced will exceed 15,000 because the business of introducing new legislative and policy proposals goes right on to the very day of adjournment.

When the legislative bonepickers finish their work, they will probably report that the verbal output on the floor of the House and Senate may reach or exceed 30,000 pages, exclusive of thousands of pages in the appendix which has now become a repository for contemporary poetry, newspaper articles and editorials, eulogies to departed citizens and winning essays in school contests, speeches and scientific treatises, earthquake and tornado reports, and replies to questionnaires addressed to the folks back home. But these are froth compared to the work of the Congress and its committees.

Considering the volume of highly important measures with which the Congress did deal, the astronomical authorizations for the expenditure of public funds, the commitments for the future, the actual appropriation of public funds, the long and short range question of policies to be approved or disapproved, there has been scant time to think it all through, to properly evaluate these measures, to find and disclose the weaknesses, to measure their impact upon the Nation now, and in fact their impact upon the course which this Republic will follow in the years ahead.

Republican Senators introduced original legislation involving all fields of endeavor but only in rare instances did such legislation receive attention from the 2-to-1 Democrat majority in the Senate. In the committees and on the floor of the Senate, Republican Members were diligent in their efforts to gather the facts on every piece of legislation, to propose amendments, to eliminate unsound or undesirable provisions, and to improve the workability of the measures proposed. I commend them for their devotion to their public duties and responsibilities.

It is an unhappy fact that some commentators on the work of the Congress will analyze it in terms of who got what. In fact, this approach is rather traditional.

What did labor get?

What did farmers get?

What did business and industry get?

What did the veterans get?

What did the armed services get?

What did research get?

What did schools and colleges get?

Too little emphasis will be placed upon what the country as a whole did or did not get. The imperishable statement of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy is all too often forgotten: "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask rather what you can do for your country."

But the book of the first session of the 89th Congress is closed. The record has been written.

But there are questions which linger. They do not go away.

What will be the real result of the many programs with fancy names and high emotional appeal? For example:

The Appalachian program, to cost more than a billion dollars over a 6-year period, 80 percent of which is to be spent on highways with inadequate data on how resources shall be developed to produce durable jobs, seems to present a tenuous hope rather than a truly practical program, and has in it a vast potential for waste.

The antipoverty program, authorized at a cost of about $5.4 billion over a 3-year period, is already under fire from all sides because of excessively high salaries, because of the intrusion of politics, because of the dubious character of the projects being explored, because of the incompetence and inexperience of persons who are entrusted with the exploitation of the many projects. The program may yet earn first prize as one of the most fantastic and costly boondoggles in all history.

Inclusion of rent subsidies in the $7.4 billion program authorized for housing and urban renewal is rather incredible.

This one session of Congress will have appropriated at least $118 billion—an all-time new high for peacetime.

The millions of frugal, thrifty, taxpaying homeowners of the Nation have not yet had a chance to pass judgment on this Government housing undertaking, but when they do, there may be a furious reaction.

Quite aside from the $100 billion administration budget which was submitted to this session of Congress and the fancy legerdemain to keep it at or under that mark, this Congress will have authorized at least $150 billion for expenditure over the next few years. This does not include a number of items on which final action has not been completed. Nor is this the whole story in the fiscal field.

For services already rendered, such as the civil service retirement fund to which the Federal Government owes $40 billion as its matching share and for other commitments such as money borrowed and reflected in the public debt, the Government obligation totals about $739 billion; for other commitments made, the total is $208 billion.

The gross total of obligations runs to $947 billion.

This is a bitter legacy for those who come after us.

Nor is this unrelated to the vexing and highly disturbing question of inflation. The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates on the basis of its Consumer Price Index alone:

What $10 would buy in 1957–59 takes $11.20 today.

What $10 would buy in 1950 takes $13.15 today.

What $10 would buy in 1940 takes $22.58 today.

Compared with 1940, the value of the dollar today is 44 cents.

This continuing decline in the buying value of the dollar, coupled with the sharp increase in social security and medicare taxes as they come into full effect, will wipe out every vestige of tax reduction over which there was such high exaltation and glee.

So I conclude this brief appraisal of the 1st session of the 89th Congress with the observation that in due course it will not be the spectacular volume of legislative grist that will count but rather its impact on the economy.

The true test will come when tax reduction, gargantuan spending, tax equalization, social security and medicare taxes, a vast variety of subsidies, defense requirements, vast research outlays, foreign aid, highway beautification, moon shots, farm surpluses, United Nations sorties, sugar quotas and subsidies far above world sugar prices, a soaring public debt, a dwindling gold supply, the poverty war, and other items are mixed in one big pot called the national economy.

Then and only then shall we know the real result of our labors.

This report would not be complete without bestowing a compliment upon the distinguished Senator from Montana, and majority leader of the Senate, MIKE MANSFIELD. At all times he has been fair, tolerant, and considerate. He has endeavored to take into consideration the commitments of all Senators whenever they had to be absent from the Senate. He has been mindful of the officework, the extracurricular chores, and other matters with which Senators must deal every day. He has been generous in allowing ample time for debate on every measure which has been presented to the Senate, and I take this means in behalf of the minority of expressing our appreciation for his kindness and consideration.

As is customary near the end of every session, the duty of the Republican leader in the Senate is to provide an outline of the more important events in the past 10 months. The observations, for the most part, concern the Senate. Therefore, the report is divided as follows:

First. A succinct listing of some pertinent facts entitled "The American Scene and the 1st Session, 89th Congress."

Second. "Examples of a Few of the Many Republican Legislative Activities in the First Session."

Third. Observations on the "Reapportionment of State Legislatures."

In connection with this report, a factual digest of the most important laws which resulted from congressional action at this session is being printed as a separate Senate document.

I. THE AMERICAN SCENE AND THE 1ST SESSION, 89TH CONGRESS

The Great Society is here—and so is the highest cost of living in history.

And the defoliated dollar.

A political poverty program is here—and so are new scandals and new political employees being paid fat salaries.

A new 30-year record of home mortgage foreclosures is here—and so is an estimate by USDA that consumers will be forced to spend $4 billion more for food this year.

A new 4-year record in the number of man-days of work lost because of increased strikes in the Nation is here—and a new 4-year record in the number of business failures is near.

A new record number of persons employed in the Nation is here—and so is a new record of one out of every six being on some kind of Government payroll.

New civil and voting rights, guaranteed by Congress, are here—and, in contrast, the Great Society has refined and perfected postal snooping, wiretapping by internal revenue agents, and Government news management.

The biggest public debt in our history is here—and for economy the White House turns off its lights but pipes in music.

Higher personal incomes are here—and so is a record high private debt, which, with the public debt, exceeds $1 trillion.

The politics of beautification and art are here—and so is a soaring national crime rate up 15 percent in 1 year.

A new social security-medicare law is here—and so are the rapid losses in the buying power of the aged. The inflationary increases voted at this session placed pensioners in a worse position than even a year ago.

An increase in farm debt from $26.2 to $38.3 billion in 4 years is here—and yet the administration wants to slash the Soil Conservation Service which for 30 years has provided technical assistance to local soil conservation districts.

The scandal, over the firing by the Democrat administration of State Department Security Officer Otto Otepka for testifying before a Senate committee about lax security in the Department, is still here—and so is:

The Bobby Baker scandal.

The poverty job-dispensing scandal.

The foreign aid wheat disappearance scandal.

The proposed closings of needed VA hospitals.

The wholesale granting of bank charters.

The coverup in the brazen theft of mint coins.

The case of the two brothers: one, valedictorian of his high school class, in Vietnam under enemy fire at $78 a month; his brother, a school dropout who assaulted his teacher, working in the poverty program's Youth Corps for $200 a month running a power mower on a golf course.

Actions abroad

The day is here when the United States exiles one of the strongest anti-Communists from the Dominican Republic—and brings back that country's former President who thereupon threatens to drive out American forces and exact a tribute of a billion dollars.

The day is here when the United States capitulates to Russia and other nations on their failure to pay U.N. peacekeeping dues—and the administration still wants approval of a treaty to reopen Soviet consulates in the Nation despite an FBI warning such consulates furnish Communists their best spying bases.

And there has been failure in getting our allies to stop trading with North Vietnam and Cuba.

The American flag still proudly flies over our servicemen in Vietnam—and the haunting shortage of military supplies now is so deplorable and dangerous in some instances to our security it has been classified top secret.

And while our flag still flies on our ships in the seven seas and at many stations around the world—it is torn down, trampled, burned, spat upon in a dozen countries; our embassies and consulates attacked, stoned, bombed in half the nations on the globe. In many areas of the world it appears that respect for the United States has vanished. All this does not comport with the restoration of prestige that was promised us in eloquent terms.

The basic complaint with U.S. foreign policy is "no one knows what our intentions are." The U.S. buildup in Vietnam, for example, has only slowly been revealed to the general public. It was the Secretary of State himself who said in an address to George Washington University students only last June: "The fundamental interests of the United States in some situations are not crystal clear and may even be in conflict with one another."

Cost of living goes up, up, up

Meat, fish, and poultry cost exactly 10.7 percent more on the average today than 1 year ago. This is an average. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported on October 1 its latest survey also showed:

Bacon has jumped 42 percent in price in Detroit. This increase is almost the same for the country as a whole. Bacon that cost you, on the average, 67.2 cents a pound for a particular grade last year now costs you 93.2 cents.

Hot dogs. The average increase across the Nation is 7 cents a pound.

Potatoes in St. Louis have jumped 24 percent in cost.

From coast to coast: pork sausage in Boston today is 35 percent over a year ago, and Chicago's average price of a pork roast cost 19 percent more; in Philadelphia, onions are up 22 percent; whole ham in Baltimore will cost you at least 21 percent more today while the popular shoulder picnic hams in Pittsburgh have gone even higher, 26 percent; rib roast in Washington, D.C., costs 16 percent more; pork chops in San Francisco now cost 16 percent more than last year.

The President's own Council of Economic Advisers reported only last June the prices of certain tires were going up, the cost of stainless steel products had increased, the cost of paper containers had gone up, and the prices of copper and aluminum had gone up.

In New York City, near the scene of the incredible multi-million-dollar salad oil scandal of the administration, this same salad and cooking oil costs 16 percent more today than a year ago.

Call it galloping inflation, limping inflation, leisurely inflation, ambling inflation, or accelerated inflation, it is still inflation.

It takes $153.68 today to match the buying power of $110 in 1952. It takes fully $22.58 today to buy what only $10 would buy in 1940. The facts set forth here give this warning: The American people had better look at the speedometer.

Nearly every housewife in the Nation pays more today for cereals, bakery goods, dairy products, clothing, women's wear, fuel oil, and footwear.

If this cost of living increases the average American consumer-taxpayer could be the first of America's natural resources to be exhausted.

What's ahead?

Three big shoe companies have just announced price increases of 4 and 5 percent. Loading charges at many port cities are going up 5 to 12 percent. The cost of glass is going up. The cost of floor tile is going up. Automobile insurance is going up. Service charges are going up. Labor costs are going up. Farm production costs continue to go up.

A multitude of economic theories are advanced as reasons for the higher cost of living. The Great Society talks of stability. But no American housewife thinks of theories or see stability when she goes to the grocery store to buy bacon and potatoes. She sees the cashier clicking off the higher prices and walks out with one grocery bag for a $10 bill.

And, most of all, the cost of Government is going up, and up, and up. Only money gets cheaper.

And for whatever the excuse, the new dimes and quarters we will soon use contain no silver; they will just be alloys of cheap base metals.

Do foreigners want our dollars? By now nearly everyone knows they want our gold and they have been getting it. Our gold supply has been getting lower and lower until today it is the lowest since the late 1930's.

Hardly had the new session opened before legislation was passed to eliminate the Federal Reserve Board's required gold reserves of 25 percent to back deposits. Then, silver was removed as backing for our dollar bills.

We have seen the last of any Federal budget of less than $100 billion. We have a Federal payroll which increased more than 50,000 in the past year. The total is 2,542,590 and going up. This payroll is $17 billion per year, costliest in all U.S. history. Plenty of Federal checks are being written but there are no balances. Yet, a score of new Federal agencies have been created. And the interest on our national (public) debt cost the American people an estimated $22,000 per minute in this fiscal year. It will go even higher.

Taxes in a majority of the States are up—an average increase of more than a billion dollars a year in the past 18 years. Social security taxes go up in January. Any tax reduction an American thought he received already has been wiped out. Thus far in 1965 property taxes throughout the country have gone up 7.3 percent since last year; sales taxes are up 8.7 percent; corporate taxes up 7.5 percent; individual income taxes up 6.3 percent. Just in the past 10 months, 26 State Governors have asked for tax increases. This is not all: consumer, payroll, and service taxes are being imposed or asked at many local levels. Today the tax-gatherer at all levels takes 35 percent of the national income.

Some States find they must raise taxes in order to obtain money with which to match Federal funds in order to get in on some of the gravy projects handed out by the Great Society. What a way to live.

Don't blame the farmer. He's paying more for family living items and being hit with higher production costs.

Farmers in many areas of the country have been struck with a thickheaded administration program preventing the usual use of migrant labor during the harvest season. The poverty program couldn't enlist enough such workers. Crops rotted and again the housewife was clipped. Even a former Democrat Secretary of Agriculture, who now sits in the U.S. Senate, declared only last August 13 the Great Society's farm programs were "a bust."

Voting rights

Despite administration propaganda to the contrary, Abraham Lincoln was a Republican.

And despite repeated attempts to cast the Republican Party in the role of bogeyman, there would have been no voting rights bill passed without vigorous and unflagging Republican leadership in both the House and the Senate.

The Republican Party demonstrated its traditional and constant dedication to civil rights for all citizens by its near unanimous support for the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as well as the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Left to its own devices, without Republican prodding and support, it is doubtful that the Great Society could have produced anything constructive in the field of civil rights.

Unanimity in support of equality for all American citizens is not a characteristic of the Democratic Party.

Republicans will, as usual, continue their support for equal rights.

They will also demand that the newly enacted civil rights legislation, as well as that enacted during the Eisenhower administration, be more vigorously enforced than is now the case.

The poverty program

The real sugar bill of the Great Society during this session has been in the poverty program.

Most of the controversy within the Great Society itself has not been about the poor, but about who was going to control the loot. Poverty money from the Federal Government could well be a kitty which could sway elections more than money passed out directly by a political party.

The poverty program had theories sounding as wholesome as blueberry pie but right at the very start it ran afoul of hanky-panky events which are still continuing. Here are some of these events taken from press reports:

The so-called war on poverty began with such items as a $25,000 loan to a fruitcake maker.

Willow Village, a community in southeast Michigan, was notified of a grant of $188,252 to finance a program of self-help for 4,500 residents. The township supervisor said the poverty report was absolutely false. There was not a home more than 10 years old. The homes had an average value of $12,000. No one could be found unemployed. Residents said the poverty program was a fraud and a disgrace.

Gum Springs, Va., a small area near Washington, D.C., was notified of a $74,000 poverty grant—with all but $20,000 going for salaries.

The New Jersey poverty office chief was hired at $25,000 a year, a salary greater than any member of the Governor's cabinet. Two assistants were hired at $19,000 each.

The Newark, N.J., poverty office hired 26 staff members at salaries ranging from $10,000 to $23,000.

In Mobile, Ala., an officer of the League of Women Voters declared "we've got nothing but chaos" in the poverty program.

The poverty program began paying Job Corps volunteers more money than an Army or Navy recruit or draftee.

In Dallas, as well as in Los Angeles, young people hired for work after school were making more per hour than their parents who worked full time.

In New York, a poverty consultant was hired at $500 per week; two other consultants at $60 and $65 per day, and a program director at $22,500 a year.

A Department of Health, Education, and Welfare official said "somehow, the Office of Economic Opportunity seems to be able to pay better salaries than other agencies and is decimating existing welfare staffs."

In Washington, D.C., the poverty office organized itself with five top jobs paying from $27,000 to $30,000 a year and 40 various assistants at salaries from $18,935 to $24,500 a year.

In Kentucky, a poverty program coordinator said the whole poverty program "thing" was a mess.

Then, a $300,000 contract was awarded a university to teach the poor in a public housing area how to organize themselves as a political force.

The poverty office reported the cost per Job Corps enrollee for 9 months was "only" $4,650, or about twice the tuition cost at Harvard.

U.S. News & World Report stated April 26 all poverty projects had to be cleared through political channels and that there was suspicion that "vast amounts of money to be poured out to fight poverty will be used either to build new political machines in cities or to lubricate those now in operation."

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors ordered an inquiry to determine whether administrative salaries totaling $408,336 for the youth opportunities board were justified.

In St. Petersburg, Fla., the new women's Job Corps center turned out to be a former resort hotel. Dropout girls were enrolled and maintained at a cost of $700 per month per pupil; scandals were uncovered; some girls were arrested for drunkenness; the city council asked the school to move elsewhere.

In Washington, a special program was announced to hire 2,150 college graduates to study the culture of poverty.

In Chicago, it was announced by a poverty official that money would be used to develop rock-and-roll choral groups.

The poverty office paid $87,000 to a private research group which compiled a catalog showing 170 Federal programs, in addition to those set up by the poverty office, which already help the poor.

A poverty kindergarten program was started at a cost per child of more than the annual tuition for the most expensive university in the Washington, D.C., area.

The poverty office in Washington had, by October, become 34 times the size of the National Security Council, the Nation's supreme strategy planning board.

There were Job Corps camp riots in four different States. Some camp enrollees who were arrested for being drunk were bailed out of jail with poverty program money. At one camp, a gang was organized to extort and prey on the other enrollees. Shootings by Job Corps enrollees were reported from Texas to Montana.

If these examples didn't serve to warn the public what the poverty program was all about, then there was one about Project Head Start in Mississippi, for which almost $1.5 million had been allocated. There were these expenses: $100 in rent to use a bathroom in a church for 8 weeks; $10 to rent a garbage can; $100 to rent a sink; $120 to use a refrigerator; $110 for a stove; and $92 for use of a carpet—all for 8 weeks.

To top it all off, one of the project officials chartered a twin-engined airplane for a 200-mile flight to address a graduating class of Head Start pupils—all between ages 5 and 6.

II. EXAMPLES OF A FEW OF THE MANY REPUBLICAN LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES IN THE FIRST SESSION

Despite the overwhelming 2-to-1 Democrat majority, Republicans were able to add amendments to many major bills of the session, either in committee or in the Senate and House, in an attempt to improve legislation, protect the public, prevent inflation, and eliminate plainly bad, politically inspired programs. In case after case, however, the administration's seemingly one-party autocracy prevented action of any type on individual Republican programs, but in several instances original Republican programs were introduced by administration supporters.

Here are a few samples of Republican activity:

The new Federal aid to higher education law was sharpened and refined by more than 25 Republican amendments to the bill, completely revising whole sections of the measure to help students of poor families, stressing scholarship, and giving States more supervisory authority.

Republicans unanimously fought for and won, over Presidential objections, a military pay raise bill which became law.

Republicans sponsored and won Senate approval of a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to file with Congress each year a complete balance sheet for every activity of Government—something never required before.

Republicans won acceptance by the Senate of a clean elections provision in the voting rights bill.

Republicans supported 100 percent an amendment making eligible for social security benefits all persons 72 years of age or older who were not otherwise eligible because the system did not provide for their participation while they were employed—but the Great Society defeated it.

Republicans were successful in advancing a special wildlife conservation program to save from extinction rare and endangered species of American wildlife.

Republicans sponsored as early as the 84th Congress the first freedom of information bills requiring Federal agencies to make nonsecurity records available to the public—and the Senate passed and sent to the House such a bill near the end of the session.

Republicans fought the Great Society's major scuttling of Army Reserves—and were joined by some Democrats, but the Great Society administration ignored congressional objections.

Republicans were successful in the Senate in having an amendment adopted to the excise tax bill which would end snooping by the Internal Revenue Service in opening first-class mail diverted to IRS by a cooperative Post Office Department.

The Republican Eisenhower administration's proposal—for health professions educational assistance—was finally passed, as was another Republican proposal to encourage young doctors to practice in areas where urgently needed.

Republicans sponsored and won Senate approval of an amendment to the social security-medicare bill guaranteeing pensioned veterans would suffer no loss because of any increase in social security payments—a provision later eliminated from the bill by the Great Society.

Republicans supported and voted almost 100 percent for the Voting Rights Act in the Senate—in fact, the measure actually was drafted in detail in Capitol Hill Republican offices.

Republicans helped the now famed section 14(b)—or right-to-work provision—of the Taft-Hartley Act to remain law when not enough Senators voted to cut off debate late in the session; and as long as 14(b) survives, so do the 19 State right-to-work laws enacted under it.

Republicans originated the career civil service for the Customs Bureau which went into effect this year under a reorganization plan with congressional approval.

Republicans sponsored an amendment to the poverty program to apply Hatch Act provisions to the $1.8 billion program to help eliminate playing politics with poverty—but the Great Society rejected it.

Republicans alerted the Nation to reapportionment during the past session, and the battle is not over, for reapportionment actually means the United States is being put in a unique position as being virtually the only nation where desires of the people can or could be stifled by an appointed tribunal. Thus, there was a Senate resolution for amending the Constitution to preserve to the people of each State the power to determine the composition and reapportionment of the membership of State legislatures.

Republicans sponsored and won Senate approval of an amendment to the social security-medicare bill providing guarantees for high quality standards for nursing home services—but the Great Society later eliminated it.

In Foreign Relations:

Republicans sponsored an amendment to the foreign aid bill to require foreign aid to be withheld from those nations over 1 year in arrears in United Nations dues and assessments—but it was turned down by the Great Society.

Republicans sponsored and won accceptance of an amendment to cut off foreign aid to countries which interfere with U.S. fishermen on the high seas.

Republicans sponsored and won approval of cuts in the foreign aid bill saving millions of dollars.

Republicans forced adoption of an amendment to protect consumers against any unwarranted coffee price rise under the International Coffee Agreement.

Republicans successfully pushed through a proposal for free mail rights and other wartime benefits for our fighting men in Vietnam.

Republicans strongly supported the Commander in Chief's prosecution of the war against communism in Vietnam—and they did so with more solidarity and firmness than that shown in Great Society circles.

The Republican desire to maintain a truly bipartisan foreign policy was in the spirit of Arthur Vandenberg's words: "We'll stand with you on the crash landings but we'd like to be consulted at the takeoff."

A few examples of individual actions

Throughout the session Republican Senators participated in a record number of legislative activities. This was accomplished despite the numerical superiority of the majority. While Republicans introduced measures for scores of domestic and international programs, and hundreds of amendments to other bills, here, in brief, are some examples just to give an idea of the variety of Republican efforts in the first session:

Republican Senator George D. Aiken, of Vermont, introduced a rural water bill, authorizing a grant program to enable rural areas to build water storage and distribution systems as well as waste disposal systems. The bill was passed by the Senate unanimously and by the House, 325 to 10. Senator Aiken's bill was cosponsored by 93 other U.S. Senators, a record believed unequaled in Senate history.

Republican Senator Gordon Allott, of Colorado, introduced an amendment to the poverty bill to create a joint committee to study all aspects of the poverty program and report to Congress by January 1, 1966. The amendment, designed to correct abuses and mismanagement of the first year of the poverty program and to focus attention on the real needs of the poor, was defeated by the Democrat majority in the Senate.

Republican Senator Wallace F. Bennett, of Utah, was a leader in the successful effort to obtain an increase in needed benefits for all veterans suffering from disabilities incurred in the armed services; proposed that appointments of postmasters be placed under civil service and that their selection be removed from the political patronage system; and was a leader in the fight in the Senate to maintain at least 40-percent silver in the half dollar, at the same time managing the new coinage bill in Senate debate.

Republican Senator J. Caleb Boggs, of Delaware, worked to improve water and air pollution legislation. At his suggestion, legislation was introduced emphasizing the responsibility of the Federal Government to lead, not follow, in making certain its own installations were not contributing to pollution problems.

Republican Senator Frank Carlson, of Kansas, proposed and fought for legislation to help disabled widows to receive widow's insurance benefits even though they had not attained retirement age; proposed social security insurance benefits for children beyond age 18 if such children were in school or college; authored legislation to give widow's benefits at age 60 instead of 65 on reduced basis; and proposed legislation providing $1,000 income tax exemption when a student is in college.

Republican Senator Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey, the original sponsor of the Federal assistance program for community colleges, established by the Higher Education Act of 1963, proposed several amendments to this year's higher education bill which the Senate adopted in whole or in part. Among them are an increase in the amount of funds made available to these 2-year institutions, inclusion of community colleges in the assistance program for developing institutions, a change in the distribution formula to give the States more flexibility in allocating their funds among several colleges, and a program of fellowships for advanced training of teachers in elementary and secondary schools.

Republican Senator John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, worked out a means for extending the voluntary feed grain program, which was accepted by the committee in lieu of a proposal to impose compulsory controls over each farmer's acreage of corn and other feed grains. Senator Cooper also secured amendments to the acreage-poundage bill to protect burley tobacco growers.

Republican Senator Norris Cotton, of New Hampshire, won a battle of importance to his own State and all other States with rural and remote areas in the enactment of his bill to provide incentives, in the form of student loan forgiveness, for physicians agreeing to practice in localities without adequate medical services. This proposal, now law, offers similar inducements to dentists, osteopaths, and optometrists, where shortage exists.

Republican Senator Carl T. Curtis, of Nebraska, ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, and other Republican members of the committee, continued during 1965 their fight to bring out the full facts surrounding the Bobby Baker case. Though the investigation has revealed collusion, kickback, influence peddling, favoritism in high places, association with unsavory characters, and corruption generally, the Republican efforts were beaten back by the Democrat members who hold a 6-to-3 voting edge.

Republican Senator Peter H. Dominick, of Colorado, fought valiantly against open-end authorizations of new programs and in favor of loans rather than grants in Federal assistance programs. He has had an excellent batting average in getting 5-year estimates of total costs made a matter of record in committee hearings on the Great Society programs.

Republican Senator Paul J. Fannin, of Arizona, fought for his amendment to retain the veto power for Governors over proposed programs in the poverty bill. Although his amendment failed on a 45-to-45 vote, a modified version later was incorporated in the conference report which became law.

Republican Senator Hiram L. Fong, of Hawaii, was a cosponsor and a leader on the Senate floor for passage of the immigration bill, now law, which abolished the national origins quota system, removed the Asia-Pacific triangle provisions, and substituted a new system of allocation based on a system of preferences which extends priorities in the issuance of immigrant visas to close relatives of U.S. citizens and aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, to aliens who are members of the professions, arts, or sciences, and to skilled or unskilled alien laborers who are needed in the United States, and to certain refugees.

Republican Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa, advanced the cause of nonpartisanship in foreign policy through the firm stands he and his colleagues took in supporting national determination that communism gain no further footholds in the Caribbean and in southeast Asia—despite cries for appeasement and retreat from others in the President's own party. He was among the leaders demanding revision of foreign assistance programs. He also succeeded in making permanent his "act of State" amendment, strengthening the "rule of law" and protection of individual property rights by enabling the private American citizen to bring suit in American courts to recover property expropriated by a foreign government without compensation as required by international law.

Republican Senator Roman L. Hruska, of Nebraska, recognizing that the skyrocketing increase in the occurrence of serious crime is fast becoming America's No. 1 domestic problem, recommended a broad-scale study into the root causes of crime using modern scientific skills and techniques. This recommendation was incorporated into the Senate Judiciary Committee report on the Law Enforcement Assistance Act.

Republican Senator Jacob K. Javits, of New York, introduced legislation designed to eliminate substandard and dangerous practices by clinical laboratories engaged in interstate commerce by providing for inspection and licensing under the authority of the Surgeon General of the United States, providing for inspection and evaluation by the Surgeon General of the effectiveness of these laboratories, establishing standards and certification of laboratory directors in various fields, providing for the revocation, suspension, or limitation of laboratory licenses for failure to meet standards, incompetence of employees, misrepresentation, or similar causes. It is anticipated that there will be hearings held by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare early in the coming session.

Republican Senator Len B. Jordan, of Idaho, consistent with his efforts in preservation of resources and land use, sponsored a new concept in the bill to create a Nez Perce National Historical Park wherein Federal acquisition was confined to the actual sites of national historic interest. Now public law, this legislation will preserve the rich heritage left by Lewis and Clark and the Nez Perce Indian tribe while not affecting adversely the existing economy by unnecessary Federal land acquisition.

Republican Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, of California, authored Colorado River Basin project legislation which, among other things, would authorize investigations to find sources and to plan projects for the importation of at least 2.5 million acre-feet of water into the main stream of the Colorado River in the lower basin; authorize a series of dams and canals; protect the areas of origin of imported water; and also protect the priority of present projects from impairment of their allocations of water under existing law and agreements until the importation works are completed to deliver the 2.5 million acre-feet annually. Under his leadership, the seven States of the Colorado River Basin have been brought together for the first time in almost four decades on one bill which will provide a truly regional basin development program. Hearings have been completed in the House committee on companion measures and are anticipated in the Senate committee during the coming session.

Republican Senator JACK MILLER, of Iowa, twice secured adoption of an amendment to protect 18,000 veterans from cuts in their pensions resulting from increases in social security pensions—increases which were barely enough to restore the purchasing power which had been lost due to inflation. Senator MILLER also cosponsored the Water Pollution Control Act of 1965, much of the drafting of which he actively participated in last year.

Republican Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky, was the focal point of efforts to shape a bill responsive to the public interest on the basis of evidence submitted, yet be fair to the domestic tobacco industry, from farmer to manufacturer, on the emotion-packed issue of cigarette smoking and health. The Congress enacted a law requiring that cigarette packs carry an appropriate warning to smokers.

Republican Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, offered a successful rider to an appropriation bill which prevented the Veterans' Administration from closing a long list of veterans' facilities scheduled for immediate termination by White House action. He also sponsored legislation designed to put a halt to the "smut racket," by setting up a Presidential commission to study ways of wiping out the flood of pornographic literature now being distributed throughout the country.

Republican Senator GEORGE MURPHY, of California, led the battle to help farmers whose crops lay rotting in the fields because of the Great Society's decision to prohibit the use of Mexican and Canadian migrant farmworkers. In areas where no suitable replacements were found crops rotted, shortages began, and prices went up. Labor, the consumer, and the farmer were hurt. As a result of Senator MURPHY's efforts, however, some migrant workers finally were permitted to come in.

Republican Senator JAMES B. PEARSON, of Kansas, introduced a bill to provide for creation of a new bipartisan commission authorized to make a study and an investigation of the organization and operation of the executive branch of the Federal Government. The need for this new Hoover-type commission stems in part from the proliferation of executive agencies and administrations in the last decade, the attendant multiplication of expenditures, and the fact that much legislation passed this session which will further expand the structure and functions of the executive branch. The Pearson bill, cosponsored by more than 30 Senators, languishes in the Goverment Operations Committee.

Republican Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY, of Vermont, sponsored and had adopted amendments to the National Defense Education Act to aid secondary schools in the teaching of economics, to create institutes of economics under the National Defense Education Act, and to make possible creation of industrial arts institutes. He also successfully sponsored an amendment to the employment-manpower bill which made it possible for private vocational educational schools to participate widely in the program, something not permitted in the administration proposal. Senator PROUTY also originated the amendment which would give student borrowers 100-percent loan forgiveness under the National Defense Education Act if they taught on poverty-impacted areas.

Republican Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, led Senate Republicans in a floor attempt to substitute their proposal, to give wartime benefits to peacetime veterans who had served in "areas of hostilities," for a bill to authorize only educational benefits to all persons who had served in the Armed Forces between 1955 and 1967. Senator SALTONSTALL's bill, designed to give members of our Armed Forces sent to critical areas of the world where armed conflict exists, such as Vietnam, the same benefits as veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, was rejected by the Democrat majority.

Republican Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, introduced a bill to amend the so-called equal time provision of the Communications Act of 1934 as a constructive alternative to bills offered which would abolish the provision altogether. This bill would permit a broadcaster to make free time available to major candidates without requiring that he make similar free time available to the nominee of each and every splinter group, and provided that, if a station chooses to sell time to a major candidate, it could effectively charge no more than two-thirds of the rate which the candidate would, under present law, be required to pay. The Scott bill, designed to protect the public interest without penalizing the broadcasting industry, was referred to the Commerce Committee, which has not held hearings.

Republican Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, of Wyoming, proposed and had adopted an amendment to the poverty bill which would prevent the Director of the Job Corps from authorizing any program which would displace workers or impair contractual obligations. This agreement was proposed in an effort to protect the free enterprise system and to see to it that when the initiative has been taken by individual citizens the Government did not interfere.

Republican Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, continued to establish, week after week throughout the session, a record in the history of the U.S. Congress for consecutive attendance on record votes. Her score on being present and voting reached 2,150 before the session closed. The Senate unanimously passed a resolution praising her record and, in another unusual tribute, gave her a standing ovation. Throughout the session, Senator SMITH sponsored and fought for a variety of space and defense programs.

Republican Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, sponsored legislation to equalize the treatment of Reserves and Regulars of the armed services in the payment of per diem allowances, and to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to allow the enlisted personnel credit for Reserve duty as well as active duty service. The Democrat-controlled Armed Services Committee has taken no action.

Republican Senator JOHN G. TOWER, of Texas, introduced legislation to grant servicemen income tax relief by designating Vietnam a combat zone, which the President had not done. As public opinion began to crystallize behind Senator TOWER's bill, the President signed an Executive order designating the Vietnam area as a combat zone, thereby affording income tax relief for servicemen in the area—exactly as Senator TOWER's bill had suggested.

Republican Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, offered an amendment to the Social Security Amendments Act of 1965, to liberalize earnings limitations for social security recipients. Approved by both the Finance Committee and the Senate, the amendment would permit a social security recipient to earn up to $1,800 per year ($1,200 under existing law) before losing any of his social security benefits. The Williams amendment was modified by the Democrat majority in conference by reducing the penalty-free limit to $1,500, with the $1 for $2 penalty being applied to the next $1,200.

Republican Senator MILTON R. YOUNG of North Dakota was appointed to a Special Committee on Veterans' Facilities, to investigate the Great Society's announced closing of 11 Veterans' Administration hospitals, 4 domiciliary homes, and 16 VA regional offices. Senator YOUNG worked with this committee, veterans, and their organization on both the State and National level. This investigation resulted in retention of at least one regional VA office for each State and prevented the closing of needed VA hospitals in sparsely populated areas.

III. REAPPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Over the past 2 years, the Supreme Court of the United States has delivered a series of momentous decisions requiring the State legislatures to reapportion on the basis of population factors alone.

These decisions were based on the principle of "one man, one vote," a sound enough principle in itself, but wrongly applied in this matter.

Blind adherence to this principle—which is currently much in vogue—despite all other considerations, indicates either a basic misunderstanding of, or blatent disregard for, the unique workings of our Federal system.

Justice Harlan, in his dissent in one of these cases, clearly perceived the dangerous course upon which the Court has directed us. His words bear repeating: "Judicial entry into this realm is profoundly ill-advised and constitutionally impermissible * * * the vitality of our political system, on which in the last analysis all else depends, is weakened by reliance on the judiciary for political reform; in time a complacent body politic may result.

"These decisions also cut deeply into the fabric of our federalism. What must follow from them may eventually appear to be the product of State legislatures. Nevertheless, no thinking person can fail to recognize that the aftermath of these cases, however desirable it may be thought in itself, will have been achieved at the cost of a radical alteration in the relationship between the States and the Federal Government, more particularly the Federal judiciary. Only one who has an overbearing impatience with the Federal system and its political processes will believe that that cost was not too high or was inevitable.

"Finally, these decisions give support to a current mistaken view of the Constitution and the constitutional function of this Court. This view, in a nutshell, is that every major social ill in this country can find its cure in some constitutional principle, and that this Court should take the lead in promoting reform when other branches of Government fail to act. The Constitution is not a panacea for every blot upon the public welfare, nor should this Court, ordained as a judicial body, be thought of as a general haven for reform movements. The Constitution is an instrument of Government, fundamental to which is the premise that in a diffusion of governmental authority lies the greatest promise that this Nation will realize liberty for all its citizens. This Court, limited in function in accordance with that premise, does not serve its high purpose when it exceeds its authority, even to satisfy justified impatience with the slow workings of the political process. For when, in the name of constitutional interpretation, the Court adds something to the Constitution that was deliberately excluded from it, the Court in reality substitutes its view of what should be so for the amending process."

A constitutional amendment was offered during the past session which would have allowed the electorates of the various States to decide for themselves whether or not they wished to apportion one house of a bicameral State legislature using factors of geography and political subdivisions as well as population. That amendment was rejected by a vote of 57 yeas to 39 nays, the necessary two-thirds of the Senators present and voting not having voted in the affirmative.

But that does not end the story. The final chapter has not yet been written. The battle will be continued.

The goal is to restore to the people of the States the right of self-determination and by so doing to restore balance within the Federal system.

The question is not one of rural domination or urban domination or ethnic domination or labor domination or any other type of domination. The issue, simply, is whether the people of a State are to be allowed to determine for themselves the manner in which they would be governed.

The one-man, one-vote principle would, in this case, lead to conformity and bring about disparities as great in representation in legislatures as had existed in some States and which the Court had properly stricken down.

If a representative system of government is fair and recognizes individual rights, protects against discrimination in voting, provides that one house be elected on the basis of population and takes into consideration the people's interest with respect to election of the other house—then it will always be people, not acres, or trees, or rocks, who will continue to live in a Republic.

We shall continue to fight for representative government.

Trite though it may appear to some, there are no better words to describe freedom than government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, near the conclusion of each session of the Congress it is customary for each party floor leader to place in the Congressional Record his observations and comments on the activities of the Congress for the past year, and I ask unanimous consent that this be placed in the body of the Record at the conclusion of my remarks and the customary number of copies be printed as a Senate document according to the rules.

I also ask unanimous consent that the digest of major laws be placed in the body of the Congressional Record and that after additions following the session the digest be printed as a separate Senate document and the customary number of copies be printed.

SUMMARIES OF LAWS AND TREATIES OF GENERAL INTEREST

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the digest of major laws be placed in the body of the Congressional Record and that after additions following the session the digest be printed as a separate Senate document and the customary number of copies be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Summaries of Laws and Treaties of General Interest—A Factual Digest of Some of the Major Public Laws Resulting From Congressional Actions This Session

(By categories)

AGRICULTURE

Acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco (Public Law 89–12. Approved April 16, 1965): This law (H.R. 5721) amended the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, and amended the tobacco price-support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Extend time for wheat referendum (Public Law 89–82. Approved July 24, 1965): This law (H.R. 9497) extended the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1966, from not later than August 1, 1965, as specified under existing law, to not later than 30 days after adjournment sine die of the first session of the 89th Congress.

APPROPRIATIONS

Supplemental agricultural appropriations, 1965 (Public Law 89–2. Approved Feb. 11, 1965):

This law (H.J. Res. 234) made supplemental appropriations of $1.6 billion for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1965.

Of this amount, $1.1 billion was to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for unreimbursed net realized losses sustained during fiscal 1963, provided none of the funds appropriated under Public Law 88–573 be used prior to May 1, 1965, in eliminating agricultural research stations or lines of research.

The law also added funds available under Public Law 480 for (1) sale of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies pursuant to title I, $250 million and (2) long-term supply contracts pursuant to title IV, $200 million, subject to the proviso that no part could be used during fiscal 1965 to finance export of any agricultural commodity to the United Arab Republic under title I, except when such exports were necessary to carry out the Sales Agreement of October 8, 1962, as amended, and if the President determined the financing of such exports was in the national interest.

The law also provided $50 million for expenses of the International Wheat Agreement. In addition, provision was made that no funds heretofore appropriated to the Veterans' Administration could be used prior to May 1, 1965, to implement the order closing or relocating the veterans' hospitals or facilities or to withdrawing, transferring, or reducing services heretofore made available to veterans.

Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965 (Public Law 89–16. Approved Apr. 30, 1965):

This law (H.R. 7091) provided $2,227,563,977 in supplemental appropriations for the various departments and agencies for fiscal 1965.

Included in this total was a total of $349,688,000 for the Appalachia program and a total of $583,117,633 for increased pay costs.

Department of Defense supplemental appropriation, 1965 (Public Law 89–18. Approved May 7, 1965): This law (H.J. Res. 447) made appropriations of $700 million to the Department of Defense for support of military functions in southeast Asia.

Interior Department appropriations for fiscal 1966 (Public Law 89–52. Approved June 28, 1965):

This law (H.R. 6767) made appropriations of $1,212,739,070 for the Department of the Interior and related agencies (except Bonneville Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, Southeastern Power Administration, and Southwest Power Administration) for fiscal year 1966.

The Interior Department total was $801,988,570. For related agencies the total was $410,750,500, including funds for the Forest Service, the Public Health Service, the Indian Claims Commission, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Capital Transportation Agency, and the National Council on the Arts.

Treasury-Post Office Departments appropriations for fiscal 1966 (Public Law 89–57. Approved June 30, 1965):

This law (H.R. 7060) made appropriations of $7,699,444,000 for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for fiscal year 1966. Of this total, $1,035 million was a fiscal 1965 supplemental appropriation for the International Monetary Fund.

The Treasury Department total was $1,291,239,000. The Post Office Department total was $5,324,400,000. For the Executive Office of the President the total was $15,805,000, including the Emergency Fund for the President and expenses of management improvement. The total for independent agencies was $3 million, including funds for the Tax Court of the United States, the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and the Administrative Conference of the United States.

Continuing appropriations, 1966 (Public Law 89–58. Approved June 30, 1965): This law (H.J. Res. 553) provided for financing continuing Government functions with respect to which fiscal 1966 appropriations bills had not been signed into law prior to July 31, 1965.

District of Columbia appropriations for fiscal 1966 (Public Law 89–75. Approved July 16, 1965): This law (H.R. 6453) authorized the District of Columbia to spend out of District of Columbia funds $360,228,500 for fiscal 1966 and appropriated $46,122,000 as the Federal payment out of general revenues of the Federal Treasury for fiscal 1966.

Legislative branch appropriations for fiscal 1966 (Public Law 89–90. Approved July 27, 1965):

This law (H.R. 8775) made appropriations in the amount of $189,993,297 for the legislative branch for fiscal year 1966. The Senate total was $36,379,790; the House, $66,414,730.

Other agencies for which appropriations were included in this law were the Library of Congress, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, and the Government Printing Office.

Continuing appropriations, 1966 (Public Law 89–96. Approved July 30, 1965): This law (H.J. Res. 591) provided for financing continuing Government functions with respect to which fiscal 1966 appropriations bills had not been signed into law prior to August 31, 1965.

Independent offices appropriations for fiscal 1966 (Public Law 89–128. Approved Aug. 16, 1965):

This law (H.R. 7997) made appropriations of $14,246,167,800 for the various independent executive offices for fiscal year 1966.

Among items included were: National Aeronautics and Space Administration, $5,175 million; Federal Aviation Agency, $714,794,500; General Services Administration, $549,678,250; Housing and Home Finance Agency, $1,038,861,200; National Science Foundation, $479,999,000; and Veterans Administration, $5,688,405,600.

Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Departments appropriations for fiscal 1966 (Public Law 89–156. Approved Aug. 31, 1965):

This law (H.R. 7765) made appropriations of $8,011,331,500 for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for fiscal year 1966.

The Labor Department total was $547,607,500. The HEW total was $7,410,170,000, including $1,178,956,000 for the National Institutes of Health.

The total for related agencies, including the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, and the Railroad Retirement Board, was $53,554,000.

Continuing appropriations, 1966 (Public Law 89–159. Approved Sept. 1, 1965): This law (H.J. Res. 639) provided for financing continuing Government functions with respect to which annual appropriations bills had not been signed into law prior to September 30, 1965.

State-Justice-Commerce Department appropriations for fiscal 1966 (Public Law 89-164. Approved Sept. 2, 1965):

This law (H.R. 8639) made appropriations of $2,057,597,150 for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1966.

Of this appropriation, the State Department total was $389,602,000; the Justice Department, $370,869,000; the Commerce Department, $856,851,250; the Judiciary, $80,693,900; the Commission on Civil Rights, $1,500,000; the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, $2,750,000; and the U.S. Information Agency, $171,617,000.

Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Departments supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1966 (Public Law 89-199. Approved Sept. 23, 1965):

This law (H.R. 10586) made supplemental appropriations of $1,223,181,500 for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal 1966.

The Labor Department total was $156,526,000. The HEW total was $1,066,655,500, including $7 million for programs for the aged and aging, and for salaries and expenses in connection therewith.

Appropriations for military construction, fiscal 1966 (Public Law 89-202. Approved Sept. 25, 1965): This law (H.R. 10323) made appropriations of $1,756,635,000 for construction at military installations in the United States and abroad, including $665,846,000 for military family housing projects.

Defense Department appropriations for fiscal 1966 (Public Law 89-213. Approved Sept. 29, 1965): This law (H.R. 9221) made appropriations for the Defense Establishment of $46,887,163,000 for fiscal year 1966. Of this appropriation, the Air Force received $17,519,600,000; the Navy, $13,957,200,000; the Army, $10,973,094,000; and the joint defense agencies, $4,437,219,000.

Continuing appropriations, 1966 (Public Law 89-221. Approved Sept. 30, 1965): This law (H.J. Res. 673) provided for financing continuing Government functions with respect to which annual appropriations bills had not been signed into law prior to October 15, 1965. The resolution also provided appropriation of such amount as may be necessary for continuing work on development of a civil supersonic aircraft.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Atomic Energy Commission appropriation authorization, 1966 (Public Law 89-32. Approved June 2, 1965): This law (H.R. 8122) authorized appropriation of $2,555,521,000 for fiscal 1966 for the Atomic Energy Commission. For operating expenses, $2,260,776,000 was authorized, and for plant and capital equipment, $294,745,000.

Amendment of Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (Public Law 89-135. Approved Aug. 24, 1965): This law (H.R. 8856) amended section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to provide that nothing in the Act shall be construed to affect the authority of any Federal, State, or local agency with respect to the generation, sale, or transmission of electric power produced through the use of nuclear facilities licensed by the Atomic Energy Commission. The law also provided that nothing in this section shall be construed to confer on any Federal, State, or local agency any authority to regulate, control, or restrict activities of the Commission.

Extending and amending the indemnity provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (Public Law 89-210. Approved Sept. 29, 1965): This law (S. 2042) amended section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, (1) to extend the effective period of the indemnity provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 for 10 additional years, to August 1, 1977; (2) to require a decrease in the $500 million governmental indemnity afforded under the indemnity provisions corresponding to the amount whereby the financial protection required of an AEC licensee or contractor exceeds the amount of commercial nuclear liability insurance currently available; i.e., $60 million; and (3) to provide that in no event would the liability of all persons who might be liable for public liability arising from a single nuclear incident exceed $560 million; i.e., the maximum amount of governmental indemnity which could be afforded under the indemnity provisions, as amended by this law, together with the maximum amount of financial protection required in accordance with these indemnity provisions.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Voting Rights Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-110. Approved Aug. 6, 1965):

This law (S. 1564) provided, among other things, for the suspension of literacy tests or other devices which (a) have been found by a Federal court to have been used to deny the right to vote on account of race or color or (b) come within a triggering formula under which there was a test or device in use in November 1964, where less than 50 percent of persons of voting age were registered on November 1, 1964, and where fewer than 50 percent of the population of voting age voted in the presidential election of 1964.

Where such triggering results in suspending a literacy test or other device, a three-judge court of the District Court for the District of Columbia would maintain jurisdiction for 5 years after entry of a judgment that discrimination had occurred within the State or political subdivision covered under the formula.

The so-called Puerto Rican amendment would allow a prospective vote to qualify without taking a literacy test by demonstrating that he had completed the sixth grade, or whatever grade the States require, in a school under the American flag conducted in a language other than English.

Examiners would be appointed by the Civil Service Commission, after court authorization, when the Attorney General certified the 15th amendment was violated. These examiners would register qualified applicants for voting and maintain a listing of those so qualified. Hearing officers, appointed by the Civil Service Commission, would hold hearings on challenges to listings on an eligibility list. Wherever examiners are serving in a political subdivision, the Civil Service Commission can assign, at the request of the Attorney General, one or more poll watchers.

The law contained a congressional finding that the poll tax was being used to deny the right to vote and instructed the Attorney General to seek a declaratory judgment or injunctive relief in such cases.

The law also had a "clean elections" provision making it a felony to encourage false registration or illegal voting or to purchase votes.

CIVIL SERVICE

Civil service retirement annuity increases (Public Law 89-205. Approved Sept. 27, 1965): This law (H.R. 8469) (1) increased all annuities having a commencing date prior to October 1, 1956, by 11 percent, (2) increased all annuities having a commencing date after October 1, 1956, by 6 percent, and (3) revised the method of determining cost-of-living increases. The estimated first-year cost was $101.9 million.

EDUCATION

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10. Approved Apr. 11, 1965):

This law (H.R. 2362) provided as follows:

In title I, it amended Public Law 874, 81st Congress (1) by adding a new title II to the act to provide financial assistance in the local educational agencies for the education of children of low-income areas on the basis of a formula which would be operative for the first fiscal year (ending June 30, 1966), the cost of which would be $1.06 billion. For each of the 2 succeeding fiscal years of the 3-year program the formula would be that established by law hereafter by the Congress; and (2) by extension of the present Public Law 874 provisions of Federal financial assistance in areas affected by Federal activities until June 30, 1968.

Title II authorized the Commissioner of Education for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years, to make grants for the acquisition of school library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools. The law authorized appropriations of $100 million solely for the first fiscal year (ending June 30, 1966). For the succeeding fiscal years, only such funds could be appropriated as may be hereafter authorized by the Congress.

Title III authorized a 5-year program of grants for supplementary educational centers and services to stimulate and assist in the provision of vitally needed educational services not available in a sufficient quantity and quality, and to stimulate and assist in the development and establishment of exemplary elementary and secondary school educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs. The law authorized appropriations of $100 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. For the succeeding 4 fiscal years only such funds could be appropriated as may be hereafter authorized by the Congress.

Title IV amended the Cooperative Research Act of 1954 by authorizing the Commissioner of Education to make grants to universities and colleges and other public or private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations and to individuals, for research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education; for the dissemination of information derived from educational research; and to provide, by contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements, for the conduct of such activities.

Title IV also amended the Cooperative Research Act of 1954 to authorize the Commissioner to make arrangements for the construction and operation of regional facilities for educational research and related purposes. Beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $100 million was authorized for the purposes. Such funds shall remain available until expended for payments with respect to projects which will have been approved by the Commissioner before July 1, 1971.

Title V authorized the Commissioner of Education to carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years, a program for making grants to stimulate and assist States in strengthening the leadership resources of their State educational agencies, and to assist those agencies in the establishment and improvement of programs to identify and meet the educational needs of States. For grants under this title, there was authorized appropriations of $25 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the 3 succeeding fiscal years, only such sums could be appropriated as the Congress hereafter authorized by law.

Title VI contained general provisions. These included provisions relating to prohibition of Federal control of education, provisions prohibiting the use of funds for religious worship or instruction, and authority to establish an advisory council of 10 members to advise and consult with the Commissioner with respect to his functions under the law.

For the five titles of the law and for administrative expenses total new obligational authority for the first year (fiscal 1966) would be $1,344,700,000. Estimated 5-year obligational authority was $6,660,100,000.

FINANCE AND TAXATION

Gold reserve requirements (Public Law 89-3. Approved Mar. 3, 1965): This law (H.R. 3818) eliminated the requirement under existing law that Federal Reserve banks maintain gold-certificate reserves of 25 percent against their reposit liabilities. It retained the existing requirement that a gold-certificate reserve of 25 percent be maintained against Federal Reserve notes.

Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-44. Approved June 21, 1965): This law (H.R. 8371) provided excise tax reductions of about $4.7 billion over the period through 1969. Some of these reductions would become effective on the day after the date of enactment and, when fully effective, would result in a revenue loss of $1.76 billion annually. A further reduction was provided for January 1966 which, when fully effective, would decrease taxes by an additional $1.62 billion.

Further reductions would occur in 1967, 1968, and 1969. The additional reductions in those years would amount to approximately $1.3 billion.

The tax reductions, when fully effective, would result in elimination of all selective excise taxes except a 1-percent tax on automobiles, the 5-percent tax on transportation of persons by air, and those taxes which represented user charges, regulatory taxes, and the taxes on alcohol, cigars, and cigarettes.

Temporary increase in public debt limit (Public Law 89-49. Approved June 24, 1965): This law (H.R. 8464) provided a temporary debt limit of $328 billion for the period July 1, 1965, to June 30, 1966. The temporary debt limit for fiscal 1965 was $324 billion. (The debt ceiling under permanent law is $285 billion.)

Temporary suspension of duties on metal scrap (Public Law 89-61. Approved June 30, 1965): This law (H.R. 4493) amended title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 to continue for 2 years, to June 30, 1967, (1) the suspension of duties on metal scrap including iron and steel, aluminum, magnesium, nickel, and nickel alloys and (2) the existing reduction of duties on copper waste and scrap. The law provided that the suspension would not apply to certain specified types of scrap.

Exemption from duty for returning residents (Public Law 89-62. Approved June 30, 1965): This law (H.R. 8147) amended the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that, effective October 1, 1965, the exemption from duty for returning residents would be $100, retail value, and this exemption would apply only with respect to goods which actually accompanied the returning residents. For tourists returning from American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, the law provided the exemption would be $200, retail value. The law also reduced the quantity of alcoholic beverages a returning resident could claim, within these dollar limitations under his personal exemption, from 1 gallon to 1 quart. The 1-gallon exemption was retained, however, for tourists returning from American island possessions. The law represented an estimated annual $55 million balance-of-payments improvement.

Coinage Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-81. Approved July 23, 1965): This law (S. 2080) provided for elimination of silver from the dime and the quarter, and for reduction of the silver in the 50-cent piece from 90 to 40 percent. It also increased the authorization for the construction of the mint facilities from $30 to $45 million.

Amendment of Merchant Marine Act, 1936, re construction-differential subsidies (Public Law 89-127. Approved Aug. 14, 1965): This law (H.R. 4346) amended section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to extend for 1 year, to June 30, 1966, the present authority of the Secretary of Commerce to make construction-differential subsidy payments of a maximum of 55 percent on new merchant vessel construction and 60 percent on reconstruction or reconditioning of passenger ships.

Interest Equalization Tax Extension Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-243. Approved Oct. 9, 1965): This law (H.R. 4750) extended the interest equalization tax (designed to aid our balance-of-payments position from December 31, 1965, to July 31, 1967. Among other things, the law (1) applied the tax to nonbank loans with a maturity of 1 to 3 years (this provision complements the application of the tax to bank loans with a maturity of 1 year or more); (2) extended exemptions provided under existing law to cover situations analogous to those now exempt or exemptions required by the application of the tax to debt obligations which mature in less than 3 years; (3) required all international agreements entered into, modified, or extended under which foreign currencies will accrue for the use of the United States to contain provisions insuring that the currencies may be used to pay U.S. debts in that country, and, to the extent not needed for such purpose, be converted into dollars or other foreign currencies to the extent deemed by the Secretary of the Treasury to be in the interests of the United States; and (4) required the Secretary of the Treasury to determine periodically the amount of funds the United States will need to meet its obligations in each foreign country and to report to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House the expenditures and balances of U.S.-owned foreign currencies.

GOVERNMENT

Further amendment of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (Public Law 89-43. Approved June 18, 1965): This law (S. 1135) further amended the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1969.

Appointment of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency (Public Law 89-46. Approved June 22, 1965): This law (H.R. 7777) authorized the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee (U.S. Air Force, retired) to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

This law was necessary because of the provision in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 that a nominee for the office of Administrator must be a civilian. This law expressed the intent of Congress that the authority granted by enactment is not to be construed as approval by the Congress of continuing appointments of military men to the office of Administrator of FAA in the future.

Extending the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 (Public Law 89-69. Approved July 8, 1965): This law (H.R. 8131) extended the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 (due to expire June 30, 1966) to June 30, 1967, and authorized appropriations of $6.5 million for fiscal year 1966 and $10 million for fiscal year 1967.

Drug abuse control amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89-74. Approved July 15, 1965): This law (H.R. 2) amended the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide increased controls over the distribution of barbiturates, amphetamines, and other drugs having a similar effect on the central nervous system through increased recordkeeping and inspection requirements, through providing for control over intrastate traffic in these drugs because of its effect on interstate traffic, and through making possession of these drugs (other than by the user) illegal outside of the legitimate channels of commerce. The law also increased the authority of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare over counterfeit drugs.

Penalties were provided. The estimated cost was $10 million annually. Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (Public Law 89-92. Approved July 27, 1965): This law (S. 559) provided for establishment of a comprehensive Federal program to deal with cigarette labeling and advertising with respect to any relationship between smoking and health. The effective date is January 1, 1966.

Five-day week for postmasters (Public Law 89-116. Approved Aug. 9, 1965): This law (H.R. 1771) established a congressional policy requiring a 5-day workweek for postmasters in post offices of the first, second, and third class.

Providing penalties for the assassination of the President (Public Law 89-141. Approved Aug. 28, 1965): This law (H.R. 6097) amended title 18, United States Code, to rectify the omission in Federal law by making it a Federal crime to kill, kidnap, or assault the President, the President-elect, the Vice President, or if there is no Vice President, the officer next in the order of succession to the office of President of the United States, the Vice-President-elect, or any individual who is acting as President. It also made it a Federal crime to attempt, or to conspire, to kill, or kidnap any of the individuals designated.

Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Archival Depository (Public Law 89-169. Approved Sept. 6, 1965): This law (H.J. Res. 632) authorized the Administrator of General Services to enter into an agreement with the University of Texas for the Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Archival Depository.

Establishing a Department of Housing and Urban Development (Public Law 89-174. Approved Sept. 9, 1965): This law (H.R. 6927) established a new executive department, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, in order to provide development of the Nation's urban communities and metropolitan areas.

The functions of the existing Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituent agencies were transferred to the new Secretary and the Federal National Mortgage Association was made a part of the new Department.

The Secretary will, among his other responsibilities: (1) advise the President with respect to Federal programs and activities relating to housing and urban development; (2) develop and recommend to the President policies for fostering the orderly growth and development of the Nation's urban areas; (3) exercise leadership at the discretion of the President in coordinating Federal activities affecting housing and urban development; (4) provide technical assistance and information (including a clearinghouse service) to aid State, county, town, village, or other local governments in developing solutions to urban and metropolitan development problems; (5) encourage comprehensive planning by State and local governments with a view to coordinating Federal, State, and local urban development activities; and (6) conduct continuing studies of housing and urban development problems.

An Under Secretary, Assistant Secretaries, and General Counsel were provided along with other officers. The Federal Housing Commissioner would be one of the Assistant Secretaries.

Protection of former Presidents and their wives or widows (Public Law 89-186. Approved Sept. 15, 1965): This law (S. 2420) provided continuing authority for Secret Service protection of any former President, his wife or widow, and minor children for a period of 4 years after he leaves or dies in office, unless such protection is declined.

Funds for the President's Crime Commissions (Public Law 89-196. Approved Sept.

21, 1965): This law (S.J. Res. 102) authorized appropriation of $1,500,000 for the expenses of the two Presidential Commissions, (1) the Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, and (2) the District of Columbia Commission on Crime and Law Enforcement.

Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–197. Approved Sept. 22, 1965): This law (H.R. 8027) authorized the Attorney General to make grants to, or to contract with, any public or private nonprofit agency to provide assistance in training State and local law enforcement officers and other personnel, and in improving capabilities, techniques, and practices in State and local law enforcement and prevention and control of crime. The law authorized appropriation of $10 million for fiscal 1966; and for fiscal 1967 and 1968, such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize.

National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–209. Approved Sept. 29, 1965): This law (S. 1483) established a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, to be composed of a National Endowment for the Arts, a National Endowment for the Humanities, and a Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities, to develop and promote a national policy of support for the humanities and the arts in the United States.

The National Endowment for the Arts will provide matching grants to States, to nonprofit or public groups, and to individuals engaged in the creative and performing arts for the whole range of artistic activity. The law transferred the National Council on the Arts (established by the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964) and its functions from the Executive Office of the President to the National Endowment for the Arts. The Council will advise the Chairman of the Endowment on policies and programs and review applications for financial assistance.

The National Endowment for the Humanities will provide grants and loans for research, award fellowships and grants to institutions for training, support the publication of scholarly works, provide for interchange of information, and foster understanding and appreciation of the humanities. The law established a National Council on the Humanities, which will advise the Chairman of the Endowment on policies and programs and review applications for financial assistance.

The law also provided for financial assistance for strengthening instruction in the humanities and the arts and for teacher training institutes.

The law authorized a total appropriation of $21 million a year for fiscal 1966, 1967, and 1968. For fiscal 1969 and each subsequent fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress shall authorize by laws. It also authorized appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to administer the provisions of the law.

Authorization for Secret Service agents to make arrests (Public Law 89–218. Approved Sept. 29, 1965): This law (H.R. 6294) amended section 3056 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to authorize members of the U.S. Secret Service to make arrests without warrants for any offense against the United States committed in their presence or for any felony cognizable under the laws of the United States if they have reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing such a felony.

HOUSING

Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–117. Approved Aug. 10, 1965):

This law (H.R. 7984) consisted of three categories authorizing total appropriations for the next 4 years of $7.4 billion. It established new programs, continued existing programs, and amended existing programs. An important new feature was the provision for rent supplements.

Principal provisions of the law included:

New programs—Rent supplements to nonprofit, cooperative, or limited dividend sponsors of moderate-cost housing, for low-income families eligible for public housing who were elderly, handicapped, displaced, or living in substandard housing, for an amount by which market rent exceeded 25 percent of tenant's income, and with a maximum annual aggregate contract authority reaching $150 million in the fourth year; rehabilitation grants up to $1,500 for low-income families in urban renewal areas; relief to distressed mortgagors affected by closing of Federal bases; FHA mortgage insurance for land developments; grants for water and sewer facilities at 50 percent of cost; grants for neighborhood facilities; and grants to pay interest charges for advance acquisition of public works sites.

Extension of existing programs—extended all FHA programs, urban renewal, urban planning grants, open-space grants, public housing, college housing, housing for elderly, public works planning, Federal-State training, FNMA, low-income housing demonstration program, low-rent housing for domestic farm labor, and rehabilitation 3-percent loan program.

Amendments to existing law—Federal Housing Administration: required FHA to establish procedures and approve technically suitable materials, required community water and sewer facilities where feasible as prerequisite to FHA and VA assistance, required regular home insurance program loans to provide 20 percent (instead of 25 percent under existing law) downpayment of value exceeding $20,000, and made peacetime as well as wartime veterans eligible for FHA insurance for loans (with no downpayment up to $15,000, 10 percent on the next $5,000, and 15 percent of the appraised value over $20,000); urban renewal: increased nonresidential exception to 35 percent of new funds, authorized direct grants to cities for two-thirds of cost for demolition of unsafe structures and local code enforcement, and clarified 1954 Housing Act to authorize nonresidential urban renewal in the District of Columbia; low-rent housing: authorized greater use of existing housing for low-rent public housing, and authorized sale of detached and semidetached public housing to tenants; FNMA: extended FNMA's authority to sell participations and to act as servicing agent for all Government-held residential mortgages; open-space land and urban beautification: extended grant authority to acquire developed land and finance cost of beautification of parks and recreation areas, increased grant to 50 percent of cost of acquisition and development of land, and increased limit on grants that could be made for open-space land and urban beautification and improvements from $75 to $310 million; repealed provision in Mass Transit Act which prohibited use of foreign-made manufactured articles; instituted new mortgage insurance program for rural housing by Department of Agriculture; instituted new lease-guarantee program by SBA for small businesses displaced by urban renewal; authorized FSLIC to require savings and loan associations to deposit up to 1 percent of savings as necessary for liquidity purposes; lowered maximum interest rate to 3 percent for housing for elderly and moderate-income families; and authorized public facility loans for nonprofit groups serving small communities or rural areas.

Another provision would apply Davis-Bacon labor provisions to certain sections of the law.

IMMIGRATION

Amendment of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Public Law 89–236. Approved Oct. 3, 1965): This law (H.R. 2580) amended the Immigration and Nationality Act to repeal the national origin quota provisions and to substitute a new system for the selection of immigrants to the United States. The law also made other basic changes, as follows: (1) established a new system of preferential admissions based upon the existence of a close family relationship with U.S. citizens or permanent resident aliens, and upon the advantage to the United States of the special talents and skills of the immigrant; (2) provided that parents of U.S. citizens (such citizen to be over 21) not come under a numerical limitation; (3) established two preference categories for immigrants to be employed in the United States, (a) a third preference for aliens who are members of professions or who have exceptional ability in the sciences or the arts, (b) a sixth preference for skilled or unskilled workers who can fill specific needs in short supply; (4) placed a limitation of 170,000 (including 10,200 refugees) on the number of immigrants who may be admitted to the United States in any fiscal year other than the defined "special immigrants" and "immediate relatives"; placed a limitation of 20,000 on the number of immigrants who may enter in any one fiscal year from a foreign state; (5) removed the Asia-Pacific triangle provisions of existing law; (6) extended an exemption from numerical limitation on immigration to newly independent Western Hemisphere countries (Jamaica, Trinidad-Tobago); (7) strengthened safeguards to protect the American economy from job competition and from adverse working standards as a consequence of immigrant workers entering the labor market; (8) granted discretionary authority under proper safeguards to the Attorney General to waive the grounds for exclusion in the case of aliens who are mentally retarded or who have a past history of mental illness and who are close relatives of U.S. citizens or lawful resident aliens; (9) made alien crewmen eligible to adjust their immigration status through the suspension of deportation procedures; (10) made aliens who entered the United States prior to June 30, 1948, eligible to obtain an adjustment of their immigration status through existing registry proceedings; (11) established a Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration and placed an annual limitation of 120,000, beginning July 1, 1968, on Western Hemisphere immigration unless Congress provides otherwise on the basis of the Commission's report.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Increased participation in the Inter-American Development Bank (Public Law 89–6. Approved Mar. 24, 1965): This law (H.R. 45) amended the Inter-American Development Loan Bank Act of 1959 to authorize the United States to contribute to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank an additional sum of $750 million at the rate of $250 million per year during fiscal 1965, 1966, and 1967. The law prohibited assistance from the Fund to countries expropriating American property without compensation.

Saigon chancery authorization (Public Law 89–22. Approved May 21, 1965): This law (H.R. 7064) authorized appropriation of $1 million, in addition to the amounts previously authorized for use in the Foreign Service buildings program, in order to permit the construction of a new chancery to replace the one destroyed in 1965 in Saigon, Vietnam.

International Coffee Agreement Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–23. Approved May 22, 1965): This law (S. 701) granted the President the authority that will permit the United States to carry out its obligations under the International Coffee Agreement of 1962 and provided a limit of $150,000 per fiscal year on the U.S. contribution toward the cost of administration of the agreement.

Arms Control and Disarmament Agency authorization (Public Law 89–27. Approved May 27, 1965): This law (H.R. 2998) amended the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, to authorize appropriation of $30 million for the 3 fiscal years 1966 through 1968.

Increase in U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund (Public Law 89–31. Approved June 2, 1965): This law (H.R. 6497) amended the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to increase the U.S. quota in the Fund by $1,035 million and authorized appropriation of $1,035 million, to remain available until expended.

Extension of the Export Control Act (Public Law 89–63. Approved June 30, 1965): This law (H.R. 7105) extended the Export Control Act of 1949 for 4 additional years, to June 30, 1969; authorized the administrative imposition of civil monetary penalties not exceeding $1,000 for violations of the act; required all domestic concerns receiving requests to furnish information or to sign agreements to report this fact to the Secretary of Commerce (countering Arab boycotts); and provided a congressional declaration that it was the policy of the United States to protect American business firms from competitive pressures to become involved in foreign trade conspiracies against countries friendly to the United States.

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation (Public Law 89–126. Approved Aug. 14, 1965): This law (S. 1742), among other things, amended the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, as amended, by adding a new section to the act which authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, as the U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) to agree to an amendment to the IBRD's articles of agreement permitting it to make loans to the International Finance Corporation (IFC). It also amended the International Finance Corporation Act to authorize a similar change in the IFC articles of agreement to permit it to lend or borrow from the IBRD within specified limitations.

The law also authorized the U.S. Governor of the IBRD to vote in favor of proposed increases in the bank authorized capital stock in the amount of $2 billion without express congressional approval, provided such proposed increases involved no change in the subscription of the United States.

Peace Corps Act amendments (Public Law 89–134. Approved Aug. 24, 1965): This law (S. 2054) amended the Peace Corps Act, as amended, to authorize an appropriation of $115 million for Peace Corps activities in fiscal year 1966 and made a number of substantive changes in the Peace Corps Act.

Foreign Assistance Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–171. Approved Sept. 6, 1965):

This law (H.R. 7750) authorized an aggregate appropriation of $3,360,000,000 for fiscal 1966 for the foreign aid program. The authorization was for development assistance, military assistance, and administrative expenses. The program was authorized for 1 year only.

Among other things, the law (1) provided a special authorization for southeast Asia of $89 million; (2) stated the policy of Congress that all foreign assistance should be withheld by the President from a country which permitted or failed to take reasonable measures to prevent the destruction by mob action of U.S. property within such country; (3) amended the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide that no sale under title I of this act shall be made to the United Arab Republic unless the President determines that such sale is essential to the national interest of the United States; (4) provided that consideration shall be given to excluding from aid any country which seizes any U.S. fishing vessels in international waters; and (5) provided that $25 million of the $55 million authorized for Latin American military assistance may be used for an inter-American military force under control of the Organization of American States.

Balance-of-payments voluntary agreements (Public Law 89–175. Approved Sept. 9, 1965): This law (H.R. 5280) provided for certain exemptions from the antitrust laws and established procedures for the formulation, organization, and operation of voluntary agreements or programs among banks, investment bankers and companies, insurance companies, finance companies, pension funds, and other financial interests, that provide for joint action, under the supervision of responsible Government officials, determined to be needed to safeguard the balance-of-payments position of the United States.

LABOR

Manpower Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–15. Approved Apr. 26, 1965):

This law (S. 974) amended the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (MDTA) by extending the program for 4 years through June 30, 1969, and by expanding various authorities provided in the original act.

The law authorized appropriations of $454 million for fiscal 1966, and such sums as might be necessary for each fiscal year thereafter.

Amendments to Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and Railroad Retirement Tax Act (Public Law 89–212. Approved Sept. 29, 1965): This law (H.R. 10874) amended the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate provisions which reduce spouses' annuities by the amount of social security or railroad retirement benefits which the spouse has earned in her own right; to increase the maximum creditable and taxable monthly compensation under the Railroad Retirement Act and Railroad Retirement Tax Act from $450 to $550 per month, effective January 1, 1966; to change the rates of tax under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act; and to provide the same treatment of tips for purposes of the Railroad Retirement Act as is provided for tips under the Social Security Act.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Disposal of zinc, lead, and copper from the national stockpile (Public Law 89–9. Approved Apr. 2, 1965): This law (H.R. 1496) (1) authorized disposal from the national and supplemental stockpiles of (a) 200,000 short tons of lead, (b) 200,000 short tons of zinc, (c) materials having a copper content of 100,000 short tons; and (2) waived the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required before disposals of strategic and critical materials can be accomplished.

Coast Guard authorization (Public Law 89–13. Approved Apr. 18, 1965): This law (H.R. 4527) authorized appropriation of $114,250,000 to the U.S. Coast Guard for fiscal 1966 to procure vessels and aircraft and construct shore and offshore establishments.

Procurement of patrol cutters for the Coast Guard (Public Law 89–21. Approved May 21, 1965): This law (H.R. 7855) authorized appropriation of $6,260,000 for construction of 17 small patrol cutters to replace patrol boats deployed to Vietnam.

Authorizations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, fiscal 1966 (Public Law 89–37. Approved June 11, 1965): This law (S. 800) authorized appropriations for fiscal 1966 of $15,402,800,000 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces. Of this amount, $133,600,000 was authorized only for construction of two nuclear powered attack submarines, $150,500,000 only for construction of a nuclear powered guided missile frigate, and $7 million only for development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft.

Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–132. Approved Aug. 21, 1965):

This law (H.R. 9075) amended title 37, United States Code, to (1) provide an increase in the basic pay for members of the uniformed services, (2) provide a monthly increase of $10 in hostile fire pay, (3) provide authority for the payment of a variable reenlistment bonus, (4) establish a statutory requirement for an annual Presidential review of military pay and allowances and a corresponding quadrennial review in respect to the principles and concepts of military compensation, (5) amend the present automatic cost-of-living increase system for retired personnel by providing for an immediate increase in accordance with the rise in the Consumer Price Index since 1962 and by providing for a change in the permanent law under which increases hereafter will be authorized whenever the Consumer Price Index advances by 3 percent or more for 3 consecutive months after a previous increase, and (6) provide military personnel free postage from combat areas.

The estimated total cost for a 12-month period was $1,048,029,000.

Prohibition of destruction or mutilation of draft cards (Public Law 89–152. Approved Aug. 30, 1965): This law (H.R. 10306) amended the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, as amended, to make those persons who knowingly destroy or knowingly mutilate a draft registration card subject to a fine of $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 5 years.

Military construction authorization, fiscal 1969 (Public Law 89–188. Approved Sept. 16, 1965): This law (H.R. 10775) authorized the Secretaries of Defense, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, with total authorizations of $1,780,062,000, including deficiency authorizations of $9,823,000. Included also in this authorization was $684,388,000 for military family housing.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

Increased SBA lending authority for SBIC's and State and local development companies (Public Law 89–78. Approved July 21, 1965): This law (H.R. 7847) increased from $341 million to $461 million the portion of the Small Business Administration's revolving fund which may be on loan to small business investment companies and State and local development companies pursuant to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. The law did not appropriate or authorize the appropriation of any new funds.

Interest rates on foreign official time deposits (Public Law 89–79. Approved July 21, 1965): This law (H.R. 5306) extended through October 15, 1968, the authority for commercial banks to pay on certain foreign time deposits higher rates of interest than those otherwise permitted by regulations issued by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The law is part of the Government's program to improve the international balance-of-payments position of the United States.

Amending Fisheries Loan Act (Public Law 89–85. Approved July 24, 1965): This law (S. 998) amended section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make loans for the financing and refinancing of new and used fishing vessels, and to extend the term during which the Secretary can make fisheries loans under the act for 5 years, to June 30, 1970. The law authorized appropriation of $20 million to the fisheries loan fund.

Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–136. Approved Aug. 26, 1965): This law (S. 1648) (largely based upon three previous acts, the Area Redevelopment Act, the Public Works Acceleration Act, and the Appalachian Regional Development Act) provided a comprehensive program of Federal assistance to help provide more jobs and higher incomes for people who live in areas where jobs are scarce and incomes low.

The law authorized the Secretary of Commerce to make grants of up to 80 percent in eligible areas for public works which are necessary for area economic development or for the objectives of the antipoverty program; make supplementary grants which would reduce the local share for needy communities in eligible areas down to as low as 20 percent for other Federal public works programs which require community contributions; make loans on favorable terms in eligible areas for public works and development facilities; make long-term, low-cost loans in eligible areas to help establish or expand job-creating businesses; guarantee up to 90 percent of the outstanding balance of private loans for working capital made in connection with the expansion or establishment of businesses assisted under the program; help communities and businessmen find the answers to the specific economic and technical problems which are obstacles to economic growth; pay up to 75 percent of the cost of providing full-time planning staff for State, district, and selected local economic development organizations; undertake research on general problems of long-term unemployment and underemployment; give communities information and advice on how to reduce unemployment and attain economic growth; establish an independent study board to investigate the effects of Government procurement on regional economic development; designate the areas which would be eligible for financial assistance on the basis of unemployment, income, and comparable criteria; provide similar financial help to areas which suffer or are about to suffer from a sudden rise in unemployment; help the States and localities form larger, multicounty economic development districts and officially recognize such districts as eligible for planning assistance; designate economic development centers within such districts as eligible for financial assistance for projects designed to reduce district unemployment; make grants of up to 10 percent extra on the cost of public works or development facilities to distressed areas cooperating in a district plan, but not to exceed an 80-percent overall maximum; designate economic development regions composed of two or more States; help the States establish multistate planning commissions for such regions; provide special technical assistance to the regional planning commissions; pay the necessary administrative expenses of each commission for the first 2 years of its existence, and half the expenses thereafter; assign the responsibility for administering and coordinating the program to a new Assistant Secretary of Commerce and an Administrator whom the President is authorized to appoint; and appoint a National Public Advisory Committee on Regional Economic Development.

The law authorized appropriations as follows:

Public works and facilities grants not to exceed $500 million a year for fiscal years 1966 through 1969;

Loans for public works and facilities, loans for industrial and commercial guarantees for working capital loans not to exceed $170 million a year for fiscal years 1966 through 1970;

Technical assistance, research, planning grants, training and study programs, $25 million a year for fiscal years 1966 through 1970;

Loans and grants to development centers, grant increase of 10 percent for designated areas in districts not to exceed $50 million a year for fiscal years 1967 through 1970; and

Technical assistance to regions, administrative expenses to regions, $15 million a year for fiscal years 1966 through 1970.

Extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases (Public Law 89–142. Approved Aug. 28, 1965): This law (H.J. Res. 431) continued until December 31, 1967, the renewal term of any copyright subsisting on the date of approval of this law where such term would otherwise expire prior to December 31, 1967.

State Technical Services Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–182. Approved Sept. 14, 1965): This law (S. 949) provided for the establishment of a 3-year matching grants program of incentives and support for the several States individually and in cooperation with each other in establishing and maintaining State and interstate technical service programs designed to enable businesses, commerce, and industrial establishments to acquire and use scientific and engineering information more effectively. The law authorized to be appropriated $10 million for fiscal 1966, $20 million for fiscal 1967, and $30 million for fiscal 1968.

Use of cargo containers in coastwise trade (Public Law 89–194. Approved Sept. 21, 1965): This law (H.R. 5989) amended section 27, Merchant Marine Act of 1920, as amended, to permit empty cargo vans, empty lift vans, and empty shipping tanks to be transported coastwise by vessels of the United States not qualified to engage in the coastwise trade and by vessels of foreign registry if the government of the nation of registry extends reciprocal privileges to U.S. vessels, so long as such vans or tanks are owned or leased by the owner or operator of the transporting vessel and are being transported for use in the carriage of cargo in foreign trade.

Amending the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act (Public Law 89–238. Approved Oct. 5, 1965): This law (H.R. 5842) amended the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961, to extend the lead-zinc small producers program for a period of 4 years, to December 31, 1969. The law also increased the tonnage a small operator may produce and still qualify for participation in the program to 1,200 tons of each metal from the present limit of 600 tons and amended the definition of "small domestic producers" to simplify administration. No new or additional appropriations were authorized, but a limitation of $2,500,000 was placed on the amount of payments which could be made in any calendar year on account of newly mined ores or concentrates produced therefrom.

Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–241. Approved Oct. 7, 1965): This law (H.R. 7969) corrected certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States and established schedules of tariff classifications which will be logical in arrangement and terminology and adapted to the changes which have occurred since 1930 in the character and importance of articles produced in and imported into the United States and in the markets in which they are sold.

Extension of vessel exchange program (Public Law 89–254. Approved Oct. 10, 1965): This law (H.R. 728) extended for an additional 5 years the vessel exchange program under section 510(i) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and broadened the exchange provisions by eliminating the requirement of existing law that the traded-in vessels shall be war-built vessels, so as to include older vessels built prior to World War II in the category of eligibility for trade-in in order to make prewar vessels operating on the Great Lakes eligible for trade-in on newer Government ships.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Movable Property Act (Public Law 89–48. Approved June 24, 1965): This law (S. 1000) amended the act of July 29, 1954, as amended, to give the Secretary of the Interior authority to transfer title to movable property to a municipality which assumes responsibility for the operation and maintenance of works constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation to furnish and distribute municipal water. It placed municipalities on the same footing as irrigation districts and other water users' organizations which have had this authority available to them since 1954 with respect to irrigation works.

Federal Water Project Recreation Act (Public Law 89–72. Approved July 9, 1965): This law (S. 1229) established prospective standard guidelines on the allocation of the reimbursability of recreation and fish and wildlife costs of Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects, gave the Secretary of the Interior certain limited authority for recreation development on existing projects under his control, and required prior approval by the Congress of any studies and investigations leading to the preparation of a "feasibility report" on a reclamation project.

Water Resources Planning Act (Public Law 89–80. Approved July 22, 1965): This law (S. 21) (1) established a Water Resources Council composed of the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, Army, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, with a permanent authorization of not to exceed $300,000 a year; (2) authorized the creation by the President of river basin commissions for coordinated studies and planning within a State, basin, or group of basins, with a permanent authorization of not to exceed $6 million a year; and (3) provided Federal grants to the States to assist them in developing comprehensive water and related land resources plans, with an authorization of $5 million a year for 10 years beginning fiscal 1967 for grants and an authorization of not to exceed $400,000 a year for 10 years beginning fiscal 1967 for administration.

Saline water conversion program (Public Law 89–118. Approved Aug. 11, 1965): This law (S. 24) expanded and extended the saline water research and development program for an additional 5 years through fiscal 1972; authorized an additional $15 million to be appropriated for research and development work (which, when added to previously authorized but unappropriated funds, makes available $35 million for appropriation after fiscal 1966); and required additional authorization by the Congress for appropriation of amounts above $90 million, with a ceiling of $185 million on such additional amounts.

Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area (Public Law 89–158. Approved Sept. 1, 1965): This law (H.R. 89) established the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area (Tocks Island National Recreation Area) in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey. The amount authorized to be appropriated was limited to $37,412,000 for land acquisition and $18,200,000 for the installation and construction of recreation facilities.

Assateague Island National Seashore (Public Law 89–195. Approved Sept. 21, 1965): This law (S. 20) provided for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia and authorized up to $16,250,000 to enable the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands and interest in land. The law authorized appropriation of such sums as may be necessary for development.

Protection of fish and wildlife from pesticides (Public Law 89–232. Approved Oct. 1, 1965): This law (S. 1623) amended the act of August 1, 1958, to increase the ceiling on authorized annual appropriations for pesticides research from $2,565,000 to $3.2 million for fiscal 1966 and to $5 million annually for fiscal 1967 and 1968.

Water Quality Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-234. Approved Oct. 2, 1965): This law (S. 4) amended the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration; to provide a 4-year, $20 million a year program for demonstration grants on controlling pollution from storm and sanitary sewers; to increase grants for municipal sewage treatment works to $150 million a year for fiscal 1966 and fiscal 1967; to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters. The law also provided for an additional Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and an Administrator to guide the program, which is taken out of the Public Health Service.

Rural water facilities (Public Law 89-240. Approved Oct. 7, 1965): This law (S. 1766) amended the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply, water systems, and waste disposal systems serving rural areas; to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities; and to increase to $450 million the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder. The new program of Federal assistance would benefit rural communities of 5,500 persons or less for the development and construction of water and sewer facilities. Among other things, the law limited a single loan to $4 million and increased the annual matching grant authority to $50 million.

PUBLIC WELFARE

Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-4. Approved Mar. 9, 1965):

This law (S. 3) (the first item of legislation to become law as a part of the package generally described as "the Great Society program" of President Johnson) created an Appalachian Regional Commission to plan special activities and undertakings in the Appalachian region. The Commission will consist of the Governor (or his designee) from each of the 11 participating States and a Federal Cochairman appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Commission will have authority to conduct studies, investigations, and demonstration projects and will recommend programs but will not be an "action" commission. The law authorized appropriation of $2.2 million to the Federal Government to pay the administrative expenses of the Commission through the period ending June 30 of the second full fiscal year after enactment.

The total authorization was $1,092 million. The $840 million for roads would be available to July 1, 1971. The balance would be available through fiscal 1966 and 1967.

Principally, the law authorized construction of 2,350 miles of development highways and 1,000 miles of local access roads. Federal assistance was limited to 70 percent of the cost. The total Federal authorization for this program was $840 million; the States will contribute $160 million.

The law authorized appropriation of $252,400,000 for the 2 fiscal years ending June 30, 1967, to be allocated as follows:

For demonstration health facilities, not to exceed $41 million for construction grants (not to exceed 80 percent of cost of the project); $28 million for operation of such facilities, with Federal grants up to 100 percent of cost for the first 2 years of operation and up to 50 percent for the next 3 years.

For land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control, not to exceed $17 million, with grants to any owner or operator not to exceed 80 percent of the cost of improving up to 50 acres of land.

For timber development organizations, not to exceed $5 million in Federal loans and not to exceed 50 percent of initial capital requirements.

For mining area restoration, $36.5 million in Federal grants, with the Federal share of projects conducted on lands other than those federally owned limited to 75 percent of costs; with a study program for the purpose of reclaiming and rehabilitating strip and surface mining areas in the United States. No funds may be spent except on lands owned by Federal, State, or local governments until authorized by law after completion of the study.

For water resource survey, not to exceed $5 million, to prepare a program for development of regional water resources.

In addition to these new programs, existing programs were supplemented and modified as follows:

For vocational education facilities, not to exceed $16 million in Federal grants for construction in addition to funds authorized previously by the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

For sewage treatment works, not to exceed $6 million in Federal grants for construction in addition to funds authorized previously by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Amendment of the Housing Act of 1954 to make the Appalachian Regional Commission an eligible agency to receive comprehensive planning grants under that act; all funds to come from the Housing and Home Finance Agency budget.

For supplements to Federal grant-in-aid programs, not to exceed $90 million for use to increase the Federal contribution to grant-in-aid programs above the fixed maximum portion authorized by the applicable law in order to decrease the local share, the Federal portion not to be increased above 80 percent of the cost.

The law also included provisions for eligibility and consent of States.

The Secretary of Commerce was authorized to make grants for investigations, research, studies, and demonstration projects; plus grants for administrative expenses of local development districts of up to 75 percent of their expenses, such grants not to be made to any one district for a period in excess of 3 years. Authorization of $5.5 million was provided for these grants for fiscal 1966 and 1967.

Scientific and technological advances resulting from Government assistance under this law would be freely available to the general public.

The Appalachian region was defined as consisting of designated counties in Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and all of West Virginia. After study, consideration, and consultation with the Governor of New York certain contiguous counties in New York could be included.

National Technical Institute for the Deaf (Public Law 89-36. Approved June 8, 1965): This law (H.R. 7031) authorized the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, subject to the appropriations process, to enter into an agreement with an institution of higher education for the establishment, construction, equipping, and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf for the purpose of providing a residential facility for postsecondary technical training and education for persons who are deaf in order to prepare them for successful employment.

Area Redevelopment Act extension (Public Law 89-55. Approved June 30, 1965): This law (H.J. Res. 541) extended the Area Redevelopment Act for 2 months to August 31, 1965.

Additional assistance for disaster victims (Public Law 89-59. Approved June 30, 1965): This law (S. 1796) amended the Small Business Act to provide additional assistance for disaster victims by increasing the maturity of SBA disaster loans from 20 to 30 years and providing for a suspension of up to 5 years on the payment of principal and interest on disaster loans at the discretion of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. The law also increased SBA's revolving fund by $50 million.

Older Americans Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-73. Approved July 14, 1965): This law (H.R. 3708) (1) provided for an Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under a Commissioner on Aging, appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and (2) authorized the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to States for (a) community planning and coordination of programs for older citizens, (b) demonstration projects, (c) training of special personnel, and (d) other programs to carry out the purposes of the act. Such grants and contracts would be with public or nonprofit agencies, organizations, institutes, or individuals for study, development, demonstration, and evaluation projects and with any public or nonprofit agency, organization, or institution for specialized training of personnel.

For community planning, services, and training, the law provided a program of grants for 5 years commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and authorized appropriations of $5 million for fiscal 1966, $8 million for fiscal 1967, and such sums as Congress may provide for the following 3 fiscal years.

For research and development projects and training projects, the law authorized appropriations of $1.5 million for fiscal 1966, $3 million for fiscal 1967, and such sums as Congress may provide for the following 3 fiscal years.

Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act Amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89-105. Approved Aug. 4, 1965): This law (H.R. 2985) amended the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. Its principal provisions included:

(1) authority for financial assistance toward meeting the initial cost of technical and professional personnel serving in community mental health centers during the first months in which such centers, or new services in existing centers, are in operation, with authorization of appropriations of $19,500,000 for fiscal 1966, $24 million for fiscal 1967 and $30 million for fiscal 1968. (For fiscal 1967, and each of the 5 succeeding years, the law authorized appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to make grants to such centers which have previously received a grant and are eligible for such a grant for the year for which sums are being apropriated.);

(2) extension and expansion of the existing program of financial assistance for training teachers of handicapped children, with authorization of appropriations of $19,500,000 for fiscal 1966, $29,500,000 for fiscal 1967, $34 million for fiscal 1968, and $37,500,000 for fiscal 1969; and

(3) continuation of research and demonstration projects to improve methods and techniques for educating handicapped children, with authorizations of $6 million for fiscal 1966, $9 million for fiscal 1967, $12 million for fiscal 1968, and $14 million for fiscal 1969.

Community health services extension amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89-109. Approved Aug. 5, 1965): This law (S. 510) authorized (1) $33 million over the 3 fiscal years 1966-68 to assist in financing immunization programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and added to the program measles and other infectious diseases; (2) $24 million over the 3 fiscal years 1966-68 for health services for domestic agricultural farmworkers and their families; (3) an increase in the subceiling on appropriations from $2,500,000 to $5 million for formula grants for schools of public health for each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967; and (4) $50 million for formula grants for fiscal year 1967 for general health services, mental health services, dental health services, health services for the chronically ill and aged, radiological health services, and schools of public health, plus $10 million for project grants for community health services for fiscal 1967.

Health research facilities amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89–115. Approved Aug. 9, 1965):

This law (H.R. 2984) extended and expanded the existing matching grant program of the Public Health Service for construction of health research facilities for an additional 3 years, fiscal 1967–69, and authorized an aggregate appropriation of not to exceed $280 million.

The law provided a 3-year authorization, fiscal 1966–68, for contract authority by the Public Health Service for research.

The law also provided for three additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Heart disease, cancer, and stroke amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89–239. Approved Oct. 6, 1965): This law (S. 596) amended the Public Health Service Act to authorize a 3-year, $340 million program of grants-in-aid to encourage and assist in the establishment of regional cooperative arrangements among medical schools, research institutions, and hospitals for research and training (including continuing education) and for related demonstrations of patient care in the fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and related diseases.

Economic opportunity amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89–253. Approved Oct. 9, 1965: This law (H.R. 8283) extended the program under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to a 3-year program ending June 30, 1967. For fiscal 1966 a total of $1,785 million was authorized. Of this total, $700 million was authorized for youth programs; $850 million for urban and rural community action programs; $55 million for special programs to combat poverty in rural areas; $150 million for work experience programs; and $30 million for administration and coordination. For fiscal 1967, the law authorized the appropriation of such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

PUBLIC WORKS

Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–41. Approved June 17, 1965): This law (S. 2089) authorized appropriations totaling $111,875,000 to provide assistance to the States of Oregon, Washington, California, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters.

Additional authorizations for certain river basin plans (Public Law 89–42. Approved June 18, 1965): This law (H.R. 6755) authorized total additional appropriations of $944 million for prosecution of projects, in amounts estimated to be necessary for a 2-year period, in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, among them the following: Alabama-Coosa, Arkansas River, Columbia River, Lower Mississipi, Missouri River, Ohio River, and Los Angeles River.

Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project (Public Law 89–108. Approved Aug. 5, 1965): This law (H.R. 237) reauthorized construction of the initial stage of the Garrison diversion unit of the Missouri River Basin project as a multiple-purpose development for irrigation, municipal and industrial water, fish and wildlife conservation and development, recreation, and flood control. The law also provided an appropriation limitation of $207 million for new construction and authorized appropriation of such additional sums as may be required for operation and maintenance of the unit.

Auburn-Folsom South Unit, American River Division, Central Valley Project, Calif. (Public Law 89–161. Approved Sept. 2, 1965): This law (H.R. 485) authorized the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws, to maximize economic utilization of the remaining waters of the American River Basin for irrigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, municipal and industrial water supply, fish and wildlife, and recreation purposes. The law authorized appropriations of $425 million for construction of the unit. It also authorized appropriation of such sums as may be required for operation and maintenance of the project.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Social Security Amendments of 1965—Medicare (Public Law 89–97. Approved July 30, 1965):

This law (H.R. 6675) established three new health care programs: (1) a compulsory hospital-based program for the aged; (2) a voluntary supplemental plan to provide physicians' and other supplementary health services for the aged; and (3) an expanded Kerr-Mills program for the needy and the medically needy. It expanded the services for child health and welfare. It revised and broadened the benefit and coverage provisions and the financing of the Federal old age, survivors, and disability insurance program (OASDI).

A basic hospital insurance plan, effective July 1, 1966, provided protection against the costs of hospital, related post-hospital care (skilled nursing home and home health visits), and outpatients, diagnostic services, for approximately 17 million individuals 65 or older who were eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits. Included were 60 days of free hospital care (subject to an initial deductible of $40), plus a maximum of 30 additional days at a cost of $10 a day. The cost of providing basic hospital and related benefits to currently aged people who were not social security or railroad retirement beneficiaries would be met through general revenues. Two million uninsured would qualify.

A voluntary supplementary insurance plan, effective July 1, 1966, provided physicians' and other medical and health services, financed through monthly premiums of $3 by individuals, matched equally by Federal Government revenue contributions. It was estimated that of the total eligible aged of 19 million, between 80 to 95 percent would participate, meaning approximately 15.2 to 18 million individuals would be involved.

With respect to OASDI, the law increased benefits for about 20 million people by 7 percent across the board, retroactive to January 1, 1965, with a $4 minimum increase for a retired worker at 65. It also liberalized the definition of disability insurance benefits; increased the amount an individual was permitted to earn under the earnings limitation, without suffering deduction from benefits; revised the coverage provisions by including self-employed physicians and earnings from cash tips; liberalized the income treatment for self-employed farmers; required disclosure to courts and to welfare officials of whereabouts of deserting fathers in certain circumstances; and revised the tax schedule and the earnings base to finance the changes made. (To finance both OASDI and (basic) medicare, the tax on employer and employee each would be increased from 4.2 percent beginning in 1966 to 5.65 percent in 1987 and thereafter; the earnings base was increased from $4,800 to $6,600 a year.)

Public assistance programs were liberalized. Some 7.2 million persons would be eligible for increased cash payments under the Federal-State matching programs. About 150,000 aged persons in mental and tuberculosis hospitals would be eligible potentially for payments because of the removal of the exclusion of these institutions from matching public assistance programs.

Total benefit and assistance payments under the entire law, including its medical provisions, would approximate $6.5 billion in the first full year.

SPACE AND AERONAUTICS

National Aeronautics and Space Administration appropriations authorization, fiscal 1966 (Public Law 89–53, approved June 28, 1965):

This law (H.R. 7717) authorized appropriations of $5,190,396,200 to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as follows: (a) Research and development, $4,536,971,000; (b) construction of facilities, $62,376,350; and (c) administrative operations, $591,048,850.

The law divided into 23 major categories all of NASA's research and development work. For the moon shot (Apollo) program, $2,967,385,000 was authorized.

TRANSPORTATION

Interstate and Defense Highways System apportionment (Public Law 89–139. Approved Aug. 28, 1965): This law (S.J. Res. 81) authorized appropriation of the additional sum of $3 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; authorized the Secretary of Commerce to apportion the sum authorized for fiscal 1967 for expenditures on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; reserved to Congress the right to disapprove the cost estimate for completion of such national system submitted by the Secretary; expressed the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Commerce shall report to Congress in January 1968, and in January of every second year thereafter, his estimates of the future highway needs of the Nation; and stated that by December 31, 1967, each State should have an approved highway safety program.

Interstate Commerce Act amendments (Public Law 89–170. Approved Sept. 6, 1965): This law (H.R. 5401) amended the Interstate Commerce Act so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system. Among other things, the law provided new methods for proceeding against illegal trucking operations.

Rail rapid transit for the National Capital region (Public Law 89–173. Approved Sept. 8, 1965): This law (H.R. 4822) authorized the establishment in the National Capital region of a system of rail rapid transit lines and related facilities, in furtherance of the objectives of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960. The law provided that the cost of constructing and equipping the system, excluding interest costs, shall not exceed $431 million.

High-speed ground transportation (Public Law 89–220. Approved Sept. 30, 1965): This law (S. 1588) authorized the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development and to contract for demonstrations in high speed intercity ground transportation as well as to secure transportation data, statistics, and other information for the improvement of the national transportation system. The program was limited to 3 years and a total cost of $90 million.

TREATIES

U.N. Charter amendments (Exec. A, 89th Cong., 1st sess. Ratified June 3, 1965): This treaty would amend the U.N. Charter to increase the number of nonpermanent members on the Security Council from 11 to 15 and to increase the membership of the Economic and Social Council from 18 to 27. It would also provide certain changes in election procedures to be effective after the increase in the membership of the two councils had been approved by the requisite number of nations.

International Wheat Agreement extension (Exec. B, 89th Cong., 1st sess. Ratified June 15, 1965): This protocol would continue the International Wheat Agreement of 1962 in force between the member nations until July 31, 1966, an extension of 1 year. The 1962 agreement set minimum and maximum prices at $1.625 and $2.025 a bushel respectively. Under the agreement, each importing member country undertook to purchase from member exporters a specified percentage of its total commercial purchases from all sources in order to help stabilize the world market.

Agreement with Canada concerning Gut Dam claims (Exec. C, 89th Cong., 1st sess. Ratified Aug. 30, 1965): This agreement would provide for establishment of a three-member tribunal to receive, determine, and make awards on claims of American citizens for damage to their properties on the shores of Lake Ontario resulting from the construction and maintenance by Canada of Gut Dam in the St. Lawrence River.

Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (Exec. H, 88th Cong., 1st sess. Ratified Sept. 14, 1965): This convention set forth the rights, privileges, and duties of all members of a diplomatic mission, of their families and private servants, and the rights and obligations of the state on whose territory they performed their functions. The convention was accompanied by an optional protocol, signed by the United States, concerning the compulsory settlement of disputes by the International Court of Justice, as a result of which the so-called Connally reservation would not apply in cases in which the United States might become involved relating to application and interpretation of the Vienna Convention.

VETERANS

Extending the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments (Public Law 89–50. Approved June 24, 1965): This law (H.R. 214)(1) extended the statute of limitations for filing for mustering-out payments and (2) repealed the authority for mustering-out payments, effective July 1, 1966. This law would affect a small group of members of the Armed Forces who served on active duty during the Korean conflict.

Increasing rates of subsistence for service-connected trainees under vocational rehabilitation (Public Law 89–137. Approved Aug. 26, 1965): This law (H.R. 206) provided a cost-of-living increase in subsistence allowances paid to disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation training. The estimated cost for the first 5 years would be $8,100,000.

Training of seriously disabled veterans under the vocational rehabilitation program (Public Law 89–138. Approved Aug. 26, 1965): This law (H.R. 208) amended chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, to extend to seriously disabled veterans the same liberalization of time limits for pursuing vocational rehabilitation training as was authorized for blinded veterans by Public Law 87–591), and to clarify the language of the law relating to the limiting of periods for pursuing such training. The estimated cost for the first 5 years would be approximately $16 million.

Group life insurance for members of the Armed Forces (Public Law 89–214. Approved Sept. 29, 1965): This law (S. 2127) amended title 38, United States Code, to provide a group life insurance plan for all members of the uniformed services on active duty on and after the effective date designated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Coverage is automatic with the serviceman being required to take affirmative action to remove himself from the program. The coverage provided is $10,000 or $5,000. Premium rates for the servicemen are expected to be $2 a month for the $10,000 policy and $1 per month for the $5,000 policy, these premiums to be deducted from the pay of the servicemen by the Department of Defense and remitted to the Veterans' Administration. The insurance will be underwritten by private insurance companies. All costs traceable to extra hazards of servicemen will be borne by the Government, otherwise the program would be self-sustaining. If an individual has a service-connected disability, he will be eligible for a commercial policy without medical examination, and in addition will be eligible for a $10,000 disabled veterans' insurance policy administered by the Veterans' Administration. For the period Januray 1, 1957, and continuing until the effective date of the group insurance plan, a maximum death gratuity of $5,000 is provided to a widow, child, or children, or the parents of individuals who served during this period in one of the branches of the armed services and who lost their lives under certain hazardous conditions as a result of such service.

Increasing rates of subsistence under war orphans' educational assistance program (Public Law 89–222. Approved Sept. 30, 1965): This law (H.R. 205) amended chapter 35 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the educational assistance allowances payable under the war orphans' educational assistance program.

EVOLUTION OF THE SENATE'S VERSION OF "THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965"

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, at the time the Senate considered S. 1564, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, I repeatedly demonstrated the numerous conflicts this measure presented with the Constitution of the United States. I noted that the provisions of that bill would violate article I, section 2, article II, section 1, and the 17th amendment to the Constitution; that it contravened the constitutional prohibition of ex post facto laws, and that while attempting to correct discrimination, the authors of the measure created one of the most discriminatory laws ever conceived. At that time, I cited constitutional support and legal decisions as well as the social desirability for the use of literacy tests.

Earlier I presented a complete and annotated explanation of the constitutional defects elsewhere in the Record. Today I shall limit my remarks to a brief reference to the constitutional defects as I trace the Voting Rights Act of 1965 from its conception through its evolution to the bill which was originally passed by the Senate.

In the Senate S. 1564 was printed in four separate and different versions, and had more than a dozen major amendments added to it, and even more amendments rejected. Even after the imposition of cloture there still were well over 50 amendments pending.

As a matter of historical interest and in order that all Americans may be fully cognizant of the evolution and ramifications of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, I think it appropriate that a chronological outline of the legislative history of S. 1564; while it was before this body, be made a part of the Record. Accordingly, I intend to allude particularly to the changes sought and achieved by those of us who believe that the Constitution provides a frame within which Congress must legislate.

On March 15, 1965, after a series of civil rights demonstrations, President Johnson addressed a joint session of Congress to announce his intention to send to the Congress a so-called voting rights bill designed as a panacea of all the ills suffered by Negroes in their attempts to register and vote. At the time the President spoke, the bill he proposed was not in final form although the Attorney General later admitted that he and his staff had been working on the measure since November 1964.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's address be printed at this point in the Record along with his formal message to the Congress.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Congressional Record, Mar. 15 1965]

Address of the President of the United States Before Congress, March 15, 1965

The President. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the Congress, I speak tonight for the dignity of man and the destiny of democracy.

I urge every member of both parties—Americans of all religions and of all colors—from every section of this country—to join me in that cause.

At times, history and fate meet at a single time in a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom. So it was at Lexington and Concord. So it was a century ago at Appomattox. So it was last week in Selma, Ala.

There, long-suffering men and women peacefully protested the denial of their rights as Americans. Many were brutally assaulted. One good man—a man of God—was killed.

There was no cause for pride in what has happened in Selma.

There is no cause for self-satisfaction in the long denial of equal rights of millions of Americans.

But there is cause for hope and for faith in our democracy in what is happening here tonight.

For the cries of pain, and the hymns and protests of oppressed people, have summoned into convocation all the majesty of this great Government, the Government of the greatest Nation on earth.

Our mission is at once the oldest and most basic of this country: to right wrong, to do justice, to serve man.

In our time we have come to live with the moments of great crisis. Our lives have been marked with debate about great issues—issues of war and peace, issues of prosperity and depression. But rarely, in any time, does an issue lay bare the secret heart of America itself. Rarely are we met with the challenge, not to our growth or abundance, or our welfare or our security—but rather to the values and the purposes and the meaning of our beloved Nation.

The issue of equal rights for American Negroes is such an issue. And should we defeat every enemy, and should we double our wealth and conquer the stars and still be unequal to this issue, then we will have failed as a people and as a Nation.

For with a country as with a person, "What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"

There is no Negro problem. There is no southern problem. There is no northern problem. There is only an American problem.

And we are met here tonight as Americans—not as Democrats or Republicans—

we are met here as Americans to solve that problem.

This was the first nation in the history of the world to be founded with a purpose. The great phrases of that purpose still sound in every American heart, north and south: "All men are created equal"—"Government by consent of the governed"—"Give me liberty or give me death." And those are not just clever words and those are not just empty theories. In their name Americans have fought and died for two centuries and tonight around the world they stand there as guardians of our liberty risking their lives.

Those words are a promise to every citizen that he shall share in the dignity of man. This dignity cannot be found in a man's possessions. It cannot be found in his power or in his position. It really rests on his right to be treated as a man equal in opportunity to all others. It says that he shall share in freedom, he shall choose his leaders, educate his children, provide for his family according to his ability and his merits as a human being.

To apply any other test—to deny a man his hopes because of his color or race or his religion or the place of his birth—is not only to do injustice, it is to deny America and to dishonor the dead who gave their lives for American freedom.

Our fathers believed that if this noble view of the rights of man was to flourish, it must be rooted in democracy. The most basic right of all was the right to choose your own leaders. The history of this country in large measure, is the history of the expansion of that right to all of our people.

Many of the issues of civil rights are very complex and most difficult. But about this there can and should be no argument. Every American citizen must have an equal right to vote. There is no reason which can excuse the denial of that right. There is no duty which weighs more heavily on us than the duty we have to insure that right.

Yet the harsh fact is that in many places in this country men and women are kept from voting simply because they are Negroes.

Every device of which human ingenuity is capable has been used to deny this right. The Negro citizen may go to register only to be told that the day is wrong, or the hour is late, or the official in charge is absent.

And if he persists, and if he manages to present himself to the registrar, he may be disqualified because he did not spell out his middle name or because he abbreviated a word on the application.

And if he manages to fill out an application he is given a test. The registrar is the sole judge of whether he passes this test. He may be asked to recite the entire Constitution, or explain the most complex provisions of State law and even a college degree cannot be used to prove that he can read and write.

For the fact is that the only way to pass these barriers is to show a white skin.

Experience has clearly shown that the existing process of law cannot overcome systematic and ingenious discrimination. No law that we now have on the books—and I have helped to put three of them there—can insure the right to vote when local officials are determined to deny it.

In such a case our duty must be clear to all of us. The Constitution says that no person shall be kept from voting because of his race or his color. We have all sworn an oath before God to support and to defend that Constitution.

We must now act in obedience to that oath.

Wednesday I will send to Congress a law designed to eliminate illegal barriers to the right to vote.

The broad principles of that bill will be in the hands of the Democratic and Republican leaders tomorrow. After they have reviewed it, it will come here formally as a bill.

I am grateful for this opportunity to come here tonight at the invitation of the leadership to reason with my friends, to give them my views, and to visit with my former colleagues.

I have had prepared a more comprehensive analysis of the legislation which I had intended to transmit to the Clerk tomorrow, but which I will submit to the Clerk tonight. But I want to really discuss with you now, briefly, the main proposals of this legislation.

This bill will strike down restrictions to voting in all elections—Federal, State, and local—which have been used to deny Negroes the right to vote.

This bill will establish a simple uniform standard which cannot be used however ingenious the effort to flout our Constitution.

It will provide for citizens to be registered by officials of the U.S. Government if the State officials refuse to register them.

It will eliminate tedious, unnecessary lawsuits which delay the right to vote.

Finally, this legislation will insure that properly registered individuals are not prohibited from voting.

I will welcome the suggestions from all the Members of Congress—I have no doubt that I will get some—on ways and means to strengthen this law and to make it effective. But experience has plainly shown that this is the only path to carry out the command of the Constitution.

To those who seek to avoid action by their National Government in the home communities—who want to and who seek to maintain purely local control over elections—the answer is simple.

Open your polling places to all your people.

Allow men and women to register and vote whatever the color of their skin.

Extend the rights of citizenship to every citizen of this land.

There is no constitutional issue here. The command of the Constitution is plain.

There is no moral issue. It is wrong—deadly wrong—to deny any of your fellow Americans the right to vote in this country.

There is no issue of States rights or National rights. There is only the struggle for human rights.

I have not the slightest doubt what will be your answer.

But the last time a President sent a civil rights bill to the Congress it contained a provision to protect voting rights in Federal elections. That civil rights bill was passed after 8 long months of debate. And when that bill came to my desk from the Congress for my signature, the heart of the voting provision had been eliminated.

This time, on this issue, there must be no delay, or no hesitation, or no compromise with our purpose.

We cannot, we must not refuse to protect the right of every American to vote in every election that he may desire to participate in.

And we ought not and we cannot and we must not wait another 8 months before we get a bill. We have already waited a hundred years and more. And the time for waiting is gone.

So I ask you to join me in working long hours, nights, and weekends if necessary to pass this bill. And I do not make this request lightly, for from the window where I sit with the problems of our country I recognize that from outside this Chamber is the outraged conscience of a nation—the grave concern of many nations—and the harsh judgment of history on our acts.

But even if we pass this bill, the battle will not be over. What happened in Selma is part of a far larger movement which reaches into every section and State of America. It is the effort of American Negroes to secure for themselves the full blessings of American life.

Their cause must be our cause too, because it is not just Negroes but really it is all of us, who must overcome the crippling legacy of bigotry and injustice. And we shall overcome.

As a man whose roots go deeply into southern soil I know how agonizing racial feelings are. I know how difficult it is to reshape the attitudes and the structure of our society.

But a century has passed—more than 100 years—since the Negro was freed. And he is not fully free tonight. It was more than 100 years ago that Abraham Lincoln, a great President of another party, signed the Emancipation Proclamation. But emancipation is a proclamation and not a fact.

A century has passed—more than 100 years—since equality was promised. And yet the Negro is not equal.

A century has passed since the day of promise. And the promise is unkept.

The time of justice has now come. And I tell you that I believe sincerely that no force can hold it back. It is right—in the eyes of man and God—that it should come. And when it does, I think that day will brighten the lives of every American.

For Negroes are not the only victims. How many white children have gone uneducated and how many white families have lived in stark poverty—how many white lives have been scarred by fear because we have wasted our energy and our substance to maintain the barriers of hatred and terror.

And so I say to all of you here and to all in the Nation tonight that those who appeal to you to hold on to the past do so at the cost of denying you your future.

This great, rich, restless country can offer opportunity and education and hope to all—all black and white, all North and South, sharecropper and city dweller. These are the enemies—poverty, ignorance, disease—they are our enemies, not our fellowman, not our neighbor. And these enemies too—poverty, disease, and ignorance—we shall overcome.

Now let none of us, in any section, look with prideful righteousness on the troubles in another section or the problems of our neighbors. There is really no part of America where the promise of equality has been fully kept. In Buffalo as well as in Birmingham, in Philadelphia as well as Selma, Americans are struggling for the fruits of freedom.

This is one Nation. What happens in Selma or in Cincinnati is a matter of legitimate concern to every American. But let us look within our own hearts and our own communities, and let each of us put our shoulder to the wheel to root out injustice wherever it exists.

As we meet here in this peaceful, historic Chamber tonight, men from the South, some of whom were at Iwo Jima, men from the North, who have carried Old Glory to far corners of the world and brought it back without a stain on it, men from the East and from the West, are all fighting together without regard to religion or color or region in Vietnam. Men from every region fought for us across the world 20 years ago.

And now, in these common dangers and these common sacrifices, the South made its contribution of honor and gallantry no less than any other region of the Great Republic, and in some instances—a great many of them—more.

And I have not the slightest doubt that good men from everywhere in this country—from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, from the Golden Gate to the harbors along the Atlantic—will rally now together in this cause to vindicate the freedom of all Americans. For all of us owe this duty, and I believe that all of us will respond to it.

Your President makes that request of every American.

The real hero of this struggle is the American Negro. His actions and protests—his courage to risk safety, and even to risk his life—have awakened the conscience of this Nation. His demonstrations have been designed to call attention to injustice, designed to provoke change, designed to stir reform. He has called upon us to make good the promise of America. And who among us can say that we would have made the same progress were it not for his persistent bravery and his faith in American democracy?

For at the real heart of battle for equality is a deep-seated belief in the democratic process. Equality depends not on the force of arms or tear gas, but depends upon the force of moral right—not on recourse to violence but on respect for law and order.

There have been many pressures upon your President—and there will be others as the days come and go—but I pledge you tonight that we intend to fight this battle where it should be fought, in the courts and in the Congress and in the hearts of men.

We must preserve the right of free speech and the right of free assembly. But the right of free speech does not carry with it, as has been said, the right to holler "fire" in a crowded theater.

We must preserve the right to free assembly, but free assembly does not carry with it the right to block public thoroughfares to traffic.

We do not have a right to protest and a right to march under conditions that do not infringe the constitutional rights of our neighbors. And I intend to protect all those rights as long as I am permitted to serve in this office.

We will guard against violence, knowing it strikes from our hands the very weapons with which we seek progress—obedience to law, and belief in American values.

In Selma, as elsewhere, we seek and pray for peace. We seek order. We seek unity.

But we will not accept the peace of stifled rights, or the order imposed by fear, or the unity that stifles protest. For peace cannot be purchased at the cost of liberty.

In Selma tonight—and we had a good day there—as in every city, we are working for a just and peaceful settlement. And we must all remember—after this speech I am making tonight, after the police and the FBI and the marshals have all gone, and after you have promptly passed this bill—the people of Selma and the other cities of the Nation must still live and work together. And when the attention of the Nation has gone elsewhere they must try to heal the wounds and to build a new community. This cannot be easily done on a battleground of violence, as the history of the South itself shows. It is in recognition of this that men of both races have shown such an outstandingly impressive responsibility in recent days—last Tuesday, and again today.

The bill that I am presenting to you will be known as a civil rights bill. But, in a larger sense, most of the program I am recommending is a civil rights program. Its object is to open the city of hope to all people of all races.

Because all Americans just must have the right to vote. And we are going to give them that right.

All Americans must have the privileges of citizenship regardless of race. And they are going to have those privileges of citizenship regardless of race.

But I would like to caution you and remind you that to exercise these privileges takes much more than legal right. It requires a trained mind and a healthy body. It requires a decent home, and the chance to find a job, and the opportunity to escape from the clutches of poverty.

Of course people cannot contribute to the Nation if they are never taught to read or write, if their bodies are stunted from hunger, if their sickness goes untended, if their life is spent in hopeless poverty just drawing a welfare check.

So we want to open the gates to opportunity. But we are also going to give all our people—black and white—the help that they need to walk through those gates.

My first job after college was as a teacher in Cotulla, Tex., in a small Mexican-American school. Few of them could speak English and I could not speak much Spanish. My students were poor and they often came to class without breakfast—hungry. And they knew, even in their youth the pain of prejudice. They never seemed to know why people disliked them, but they knew it was so because I saw it in their eyes.

I often walked home late in the afternoon after the classes were finished wishing there was more that I could do. But all I knew was to teach them the little that I knew—hoping that it might help them against the hardships that lay ahead.

Somehow you never forget what poverty and hatred can do when you see its scars on the hopeful face of a young child.

I never thought then in 1928 that I would be standing here in 1965. It never even occurred to me in my fondest dreams that I might have the chance to help the sons and daughters of those students—and to help people like them all over this country.

But now I do have that chance and I will let you in on a secret—I mean to use it.

And I hope that you will use it with me.

This is the richest and most powerful country which ever occupied this globe. The might of past empires is little compared to ours.

But I do not want to be the President who built empires, or sought grandeur, or extended dominion.

I want to be the President who educated young children to the wonders of their world.

I want to be the President who helped to feed the hungry and to prepare them to be taxpayers instead of "taxeaters."

I want to be the President who helped the poor to find their own way and who protected the right of every citizen to vote in every election.

I want to be the President who helped to end hatred among his fellow men and who promoted love among the people of all races and all regions and all parties.

I want to be the President who helped to end war among the brothers of this earth.

And so at the request of your beloved Speaker and the Senator from Montana, the majority leader, Mr. MANSFIELD, and the Senator from Illinois, the minority leader, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. MCCULLOCH and others, members of both parties, I come here tonight not as President Roosevelt came down one time in person to veto a bonus bill; not as President Truman came down one time to urge the passage of a railroad bill. But I come here to ask you to share this task with me and to share it with the people we both work for.

I want this to be the Congress—Republicans and Democrats alike—which did all these things for all these people.

Beyond this great Chamber—out yonder in the 50 States are the people we serve. Who can tell what deep and unspoken hopes are in the hearts tonight as they sit there and listen? We all can guess, from our own lives, how difficult they often find their own pursuit of happiness; how many problems each little family has. They look most of all to themselves for their future.

But I think that they also look to each of us.

Above the pyramid on the great seal of the United States it says in Latin, "God has favored our undertaking."

God will not favor everything that we do. It is rather our duty to divine His will. I cannot help but believe that He truly understands and that He really favors the undertaking that we begin here tonight.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 15, 1965]

RIGHT TO VOTE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 117)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

"*To the Congress of the United States:*

"In this same month 95 years ago—on March 30, 1870—the Constitution of the United States was amended for the 15th time to guarantee that no citizen of our land should be denied the right to vote because of race or color.

"The command of the 15th amendment is unequivocal and its equal force upon State governments and the Federal Government is unarguable.

"Section 1 of this amendment provides:

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

"By the oath I have taken 'to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States' duty directs—and strong personal conviction impels—that I advise the Congress that action is necessary, and necessary now, if the Constitution is to be upheld and the rights of all citizens are not to be mocked, abused, and denied.

"I must regretfully report to the Congress the following facts:

"1. That the 15th amendment of our Constitution is today being systematically and willfully circumvented in certain State and local jurisdictions of our Nation.

"2. That representatives of such State and local governments acting 'under the color of law,' are denying American citizens the right to vote on the sole basis of race or color.

"3. That, as a result of these practices, in some areas of our country today no significant number of American citizens of the Negro race can be registered to vote except upon the intervention and order of a Federal court.

"4. That the remedies available under law to citizens thus denied their constitutional rights—and the authority presently available to the Federal Government to act in their behalf—are clearly inadequate.

"5. That the denial of these rights and the frustration of efforts to obtain meaningful relief from such denial without undue delay is contributing to the creation of conditions which are both inimical to our domestic order and tranquillity and incompatible with the standards of equal justice and individual dignity on which our society stands.

"I am, therefore, calling upon the Congress to discharge the duty authorized in section 2 of the 15th amendment 'to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.'

"I

"It could never be a welcome duty for any President to place before Congress such a report of the willful failure and refusal of public officials to honor, respect, and abide by any provision of the Constitution of the United States. It is especially repugnant to report such disregard directed against the 15th amendment by officials at the State and local levels.

"The essence of our American tradition of State and local goverments is the belief expressed by Thomas Jefferson that government is best which is closest to the people. Yet that belief is betrayed by those State and local officials who engage in denying the right of citizens to vote. Their actions serve only to assure that their State governments and local governments shall be remote from the people, least representative of the people's will and least responsive to the people's wishes.

"If there were no other reasons, the strengthening and protection of the vital role of State and local governments would be reasons enough to act against the denial of the right to vote for any of our citizens.

"But there are other reasons to act—clear, compelling, and present reasons.

"1. The challenge now presented is more than a challenge to our Constitution—it is a blatant affront to the conscience of this generation of Americans. Discrimination based on race or color is reprehensible and intolerable to the great American majority. In every national forum, where they have chosen to test popular sentiment, defenders of discrimination have met resounding rejection. Americans now are not willing that the acid of the few shall be allowed to corrode the souls of the many.

"The Congress, the courts, and the Executive, acting together in clear response to the will of the people and the mandate of the Constitution, have achieved more progress toward equality of rights in recent years than in all the years gone before. This tide will not be turned. The purposeful many need not and will not bow to the willful few.

"2. In our system, the first right and most vital of all our rights is the right to vote. Jefferson described the elective franchise as 'the ark of our safety.' It is from the exercise of this right that the guarantee of all our other rights flows.

"Unless the right to vote be secure and undenied, all other rights are insecure and subject to denial for all our citizens. The challenge to this right is a challenge to America itself. We must meet this challenge as decisively as we would meet a challenge mounted against our land from enemies abroad.

"3. In the world, America stands for—and works for—the right of all men to govern themselves through free, uninhibited elections. An ink bottle broken against an American Embassy, a fire set in an American library, an insult committed against our American flag, anywhere in the world, does far less injury to our country and our cause than the discriminatory denial of the right of any American citizen at home to vote on the basis of race or color.

"The issue presented by the present challenge to our Constitution and our conscience transcends legalism, although it does not transcend the law itself. We are challenged to demonstrate that there are no sanctuaries within our law for those who flaunt it. We are challenged, also to demonstrate by our prompt, fitting, and adequate response now that the hope of our system is not force, not arms, not the might of militia, or marshals—but the law itself.

"II

"The problem of discriminatory denial of the right to vote has been with us ever since colonial times.

"The test of real property ownership was universal among the colonies and religious qualifications were numerous. Race, color, sex, age, employment, and residence were all used as the basis for qualifying voters. Such restrictions continued to flourish among the States even after formation of the Union.

"The first literacy tests were legislated in Northern States in an effort to exclude immigrants—especially Irish—from the franchise. When the 15th amendment was adopted, there were only six States which had never discriminated against voting by Negroes.

"If discrimination has been a prevalent practice in our history of voting rights, the struggle against discrimination has been our consistent purpose generation after generation.

"Since the adoption of the Bill of Rights, no other right has been strengthened and fortified so often by constitutional amendment as the right to vote. As early as 1804—and as recently as 1964—the Constitution of the United States has been amended on at least six occasions to prohibit discrimination against the right to vote, to enlarge the franchise, and to assure the expression of the people's will as registered by them at the polls.

"The challenge facing us today is not a challenge of what the Constitution of the United States shall say—but of what it shall mean.

"What the 15th amendment says is unmistakable. What the 15th amendment actually means for some Americans in some jurisdictions is diametrically opposite to the clear intent of the language.

"By the device of equal laws, unequally applied, Negro Americans are being denied the right and opportunity to vote and discrimination is given sanction under color of law. Varieties of techniques are infinite. Three are most commonplace.

"1. THE TECHNIQUE OF TECHNICAL 'ERROR'

"Negro applicants for registration are disqualified on grounds of technical 'errors' in their registration forms. Instances of record show Negroes disqualified for 'errors' such as failure to write out middle names, abbreviating the words 'street' and 'avenue' in addresses, or failing to compute age exactly to the day. Where this technique is employed 'errors' are found in substantially all applications filed by Negroes, but few or none in applications filed by whites.

"2. THE TECHNIQUE OF NONCOOPERATION

"A technique commonly used in conjunction with the 'error' technique involves simple noncooperation by the registrar. Thus, he may be 'out' for most of the day during registration periods. Registration may be possible only on certain days each month. Limits may be imposed upon the number of applicants processed each registration day. The variety of circumventions possible by this device is endless.

"3. THE TECHNIQUE OF SUBJECTIVE TESTS

"By far the common technique by which Negro citizens are prevented from exercising their right to register and to vote is the use of subjective tests, unfairly administered literacy tests, tests of 'understanding,' and tests of 'character.' The only standard used is the whim of the registrar. Such devices are used as vehicles for the rejection of untold thousands of voters—soley on the basis of race and color.

"Whatever the technique, the intended purpose of such device is effectively served.

"In one State 10 years ago, 59.6 percent of voting age white persons were registered to vote. Only 4.3 percent of eligible Negroes were registered to vote. The changes since then are negligible.

"In several States, there are counties with sizable Negro populations where not a single Negro is registered to vote.

"In scores of other counties where discrimination is not so blatant, it remains far more difficult for Negroes to register than for whites.

"Too frequently discrimination is the aim and intent of such device—and discrimination is the result.

"III

"The Congress and the executive branch of the Federal Government have recognized—and sought to meet—these challenges to the authority of the Constitution of the United States. I am proud to have been closely associated with the succession of Federal enactments, beginning in 1957 with the first civil rights law in more than 80 years.

"The major steps taken have been these:

"1. The Civil Rights Act of 1957: The approach of this statute was to challenge through litigation the discriminatory use of vote tests.

"2. The Civil Rights Act of 1960: This statute, pursuing the same approach, sought to simplify such litigation.

"3. The Civil Rights Act of 1964: Still following the same approach, sought to expedite litigation.

"In some areas litigation has been effective. But 8 years of litigation has made it clear that the prompt and fair registration of qualified Negro citizens cannot be achieved under present legislation in the face of consistent defiance of the laws of Congress or the command of the Constitution.

"IV

"The challenge facing us is clear and immediate—it is also profound.

"The Constitution is being flouted.

"The intent of Congress expressed three times in the last 7 years is being frustrated.

"The national will is being denied.

"The integrity of our Federal system is in contest.

"Unless we act anew, with dispatch and resolution, we shall sanction a sad and sorrowful course for the future. For if the 15th amendment is successfully flouted today, tomorrow the 1st amendment, the 4th amendment, the 5th amendment, the 6th, and 8th—indeed, all the provisions of the Constitution on which our system stands—will be subject to disregard and erosion. Our essential strength as a society governed by the rule of law will be crippled and corrupted and the unity of our system hollowed out and left meaningless.

"For these reasons, therefore, I ask the Congress under the power clearly granted by the 15th amendment to enact legislation which would:

"1. Strike down restrictions to voting in all elections—Federal, State, and local—which have been used to deny Negroes the right to vote.

"2. Establish in all States and counties where the right to vote has been denied on account of race a simple standard of voter registration which will make it possible to thwart the 15th amendment.

"3. Prohibit the use of new tests and devices wherever they may be used for discriminatory purposes.

"4. Provide adequate power to insure, if necessary, that Federal officials can perform functions essential to the right to vote whenever State officials deny that right.

"5. Eliminate the opportunity to delay the right to vote by resort to tedious and unnecessary lawsuits.

"6. Provide authority to insure that properly registered individuals will not be prohibited from voting.

"Our purpose is not—and shall never be—either the quest for power or the desire to punish. We seek to increase the power of the people over all their governments, not to enhance the power of the Federal Government over any of the people.

"For the life of this Republic, our people have zealously guarded their liberty against abuses of power by their governments. The one weapon they have used is the mightiest weapon in the arsenal of democracy—the vote. This has been enough, for as Woodrow Wilson said, 'The instrument of all reform in America is the ballot.'

"Yet today, in areas of America, segments of our populace must live in just that involuntary condition—policed by forces they have no voice in choosing and forced to abide by laws they have no vote in adopting.

"A people divided over the right to vote can never build a nation united.

"I am determined that these years shall be devoted to perfecting our unity so that we may pursue more successfully the fulfillment of our high purposes at home and in the world. While I have proposed to you other measures to serve the strengthening of our free society and the happiness of our free people. I regard action on the measures proposed in this message to be first in priority. We cannot have government for all the people until we first make certain it is government of and by all the people.

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

"THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 15, 1965*."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, shortly after the President's message, the joint leadership introduced S. 1564, "a bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States." It was in this bill that we first saw the means by which the President was to implement his proposal. So that we may have a basic piece of legislation with which to compare and analyze the subsequent changes, I ask unanimous consent that the original bill be printed at this point in the RECORD along with a summary analysis.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[89th Cong., 1st Sess.]

S. 1564

(March 18, 1965)

A bill to enforce the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "Voting Rights Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. No voting qualification or procedure shall be imposed or applied to deny or abridge the right to vote on account of race or color.

SEC. 3. (a) No person shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his failure to comply with any test or device, in any State or in any political subdivision of a State which (1) the Attorney General determines maintained on November 1, 1964, any test or device as a qualification for voting, and with respect to which (2) the Director of the Census determines that less than 50 per centum of the persons of voting age residing therein were registered on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 per centum of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964.

(b) The phrase "test or device" shall mean any requirement that a person as a prerequisite for voting or registration for voting (1) demonstrate the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter, (2) demonstrate any educational achievement or his knowledge of any particular subject, (3) possess good moral character, or (4) prove his qualifications by the voucher of registered voters or members of any other class.

(c) Any State with respect to which determinations have been made under subsection (a) or any political subdivision with respect to which such determinations have been made as a separate unit, may file in a three-judge district court convened in the District of Columbia an action for a declaratory judgment against the United States, alleging that neither the petitioner nor any person acting under color of law has engaged during the ten years preceding the filing of the action in acts or practices denying or abridging the right to vote for reasons of race or color. If the court determines that neither the petitioner nor any person acting under color of law has engaged during such period in any act or practice denying or abridging the right to vote for reasons of race or color, the court shall so declare and the provisions of subsection (a) and the examiner procedure established by this Act shall, after judgment, be inapplicable to the petitioner. Any appeal from a judgment of a three-judge court convened under this subsection shall lie to the Supreme Court.

No declaratory judgment shall issue under this subsection with respect to any petitioner for a period of ten years after the entry of a final judgment of any court of the United States, whether entered prior to or after the enactment of this Act, determining that denials or abridgments of the right to vote by reason of race or color have occurred anywhere in the territory of such petitioner.

SEC. 4. (a) Whenever the Attorney General certifies (1) that he has received complaints in writing from twenty or more residents of a political subdivision with respect to which determinations have been made under section 3(a) alleging that they have been denied the right to vote under color of law by reason of race or color, and that he believes such complaints to be meritorious, or (2) that in his judgment the appointment of examiners is otherwise necessary to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint as many examiners in such subdivision as it may deem appropriate to prepare and maintain lists of persons eligible to vote in Federal, State, and local elections. Such appointments shall be made without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and may be terminated by the Commission at any time. Examiners shall be subject to the provisions of section 9 of the Act of August 2, 1939, as amended (the Hatch Act). An examiner shall have the power to administer oaths.

(b) A determination or certification of the Attorney General or of the Director of the Census under section 3 or 4 shall be final and effective upon publication in the Federal Register.

SEC. 5. (a) The examiners for each political subdivision shall examine applicants concerning their qualifications for voting. An application to an examiner shall be in such form as the Commission may require and shall contain allegations that the applicant is not otherwise registered to vote, and that, within ninety days preceding his application, he has been denied under color of law the opportunity to register or to vote or has been found not qualified to vote by a person acting under color of law: *Provided,* That the requirement of the latter allegation may be waived by the Attorney General.

(b) Any person whom the examiner finds to have the qualifications prescribed by State law in accordance with instructions received under section 6(b) shall promptly be placed on a list of eligible voters. A challenge to such listing may be made in accordance with section 6(a) and shall not be the basis for a prosecution under any provision of this Act. The list shall be available for public inspection and the examiner shall certify and transmit such list, and any supplements as appropriate, at the end of each month, to the offices of the appropriate election officials, with copies to the Attorney General and the attorney general of the State. Any person whose name appears on such a list shall be entitled and allowed to vote in the election district of his residence unless and until the appropriate election officials shall have been notified that such person has been removed from such list in accordance with subsection (d): *Provided,* That no person shall be entitled to vote in any election by virtue of this Act unless his name shall have been certified and transmitted on such a list to the offices of the appropriate election officials at least forty-five days prior to such election.

(c) The examiner shall issue to each person appearing on such a list a certificate evidencing his eligibility to vote.

(d) A person whose name appears on such a list shall be removed therefrom by an examiner if (1) he has been successfully challenged in accordance with the procedure prescribed in section 6(a), or (2) he has been determined by an examiner (i) not to have voted at least once during three consecutive years while listed, or (ii) to have otherwise lost his eligibility to vote.

(e) No person shall be denied the right to vote for failure to pay a poll tax if he tenders payment of such tax for the current year to an examiner, whether or not such tender would be timely or adequate under State law. An examiner shall have authority to accept such payment from any person authorized to make an application for listing, and shall issue a receipt for such payment. The examiner shall transmit promptly any such poll tax payment to the office of the State or local official authorized to receive such payment under State law, together with the name and address of the applicant.

SEC. 6. (a) Any challenge to a listing on an eligibility list shall be heard and determined by a hearing officer appointed by and responsible to the Civil Service Commission and under such rules as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe. Such challenge shall be entertained only if made within ten days after the challenged person is listed, and if supported by the affidavit of at least two persons having personal knowledge of the facts constituting grounds for the challenge, and such challenge shall be determined within seven days after it has been made. A petition for review of the decision of the hearing officer may be filed in the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the person challenged resides within fifteen days after service of such decision by mail on the moving party, but no decision of a hearing officer shall be overturned unless clearly erroneous. Any person listed shall be entitled and allowed to vote pending final determination by the hearing officer and by the court.

(b) The times, places, and procedures for application and listing pursuant to this Act and removals from the eligibility lists shall be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Civil Service Commission and the Commission shall, after consultation with the Attorney General, instruct examiners concerning the qualifications required for listing.

SEC. 7. No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall fail or refuse to permit a person whose name appears on a list transmitted in accordance with section 5(b) to vote, or fail or refuse to count such person's vote, or intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any person for voting or attempting to vote under the authority of this Act.

SEC. 8. Whenever a State or political subdivision for which determinations are in effect under section 3(a) shall enact any law or ordinance imposing qualifications or procedures for voting different than those in force and effect on November 1, 1964, such law or ordinance shall not be enforced unless and until it shall have been finally adjudicated by an action for declaratory judgment brought against the United States in the District Court for the District of Columbia that such qualifications or procedures will not have the effect of denying or abridging rights guaranteed by the fifteenth amendment. All actions hereunder shall be heard by a three-judge court and there shall be a right of direct appeal to the Supreme Court.

SEC. 9. (a) Whoever shall deprive or attempt to deprive any person of any right secured by section 2 or 3 or who shall violate section 7, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever, within a year following an election in a political subdivision in which an examiner has been appointed (1) destroys, defaces, mutilates, or otherwise alters the marking of a paper ballot cast in such election, or (2) alters any record of voting in such election made by a voting machine or otherwise, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(c) Whoever conspires to violate the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or interferes with any right secured by section 2, 3, or 7, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(d) Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice prohibited by section 2, 3, 7, or 8 or subsection (b) of this section, the Attorney General may institute for the United States, or in the name of the United States, an action for preventive relief, including an application for a temporary or permanent injunction, restraining order, or other order, and including an order directed to the State and State or local election officials to require them to honor listings under this Act.

(e) Whenever a person alleges to an examiner within twenty-four hours after the closing of the polls that notwithstanding his listing under this Act he has not been permitted to vote or that his vote was not counted, the examiner shall forthwith notify the United States attorney for the judicial district if such allegation in his opinion appears to be well founded. Upon receipt of such notification, the United States attorney may forthwith apply to the district court for an order enjoining certification of the results of the election, and the court shall issue such an order pending a hearing to determine whether the allegations are well founded. In the event the court determines that persons who are entitled to vote under the provisions of this Act were not permitted to vote or their votes were not counted, it shall provide for the casting or counting of their ballots and require the inclusion of their votes in the total vote before any person shall be deemed to be elected by virtue of any election with respect to which an order enjoining certification of the results has been issued.

(f) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether an applicant for listing under this Act shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.

SEC. 10. Listing procedures shall be terminated in any political subdivision of any State whenever the Attorney General notifies the Civil Service Commission (1) that all persons listed by the examiner for such subdivision have been placed on the appropriate voting registration roll, and (2) that there is no longer reasonable cause to believe that persons will be deprived of or denied the right to vote on account of race or color in such subdivision.

SEC. 11. (a) All cases of civil and criminal contempt arising under the provisions of this Act shall be governed by section 151 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1995).

(b) No court other than the District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to issue any declaratory judgment or any restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction against the execution or enforcement of any provision of this Act or any action of any Federal officer or employee pursuant hereto.

(c) The term "vote" shall have the same meaning as in section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971(e)).

(d) Any statement made to an examiner may be the basis for a prosecution under section 1001 of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 13. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of the provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Section 1: Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Section 2 prohibits application of voting qualifications and procedures in a manner intended to deny the right to vote on account of race or color.

Section 3:

(a) No person because of failure to comply with any test or device, shall be denied the right to vote in those States, or subdivisions determined by the Attorney General as having used such a test, device or qualification for voting in the 1964 election, and which had less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age registered on November 1, 1964, or less than 50 percent of such persons voting in 1964.

(b) "Test or device" is defined as any literacy test or demonstration of good moral character.

(c) This subsection gives any State or political subdivision falling within the sanctions of subsection (a) the right to sue in a three-judge court for declaratory judgment alleging that petitioner had not practiced acts abridging right to vote for 10 years. Findings in favor of petitioner shall make subsection (a) inapplicable. An appeal from three-judge court shall lie in the Supreme Court.

After a finding that the right to vote has been abridged by reason of race or color anywhere in the territory of a petitioner, no declaratory judgment shall lie with respect to any petitioner for 10 years in such territory.

Section 4: If the Attorney General certifies that he has received at least 20 complaints from residents of a political subdivision alleging that they were denied the right to vote by reason of race or color, or in his judgment he believes the appointment of examiners is necessary to enforce the 15th amendment, then the Civil Service Commission shall appoint such examiners to prepare and maintain lists of persons eligible to vote in Federal, State, and local elections.

(b) A determination by the Attorney General or director of census under section 3 or 4 is final, and effective upon publication in the Federal Register.

Section 5:

(a) The examiners shall examine applicants concerning their qualifications for voting.

(b) Any person, determined by such examiner, found to have the qualifications prescribed by State law, according to regulations promulgated by Civil Service Commission, shall be allowed to vote if his name is transmitted to the appropriate election official at least 45 days prior to an election.

(c) The examiner shall issue to each person appearing on such list a certificate evidencing his eligibility to vote.

(d) This section provides for the removal from such list of persons successfully challenged in accordance with section 6(a), or of persons failing to vote once during 3 consecutive years while listed or otherwise losing his eligibility.

Section 6:

(a) Challenges to a listing on an eligibility list shall be made to and heard by a hearing officer appointed by the Civil Service Commission. A petition for review of the decision of the hearing officer may be filed in U.S. court of appeals.

(b) The times, places, and procedures for application of this act shall be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission.

Section 7 states that no person shall (1) refuse another the right to vote; (2) refuse to count such vote; or (3) attempt to keep any person from voting, if such person has been found qualified by the "Federal examiners."

Section 8 concerns the future enactment of voter qualifications, etc., by States or subdivisions which failed to have 50 percent of their population registered or voting on November 4, 1964 (sec. 3). Before these new voter qualifications can become effective it has to be finally adjudicated by an action for declaratory judgment originating in the District of Columbia district court that the new qualifications will not have the effect of denying the right to vote. Appeal shall be to three-judge court and to Supreme Court.

Section 9 concerns enforcement provisions for this act.

(a) Five thousand dollars or 5 years for violating the act.

(b) Five thousand dollars or 5 years for destroying a cast ballot within a year following an election, or altering any record of voting made by a voting machine.

(c) Five thousand dollars or 5 years for conspiring to violate (a) or (b).

(d) Provides injunctive relief when there are reasonable grounds to believe that the act will be violated.

(e) Provides for enjoining certification of the results of an election when a person alleges that he was not permitted to vote or his vote was not counted and he was otherwise qualified. If allegation is found to be true then the questioned votes will be included in the total.

(f) Gives the district courts jurisdiction over proceedings under this act.

Section 10 provides for the removal of listing procedures when the Attorney General finds all persons listed by the Federal "examiners" have been plaecd on the appropriate voting roll, and there is no reasonable cause to believe that persons subsequently will be deprived of the right to vote.

Section 11:

(a) Civil and criminal contempt, under the act, governed by 42 U.S.C. 1995.

(b) Only the district court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to issue (1) declaratory judgment (2) any restraining order or permanent injunction against the execution or enforcement of this act or the action of any Federal offices operating under this act.

(c) The term "vote" means same as 42 U.S.C. 1971.

(d) Any statement made to an examiner may be the basis for a prosecution under section 1001 of title 18.

Section 12 authorizes sums for carrying out provisions of this act.

Section 13 provides that if any section of his act is held unconstitutional, other provisions will not be affected.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, notwithstanding that the Justice Department, with all of its resources, had taken some 4 months to produce the measure, the bill was referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee with instructions from the Senate to hold hearings and report the bill to the Senate within 15 days. The committee began a very hurried examination of this far-reaching and complex measure, S. 1564, on March 23, 1965. The bill proved to be so badly drawn, so arbitrary, so unjust and so unconstitutional that each hearing session was filled with a barrage of objections and suggestions for modification.

The bill was discussed by the Judiciary Committee in executive session for 3 days. Proposed amendments, which I felt would enhance the constitutionality and the desirability of the legislation, unfortunately were rejected. A number of modifications which posed grave constitutional problems were offered during the executive session and although some of them proved to be too extreme even for the leadership, a number of these were incorporated in the bill reported by the committee. Unfortunately, the deadline under which the committee worked coupled with the wide divergency of the members' views marked the session with confusion and incompleteness.

Finally, on April 9, 1965, the Judiciary Committee reported the amended bill without recommendations. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee's final version of the bill be inserted at this point in the RECORD along with a section-by-section analysis.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1564

A bill to enforce the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "Voting Rights Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. No voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure shall be imposed or applied by any State or political subdivision to deny or abridge the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color.

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the Attorney General institutes a proceeding under any statute to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment in any State or political subdivision the court shall authorize the appointment of examiners by the Civil Service Commission in accordance with section 6 to serve for such period of time and in such political subdivisions as the court shall determine is appropriate to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment (1) as part of any interlocutory order if the court determines that the appointment of such examiners is necessary to enforce such guarantees or (2) as part of any final judgment if the court finds that violations of the fifteenth amendment justifying equitable relief have occurred in such State or subdivision: *Provided,* That the court need not authorize the appointment of examiners if any incidents of denial or abridgment of the right to vote on account of race or color (1) have been limited in number and have been promptly and effectively corrected by State or local action, (2) the continuing effect of such incidents has been eliminated, and (3) there is no reasonable probability of their recurrence in the future.

(b) If in a proceeding instituted by the Attorney General under any statute to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment in any State or political subdivision the court finds that a test or device has been used for purposes of denying or abridging the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color, it shall suspend the use of such test or device in such State or political subdivisions as the court shall determine is appropriate and for such period as it deems necessary.

(c) If in any proceeding instituted by the Attorney General under any statute to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment in any State or political subdivision the court finds that violations of the fifteenth amendment justifying equitable relief have occurred within the territory of such State or political subdivision, the court, in addition to such relief as it may grant, shall retain jurisdiction for such period as it may deem appropriate and shall order that during such period any voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting different from that in force or effect at the time the proceeding was commenced shall be submitted to the Attorney General. If the Attorney General files objection with the court within sixty days after such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure has been submitted by the chief legal officer or other appropriate official of such State or subdivision to him, such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure shall not be enforced unless and until the court finds that it does not have the purpose or will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color; except that neither the court's finding nor the Attorney General's failure to object shall bar a subsequent action to enjoin enforcement of such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure.

SEC. 4. (a) To assure that the right of citizens of the United States to vote is not denied or abridged on account of race or color, no citizen shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his failure to comply with any test or device in any State with respect to which the determinations have been made under subsection 4(b) or in any political subdivision with respect to which such determinations have been made as a separate unit, unless the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in an action for a declaratory judgment brought by such State or subdivision against the United States has determined that (1) no such test or device has been used during the five years preceding the filing of the action for the purpose of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color or (2)(A) the per centum of persons in such State or subdivision voting in the most recent presidential election exceeded the national average per centum of persons voting in such election or the per centum of such persons registered to vote in a State or subdivision by State or local election officials exceeded 60 per centum of persons of voting age meeting residence requirements in such State or subdivision, and (B) that there is no denial or abridgment of the right to vote on account of race or color in such State or subdivision: *Provided,* That a final judgment heretofore or hereafter rendered by any court of the United States, determining that denials or abridgments of the right to vote on account of race or color through the use of such tests or devices have occurred anywhere in the territory of any such plaintiff, may be introduced in any such declaratory judgment action brought within five years of such final judgment as prima facie evidence of the facts found by the court, except that nowithstanding this provision the judgment shall retain whatever legal effect it would have under existing law.

An action pursuant to this subsection shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28 of the United States Code and any appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court. The court shall retain jurisdiction of any action pursuant to this subsection for five years after judgment and shall reopen the action upon motion of the Attorney General alleging that a test or device has been used for the purpose of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color.

If the Attorney General determines that he has no reason to believe that any such test or device has been used during the five years preceding the filing of the action for the purpose of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color, he shall consent to the entry of such judgment.

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall apply in any State or in any political subdivision of a State which (1) the Attorney General determines maintained on November 1, 1964, any test or device, and with respect to which (2) the Director of the Census determines (A) that less than 50 per centum of the persons, other than aliens and persons in active military service and their dependents, of voting age residing therein were registered on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 per centum of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964, and (B) that according to the 1960 census, more than 20 per centum of the persons of voting age were nonwhite; or, (3), notwithstanding the foregoing (1) and (2), the Director of the Census determines, by a survey made upon the request of the Attorney General that the total number of persons of any race or color who are registered to vote in any State or political subdivision is less than 25 per centum of the total number of all persons of such race or color of voting age residing in such State or political subdivision.

A determination or certification of the Attorney General or of the Director of the Census under this section or under section 6 shall be final and effective upon publication in the Federal Register.

(c) The phrase "test or device" shall mean any requirement that a person as a prerequisite for voting or registration for voting (1) demonstrate the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter, (2) demonstrate any education achievement or his knowledge of any particular subject, (3) possess good moral character, or (4) prove his qualifications by the voucher of registered voters or members of any other class.

(d) For purposes of this section no State or political subdivision shall be determined to have engaged in the use of tests or devices for the purpose of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color if (1) incidents of such have been limited in number and have been promptly and effectively corrected by State or local action, (2) the continuing effect of such incidents has been eliminated, and (3) there is no reasonable probability of their recurrence in the future.

SEC. 5. Whenever a State or political subdivision with respect to which the prohibitions set forth in section 4(a) are in effect shall enact or seek to administer any voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting different from that in force or effect on November 1, 1964, such State or subdivision may institute an action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for a declaratory judgment that such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure does not have the purpose or will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color, and unless and until the court enters such judgment no person shall be denied the right to vote for failure to comply with such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure unless such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure has been submitted by the chief legal officer or other appropriate official of such State or subdivision to the Attorney General and the Attorney General has not interposed an objection within sixty days after such submission. Neither the Attorney General's failure to object nor a declaratory judgment entered under this section shall bar a subsequent action to enjoin enforcement of such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure. Such an action shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28 of the United States Code and any appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court.

SEC. 6. Whenever the Attorney General certifies (a) that a court has authorized the appointment of examiners pursuant to the provisions of section 3(a); or (b) unless a declaratory judgment has been rendered under section 4(a), with respect to any political subdivision named in, or included within the scope of, determinations made under section 4(b) that (1) he has received complaints in writing from twenty or more residents of such political subdivision alleging that they have been denied the right to vote under color of law on account of race or color, and that he believes such complaints to be meritorious, or (2) that in his judgment (considering, among other factors, whether the ratio of nonwhite persons to white persons registered to vote within such subdivision appears to him to be fairly attributable to violations of the fifteenth amendment), the appointment of examiners is otherwise necessary to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint as many examiners, who shall to the extent practicable be residents of such State, in such subdivision as it may deem appropriate to prepare and maintain, by examining applicants pursuant to section 7, lists of persons eligible to vote in Federal, State, and local elections. Such examiners, hearing officers provided for in section 8(a), and other persons deemed necessary by the Commission to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act shall be appointed, compensated, and separated without regard to the provisions of any statute administered by the Civil Service Commission, and service under this Act shall not be considered employment for the purposes of any statute administered by the Civil Service Commission, except the provisions of section 9 of the Act of August 2, 1939, as amended (5 U.S.C. 118i), prohibiting partisan political activity: Provided, that the Commission is authorized, after consulting the head of the appropriate department or agency, to designate suitable persons in the official service of the United States, with their consent, to serve in these positions. Examiners and hearing officers shall have the power to administer oaths.

SEC. 7. (a) The examiners for each political subdivision shall, at such places as the Civil Service Commission shall by regulation designate, examine applicants concerning their qualifications for voting. An application to an examiner shall be in such form as the Commission may require and shall contain allegations that the applicant is not otherwise registered to vote and that he has been deprived of the right to register or vote on account of race or color: *Provided,* That the Attorney General may require the applicant in such State or political subdivision to allege further that, within ninety days preceding his application, he has been denied under color of law the opportunity to register or to vote or has been found not qualified to vote by a person acting under color of law.

(b) Any person whom the examiner finds, in accordance with instructions received under section 8(b), to have the qualifications prescribed by State law not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States shall promptly be placed on a list of eligible voters. A challenge to such listing may be made in accordance with section 8(a) and shall not be the basis for a prosecution under section 11 of this Act. The examiner shall certify and transmit such list, and any supplements as appropriate, at least once a month to the offices of the appropriate election officials, with copies to the Attorney General and the attorney general of the State, and any such lists and supplements thereto transmitted during the month shall be available for public inspection beginning on the last business day of the month and on the forty-fifth day prior to any election. Any person whose name appears on such a list shall be entitled and allowed to vote in the election district of his residence unless and until the appropriate election officials shall have been notified that such person has been removed from such list in accordance with subsection (d): *Provided,* That no person shall be entitled to vote in any election by virture of this Act unless his name shall have been certified and transmitted on such a list to the offices of the appropriate election officials at least forty-five days prior to such election.

(c) The examiner shall issue to each person whose name appears on such a list a certificate evidencing his eligibility to vote.

(d) A person whose name appears on such a list shall be removed therefrom by an examiner if (1) such person has been successfully challenged in accordance with the procedure prescribed in section 8, or (2) he has been determined by an examiner to have lost his eligibility to vote under State law not inconsistent with the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

SEC. 8. (a) Any challenge to a listing on an eligibility list shall be heard and determined by a hearing officer appointed by and responsible to the Civil Service Commission and under such rules as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe. Such challenge shall be entertained only if filed at such office within the State as the Civil Service Commission shall by regulation designate within ten days after the listing of the challenged person is made available for public inspection, and if supported (1) by the affidavit of at least two persons having personal knowledge of the facts constituting grounds for the challenge, and (2) a certification that a copy of the challenge and affidavits have been served by mail or in person upon the person challenged at his place of residence set out in the application. Such challenge shall be determined within fifteen days after it has been filed. A petition for review of the decision of the hearing officer may be filed in the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the person challenged resides within fifteen days after service of such decision by mail on the moving party, but no decision of a hearing officer shall be overturned unless clearly erroneous. Any person listed shall be entitled and allowed to vote pending final determination by the hearing officer and by the court.

(b) The times, places, and procedures and form for application and listing pursuant to this Act and removals from the eligibility lists shall be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Civil Service Commission and the Commission shall, after consultation with the Attorney General, instruct examiners concerning applicable State law not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States with respect to (1) the qualifications required for listing, and (2) loss of eligibility to vote.

(c) Upon the request of the applicant or the challenger, the Civil Service Commission shall have the power to require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence relating to any matter pending before it under the authority of this section. In a case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena, any district court of the United States or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or is domiciled or transacts business, or has appointed an agent for receipt of service of process, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a hearing officer, there to produce pertinent, relevant, and nonprivileged evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

SEC. 9. No State or political subdivision shall deny or deprive any person of the right to register or to vote because of his failure to pay a poll tax or any other tax or payment as a precondition of registration or voting.

SEC. 10. (a) Whenever an examiner is serving under this Act in any political subdivision, the examiner may assign his representatives who shall be within the meaning of "other persons" as used in section — who may be officials of the United States, (1) to enter and attend at any place for holding an election in such subdivision for the purpose of observing whether persons who are entitled to vote are being permitted to vote, and (2) to enter and attend at any place for tabulating the votes cast at any election held in such subdivision for the purpose of observing whether votes cast by persons entitled to vote are being properly tabulated.

(b) No person shall obstruct, impede, or interfere with, or attempt to obstruct, impede, or interfere with, any duly assigned representative of the Department of Justice in the performance of the duties conferred upon him under this section.

SEC. 11. (a) No person acting under color of law shall fail or refuse to permit to vote any person who is entitled to vote under any provision of this Act, or fail to refuse to count such person's vote.

(b) No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall intimidate, threaten, or coerce or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any person from voting or attempting to vote or to intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any person from exercising any powers or duties under section 3(a), 6, 8, 10, or 12(e).

SEC. 12. (a) Whoever shall willfully and knowingly deprive or attempt to deprive any person of any right secured by section 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, or 10 or who shall willfully and knowingly violate section 11, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever, within a year following an election in a political subdivision in which an examiner has been appointed (1) fraudulently destroys, defaces, mutilates, or otherwise alters the marking of a paper ballot cast in such election, or (2) fraudulently alters any record of voting in such election made by a voting machine or otherwise, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(c) Whoever conspires to violate the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or willfully and knowingly interferes with any right secured by section 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, or 11 shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(d) Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice prohibited by section 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, or subsection (b) of this section, the Attorney General may institute for the United States or in the name of the United States, an action for preventive relief, including an application for a temporary or permanent injunction, restraining order, or other order, and including an order directed to the State and State or local election officials to require them (1) to permit persons listed under this Act to vote and (2) to count such votes.

(e) Whenever in any political subdivision in which there are examiners appointed pursuant to this Act any persons allege to such an examiner within twenty-four hours after the closing of the polls that notwithstanding (1) their listing under this Act or registration by an appropriate election official and (2) their eligibility to vote, they have not been permitted to vote in such election, the examiner shall forthwith notify the United States attorney for the judicial district if such allegations in his opinion appear to be well founded. Upon receipt of such notification, the United States attorney may not later than seventy-two hours after the closing of the polls file with the district court an application for an order providing for the casting or counting of the ballots of such persons and requiring the inclusion of their votes in the total vote before the results of such election shall be deemed final and any force or effect given thereto. The district court shall hear and determine such matters immediately after the filing of such application. The remedy provided in this subsection shall not preclude any remedy available under State or Federal law.

(f) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether a person asserting rights under the provisions of this Act shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.

SEC. 13. Listing procedures shall be terminated in any political subdivision of any State (a) with respect to examiners appointed pursuant to clause (b) of section 6 whenever the Attorney General notifies the Civil Service Commission (1) that all persons listed by the examiner for such subdivision have been placed on the appropriate voting registration roll, (2) that there is no longer reasonable cause to believe that persons will be deprived of or denied the right to vote on account of race or color in such subdivision; and (b), with respect to examiners appointed pursuant to section 3(a), upon order of the authorizing court. A political subdivision may petition the Attorney General for the termination of listing procedures under clause (a).

SEC. 14. (a) All cases of criminal contempt arising under the provisions of this Act shall be governed by section 151 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1955).

(b) No court other than the District Court for the District of Columbia or a court of appeals and any proceeding under section 8 shall have jurisdiction to issue any declaratory judgment pursuant to section 4 or any restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction against the execution or enforcement of any provision of this Act or any action of any Federal officer or employee pursuant hereto. The right to intervene in any action brought under the authority of this Act shall be limited to the Attorney General and to States, political subdivisions, and their appropriate officials.

(c)(1) The term "vote" shall include all action necessary to make a vote effective in any primary, special, or general election, including, but not limited to, registration, listing pursuant to this Act, or other action required by law prerequisite to voting, casting a ballot, and having such ballot counted and included in the appropriate totals of votes cast with respect to candidates for public office and propositions for which votes are received in an election.

(2) The term "political subdivision" shall mean any county or parish, except that where registration for voting is not conducted under the supervision of a county or parish, the term shall include any other subdivision of a State which conducts registration for voting.

(d) Whoever knowingly and willfully gives false information as to his name, address, or period of residence in the voting district for the purpose of establishing his eligibility to register or vote under this Act, or conspires with another individual for the purpose of encouraging the fraudulent registration or illegal voting of such individual under this Act, or pays or offers to pay or accepts payment either for fraudulent registration or for illegal voting under the provisions of this Act shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

SEC. 15. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 16. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of the provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF NEW VOTING BILL

Section 1: Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Section 2: Prohibits the use of any qualification or procedure to deny the right to vote on account of race or color.

Section 3: (a) When Attorney General institutes a proceeding to enforce 15th amendment, the court shall authorize the appointment of such examiners as are necessary to enforce the guarantees of 15th amendment as part of an interlocutory order or as part of any final judgment.

(b) In such proceedings, the court may suspend for as long as necessary the use of a test or device or poll tax if such are found to have been used to deny or abridge the right to vote.

(c) In such proceedings, the court may retain jurisdiction for such period as it deems appropriate. Any new qualification or practice with respect to voting different from that in force when the proceeding commenced must be approved by such court as not having the effect of denying the right to vote on account of race or color. Provided, such qualification may be enforced if submitted by the appropriate official of such State or political subdivision and the Attorney General has not objected within 60 days after submission.

Section 4: (a) No citizen shall be denied the right to vote in any election because of a failure to comply with a test or device in any State or political subdivision to which determinations are made under subsection (b), unless the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia finds in an action for declaratory judgment that no test or device has been used in such State or political subdivision for 5 years prior to such action to deny the right to vote on account of race or color.

Provided, no declaratory judgment shall issue for 5 years after any final judgment of any court of the United States determining denials of the right to vote, whether entered prior to or ofter the enactment of this act.

Such actions shall be heard by a three-judge court and an appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court. The court shall retain jurisdiction for 5 years after judgment and reopen the action upon the Attorney General's motion alleging the use of a test or device to deny the right to vote on account of race or color.

If the Attorney General makes no such determination, he shall consent to the entry of such judgment.

(b) Subsection (a) applies to any State or political subdivision which maintained a test or device on November 1, 1964, and in which less than 50 percent of persons of voting age were registered or voted at the time of the 1964 presidential election, and in which more than 20 percent of the persons of voting age were nonwhite.

A determination or certification of the Attorney General or Director of the Census under this section or under section 6 shall be final and effective upon publication in the Federal Register.

(c) Defines "test or device."

(d) Under this section no State or political subdivision shall be determined to have denied the right to vote on account or race or color if (1) incidents were limited in number and promptly corrected by State or local action; (2) continuing effects have been eliminated, and (3) there is no probability of recurrence.

Section 5: Whenever a State or political subdivision coming under the prohibitions of section 4(a) enacts a new voting law, no person can be denied the right to vote for failure to comply with such law until the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia determines in an action for declaratory judgment that such law will not have the effect of denying the right to vote on account of race or color.

The same proviso as in section 3(a) shall apply to section 5, except that a failure of the Attorney General to object shall not bar a subsequent action under section 3(c). Action to be heard by a three-judge court with the right to appeal to the Supreme Court.

Section 6: Whenever the Attorney General certifies authorization of examiners under section 3(a), or that he has received 20 meritorious complaints from residents of a State or political subdivision determined under section 4(b), or in his judgment the appointment of examiners is otherwise necessary to enforce the guarantees of the 15th amendment, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint an appropriate number of examiners who shall, to the extent practicable, be residents of such State, to prepare and maintain a list of persons eligible to vote.

Provides for compensation, etc., of examiners without regard to the laws governing the Civil Service Commission except 5 U.S.C. 118 i. However, persons in the official service of the United States may serve in these positions.

Section 7: (a) The examiners shall examine applicants concerning their qualifications for voting. An application shall allege that the applicant is not otherwise registered to vote and that within 90 days preceding his application, he has been denied under color of law the opportunity to register to vote. The Attorney General may waive the latter requirement.

(b) Persons found to qualify shall be placed on a list of eligible voters. Challenges to such list are to be made in accordance with section 8(a) and shall not be a basis for prosecution under section 11 of this act.

Provides for the transmittal of such lists to the appropriate election officials and the Attorney General and attorney general of the State. The list is to be available for public inspection. Persons appearing on such list shall be entitled to vote if their names are certified and transmitted to the appropriate election official at least 45 days prior to such election.

(c) Persons on such list shall receive a certificate of eligibility to vote.

(d) Provides for removal of names if such persons are successfully challenged under section 8, or loses eligibility under State law not inconsistent with the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

SEC. 8. (a) Any challenge to a listing will be heard by a hearing officer appointed by the Civil Service Commission if filed at a designated office within the State within 10 days after the challenged listing is made available for public inspection. It must be supported by the affidavit of at least two persons and a certification that the person challenged has been served with a copy of the challenge. All challenges must be determined within 15 days after filing. The decision may be reviewed upon petition within 15 days to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the circuit where the challenged person resides, but may be overturned only if clearly erroneous. The challenged person is permitted to vote pending final determination.

(b) The Civil Service Commission will promulgate regulations governing the times, places, and procedures for listings and removals from the lists. Instructions to examiners concerning listing qualifications and loss of voting eligibility will be issued by the Commission, after consultation with the Attorney General.

(c) The Commission is given power to subpena witnesses and documentary evidence. In case of disregard of a subpena, the Federal district court with jurisdiction over the offender may, upon application of the Attorney General, order the offender to appear and testify or produce evidence. Disregard of such an order is punishable as contempt.

Section 9: (a) No person in a political subdivision covered by section 4(a), or with respect to which there has been a court finding of violations of the 15th amendment warranting equitable relief, shall be denied the right to vote for failure to pay a poll tax if he pays the required tax directly to the appropriate State official or transmits to such official a U.S. Post Office money order in payment of the tax. Such money orders can be purchased at any U.S. Post Office or from any examiner appointed under the act. Receipts issued upon purchase shall be conclusive evidence of such purchase and transmittal.

(b) No such person registering for the first time after November 1, 1964, shall be denied the right to vote for failure to make timely payment of a poll tax if he pays the tax for the current year at least 45 days before the election. He shall not be required to pay poll taxes for prior years.

Section 10: This section makes it unlawful for anyone acting under color of law to refuse to permit anyone to vote who is entitled to do so under this act, to refuse to count such person's vote, or to intimidate, threaten or coerce (or attempt to do so) anyone for voting under this act. Whether acting under color of law or otherwise, it is made unlawful to threaten, etc., anyone for exercising any powers or duties (as examiners, hearing officers, etc.) under the act.

Section 11: (a) Anyone who deprives (or attempts to do so) anyone of any right secured by the act, or who violates section 10, may be fined up to $5,000 or imprisoned for up to 5 years, or both.

(b) The same punishment can be assessed against anyone who destroys or alters a paper ballot, or alters any record of voting made by a voting machine or otherwise, within a year after an election in a political subdivision where an examiner has been appointed.

(c) The same punishment is prescribed for conspiring to violate subsections (a) or (b) or interfering with any right secured by the act.

(d) The Attorney General may bring an action for preventive relief whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds for believing any person is about to engage in any act or practice prohibited by the act. Such relief may include a court order directed to a State or to State or local election officials requiring them to permit listed persons to vote and to count such votes.

(e) If any person in a political subdivision where examiners are appointed alleges to an examiner within 48 hours after the closing of the polls that he has not been permitted to vote, although listed and eligible under the act, the examiner shall notify the local U.S. attorney if the allegations appear well founded. The U.S. attorney may then apply to the local district court for an order temporarily restraining the certification of the election results, and the court shall issue such an order pending a hearing on the merits. If the court determines that persons were not permitted to vote in violation of the act, it shall provide that their votes be counted before the results of the election can be deemed final. The remedy provided here is in addition to any already available under State or Federal law.

(f) The Federal district courts are given jurisdiction over proceedings under this section without regard to whether administrative or other available remedies have been exhausted.

Section 12: Listing procedures shall be terminated in any political subdivision where examiners were appointed upon certification of the Attorney General under section 6 whenever the Attorney General notifies the Civil Service Commission that all listed persons have been registered and that there is no longer reason to believe that racial discrimination in voting will continue. A political subdivision may petition the Attorney General for termination under this clause.

In subdivisions where examiners were appointed by court order under section 3(a), listing procedures shall be terminated by order of the authorizing court.

Section 13: (a) All cases of criminal contempt arising under the act are governed by the appropriate provisions of the 1957 Civil Rights Act.

(b) Jurisdiction to issue a declaratory judgment, restraining order or injunction against the execution or enforcement of any provision of the act or any action of any Federal officer or employee under the act is given exclusively to the District Court for the District of Columbia.

(c) (1) The term "vote" is broadly defined to include all action necessary to make a vote effective in any primary or special or general election.

(2) "Political subdivision" is defined to mean any county or parish or whatever other subdivision of a State which conducts registration for voting.

(d) Knowing and willful falsification or concealment of material facts and knowing use of false writings or documents having to do with matters within the jurisdiction of an examiner or hearing officer is made punishable by a fine of up to $10,000 or up to 5 years' imprisonment, or both.

Section 14: Authorizes the appropriation of sums necessary to implement the act.

Section 15: Any invalidity of any provision of the act or its application to any person or circumstances shall not affect the validity of the remainder of the act and application of the provision to different persons or circumstances.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, many of the suggestions which I and other members of the Judiciary Committee considered necessary to rectify the injustices and unconstitutionality of the original bill appeared in the amended bill.

First, the original bill referred to the denial of the right to vote of persons on account of race or color. Some of my colleagues and I pointed out that the 15th amendment is applicable only to citizens and that, by using the words "persons," the original bill would include certain categories of persons, including aliens, who are not citizens within the meaning of the 15th amendment. As a result of this criticism, the bill reported by the Judiciary Committee was amended to cover "citizens" instead of "persons."

Perhaps the most serious defect in the original bill was the arbitrariness of the triggering device used to determine what States or political subdivisions of States were to be affected by the punitive provisions of the bill. Those punitive provisions were stated to apply to any State or political subdivisions of States which maintained a literacy test on November 1, 1964, and in which less than 50 percent of all eligible adults voted or were registered in the presidential election of November 1964.

In the course of the hearings on the bill, I contended that this triggering device exceeded the authority of the Congress under the 15th amendment. The 15th amendment provides as follows:

> SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.
>
> SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The legislative power of Congress under this amendment is restricted to legislation to enforce a prohibition on State action and Congress is not justified in taking upon itself what the State has the power to do. Congress may do no more than enact legislation designed to prohibit the States from denying suffrage on the ground of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. I repeatedly demonstrated the fact that a State or political subdivision cannot logically be presumed guilty of violating the 15th amendment merely because it had low voter participation in an election with respect to which it administered literacy tests.

Specifically, I pointed out that in some North Carolina counties low voting and registration percentages resulted because the adult population in those counties include large numbers of aliens and military personnel, and their dependents, who were ineligible, in any event, to register and vote. In addition, I pointed out that some political subdivisions could be affected by the triggering device even though there might be only a very small number of nonwhites among their voting populations.

The bill arbitrarily determines the existence of voter discrimination notwithstanding the fact that the 1962 Report of the North Carolina Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights stated that:

> The disproportionately low registration and low voting of Negroes in North Carolina is due more to apathy or * * * to poor schooling and poor school attendance, than to election officials' arbitrary denial of the right to register on account of race.

The bill reported by the Judiciary Committee retained the basic triggering device, but in a somewhat modified form. A provision was added excluding aliens and military personnel and their dependents from the number of eligible adults used as a basis for determining whether a State or political subdivision had less than 50-percent voter participation in the 1964 presidential election. In addition, a provision was added excluding from coverage those political subdivisions in which less than 20 percent of all eligible adults were nonwhite according to the 1960 census.

As a result of criticism which some of my colleagues and I made, the provisions in the bill setting the conditions under which a State caught by the triggering device could escape the bill's punitive provisions were significantly modified. The original bill provided that a State or political subdivision could escape the punitive provisions, only by securing from a three-judge district court in the District of Columbia, a declaratory judgment to the effect that no one had been denied the right to vote under color of law by reason of race or color during the 10 years preceding the filing of the action. I repeatedly protested the severity of this requirement, and suggested that the 10-year period be stricken and that a State or political subdivision be required only to prove itself free of discrimination since the last general election. I pointed out also the near-impossibility of proving absolute innocence from discrimination and suggested instead that States or political subdivisions required to bring suits for declaratory judgments be required only to prove that incidents of racial discrimination were few and insufficient to establish a pattern of discrimination.

Although these suggestions were not adopted, the escape provisions in the reported bill were much less stringent than those in the original bill. The 10-year period was reduced to 5 years and an alternative means of escape from the punitive provisions of the bill was provided for those States or political subdivisions which could prove that their voter participation in the most recent presidential election exceeded the national average or that more than 60 percent of their adult population was registered to vote in the most recent presidential election.

In addition, States bringing suits for declaratory judgments were not required to prove complete innocence of racial discrimination, but only to prove that any incidents of racial discrimination in voting were limited in number, promptly corrected by State or local action, not likely to recur, and that the continuing effect of any such incidents has been eliminated.

The original bill provided that no State or political subdivision caught by the triggering device could enact or administer any new voting law without first obtaining, from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, a declaratory judgment to the effect that the new law would not have the purpose or effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color. I pointed out that this provision was overly stringent and that, in addition, it was discriminatory in that it would not prohibit States which did not have literacy tests in 1964 from subsequently enacting and enforcing literacy tests which might be much harsher and more unfairly administered than those of the States originally affected by the bill.

In the reported bill, this provision was modified to provide that States or political subdivisions caught by the triggering device could either bring suit for declaratory judgment, as provided in the original bill, or submit any new voting law to the Attorney General for his approval. Should the Attorney General fail to object to the new voting law within 60 days, the State or political subdivision would be free to enforce it.

The original bill provided that Federal examiners should be appointed in those States or subdivisions with respect to which the Attorney General certifies that he has received written complaints which he believes to be meritorious from 20 or more residents alleging that they have been denied the right to vote under color of law by reason of race or color. Alternatively, the Attorney General could order the appointment of Federal examiners whenever he deemed it otherwise necessary to enforce the guarantees of the 15th amendment. I criticized the unlimited discretion given to the Attorney General to order the appointment of Federal examiners whenever he deemed it "otherwise necessary" to enforce the 15th amendment, without being required to specify the factors contributing to his decision. Further, there was no requirement that the appointed Federal examiners be residents of the political subdivisions to which they were to be appointed. I stressed that any Federal examiner should be a resident of the subdivision in which he would be serving.

The reported bill retained both alternatives under which the Attorney General could order the appointment of Federal examiners. However, when 20 complaints had not been received, the Attorney General in order to appoint examiners must consider, among other factors, whether low registration of nonwhites "appears to him to be fairly attributable to violations of the 15th amendment."

After vigorous protests by a number of Senators, of whom I was one, some of the provisions in the original bill relating to examinations and listing procedures were modified in the reported bill. For example, the original bill, which purported to be based on the 15th amendment as a justification for legislation at the national level, did not require that a person applying for registration to a Federal examiner allege that he had been denied the right to register or to vote on account of race or color. He merely needed to allege that he had been denied the opportunity to vote or found not qualified to vote by a person acting under color of law. I pointed out that this language could include a person who was properly denied the opportunity to vote because he was an idiot or an alien. The reported bill required that an applicant allege that he had been denied the right to register or vote on account of race or color. Further, the Attorney General could require the additional allegation that such denial was under color of law and within 90 days preceding the application.

The original bill made it a crime punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, for anyone, within a year following an election in a political subdivision in which a Federal examiner has been appointed, to destroy, deface, mutilate or otherwise alter a paper ballot cast in such election, or alter any record made by a voting machine in such election. I pointed out that this provision might have the unintended effect of subjecting election officials to a heavy fine or imprisonment for innocently altering or destroying voting records in the course of their official duties. Accordingly, the reported bill provided that such acts should be deemed criminal only if done fraudulently.

A section in the original bill which was widely and severely criticized by many Senators and witnesses appearing before the Judiciary Committee was the section providing for the enjoining of the certification of the results of any election in which any person alleged that he was denied the right to vote notwithstanding his listing by a Federal examiner. The original bill provided that, if any person made such an allegation within 24 hours after the closing of the polls, the examiner should forthwith notify the local U.S. attorney who would, in turn, apply to the local U.S. district court for an order enjoining certification of the results of the election. The bill provided that the court should issue the order pending a hearing to determine whether the allegations were well founded. This could hold up certification of those elected even where the ballots in dispute would not affect the results of the elections. Despite the severe criticisms of this provision, it was retained in substance in the reported bill. However, the provision requiring the district court to issue a temporary injunction pending a hearing on the merits was deleted, and it was provided instead that the district court should hear and determine such matters on the merits "immediately after the filing of such application," and only then issue a permanent injunction.

After a series of debates in the Senate on the committee bill, attention was first drawn to amendment No. 82, proposed by Senator Williams of Delaware. On April 29 my amendment No. 117 was incorporated into Senator Williams' amendment and passed by a vote of 86 to 0.

Senator Williams' amendment imposed a criminal sanction of a $10,000 fine or imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both, for anyone "knowingly and willingly giving false information as to his name, address, or period of residence in the voting district for the purpose of establishing his eligibility to register or vote, or conspiring with another individual for the purpose of encouraging his false registration or illegal voting, or paying or offering to pay or accepting payment either for registering or for voting." My amendment limited the application of this provision to elections held for the selection of presidential electors, Members of the U.S. Senate, and the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives because the Constitution only grants the Congress the power to regulate Federal elections.

We were next confronted with the third version of S. 1564; to wit, an amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by Senator Mansfield for himself and Senator Dirksen, introduced on April 30, 1965. Due largely to the insistence of some of my colleagues and me, this version of the bill is predicated more on the 15th amendment than were the two previous versions. With only the exception of the administrative provisions under the bill, each section was either expressly based on the 15th amendment or generally premised on the denial of the right to vote on account of race or color.

The actual changes from the committee version of the bill appear in sections 4, 7, 9, and 10 of the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute bill. The first change appears in the so-called cleansing portion of the bill, section 4(a). The substitute bill eliminates those clauses which I have asserted are a more clear reflection of a voting or registration pattern which could indicate whether the low percentages of registration or voting are due to discrimination or to mere apathy.

The so-called escape clauses, unfortunately eliminated in the substitute bill, provided that a State or political subdivision could cleanse itself of the guilt imposed upon it by the triggering device of the bill by showing that—

> (1) no such [literacy] test or device has been used during the 5 years preceding the filing of the action for the purpose of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color or (2)(A) the per centum of persons in such State or subdivision voting in the most recent presidential election exceeded the national average per centum of persons voting in such election or the per centum of such persons registered to vote in a State or subdivision by State or local election officials exceeded 60 per centum of persons of voting age meeting residence requirements in such State or subdivision, and (B) that there is no denial or abridgement of the right to vote on account of race or color in such State or subdivision.

The substitute bill provides that a State or subdivision may get out from under its punitive provisions only when the effects of the denial and the abridgments of the right to vote have been effectively corrected by State or local action and that there is no reason or cause to believe that any test or device will be used to abridge the right to vote on account of race or color.

The next change appears in section 7(a). This change assertedly simplifies the procedure for listing voters for Federal examinations. The applicant need only allege, under this provision, that he has not registered to vote and that within 90 days preceding his application he has been denied under color of law the opportunity to register or to vote. As in the committee bill, the Attorney General may also waive the latter requirement.

The most outstanding change in the bill concerned the poll tax provision in section 9. The committee bill had the effect of completely abolishing the poll tax. By doing so, it overruled the Supreme Court's holdings that the requirement of the payment of a poll tax is within the State's authority to set voter qualifications. The substitute bill was at least a step away from total unconstitutionality. It provided in section 9(a) in lieu of other references to the abolition of the poll tax that the Attorney General "shall institute actions for declaratory judgment or injunctive relief against the enforcement of any poll tax which has the purpose or effect of denying or abridging the right to vote."

A new section 10 in the substitute measure was designed to insure that persons listed by Federal examiners will actually have their names "placed on the official voting lists and be permitted to vote." This is achieved by the Attorney General receipt of a complaint signed by 20 or more persons of voting age alleging they are residents of a political subdivision and have not been placed upon the official voting lists.

Finally, the Williams-Ervin amendment, referred to earlier, is contained in section 14(d) of the substitute bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 124, an amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by Senator MANSFIELD and Senator DIRKSEN be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment (in the nature of a substitute) proposed by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN), to S. 1564, a bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, viz: In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted beginning on line 3, page 12, down through and including line 12, page 30, insert the following: "That this Act shall be known as the 'Voting Rights Act of 1965'.

"SEC. 2. No voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure shall be imposed or applied by any State or political subdivision to deny or abridge the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color.

"SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the Attorney General institutes a proceeding under any statute to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment in any State or political subdivision the court shall authorize the appointment of examiners by the Civil Service Commission in accordance with section 6 to serve for such period of time and in such political subdivisions as the court shall determine is appropriate to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment (1) as part of any interlocutory order if the court determines that the appointment of such examiners is necessary to enforce such guarantees or (2) as part of any final judgment if the court finds that violations of the fifteenth amendment justifying equitable relief have occurred in such State or subdivision: *Provided,* That the court need not authorize the appointment of examiners if any incidents of denial or abridgment of the right to vote on account of race or color (1) have been limited in number and have been promptly and effectively corrected by State or local action, (2) the continuing effect of such incidents has been eliminated, and (3) there is no reasonable probability of their recurrence in the future.

"(b) If in a proceeding instituted by the Attorney General under any statute to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment in any State or political subdivision the court finds that a test or device has been used for purposes of denying or abridging the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color, it shall suspend the use of such test or device in such State or political subdivisions as the court shall determine is appropriate and for such period as it deems necessary.

"(c) If in any proceeding instituted by the Attorney General under any statute to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment in any State or political subdivision the court finds that violations of the fifteenth amendment justifying equitable relief have occurred within the territory of such State or political subdivision, the court, in addition to such relief as it may grant, shall retain jurisdiction for such period as it may deem appropriate and shall order that during such period any voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting different from that in force or effect at the time the proceeding was commenced shall be submitted to the Attorney General. If the Attorney General files objection with the court within sixty days after such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure has been submitted by the chief legal officer or other appropriate official of such State or subdivision to him, such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure shall not be enforced unless and until the court finds that it does not have the purpose or will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color; except that neither the court's finding nor the Attorney General's failure to object shall bar a subsequent action to enjoin enforcement of such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure.

"SEC. 4. (a) To assure that the right of citizens of the United States to vote is not denied or abridged on account of race or color, no citizen shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his failure to comply with any test or device in any State with respect to which the determinations have been made under subsection 4(b) or in any political subdivision with respect to which such determinations have been made as a separate unit, unless the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in an action for a declaratory judgment brought by such State or subdivision against the United States has determined that the effects of denial or abridgment, if any, of the right to vote on account of race or color have been effectively corrected by State or local action and that there is no reasonable cause to believe that any test or device sought to be used by such State or subdivision will be used for the purpose or will have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color:

"*Provided,* That a final judgment heretofore or hereafter rendered by any court of the United States, determining that denials or abridgments of the right to vote on account of race or color through the use of such tests or devices have occurred anywhere in the territory of any such plaintiff, may be introduced in any such declaratory judgment action brought within five years of such final judgment as prima facie evidence of the facts found by the court, except that notwithstanding this provision the judgment shall retain whatever legal effect it would have under existing law.

"An action pursuant to this subsection shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28 of the United States Code and any appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court. The court shall retain jurisdiction of any action pursuant to this subsection for five years after judgment and shall reopen the action upon motion of the Attorney General alleging that a test or device has been used for the purpose or will have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color.

"If the Attorney General determines that he has no reason to believe that any such test or device has been used during the five years preceding the filing of the action for the purpose of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color, he shall consent to the entry of such judgment.

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall apply in any State or in any political subdivision of a State which (1) the Attorney General determines maintained on November 1, 1964, any test or device, and with respect to which (2) the Director of the Census determines (A) that less than 50 per centum of the persons, other than aliens and persons in active military service and their dependents, of voting age residing therein were registered on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 per centum of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964, and (B) that according to the 1960 census, more than 20 per centum of the persons of voting age were nonwhite; or (3), notwithstanding the foregoing (1) and (2), the Director of the Census determines, by a survey made upon the request of the Attorney General that the total number of persons of any race or color who are registered to vote in any State or political subdivision is less than 25 per centum of the total number of all persons of such race or color of voting age residing in such State or political subdivision.

"A determination or certification of the Attorney General or of the Director of the Census under this subsection or under section 6 shall be final and effective upon publication in the Federal Register.

"(c) The phrase 'test or device' shall mean any requirement that a person as a prerequisite for voting or registration for voting (1) demonstrate the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter, (2) demonstrate any education achievement or his knowledge of any particular subject, (3) possess good moral character, or (4) prove his qualifications by the voucher of registered voters or members of any other class.

"(d) For purposes of this section no State or political subdivision shall be determined to have engaged in the use of tests or devices for the purpose of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color if (1) incidents of such have been limited in number and have been promptly and effectively corrected by State or local action, (2) the continuing effect of such incidents has been eliminated, and (3) there is no reasonable probability of their recurrence in the future.

"Sec. 5. Whenever a State or political subdivision with respect to which the prohibitions set forth in section 4(a) are in effect shall enact or seek to administer any voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedures with respect to voting different from that in force or effect on November 1, 1964, such State or subdivision may institute an action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for a declaratory judgment that such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure does not have the purpose or will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color, and unless and until the court enters such judgment no person shall be denied the right to vote for failure to comply with such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure unless such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure has been submitted by the chief legal officer or other appropriate official of such State or subdivision to the Attorney General and the Attorney General has not interposed an objection within sixty days after such submission. Neither the Attorney General's failure to object nor a declaratory judgment entered under this section shall bar a subsequent action to enjoin enforcement of such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure. Such an action shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28 of the United States Code and any appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court.

"Sec. 6. Whenever the Attorney General certifies (a) that a court has authorized the appointment of examiners pursuant to the provisions of section 3(a); or (b) unless a declaratory judgment has been rendered under section 4(a), with respect to any political subdivision named in, or included within the scope of determinations made under section 4(b) that (1) he has received complaints in writing from twenty or more residents of such political subdivision alleging that they have been denied the right to vote under color of law on account of race or color, and that he believes such complaints to be meritorious, or (2) that in his judgment (considering, among other factors, whether the ratio of nonwhite persons to white persons registered to vote within such subdivision appears to him to be fairly attributable to violations of the fifteenth amendment), the appointment of examiners is otherwise necessary to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint as many examiners, who shall to the extent practicable be residents of such State, in such subdivision as it may deem appropriate to prepare and maintain, by examining applicants pursuant to section 7, lists of persons eligible to vote in Federal, State, and local elections. Such examiners, hearing officers provided for in section 8(a), and other persons deemed necessary by the Commission to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act shall be appointed, compensated, and separated without regard to the provisions of any statute administered by the Civil Service Commission, and service under this Act shall not be considered employment for the purpose of any statute administered by the Civil Service Commission, except the provisions of section 9 of the Act of August 2, 1939, as amended (5 U.S.C. 118i), prohibiting partisan political activity: *Provided*, that the Commission is authorized, after consulting the head of the appropriate department or agency, to designate suitable persons in the official service of the United States, with their consent, to serve in these positions. Examiners and hearing officers shall have the power to administer oaths.

"Sec. 7. (a) The examiners for each political subdivision shall, at such places as the Civil Service Commission shall by regulation designate, examine applicants concerning their qualifications for voting. An application to an examiner shall be in such form as provided by section 8(b) and in addition shall contain allegations (1) that the applicants is not registered to vote, and (2) that, within ninety days preceding his application, he had been denied under color of law the opportunity to register or to vote or has been found not qualified to vote by a person acting under color of law: *Provided*, That the requirement of clause (2) of this subsection may be waived by the Attorney General.

"(b) Any person whom the examiner finds, in accordance with instructions received under section 8(b), to have the qualifications prescribed by State law not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States shall promptly be placed on a list of eligible voters. A challenge to such listing may be made in accordance with section 8(a) and shall not be the basis for a prosecution under section 11 of this Act. The examiner shall certify and transmit such list, and any supplements as appropriate, at least once a month to the offices of the appropriate election officials, with copies to the Attorney General and the attorney general of the State, and any such lists and supplements thereto transmitted during the month shall be available for public inspection beginning on the last business day of the month and on the forty-fifth day prior to any election. The appropriate State or local election official shall place such names on the official voting list. Any person whose name appears on the examiner's list shall be entitled and allowed to vote in the election district of his residence unless and until the appropriate election officials shall have been notified that such person has been removed from the examiner's list in accordance with subsection (d): *Provided*, That no person shall be entitled to vote in any election by virtue of this Act unless his name shall have been certified and transmitted by the examiner to the offices of the appropriate election officials at least forty-five days prior to such election.

"(c) The examiner shall issue to each person whose name appears on the examiner's list a certificate evidencing his eligibility to vote.

"(d) A person whose name appears on the examiner's list shall be removed therefrom by an examiner if (1) such person has been successfully challenged in accordance with the procedure prescribed in section 8, or (2) he has been determined by an examiner to have lost his eligibility to vote under State law not inconsistent with the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

"Sec. 8. (a) Any challenge to a listing on an eligibility list prepared by an examiner shall be heard and determined by a hearing officer appointed by and responsible to the Civil Service Commission and under such rules as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe. Such challenge shall be entertained only if filed at such office within the State as the Civil Service Commission shall by regulation designate within ten days after the listing of the challenged person is made available for public inspection, and if supported (1) by the affidavit of at least two persons having personal knowledge of the facts constituting grounds for the challenge, and (2) a certification that a copy of the challenge and affidavits have been served by mail or in person upon the person challenged at his place of residence set out in the application. Such challenge shall be determined within fifteen days after it has been filed. A petition for review of the decision of the hearing officer may be filed in the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the person challenged resides within fifteen days after service of such decision by mail on the moving party, but no decision of a hearing officer shall be overturned unless clearly erroneous. Any person listed shall be entitled and allowed to vote pending final determination by the hearing officer and by the court.

"(b) The times, places, and procedures and form for application and listing pursuant to this Act and removals from the eligibility lists shall be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Civil Service Commission and the Commission shall, after consultation with the Attorney General, instruct examiners concerning applicable State law not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States with respect to (1) the qualifications required for listing, and (2) loss of eligibility to vote.

"(c) Upon the request of the applicant or the challenger, the Civil Service Commission shall have the power to require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence relating to any matter pending before it under the authority of this section. In a case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena, any district court of the United States or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or is domiciled or transacts business, or has appointed an agent for receipt of service of process, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a hearing officer, there to produce pertinent, relevant, and nonprivileged evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

"Sec. 9. (a) In view of evidence presented to the Congress that the constitutional right of citizens of the United States to vote is denied or abridged in some States by the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a condition of voting in State or local elections and to assure that such right is not denied or abridged in violation of the Constitution, the Attorney General shall forthwith institute in the name of the United States actions for declaratory judgment or injunctive relief against the enforcement of any poll tax, or other tax or payment, which, as a condition of voting in State or local elections, has the purpose or effect of denying or abridging the right to vote.

"(b) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of such actions which shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of Title 28 of the United States Code and any appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court. It shall be the duty of the judges designated to hear the case to assign the case for hearing at the earliest practicable date, to participate in the hearing and determination thereof, and to cause the case to be in every way expedited.

"Sec. 10. Whenever the Attorney General receives at least twenty days prior to any election a complaint in writing signed by twenty or more persons of voting age who are residents of a political subdivision alleging that persons who have been listed in accordance with the provisions of section 7 have not been placed upon the official voting lists by the appropriate local or State election officials he shall institute an action to require that such persons be placed on the official voting lists and be permitted to vote. Such action shall be filed in the appropriate district court which shall have jurisdiction thereof and upon request of the Attorney General shall be determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of Title 28, United States Code. The relief in such action shall, upon request of the Attorney General, include the appointment by the court of such persons as may be necessary to observe, at such places as the court may order, whether persons entitled to vote are permitted to vote and have their votes counted and the court may in its discretion impound all ballots cast in such election until such time as all persons whom the court has ordered permitted to vote, and who are refused or denied the opportunity to vote, have the opportunity to vote on election day or the day following. The remedy provided by this section shall not preclude any other remedy available under State or Federal law.

"Sec. 11. (a) No person acting under color of law shall fail or refuse to permit to vote any person who is entitled to vote under any provision of this Act, or fail or refuse to count such person's vote.

"(b) No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any person from voting or attempting to vote or to intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any person from exercising any powers or duties under section 3(a), 6, 8, 10, or 12(e).

"Sec. 12. (a) Whoever shall willfully and knowingly deprive or attempt to deprive any person of any right secured by section 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, or 10 or who shall willfully and knowingly violate section 11, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) Whoever, within a year following an election in a political subdivision in which an examiner has been appointed (1) fraudulently destroys, defaces, mutilates, or otherwise alters the marking of a paper ballot cast in such election, or (2) fraudulently alters any record of voting in such election made by a voting machine or otherwise, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(c) Whoever conspires to violate the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or willfully and knowingly interferes with any right secured by section 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, or 11 shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(d) Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice prohibited by section 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, or subsection (b) of this section, the Attorney General may institute for the United States, or in the name of the United States, an action for preventive relief, including an application for a temporary or permanent injunction, restraining order, or other order, and including an order directed to the State and State or local election officials to require them (1) to permit persons listed under this Act to vote and (2) to count such votes.

"(e) Whenever in any political subdivision in which there are examiners appointed pursuant to this Act any persons allege to such an examiner within twenty-four hours after the closing of the polls that notwithstanding (1) their listing under this Act or registration by an appropriate election official and (2) their eligibility to vote, they have not been permitted to vote in such election, the examiner shall forthwith notify the United States attorney for the judicial district if such allegations in his opinion appear to be well founded. Upon receipt of such notification, the United States attorney may not later than seventy-two hours after the closing of the polls file with the district court an application for an order providing for the casting or counting of the ballots of such persons and requiring the inclusion of their votes in the total vote before the results of such election shall be deemed final and any force or effect given thereto. The district court shall hear and determine such matters immediately after the filing of such application. The remedy provided in this subsection shall not preclude any remedy available under State or Federal law.

"(f) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether a person asserting rights under the provisions of this Act shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.

"Sec. 13. Listing procedures shall be terminated in any political subdivision of any State (a) with respect to examiners appointed pursuant to clause (b) of section 6 whenever the Attorney General notifies the Civil Service Commission (1) that all persons listed by the examiner for such subdivision have been placed on the appropriate voting registration roll, (2) that there is no longer reasonable cause to believe that persons will be deprived of or denied the right to vote on account of race or color in such subdivision; and (b), with respect to examiners appointed pursuant to section 3(a), upon order of the authorizing court. A political subdivision may petition the Attorney General for the termination of listing procedures under clause (a).

"Sec. 14. (a) All cases of criminal contempt arising under the provisions of this Act shall be governed by section 151 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1955).

"(b) No court other than the District Court for the District of Columbia or a court of appeals in any proceeding under section 8 shall have jurisdiction to issue any declaratory judgment pursuant to section 4 or any restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction against the execution or enforcement of any provisions of this Act. The right to intervene in any action brought under the authority of this Act shall be limited to the Attorney General and to States, political subdivisions, and their appropriate officials.

"(c)(1) The term 'vote' shall include all action necessary to make a vote effective in any primary, special, or general election, including, but not limited to, registration, listing pursuant to this Act, or other action required by law prerequisite to voting, casting a ballot, and having such ballot counted and included in the appropriate totals of votes cast with respect to candidates for public office and propositions for which votes are received in an election.

"(2) The term 'political subdivision' shall mean any county or parish, except that where registration for voting is not conducted under the supervision of a county or parish, the term shall include any other subdivision of a State which conducts registration for voting.

"(d) Whoever knowingly or willfully gives false information as to his name, address, or period of residence in the voting district for the purpose of establishing his eligibility to register or vote, or conspires with another individual for the purpose of encouraging his false registration or illegal voting, or pays or offers to pay or accepts payment either for registration or for voting shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both: *Provided, however,* That this provision shall be applicable only to elections held for the selection of presidential electors, Members of the United States Senate, and Members of the United States House of Representatives.

"Sec. 15. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"Sec. 16. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of the provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on the same day the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute bill was introduced, April 30, Senator Fulbright called up amendment No. 115 to S. 1564, introduced by himself and Senator McClellan. This amendment affects the Attorney General's factfinding powers under the provisions of clause (3) of section 4(b) in the determination of whether 25 percent of the total number of persons of any race or color residing in any State covered by the bill were registered to vote. In effect, the time of these determinations would be changed from November 1, 1964, to 30 days prior to the first primary election or general election in the calendar year 1966 in those States which have adopted or will adopt registration laws since November 1, 1964, and prior to March 1, 1965, which do not require the payment of a poll tax or impose any tax or device as a precondition for voting or registering to vote.

This amendment was agreed to by voice vote on April 30, 1965. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 115 to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Amendment No. 115

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"Sec. 17. The provisions of clause (3) of section 4(b) shall not become effective until thirty days prior to the first primary election or general election in calendar year 1966, within the territory of any State which has adopted any amendment to its State constitution, or enacted any law, subsequent to November 1, 1964, under which all persons desiring to vote in any election held in such State, including persons formerly registered for voting in such elections, are required to register in order to qualify for voting in such elections, if such amendment or law—

"(1) does not require the payment of a poll tax or any other tax as a precondition for voting or registration for voting, and

"(2) does not impose any test or device as a precondition for voting or registration for voting."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the fourth printing of the complete bill occurred as amendment No. 124, the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute bill, was modified by its sponsors. However, the only variance between the original substitute bill and the modified bill is the addition of a new subsection (c) to section 9. It reads as follows:

(c) During the pendency of such actions, and thereafter if the courts declare the requirement of the payment of a poll tax to be constitutional, no citizen of the United States who is a resident of a State or political subdivision with respect to which determinations have been made under subsection 4(b) and a declaratory judgment has not been entered under subsection 4(a), during the first year he becomes otherwise entitled to vote by reason of registration by State or local officials or listing by an examiner, shall be denied the right to vote for failure to pay a poll tax if he tenders payment of such tax for the current year to an examiner at least 45 days prior to election, whether or not such tender would be timely or adequate under State law. An examiner shall have authority to accept such payment from any person authorized by this Act to make an application for listing, and shall issue a receipt for such payment. The examiner shall transmit promptly any such poll tax payment to the office of the State or local official authorized to receive such payment under State law, together with the name and address of the applicant.

On May 19, by a vote of 56 to 25, amendment No. 167 passed. It was proposed by Senator FONG and others to amend the substitute proposal to S. 1564.

This amendment authorizes the assignment by the Attorney General of persons to observe voting procedures at any place for holding an election in any State or political subdivision coming under the purview of this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 167 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 15, line 4, after "SEC. 10." insert "(a)".

One page 16, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

"(b) Whenever an examiner is serving under this Act in any political subdivision, the Attorney General may assign one or more persons, who may be officers of the United States, (1) to enter and attend at any place for holding an election in such subdivision for the purpose of observing whether persons who are entitled to vote are being permitted to vote, and (2) to enter and attend at any place for tabulating the votes cast at any election held in such subdivision for the purpose of observing whether votes cast by persons entitled to vote are being properly tabulated. Persons assigned by the Attorney General pursuant to this subsection shall be appointed, compensated, and separated without regard to the provisions of any statute administered by the Civil Service Commission, and service under this Act shall not be considered employment for the purposes of any statute administered by the Civil Service Commission, except the provisions of section 9 of the Act of August 2, 1939, as amended (5 U.S.C. 118i), prohibiting partisan political activity."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, from April 29 to May 14, there were nine unsuccessful attempts to amend S. 1564. After numerous controversies over the poll tax provision of the bill, Senators MANSFIELD and DIRKSEN introduced a final amendment to their last substitute bill. This amendment, No. 187, revised section 9(a) of the bill. As I noted earlier, that section had previously issued a mandate that the Attorney General "shall forthwith institute in the name of the United States actions for declaratory judgment or injunctive relief against the enforcement of any poll tax, or other tax or payment, which, as a condition of voting in State or local election, has the purpose or effect of denying or abridging the right to vote."

Due to the fears on the part of the joint leadership, and other Senators, that the poll tax provision was too harsh and would impede the speedy passage of the bill, amendment No. 187 was introduced to give some ameliorating effect to the Senate's attack on the poll tax. This new provision nevertheless includes a congressional declaration "that the constitutional right for citizens of the United States to vote is denied or abridged in such States by the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a condition of voting." Additionally, the Attorney General is now directed to institute similar actions in those States which enact laws after November 1, 1964, requiring a poll tax as a condition of voting and which have the purpose or effect of denying or abridging the right to vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 187 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 14, strike out section 9(a) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 9. (a) In view of the evidence presented to the Congress that the constitutional right of citizens of the United States to vote is denied or abridged in certain States by the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a condition of voting, Congress declares that the constitutional right of citizens of the United States to vote is denied or abridged in such States by the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a condition of voting. To assure that such right is not denied or abridged in violation of the Constitution, the Attorney General shall forthwith institute in such States in the name of the United States action for declaratory judgment or injunctive relief against the enforcement of any poll tax, or substitute therefor enacted after November 1, 1964, which, as a condition of voting, has the purpose or effect of denying or abridging the right to vote."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, a new feature of the bill raising a presumption of literacy was last suggested to the Senate in 1962, when it was wisely defeated. The provisions of amendment No. 176, introduced by my distinguished colleagues, Senator KENNEDY and Senator JAVITS from New York, and agreed to by a vote of 48 to 19 on May 20, are assumedly based on the 14th amendment. The amendment declares that no person who has successfully completed the sixth primary grade in a school in which the predominant classroom language was other than English, shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election. Such a declaration gives a presumption of literacy without requiring a demonstration thereof.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 176 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 7, between line 17 and line 18 insert a new section 4(e):

"(e)(1) Congress hereby declares that to secure the rights under the fourteenth amendment of persons educated in American-flag schools in which the predominant classroom language was other than English, it is necessary to prohibit the States from conditioning the right to vote of such persons on ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter in the English language.

"(2) No person who demonstrates that he has successfully completed the sixth primary grade in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which the predominant classroom language was other than English, shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his inability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter in the English language, except that in States in which State law provides that a different level of education is presumptive of literacy, he shall demonstrate that he has successfully completed an equivalent level of education in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which the predominant classroom language was other than English."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as the Senate continued consideration of the bill (S. 1564) on May 20, 1965, I called up my amendment No. 174. When the original bill was introduced it was a highly punitive and vindictive bill. It provided that none of the States or subdivisions of the States covered by the triggering process could secure exoneration if at any time within the previous 10 years a single election official had been guilty of a single violation of the 15th amendment with respect to a single applicant for registration. Modifications have made the bill less punitive and vindictive by reducing the period from 10 years to 5 years.

The measure contained, on May 20, a provision which I still considered highly punitive and vindictive. This provision appeared at the bottom of page 5 of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, beginning with line 20 and ending with line 24, on page 5, as follows:

If the Attorney General determines that he has no reason to believe that any such test or device (that is, a literacy test) has been used during the 5 years preceding the filing of the action for the purpose of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color, he shall consent to the entry of such judgment.

This is in reference to the entry of a judgment which allows the political subdivision involved in the action for declaratory judgment to manage its own affairs so far as the registration of voters is concerned.

My amendment would strike out the words "has been used during the 5 years preceding the filing of the action," and inserts in lieu thereof the words "is being used." I agreed to a modification of my amendment so as to provide in addition to the original amendment the word "shall" on line 24, page 5, of the substitute bill would be changed to "may." This would mean that if a State or political subdivision covered by the triggering device is no longer engaged in violations of the 15th amendment, the Attorney General would have the authority to consent to a judgment exonerating it from the provisions of the bill. This amendment was agreed to by a voice vote of the Senate.

Two amendments were voted upon and defeated on Monday, May 24, 1965. The first was proposed by Senator Tower and the other by myself. I had felt that my amendment would receive the support of every Senator who had any confidence in the judges sitting in the district court of the District of Columbia, as well as the vote of every Senator who believes that the courts of justice exist for the purpose of administering justice. The bill abolishes a Federal statutory concept which allows for the removal of cases to other jurisdictions for the convenience of witnesses and for the ends of justice. My amendment, No. 191 to S. 1564, would simply have restored this discretionary power of the district court for the District of Columbia to remove cases brought under the bill to the jurisdiction in which the alleged discrimination occurred if the court were to find the removal would promote the ends of justice. The obvious necessity of this proposal has been suggested by me and many of my colleagues in the Senate since we first became aware of its absence in the bill. Nevertheless, the amendment was defeated by a vote of 32 to 49.

On Tuesday, May 25, 70 Senators voted to impose cloture on the debates concerning this most controversial measure. They did so, despite the fact that well over 50 amendments to S. 1564 were still pending. Thirty Senators voted against the cloture petition, thereby expressing their faith in constitutional government.

Senator Long of Missouri called up an amendment which incorporated what I have asserted as very reasonable and necessary modifications of S. 1564. His amendment, adopted on Tuesday, May 25, allows political subdivisions of States where more than 50 percent of the nonwhite citizens are registered to vote to present proof in the district court for the District of Columbia that they are not discriminating in their voting procedures on account of race or color. Upon a finding in favor of a political subdivision, such subdivision will be relieved of the requirement of Federal examiners replacing those presently registering voters.

Other amendments adopted on voice votes were an amendment proposed by Senator Allott which gives the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia, in cases growing out of the proposed legislation, discretionary subpena authority beyond the present 100-mile limitation.

Another amendment, proposed by Senator Tower to safeguard the voting rights of servicemen, was passed by a voice vote.

Finally, Senator Cotton's amendment, making it clear that any suspension of literacy tests under the bill would not be regarded as permanent, was passed by a voice vote.

Numerous amendments of a technical and corrective nature called up by Senator Hart, the manager of the bill, were also passed.

During the 1 hour allotted me under the rules of the Senate after cloture is invoked, I called up 10 amendments in a last attempt to improve the constitutional defects of S. 1564. Unfortunately, each of the amendments was rejected by the Senate.

In the waning hours of debate on May 26, two final amendments to S. 1564 were agreed to. The first of these, unfortunately, was a very unwise decision. During the executive session of the Judiciary Committee, it was discovered that several counties in each of three States—Alaska, North Carolina, and Virginia—were to be unfairly covered by the bill because of the inclusion of many aliens and servicemen residing in these counties in the population count by the Bureau of Census. This inclusion proved to be inappropriate in arriving at a registration or voting record for these counties since obviously the aliens did not vote and many of the military personnel and their dependents voted in other States by absentee ballot.

Nevertheless, amendment Number 210, proposed by Senator Tydings, brought these people back into the count. It was passed by a voice vote almost immediately after being called up.

Later in the afternoon of the same day, May 26, Senator Hart called up an amendment which could have corrected the defects suggested by Senator Tydings in order to have his amendment passed. He had argued that there would not be available census information to allow for a determination of the number of military personnel and aliens. Now Senator Hart's amendment, passed by a voice vote, empowers the Attorney General to request the Director of the Census to take a special census to determine the number of nonwhites registered in a particular county seeking a release from the Federal examiners sent in by the Attorney General.

This last amendment was, of course, a much needed modification to S. 1564 and had been suggested many times by the Senators representing the States covered by this bill.

It has been a source of great concern to me that it was not possible for more of the Members of this body to study this measure carefully. Unfortunately, it appears that pride in its authorship has been such that only its proponents have been permitted to offer substitute bills which were acceptable to the majority of our Members.

It is unfortunate for constitutional government that I and others who offered amendments, as a means of improving the bill, have found that the predilections of the majority of the Senate were such that however meritorious the suggested amendments might have been they were unacceptable.

The Constitution is our bulwark against tyranny—whenever we weaken it we have done violence to our safety and that of all future generations of Americans. This legislation has been produced during a period of national racial crisis. It has not been considered in a dispassionate manner. It is sectional and discriminatory in nature and as such it does irreparable harm to constitutional government in the United States.

I have reason to entertain a high opinion of the place of the courts in the life of our Nation. Indeed, I believe the administration of justice to be the most sacred function of government. This bill is completely incompatible with devotion to the rule of law or respect for the judicial process.

I do not know of a worse offense which can be committed by a legislative body than to allow what this act does with respect to the judicial process; that is, to take a process which was created to do justice and pervert it, distort it, and prostitute it so that justice cannot be done.

Although I favor every qualified voter's being permitted to vote, as one who has sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States, I did not support this discriminatory and patently unconstitutional legislation. However, after the House passed this bill with amendments, the Senate agreed to the conference report on August 4. The President, of course, approved the act on August 6, 1964.

In order that all persons may have easy access to a major product of the 1st session of the 89th Congress, I ask unanimous consent that Public Law 89–110, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the act was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1564

An act to enforce the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "Voting Rights Act of 1965".

Sec. 2. No voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure shall be imposed or applied by any State or political subdivision to deny or abridge the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color.

Sec. 3. (a) Whenever the Attorney General institutes a proceeding under any statute to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment in any State or political subdivision the court shall authorize the appointment of Federal examiners by the United States Civil Service Commission in accordance with section 6 to serve for such period of time and for such political subdivisions as the court shall determine is appropriate to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment (1) as part of any interlocutory order if the court determines that the appointment of such examiners is necessary to enforce such guarantees or (2) as part of any final judgment if the court finds that violations of the fifteenth amendment justifying equitable relief have occurred in such State or subdivision: *Provided*, That the court need not authorize the appointment of examiners if any incidents of denial or abridgment of the right to vote on account of race or color (1) have been few in number and have been promptly and effectively corrected by State or local action, (2) the continuing effect of such incidents has been eliminated, and (3) there is no reasonable probability of their recurrence in the future.

(b) If in a proceeding instituted by the Attorney General under any statute to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment in any State or political subdivision the court finds that a test or device has been used for the purpose or with the effect of denying or abridging the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color, it shall suspend the use of tests and devices in such State or political subdivisions as the court shall determine is appropriate and for such period as it deems necessary.

(c) If in any proceeding instituted by the Attorney General under any statute to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment in any State or political subdivision the court finds that violations of the fifteenth amendment justifying equitable relief have occurred within the territory of such State or political subdivision, the court, in addition to such relief as it may grant, shall retain jurisdiction for such period as it may deem appropriate and during such period no voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting different from that in force or effect at the time the proceeding was commenced shall be enforced unless and until the court finds that such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure does not have the purpose and will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color: *Provided*, That such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure may be enforced if the qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure has been submitted by the chief legal officer or other appropriate official of such State or subdivision to the Attorney General and the Attorney General has not interposed an objection within sixty days after such submission, except that neither the court's finding nor the Attorney General's failure to object shall bar a subsequent action to enjoin enforcement of such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure.

SEC. 4. (a) To assure that the right of citizens of the United States to vote is not denied or abridged on account of race or color, no citizen shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his failure to comply with any test or device in any State with respect to which the determinations have been made under subsection (b) or in any political subdivision with respect to which such determinations have been made as a separate unit, unless the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in an action for a declaratory judgment brought by such State or subdivision against the United States has determined that no such test or device has been used during the five years preceding the filing of the action for the purpose or with the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color: *Provided*, That no such declaratory judgment shall issue with respect to any plaintiff for a period of five years after the entry of a final judgment of any court of the United States, other than the denial of a declaratory judgment under this section, whether entered prior to or after the enactment of this Act, determining that denials or abridgments of the right to vote on account of race or color through the use of such tests or devices have occurred anywhere in the territory of such plaintiff.

An action pursuant to this subsection shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28 of the United States Code and any appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court. The court shall retain jurisdiction of any action pursuant to this subsection for five years after judgment and shall reopen the action upon motion of the Attorney General alleging that a test or device has been used for the purpose or with the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color.

If the Attorney General determines that he has no reason to believe that any such test or device has been used during the five years preceding the filing of the action for the purpose or with the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color, he shall consent to the entry of such judgment.

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall apply in any State or in any political subdivision of a state which (1) the Attorney General determines maintained on November 1, 1964, any test or device, and with respect to which (2) the Director of the Census determines that less than 50 per centum of the persons of voting age residing therein were registered on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 per centum of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964.

A determination or certification of the Attorney General or of the Director of the Census under this section or under section 6 or section 13 shall not be reviewable in any court and shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register.

(c) The phrase "test or device" shall mean any requirement that a person as a prerequisite for voting or registration for voting (1) demonstrate the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter, (2) demonstrate any educational achievement or his knowledge of any particular subject, (3) possess good moral character, or (4) prove his qualifications by the voucher of registered voters or members of any other class.

(d) For purposes of this section no State or political subdivision shall be determined to have engaged in the use of tests or devices for the purpose or with the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or collor if (1) incidents of such use have been few in number and have been promptly and effectively corrected by State or local action, (2) the continuing effect of such incidents has been eliminated, and (3) there is no reasonable probability of their recurrence in the future.

(e)(1) Congress hereby declares that to secure the rights under the fourteenth amendment of persons educated in American-flag schools in which the predominant classroom language was other than English, it is necessary to prohibit the States from conditioning the right to vote of such persons on ability to read, write, understand, or intepret any matter in the English language.

(2) No person who demonstrates that he has successfully completed the sixth primary grade in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which the predominant classroom language was other than English, shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his inability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter in the English language, except that in States in which State law provides that a different level of education is presumptive of literacy, he shall demonstrate that he has successfully completed an equivalent level of education in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which the predominant classroom language was other than English.

SEC. 5. Whenever a State or political subdivision with respect to which the prohibitions set forth in section 4(a) are in effect shall enact or seek to administer any voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting different from that in force or effect on November 1, 1964, such State or subdivision may institute an action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for a declaratory judgment that such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure does not have the purpose and will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color, and unless and until the court enters such judgment no person shall be denied the right to vote for failure to comply with such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure: *Provided*, That such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure may be enforced without such proceeding if the qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure has been submitted by the chief legal officer or other appropriate official of such State or subdivision to the Attorney General and the Attorney General has not interposed an objection within sixty days after such submission, except that neither the Attorney General's failure to object nor a declaratory judgment entered under this section shall bar a subsequent action to enjoin enforcement of such qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure. Any action under this section shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28 of the United States Code and any appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court.

SEC. 6. Whenever (a) a court has authorized the appointment of examiners pursuant to the provisions of section 3(a), or (b) unless a declaratory judgment has been rendered under section 4(a), the Attorney General certifies with respect to any political subdivision named in, or included within the scope of, determinations made under section 4(b) that (1) he has received complaints in writing from twenty or more residents of such political subdivision alleging that they have been denied the right to vote under color of law on account of race or color, and that he believes such complaints to be meritorious, or (2) that in his judgment (considering, among other factors, whether the ratio of nonwhite persons to white persons registered to vote within such subdivision appears to him to be reasonably attributable to violations of the fifteenth amendment or whether substantial evidence exists that bona fide efforts are being made within such subdivision to comply with the fifteenth amendment), the appointment of examiners is otherwise necessary to enforce the guarantees of the fifteenth amendment, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint as many examiners for such subdivision as it may deem appropriate to prepare and maintain lists of persons eligible to vote in Federal, State, and local elections. Such examiners, hearing officers provided for in section 9(a), and other persons deemed necessary by the Commission to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act shall be appointed, compensated, and separated without regard to the provisions of any statute administered by the Civil Service Commission, and service under this Act shall not be considered employment for the purposes of any statute administered by the Civil Service Commission, except the provisions of section 9 of the Act of August 2, 1939, as amended (5 U.S.C. 118i), prohibiting partisan political activity: *Provided*, That the Commission is authorized, after consulting the head of the appropriate department or agency, to designate suitable persons in the official service of the United States, with their consent, to serve in these positions. Examiners and hearing officers shall have the power to administer oaths.

SEC. 7. (a) The examiners for each political subdivision shall, at such places as the Civil Service Commission shall by regulation designate, examine applicants concerning their qualifications for voting. An application to an examiner shall be in such form as the Commission may require and shall contain allegations that the applicant is not otherwise registered to vote.

(b) Any person whom the examiner finds, in accordance with instructions received under section 9(b), to have the qualifications prescribed by State law not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States shall promptly be placed on a list of eligible voters. A challenge to such listing may be made in accordance with section 9(a) and shall not be the basis for a prosecution under section 12 of this Act. The examiner shall certify and transmit such list, and any supplements as appropriate, at least once a month, to the offices of the appropriate election officials, with copies to the Attorney General and the attorney general of the State, and any such lists and supplements thereto transmitted during the month shall be available for public inspection on the last business day of the month and in any event not later than the forty-fifth day prior to any election. The appropriate State or local election official shall place such names on the official voting list. Any person whose name appears on the examiner's list shall be entitled and allowed to vote in the election district of his residence unless and until the appropriate election officials shall have been notified that such person has been removed from such list in accordance with subsection (d): *Provided,* That no person shall be entitled to vote in any election by virtue of this Act unless his name shall have been certified and transmitted on such a list to the offices of the appropriate election officials at least forty-five days prior to such election.

(c) The examiner shall issue to each person whose name appears on such a list a certificate evidencing his eligibility to vote.

(d) A person whose name appears on such a list shall be removed therefrom by an examiner if (1) such person has been successfully challenged in accordance with the procedure prescribed in section 9, or (2) he has been determined by an examiner to have lost his eligibility to vote under State law not inconsistent with the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

SEC. 8. Whenever an examiner is serving under this Act in any political subdivision, the Civil Service Commission may assign, at the request of the Attorney General, one or more persons, who may be officers of the United States, (1) to enter and attend at any place for holding an election in such subdivision for the purpose of observing whether persons who are entitled to vote are being permitted to vote, and (2) to enter and attend at any place for tabulating the votes ment brought by any political subdivision for the purpose of observing whether votes cast by persons entitled to vote are being properly tabulated. Such persons so assigned shall report to an examiner appointed for such political subdivision, to the Attorney General, and if the appointment of examiners has been authorized pursuant to section 3(a), to the court.

SEC. 9. (a) Any challenge to a listing on an eligibility list prepared by an examiner shall be heard and determined by a hearing officer appointed by and responsible to the Civil Service Commission and under such rules as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe. Such challenge shall be entertained only if filed at such office within the State as the Civil Service Commission shall by regulation designate, and within ten days after the listing of the challenged person is made available for public inspection, and if supported by (1) the affidavits of at least two persons having personal knowledge of the facts constituting grounds for the challenge, and (2) a certification that a copy of the challenge and affidavits have been served by mail or in person upon the person challenged at his place of residence set out in the application. Such challenge shall be determined within fifteen days after it has been filed. A petition for review of the decision of the hearing officer may be filed in the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the person challenged resides within fifteen days after service of such decision by mail on the person petitioning for review but no decision of a hearing officer shall be reversed unless clearly erroneous. Any person listed shall be entitled and allowed to vote pending final determination by the hearing officer and by the court.

(b) The times, places, procedures, and form for application and listing pursuant to this Act and removals from the eligibility lists shall be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Civil Service Commission and the Commission shall, after consultation with the Attorney General, instruct examiners concerning applicable State law not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States with respect to (1) the qualifications required for listing, and (2) loss of eligibility to vote.

(c) Upon the request of the applicant or the challenger or on its own motion the Civil Service Commission shall have the power to require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence relating to any matter pending before it under the authority of this section. In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena, any district court of the United States or the United States court of any territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or is domiciled or transacts business, or has appointed an agent for receipt of service of process, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a hearing officer, there to produce pertinent, relevant, and nonprivileged documentary evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

SEC. 10. (a) The Congress finds that the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a precondition to voting (i) precludes persons of limited means from voting or imposes unreasonable financial hardship upon such persons as a precondition to their exercise of the franchise, (ii) does not bear a reasonable relationship to any legitimate State interest in the conduct of elections, and (iii) in some areas has the purpose or effect of denying persons the right to vote because of race or color. Upon the basis of these findings, Congress declares that the constitutional right of citizens to vote is denied or abridged in some areas by the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a precondition to voting.

(b) In the exercise of the powers of Congress under section 5 of the fourteenth amendment and section 2 of the fifteenth amendment, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to institute forthwith in the name of the United States such actions, including actions against States or political subdivisions, for declaratory judgment or injunctive relief against the enforcement of any requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a precondition to voting, or substitute therefor enacted after November 1, 1964, as will be necessary to implement the declaration of subsection (a) and the purposes of this section.

(c) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of such actions which shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28 of the United States Code and any appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court. It shall be the duty of the judges designated to hear the case to assign the case for hearing at the earliest practicable date, to participate in the hearing and determination thereof, and to cause the case to be in every way expedited.

(d) During the pendency of such actions, and thereafter if the courts, notwithstanding this action by the Congress, should declare the requirement of the payment of a poll tax to be constitutional, no citizen of the United States who is a resident of a State or political subdivision with respect to which determinations have been made under subsection 4(b) and a declaratory judgment has not been entered under subsection 4(a), during the first year he becomes otherwise entitled to vote by reason of registration by State or local officials or listing by an examiner, shall be denied the right to vote for failure to pay a poll tax if he tenders payment of such tax for the current year to an examiner or to the appropriate State or local official at least forty-five days prior to election, whether or not such tender would be timely or adequate under State law. An examiner shall have authority to accept such payment from any person authorized by this Act to make an application for listing, and shall issue a receipt for such payment. The examiner shall transmit promptly any such poll tax payment to the office of the State or local official authorized to receive such payment under State law, together with the name and address of the applicant.

SEC. 11. (a) No person acting under color of law shall fail or refuse to permit any person to vote who is entitled to vote under any provision of this Act or is otherwise qualified to vote, or willfully fail or refuse to tabulate, count, and report such person's vote.

(b) No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any person for voting, or attempting to vote, or intimidate, threaten, or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any person for urging or aiding any person to vote or attempt to vote, or intimidate, threaten, or coerce any person for exercising any powers or duties under section 3(a), 6, 8, 9, 10, or 12(e).

(c) Whoever knowingly or willfully gives false information as to his name, address, or period of residence in the voting district for the purpose of establishing his eligibility to register or vote, or conspires with another individual for the purpose of encouraging his false registration to vote or illegal voting, or pays or offers to pay or accepts payment either for registration to vote or for voting shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both: *Provided, however,* That this provision shall be applicable only to general, special, or primary elections held solely or in part for the purpose of selecting or electing any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the United States Senate, Member of the United States House of Representatives, or Delegates or Commissioners from the territories or possessions, or Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(d) Whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of an examiner or hearing officer knowingly and willfully falsifies or conceals a material fact, or makes any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or representations, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

SEC. 12. (a) Whoever shall deprive or attempt to deprive any person of any right secured by section 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, or 10 or shall violate section 11 (a) or (b), shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever, within a year following an election in a political subdivision in which an examiner has been appointed (1) destroys, defaces, mutilates, or otherwise alters the marking of a paper ballot which has been cast in such election, or (2) alters any official record of voting in such election tabulated from a voting machine or otherwise, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(c) Whoever conspires to violate the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or interferes with any right secured by section 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, or 11 (a) or (b) shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(d) Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice prohibited by section 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, or subsection (b) of this section, the Attorney General may institute for the United States, or in the name of the United States, an action for preventive relief, including an application for a temporary or permanent injunction, restraining order, or other order, and including an order directed to the State and State or local election officials to require them (1) to permit persons listed under this Act to vote and (2) to count such votes.

(e) Whenever in any political subdivision in which there are examiners appointed pursuant to this Act any persons alleged to such an examiner within forty-eight hours after the closing of the polls that notwithstanding (1) their listing under this Act or registration by an appropriate election official and (2) their eligibility to vote, they have not been permitted to vote in such election, the examiner shall forthwith notify the Attorney General if such allegations in his opinion appear to be well founded. Upon receipt of such notification, the Attorney General may forthwith file with the district court an application for an order providing for the marking, casting, and counting of the ballots of such persons and requiring the inclusion of their votes in the total vote before the results of such election shall be deemed final and any force or effect given thereto. The district court shall hear and determine such matters immediately after the filing of such application. The remedy provided in this subsection shall not preclude any remedy available under State or Federal law.

(f) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether a person asserting rights under the provisions of this Act shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.

SEC. 13. Listing procedures shall be terminated in any political subdivision of any State (a) with respect to examiners appointed pursuant to clause (b) of section 6 whenever the Attorney General notifies the Civil Service Commission, or whenever the District Court for the District of Columbia determines in an action for declaratory judgment brought by any political subdivision with respect to which the Director of the Census has determined that more than 50 per centum of the nonwhite persons of voting age residing therein are registered to vote, (1) that all persons listed by an examiner for such subdivision have been placed on the appropriate voting registration roll, and (2) that there is no longer reasonable cause to believe that persons will be deprived of or denied the right to vote on account of race or color in such subdivision, and (b), with respect to examiners appointed pursuant to section 3(a), upon order of the authorizing court. A political subdivision may petition the Attorney General for the termination of listing procedures under clause (a) of this section, and may petition the Attorney General to request the Director of the Census to take such survey or census as may be appropriate for the making of the determination provided for in this section. The District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to require such survey or census to be made by the Director of the Census and it shall require him to do so if it deems the Attorney General's refusal to request such survey or census to be arbitrary or unreasonable.

SEC. 14. (a) All cases of criminal contempt arising under the provisions of this Act shall be governed by section 151 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1995).

(b) No court other than the District Court for the District of Columbia or a court of appeals in any proceeding under section 9 shall have jurisdiction to issue any declaratory judgment pursuant to section 4 or section 5 or any restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction against the execution or enforcement of any provision of this Act or any action of any Federal officer or employee pursuant hereto.

(c) (1) The terms "vote" or "voting" shall include all action necessary to make a vote effective in any primary, special, or general election, including, but not limited to, registration, listing pursuant to this Act, or other action required by law prerequisite to voting, casting a ballot, and having such ballot counted properly and included in the appropriate totals of votes cast with respect to candidates for public or party office and propositions for which votes are received in an election.

(2) The term "political subdivision" shall mean any county or parish, except that where registration for voting is not conducted under the supervision of a county or parish, the term shall include any other subdivision of a State which conducts registration for voting.

(d) In any action for a declaratory judgment brought pursuant to section 4 or section 5 of this Act, subpenas for witnesses who are required to attend the District Court for the District of Columbia may be served in any judicial district of the United States: *Provided*, That no writ of subpena shall issue for witnesses without the District of Columbia at a greater distance than one hundred miles from the place of holding court without the permission of the District Court for the District of Columbia being first had upon proper application and cause shown.

SEC. 15. Section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971), as amended by section 131 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 637), and amended by section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 90), and as further amended by section 101 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 241), is further amended as follows:

(a) Delete the word "Federal" wherever it appears in subsections (a) and (e);

(b) Repeal subsection (f) and designate the present subsections (g) and (h) as (f) and (g), respectively.

SEC. 16. The Attorney General and the Secretary of Defense, jointly, shall make a full and complete study to determine whether, under the laws or practices of any State or States, there are preconditions to voting, which might tend to result in discrimination against citizens serving in the Armed Forces of the United States seeking to vote. Such officials shall, jointly, make a report to the Congress not later than June 30, 1966, containing the results of such study, together with a list of any States in which such preconditions exist, and shall include in such report such recommendations for legislation as they deem advisable to prevent discrimination in voting against citizens serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

SEC. 17. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to deny, impair, or otherwise adversely affect the right to vote of any person registered to vote under the law of any State or political subdivision.

SEC. 18. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 19. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of the provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

(Approved August 6, 1965.)

COMMENTS ON THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have followed with interest the comments made by my colleagues, by the press, and by private individuals after my speech of September 15 regarding the Dominican Republic. I have also followed with interest events in the other body that may have been related to my speech.

Much of the discussion, I have noted to my surprise, has been about me rather than about the Dominican Republic and Latin America. Some of these personal comments have been complimentary, and to those who made them I express my thanks. Others have been uncomplimentary, and to those who made them I can only say that our country is still strong enough to survive an occasional dissenting view even though the consensus is virtually unanimous.

There has been a good deal of discussion as to whether it is proper for the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to make a speech critical of an administration of his own party which he generally supports. There is something to be said on both sides of this question and it is certainly one which I considered with care before deciding to make my speech on the Dominican Republic. I concluded, after hearing the testimony of administration witnesses in the Committee on Foreign Relations, that I could do more to encourage carefully considered policies in the future by initiating a public discussion than by acquiescing silently in a policy I believed to be mistaken. It seemed to me, therefore, that, despite any controversy and annoyance to individuals, I was performing a service to the administration by stating my views publicly.

I do not like taking a public position criticizing a Democratic administration which in most respects I strongly support; I do not like it at all. Neither do I like being told, as I have been told, that my statement was "irresponsible" or that it has given aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States. I am quite prepared to examine evidence suggesting that my statement contained errors of fact or judgment; I am not prepared to accept the charge that a statement following upon many hours of listening to testimony in the Foreign Relations

Committee and many more hours of examining and evaluating relevant documents was irresponsible. Nor do I take kindly to the charge that I gave aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States. If that accusation is to be pressed—and I should hope it would not be—an interesting discussion could be developed as to whether it is my criticisms of U.S. policy in the Dominican Republic or the policy itself which has given aid and comfort to our enemies.

A Senator has a duty to support his President and his party, but he also has a duty to express his views on major issues. In the case of the Dominican crisis I felt that, however reluctant I might be to criticize the administration—and I was very reluctant—it was nonetheless my responsibility to do so, for two principal reasons.

First. I believe that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has a special obligation to offer the best advice he can on matters of foreign policy; it is an obligation, I believe, which is inherent in the chairmanship, which takes precedence over party loyalty, and which has nothing to do with whether the chairman's views are solicited or desired by people in the executive branch.

Second. I thought it my responsibility to comment on U.S. policy in the Dominican Republic because the political opposition, whose function it is to cricitize, was simply not doing so. It did not because it obviously approved of U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic and presumably, had it been in office, would have done the same thing. The result of this peculiar situation was that a highly controversial policy was being carried out without controversy—without debate, without review, without that necessary calling to account which is a vital part of the democratic process. Again and again, in the weeks following the committee hearing I noted the absence of any challenge to statements appearing in the press and elsewhere which clearly contradicted evidence available to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Under these circumstances I am not impressed with suggestions that I had no right to speak as I did on Santo Domingo. The real question, it seems to me, is whether I had the right not to speak.

Insofar as it represents a genuine reconciliation of differences, a consensus is a fine thing; insofar as it represents the concealment of differences, it is a miscarriage of democratic procedure. I think we Americans tend to put too high a value on unanimity—on bipartisanship in foreign policy, on politics stopping at the water's edge, on turning a single face to the world—as if there were something dangerous and illegitimate about honest differences of opinion honestly expressed by honest men. Probably because we have been united about so many things for so long, including the basic values of our free society, we tend to be mistrustful of intellectual dissent, confusing it with personal hostility and political disloyalty.

As the distinguished commentator, Marquis Childs, recently noted, we tend in America toward a tyranny of the majority. More than a century ago, Alexis de Tocqueville took note of that tendency in these words:

> I know of no country in which there is so little independence of mind and real freedom of discussion as in America. Profound changes have occurred since democracy in America first appeared and yet it may be asked whether recognition of the right of dissent has gained substantially in practice as well as in theory.

Tocqueville was a friend and admirer of the United States but he regarded the tyranny of the majority as the greatest of dangers in a democracy.

> The smallest reproach—

He wrote—

> irritates its sensibility and the slightest joke that has any foundation in truth renders it indignant; from the forms of its language up to the solid virtues of its character, everything must be made the subject of encomium. No writer, whatever be his eminence, can escape paying this tribute of adulation to his fellow citizens.

A recent Harris survey, showing strong public disaproval of nonconformist opinions, tends to sustain Tocqueville's view of tyranny by the majority. In an article in the Washington Post dated September 27, 1965, Mr. Harris writes:

> America has long prided itself as a nation of rugged individualists where the pioneer tradition allows a man to hold his own views and go his own way. However, the latest Harris survey reveals widespread misgivings among many Americans over present-day examples of social, political or intellectual nonconformity.
>
> The man who stands apart from the crowd—because he does not believe in God, because he pickets against the war in Vietnam, because he demonstrates for civil rights—is regarded as harmful to the American way of life by two out of three of his fellow citizens, a survey of a carefully drawn cross-section of the adult public shows.

Far from being the danger many of us make it out to be, responsible dissent is one of the great strengths of democracy. France, for example, is unquestionably in a stronger position today in her relations with the emerging nations of Asia and Africa because during the years of her colonial wars in Indochina and Algeria a large and articulate minority refused to acquiesce in what was being done and, by speaking out, pointed the way to the enlightened policies of the Fifth Republic. The British Labor Party, to take another example, not only protested the Suez invasion in 1956 but did so while the invasion was being carried out; by so doing, the opposition performed the patriotic service of helping Britain to recover its good name in the wake of a disastrous adventure, starting to repair the damage while the damage was still being done.

It seems to me a manifestation of the tyranny of the majority that there has been so much talk about when it is proper for a Senator to make a speech and so little about the subject matter involved, which was the Dominican Republic and Latin America. It was my intention on September 15 to start a discussion about these and not about myself. There is a very great deal to be said about U.S. policy in Latin America—about political and economic reform and the Alliance for Progress, about collective security and the Organization of American States, about social revolutions and the interests of the United States. I should like very much to hear the views of my colleagues on these and other matters, including the suggestion tentatively put forth in my statement of September 15 that an inter-American partnership of equals in the long run might be advanced by a loosening of ties in the short run.

I would especially like to hear the views of my colleagues on the proposition put forth by President Johnson in his address of August 17 to the Latin American Ambassadors to the effect that the United States hopes to see Latin Americans achieve the same kinds of reform through the Alliance for Progress that we seek for ourselves through the Great Society. Starting with this premise, there is much to be said about how the United States can aid and support the true friends of social reform in Latin America—men like President Belaunde Terry of Peru and President Frei of Chile, whose programs for social justice are also, and for that reason, antidotes to communism.

A general discussion of the Latin American policies of the United States would be interesting and rewarding, far more so than personal recriminations about tolerance of communism and infatuation with revolutions. I myself am too old to change, but there is still hope for the United States and Latin America.

Mr. President, in the weeks since I made my speech on the Dominican Republic I have received over 1,500 letters commenting on it. Approximately 90 percent of these letters expressed concern about the way in which the United States intervened in Santo Domingo. This public reaction suggests that a large sector of the American public shares my concern about the Latin American policy of the United States. Many of the letters I received expressed concern about the role of the Department of Defense and the role of the Central Intelligence Agency in the conduct of American foreign policy. Many, I am pleased to note, expressed the conviction that the United States should abide by its obligations of multilateralism and nonintervention under the Charter of the Organization of American States, and a great many expressed the view, in one way or another, that the foreign policy they desired for the United States was one which was true to its own democratic values.

There has been a great deal of press and periodical commentary on my speech of September 15, much of it favorable, much of it unfavorable. I have selected comments, pro and con, which I judge to be representative and which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point. For the benefit of those who may not have seen the entire text of my speech, and to provide a point of reference, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my speech be inserted just prior to these insertions in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech and material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Congressional Record, Senate, Sept. 15, 1965]

THE SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the formation of a provisional government in Santo Domingo under the leadership of Dr. Hector Garcia-Godoy is good news. It provides reason for cautious optimism as to the future and testifies as well to the arduous and patient efforts of the OAS mediating team. I wish to pay tribute especially to Ambassador Bunker for his wisdom and patience in handling this difficult affair. The formation of a provisional government is not the end of the Dominican crisis, but it does bring to an end a tragic and dangerous phase of the crisis. Many problems remain, particularly the problem of establishing the authority of a democratic government over the Dominican military. Nonetheless, the situation now seems to be moving into a less dangerous and more hopeful phase. At this time of relative calm it is appropriate, desirable and, I think, necessary to review events in the Dominican Republic, and the U.S. role in those events. The purpose of such a review—and its only purpose—is to develop guidelines for wise and effective policies in the future.

I was in doubt about the advisability of making a statement on the Dominican affair until some of my colleagues made public statements on the floor. Their views on the way in which the committee proceedings were conducted and, indeed, on the Dominican crisis as a whole, are so diametrically opposed to my own that I now consider it my duty to express my personal conclusions drawn from the hearings held by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The suggestions that have been made that the committee was prejudiced in its approach against the administration's policies are, in my opinion, without merit. The committee was impartial and fair in giving a full and detailed hearing to the administration's point of view, so much so, in fact, that it heard only one witness from outside the Government.

U.S. policy in the Dominican crisis was characterized initially by overtimidity and subsequently by overreaction. Throughout the whole affair, it has also been characterized by a lack of candor.

These are general conclusions I have reached from a painstaking review of the salient features of the extremely complex situation. These judgments are made, of course, with the benefit of hindsight and, in fairness, it must be conceded there were no easy choices available to the United States in the Dominican Republic. Nonetheless, it is the task of diplomacy to make wise decisions when they need to be made and U.S. diplomacy failed to do so in the Dominican crisis.

It cannot be said with assurance that the United States could have changed the course of events by acting differently. What can be said with assurance is that the United States did not take advantage of several opportunities in which it might have changed the course of events. The reason appears to be that, very close to the beginning of the revolution, U.S. policymakers decided that it should not be allowed to succeed. This decision seems to me to have been based on exaggerated estimates of Communist influence in the rebel movement in the initial stages and on distaste for the return to power of Juan Bosch or of a government controlled by Bosch's party, the PRD—Dominican Revolutionary Party.

The question of the degree of Communist influence is of critical importance and I shall comment on it later. The essential point, however, is that the United States, on the basis of ambiguous evidence, assumed almost from the beginning that the revolution was Communist dominated, or would certainly become so. It apparently never occurred to anyone that the United States could also attempt to influence the course which the revolution took. We misread prevailing tendencies in Latin America by overlooking or ignoring the fact that any reform movement is likely to attract Communist support. We thus failed to perceive that if we are automatically to oppose any reform movement that Communists adhere to, we are likely to end up opposing every reform movement, making ourselves the prisoners of reactionaries who wish to preserve the status quo—and the status quo in many countries is not good enough.

The principal reason for the failure of American policy in Santo Domingo was faulty advice given to the President by his representatives in the Dominican Republic at the time of acute crisis. Much of this advice was based on misjudgment of the facts of the situation; some of it appears to have been based on inadequate evidence or, in some cases, simply inaccurate information. On the basis of the information and counsel he received, the President could hardly have acted other than he did.

I am hopeful, and reasonably confident, that the mistakes made by the United States in the Dominican Republic can be retrieved and that it will be possible to avoid repeating them in the future. These purposes can be served, however, only if the shortcomings of U.S. policy are thoroughly reviewed and analyzed. I make my remarks today in the hope of contributing to that process.

The development of the Dominican crisis, beginning on April 24, 1965, provides a classic study of policymaking in a fast-changing situation in which each decision reduces the range of options available for future decisions so that errors are compounded and finally, indeed, there are few if any options except to follow through on an ill-conceived course of action. Beyond a certain point the Dominican story acquired some of the inevitability of a Greek tragedy.

Another theme that emerges from the Dominican crisis is the occurrence of a striking change in U.S. policy toward the Dominican Republic and the possibility—not a certainty, because the signs are ambiguous, but only the possibility—of a major change as well in the general Latin American policies of the United States. Obviously, an important change in the official outlook on Dominican affairs occurred between September 1963, when the United States was vigorously opposed to the overthrow of Juan Bosch, and April 1965, when the United States was either unenthusiastic or actually opposed to his return.

What happened in that period to change the assessment of Bosch from favorable to unfavorable? It is quite true that Bosch as President did not distinguish himself as an administrator, but that was well known in 1963. It is also true, however, and much more to the point as far as the legitimate interests of the United States are concerned, that Bosch had received 58 percent of the votes in a free and honest election and that he was presiding over a reform-minded government in tune with the Alliance for Progress. This is a great deal more than can be said for any other President of the Dominican Republic.

The question therefore remains as to how and why the attitude of the U.S. Government changed so strikingly between September 1963 and April 1965. And the question inevitably arises whether this shift in the administration's attitude toward the Dominican Republic is part of a broader shift in its attitude toward other Latin American countries, whether, to be specific, the U.S. Government now views the vigorous reform movements of Latin America—such as Christian Democracy in Chile, Peru, and Venezuela, APRA in Peru and Accion Democratica in Venezuela—as threatening to the interests of the United States. And if this is the case, what kind of Latin American political movements would now be regarded as friendly to the United States and beneficial to its interests?

I should like to make it very clear that I am raising a question not offering an answer. I am frankly puzzled as to the current attitude of the U.S. Government toward reformist movements in Latin America. On the one hand, President Johnson's deep personal commitment to the philosophy and aims of the Alliance for Progress is clear; it was convincingly expressed, for example, in his speech to the Latin American Ambassadors on the fourth anniversary of the Alliance for Progress—a statement in which the President compared the Alliance for Progress with his own enlightened program for a Great Society at home. On the other hand, one notes a general tendency on the part of our policymakers not to look beyond a Latin American politician's anticommunism. One also notes in certain Government agencies, particularly the Department of Defense, a preoccupation with counterinsurgency, which is to say, with the prospect of revolutions and means of suppressing them. This preoccupation is manifested in dubious and costly research projects, such as the recently discredited Camelot; these studies claim to be scientific but beneath their almost unbelievably opaque language lies an unmistakable military and reactionary bias.

It is of great importance that the uncertainty as to U.S. aims in Latin America be resolved. We cannot successfully advance the cause of popular democracy and at the same time aline ourselves with corrupt and reactionary oligarchies; yet that is what we seem to be trying to do. The direction of the Alliance for Progress is toward social revolution in Latin America; the direction of our Dominican intervention is toward the suppression of revolutionary movements which are supported by Communists or suspected of being influenced by Communists. The prospect of an election in 9 months which may conceivably produce a strong democratic government is certainly reassuring on this score, but the fact remains that the reaction of the United States at the time of acute crisis was to intervene forcibly and illegally against a revolution which, had we sought to influence it instead of suppressing it, might have produced a strong popular government without foreign military intervention. Since just about every revolutionary movement is likely to attract Communist support, at least in the beginning, the approach followed in the Dominican Republic, if consistently pursued, must inevitably make us the enemy of all revolutions and therefore the ally of all the unpopular and corrupt oligarchies of the hemisphere.

We simply cannot have it both ways; we must choose between the Alliance for Progress and a foredoomed effort to sustain the status quo in Latin America. The choice which we are to make is the principal unanswered question arising out of the unhappy events to the Dominican Republic and, indeed, the principal unanswered question for the future of our relations with Latin America.

It is not surprising that we Americans are not drawn toward the uncouth revolutionaries of the non-Communist left. We are not, as we like to claim in Fourth of July speeches, the most truly revolutionary nation on earth; we are, on the contrary, much closer to being the most unrevolutionary nation on earth. We are sober and satisfied and comfortable and rich; our institutions are stable and old and even venerable, and our Revolution of 1776, for that matter, was not much of an upheaval compared to the French and Russian revolutions and to current and impending revolutions in Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

Our heritage of stability and conservatism is a great blessing, but it also has the effect of limiting our understanding of the character of social revolution and sometimes as well of the injustices which spawn them. Our understanding of revolutions and their causes is imperfect not because of any failures of mind or character but because of our good fortune since the Civil War in never having experienced sustained social injustice without hope of legal or more or less peaceful remedy. We are called upon, therefore, to give our understanding and our sympathy and support to movements which are alien to our experience and jarring to our preferences and prejudices.

We must try to understand social revolution and the injustices that give it rise because they are the heart and core of the experience of the great majority of people now living in the world. In Latin America we may prefer to associate with the well-bred, well-dressed businessmen who often hold positions of power, but Latin American reformers regard such men as aliens in their own countries who neither identify with their own people nor even sympathize with their aspirations. Such leaders are regarded by educated young Latin Americans as a "consular bourgeoisie," by which they mean business-oriented conservatives who more nearly represent the interests of foreign businessmen than the interests of their own people. Men like Donald Reid—who is one of the better of this category of leaders—may have their merits, but they are not the force of the future in Latin America.

It is the revolutionaries of the non-Communist left who have most of the popular support in Latin America. The Radical Party in Chile, for example, is full of 19th century libertarians whom many North Americans would find highly congenial, but it was recently crushed in national elections by a group of rambunctious, leftist Christian Democrats. It may be argued that the Christain Democrats are anti-United States, and to a considerable extent some of them are—more so now, it may be noted, than prior to the intervention of the United States in the Dominican Republic—but they are not Communists and they have popular support. They have also come to terms with the American copper companies in Chile; that is something which the predecessor conservative government was unable to do and something which a Communist government would have been unwilling to do.

The movement of the future in Latin America is social revolution. The question is whether it is to be Communist or democratic revolution and the choice which the Latin Americans make will depend in part on how the United States uses its great influence. It should be very clear that the choice is not between social revolution and conservative oligarchy but whether, by supporting reform, we bolster the popular non-Communist left or whether, by supporting unpopular oligarchies, we drive the rising generation of educated and patriotic young Latin Americans to an embittered and hostile form of communism like that of Fidel Castro in Chile.

In my Senate speech of March 25, 1964, I commented as follows on the prospect of revolution:

"I am not predicting violent revolutions in Latin America or elsewhere. Still less am I advocating them. I wish only to suggest that violent social revolutions are a possibility in countries where feudal oligarchies resist all meaningful change by peaceful means. We must not, in our preference for the democratic procedures envisioned by the Charter of Punta del Este, close our minds to the possibility that democratic procedures may fail in certain countries and that where democracy does fail violent social convulsions may occur."

I think that in the case of the Dominican Republic we did close our minds to the causes and to the essential legitimacy of revolution in a country in which democratic procedures had failed. That, I think, is the central fact concerning the participation of the United States in the Dominican revolution and, possibly as well, its major lesson for the future. I turn now to comment on some of the events which began last April 24 in Santo Domingo.

When the Dominican revolution began on Saturday, April 24, the United States had three options available. First, it could have supported the Reid Cabral government; second, it could have supported the revolutionary forces; and third, it could do nothing.

The administration chose the last course. When Donald Reid Cabral asked for U.S. intervention on Sunday morning, April 25, he was given no encouragement. He then resigned, and considerable disagreement ensued over the nature of the government to succeed him. The party of Juan Bosch, the PRD, or Dominican Revolutionary Party, asked for a "U.S. presence" at the transfer of government power but was given no encouragement. Thus, there began at that time a chaotic situation which amounted to civil war in a country without an effective government.

What happened in essence was that the Dominican military refused to support Reid and were equally opposed to Bosch or other PRD leaders as his successor. The PRD, which had the support of some military officers, announced that Rafael Molina Urena, who had been president of the senate during the Bosch regime, would govern as provisional president pending Bosch's return. At this point, the military leaders delivered an ultimatum, which the rebels ignored, and at about 4:30 on the afternoon of April 25 the air force and navy began firing at the National Palace. Later in the day, PRD leaders asked the U.S. Embassy to use its influence to persuade the air force to stop the attacks. The Embassy made it clear it would not intervene on behalf of the rebels, although on the following day, Monday, April 26, the Embassy did persuade the military to stop air attacks for a limited time.

This was the first crucial point in the crisis. If the United States thought that Reid was giving the Dominican Republic the best government it had had or was likely to get, why did the United States not react more vigorously to support him? On the other hand, if the Reid government was thought to be beyond salvation, why did not the United States offer positive encouragement to the moderate forces involved in the coup, if not by providing the "U.S. presence" requested by the PRD, then at least by letting it be known that the United States was not opposed to the prospective change of regimes or by encouraging the return of Juan Bosch to the Dominican Republic? In fact, according to available evidence, the U.S. Government made no effort to contact Bosch in the initial days of the crisis.

The United States was thus at the outset unwilling to support Reid and unwilling to support if not positively opposed to Bosch.

Events of the days following April 24 demonstrated that Reid had so little popular support that it can reasonably be argued that there was nothing the United States could have done, short of armed intervention, to save his regime. The more interesting question is why the United States was so reluctant to see Bosch returned to power. This is part of the larger question of why U.S. attitudes had changed so much since 1963 when Bosch, then in power, was warmly and repeatedly embraced and supported as few if any Latin American presidents have ever been supported by the United States.

The next crucial point in the Dominican story came on Tuesday, April 27, when rebel leaders, including Molina Urena and Caamano Deno, called at the U.S. Embassy seeking mediation and negotiations. At that time the military situation looked very bad for the rebel, or constitutionalist forces. Ambassador Bennett, who had been instructed four times to work for a cease-fire and for the formation of a military junta, felt he did not have authority to mediate; mediation, in his view, would have been "intervention." Mediation at that point might have been accomplished quietly and without massive military intervention. Twenty-four hours later the Ambassador was pleading for the Marines, and as we know some 20,000 soldiers were landed—American soldiers.

On the afternoon of April 27 Gen. Wessin y Wessin's tanks seemed about to cross the Duarte bridge into the city of Santo Domingo and the rebel cause appeared hopeless. When the rebels felt themselves rebuffed at the American Embassy, some of their leaders, including Molina Urena, sought asylum in Latin American embassies in Santo Domingo. The administration has interpreted this as evidence that the non-Communist rebels recognized growing Communist influence in their movement and were consequently abandoning the revolution. Molina Urena has said simply that he sought asylum because he thought the revolutionary cause hopeless.

An opportunity was lost on April 27. Ambassador Bennett was in a position to bring possibly decisive mediating power to bear for a democratic solution, but he chose not to do so on the ground that the exercise of his good offices at that point would have constituted intervention. In the words of Washington Post writer Murray Marder—one of the press people who, to the best of my knowledge, has not been assailed as prejudiced:

"It can be argued with considerable weight that late Tuesday, April 27, the United States threw away a fateful opportunity to try to prevent the sequence that produced the American intervention. It allowed the relatively leaderless revolt to pass into hands which it was to allege were Communist."[1]

The overriding reason for this mistake was the conviction of U.S. officials, on the basis of evidence which was fragmentary at best, that the rebels were dominated by Communists. A related and perhaps equally important reason for the U.S. Embassy's refusal to mediate on April 27 was the desire for and, at that point, expectation of an antirebel victory. They therefore passed up an important opportunity to reduce or even eliminate Communist influence by encouraging the moderate elements among the rebels and mediating for a democratic solution.

Owing to a degree of disorganization and timidity on the part of the antirebel forces which no one, including the U.S. Embassy and the rebels themselves, anticipated, the rebels were still fighting on the morning of Wednesday, April 28. Ambassador Bennett thereupon urgently recommended that the antirebels under Air Force General de los Santos be furnished 50 walkie-talkies from U.S. Defense Department stocks in Puerto Rico. Repeating this recommendation later in the day, Bennett said that the issue was one between Castroism and its opponents. The antirebels themselves asked for armed U.S. intervention on their side; this request was refused at that time.

During the day, however, the situation deteriorated rapidly, from the point of view of public order in general and of the antirebels in particular. In midafternoon of April 28 Col. Pedro Bartolome Benoit, head of a junta which had been hastily assembled, asked again, this time in writing, for U.S. troops on the ground that this was the only way to prevent a Communist takeover; no mention was made of the junta's inability to protect American lives. This request was denied in Washington, and Benoit was thereupon told that the United States would not intervene unless he said he could not protect American citizens present in the Dominican Republic. Benoit was thus told in effect that if he said American lives were in danger the United States would intervene. And that is precisely what happened.

---

[1] Washington Post, June 27, 1965, p. E3.

It was at this point, on April 28, that events acquired something of the predestiny of a Greek tragedy. Subsequent events—the failure of the missions of John Bartlow Martin and McGeorge Bundy, the conversion of the U.S. force into an inter-American force, the enforced stalemate between the rebels under Caamano Deno and the Imbert junta, the OAS mediation and the tortuous negotiations for a provisional government—have all been widely reported and were not fully explored in the committee hearings. In any case, the general direction of events was largely determined by the fateful decision of April 28. Once the marines landed on that day, and especially after they were heavily reinforced in the days immediately following, the die was cast and the United States found itself deeply involved in the Dominican civil conflict, with no visible way to extricate itself, and with its hemisphere relations complicated in a way that few could have foreseen and no one could have desired.

The danger to American lives was more a pretext than a reason for the massive U.S. intervention that began on the evening of April 28. In fact, no American lives were lost in Santo Domingo until the marines began exchanging fire with the rebels after April 28; reports of widespread shooting that endangered American lives turned out to be exaggerated.

Nevertheless, there can be no question that Santo Domingo was not a particularly safe place to be in the last days of April 1965. There was fighting in the streets, aircraft were strafing parts of the city, and there was indiscriminate shooting. I think that the United States would have been justified in landing a small force for the express purpose of removing U.S. citizens and other foreigners from the island. Had such a force been landed and then promptly withdrawn when it had completed its mission, I do not think that any fairminded observer at home or abroad would have considered the United States to have exceeded its rights and responsibilities.

The United States intervened in the Dominican Republic for the purpose of preventing the victory of a revolutionary force which was judged to be Communist dominated. On the basis of Ambassador Bennett's messages to Washington, there is no doubt that the threat of communism rather than danger to American lives was his primary reason for recommending military intervention.

The question of the degree of Communist influence is therefore crucial, but it cannot be answered with certainty. The weight of the evidence is that Communists did not participate in planning the revolution—indeed, there is some indication that it took them by surprise—but that they very rapidly began to try to take advantage of it and to seize control of it. The evidence does not establish that the Communists at any time actually had control of the revolution. There is little doubt that they had influence within the revolutionary movement, but the degree of that influence remains a matter of speculation.

The administration, however, assumed almost from the beginning that the revolution was Communist dominated, or would certainly become so, and that nothing short of forcible opposition could prevent a Communist takeover. In their apprehension lest the Dominican Republic become another Cuba, some of our officials seem to have forgotten that virtually all reform movements attract some Communist support, that there is an important difference between Communist support and Communist control of a political movement, that it is quite possible to compete with the Communists for influence in a reform movement rather than abandon it to them and, most important of all, that economic development and social justice are themselves the primary and most reliable security against Communist subversion.

It is, perhaps, understandable that administration officials should have felt some sense of panic; after all, the Foreign Service officer who had the misfortune to be assigned to the Cuban desk at the time of Castro's rise to power has had his career ruined by congressional committees. Furthermore, even without this consideration, the decisions regarding the Dominican Republic had to be made under great pressure and on the basis of inconclusive information. In charity, this can be accepted as a reason why the decisions were mistaken; but it does not change the conclusion that they were mistaken.

The point I am making is not—emphatically not—that there was no Communist participation in the Dominican crisis, but simply that the administration acted on the premise that the revolution was controlled by Communists—a premise which it failed to establish at the time and has not established since. The issue is not whether there was Communist influence in the Dominican revolution but its degree, which is something on which reasonable men can differ. The burden of proof, however, is on those who take action, and the administration has not proven its assertion of Communist control.

Intervention on the basis of Communist participation as distinguished from control of the Dominican revolution was a mistake in my opinion which also reflects a grievous misreading of the temper of contemporary Latin American politics. Communists are present in all Latin American countries, and they are going to inject themselves into almost any Latin American revolution and try to seize control of it. If any group or any movement with which the Communists associate themselves is going to be automatically condemned in the eyes of the United States, then we have indeed given up all hope of guiding or influencing even to a marginal degree the revolutionary movements and the demands for social change which are sweeping Latin America. Worse, if that is our view, then we have made ourselves the prisoners of the Latin American oligarchs who are engaged in a vain attempt to preserve the status quo—reactionaries who habitually use the term "Communist" very loosely, in part out of emotional predilection and in part in a calculated effort to scare the United States into supporting their selfish and discredited aims.

If the United States had really been intervening to save American lives, as it had a moral if not a strictly legal right to do, it could have done so promptly and then withdrawn and the incident would soon have been forgotten. But the United States did not intervene primarily to save American lives; it intervened to prevent what it conceived to be, a Communist takeover. That meant, in the terms in which the United States defined the situation, that it was intervening against the rebels, who, however heavily they might or might not have been infiltrated by Communists, were also the advocates of the restoration of a freely elected constitutional government which had been forcibly overthrown. It also meant that the United States was intervening for the military and the oligarchy—to the detriment of the Dominican people and to the bitter disappointment of those throughout Latin America who had placed their hopes in the United States and the Alliance for Progress.

On the basis of the record, there is ample justification for concluding that, at least from the time Reid resigned, U.S. policy was directed toward construction of a military junta which hopefully would restore peace and conduct free elections. That is to say that U.S. policy was directed against the return of Bosch and against the success of the rebel movement.

In this connection it is interesting to recall U.S. policy toward Bosch when he was in power in the Dominican Republic between February and September of 1963. He had been elected, as I have already mentioned, in the only free and honest election ever held in the Dominican Republic, in December 1962, with 58 percent of the votes cast.

The United States placed such importance on his success that President Kennedy sent the then Vice President Johnson and Senator HUMPHREY, among others, to attend his inauguration in February 1963. In September 1963, when he was overthrown in a military coup, the United States made strenuous efforts—which stopped just short of sending the marines—to keep him in power, and thereafter the United States waited almost 3 months before recognizing the successor government. Recognition came, by the way, only after the successor government had conducted military operations against a band of alleged Communist guerrillas in the mountains, and there is a suspicion that the extent of the guerrilla activities was exaggerated by the successor government in order to secure U.S. recognition.

It may be granted that Bosch was no great success as President of the Dominican Republic but, when all his faults have been listed, the fact remains that Bosch was the only freely elected President in Dominican history, the only President who had ever tried, however ineptly, to give the country a decent government, and the only President who was unquestionably in tune with the Alliance for Progress.

Despite these considerations, the United States was at the very least unenthusiastic or, more probably, opposed to Bosch's return to power in April 1965. Bosch himself was apparently not eager to return—he vacillated in the very early stages and some well-informed persons contend that he positively refused to return to the Dominican Republic. In any case, he missed a critical opportunity. But the United States was equally adamant against a return to power of Bosch's party, the PRD, which is the nearest thing to a mass-based, well-organized party that has ever existed in the Dominican Republic. The stated reason was that a PRD government would be Communist dominated.

This might conceivably have happened, but the evidence by no means supports the conclusion that it would have happened. We based our policy on a possibility rather than on anything approaching a likelihood. Obviously, if we based all our policies on the mere possibility of communism, then we would have to set ourselves against just about every progressive political movement in the world, because almost all such movements are subject to at least the theoretical danger of Communist takeover. This approach is not in the national interest; foreign policy must be based on prospects that seem probable, hopeful and susceptible to constructive influence rather than on merely possible dangers.

One is led, therefore, to the conclusion that U.S. policymakers were unduly timid and alarmist in refusing to gamble on the forces of reform and social change. The bitter irony of such timidity is that by casting its lot with the forces of the status quo, in the probably vain hope that these forces could be induced to permit at least some reform and social change, the United States almost certainly helped the Communists to acquire converts whom they otherwise could not have won.

How vain the hopes of U.S. policymakers were is amply demonstrated by events since April 28. The junta led by Gen. Antonio Imbert, which succeeded the junta led by Colonel Benoit, proved quite intractable and indeed filled the airwaves daily with denunciations of the United States and the Organization of American States for preventing it from wiping out the Communist rebels. These are the same military forces which on April 28 were refusing to fight the rebels and begging for U.S. intervention. Our aim apparently was to use Imbert as a counterpoise to Caamano Deno in the ill-founded hope that non-Communist liberals would be drawn away from the rebel side.

In practice, instead of Imbert becoming our tractable instrument, we, to a certain extent, became his: he clung tenaciously to the power we gave him and was at least as intransigent as the rebels in the protracted negotiations for a provisional government.

The resignation of Imbert and his junta provides grounds for hope that a strong popular government may come to power in the Dominican Republic, but that hope must be tempered by the fact that the military continues to wield great power in Dominican politics—power which it probably would not now have if the United States had not intervened to save it from defeat last April 28. Even with a provisional government installed in Santo Domingo, and with the prospect of an election in 9 months, there remains the basic problem of a deep and widespread demand for social change. The prospect for such social change is circumscribed by the fact that the military has not surrendered and cannot be expected voluntarily to surrender its entrenched position of privilege and outrageous corruption.

The United States has grossly underestimated the symbolism of the Bosch constitution of 1963. It can be argued that this contains unrealistic promises, but it has stirred the hopes and idealism of the Dominican people. The real objections to it, the part of conservative Dominicans, seem to be that it provides for separation of church and state and that it provides that Dominican citizens have the right to live in the Dominican Republic if they so desire—that is, that Dominican citizens who happen also to be Communists cannot be deported. In passing, one may note a similarity to the U.S. Constitution on both of these points.

The United States has also misread the dedication of the Dominican military to the status quo and to its own powers and privileges. It may be said that the United States has overestimated its ability to influence the military while failing to use to the fullest the influence it does have.

The act of United States massive military intervention in the Dominican Republic was a grievous mistake, but if one is going to cross the bridge of intervention, with all of the historical ghosts which it calls forth throughout Latin America, then one might as well cross all the way and not stop in the middle. It is too late for the United States to refrain from intervention; it is not too late to try to redeem some permanent benefit from that intervention. Specifically, I think that the influence of the United States and the Organization of American States should be used to help the Dominican people free themselves from the oppressive weight of a corrupt and privileged military establishment. It is entirely possible, if not likely, that if the military is allowed to retain its power it will overthrow any future government that displeases it just as it has done in the past. The OAS mediating team made a contribution by bringing about the installation of a provisional government; the OAS can still make a solid contribution to Dominican democracy by urging or insisting that as part of a permanent solution the Dominican military establishment be substantially reduced in size and some of the more irresponsible generals be pensioned off or sent on lengthy diplomatic holidays abroad. If the United States and the OAS are going to impose a solution in the Dominican Republic, they might as well impose a good solution as a bad one.

Since preparing these remarks, I note in this morning's press that General Wessin has been induced to leave the Dominican Republic. This, I believe, is a step in the right direction.

The Foreign Relations Committee's study of the Dominican crisis leads me to draw certain specific conclusions regarding American policy in the Dominican Republic and also suggests some broader considerations regarding relations between the United States and Latin America. My specific conclusions regarding the crisis in Santo Domingo are as follows:

First. The United States intervened forcibly in the Dominican Republic in the last week of April 1965 not primarily to save American lives, as was then contended, but to prevent the victory of a revolutionary movement which was judged to be Communist-dominated. The decision to land thousands of marines on April 28 was based primarily on the fear of "another Cuba" in Santo Domingo.

Second. This fear was based on fragmentary and inadequate evidence. There is no doubt that Communists participated in the Dominican revolution on the rebel side, probably to a greater extent after than before the landing of U.S. marines on April 28, but just as it cannot be proved that the Communists would not have taken over the revolution neither can it be proved that they would have. There is little basis in the evidence offered the committee for the assertion that the rebels were Communist-dominated or certain to become so; on the contrary, the evidence suggests a chaotic situation in which no single faction was dominant at the outset and in which everybody, including the United States, had opportunities to influence the shape and course of the rebellion.

Third. The United States let pass its best opportunities to influence the course of events. The best opportunities were on April 25, when Juan Bosch's party, the PRD, requested a "United States presence," and on April 27, when the rebels, believing themselves defeated, requested United States mediation for a negotiated settlement. Both requests were rejected, in the first instance for reasons that are not entirely clear but probably because of United States hostility to the PRD, in the second instance because the U.S. Government anticipated and desired a victory of the antirebel forces.

Fourth. U.S. policy toward the Dominican Republic shifted markedly to the right between September 1963 and April 1965. In 1963, the United States strongly supported Bosch and the PRD as enlightened reformers; in 1965 the United States opposed their return to power on the unsubstantiated ground that a Bosch or PRD government would certainly, or almost certainly, become Communist dominated. Thus the United States turned its back on social revolution in Santo Domingo and associated itself with a corrupt and reactionary military oligarchy.

Fifth. U.S. policy was marred by a lack of candor and by misinformation. The former is illustrated by official assertions that U.S. military intervention was primarily for the purpose of saving American lives; the latter is illustrated by exaggerated reports of massacres and atrocities by the rebels—reports which no one has been able to verify. It was officially asserted, for example—by the President in a press conference on June 17 according to an official State Department bulletin—that "some 1,500 innocent people were murdered and shot, and their heads cut off." There is no evidence to support this statement. A sober examination of such evidence as is available indicates that the Imbert junta was guilty of at least as many atrocities as the rebels.

Sixth. Responsibility for the failure of American policy in Santo Domingo lies primarily with those who advised the President. In the critical days between April 25 and April 28, these officials sent the President exaggerated reports of the danger of a Communist takeover in Santo Domingo and, on the basis of these, recommended U.S. massive military intervention. It is not at all difficult to understand why, on the basis of such advice, the President made the decisions that he made.

Seventh. Underlying the bad advice and unwise actions of the United States was the fear of another Cuba. The specter of a second Communist state in the Western Hemisphere—and its probable repercussions within the United States and possible effects on the careers of those who might be held responsible—seems to have been the most important single factor in distorting the judgment of otherwise sensible and competent men.

I turn now to some broader and long-term implications of the Dominican tragedy, first to some considerations relating to the Organization of American States and its charter, then to the problem of reaction and revolution in Latin America, finally to a suggestion for a freer and, I believe, healthier relationship between the United States and Latin America.

Article 15 of the Charter of the Organization of American States says that:

"No state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other state."

Article 17 states that:

"The territory of a State is inviolable; it may not be the object, even temporarily, of military occupation or of other measures of force taken by another State, directly or indirectly, on any grounds whatever."

These clauses are not ambiguous. They mean that, with one exception to be noted, all forms of forcible intervention are absolutely prohibited among the American States. It may be that we should never have accepted this commitment at Bogota in 1948; it is obvious from all the talk one hears these days about the obsoleteness of the principle of nonintervention that some U.S. officials regret our commitment to it. The fact remains that we are committed to it, not partially or temporarily or insofar as we find it compatible with our vital interests but almost absolutely. It represents our word and our bond and our willingness to honor the solemn commitments embodied in a treaty which was ratified by the Senate on August 28, 1950.

There are those who might concede the point of law who would also argue that such considerations have to do with our ideals rather than our interests and are therefore of secondary importance. I do not believe that is true. We are currently fighting a war in Vietnam, largely, we are told, because it would be a disaster if the United States failed to honor its word and its commitment; the matter, we are told, is one of vital national interest. I do not see why it is any less a matter of vital interest to honor a clear and explicit treaty obligation in the Americas than it is to honor the much more ambiguous and less formal promises we have made to the South Vietnamese.

The sole exception to the prohibitions of articles 15 and 17 is spelled out in article 19 of the OAS Charter, which states that "measures adopted for the maintenance of peace and security in accordance with existing treaties do not constitute a violation of the principles set forth in articles 15 and 17." Article 6 of the Rio Treaty states:

"If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack or by an extracontinental or intracontinental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which must be taken in case of aggression to assist the victim of the aggression or, in any case, the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent."

The United States thus had legal recourse when the Dominican crisis broke on April 24, 1965. We could have called an urgent session of the Council of the OAS for the purpose of invoking article 6 of the Rio Treaty. But we did not do so. The administration has argued that there was no time to consult the OAS, although there was time to consult—or inform—the congressional leadership. The United States thus intervened in the Dominican Republic unilaterally—and illegally.

Advising the Latin American countries of our action after the fact did not constitute compliance with the OAS Charter or the Rio Treaty; nor, indeed, would advising them before the fact have constituted compliance. One does not comply with the law by notifying interested parties in advance of one's intent to violate it. Inter-American law requires consultation for the purpose of shaping a collective decision. Only on the basis of advance consultation and agreement could we have undertaken a legal intervention in the Dominican Republic.

It is possible, had we undertaken such consultations, that our Latin American partners would have delayed a decision; it is possible that they would have refused to authorize collective intervention. My own feeling is that the situation in any case did not justify military intervention except for the limited purpose of evacuating U.S. citizens and other foreigners, but even if it seemed to us that it did, we should not have undertaken it without the advance consent of our Latin American allies. We should not have done so because the word and the honor of the United States were at stake just as much—at least as much—in the Dominican crisis as they are in Vietnam and Korea and Berlin and all the places around the globe which we have committed ourselves to defend.

There is another important reason for compliance with the law. The United States is a conservative power in the world in the sense that most of its vital interests are served by stability and order. Law is the essential foundation of stability and order both within societies and in international relations. A great conference is taking place here in Washington this week on the subject, World Peace Through Law. As a conservative power the United States has a vital interest in upholding and expanding the reign of law in international relations. Insofar as international law is observed, it provides us with stability and order and with a means of predicting the behavior of those with whom we have reciprocal legal obligations. When we violate the law ourselves, whatever short-term advantage may be gained, we are obviously encouraging others to violate the law; we thus encourage disorder and instability and thereby do incalculable damage to our own long-term interests.

There are those who defend U.S. unilateral intervention in the Dominican Republic on the ground that the principle of nonintervention as spelled out in the OAS Charter is obsolete. The argument is unfortunate on two grounds. First, the contention of obsoleteness justifies an effort to bring about changes in the OAS Charter by due process of law, but it does not justify violation of the charter. Second, the view that the principle of nonintervention is obsolete is one held by certain U.S. officials; most Latin Americans would argue that, far from being obsolete, the principle of nonintervention was and remains the heart and core of the inter-American system. Insofar as it is honored, it provided them with something that many in the United States find it hard to believe they could suppose they need: protection from the United States.

Many North Americans seem to believe that, while the United States does indeed participate in Latin American affairs from time to time, sometimes by force, it is done, with the best of intentions, usually indeed to protect the Latin Americans from intervention by somebody else, and therefore cannot really be considered intervention. The trouble with this point of view is that it is not shared by our neighbors to the south. Most of them do think they need protection from the United States and the history of the Monroe Doctrine and the "Roosevelt corollary" suggest that their fears are not entirely without foundation. "Good intentions" are not a very sound basis for judging the fulfillment of contractual obligations. Just about everybody, including the Communists, believes in his own "good intentions." It is a highly subjective criterion of national behavior and has no more than a chance relationship to good results. With whatever justice or lack of it, many Latin Americans are afraid of the United States; however much it may hurt our feelings, they prefer to have their security based on some more objective standard than the good intentions of the United States.

The standard on which they rely most heavily is the principle of nonintervention; however obsolete it may seem to certain U.S. officials, it remains vital and pertinent in Latin America. When we violate it, we are not overriding the mere letter of the law; we are violating what to Latin Americans is its vital heart and core.

The inter-American system is rooted in an implicit contract between the Latin American countries and the United States. In return for our promise not to interfere in their internal affairs they have accepted a role as members of our "sphere" and to support, or at least not to obstruct, our global policies. In the Dominican Republic we violated our part of the bargain; it remains to be seen whether Latin Americans will now feel free to violate theirs.

In the eyes of educated, energetic, and patriotic young Latin Americans—which is to say, the generation that will make or break the Alliance for Progress—the United States committed a worse offense in the Dominican Republic than just intervention; it intervened against social revolution and in support, at least temporarily, of a corrupt, reactionary military oligarchy.

It is not possible at present to assess the depth and extent of disillusion with the United States on the part of democrats and reformers in Latin America. I myself think that it is deep and widespread. Nor am I reassured by assertions on the part of administration officials that a number of Latin American governments have secretly expressed sympathy for our actions in the Dominican Republic while explaining that of course they could not be expected to support us openly. Why cannot they support us openly, unless it is because their sympathy does not represent the views of their own people and they do not dare to express it openly? In fact, real enthusiasm for our Dominican venture has been confined largely to military dictators and ruling oligarchies.

The tragedy of Santo Domingo is that a policy that purported to defeat communism in the shortrun is more likely to have the effect of promoting it in the longrun. Intervention in the Dominican Republic has alienated—temporarily or permanently, depending on our future policies—our real friends in Latin America. These, broadly, are the people of the democratic left—the Christian and social democrats in a number of countries, the APRA Party in Peru, the Accion Democratica Party in Venezuela, and their kindred spirits throughout the hemisphere. By our intervention on the side of a corrupt military oligarchy in the Dominican Republic, we have embarrassed before their own people the democratic reformers who have counseled trust and partnership with the United States. We have lent credence to the idea that the United States is the enemy of social revolution in Latin America and that the only choice Latin Americans have is between communism and reaction.

If those are the available alternatives, if there is no democratic left as a third option, then there is no doubt of the choice that honest and patriotic Latin Americans will make: they will choose communism, not because they want it but because U.S. policy will have foreclosed all other avenues of social revolution and, indeed, all other possibilities except the perpetuation of rule by military juntas and economic oligarchies.

The dominant force in Latin America is the aspiration of increasing numbers of people to personal and national dignity. In the minds of the rising generation there are two principle threats to that aspiration—reaction at home and domination from abroad. As a result of its Dominican actions the United States has allowed itself to become associated with both. We have thereby offended the dignity and self-respect of young and idealistic Latin Americans who must now wonder whether the United States will one day intervene against social revolutions in their own countries, whether one day they will find themselves facing U.S. Marines across barricades in their own home towns.

I, myself, am sure, as I know President Johnson and, indeed, most U.S. citizens are sure, that our country is not now and will not become the enemy of social revolution in Latin America. We have made a mistake in the Dominican Republic, as we did at the Bay of Pigs in 1961, but a single misjudgment does not constitute a doctrine for the conduct of future policy and we remain dedicated to the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

We know this ourselves but it remains to convince our true friends in Latin America that their social revolutions will have our sympathy and support. It will not be easy to do so, because our intervention in Santo Domingo shook if it did not shatter a confidence in the United States that had been built up over 30 years since the liquidation of the Caribbean protectorates and the initiation of the "good neighbor policy."

It will be difficult but it can be done. President Johnson took a positive step on the long road back in his statement of rededication to the Alliance for Progress to the Latin American Ambassadors on August 17. It remains for us to eliminate the ambiguity between the antirevolutionary approach symbolized by Project Camelot and the preoccupation with problems of counterinsurgency on the one hand and the creative approach of the Alliance for Progress on the other. If we do this—and I am both sure that we can and reasonably hopeful that we will—then I think that the Dominican affair will be relegated in history to the status of a single unhappy episode on the long road toward the forging of a new and creative and dignified relationship between the United States and Latin America.

In conclusion, I suggest that a new and healthier relationship between the United States and Latin America must be a freer relationship than that of the past.

The United States is a world power with world responsibilities and to it the inter-American system represents a sensible way of maintaining law and order in the region closest to the United States. To the extent that it functions as we want it to function, one of the inter-American system's important advantages is that it stabilizes relations within the Western Hemisphere and thus frees the United States to act on its worldwide responsibilities.

To Latin Americans, on the other hand, the inter-American system is politically and psychologically confining. It has the effect, so to speak, of cooping them up in the Western Hemisphere, giving them the feeling that there is no way to break out of the usually well intentioned but often stifling embrace of the United States. In their hearts, I have no doubt, most Latin Americans would like to be free of us, just as a son or daughter coming of age wishes to be free of an overprotective parent. A great many of those Latin Americans for whom Castro still has some appeal—and there are now more, I would guess, than before last April 28—are attracted not, I feel, because they are infatuated with communism, but because Cuba, albeit at the price of almost complete dependency on the Soviet Union, has broken out of the orbit of the United States.

It is the nature of things that small nations do not live comfortably in the shadow of large and powerful nations, regardless of whether the latter are benevolent or overbearing. Belgium has always been uncomfortable about Germany and France; Ireland has never been able to work up much affection for Great Britain. And in recent years some of the Eastern European governments have demonstrated that, despite the Communist ideology which they share with the Soviet Union, they still wish to free themselves as much as they can and as much as they dare from the overbearing power of Russia. It is natural and inevitable that Latin American countries should have some of the same feelings toward the United States.

Perhaps, then, the foremost immediate requirement for a new and more friendly relationship between Latin America and the United States in the long run is not closer ties and new institutional bonds but a loosening of existing ties and institutional bonds. It is an established psychological principle—or, for that matter, just commonsense—that the strongest and most viable personal bonds are those which are voluntary, a voluntary bond being, by definition, an arrangement which one is free to enter or not to enter. I do not see why the same principle should not operate in relations between nations. If it does, it would follow that the first step toward stronger ties between Latin America and the United States would be the creation of a situation in which Latin American countries would be free, and would feel free, to maintain or sever existing ties as they see fit and, perhaps more important, to establish new arrangements, both among themselves and with nations outside the hemisphere, in which the United States would not participate.

President Frei of Chile has taken an initiative to this end. He has visited European leaders and apparently indicated that his Christian Democratic Government is interested in establishing new political, economic, and cultural links with European countries. For the reasons suggested, I think this is an intelligent and constructive step.

I think further that it would be a fine thing if Latin American countries were to undertake a program of their own for "building bridges" to the world beyond the Western Hemisphere—to Europe and Asia and Africa, and to the Communist countries if they wish. Such relationships, to be sure, would involve a loosening of ties to the United States in the immediate future, but in the long run, I feel sure, they would make for both happier and stronger bonds with the United States—happier because they would be free, stronger because they would be dignified and self-respecting as they never had been before.

FAVORABLE COMMENTS

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Sept. 20, 1965]

THE LASTING FRIENDSHIPS ATTAINED BY EQUALS

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT'S address to the Senate last week drew first attention as an emphatic dissent, which it certainly was, to the administration's view of the intervention in the Dominican Republic. But the larger importance in the address may very well have lain in FULBRIGHT's treatment of the broad context of relations between the United States and Latin America.

The Senator surveyed with thorough candor the way Latin American countries look upon the United States, and what he found was not particularly gratifying. He compared Latin America to a son or daughter coming of age and wanting to be free of an overprotective parent; he said the inter-American system coops the Latin countries up in the Western Hemisphere and gives them the feeling that there "is no way to break out of the usually well intentioned but often stifling embrace of the United States."

What FULBRIGHT was engaged in was the introspective practice of seeing ourselves as others see us, and it is not always a comfortable exercise. The truth of what he said, nevertheless, is really beyond question. Our power and wealth are respected in Latin America, but there is not much love for us, because of the very restiveness, the very sense of dependence, that FULBRIGHT has cited.

It is hardly coincidence that the best relationship the United States has in Latin America may very well be with Mexico, a country that is solidly independent in determining its national policies. Mexico has made great progress in mastering the enormous economic, social, and political ills common to Latin America. Mexico, in the memory of two wars, has more reason than any country except Panama to feel bitterness toward the Colosus del Norte, yet Mexico and the United States have a strength of understanding that would hardly have been attained if Mexico did not have a feeling of confidence, independence, and self-respect.

What FULBRIGHT suggested for the Latin American future was in sharp departure from the most hallowed of past U.S. doctrines.

Historically our Government has sought a sort of hemispheric isolation, at least for Latin countries if not necessarily for the United States. President Monroe told European powers to stay out, period. In recent decades the appeal has been somewhat different, pitched to hemispheric solidarity. But FULBRIGHT has now argued that Latin American nations should seek to build bridges of their own to Europe and Africa and Asia—even to Communist countries if they wished. Immediately, he said, the ties with the United States would be loosened but in the longer run the bonds between Latin Americans and the United States would become stronger than ever.

It is an interesting, provocative suggestion that FULBRIGHT advances. With certain reservations (and surely FULBRIGHT himself has reservations) it warrants the close attention of the President and of the movers and shakers in the State Department. We consider the Organization of American States a nearly indispensable agency in Latin America's development and in inter-American affairs. We cannot dismiss out of hand the eventualities of United States intervention in Latin America in emergency circumstances. Yet the truth remains that big brotherliness has been as evident as good neighborliness in hemispheric affairs and in the sweep of history the most enduring friendships are attained by nations that regard each other as equals.

L.B.J. AND BEAUREGARD

Of all the snap responses made to Senator FULLBRIGHT's studiedly delayed response to the precipitate nature of our intervention in the Dominican Republic, the most unfortunate, in its way, may have been that of Senator LONG of Louisiana:

"Whatever anybody says about Lyndon Johnson, he's a mover. He moves. The South would be an independent nation today—I'm not saying it ought to be—but it would if Gen. P. T. Beauregard of my own Louisiana hadn't waited for the smoke to settle at the battle of Shiloh in Tennessee. I'd rather have a man who moves than one who waits."

One guess as to who had been in command of the Confederate shore batteries at Charleston Harbor the year before.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 18, 1965]

FULBRIGHT ON THE DOMINICAN CRISIS

Senator FULBRIGHT often speaks as the conscience of the United States in foreign affairs. This makes him a disturbing person, but he plays a valuable and salutary, if often a thankless, role. He has now said a number of things about U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic that needed saying on the Senate floor.

The New York Times and a few other publications had, as the story unfolded editorially, made every argument that Senator FULBRIGHT now makes; but the dominant voices were those of President Johnson, McGeorge Bundy, Under Secretary Mann, and Ambassador Tapley Bennett, of Santo Domingo. The latter's unfortunate role is properly and devastatingly described by the Arkansas Democrat.

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee waited until a 2-month series of hearings on the Dominican crisis was over and until a hopeful settlement of the conflict was beginning to shape up. For Senator FULBRIGHT, the evidence of Communist participation was "fragmentary" and "not persuasive"; the advice given to President Johnson was "faulty"; and the real reason for the intervention was not to save American lives but the dread of "another Cuba." As he points out, the fear of communism leads the United States into opposition to all revolutions and hence makes us "the ally of all the unpopular and corrupt oligarchies of the hemisphere."

These ideas led Senator DODD to accuse Mr. FULBRIGHT of a "tolerance of communism." In reality, Senator FULBRIGHT is an infinitely more effective anti-Communist than the heavy-handed Senator DODD. There is no doubt that the latter, and not Mr. FULBRIGHT, speaks for the Johnson administration. This means that the same errors can be repeated if there are other crises in Latin America.

"The movement of the future in Latin America is social revolution," Mr. FULBRIGHT said. He does not mean the Communist type. The United States can crush any revolution by military force, but only at the price of supporting reaction, militarism, oligarchy and the status quo.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 18, 1965]

THE FULBRIGHT SPEECH

It will be a great pity if Senator FULBRIGHT's Senate speech on the handling of the Dominican crisis leads simply to a fierce public argument about the past. As he himself says, analysis of the past is useful only if it helps to avoid mistakes in the future.

There is validity in Mr. FULBRIGHT's charges of initial "overtimidity" and subsequent "overreaction." But he is careful to say that his assessments are made with the advantage of hindsight. Yet even if one concedes that there were mistakes during those early weeks of the upheaval, we believe that the U.S. Government has since done a good job in trying to pick up the pieces which it perhaps helped to shatter—albeit involuntarily.

Only the first wobbly steps have been made toward normalcy in Santo Domingo. But Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, tireless and resourceful, would never have been able to encourage those steps if he had not had Washington's backing. It has been a little bit like Macmillan furiously repairing the damage done by Eden at Suez, protesting all the time that no damage had been done. But over the Dominican Republic, the Macmillan and Eden roles are combined in one man—and he wears a Texas hat.

As we have already said, however, we think that what is important now is to eschew the same kind of mistake in the future. Senator FULBRIGHT uttered a few home truths, among them:

"The movement of the future in Latin America is social revolution and the choice which the Latin Americans make will depend in part on how the United States uses its great influence.

"Since just about every revolutionary movement is likely to attract Communist support, at least in the beginning, the approach followed in the Dominican Republic, if consistently pursued, must inevitably make us the enemy of all revolutions and therefore the ally of all the unpopular and corrupt oligarchies of the hemisphere.

"It should be very clear that the choice is not between social revolution and conservative oligarchy; but whether, by supporting reform, we bolster the popular non-Communist left or whether, by supporting unpopular oligarchies, we drive the rising generation of educated and patriotic young Latin Americans to an embittered and hostile form of communism like that of Fidel Castro."

Admittedly all this is easier to preach than to practice. To begin with, effective communication has to be established with that rising generation—and their confidence won. Their language will differ from ours in many ways. But most of them want for themselves what we have won and want—and the overwhelming majority of them would still prefer not to turn outside the American hemisphere or to alien tyrannies to try to get it.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 16, 1965]

STEMWINDER

Those who admire the analytical powers of Senator FULBRIGHT have come to expect penetrating truths from the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that cut through the veneers of cant and illusion. He has done it again with his incisive speech about the American military intervention in the Dominican Republic. What he says about initial overtimidity, later overreaction and lack of candor throughout is sure to lacerate a lot of feelings. But essentially his point is that with the information available to him President Johnson could have taken no other course.

The pertinent question, of course, is why the advice to the President was so bad. Beyond this the Senator asks several ancillary questions: Why, for example, did the United States veer so far from its general support for Juan Bosch, the elected President ousted by a military coup in 1963, as to oppose his return? Was this part of a more ominous shift against reform movements in Latin America out of fear that the Communists would dominate them? Do we lack confidence in our own ability to influence the course of revolution?

For social revolution, Mr. FULBRIGHT contends, is the course of the future in Latin America, and by seeming to oppose it blindly we only drive those who are dissatisfied with the oligarchical status quo into the arms of the Communists. His characterization of this country's role is acid:

"We are not, as we like to claim in Fourth of July speeches, the most truly revolutionary nation on earth; we are, on the contrary, much closer to being the most unrevolutionary nation on earth. We are sober and satisfied and comfortable and rich."

In another reproach, Mr. FULBRIGHT contends that the administration broke international law and damaged its own reputation in not seeking a collective decision by the Organization of American States before its own unilateral action. His point is well taken, but he might well have addressed himself further to the fundamental need for improved machinery in view of the utter inability of the OAS to reach a decision quickly in emergency.

Happily, the situation in the Dominican Republic now seems to be turning out better than might have been expected from the sorry beginning, and for this recovery the administration deserves a share of credit. In any effort to derive lessons from the experience, however, Mr. FULBRIGHT's questions deserve some frank answers, not merely anguished screams from wounded policymakers.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 17, 1965]

PANIC BUTTON

Senator DODD's reply to Senator FULBRIGHT's critique of the American military intervention in the Dominican Republic is essentially to try to depict Mr. FULBRIGHT as soft on communism. This tawdry if familiar tactic does Mr. DODD no credit. There is legitimate ground for disagreement with Mr. FULBRIGHT's analysis, which had the benefit of 4 months of hindsight, without attempting to smear his motives.

That there were, and are, Communists in the Dominican Republic no one disputes; here Mr. DODD is tilting at the wrong windmill. What is disputed is whether they were in a position to capture the revolution that the United States in effect halted when representatives of the American Embassy induced the administration to push the panic button. Some influential anti-Communist Dominicans think they were not.

Nowhere does Mr. DODD deal with several basic questions raised by Mr. FULBRIGHT: Did the United States fully use the resources available to it without sending in the Marines—and was the administration candid with the public? Obviously the United States must be alert to Castroite maneuvers, including efforts to take over and direct local grievances. But if we allow American policy to be dominated and even paralyzed by fear of another Cuba, we shall soon find ourselves sending Marines around the hemisphere losing friends and alienating people.

Mr. DODD contends, and some in the administration agree with him, that Mr. FULBRIGHT's speech damaged the country because the criticism will be picked up abroad. On the contrary the intervention, whether or not it was necessary, is what started the process. One of the strengths of America in the eyes of other peoples—and a point that can belie Mr. FULBRIGHT's complaint that the United States appears unsympathetic to demands for social justice abroad (by contrast with the social revolution taking place at home) is that we can debate issues publicly and seek to learn from experience. But to argue that all's well that ends well in the Dominican Republic is like insisting that because a broken leg ultimately heals it somehow is good for you.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Oct. 13, 1965]

MANN REBUTS FULBRIGHT"S ATTACK ON DOMINICAN ACTIONS BY THE UNITED STATES

(By Richard Dudman)

WASHINGTON, October 13.—Under Secretary of State Thomas C. Mann struck back last night at Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT in defense of the U.S. military intervention in the Dominican Republic.

Without mentioning FULBRIGHT's name, Mann delivered a point-by-point rebuttal of FULBRIGHT's September 15 attack on the intervention and on current Latin American policy generally.

He issued a warning to underdeveloped nations against the "grave dangers of tolerating Communist popular front activity."

Mann chose a friendly audience, the annual meeting of the Inter-American Press Association at San Diego, Calif. The association has been dominated by writers and publishers who favor a Latin American policy based mainly on opposition to communism.

ADVOCATE OF INTERVENTION

Mann gained a reputation for similar views as Ambassador to Mexico and Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. He was known to be a chief advocate of unilateral American intervention in the Dominican Republic in the revolution that broke out April 24. FULBRIGHT's speech last month was thus in part an attack on Mann.

Promising to "clarify a number of misconceptions," Mann went on to quote and contradict the principal points made by FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

FULBRIGHT had charged that the United States had intervened illegally, "not to save American lives as was then contended but to prevent the victory of a revolutionary movement that was judged to be Communist dominated."

Mann said, "One misconception is that danger to American lives was more a pretext than a reason for U.S. action. This is demonstrably incorrect."

IMMINENT PERIL

Mann asserted that the original intent in sending United States troops to Santo Domingo was to pull them out as soon as American civilians were evacuated. He said that it was not until the day after the April 28 landing by 500 marines that the United States decided that "the Communist elements in the rebel camp presented a clear and imminent peril to the freedom of the Dominican nation."

FULBRIGHT had charged that those who advised President Lyndon B. Johnson between April 25 and April 28 had "exaggerated reports of the danger of a Communist takeover in Santo Domingo, and on the basis of these recommended U.S. military intervention."

Mann said, "It is charged that from the beginning that the revolution was Communist dominated and that it should therefore be opposed by military force."

He asserted that although the United States had been concerned about Communist influences in the Dominican Republic for a long time, it did not decide until the evening of April 29 that there was "clear and imminent peril" and that additional troops should be landed.

MISJUDGMENT CHARGED

FULBRIGHT had charged that much of the advice given Mr. Johnson about the danger of a Communist takeover was based on misjudgment of the facts, inadequate evidence or, in some cases, false information.

Mann said, "The degree of Communist influence in the rebel movement has been especially questioned." He said that facts already obtained would fill a volume and that each passing day was bringing more facts to light.

"The danger will soon become apparent even to the most skeptical," he said. "In a very real sense the danger still exists.

"All those in our Government who had full access to official information were convinced that the landing of additional troops was necessary in view of the clear and present danger of the forcible seizure of power by the Communists.

"The evidence we have indicates that at that stage the paramilitary forces under the control of known Communists exceeded in military strength the forces controlled by the non-Communist elements within the rebel movement. Equally important is the fact that these non-Communist elements were working hand in glove with the Communists."

ALLY OF OLIGARCHIES

FULBRIGHT had contended that "just about every revolutionary movement is likely to attract Communist support, at least in the beginning." He had warned that "the approach followed in the Dominican Republic, if consistently pursued, must inevitably make us the enemy of all revolutions and therefore the ally of all the unpopular and corrupt oligarchies of the hemisphere."

Mann said, "Next, it is said that the United States overlooked the fact that reform movements are likely to attract Communist support; that the United States failed to perceive that if it is automatically to oppose any reform movement that Communists adhere to, it is likely to end up opposing every reform movement and, in the process, make itself a prisoner of reactionaries."

He contended that this theory assumes that Communists and the non-Communist left are natural allies, essentially the same as the Marxian theory that Communists are in the vanguard of all truly revolutionary movements.

NEED FOR A DISTINCTION

"The need to distinguish between a reform movement allied with the Communists and a movement dedicated to reform in freedom should be emphasized over and over again," he said. "Indeed, it is precisely the failure to make this distinction, the tendency of some to lump all 'reformers' together and to evaluate them solely on the basis of their rhetoric, that causes a great deal of the confusion."

He went on to warn what he termed the world's immature underdeveloped nations against the "grave dangers of tolerating Communist popular front activity."

"Popular front movements," he said, "are almost always dangerous for those countries that tolerate them. Their principal objective is political power. They are often formed by those who want the Communist vote in order to get elected."

He said that at times popular fronts are formed "because the help of disciplined Communists is needed to overthrow a government. They are sometimes formed by politicians already in power to 'buy their peace.' "

FRONTS SERVE RED ENDS

"Moreover," he said, "popular fronts serve Communist ends. Communists gain from them a respectability they do not deserve. They use this respectability to infiltrate their partisans into the educational system, organize worker and farm groups, the mass media and, of course, the government itself.

"In participating in popular fronts, politicians usually have in mind a short term, personal, political, selfish gain. On the other hand, Communists are content to work today in order to prepare for tomorrow."

"The United States," Mann said, "does not have to choose between reaction and leftist extremism." He said "that there was a large and growing number of persons in Latin America who were dedicated to rapid and far-reaching reform."

He said the Latin American military, for example, contain in their ranks many able and dedicated men who do not deserve to be smeared with the brush that ought to be reserved for the few."

Mann disputed also what he called suggestions that nonintervention was now an obsolete doctrine.

"On the contrary," he said, "the United States believes that unilateral intervention by one American state in the political affairs of another is illegal under the charter of the Organization of American States and that nonintervention is the keystone of the structure of the inter-American system."

SUPPORTED NEITHER SIDE

Thus, Mann said, the United States refrained from supporting either contending faction in the first days of violence and since has avoided "proposing political solutions with a made in U.S.A. label on them."

He said that there was confusion over the response that could be made by an American state or the OAS as a whole to a case of intervention.

"When, in other words, a Communist state has intervened in the internal affairs of an American state by training, directing, financing, and organizing indigenous Communist elements to take control of the government of an American state by force and violence, should other American states be powerless to lend assistance?" he asked.

"Are Communists free to intervene while democratic states are powerless to frustrate that intervention?

"This is not so much a question of intervention as one of whether weak and fragile states should be helped to maintain their independence when they are under attack by subversive elements responding to direction from abroad."

[From the St. Louis Post Dispatch, Oct. 14, 1965]

LAME REBUTTAL

The Johnson administration would do well to stop trying to defend its intervention in the Dominican Republic, and start developing a hemisphere policy based on something more substantial than confused and frantic anticommunism. That is the conclusion we draw from Under Secretary of State Mann's lame reply to the Fulbright critique of the Dominican adventure.

Mr. Mann did not rebut, he confirmed the main points of Senator FULBRIGHT's analysis, one of which was that President Johnson in this case was the victim of bad advice, poor judgment, and immature understanding. The Under Secretary exhibits symptoms of all three.

Senator FULBRIGHT concluded, from a careful study of the facts, that President Johnson's advisers exaggerated the danger of a Communist takeover of the revolt in Santo Domingo last April. He offered evidence to support his view. 'Tain't so, replies Mr. Mann; but the evidence he offers is simply that all the President's advisers were convinced that a danger was clear and present.

There is no argument that the advisers were convinced. The question is whether they were correct, and we suspect that Juan Bosch will have the last word on that. He has declared that American intervention created more Communists than ever were involved in the attempt to restore his constitutional government, and we expect that history will bear him out.

The basic issue, however, is not the extent of Communist involvement, but Mr. Mann's implicit assumption that Communist involvement somehow gives the United States an automatic license to put down a Latin American revolt by the unilateral use of American armed force. How can any such doctrine possibly be squared with the principle, which Mr. Mann himself claims to support, that unilateral intervention is illegal under the OAS Chapter and that nonintervention is the keystone of the inter-American structure?

The administration appears to contend that any Communist activity in Latin America must by definition represent intervention by a Communist state. But no evidence has been presented of any substantial involvement in Santo Domingo of Cuba, China, Russia, or any other Communist government. If such evidence had existed, the proper response would have been collective action under the OAS Charter and not unilateral action by the United States. Our Government simply does not have the right to set itself up as the sole judge of what kind of revolution or reform our Latin American neighbors shall be permitted. Attempts to play this role can only alienate us steadily from the peoples of the hemisphere.

Senator FULBRIGHT was profoundly right in saying that the policy followed in Santo Domingo, consistently pursued, would make the United States "the enemy of all revolutions and therefore the ally of all the unpopular and corrupt oligarchies of the hemisphere." When will our leaders learn that, quite apart from international law and the treaty obligations that argue against such a policy, pursuing it in an age of social revolution means deliberately choosing the losing side? There are going to be social revolutions in Latin America and eleswhere, whether we like it or not, and the surest way to encourage Communist capture of them is to aline American armed power everywhere on the side of the status quo.

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade, Sept. 24, 1965]

SENATOR FULBRIGHT'S CRIME

Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT criticized the administration on the grounds that it did not take advantage of several opportunities in which it might have changed the course of events in the Dominican crisis. He alleged that there was overreaction on the basis of exaggerated estimates of Communist influence in the rebel movement, and that our choices for action were too swiftly narrowed. For speaking his piece, the Senator has drawn upon himself a veritable torrent of abuse from administration echoers, apologists for the State Department establishment, and cold war hardliners generally.

It particularly pains them that this criticism comes from the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, a position that carries great prestige and suggests knowledge on the part of the person who occupies it. Those with a vested interest in the infallibility of our early Dominican decisions are now implying, by way of rebuttal, that the foreign relations chairman is soft in the head if not soft on communism. They picture him as a woolly minded character who would timidly sit back and let the Reds set up another Cuba.

The clamor of the attack upon him, generally irrelevant to what he had to say or his manner and spirit in the saying, has all but drowned out what the Senator was really getting at.

The very nub of the FULBRIGHT commentary is the attitude the United States is going to take toward future troubles in Latin America, a region that seems destined to be in the throes of social revolution for many years to come. And the choice for America, to Senator FULBRIGHT, is whether this country is going to support reform that bolsters the non-Communist left and leads in democracy's direction or, by supporting unpopular oligarchies, force Latin Americans striving to change their way of life into the arms of the Communists.

There were Communists involved in the Dominican rising. There are Communists throughout Latin America. The Communists will inject themselves into revolutions and try to seize control of them. But it is Senator FULBRIGHT's assertion that "if any group or any movement with which the Communists associate themselves is going to be automatically condemned in the eyes of the United States, then we have indeed given up all hope of guiding or influencing even to a marginal degree the revolutionary movements and the demands for social change which are sweeping Latin America." We will have made ourselves the prisoners of the reactionaries who are trying vainly to preserve the status quo and, who habitually cry Communist, partly to scare the United States into supporting them.

There is no assurance, we think, that supporting the "non-Communist left" will keep from power in Latin America regimes that are far too radical for our taste or even hostile to us. There is no assurance either that dedication to the aims of the Alliance for Progress—for which Senator FULBRIGHT, incidentally, praised President Johnson—will in fact produce the kind of political and economic change we hope it will.

But Senator FULBRIGHT at least is right to the extent that we should not, by seeming to aline ourselves with reactionaries against all revolutions, forfeit any chance of influencing Latin American development along lines favorable to our interests.

We are a conservative, rich, and stable nation. We are far removed in time from our own uncomplicated revolutionary struggle and far removed in spirit from the kind of ferment that is in progress in Latin America. We need to ask ourselves if Senator FULBRIGHT may not have been right in suggesting that, as such a great conservative power, it is in our interest to uphold the law in international relations rather than break it by armed intervention contrary to American treaty obligations.

Agree with WILLIAM FULBRIGHT or not, it is plain that his real crime has been to think, and to ask the American people and their Government to think, about the fundamental direction of our policy in Latin America. He himself thinks in terms far more sophisticated that the cliches favored by our cold—and hot—warriors. And that in itself is an offense to those who would prefer not to think at all.

At some future time in our history, Mr. FULBRIGHT may qualify for a posthumous profile in courage for so thinking and speaking. Just now he is getting a verbal bum's rush. But is the U.S. Senate always going to consent rather than advise?

[From the Bennington (Vt.) Banner, Sept. 20, 1965]

SENATOR FULBRIGHT'S UNPLEASANT TRUTHS

It will be surprising if Senator FULBRIGHT's blockbusting statement of last week on U.S. policy in the Dominican Republic doesn't produce a profound chill in his relations with the White House.

Senator FULBRIGHT, to be sure, was careful to blame what he considers gross mishandling of the Dominican crisis on the President's advisers. Yet it is hardly flattering to President Johnson to say that he was pushed by his subordinates into an unjustified military adventure, and into misrepresenting the facts to the American people.

The burden of the Senate foreign policy chairman's argument is that the marines were sent into Santo Domingo last April not, as the President claimed, to save American lives but to prevent "a return to power of Juan Bosch or of a government controlled by Bosch's party, the Dominican Revolutionary Party."

He contends further that estimates of Communist influence in the revolutionary movement were "grossly exaggerated" and that evidence doesn't verify the administration's assertion that the revolution was in danger of being taken over by Communist elements when we intervened.

Senator FULBRIGHT also raised other important questions that our Latin American policymakers would do well to ponder before they advise the President to intervene in another revolution. Most important, Senator FULBRIGHT asks whether the administration's reaction to the Dominican crisis "is part of a broader shift in its attitudes toward Latin American countries."

He makes it clear that social revolution is inevitable in Latin America, and that the United States can use its power to influence the choice the Latin Americans make. This choice, more often than not, will be between corrupt military dictatorships and social revolutionary parties.

"Since just about every revolutionary movement is likely to attract Communist support, at least in the beginning," the Senator declared, "the approach followed in the Dominican Republic, if consistently pursued, must inevitably make us the enemy of all revolutions and therefore the ally of all the unpopular and corrupt oligarchies of the hemisphere."

The United States must decide, he suggested, "whether, by supporting reform, we bolster the popular non-Communist left, or whether, by supporting unpopular oligarchies we drive the rising generation of educated and patriotic young Latin Americans to an embittered and hostile form of communism like that of Fidel Castro."

Predictably, the words had hardly left Senator FULBRIGHT's mouth before he was accused of being soft on communism, but these charges in no way detract from the importance of the issues he has raised. Intervention in the affairs of another nation, as the United States often loudly proclaims, is an extreme and not easily justified course of action. The lessons learned in the Dominican Republic should make us think twice before trying it again.

Under normal circumstances, one might perhaps question the propriety of such a frontal attack by the Democratic chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee on the policies of a Democratic President. But the circumstances in this case are not normal, first, because the Republican leadership in Congress is too illiberal to make the point that FULBRIGHT has made, and second, because the issue raised by our Dominican adventure is far too important to be stifled by a senseless consensus.

It can be argued, perhaps, that the Senator does not make sufficient allowances for the political dilemma which the Johnson administration faced in the Dominican crisis. Obviously the President and his advisers were strongly motivated by a morbid fear of what would happen to the Democrats' political fortunes if they permitted the establishment of "another Cuba." No doubt they reasoned that even in a 1-in-20 chance of a Communist takeover was a risk to be avoided at any cost.

But this is a pretty poor excuse for a decision that alined us with the enemies of reform, violated our solemn treaty obligations, and rendered our Latin American aims deeply suspect among liberals everywhere. FULBRIGHT is right when he says the Johnson administration should have had the sense and the courage to take the minimal risk entailed in casting our lot with the forces of social justice.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Sept. 17, 1965]

WISE COUNSEL AND PLAIN TALK AGAIN FROM SENATOR FULBRIGHT

It is possible that if there were no Senator FULBRIGHT in the Senate he might have to be invented. Time and again he expresses the opinions of moderation—of what he likes to call flexibility—against all the zigs and zags of a foreign policy that seems to him to respond too much to mood and not enough to reason.

Senator FULBRIGHT's observations on our intervention in the Dominican Republic could hardly be expected to bring the open approval of President Johnson. But if the President is willing to listen to counsels of moderation, and recent events indicate this willingness in increasing proportion, he must acknowledge the wisdom and justice of the Senator's criticism.

Mr. FULBRIGHT attributes what he calls the failure of our Dominican intervention to faulty advice given the President. And in particular he warned against the tendency in this country to overreact against any suspicion of communism in Latin American efforts for social change. This attitude, he feels, makes impossible any effective cooperation from this country in the social revolutions so necessary in nations to the south of us.

Mr. FULBRIGHT, as he freely acknowledged, spoke from hindsight. But it was informed hindsight, gathered after 13 hearings of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations held in the past two months. If it can help rechart our policies, not only in Latin America but toward the Western world, the Senator's warning will have great value. What he is trying to tell us, after all, is that the word Communist no longer sums up one monolithic evil to which we must react by instinct. The currents and divergences of Communism are as great in their way as the differences between democracies. All of them are not potentially deadly to us and many of the people who have been labelled Communist in struggling Latin American republics are home-grown revolutionaries struggling to right their own home-grown injustices.

If we are to intervene in every such situation because people the CIA calls Communists are in the forefront of rebel movements, we have already lost touch with the needs and the desperation which are pushing all Latin America toward change.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, Sept. 17, 1965]

BLUNT TRUTHS ABOUT OUR DOMINICAN BLUNDER

Senator FULBRIGHT, the Jiminy Cricket of American foreign policy, has spoken some blunt truths about the American intervention in the Dominican Republic and about U.S. relations with Latin America in general; truths that badly needed saying by some responsible public figure.

The Senator contends the United States committed an illegal, monumental blunder in its Dominican intervention and that we are following contradictory policies in Latin America, one phase of which—that represented by the U.S. role in the Dominican affair—alienates the United States from the social revolution that is the "movement of the future" in the southern hemisphere.

These are not light charges and they are not given lightly. Senator FULBRIGHT responsibly waited until he had weighed extensive evidence presented in lengthy hearings of his Foreign Relations Committee on the Dominican intervention and until the primary crisis in the Dominican Republic was resolved before he stated his thoughtful case for a reappraisal of U.S. Latin American policy.

It is painful to acknowledge that one's country was wrong, but it would be dangerous for Americans to ignore the disturbing conclusions this intelligent and conscientious Senator has reached after a painstaking sifting of available evidence; namely:

1. That the United States intervened in the Dominican Republic not to save American lives, as was officially contended, but to

prevent the victory of a revolutionary movement that was judged to be Communist dominated.

2. That the fear of a Communist take-over was based on fragmentary and inadequate evidence.

3. That the United States let pass its best opportunities to influence events because U.S. officials were hostile to the party of Juan Bosch, which sought a return to constitutional government, and preferred instead the victory of antirebel forces.

4. That even before the revolution, the United States had "turned its back on social revolution in Santo Domingo and associated itself with a corrupt and reactionary oligarchy."

5. That U.S. officials, including the President, issued "wildly exaggerated reports" of rebel atrocities—reports that cannot be supported by evidence.

6. That the President acted in good faith on the basis of exaggerated reports of the danger of a Communist take-over from American officials on the scene.

7. That the fear of another Cuba and its effect on their careers distorted the judgment of otherwise sensible and competent men.

Senator Fulbright observed that when the American government chooses the "safe" course of supporting corrupt and reactionary strong-man regimes, clinging to the status quo in Latin American countries, it contradicts the spirit of our Alliance for Progress and the peaceful social revolution it was fashioned to support.

"We cannot successfully advance the cause of popular democracy and at the same time aline ourselves with corrupt and reactionary oligarchies. * * * We simply cannot have it both ways; we must choose * * *," the Senator concludes.

In the Dominican Republic, if the ouster last week of General Wessin y Wessin is any indication, we are beginning to make the right choice—for popular democracy. Will we now have the wisdom to apply the lessons of the Dominican Republic, as they were so clearly detailed by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to the rest of hemisphere where American policy remains spotty, at best?

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Sept. 17, 1965]

A Devastating Policy Blast

After having conducted a 2-month inquest into the Dominican Republic affair, Senator J. W. Fulbright has delivered in the Senate a devastating arraignment of the Johnson administration's course of action.

It is a highly effective example of the duty of a Senator to criticize and lay bare the follies of Government policy when he profoundly disagrees with it.

We sent troops into Santo Domingo last April, he said, from "overtimidity and overreaction." Throughout the episode, which is not yet ended, the administration acted with a "lack of candor."

The intervention arose from a decision that the revolution launched by the Dominican rebel movement "should not be allowed to succeed."

It rested on exaggerated estimates of Communist influence on the rebels and it failed to perceive that if we automatically oppose any reform movement the Communists adhere to, we shall end up opposing every reform movement, "making ourselves the prisoners of reactionaries."

Senator Fulbright let the President down easy by saying he had been given faulty advice which exaggerated the Communist danger. That is true, for the President does have to base decisions on advice, yet it remains a fact—though Fulbright politely refrained from saying so—that basing foreign policy too much on the advice of CIA and FBI agents, as the President did, can be fatal to the proper ends of that policy.

As the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Fulbright has not only struck a very hard blow at the President's excuses for "forcibly and illegally" invading Santo Domingo, but he has also raised the ultimate question about American policy toward Latin America. His words were:

"The direction of the Alliance for Progress is toward social revolution in Latin America; the direction of our Dominican intervention is toward the suppression of revolutionary movements which are supported by Communists or suspected of being influenced by Communists * * *.

"We simply cannot have it both ways: we must choose between the Alliance for Progress and a foredoomed effort to sustain the status quo in Latin America."

This needed to be said. As Senator Fulbright remarked after dropping his bomb: "I think maybe they'll stop and think a bit before rushing into more military interventions."

[From the New York Post, Sept. 16, 1965]

Fulbright's History Lesson

Senator Fulbright's review of U.S. policy in the Dominican crisis deserves study by responsible Americans. It is as certain as anything in the area of foreign affairs can be certain that last April's revolution in Santo Domingo is not the last of such upheavals in Latin America. Unless there is careful, courageous analysis of where our policy failed, such as Mr. Fulbright presented to the Senate yesterday, the mistakes will be repeated.

Fulbright, perhaps too generously, absolved President Johnson. U.S. failures in Santo Domingo were principally the result of the faulty advice given the President by U.S. representatives on the spot, Fulbright said. But Ambassador Tapley Bennett, Jr., it should be noted, is still at his post in Santo Domingo.

The danger to American lives was "more a pretext," Fulbright concluded on the basis of his committee's inquiry, than a reason for our intervention. It was the threat of communism rather than the danger to American lives that produced the massive landings, he asserted.

"In their panic lest the Dominican Republic become another Cuba," continued Fulbright in the most significant part of his commentary, "some of our officials seem to have forgotten that virtually all reform movements attract some Communist support, that there is an important difference between Communist support and Communist control of a political movement, that it is quite possible to compete with the Communists for influence in a reform movement rather than abandon it to them, and, most important of all, that economic development and social justice are themselves the primary and most reliable security against Communist subversion."

The Fulbright formula lacks the simplicity and he-man quality of landing the marines. But it is based on a more accurate reading of Latin American realities. It is sound counsel for the explosive future.

[From the New York Post, Sept. 21, 1965]

After Fulbright's Speech: Blasts and Silences

Chairman Fulbright of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently delivered a carefully documented, thoughtful critique of our intervention last April in Santo Domingo.

He faced the hard questions. Did we act wisely? If not, why not, and more important, where do we go from here?

In undertaking this assignment, Senator Fulbright knew he was risking the displeasure of the President, even though he portrayed Mr. Johnson as the victim of faulty counsel. In view of the shambles in which our intervention had left three decades of good neighbor policy and the ensuing rise in anti-Americanism, Fulbright rightly argued that self-critical analysis of the experience was as indispensable as the Bay of Pigs post mortem ordered by President Kennedy.

In the aftermath of his indictment, Fulbright's view was promptly and predictably denounced by Senators Dodd, Long, Smathers, Lausche, and Mundt. Dodd even intimated that the chairman's dissents from administration policy reflected a lamentable softness on communism.

If these responses could have been foretold, what has been disconcerting has been the general silence of the Senate liberals. Except for Senators Joseph Clark and maverick Wayne Morse, liberal Senators have risen neither to defend nor develop the views set forth by Fulbright.

Fulbright asked disturbing questions. They merit public debate and scrutiny. They should not be swept under the rug because, for the moment, things are going a little better in Latin America.

Fulbright's central point was that obsessive, panicky fear of a Castroite takeover led U.S. representatives to rebuff the democratic non-Communist left and to ally themselves with the military oligarchs in Santo Domingo. When the revolution broke out on April 24 under the leadership of the moderate Bosch party, Ambassador William Tapley Bennett, Jr., refused its request for an "American presence," Fulbright reports. Again, 2 days later, when the constitutionalists, fearing themselves defeated by the military, appealed to Bennett for U.S. mediation, he turned them down on the grounds that such mediation would constitute intervention.

But a few hours later, when the tide of battle turned against the military junta and the latter begged for help, Bennett said, "I can't get away with bringing Americans in on that ground'—of preventing an alleged Communist takeover. He hereupon cynically advised the junta to ask American intervention under the slogan of protecting American lives. This was done and the marines were sent in. Soon thereafter the Red cry was raised.

Since the Bosch forces are characteristic of the non-Communist reform movements hitherto backed by the United States in Latin America, Fulbright asked whether the Dominican Republic policy (whose architect, said Senator Clark, was Under Secretary of State Thomas Mann) represented a "broader shift" in attitude toward Latin America. Were we turning away from the "revolutionaries of the non-Communist left" to the "military dictators and ruling oligarchies"?

"I suggest," Senator Clark observed, "that Under Secretary of State Mann and Assistant Secretary of State Jack Vaughn would be well advised, and I hope they will be, if they devote their best efforts from here on in to patching up our damaged relationships with those men in Latin America and the countries they represent who are our real friends: the democratic, the liberal and, if you will, the slightly left-of-center leaders, not the military juntas or the oligarchial landowners, who are cheering what we did in the Dominican Republic."

Why did most Senate liberals shrink from the public discussion Fulbright and Clark were striving to promote? Why did they stand by mutely when the counterattack was unleashed by Dodd and Company?

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, Oct. 12, 1965]

House Resolution Ignores Scholarly Fulbright Talk

On September 15 the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, J. William Fulbright, delivered a major speech on U.S.

foreign policy. It was a long speech. It was also a sensible speech, knowledgeable, comprehensive, dispassionate, pertinent to and questioning of United States handling of the Dominican Republic affair in particular and of all South American countries in general.

Five days later, the House of Representatives by an overwhelming margin (312 to 52) adopted a resolution urging precisely the sort of irresponsible reaction toward provocations in South America Senator FULBRIGHT had warned against. The United States, said the resolution, should immediately intrude anywhere in the hemisphere to prevent Communist takeovers. The resolution, thereby, not only defended the Johnson administration's response to last spring's revolution in the Dominican Republic but encouraged a similar response in the future throughout South America, should the circumstances warrant.

Two reasons dictate why such policy, as endorsed and recommended by the House, is idiocy compounded:

Most important is the solemn pledge the United States took when its Government with Senate approval signed the charter of the Organization of American States. Article 15 of the charter flatly declares: "No state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other state." Article 17 reinforces article 15: "The territory of a state is inviolable; it may not be the object, even temporarily, of military occupation or of other measures of force taken by another state, directly or indirectly, on any grounds whatever."

The language of these clauses isn't obscure. It is language that should be evident to anyone who possesses even a rudimentary understanding of words. The language doesn't say it is permissible for Organization countries to interfere in the affairs of a neighbor in the event of a Communist revolution. It says exactly the opposite. There is to be no interference regardless of what type of revolution occurs. "The territory of a state is inviolable."

At Bogotá, Colombia, in 1948 the United States agreed to the terms of this language; later, on August 28, 1950, the U.S. Senate ratified the Charter of the Organization of American States, and the treaty became operable.

(It should be noted the treaty does provide for specific steps to be followed to thwart external or internal aggression arising from Communist or other sources. The victim of aggression can receive relief, if the Organization of American States in concert subscribes to the measures to be applied in the former's behalf. The controlling factor, however, is orderly procedure and action by all, not the absence of procedure and action by one member or a minority of members.)

Of lesser importance why the House resolution was reckless and ridiculous is that the United States has had an unending history of overreaction to incidents that have erupted in South America. And, of late our paternalistic interference has been equated with selfish motivations.

Thus, prevailing opinion among the oppressed majority in most South American countries is the United States has used the threat of communism to excuse its meddling in situations that have very little to do with this alien ideology.

In his speech Senator FULBRIGHT made clear that not all rebellions are Communist inspired or dominated. Many are merely the logical consequence of deplorable living standards, evil public officials, and a much-too-stratified society. Instead of siding with the afflicted, the United States too frequently has jumped too quickly to the aid of the privileged under the guise of stamping out communism. It is these hasty, ill-considered moves that frighten Senator FULBRIGHT and cause him to wonder aloud about the sense of American foreign policy.

The United States is fortunate to have a man of FULBRIGHT'S qualifications who is willing to speak out on sensitive issues and bring to the attention of those who would listen the inconsistency of American foreign policy. Regrettably, many in complete accord with FULBRIGHT have remained silent lest they be dubbed "pinkos" or commie dupes.

As for the House of Representatives and the silly resolution bearing its name, obviously the 312 Members voting for that resolution either didn't read FULBRIGHT'S speech or failed to understand its contents. Otherwise, how is it possible to justify the extraordinary injunction of the resolution that the United States should disregard utterly a treaty obligation to which it affixed its signature and to which it gave its golden vow? Assuredly those Members aren't advocating the United States do what the United States has charged the Soviet Union with doing time and again. Or are they?

[From the Greenwich (Conn.) Time, Sept. 21, 1965]

MAKES POINT

Senator FULBRIGHT'S criticism of how our Government handled the Dominican Republic crisis cannot be shrugged off as unwarranted sniping at the administration. The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is a thoughtful, responsible critic of the conduct of foreign affairs. His remarks cannot fairly be dismissed with such shallow judgments as that voiced by Senator LONG, of Louisiana, who referred to what he called the "Fulbright doctrine: Don't intervene; you might be criticized." That is not what FULBRIGHT said, nor what he meant.

What he did say was that our intervention was based on poor intelligence, which led the President to overreact to an exaggerated threat of Communist control of the rebel movement. And what FULBRIGHT is concerned about is that this mistake, based partly on misunderstanding of the vital difference between Communist participation and Communist control, not be repeated elsewhere in Latin America.

"One is led to the conclusion," FULBRIGHT said, "that U.S. policymakers were unduly timid and alarmist in refusing to gamble on the forces of reform and social change." And he added: "The bitter irony of such timidity is that by casting its lot with the forces of status quo * * * the United States almost certainly helped the Communists to acquire converts whom they otherwise could not have won."

It is an important point. A policy of maintaining the status quo at all costs simply would not jibe with the more enlightened philosophy that undergirds the Alliance for Progress. Social progress and stalemate are incompatible.

[From the Little Rock (Ark.) University Forum, Sept. 23, 1965]

FULBRIGHT TELLS IT—THE WAY IT IS

Those of us who are appalled by many aspects of President Johnson's foreign policy, and especially by the President's use of armed intervention in the Dominican Republic and in Vietnam, found last week that we have a new ally, if not on Vietnam, at least on the Caribbean issue; none other than one of the most powerful and respected liberal Democrats in Washington, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The irony of the situation is that FULBRIGHT'S charges against the administration's handling of the affair are virtually the same charges the student left and the radical press have been making all summer in print at teach-ins, on the picket lines.

According to FULBRIGHT, the military intervention aimed not at saving American lives, which was the official reason given, but aimed at preventing the victory of a revolution which was thought at the time to be Communist-dominated. The Senator pointed out that Communist influence on the rebels was vastly overestimated by the President's advisers and by the U.S. intelligence and diplomatic services in the Dominican Republic, and that the use of troops was an overhysterical reaction to the fear of another Cuba, a direct result of the kind of blindly fanatic anticommunism characteristic until recently of only a minority on the radical right.

"The tragedy of Santo Domingo," said FULBRIGHT, "is that a policy that purported to defeat communism in the short run is more likely to have the effect of promoting it in the long run." Later in his speech, FULBRIGHT called for a Latin American policy which would allow the nations of that area free and autonomous development of individual domestic and foreign policies. The Senator asserted that U.S. support of "corrupt and reactionary military oligarchies" frustrates "the revolutionary movements and the demands for social change which are sweeping Latin America," and that continuation of such a policy might gravely endanger the U.S. position in the Western Hemisphere.

Senator FULBRIGHT was careful to lay the blame for the "grievous mistake" on Johnson's diplomatic and intelligence advisers, and not on the President himself. Whatever the individual burden of guilt, the administration can no longer dismiss all critics of its foreign policy as politically naive intellectuals or as irresponsible, attention-seeking radicals. The prompt White House denial of FULBRIGHT'S conclusions was ostensibly supported by much of the Congress, but such acid condemnation by such a high-ranking official is almost certain to have wide repercussions.

The Senator's comments are no cause for heady optimism, but they are a hopeful sign that change may be on the way. There is now at least a crack in the monolithic wall.

Thank you, Senator FULBRIGHT, for having the guts to "tell it the way it is."—B.P.

[From the Harvard Crimson]

FULBRIGHT AT THE CROSSROADS

The hunt is on for the scalp of WILLIAM FULBRIGHT. Senator DODD has attacked him. Senator LONG has attacked him. Senator LAUSCHE has attacked him. Senator RUSSELL has attacked him. The House has voted a resolution which indirectly censures his critique of military intervention in the Dominican Republic. And, according to Joseph Kraft's column in Monday's Globe, a piqued administration is doing nothing to shield the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee from rightwing flak: "On the contrary, the administration is itself holding the anti-Communist issue in reserve as a rod to dissident members of its majority."

Senator FULBRIGHT is being carefully isolated, and he may soon suffer a fate that not too many years ago befell a man who resembles him in many ways, Adlai Stevenson. No man of prominence in America represents the Stevenson tradition more faithfully than Senator FULBRIGHT. He speaks out infrequently, and when he does, it appears to pain him greatly. He chooses his phrases carefully, balancing and moderating his assertions as would a conscientious logician. A politician in name only, he seems more the lonely statesman, agonizing over his place in history.

Like Stevenson, FULBRIGHT clearly abhors the role of crusader. He fears the consequences of discord in a time of crisis. Now all about him the big guns of the Senate are firing, determined to demonstrate just how noisy and distasteful such discord can be. They realize just how dangerous—to them—a man like FULBRIGHT might be.

In the last month, the Senator has made a major congressional address and written a searingly critical article in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Now he stands at the crossroads. He can continue to speak and, by his very eloquence and persistence, force the administration and its policymakers to recognize the spirit and intelligence he represents. Or, like Stevenson before him, this man—who foresaw the cataclysm of the Bay of Pigs, who foresaw the neutralism of Tito, who now foresees more Santo Domingos—can fall silent and allow the consensus to engulf and encyst him.

On FULBRIGHT's answer hangs far more than the career of one man. As Louis Hartz perceives, in his "Liberal Tradition in America," the answer will be of sweeping significance:

"Will the insight of a Willkie or a Stevenson offset the end of insight a McCarthy inspires? This is the largest challenge the American liberal world has faced, and the payment for meeting it effectively is more than mere survival in an age of world turmoil. It holds out the hope of an inward enrichment of culture and perspective, a 'coming of age' * * * which in its own right is well worth fighting for."

[From Christianity and Crisis, Sept. 28, 1965]

SENATOR FULBRIGHT'S ACHIEVEMENT

Senator FULBRIGHT's speech in the Senate on our policy in the Dominican Republic is significant both in form and content. In form it is a critical challenge by the Democratic chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to the administration's policy of Marine landings. It must be hailed by all thoughtful observers because it questioned the actions of a powerful Chief Executive who has immense prestige, drawn partly from his tremendous achievements in domestic policy and partly from the strength of anti-Communist sentiment in the American public. Such an act required considerable courage. The President's power is so great that it approaches General de Gaulle's authority in the Fifth French Republic—not, of course, in terms of the Constitution but in terms of political realities.

The content of the speech took on special significance because it reflected the proceedings of the Foreign Relations Committee in its weeks of testimony from various experts on the Dominican crisis. It was, therefore, more than a mere personal opinion.

In brief, FULBRIGHT's criticism was that the administration mistakenly relied on dubious advice in ordering the Marines to the Dominican Republic, ostensibly to protect American lives but actually to frustate a Communist takeover in Santo Domingo. The Arkansan said:

"Responsibility for the failure of American policy in Santo Domingo lies primarily with those who advised the President. In the critical days between April 25 and April 28 these officials sent the President exaggerated reports of the danger of a Communist takeover. * * * Underlying the bad advice and unwise actions of the United States was the fear of 'another Cuba.' The specter of a second Communist state in the Western Hemisphere—and its probable political repercussions within the United States and possible effects on the careers of those who might be held responsible—seems to have been the most important single factor in distorting the judgment of otherwise sensible and competent men."

The rigor of this criticism, particularly the hazardous speculation about the personal motives of those generally unidentified advisers of the President, was bound to create violent reactions.

The Senator also gave a comprehensive analysis of the relation of North American democracy to the democratic movements in Latin America. He distinguished between the gradualist democratic movements, which the Alliance for Progress hoped to promote and of which the Allianza Popular Revolutionaria Americana in Peru and Betancourt's party in Venezuela are examples, and the "uncouth" revolutionary movements.

FULBRIGHT is quite right in suggesting that the social structure of most Latin nations includes political movements in which leftist elements are bound to be present. It is difficult to determine whether these revolutionary elements contain the seeds of Communist totalitarianism. Hence extreme caution is necessary in defining our attitude toward them. He is probably right also in suggesting that we are under the illusion that our revolutionary past gives us an affinity with these movements when, as a matter of fact, "We are the most unrevolutionary nation in the world."

In short, FULBRIGHT has the distinction of raising all the significant issues about the relation of an essentially bourgeois democracy to the nations in which democratic institutions are at best imposed in various ways on a feudal tradition.

The official patriots in the Democratic Party made heavyhanded accusations against Chairman FULBRIGHT's loyalty to our tradition and insinuated that he was enamored of revolutionary zeal. Efforts of the United States and OAS to superimpose democracy in Santo Domingo might be striking evidence of the pertinence of the Senator's position because they prove that superimposed democracy cannot give a democratic solution. There a provisional government has difficulty in providing an atmosphere of democratic give-and-take between the revolutionary and the conservative factions—without which the promised elections will give no peace. On the other hand, the presence of three Communist parties is regarded by FULBRIGHT's critics as a refutation of his position. But these parties might also be seen as the inevitable fruit of our ill-conceived military intervention.

[From the Nation, Oct. 4, 1965]

SENATOR FULBRIGHT DISSENTS

Any American who says a critical word about U.S. military or paramilitary operations anywhere on the globe is assured of a generally bad press in his own land, and Senator FULBRIGHT is no exception. It avails him nothing that he is the Senate's leading scholar on foreign affairs, that the Fulbright scholarships are a landmark in creative statesmanship, that he is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. When, as in his speech on U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic, he presumes to criticize our policy in the Caribbean and in Latin America generally, he is rebuked by most of the commentators. In the Senate, MORSE and CLARK spoke up in defense of their colleague, but Senators DODD, SMATHERS, LAUSCHE, LONG, and others laid down the predictable barrage. As Newsweek observed, Senator FULBRIGHT had knowingly staked out a lonely position.

But perhaps his position is not as lonely as it appears to be. Any number of Senators who are known to agree with Senator FULBRIGHT maintained a discreet silence for fear of incurring the displeasure of the White House. At about the same time that Senator FULBRIGHT was speaking, Dr. Wolfgang Friedmann, an international law expert from Columbia University, voiced much the same criticism of the President's handling of the Dominican crisis before the World Peace Through Law Conference in Washington. Dr. Friedmann took the position that the unilateral use of force signals a major weakening of the United Nations. "We are faced," he said, "with the threat of a collapse of the painstaking efforts of nearly half a century, and especially the last 20 years, to build up a system of organized international control of the use of force." U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic, without a showing of outside direction of the rebellion, "cannot be justified by any canons of international law."

After the Bay of Pigs fiasco, which Senator FULBRIGHT also opposed, President Kennedy lamented: "How can I have been so stupid?" But his successor will not abide criticism nor acknowledge mistakes. Asked how he felt about the decision to intervene in the Dominican Republic, he replied: "I would do it all over again, only we'd have done it earlier and tougher." At the last moment, the President put in an unexpected appearance at the World Peace Through Law Conference to voice a few platitudes about the U.N. while carefully avoiding any reference to the Dominican Republic. The distinguished array of 3,000 Supreme Court Justices and international law experts heard him out, but his remarks drew only "a tepid response."

In the wake of the Fulbright speech the House proceeded to adopt a resolution endorsing the unilateral use of force by the United States or by any other Western Hemisphere country to prevent a Communist takeover anywhere in the hemisphere. The resolution was approved by a vote of 312 to 52. The administration had not asked for the resolution but it did not oppose it. Many Members, though made uneasy, said that they couldn't oppose a resolution that seemed to be intended to serve as an ex post facto endorsement of the President's Dominican policy. Some of these same Members also criticized the State Department for "lack of backbone" in not taking a stand against the resolution. While the resolution is without legal effect, it will be read as a blanket endorsement of the unilateral use of force and will add to the criticism of American policy in South America. Representative JOHN BRADEMAS said that he had gone all the way up to Secretary Dean Rusk and had been unable to get anyone to say whether the Department was for or against the resolution. In brief, there is no indication in Washington of a willingness to learn from experience or to listen to critics.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 27, 1965]

TYRANNY OF THE MAJORITY IN UNITED STATES

(By Marquis Childs)

The Johnson consensus is so powerful that large areas of policy—normally in past years a subject for debate—are now off limits. The zeal of a majority President, who by temperament and conviction draws the line against dissenters, underscores the fears of a time of troubles when revolutionary regimes threaten all order and stability.

Add to this an expanding Federal Government dispensing money in old ways—the House just passed a $1.7 billion pork barrel rivers and harbors bill—and new ways such as huge defense and research contracts. The sum total in the view of pessimistic observers is a new America with little resemblance to the give and take democracy of the past.

A case in point is what happened to Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Waiting until after a provisional government had been established in the Dominican Republic, FULBRIGHT in a Senate speech delivered a carefully reasoned criticism of how the Dominican crisis had been handled. This was based on an inquiry before the Foreign Relations Committee with 13 sessions at which all the principals testified.

Immediately the full force of administration spokesmen big and little was leveled against him. The voices turned up high did not so much seek to refute the criticism as to discredit the critic. At the lowest level, as represented by Senator RUSSELL LONG of Louisiana, the majority whip, the suggestion was that if you didn't believe Communists were about to take over in the Dominican Republic then you must have more sympathy for communism than you know.

On careful rereading of the Fulbright speech it is hard to discover why the reaction was as though it had been an offense against majesty. He was saying that aspects of America's policy in the Dominican Republic compounded these faults. The example of a Senator soundly birched for faulting the administration raises a troubling question: Is any dialog at all possible on the great issues of foreign policy?

To put it another way: Must the power of the Executive be so absolute in view of the threat to America's security that critics should keep silent? An American war in Vietnam is rapidly expanding with reports of 200,000 troops to be committed by the year's end and yet scarcely a doubt is expressed publicly over the authority of the Commander in Chief to direct an undeclared war.

Granted the stakes are awesome and the power of the Executive great in conducting policy with proper secrecy as in the India-Pakistan crisis. Granted, too, that nothing succeeds like the Johnson successes.

Nevertheless, the domination of the majority is so all-encompassing that a fundamental distortion of the American system seems for the time being at least to have resulted. More than a century ago Alexis de Tocqueville, one of the most searching and at the same time sympathetic foreign critics, wrote in his "Democracy in America" of the danger of the "tyranny of the majority." Of the tyranny this French aristocrat considered the main evil of democratic institutions he wrote:

"The smallest reproach irritates its sensibility and the slightest joke that has any foundation in truth renders it indignant; from the forms of its language up to the solid virtues of its character, everything must be made the subject of encomium. No writer, whatever be his eminence, can escape paying this tribute of adulation to his fellow citizens."

De Tocqueville was writing of the majority itself but his words today might be applied to the master of the majority.

"I know of no country," De Tocqueville wrote, "in which there is so little independence of mind and real freedom of discussion as in America. Profound changes have occurred since democracy in America first appeared and yet it may be asked whether recognition of the right of dissent has gained substantially in practice as well as in theory."

Senator FULBRIGHT discovered in 1957 what it meant to go against the majority. He opposed the Eisenhower-Dulles doctrine embodied in a resolution giving the President power to use "the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary" in the Middle East and to spend $200 million as he saw fit without congressional restrictions. The Senate majority leader then was Lyndon B. Johnson. He urged FULBRIGHT to back Eisenhower as he himself had.

Johnson has triple-starred consensus in the political lexicon. But, defined as "tyranny of the majority," consensus has another look.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 27, 1965]

THE FULBRIGHT SPEECH

The September 20 Evans and Novak attack on Senator FULBRIGHT's Dominican speech makes the preposterous assertion that the speech will be certain to lift the chances of the most anti-Yankee candidate in the field.

It is extremely unlikely that one Dominican in a thousand knows who Senator FULBRIGHT is and it is even less likely that many Dominicans know he made the speech.

Undoubtedly, one dominant theme in the elections will be the pros and cons of the U.S. intervention. The attitudes of the Dominicans will be determined by them and their friends' immediate experiences with the revolution, not with Senator FULBRIGHT's indictment which should influence the policymakers in the executive branch to whom it was addressed.

One might ask the columnists why the Dominican crisis was such a dangerous confrontation. Was it a crisis involving a threat to the security of the United States, or, rather, a tragic confrontation between the United States, international law, and the inevitable, and hopefully democratic, social revolution in Latin America?

JONATHAN F. GALLOWAY.

WASHINGTON.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 18, 1965]

THE NEED FOR CRITICS

(By Erwin D. Canham)

You can take it for granted that Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, though a Democrat, a close and old friend of President Johnson, and longtime chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, will not be the next Secretary of State. He has burned his bridges. His recent outspoken criticism of administration policy in Santo Domingo, on top of several other recent dissents, has undoubtedly disturbed the President if it has not angered him.

It is by no means certain that Senator FULBRIGHT ever wanted to be Secretary of State. He is no administrator. He hasn't administered anything since he was president of the University of Arkansas in 1939–41. He has been in Congress since 1943. The legislative life suits him fine. And he may well believe he can be of more help in criticizing American foreign policy as a sovereign Senator and chairman of his powerful committee, than if he were working for a President as Secretary of State.

WRY COMMENTS

For some time, Senator FULBRIGHT has been rather frustrated. He does not think the President or the State Department pay much attention to his ideas. He comments on the situation wryly. His latest statement puts him further out of line than ever.

But Senator FULBRIGHT may be the voice of honest, critical perception, and of commonsense. What he says about the misevaluation of the situation in Santo Domingo is confirmed by most responsible correspondents who were on the spot and tried to untangle the facts.

The Arkansas Senator may be in advance of American public opinion on many issues. But American policy is badly in need of critical examination. It has been rigid and defensive for many months. Secretary of Defense McNamara may have been making foreign policy more than Secretary of State Rusk. Mr. McNamara is a powerful personality. He has a sharper cutting edge than Mr. Rusk, although the Secretary of State's quiet intellectual power and character should not be underestimated.

ORIGINAL VIEW

Senator FULBRIGHT always comes with a fresh and original mind, and an experienced political touch, to problems that are jaded and frozen. His analysis is just what the administration needs, whether he is always right or not. It should not be resented.

Senator FULBRIGHT's speech in Vienna in May, outlining ways for easing the central Europe situation and opening wider doors through the formerly Iron Curtain, was attentively studied in Budapest and Prague. I know, because officials in the Hungarian and Czech foreign offices told me so. Senator FULBRIGHT said: "I only wish they studied it as attentively in Washington."

Senator FULBRIGHT's name will be remembered for the most massive international scholarship program the world has ever seen.

His was almost a lone voice arguing behind the scenes against the Bay of Pigs misadventure. (But he was in favor of invading Cuba at the time of the missile crisis, writes President Kennedy's assistant, Theodore C. Sorensen.)

DISSENSION EXISTS

The senatorial group of Democrats which is unhappy about foreign policy, for sometimes conflicting reasons, is impressive. The Senate leader, Senator MANSFIELD is discreetly but definitely in disagreement on aspects of the Vietnam problem. Senator CHURCH has long been off the reservation, and Senator MORSE, as usual, is a violent dissenter. There are several others. This is a far cry from the little band of obdurate men who blocked Woodrow Wilson's hopes for an organized peace. But it is a faction which might some day coalesce, though not necessarily behind Senator FULBRIGHT.

It would be interesting to know Vice President HUMPHREY's ideas on the necessity of a reevaluation of foreign policy methods and goals. He has long been an imaginative critic of set policies, but now his lips are sealed.

Long-established policies have a way of gaining a life of their own, riding juggernaut-like over the humans who administer them. Now and then somebody throws a brick at the juggernaut and it turns out to be of paper. It is time to challenge the juggernaut now, to call for candid rethinking. Senator FULBRIGHT may have made a beginning, frank and provocative.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 25, 1965]

INSIGHT AND OUTLOOK—FULBRIGHT AND HIS CRITICS

(By Joseph Kraft)

The doubts raised by Senator FULBRIGHT with respect to this country's policy in Latin America have been intensified by the cries of his critics.

Basically, the Senator was only posing a good question. He was asking whether this country had reverted to the policy of direct military intervention in South America.

With the Dominican case before him, he sensed a new disposition to identify all social protest with Communist subversion, and a connected tendency to shoot first and think later. He pointed out that there were important distinctions between protests backed by the Communists and protests under their control. He suggested that when trouble south of the border developed next, it might be appropriate for this country to think first and shoot next.

A reasonable, and I believe honest, response to Senator FULBRIGHT'S question was available to the administration. It would have emphasized that there was no basic change in American policy; that there were matters open for debate in the Dominican record; but that the Dominican case, because of the special impact of the Trujillo dictatorship, was a special one without general application to Latin America.

The actual reaction was not unlike the stoning reserved by the high priests of primitive communities for those who question the efficacy of blood sacrifice.

For a starter there was Senator THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut, with his usual tactic of crying soft on communism. DODD charged that FULBRIGHT "suffers from an indiscriminating infatuation with revolutions of all kinds, national, democratic, or Communist."

Short remarks in similar vein were made by Senators FRANK LAUSCHE and RUSSELL LONG—a member of Senator FULBRIGHT'S Foreign Relations Committee who had not even bothered to attend the committee's recent hearings on the Dominican Republic. Then, in defense of the American Ambassador in the Dominican Republic, Tapley Bennett, there boomed the big gun of the Senate, RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia.

RUSSELL had known Ambassador Bennett "as a small boy." He had known "his father and his mother." He had known "both of his grandfathers." Only last year he had had a meal "with Ambassador Bennett's father and mother on their Franklin County farm in the rolling red clay hills of northeast Georgia." With that pedigree, and that solid rural background, how could anyone even begin to have doubts?

A day earlier, the House had expressed its reaction to Senator FULBRIGHT. It passed by an overwhelming vote a resolution that, in effect, endorsed direct military intervention by the United States in Latin America to prevent "subversive action or the threat of it."

By themselves, neither the House resolution nor the Senate statements have any practical force. But precisely because they are free of real content, they provide a good measure of the play of domestic and bureaucratic politics on foreign affairs.

At the base, plainly, there are politicos with self-interested motives for raising anew the issue of softness on communism. The original author of the House resolution, ARMISTEAD SELDEN, of Alabama, for instance, comes from a district that is being changed by reapportionment, by Federal registration of voters, and by possible action on the poll tax. With Negro voters due to figure in the Alabama primary next May, SELDEN can no longer fall back on the usual theme of protecting white supremacy. Instead, he is wrapping himself in the mantle of anticommunism.

Politicians with such an obvious interest in raising the Communist issue are, to be sure, limited in number. But their strength is as the strength of 10 because the administration is doing nothing to organize resistance against them.

On the contrary, the administration has promoted inside the State Department a group of regular Foreign Service officers, heading up in Under Secretary Thomas Mann and Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Douglas MacArthur II, who made their way in the era of unsophisticated, monolithic anticommunism. Their ideas, indeed their careers and reputations, are tied up with that era. Not surprisingly, they practically invited the Selden resolution.

Lastly, the White House itself seems to be holding anticommunism in reserve as a rod to discipline its congressional majority. Where there is a jingoist issue working, in other words, the President wants it working on his side. He has gone soft on Goldwaterism. And while he maintains that stance, it remains a question whether this country will be able to move in harmony with the vast social changes that are sweeping Latin America, Africa and Asia, too.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Sept. 26, 1965]

FULBRIGHT'S "UNTHINKABLE THOUGHTS" STING THE SENATE

(By Ben Reeves)

WASHINGTON.—JAMES WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Arkansas Democrat, has been in the U.S. Senate nearly 21 years, and the Senate still doesn't know quite what to make of him.

By ordinary standards, he ought to be a Member of the Senate establishment, the tightly knit inner core that runs the show. He is a southerner, he is a Protestant, he is a member of an important standing committee, and he is a proven votegetter with the folks back home. He is one of the few Members who have won election to as many as four full Senate terms. But there is a maverick streak about BILL FULBRIGHT that defies predictability.

When he arose from his place in the Senate on the early afternoon of September 15 with a sheaf of papers in his hand—in the midst of discussion of the highway beautification bill—the few Members on the floor had no inkling that one of the sharpest fusses of the 1965 session was about to begin. There was no objection when the rule of germaneness was waived to permit FULBRIGHT to speak on a subject other than that officially before the Chamber.

THE ONLY PURPOSE

In his dry, monotonous, non-spine-tingling manner, he addressed himself to "the situation in the Dominican Republic." The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations felt that "at this time of relative calm it is appropriate, desirable, and I think, necessary to review events in the Dominican Republic and the U.S. role in those events. The purpose of such a review, and its only purpose, is to develop guidelines for wise and effective policies in the future."

Then, in an unemotional and unhurried way (9,500 words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD), FULBRIGHT contended that United States handling of the Dominican crisis last April was "characterized initially by overtimidity and subsequently by overreaction. Throughout the whole affair, it has also been characterized by a lack of candor."

FULBRIGHT'S villain of the afternoon was not President Lyndon B. Johnson or Secretary of State Dean Rusk, but the U.S. Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, W. Tapley Bennett.

Bennett, the Senator said, had muffed an opportunity to "bring possibly decisive mediating power to bear for a democratic solution" on April 27, the most critical day in the rebellion against the Dominican Government.

REASON FOR MISTAKE

"The overriding reason for this mistake was the conviction of U.S. officials, on the basis of evidence which was fragmentary at best, that the rebels were dominated by Communists. A related and perhaps equally important reason for the U.S. Embassy's refusal to mediate on April 27 was the desire for and, at that point, expectation of an antirebel victory. They therefore passed up an important opportunity to reduce or even eliminate Communist influence by encouraging the moderate elements among the rebels and mediating for a democratic solution," FULBRIGHT said.

He called unilateral intervention in the Dominican Republic a grievous mistake that has alienated our real friends in Latin America: broadly speaking, the people of the democratic left.

FULBRIGHT said he wanted to make it clear he was not saying that no Communist participated in the crisis, "but simply that the administration acted on the premise that the revolution was controlled by Communists, a premise which it failed to establish and has not established since."

President Johnson's decision to intervene with armed force was based on bad information and worse advice, the Senator contended.

NO EASY CHOICES

Almost completely overlooked by FULBRIGHT'S attackers was the fifth paragraph of his speech in which he said his judgments were made with the benefit of hindsight, "and in fairness it must be conceded there were no easy choices available to the United States in the Dominican Republic."

He tried to make it clear that he was more concerned with long-term lessons deriving from our experience in the Dominican crisis than with profitless digging into past mistakes.

But in the Senate, as elsewhere, reasonableness is always upstaged by dramatic action, in this case the spectacle of the Foreign Relations Committee chairman attacking American policy.

FULBRIGHT had not taken his seat before two of his fellow Democrats were on their feet to belabor him for attacking the President and the American course of action.

RUSSELL LONG, of Louisiana, the Democrats' pudgy whip, came out shaking his jaws and declaring: "I thank the merciful Lord that our President possesses a sense of urgency and that he possesses initiative." GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, angrily demanded: "What is wrong with trying to save a country from communism? We had already lost Cuba to Castro. It has been admitted that there were only about 12 known Communist leaders in Cuba with Castro when he started his revolution."

THE USUAL FUMING

There was the customary fuming in the cloakrooms and in the corridors that accompanies just about every one of FULBRIGHT'S "significant" speeches. What was he up to? What was he trying to accomplish?

The next day, Connecticut's white-maned Senator THOMAS DODD took to the floor to denounce the Fulbright speech and defend the action of the administration, and to say bitterly that "it seems to me that he suffers from an indiscriminating infatuation with revolutions of all kinds, national, democratic, or Communist."

It was a full week later that another big Senate gun was brought to bear on FULBRIGHT. Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, came onto the floor to say that Ambassador Tapley Bennett was a Georgia boy who comes from stock that does not panic or frighten easily. FULBRIGHT had done Bennett a grave disservice, the Georgian said.

In the interval, the White House took time to issue a statement saying that it could find no one who thought FULBRIGHT'S views were justified. And other Members got in their licks, too.

But the Arkansas Senator was not entirely alone on the Dominican matter. Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, told the Senate he was in complete accord with FULBRIGHT'S views. He called the speech overdue, sound, and wise.

During the past week, Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio, backed FULBRIGHT, and also criticized Bennett's handling of the crisis in his ambassadorial role.

FULBRIGHT also gathered perhaps unexpected support from the editorials of some of the country's leading newspapers.

UNTHINKABLE THOUGHTS

There are more than a few in the Senate who privately agree with FULBRIGHT'S main point in the argument. In the future, we must try to be on the side of democratic social revolution in Latin America and elsewhere, and not let our anticommunism panic us into supporting rightwing dictatorships. But they doubt his wisdom in bringing the argument into the forum of the Senate, where its main points become oversimplified by necessarily abbreviated news reports and he is exposed to unnecessary attack.

This is the same WILLIAM FULBRIGHT who, on March 25, 1964, made a Senate speech entitled "Old Myths and New Realities," which has been widely hailed as an air clearer in the field of foreign policy. In it he challenged the country to think "unthinkable thoughts" about such subjects as the cold war, the two Chinas, our role in Latin America, and the future of Vietnam.

Neither the President nor the State Department was happy to have such a speech come from so high-ranking a figure in the governmental mill that grinds out foreign policy. But 18 months later, even his severest critics would agree that it has helped create an atmosphere in which negotiations can be undertaken between our side and the Communist world.

STUBBORNNESS ADMIRED

This is the same Fulbright who, after the Republican congressional victory of 1946, publicly urged President Harry Truman to appoint a leading Republican as Secretary of State and then resign, thus turning the Presidency over to the party that had scored so handsomely in the congressional elections. Truman never forgave him for that, and a good many "regular" Democrats have always regarded him with a certain suspicion because of it.

The idea no doubt stemmed from his experiences as a Rhodes scholar at Oxford University in 1928.

Both friends and foes have to admire his stubbornness in refusing to vote for the foreign aid bill Thursday night, hoping by his strategic protest to force a new look at the whole foreign aid system next year.

Fulbright was born in Missouri 60 years ago last April, but his family took him to Arkansas when he was only a year old. He was graduated from the University of Arkansas, at Fayetteville, in 1925, and studied law at George Washington University in Washington after his return from England.

Fulbright took his law degree in 1934, and went to work for the Justice Department's Antitrust Division in the early days of the New Deal. He taught law at George Washington in 1935, then became a law lecturer at the University of Arkansas in 1936. He was elected president of the university 3 years later.

Fulbright was elected to the House of Representatives in 1942, and 2 years later successfully campaigned for the Senate seat that had been held by Hattie W. Carraway. He was reelected in 1950, 1956, and 1962. His prestige is such in Arkansas that even vote-fetching Gov. Orval Faubus decided against challenging him 3 years ago.

In the Senate, he is a reasonably consistent party man, but he is never found in anybody's pocket. He is jealous of his independence, and is not afraid to think for himself—even unthinkable thoughts. When he does think such thoughts, he becomes, as he did last week, a lonely man.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, Sept. 28, 1965]

Critic

(By Bill Baggs)

A bitter smile must occupy the face belonging to James William Fulbright as he listens to the rustic oratory of his colleagues.

For 20 years, as a resident of the Federal Senate, he has lawyered for new thinking to attend the related issues of world peace and the security of the United States.

Now, after a criticism of our policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, Senator Fulbright has been backcapped by the indignant prose of other Senators to the extent you might think he were guilty of parliamentary treason.

The poet and diplomat, James Russell Lowell, handed down a slice of good sense when he wrote: "A wise skepticism is the first attribute of a good critic."

SKEPTICISM

If Senator Fulbright were skeptical of our policies in the two countries, where we have made large military and diplomatic investments, and if he lived with his skepticism as a mute companion, he indeed would be a sorry Senator.

The beginning fact here is not whether the Senator is correct in his views. Rather, it is that the continuous absence of debate on serious business of Government can evolve into a kind of tyranny costumed as democracy. Every right we have is strengthened by our freedom to disagree and to refine our national decisions by such disagreement.

But what must put the rock in the Senator's shoe is that not only his good sense, but also his good intentions, appear challenged by some as he speaks as a critic of our Viet and Dominican policies.

Since the middle 1940's, Senator Fulbright has been seeing quicker and clearer than most gentlemen in Congress. In 1943, he authored a resolution for a world organization to keep the peace, once it had been won, and he was gracious enough to phrase his resolution in 55 words. Congress agreed, and 2 years later, the United Nations was born.

REFORMER

More than a decade before Bobby Baker's head bobbed to the surface, Senator Fulbright pleaded with his colleagues to adopt a code of ethics. He had just completed washing some dirty linen when his own party occupied the White House.

Eloquently has he argued for less waste in foreign aid and for more funds in education, again long before any serious education bill was floated from a President to Congress and, in general, Senator Fulbright has been a public servant willing to speak as a critic when the mood of the country washed high against his views.

The Prince de Ligne complained: "The Congress never runs. It waltzes." Today, with a persuasive President, our Congress is running. And a critic with courage and sense is needed to examine the legislation-in-a-hurry. Thank goodness William Fulbright is there.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 28, 1965]

Soviet-American Relations

(By Walter Lippmann)

Last week the world had a fleeting but tantalizing glimpse of what might become possible if the cold war subsided. The U.S.S.R. and the United States of America, acting on their parallel interests in averting a war between Pakistan and India, made it possible for the United Nations to order a cease-fire. This show of unanimity discouraged the Chinese from intervening in the quarrel.

Parallelism is a long way short of positive cooperation, and there is no assurance that a settlement of the quarrel is in sight or even that the underlying hostility will not smolder on for a very long time. Nevertheless, the events of last week were a spectacular demonstration of how all hope and prospect of a reasonably peaceable world is tied up with an improvement in Soviet-American relations.

Is an improvement possible? What is there between us that now sets us against each other? It is, quite plainly, the conflict of ideology and interest, of emotion and of prejudice, over the revolutionary condition of the so-called third world—the world of the underdeveloped and emerging nations of the Southern Hemisphere—in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The revolutionary condition is an objective historical fact of this century, and it will continue to exist no matter what the Russians or we say or do about it.

The Soviet-American conflict is about this revolutionary condition. Thus, the conflict is no longer, as it was a generation ago, about what kind of social order is to exist in the highly developed countries of Europe and North America. As a matter of fact, in this whole area, which includes European Russia itself, the old argument between the Marxists and the laissez faire capitalists has been bypassed by events. For example, the economic philosophy of General Eisenhower and Senator Goldwater in America is as dead as the economic philosophy of Marx is among the European Socialists. In the whole developed, progressive, industrial world, the prevailing economic order is a mixture in varying degrees of planning and the incentive of profit, of fiscal management and social regulation.

It is in regard to the turbulence of this third world—which was not foreseen a generation ago—that the Soviet Union and the United States find themselves locked into what has the appearance of an irreconcilable conflict.

In its official ideology, the Soviet Union is committed to the support of the revolutionaries, to the incitement and supplying of "wars of national liberation."

In the American ideology, we are not absolutely opposed to wars of national liberation, provided they are not inspired or supported by Communists. We are very much disposed to feel, however, that all revolutions will be captured by the Communists who invariably participate in them.

Thus, Russia and America find themselves in a vicious circle. The Russians are disposed to intervene wherever there is a rebellion, and the United States is inclined to intervene to oppose as aggression the Communist intervention. In the Soviet Union there exists a prejudice in favor of rebellion as such, of rebellion against any established order. The Soviet Union is the product of a fairly recent revolution. In the United States, where the revolution occurred nearly two centuries ago, there is now a prejudice against revolution. The result is a vicious circle in which dogmatic communism and dogmatic anticommunism incite and exasperate each other.

The improvement of Soviet-American relations, which is prerequisite to an accommodation between the West and China, requires the breakup of this vicious circle. How? Essentially, I believe, by fostering the ascendancy of national interests over global ideology, by the reassertion in both countries of prudence and calculation against semireligious fanaticism and frenzy.

We had a glimpse last week of how this can happen. The hostilities in Kashmir began with an infiltration of guerrilla troops (recruited as a matter of fact from the Pakistan Army though they wore different uniforms). The purpose of the guerrillas was to arouse the population and to liberate Moslem Kashmir from Hindu rule. Here was a war of national liberation which the Soviet Union, according to its theoretical doctrine, was bound to support. However, the fact of the matter is that it did not suit the Soviet Union that Pakistan, in cahoots with Red China, should defeat India, which is a tacit ally of the Soviet Union. So the Soviet Union acted in favor of peace, which is its real interest, rather than on behalf of an ideological prejudice.

At the same time, the United States, having learned something in recent months, resisted the temptation to take a lofty position against aggression, and instead, reticently and prudently, chose to work quietly and behind the scenes.

This is the way that Soviet-American relations can be improved—by encouraging the prudent and the practical to predominate over the ideological and the hot. In this country, at least, the process will require the resumption of public debate—the kind of debate which Senator Fulbright has once again opened up.

For the issue which he has posed in his remarkable speech is the essential issue in our attitude and policy toward the revolutionary condition of our time. The question he posed is how to tolerate rebellion, which is often necessary and desirable, without surrendering the control of the rebellion to the Communists who will always be part of it.

There is no rule of thumb for answering this question. But there has to be some kind of accommodation, such as the Soviet Union made about the Kashmir freedom fighters and such as we made about the Chinese threat of military aggression. The discussion of this serious and difficult problem cannot be monopolized by the assorted hangers-on, often more Johnsonian than Johnson himself, who are presuming to lay down the rule that only those who conform with the current political improvisations are altogether respectable and quite loyal.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, October 4, 1965]

CONGRESS: SOUL SEARCHING IN ORDER

(By Eric Sevareid)

Nothing better illustrates the diminished stature of individual Members of Congress—in terms of its "public image," not its practical accomplishments, the Congress as an institution—than the affair of Senator FULBRIGHT and his negative finding on our Dominican intervention.

On the face of it one should conclude the opposite, that his courageous dissent demonstrates the indispensable importance of the modern Congressman's role and shows us that the institution designed to check and balance, among other functions, still checks and balances in the old style. But, on the contrary, the Fulbright speech was a drama simply because it was unique in this period of consensus and a homogenized Congress.

It was the exception that reveals and illustrates the rule. What was shocking was not his defiance of the President and official policy but the fact that so many people in Congress reacted with shock. Some of them not only repudiated his conclusions about the Dominican affair (this writer also happens to disagree with them) but they seemed to repudiate his right to announce his conclusions.

This is a sign that the soul of Congress is in disrepair and ought to be looked into. The honor and the wisdom of the United States, as well as its might, were deeply involved in the Dominican business. The evidence pro and con has always been considerably confused. Many very good men have reached flatly opposing estimates as to what would have happened in that island had we not intervened.

Of course, ex post facto investigation was not only proper, but necessary if we are to have any regard for keeping the historical record straight and if we are to learn any lessons for the future. The man from Arkansas did what his conscience instructed him to do, and yet other Congressmen reacted as if someone had belched in a prayer meeting.

"Consensus" has its immense practical advantages; it does permit a great leap forward, and, in the end, I imagine the country will be the better for this current period and its product. But a curious kind of intimidation also goes with this consensus and with the presence of an elemental force such as this President happens to be. In Franklin Roosevelt's first term, he too, was something of an elemental force; he, too, was a master politician and manipulator of men's ambitions and fears.

But big men in the Congress still behaved like big men and when one spoke his passionate mind there was neither shock nor the silence of the awed. Big men ran Cabinet departments and agencies then, too, but they frequently fought one another and even their President, and publicly. There was not only passion and courage present but a kind of gaiety; and an awful lot of business got done.

That unique climate may not return to Washington, because America is now a great power, with the heaviness that goes with fateful and grinding responsibilities and because there is nothing gay about the implications of this age, both revolutionary and nuclear. But Washington will change, nevertheless, and the Congress will change with it. It will not proceed, next session, at the frantic pace of this session. It will be too tired, and many second thoughts about its accomplishments, thoughts now dormant, are bound to rise to the top of its mind.

It must find the time and the courage for close examination, not only of administrative legislation, but of its own mechanisms. Unless more of the exterior world blows up next winter, the Congress might take a long, hard look at a number of traditional institutions to see if they really serve us any longer and how they might be changed. Suggestions from students of government, are piling high; the field is wide open.

Congress might seriously consider, for example, the proposals of Senator WARREN MAGNUSON. He suggests that there be two distinct sessions of Congress each year, one from, say, the start of November to the end of December dealing entirely with Government finances. He suggests that the earlier or legislative session end, perforce, around late summer, the administration's budget having been submitted by mid-July.

As part of the whole package, he would change the Government's fiscal year to coincide with the calendar year, which is, after all, the basis for reporting the Government's income—our taxes—and he would revive the plan to divide the Federal budget in two, the second half of it amounting to a "capital budget," showing the Government's total assets and their current value.

The Federal Government, that is, the people, own tens of billions in land, buildings, minerals, supplies, but the public hasn't the faintest idea what it owns because no accounting of these possessions has ever been made to it.

An immense job lies ahead in adjusting our institutions and our practices to this new, overwhelming, rapidly changing America. The elected term of Members of the House simply must be lengthened. The whole judicial system of the country is staggering and floundering under its burdens and something like an additional system of courts to deal with "administrative laws" in this age of governmental regulations and baffled citizens ought to be seriously considered.

If it is in the present nature of things that the initiative for these great institutional changes must come from the executive branch, so be it—history will probably not object.

[From Newsweek, Oct. 4, 1965]

THE CONTAGION OF HOPE

(By Emmet John Hughes)

As the chorus of voices extolling or excoriating U.S. foreign policy has lately swelled, we seek for the sense in the din. The boldest cry has been Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT's lament over U.S. conduct toward the whole social revolution in Latin America: "If we are automatically to oppose any reform movement that Communists adhere to, we are likely to end by opposing every reform movement." In Washington, Senator THOMAS J. DODD did more than snap back that such logic betrayed "an indiscriminate infatuation with revolution of all kinds": he slashed at all signs of "conciliationism" in U.S. policy, feverishly comparing sale of wheat to the Soviets in the 1960's to sale of scrap to Japan in the 1930's. In New York, however, U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg has sounded stubbornly "conciliationist" in hailing Soviet-American action on the Kashmir crisis as "a very dramatic example of cooperation * * * without any evidence of cold war confrontation." But back from Washington has come the bellicose cry of more than 300 Congressmen in support of the preposterous Selden resolution—inviting any Western Hemisphere nation to take any military action against any Communist threat.

There is something to be learned from this babble. For quite independently, both Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. Goldberg believe they discern three critical facts of world life to which many others seem blind.

1. The central hope and thrust of U.S. policy must be to encourage more confident relations with Moscow and more responsible behavior by Moscow. "Every important U.S. posture in the world today," a U.S. diplomat at the U.N. recently confessed, "has come to depend on Soviet restraint and reason." To see the force of this truth, one need take only a bleak moment to envision the world of the last year inflamed by a Soviet policy of militant retaliation—pouring massive aid into North Vietnam, answering U.S. action in the Caribbean with Soviet action in Berlin, and rivaling Peiping with slogans and arms to goad Pakistan toward war.

2. Within the highest U.S. councils, however, this political view of relations with world communism suffers almost constant challenge from an essentially military view. In the lament of one high official often taking part in sessions of the National Security Council: "Every time a major policy decision arises, the soldiers outtalk the diplomats. Their targets are precise, their maps beautiful, their confidence complete. And any State Department rebuttal usually flounders in mere reticences or mild reservations." And it is a keen knowledge of this fact that impels men like FULBRIGHT to warn against total faith in military solutions—from the Caribbean to southeast Asia.

3. Just as U.S. diplomacy toward sovereign Communist governments has had to heed differences among them, so U.S. policy—as it contends with upheaval in Asia, Africa, and Latin America—must learn now to distinguish among revolutionary forces even when they may be tinged with Communist influence. In the immediate postwar years, the tough-minded Secretary of State Dean Acheson knew that the United States must recognize and defend many a regime unpalatably rightist and militarist; and he warned U.S. liberals to stop demanding litmus-paper tests on all allies to assure their true-blue devotion to democracy. It took many liberals a while to accept such pragmatism. And it is now the turn of the conservatives to be tutored in the matching truth: if all the world's revolutionary forces are to be condemned unless their political purity is perfect and proven, all these forces finally will be pitted against America.

DEADLY PLAY

Precisely because these new truths jar old premises, a large band of leaders in both parties stoutly ignores them. This band still traffics in the stalest cliches of anticommunism. It regards Soviet-American relations with more horror than hope. And it thus stays a decade behind history in apprehending the still perilous balance of powers on which rests all chance of peace.

The Fulbrights and the Goldbergs nonetheless persist. They are wholly uninterested in the empty wordplay about "soft" and "hard" policies shouted around the Nation; they are fiercely concerned about the life-and-death play between revolutionary and counterrevolutionary forces surging around the world. They are unafraid of any fitting use of American firepower; they are afraid only of its feckless substitution for American brainpower.

And they doubt—above all—that the course of world politics can be turned by the antiseptic devices of quarantine or embargo or repression. For their sense of reality is wholly different. Their faith is in what Jefferson called "the disease of liberty."

It can be spread and caught in improbable places and under intractable tyrannies. And it will require the most patient physicians—quite unafraid to deal, at times, with queer seeds and alien germs—to extend this subtle and splendid contagion.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 26, 1965]

WHY A FOREIGN RELATIONS CHAIRMAN SPEAKS OUT

(NOTE.—Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has been outspoken recently, as always, on American foreign policy, often at variance with the expressed or implied views of the Democratic administration. The following is a tape-recorded interview with the Senator by Washington Post Staff Writer Chalmers M. Roberts.)

ROBERTS. Senator, you recently made a speech about American intervention in the Dominican Republic which produced a lot of criticism. Some said your timing was bad. One critic said the speech was "a personal proclamation of a personal foreign policy." An editorial called it a "grossly irresponsible attack on the administration." And it was reported that President Johnson's reaction was that the speech would "embarrass the future course of U.S. diplomacy in the Dominican Republic."

Those are strong words to throw at the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. What do you think of such critisim?

FULBRIGHT. I think it's quite unusual that anyone should question the right and the duty of a Member of the Senate to express his views about an incident of great importance. I have always assumed that a Member of the Senate has the responsibility to tell the truth as he sees it. I don't pretend our judgments are infallible, but it is one of the functions of a Member of the Senate to raise these questions for public discussion, and out of this a sound foreign policy may be developed. If I am wrong, this still would clarify the issues involved in this case.

The purpose of this was not in any way to affect what's happened in the Dominican Republic. Obviously, it's much after the event. Its real purpose was to influence the course of events in future revolutions that are inevitable, I think, in Latin America, because it is in a process of change.

When I use the word revolution, I don't necessarily mean a violent one, but changes in their social structure, and I think the very basis of the Alliance for Progress is an assumption that changes in their social and economic structure are necessary—their land tenure, taxes, and so on. I've been a little surprised that they've questioned the propriety of a Senator speaking out on these matters.

SOME EXTRA STATUS

Question. Senator, I think that the criticism runs not to a Senator speaking out but to you speaking out because you are the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Perhaps it would be useful to discuss that role for a minute. Some names come to mind: Borah, Vandenberg, Connally, George, Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr., all had great influence on American foreign policy one way or another.

In each of these cases, the Senator who was the chairman of the committee had some extra status. Now, as America's role in the world has increased, this status has increased. Do you draw any distinction between your right to speak as you just indicated as a Senator, and your role as chairman of this particular committee?

Answer. Well, it's my impression that the men you mention as my predecessors as chairman—take Lodge, for example, or Borah—often spoke out very vigorously in dissent to the current policy of the time; and Vandenberg exercised a great deal of influence, certainly much more than I or any other person recently.

I think there are several reasons for that. One, he individually was a powerful personality. In addition to that, the party division at that time was very close, and Vandenberg, by virtue of that fact, could exercise a decisive influence on the course of events in the Senate. Without his cooperation, the administration would have been in great difficulty, because during the period of his chairmanship his party had numerical control of the Senate and he had a special position of power. He complained that he wanted to "be in on the takeoffs as well as the crash landings," and he was consulted to a much greater extent than I've ever been consulted in advance of actions taken.

During part of his tenure, at least, he could decisively influence the course of the action of the Senate versus the administration. I cannot do that, because the President at this time is clearly the dominant personality in our Government, and as this session has proved, he can get what he wants out of Congress with or without my support.

But that isn't important in this context. All I was trying to do in this case, as I have in others, was to give the Senate and the country the benefit of my best judgment on a matter of policy. And I also want to say that in this case, as in some of the other cases that have been mentioned, it was after the fact. I had no notice of what was going to happen in the Dominican Republic. The only way I could comment on it was after the fact.

A RARE RAPPROCHEMENT

Question. That's in some contrast to your relationship with President Kennedy before the Bay of Pigs affair, where you were called in and did have a chance to make known your opinion in advance.

Answer. That was a very unusual specific instance in which purely by chance I happened to be invited to go with him on a weekend at Easter. He didn't invite me for that purpose; he happened to be going the same place I was, and he said come along.

Question. You seized on the opportunity.

Answer. I seized upon the opportunity to present him with a memorandum and my advice. He didn't solicit it and didn't expect it, but he got it, and that's the way it developed.

He did call me in. That is almost unique; I think it was the only instance in which, prior to the event, I was thoroughly aware of what was up and had an opportunity to express my opinion.

In contrast, there was the Dominican case. We and other Members of Congress were advised, at about the time the marines were being landed, that they were being landed for the purpose of saving American lives. Now, no one would object to landing some marines to save American lives, assuming, of course, that the conditions were as described.

I've been asked: Why didn't you object then? Why, I didn't know anything about the events that were actually taking place other than what we were told at that meeting. Now we have had this review (of the Dominican case in the Foreign Relations Committee). I don't quite see why it is considered unusual to discuss an event of this significance with a view to influencing the attitude of our policymakers in future events of a similar nature which are very likely to take place.

EXTRA QUARTERBACK?

Question. Let's go back to the original question as to whether there is a special responsibility on the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as distinguished from other Senators. You yourself said on becoming chairman of the committee that "no football team can expect to win with every man his own quarterback. The Foreign Relations Committee is available to advise the President, but his is the primary responsibility." In effect, you've been charged here with being a quarterback, or at least a Monday morning quarterback. Is that a fair criticism?

Answer. Well, I think it's a fair observation. I am not quite prepared to say it is necessarily criticism, because under the circumstances here, I wasn't in on the takeoff, so to speak. I wasn't consulted as to whether or not—certainly with the background material and an opportunity to consider it—whether or not the intervention should take place.

Question. Are you taking the position that as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, you, or whoever else may hold that job, is entitled to speak his mind without reservation after the fact in the sense that you've described it here as long as he has not been in on the takeoff? On the Bay of Pigs affair, where you were in on the takeoff, you were careful or considerably less critical afterward, I think, because of that fact.

Answer. Well, another difference is that in the Bay of Pigs, the matters continued after that to be very critical, and as you know, a further event took place.

Question. The missile crisis?

Answer. Yes. This was still an active matter that was going on. After it was done, I don't know what further I could have said. We were consulted about the missile crisis, that is, the Senate leadership. But there again, when we were consulted, we were brought in about 5 o'clock on the day of the warning given to Khrushchev, and we were told what had been decided. Nothing we or any other Members—the senior Members such as Senator RUSSELL and the leadership on both sides—I don't think anything they could have said at that moment would have changed the course at all.

There is the well-known custom that we are advised of what the administration is going to do. I often get a telephone call after 5 o'clock saying that there will be an announcement at 5:30 that such and such is going to take place. I don't complain about that. It isn't necessary for them to ask my advice unless they think my advice is worth something.

I have volunteered without being invited on two or three cases in the last 8 months on Vietnam. I have done it privately. I've submitted memorandums which I have never made public. But every now and then occasion arises when it seems to me that it develops public discussion and is good for the country to try to understand the points of view. I cannot quite see that under our system it is necessary that we all join in endorsing administration policy in every case.

I may say I don't think I'm the only one that has indulged in the expression of views contrary to whatever administration is in power. Normally, the opposition party in a government will take a lead in this. Under present conditions, the minority party is so much in accord with certain policies of the administration that it does not criticize them.

THE GROWING BRANCH

Question. Is part of this problem the fact that the way foreigr policy is developed in the nuclear age, the Senate and the House have less and less power and authority? Could these remarks by yourself and others be almost a declaration of independence, to say that you still have some rights and prerogatives and, by gosh, you want to be heard?

Answer. I think it's inevitable, with the growing complexity of our international relations as influenced by nuclear power, the rapidity of communications and so on, that the Chief Executive will inevitably play an ever-increasing power. I don't think that this is a bad thing as such; I don't think that foreign relations are as well suited for congressional action as domestic matters.

Most of us do not in our everyday experiences have contact with foreign countries and none of us can claim to be real experts in this field. But under the Constitution, we are supposed to advise and consent, and we may from time to time offer suggestions out of our experience for the consideration of the Executive. They don't necessarily—in fact they rarely—seem to take it. But what harm does it do as an educational matter for the American people to discuss?

Question. When you have a strong President, he prefers consent to advice.

Answer. This relationship is nearly altogether dependent upon the strength of the President. When he is a very strong and a very competent man, as I think we have in the President today, this naturally is going to overshadow the Congress.

Now, there has been complaint on the other hand that Congress hasn't developed any debate, not only on this matter but on other matters, Vietnam and domestic matters; that we are a rubberstamp Congress. Then when I make a speech, my God, it is a terrible thing; you spoke out in a way that was not entirely in accord with the accepted policy, and so you are criticized for starting a debate. I don't think you can have it both ways.

UNREVOLUTIONARY NATION

Question. Senator, I'd like to go back to a statement you made in the Dominican speech, one that kicked up considerable dust. You said, "We are not, as we like to claim in Fourth of July speeches, the most truly revolutionary nation on earth. We are, on the contrary, much closer to being the most unrevolutionary nation on earth."

The complaint I got on these sentences was that you were handing the opposition, whether they are Communists or nationalists, or just anti-Americans abroad, a handy weapon to beat us over the head by denying what we have already said that we were—not just a Senator denying it, but the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Answer. Well, it so happens I've uttered the sentence before in a little different context, because the nature of our Revolution in 1776, it seems to me, was entirely different from the kinds of revolutions that have been taking place recently. It was a relatively minor change in the social and economic status of the people of the United States. The reason for the Boston Tea Party wasn't the grinding misery of people in utter poverty.

I think because we have been so successful, we are very attached to our rather ancient system. I don't think our inclination is to overchange. You know what happens if someone suggests a change in our Constitution. It is in this sense that I have said that before and I do now.

I think the great merit of our system is that it's adaptable. This is the great merit of our system as opposed to a totalitarian system, that we can make these internal changes within the context of our Constitution, changes that completely alter our domestic scene.

We're more comparable to the Scandinavian countries. We're doing internally very many things they did.

SHAKING US UP

Question. Are you saying that we are a status quo country in relation to the world and we're not adapting ourselves or our minds sufficiently to the kind of revolutionary action that is abroad in the world?

Answer. I think that's right. And a country that's as well off as we are tends to want to rely on established law and to follow conservative principles in that connection, and we are that way, I think.

Question. What you're really trying to do, then, in all these speeches, is to shake up the American mind, is that it?

Answer. Well, I guess, being an old professor, if I perform any function at all, it is trying to make my colleagues in the country think about these matters in the hope that wiser people than myself can improve our policies.

I must say I think that in this foreign field, because of the great success of our own economy, it's very difficult for us to conceive of the conditions in another country, to conceive of the difficulties of changing the existing social and political order there. It is very difficult for Americans, I think, to put themselves into the position of the ordinary citizens in those countries where the per capita income is $200 or $300 a year. It's difficult for us to realize the pressure upon these people to try to improve their lot.

I am very pleased that this country has been able to do what it has done. All I would like to see is that we show a little more appreciation of their problems and try to work with them in a more cooperative spirit rather than assuming an attitude that we know all the answers and that if they'll do as we say, things will be fine.

One example is foreign aid. I've done all I could in the last 2 or 3 years to shift this operation from a bilateral program in which we undertake to direct their activities for improvement. I know our motives are good, we'd like to help them. I think it would be much more effective if we'd do it through a cooperative venture such as the Inter-American Bank in which they play a part.

NOT ALWAYS ANTI

Question. To sum it up then, is what you are really saying that you believe in free speech for Senators, including the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and that you don't intend to be inhibited beyond some reasonable degree by the fact that you may be speaking out against administration policy in this or any other administration?

Answer. I don't always speak out against it. I approve of practically everything this administration has done. In this particular instance, all I said is that I think the judgment, not the motives, may not have been correct, and that when similar occasions arise in the future, I would hope we would be a little bit more careful in the way we intervene our power into the affairs of other countries.

Question. Would you like to be in a little more on the takeoffs as well as the crash landings?

Answer. I don't like to be in the position of begging to be in. If they don't think my views are of any value, I'm certainly not anxious to intervene. I don't think I'm infallible, but that doesn't mean I don't think I have a right to say what I think about the effect of some occurrence. I think it is my duty to do it.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Sept. 20, 1965]

Fulbright's Speech Draws Support

To the Editor of the Gazette:

I agree with Senator Fulbright on the Dominican Republic statement and shall make a few comments.

In Latin America we have a number of military oligarchies that appear to run the Government. They can be called hatchetmen, as they are paid to do the dirty work so as to maintain the status quo. For their work, they are paid a high price, and are blessed. Paid to permit the exploitation of the people and their natural resources by dynasties of the world. Blessed because they control free worship on the part of the people, in the name of God to stop communism.

The power structures are the dynasties that move into any country, and take over that something of value, by any method to attain that end. They install the military and use the church. When the people rise up, the military and church go down, but the real power structure slips away to await another day.

We must help other countries to have constitutional governments, that will protect the people from exploitation by any robber barons from any dynasties. To get rid of slums, we must name the slum landlords. To get rid of causes of trouble in Latin America, let us give family names to the dynasties, and not call them corporations. Our boys must not die for an elite, or a Mr. Morgan, so that they may get more on top of more.

Uncle Arnold.

Hot Springs.

Latin America

To the Editor of the Gazette:

A great deal is being said about Senator Fulbright's recent speech in the U.S. Senate labeling U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic as a major blunder. Mr. Fulbright says that our recent action there has provoked the resentment of the Latin American Republics and has in the long run helped the Communists. There is no doubt that the Communists will take advantage of any resentment to further their own objectives. They like to fish in troubled waters. Our intervention may have chilled the cordial relationships between the United States and the Latin American countries. Surely it has not helped the Alliance for Progress program so eloquently proclaimed by the late President Kennedy and later endorsed by President Johnson. Money is not enough. There must also be international goodwill and understanding.

It would have been better if the United States had worked on this thing in conjunction with the Organization of American States. It seems that the OAS was ignored. And this is not good for us. As the Senator says we should encourage them to build their own bridges to other nations. We will make a mistake if we try to do it for them. They are now grown nations with some social and political maturity and naturally will resent a paternalistic overlordship from the United States. We resented it in 1776. The American Revolution is still one of the great revolutions in world history.

Again we cannot ignore the Monroe Doctrine. Its enforcement should be multilateral and not unilateral. All the nations of the Western Hemisphere have a vital part in the enforcement of it. In fact the time is past when we can do or attempt to do it alone. The Senator may have sensed something that the masses of the people have not as yet sensed.

We still have good people who see a Communist under every bed and a Negro in every parlor or living room. Often we get scared when we should do some reflective thinking. We will recall that Hitler also fought communism with all the power at his command. Yet he killed some 6 million people in gas chambers and concentration camps.

H. W. Jinske.

Hot Springs.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Sept. 20, 1965]

A Physicist on Dominican Republic and Fulbright

To the Editor of the Gazette:

Senator Fulbright is to be complimented on his Senate speech concerning our policy in the Dominican Republic. Arkansas is fortunate to have in Senator Fulbright a man who is able to think independently, to arrive at well-considered conclusions in a cogent manner.

As a physicist, I feel a special responsibility toward the strengthening of world understanding and the consequent preservation of world peace. As the creators of the instruments of war, scientists have a special responsibility to see that war does not occur. Senator Fulbright's policy of "building bridges" between the societies of the world is the only one which can lead to a stable peace. Our present unstable peace, if one could call it peace, is analogous to the unstable equilibrium of a ball balanced on the top of a mountain. The ball is balanced now, but just be careful not to give it a push. A stable peace would be based on understanding and world law, rather than on the present balance of terror.

When we build factories in Eastern Europe, when we trade with Russia, when we rely on the U.N. (as in the Kashmir fighting), we are building bridges. I feel that recognition of Red China and admission of Red China to the U.N. are bridges long overdue. The Government of Red China has been viable for nearly 20 years, shows no indication of losing its grip, and is at least as legitimate as most of the governments of the world. To refuse to be on speaking terms with Red China because we do not like her seems unrealistic, to say the least.

The world has lived on the brink of destruction for the past two decades. With each passing year, as the weapons become more monstrous and the stockpiles grow and more nations acquire the capability of destroying civilization, we move closer to the edge of the precipice. No one can say how long we will survive in our present predicament. We can only say that if a solution is not found, the end will eventually come. The balance of terror cannot be maintained forever. The solution lies in the building of bridges: bridges from man to man, and bridges from nation to nation. When our country violates the OAS treaty and imposes her own will (rather than that of the U.N. or of the OAS) on the Dominican Republic, we are tearing down the bridges which mankind so badly needs in this nuclear age.

ARTHUR HOBSON.

FAYETTEVILLE.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Sept. 20, 1965]

FULBRIGHT AND OTHERS

SIR: The quick castigation of Senator FULBRIGHT by some of his colleagues is sad, although certainly not unexpected in the light of his sharply critical speech on our Dominican actions. Senator DODD's attempted rebuttal deserves comment, for it so perfectly reveals the implied, but rarely revealed bias at the root of too many of our foreign policy decisions.

There is fundamentally a fanatic demand for orderly, agreeable and, above all, noiseless governments, whatever the cost. The cost becomes, in practical terms, easy acceptance of very conservative regimes with often dominant military elements, repression of civil liberties and disregard or, at best, token concessions toward land reforms and other basic socioeconomic improvements.

Democracy, especially the forms it is likely to take in emergent nations, lacking a long tradition of self-government, is probably inefficient and even chaotic in comparison to the traditional rigid oligarchy. But in this regard, it is edifying to think of Senator DODD's chagrin when, as a foreign observer of some years ago, he saw that upstart frontiersman Andrew Jackson and his crude followers replacing the tried-and-true old guard. Still further, we can rejoice today that no paternalistic guardian of world peace stepped in with a few thousand troops to replace that weak agrarian social reformer A. Lincoln, obviously unable to maintain order in his own country, torn by internal revolution.

One characteristic of any mature nation is the ability freely to air differences of opinion and to admit and learn from mistakes, no matter how embarrassing. We, as a Nation, must soon emerge from an over-long adolescence in matters of foreign policy. We need to hear from Senator FULBRIGHT, and many more like him.

M. J. BRODIE.

BALTIMORE.

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal, Sept. 26, 1965]

THE FULBRIGHT FUROR—HE CHAIRS GROUP DEEPLY DIVIDED AND LOSING PRESTIGE

(By Lee Winfrey)

WASHINGTON.—On the wall of the office of J. W. FULBRIGHT, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hang six pictures of FULBRIGHT with the President of the United States.

One shows the Arkansas Senator sitting on a couch in the oval office of the White House, legs crossed, glasses perched down low on his nose, forehead furrowed skeptically. Before him sits Lyndon B. Johnson, who has autographed the picture and added this note:

"BILL—I can see I haven't been very persuasive."

On the issue of U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic, JAMES WILLIAM FULBRIGHT is indeed unpersuaded. In a 9,500-word Senate speech on September 15, he called the intervention "a grievous mistake."

Several of his colleagues quickly agreed that a mistake had been made, but that the mistake was FULBRIGHT's. Senator THOMAS J. DODD led the criticism, charging that FULBRIGHT "suffers from an indiscriminating infatuation with revolutions of all kinds."

FULBRIGHT has been under sharp attack before, notably for a speech on March 25, 1964, entitled "Old Myths and New Realities." Now he himself faces a new reality: He is not only being criticized personally, as in the past, but for his direction of the Foreign Relations Committee as well.

In his private office, where an American flag and an unabridged dictionary share the place of honor directly behind his chair, the scholarly FULBRIGHT defends firmly his right to criticize administration policy in Santo Domingo.

"I think he (Johnson) is a political genius but that doesn't mean he's infallible—or that he hasn't made a mistake in this instance that won't be detrimental to his own long-term foreign policy interests. I think it will be (detrimental).

"I think there are people in the administration who think it was a mistake," he adds, "but they can't speak out. A Senator can. I think it's not only a Senator's right, but his duty, to speak out in a case where a serious mistake has been made."

FULBRIGHT traces the current furor, which he admits is "a little more stridently critical" than he anticipated, back to an old enemy of his, the late Senator Joe McCarthy of Wisconsin.

"Since the days of McCarthy," he says in his soft Ozark drawl, "discussion of anything around here that involves communism has been pretty heated."

FULBRIGHT's credentials as an intellectual (Rhodes Scholar at Oxford, president of the University of Arkansas at the age of 34) are widely honored. They do not shield him, however, from current charges that the Foreign Relations Committee is suffering under his leadership.

Among the 16 standing committees of the Senate, Foreign Relations has long ranked first in prestige. HUBERT HUMPHREY and the late John F. Kennedy are among its alumni. Its current roster includes both Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD and Majority Whip RUSSELL LONG, the two most powerful Democrats in the Senate.

But in a viewpoint recently put into print by Syndicated Columnist William S. White: "The old congressional citadel of power and prestige in foreign policy, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has fallen upon the poorest days it has known in many decades."

White advanced one major reason: FULBRIGHT's alleged inability to keep the committee "on the track." There are, however, at least five things troubling the committee at present.

Unwieldy size—from 13 members in 1947, the committee has grown to 19 as more Senators sought the prestige that attached to a seat there. This leaves less time for each member to question witnesses and advance his views.

Chronic absenteeism. DODD, for example, attended only 1 of the 13 hearings concerning the Dominican Republic. Often FULBRIGHT and the ranking Republican, BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, are the only members at a hearing.

Six members, including FULBRIGHT and LONG, are also on the powerful Finance Committee. FULBRIGHT practically never goes to Finance. The other five regularly attend Finance and seldom come to Foreign Relations.

Ideological differences. On most issues involving communism (and most foreign policy questions do), the committee is severely split into at least three camps.

There are the "doves," led by FULBRIGHT, generally followed by Democrats JOSEPH CLARK, WAYNE MORSE, FRANK CHURCH, CLAIBORNE PELL, and surprisingly to some, Republican KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota. LONG joined them in opposition to FULBRIGHT on Santo Domingo.

There are the "hawks"—DODD, Democrat FRANK LAUSCHE, of Ohio, and Republican KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota. LONG joined them in opposition to FULBRIGHT on Santo Domingo.

In between are the moderates, notably MANSFIELD, JOHN SPARKMAN, and STUART SYMINGTON.

FULBRIGHT's methods as chairman, which differ substantially from those of his predecessors.

The great chairmen of the last 20 years—Democrats Walter George of Georgia and Tom Connally of Texas, Republican Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan—sought a broad consensus, rounding off the corners of individual views in order to arrive at general agreement.

FULBRIGHT, since becoming chairman in 1959, has been much more inclined to advance his own views early and often. A watered-down consensus, diluting or omitting major points at issue, is not his cup of tea.

The maverick manner of two Democrats at opposite political poles, LAUSCHE and MORSE.

Both MORSE and LAUSCHE are contentious men. They will badger witnesses they do not like and do not hesitate to consume a full hour or two advancing their views. They bore or irritate several of their colleagues who walk out or prefer not to attend their diatribes.

Summing up the current situation, Columnist Marquis Childs wrote recently:

"What was once a committee assignment pursued by Senators seeking prestige and influence has fallen to such a low state that recently Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, who has a sensitive nose for where power resides, gave up a seat on Foreign Relations."

SMATHERS' departure for a seat on the Judiciary Committee was unprecedented. Diplomatically, SMATHERS gives as his reason:

"The problems (in foreign relations) are so big and all-encompassing that in the final analysis you can do nothing about them. I preferred to go to Judiciary because there the problems are specific and you can hammer at them and work out some solution."

Ideological differences probably played a part, however. SMATHERS was the second Senator on his feet (LONG was the first) to defend the administration following FULBRIGHT's lengthy Dominican speech.

Regarding the split in his committee, FULBRIGHT admitted in his characteristically mild tone of voice that "The committee is deeply divided on any matter involving our dealings with the Communist world."

He added that he is "hopeful that the differences will be ameliorated." But his tone carried little conviction and other observers see little prospect for any great improvement.

For between FULBRIGHT and the DODD-LAUSCHE-MUNDT wing of his committee yawns an awesome gulf. Involved are two entirely different ways of looking at the contemporary world.

In the view of DODD and LAUSCHE and MUNDT, the United States is at war with communism, with all kinds of communism. As a practical matter, they see little difference between the Russian, Chinese, Cuban, or Yugoslavian brands.

This is a viewpoint shared by millions of Americans, but it is not the viewpoint of FULBRIGHT. He would like to build "bridges of accommodation" to the Communist world, to "take the heat out of the cold war."

In his "myths and realities" speech, he proposed the possibility of Russia joining with the United States in building a new Panama Canal. He is encouraged by the fact that Senate opposition to selling wheat to Russia is much less than it was 2 years ago.

Behind this attitude lies another controlling idea of FULBRIGHT's. The belief that the United States is spending too much on munitions and the space race, and not enough on domestic improvements, notably on education.

Now 60, a Senator for precisely one-third of his life, FULBRIGHT has the appearance of a man several years younger. He exercises regularly, shuns the cocktail circuit, and seems to bear up well under the controversy aroused by his lengthy, closely reasoned speeches.

In an era of consensus politics, he remains the unpersuaded one.

UNFAVORABLE COMMENTS

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 17, 1965]

SENATOR FULBRIGHT'S WAVE OF THE FUTURE

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT was in his accustomed character when he moaned in a Senate speech that American intervention in the Dominican Republic rebellion was all wrong. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee contended that in Latin America "the movement of the future * * * is social revolution," and that if we "oppose any reform movement that Communists adhere to, we are likely to end up opposing every reform movement."

Mr. FULBRIGHT went so far as to say that, we had intervened "forcibly and illegally against a revolution," which is equivalent to saying that revolutions, even those which are Communist-dominated, are legitimate, while to oppose them is illegal and illegitimate.

Senator THOMAS DODD appropriately remarked that FULBRIGHT "suffers from an indiscriminating infatuation with revolutions of all kinds, national, democratic, or Communist." DODD observed that FULBRIGHT never expressed any concern about the establishment of Castro's Communist regime in Cuba, or about the Communist campaign of terror and subversion throughout Latin America. He failed to mention that FULBRIGHT also opposes American intervention against the Communists in Vietnam.

FULBRIGHT complained that the United States decided that the Dominican rebellion "should not be allowed to succeed." He added that "any reform movement is likely to attract Communist support," and, while conceding that "it cannot be proven that the Communists would not have taken over the revolution," said it was equally impossible to prove that they would.

In such circumstances—revolutions in which Communists figure—FULBRIGHT is perfectly willing to split the difference. For the sake of "reform" and "social revolution," he will chance a Communist takeover any old day. This is open-mindedness on the scale of a wind tunnel.

FULBRIGHT, in fact, fears the Communists much less than he fears an American association with "reactionary oligarchies." His expressed sympathies are with what he calls "the popular noncommunist left." The villains in his set piece presumably are the Latin American military, who are conservative and anti-communist, just as the villains on the domestic scene are American military officers, who were the subjects of the celebrated "Fulbright memorandum," charging that they were too anti-communist and thus enemies of all social welfare and "reform." Ever since this screed in 1961, American officers have been effectively gagged.

It is hardly necessary to say Senator FULBRIGHT is wrong. He is always wrong; there is no news in that. The administration was not wrong in sending troops into the Dominican Republic. It was not wrong in perceiving the threat of a Communist takeover and of another Cuba. But where it was wrong—and this FULBRIGHT never even touched upon—was that it failed to carry thru. It kept its troops under wraps and refused to dislodge and disarm the Communists, and to end the Communist threat. It left the rebels armed and intact. It appeased them. It kidnaped and hustled out of the country the strongest anti-communist Dominican military officer, Gen. Wessin y Wessin. Now it is expelling all the military men who are close to him.

In his preoccupation with the nobility of left-wing revolutions, FULBRIGHT is blind to the real failures of administration policy, which are founded on irresolution, an exaggerated respect for "world opinion," and a distrust of the "military mind." The results are a tendency to shrink from unambiguous action resolutely carried out and to indulge, instead, in fatal pullbacks, from the Bay of Pigs to Santo Domingo.

[For an eloquent statement of the magnitude of America's default, read the tragic letter of Gen. Wessin in the Voice of the People today. This is the first time that this document has been printed anywhere in full.]

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 17, 1965]

THE TWO FULBRIGHTS

Senator FULBRIGHT's speech denouncing our intervention in the Dominican Republic last April is a remarkable exercise in second-guessing. And even some of the second guesses are wrong.

One might almost think that this speech was delivered by two men.

The first Senator FULBRIGHT engaged in a grossly irresponsible attack on the administration. True, most of this is done through the process of insinuation and suggestion. It "appears" that this was the case. If something else had been done a different result "might possibly" have emerged. That sort of thing.

FULBRIGHT seeks to excuse the President from any responsibility for what he regards as an unwarranted and illegal intervention. Mr. Johnson is made to look like a well-intentioned but bumbling dupe who was deceived by his subordinates. The integrity of W. Tapley Bennett, our ambassador in Santo Domingo, is brought directly into question. The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said "there is no doubt that the threat of communism rather than danger of American lives was his (Bennett's) primary or sole reason for recommending military intervention."

This, of course, does not jibe with what Bennett, crouching under his desk while bullets whistled through his office, said when he called the White House on April 28. The burden of his message was that troops were urgently needed to protect American lives, not to mention the lives of thousands of other innocent bystanders. Perhaps Senator FULBRIGHT might take a different view now had he been under the desk with the ambassador.

Finally, FULBRIGHT said "we cannot successfully advance the cause of popular democracy (in Latin America) and at the same time aline ourselves with corrupt and reactionary oligarchies; yet that is what we seem to be trying to do."

The first half of the sentence just quoted is, of course, correct; the last half is not. All over Latin America, where progressive forces can be found, we have supported them: Frei in Chile, Betancourt in Venezuela, Figueres in Costa Rica, Belaunde in Peru—to name a few. The tragedy in the Dominican Republic is that no such democratic figures have emerged.

The second Senator FULBRIGHT concedes this on page 15 of the lengthy speech. There, he said he is "sure, as I know President Johnson and, indeed, most U.S. citizens are sure, that our country is not now and will not become the enemy of social revolution in Latin America."

But the damage had been done in the preceding 14 pages. Every two-bit Communist propaganda artist will pounce upon those sections of the speech in which the Senator cast doubt on our motives and intentions. The brief and belated disclaimer will receive little if any attention.

There is nothing to be gained by debating the question of whether, at the time of our intervention, the revolution had been taken over by the Communists or was in serious danger of being taken over. For it is obvious that the Senator, while expressing skepticism, doesn't know and doesn't pretend to know. A few things, however, are worth mentioning. He ignored the report of the five-member OAS Committee which conducted an investigation on the scene. The burden of its report was that the Communist threat was real. He mentioned the failure of the mission of John Bartlow Martin, who was sent to Santo Domingo by the President. It was left to Senator DODD to report that Martin, an admirer of Juan Bosch and our Ambassador to the Dominican Republic while Bosch was in office, left Washington believing that we had done the wrong thing. It was also left to Senator DODD to reveal that he had been told on reliable authority that Martin changed his mind 48 hours after arriving in Santo Domingo because he realized that the Communists at least exercised an exceedingly dangerous degree of control.

Senator FULBRIGHT wrung his hands because we were not enthusiastic about the possible return of Bosch to his country. But he conceded that Bosch apparently was not eager to return—"that he vacillated in the very early stages and some well-informed persons contend that he positively refused to return."

The most that Senator FULBRIGHT will grant is that we might have been morally though perhaps not legally justified in landing a few marines to take out American civilians. Beyond this, he would have let the fighting—and communism—run its course. Nothing that he said indicates the slightest concern over the danger that we might have found ourselves with a second Cuba on our hands in the Caribbean.

For our part, we think that the President was not bamboozled by his subordinates and that he was fully justified in doing what he did. American lives were in danger and the Communist threat was real. It was necessary to intervene and it was essential to use enough force to achieve our objectives. One of the most important of those objectives was to prepare the way for a return to democratic government in the Dominican Republic. It looks as though we are now in the process of attaining this objective, and even Senator FULBRIGHT concedes that this is so.

[St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Sept. 20, 1965]

Fulbright's Blind Bias

Senator J. William Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, has once more attempted to divide Americans on foreign policy as he lashed out at United States intervention in Santo Domingo, calling it a "grievous" mistake.

He is, as usual, dead wrong. But he also does great harm to the Nation's cause because of his imposing title as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Fulbright contends that the President's decision to send troops into Santo Domingo was based upon exaggerated estimates of Communist influence in the rebel movement and from a panicky fear that the Dominican Republic was about to become another Cuba.

The fuzzy-liberal Senator conspicuously omitted reference to the May 7 Organization of American States report which said that the Communists were in control of the revolution and that the United States had taken the only course it could have taken.

He also presumes to know more than our on-the-spot representatives—who were being shot at and who gave an hourly account of their estimates that the Reds were gaining control.

His attack on U.S. Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, W. Tapley Bennett, appears a thinly disguised attempt to "get" Bennett who was instrumental in bringing about strong U.S. response to the threatened Red takeover.

Fulbright does further disservice by attempting to disprove the contention that United States troops weren't sent in to protect American lives.

American lives quite obviously were in danger. Bullets whistled through the Embassy windows in Santo Domingo as rebels and loyalists fought pitched battles in the populous city.

The Arkansas Senator seems contemptuous that our Government would be fearful of another Cuba, claiming Washington "overreacted."

It is precisely the sort of gullible Fulbright frame of mind that made the Castro takeover of Cuba possible. Our State Department saw no Communists at all until it was far, far too late.

The Weilands in State, according to testimony in the Senate, had reports of Castro's affiliations with the Reds and of his ties with communism, but this information mysteriously never reached top levels of Government.

Senator Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut, quite rightly has called this slanted Fulbright report "tendentious;" it ignored massive evidence of Communist involvement in the revolt.

And once again the GOP leadership properly backed the President against Fulbright, agreeing the Chief Executive had no other course but to act as he did.

If there has been a "grievous" mistake, it was committed by Senator Fulbright, not the President.

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 16, 1965]

Fulbright's Expostulation

Senator Fulbright, for reasons probably only he would understand, has gone out of his way at a critical moment to undermine his Government's effort—and the efforts of the Organization of American States—to produce peace and stability in the Dominican Republic.

In a gratuitous speech on the Senate floor, he practically has condemned everything the United States (and by implication the OAS) did and did not do in trying to stop the fighting and set up some type of stable administration in the island nation.

When President Johnson sent troops, the Senator alleged, rescuing Americans in the country was more a pretext than a reason. The real reason, he claimed, was an exaggerated estimate of Communist influence on the rebel side of the civil war.

It is obvious the Senator was not one of the hundreds of Americans in the country, many of whom believe if it had not been for our forces their lives would have been lost. And the fact is that Communist influence on the so-called "rebel" side, and Communist activity in the midst of the bloodshed, turned out to be more significant than was apparent at first.

Mr. Fulbright manages to confuse Communist terrorism and agitation in Latin American countries with "reform movements" as though they all were of a package.

He accuses the Johnson administration of "timidity" at the outset of the fighting and of overreaction after that. By the Senator's outline, the "timidity" covered a 3-day period from April 25 to April 28, the day President Johnson sent the troops.

The Senator has had the advantage of nearly 5 months of hindsight to prepare this latest remonstrance. And he unloads this masterpiece of fuzziness right at the moment the patiently created provisional government of the Dominican Republic is painfully trying to get off the ground.

[From the Sun-Sentinel, Sept. 17, 1965]

Fulbright Discloses More Addled Thought

Charges by Senator William Fulbright, of Arkansas, that the United States has an exaggerated fear of Communists in foreign uprisings—and that Marines were sent into the Dominican Republic predicated on this fear rather than for saving American lives—reveals once more the addled thinking which exists at high level.

To begin with, are the two not analogous? If the advance of communism in any sphere is not a definite threat to Americans and the lives of other freedom-seeking people, then we have allowed our thinking to travel a fantastic circuitous path in recent years.

Perhaps Senator Fulbright will see fit to enlighten his colleagues, and the American people, as to which recent foreign uprisings did not have their roots, and/or support, in international communism.

And he may be able to further enlighten us as to the reason so many Americans have died in the midst of many of these uprisings.

In the Congo, for example, slaughter was rampant and there could certainly have been no doubt as to the source of aid and comfort to those perpetrating the atrocities. And does the honorable gentleman really believe that Communist encouragement in Vietnam, Pakistan, Cuba, and Korea has been passive and without danger?

It is our opinion that Senator Fulbright missed a very signficant effect of the Marine landings in the Dominican Republic. This is affirmed by his assertion, as reported, that "United States policy was marred by lack of candor and by misinformation." He went on to call reports of massacres and atrocities by the rebels as "wildly exaggerated."

Apparently missed by the Senator, was the wholehearted endorsement given the President's intervention action by the American public. There was certainly little doubt in anyone's mind that American lives were in danger. Had only one life been in jeopardy, the people of this land would have rejoiced to see, at long last, a firm and positive move by this great Nation which has achieved an unenviable record of ignoring its citizens abroad.

Along with the saving of lives, and this was omitted by the Senator in his remarks, was a commitment to protect American property.

The staggering economic loss to Fidel Castro of U.S. investments and developments in Cuba is not easily forgotten. Without these facilities, it is highly probable we would not have endured the embarrassment of a full-fledged Communist operation at our doorstep.

The chairman of the powerful and influential Senate Foreign Relations Committee infers that we used protection of lives as an excuse for intervention. By this inference, he does not say we should have gone in to settle matters, but under colors of our stand against communism. He rather takes a position in opposition to being there at all.

We hold that Senator Fulbright would be shaken to his grassroots, if he would bother to get out and check them, by the sheer disbelief among the citizens at such weakness as his public skepticism reveals in high office.

Once American lives were relatively secure, the public inclination was to urge a clean sweep of potential subversion in the Dominican.

It was accepted fact, based on experience, that "Big Daddy" would foot the bills for whoever came out on top. The hope was obvious that every effort would be made to assure a non-Communist, non-anti-American and sufficiently stable government.

A lot of this hope went glimmering when McGeorge Bundy got into the act. The OAS came into the picture and we relinquished our chance to obtain the guarantees we sought. Where was the voice of righteous indignation at this time?

To appreciate U.S. interest properly in the Dominican Republic, it might be well to review history. In 1869, President Grant and President Baez signed a treaty for the annexation of the Republic of Santo Domingo to the United States. Dominicans approved this treaty, but it was not ratified by the U.S. Senate.

In 1905, the United States assumed management of the Dominican debt and collection of customs. In 1916, unrest and instability brought on U.S. military intervention which lasted until 1924. Since that time, most of the Dominican economy has been closely tied to American support.

We have not yet had adequate time to assess the situation surrounding Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin. Whether he is as pro-American as he is anti-Communist may be significant.

It has appeared recently that among other peculiar vacillations, the State Department accepts the premise that support of an openly pro-American personality may offend other nations to the point they will say nasty things or even object.

Our bright-eyed and bungling appeasers are engaged in some sort of underhanded finagling to control the General's status and activities in this country. We detect the inkling of fear that Castro may be irritated if he is permitted to roam free among the avid and homesick Cuban refugees in south Florida. We suggest that fear is well founded, and should be fully exploited, not assuaged.

We see at hand a golden opportunity, Fulbright's, Bundy's, and indistinguishable-shadow policymakers notwithstanding, to strike a blow for freedom rather than gird against antifreedom.

Peace may be bought. Freedom must be earned. We have spent enough. Let's go to work.

Budd W. Boyer.

[From the Elkhart (Ind.) Truth, Sept. 17, 1965]

Untimely Criticism by Fulbright

Poor judgment and poor timing were shown Wednesday by Senator J. William Fulbright in his criticism of the Johnson administration for intervening in the Dominican Republic last April.

Fulbright put it like this:

"The issue is not whether there was Communist influence in the Dominican revolution but its degree, which is something on which reasonable men can differ.

"The burden of the proof, however, is on those who take action, and the administration has not proven its assertion of Communist control."

One Washington correspondent says that no top official in our Government's executive branch, including those responsible for intelligence, has faltered in the judgment that a Communist takeover would have resulted if the United States had not intervened in the Caribbean island.

Senator FULBRIGHT obviously is entitled to disagree with that if he chooses. But he himself admits he now is talking from the benefit of hindsight.

When President Johnson decided to use troops, FULBRIGHT was among congressional leaders whom L.B.J. called in to explain his actions.

Senator RUSSELL LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, says that nobody, including Senator FULBRIGHT, then raised a dissenting voice.

Senator FULBRIGHT now tries to affix the blame to the President's advisers, not to Mr. Johnson himself. But the distinction is academic, for the reasons L.B.J. gave were precisely those which FULBRIGHT attacked most vigorously.

The bitter fact is that the White House was getting some mighty bum advice about Cuba when Castro was struggling to take over there, and after the Castro takeover, too.

If the White House years ago had been enabled to see Castro in his true Marxist light, the Cuban tragedy could have been prevented.

President Johnson obviously wasn't about to repeat the Cuban mistake in the Dominican Republic. He dared not take the chance of another Communist bastion so close to our shores.

After all, it doesn't take very many Reds to seize a country that is in utter chaos.

We doubt that FULBRIGHT's criticism will alter many American views. Unfortunately, he has spoken just after the recent trip to seven Latin countries by Jack Hood Vaughn, Assistant Secretary of State, who has been trying to convince his hosts that President Johnson is deeply concerned with their well-being.

The Fulbright speech illustrates U.S. free speech. But it is hardly calculated to allay age-old suspicions by Latin people that the United States interferes unduly in their affairs.

[From the Syracuse (N.Y.) Post-Standard, Sept. 17, 1965]

FULBRIGHT OFF BASE

In a Senate speech, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, blasts American policy in the Dominican crisis, suggesting that President Johnson acted on "faulty advice" in sending U.S. troops to prevent Communist seizure of the Government.

A small force would have been enough, and should have been promptly withdrawn later after Americans had been evacuated, says FULBRIGHT. Massive intervention promotes communism in Latin America in the long run, he adds, and the United States is guilty of overaction.

The Senator from Arkansas makes strange comments at times on U.S. policy and these views are no exception.

The Dominican action was fully justified. Communists were about to take over and latest developments indicated they may still do so. But instead of blasting recent United States and Organization of American States maneuvers, FULBRIGHT hashes up events long past and ignores present realities.

U.S. troops went into Santo Domingo to prevent Communist-infiltrated rebels under Col. Francisco Caamano Deno from seizing power. But now, under Hector Garcia-Godoy, Dominican provisional President set up by the United States and Organization of American States, anti-Communist General Wessin y Wessin has been deported to appease the rebels.

The deportation is supposed to induce the rebels to give up their arms. But indications are that Garcia-Godoy will give the rebels a free rein. He served, incidentally, under Juan Bosch, who now seeks a return to the presidency with support of a Communist-dominated front. Bosch permitted Communists to hold high positions in his government.

Garcia-Godoy is suggesting that the role of the OAS peace force be "redefined," which is a polite way of saying U.S. troops should get out.

American forces not only should have been sent in in the beginning; they should stay there until we are sure—if ever—that the Dominican Republic won't become another Cuba. The job is far from done.

[From the Garden City (N.Y.) Newsday, Sept. 17, 1965]

HOW SOUND ARE SENATOR FULBRIGHT'S CONCLUSIONS?

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and a charming, erudite, former college president with a deep feeling for people as individuals that is not always matched by his understanding of international realities. This was evidenced in March 1964, when he described Fidel Castro as a nuisance instead of a danger. He has compounded this misconception in a statement attacking the policy of the United States in the continuing Dominican crisis.

More in sorrow than in anger, Senator FULBRIGHT has described our actions in the Dominican Republic as both wrong and harmful. He argues we intervened on exaggerated estimates of Communist influence in the rebel movement; that we attempted to influence the course the revolution took; and that we overlooked or ignored "the fact that any reform movement is likely to attract Communist support."

For whom does Senator FULBRIGHT speak? Not for his committee. That body of Senators, after protracted hearings behind closed doors, was unable even to agree upon a report about the merits or demerits of U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic. He speaks, therefore, for himself alone, and in contradiction to President Johnson. The President based his decision to intervene upon evidence gathered by experts who justly feared a Communist takeover. Among them was a Stevenson liberal, John Bartlow Martin, former Ambassador to the Dominican Republic.

Senator FULBRIGHT has had only the most limited personal experience with Latin America and its problems, but he speaks as if his experience were limitless. His philosophy is that revolutions, in Latin America, are social matters based upon a deep desire for more liberty. In fact they are almost invariably revolutions of the empty belly, based upon the desire of the starving to enjoy a better share of worldly goods. These people become easy victims of the Communists.

Judging from his statement, Senator FULBRIGHT is willing to take the risk of Communist leadership of revolutions over that of the more moderate parties such as the one led by President Frei in Chile. That is putting one's head in the tiger's mouth. Soft counsel by wishful thinkers led this country to accept Fidel Castro as a great liberal reformer who turned out, in the end, to be a police-state butcher. Make no mistake. In Latin America, communism is being actively encouraged from outside—by Cuba, by Russia, and by China.

It is unfortunate than a man of standing and reputation should lend himself to statements that simply encourage the troublemakers. He has done his country a disservice.

[From the Pine Bluff (Ark.) Commercial, Sept. 26, 1965]

THE SENATOR AND STRATEGY

By this time, both the House of Representatives and Arkansas' J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT have voiced their opinions on American foreign policy in Latin America. It can be assumed that the House voiced its collective opinion—in a brief resolution—precisely because Senator FULBRIGHT had voiced his earlier—in a protracted speech. The difference between the two turns out to be not so much whether the United States should intervene in Latin Amreican affairs but on whose side.

The Representatives (or at least the 312 out of 364 who voted) went on record in favor of the United States using force to prevent Communists from seizing any nation in the Western Hemisphere. Senator FULBRIGHT argued that the United States should support social revolution in Latin America and risk the growth of Communist power rather than side with doomed dictators and assure it.

It would be a costly mistake if American foreign policy failed to differentiate between one anti-Communist and another, between a hated dictator like Rafael Trujillo late of the Dominican Republic and a popular democrat like Eduardo Frei in Chile. RUSSELL LONG illustrated the prevalence of this common failure to make distinctions when, only minutes after Senator FULBRIGHT had concluded his lengthy analysis, Senator LONG rose to explain why the United States did not prevent a military junta from overthrowing the elected government of the Dominican Republic 2 years ago: "It was a fight between one crowd of anti-Communists and another crowd. I do not believe that we would have had any right to go in there."

At the time, the Kennedy administration did not equate the two crowds the way Senator LONG does now. There was the traditional display of naval power off the Dominican coast, and the United States did not recognize the military government for 3 months, though it did not intervene in force. Under the military government, the Communists grew so powerful that an American administration felt it had to intervene in strength within 2 years. The administration's own reasons for intervention—to prevent a Communist takeover—supports Senator FULBRIGHT's thesis about the folly of entrusting anticommunism to Latin American dictators.

"The movement of the future in Latin America is social revolution," Senator FULBRIGHT told his colleagues last week. And he said the United States must side with it, despite its Communist hangers-on, in order to win. Or as the Senator expressed it in his speech:

"Since just about every revolutionary movement is likely to attract Communist support, at least in the beginning, the approach followed in the Dominican Republic, if consistently pursued, must inevitably make us the enemy of all revolutions and therefore the ally of all the unpopular and corrupt oligarchies of the hemisphere."

Our quarrel with this strategy is not that Senator FULBRIGHT makes distinctions between political forces in Latin America but that he does not make enough of them. The United States would not be making prudent distinctions if it supported just about every social revolution in Latin America. The leaders of the United States are obliged to recognize not only the Trujillos and Freis of this hemisphere, but the Castros as well. That such differences are not easy to spot does not make them any the less real—or less dangerous.

What differentiates a democratic social revolution from a totalitarian one? Primarily it is a respect for democratic procedures. Democracy is as much method as ideology. "The spirit of liberty" said Learned Hand, is the spirit that is not sure it is right.

So it allows free speech and free press and free elections. Those are some of the indications of a democratic social revolution.

When Fidel Castro appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as the leader of a victorious social revolution, someone asked him when he intended to have free elections. "There is no use in having elections," he replied, "because I will be elected over and over again." That should have alerted Americans to the difference between Senores Frei and Castro. In short, Fidel Castro does not have the requisite respect for democratic procedures.

Yet Senator FULBRIGHT doubts if that criterion always applies to a social revolution. Last March, he told the Senate:

"I * * * suggest that violent social revolutions are a possibility in countries where feudal oligarchies resist all meaningful change by peaceful means. We must not, in our preference for the democratic procedures * * * close our minds to the possibility that democratic procedures may fail in certain countries and that where democracy does fail violent social convulsions may occur."

Mr. FULBRIGHT was more specific in his speech of September 15:

"I think that in the case of the Dominican Republic we did close our minds to the causes and to the essential legitimacy of revolution in a country in which democratic procedures had failed. That, I think, is the central fact concerning the participation of the United States in the Dominican revolution and, possibly as well, its major lesson for the future."

Procedure is a definitive element of democracy. To ignore it in any appraisal of a revolution's legitimacy would be an error for any country interested in promoting democracy. The administration, in judging the Dominican situation, had to take into account these considerations:

By the time American forces landed, the man Senator FULBRIGHT considered the "legitimate successor" had left the rebel forces and taken asylum in the Colombian Embassy.

Senator FULBRIGHT says the United States should have worked with the last freely elected President of the Dominican Republic, Juan Bosch. He criticized the administration because "the U.S. Government made no effort to contact Bosch in the initial days of the crisis." But the rebel forces, for all their talk about bringing Juan Bosch back to the Dominican Republic, in fact named their commanding general President. (The provisional government installed by the United States and the Organization of American States has been instructed to hold free elections within 9 months.)

In his speech last week, Senator FULBRIGHT treated such procedural considerations as a sort of snobbishness that affects the gringos when they confront uncouth revolutionaries:

"It is not surprising that we Americans are not drawn toward the uncouth revolutionaries of the non-Communist left. We are not, as we like to claim in Fourth of July speeches, the most truly revolutionary nation on earth; we are, on the contrary, much closer to being the most unrevolutionary nation on earth."

That is a curious statement coming from a Member of the U.S. Senate during one of the most revolutionary periods in American history. One whole section of the country is undergoing a social revolution as its public schools system—one of the foundations of its society—is desegregated. And the Senate has just concluded debate on one of the most revolutionary decisions in American history: The Supreme Court ruling that from now on all representation in State legislatures must be based on population and nothing else. That these are more or less peaceful revolutions, being carried out with a general respect for law and order, does not make them any the less revolutionary or social. Those Fourth of July speeches may not be very far off base after all.

[From the Reporter, Sept. 27, 1965]

CHARITY BEGINS ABROAD

(By Max Ascoli)

The cause may well be the too-broad, bipartisan consensus that the President has assiduously cultivated for the enactment of his basic domestic reforms. As if to make him pay for it, a rash of aggravating criticisms of his major undertakings in foreign affairs has broken out from some Senators of his own party.

The latest instance has been provided once more by Senator FULBRIGHT, a high-minded man addicted to introspection and conscience-listening. He is in politics, but not quite at ease in it. To politics he mostly contributes his unhappiness—a disposition that can sometimes be beneficial if it is sparingly represented in the hierarchy of a ruling party. The latest foreign-policy pronouncements by Senator FULBRIGHT do not exempt him from the respect due him; neither do they exonerate him from criticism. Sometimes it is better when cranky opinions are formulated by a crank rather than by a thoughtful man.

In his recent attack on the administration's intervention in the Dominican crisis, he identified the cause of the mistakes and the criteria to be followed if their repetition is to be avoided. It's all exceedingly simple: we must not antagonize; indeed, we must give all our support in the hemisphere to social revolution, which seems to be the new wave of the future. "The direction of the Alliance for Progress is toward social revolution in Latin American."

If the Senator is correct, he has discovered the criterion that can allow our Government to choose among the various claimants to our support in the countries of Latin America, where, he says, "just about every reform movement is likely to attract Communist support * * *." Later on, he adds that "by supporting reform" and the Communists along with it, "we bolster the popular non-Communist left * * *." This is a truly bewildering notion which can only mean a conviction that, in the game of politics abroad, the Communists who are professional can frequently be defeated by the dilettantes of the non-Communist left. All this is strictly for alien consumption: according to Mr. FULBRIGHT, there is no taste for revolution in this country; and the Senator from Arkansas has given evidence of this with his unresponsiveness to the social reforms of the Johnson administration, sometimes called revolutions. His charity begins abroad.

The advocacy of social revolution is in no way tempered by the knowledge that ever since their premature emergence from colonialism, the countries south of the Rio Grande have suffered a surfeit of revolutions—most of them social. In our times, if the Senator is right, our country should have rushed to defend Goulart in Brazil, or Juan Perón, who, after having debauched the working classes in Argentina, is still the beneficiary of a large popular following and Communist sympathy. And even Fulgencio Batista tried his hand at social revolution and was not disliked by the Cuban Communists.

What is wrong with Senator FULBRIGHT, and with quite a number of American liberals, is an ingrained habit of abstract theorizing in terms of black and white, with little or no care for rounded historical reasoning. One of the most typical evidences of this trend was Senator FULBRIGHT's speech "Old Myths and New Realities." Since the old myths are centered on the incompatibility between the worldwide ambitions of communism and the supreme value of freedom, nothing remains but to go through an endless series of accommodations with Moscow, Peiping, or Havana at all possible levels—a singularly lunar and truly unreal picture of what is ahead of us.

Senator FULBRIGHT is not the only eminent man who voices such peculiar views on the Democratic side of the Senate. Another, equally earnest and somber, is Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD. He seems to have found his specialty in prescribing how bloodily divided countries can be patched together. The method is simplicity itself: hold a general election in which all the inhabitants will have their say, even those who have been long segregated and robotized by unchanging totalitarian regimes. There are no conditions other than a reciprocal amnesty and some kind of U.N. supervision; then the inhabitants will turn into citizens by casting their ballots, thus redeeming their right to freedom. A few years ago, still under the Eisenhower administration, the good Senator from Montana advanced a similar program for the unification of Germany, East and West.

Perhaps President Johnson could use an opposition that opposes, according to the good old Taft saying, in exchange for the soulful sermonizing by some of his distinguished former colleagues in the U.S. Senate. The problems he has to face abroad are awesome, and one piece of advice can be freely given him in the firm confidence that it is unneeded: our country may have different kinds of relations with the various Communist powers, but it should never sponsor or promote popular-front governments—in Vietnam, Germany, or anywhere else. As to the fostering of social revolutions in Latin America, let's establish a division of labor between ourselves on the one side and the followers of Marxism on the other. Our country is for good works with and for the peoples of Latin America, but is unavailable for revolutionary promiscuity.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 17, 1965]

FULBRIGHT'S FOLLY—AN IRRESPONSIBLE SPEECH

(By William S. White)

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT's attack upon the basic honesty of this Government's intervention in the Dominican Republic against the possibility of a Communist takeover has created a poignant crisis for the orderly conduct of American foreign policy.

Not in 30 years, at least, has a chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee so bitterly ranged himself against an emergency action of his Nation abroad and against so vast a majority of his own colleagues in the Senate. Wherever Senator FULBRIGHT retains influence abroad—and this influence is substantial both among the hopefully neutralist-minded and the automatic critics of any use of military force for almost any reason—the position of the United States has been dreadfully injured.

For that world still believes, not unnaturally, that Senator FULBRIGHT, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, speaks from within the high councils of this Nation. To much of that world his embittered testimony against this Government's course in Latin America is turning state's evidence and assisting the prosecution of his own side.

What is even more painfully awkward, however, is the harm that has been done, for the first time irreparably, by Senator FULBRIGHT to himself as officially the chief Democratic foreign affairs spokesman in Congress.

Already, by personal proclamations of a personal foreign policy which repeatedly harassed the late President Kennedy in world crises no less than they harass President Johnson now, Senator FULBRIGHT had gravely weakened the effective consensus of collective judgment which his committee had traditionally embodied.

Now, in the deep institutional sense he has destroyed his own voice as well. He will retain his post; but in reality he can hardly speak hereafter for more than Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas. He can hardly speak for the Foreign Relations Committee, for the administration, for the Democratic Party, or for anything save a tiny minority of the Senate in which he sits.

For it is not simply with President Johnson and Secretary of State Dean Rusk that FULBRIGHT has broken. He has also broken the unwritten rule of the game, a code which demands of those holding high committee chairmanships—and uniquely the chairmanship of foreign relations—a degree of self-restraint and personal responsibility not demanded of the rank and file.

It is a tragic case of a good man's private judgment carried to such extremes as to become alien to the controlling spirit and action of the most tolerant political forum in the world. Senatorial privilege reaches far. "Free speech"—any Senator's undoubted right to speak his full mind—has no formal limitation. It does, however, carry an unalterable qualification arising from the plain facts of life. A man may say what he wishes; but no man, not even a Senator, can claim special exemption for himself from the consequences of what he says.

Concretely, Senator FULBRIGHT's departure from the national and Senate consensus is easy to explain. At bottom, he admits that there was some Communist participation in the Dominican Republic but he argues that maybe it was not much and in any event nobody can say for certain that it would have been enough to set up another Castro Cuba in this hemisphere.

He honestly fears we are so preoccupied with the Communist peril that we are adopting "reactionary" attitudes against good revolutions as well as bad. The sad and self-evident truth, however, is that nobody bearing the ultimate and terrible responsibility to see to it that there shall never be another Castro Cuba can afford the splendid luxury of this ivory tower view. Such a luxury was, in fact, adopted as to Cuba when Fidel Castro was coming up. Its end was to carry the whole globe to the edge of nuclear holocaust. The frightful realities of the cold war do not submit to the perfectly honorable, relaxed detachment of collegiate debating exercise.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 20, 1965]

INSIDE REPORT—THE FULBRIGHT FUROR

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

One month ago, when the Johnson administration was playing midwife in the birth of a new government in Santo Domingo, Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, temporarily laid aside his scathing indictment of U.S. intervention in the bloody Dominican revolution.

FULBRIGHT's reason for delay: With the new government of U.S.-backed Hector Garcia-Godoy barely coming into its own, the highly critical analysis of U.S. actions during the late April uprising might set back the whole affair. FULBRIGHT, chairman of the once-prestigious Senate Foreign Relations Committee, decided to postpone his condemnation of U.S. policy.

But when it came last week, the Fulbright speech was just as ill-timed as it would have been a month earlier.

This was President Johnson's appraisal. When he received a copy of the speech 24 hours before its delivery in the Senate, he scanned it briefly.

His immediate complaint: FULBRIGHT's one-sided view of U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic last April would receive far more attention than it deserved (because he is Foreign Relations Committee chairman) and embarrass the future course of U.S. diplomacy in the Dominican Republic.

But in fact, remarked the President to a Senator, the Fulbright critique did not represent even a simple majority of the 19-member committee.

This raises a serious issue: In critical matters of foreign policy, how candid should a Senator of FULBRIGHT's prestige be in attacking and undermining the Government's policy in such a dangerous confrontation?

Until recently, a major controversy such as the one over U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic would have come before FULBRIGHT's committee for a long, reasoned investigation (far more thorough than the quickie probe by the Fulbright committee this summer). This, in times past, would have resulted in a committee report backed by a strong majority. But today, FULBRIGHT's 19-man committee is split into almost 19 parts, representing every shade of opinion.

As the committee has gradually increased in size to accommodate ambitious Senators (from 13 members in 1947 to 19 members today), its ability to act in unison has declined drastically.

Furthermore, FULBRIGHT is a uniquely original thinker, the antithesis of the organization man or Senate type. Under his chairmanship, the committee has succumbed to factional bickering so severe that FULBRIGHT threatened at one point to refuse to handle the foreign aid bill.

As a result, it is now every man for himself on the committee. But Chairman FULBRIGHT, as the embodiment of the Senate's unique constitutional powers in foreign affairs, still has a special responsibility to consider the results of what he says and its impact outside the United States.

In the Dominican Republic, the impact of FULBRIGHT's speech (described by Senator THOMAS E. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, as "a sweeping condemnation of U.S. policy) is predictable. With all Dominican politicians pointing to the next presidential election there, the Fulbright indictment is certain to lift the chances of the most anti-Yankee candidate in the field.

By dramatizing so harshly his own disillusion with the U.S. decision to intervene, the Senator gives the most extreme anti-U.S. political factions in the Dominican Republic a readymade presidential campaign text. The condemnation of Washington that will soon be ringing from the hustings in Santo Domingo will be flavored with the Senator's own ringing condemnation.

Nobody questions FULBRIGHT's unlimited right to condemn U.S. policy. What critics in the administration—and the Senate as well—question is his timing.

Finally, these critics challenge the Senator's disregard of the sudden chaos last April in Santo Domingo and the impressive evidence of deep Communist penetration of the rebel command.

When DODD made his reply on Thursday, the White House was concerned enough to give security clearance to a censored report on the full extent of Communist influence in the April revolt. The report alone is a compelling argument for the intervention.

But in the Dominican Republic, FULBRIGHT's attack will be remembered long after the intelligence report is forgotten.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 20, 1965]

SCHOLAR FULBRIGHT'S STRANGE LOGIC

(By David Lawrence)

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, studied as a Rhodes scholar in England and must have familiarized himself with the British parliamentary system.

If FULBRIGHT had been a member of the House of Commons and had made the same kind of speech as he delivered in the Senate the other day—saying, in effect, that the leader of the majority party had bungled in handling a grave international problem—it would have been regarded either as a call for a "vote of confidence or no confidence" by the people, or the removal of the critic himself from the councils of his party.

But political parties in the United States have no such system of discipline. FULBRIGHT will continue to hold his post as a spokesman of the Democratic Party in the Senate on foreign relations.

FULBRIGHT insists that he wasn't exactly blaming President Johnson for what he regards as a blundering policy in intervening with military force in the Dominican Republic. The Senator attributes this instead to "faulty advice" given Johnson by his advisers at the time of the crisis. The Senator doesn't say to what extent Secretary of State Dean Rusk was at fault and whether he should be removed, but the impression conveyed is that the President of the United States is either a gullible person or not as perceptive as FULBRIGHT himself would have been if he had happened to be President or Secretary of State.

FULBRIGHT is considered one of the modern "intellectuals," but his speech is a little difficult for a "nonintellectual" to understand. He says for instance:

"The question of the degree of Communist influence [in the Dominican Republic] is, therefore, crucial, but it cannot be answered with certainty. The weight of the evidence is that Communists did not participate in planning the revolution—indeed there is some indication that it took them by surprise—but that they very rapidly began to try to take advantage of it and to seize control of it. The evidence does not establish that the Communists at any time actually had control of the revolution. There is little doubt that they had influence within the revolutionary movement but the degree of that influence remains a matter of speculation. * * *

"The point I am making is not—most emphatically not—that there was no Communist participation in the Dominican crisis, but simply that the administration acted on the premise that the revolution was controlled by Communists—a premise which it failed to establish at the time and has not established since. * * *

"Intervention on the basis of Communist participation as distinguished from control of the Dominican revolution was a mistake of panic and timidity which also reflects a grievous misreading of the temper of contemporary Latin American politics."

FULBRIGHT evidently doesn't believe in fire hoses or fire apparatus being used when there's a smouldering fire but only when it has burst into flame and a property has already been virtually destroyed. He seems to have forgotten that the American policy in 1949, which assumed that a coalition in China with the Communists would be a recognition of a "social revolution," wound up with the loss of the mainland to the Communist Chinese. Similar vacillation and hesitancy on the part of the United States lost Cuba to Fidel Castro and the Communists.

FULBRIGHT concedes that a Communist-dominated government might have emerged in the Dominican Republic. He rationalizes, however, that "this might conceivably have happened, but the evidence by no means supports the conclusion that it would have happened." He declares that "we based our policy on a possibility rather than on anything approaching a likelihood."

So the Arkansas Senator feels that the judgment of President Johnson, Secretary of State Rusk and the American Ambassador who was dodging bullets on the spot in Santo Domingo was, so to speak, "faulty."

FULBRIGHT thinks that the United States shouldn't have landed troops to save American lives or to save Latin America from more of such revolutions but simply should have waited on the sidelines until the Communist mission was actually accomplished. Would it have been another fiasco like the Bay of Pigs? Only FULBRIGHT knows.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 25, 1965]

THESE DAYS—FULBRIGHT'S CHANCY BET ON HISTORY

(By John Chamberlain)

I wouldn't want to be in Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT's shoes. For, in criticizing the Johnson administration for "overreacting" in the Dominican Republic crises last April, the Senator has, in effect, tied his reputation to the assurance that the Dominican people are not in imminent danger of being taken over by Communists or Castroites.

True, history may eventually bear Senator FULBRIGHT out. But observers who are fully as qualified as any the Senator depends upon just do not go along with the Fulbright optimism.

The Senator would probably scoff at the idea that the Dominican June 14 Movement, which is Castro-oriented, represents any continuing menace to the chances for a "strong democratic government" (FULBRIGHT's own words) emerging from the election 9 months from now. Nevertheless the June 14 Movement continues to recruit youths for espionage, sabotage, and terrorism, bringing them into Santo Domingo for instruction and sending them back under discipline to the countryside to become "sleepers" in the mountains and the farming regions.

At least 3,000 trainees have gone through this mill, learning how to use radio equipment and unconventional arms. Their weapons will hardly be surrendered merely because the official agreement between the factions calls for it.

That the surrender of even the most conventional arms is extremely unlikely is proved by the behavior of the rebels in the Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin contretemps.

The rebels made surrender of arms conditional on the banishment of Wessin y Wessin from his army post and, indeed, from the country. Forced by U.S. pressure to give in to the rebels' tactical move, Wessin y Wessin stepped down.

Whereupon the rebels escalated their demands; without blinking an eye, they imposed new conditions, making surrender of arms conditional upon the removal not only of Wessin, but also of a whole group of conservative army officers.

Absurdly enough, there was never any counterdemand from the so-called "right" for the expulsion of Col. Francisco Caamano Deno as a "symbol" of rebel extremism.

FULBRIGHT, a one-sided critic, has generally applied double-standard thinking to the business of keeping any balance between left and right extremists.

He will not be exposed by events as long as groups like the June 14 movement "play it legal," as they will probably do during the 9 months of Hector Garcia-Godoy's Provisional Presidency. As long as the legal amenities are observed, the Senator will be able to maintain that the future history of the Dominican Republic is bound to conform to his hopes.

But I am putting the Senator's blast against the Johnson administration's overreaction in my prophecy file. Let's see how things turn out 9 months hence.

Surely, the Senator has not been lucky in his projections in the past. He spoke of the "myths" of Communist menace just before the Maoists became really menacing in southeast Asia.

He has treated Castroism in Cuba as a nuisance. Well, Fidel, the operator of the Cuban nuisance, continues to build high-powered radio stations for use in the effort to create other nuisances in Guatemala, Panama, and Venezuela.

This, of course, does not guarantee that Castro's words will be sufficiently heeded to result in revolutionary overturns throughout Latin America. But when FULBRIGHT dismissed Cuba as a nuisance, he risked encouraging a complacency among Americans that could easily let the nuisance get out of hand. After all, Lenin was merely a nuisance when he was sitting around the cafe tables in Geneva. But, with the quirks of history, nuisances, like other things, can escalate into something qualitatively different.

Fortunately for our sense of wariness, Senators THOMAS J. DODD and FRANK J. LAUSCHE, both belonging to FULBRIGHT's own Democratic Party, believe that it is better to overreact to Communist threats than it is to underreact.

Nine months from now, when the Dominicans choose their President, we will see whether DODD or FULBRIGHT is closer to the mark.

[From Time magazine, Sept. 24, 1965]

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC—ERRATIC ATTACK

At the close of his July hearings on U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, announced that no formal report would be issued. Last week, in a 2-hour Senate speech, Fulbright delivered his own delayed opinion—a scalding denunciation of the intervention and its portent for U.S. policy in general. FULBRIGHT's erratic attacks on the administration are no longer surprising. What made this one particularly curious was the fact that, on White House orders, he had access to every scrap of information in the files—but apparently based his conclusions more heavily on the same old highly colored newspaper reports.

FULBRIGHT called the intervention as grievous a mistake as the Bay of Pigs invasion of Communist Cuba. He accused the United States of intervening "not to save American lives, as was contended, but to prevent the victory of a revolutionary movement" wrongly judged to be Communist-dominated. President Johnson, said FULBRIGHT, reacted to "exaggerated estimates of Communist influence in the rebel movement," then overreacted by sending in 20,000 troops. To make matters worse, the United States took sides with Brig. Gen. Antonio Imbert's loyalist junta—"a corrupt and reactionary military oligarchy." Concluded FULBRIGHT: "If we are automatically to oppose any reform movement that Communists adhere to, we are likely to end up opposing every reform movement, making ourselves the prisoners of reactionaries who wish to preserve the status quo."

REFORMERS AND REDS

In the Senate, FULBRIGHT's colleagues, who had access to the same files as he, rose one after another to dispute his conclusions. Said Connecticut's Democratic Senator THOMAS J. DODD: intervention was an "unavoidable necessity." FULBRIGHT, he noted, "suffers from an indiscriminate infatuation with revolutions of all kinds—national, democratic, or Communist."

Few would question the argument that the United States should support reform and social revolution in Latin America, even if it is sometimes hard to separate the genuine reformers from the Communists. And there are still, as FULBRIGHT says, Latin Americans who cry communism to resist change. But the United States has found plenty of anti-Communists to back—anti-Communists who are also reformers. It wholeheartedly supports Chile's President's Eduardo Frei, who beat a Marxist to win office. It has committed $119 million to help Peru's Fernando Belaúnde Terry wage a social revolution that will aid millions of backlands Indians.

With U.S. help, Venezuela's left-of-center Raúl Leoni has built such a prosperous economy that he is considering his own Alianza-like program to help less-developed neighbors. Mexico's strongly independent President Gustavo Díaz Ordaz paid high compliments to U.S.-Alianza efforts in his recent state of the Nation speech. The United States is pushing hard for social reform in Guatemala, Honduras, Ecuador, Brazil, Bolivia and Paraguay, all run by authoritarian regimes that are not necessarily throwbacks to the old-line oligarchies.

AMPLE EVIDENCE

In the Dominican Republic itself, the United States was instrumental in bringing an end to the Trujillo dictatorship. In the recent crisis, U.S. policy may well have suffered from some mistakes and misinformation. But the fact remains that the country was on the verge of a bloodbath, and that the Communists were swiftly profiting from the chaos. U.S. troops, whether 5,000 or 20,000, enforced a more or less peaceful settlement—and the United States, in the end, was far tougher with the loyalist "reactionaries" than with the Communist-infiltrated rebels.

Last week, as Provisional President Héctor Garcia-Godoy completed his second week in office, 9,200 U.S. and OAS troops were still in the Dominican Republic. García-Godoy needs them there. During the revolt, the three shades of communism—the Peiping-lining Dominican Popular Movement, the Moscow-oriented Dominican Communist Party, the Castroite 14th of June Movement—controlled some 2,500 armed fighters. All three groups have been smuggling arms out of Santo Domingo to stash them in other cities and in the hills.

After FULBRIGHT's speech, President Johnson was asked how he now felt about the intervention. His reply: "I would do it all over again, only we'd have done it earlier and tougher."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Sept. 20, 1965]

SENATOR FULBRIGHT GAVE REBELS AMMUNITION

(By Virginia Prewett)

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT's attack on President Johnson's Dominican policy came in a lull when things were definitely looking better in Santo Domingo.

The moderates in the rebel camp were about to prevail on the extremists to turn in a substantial number of arms. This would have been one more tiny step forward toward stability and a chance for free elections in the Dominican Republic.

If the extremists in the rebel camp are not fired up by the Arkansas Senator's speech, it will not be the latter's fault. Everything he said was calculated to encourage the Dominican leftist extremists.

TOO MUCH

It seems almost as if the prospect of successful peace in the Dominican Republic was too much for the Senator to bear.

Senator FULBRIGHT's charges against President Johnson also came at a moment when it seems as if the United States may be winning ground in South Vietnam. Perhaps the Senator thinks too much success for U.S. foreign policy is bad for us.

The Senator's assault on Mr. Johnson deserves to be studied first of all for the way it was built up.

Mr. FULBRIGHT discounted a U.S. policy that President Johnson had revived—that of valuing endangered Americans' lives enough to send military assistance to protect them—simply by pretending that President Johnson entertained no such thought when he sent the marines into the Dominican Republic.

DEFLATION

Those Americans who have felt a little better because their President did send marines to rescue our stranded fellow countrymen in the Embajador Hotel may now feel deflated again—if they believe Senator FULBRIGHT.

Senator FULBRIGHT was quoted as saying that Latin Americans should make new arrangements with other countries, including the Communists.

The Senator owes it to the Nation to say plainly what he means by his encouragement to Latin Americans to cease cooperating with the United States.

What Senator FULBRIGHT actually appears to be espousing is tolerance of the latest Communist strategy for Latin America. This is the policy of the undeclared united front.

The situation that existed in Santo Domingo was a de facto united front between the Communists and the leaders who said they represented constitutionalism. Senator FULBRIGHT must know perfectly well what he is doing when he espouses such a combination.

What Senator FULBRIGHT is preaching is tacit U.S. agreement to allow communism's political representatives a free hand in the New World.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 15, 1965]

FULBRIGHT SEES U.S. BLUNDER IN SANTO DOMINGO—INFLATED ESTIMATES OF REDS BLAMED FOR INTERVENTION POLICY

(By Cecil Holland)

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, charged today that U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic revolt was "a grievous mistake" and was characterized by "a lack of candor."

"The danger to American lives," he said in a Senate speech, "was more the pretext than a reason for the massive U.S. intervention * * *."

The real reason, he added, was fear of a Communist takeover of that country and that decision, he said, was based on misinformation and "on exaggerated estimates of Communist influence in the rebel movement."

QUESTIONS U.S. PREMISE

FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said the administration acted on the premise that the revolution was controlled by Communists—"a premise which it failed to establish at the time and has not established since."

He placed the blame for the failure of American policy in the Dominican crisis on Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., and other American representatives who advised President Johnson on events there.

In three critical days between April 25 and April 28, FULBRIGHT said, officials sent the President exaggerated reports on the danger of a Communist takeover in Santo Domingo and, on the basis of these, recommended military intervention.

"It is not at all difficult to understand why, on the basis of such faulty advice, the President made the decisions that he made," FULBRIGHT said.

CHARGES EXAGGERATION

The Senator cited what he described as "widely exaggerated reports of massacres and atrocities" by the rebel forces. He noted that the President, in a June 14 press conference, said that "some 1,500 innocent people were murdered and shot, and their heads cut off."

"There is no evidence to support this statement," the Senator said.

FULBRIGHT said he was discussing this country's role in the Dominican crisis in the hope that the mistakes that were made by the United States can be corrected and that it will be possible to avoid them in the future.

"U.S. policy in the Dominican crisis," FULBRIGHT said, "was characterized initially by overtimidity and subsequently by overreaction. Throughout the whole affair, it has also been characterized by a lack of candor."

SEES NO EASY CHOICE

FULBRIGHT said he had made a painstaking review of the situation, but conceded his judgments were made with the benefit of hindsight. In fairness, he added, it must be conceded that there were no easy choices available to the United States.

"Nonetheless," he said, "it is the task of the diplomacy to make wise decisions when they need to be made and U.S. diplomacy failed to do so in the Dominican crisis."

FULBRIGHT said that the United States might not have changed the course of events there by acting differently. But, he added, it could be said with assurance that the United States did not take advantage of several opportunities in which it might have changed the course of events.

WARY OF BOSCH

"The reason appears to be," FULBRIGHT said, "that, very close to the beginning of the revolution, U.S. policymakers decided that it should not be allowed to succeed.

"This decision seems to have been based on exaggerated estimates of Communist influence in the rebel movement and on distaste for the return to power of Juan Bosch or a government controlled by Bosch's party, the PRD (Dominican Revolutionary Party)."

FULBRIGHT said he was raising questions and not offering an answer regarding this country's policy toward Bosch and the return to power of his party. He added that the question involves what will be the administration's attitude toward reform movements in other Latin American countries.

MUST AVOID CORRUPTION

"It is of great importance that the uncertainty as to U.S. aims in Latin America be resolved," FULBRIGHT said. "We cannot successfully advance the cause of popular democracy and at the same time align ourselves with corrupt and reactionary oligarchies; yet that is what we seem to be trying to do."

FULBRIGHT noted that every revolutionary movement is likely to attract Communist support, at least in the beginning, and the approach followed in the Dominican Republic, if pursued, "must inevitably make us the enemy of all revolutions and therefore the ally of all the unpopular and corrupt oligarchies of the hemisphere."

"We simply cannot have it both ways," he added. "We must choose between the Alliance for Progress and a foredoomed effort to sustain the status quo in Latin America."

In some respects, FULBRIGHT said, the Dominican story "acquired some of the inevitability of a Greek tragedy."

When the revolution began, the Senator pointed out, the United States had three options: It could have supported the Reid Cabral government; it could have supported the revolutionary forces, or it could do nothing.

The administration, he said, chose to do nothing.

The next crucial point came on April 27, FULBRIGHT said, when Ambassador Bennett rejected an appeal by rebel leaders to mediate and seek a cease-fire, on grounds that this would have been intervention.

"Mediation at that point might have been accomplished quietly and peacefully," FULBRIGHT said. "Twenty-four hours later the Ambassador was pleading for the marines, and ever since the United States has been intervening up to its eyebrows."

He blamed this mistake on the feeling of officials there on the basis of evidence which was fragmentary at best that the rebels were dominated by Communists. He pointed out that the situation rapidly deteriorated and that the head of a military junta, which had been assembled, was told that the United States would not intervene unless is was to protect American lives.

PRETEXT IS CHARGED

That was eventually done on such a pretext, FULBRIGHT said.

"In fact, no American lives were lost in Santo Domingo until the marines began exchanging fire with the rebels after April 28; reports of widespread shooting that endangered American lives turned out to be greatly exaggerated."

FULBRIGHT said the United States would have been justified in landing a small force for the express purpose of removing U.S. citizens and other foreigners, and then withdrawing such a force when it had completed its mission.

"Intervention on the basis of Communist participation as distinguished from the control of the Dominican revolution was a mistake of panic and timidity which also reflects a grievous misreading of the temper of contemporary Latin American politics," FULBRIGHT said. "Communists are present in all Latin American countries, and they are going to inject themselves into almost any Latin American revolution and try to seize control of it."

HELPED BUILD JUNTA

The Senator said from the time the Reid government resigned, U.S. policy was directed toward the construction of a military junta and against the return of Bosch and the success of the rebel movement.

"One is led, therefore, to the conclusion that U.S. policymakers were unduly timid and alarmish in refusing to gamble on the forces of reform and social change," FULBRIGHT said.

"The bitter irony of such timidity is that by casting its lot with the forces of the status quo * * * the United States almost certainly helped the Communists to acquire converts whom they otherwise could not have won."

[From the Latin American Times, Sept. 16, 1965]

DOMINICAN ACTION BLASTED—FULBRIGHT SAYS INTERVENTION COMPROMISED U.S. HONOR

(By John T. Skelly, Latin American Times Washington bureau)

WASHINGTON, September 15.—Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, today in effect accused President Johnson and his advisers of compromising the "word and honor" of the United States before the eyes of Latin American countries by intervening in the Dominican Republic in April.

Senator FULBRIGHT, in an 11,000-word speech delivered on the floor of the Senate, charged that "the United States intervened forcibly in the Dominican Republic in the last week of April 1965, not to save American lives, as was then contended, but to prevent the victory of a revolutionary movement which was judged to be Communist-dominated. The decision to land marines on April 28 was based primarily on the fear of 'another Cuba' in Santo Domingo."

Senator FULBRIGHT said that the United States violated its commitment to Latin America not to intervene in the internal affairs of their countries as provided by article 1 of the Charter of the Organization of American States.

"The Inter-American system is rooted in an implicit contract between the Latin American countries and the United States. In return for our promise not to interfere in their internal affairs, they have tacitly agreed to remain members of our 'sphere' and to support, or at least not to obstruct, our global policies.

"VIOLATED BARGAIN

"In the Dominican Republic we violated our part of the bargain; it remains to be seen whether Latin Americans will now feel free to violate theirs," Senator FULBRIGHT said.

He did not absolve President Johnson from being the man responsible for the order to intervene. However, the Senator, a close friend of the President, made it clear that the President, in effect, was sold a bill of goods by his immediate advisers, primarily the U.S. Ambassador in the Dominican Republic, W. Tapley Bennett.

"Responsibility for the failure of American policy in Santo Domingo lies primarily with those who advised the President * * *. It is not at all difficult to understand why, on the basis of such faulty advice, the President made the decisions that he made," Senator FULBRIGHT said.

Stating his position after long and careful study of what happened, he said that "my own feeling is that the situation in any case did not justify military intervention except for the limited purpose of evacuating U.S. citizens and other foreigners, but even if it did, we should not have undertaken it without the advance consent of our Latin American allies."

"We should not have done so because the word and honor of the United States were at stake just as much—at least as much—in the Dominican crisis as they are in Vietnam and Korea and Berlin and all the places around the globe which we have committed ourselves to defend," he said.

ENCOURAGED DISORDER

Senator FULBRIGHT pointed out that by intervening in the Dominican Republic "unilaterally—and illegally" we violated the basis of the U.S. system which is respect for law.

"When we violate the law ourselves, whatever short-term advantage may be gained, we are obviously encouraging others to violate the law; we thus encourage disorder and instability and thereby do incalculable damage to our long-term interests."

Senator FULBRIGHT expressed regret that there are still those who believe that the principle of nonintervention in Latin America is obsolete. He said:

"Most Latin Americans would argue that, far from being obsolete the principle of nonintervention was and remains the heart and core of the inter-American system. Insofar as it is honored, it provides them with something that many in the United States find it hard to believe they could suppose they need—protection from the United States."

He said that the idea held by many North Americans that the United States can intervene in Latin America with "good intentions" when the United States thinks it convenient comes as a shock to Latin Americans.

"The trouble with this view is that it is not shared with our neighbors to the south * * * 'good intentions' are not a very sound basis for judging the fulfillment of contractual obligations," he said. "Just about everybody, including the Communists, believes in his own 'good intentions.' "

DOMINICAN TRAGEDY

Senator FULBRIGHT said that "the tragedy of Santo Domingo is that a policy that purported to defeat communism in the short run is more likely to have the effect of promoting it in the long run.

"Intervention in the Dominican Republic has alienated—temporarily or permanently, depending on our future policies—our real friends in Latin America.

"These broadly, are the people of the democratic left—the Christian and Social Democrats in a number of countries, the APRA in Peru, the Accion Democratica Party in Venezuela, and their kindred spirits throughout the hemisphere."

Senator FULBRIGHT repeated continually throughout his speech that by "our intervention on the side of the corrupt, military oligarchy in the Dominican Republic, we have embarrassed before their own people the Democratic reformers who have counseled trust and partnership with the United States.

"We have lent credence to the idea that the United States is the enemy of social revolution in Latin America and that the only choice Latin Americans have is between communism and reaction."

MAY BE FORCED TO COMMUNISM

Referring to the choice that Latin Americans will make if they are denied the right to carry out social revolutions he said:

"If those are the available alternatives, if there is no democratic action left as a third option, then there is no doubt of the choice that honest and patriotic Latin Americans will make—they will choose communism, not because they want it but because U.S. policy will have foreclosed all other avenues of social revolution and, indeed, all other possibilities except the perpetuation of rule by military juntas and economic oligarchies."

Senator FULBRIGHT said that as a result of the Dominican Republic action "The United States has allowed itself to become associated with both reaction at home and domination from abroad.

"We have thereby offended the dignity and self-respect of young idealistic Latin Americans who must now wonder whether the United States will one day intervene against social revolutions in their own countries, whether one day they will find themselves facing U.S. marines across barricades in their own hometowns."

He expressed conviction, however, that President Johnson "and indeed, most U.S. citizens are sure, that our country is not now and will not become an enemy of social revolutions in Latin America."

"MADE A MISTAKE"

"We have made a mistake in the Dominican Republic as we did at the Bay of Pigs in 1961, but a single misjudgment does not constitute a 'doctrine' for the conduct of future policy and we remain dedicated to the goals of the Alliance for Progress."

He pointed out that "we know this ourselves" but wondered whether or not "our friends in Latin America" will understand that their social revolutions will have U.S. sympathy and support.

Senator FULBRIGHT said that if the United States follows the creative approach of the Alliance for Progress that someday "the Dominican affair will be relegated in history to the status of a single unhappy episode on the long road toward the forging of a new and creative and dignified relationship between the United States and Latin America."

SEEK OTHER RELATIONS

Senator FULBRIGHT ended his speech that took 2 hours to deliver by suggesting that it would be beneficial for Latin Americans to cut the umbilical cord by which they are tied to the United States and seek closer relations with other countries, "and with Communist countries if they wish."

"The first step toward stronger ties between Latin America and the United States would be the creation of a situation in which Latin American countries would be free, and would feel free, to maintain or sever existing ties as they see fit and, perhaps more important, to establish new arrangements both among themselves and with nations outside the hemisphere, in which the United States would not participate."

He praised Chilean President Eduardo Frei for having taken the initiative by visiting European leaders in July to establish new political, economic and cultural ties.

"I think this is an intelligent and constructive step," Senator FULBRIGHT concluded.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Sept. 16, 1965]

LATIN POLICY IS CRITICIZED BY FULBRIGHT—DOMINICAN INTERVENTION "MISTAKE" BLAMED ON BAD ADVICE, ENVOY

(By Joseph R. L. Sterne)

WASHINGTON, September 15.—Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat of Arkansas, said today that the U.S. military intervention in the Dominican Republic last April was a "grievous mistake" caused by officials who exaggerated the danger of a Communist takeover.

FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, carefully exonerated President Johnson, saying that the President was the victim of faulty advice.

But he was highly critical of Ambassador William Tapley Bennett, charging that Bennett failed to seize early opportunities to bring about a cease-fire in the hope that Dominican militarists would crush the left-wing uprising.

"DEEP" DISTRUST FOUND

FULBRIGHT warned that the intervention Bennett subsequently arranged had provoked "deep and widespread" distrust of the United States among young social reformers who will control the political future of Latin America.

While most of these reformers are non-Communists whose goals are similar to those of the Alliance for Progress, FULBRIGHT said U.S. support of the status quo and "reactionary oligarchies" could drive them to communism.

The Senator's hour-long speech drew angry retorts from Senator LONG, Democrat of Louisiana, and Senator SMATHERS, Democrat of Florida, who contended that the President's prompt action had forestalled Communist efforts to seize the Dominican Republic in the same manner that Fidel Castro seized Cuba.

WHITE HOUSE SUMMONS

FULBRIGHT's criticisms from hindsight were unfair, they suggested, since he had not objected to the impending landing of marines when he was summoned to the White House along with other congressional leaders on the night of April 28.

At the White House this afternoon it was emphasized that President Johnson still has the high regard for Ambassador Bennett that he publicly mentioned during the height of the Dominican crisis,

Bill D. Moyers, presidential press secretary, said he personally had read the Fulbright speech and then talked "to a number of Government officials, career and otherwise, who simply do not believe the Senator's conclusions were justified."

Moyers declined to say whether the President was one of the officials he had consulted and said he did not know if Mr. Johnson was pleased or displeased.

FULBRIGHT's speech was based, in part, on evidence gathered by his committee during a series of closed hearings with Bennett and other officials who hold high positions in U.S. policy toward Latin America.

So deeply divided was the committee at the conclusion of this investigation that the idea of publishing a report was abandoned.

SUPPORT BY MORSE

FULBRIGHT's critical view of the Dominican operation and his fear that the United States is alienating the non-Communist left in Latin America reportedly are shared by some liberal members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Among those placed in this category today by a knowledgeable source were Senators SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho, PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island, MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont.

Of this group, Senator Clark took the floor to say that he was in complete accord with Fulbright's "sound and wise" speech.

Among the Foreign Relations Committee members who are said to be fully behind the President's Dominican policy are Senators Lausche, Democrat, of Ohio, Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, Hickenlooper, Republican, of Iowa, Mundt, Republican, of South Dakota, and Long.

Dodd said he would reply to Fulbright tomorrow, thus indicating the Senate may have a second day of the kind of give-and-take debate that has been notably absent in the set speeches on Vietnam.

Fulbright launched his attack today by charging that there had been a "lack of candor" about United States actions during the entire Dominican operation.

Officials responsible, he said, were so panicky at the thought of "another Cuba" that they exaggerated both the danger to United States citizens and the extent of Communist influence in the rebel movement.

OAS PREFERRAL BACKED

As a result, the Senator continued, President Johnson was supplied with faulty and unreliable information that left him no choice but to order the intervention.

Fulbright was less gentle, however, in assessing the President's role after the decision to intervene.

He faulted the administration for failing to place the matter before the Organization of American States before the landing of the marines.

He noted that the "pretext" of sending in troops to safeguard American citizens had to be replaced by the anti-Communist argument to justify the intervention. And he said the number of troops sent in was so large that the United States found it difficult to extricate itself from a situation where it had intervened "up to its eyebrows."

Fulbright said he had no doubts about the President's personal belief in the social reform goals of the Alliance for Progress, noting that Mr. Johnson had recently equated the Alliance with his own Great Society program.

But the Foreign Relations Committee chairman expressed deep concern over what he characterized as a drift to the right among United States officials who have a policymaking role in Latin America.

In the Dominican Republic itself, Fulbright observed, the United States had moved from a position of supporting the social reformer, Juan Bosch, in the 1963 elections to opposing a "legitimate" revolution to restore him to the office 2 years later.

"UNCERTAINTY" DECRIED

What is more important, the Senator went on, there have been signs that the United States may be getting into a position of repelling instead of luring the vigorous social reform movements evident throughout Latin America.

Citing a preoccupation with anticommunism among some United States diplomats and with "counterinsurgency" in the Pentagon, Fulbright said:

"It is of great importance that the uncertainty as to United States aims in Latin America be resolved.

"We cannot successfully advance the cause of popular democracy and at the same time aline ourselves with corrupt and reactionary oligarchies; yet that is what we seem to be trying to do.

"SOCIAL REVOLUTION FORESEEN

"The movement of the future in Latin America is social revolution. The question is whether it is to be Communist or democratic revolution, and the choice which the Latin American makes will depend in part on how the United States uses its great influence.

"It should be very clear that the choice is not between social revolution and conservative oligarchy but whether, by supporting reform, we bolster the popular non-Communist left or whether, by supporting unpopular oligarchies, we drive the rising generation of educated and patriotic young Latin Americans to an embittered and hostile form of communism like that of Fidel Castro in Cuba."

Since the intervention is a fact, Fulbright said, the presence of OAS forces should be used to curb the power of Dominican militarists.

"BRIDGES" TO WORLD ASKED

In this way, he contended, the United States might begin the process of winning back the support of young reformers throughout the hemisphere.

The Senator also said the United States should begin loosening its ties with Latin American countries and encouraging them to "build bridges" with nations in Europe, Africa, Asia, and even in the Communist bloc.

Once freed from a too-close relationship with the United States, he contended, they would become less resentful and suspicious of this country.

The Fulbright statements that caused the greatest immediate controversy concerned Bennett's actions during the crisis and the degree of Communist involvement in the uprising.

The Senator charged that the Ambassador was against Bosch and the left-wing rebel movement.

Hence, he said, Bennett had not seized an opportunity to end the fighting when it appeared the conservative elements would win handily.

EXAGGERATION CHARGED

When rebel fighting continued Fulbright added, the Ambassador secured President Johnson's decision to intervene by exaggerating the danger to American citizens and the degree of Communist influence in the rebel movement.

Fulbright insisted that the Communists had no part in the early planning of the reformers' revolution and at no time controlled it.

The irony of the situation, he said, is that the United States foreclosed all opportunity to compete with the Communists within the rebel movement and, instead, engaged in actions that produced "Communist converts" in Latin America.

CUBA TAKEOVER CITED

Senators Long and Smathers took up Fulbright on this point by recalling the experience in Cuba where a small number of hardcore Communists took over a rebel movement that had its origins among liberals and social democrats.

They said President Johnson was correct in preventing a repetition of the Cuban takeover by intervening quickly and massively in the Dominican Republic.

The wisdom of the President's policy, they added, lies in the fact that a coalition government free of Communist influence now exists in Santo Domingo.

During the fiery exchange between Long, who is Democratic whip, and Fulbright, the Democratic chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Dirksen, the Republican leader, strode in the Chamber.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 18, 1965]

Fulbright, Dodd Clash in Foreign-Policy Debate

(By Richard L. Strout)

Washington.—The most clear-cut foreign-policy debate of this session of Congress now is underway.

The strongest voice on foreign affairs in the U.S. Senate, J. W. Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, has delivered what amounts to a scathing attack on the Johnson administration's handling of the Dominican Republic crisis.

And a formidable debater on the other side, Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, has delivered a sharp counterattack, in effect implying that Mr. Fulbright is soft on communism.

Both Senators are Democrats. It is notable that the debate is being carried on by two members of President Johnson's own party.

INTERVENTION ASSESSED

Republicans overwhelmingly support President Johnson in his massive intervention in Santo Domingo. During the Fulbright-Dodd clash they sat hugging themselves to see the majority party sharply splintered.

The issue is of great and, perhaps, paramount importance in future U.S. relations with Latin America.

Both Messrs. Fulbright and Dodd deplore and loathe the communism, but the first contend that the circumstances of massive U.S. intervention in Santo Domingo actually aided communism; the second contends that intervention was justified because it headed off a potential Castro-like takeover and, by inference, is the formula that should be applied in other like circumstances.

The essence of the Fulbright criticism is in two statements:

"The approach followed in the Dominican Republic, if consistently pursued, must inevitably make us the enemy of all revolutions, and, therefore, the ally of all the unpopular and corrupt oligarchies of the hemisphere."

And further:

"And the question inevitably arises whether this shift in the administration's attitude toward the Dominican Republic is part of a broader shift in its attitude toward other Latin American countries."

FULBRIGHT CRITICIZED

Mr. Dodd, in reply, massed counterevidence to argue that Communists were taking control of Santo Domingo. He said:

"I therefore consider it all the more regrettable that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. Fulbright], with the great prestige that attaches to his position, has seen fit to reopen the entire issue in this tendentious manner."

He added:

"I am certain that his speech will be picked up and played heavily by every Communist and crypto-Communist and fellow traveler and anti-American leftist who wheels a pen in the Latin American press."

STATEMENT UNEXPECTED

Chairman Fulbright is somewhat of an oddity in the United States Senate. A former Rhodes scholar and college president, he tends to be studious in his approach and normally avoids toe-to-toe debate. He has not directly attacked President Johnson. Even in this instance he assailed Mr. Johnson's "advisers," not the Chief Executive. It is known that he feels he may have more influence in this approach.

On the other hand, Mr. Fulbright has seen his prized committee attacked for what has been called failure to explore and debate big foreign issues. In this instance he found the committee apparently unable to bring in a report on Santo Domingo after days of evidence, which convinced him of the importance of forming judgment.

So, in characteristic manner, without advance warning to the press, with little or no notice to the White House, before a handful of Senators and in a rather low voice September 15, he delivered his lengthy indictment, fully aware that it would bring the kind of attack upon his judgment and even Americanism which it actually provoked.

"U.S. policy is the Dominican crisis," he said, "was characterized initially by overtimidity, and subsequently by overreaction."

POINTS OF ACCORD

In violation of treaty obligations not to intervene, Mr. Fulbright charged, the United States did intervene. It thereby pushed what he considers to be the inevitable social revolution in Latin America toward communism as against more moderate development.

"It is the revolutionaries of the non-Communist left," he contended, "who have most of the popular support in Latin America."

Messrs. Fulbright and Dodd are alike in this: they both oppose communism; both say that communism cannot be defeated by siding with landowners, dictators, and tyrants; and they both feel that in the latter stage of the Dominican crisis, at least, some intervention was justified, as a minimum to save American lives.

ATTACK UNPARALLELED

But Senator Fulbright attacks Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., Senator Dodd praises him; Mr. Fulbright minimizes Communist influence in the rebel movement, Mr. Dodd charges it was Communist-dominated; Mr. Fulbright says the rest of Latin America has recoiled from massive U.S. intervention, Mr. Dodd thinks American action has won substantial support.

Senator Dodd's personal attack on Senator Fulbright for what was called "softness" toward communism is almost unparalleled against a chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 17, 1965]

Supporters of U.S. Dominican Stance Lower Boom on Fulbright's Criticism

(By John M. Goshko)

Senator J. William Fulbright's characterization of the Dominican Republic intervention as a "grievous mistake" came under heavy attack yesterday by Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, who called the U.S. action an "unavoidable necessity."

In a lengthy Senate speech, Dodd charged that Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, had ignored a mass of evidence supporting the correctness of President Johnson's dispatch of troops to Santo Domingo last April.

Dodd's speech was the principal thrust in a multipronged counterattack that proadministration figures began mounting against Fulbright yesterday.

On Wednesday, Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, charged that the U.S. intervention had resulted from a panicky overestimation of Communist strength among the Dominican rebels, had placed the United States on the side of rightwing forces and had thus damaged U.S. prestige among progressive forces in Latin America.

Most of the resultant furor that sprang up yesterday was centered on Capitol Hill—and most of it was directed against Fulbright. Among those defending the administration were Senate Republican Leader Everett Dirksen, of Illinois, House Republican Leader Gerald Ford, of Michigan, Senator Russell B. Long, Democrat, of Louisiana, Senator George A. Smathers, Democrat, of Florida, and Senator Clifford P. Case, Republican, of New Jersey.

Backing for Fulbright came from Senator Joseph S. Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, who found Fulbright's views "overdue, sound, and wise," and Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, who supported Fulbright "100 percent."

Within the administration itself, most officials took a flat "no comment" position. Privately, however, they made no secret of their anger at Fulbright and implied that Dodd's reply had the tacit blessing of the administration.

The sole exception to this "no comment" stance was Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, who described Fulbright's criticism of U.S. Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett as "an unfair attack on a very dedicated and very able Foreign Service officer."

McNamara also said there was "no question in my mind" that U.S. citizens in the Dominican Republic had been endangered by the revolution. But he did not answer Fulbright's assertion that U.S. officials had overestimated the Communist threat.

Dodd, a close friend of President Johnson, charged Fulbright with a "tolerance of communism" and said he "suffers from an indiscriminate infatuation with revolutions of all kinds, national, democratic, or Communist."

The Connecticut Senator agreed with Fulbright that the United States cannot beat communism by siding with rightist elements in Latin America and that the "best hope for the future * * * lies with the parties of the so-called democratic left."

However, he argued, the situation in the Dominican Republic, when judged by any criteria, showed a danger of a Communist takeover and required direct action.

To buttress this contention, Dodd cited State Department estimates of Communist strength within the rebel leadership, the views of John Bartlow Martin, former U.S. Ambassador in Santo Domingo, and the report of a five-member Organization of American States Commission that visited Santo Domingo shortly after the U.S. intervention.

The OAS Commission's report stated that Santo Domingo was in a state of anarchy in the days after the revolution's outbreak and that the rebel ranks included several pro-Castro figures. However, the report does not state outright that the rebel movement was Communist-controlled; and there has been considerable controversy about whether the Commission intended to imply that it was.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 16, 1965]

Compares It to Bay of Pigs—Fulbright Criticizes Johnson on Dominican Intervention

(By Dom Bonafede)

Washington.—In a blistering critique on U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic, Senator J. William Fulbright yesterday charged the administration with committing an illegal, monumental blunder comparable to the 1961 Bay of Pigs fiasco in Cuba.

During a speech delivered on the Senate floor, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee maintained that the unilateral U.S. action of last April was characterized by timidity, overreaction and a lack of candor.

He contended that the April 28 decision by President Johnson to send in the marines purportedly to protect American lives was based on exaggerated estimates of the role played by Communists during the Dominican crisis.

"The danger to American lives was more a pretext than a reason for the massive U.S. intervention," Senator Fulbright declared.

HARDEST

The speech by the Arkansas Democrat constituted the hardest-hitting attack against the U.S. action in the Dominican Republic by a member of the Presidents own party.

In all probability, the Senator's statements will be used as ammunition by Republicans in upcoming elections. On Tuesday former Vice President Richard M. Nixon said in Washington that the Republicans are likely to make foreign policy an issue in the 1966 and 1968 campaigns.

Without saying so flatly, White House spokesmen indicated that the President was piqued by Senator Fulbright's remarks.

MOYERS

Presidential Press Secretary Bill D. Moyers told newsmen, "I talked to a number of officials in Government * * * who simply do not believe the Senator's conclusions are justified."

Asked if they included the President, Mr. Moyers simply replied, "a number of officials."

Senator Fulbright tempered his criticism of Mr. Johnson by centering his attack on U.S. Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett and unidentified U.S. policymakers.

"On the basis of the information and counsel he received, the President could hardly have acted other than he did; it is very difficult to understand, however, why so much unsound advice was given him," the Senator remarked.

He disputed claims made by the United States that it had intervened to save American lives; that U.S. troops in Santo Domingo were neutral in the struggle between rebel forces supporting former President Juan Bosch and so-called government loyalists, and that moderate elements among the rebels sought asylum in foreign embassies because Communists had seized control of their ranks.

According to Senator Fulbright, "In midafternoon of April 28, Col. Pedro Bartolome Benoit, head of a junta which had been hastily assembled, asked again, this time in writing, for U.S. troops on the ground that this was the only way to prevent a Communist takeover. No mention was made of the junta's inability to protect American lives.

"This request was denied in Washington, and Benoit was thereupon told that the United States would not intervene unless he said he could not protect American citizens present in the Dominican Republic. Benoit was thus told in effect that if he said American lives were in danger the United States would intervene. And that is precisely what happened."

On April 28, 4 days after the fall of Dominican President Donald Reid Cabral, Mr. Johnson announced on television he was ordering in the marines to protect Americans. He made no mention of pro-Communist forces being involved. The New York Herald Tribune, however, reported that the unilateral action was being taken because the administration feared a Castroite takeover.

It was not until the following Sunday that the President first publicly mentioned the supposed Communist threat.

Senator Fulbright stated rebel leaders on April 27, called at the American Embassy "seeking mediation and negotiations" but were rebuffed by Ambassador Bennett, who interpreted mediation as a form of intervention.

"Twenty-hour hours later the ambassador was pleading for the marines, and ever since the United States has been intervening up to its eyebrows," the Senator said.

CHARTER

The Senator said the U.S. military action violated a provision of the Charter of the Organization of American States (OAS) which prohibits unilateral intervention by members.

"The administration has argued that there was no time to consult the OAS, although there was time to 'consult'—or inform—the congressional leadership. The United States thus intervened in the Dominican Republic unilaterally—and illegally," he declared.

By such action, he said, "we thus encourage disorder and instability and thereby do incalculable damage to our own long-term interests."

The Dominican "venture," he said, alienated "real friends" of the United States in Latin America, interrupted the social democratic revolution in the hemisphere and promoted communism by revealing a policy which inherently supports military dictators and ruling oligarchies.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 17, 1965]

FULBRIGHT ASSAILS JOHNSON

(By Saville R. Davis)

WASHINGTON.—The personal power of the Presidency, and the characteristically stern use of it by Lyndon B. Johnson on many occasions, are under fresh discussion here as the result of the Dominican revolution.

President Johnson has tenaciously insisted that everything was done right, and that nothing was done wrong by his administration, in the Dominican crisis. His claim has now been severely challenged.

Two separate developments in the past fortnight contradicted Mr. Johnson's position.

One was an event. The President was forced to overthrow the military leadership in Santo Domingo that his administration had favored and supported with troops and money at the start of the incident.

FULBRIGHT CRITICISM

The other was a verbal assault launched at the President's espousal of Dominican military figures from the Trujillo dictatorship. J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said the United States had thereby alined itself with a "corrupt and reactionary oligarchy."

Unless this was recognized as a "mistake" and not repeated, he said, the actions of the United States would increase the power of communism in the hemisphere instead of reduce it.

Unless the United States supported political moderates, Senator FULBRIGHT continued, the choice would be between reaction and communism. The embittered forces of democratic reform in the Americas, in his judgment, would choose communism.

MEMBERS HOLD BACK

Several members of the Foreign Relations Committee at once disassociated themselves from the FULBRIGHT statement. It was asserted that the chairman spoke for himself. The White House was officially silent, discussing a rebuttal.

It was generally agreed in Washington, openly as well as privately, that the Fulbright statement could be the most serious challenge President Johnson has yet faced.

It began with the Senator's statement that U.S. policy in this affair has been characterized "throughout" by a "lack of candor." This was taken as a direct reference to the refusal of the President to discuss the incident on other than his own terms, and to what one critic called his "high-handed beating down of any criticism."

METHODS ASSAILED

There has been a rising undercurrent of concern here at the personal domination of discussion and maneuvering which has been the counterpart of the President's successes in establishing a "consensus" in domestic affairs and foreign policy. It affects lesser officials, the press, and politicians alike.

The President's supporters consider this a drawback in an otherwise successful presidency, and his opponents suggest that it is an abuse of power and may undo him. Both groups, however, have become more restive as the President has ridden higher.

"The President has effectively managed to smother a really useful national debate on this issue," said one critic, "and the public needs it. Few people are aware, for example, that while vehemently rejecting any criticism of his support for the Dominican military junta, Mr. Johnson has worked through the OAS [Organization of American States] to terminate its power over the democratic forces there."

It is noted here that Senator FULBRIGHT has ended his conspicuous restraint in criticism of the President up to now. He explained to this correspondent among others that he did not wish to upset the applecart in a period of national crisis and that he felt a responsibility to support the President.

DEBATE EXPECTED

In this case he waited until the heat of the crisis subsided. But he did not deal gently with Mr. Johnson, apart from the polite device of blaming the President's advisers. He struck with what is being ranked as unparalleled force, since Mr. Johnson became President, at a policy sternly carried out and defended by the President himself.

The Fulbright document in its entirety is a root and branch condemnation of the Johnson policy in the Dominican incident. It will be hotly debated. Approval and disapproval already have begun to follow the lines of battle that long since have been established over the degree of the Communist danger in Santo Domingo and the best method of dealing with it.

But on the fact that this is a full-scale challenge directly to President Johnson himself, no dissent is expected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT says he believes the United States could have intervened briefly, to save American lives, and then sought to help the moderates organize themselves and to keep power out of Communist hands—instead of turning against the "only available forces of democracy and social reform."

Unless corrected, the Senator said, this policy would serve notice on all reform movements in the hemisphere, which inevitably attract the Communists, that the United States was against them.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 16, 1965]

DOMINICAN ROLE OF UNITED STATES IS ASSAILED—FULBRIGHT CRITICISM REKINDLES DISPUTE OVER INTERVENTION

(By John M. Goshko)

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, yesterday attacked the United States intervention in the Dominican Republic as a "grievous mistake" characterized "initially by overtimidity and subsequently by overaction."

FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, charged that the U.S. action was the result of "faulty advice given to the President by his representatives in the Dominican Republic at the time of acute crisis."

Speaking for more than an hour on the Senate floor, FULBRIGHT delivered the most far-reaching and scathing criticism of the Dominican intervention that has been uttered by a U.S. official to date. Because of his prestige and influence, the speech is certain to rekindle the controversy that broke out last April when President Johnson ordered 24,000 U.S. troops into the midst of the Dominican revolution.

PARALLEL DRAWN

FULBRIGHT drew a parallel between the Dominican intervention and the U.S. commitment to Vietnam, saying:

"We are currently fighting a war in Vietnam, largely, we are told, because it would be a disaster if the United States failed to honor is word and its commitment. I do not see why it is any less a matter of vital interest to honor a clear and explicit treaty obligation in the Americas."

He was referring to the Organization of American States Charter, which explicitly forbids OAS members to intervene in the internal affairs of any American republic.

Pointing to Latin American fears that the United States is obsessed with fear of communism, he cited the Defense Department's preoccupation with counterinsurgency projects such as the controversial Project Camelot. These studies, FULBRIGHT said, "claim to be scientific but beneath their almost unbelievably opaque language lies as unmistakable military and reactionary bias."

TESTIMONY TAKEN

FULBRIGHT said he had reached his conclusions about the Dominican situation after listening to the testimony taken by the Foreign Relations Committee in a series of closed hearings during July.

Charging the administration with "a lack of candor," the Senator said, "The danger to American lives was more the pretext than a reason for the massive U.S. intervention."

The real reason, he asserted, was the administration's fear of a Communist takeover—a fear based on "exaggerated estimates of Communist influence in the rebel movement."

These "exaggerated estimates," FULBRIGHT said, were the fault of W. Tapley Bennett, U.S. Ambassador in Santo Domingo, and other U.S. officials on the scene. He charged that during the early days of the revolution last April, they sent Washington reports based on misjudgment of the facts, inadequate evidence, and false information.

"It is not at all difficult to understand why, on the basis of such faulty advice, the President made the decisions that he made," FULBRIGHT said.

Because of this, he charged, the United States lost the opportunity to channel the course of the revolution toward an immediate restoration of Dominican democracy. As a result, he said, the United States both alienated mass opinion in Latin America and placed itself in the position of abetting rightwing, militaristic forces in the Dominican Republic.

"It cannot be said with assurance that the United States could have changed the course of events by acting differently," he asserted. "What can be said with assurance is that the United States did not take advantage of several opportunities in which it might have changed the course of events.

"The reason appears to be that, very close to the beginning of the revolution, U.S. policymakers decided that it should not be allowed to succeed. This decision seems to me to have been based on exaggerated estimates of Communist influence in the rebel movement and on distaste for the return to power of Juan Bosch (former Dominican president) or a government controlled by Bosch's party, the PRD (Dominican Revolutionary Party)."

This hostility toward the rebels, he said, seemed based partly on the official U.S. view that Bosch had been an incompetent president before he was deposed by a military coup in 1963. Even more, he added, U.S. diplomats and officials appeared to be motivated by fears that they might be held responsible for "another Cuba" in Santo Domingo.

In summarizing his views on what happened in Washington and Santo Domingo during late April and early May, the Senator made seven specific points.

1. The United States intervened "not to save American lives, as was then contended, but to prevent the victory of a revolutionary movement which was judged to be Communist-dominated."

2. Although there is no doubt that Communists joined the Dominican rebels, the evidence offered the Foreign Relations Committee by the administration does not support "the assertion that the rebels were Communist-dominated or certain to become so."

3. "The United States let pass its best opportunities to influence the course of events." These occurred on April 25, when the PRD requested United States presence, and on April 27, when the rebels, believing themselves defeated, requested U.S. mediation for a negotiated settlement.

FULBRIGHT said the first request apparently was rejected because of Johnson administration hostility toward Bosch and the PRD and the second because "Ambassador Bennett and the U.S. Government anticipated and desired a victory of the antirebel forces."

4. U.S. policy toward the Dominican Republic shifted markedly to the right between September, 1963 (the date of Bosch's ouster) and April 1965. "Thus the United States turned its back on social revolution in Santo Domingo and associated itself with a corrupt and reactionary military oligarchy."

5. "U.S. policy was marred by a lack of candor and by misinformation." In this respect, FULBRIGHT recalled that Mr. Johnson asserted on June 17 that "some 1,500 innocent people were murdered and shot, and their heads cut off." There is, FULBRIGHT said, no evidence to support this statement.

6. "Responsibility for the failure of American policy lies primarily with those who advised the President"—who in the critical early days sent reports exaggerating the Communist danger and who then recommended military intervention.

7. The fear of "another Cuba" in the Caribbean and its "possible effects on the careers of those who might be held responsible" seems to have been "the most important single factor in distorting the judgment of otherwise sensible and competent men."

After he finished speaking, FULBRIGHT was challenged sharply by the assistant Democratic leader, Senator RUSSELL B. LONG of Louisiana, and by Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida.

LONG disputed FULBRIGHT'S contention that the United States will jeopardize its standing in Latin America if it opposes any radical reform movement because it might have Communist support. So long as there is a hint or a possible Communist takeover, LONG asserted, the United States must move against it.

SMATHERS agreed saying: "What's wrong with trying to save a country from communism? What we ought to be doing is applauding the President as, thank God, 85 percent of the American people have done."

At the White House, Presidential Press Secretary Bill D. Moyers said he had talked to a number of officials "who simply do not believe that the Senator's views are justified." FULBRIGHT, Moyers added, seemed to be expressing his personal opinions and was not speaking for the Foreign Relations Committee.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 16, 1965]

WESSIN VOWS TO FORM ORGANIZATION OF EXILES

MIAMI, FLA., September 15.—Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin said today he would go to Puerto Rico soon to try and organize Dominican exiles there in a fight for what he termed the recovery of democracy in the Dominican Republic.

Wessin, who last night turned down the job of consul general here, did not give a date for going to Puerto Rico.

In Washington, the State Department said the ousted general was in the United States on "deferred inspection status," meaning the Government will decide later whether to let him stay.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 16, 1965]

FULBRIGHT DECRIES U.S. LATIN POLICY—CRITICIZES DOMINICAN ACTION AS "FAILURE" THAT LED UNITED STATES TO BACK "CORRUPT" REGIME

(By Richard Eder)

WASHINGTON, September 15.—Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, in a scathing criticism of the administration, condemned today the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic and raised serious questions about Washington's policy in Latin America.

In a long statement, most of which he delivered in a speech on the Senate floor, Mr. FULBRIGHT, who is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and a major Democratic spokesman on foreign policy, analyzed the United States decision to intervene in the Dominican Republic.

The statement was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

He termed the intervention a "failure," and placed much of the responsibility for the failure on "faulty advice" given to President Johnson by his advisers.

Underlying what he characterized as an initial "overtimidity" and a subsequent "overreaction" by the U.S. Ambassador, W. Tapley Bennett, in the critical days during the outbreak of the fighting, Mr. FULBRIGHT said he discerned a wider tendency of the United States to suspect communism in any effective Latin American effort for social change.

This attitude, he said, made it impossible for the United States to establish an effective policy in Latin America where, he said, "the movement of the future * * * is social revolution."

Mr. FULBRIGHT's speech caused considerable displeasure in the administration but little public comment by it. President Johnson is understood to have read a copy of the speech this morning, but officials in the White House did not disclose what he thought of it.

The President's press secretary, Bill D. Moyers, said this afternoon:

"I talked to a number of officials in Government who simply do not believe that the Senator's conclusions are justified."

Mr. FULBRIGHT's analysis of the Dominican events withheld any judgment of what the consequences of U.S. actions would be for the Republic's future, although he cited unfavorable repercussions among progressive groups throughout Latin America.

HEARINGS WERE INCONCLUSIVE

The Foreign Relations Committee held 13 hearings over the last 2 months, with the witnesses being summoned almost exclusively from high levels of the administration. The conclusions of the committee's members, when the hearings were over, were so disparate that no report was issued.

The United States lost a valuable opportunity to influence developments in the Dominican Republic before they got out of hand, he said. The main opportunity was when the rebels met with Ambassador Bennett, before the U.S. marines landed, and asked him to negotiate a settlement.

Mr. Bennett said he had no authority to do so and that such an attempt on his part would be "intervention."

"Mediation at that point might have been accomplished quietly and peacefully," Mr. FULBRIGHT said. "Twenty-four hours later the Ambassader was pleading for the marines and ever since the United States has been intervening up to its elbows."

The United States, while maintaining that its intervention was for the purpose of saving lives actually was bent on preventing the victory of the rebels, the Senator said. The result, he added, was that for the first weeks U.S. policy was associated "with a corrupt and reactionary military" rule.

The responsibility for exaggerating the Communist danger and the extent of a breakdown of law and order in Santo Domingo lay with Mr. Johnson's advisers, Mr. FULBRIGHT asserted. "It is not at all difficult to understand why, on the basis of such faulty advice, the President made the decisions that he made," the Senator added.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 16, 1965]

WESSIN TO GO TO PUERTO RICO

MIAMI, September 15.—Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin said today that he would go to Puerto Rico soon to try and organize Dominican exiles there.

The 41-year-old officer, who was exiled from his country by the new Government, said he would lead a fight for what he termed the reestablishment of democracy in the Dominican Republic.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Sept. 26, 1965]

LETTER WRITERS SUPPORT FULBRIGHT'S DOMINICAN REPUBLIC STAND

(By Ned Curran)

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT'S main problem may be overprecision.

It is certainly an important element in the Dominican Republic storm that is swirling about his head. And it has been and probably will continue to be an element in any major FULBRIGHT utterances.

The point is that much, if not all, the criticism the Senator has reaped for his speech on U.S. intervention in the Caribbean stems from the finely shaded phrasing and logic of the speech.

This was apparent as soon as he finished delivering his 10,000-word speech that ran 16 legal-sized, single-space pages. Senators RUSSELL LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana and GEORGE SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, immediately jumped to their feet, berating FULBRIGHT although they had listened to the speech only briefly and did not appear to have read it. LONG and other subsequent critics did not even attend the Foreign Relations Committee hearings on which FULBRIGHT based his conclusions.

It was less apparent in the days that followed, when critics had to be given the benefit of any doubt that they had digested the speech. And yet some of the reaction betrayed the fact that it was to newspaper reports of the speech rather than to the speech itself. Some of it was reprehensible, going so far as to accuse FULBRIGHT of irresponsibility.

All of which the Senator actually brings on himself to some extent. And that leads unavoidably to the conclusion that the real problem may be J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT.

In the first place, FULBRIGHT is probably the very last Member of Congress who can be called irresponsible. He is almost totally oblivious to time, opportunism, and headline-baiting. He is jealous of the minor chores and distractions which rob him of the opportunity to worry literally about the state of the world and the true perspective of the trite "big picture."

His Dominican speech, therefore, was not hastily or opportunistically conceived. Nor was it really any departure from or innovation in the mainstream of FULBRIGHT's thinking. It was merely an extension and reiteration of the theme he has been developing in his public remarks for the past several years.

Characteristically, the speech was thoroughly thought out, carefully structured and documented and precisely honed in organization and wording. Even a casual reading of it belies anything else.

The result was one of the truly rare examples of an exhaustive and coherent discussion of a major subject by a member of the Government, devoid of partisanship, irresponsibility, politics, demagoguery, window dressing, or ax grinding. It was, plainly, too quietly cerebral, too careful and too long.

All FULBRIGHT was really trying to say, as he has before in other contexts, was that the United States was precipitated into another action by its preoccupation with communism. It was precipitant because it was unnecessary, he reasoned, implying that it is a preoccupation because it keeps the country off balance, chronically discharging its energy and attention in rising to meet a challenge which might not be a challenge if we didn't keep rising to meet it.

His further implicit point was that then we might have the added strength to deal with more basic threats at home. He thus came close to touching the nerve of mid-century America which is the probable delusion that national high blood pressure may be the unfortunate necessity of economic health.

But because he had manufactured a complete tapestry it did not lend itself to the divisible blacks and whites of politics nor the necessary oversimplifications of newspaper reporting. It is nearly impossible to reduce a Fulbright speech to an aural attention span or the restraining space of a newspaper column.

So he was condemned almost as much to misunderstanding as he was to criticism. It is only unfortunate that the rebuttal hasn't been as carefully considered, complete and precise as the statement.

Surprisingly, despite all of this, the people seem to agree with FULBRIGHT if the mail his speech inspired is any measurement.

He had received, at this writing, 647 letters addressed to his Dominican remarks. A total of 584 support his position, only 63 opposed.

And perhaps more importantly, there were but 12 letters from Arkansas, 8 to 4 in favor of FULBRIGHT. This might indicate that Arkansans either don't care or tacitly agree with the Senator. If the latter is true, that is all that really matters to him in the summing up.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Sept. 26, 1965]

THE JUNIOR SENATOR SPEAKS OUT ON INTERVENTION

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT's denunciation of the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic brought forth considerable editorial comment.

Editor Paul Buchanan in the Batesville Guard: "Senator FULBRIGHT's speech in the Senate last week sharply criticizing the Johnson administration about our intervention in the Dominican Republic makes sense to me. It is my candid opinion that the President is relying too much on advice from officials of the Pentagon concerning foreign affairs.

"The President is an expert at handling the Congress about domestic affairs but, when an emergency arises outside the country, he does not seem to have confidence in himself and must rely on others for guidance.

"The sudden, sharp criticism of FULBRIGHT by both Republicans and Democrats raises the thought that they are jittery of the President's capabilities in dealing with foreign affairs and resent any such criticism as being a dangerous 'rocking of the boat.'"

The Petit Jean Country Headlight: "While we suspect that Senator FULBRIGHT, this time, may be more right than wrong with regard to the extent of the Communist danger in the Dominican Republic, we can't help but be wary of Senator FULBRIGHT's assessment of the situation.

"We cannot recall a time when our junior Senator has denounced a Communist as forthrightly as he had L.B.J.'s attempt to thwart a Communist takeover.

"Nevertheless, we believe that Senator FULBRIGHT is honest in his convictions. And, once he is retired by another honest man (who is not yet on the horizon), we hope he will have the opportunity to return to his former avocation—university president. He might be welcome at Berkeley."

The Warren Eagle-Democrat: "There have been times when the assorted pronouncements of the junior Senator from Arkansas have seemed a bit 'global' for the more conservative elements in this State."

"As a matter of fact, it's always been a source of amazement to us that a man with the background of BILL FULBRIGHT was ever able to get elected in the first place back in the forties in the predominantly rural, mostly conservtive State of Arkansas.

"Perhaps Arkansas realized that, beneath the Rhodes scholar sheen of BILL FULBRIGHT, there was some flint-hard honesty and singleness of purpose—a determination to do his best for his country.

"This characteristic was never more apparent than the other day when BILL FULBRIGHT got up on the floor of the Senate and proceeded to dismember the Johnson administration's Dominican Republic policies.

"We don't know enough about the subject to know whether FULBRIGHT or the administration is right—and that isn't the point of this discussion anyway.

"The point is this: You can't help but admire a man who will stand up and take the leader of his party to the cleaners if he thinks the leader needs such a little trip. And the courage and resolution of the action take on added weight when it's remembered that Lyndon Johnson and FULBRIGHT are close, personal friends.

"To BILL FULBRIGHT, both politics and friendship apparently take a second place when the interests of the United States are involved.

"That's the reason we're proud of Mr. F., be he 'one-worlder' or not."

The Crossett News-Observer: "As we have pointed out in these columns in times past, Arkansas' junior Senator, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, is a man of courage and much more.

"New evidence of this singular political trait was in ample view this week as the fur began to fly over the Senator's latest, well thought-out comments on the Johnson administration's handling of the Dominican Republic crisis of a few weeks back.

"Although he didn't come right out and say so, Senator FULBRIGHT accused L.B.J. of the same kind of 'hip-shooting' which was in such ill-repute this time last year when at that stage of the game it centered around a fellow named Goldwater."

The Morrilton Democrat: "The junior Senator calculates what Latin and South America need is a good revolution. The status quo, says FULBRIGHT, should be ousted forthwith. Maybe so.

"For our dough, FULBRIGHT is as much a part of Arkansas and United States 'status quo' as anything can be. He's been Senator so long we can hardly remember who he replaced in that position.

"We wonder if the junior Senator can explain how he says the Latin and South Americans need 'new blood' while he sings a different tune here at home. Here, FULBRIGHT and the rest of the 'status quo' have a well-worn phrase: 'It's experience that counts.'"

The Nashville News: Senator FULBRIGHT of Arkansas seems too enchanted with idealism, revolutionary change and the "intellectual" approach to world troubles, he has become more of a 1965 Chamberlain than a source of a calm reason.

"His recent differences with the administration's handling of the Dominican crisis is another in a series of points to support the above conclusion.

"Had the FULBRIGHT opinions dominated in recent events, we would have more Commies in depth in Cuba, weakened our status in West Germany, pulled our synthetic rubber plant in Yugoslavia and continued training jet pilots for Iron Curtain countries.

"Despite all of the gains made by communism, the millions killed, captured or controlled, the Senator is determined to view this bloody plot against mankind as nothing but a social revolution, a mild Boston Tea Party.

"It isn't, and the tragedy for Senator FULBRIGHT is that his built-in glow of idealism blinds him so completely to the bloody history of communism."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 22, 1965]

BENNETT GETS SUPPORT OF SENATOR RUSSELL

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, yesterday accused critics of the administration's Dominican policies of attempting "to make a whipping boy" of Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett, Jr.

In a Senate speech, RUSSELL said, "I vigorously and categorically disagree" with contentions by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, and others that President Johnson was a gullible victim of faulty advice in sending troops to Santo Domingo.

FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, voiced his criticism in a recent speech.

RUSSELL, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, said that since Mr. Johnson's decision the "fighting was brought to a halt and we do not have another Castroite dictatorship in the Caribbean Isles."

"It is a grievous disservice to a dedicated public servant," RUSSELL said of criticism of Bennett, a native Georgian. The Senator recalled that he had served with Bennett's grandfather in the Georgia Legislature.

RUSSELL said criticism of Bennett was coming from those he called "some of our hindsighters."

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 22, 1965]

RUSSELL BACKS BENNETT ADVICE

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL says critics of the administration's Dominican policies are committing a grievous disservice by attacking Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett, Jr.

The Georgia Democrat told the Senate Tuesday he vigorously and categorically disagrees with Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, and others who have contended that Tapley gave poor advice to President Johnson before Johnson sent U.S. Marines to Santo Domingo.

Since Johnson's decision, RUSSELL said, "fighting was brought to a halt and we do not have another Castroite dictatorship in the Caribbean Isles.

"It is a grievous disservice to a dedicated public servant," RUSSELL said of the criticism aimed at Bennett. The Senator, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, recalled that he served with Bennett's grandfather in the Georgia Legilsature.

Some critics have contended that Bennett overemphasized the extent of Communist influence among the revolutionaries during the Dominican crisis.

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, who supported FULBRIGHT's recent speech attacking Bennett, said his criticism of the Ambassador was not personal but was directed at his judgment.

[From Newsweek, Sept. 27, 1965]

MYTH AND REALITY II

For 13 closed-door sessions between April 30 and July 29, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee listened to administration testimony on U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic. Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT listened hardest of all and emerged most dissatisfied of all. And last week in a nearly empty Senate Chamber the Senator from Arkansas suddenly loosed a broadside at the landing in Santo Domingo—and at U.S. Latin American policy generally.

FULBRIGHT bluntly charged that the administration's handling of the Dominican crisis "was characterized initially by overtimidity and subsequently by overreaction. * * * His criticism echoed his earlier salvo against U.S. foreign policy last year. In that widely heralded speech, he spoke of clinging to "old myths" in the face of "new realities." Last week, the new reality he stressed was the aspiration for reform in Latin America and the inevitability that Communists would attach themselves to reform movements. The old myth: the view that Communist support means Communist control.

While there were certainly some Communists on the side of the rebels in the Dominican uprising, said FULBRIGHT, the administration failed to establish that Communists controlled the revolt. And "intervention on the basis of Communist participation * * * reflects a grievous misreading of the temper of contemporary Latin American politics." If the United States automatically condemns any movement involving Communists, the scathing counterattack came from Senator THOMAS DODD, a close friend of L.B.J. FULBRIGHT, charged Senator DODD, "suffers from an indiscriminate infatuation with revolutions of all kinds, national, democratic, or Communist."

In the hope of forestalling another Santo Domingo, FULBRIGHT had knowingly staked out a lonely position. Amid the swirl of criticism, that was just where he found himself late last week.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 4, 1965]

LONG SAYS FULBRIGHT TALK HURT UNITED STATES

Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, charged yesterday that Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT's recent attack on the Santo Domingo intervention could become "the key factor in the Communists winning an election * * * in the Dominican Republic.

The comments by LONG, assistant Democratic leader in the Senate, marked the latest round in the controversy sparked last month by FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The Arkansas Democrat charged that the United States has been unable to substantiate the contention that the Dominican Republic was in danger of a Communist takeover.

LONG spoke on the television program, "Face the Nation" (CBS–WTOP). He said FULBRIGHT's speech "has hurt this country tremendously all over Latin America" and would be cited by Dominican leftists as proof that the U.S. action was "unjustified aggression."

LONG said he doubted that the closed hearings held by FULBRIGHT's committee were "in sufficient depth" to justify any action.

The Fulbright committee's hearings in July included testimony from most of the administration officials who played key roles in the Dominican intervention.

LONG also was asked about a resolution passed recently by the House of Representatives that has been widely interpreted as condoning unilateral intervention in any hemispheric country where there is a threat of "Communist domination."

To this, LONG merely said he could understand why the resolution was "resented in Latin America." He defended the right of the resolution's sponsor, Representative ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, Jr., Democrat, of Alabama, to offer it, but added: "I am not saying that he was right or wrong."

As the result of hearings held last week, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the State Department are trying to compose a statement of United States Latin American policy aimed at counteracting the adverse reaction prompted by the Selden resolution.

Meanwhile, criticism of current U.S. policy in the Dominican Republic was voiced by Senator GEORGE MURPHY, Republican, of California, on the television program, "Issues and Answers" (ABC–WMAL). MURPHY charged that rightist Dominican Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, whom he described as a stanch anti-Communist, has been "spirited" out of his country with apparent U.S. cooperation.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 19, 1965]

DOMINICAN CHARGES BRING RASH OF FLAG WAVING—FULBRIGHT'S CRITICS SIDESTEP THE ISSUE

(By John M. Goshko)

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT's attempt to provoke a debate on the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic has called forth only a babble.

Since Wednesday, when FULBRIGHT rose on the Senate floor to characterize the intervention as a "grievous mistake," the Washington atmosphere has been filled with a great deal of heat—and almost no light.

Those most directly affected by the Arkansas Democrat's criticism, the top foreign policymakers of the Johnson administration, have retreated behind a wall of angry silence. And although their reticence has not been shared by proadministration figures in Congress, most of the retorts emanating from Capitol Hill have been distinguished primarily by their irrelevance to the charges raised by FULBRIGHT.

The sole exception has been Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, whose lengthy Senate rebuttal on Thursday came directly to grips with FULBRIGHT's contention that the extent of Communist influence on the Dominican rebels had been exaggerated.

In the end, however, DODD also went the route of the others who rose in Congress to chastize FULBRIGHT. He implied that FULBRIGHT, if not exactly soft on communism, is complacent about its dangers.

But even if this charge was conceded to be 100 percent accurate, it still would not constitute a reply to some of the major questions raised by FULBRIGHT. And because of his longstanding prestige as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, they are questions that cannot be disposed of by ignoring them or by impugning the qualifications of the man who asked them.

FULBRIGHT's questions were prompted by the testimony given his committee by administration officials during closed hearings in July. In essence, what he said was this:

That the intervention had resulted from a panicky overestimation of Communist strength among the rebels, that the danger to U.S. citizens had been used as a pretext to cover the anti-Communist basis of the intervention, that it had placed the United States on the side of reactionary elements and that the effect had damaged U.S. prestige among progressive forces in Latin America.

Moreover, he added, U.S. actions had been accompanied by misinformation and a "lack of candor." In this respect, he charged that U.S. officials had sought almost from the outset of the revolution to create a Dominican military junta, that the Dominican military was told the United States would intervene only if they would say American lives were endangered and that no proof has ever been offered to substantiate President Johnson's charge that "some 1,500 innocent people were murdered and shot, and their heads cut off."

Only seconds after FULBRIGHT finished speaking, the tone of what was to come was set by Louisiana Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, the majority whip. In an arm-waving classic of old-fashioned oratory, LONG managed to invoke his "daddy," the Confederacy and General de Gaulle in defense of the administration.

On the day following FULBRIGHT's speech, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara told a press conference he never had any doubts that U.S. citizens in Santo Domingo had been endangered. However, McNamara was silent in regard to FULBRIGHT's assertion that the danger also was being used to cover up a move against suspected Communists.

Since then, there have been calls to rally round the President, flag-waving diatribes against the Communist conspiracy and appeals for FULBRIGHT to "get back on the team." But there has been no attempt to answer or rebut him on a point-by-point basis.

This is true even of DODD's speech. The Connecticut Senator did tackle the question of Communist influence by marshalling virtually every available fact tending to support the thesis that the Communist threat was real and pressing.

His performance on this score was impressive; and if he failed to defeat FULBRIGHT's contention that the danger was overrated, he at least established the fact that legitimate grounds for a debate do exist.

What was missing from DODD's speech was any reply to FULBRIGHT's charge that the administration engaged in duplicity. Yet this is the very point that underlies most of the criticism directed against the U.S. action.

It is also the point on which administration officials have persistently refused to answer questions. Now, in the face of FULBRIGHT's challenge, they appear determined to maintain this silence while hoping that their friends in Congress will be able to overcome the embattled Senator.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 527, which was read as follows:

> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, October 22, 1965, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to strike out the words "Friday, October 22," and insert in lieu thereof, "Saturday, October 23," so as to make the concurrent resolution read as follows:

> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, October 23, 1965, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

ANDERSON G. MATSLER

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 10878.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10878) for the relief of Anderson G. Matsler, senior master sergant, U.S. Air Force, retired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a bill for $300, reported by the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It came from the House on October 5. It is a private relief bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and opened to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MINIMUM WAGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] and the majority leader [Mr. Mansfield].

Mr. President, the Senate did not take up the Senate version of a minimum wage bill for the District of Columbia. The House passed H.R. 8126. The Senate committee approved a minimum wage bill drastically different, in many respects, from the House bill.

I wish the Record to show that in consultation with the majority leader and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty],

I agreed that the minimum wage bill go over until January, because it was impossible to have conferences with the House on it before adjournment. I believe the majority leader will verify what I now say, that we will take up the minimum wage bill for the District of Columbia early, at the beginning of the next session of this Congress.

Another reason why I agreed to let the bill go over was that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] has several amendments that he wished to offer to the bill. The amendments were offered in the District of Columbia Committee, and all except one were defeated by a substantial vote. Nevertheless, I felt that the Senator from Vermont was entitled to every fair consideration, and an opportunity to present his amendments.

Let us face it. In the closing hours of the session, there never is adequate time for thorough consideration. We could not have had the type of debate to which I felt the Senator from Vermont was entitled, and therefore I have agreed to let this bill go over until early in the next term, in January. I ask the majority leader to state whether or not I have accurately stated his position in the matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I say to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon that I am in full accord with his views on a minimum wage bill for the District of Columbia.

I should make the Record clear that as far as the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] was concerned, he has been prepared, for the past several days, to take up his amendments, but, as the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon has stated, there was not time, in view of the developments which occurred.

However, I assure the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon—and I do so with the approval of the distinguished Senator from Vermont—that one of the first orders of business next January when we return will be the bill now being discussed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, all I wish to say tonight about the bill we must do something very quickly in the District of Columbia to stop the exploitation of a great many workers in this city who are working at substandard wages. Do not forget that we have, in the District of Columbia, a Minimum Wage Act that covers women and minors, but none for men. To give some idea of the unfair discrimination that exists, for example——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend. The Senate will be in order. Attachés will leave the Chamber or take seats, and the Chair will ask the Sergeant at Arms once more to inquire of those persons standing around the Chamber, beside the doors, and along the walls as to whether or not they have business in the Chamber, and if they do not have business in the Chamber, they will be asked to leave. The Chair insists upon having order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say, in the minute or two more I shall take, that some of the exploitation and discrimination in the District of Columbia in regard to the shockingly low wages being paid, particularly to men. For example, let us take the women or girls who heretofore served the cars at drive-in restaurants. They do not hire women any more. They hire men, because they can hire men at a much lower wage. They have to pay the girls a minimum wage. That is particularly true of some of our chain restaurants, such as the Hot Shoppes, in the District of Columbia.

They have indicated to me that they might go broke if we put in the minimum wage. But Senators who have read their financial reports in the newspapers in recent days know that they have never made so much profit as they have recently, and they are planning a great expansion of their restaurant service. They are not deceiving the chairman of the subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee.

We need a minimum wage for men and women working in the restaurants in the District of Columbia. We need a minimum wage for the service employees working in the hotels in the District of Columbia. We have no right to expect those low-paid workers in the District of Columbia to subsidize the rest of us by working for a substandard wage, while we enjoy their services as consumers.

So, Mr. President, having covered that matter, I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my friend, the Senator from Oregon. I wish to make the record clear that the Senator from Vermont did not fight the action on the minimum wage bill in the District of Columbia. I would go far beyond what the Senator from Oregon has suggested, as I have in the past, and the Senator knows it.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator——

Mr. PROUTY. I merely said that we did not have time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is what the Senator from Oregon said also.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Vermont is laboring under the impression that I think he is fighting the bill, he is mistaken. The Senator from Verment wanted some amendments which the committee rejected, and the Senator said he might offer them on the floor of the Senate.

But the Senator from Vermont has joined me time and again on most sections of the bill urging that wages be increased. I have not sought to give the impression that the Senator would not vote for the bill. I have reported, and I believe correctly, that the Senator from Vermont told me he might offer some of the amendments he offered in committee, which were voted down. If he has changed his mind about offering amendments, that is fine with me. I am not taking the position that the Senator from Vermont is opposed, for example, to increases in the wages of the class of employees I have just talked about; namely, restaurant employees and service employees. To the contrary, the Senator from Vermont has always supported me in the committee in urging an increase in those wages.

Mr. PROUTY. Let me say to the Senator that I believe I misunderstood him. I appreciate what he has said, and I agree with him completely.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is the view of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia that H.R. 8126, as amended, is a reasonable, modest, and practical bill. The bill prescribes fair minimum wages and maximum hours standards for employees already protected by the District of Columbia minimum wage law and extends these standards to many persons who are not denied even the more limited protection the law now affords.

H.R. 8126, as amended, is similar to S. 860 of the 88th Congress which was unanimously reported to the Senate by the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia and was unanimously approved by the Senate on August 21, 1964. The bill, S. 860, received the support of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], and our former colleague, Mr. Beall.

Testimony received by the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety, of which I have the privilege of being chairman, demonstrates that H.R. 8126, as amended, has the strong support of the U.S. Department of Labor, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, the AFL–CIO, Greater Washington Council of Churches, District of Columbia Citizens Council, District of Columbia Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board, District of Columbia Health and Welfare Council, District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia Apprenticeship Council, District of Columbia Board of Education, District of Columbia League of Women Voters, Catholic Interracial Council of the National Capital Area, National Association of Social Workers—metropolitan area—Democratic Central Committee, Forward Looking Republicans, Washington Medical Committee for Human Rights, Washington Urban League, Teachers Union of Washington, D.C., and numerous neighborhood and church groups in the city.

The District of Columbia Committee heard testimony of the board of trade and received statements from the Restaurant Association of Metropolitan Washington and the Hotel Association of Washington, D.C., in opposition to the bill. The committee carefully studied the statements presented by the abovementioned groups and concluded that H.R. 8126, as amended, would best serve the public interest and welfare of the entire community.

H.R. 8126, as amended, extends coverage to approximately 300,000 men, women, and minors in the District of Columbia. The provision for overtime pay would reduce the excessively long hours worked in many establishments in the District of Columbia. A statutory minimum wage floor of $1.25 an hour would help many employees buy a little more and better food, clothes, housing, medical care, and other necessities of life.

We are not talking here about large salaries and fringe benefits. With a minimum wage rate of $1.25 per hour, the individual would have to work 52 weeks per year at 40 hours per week in order to earn $2,600 per year. In most cases, if the worker was sick, he would not receive any pay for that period of time. How in the world can we expect workers to maintain a home and family on $2,600 per year? Many of these wage earners, providing very useful services, would be far better off if they quit work and applied for welfare benefits.

Yet there is still some segments of the business community in the Nation's Capital that are still quibbling over whether they can afford to pay an employee who works for them a mere $2,600 per year. The Senate Committee on the District of Columbia believes that businesses in the District of Columbia can not only afford to pay their employees a decent minimum wage but should do so without further delay.

According to testimony received by the subcommittee, the last census for the District of Columbia revealed that, in the midst of prosperity in the District of Columbia, 17.3 percent—or nearly one-fifth of all District of Columbia families—had incomes of less than $3,000 per year.

Mr. President, not very long ago, President Johnson in discussing the war on poverty stated that:

> What we do in our Capital City, will stand as a measure of our overall progress to that end.

I have long shared the President's view. I believe that this bill is a good place to begin a more intensive war on the roots of poverty in the District of Columbia.

We hear much from some so-called spokesmen of the business community about the high rate of crime in the District of Columbia. Their answer to the crime problem by and large is to greatly increase the penalties for committing crimes, greatly increase the size of the penal facilities for the District of Columbia, and give the local police department whatever authority it seeks to apprehend alleged criminals. When it is suggested and recommended that legislation be enacted into law to curtail and eliminate the causes of poverty, crime, and unhealthful living conditions in the Nation's Capital they are more often than not opposed to it.

I hold to the position, and have for many years, that no employer has the moral right, and should not be allowed the legal right, to exploit fellow human beings by paying them a wage that does not make it possible for them to maintain their family in health and decency. To me, S. 19 involves a moral issue.

Mr. President, the Senate District of Columbia Committee heard the argument made by the opponents of minimum wage legislation, which is always heard when minimum wage legislation is under discussion either locally or nationally that the enactment of legislation such as the pending bill would force businesses to leave the District of Columbia and move to Maryland and Virginia where there is no minimum wage law. The argument was made but the witnesses provided no evidence to substantiate it.

As we all know, the chief industry in the Nation's Capital is the service industry. This industry consists mainly of retail stores, restaurants, hotels, gas stations, laundries, motion picture theaters, beauty and barber shops, parking lots and building contractors. These businesses are located in the District of Columbia because there is a need for their services in the District of Columbia. Otherwise, they would not be here in the first place. Everytime the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia considers any piece of social welfare legislation, the opponents of such legislation attack it with the same argument that business will move out of the District of Columbia if it is passed. Such has not been the case.

There are many business firms doing business in the District of Columbia that are presently covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act. According to a 1965 estimate, there are approximately 151,500 employees in the District of Columbia covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act. Firms covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act would have little to gain by moving out of the District of Columbia. The committee has been advised that there has been no appreciable decrease in the number of women employed in the District of Columbia nor was there any apparent exodus from the city when wage rates are increased from time to time by the District of Columbia Minimum Wage Board for certain women presently working in the city. The committee is also advised that business in the Nation's Capital appears to have increased rather than decreased, even though minimum wage rates have increased periodically under the current District of Columbia law.

The State of North Carolina points with pride at its business growth. Yet North Carolina has a minimum wage law in effect while its sister states do not. I do not personally know of any businesses leaving North Carolina because that State passed a minimum wage law in 1959 covering men, women, and minors.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a letter addressed to me by J. Willard Marriott of Hot Shoppes, Inc., and a letter addressed to me by Mr. Carl L. Shipley who is a partner in a local law firm and chairman of the Republican Party in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOT SHOPPES, INC.,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1963.

Re Senate bill 860, District of Columbia minimum wage.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
District of Columbia Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Senate bill 860 is a serious threat to the restaurant industry and to the income of restaurant and hotel workers in the District of Columbia because it will eliminate profits and cause unemployment of many unskilled workers.

The accusation that restaurant workers are underpaid does not consider the fact that their cash wages greatly understate their actual income when we take into consideration the value of meals, tips, and uniforms—items that are not furnished in other industries. Senate bill 860 and minimum wage laws in general do not give allowance for the true value of these items; for example, the majority of tipped employees surveyed by the Department of Labor earn more in tips alone than any of the minimums established by law.

Most employees in the restaurant industry are marginal workers, not skilled, and to increase their wages to the rates your bill indicates would force an employer to hire more competent and skilled people, further increasing unemployment among the group of marginal workers that are already causing not only Washington but many other cities serious unemployment problems.

Our company is not opposed to a fair wage for labor, and I reiterate that the true income of restaurant workers is considerably understated by the dollar income; that an increase in wages generally in the District as indicated in this bill would seriously affect business and employment in the District; and for these reasons, I recommend your committee vote against this bill.

Sincerely yours,
J. WILLARD MARRIOTT.

SHIPLEY, AKERMAN & PICKETT,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1963.

Re District of Columbia minimum wage, S. 860.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Senate District of Columbia Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: S. 860 to increase and broaden coverage of the minimum wage in the District might well have the result of increasing unemployment and driving business out of the District.

Senator MORSE's proposal would make District businesses pay a higher minimum wage than now provided under the Federal Minimum Wage and Hour Act, causing a great competitive disadvantage. It would hit restaurants especially hard, because of the large number of marginal workers in that industry.

S. 860 would give $1.25 per hour minimum, or any higher wage set by a wage order, to nearly every nongovernmental employee in the District, plus time and a half over 40 hours a week. This is higher than any State but 4 or 5—most of the other 28 States with local minimum wage legislation have 75 cents and $1.

S. 860 has no adequate provision for tips and gratuities. It would also invite litigation with its provision for double back wages and attorneys' fees and costs.

S. 860 would injure many small businesses, drive others from the District, force food prices upward, and act as a further drag on the economy in general.

Washington depends on tourist business for its economic prosperity. Excessive labor costs will price us out of the restaurant and hotel market. S. 860 would strike a serious blow against job opportunities and economic growth. We recommend your committee report the bill unfavorably.

Very truly yours,

Carl L. Shipley.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I believe it is fairly well known that the Marriott Hot Shoppes chain of restuarants and motels are the largest employers of unskilled workers in the Nation's Capital. All one has to do is read the financial pages of the local newspapers to see that this firm continues to prosper. Yet this firm states that it cannot afford to pay its employees $1.25 an hour. This company says that it is not opposed "to a fair wage for labor." Yet it has not told us what it considers a fair wage for labor. Anyone living in this area very long knows that this business enterprise continues to grow at a very rapid pace. I have no quarrel with that. However, I do not believe that this business enterprise or any other business enterprise has any moral right to expect its employees to subsidize its building and expansion programs.

I suggest to the Marriott family that if they would take the money they contribute both locally and nationally to promote a certain political cause—which has been in some difficulty lately—it could afford the additional cost this piece of legislation would entail for them. We must keep in mind, I believe, that the public has an interest in the wages workers are paid. Sometimes I believe that this is forgotten.

ALLOWANCES FOR GRATUITIES

S. 19 permits the establishment of regulations governing "allowances for gratuities customarily received by employees in any occupation in which gratuities have customarily and usually constituted and have been recognized as a part of the remuneration for hiring purposes." The District of Columbia Commissioners would establish the necessary regulations.

In the opinion of the committee, the District of Columbia Commissioners, the U.S. Department of Labor, and the District of Columbia Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board, this procedure is the best method of taking gratuities into account. This procedure permits consideration of the maximum amount which may be allowed to make up the minimum wage. The amount may be established on an occupation-by-occupation basis and the regulations may specify the enforcement safeguards, including the conditions under which such allowances may be made. Regulations may specify the type of evidence necessary to determine that sufficient gratuities to be considered have in fact been received by the employee.

Another method of taking gratuities into account was considered by the Senate District of Columbia Committee. It would specify in the statute the maximum amount per hour which may be permitted to make up the minimum wage. However, in the opinion of the committee, this method does provide the flexibility as the one contained in S. 19.

In regard to enforcement of minimum wage legislation under either method, it is necessary to establish a maximum hourly allowance for gratuities which may be permitted to make up the minimum wage, and it is necessary to require accurate records of time worked and wages paid each employee by the day and by the week. I am assured by the District of Columbia Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board that unless such records are available, there can be no successful administration of a minimum wage law.

The District of Columbia Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board also advised me and the committee that, in the administration of a minimum wage law, the recently enacted provision of the Social Security Act which requires reporting of gratuities, cannot be used. I understand that under the social security law reports on gratuities are made quarterly and without regard to the hours worked. Therefore, they cannot be used in determining compliance with the minimum wage requirements.

The committee believes the problem of allowances as related to wages would most adequately be handled by the definition of "wage" contained in S. 19. Under the language of the bill, "wage" means compensation due to any employee by reason of his employment payable in legal tender of the United States or checks on banks convertible into cash on demand at full value, including such allowances—board, lodging, and so forth—as may be permitted by regulations or orders; and "gratuities" mean voluntary monetary contributions received by an employee from a guest, patron, or customer for services rendered.

The bill also provides for certain types of adjustments in wages such as provisions for apprentices, learners, handicapped workers, students, and the making of regulations relating to various kinds of allowances.

I understand that the restaurant and hotel industry seeks to retain Minimum Wage Order No. 10 which is in effect under the present statute. The above mentioned order provides a minimum wage rate of not less than $1.15 an hour on August 15, 1967. A minimum wage rate of $1.25 would become effective under the order on August 15, 1968. I am advised that in regard to the payment of overtime compensation, the restaurant and hotel industry seeks a provision providing that effective August 15, 1967, the Minimum Wage Board shall establish a wage conference to examine and make recommendations pertaining to overtime compensation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert some material on this subject at this point in the Record.

There being no objection the material was ordered to be printed in the Record. as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 20, 1965]

Fair Wage for Busboys

The minimum wage bill reported out by the Senate District Committee merits a prominent place in the war on poverty. It is a bill, the committee's report makes plain, to aid the "working poor" of this city. The benefits would go to some 300,000 men and women "who work at the most arduous and menial tasks." Instead of granting subsidies or handouts, the bill would require the payment of fair minimum wages to dishwashers, busboys, short-order cooks, carwashers, domestic workers, janitors, porters, cleaners, and hospital employees.

The Senate Committee has made numerous improvements in the House bill. Although there is some disappointment over its recommendation of a statutory minimum wage of $1.25 an hour, with payment of time and one-half the regular rate for more than 40 hours a week, the bill also contains a provision for automatic increases whenever the Federal minimum wage may be hiked. More important than the minimum wage figure itself is the extended coverage, which sweeps far beyond the restricted categories of the House bill.

We think the committee is entirely right in relating this bill to the social and economic welfare of the District. "Your committee is confident," the report says, "that more decent wages will help hold families together, keep down relief rolls, and give children a better chance for proper development." Since virtually all of the increased income for families on the border line of poverty will be spent for consumer goods, moreover, the result should be to increase demand and new job opportunities.

So the bill should have an important bearing upon economic conditions in the community as well as an impact upon poverty, crime and social malaise. With this kind of an endorsement from the committee, the bill should sail through the Senate with no difficulty. And we hope that the House will have the good judgment to accept the wiser Senate provisions.

Statement of Hotel Association of Washington, D.C., Regarding S. 19 and Other Proposed Amendments to District of Columbia Minimum Wage Law

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, the Hotel Association of Washington, D.C., made up of 46 members in the District of Columbia with approximately 8,000 steady employees, is in agreement with those provisions of S. 19 which would extend the coverage of the Minimum Wage Law in the District to men as well as women and minors. We are very concerned, however, with the bill's treatment of wages earned by tip employees and its rigid standard setting a flat time and one-half rate for overtime pay.

At the hearing before this subcommittee in October 1963 on S. 860, the subcommittee, through Senator Morse, clearly recognized the need for including tips and certain employee benefits as part of an employee's wage in determining his full rate of pay. We are pleased that our problem has been so recognized but would strongly urge the subcommittee to make full provision for treatment of the situation in the definition of "wages" rather than referring the matter to such allowances as the District of Columbia Commissioners may prescribe by regulation at some future date. We respectfully submit that the following definition of wages as used in H.R. 8126 be incorporated within S. 19:

"The term 'wage' means compensation due an employee by reason of his employment, payable in legal tender of the United States or by checks on banks convertible into cash on demand at full face value and such term shall include the fair value to the employee of board, lodging, apparel, or other facilities or services customarily furnished by the employer to the employee. Such term shall also include the reasonable value of gratuities received by the employee if such employee is employed in an occupation in which gratuities have customarily and usually constituted, and have been recognized as, part of the remuneration for hiring purposes. The Board is authorized to determine (a) the fair value of such board, lodging, apparel, or other facilities or services for defined classes of employees taking into account the average cost to the employer or to groups of employers similarly situated, and (b) the fair value of gratuities for defined classes of employees in such occupations."

Our industry faces a tremendous problem if the overtime provisions of S. 19 become law. Our workday and workweek are considerably different from most other businesses. We are open to the public 24 hours daily, 7 days a week. Many of our employees work a 48-hour week due to this feature of our business. These employees include, among others, cashiers, room clerks, bartenders, bellmen, waiters, and kitchen personnel. In fact, under our most recent labor union contract, 1 of our members has 69 job classifications, of which 58 call for 48-hour weeks and only 11 are set at 40 hours. These people are paid a fair wage for their services and in the great majority of cases the hourly rate exceeds $1.25. To be required to pay these employees a 50-percent premium for overtime based upon their regular rate would work a tremendous financial hardship on our members. A recent survey conducted by our association and based upon responses from 13 representative members establishes that, if legislation were enacted providing that overtime payments be set at time and one-half the regular rate of pay for time worked in excess of 40 hours per week, this would mean an annual payroll increase of over $265,000 for the 13 reporting hotels. This increase in payroll does not apply to either executive or administrative personnel. These cost increases could not be absorbed under our present rate and price structure and would require additional annual sales by these 13 hotels (mainly in the food and beverage departments) of more than $1,750,000 to offset the increase in payroll without additional profit. This survey was conducted among a cross-section of our membership and includes large, medium and small hotels, chain and independents, hotels with and without union contracts, and hotels with a wide range of rate and price structure. In the past we have found such surveys on other subjects to be representative of our entire membership.

Since the last hearing before this subcommittee, the full wage conference procedure as provided for under our present law was utilized for the hotel, restaurant, and allied industries and resulted in the promulgation of a revised District of Columbia Minimum Wage Order No. 10, made effective August 15, 1964. Significantly, Wage Order No. 10, as revised, recognizes and calls for only a slight increase in hourly rates for time worked in excess of 40 hours (6 percent or less per hour on the minimum rate for nontip and 5 percent or less per hour on the minimum rate for tip employees), whereas, as previously stated, S. 19 calls for payment of a flat 50 percent premium on the regular rate. It must be firmly kept in mind that this wage order is tailor-made to our industry and the rates for overtime were set after an extensive wage conference procedure between representatives from labor, management, and the general public as required by law. The findings of this recent wage conference were in keeping with those of past conferences which have historically recognized the industry's problem in the area of overtime and have, accordingly, recommended to the Minimum Wage Board that only slight increases be given employees for time worked in excess of 40 hours per week.

For the above reasons, we strongly urge you to continue in full force and effect District of Columbia Minimum Wage Order No. 10 and to exclude from the overtime provisions of the bill those employees covered by such wage order whose overtime wage rates are established by the Minimum Wage Board. In short, we are not asking for a complete exemption from the overtime provisions of the bill but rather that our overtime rates continue to be established by the Minimum Wage Board through wage conference procedure.

Thank you for affording us this opportunity to present our views on this important legislation.

Statement of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade on S. 19, Minimum Wage Bill Before the Senate District of Columbia Committee, June 23, 1965

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am William H. Press, executive vice president of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade. I have a very brief statement to make respecting the proposed minimum wage law for the District of Columbia which has been authorized by our board of directors.

As everyone knows, business people generally oppose laws regulating employment conditions and compensation, and the board of trade, being the largest business group in this area, has heretofore opposed virtually all such proposals. In October of 1963, we appeared before the Senate District Committee in opposition to S. 860. We appeared the same year before the House committee and opposed a similar bill, H.R. 8423.

Our employment and security committee and subsequently our board of directors reached the conclusion when this session of Congress convened that we would no longer oppose the enactment of a minimum wage law for the District of Columbia since much employment here is already covered by the Federal wage and hour law and since much of that excluded will undoubtedly be brought into coverage under the act as time passes.

We do, however, urge this committee to amend the bill under consideration in such a manner that it will correspond fully or quite closely to the provisions of the Federal wage and hour law.

A tremendous amount of study has gone into drafting and amending the Federal law. It has been and is being phased into full operation over a period of time which cushions foreseen difficulties by specified kinds and sizes of employing units. It seems to us that the conclusions of the Congress concerning these matters which reflect exhaustive studies by business groups, labor organizations, and Federal agencies should not be overlooked or ignored in legislating for the District.

The problems of differences between Federal law and S. 19 affect principally retailers, restaurants, and hotels, and representatives of those groups are here today to present their views.

The board of trade and employers generally devoted a great deal of time to presenting their views to the House District of Columbia Committee concerning a District of Columbia minimum wage law. On the House side, the subcommittee took the view that it "should not put any additional burden on industry or employers in the District that is not placed upon them by the National Minimum Wage Act. If possible, we ought to reconcile the differences."

H.R. 8126 which has been favorably reported by the House Committee on the District of Columbia recently would provide for a local law closely conforming to the Federal act. We supported H.R. 8126 in its present form and will support its passage by the House of Representatives. We would hope that the Senate committee would report a bill similar to H.R. 8126.

Testimony of the Restaurant Association of Metropolitan Washington Before the Committee on District of Columbia Minimum Wage Proposals

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is John S. Cockrell. I am the executive vice president of the Restaurant Association of Metropolitan Washington. I have been associated with the restaurant business over 25 years in Washington, D.C. I am representing the Restaurant Association of Metropolitan Washington here today. This association represents approximately 500 restaurants in the District of Columbia which do 85 percent of the volume of restaurant business here.

The application of a high minimum wage to the restaurant industry will have a greater effect on employment in our industry than in any industry to be covered under this proposal. This is because wages will be increased so drastically in the restaurant industry. Such an increase will have an inflationary effect. As we will explain, we honestly believe a 20-percent payroll increase will be the result with a corresponding increase in prices. Mechanization will have to be increased. Automatic cafeterias will replace the new service restaurants that have been opening. A food cutter is now on the market which makes—for example—cole slaw in 15 minutes with one operator which before had taken two persons 3 hours to make. Beyond this effect, and even more important, borderline employees will be substituted with more productive help.

Because of the restaurant industry's ability to pace its work according to the individual's ability to produce, the industry has traditionally filled a need in the American economy by offering employment for the unskilled and somewhat unproductive worker. As a result, the industry has always provided jobs for many thousands of employees who might otherwise be classified as temporarily unemployable. The restaurant industry provides work for the untrained, the transient, people temporarily out of work, school dropouts, individuals looking for part-time or temporary employment, and students.

If the restaurant industry can't use these people, who can? All too often, they will be forced to unemployment compensation, public welfare. These people, because of their lack of productiveness, are invariably paid a minimum wage. In the same establishment where a cook will receive $2 or $3 an hour, a dishwasher will receive $1. Rightly or wrongly, this is a fact and we wish to bring it to the attention of the committee. This legislation proposes a schedule which will put our industry under coverage 3 years earlier than even the Federal Government proposes. The Federal proposals give raises over 3 years to get to $1.25. The drastic effects of an application of the $1.25 minimum wage to a restaurant operation is particularly acute in the restaurant industry because our labor cost is already the highest of any major industry and ranges anywhere from 25 to 42 percent of sales. The escalator effect of the $1.25 minimum wage will drive our costs up. The fellow who is making $1.25 now will not be satisfied without an increase when the less skilled worker comes up to his level of pay. The entire scale will have to go up.

How can restaurant establishments absorb a large percent increase in labor cost when, in fact, its labor cost now averages 30 percent of sales? A large retailer might well raise prices in view of the fact that he already has an advantage. But not so with the restaurant operator. Labor cost is simply too great a factor with restaurants. Large retail food stores might increase their prices as little as 4 percent if a 40-percent increase in labor costs were forced upon them and still compete with their smaller competitors. But a restaurant could hardly survive a 20-percent increase in restaurant prices.

In many industries, wage increases can be passed off through increased prices. This is not true, however, in the restaurant industry. The public is far more sensitive to prices of restaurant meals than any other major commodity. (They eat three times a day.) The reason or explanation is quite simple. There is an immediate economic alternative available to the vast majority of the eating-out public. The housewife can and will feed her family at home or the workingman will carry his lunch if they feel restaurant meals are priced too high. A 15-percent increase in menu prices will unquestionably sharply curtail sales in our industry. Nor will the drop in sales be substantially offset by the fact that competition will also be forced up. Competition, as we said earlier, from the housewife, from her family budget, and from the widespread use of frozen foods, frozen complete dinners, and other convenience items produced and merchandised on a low cost, mass-production basis through supermarkets. If prices are forced up to the extent indicated by our evaluation of this proposal, families will eat at home and workers will return to the lunch pail. This will curtail jobs in our industry.

The restaurant industry differs from other retail-service industries in another very important respect, i.e., the annual sales volume productivity per employee. The annual sales volume per employee in an average price restaurant is approximately $7,000 to $8,500. By comparison, I would like to cite a few examples of annual sales volume per employee of a few other service industries. Remember, our per person sales were, at the highest, only $8,500.

	Number of employees	Annual sales	Annual sales per employee
A. & P	135, 000	$4, 139, 966, 000	$30, 666
Sears	185, 000	3, 306, 886, 000	17, 874
Safeway	54, 257	1, 932, 243, 000	35, 618
J. C. Penney	75, 000	1, 220, 085, 000	16, 267
Allied Stores	30, 800	5, 581, 901, 000	18, 892
Mays	29, 000	494, 366, 000	17, 047
Food Fair	13, 444	410, 053, 000	30, 500
W. T. Grant	27, 800	351, 849, 000	12, 656

It is thus understandable that any further disturbance of the cost ratios in relation to sales volume would have a severe effect on the restaurant industry. (To force the industry under an extremely difficult handicap.) The industry price levels are at a point now where any further price increase would meet with serious customer dissatisfaction and consequent drop in customers and sales.

As an example, to cite one such unbalanced cost ratio, percentage labor costs against sales have just about doubled in the past 20 years. Contrast a 30-percent-of-sales labor cost in the restaurant industry with 11.5 percent in retail, 7.2 percent in food stores, 15.3 percent in general merchandise, 14.3 percent in furniture and appliances. These contrasts further accentuate the differences between the restaurant industry and other retail-service industries.

I would like to point out that 30 percent of the total restaurant employees receive the majority of their income in the form of tips; and another 10 percent, bus boys and girls, receive part of their income from tip-sharing plans worked out by the employees themselves. A very large percent of all employees receive free meals. Surely, these are worth a considerable amount over a week's time. I suppose all of us would appreciate 10 or 12 or 21 free meals a week. We recommend that we do as Baltimore, Md., has just done and exempt all tipped employees. Their new law sets the wage at $1 an hour with no penalty for overtime. Maryland has just passed a new minimum wage law that exempts restaurants entirely.

The suggested minimum wage would impose a prohibitive and unnecessary wage increase on our business—not because our wage scale is low, but because an across-the-board wage law would find great difficulty in allowing adequate credit for fringe items which are part of our employees' total wage—I speak of tips, laundry, and meals. Add tips to the daily wage, his meals, uniforms, laundry, insurance, etc., valued at $3 to $3.50 per day, and you can see that his wage is far above $1.25, but not in cash wages.

This proposal would cover men as well as women. These men are making more than the minimum wage and all the law would do would be to cause us to do a great deal of paperwork we have never had to do before. We recommend that the law be left as it is to cover women and minors.

Our industry believes that minimum rates in the District of Columbia should not be higher than those established by any Federal minimum wage which might be enacted. Neither Maryland nor Virginia have minimum wage laws covering our industry and we must compete with establishments in those areas adjacent to the District.

PRESENT DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MINIMUM WAGE LAW ADEQUATELY MEETS CURRENT NEED

The District of Columbia, unlike most other jurisdictions, does have a sound minimum wage program today. For nearly 50 years the Minimum Wage Board of the District of Columbia has had full authority to fix minimum wages and, with the assistance of a minimum wage conference composed of three employee representatives, three employer representatives, and three public representatives, has established minimum wages applicable to all women and minors in the District of Columbia.

Experience during these many years has proved beyond a doubt that this method of arriving at a minimum wage rate is, by far, better than that of establishing a statutory minimum which deprives the local Wage Board of its opportunity to exercise sound judgment on the basis of local conditions.

The Minimum Wage Board has held numerous conferences with representatives of various industries, employee groups, and public citizens, out of which have come constantly increasing minimum wage rates which have been fair and equitable to employees and employers.

We have developed a great appreciation for the opportunities which have been afforded to us in the restaurant industry to participate in these conferences. We are convinced that the present law and the procedure which it provides for establishing such minimum rates is the best method of establishing such rates. We recommend that the current law remain in effect.

Wage Order No. 10, prepared by the District of Columbia Minimum Wage Board relating to wages for the hotel and restaurant industry, resulted from a series of meetings of the conference called by the Board in early 1964. The conference completed its deliberations on April 30, 1964. It made exhaustive studies of statistical and economic data submitted by employee, employer, and public representatives. With the data and information available, the Minimum Wage Conference arrived at proper minimum wages, along with appropriate allowances for tips, meals, uniforms, etc., which are necessary considerations in the development of wage rates for the hotel and restaurant industry. We urge you to do as the House subcommittee and full committee did, and allow Wage Order No. 10 to stay in effect until it runs its course.

Similar wage orders are in effect in the District of Columbia for most other industries. For example, minimum wages currently exist for the following businesses: beauty culture, clerical, semitechnical, building service, manufacturing, wholesaling, laundry, dry cleaning, and all retail trade, as well as the hotel, restaurant, and allied occupations. Minimum wages prescribed by these orders vary slightly as do the particular allowances and other requirements necessary to make such orders practical. We believe that the Minimum Wage Board has been able to provide a better service to the community with the latitude which it now has than could ever be provided by a single statutory minimum as proposed in this bill.

CONSIDERATION OF GRATUITIES UNDER MINIMUM WAGE

No satisfactory solution has ever been developed to the many problems associated with income of employees who normally receive gratuities in the performance of their work. This bill provides no solution to this problem.

Nearly half the employees of hotels and restaurants receive total income (cash wages, plus tips, meals and lodging) which is significantly greater than this minimum rate proposed. For this reason, if this bill should be enacted we would recommend the exemption of "any employee of a hotel or restaurant in an occupation in which gratuities are customarily recognized as part of remuneration for hiring purposes."

Because of tips, the income of waiters and waitresses, as a group, is substantial. Anyone familiar with our industry knows that waiters and waitresses probably receive more income than any other nontechnical group in the labor market. Employers find it extremely difficult to persuade a waiter or waitress to accept another position, such as host or hostess paying from $70 to $90 per week. The income of a waiter or waitress is substantially better than that normally paid for such positions. We, therefore, believe they should be exempted from the provisions of any minimum wage law. If men are to be covered by the act, there is even greater reason to exempt tip employees, because their tip income is normally more than that of waitresses.

MEALS, LODGING, AND APPAREL

This bill fails to include in the definition of wages, a proper recognition of the value of meals, lodging, and apparel, or other facilities. We believe it must contain a definition of wages similar to that provided in the Federal Far Labor Standards Act. We recommend the following definition for this purpose: "the term wage means compensation due an employee by reason of his employment, payable in legal tender of the United States or by checks on banks convertible into cash on demand at full face value except that wages shall include the reasonable value to the employee of board, lodging, apparel or other facilities or services customarily furnished by the employer to the employee, provided that the Board is authorized to determine the fair value of such board, lodging, apparel or other facilities for defined classes of employees based on the average cost to the employer or to groups of employers similarly situated."

OVERTIME PROVISION

We are concerned about the 40-hour-workweek proposals with time and a half for hours in excess thereof. This bill completely disregards the historical patterns of the restaurant industry and basic organizational makeup of our business, and the consumer need it provides. We are not an industry that manufactures a product which leaves our plant for future consumption and can therefore be manufactured in any set period of time—but instead, we are a service business satisfying a human need. The greatest percentage of our business is geared to provide meals at four distinct periods of the day—breakfast, lunch, dinner, and late supper. To be successful and meet the consumer need, we are open 7 days a week.

Not necessarily by choice alone do we operate on a 7-day week, based on a hard economic fact—the demand of the consumer. A service industry, in order to be successful, cannot set its working schedule to suit its own purposes or desires, but must meet the need of the consumer. In a highly simplified form, as a manufacturer cannot stay in business producing a product the consuming public will not buy, neither can the restaurant industry be successful on a set schedule of 40 hours and cover all the desires of the dining-out public. Penalty pay for overtime has been established for industrial firms basically to prevent the exploitation of workers. Historically, our workweek has been on 6-day schedules. To find part-time cooks, waitresses, hostesses, or other key people to satisfy a 40-hour week provision is virtually an impossibility in the Washington Metropolitan area. Our business will be forced to pay overtime premium of great proportions to satisfy only the basic needs of our business to meet consumer demand. The additional cost cannot be absorbed. To pass these costs on to the consumer in the form of higher menu prices will be disastrous for our industry. Small operators will find themselves literally smothered by the competition from the frozen food market, the lunch pail, and eating at home which comprises our principal competition.

The District of Columbia Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board has recognized in the past that some type of premium pay is justified in our industry. Through wage conferences we have agreed to these considerations. The important point to be made here, however, is that adequate consideration was given to the nature of our business and an arbitrary premium of time and one-half was not established under Wage Order No. 10. Congress cannot legislate jobs, nor can it assure us of customers who can pay increased menu prices to meet increased labor costs brought about by legislated minimum wages.

Should any law be passed applicable to the hotel and restaurant industry, it is most important that a lengthy period of adjustment be provided with respect to overtime provisions. Proposed Federal legislation recognizes this necessity by establishing a 44-hour workweek for the first 3 years following enactment, 42 hours the fourth year, and 40 hours thereafter as the regular workweek.

EXECUTIVES, ADMINISTRATIVE, TRAINEES, AND APPRENTICES

The definition of executive, administrative, trainees, and apprentices as outlined in this bill fails to take into consideration the practical problems of the restaurant industry. Restaurant management and supervisory personnel are, for the most part, "working management"—that is, they normally spend as much as half, and sometimes three-quarters, of each day in actual production capacities. If, for example, the standards adopted by the U.S. Department of Labor, with respect to the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act, were applied to the restaurant industry, virtually every member of management would have to be paid time and a half for all hours worked in excess of 40 hours per week. This comes about because the U.S. Department of Labor has established regulations which provide that an executive who spends more than 20 percent (40 percent in retail establishments) of his working hours in production capacity is not considered an exempt employee. To have such an interpretation placed upon the restaurant industry would literally require that many management employees earning as much as $10,000 per year may have to be paid time and a half for all hours worked in excess of 40 hours per week. This bill in its present form would require that chefs, lead cooks, and other skilled technicians earning as much as $4 to $5 per hour would have to be compensated at the rate of time and a half for hours in excess of 40 per week. Employees in these positions have customarily and traditionally worked 6 days per week. Since these employees are skilled artisans, and for all practical purposes are professional employees, we do not see any justification for requiring that they be paid time and a half for hours in excess of 40. However, this bill makes no provision whatsoever for the exemption of this class of professional employee. We believe that if an employee's normal rate of pay is one and a half times the minimum rate, he should be exempt from the overtime provisions of the act.

EXCLUDE TIPS AND MEALS FROM OVERTIME PROVISION

This bill requires that an employee must be paid one and one-half times the "regular rate" at which he is employed for all hours in excess of 40. No provision is made for the exclusion of gratuities, meals, and lodging from the overtime requirements of the act. We do not believe this is the spirit or intent of the act. However, the act is not clear in its definition of the term "regular rate," in this use.

We believe that tips, board, lodging, uniforms, and other facilities should not be considered for the purpose of computing overtime and allowances should be deducted to establish the regular rate. Most States having minimum wage laws recognize and exclude these allowances from the overtime provisions.

CONCLUSION

Although it has been said before, I cannot be more emphatic when I sincerely urge you to consider the damaging effects of legislation now proposed and be cognizant of the fact that our restaurant industry follows patterns uniquely different from any other mercantile establishment.

Our industry thanks you for your time and attention and your interest in our problems.

Respectfully,

JOHN S. COCKRELL,
Executive Vice President, Restaurant Association of Metropolitan Washington.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., August 9, 1965.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
Committee on the District of Columbia,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for our comments on H.R. 8126, a bill to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law, as it passed the House.

Although H.R. 8126 incorporates a number of desirable principles, we believe it fails to protect wage earners in the District of Columbia in many important respects. We are attaching a detailed statement regarding our view of the deficiencies of H.R. 8126, in the form in which it is before your committee. Briefly, our main objections are as follows:

1. The bill excepts from the definition of "employee" several categories of workers whose need for minimum wage protection is urgent.

2. We are strongly opposed to escalation in the application of the minimum wage and overtime provisions as H.R. 8126 provides.

3. We believe the problem of allowances as related to wages would most adequately be handled by the definition of "wage" contained in S. 19 or in section 3(m) of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

4. The exemption of several categories of low-paid workers from the overtime provisions of the proposal is not justified.

5. The exemption from the overtime provisions based on the regular rate of employee paid in excess of one and a half times the minimum hourly rate for 4 consecutive weeks or for a month would nullify overtime pay for large numbers of employees.

6. The provision authorizing the Board to except any occupation or employer from the act on the basis of extreme economic hardship is unique in its concept and could give rise to serious inequities in its application, both as to employees denied minimum wage protection and employers who are not granted an exemption.

As indicated in our report on S. 19 and in testimony of Assistant Secretary of Labor Peterson, to your committee, we strongly favor the enactment of S. 19 as a means to material improvement in the economic standing of many needy District of Columbia workers.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

STATEMENT RELATING TO DEFICIENCIES IN H.R. 8126, AS PASSED BY HOUSE ON JUNE 28, 1965

1. Workers exempt from coverage: Among these are persons employed in domestic service in a private home, in a public and private nursing home, in hospitals of any type, or in eleemosynary institutions. It also exempts all persons employed in educational, charitable, religious, or nonprofit organizations.

HOSPITAL WORKERS

The District of Columbia pioneered in the minimum wage coverage of hospital workers. Women and minor workers in hospitals, rest homes, and similar institutions have enjoyed minimum wage protection under the 1918 law since issuance of the first D.C. wage orders in 1920, except for the period when the law was held to be unconstitutional (1923–37). In fact it was hospital coverage that led to the Supreme Court case in 1923 (*Atkins* v. *Childrens Hospital*, 261 U.S. 525). Five of the seven District of Columbia minimum wage orders presently in effect apply to workers in hospitals. Thus, the hotel and restaurant order specifically covers hospitals, convalescent homes, and rest homes. The clerical and semitechnical order covers practical nurses, nurses aids, house mothers, and institutional attendants; the laundry order covers laundry services; the building service order covers maids, cleaners, and elevator operators; the retail order covers hospital gift shops.

H.R. 8126 would deny minimum wage coverage to men workers in hospitals who are equally in need of protection as women workers. The BLS survey of employee earnings in 1962 in selected industries in the District showed that men are 25 percent of the workers in hospitals and that, in hospitals, a slightly larger proportion of men than of women earned under $1 an hour. About one-quarter of the workers of both sexes earned under $1.13 an hour and two-fifths of both sexes earned under $1.25 an hour.

The proposed exemption of men workers in hospitals and similar types of employment is contrary to the long-term trend in other States. Of the minimum wage law in

22 States applicable to men as well as women, all but six apply the minimum wage rate to hospital employees irrespective of sex. One of these six States, Washington, has a wage order in effect for women and minors in the health care industry, including hospitals. States with minimum wage rates for men and women hospital workers are: Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Vermont, Wyoming. In an additional 13 States with minimum wage laws applicable only to women and minors, all but 1 State (South Dakota) has rates in effect for such workers. States that cover women and minor hospital workers are: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Kentucky, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon, Utah, Wisconsin.

The need for minimum wage coverage of hospital workers is supported by State hours and earnings surveys. One of the more recent is that of the New York Labor Department, Report B-131, April 1962, which shows the effect on hospital workers' earnings of minimum wage order No. 11 which established $1 an hour effective October 1960. On the survey date, June 1961 earnings of hospital workers as a group were concentrated at or near the minimum rate. For New York State as a whole, workers paid cash wages under $1.25 an hour constituted almost half (48.5 percent) of hospital workers; two-thirds (67.8 percent) of workers in nursing homes; and nearly one-fourth (22 percent) of workers in miscellaneous health services. New York subsequently increased the minimum wage for such workers to $1.25 an hour. At the present time rates of $1.25 or more an hour for hospital workers are in effect in 11 States: Alaska, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont (effective October 1, 1965), and Washington. All except California and Washington cover men as well as women.

EDUCATIONAL AND CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Specific exemption of employees of educational and charitable organizations likewise seems to us unwarranted. These employees must depend on their wage rates for a livelihood and the fundamental purpose of the organization they work for should not be used as an excuse for denying these workers the minimum essentials of life.

DOMESTIC WORKERS

The Department recommends that Congress bring workers in household employment under coverage of the amended District of Columbia law. The example thus set would have a far-reaching effect on future State legislation and would be an important factor in the much-needed upgrading of the skill and status of the household worker.

Wisconsin has long covered domestic workers with a wage order establishing the same hourly wage rates for such workers as for those in service and industrial jobs. North Dakota amended its wage board law in 1965 to cover men and to delete the exemption for domestic as well as agricultural workers. While North Dakota has not yet issued a wage order applicable to domestic workers, the way has been opened for establishment of such a rate. A New York bill that brings domestic workers under coverage of the $1.25 statutory minimum in New York passed both houses of the legislature and is now awaiting signature by the Governor.

2. H.R. 8126 provides an outright exemption from the statutory overtime provisions of several categories of workers in occupations normally characterized by low wages and long hours, including hotel, restaurant, and allied workers covered by minimum wage order No. 10; car washers; and parking lot and parking garage attendants.

While hours of women workers in District of Columbia hotel and restaurant occupations are limited to 48 hours a week, men workers have no similar legal standard. The BLS survey of selected industries in the District of Columbia shows that half of the men in eating and drinking places work 48 hours a week or longer and about one-fourth of the women work as much as 48 hours, the maximum set for women and minors by District law.

In the car washing and parking lot occupations, employees are almost entirely male, without union organization, and not covered by any law limiting their hours of work. The BLS survey showed that in automobile service industries over one-third of the men work over 48 hours a week. These employees have special need of reasonable working schedules and should certainly have the benefit of the overtime pay provisions of the act.

3. The provision that the overtime section shall not apply to any employee who is paid in excess of one and a half times the minimum hourly rate for a period of 4 consecutive weeks, or for a month, seems to us to make the requirement for overtime pay a meaningless one. It also increases the difficulty of administration. It would require the inspector to examine the payroll for 4 consecutive workweeks instead of making a spot check as is customary in minimum wage inspection as a whole.

4. The provision in H.R. 8126 authorizing the Board to exempt any occupation or employer from the minimum wage or overtime provisions for cases of extreme economic hardship is unique in State minimum wage experience and is not found in any existing law. If this section is intended to provide continued employment for persons, such as handicapped workers who would otherwise not be employed their employment could be handled in a more feasible way. For example, under the existing District law and laws of other States, employment of handicapped persons is authorized at rates lower than the minimum.

In practical effect, H.R. 8126 would permit an employer to apply as a "handicapped business" on the ground of extreme economic hardship. The only conceivable result of this provision would be to place an indefensible administrative load on the enforcing agency. Such a provision would almost certainly lead to inequities and injustices as between one employer and another and its operation would tend to favor those inefficient employers who can only continue in business by paying unconscionably low wages. We strongly urge the deletion of this provision.

5. The escalation to $1.25 an hour at different rates for different groups of employees is, we believe, unjustified. Women and minors in most occupations in the District have for many years been subject to a minimum wage law, therefore industrywide adjustments will not have to be made to initial minimum wage coverage. The unsoundness of the escalation proposed is pointed up by the fact that the hotel and restaurant workers would remain at their present wage order rate for a year and would not attain the rate of $1.25 an hour until 1968.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA, MINIMUM WAGE AND
INDUSTRIAL SAFETY BOARD,
Washington, D.C., July 13, 1965.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is in reply to the letter from Chester H. Smith, Esq., staff director, dated July 2, 1965, addressed to Mr. Charles W. Putnam, chairman of the District of Columbia Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board, in which he asked for suggestions touching on the merits of H.R. 8126 and the propriety of its passage.

The board has reviewed H.R. 8126 as passed by the House of Representatives and objects especially to the provisions which limit coverage, exempt specified workers from minimum wage and overtime protection, provide for the payment to some workers of less than $1.25 an hour on the effective date of the act, and provisions which delay until 1968 the application of the hourly rate of $1.25 to hotels and restaurants.

Specifically, H.R. 8126:

1. Fails to cover domestic workers and men employed in nursing homes for the aged or for the infirm, men employed in hospitals, in eleemosynary institutions, and men employed in educational, charitable, religious, or nonprofit organizations. (Sec. 2(a)(1) definition of "employee.")

The board finds no basis for excluding these employees, since no evidence has been provided to indicate that their living costs are less than living expenses of other employees in the District of Columbia.

By adding a "proviso" to the definition of "employee" H.R. 8126 appears to continue minimum wage protection for approximately 20,000 women and minors in the occupations listed above who are now covered by minimum wage orders issued under the current minimum wage law. It is suggested that the definition include these employees by language somewhat as the following:

"The term 'employee' means a person employed or suffered or permitted to work by an employer, including, without limitation, women and minors employed in any occupation covered by a minimum wage order in effect on the date immediately prior to the effective date of the District of Columbia Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1965 but, except as hereinbefore provided, the term 'employee' shall not include:

"(A) any person employed in domestic service, in or about a private home, in or about a public or private nursing home for the aged or for the infirm, in or about a hospital of whatever kind and character, public or private, or in an eleemosynary institution;

"(B) any person engaged or employed, whether on a voluntary basis or otherwise, in the activities of an educational, charitable, religious, or nonprofit organization;"

2. Provide that the Board by administrative action may exempt from the minimum wage and overtime provisions an employer or an occupation under specified conditions. It also provides that by the same procedure the Board may establish a lower minimum wage or overtime rate for an employer or an occupation under the same specified conditions. (Sec. 9(g).)

If such exemptions were granted or if lower rates were established such actions would result in discrimination in favor of employers paying low wages; would give the employers an economic advantage over their competitors who maintain decent wage standards. The action would perpetuate the paying of the low rates already in existence and would deny to the employees involved adequate wages to provide a decent living.

Administration of this provision would place the agency involved under great and undue pressure for exemptions. It would require extensive research. It would require determining, among other things, wages generally paid in the Washington metropolitan area and would require a large staff to administer these provisions.

The Board seriously objects to this section of H.R. 8126 and urges its deletion.

3. Provides that the overtime provisions shall not apply to any employee whose regular rate of compensation is in excess of one and one-half times the applicable minimum hourly rate (sec. 9(d)(3)).

This provision is not limited to employees earning commissions but denies overtime rates to all workers earning over one and one-half times the minimum applicable rate.

4. Provides no overtime rate for car washers (sec. 9(d)(2)(C)) and attendants at a parking lot or parking garage (sec. 9(d)(2)(E)).

No limit is placed on the number of hours employees in these occupations may be paid the regular rate of pay.

5. Provides for the payment to some workers of less than $1.25 an hour on the effective date of the act.

A rate of $1.15 per hour is provided for those occupations for which there are minimum wage orders outstanding on the date of enactment of the District of Columbia Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1965. This rate would become effective 180 days after the date of enactment of H.R. 8126. On September 3, 1966, the rate of $1.25 per hour would supersede the $1.15 rate.

Allowing a normal lapse of time for the enactment of legislation and 6 months of time between the enactment and the effective date of H.R. 8126 the hourly rate of $1.15 would be in effect a very few months, a period of time too short for effective enforcement of the minimum wage. The Board objects to the $1.15 hourly rate and prefers the establishment of $1.25 hourly rate on the effective date of H.R. 8126.

For an occupation with respect to which there is not an existing minimum wage order on the date of enactment of the Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1965, the rate is $1 per hour on the effective date of the act and the $1.25 hourly rate would become effective by September 1967. The Board considers that this hourly rate should be $1.25 on the effective date of the act.

6. Delays the application of the $1.25 rate to hotels and restaurants until 1968. (sec. 9(e)(2)).

The Board considers that the delay in the application of the $1.25 rate to these industries is objectionable, especially since it is recognized that these are the industries which profit most by the allowances which may be made for meals, lodging and gratuities.

H.R. 8126 does not establish an overtime rate of one and one-half times the regular rate of pay for these industries. It provides for the establishment of overtime rates by wage conference procedure after August 1967.

None of the objectionable provisions listed above are found in S. 19. The Board prefers the language of S. 19 and would like to have H.R. 8126 amended so as to substitute for the language contained in H.R. 8126 the language of the Senate bill, S. 19, with any changes the Committee deems necessary as a result of testimony at the hearings on S. 19.

Sincerely yours,

CARRIE L. ALLGOOD,
Executive Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
June 18, 1965.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your request of February 9, 1965, for a report on S. 19, a bill "To amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement."

This bill would amend the minimum wage law of the District of Columbia to provide a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour for all persons employed in the District of Columbia, with the exception of those employed by the United States or by the District of Columbia, and certain other identified categories of employees. Provision is made for adjustment in such minimum wage rate to make allowance for special conditions and circumstances, such as the existence of facilities and services customarily furnished by employers, and of gratuities customarily received by employees. Wage adjustments may also be made in the case of learners, apprentices, and handicapped workers and students. Another feature of primary significance in the bill is contained in the mandatory requirement for the payment of overtime compensation, at not less than time and one-half, for all hours of work over 40 in a workweek.

Insofar as S. 19 would raise present substandard wages now being received by many workers in the District of Columbia, it would enable individuals and families to support themselves more nearly at levels of health and decency, and thus help to prevent and reduce dependency.

We support the objectives of S. 19 and recommend that legislation be enacted embodying these objectives. However, we defer to the views of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as to timing, methods of administration, and other details of such legislation.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

——— ———,
Secretary.

JUNE 17, 1965.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have for report S. 19, 89th Congress, a bill "To amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement."

The Commissioners believe that present social and economic conditions in the District require that all persons employed in private industry be paid wages sufficient to provide them with adequate maintenance and to protect their health. A minimum wage law covering all workers in the District and providing adequate rates is, in the view of the Commissioners, necessary to the public welfare. Employment at insufficient wages curbs the economic growth of the area, threatens the health and well-being of the people, results in large public relief expenditures, and demands the use of the police power to protect individuals and the overall economy. Further, the Commissioners believe that the underpayment of workers leads to deterioration of their families, as well as of themselves; promotes the spread of slums; and increases disease and crime. These conditions, in the opinion of the Commissioners, inevitably result in increased expenditures for police and health protection and for public welfare.

The Commissioners are informed that a study of selected industries in the District in the summer of 1962 (latest figures available) indicates that employees earning less than $1.25 an hour ranged from 29 percent of those employed in retail trade to 60 percent or more of those employed in hotels, in eating and drinking establishments, and in motion picture theaters. More than half of the employees in the real estate industry, in laundry and drycleaning establishments, and in building service earned less than $1.25 an hour.

The Commissioners are of the view that the earnings of all too many persons in the District must be considered inadequate when viewed in the light of the cost of living. The living cost in this area is among the highest in the United States, ranking with the 13 cities whose budgets for a family of four, as priced in 1959 by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, amount to between $6,000 and $6,600 a year. On the basis of officially recognized measurement of price changes, the cost of living in Washington, D.C., increased approximately 27 percent in the 14-year period from 1950 to 1964.

Since 1918 the District of Columbia has enjoyed the benefits of a minimum wage law covering women and minors. This law (act of Sept. 19, 1918, as amended; secs. 36–401 through 36–422, D.C. Code) has served the District well, but the Commissioners believe the time has now come when all employees in the District—men, women, and minors—should be covered by generally applicable minimum wage legislation. In this respect, the District lags behind 19 States which have made such provision. Twenty-six years ago, Connecticut was the first State to enact minimum wage legislation for men. The Commissioners believe that many of the economic and social ills of the District may well be traced to this lag in protective wage legislation.

The bill provides protective legislation which in the opinion of the Commissioners the Congress should enact for the benefit of employees in the District of Columbia. The bill affords broader coverage and protects gains made under the existing 1918 law. It would increase current minimum wage coverage for persons employed in the District from about 87,000 women and minors to about 300,000 men, women, and minors, many of whom are in the lowest income level and are not covered by any local or Federal minimum wage law. The bill contains strong administrative provisions, including provisions for revision of minimum wage orders, enforcement, subpena powers, effective penalties, and machinery to assist workers in collecting unpaid minimum wages. It preserves all benefits which women and minor employees now have under the 1918 law, so that, if, in the course of the legislative process, there should be excluded from coverage by the bill an occupation with respect to which women and minor employees are presently protected by a wage order issued under the authority of the 1918 minimum wage law, these employees would nevertheless continue to enjoy the benefits of the earlier law.

The first of the 18 new sections which the bill substitutes for the first 23 sections of the act approved September 19, 1918, constitutes a finding by Congress that wages paid many employees in the District of Columbia are too low to provide them with adequate maintenance and health protection. This section declares it to be the policy of the Congress to correct and as rapidly as practical to eliminate the conditions referred to earlier in the section. Section 2 sets forth definitions. Section 3 establishes a $1.25 statutory minimum wage rate for all employees (with certain exceptions), and, with respect to overtime compensation, establishes a 40-hour workweek. This section also provides that existing wage orders issued under authority of the Act of September 19, 1918, shall remain in full force and effect and be modified to apply to all employees without regard to sex, with the minimum wage rate and payment for overtime work established by such wage orders to be modified in conformity with the minimum wage rate and requirement for the payment of overtime compensation specified earlier in the section. Provision is also made for the issuance of new wage orders to cover occupations with respect to which there are no existing minimum wage orders as of the date of enactment of the bill.

The Commissioners note, incidentally, that section 11 of the proposed amendment of the 1918 act includes, in subsection (c), language which properly is a part of section 3(b) inasmuch as it excepts from its effect the employers of employees whose pay conforms with certain criteria. Accordingly, the Commissioners recommend that subsection (c) of section 11 be deleted, and that there be inserted immediately before the period at the end of subsection (b) of section 3, in line 16 on page 4, the following: ": *Provided*, That no employer shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of this subsection by employing any employee of a retail or service establishment for a workweek in excess of the workweek specified herein, if (1) the regular rate of pay of such employees is in excess of one and one-half times the minimum hourly rate specified in subsection (a) or such higher rate as may be applicable to such employee under a wage order issued pursuant to this act, and (2) more than half his compensation for a representative period (not less than 1 month) represents commissions on goods or services".

With respect to the statutory minimum wage established by the bill, the Commissioners have considered and approved a suggestion made by Mrs. Esther Peterson, Assistant Secretary for Labor Standards, Department of Labor, that there be a direct statutory tie between the minimum wage established under the Fair Labor Standards Act and the statutory minimum wage established for the District of Columbia. Accordingly, in order to provide for such a direct statutory tie, the Commissioners recommend that section 3 of the bill be changed as follows:

1. Page 4, strike lines 4 through 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "at a rate not less than such rate as may, from time to time, be established by section 6 (a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C.A., § 206(a)(1)): *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed so as to reduce any higher rate of pay established by any wage order issued pursuant to this Act or preserved by section 2 of the Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1965."

2. Page 4, strike line 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "minimum wages at least equal to the rate established by subsection (a) shall".

3. Page 5, strike lines 2 and 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "for the payment of wages at such rate (except as otherwise provided in this act);".

4. Page 5, strike line 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "for minimum wages at a rate not less than the rate prescribed by subsection (a)".

Section 4 of the proposed amendments of the 1918 Act sets forth the powers and duties of the Commissioners under the act, while section 5 provides for revision of wage orders issued under authority of the bill. Section 6 specifies the manner in which the Commissioners are to issue revised wage orders, while section 7 vests in the Commissioners authority to make and revise regulations, subject to public hearing. Section 8 provides for judicial review of an order upon filing a petition in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. Section 9 vests the Commissioners with power to administer oaths and issue subpenas. Section 10 provides for certain exemptions from the act, while section 11 (subsection (c) of which should be relocated, for the reason set forth above) requires employers to make and keep for a period of not less than 3 years an employment record for each of his employees. Section 12 requires the posting of a copy of the law and a copy of each of the regulations or orders issued under the authority of the law, while section 13 proscribes certain acts as violations of the act, among which are included the violation of any regulation or order preserved by section 2 of the Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1965. Section 14 sets forth penalties for violation of section 13 of the act, while section 15 establishes remedies available to an employee who may be paid less than the wage to which he is entitled under the act or any order or regulation issued thereunder. Section 16 specifies that action to enforce any cause of action for unpaid wages or liquidated damages must be commenced within 3 years after the cause of action accrued, or be forever barred. Section 17 states that nothing in the act should be deemed to interfere with, impede, or diminish the right of employees to bargain collectively with their employers through representatives of their own choosing in order to establish wages or other conditions of work in excess of the standards applicable under the act. Section 18 provides a separability provision.

Section 2 of the bill is designed to preserve the benefits of existing wage orders listed under authority of the act of September 19, 1918, supra. The employees affected by this provision are women and minors who conceivably, were the industry in which they are employed exempted from the provisions of the bill, would be left without the protection presently afforded by existing wage orders were it not for the preservation of such orders by section 2. This section also provides for revising the preserved wage orders under the procedures provided for by the amendments made by the act, except that in any such revision the wage rate need not be that prescribed in section 3 of the amendments made by the first section of the bill.

The remaining sections of the bill—sections 3, 4, and 5, respectively—authorize the Commissioners to delegate functions vested in them by the act, except the function of making and adopting regulations to carry out the purposes of the act or of any amendments made by the act, which they themselves must do; establish an effective date of 180 days after the date of the enactment of the bill, except that the Commissioners are authorized to promulgate necessary rules, regulations, and orders on and after the date of enactment; and provide a short title, "Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1965."

In addition to the changes in the bill suggested earlier, involving adding to subsection (b) of section 3 of the amendments made by the bill the language presently contained in subsection (c) of section 11 of such amendments, and changing the language of such section to provide a direct statutory tie between the minimum wage established by the Fair Labor Standards Act and the statutory minimum wage established for the District of Columbia, the Commissioners also recommended the following changes, most of which are self-explanatory:

1. Page 3, line 9, insert "governments of the" before "United States".

2. Page 7, line 12, insert after "Commissioners" the following: ", but not before the effective date of the Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1965".

3. Page 11, insert between lines 5 and 6 the following: " 'Issuance of Revised Wage Orders' ".

4. Page 12, line 9, insert after "wage" the following: "rates and overtime compensation".

5. Page 12, line 10, strike the word "Administrative".

6. Page 13, line 15, strike "revision" and insert in lieu thereof "revisions".

7. Page 13, line 21, strike "administrative regulations", and insert in lieu thereof "regulation". The word "administrative" appearing in the caption of section 7 and in section 8(a) of the amendments made by the bill seems to indicate that the regulations referred to by the term "administrative regulations" differ in some respect from "regulations" in a general sense. A reading of the bill, however, indicates that "administrative regulations" are in fact "regulations", and that the word "administrative" is not intended to qualify the word "regulations". Accordingly, the Commissioners believe it is desirable to eliminate the word "administrative" wherever such word appears in the phrase "administrative regulations" so as to avoid any uncertainty as to the scope of such regulations.

8. Page 14, line 23, strike "it", and insert in lieu thereof "them".

9. Page 15, line 5, strike "shall" where it appears the second time, and insert in lieu thereof "may".

10. Page 15, line 22, amend to read " 'Authority To Take Testimony and Issue Subpenas".

11. Page 16, lines 5 and 6, strike "United States District Court for the District of Columbia", and insert in lieu thereof "District of Columbia Court of General Sessions".

12. Page 17, line 15, insert "issued" after "orders".

13. Page 19, line 12, insert "issued" after "order".

14. Page 20, between lines 15 and 16 insert "shall be in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions and".

15. Page 23, insert between lines 7 and 8 the following: " 'Preservation of Wage Orders Issued Prior to this Act".

16. Page 23, line 20, insert after "Act" the following: ", except that the proviso in section 5(d) of the amendments made by this Act shall not be applicable in the revision of wage orders preserved by this section".

The foregoing is required in order to make the proviso of section 5(d) of the amendments made by the bill consistent with the requirements of the second sentence of section 2 (page 23) of the bill.

17. Page 24, lines 9 and 10, strike "including, notwithstanding clause numbered (1) of subsection (b) of such second 3,", and insert in lieu thereof "except". The effect of the language which the Commissioners recommend be deleted is to authorize the Commissioners to delegate to the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board the function of making regulations to carry out the purposes of the bill. The Commissioners consider it desirable that the regulation-making authority be centralized in them, thereby conforming with the principle set forth in Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952. The Commissioners believe it obvious that it is to the benefit of the general public that regulation-making authority be centralized, rather than decentralized. Accordingly, the Commissioners recommend that section 3 of the bill be changed so as to eliminate therefrom the authority of the Commissioners to delegate the function of making regulations to carry out the purposes of the bill and the amendments made by the bill.

18. Pages 24 and 25, strike the last sentence of subsection (b) of section 4 (in lines 22–25 of page 24, and lines 1–3 of page 25), since this sentence makes it mandatory that the Commissioners modify and promulgate certain wage orders and regulations prior to the effective date of the Minimum Wage Amendments Act of 1965 (one hundred and eighty days after its approval), and this may not be possible of accomplishment, or even advisable if it were possible. Accordingly, the Commissioners ask that the last sentence of section 4(b) be deleted.

The Commissioners estimate that the cost to the District of administering the District of Columbia minimum wage law, as it would be amended by the bill, will amount to approximately $62,000, representing the salaries for two GS–9 wage and hour investigators ($14,400), five GS–7 investigators ($30,250), and one GS–5 clerk ($5,000), and related costs.

The Commissioners are informed that in some industries the wages presently being paid employees are so low that the proposed statutory minimum rate would result in a raise in pay for a large number of workers in such industries. In eating and drinking establishments, for instance, 67 percent of the employees will have increases of varying amounts on and after the effective date of the legislation recommended by the Commissioners. The increase, however, will not be so great as would first appear, inasmuch as the bill, in section 7, provides that certain benefits received by the workers may be taken into account in making up the minimum rate, such as, for example, meals furnished to and gratuities received by, workers in hotels and restaurants. The bill also provides that the Commissioners may issue regulations controlling the amount of such items going to make up the minimum wage rate.

With respect to the impact of the 40-hour workweek after which overtime compensation is required to be paid, the Commissioners are informed that during the period covered by the study referred to earlier, in retail trade over 12,000 employees worked more than 40 hours per week, in eating and drinking establishments more than 6,000 employees worked more than 40 hours per week, and 36 percent of the workers in hotels, 35 percent of those in laundries, and 31 percent of those in real estate establishments exceeded 40 hours of work per week. The Commissioners are further informed that the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board expects employers to adjust working hours in such a way that only a minimum number of employees will be employed in excess of 40 hours after effective date of the act. The Board further is of the view that such action will have the effect of reducing the length of the employee's workweek, increasing the efficiency of the workers, and in some instances in contributing to the creation of additional jobs and the reduction of unemployment. The Commissioners recognize that one of the industries in the District of Columbia which will be most affected by the proposed legislation is the hotel and restaurant industry. They note the increased number of large and elaborate hotels and restaurants opening up throughout the District and the increase in the number of visitors to the city, in large part the result of a vigorous and successful program carried on by the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade. The Commissioners believe that the employees of the hotels and restaurants should participate in the apparent prosperity of the industry at least to the extent of receiving a wage adequate to meet the needs of persons residing in Washington, D.C. The Commissioners believe it obvious that the failure of the proposed legislation to protect any sizable body of employees, with the result that members of the group continue to receive inadequate compensation to meet their needs, cannot help but have the effect of continuing in existence a situation which the Commissioners believe operates strongly to the detriment of the entire community. For this reason, they desire to emphasize the necessity of providing minimum wage legislation covering all persons employed in private industry carried on in the District of Columbia.

In summation, the Commissioners believe that the establishment of a statutory minimum wage rate for all employees in the District of Columbia—men, women, and minors—is needed. They believe that the economic and social health of the community demands the establishment of such a minimum wage rate. Accordingly, they strongly recommend that the Congress enact S. 19 at the earliest possible date in order to provide such a minimum wage rate for employees in the District of Columbia, to the end that such employees will receive an adequate living wage which the Commissioners believe will tend to alleviate economic and social evils existing in the District of Columbia. Further, the Commissioners are of the view that a statutory minimum wage for all persons employed in the District of Columbia would, as far as the District is concerned, be a formidable weapon in the administration's war against poverty.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this report to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS
Washington, D.C., October 7, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
District of Columbia Committee,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: On June 23, 1965, we were pleased to have the opportunity to present testimony to the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare and Safety in support of S. 19, the District of Columbia minimum wage bill.

This proposal has wide public support, as demonstrated by the testimony of the AFL–CIO and a number of other organizations. Especially significant is the testimony of the Citizens Committee on Minimum Wages for the District of Columbia, which is composed of a number of communitywide organizations.

We quote from our testimony before the subcommittee:

"A special study was made in 1962 by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor of wages being paid, hours being worked per week, and work practices in the District of Columbia. This study showed that earning less than $1 an hour were 20 percent of the employees employed in real estate occupations, 29 percent of the employees in motion picture theaters, and 42 percent of the employees in eating and drinking places. The percentage of workers who earned less than $1.15 an hour ranged from 19 percent in retail trade to 61 percent in eating and drinking places. Receiving less than $1.15 an hour were 33 percent of the employees in automobile repair and servicing, 32 percent of the employees in hotels, motels, and rooming and boarding houses, 37 percent of the employees in real estate, 28 percent of the workers in laundries, 25 percent of the employees in hospitals, and 19 percent of the employees in retail trade.

The percentage of employees earning less than $1.25 an hour in 1962 ranged from 29 percent of those in retail trade to between 50 and 60 percent of the employees in laundries and miscellaneous services, and 60 percent of the employees in eating and drinking places, hotels, motels, and rooming and boarding houses, and motion picture theaters.

As is well known, living costs in Washington, D.C., have risen at a rapid rate—27 percent from 1950–64—and are among the highest in the country. A modest but adequate budget for a family of four in Washington has been estimated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as requiring an income of over $6,000 per year. Compare this, Mr. Chairman, with the annual income of $2,500 which a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour will earn during a year for a worker working 50 weeks at 40 hours per week. Even if two members of the family were working and earning at these levels, they could not between them provide an adequate level of living for the family in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 648, which was passed by the House, is in our opinion a very inadequate bill; and we are hopeful that the committee will adopt the Senate subcommittee recommendations and lay the groundwork for a fruitful conference which will produce a fair minimum wage bill for the District of Columbia.

Very truly yours,

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Director, Department of Legislation.

GREATER WASHINGTON CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL, AFL–CIO,
Washington, D.C., October 7, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate District Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are writing to endorse in the strongest terms S. 19 on the District of Columbia minimum wage which I understand will come before your full Senate District Committee on Friday, October 8. If any representations have been made to you to the effect that the Greater Washington Central Labor Council supports H.R. 8126, please be advised that such information is erroneous in the extreme. There are a number of bad provisions in the legislation which passed the House of Representatives.

We hope that you will do everything possible to pass S. 19.

With best wishes,

Very truly yours,

J. C. TURNER,
President, Greater Washington Central Labor Council.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 15, 1965.

Re S. 19, District of Columbia minimum wage.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: While I admire your leadership and fairness in dealing with most issues, and agree with you about 90 percent of the time, I do believe the examples of low wages paid in the District of Columbia cited on page 140 of the hearings on S. 19, the District of Columbia minimum wage bill, is very misleading. You do not indicate that the waiters get tips averaging more than $1 an hour in addition to their wages, that they get food, and in many instances they get uniforms.

Similarly, you do not indicate that the other restaurant and hotel personnel listed as being in the low wage group similarly get many fringe benefits in the form of food, etc., which is a very significant item in any person's budget.

In view of the fact that neither Maryland nor Virginia has minimum wage laws, and the fact that the Federal minimum wage law is going over until next year, I strongly urge that you hold up action on S. 19 until we see what is in the Senate bill. The hotel and restaurant people in Washington must remain competitive. They are one of our largest employer groups, and the success of our high cost tourism promotion turns upon availability of food and lodging for travelers at reasonable rates.

Very truly yours,

CARL L. SHIPLEY.

Copies to: Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY, U.S. Senate, Hon. PETER H. DOMINICK, U.S. Senate, Hon. EVERETT DIRKSEN, U.S. Senate, Hon. MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD, U.S. Senate, Hon. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, U.S. Senate, and Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, U.S. Senate.

ROBERT G. BAKER INVESTIGATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a recent article published in the Chicago Tribune, entitled "Lid Poised To Clamp on Baker Jury," followed by an editorial of the same date entitled "Serve—Who?"

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Lid Poised To Clamp on Baker Jury—Katzenbach Will Handle Case

(By William Moore)

Washington, September 21.—The Johnson administration placed itself in position today to clamp down the lid on further disclosures in the Bobby Baker scandal.

Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach told a Senate Judiciary subcommittee that if Baker is indicted in his get-rich-quick influence peddling schemes, Katzenbach will bypass the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia and turn the prosecution over to the Justice Department's Criminal Division.

Katzenbach, a member of President Johnson's Cabinet, would then have control over the fate of Johnson's protege, Baker. The Justice Department already has bypassed the U.S. attorney in the Government's investigation.

GETTING JOHNSON OFF HOOK

Katzenbach's announcement was seen here as an effort to take Johnson off the hook in his appointment of two former Baker attorneys to high Federal posts.

The first was Abe Fortas, whom Johnson named to the Supreme Court. The second is David Bress, whom Johnson is asking the Senate to confirm for the $27,000-a-year job of U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

WILLIAMS OPPOSES NOMINEE

When objection was raised by Senators John J. Williams, Republican, of Delaware, and Jack Miller, Republican, of Iowa, it was emphasized that it is the responsibility of a U.S. district attorney to conduct grand jury investigations and prosecute if indictments are returned.

Thus, Miller said, the U.S. attorney could control the return of indictments, and the vigor of the prosecution if they were returned.

Williams likened the appointment of Bress to the appointment of a former lawyer for Teamster Boss Jimmy Hoffa as district attorney in a district in which a Federal grand jury might be investigating Hoffa.

Williams appeared as a witness today to protest Bress' confirmation by the Senate to the subcommittee members, Senator James Eastland, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman, and Senators John McClellan, Democrat, of Arkansas, and Dirksen, of Illinois, the Senate Republican floor leader.

Katzenbach told the committee that the criminal division would continue in charge of the Baker case, and Bress said that if any conflict of interest occurs he will disqualify himself in the case.

QUESTIONS OWN DISQUALIFICATION

Williams questioned whether Bress could disqualify himself in the case.

"The office of the U.S. attorney in the District of Columbia will undoubtedly become the headquarters for the prosecution of the Baker case should he be indicted by the grand jury," Williams said.

"It would be impossible under such circumstances for Bress not to be aware of the progress being made in the preparation of the case.

"As one of the former attorneys for Baker, no doubt Bress through his client relationship has much information which would be of tremendous benefit to the Justice Department in the development of its case against Baker.

"For Bress to make available all of his knowledge thus obtained would be a violation of the attorney-client relationship. On the other hand if he withheld his knowledge obtained through such client relationship, as he would be expected to do, it would result in this situation: An acting U.S. attorney withholding evidence from a grand jury which was directly under his jurisdiction."

ATTORNEY FOR BAKER FIRM

Williams said that Bress is known as a man of highest integrity, but said the nomination should be withdrawn, or the Senate should defer action until the Baker case is disposed of. Numerous lawyers and several bar associations have urged Bress' confirmation.

Bress was attorney for the Serv-U Corporation, which has a multimillion-dollar-a-year income from vending food and beverages by machines in defense plants. Baker was its major stockholder.

Bress denies having known this, a denial that Williams told the Senate recently is ridiculous.

Williams said if the administration did not know of Bress' relationship with Baker, whoever recommended the nomination was lax. Katzenbach said he made the recommendation and that he knew all about the relationship. Williams said if the administration had the facts the nomination is "a complete disregard for normal ethical sensitivity and for public opinion."

Serve—Who?

The odor of the Bobby Baker scandal still pervades the Senate and clings to the Johnson administration. It is astonishing, therefore, that the President should for the second time in recent weeks nominate a former Baker lawyer for a high Federal post. He is David Bress, whom Mr. Johnson wants the Senate to confirm as U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia.

Bress was attorney for Baker's Serv-U Corp. in the civil suit that blew the lid off the Baker scandal and exposed the Government higher-ups who were his cronies. Another lawyer for Baker, Abe Fortas, long-time political fixer and President Johnson's personal attorney, was recently appointed to the Supreme Court.

Baker himself had few peers as a political fixer. Indeed, he parlayed his post as secretary to the Senate Democratic majority (a job he gained as Mr. Johnson's protege) into a multimillion-dollar fortune. One of the ventures in which he exercised his influence peddling proclivities was Serv-U, a big food and beverage vending business in which he was the prime factor and principal stockholder.

Senator John J. Williams, of Delaware, has aptly likened Bress' nomination to appointment of a Teamsters Union lawyer as U.S. attorney or judge in a district where Jimmy Hoffa, union president, is under investigation. Senator Jack Miller, of Iowa, has reminded the Senate that a District of Columbia grand jury is currently investigating Baker's influence peddling and that Bress would be responsible for prosecution if Baker is indicted and could have power over whether the grand jury indicts him or not.

Bress' statement that as attorney for Serv-U he had not known Baker was a stockholder is, as Williams points out, ridiculous. Baker's name led the list of defendants in the corporation's reply in the suit, and Bress signed the document. Williams also is correct in his appraisal that the nomination reveals either gross laxity or an arrogant disregard for normal ethical sensitivity and public opinion on the part of the administration.

The way things go in Washington these days, it is not likely that President Johnson will withdraw the nomination. The Senate, however, can refuse to confirm this scandalous appointment. If it fails to do so, the public cannot be blamed for drawing the conclusion that Bobby Baker and his friends still wield a lot of influence.

METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member for a good number of years of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety, I have received numerous allegations by citizens of the District of Columbia concerning some of the practices and policies of the Metropolitan Police Department. In addition, I received many allegations by employees of the Metropolitan Police Department regarding the internal operation of that Department.

On April 8, 1964, I requested the Honorable John Campbell, the very able and efficient Comptroller General of the United States, and two members of his staff, Mr. Fred Thompson and Mr. Francis Mackin, to have a conference with me in my office, in order that I could discuss with them the possibility of the General Accounting Office giving me some assistance in connection with my studying the complaints raised by employees of the Metropolitan Police Department and District of Columbia citizens.

I had a meeting with Mr. Campbell and his assistants in my office on April 9, 1964, and it was agreed that the General Accounting Office would undertake the study that I suggested relative to certain administrative policies and practices of the Metropolitan Police Department. The study was continued over a period of several months. The Comptroller General furnished me with a report of his findings on October 9, 1964.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter of April 15, 1964, addressed to the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Campbell, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
April 15, 1964.

Hon. Joseph Campbell,
Comptroller General of the United States,
General Accounting Office,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Campbell: I want you to know that I appreciate very much the conference that I had with you, Mr. Fred Thompson and Mr. Francis Mackin in my office on April 9, in respect to what help, if any, the General Accounting Office could give to me in connection with my study of the administrative policies and practices of the Metropolitan Police Department in the District of Columbia.

As I pointed out to you in that conference, many allegations have been made to me by reliable citizens of the District of Columbia, concerning alleged abuses involved in some of the practices and policies of the Metropolitan Police Department. Towards the end of our conference, which I assure you was very helpful to me and which I appreciate very much, I agreed to submit to you a memorandum setting forth a list of some of the subject matters and issues which I am studying in respect to the Metropolitan Police Department operations. I am particularly concerned with the following matters at the present time:

1. The procedures followed by the Metropolitan Police Department for recording and reporting upon crime statistics and the validity of these statistics as furnished to the

Congress and the public. With respect to crime statistics, I need information on the effect of any changes in procedures employed in compiling statistics since 1950 and the related effect these changes may have had on the comparability of reported statistical information.

2. The bookkeeping procedures at Metropolitan Police Department warehouses for maintaining accountability over property and whether items are either stolen or otherwise not accounted for.

3. The procedures for handling of paid, unpaid, canceled and adjusted traffic tickets.

4. The subject of work classification. From time to time, I have received allegations that police officers are not doing the work as specified by civil service classifications and that appropriate regulations have not been followed in promoting police officers.

5. The subject of officer training. It is my understanding that the training of new officers on the police force follows an inconsistent pattern and varies within the Department headquarters and with the precincts. This allegation leads to the public charge that favoritism characterizes the training and promotion policies of the police department. I recognize that full evaluation of some of these matters relating to personnel practices may not be within the investigative procedures of the General Accounting Office, but your comments and views on the practices and policies will be helpful to me.

6. Information concerning wiretapping and lie detector equipment. Based on available records, I would appreciate receiving information on wiretapping and lie detector equipment maintained by the Metropolitan Police Department and the use of this equipment. The propriety of such use, as well as the validity of the results, need not be considered in your review.

If, in the course of any work your staff does on any of the aforementioned items, you run across ancillary or subsidiary issues of problems which you think would be related to my study of the Metropolitan Police Department, I would appreciate receiving the benefit of a report on the same.

I want to thank you, as a Member of the Senate, for the outstanding record of dedicated, courageous public service which you are rendering as Comptroller General of the United States.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent that Mr. Campbell's letter of October 30, 1964 be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., October 30, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our report on review of certain administrative policies and practices of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia is furnished herewith in response to your letter dated April 15, 1964. A summary of our conclusions and recommendations are presented in the forepart of the report.

As you know, we did not make our findings available to the agency or obtain its comments, and it is our understanding that you plan to do so at an appropriate time. We understand also that you will bring our recommendations to the attention of the appropriate authorities.

We plan to make no further distribution of this report unless copies are specifically requested and then only after your approval has been obtained or public announcement has been made by you concerning the contents of the report.

We will be glad to discuss this report with you or members of your staff, if you so desire.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General
of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Comptroller General of the United States and the many very dedicated employees of the General Accounting Office for the very thorough study they have made in regard to the several subject matters I asked them to carefully examine. I am pleased to receive the report which I plan to release to the public today, for I believe it generally brings credit to the Metropolitan Police Department. It does not substantiate many of the criticisms which have been circulated throughout this community for a good many years about the Department.

The report I have received from the Comptroller General has been very helpful to me, and I believe will be very helpful to the District Commissioners, the President's D.C. Committee on Crime, and the Metropolitan Police Department. I am very pleased with many of the affirmative supporting findings that the Comptroller General has made in connection with some of the criticisms that have been raised in the past about the Metropolitan Police Department.

Mr. President, you will recall that when I requested that the study be made by the General Accounting Office, there were many in this community who severely criticized the senior Senator from Oregon. They claimed that the senior Senator from Oregon was unfair, and that the study he had requested the General Accounting Office to make was a misuse of public funds. I asked then, and I ask now, "What is wrong with studying the operations and practices of any department of the Federal or District government to see whether it is carrying out its public trust and responsibility with a maximum degree of efficiency and fairness to all concerned?" I have always taken the position that when serious allegations are made by responsible citizens about the conduct of an agency of their government, that those allegations should be looked into. We in the Congress have a responsibility to determine whether such allegations have substance to them. On this basis, I directed that this study be made, and I am glad that I did, because the report that I have received from the General Accounting Office, in my judgment, does not substantiate some of the allegations made by individuals and groups within this community.

The Senate will recall that in 1963 and 1964, the senior Senator from Oregon severely criticized the then Chief of Police, Robert V. Murray, for his inertia, his lack of direction of his Department, his lack of foresight and imagination and his police politics.

Since Chief Murray's departure from the Metropolitan Police Department, many policy changes have been made, I believe many of these policies are in the public interest, and I fully support a majority of them. I believe the general tempo of the Department and the morale have greatly improved since Chief Layton has taken over the direction of the Department.

Mr. President, at this time I want to turn to a brief discussion of the special report on review of certain administrative policies and practices which I requested from the Comptroller General of the United States and which was completed for me in October 1964.

RECORDING AND REPORTING OF CRIME STATISTICS

Over a period of several years, individuals have privately reported to me, and some witnesses have testified before the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia that they had some suspicions which caused them to question the accuracy of the recording and reporting of crime statistics by the Metropolitan Police Department. In their judgment there was reason to believe that the method of recording and reporting of crime statistics had been modified from time to time between 1950 and 1964.

In order to determine whether there was any substance to the questions raised by these people, I asked the General Accounting Office to study the Police Department's prescribed recording and reporting procedures from 1950 to 1964. The Comptroller General advises me that the General Accounting Office study "did not disclose any deficiencies which would indicate that reports for fiscal years 1950 through 1963 had not been prepared on a reasonably consistent basis in accordance with guidelines for reporting, as established by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

In this connection, the General Accounting Office also reviewed all closed offense cases which were included in its test of offenses reported. During March 1963, a study of those cases caused the General Accounting Office to conclude that "from a judicial point of view many of the reported offenses were later found to be less serious or without legal basis for action."

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR PROPERTY TAKEN INTO CUSTODY

Allegations and rumors have circulated throughout the Nation's Capital and have been brought to my attention for some time, that some property, including liquor, which has been taken into custody by the Metropolitan Police Department and stored at the Police Department warehouse, has been stolen by some members of the police force and taken to their homes and vacation retreats. Due to the seriousness of the allegations and because the rumors have been so widely circulated throughout the community, I felt that in fairness to the Police Department and the community, I should request the General Accounting Office to make a thorough study of the bookkeeping procedures at the Metropolitan Police Department warehouse for maintaining accountability of the property, and whether items are either stolen or otherwise not accounted for. The General Accounting Office made such a study.

General Accounting Office investigators caused to be made a physical count of selected property listed on selected property return forms. The investigators made a physical count of property covered by 112 property return forms which disclosed discrepancies in 5 of the 112 returns.

The investigators suggest that while the discrepancies which occurred do not appear significant per se, they indicate a need for a much more careful preparation and verification of property return forms and for more adequate controls over property. The investigation showed that a number of regulations were not being complied with by officers in charge of property at the Police Department warehouse. It was found that guns were being held for more than a year after being received in the property office, and regulations require that they be disposed of after 90 days. It was also found that property was being held for long periods of time and that no followup had been made with the U.S. attorney for more than 10 years to determine the advisability of disposing of the property.

For instance, property acquired in 1950 from a mental patient was still being held even though the patient died in 1958. The investigation further showed that an inventory of property stored in the warehouse vault had not been made for about 4 years, and that an inventory of property in the storeroom and in the warehouse had not been made within 6 years. I am advised that very poor records were kept of those inventories.

The Comptroller General advises me that by law the Metropolitan Police Department is required to collect storage fees for certain property in its custody, and he found that no action had been taken to implement the law until February 15, 1964.

The General Accounting Office investigation further disclosed that certain reports required by the manual of the Metropolitan Police Department were not made to the Chief of Police. However, I am advised that after General Accounting Office investigators began investigating practices at the Police Department warehouse, a formal report was made to the Chief of Police in accordance with the Department's own manual.

The Comptroller General further advises me that regulations of the Metropolitan Police Department prohibit the retention of property, other than prisoners' property, by any unit of the Police Department more than 5 days before submitting it to the property office. The investigation showed that in numerous instances these regulations were not complied with.

On the subject of accountability for property taken into custody, the Comptroller General states that:

> Although our review disclosed only minor discrepancies in the records of the property clerk, we believe that the existing system of internal controls unnecessarily provides opportunities for irregularities to occur and not be detected for many years, if at all.

The Comptroller General further states that in his judgment there is a need to strengthen internal controls over property taken into custody by the Police Department, and he makes the following recommendations:

> 1. A control register be established and properly maintained which would constitute a permanent record of property taken into custody, and its disposition.
>
> 2. Physical inventories be taken annually and reconciled with the individual property return forms.
>
> 3. A followup be made periodically on the status of property to determine whether it should be disposed of by public auction, if salable, or destroyed if not salable.
>
> 4. The duties of keeping records of property be separated from those relating to the physical handling of property.
>
> 5. The need for timely submission, careful preparation, and verification of property return forms be emphasized.

WORK CLASSIFICATIONS

Over a period of time allegations have been made to me by police officers that work assigned to them was not consistent with their training and experience as police officers. The General Accounting Office study disclosed that no review is made of work assignments by the Metropolitan Police Department, the Civil Service Commission, or the District of Columbia Personnel Office. Although the Metropolitan Police Department has made some progress in assigning civilian personnel to positions in order to relieve policemen of duties not directly related to the prevention and detection of crime, it has not made the progress which is warranted. This is especially true in view of the fact that the Metropolitan Police Department is finding it extremely difficult to recruit police officers into the Department. The Metropolitan Police Department has not been able to recruit sufficient police officers to bring the force up to its authorized strength. Yet there are police officers receiving police officers' pay, and all of the fringe benefits which police officers receive, because it is generally acknowledged that they have performed hazardous work, who are working as mechanics, radio repairmen, licensing officials in various Government agencies, officers working in the clothing room, service and crane shop, central garage, emergency building repair, payrolls office, property office, clinic office, and yes, Mr. President, a marine mechanic.

Mr. President, in my judgment, these and many other police positions should be replaced by civilians at the earliest possible date. Such action would release police officers who have extensive police training and experience, to return to crime prevention and detection work and at the same time the civilians filling these positions could do just as fine a work.

In addition to some of the positions I have just mentioned, I am advised that there are four policemen working in the Corporation Counsel's office, six policemen working in the Property Clerk's office, 27 policemen working in various licensing offices. Mr. President, Commissioner Tobriner testified before the Senate District of Columbia Committee that he is in full support of replacing many of these positions with civilians. I say to Mr. Tobriner that "You are a Johnny Come Lately, because the facts of the situation do not bear out your assertion." The truth of the matter is that year after year the District Commissioners have disallowed many of the requests by the Chief of Police to replace policemen in clerical, technical, and other assignments, by civilians.

In fiscal years 1953 through 1966 the Metropolitan Police Department requested 175 full-time civilian positions. Of the 175 requested by the Metropolitan Police Department, the Commissioners recommended 94, and Congress allowed 86. The practice which has been followed in recent years by the Congress has been to accept the figure recommended by the Commissioners.

In fiscal years 1961 through 1966, Congress has allowed the exact number of positions requested by the Commissioners. So, if Mr. Tobriner is serious in his statement that he is in full agreement with the program of replacing policemen in clerical, technical, and other assignments by civilians, all he has to do is recommend to the Congress the number of positions requested by the Police Department, because, Mr. President, the Police Department figure is very low. All one has to understand is a little bit of the politics within the Police Department to know why that figure is low.

In order that Members of Congress and the public will have a better understanding of the problem involved in job descriptions and assignments, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a letter dated April 27, 1965, addressed to me by Chief of Police John B. Layton, enclosing a copy of a statement made by retired Chief of Police Robert Murray, on April 1, 1963; also a memorandum showing congressional appropriation actions on requests for release of police officers by civilian personnel for fiscal years 1953 through 1964. That memorandum tells a great deal of the story.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT
OF COLUMBIA,
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is in response to your request for justification of assignments of police officers to clerical, technical, and similar duties in the following functions:

1. Corporation Counsel's Office.
2. Central Violations Bureau.
3. Property Clerk's Office.
4. License Officer duties.
5. School Crossing Guard duties.
6. Various other clerical duties.
7. Radio operation and maintenance and service and repair duties.

The problem of replacing policemen in clerical, technical, and other assignments with civilian personnel is a complex and difficult one which faces administrators in every major American police department. This problem has been the subject of two major studies within the Metropolitan Police Department in the past 13 years.

I am furnishing herewith copies of a report, dated April 1, 1963, which was prepared under the direction of former Chief of Police Murray, which relates the findings of the 1959 study of this problem and which recapitulates the efforts made by this Department through that date to achieve replacement of police officers with civilian positions where possible. I am also furnishing an updating of that recapitulation which brings it through the fiscal year 1966 budget as approved by the House; this recapitulation shows that from the fiscal year 1953 through the fiscal year 1966, this Department made 206 recommendations for full-time civilian replacements for policemen, from which it obtained 87 positions, and the Department made 454 recommendations for part-time crossing guards, from which it obtained 100 positions.

These data are provided without intending to blame the Board of Commissioners or the Congress for their actions on our requests for civilian positions. For several years the Board of Commissioners have been under mandate from the Congress to provide police personnel strength required by law, and the Congress has always supported departmental requests for providing that strength. Each appropriation item must be measured against other important requests and against revenue availability, and this Department has consistently recommended that priority should be given to addition of police strength; on the other hand, the record reflects the willingness of this Department to request and to use civilian employees for replacement of police officers where possible.

With regard to the specific assignments for which you requested justification, I would offer the following comments:

1. Office of the Corporation Counsel: As indicated by the material furnished herewith, this Department recommended in 1962 that action be taken to release police officers from this nonpolice function. I am in full accord with that recommendation.

2. Central Violations Bureau: As indicated by the material herewith, this Department, in the fiscal year 1964, obtained civilian personnel to release police officers from clerical duties in connection with the traffic warrant service function which was transferred from the Central Violations Bureau to the Traffic Division.

3. Property Clerk's Office: As reflected by the material herewith, a request was made but rejected in our 1965 estimates for one civilian position to release police personnel from clerical duties in the Property Clerk's Office. Review of unit budget requests submitted for the fiscal year 1967 show that the Chief (also Property) Clerk has requested two civilian positions to release police officers from clerical and other nonpolice duties in his office; his recommendation will be included in our budget request to the Commissioners. I am informed that he proposes to make additional requests for civilian personnel for this purpose in future fiscal years as the positions already requested are allowed and assimilated into the organization.

4. License officers: The material forwarded herewith reflects a March 1962 recommendation for action to release police officers from nonpolice functions connected with enforcement of license laws and regulations. I am in full accord with that recommendation.

5. School crossing guard duties: Data for the fiscal year 1964 indicate that for that year civilian crossing guards provided approximately 38,000 hours of school crossing coverage as compared with approximately 45,000 hours coverage provided by police officers. I am totally in support of the civilian school crossing guard program and sincerely hope that in future budgets it will be possible to provide sufficient additional civilian crossing guards or additional police cadets to relieve police officers from practically all school crossing guard duty.

6. General clerical duties: Although, for the various reasons listed in the report of April 1, 1963, it would be impractical to use civilian personnel to release every police officer presently assigned to clerical or technical functions from such duties, it is quite obvious that many of the approximately 104 police positions we now have submitted to clerical assignments could be released by use of civilian personnel. Our reason for not having already replaced some of these police officers with civilians is simply that, as reflected in the material furnished herewith, we have been unable to obtain positions to make such replacements. I do anticipate that we can make some headway on this problem as our Cadet Corps gets fully underway, and I can assure you that future budgets of this department will, as those of the past have, include requests for civilian positions to replace police officers in clerical assignments.

7. Radio operation and maintenance and service and repair: A majority of the positions in this classification are radio dispatcher assignments, which I would not recommend for replacement with civilian personnel because of the high degree of knowledge and training in police procedures and operations needed for that duty. Another large group of positions in this category are our radio repairmen. Because of the need for a great degree of security over our highly important radio facilities, I am not inclined to recommend that all of our existing radio repair positions be converted to civilian positions; however, shortly after my appointment as Chief of Police, when I became aware of the anticipated need for additional radio repair personnel as our footmen and other radio systems increase in size and complexity, I directed that future budgets of this department include civilian positions to supplement our radio repair service. This category of service and repair assignments also includes other police positions which I expect to recommend in future budgets for replacement with civilian personnel.

JOHN B. LAYTON,
Chief of Police.

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,
April 1, 1963.

REPLACEMENT OF POLICEMEN IN CLERICAL, TECHNICAL AND OTHER ASSIGNMENTS WITH CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

During my tenure as Chief of Police I have placed strong, consistent emphasis on the necessity for replacing policemen in clerical, technical, and other assignments with civilian personnel whenever such replacement was practicable. One of the major administrative projects undertaken at my direction during my first year as Chief of Police was a complete survey and study by the Chief Clerk's section of various possibilities for release of police officers for crime prevention by their replacement with civilian personnel.

The first budget prepared under my direction included a request for civilian school crossing guards to relieve police officers from that duty. And every budget prepared under my direction as Chief of Police has included requests for civilian positions to release policemen from duties not directly related to prevention and detection of crime. Information supporting this statement is furnished herewith.

Certainly there are some problems connected with the use of civilian personnel instead of policemen in clerical and technical duties. Under my direction a thorough study of these problems was made in 1959 and the following adverse factors were found to exist in such replacements:

1. Some positions which require no actual police authority do require police training and experience.

I have hope that we may be able to overcome this problem to some extent in the future by establishing formal training programs for civilian personnel; however, because civilian personnel are able to and do transfer with ease between agencies, and because many civilian clerical employees do not plan on making the police department a permanent career, it will never be practical to train every civilian employee to the extent we train a police officer.

2. A civilian position often will not blend efficiently into the quasi-military organization of the police department.

Many of our clerical positions are in fact administrative aids to unit commanders and, as such, incumbents must frequently convey instructions of the commander to subordinate personnel and, in the absence of the commander, must be able to advise personnel of procedures acceptable to the unit commander.

3. When a group of civilian positions within the police department tends toward the nature of police work, there is a tendency to blanket the civilian group into the police force by statute.

This has occurred at least four times in the history of this department. Such statutory action obviously blankets into the force persons who otherwise would be unable to qualify under the mental and/or physical appointment standards; therefore, it is important to avoid employing civilians in duties too closely resembling those of a police officer.

4. Recruiting of a qualified civilian employee for a specific position within the Police Department is frequently difficult.

This is an especially acute problem. It is extremely difficult to find a qualified male employee willing to accept lower grade clerical positions, especially in the Police Department where there are few higher grade supervisory civilian positions. This same factor also deters many of the more ambitious female applicants from seeking employment with the Police Department and, of course, female employees would be undesirable in those precinct positions where there is a need for handling male prisoners.

A problem is also encountered in recruiting civilian employees for work on night shifts and on changing shifts.

5. Some police officers assigned to nonpolice duties cannot be returned to regular duty because of age or disability.

This is a problem which affects a number of the assignments of police officers to clerical duties; however, there remain a large number of assignments where it is now necessary to employ able-bodied men who could be replaced with civilian employees, and until those replacements are made, it is not necessary to examine this area in depth.

Despite these foregoing factors, which I assure you are real problems, I have, as I pointed out to you earlier, made repeated efforts to obtain authorizations for civilian positions to replace police officers where possible. In all, I have made 130 recommendations for full-time civilian replacements for policemen, from which I obtained 46 positions, and I have made 424 recommendations for part-time crossing guards, from which I have obtained 76 positions.

I make this last statement without intending to blame the Board of Commissioners or the Congress for their actions on these requests. And I want to emphasize this statement. For several years the Board of Commissioners has been under mandate from the Congress to provide the police personnel strength required by law, and during the last decade the Congress has never failed to support me by providing that strength. Certainly each appropriation item requested must be measured against other important requests and against revenue availability, and I have believed and do believe that priority should be given to attainment of the authorized police strength of 3,000 men; on the other hand, the record clearly shows that I have never been unwilling to request and to use civilian employees for replacement of police officers where possible.

Anticipating the provision in the 1964 appropriation of the full 3,000-man police force now authorized by law, my tentative plan for subsequent years is to approach on two major fronts the possible use of civilian personnel to release police officers for regular police duties. These approaches are:

First: An increase in the number of school crossing guards from 76 to 150 positions.

During the fiscal year 1962, with 76 crossing guard positions, those guards served 38,444 hours on school crossings. During that same year, police personnel served 42,603 hours on school crossings.

Provision of another 74 crossing guard positions will release police officers from nearly all school crossing guard duty, thus providing better patrol patterns and freeing more men for assignment to evening and night tours of duty when crime is prevalent.

Second: Establishment of a police cadet corps within the department.

Establishment of a police cadet corps would serve the department in two ways. First, it would provide a source of supply of younger and better trained men who desire a permanent career in police work. Second, while providing on-the-job training for the cadets, it would provide a source of employees, to whom the factors I have outlined heretofore would not be applicable, for use in many of the clerical and similar assignments where police officers are now employed.

In addition to these two major programs, I intend to continue working toward replacement of policemen with civilians in those other assignments where these programs would not apply. In this connection, I directed my unit commanders, in their planning for the 1965 budget, to carefully examine assignments within their units to determine whether or not there were any positions where they might utilize civilian personnel to replace policemen on clerical duty. I expect to include requests for several such positions in the 1965 estimates.

Civilian positions requested to replace policemen in clerical, technical, and other assignments

[By fiscal years—By final action]

Fiscal year	Full-time positions			Part-time school-crossing guards		
	Requested by Department	Recommended by Commissioners	Allowed by Congress	Requested by Department	Recommended by Commissioners	Allowed by Congress
1953	2					
1954				200	200	24
1955				176	100	52
1956				24		
1957	6	[1] 6	[1] 6			
1958	19					
1959	19	2				
1960	6	6				
1961	31	29	29			
1962	4	4	4			
1963	6	6	6			
1964	2		(2)	24		(2)
Total [3]	95	53	45	424	300	76
Nonbudget recommendation [4]	35	[4] 1	(3)			

[1] In 1957 the Department requested 6 positions to relieve policemen from duty in central driver file, the Commissioners transferred the function and thereby released the policemen.

[2] No congressional action on 1964 appropriation thus far.

[3] Totals recommend number of requests made, but not number of individual positions requested; in many instances requests rejected in 1 year were repeated in subsequent years.

[4] This reflects a recommendation that police officers performing nonpolice duties rated to functions of other District agencies be released from those duties; this recommendation is still under study.

APPROPRIATION ACTIONS ON REQUESTS FOR RELEASE OF POLICE OFFICERS BY CIVILIAN PERSONNEL, FISCAL YEARS 1953–64

BY TYPE OF REQUEST

1. School crossing guards:

Fiscal year 1954: Department requested 200; Commissioners recommended 200; Congress rejected 176 and allowed 24.

Fiscal year 1955: Department requested 176; Commissioners rejected 100 and recommended 76; Congress rejected 24 and allowed 52.

Fiscal year 1956: Department requested 24; Commissioners rejected 24.

Fiscal year 1964: Department requested 24; Commissioners rejected 24.

2. Clerk-typist to release police officer in uniforms and equipment section:

Fiscal year 1953: Department requested 1; Commissioners rejected 1.

3. Clerk-typists to release police officer in Statistical Bureau:

Fiscal year 1953: Department requested 1; Commissioners rejected 1.

4. Statistical clerk to release police officer in Statistical Bureau:

Fiscal year 1962: Department requested 1; Commissioners recommended 1; Congress allowed 1.

5. Clerk-typists for Statistical Bureau to obviate necessity for hand tabulation of traffic arrests by police personnel in precincts:

Fiscal year 1958: Department requested 2; Commissioners rejected 2.

Fiscal year 1959: Department requested 2; Commissioners recommended 2; Congress rejected 2.

Fiscal year 1961: Department requested 2; Commissioners rejected 2.

Fiscal year 1962: Department requested 2; Commissioners recommended 2; Congress allowed 2.

6. Clerk-typist to release police personnel in Central Driver File:

Fiscal year 1957: Department requested 6; Commissioners transferred Central Driver File to Department of Vehicles and Traffic and released police officers.

7. Clerks to release police officers from clerical work in Public Vehicles Unit:

Fiscal year 1958: Department requested 6; Commissioners rejected 6.

Fiscal year 1959: Department requested 6; Commissioners rejected 6.

Fiscal year 1960: Department requested 6; Commissioners recommended 6; Congress rejected 6.

Fiscal year 1961: Department requested 3; Commissioners recommended 3; Congress allowed 3.

8. Clerks to release police officers doing clerical work in Communications and Records Bureau:

Fiscal year 1958: Department requested 11; Commissioners rejected 11.

Fiscal year 1959: Department requested 11; Commissioners rejected 11.

9. Parking patrol aids:

Fiscal year 1961: Department requested 26; Commissioners recommended 26, Congress allowed 26.

10. Clerk-typist to release police personnel from clerical work in Pawn Office;

Fiscal year 1962: Department requested 1; Commissioners recommended 1; Congress allowed 1.

11. Typewriter repairman to release police officer performing such work:

Fiscal year 1963: Department requested 1; Commissioners recommended 1; Congress allowed 1.

12. Cerk-typist to release police officer performing clerical work in training section:

Fiscal year 1963: Department requested 1; Commissioners recommended 1; Congress allowed 1.

13. Clerks to relieve police officers from clerical duties in Accident Investigation Unit:

Fiscal year 1963: Department requested 3; Commissioners recommended 3; Congress allowed 3.

14. Clerk to relieve police officer from clerical duties in Juvenile Bureau:

Fiscal year 1964: Department requested 1; Commissioners rejected 1. (To continue through 1964 on temporary basis.)

15. Teletype operator to preclude necessity for details of police officers to that work in Communications and Records Bureau:

Fiscal year 1964: Department requested 1; Commissioners rejected 1.

16. Teletype operator to relieve police position formerly assigned to that duty:

Fiscal year 1964: Department requested 1 on temporary basis through fiscal year 1964; to be requested in 1965 estimates.

RECAPITULATION BY FISCAL YEARS [1]

Fiscal year 1953: Department requested 2 clerical positions; Commissioners rejected 2.

Fiscal year 1954: Department requested 200 school crossing guards; Commissioners recommended 200; Congress rejected 176 and allowed 24.

Fiscal year 1955: Department requested 176 school crossing guards; Commissioners rejected 100 and recommended 76; Congress rejected 24 and allowed 52.

Fiscal year 1956: Department requested 24 school crossing guards; Commissioners rejected 24.

Fiscal year 1957: Department requested 6 clerical positions for Central Driver File; Commissioners transferred function and released police officers.

Fiscal year 1958: Department requested 19 clerical positions; Commissioners rejected 19.

Fiscal year 1959: Department requested 19 clerical positions; Commissioners rejected 17 and recommended 2; Congress rejected 2.

Fiscal year 1960: Department requested 6 clerical positions; Commissioners recommended 6; Congress rejected 6.

Fiscal year 1961: Department requested 5 clerical positions; Commissioners rejected 2 and recommended 3; Congress allowed 3. Department requested 26 parking patrol aids; Commissioners recommended 26; Congress allowed 26.

Fiscal year 1962: Department requested 4 clerical positions; Commissioners recommended 4; Congress allowed 4.

---

[1] Years cannot be totaled to provide a total for the entire period because requests once rejected are sometimes repeated.

Fiscal year 1963: Department requested 1 technical and 5 clerical positions; Commissioners recommended 6; Congress allowed 6.

Fiscal year 1964: Department requested 24 school crossing guards and 2 clerical positions; Commissions rejected the 26 positions.

COMMENTS

During the review period of fiscal year 1958 and 1959 appropriations, the Board of Commissioners was under a mandate by the Congress (Public Law 84–514) to bring the police officer strength of the Metropolitan Police Department up to a 2,500 man minimum. Priority was, therefore, given to provision of additional police officers and most requests for civilian positions to release police from clerical duties were rejected as a general policy of the Board of Commissioners.

In pointing out that civilian personnel had been requested in the past to release police officers from clerical work and had been refused, it was not the intention of the Chief of Police to criticize the actions of authorities responsible for review of appropriation requests, who must measure each request against other important items and against revenue sources. The record should indicate that this matter was brought out in response to a series of testimony which might otherwise have been construed to indicate that the Chief of Police has failed to make any attempt to utilize civilian personnel in releasing police officers from clerical, administrative, and technical duties.

SPECIAL REQUESTS OUTSIDE APPROPRIATIONS

In March 1962, the Department recommended that the Board of Commissioners take action to release police officers from nonpolice functions connected with other agencies. These positions included:

1. Three police officers detailed to clerical duties in the Office of the Corporation Counsel.

2. One police officer detailed to guard duties in the Finance Office.

3. Four police officers performing clerical duties in the Central Violations Bureau.

4. Twenty-seven police officers performing duty in enforcement of license laws and regulations.

As a result of that recommendation, the position referred to in paragraph 2 was released and a related civilian position in the Finance Office was abolished, at a savings of about $7,000, by using armored car service for transportation of funds.

As of this date (April 1, 1963), the recommendations regarding the remaining 34 positions are awaiting study by the Management Office.

Civilian positions requested to replace policemen in clerical, technical, and other assignments

[By fiscal years—By final action]

Fiscal year	Full-time positions			Part-time school-crossing guards		
	Requested by Department	Recommended by Comissioners	Allowed by Congress	Requested by Department	Recommended by Commissioners	Allowed by Congress
1953	2	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1954	----------	----------	----------	200	200	25
1955	----------	----------	----------	176	100	52
1956	----------	----------	----------	24	----------	----------
1957	6	[1]6	[1]6	----------	----------	----------
1958	19	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1959	19	2	----------	----------	----------	----------
1960	6	6	----------	----------	----------	----------
1961	31	29	29	----------	----------	----------
1962	4	4	4	----------	----------	----------
1963	6	6	6	----------	----------	----------
1964	7	5	5	24	----------	----------
1965	66	32	32	24	24	18
1966	9	4	4	6	6	[2]6
Total[3]	175	94	86	454	330	100
Nonbudget recommendation[4]	31	[4]1	([4])	----------	----------	----------

[1] In 1957 the Department requested 6 positions to relieve policemen from duty in central driver file, the Commissioners transferred the function and thereby released the policemen.

[2] House action on 1966 appropriation.

[3] Totals recommend number of requests made, but not number of individual positions requested; in many instances requests rejected in 1 year were repeated in subsequent years.

[4] This reflects a recommendation that police officers performing nonpolice duties related to functions of other District agencies be released from those duties; this recommendation is still under study.

APPROPRIATION ACTIONS ON REQUESTS FOR RELEASE OF POLICE OFFICERS BY CIVILIAN PERSONNEL, FISCAL YEARS 1953–66

BY TYPE OF REQUEST

1. School-crossing guards:

Fiscal year 1954: Department requested 200; Commissioners recommended 200; Congress rejected 176 and allowed 24.

Fiscal year 1955: Department requested 176; Commissioners rejected 100 and recommended 76; Congress rejected 24 and allowed 52.

Fiscal year 1956: Department requested 24; Commissioners rejected 24.

Fiscal year 1964: Department requested 24; Commissioners rejected 24.

Fiscal year 1965: Department requested 24; Commissioners recommended 24; Congress rejected 6 and allowed 18.

Fiscal year 1966: Department requested 6; Commissioners recommended 6; House allowed 6.

2. Clerk-typist to release police officer in uniform and equipment section:

Fiscal year 1953: Department requested 1; Commissioners rejected 1.

3. Clerk-typists to release police officer in statistical bureau:

Fiscal year 1953: Department requested 1; Commissioners rejected 1.

4. Statistical clerk to release police officer in statistical bureau:

Fiscal year 1962: Department requested 1; Commissioners recommended 1; Congress allowed 1.

5. Clerk-typists for Statistical Bureau to obviate necessity for hand tabulation of traffic arrests by police personnel in precincts:

Fiscal year 1958: Department requested 2; Commissioners rejected 2.

Fiscal year 1959: Department requested 2; Commissioners recommended 2; Congress rejected 2.

Fiscal year 1961: Department requested 2; Commissioners rejected 2.

Fiscal year 1962: Department requested 2; Commissioners recommended 2; Congress allowed 2.

6. Clerk-typists to release police personnel in Central Driver File:

Fiscal year 1957: Department requested 6; Commissioners transferred Central Driver File to Department of Vehicles and Traffic and released police officers.

7. Clerks to release police officers from clerical work in Public Vehicles Unit:

Fiscal year 1958: Department requested 6; Commissioners rejected 6.

Fiscal year 1959: Department requested 6; Commissioners rejected 6.

Fiscal year 1960: Department requested 6; Commissioners recommended 6; Congress rejected 6.

Fiscal year 1961: Department requested 3; Commissioners recommended 3; Congress allowed 3.

8. Clerks to release police officers doing clerical work in Communications and Records Bureau:

Fiscal year 1958: Department requested 11; Commissioners rejected 11.

Fiscal year 1959: Department requested 11; Commissioners rejected 11.

9. Parking patrol aids:

Fiscal year 1961: Department requested 26; Commissioners recommended 26, Congress allowed 26.

10. Clerk-typist to release police personnel from clerical work in Pawn Office:

Fiscal year 1962: Department requested 1; Commissioners recommended 1; Congress allowed 1.

11. Typewriter repairman to release police officer performing such work:

Fiscal year 1963: Department requested 1; Commissioners recommended 1; Congress allowed 1.

12. Clerk-typist to release police officers performing clerical work in training section:

Fiscal year 1963: Department requested 1; Commissioners recommended 1;, Congress allowed 1.

Fiscal year 1966: Department requested 3; Commissioners recommended 2; House allowed 2.

13. Clerks to relieve police officers from clerical duties in Accident Investigation Unit:

Fiscal year 1963: Department requested 3; Commissioners recommended 6; Congress allowed 3.

Fiscal year 1965: Department requested 1; Commissioners rejected 1.

14. Clerk to relieve police officer from clerical duties in Juvenile Bureau:

Fiscal year 1964: Department requested 1; Commissioners rejected 1.

Fiscal year 1965: Department requested 1; Commissioners recommended 1; Congress allowed 1.

15. Teletype operator to preclude necessity for details of police officers to that work in Communications and Records Bureau:

Fiscal year 1964: Department requested 1; Commissioners rejected 1.

Fiscal year 1965: Department requested 2; Commissioners recommended 1; Congress allowed 1.

16. Teletype operator to relieve police position formerly assigned to that duty:

Fiscal year 1964: Department requested 1 on temporary basis through fiscal year 1964; to be requested in 1965 estimates.

Fiscal year 1965: Department requested 1; Commissioners recommended 1; Congress allowed 1.

17. Clerks to replace police officers performing clerical duties in connection with Traffic Warrant Service (formerly in Central Violations Bureau):

Fiscal year 1964: Department requested 5; Commissioners recommended 5; Congress allowed 5.

18. Clerk-typist to release police officer from clerical duties in Property Clerk's Office:

Fiscal year 1965: Department requested 1; Commissioners rejected 1.

19. Clerk-typist to release police officer from clerical duties in the First Precinct:

Fiscal year 1965: Department requested 1; Commissioners rejected 1.

Fiscal year 1966: Department requested 1; Commissioners rejected 1.

20. Clerk-typists to release police officers from clerical work in the Detective Division:

Fiscal year 1965: Department requested 9; Commissioners recommended 4; Congress allowed 4.

Fiscal year 1966: Department requested 4; Commissioners recommended 2; House allowed 2.

21. Clerk-typist to release police officer of clerical work in the Woman's Bureau:

Fiscal year 1966: Department requested 1; Commissioners rejected 1.

22. Police cadets to release police officers from clerical and other similar duties not requiring police authority:

Fiscal year 1965: Department requested 50; Commissioners recommended 25; Congress allowed 25.

RECAPITULATION BY FISCAL YEARS

Fiscal year 1953: Department requested two clerical positions; Commissioners rejected two.

Fiscal year 1954: Department requested 200 school-crossing guards; Commissioners recommended 200; Congress rejected 176 and allowed 24.

Fiscal year 1955: Department requested 176 school-crossing guards; Commissioners rejected 100 and recommended 76; Congress rejected 24 and allowed 52.

Fiscal year 1956: Department requested 24 school-crossing guards; Commissioners rejected 24.

Fiscal year 1957: Department requested six clerical positions for Central Driver File; Commissioners transferred function and released police officers.

Fiscal year 1958: Department requested 19 clerical positions; Commissioners rejected 19.

Fiscal year 1959: Department requested 19 clerical positions; Commissioners rejected 17 and recommended 2; Congress rejected 2.

Fiscal year 1960: Department requested 6 clerical positions; Commissioners recommended 6; Congress rejected 6.

Fiscal year 1961: Department requested 5 clerical positions; Commissioners rejected 2 and recommended 3; Congress allowed 3.

Department requested 26 parking patrol aids; Commissioners recommended 26; Congress allowed 26.

Fiscal year 1962: Department requested 4 clerical positions; Commissioners recommended 4; Congress allowed 4.

Fiscal year 1963: Department requested 1 technical and 5 clerical positions; Commissioners recommended 6; Congress allowed 6.

Fiscal year 1964: Department requested 24 school-crossing guards and 7 clerical positions; Commissioners rejected 26 positions and recommended 5 clerical positions; Congress allowed 5.

Fiscal year 1965: Department requested 66 positions; Commissioners rejected 34 and recommended 32; Congress allowed 32.

Fiscal year 1966: Department requested 6 school-crossing guards and 9 clerical positions; Commissioners recommended 6 crossing guards and 4 clerical; House allowed 10.

COMMENTS

During the review period of fiscal years 1958 and 1959 appropriations, the Board of Commissioners was under a mandate by the Congress (Public Law 84-514) to bring the police officer strength of the Metropolitan Police Department up to a 2,500-man minimum. Priority was, therefore, given to provision of additional police officers and most requests for civilian positions to release police from clerical duties were rejected as a general policy of the Board of Commissioners.

In pointing out that civilian personnel has been requested in the past to release police officers from clerical work and has been refused, it is not the intention of the Chief of Police to criticize the actions of authorities responsible for review of appropriation requests, who must measure each request against other important items and against revenue sources. This record is provided in response to frequent misapprehensions that this department has failed to make any attempt to utilize civilian personnel in releasing police officers from clerical, administrative, and technical duties.

SPECIAL REQUESTS OUTSIDE APPROPRIATIONS

In March 1962, the department recommended that the Board of Commissioners take action to release police officers from nonpolice functions connected with other agencies. These positions included:

1. Three police officers detailed to clerical duties in the Office of the Corporation Counsel.
2. One police officer detailed to guard duties in the Finance Office.
3. Twenty-seven police officers performing duty in enforcement of license laws and regulations.
4. Four police officers performing clerical duties in the Central Violations Bureau. (Alternate proposal allowed in 1964 budget.)

As a result of that recommendation, the position referred to in paragraph 2 was released and a related civilian position in the Finance Office was abolished, at a savings of about $7,000 by using armored car service for transportation of funds.

A supplemental budget request for fiscal year 1964 provided five civilian clerks to release police officers from clerical duties reflected in paragraph 3, a function which, incidentally, was transferred from the Central Violations Bureau to the Traffic Division. As of this date (April 1965) the recommendations regarding the remaining 30 positions are awaiting study by the Management Office.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a table showing the positions which the Metropolitan Police Department believes could be replaced by civilian employees. It is interesting to note that the Metropolitan Police Department's chart shows only about one-half or less such positions than the General Accounting Office. That is why I say, Mr. President, the Police Department figures are conservative ones. I have a hunch that the General Accounting Office figures are also conservative.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Police positions which could be replaced by civilian positions

[By unit—By type of duty—May 1965]

	Number of positions
Administrative headquarters:	
License and station clerk office	1
Court detail and liaison office	7
Uniform and equipment section:	
Clothing room	3
Central garage	1
Service and crane shop	1
Emergency building repair	2
Chief clerk's section:	
Purchasing and accounts and payrolls	1
Property office	2
Total, Administrative Headquarters	18
Communications and Records Bureau:	
Records clerks	6
Clinic clerk	1
Relief station and clinic clerk	1
Central index	1
Radio maintenance	2
Total, Communications and Records Bureau	11

Police positions which could be replaced by civilian positions—Continued

[By unit—By type of duty—May 1965]

	Number of positions
Detective Division:	
Office of the chief of detectives	1
Station clerk's office	4
Identification Bureau: Clerks	1
Total, detective division	6
Traffic division: Accident investigation unit	1
Total, traffic division	1
Youth aid division: Clerk	1
Total, youth aid division	1
Morals Division: Station clerk	1
Total, morals division	1
Precincts:	
Clerks	16
Marine mechanic	1
Total, precincts	17
Grand total	55

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point of my remarks a letter I received from Chief of Police John B. Layton, stating his full agreement with my suggestion that a complete review be made of the utilization of all police manpower.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT
OF COLUMBIA,
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,
June 15, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In response to the inquiry from your staff the following information is supplied regarding steps taken since our discussion of the subject at the hearings of the Senate District Committee to improve utilization of police manpower.

First, as you already know, at the direction of the committee chairman, officials of the District working with the President's Adviser on National Capital Affairs prepared a proposal of eight special anticrime programs which were presented to the Senate District Committee. The five of those programs ready for financing in the 1966 budget were also submitted to the Senate Subcommittee on District Appropriations.

The most important of those programs, in terms of long-range improvement of utilization of police manpower, is in my judgment our recommendation for establishing of a planning and development bureau within the department and the application of computers to police work.

Other programs in that proposal which also affect various aspects of manpower utilization are the recommended experimenting with and analysis of the efficacy of saturation patrol techniques in crime prevention, the use of one-man patrol cars to achieve greater patrol coverage at a smaller proportional cost in manpower, and the immediate expansion of our footman radio system to obtain more effective use of our foot patrol force.

More directly in line with the area in which you have shown special interest is our program for increasing the number of school

> crossing guards and for undertaking a complete review of all assignments of police officers to administrative, clerical, and technical duties. The increase in crossing guards was submitted in our 1966 budget amendment; I expect that our 1967 budget will include at least 50 cadet and civilian positions to replace policemen in nonpolice assignments.
>
> I would also call your attention to the fact that this Department has developed to near implementation a cadet program which includes as one of its primary purposes the provision of a group of employees trained in police work who can be used for the relief of policemen from quasi-police assignments. Our only reason for not having already fully begun that program is that most of the applicants on the registers are students scheduled to graduate from high school this month; we will have the 25 cadet positions presently authorized filled by the end of this month, just after school vacations begin.
>
> I would mention, too, that at our May 19 staff meeting I called to the attention of our unit commanders our desire to relieve as many policemen as possible from clerical duties, and I directed them to be alert to possibilities for making such replacements where appropriate. And just before I received the telephone call asking for this report, I had directed the official in charge of our communications to prepare a report on the possibility of using civilians as radio repairmen in our expanding radio system.
>
> These are the actions we have already taken. As I indicated in our proposals to the Senate District Committee, I am fully in agreement with your suggestion that a complete review be made of assignments of policemen to non-police-type duties and, for that matter, of all utilization of police manpower. This task ranks high among the projects I expect to assign to the Planning and Development Bureau I have requested in our 1966 budget amendment. And I assure you that the replacement of as many policemen in these assignments with civilians as practicable and economical ranks high among the goals I hope to achieve during my time as chief of police.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> John B. Layton,
> *Chief of Police.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I urge the Chief of Police and the District of Columbia Commissioners to make every effort to replace every police officer that is doing work which could just as well be done by civilians, in order that those police officers may better spend their time and talent doing crime detection and crime prevention work. Of course, Mr. President, I know that many of these police officers do not want to do crime detection and crime prevention work, because they have "gone soft," and they want a soft, inside job, and still retain all the pay, retirement, and medical benefits that accrue to a policeman. It is no secret that for years some of these police officers have lobbied on Capitol Hill to get assigned to these indoor positions. And, of course, Mr. President, I know there are situations and circumstances where, for health reasons, a police officer cannot continue his outdoor activities. If such is the case, he should be brought in and assigned to desk work, but his many police officers' benefits should be reduced to those benefits received by civilian employees doing comparable clerical work. If such were the practice, we would not have nearly as many police officers seeking indoor jobs.

In his report, the Comptroller General states:

> We believe that a periodic review of job descriptions of technicians should be made by the Civil Service Commission.

The General Accounting Office advises me that it did not attempt to make desk audits or comparisons of duties performed by police officers. The report states, however, that—

> Notwithstanding these limitations, we noted during our review several situations in which it appears questionable that special police training is necessary to perform the duties assigned to policemen.

The Comptroller General recommends that—

> On the basis of our limited examination in this area, we believe that a thorough study of the duties being performed by policemen not actually engaged in patrol duties or in the investigation of crime, would probably reveal that a substantial number of policemen are assigned to duties which do not require the specialized training, physical qualifications, experience, and other attributes that are choices by the policemen performing such duties.

The Comptroller General further recommends that the Metropolitan Police Department give serious consideration to requesting the U.S. Civil Service Commission to make a study of administrative-type duties within the Department, which are being performed by policemen, to determine whether these duties can be adequately performed by civilians, thereby releasing policemen to perform duties of the type which will enable full utilization of their special abilities.

PROMOTION PRACTICES

Police officers holding the rank of captain and above may be promoted by the Chief of Police without regard to examination. Police officers under the rank of captain must be processed through a dual appraisal system in determining the order of promotion. The dual appraisal system consists of a written civil service examination which counts 40 percent toward the promotion rating, and an evaluation by superior officers rates 60 percent of the examination. Applying the 40- to 60-percent rate, respectively, the final rating of candidates for promotion is determined.

Before an officer can become eligible to apply for promotion, however, he must meet certain basic Metropolitan Police Department requirements regarding length of service and time in a given rank. These eligibility requirements are rules of the Metropolitan Police Department and not the Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission's function is merely to administer and score the examination.

The General Accounting Office report goes into some detail as to the procedures which are followed by the Police Department in rating the performance of police officers. Therefore, I shall not duplicate the General Accounting Office explanation in this regard.

On June 30, 1961, according to the General Accounting Office report, the Metropolitan Police Department employed 2,696 officers, of whom 2,315 were white and 381 colored. At that time, there were 1,042 officers who met the basic eligibility requirements and expressed interest in being promoted and thus were given a suitability for promotion rating in 1961. The number of officers given the suitability for promotion rating included 113 colored officers and 929 white officers. Of the 1,042 officers who were rated by the Metropolitan Police Department, 983 officers actually took the Civil Service Commission written examination. Of the 983 officers taking the examination, there were 98 colored officers and 825 white officers. Of this number, 37 colored officers and 393 white officers passed the examination; 62 percent of the colored officers taking the examination failed, and 56 percent of the white officers failed the examination. The General Accounting Office noted that 96 percent of the candidates who failed the written examination for promotion received excellent or satisfactory ratings on suitability for promotion.

The General Accounting Office further states that it has been told that many police officers are probably rated much higher than they should be and that all ratings in 1961 were 75 or higher. The report states that starting in 1942 and continued through fiscal year 1963, several District of Columbia appropriation acts had provision in them requiring the Metropolitan Police Department to make out-of-order promotions. Since fiscal year 1963, 11 out-of-order promotions have been made.

I am pleased to note that the Senate and House Subcommittees on Appropriations for the District of Columbia have discontinued the practice of promoting police officers out of turn. Though the General Accounting Office concludes that its reviews and tests of the procedures and practices followed by the police department in making promotions of policemen up through the rank of captain during the 2-year period ending March 1964 disclosed no deficiencies which would indicate that such promotions were not made either on a reasonably competitive merit basis or as otherwise required by a mandate of Congress, I believe the practice of giving so much weight to suitability rating leaves open a great deal of room for abuse. I believe that it is here that a lot of politics in the police department begins, because it is here where officers seek the favor of their superiors in order to receive high ratings. I think considerable study and attention should be given to this matter to see whether some other procedure might prove more satisfactory.

Lastly, I wish to say that the Comptroller General's report under the heading of Police Training states that too frequently new recruits were assigned to precincts without adequate police training. This situation is being noted by Police Chief Layton and I am hopeful will be corrected as rapidly as possible. I shall do whatever I can to help secure the necessary appropriations for a new police training school and additional manpower for the Department. I shall have more to say about this early next year.

Mr. President the Comptroller's special report on review of certain adminis-

trative policies and practices of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia government speaks for itself. We are indebted to the Comptroller General and his able staff for this thorough report. In behalf of my subcommittee of the Senate District of Columbia Committee I am pleased to present it to the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL REPORT ON REVIEW OF CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES AND PRACTICES—METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

(By the Comptroller General of the United States, October 1964)

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with a request dated April 15, 1964, from Senator WAYNE MORSE, and discussions with him and his representative, the General Accounting Office has made a review of certain administrative policies and practices of the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD), District of Columbia government.

Our review was directed principally toward examining into the administrative policies and practices specified in the letter of inquiry; namely, (1) recording and reporting crime statistics and the effects of any changes in procedures and practices since 1950, (2) bookkeeping procedures at Metropolitan Police Department warehouses for maintaining accountability over property, (3) handling of paid, unpaid, canceled, and adjusted traffic tickets, (4) work classification and promotion policies and practices, (5) officer training, and (6) maintenance and use of wire-tapping and lie-detector equipment. A copy of the letter appears as appendix I to this report.

In conducting our review, we examined the reorganization order establishing the Metropolitan Police Department and the related laws, Commissioners' orders, and departmental orders and regulations and we interviewed officers, examined records, and observed activities of members of the Metropolitan Police Department.

The principal officials of the District of Columbia government responsible for administration of the activities discussed in this report are listed in appendix II.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Metropolitan Police Department, District of Columbia Government, was established in its present form by Reorganization Order No. 46, effective August 1, 1953, for the purpose of providing maximum protection of life and property in the community through the prevention and detection of crime and the enforcement of all local and locally applicable statutes, regulations, and ordinances. The Metropolitan Police Department is under the direction and control of the President of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia Government. The MPD is headed by the Chief of Police and consists of the following organizational components.

Description	*Number of Officers*
Chief of Police	1
Executive Office	7
Internal Investigations Unit	4
Patrol Division	2,025
Traffic Division	237
Detective Division	215
Morals Division	45
Youth Aid Division	86
Uniforms and Equipment Section	12
Chief Clerk's Section	19
Special Services Section	86
Police Academy and Training Section (includes 137 students)	150
Actual strength, August 29, 1964	2,887
Military leave	6
Vacancies	107
Authorized strength	3,000

In addition to its uniformed force, the Metropolitan Police Department is authorized to employ 316 civilians, and at August 29, 1964, it had 298 civilians on its payroll.

Following is information concerning appropriations and reimbursements to the Metropolitan Police Department for fiscal year 1964:

Regular annual appropriation	$31,028,000
Supplemental appropriation	146,000
Reimbursement from Capitol police	166,000
Total	31,340,000

A comparative analysis of authorized police personnel of the Metropolitan Police Department for selected fiscal years follows:

Fiscal year	Authorized strength	District population	Police per 1,000 people
1910	731	331,069	2.21
1920	899	437,571	2.05
1930	1,262	486,869	2.59
1940	1,422	663,091	2.14
1950	1,954	802,178	2.44
1960	2,608	763,956	3.41
1964	3,000	[1] 763,956	3.93

[1] Using 1960 census figure.

A summary of the offenses reported by the Metropolitan Police Department during fiscal year 1963 and subsequent actions taken by the Department follows:

	Offenses reported	Cleared by arrest	Cleared by other means	Pending, inactive, or not cleared
Pt. I offenses: [1]				
Murder	82	77	4	1
Negligent homicide	18	18		
Rape	119	102	3	14
Attempted rape	23	22	1	
Robbery	2,185	874	137	1,174
Attempted robbery	251	128	17	106
Aggravated assault	2,998	2,189	249	560
Housebreaking	5,597	1,468	390	3,739
Attempted housebreaking	192	89	21	82
Larceny, $100 and over	1,162	263	44	855
Larceny, under $100	7,793	1,915	669	5,209
Auto theft	2,774	556	246	1,072
Subtotal	23,194	7,701	1,781	13,712
Pt. II offenses: [2] Forgery, fraud, gambling, etc	12,721	8,502	1,062	3,157
Grand total	35,915	16,203	2,843	16,869

[1] Major offenses that are regularly reported to the police.
[2] All other offenses.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our conclusions and recommendations are summarized below and are discussed in detail in subsequent sections of the report.

Recording and reporting crime statistics

Our review of the prescribed reporting procedures, our examination of reports, and our tests of documents supporting fiscal year 1963 reports did not disclose any deficiencies which would indicate that reports for fiscal years 1950 through 1963 had not been prepared on a reasonably consistent basis in accordance with the guidelines for reporting as established by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Accountability for property taken into custody

Although our review disclosed only minor errors in records of property in the custody of the department, we believe that the existing system of internal controls unnecessarily provides opportunities for irregularities to occur and not be detected for many years, if at all. We believe that there is a need to strengthen internal controls over property taken into custody and we are recommending that (1) a control register be established and properly maintained which will constitute a permanent record of property taken into custody and its disposition, (2) physical inventories be taken annually and reconciled to the individual property reports, (3) the duties of keeping records for property be separated from those relating to the physical handling of property, and (4) the need for timely submission, careful preparation, and verification of property reports be emphasized.

Traffic ticket processing procedures

The accountability controls over traffic tickets were significantly strengthened in April 1964, and we believe that they now provide an adequate basis for the preparation of useful reports to management.

We did not examine into whether irregularities occurred in adjusting traffic tickets; however, considering the volume of tickets that have been adjusted and the substantial number of policemen who can participate in the adjustment, it appears probable that some irregularities may occur. We believe that the proposal by the District Commissioners to transfer the authority to adjust tickets to the Office of the Corporation Counsel would tend to reduce the possibility of irregularities occurring in the adjustment of tickets.

Work classifications

Because of the broadness of job descriptions of policemen, we did not attempt to make desk audits of duties performed. We noted several situations, however, in which it was questionable whether duties being performed by policemen required that they have special police training. We are recommending that the MPD give consideration to requesting that the Civil Service Commission make a study of administrative-type duties within the department to determine whether these duties can be adequately performed by civilians, thereby releasing policemen to perform duties of a type which will enable fuller utilization of their special abilities.

Promotion practices

Our review and tests of promotions of policemen through the rank of captain during the 2-year period ending March 1964 disclosed no evidence that such promotions had not been made on a reasonably competitive basis or as otherwise required by direction of the Congress.

Training of policemen (see p. 43)

Because of the lack of facilities and the large number of new policemen to be trained, the Department has been unable to keep up with its minimum training requirements.

Therefore, during the past 2 years new policemen were on duty an average of 8 months before undertaking the required 13 weeks of basic training. It appears questionable whether the 2-week indoctrination course that new policemen receive is sufficient to enable them to effectively perform regular police functions.

We are recommending that the MPD improve its planning so that training facilities and training personnel will be provided and new appointments will be so scheduled as to enable new policemen to receive adequate basic training before assignment to regular police duties.

We noted a lack of consistency in in-service training between precincts. We are recommending that consideration be given to assigning to the Police Academy and Training Section the function of controlling and directing in-service training so that the various participating units may have full and uniform benefits.

Lie-detection and wiretapping equipment

The Metropolitan Police Department has three lie-detection machines, or polygraphs, and six detectives have been trained as operators; however, relatively few polygraph examinations have been conducted, considering the number of offenses reported in the District of Columbia.

The department has no written policies, procedures, or reporting system for the use of the polygraph. We believe that it would be desirable to establish written policies and procedures for the use of the polygraph, supplemented by an accumulation of information on its use so that the department would be in a better position to evaluate its effectiveness and know whether the benefits derived would be commensurate with the costs of its use.

The records show that the polygraph was used in the examination of 77 policemen during the last 3 years regarding personnel matters. We found no indication that the race of the policemen had any bearing on whether an examination was given.

We were told that the MPD had no wiretapping equipment. Our review of current property records did not disclose equipment specifically identified as wiretapping equipment; however our review disclosed that the MPD had miniature recorders and concealable one-way radio equipment adaptable for use in wiretapping and "bugging." We found no evidence in the records examined by us that the MPD had not followed its stated policy which prohibits the use of equipment for wiretapping and "bugging."

RECORDING AND REPORTING CRIME STATISTICS

The present system of classifying and reporting crime statistics was initiated in 1948. Crime statistics are compiled from reports submitted by investigating units of the Metropolitan Police Department. These reports are required to be prepared in every case where a complaint has been determined to involve a criminal offense.

Reports prepared by the investigating units are forwarded to the Statistical Bureau of the MPD which has the responsibility for compiling, maintaining, and reporting statistics on crime reported in the District of Columbia. Reports received by the Statistical Bureau are examined for correctness of classification and are then coded and keypunched on cards. These cards become the basis for the department's statistical reports on criminal activity. The cards are maintained on file in the Statistical Bureau for 1 year and are then destroyed. The original investigation reports are maintained on file in the Statistical Bureau for 6 years and are then transferred to a "dead" storage file.

The Statistical Bureau issues crime reports monthly to the Chief of Police and to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). In addition, annual reports of crime are prepared for the MPD's fiscal year report and for the FBI's calendar year report, and certain other reports are prepared.

Criminal activity is generally measured by law-enforcement officials in terms of seven offenses: criminal homicide, rape, robbery, burglary, aggravated assault, larceny, and auto theft. In reporting, these seven offenses are called "Part I offenses" and are a measure of crime which has been selected because of the frequency with which the offenses are committed and the dependability with which they are reported. They are considered as an index of criminal activity in an area and are used as a basis for comparison with crime in other cities. The MPD uses this system in reporting on the District's crime rate.

Our review included a test of crime statistics reported for the month of March 1963. Because the crime rate, which is used in showing the trends of criminal activity and also in comparing area crime with crime reported in other sections of the Nation, is based on the number of criminal offenses reported, we concentrated our review on those offenses that comprise this crime rate; i.e., the "part I offenses" of criminal homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, housebreaking (burglary), larceny (theft), and auto theft. We narrowed our review to those offenses (1) which showed the greatest numerical increase since 1957; i.e., housebreaking, robbery, and larceny and (2) which could most easily be erroneously classified; i.e., aggravated assault. By random sample, within these classes, we examined 124 reports representing about 6 percent of the part I offenses reported during March 1963. We also examined 40 reports on offenses in the part II classification. Our tests did not disclose any errors in classification.

We found that the MPD uses the FBI's "Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook" as a guide for offense definitions and classifications. Minor deviations from this handbook are made in conforming MPD reports with the District of Columbia Code. Such deviations are made in cases concerning pickpockets and purse snatchers, where no force is involved. These offenses are defined as larcenies in the handbook and as robberies by the District of Columbia Code. The guidelines in the FBI handbook call for the reporting of crime statistics on the basis of the police investigations, without consideration of the ultimate disposition of the cases. In other words, the statistics do not take into consideration findings or actions taken by other groups, such as coroners, courts, juries, or prosecutors.

Change in larceny (theft) classification

Our review of the MPD annual reports issued for fiscal years 1950 through 1963 disclosed that there was a change in the classification of "grand larceny" beginning in fiscal year 1954. In prior reports a larceny involving $50 or more was classified as a grand larceny (felony), and one involving less than $50 was classified as a petit larceny (misdemeanor). One June 29, 1953, the law was changed (22 D.C. Code 2201), increasing the minimum dollar value of a grand larceny from $50 to $100. This change had the effect of reducing the total number of part I felonies and increasing the number of part I misdemeanors reported for 1954 and subsequent years.

Change in aggravated assault classification

Our review also disclosed that in 1955 there was a change in the definition of "aggravated assault" which redefined that classification to exclude offenses where injury was slight and the courts did not prosecute the offender. Such offenses were classified as simple assaults, or part II offenses. If the assaults had not been reclassified, part I offenses would have shown an increase of 1 percent in fiscal year 1956 over fiscal year 1955, in lieu of the 6.9 percent decrease as reported after the reclassification. The effect of this change is that crime reports compiled prior to fiscal year 1956 are not comparable with those prepared for fiscal year 1956 and subsequent years. However, the reports for fiscal years 1956 through 1963 seem to be comparable.

Disposition of closed offense cases

To determine the disposition of reported offenses, we selected for further review all closed offense cases which were included in our test of offenses reported during March 1963. This test included 82 offense reports, involving 84 offenses, and comprised approximately 50 percent of our original sample. A table showing disposition of the 84 cases is presented below.

Disposition	Type of offenses reported				
	Pt. I		Pt. II		Total
	Felonies	Misdemeanors	Felonies	Misdemeanors	
Offenses cleared by other means [1]	8	2	1	7	18
Offenses cleared by arrest:					
Case presented to grand jury	9		2		11
Case referred to juvenile court	6		1	1	8
Offender committed		4		3	7
	15	4	3	4	26
Charge changed to:					
Misdemeanor	4		9		13
Pt. II offense	7				7
No papers filed	5	1		1	7
Prosecutor decided not to prosecute (nolle prosequi)	4	2	1	2	9
Case dismissed	2	1		1	4
	22	4	10	4	40
Total	45	10	14	15	84

[1] Cleared by other means: Offender is killed in the commission of the crime; offender is already in jail convicted of another offense; there has been a double murder; offender has committed suicide; complainant refuses to prosecute; offender is in jail in another State, etc.

The table above shows that, from a judicial point of view, many of the reported offenses were later found to be less serious or without legal basis for action. The available statistics on disposition of offenses reported by other cities of comparable size did not contain sufficient information for comparison with the information we accumulated on the disposition of offenses reported by the District.

Conclusions

Our review of the prescribed reporting procedures, our examination of the reports, and our tests of documents supporting fiscal year 1963 reports did not disclose any deficiencies which would indicate that the reports for fiscal years 1950 through 1963 had not been prepared on a reasonably consistent basis in accordance with the guidelines for reporting established by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR PROPERTY TAKEN INTO CUSTODY

The Property Clerk, Metropolitan Police Department, holding the rank of Deputy Chief of Police, is responsible for the central property office, which receives, stores, and disposes of private property taken into the custody of the Department. Physical facilities used by the property office are (1) a walk-in vault and a storeroom, located in the East Administration Building, 300 Indiana Avenue NW., (2) four floors of warehouse space in the May Building, rear of 469 C Street NW., (3) an automobile storage lot about 275,000 square feet in area at Blue Plains, and (4) a property room in the U.S. District Court, District of Columbia, for property required in court proceedings.

The property office is staffed with nine policemen and one civilian. One sergeant and three privates maintain all property returns and handle the property stored in the vault; these same four policemen have access to property storage areas at all locations. Two police privates operate the property room in the U.S. District Court. Three police privates and one civilian handle property at the other storage locations. The regular office hours of the property office are from 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday; it is closed on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays.

The responsibility for the care and use of clothing, equipment, and other property of the MPD, as distinguished from private property taken into custody, is assigned to another Deputy Chief of Police. This activity was not reviewed by us.

Property taken into custody

A list of the various classes of private property for which the Property Clerk is accountable follows:

1. Property or money on suspicion of having been feloniously obtained and/or being the proceeds of a crime.
2. Property held as evidence.
3. Abandoned property.
4. Lost and found property.
5. Property of deceased persons.
6. Property of mental patients.
7. Prisoner's personal property taken at time of arrest.
8. Property involved in evictions.
9. Impounded vehicles.

All property turned in to the property office is accompanied by a property return form—PD form 81—"Property Deposited With the Property Clerk," in triplicate, with the exception of impounded vehicles. A 5-day lag is allowed before property return forms are required for impounded vehicles. After the property has been inspected and verified, the property office assigns the property return form a number, stamped on it by a numbering machine. A copy of the property return form is then returned to the person or unit which submitted it.

The property office files the property return forms in separate binders for each of the following classifications of property:

1. Evidence money (money which has been marked, used in an investigation, reclaimed, and held as evidence).
2. Guns.
3. Liquor.
4. Bicycles.
5. Automobiles.
6. Property of mental patients.
7. Miscellaneous property (all property not covered by other classifications).

Within these classifications, the property return forms are also divided into active and inactive groups. The active group covers property currently in the custody of the property office, and the inactive group covers property no longer in the custody of the property office.

Fees have been established for the storage of certain types of property, the minimum fee being $1. Fees for storage of property are 2 cents per cubic foot per month, and fees for impounded motor vehicles are 50 cents a day if stored in or on a District of Columbia facility. No fees are charged for property received as evidence, as proceeds of crime, or from insane persons, unless commercial storage is used. When commercial storage is used, the fees are the same as those charged by the commercial storage firm.

Salable property not returned to owners or other claimants within specified time periods is sold at public auction. The auctioneering is done by a private auctioneer under contract on a commission basis. Unsalable property is destroyed.

Verification of selected property returns by physical count

We made arrangements with the Property Clerk for policemen assigned to the property office to make a physical count of the property listed on property returns forms selected by us and to allow us to observe the physical count. We selected 112 property return forms, covering the following types of property.

Type of property	Estimated number of open returns	Number of returns selected for count	Location of property
General	2,000	76	Vault.
Guns	1,500	19	Storeroom.
Whisky	800	9	Warehouse.
Property of mental patients.	140	8	Vault (3). Warehouse (4). Storeroom (1).

In making our selection of property return forms for general property in the vault, we selected the 10 oldest return forms, every 50th return form after the oldest 10, and every return form covering property with an estimated value of $1,000 or more. We selected every 100th property return form for guns and liquor, every 20th return form for property of mental patients, and a few return forms out of this sequence.

The physical count of the property covered by 112 property return forms disclosed discrepancies in 5 returns, as follows:

[Return and nature of discrepancies]

1. Property missing: one set of keys, one gray cap, and 11 cents, taken into custody in 1929 as evidence in a murder case.

2. Property missing: one lead slug, taken into custody in 1939 as part of the evidence in a murder case.

3. Property missing: one portable phonograph, taken into custody in 1959 as part of the property of a mental patient.

4. Unrecorded property: one half pint of liquor. Property return shows that 10 half pints of liquor were taken into custody in 1964 as evidence in a case involving sale of liquor without a license; however, 11 half pints of liquor were in custody.

5. Unrecorded property: 6 cans of beer. Property return shows that 15 cans of beer were taken into custody in 1963 as part of the property of a mental patient; however, 21 cans of beer were in custody.

While these discrepancies do not appear significant per se, they indicate a need for more careful preparation and verification of property return forms and for more adequate controls over property.

The physical count also disclosed several guns which had been held more than 1 year after being received in the property office. Under the regulations, they could have been disposed of after 90 days. We also noted that several of the 112 property return forms were for property that had been held for long periods of time and that no followup had been made with the United States Attorney for more than 10 years to determine whether the property could be disposed of. Regarding one property return form for property acquired in 1950 from a mental patient, our inquiry disclosed that the mental patient had died at St. Elizabeths Hospital in 1958 but the property had not been disposed of.

Failure to take periodic inventories of property on hand

We were told by the Property Clerk that the last physical inventory of the property stored in the vault had been made about 4 years ago and that the last physical inventory of property in the storeroom and the warehouse had been made about 6 years ago. He said that the inventories had been made by members of the Metropolitan Police Department and that a list of the items inventoried had not been prepared nor had any notations been placed on the property return forms to indicate whether the items shown were found to be on hand.

For the security of the property in his custody, the Property Clerk relies on four policemen assigned to maintain property return forms and handle property in the vault and on the fact that at any time these policemen may be required to produce to a proper claimant the property covered by any open property return form on file.

Long delay in initiating storage fees

The act of June 29, 1953 (67 Stat. 101), required the collection of storage fees for certain property in the custody of the Property Clerk; however, no action has been taken to implement this law. We were told that it would have been extremely difficult to administer; therefore, action was withheld until Public Law 87-691, which contained more workable provisions, was enacted on September 25, 1962. Subsequently implementing orders were issued and the collection of storage fees was initiated on February 15, 1964.

Failure to formally report property office business to Chief of Police

Our review disclosed that formal annual reports of property office business by the Property Clerk had not been made to the Chief of Police as required by the manual of the MPD. The Property Clerk stated that informal reports had been made in the past, but he agreed that formal reports should be made in the future. Accordingly, the Property Clerk made a formal report to the Chief of Police covering business of the property office during fiscal year 1964 soon after the close of the fiscal year.

Delay in submitting property return forms

Regulations of the MPD prohibit the retention of property, other than prisoners' property, by various units of the Department, more than 5 days before turning it in to the property office. Our review disclosed numerous instances where the time limit established by these regulations had not been complied with. We brought this matter to the attention of the Property Clerk. Subsequently we saw policemen in the property office noting returns that had not been submitted within the required period. Later we noted that the Property Clerk requested a report from one unit concerning noncompliance with the time limit.

Conclusions and recommendations

Although our review disclosed only minor discrepancies in the records of property in the custody of the Property Clerk, we believe that the existing system of internal controls unnecessarily provides opportunities for irregularities to occur and not be detected for many years, if at all.

We believe that there is a need to strengthen internal controls over property taken into custody, and it is recommended that:

1. A control register be established and properly maintained which would constitute a permanent record of property taken into custody and its disposition.

2. Physical inventories be taken annually and reconciled to the individual property return forms.

3. A followup be made periodically on the status of property to determine whether it should be disposed of by public auction if salable or destroyed if unsalable.

4. The duties of keeping records for property be separated from those relating to the physical handling of property.

5. The need for timely submission, careful preparation, and verification of property return forms be emphasized.

TRAFFIC TICKET PROCESSING PROCEDURES

Traffic tickets (traffic violation notices) are issued by policemen for two types of violations of the District's traffic laws; namely, nonmoving (parking), and moving violations. The processing procedures for tickets issued for the two types of violations are somewhat different.

Accountability controls

Prior to April 22, 1964, the Metropolitan Police Department did not maintain central records of the type that would enable complete accountability control over traffic tickets. In essence, each officer who was issued a ticket book was accountable to a superior officer for the tickets in the book. Central control was exercised only over issued tickets that were forwarded by the units either to the Central Violations Bureau (CVB) of the court of general sessions (parking violations) or to the Statistical Bureau, MPD (moving violations). These two central units maintained no statistics regarding tickets that had been voided, canceled, or otherwise adjusted but had not been forwarded by the various units.

Effective April 22, 1964, the MPD revised its accountability procedures so that the Central Violations Bureau is now able to determine the disposition of all traffic tickets. In essence, the new procedures provide that a copy of all tickets, regardless of ultimate disposition, be forwarded to CVB. By matching the numbers on tickets received against the numbers on tickets issued to officers, the CVB can determine whether rall tickets in a book have been accounted for. Also, CVB can prepare statistical reports showing the disposition of all parking tickets. Our tests of the new procedures indicated that the procedures were being adequately carried out and that tickets were being satisfactorily accounted for.

Procedures for processing tickets

Parking Tickets

Parking tickets are normally turned in by policemen going off duty, consolidated within the unit, and sent to the CVB the following morning; however, prior to April 22, 1964, tickets that had been voided, canceled, or otherwise adjusted in the unit were not sent to CVB. After the tickets are received by the CVB, the basic responsibility for processing them rests with the CVB.

Persons receiving tickets for parking violations are required to post collateral with the CVB, and at that time they can elect to forfeit the collateral or they can request a court hearing. If the violator fails to appear, the CVB normally secures a warrant for the arrest of the violator, if he can be identified and lives within a 50-mile radius of the District of Columbia. We were advised by CVB officials that legal differences between jurisdictions and the inability to serve warrants beyond a 50-mile radius make it impractical to obtain warrants for violators living outside this area.

Volume and disposition of parking tickets

Following are statistics showing for fiscal year 1963 the volume and disposition of parking tickets which were issued by the MPD and forwarded to the Central Violations Bureau.

	Number of tickets
Outstanding at July 1, 1962	75,000
Received by CVB from the Metropolitan Police Department	448,000
Total	523,000
Dispositions:	
1. Forfeited collateral or elected to stand trial	286,000
2. Withdrawn at request of MPD	33,000
3. Out of jurisdiction or unable to identify violator	95,000
4. Unable to serve warrant	54,000
5. Corporation Counsel's office did not prosecute	4,000
Total	472,000
Outstanding at June 30, 1963	51,000

The numbers shown above were taken from reports prepared by the CVB and have been rounded to the nearest 1,000.

We noted that, in its annual reports, the Metropolitan Police Department shows statistics on parking tickets only in categories (1) forfeited collateral or elected to stand trial, and (5) did not prosecute. (See above.) Statistics on parking tickets in categories (2) withdrawn, (3) out of jurisdiction or unable to identify, and (4) unable to serve warrants, are not included in the Metropolitan Police Department's annual reports. We have been informed by police officials that the annual reports include "arrests" only and that an "arrest" on a parking ticket takes place only when the violator posts collateral or is booked at a police station.

We also found that prior to April 22, 1964, many tickets were not reported to the CVB. These tickets, therefore, do not appear in the statistics showing tickets issued and their disposition. We reviewed selected Metropolitan Police Department records relating to tickets sent to the CVB during January 1964. The records we reviewed covered the transmittals of 10,780 tickets. By checking the continuity of serial numbers of tickets, we were able to identify 400 tickets which had not been received by CVB. We then went to the issuing units and, with their help, ascertained the recorded disposition of these tickets. The records showed that 261 tickets had been adjusted, voided, or canceled by police officials. One hundred and thirty-nine tickets could not be located. By using the results of our test of 10,780 tickets as a basis, we estimate that during fiscal year 1963 about 1,600 parking tickets were issued but not forwarded to CVB or recorded in its control records.

Moving Violation Tickets

Prior to April 22, 1964, tickets issued for moving violations normally were retained in the issuing unit for up to 10 days to allow the violator time to appear and either forfeit collateral or request a court hearing. If the violator did not appear within about 10 days, a warrant was obtained for his arrest and an attempt was made to serve the warrant. Tickets for those violators who appeared and either forfeited collateral or received a court hearing were sent to the Statistical Bureau, Metropolitan Police Department, where they were entered in its central records of moving violations. All other tickets were retained by the issuing units. The Statistical Bureau forwarded the tickets to the Department of Motor Vehicles so that points toward the revocation of driving permits could be assessed for each violation.

Effective April 22, 1964, the procedures were revised principally to require that a copy of each ticket be submitted to the Central Violations Bureau for accountability purposes on the day after the ticket was issued.

Statistics on moving violations are prepared by the Statistical Bureau. The following table shows the reported disposition of moving violation traffic tickets which were processed during fiscal year 1963.

Disposition	*Number of tickets*
Forfeited collateral, fined, or committed to an institution by court action	94,313
Corporate Counsel's office did not prosecute	4,452
Dismissed by the court	970
Turned over to juvenile authorities	1,475
Other dispositions, including being sent to traffic school	1,231
Awaiting final action	2,361
Total tickets processed	104,802

The table above covers only tickets that were received by the Statistical Bureau and does not include tickets voided, canceled, or adjusted during fiscal year 1963. There are no Police Department records which show the number of tickets issued for moving violations and their disposition.

We visited several units of the Metropolitan Police Department to examine into the issuance and disposition of tickets for moving violations. We selected for review 300 tickets which had been issued at various dates from October 1963 through April 1964 and found that 8, or 2.7 percent, had been adjusted for various reasons. We have been informed by members of the Metropolitan Police Department that no statistics are compiled on the number of tickets adjusted for moving violations; however, several policemen have informed us that such adjustments are relatively few when compared with the number of adjustments of tickets issued for parking violations.

Adjustment of Tickets

The Traffic Violations Procedures Manual of the Metropolitan Police Department states that the commanding officer of a police unit, such as a precinct commander, has the authority to adjust or cancel tickets issued for minor traffic violations, provided that the violator is given a warning and the ticket has not reached the warrant stage. If a ticket has reached the warrant stage, any adjustments must be approved by the Chief Judge of the Court of General Sessions, District of Columbia, or his designee.

During June 1964, the District Commissioners considered the propriety of the practice of the Metropolitan Police Department of adjusting tickets and concluded that it should be discontinued and that any adjustment of tickets should be handled by an independent organization—the Office of the Corporation Counsel. However, the Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, raised questions regarding the decision by the District Commissioners in this matter; and, as a result, the District Commissioners did not direct the chief of police to discontinue the practice of adjusting tickets. Local newspapers publicized the initial decision of the District Commissioners, and ticket adjustments declined sharply. Records of CVB show that fewer than 200 parking tickets were adjusted during the month of July 1964, whereas an average of over 2,700 parking tickets a month were recorded as adjusted during fiscal year 1963.

Conclusions

The accountability controls over traffic tickets were significantly strengthened on April 22, 1964. We believe that the revised procedures provide an adequate basis for accountability control over tickets and will enable the preparation of reports that can be useful to management in evaluating policies and procedures relating to traffic tickets.

With respect to the adjustment of traffic tickets, our review did not include an examination into whether irregularities have occurred under the existing system. However, considering the volume of tickets that have been adjusted and the substantial number of policemen who can participate in the adjustment of tickets, it appears probable that some irregularities would occur. We believe that the proposal by the District Commissioners to transfer the authority for adjusting tickets from the Metropolitan Police Department to the Office of the Corporation Counsel would tend to reduce the possibility of irregularities occurring in the adjustment of tickets.

WORK CLASSIFICATIONS

The Metropolitan Police Department currently has 12 ranks of which 3 are filled by appointment and 9 are filled by competitive examination. The ranks of the Metropolitan Police Department and the approximate number of men holding such ranks at July 24, 1964, are shown below:

Rank:	*Number of men*
Chief	1
Deputy chief	10
Inspector	16
Total appointed ranks	27
Captain	32
Detective captain	13
Lieutenant	66
Detective lieutenant	20
Sergeant	140
Detective sergeant	78
Detective	136
Private	2, 258
Plainclothesman	135
Total, competitive ranks	2, 878
Total force	2, 905

Within the ranks of private and sergeant there are several subclassifications for certain positions requiring special skills or talents, such as motorcycle officers, station clerks, and technicians. Additional pay is given for assignment to these positions.

Job descriptions

The functions and responsibilities of all ranks of the Metropolitan Police Department are set forth in either the Metropolitan Police Department manual or in various Metropolitan Police Department general orders and reorganization orders in the District of Columbia Code. With the principal exception of certain positions which carry technical ratings (see below), the job descriptions of all ranks are very broad and general. Basically, all ranks have one broad duty and responsibility—that of the prevention and detection of crime through effective implementation of laws and regulations. The degree of responsibility varies primarily with the amount of supervisory duties required in a given rank. In some instances the job descriptions of policemen, particularly in the ranks of captain and above, or groups of men assigned to specialized units, include some more specific duties and responsibilities relating to their operating and administrative functions.

Technical ratings

The Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1082) provides for technical ratings for certain civil service employees having a special talent or knowledge within a field. The act enables the payment of additional compensation without promotion or higher rank or grade. The Metropolitan Police Department has given a total of 145 technical ratings to 82 canine corps members and 63 officers in other positions; Metropolitan Police Department is authorized to give a total of 173 technical ratings.

The responsibility for the establishment of technician positions rests with the District of Columbia personnel office upon the recommendation of the Metropolitan Police Department. The District of Columbia personnel office performs a desk audit of the position recommended for technical rating and weighs its findings against Civil Service Commission standards.

Absence of periodic review of job descriptions

Our examination into the area of job descriptions and work classifications disclosed that no periodic review of job descriptions is made either by the Metropolitan Police Department, the District of Columbia personnel office, or the Civil Service Commission.

We found that the dealings of the District of Columbia personnel office with the Metropolitan Police Department are limited to those officers having technician ratings. The District of Columbia personnel office performs desk audits of new technical positions requested by the Metropolitan Police Department but does not make any subsequent reviews unless there is a change in the job description.

According to officials of the Metropolitan Police Department and the Civil Service Commission, CSC does not perform desk audits of any positions in the Metropolitan Police Department. These officials claim that CSC has no responsibility in this area.

The Metropolitan Police Department does not perform periodic reviews of job descriptions because, according to its officials, no detailed job descriptions exist within the Metropolitan Police Department.

More civilian positions appear to be needed

The Metropolitan Police Department has recognized the necessity for replacing policemen in clerical, technical, and other assignments with civilian personnel whenever such replacement is practicable. Budget requests of the Metropolitan Police Department in the past have included requests for civilian positions to release policemen from duties not directly related to the prevention and detection of crime. During the period 1953 through 1964, 45 full-time positions and 76 part-time positions have been created to replace policemen in clerical, technical, and other assignments.

During our review we noted several situations where it appears questionable that special police training is necessary to perform the duties assigned to policemen. These situations involved the Office of the Corporation Counsel, the Property Clerk's Office, various licensing offices, and school crossings guards.

In addition, the annual report of the Metropolitan Police Department for fiscal year 1963 showed that 94 policemen were engaged in clerical duties and 22 policemen were engaged in radio operation and maintenance duties.

Conclusions and recommendations

We believe that a periodic review of job descriptions of technicians should be made by the Civil Service Commission. Because of the broadness of the job descriptions of policemen and because of the lack of knowledge required for measuring methods of crime prevention and law enforcement, we did not attempt to make desk audits or comparisons of duties performed with those specified in job descriptions. However, notwithstanding these limitations, we noted, during our review, several situations in which it appears questionable that special police training is necessary to perform the duties assigned to policemen.

On the basis of our limited examination in this area, we believe that a thorough study of the duties being performed by policemen not actually engaged in patrol duties or in the investigation of crime would probably reveal that a substantial number of policemen are assigned to duties which do not require the specialized training, physical qualifications, experience, and other attributes that are possessed by the policemen performing such duties.

In view of the Metropolitan Police Department's published comments regarding the need for additional policemen and the difficulty in obtaining them, we recommend that the Metropolitan Police Department give consideration to requesting that the Civil Service Commission make a study of administrative-type duties within the Department, which are being performed by policemen, to determine whether these duties can be adequately performed by civilians, thereby releasing policemen to perform duties of the type which will enable full utilization of their special abilities.

PROMOTION PRACTICES

Except for about 27 positions above the rank of captain, the Metropolitan Police Department uses a dual appraisal system for determining the order of promotions of policemen. The system consists of Metropolitan Police Department evaluation of the suitability for promotion of those officers who are eligible and indicate a desire for promotion and of written examinations which are given only to officers who have received an acceptable suitability rating.

The written examinations, which are given every 2 years, are prepared and administered by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, under a 1927 agreement with the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners. The Civil Service Commission grades the written examinations and combines the resultant scores with the Metropolitan Police Department suitability ratings for overall promotion ratings. In combining the scores, the suitability rating is given a weight of 60 percent and the Civil Service Commission written examination is given a weight of 40 percent.

The Civil Service Commission prepares registers showing the final ratings in numerical sequence. These registers are used by Metropolitan Police Department as the basis for determining the order of promotions. The registers are replaced with new ones every 2 years.

For the purpose of reviewing promotion practices, we selected the promotion registers which were in effect from March 1962 to March 1964. These registers were established as the result of written examinations given in October 1961.

Eligibility for promotion

Before an officer can become eligible to apply for promotion, he must meet certain basic Metropolitan Police Department requirements regarding length of service and time in rank. For example, policemen now applying for promotion to sergeant must have served at least 5 years continuously in the Metropolitan Police Department and must be serving in the fourth in-service step of the rank of private; sergeants applying for promotion to lieutenant must have served at least 9 years in the Department and have at least 1 year of continuous service in the rank of sergeant.

Suitability for promotion procedures

Every 2 years, officers who meet the basic eligibility requirements and have applied for promotion are evaluated as to suitability for promotion by their superior officers, including precinct, division, and bureau Commanding Officers and District Inspectors.

Rating officers use monthly evaluation reports (PD 346) concerning each officer in preparing a promotion rating. This report shows information regarding leave, duty time in the station, and on the street, and violations handled. The monthly evaluation report data are summarized on an individual evaluation sheet (PD 346–A). This form also shows by month, for a year, extra duty on days off, overtime, and time in court.

Officers are given a categorical rating; and this, in turn, is assigned a numerical rating. The categories are: ineligible, fair, satisfactory, and excellent. The four categories include the following numerical scores:

Ineligible	Under 75.
Fair	75 to 79.
Satisfactory	81 to 87.
Excellent	89 to 95.

Additional fractional points are then assigned for meritorious service awards.

The commanding officer reviews the various ratings given to each officer and gives the officer a single rating. In precincts, the CO's rating is then presented to the District inspector for review, which may include a personal interview with the applicant. The District inspector may raise or lower a rating recommended by a precinct CO, but he must submit both ratings to the Promotional Rating Board if changes are made.

The District inspectors present the ratings of members to the Promotional Rating Board. The Board takes the necessary action to equalize ratings among the inspection districts, bureaus, and divisions. This is done to eliminate any tendency to overrate or underrate members of each CO's command.

Two Promotional Rating Boards, one each for the uniformed and plainclothes forces, review and evaluate ratings given by rating officers. The Boards are made up of deputy chiefs and inspectors. Rating officers rate each member individually and confidentially.

As part of the promotion rating procedure, personal interviews by the Promotional Rating Board are required of sergeants and lieutenants who are seeking promotion.

MPD's written procedures require that each officer be promptly given a copy of his suitability-for-promotion rating. The rating is personally delivered to each candidate for promotion in a sealed envelope. At the time delivery of the rating is made, the promotion candidate is notified that he has 5 days from the date he receives his rating to make an appeal to the Promotional Rating Board should he wish to do so and that such an appeal must be in writing. The officer's appeal must give detailed reasons in support of his appeal. The Board has the authority either to raise or lower the appellant's rating as a result of the appeal hearing.

It is mandatory that each applicant for promotion attain a suitability rating of 75 or more out of a maximum possible score of 95 to qualify to take the written examination.

Civil Service Commission written examinations

The CSC written examinations have been given in October of every other year. The October 1961 examinations were given at a District of Columbia public high school on a Saturday.

The technical content of the examinations is provided by the Metropolitan Police Department to the CSC which puts the data in test form, prints the test papers, safeguards the tests' contents, secures an examination place, administers the tests, grades the tests, and weights the suitability ratings and the written examination scores together for the final numerical ratings from which the promotional register is prepared by the CSC. The CSC certifies, from the register, names to fill vacancies in numerical order.

The Civil Service Commission's services are performed at no expense to the District of Columbia. The Metropolitan Police Department is exempt from the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1082) and the Performance Rating Act of 1950 (5 U.S.C. 2001(9)); however, the District of Columbia Code (4–103) requires that the District Commissioners appoint and promote members of the police force in accordance with the law (5 U.S.C. 638) and in the same manner as members of the classified civil service of the United States are promoted. The CSC's authority with respect to the promotion of policemen is specified in an agreement with the District's Board of Commissioners dated October 28, 1927.

There are three units within the CSC which are involved in the written examinations. The Personnel Measurement Research and Development Center is responsible for the physical design of the examinations from the technical questions submitted by the Metropolitan Police Department. The Bureau of Recruiting and Examining prints, administers, scores, and grades the examinations. It also makes the final rating based on the weighting of the examination score and suitability rating and handles any appeals on the written tests by examinees. The Office Service Division is charged with the security and delivery to the examination site of the test and with the ancillary activities relating to the test.

The Metropolitan Police Department Civil Service Advisory Board determines the examination plan; e.g., number of parts, weight of each part, type of questions, and the answers, etc.

Candidates for promotion are allowed to review the test and answers after CSC scores the examination. The competitors may appeal their scores to CSC on the basis of content of the tests and examining procedures.

A register, by rank, is prepared for Metropolitan Police Department use, after all appeals have been adjudicated. A grade of 75 or more out of a possible 100 on the written examination must be attained before an officer's name can be listed on the promotion register. The list shows the numerical rating of the successful competitors as well as the order of standings. The CSC certifies names from the register at Metropolitan Police Department request, and promotions are made from the certifications. With few exceptions, the Metropolitan Police Department promotes strictly in the order of certification on the register. In instances of tied ratings, other factors are considered, such as seniority in grade and/or in the Metropolitan Police Department. The Metropolitan Police Department has authority to approve all recommendations for promotion for the ranks below captain, pursuant to a memorandum dated July 2, 1963, promulgated by the Director, Department of General Administration. Prior to the above date, the District Commissioners approved all recommendations for promotion.

Adjustment of scores on written examinations

Final standing on the promotion registers is determined by the weighted average of the suitability for promotion rating (60 percent) and the written examination score (40 percent) and is established by the Civil Service Commission. The final ratings on the promotion registers are established after the Metropolitan Police Department furnishes the Civil Service Commission an estimate of its needs, by rank, for 2 years. With knowledge of the needs of the Metropolitan Police Department, the Civil Service Commission reviews and adjusts the written examination scores to produce the number of eligibles desired by the Metropolitan Police Department. The Civil Service Commission then establishes the cutoff scores which will produce slightly more than the number of applicants needed to fill expected vacancies. The cutoff score for each rank is established on the basis of the lowest written test grade made by any of the candidates who are to be included on the promotion register. The difference between that grade and a grade of 75 is added to all the test scores for each rank. This blanket allowance of points to all candidates permits the raising of marks of all officers tested for a particular rank. Following the adjustment of scores, the revised examination scores and the suitability rating scores are combined, applying the 40–60 percent weight, respectively, and the final rank of candidates is determined.

Statistical data on promotion ratings

The following data pertain to the suitability ratings and written examination ratings which were given in 1961 and became the bases for Metropolitan Police Department's promotion registers for the period March 1962 through March 1964.

At June 30, 1961, the Metropolitan Police Department employed 2,696 officers of whom 2,315 were white and 381 were colored. The following table shows the number of officers who met the basic eligibility requirements and expressed an interest in being promoted and therefore were given a suitability-for-promotion rating in 1961.

Race	Number of officers rated	Percent of officers rated	Percent of total force
Colored	113	11	30
White	929	89	40
Total	1,042	100	39

Of the 1,042 officers who were rated by the MPD, 983 officers took the CSC written examinations. The following table shows data on the results of the CSC examinations.

Race	Total	Passed		Failed	
		Number	*Percent*	*Number*	*Percent*
Colored	98	37	38	61	62
White	885	393	44	492	56
Total	983	430	44	553	56

We noted that 533 out of 553, or 96 percent, of the candidates who failed the examination for promotion to the next higher rank received excellent or satisfactory ratings on suitability for promotion. Following is a table showing the numbers of candidates who received excellent, satisfactory, or fair ratings on suitability for promotion:

Suitability-for-promotion ratings of unsuccessful applicants

Race	Excellent, 89 to 95		Satisfactory, 81 to 87		Fair, 75 to 79		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Colored	45	74	11	18	5	8	61	100
White	343	70	134	27	15	3	492	100
Total	388	----------	145	----------	20	----------	553	100

We have been told by officials of the Metropolitan Police Department that the suitability-for-promotion rating covers knowledge and performance and represents the best possible appraisal of an applicant's potential for the next higher rank. We have been told also that many of the ratings are probably higher than they really should be; that all ratings in 1961 were 75 or higher; and that, after stressing the importance of rating objectively prior to the October 1963 examinations, a wider spread in ratings was obtained, including a few ratings of ineligible.

Promotions by the Congress

Until fiscal year 1964, several District of Columbia appropriation acts contained language which had the effect of requiring the Metropolitan Police Department to make out-of-order promotions of officers who were performing certain duties. This practice was first started in fiscal year 1942.

Since fiscal year 1961, 11 out-of-order promotions have been made. They are as follows:

Former rank	Promoted to rank of—	Unit
Lieutenant	Captain	Homicide squad.
Do	do	General assignment squad.
Do	do	Special investigation squad.
Do	do	Check and fraud squad.
Do	do	Robbery squad.
Do	do	Automobile squad.
Do	do	Purchasing and accounts.
Do	do	Accident investigation unit.
Do	do	Court liaison officer.
Acting captain.	do	Public vehicle unit.
Acting sergeant.	Sergeant	Police automobiles.

The first four captains in charge of the homicide, general assignment, special investigation, and check and fraud squads, respectively, now have full civil service status because, although they had been promoted by the Congress, their names later reached the top of the promotion register and their promotions were then permanently established on an in-order basis.

Three of the remaining seven men were promoted by the appropriation act for 1961; such promotions were continued in effect by provisions in 1962, 1963, and 1964 appropriation acts (sec. 15 of the 1962, 1963, and 1964 acts). These three men occupied the positions of captain, automobile squad; captain, purchasing and accounts; and sergeant, police automobiles.

The other four promotions were first made by the provisions of the 1962 appropriation act, and the language applying to these positions was repeated in the appropriation act for 1963. These four men occupied the positions of captain, public vehicle unit; captain, accident investigation unit; captain, robbery squad; and captain, court liaison officer. During the hearings on the 1963 appropriation, the House and the Senate Subcommittees on Appropriations for the District of Columbia emphatically stated that out-of-order promotions should not be made through appropriation acts and that no such promotions would be provided for in future acts. The Metropolitan Police Department, with the approval of the Board of Commissioners, requested the Civil Service Commission to authorize continuing incumbents in their higher ranks on the basis of incumbency, experience, and, where applicable, technical qualifications. In addition, the chief of police, although in full accord with the subcommittees' policy, believes that, in order to preserve continuity of administration of the units affected, and as a matter of fairness to the personnel involved, the personnel currently holding higher ranks because of provisions of appropriation acts should be continued in those ranks. The Civil Service Commission approved the abovementioned seven promotions on January 29, 1963. The District of Columbia Board of Commissioners has initiated action to obtain a permanent continuance of certain ranks previously provided for under the various appropriation acts. The disposition of this legislation is pending.

Conclusion

Our review and tests of the procedures and practices followed in making promotions of policemen up through the rank of captain during the 2-year period ended March 1964 disclosed no deficiencies which would indicate that such promotions were not made either on a reasonably competitive merit basis or as otherwise required by direction of the Congress.

Training of policemen

Formal training of policemen is accomplished in two basic ways; namely, centralized training given by the Police Academy and Training Section of the Metropolitan Police Department and inservice training given at the precinct or unit level. In addition, the Metropolitan Police Department helped establish and participates in a program with the University of Maryland and the American University leading to a police certificate. For policemen who meet certain requirements, the Department pays three-fourths of the tuition cost of one subject per semester leading to the police certificate; the policemen pay the remaining one-fourth of the tuition cost.

Informal training is obtained through job assignments with experienced policemen. We did not examine into this type of training.

Police academy and training section

The police academy and training section consists of a training school for new policemen, an academy for experienced officers, and a group to screen applicants for appointment to the Metropolitan Police Department. The section is headed by a captain who reports directly to the Executive Officer, Metropolitan Police Department; and it is staffed by two lieutenants, two sergeants, three acting sergeants, a desk sergeant, a technician, six uniformed privates, a plainclothesman, and two civilian secretaries. Physical facilities of the section consist of the north half of the sixth floor of the Municipal Center, 300 Indiana Avenue NW., which is used for classrooms, gymnasiums, showers, locker rooms, and office space.

In addition, a five-position pistol range is located on the first floor of the same building.

The program of the Police Academy and Training Section provides for the following principal training courses:

1. A 2-week indoctrination course.
2. A 13-week basic training course.
3. A 4-week advanced training course.

The 2-week indoctrination course is given for new policemen whenever a group is appointed. It consists principally of instructions on the care and use of the service revolver and on the functions and facilities of the Metropolitan Police Department.

The 13-week basic training course is generally given three times a year. It covers the police manual of the Metropolitan Police Department, general orders, policies and procedures, police regulations, traffic regulations, alcoholic beverage control regulations, sign regulations, the criminal code of the District of Columbia, information on the courts, and other matters. The trainees are taken on field trips to such places as the District of Columbia General Hospital, the Coroner's office, St. Elizabeths Hospital, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. During the course of training, 40 hours are devoted to public relations during which time leaders in this field address the students. Also, 40 hours are devoted to physical training.

The 4-week advanced training course is given to officers with 5 or more years of service. This course covers the latest methods of crime detection and police administration, and it also serves as a refresher course in basic police work.

Long delay before new policemen are given basic training

During the 2 years prior to June 1964, new policemen spent an average of 8 months on duty with the Metropolitan Police Department before taking the 13-week training course. We were advised that, upon completion of the 2-week indoctrination course, new policemen had been assigned to precincts to work with experienced policemen until the training school had room to accept them for the 13-week basic training course.

The physical facilities of the Police Academy and Training Section are designed to accommodate about 50 trainees at a time. Until 1958 there were about 45 trainees in a class. However, since that time the size of the classes has been increased and up to 100 trainees have attended at one time. Our review disclosed that, during the 2-year period ended June 1964, new policemen were assigned to regular police duties for an average of 8 months before attending the 13-week basic training course. During this period 569 individuals were appointed to the Metropolitan Police Department; however, 56 persons either resigned before being given basic training or had previous police experience and were not required to take basic training.

We were informed by the officer in charge of training that the main reasons for the lengthy delays before new policemen have been given basic training were:

1. In November 1962, the 13-week basic training course was closed and did not reopen until April 1963. The Chief of Police ordered the closing of the training school because of the increase in crime at that time and the Christmas rush.

2. Policemen have to be appointed to the force to replace policemen who retire or resign, even though they cannot be enrolled in the 13-week basic training course immediately after appointment.

3. Some policemen cannot be enrolled in the 13-week basic training course in the same order as appointed because they are put on special assignments and are not available for training.

4. The authorized strength of the force was increased in 1959. Since that date the Metropolitan Police Department has attempted to fill the new positions as quickly as possible, regardless of the availability of the training facilities.

After the public schools were dismissed for summer vacation in 1964, arrangements were made to use the facilities of McKinley Technical High School, and on June 22, 1964, 205 policemen were enrolled in the 13-week basic training course This action left only eight new policemen who had not received basic training.

The officer in charge of training said that it would be desirable to appoint members to the Metropolitan Police Department in groups of about 45 on dates which would allow them to spend the first 13 to 15 weeks of duty being indoctrinated, trained, and equipped before being assigned to regular police duties.

Advanced training course suspended since April 1960

We have been informed that it is the policy of the Metropolitan Police Department that policemen must have 5 years of service on the force before attending a 4-week advanced training course on the latest methods of crime detection and police administration as well as a review of various aspects of police work.

Our review disclosed that 124 members of the Metropolitan Police Department satisfactorily completed the advanced training course at the police academy in the first 3 months of 1960. We were advised that the advanced training course was suspended in April 1960 primarily because all training facilities were needed to train new policemen; the course has not been resumed. The officer in charge of training said that it was planned to resume the advanced training course when training facilities became available.

In-service training

On December 4, 1962, the Chief of Police issued an order requiring unit commanders to institute unit level in-service training designed to give some basic training to the new policemen and refresher information to experienced policemen. The Chief of Police suggested that normally the in-service training could be given a few minutes during or immediately before the rollcall period; he also outlined the possible subjects to be included in the in-service training program.

Lack of uniformity and scope of coverage of in-service training

Neither the Police Academy and Training Section nor other central group directs and controls in-service training on a departmentwide basis. As a result there is a lack of uniformity and scope of coverage of in-service training.

The in-service training program is designed to include lectures on such subjects as rules of evidence, courtesy, law of arrest, judgment, use of service revolvers, and search and seizure. It also includes home study and examinations on such subjects as traffic regulations, police regulations, and departmental orders. There are no publications on the in-service training program and none are contemplated at the present time.

Unit commanders are required to submit monthly reports to the Chief of Police on in-service training within their units. We reviewed these reports covering the period January through May 1964 and we found that the in-service training varied considerably in the number of subjects covered and the amount of time spent in training. Some units covered as many as 46 subjects during 1 month, whereas, other units covered only one or two subjects during a month. One unit reported 1,098 man-hours devoted to training during February 1964, whereas another unit reported only 24 man-hours devoted to training during this same period. One of the units we visited required home study and gave written examinations, while other units did not. Some of the in-service training reports for some units were not on file at the Department.

We were informed that low records of in-service training were attributable to lack of time to spend during the rollcall period and reluctance to require policemen to spend off-duty time in training because there are already some demands on their off-duty time, such as appearing in the courts.

The officer in charge of training told us that he believed that in-service training at the unit level should be controlled by the Police Academy and Training Section in order to distribute the training throughout the Department more uniformly.

Possibility of saving time at rollcall period

Our review disclosed that policemen make handwritten records, during the rollcall period, of stolen cars, missing persons, and similar information which is verbally announced by the officer in charge of the rollcall.

We noted that a time saving procedure was used in one precinct. This procedure consisted of preparing and distributing to each policeman a list of stolen cars, missing persons, and similar information. Two precinct commanders indicated that central preparation and distribution of such a list to each precinct in a quantity sufficient to give one to each policeman before rollcall would save time and also reduce the possibility of errors in lengthy handwritten copies of the information.

Conclusions and recommendations

Due to the lack of facilities and the large number of new policemen to be trained, the Metropolitan Police Department has been unable in recent years to keep up with its minimum training requirements.

It appears questionable whether attendance at a 2-week indoctrination course would prepare a policeman for effectively performing regular duties.

It is recommended that the MPD improve its planning so that training facilities and training personnel will be provided and new appointments will be scheduled in a manner which will enable new policemen to receive an adequate amount of basic training before assignment to regular duties.

It is also recommended that consideration be given to assigning to the Police Academy and Training Section the function of controlling and directing the inservice training program so that the benefits of such a program may be more fully and uniformly obtained by the various participating units.

It is further recommended that consideration be given to centrally preparing lists of stolen cars, missing persons, and similar information so that this data can be distributed to each policeman during the rollcall period, thereby saving time which can be used for training and other productive purposes.

LIE-DETECTION AND WIRETAPPING EQUIPMENT

Lie-detection equipment

Equipment and Facilities

Lie-detection machines are devices that generally measure and record responses of a person's breathing, his blood pressure and pulse, and his skin's resistance to electrical current. These machines are generally called polygraphs. It was brought out in hearings before the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, held in April and May 1964, that the polygraph measures and records certain physiological actions or reactions representing some function of the human body which are not fully understood even by the best informed in the research field and that the polygraph does not, per se, reveal whether a person is truthful, or reliable, or untruthful, or unreliable.

The Metropolitan Police Department owns three polygraphs assigned to the Detective Division which were purchased as follows:

Year purchased:	*Cost*
1952	$1,238
1960	1,372
1962	1,380
Total	3,990

Prior to fiscal year 1965, the Metropolitan Police Department had one room equipped for polygraph examinations. The room included a two-way mirror and sound equipment arranged so that examinations could be monitored and recorded. During August 1964, the Department set aside and equipped three small rooms in the Detective Division for the use of its three polygraphs. At the time of our review, the sound equipment had been obtained but not installed.

Training of Operators

The Metropolitan Police Department has six polygraph operators, all of whom had more than 5 years of service with the Department before becoming polygraph operators. These men were trained to operate polygraphs by the U.S. Army at the Provost Marshal General's School, Fort Gordon, Ga. The curriculum of the polygraph course included operation of the polygraph; interrogation procedures; record interpretation; legal, medical, and psychological aspects of operation; and practice and casework.

Information concerning the dates of training, educational background, rank, and assignments of the polygraph operators follows:

Operator	Period of polygraph training	Educational background	Present rank	Assignment
A	May 19 to July 11, 1952	9th grade	Lieutenant	General assignment squad, Detective Division.
B	Aug. 10 to Oct. 5, 1960	High school graduate.	Detective	Check and fraud squad, Detective Division.
C	Mar. 13 to May 4, 1962	do	do	General assignment squad, Detective Division.
D	Aug. 4 to Oct. 4, 1961	do	do	Homicide squad, Detective Division.
E	Jan. 9 to Mar. 6, 1962	9th grade	Detective sergeant.	Narcotics squad, Morals Division.
F	Oct. 18 to Dec. 15, 1960	High school graduate.	do	Robbery squad, Detective Division.

During 1962 and 1963 operator A attended several seminars relating to the use of the polygraph conducted by the U.S. Treasury Department, the Academy for Scientific Interrogation, and the University of Maryland.

Operators B, D, and F advised us that they attended a 5-day polygraph seminar which was conducted by the U.S. Air Force in July 1962.

According to police officials, the six polygraph operators are trained detectives and cases are assigned to them in the same manner and proportion as they are assigned to other detectives. They do not receive any special consideration because of their ability to operate a polygraph.

Policies and Procedures Regarding Use of Polygraphs

There are no written policies or procedures covering the use of polygraphs or the circumstances under which polygraph examinations will be given in the Metropolitan Police Department; use of the polygraphs is generally left to the discretion of the operators or their superior officers. An appointment log is maintained by the general assignment squad, Detective Division, for the purpose of reserving periods of time needed by polygraph operators.

We have been advised that the polygraphs are used as investigative aids to augment rather than displace the usual investigative techniques and procedures. The six polygraph operators conduct examinations for other detectives upon request.

Police Department records show that about 5 percent of the polygraph examinations given by the Metropolitan Police Department operators are requested by persons outside the Department, such as the U.S. attorney, on matters not normally handled by the Department. All requests for polygraph examinations received from sources outside the Metropolitan Police Department are approved by the Chief of Detectives.

There are no centralized records on the use of the polygraphs. Each operator maintains a file on the individuals he examines.

This file usually contains a consent form signed by the individual, the polygraph charts, and a data sheet containing the questions asked and information obtained from the investigating officer and the person being examined. From information submitted by the Chief of the Detectives, from interviews with each operator, and from our review of selected case folders, we found that 769 polygraph examinations were conducted during the period July 1, 1961 to May 14, 1964. Following is a tabulation of the number of examinations conducted by each operator.

Operator:	*Number of examinations*
A	182
B	111
C	246
D	102
E	24
F	104
Total	769

The records of the polygraph operators do not show whether the results of the examinations had any bearing on the final disposition of the allegations made against the persons being examined. Further, there are no formal statistical records showing the number of polygraph examinations given and the results achieved which would provide a basis for evaluating the utilization of the polygraphs and indicate whether the benefits derived from them are commensurate with the costs of their use.

Examination Procedures

The Metropolitan Police Department polygraph operators stated that they were following generally accepted methods of conducting examinations which included preparation of questions before the examination in a form which permits only "yes" or "no" answers. Before the polygraph is attached, it is general practice for the operators to review with the person being examined the precise questions to be asked to make sure they are completely understood.

We were advised by the operators that a polygraph examination is severely hampered if a person does not fully understand the questions being asked. Every effort is made to (1) reduce extraneous influences, (2) make the questions as clear and obvious as possible, and (3) have the examiner maintain a neutral manner.

We were informed that in personnel investigations a written report is usually made by the polygraph operator to the officer conducting the investigation. A review of the Metropolitan Police Department's central personnel files of a limited number of police officers who had taken polygraph examinations disclosed that there was no record of the examinations in the personnel files.

We were told by police officials that persons are not given polygraph examinations unless the polygraph operators have obtained their consent and cooperation. The Chief of Police testified to that effect before the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, in 1963. We were told also by police officials that if persons resist the test there is no point in giving them a polygraph examination because the results of the test would be inconclusive.

In the military service, which trains the Metropolitan Police Department polygraph operators, it is customary for the polygraph examiner, before giving an examination, to obtain a signed and witnessed statement that the person is taking the examination of his own free will. The signed agreement reduces the possibility that a disgruntled person will claim that he was coerced into submitting to a polygraph test. The polygraph operators advised us that, in the absence of a Metropolitan Police Department policy on this matter, they had originated and used a consent form similar in purpose to the agreement form used by the military. The content of the Department's consent form is as follows:

"I have been informed of my constitutional rights, and understand that I am not obliged to say or do anything that might incriminate me in any manner. With full knowledge of those rights, I hereby voluntarily submit to take a lie detector test in regard to the following."

Examination of Police Officers

Regulations of the Metropolitan Police Department require policemen to answer questions relating to official business of the Police Department. Also, the law (1 D.C. Code 319) provides generally that any officer or employee of the District of Columbia who refuses to testify in any proceeding where he is a defendant or witness upon matters relating to his office or employment on the ground of self-incrimination shall forfeit his employment. However, we found no evidence that the courts of the District of Columbia have been asked to rule on whether this law would be applicable to a polygraph examination. In this connection, however, we noted that the District Court of Appeals of the State of California, in 1959, *Frazee* v. *Civil Service Board of the City of Oakland* (338 Pac. 2d 943), denied a peremptory writ of mandate to compel the reinstatement of an Oakland, Calif., police officer who had been discharged for refusing to take a polygraph test after having been accused of attempting to commit a felony.

Our review of files relating to polygraph examinations given to policemen during the period July 1, 1961, to May 14, 1964, disclosed that all nonwhite officers had signed consent forms and all but four white officers had signed consent forms. The responsible operators explained that in one case the investigating officer ordered the policeman to take the examination and in the other three cases the agreement forms were not obtained because of oversight.

Of the 769 examinations listed on page 53, 97 involved personnel matters of the Metropolitan Police Department. Seventy-seven police officers were the subjects of 85 examinations and civilians were the subjects of 12 examinations. Results of the examination of the policemen follow:

Result of examination	Examinations		
	White	Non-white	Total
Deception indicated	10	8	18
No deception indicated	55	6	61
Inconclusive	4	2	6
Total	69	16	85

Conclusions

The records show that the police department has used polygraphs in only a relatively few instances during the last 3 years in comparison with the number of crimes reported in the District. The records show also that policemen have been given the examinations in relatively few instances. We found no indications that the race of the policeman had any bearing on whether an examination was given.

We believe that it would be desirable for the Metropolitan Police Department to establish written policies and procedures regarding the use of the polygraph. We believe also that consideration should be given to supplementing such policies and procedures with a system of reporting on the number of polygraph examinations given and on the overall results achieved by such examinations. With this information, the Department would be in a position to determine periodically whether the polygraphs were being effectively utilized and were providing benefits commensurate with the costs of their use.

WIRETAPPING EQUIPMENT

The published policy of the Metropolitan Police Department issued in May 1964 does not permit the use of wiretapping equipment. The Chief of Police testified before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, on May 16, 1962, that he was opposed to the use of wiretapping and the use of electronic "bugs." He further testified that anyone discovered using wiretapping or "bugging" equipment in the Metropolitan Police Department would be punished. On May 11, 1964, the Chief of Police issued General Order No. 5, reiterating his testimony before the House of Representatives Subcommittee and stating that his policy since becoming Chief of Police in 1951 had been "not" to permit the use of wiretapping or "bugging" equipment by members of the Metropolitan Police Department.

We interviewed various officials of the Metropolitan Police Department regarding the ownership and use of wiretapping equipment. We were told that the Department had no wiretapping equipment. We reviewed current property records of the Department and did not find any record of equipment which could be specifically identified as wiretapping equipment. However, our review disclosed that the Metropolitan Police Department had a variety of radio and recording equipment, including miniature and table-model wire and tape recorders and miniature concealable radio equipment with specialized microphones. Equipment of this type is adaptable for use in wiretapping and "bugging." We found no evidence in the records that the equipment had been used for these purposes.

CONCLUSION

We found no evidence in the records examined by us that the Police Department has not followed its stated policy which prohibits the use of equipment for wiretapping or "bugging" purposes.

Officials of the District of Columbia government responsible for the administration of activities discussed in this report

	Tenure of office	
	From—	To—
Board of Commissioners:		
President Walter N. Tobriner	March 1961	Present.
John B. Duncan	July 1961	Do.
Brig. Gen. Charles M. Duke	July 1963	Do.
Metropolitan Police Department:		
Chief of Police Robert V. Murray	December 1951	Do.
Deputy Chief Howard V. Covell, Executive Officer	December 1951	Do.
Deputy Chief Ashley A. Aderholt, Chief Clerk	August 1960	Do.
Deputy Chief Roy E. Blick, Commanding Officer, Morals Division	April 1958	June 1964.
Inspector Scott E.Moyer, Commanding Officer, Morals Division	July 1964	Present.
Deputy Chief Henry H. Heflin, Commanding Officer, Uniforms and Equipment Section.	March 1956	Do.
Deputy Chief John B. Layton, Chief of Detectives	May 1963	Do.
Deputy Chief William J. Liverman, Commanding Officer, Traffic Division.	April 1960	Do.
Captain William J. Couperthwaite, Commanding Officer, Police Academy and Training Section.	March 1964	Do.

THREE-HOUR QUIZ

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial which was published in the Washington Post of September 21, 1965, entitled "Three-Hour Quiz," which is an editorial which supports my position in opposition to that provision in the omnibus crime bill which would give the Police Department power to arrest persons without any proximate cause able to be shown against them, and to take them to jail and cross-examine them for 3 hours.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Three-Hour Quiz

Like a traveler trying to cram into a vacation suitcase more than it can possibly contain, Police Chief Layton keeps trying to cram his new arrest and interrogation procedure, bequeathed to him by former U.S. Attorney David Acheson, within the confines of the Constitution, the law and relevant judicial decisions. Unhappily for him, it simply cannot be done.

There is something appealing about the Police Chief's relief at being able to explain that the new procedure is not the same as the arrests for investigation forbidden as flagrantly unconstitutional by the District of Columbia Commissioners. Of course, it is not. Under the old system of investigative arrests, the police admittedly arrested on mere suspicion. Under the new system, they are to make arrests only when they themselves believe they have probable cause; but their belief is not to be subjected to a judicial test until after they have had an opportunity to interrogate the arrested person for as much as 3 hours "exclusive of interruptions."

The plain purpose of this procedure, whatever it is called, is to investigate by interrogation—and to have the interrogation take place in the intimidating atmosphere of a police station. The procedure is designed to let the police question anyone they believe to be guilty, before a judge has had opportunity to decide whether their belief is justified, before a judge has had opportunity to advise the arrested person of his constitutional rights and before the arrested person, if he is indigent, can be given the assistance of counsel.

This is precisely what the Mallory rule was intended to forbid. If it is not forbidden, an arrested person may be deprived of the right guaranteed by him by the fourth amendment to be free from unreasonable arrests; he may be deprived of the right guaranteed to him by the fifth amendment to refrain from incriminating himself; and he may be deprived, at the most crucial stage of the case against him, of the right guaranteed by the sixth amendment to have the assistance of counsel for his defense. We think it unlikely that the courts are going to allow this disregard of the Constitution of the United States.

OMNIBUS CRIME BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am glad that we have not taken up the omnibus crime bill in the mad hours of the final session.

I appreciate very much the work of the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee. He has been exceedingly fair in agreeing that such matters as this should go over until there can be due deliberation. I, therefore, wish to thank him very much, as I also wish to thank again my friend the Senator from Vermont, for the cooperation which he always extends to me in the committee.

But I serve notice tonight that come January I intend to urge the earliest possible action on these District of Columbia bills, in complete cooperation with my chairman, because they include the revenue bill, the omnibus crime bill, the minimum wage bill, and the whole series of District of Columbia bills that we have had to let go over because we did not feel there was adequate time to give them due deliberation which should be given.

We must watch out, in the last hours of a session, that we do not make grievous mistakes. Let me say respectfully that I believe we have made some, even in this session, but I do not wish to be a contributor to even more grievous mistakes.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of West Virginia in the chair). The clerk will state the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 160), as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER appointed Mr. Mansfield and Mr. Dirksen as members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

INTERAMA—H.R. 30

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the majority leader. He knows that on the floor of the Senate he and I and several other Senators, in private negotiations, have sought in vain for unanimous consent, required under the parliamentary situation today, to call up H.R. 30, the so-called Interama bill which will be on the calendar next January.

I hope that the majority leader has in mind to call up that bill within the first few days of the new session for consideration by the Senate. I strongly urge, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. Smathers], and myself, that the majority leader follow that course, because rather heavy interest rates on the bond issue which is outstanding will continue to accumulate while this matter awaits decision.

I trust that it is the intention of the Senator from Montana to call up this bill early in the session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the distinguished Senators from Florida [Mr. Holland and Mr. Smathers], and also with the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] and the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] as well as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Bass]. I assure the Senators from Florida that I shall be most happy to see that the measure covering this most worthwhile project in Dade County will be brought up as soon as possible after the Senate convenes for its second session next January.

Mr. HOLLAND. On behalf of my colleague Mr. Smathers and myself, I thank the majority leader warmly. I see the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] concurring, apparently, in this intent, and I certainly appreciate the cooperation which we have received today from both leaders.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I anticipate without question that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] will not be averse to bringing the bill up at that time.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS. I appreciate, on behalf of the majority leader, at 15 minutes after midnight on the eve of adjournment, his making this commitment, because I believe this is a worthy project, and I know that the majority leader can be depended upon to do exactly what he says he will do.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Tennessee has been in the Chamber for several hours and has been participating in debate and I am therefore delighted to have his support at this time.

THE SUGAR PROGRAM

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I presume that many Senators will not read again the Record made tonight. I hope that those who may be concerned about what was accomplished in the conference report will go back and read what the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] had to say when the Senate was considering the sugar program, and what he had to say about what an improvement the work of the committee was over the other formula proposed, and how wisely and prudently we had examined the problem.

Also, I hope that they will read the remarks made about the House bill—about how it incorporated much of the influence of the sugar lobbyists—and about the special virtue which was claimed for us in the Senate because we had not listened to them. And then I hope that they will look at what the conference agreed to, and judge how close they came to accepting not what was indicated here, but what the lobbyists had wanted.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

It happens that I come from a State which was assured that if it could produce the proper beet, it would be considered for part of the sugar program of the United States.

After spending a great many hundreds of thousands of dollars to produce the proper beet in a country which was in an unfortunate situation because of the present condition of cotton, in one crop area of my State, we were not even given the back of the hand by those who control the sugar industry.

ESTABLISHMENT OF DATE OF 2D SESSION OF 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate House Joint Resolution 788.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 788) to establish the date of the second regular session of the 89th Congress, which was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second regular session of the Eighty-ninth Congress shall begin at noon on Monday, January 10, 1966.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 788) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORITY FOR THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 161), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the final adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the President of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ANDERSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the great Southwest has produced many outstanding men, but none of greater stature than the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. His has been an exemplary record of public service and personal accomplishment. Over the years, he has worked tirelessly in behalf of his State and the Nation. A great many major legislative works have borne the stamp of his intellect and humanity. Not the least of these is the so-called medicare bill enacted earlier this year by the 89th Congress. That monumental work, although one of the greatest of his accomplishments, represents but one milestone in the professional life of the senior Senator from New Mexico.

Tomorrow, Senator ANDERSON will mark an important milestone in his personal life. On that occasion, Mr. President, he will celebrate his 70th birthday. I regret that I cannot offer him my congratulations personally since he is not in the city at this time. But I did want to affirm on this occasion the high value that I place on his friendship and counsel. And I did not want the day to go by without assuring him of the affection of all of the Members of this body. We join with his family and friends in wishing him many happy returns of the day.

REPORT ON SOUTHEAST ASIA BY SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to refer to a brief report that the Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, presided over by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], and also accompanied by the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] and the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] have filed an interesting and constructive report as a result of the trip to southeast Asia, primarily to Korea and South Vietnam.

Unfortunately, this report cannot be made a part of the RECORD, because it is classified; but all those who are privileged to read it, as I have been, I am sure will find it of great interest, because, in my opinion, and I am sure that of the other members of the Armed Services Committee, it is a significant contribution to an understanding of the problems that face us in that part of the world today.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 528.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 528) as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that the senior Senator from Oregon votes against the resolution for a sine die adjournment. As I have said in recent weeks, I think it is inexcusable for Congress to adjourn sine die when our boys are dying in Vietnam. I think we should remain in session as a check. We should remain in session to check this administration while we are engaged in an unconstitutional war in southeast Asia.

THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 162) was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the first session of the Eighty-ninth Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

THANKS OF THE SENATE, TO THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk another resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 163) was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the first session of the Eighty-ninth Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

THANKS OF THE SENATE, TO THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 164) as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable LEE METCALF, Acting President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the first session of the Eighty-ninth Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senate, I suggest the absence of a quorum, so the distinguished minority leader and I may get in touch with the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 527) providing for adjournment sine die of the 1st session, 89th Congress.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, from the committee appointed to notify the President of the United States that the Congress had completed its business and was ready to adjourn unless he had further communications to make to them, I report that the committee has performed that duty, and the President has informed us that he has no further communications to make to the Congress at this session.

LETTER OF COMMENDATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would like to read to the Senate a letter received this evening from the President of the United States.

It reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., October 22, 1965.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: As you know, I have stated publicly my firm belief that the 1st session of the 89th Congress will be recorded as the greatest session of Congress in the history of our Nation. To that statement I would now like to add my own personal thanks to you for the major part you played in making that record possible. You have earned the gratitude not only of your President, but what is more important, of the entire Nation as well.

This session of the Congress passed 86 major administration measures, but there were other important items on which the Congress did not complete action.

The final record of this Congress is unusually productive. The big job that remains before us is to make certain that what Congress has passed will be carried forward efficiently, with dispatch, and with economy and good judgment. The unfinished work on our agenda will be our first task in the next session of this enlightened and progressive Congress.

Again, the gratitude of the Nation and the President goes to each Member who made his contribution to this record. What you have done will find a shining residence in the history books.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

TRIBUTE TO THE MINORITY LEADER, SENATE, AND SENATE STAFFS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before I make the motion to adjourn sine die, I would like to express my personal gratitude and thanks to the distinguished minority leader for the cooperation, understanding, and tolerance that he has shown; to all Senators, both Democrats and Republicans, who have performed so well and so effectively; to the staffs, who have supplied us with information and counsel as it was needed; to the pages who have performed so efficiently and effectively; and, for that matter, to everyone, because I feel that I owe to all a debt of gratitude which I find hard to express in words.

AUTHORIZATION FOR INSERTIONS IN RECORD FOLLOWING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD following the adjournment of Congress until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with the terms of House Concurrent Resolution 527, previously agreed to, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned sine die.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m., Saturday, October 23, 1965) the Senate adjourned sine die.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 528, the Secretary of the Senate, on October 25, 1965, received a message from the House of Representatives, which announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 149. An act for the relief of Benjamin A. Ramelb;

S. 1320. An act to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1647. An act for the relief of Kim Sung Jin;

H.R. 168. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 227. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to entitle the children of certain veterans who served in the Armed Forces prior to September 16, 1940, to benefit under the war orphans educational assistance program;

H.R. 797. An act to establish the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1778. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended;

H.R. 2571. An act for the relief of Ralph S. DeSocio, Jr.;

H.R. 4421. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.;

H.R. 4845. An act to provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies;

H.R. 5026. An act to authorize the Burt County Bridge Commission, a public body politic and corporate in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, to refund the outstanding revenue bonds of said Burt County Bridge Commission heretofore issued to finance the cost of the construction of a bridge, together with the necessary approaches and appurtenances therefor, from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebr., across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa;

H.R. 5493. An act to provide that the flag of the United States of America may be flown for 24 hours of each day in Lexington, Mass.;

H.R. 5597. An act to relieve physicians of liability for negligent medical treatment at the scene of an accident in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 7475. An act to name the authorized lock and dam No. 6 on the Arkansas River in Arkansas and the lake created thereby for David D. Terry;

H.R. 7812. An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8310. An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8353. An act for the relief of Becky Jo and Charles R. Smith;

H.R. 9047. An act to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both;

H.R. 9830. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize reimbursement to a State or political subdivision thereof for sidewalk repair and replacement or to make other arrangements therefor;

H.R. 9903. An act to provide for the free entry of certain scientific instruments for the use of certain universities;

H.R. 10097. An act for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co.;

H.R. 10281. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10305. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 200 million pounds of nickel from the national stockpile;

H.R. 10878. An act for the relief of Anderson G. Matsler, senior master sergeant, U.S. Air Force, retired;

H.R. 11135. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended;

H.R. 11267. An act to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove certain limitations;

H.J. Res. 641. Joint resolution authorizing Father Flanagan's Boys' Home to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs; and

H.J. Res. 788. Joint resolution establishing that the second regular session of the Eighty-ninth Congress convent at noon on Monday, January 10, 1966.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 528, the Vice President, on October 27, 1965, signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 149. An act for the relief of Benjamin A. Ramelb;

S. 619. An act for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli;

S. 919. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force (retired);

S. 1004. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and services by executive agencies, and for other purposes;

S. 1320. An act to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1647. An act for the relief of Kim Sung Jin;

S. 1758. An act to provide for the right of persons to be represented in matters before Federal agencies;

S. 2092. An act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to various fruits and vegetables to provide for paid advertising;

S. 2118. An act to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920;

S. 2150. An act to discontinue or modify certain reporting requirements of law;

S. 2542. An act to amend the Small Business Act;

S. 2679. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended;

H.R. 168. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 227. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to entitle the children of certain veterans who served in the Armed Forces prior to September 16, 1940, to benefits under the war orphans educational assistance program.

H.R. 797. An act to establish the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1778. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended;

H.R. 2303. An act for the relief of Ernest J. Carlin;

H.R. 2571. An act for the relief of Ralph S. DeSocio, Jr.;

H.R. 3079. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eleni Bacola Ciacco, doctor of medicine;

H.R. 4170. An act to provide adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system;

H.R. 4421. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.;

H.R. 4845. An act to provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies;

H.R. 5026. An act to authorize the Burt County Bridge Commission, a public body politic and corporate in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, to refund the outstanding revenue bonds of said Burt County Bridge Commission heretofore issued to finance the cost of the construction of a bridge, together with the necessary approaches and appurtenances therefor, from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebr., across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa;

H.R. 5493. An act to provide that the flag of the United States of America may be flown for 24 hours of each day in Lexington, Mass.;

H.R. 5597. An act to relieve physicians of liability for negligent medical treatment at the scene of an accident in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 6666. An act to provide for the free entry of a 90-centimeter, split-pole magnetic spectrograph system with orange-peel internal conversion spectrometer attached for the use of the University of Pittsburgh;

H.R. 7475. An act to name the authorized lock and dam No. 6 on the Arkansas River in Arkansas and the lake created thereby for David D. Terry;

H.R. 7812. An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8310. An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8353. An act for the relief of Becky Jo and Charles R. Smith;

H.R. 8370. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9047. An act to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 9567. An act to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education;

H.R. 9830. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize reimbursement to a State or political subdivision thereof for sidewalk repair and replacement or to make other arrangements therefor;

H.R. 9903. An act to provide for the free entry of certain scientific instruments for the use of certain universities:

H.R. 10097. An act for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co.;

H.R. 10281. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10305. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period of approximately 200 million pounds of nickel from the national stockpile;

H.R. 10878. An act for the relief of Anderson G. Matsler, senior master sergeant, U.S. Air Force, retired;

H.R. 11135. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended;

H.R. 11267. An act to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove certain limitations;

H.R. 11539. An act to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane;

H.R. 11588. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 641. Joint resolution authorizing Father Flanagan's Boys' Home to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs;

H.J. Res. 671. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of November as "Water Conservation Month"; and

H.J. Res. 788. Joint resolution establishing that the second regular session of the Eighty-ninth Congress convene at noon on Monday, January 10, 1966.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 528, the President pro tempore, on October 26, 1965, signed the enrolled bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The Secretary of the Senate, on October 26, 1965, presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 2300. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The Secretary of the Senate, on October 27, 1965, presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 149. An act for the relief of Benjamin A. Ramelb;

S. 619. An act for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli;

S. 919. An act for the relief of Lt Col. Wilian T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force, retired;

S. 1004. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and services by executive agencies, and for other purposes;

S. 1320. An act to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1647. An act for the relief of Kim Sung Jin;

S. 1758. An act to provide for the right of persons to be represented in matters before Federal agencies;

S. 2092. An act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to various fruits and vegetables to provide for paid advertising;

S. 2118. An act to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920;

S. 2150. An act to discontinue or modify certain reporting requirements of law;

S. 2542. An act to amend the Small Business Act; and

S. 2679. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 19, 1965, the names of Senators **Dodd** and **Lausche** were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 119) authorizing the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to sine die adjournment, notified the Secretary of the Senate that on the following dates, he had approved and signed the following Senate bills and joint resolution:

On October 20, 1965:

S. 306. An act to amend the Clean Air Act to require standards for controlling the emission of pollutants from certain motor vehicles, to authorize a research and development program with respent to solid-waste disposal, and for other purposes.

On October 22, 1965:

S. 32. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes.

On October 27, 1965:

S. 2300. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury to persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952.

On October 30, 1965:

S. 337. An act for the relief of F. F. Hintze;

S. 343. An act for the relief of Paride Marchesan;

S. 374. An act for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Castrillo (Fernandez);

S. 516. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 386), to provide that eight members of such Commission shall be appointed by the President, and that such Commission may continue in existence until December 31, 1966.

S. 711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hertha L. Wohlmuth;

S. 1735. An act relating to the use by the Secretary of the Interior of land at La Jolla, Calif., donated by the University of California for a marine biological research laboratory, and for other purposes; and

S. 2039. An act for the relief of Den Allen Keene (Yasuo Tsukikawa).

On November 7, 1965:

S. 619. An act for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli.

On November 8, 1965:

S. 149. An act for the relief of Benjamin A. Ramelb;

S. 919. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force (retired);

S. 1004. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and services by executive agencies, and for other purposes;

S. 1320. An act to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1647. An act for the relief of Kim Sung Jin;

S. 1758. An act to provide for the right of persons to be represented in matters before Federal agencies;

S. 2092. An act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit marketing orders applicable to various fruits and vegetables to provide for paid advertising;

S. 2118. An act to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920;

S. 2150. An act to discontinue or modify certain reporting requirements of law;

S. 2542. An act to amend the Small Business Act; and

S. 2679. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 161, agreed to October 23, 1965, the Vice President, on November 15, 1965, announced the appointment of the following Senators to be members of the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration: Senators **Eastland**, **Hart**, **Kennedy** of Massachusetts, **Hruska**, and **Dirksen**.

To attend the Second Special Inter-American Conference in Rio de Janeiro, convening on November 17, 1965: Senators **Church** and **Scott**;

To be members of the Parliamentary Conference in Tokyo and New Delhi, convening on November 24–December 21, 1965: Senator **Hartke**;

To attend the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM) to be held in Geneva, Switzerland, from November 23 to December 3, 1965: Senator **Kennedy** of Massachusetts.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 22, 1965:

Mississippi River Commission

Frederic H. Kellogg, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

Diplomatic Service

Cecil B. Lyon, of New Hampshire, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ceylon, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Maldive Islands.

Public Health Service

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for terms expiring August 3, 1969:

Dr. William B. Bean, of Iowa.

Dr. Stewart G. Wolf, Jr., of Oklahoma.

In the Army

Lt. Gen. Charles Hartwell Bonesteel III, O18655, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), for appointment as Senior U.S. Army Member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711.

In the Navy

Vice Adm. Charles L. Melson, U.S. Navy, when retired, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Bureau of Mines

Walter H. Hibbard, Jr., of New York, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, vice Marling J. Ankeny, resigned.

Environmental Science Services Administration

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Environmental Science Services Administration:

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert G. Sanders
James P. Brown

To be ensigns

Robert A. Rivera
Fidel T. Smith
Carl W. Fisher
Arthur P. Sibold III
John O. Rolland
Phillip F. Dean
Steven M. Erickson
David J. Pashinski
Joseph L. Scott
Lance W. Pape
Glen R. Schaefer
Harold D. Nilsson
Duane D. Helton
Lionel Greve
James L. Murphy
William M. Goodhue, Jr.
William S. Richardson
Charles H. McClure
Christopher C. Mathewson
Otto F. Steffin.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 22, 1965:

Department of Justice

David G. Bress, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia for a term of 4 years.

U.S. Army

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sec. 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. William Henry Sterling Wright O18129, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

U.S. Navy

To be vice admiral

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sec. 5231, Rear Adm. Thomas F. Connolly, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving.

The following-named officers of the line of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade indicated, subject to qualifications therefor as provided for law:

To be rear admiral

Harvey P. Lanham
Lawrence G. Bernard
Harry C. Mason
Jamie Adair
Lester E. Hubbell
Eugene G. Fairfax
Means Johnston, Jr.
Alexander S. Goodfellow, Jr.
Horace H. Epes, Jr.
Thomas R. Weschler
Malcolm W. Cagle
Pierre N. Charbonnet, Jr.
Gene R. Larocque

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Frederick H. Kellogg, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

COMMISSIONER ON AGING

William D. Bechill, of California, to be Commissioner on Aging. (New position.)

ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Philip H. Trezise, of Michigan, to be the representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development vice John M. Leddy.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Vernon M. Livingston, Mansfield.

CALIFORNIA

Andrew Chemycz, Crockett.
William F. Walker, Gualala.
Anthony L. Zangri, Montclair.
Leon Kulekjian, Parlier.
Raymond A. Brandt, Santa Rosa.
Dorothy E. Harrington, Taft.

COLORADO

Susan L. Thompson, Frisco.
James A. Guadnola, Grand Junction.
Robert W. Shewfelt, Parker.

CONNECTICUT

Francis I. Welles, Washington Depot.
Adolph J. Wojick, Willimantic.

GEORGIA

Charles C. Poindexter, Jr., Ellijay.

IDAHO

Daniel K. Wilson, Lapwai.

ILLINOIS

Joseph A. Stal, Georgetown.
Marlin H. Ferguson, Hartford.
Joe E. Brooks, Perry.

INDIANA

J. Maxwell Clouse, Nappanee.
Lloyd G. Schroeder, Wheeler.

KENTUCKY

Maxine D. Remley, Silver Grove.

LOUISIANA

Allen R. Bruhl, Covington.
Marilyn B. Coco, Hamburg.

MAINE

Orville B. Denison, Jr., Cornish.

MARYLAND

Irvington R. Davidson, California.
Thelma Wilburn, Gambrills.

MASSACHUSETTS

Joseph L. Lemieux, North Brookfield.

MICHIGAN

Paul H. Mominee, Dundee.

MISSISSIPPI

William T. Hudspeth, Hickory Flat.

MISSOURI

Lawrence P. Cook, California.
Donald H. McConnell, Greenfield.

NEBRASKA

Allan K. Lookabill, Lisco.
Audrey A. Adams, Lyman.

NEVADA

Catherine C. McKenna, Hawthorne.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Parker A. Rolston, Greenland.

NEW JERSEY

Frances L. Weil, Essex Fells.
John J. McLaughlin, Jr., Orange.

NEW MEXICO

Elena M. Sosa, Sunland Park.
Hazel L. Engram, Texico.

NEW YORK

William B. Chavis, Long Eddy.

NORTH CAROLINA

Henrietta C. Turner, Atkinson.
William P. Jobe, Forest City.
George E. Harvey, Littleton.

OHIO

Jean C. Ebinger, North Fairfield.

OKLAHOMA

Oscar C. Baker, Hominy.
Charles G. LaRreau, Wanette.

PENNSYLVANIA

Woodrow W. Clapper, Bedford.
John J. Buggey, Brockway.
Charles W. Burns, Chicora.
Kenneth W. Nyswaner, Clarksville.
Ray F. Kuhns, East Greenville.
James E. Pontious, Edinboro.
J. Leslie Marstellar, Fredonia.
A. Valadia Mackereth, Mendenhall.
George Mermon, Nesquehoning.
Matthew T. Chubski, South Fork.

TEXAS

Alfred M. Lemons, Booker.
Betty J. Yauck, Darrouzett.
Lynn Ratliff, Madisonville.
Ferman C. Martinez, Port Arthur.
Ross B. Stuart, Strawn.

WISCONSIN

Stanley J. Cybulski, Milwaukee.

WYOMING

Wesley G. Somers, Kemmerer.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with this verse of Scripture: Isaiah 43: 10: *Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my servants.*

Almighty God, in whose divine keeping and control are the coming in and the going out of all our days and years, hitherto Thou hast blessed us and we have found Thee faithful to all Thy promises.

Grant that when we come to the closing hour of this 1st session of the 89th Congress, our President, our Speaker, and every Member of this legislative body and all the officers, clerks, reporters, secretaries, pages, and employees serving in whatever capacity, may be grateful for having had the privilege of walking and working together in the service of our God, our country, and humanity.

We pray that we may be worthy of receiving the benediction of Thy peace and the diadem of Thy praise and have within our hearts the testimony and joy of feeling that we have sought to discharge our duties and responsibilities with a pure and steadfast devotion.

May we commend and commit ourselves and our loved ones to Thy care and keeping.

"The Lord bless us and keep us; the Lord make His face to shine upon and be gracious unto us; the Lord lift upon us the light of His countenance and give us peace."

In Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4421. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 448. To authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating September 3, 1965, as Crusade for Safety Day.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1004. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes; and

S. 2150 An act to discontinue or modify certain reporting requirements of law.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (S. 619) entitled "An act for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 168) entitled "An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8310) entitled "An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R.

11588) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, joint and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2394. An act to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States;

S. 2679. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended;

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands;

S. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of additional copies of the hearings held by the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs during the 89th Congress, 1st session, on S. 9, the cold war GI education bill;

S. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution providing additional copies of hearings on antitrust monopoly;

S. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a Senate document of 10,000 copies of a study entitled "The Anti-Vietnam Agitation and the Teach-In Movement," prepared for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary; and

S. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution to authorize certain corrections in the enrollment of S. 919.

CRUSADE FOR SAFETY DAY

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 448) to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating September 3, 1965, as Crusade for Safety Day, with amendments of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "September 3, 1965," and insert "November 26, 1965,".

Amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating November 26, 1965, as Crusade for Safety Day."

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Friedel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. Rogers, for calling up my resolution for concurrence in the Senate amendment.

When I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 448 on July 9, I was hopeful that it could be passed by both Houses of Congress in time for the President to issue a proclamation designating September 3 as "Crusade for Safety Day," I chose this date because it was the beginning of the long Labor Day weekend and because a special traffic safety stamp was being issued in Baltimore on that date.

Statistics show that more people are killed on the Nation's highways over the Labor Day weekend than on any other long holiday weekend, with the possible exception of the Fourth of July. Since it was not possible to have my resolution passed prior to September 3, I advised the Senate Judiciary Committee that it would be appropriate to amend House Concurrent Resolution 448 to designate the next long holiday weekend as "Crusade for Safety Day." We chose the date of November 26 because it falls on the Thanksgiving weekend, when hundreds of people are expected to be killed in traffic accidents.

The whole purpose of issuing a traffic safety stamp and calling upon the President to issue a proclamation designating a "Crusade for Safety Day" is to call to the attention of the public the need for safe driving to save lives. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to concur in the Senate amendment to House Concurrent Resolution 448.

At the time the special traffic safety stamp was issued in Baltimore, on September 3, Deputy Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen made an excellent speech concerning the need to remind the Nation's motorists that they must improve their driving habits to reduce the slaughter on our streets and highways. This is such an important address that it cannot be repeated too often, and I include it at this point in the Record:

REMARKS BY FREDERICK C. BELEN, DEPUTY POSTMASTER GENERAL, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE TRAFFIC SAFETY STAMP, SEPTEMBER 3, 1965, BALTIMORE, MD.

Today we issue a stamp of special significance. Besides its commemorative value, the traffic safety stamp is particularly important. It is intended to remind the Nation's motorists that they must improve their driving habits. It is an appeal to the national conscience to take every possible step to prevent accidents and the needless tragedy and death that go with them.

Today is the beginning of the last big holiday of the summer—the Labor Day weekend—and millions of Americans will be on the Nation's highways headed for beaches, parks, and the homes of relatives to take advantage of the warm weather.

We choose this time for our stamp ceremony because we want to dedicate this weekend to a safe journey home for every vacationing American.

The Labor Day weekend ranks with the Fourth of July as the most hazardous for the driver and his family. Last year 557 persons died in traffic accidents during the Fourth of July weekend; the toll was even worse for Labor Day: 561 died during that holiday in 1964.

Again this year the National Safety Council is predicting major tragedy for the Labor Day weekend. We must prove this prediction wrong.

Safety is no accident. It is a very deliberate endeavor, and it must be promoted and cultivated and encouraged if it is to be achieved.

Such work can be undertaken with no less zeal and determination than that displayed here in Baltimore by the Safety First Club of Maryland.

This organization, now under the able leadership of President Paul Huddles, has been a persuasive force for traffic safety in this State since 1956. Twice the club has won National Safety Council Awards for its work.

Its successful campaign to reduce traffic accidents in Maryland is an inspiring demonstration of what might be done if its work were emulated in other States and cities and towns throughout the country.

Let me tell you what I've learned about the well-balanced program developed by the Safety First Club.

It sponsors a message of safety that is regularly delivered to the public through radio and television announcements, newspaper articles, billboards, special conferences and exhibits, pamphlets, stickers, and special mailings.

It builds for a better tomorrow by passing along a tradition of traffic safety to our youth.

It presses for passage and enforcement of proper laws to safeguard those who use our streets and highways.

It gives awards and recognition to individuals who have contributed significantly to traffic safety.

Governor Tawes has given major credit to the Safety First Club for enactment of the 1961 law requiring the State's 140 high schools to offer driver education courses. Now the club is seeking even more extensive driver education programs, and it is supporting the formation of teenage traffic courts in Maryland communities similar to the one in Baltimore that has earned so much admiration and respect.

Morris Kasoff, past president of the club, has secured a grant that provides two teachers with driver education scholarships to the University of Maryland each year.

Two major revisions of State law—chemical tests for drivers accused of intoxication and a drivers' point system—were original projects of the Safety First Club.

It was this organization that first polled city legislators in 1957 and discovered a consensus in favor of hiring meter maids. The poll was in good part responsible for the program that is in operation today.

And it was the Safety First Club that championed a memorial to Thomas Harry Riley, late traffic analyst of the Baltimore News-Post, and in 1961 contributed the plaque dedicating the new Patapsco River bridge in his name.

All these projects took considerable time, but the Safety First Club, once convinced of its cause, is a persistent organization. I can testify to that.

The club's campaign for a traffic safety stamp arrived at the Post Office Department a number of years ago and the campaign for the stamp never stopped.

The drive for a commemorative stamp began more than 6 years ago when your Congressman Samuel Friedel spoke in your behalf and inserted into the Congressional Record a request for such a stamp.

Congressman Friedel pointed out that traffic safety is not just a problem in Maryland. He said: "We need to make each and every automobile driver conscious of the fact that it is his personal responsibility to drive safely for the protection of himself and his fellow citizens."

He endorsed the suggestion of the Safety First Club that a special stamp would be an excellent method of calling the national attention to this effort.

Your Congressmen George Fallon and Edward Garmatz took up the cause with no less enthusiasm than Sam Friedel. Like the Safety First Club, all three men are persuasive and persistent, and their good arguments did a lot to convince us of the value of such a stamp.

As Congressman Friedel said 6 years ago, no war or calamity has taken the lives of so many of our people as traffic accidents.

And yet, we all know that accidents can be prevented. That they are not is waste.

President Johnson is particularly concerned about the waste of manpower through accidents. He is concerned about the cost and the lost worktime and most of all about the pain and human suffering or death for which nothing ever compensates.

The President has said: "Americans have always placed the highest value on human life, in accord with our concept of the worth of every individual. As the public repository of our social ideals, Government has a direct obligation to express our regard for human life in every measure necessary to safeguard and protect it."

President Johnson has inaugurated a new program to meet the problem of accidents in the Government service. It's called Mission Safety-70, and through it the President has devised a rather direct method of dealing with the problem.

He is ordering the heads of Government offices to reduce the number of employee injuries and injury costs 30 percent by 1970.

We in the Post Office Department intend to meet our share of that commitment.

A good place to begin is with our traffic safety program. Last year our fleet of 88,000 postal vehicles drove 1.1 billion miles and averaged a little more than 14 accidents for every million miles on the road.

That average is down about 5 percent from the year before. The number of fatal accidents involving postal vehicles is down 8 percent even though the national fatality average increased 5½ percent last year.

We are particularly proud of the accomplishment of our 31,000 rural letter carriers who drove 593 million miles last year and incurred fewer than two accidents per million miles.

Still, even with our improvements, our overall safety record in the post office is the worst in the Federal Government. Disabling injuries deprived us of 303,000 workdays last year and cost us $27 million in lost time, sick pay, and attendant items. And, of course, the unnecessary suffering inflicted upon our employees is beyond any value in dollars.

That time, money and effort all could have been used to provide additional service to the American public.

We intend to see that our record undergoes a rapid and dramatic improvement. Safety is a high priority project at the Post Office Department. The Postmaster General has made it the direct responsibility of our top headquarters and regional officers and postmasters. All of them have been directed to submit plans and suggestions for safety improvements.

We are going to make a post-office-by-post-office search of safety records, and we intend to accord the good ones proper recognition. The rest are going to get a thorough examination, and if improvements are not forthcoming, we're going to bring the responsible official to Washington and ask why.

Safety performance is going to have a more important place in our postmaster appraisal program; it will become a consideration in promotions within the Postal Field Service.

Right now, our Bureau of Personnel is analyzing safety suggestions and mapping our general plan for achieving President Johnson's safety objectives. We are establishing a safety performance review group at headquarters to review activities at the post office level.

And we intend to solicit advice from those private businesses and industries that have developed the most distinguished records in safety. We are about to establish an advisory safety committee made up of executives from such firms.

With the Safety First Club, we at the post office share a firm commitment to motor vehicle safety equipment.

The Safety First Club is campaigning for greater use of seat belts among the general public. We at the Department are spending $350,000 to install seat belts in all of our motor vehicles. We are issuing firm instructions to our drivers and supervisors that these belts are to be used and not ignored.

In addition, we have contracted with private firms for a series of extensive tests in order to determine the best type of automobile construction and safety features. We are giving special attention to the three-wheeled mailsters used by some of our city letter carriers. We have had some complaints from one of our employee unions, and we want to make sure that no employee is driving an unsafe motor vehicle.

From the results of these tests, we expect to learn how to build a safer vehicle for all our postal drivers. Perhaps the innovations and safety advances pioneered in postal vehicles will be adopted by the manufacturers and used to construct an improved automobile for the general public.

We would be glad to make this contribution to the public welfare, of course, but this does not change the fact that ultimate responsibility for safety on the highways is in the hands of the individual driver.

He is the one who must get the message to drive carefully.

There is no better way to reach him than through the public spirited efforts of such organizations as the Safety First Club.

That group was begun in 1956 as the inspiration of two men—J. O. Shuger who was president for 6 years, and Executive Vice President Maurice Shochatt—and has since grown to 400 members and influence beyond its members.

It is an example of a united, articulate citizenry doing something about a problem that concerns all of us.

The traffic safety stamp is a proper commemoration of that effort; we dedicate it to a continuing crusade for safer streets and highways over all America.

I bid you all safe journey home.

Thank you.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION FOR REFUND OF OUTSTANDING REVENUE BONDS OF BURT COUNTY BRIDGE COMMISSION, NEBRASKA

Mr. **JOHNSON** of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 5026) to authorize the Burt County Bridge Commission, a public body politic and corporate in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, to refund the outstanding revenue bonds of said Burt County Bridge Commission heretofore issued to finance the cost of the construction of a bridge, together with the necessary approaches and appurtenances therefor, from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebr., across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, strike out lines 1 to 6, inclusive.

Page 3, line 7, strike out "4" and insert "3".

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. WILLIAM T. SCHUSTER, U.S. AIR FORCE—CORRECTION OF ENROLLED BILL

Mr. **ASHMORE**. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 67 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 67

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (S. 919) for the relief of Lieutenant Colonel William T. Schuster, United States Air Force (retired), the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the said bill, to make the following corrections, namely, on line 5, page 1, strike out "$4,153.83" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,771.33", and on line 9, page 1, strike out "August 31, 1960" and insert in lieu thereof "October 2, 1959".

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the subcommittee bringing this Senate concurrent resolution to the floor, whether this is the same Lt. Col. William T. Schuster in relation to whom a bill was passed on the Private Calendar last Tuesday?

Mr. **ASHMORE**. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

The bill had been passed by both the Senate and the House. The Air Force, in recomputing and checking the record, determined that the figure should be reduced by the sum of $382.50, and that is what the concurrent resolution would do.

Mr. **HALL**. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I wish to point out to the House that this is one of those most interesting cases that we have been considering as private bills to which there has been rather routine objection until such time as overpayment or dual pay for dual service in Government, or other errors, in which the question of accountability as well as responsibility is involved, is solved by a bill such as the one which the gentleman from South Carolina and others has pending before the Committee on the Judiciary.

This bill was allowed to go through the House of Representatives last Tuesday after many objections, some of which were made by the gentleman from Missouri, now speaking, and by others, because similar bills had passed previously in spite of errors in the bills as a result of various causes, errors by paymasters in pay for civilian or military personnel and for other reasons. I wish to compliment the Judge Advocate General's Department in the military service that brought this error to our attention, in that it was not only an overpayment but an overclaim for overpayment. It indicates that there is considerable good checking and work being done by the committee and the Judge Advocate General and other officers of the military services.

My understanding of the legislative situation is that only by concurrence in the resolution originating in the Senate can we preclude the previously passed bill from going to the White House and being signed in the full amount and not excluding this overage in the amount of $382.50. It was, in fact, an overclaim. Is that correct?

Mr. ASHMORE. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. HALL. I also compliment the committee and the chairman for bringing it back, albeit it would be my personal preference, that having detected this error and overcall; that the entire bill be put over without prejudice until the second session.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

FREE ENTRY OF ONE MULTIGAP MAGNETIC SPECTROGRAPH FOR THE USE OF YALE UNIVERSITY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9903) to provide for the free entry of one multigap magnetic spectrograph for the use of Yale University, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one multigap magnetic spectrograph and one MS–9 mass spectrometer (including in each case all accompanying equipment, parts, accessories, and appurtenances) for the use of Yale University.

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one digital polarimeter for the use of Smith College.

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one photomicroscope (including all accompanying equipment, parts, accessories, and appurtenances) for the use of the Utah State Training School.

"(d) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one Weissenberg rheogoniometer for the use the Catholic University of America.

"(e) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one double focusing mass spectrometer (including all accompanying equipment, parts, accessories, and appurtenances) for the use of Ohio State University.

"SEC. 2. If the liquidation of the entry of any article described in the first section of this Act has become final, such entry shall be reliquidated and the appropriate refund of duty shall be made."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object in order to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, for a brief explanation.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

The House bill provided for duty-free admission of a spectrograph for the use of Yale University. This was one of a number of similar bills which the Committee on Ways and Means unanimously reported favorably and which were recently passed by the House and sent to the Senate. They provide for exemption from duty for scientific instruments imported by various colleges and universities; the equivalents of which instruments the Department of Commerce reported were not available in the United States.

In the case of H.R. 9903, the Senate added provisions for duty exemption for scientific instruments imported or to be imported by Yale University and by a number of other educational institutions. These additions cover a mass spectrometer for Yale University and for Ohio State University, respectively, a digital polarimeter for Smith College, a photomicroscope for Utah State Training School, and a rheogoniometer for Catholic University of America. We are advised that a mass spectrometer is used by chemists and chemical engineers to provide chemical analyses, measurements, and other research features; the digital polarimeter is used for optical chemical analysis; the photomicroscope combines, as an integral unit, a microscope, photoelectric light meter, timing device, and related components; and the rheogoniometer accurately measures fluids under steady-rate condtions, fluctuating rates of flow, or both.

Each of these instruments is either made to specifications to meet particular research or other special requirements or have unique features differing from similar instruments that might be produced in the United States. With the exception of the mass spectrometers, the instruments covered by H.R. 9903, as amended by the Senate, have been reported by the Department of Commerce as having no domestically produced counterparts of equivalent scientific value. Because of the short time available, the Department has as of this moment not completed its inquiry with regard to the mass spectrometer for Yale University and the one for Ohio State University. However, aside from the fact that mass spectrometers have been the subject of duty exemption bills in the past, we are informed that these spectrometers are of the same type as the one for the University of Chicago that was the subject of H.R. 2565, which passed the House on October 5 and the Senate on October 19.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Are the amendments to the bill all germane?

Mr. MILLS. They are all germane, and relate to the same subject.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS ON THE COLD WAR GI EDUCATION BILL

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 62.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 62

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare two thousand additional copies of the hearings held by its Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs during the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, on S. 9, a bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 63.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 63

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary two thousand additional copies of volume 2 and volume 3 of the hearings held by its Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly during the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, on economic concentration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A STUDY ENTITLED "THE ANTI-VIETNAM AGITATION AND THE TEACH-IN MOVEMENT"

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 65.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 65

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the pamphlet entitled "The Anti-Vietnam Agitation and the Teach-In Movement," prepared for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, be printed as a Senate document.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed ten thousand additional copies of such Senate document for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURLESON

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURLESON: On page 1, after the word "printed", strike out the rest of the sentence and insert the following in lieu thereof: "22,975 additional copies of which 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 10,975 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and 2,000 copies shall be for the House Document Room".

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate concurrent resolution, as amended, was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8310) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1204)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8310) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965'.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; ALLOTMENTS

"SEC. 2. (a) Sections 1, 2, and 3 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act are amended to read as follows:

" 'AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR GRANTS; PURPOSES FOR WHICH AVAILABLE

" 'SECTION 1. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants as provided in this Act for the purpose of assisting States in rehabilitating handicapped individuals so that they may prepare for and engage in gainful employment to the extent of their capabilities, thereby increasing not only their social and economic well-being but also the productive capacity of the Nation.

" '(b) (1) For the purpose of making grants to States under section 2 to assist them in meeting the costs of vocational rehabilitation services, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the sum of $300,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $350,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of $400,000,000.

" '(2) For the purpose of making grants under section 3, relating to grants to States to assist them in meeting the costs of projects for innovation of vocational rehabilitation services, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the sum of $5,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $7,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of $9,000,000.

" '(3) For the purpose of making grants (A) under section 4(a) (1) for research, demonstrations, training, and traineeships; (B) under clause (2) (A) of section 4(a) for planning, preparing for, and initiating special programs to expand State vocational rehabilitation services; and (C) under clause (2) (B) of section 4(a) to meet the cost of planning for the development of a comprehensive vocational rehabilitation program in each State, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the sum of $80,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the sum of $104,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of $117,000,000.

" '(4) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and each of the succeeding fiscal years, only such sums may be appropriated for the purposes described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

" 'GRANTS TO STATES FOR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES

" 'SEC. 2. (a) For each fiscal year each State shall be entitled to an allotment of an amount bearing the same ratio to the amount authorized to be appropriated by paragraph (1) of section 1(b) for meeting the cost of vocational rehabilitation services, as the product of (1) the population of the State and (2) the square of its allotment percentage (as defined in section 11(h)) bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States. The allotment to any State under the preceding sentence which is less than the amount such State was entitled to receive under subsection (b) of this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being deprived by proportionately reducing the allotments of each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount.

" '(b) For each fiscal year the Secretary shall pay to each State an amount equal to the Federal share (determined as provided in section 11(i)) of the cost of vocational rehabilitation services under the plan for such State approved under section 5, including expenditures for the administration of the State plan, except that the total of such payments to such State for such fiscal year may not exceed its allotment under subsection (a) for such year, and except that the amount otherwise payable to such State for such year under this section shall be reduced by the amount (if any) by which expenditures from non-Federal sources (except for expenditures with respect to which the State is entitled to payments under section 3) during such year under such State's plan are less than such expenditures under such plan for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965.

" 'GRANTS TO STATES FOR INNOVATION OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES

" 'SEC. 3 (a) (1) From the sums available for any fiscal year for grants to States to assist them in meeting the costs described in paragraph (2) of this subsection, each State shall be entitled to an allotment of an amount bearing the same ratio to such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of all the States. The allotment to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than $5,000 (or such other amount as may be specified as a minimum allotment in the Act appropriating such sums for such year) shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount.

" '(2) From each State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall pay to such State a portion of the cost of approved projects for vocational rehabilitation services (including their administration) under the State plan which (A) provide for the development of methods or techniques, which are new in the State, for providing vocational rehabilitation services for handicapped individuals, or (B) are specially designed for development of, or provision for, new or expanded vocational rehabilitation services for groups of handicapped individuals having disabilities which are catastrophic or particularly severe. The Secretary shall approve any project for purposes of this section only if the plan of such State approved under section 5 includes such project or is modified to include it.

" '(b) Payments under this section with respect to any project may be made for a period of not to exceed five years beginning with the commencement of the first fiscal year for which any payment is made with respect to such project from an allotment under this section. To the extent permitted by the State's allotment under this section, such payments with respect to any project shall be equal to 90 per centum of the cost of such project for the first three years and 75 per centum of the cost of such project for the next two years, except that, at the request of the State, such payments may be less than such percentage of the cost of such project.

"'(c) No payment may be made from an allotment under this section with respect to any cost with respect to which any payment is made under section 2.'

"(b) The amendment made by this section shall be in effect for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1965, except that payments may be made from a State's allotment under section 3 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act for any project approved under such section before the enactment of this Act. Such payments may be made for the period for which such project was approved and at the rate provided for in such section at the time of such approval.

"CONSTRUCTION OF REHABILITATION FACILITIES; WORKSHOP IMPROVEMENT; REMOVAL OF ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS

"SEC. 3. The Vocational Rehabilitation Act is further amended by redesignating sections 12 and 13 as sections 16 and 17, and by inserting after section 11 the following new sections:

"'GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF REHABILITATION FACILITIES AND WORKSHOPS

"'SEC. 12. (a) Effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1965, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to assist in meeting the costs of construction of public or other nonprofit workshops and rehabilitation facilities. Such grants may be made only for projects for which applications are approved by the Secretary under this section.

"'(b) To be approved, an application for a grant for a construction project under this section must—

"'(1) contain or be supported by reasonable assurances that (A) for a period of not less than twenty years after completion of construction of the project it will be used as a public or other nonprofit workshop or rehabilitation facility, (B) sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal share of the cost of construction of the project, and (C) sufficient funds will be available, when construction of the project is completed, for its effective use as a workshop or rehabilitation facility, as the case may be;

"'(2) be accompanied or supplemented by plans and specifications which comply with regulations of the Secretary relating to minimum standards of construction and equipment, and with regulations of the Secretary of Labor relating to safety standards for workshops and rehabilitation facilities;

"'(3) be approved, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, by the appropriate State agency designated as provided in section 5(a)(1);

"'(4) contain or be supported by reasonable assurance that any laborer or mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractor in the performance of work on any construction aided by payments pursuant to any grant under this section will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a–5); and the Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"'(c) The amount of a grant under this section with respect to any construction project in any State shall be equal to the same percentage of the cost of such project as the Federal share which is applicable in the case of rehabilitation facilities (as defined in section 625(g) of the Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 291o(g)) in such State, except that if the Federal share with respect to rehabilitation facilities in such State is determined under subparagraph (A) of section 625(b)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 291o(b)(1)), the percentage of the cost for purposes of this section shall be determined in accordance with regulations of the Secretary designed to achieve as nearly as practicable results comparable to the results obtained under such subparagraph.

"'(d) Upon approval of any application for a grant for a construction project under this section, the Secretary shall reserve, from any appropriation available therefor, the amount of such grant determined under subsection (c); the amount so reserved may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as the Secretary may determine. In case an amendment to an approved application is approved or the estimated cost of a project is revised upward, any additional payment with respect thereto may be made from the appropriation from which the original reservation was made or the appropriation for the fiscal year in which such amendment or revision is approved.

"'(e) If, within twenty years after completion of any construction project for which funds have been paid under this section, the workshop or rehabilitation facility shall cease to be a public or other nonprofit workshop or rehabilitation facility, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the workshop or facility the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such workshop or facility is situated) of the workshop or facility, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such workshop or facility.

"'(f) The Secretary is also authorized to make grants to assist in the initial staffing of any public or other nonprofit workshop or rehabilitation facility constructed after the date of enactment of this section (whether or not such construction was financed with the aid of a grant under this section) by covering part of the costs (determined in accordance with regulations of the Secretary) of compensation of professional or technical personnel of such workshop or facility during the period beginning with the commencement of the operation of such workshop or facility and ending with the close of four years and three months after the month in which such operation commenced. Such grants with respect to any workshop or facility may not exceed 75 per centum of such costs for the period ending with the close of the fifteenth month following the month in which such operation commenced, 60 per centum of such costs for the first year thereafter, 45 per centum of such costs for the second year thereafter, and 30 per centum of such costs for the third year thereafter.

"'(g) The Secretary is also authorized to make grants (1) to the State agency or agencies designated as provided in section 5 (a)(1) to assist in meeting the cost of determining the State's needs for workshops and rehabilitation facilities and (2) upon application approved by the appropriate State agency so designated for such State, to public or other nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations to assist them in meeting the costs of planning workshops and rehabilitation facilities and the services to be provided thereby.

"'(h) Payment of grants under subsection (f) or (g) may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine.

"'(i) There is authorized to be appropriated for carrying out this section $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years only such sums may be appropriated for carrying out this section as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law. Sums so appropriated shall remain available for payment with respect to construction projects approved or initial staffing grants made under this section prior to July 1, 1970.

"'(j) For purposes of this section—

"'(1) "construction" includes construction of new buildings, acquisition of existing buildings, and expansion, remodeling, alteration, and renovation of existing buildings, and initial equipment of such new, newly acquired, expanded, remodeled, altered, or renovated buildings;

"'(2) the "cost" of construction includes the cost of architects' fees and acquisition of land in connection with construction, but does not include the cost of offsite improvements;

"'(3) a project for construction of a workshop may include such construction as may be necessary to provide residential accommodations for use in connection with the rehabilitation of mentally retarded individuals or such other categories of handicapped individuals as the Secretary may designate.

"'WORKSHOP IMPROVEMENT

"'Grants for projects for training services

"'SEC. 13. (a)(1) The Secretary is authorized, during the period beginning July 1, 1966, and ending June 30, 1971, to make grants to States and public and other nonprofit organizations and agencies to pay 90 per centum of the cost of projects for providing training services to handicapped individuals in public or other nonprofit workshops and rehabilitation facilities.

"'(2)(A) Training services, for purposes of this subsection, shall include training in occupational skills; related services, including work evaluation, work testing, provision of occupational tools and equipment required by the individual to engage in such training, and job tryouts; and payment of weekly allowances to individuals receiving such training and related services.

"'(B) Such allowances may not be paid to any individual for any period in excess of two years, and such allowances for any week shall not exceed $25 plus $10 for each of the individual's dependents, or $65, whichever is less. In determining the amount of such allowance for any individual, consideration shall be given to the individual's need for such an allowance, including any expenses reasonably attributable to receipt of training services, the extent to which such an allowance will help assure entry into and satisfactory completion of training, and such other factors, specified by the Secretary, as will promote such individual's fitness to engage in a remunerative occupation.

"'(3) The Secretary may make a grant for a project pursuant to this subsection only on his determination that (A) the purpose of such project is to prepare handicapped individuals for a gainful occupation, (B) the individuals to receive training services under such project will include only individuals who have been determined to be suitable for and in need of such training services by the State agency or agencies designated as provided in section 5(a)(1) of the State in which the workshop or rehabilitation facility is located, (C) the full range of training services will be made available to each such individual, to the extent of his need for such services, and (D) the project, including the participating workshop or rehabilitation facility and the training services provided, meet such other requirements as he may prescribe for carrying out the purposes of this subsection.

"'(4) Payments under this subsection may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, and shall be made on such conditions as he finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

" 'Workshop Improvement Grants

" '(b) (1) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to public or other nonprofit workshops during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years to pay part of the cost of projects to analyze, improve, and increase their professional services to the handicapped, their business management, or any other part of their operations affecting their capacity to provide employment and services for the handicapped.

" '(2) No part of any grant made pursuant to this subsection may be used to pay costs of acquiring, constructing, expanding, remodeling, or altering any building.

" '(3) Payments under this subsection may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, and shall be made on such conditions as he finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

" 'Technical Assistance to Workshops

" '(c) (1) The Secretary is authorized, directly or by contract with State vocational rehabilitation agencies or experts or consultants or groups thereof, to provide technical assistance to workshops.

" '(2) Any such experts or consultants shall, while serving pursuant to such contracts, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expense Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

" 'National Policy and Performance Council

" '(d) (1) There is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Policy and Performance Council, consisting of twelve members, not otherwise in the regular full-time employ of the United States, appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws. The Secretary shall from time to time appoint one of the members to serve as Chairman. The appointed members shall be selected from among leaders in the vocational rehabilitation or workshop fields, State or local government, and business and from among representatives of related professions, labor leaders, and the general public. Each appointed member shall hold office for a term of four years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and except that, of the twelve members first appointed, three shall hold office for a term of three years, three shall hold office for a term of two years, and three shall hold office for a term of one year, as designated by the Secretary at the time of appointment. None of such twelve members shall be eligible for reappointment until a year has elapsed after the end of his preceding term.

" '(2) The Council shall (A) advise the Secretary with respect to the policies and criteria to be used by him in determining whether or not to make grants under subsection (a); (B) make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to workshop improvement and the extent to which this section is effective in accomplishing this purpose; and (C) perform such other services with respect to workshops as the Secretary may request.

" '(3) The Secretary shall make available to the Council such technical, administrative, and other assistance as it may require to carry out its functions.

" '(4) Appointed members of the Council, while attending meetings or conferences thereof or otherwise serving on business of the Council, shall be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expense Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

" '(e) The Secretary shall make no grant under this section to any workshop or rehabilitation facility which does not comply with safety standards which the Secretary of Labor shall prescribe by regulation.

" '(f) There is authorized to be appropriated for making grants under subsection (a) and subsection (b) of this section $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $14,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years only such sums may be appropriated for making grants under subsection (a) and subsection (b) of this section as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

" 'WAIVER OF STATEWIDENESS REQUIREMENTS FOR LOCALLY FINANCED ACTIVITY

" 'SEC. 14. In the case of any activity which, in the judgment of the Secretary, is likely to assist in promoting the vocational rehabilitation of substantially larger numbers of handicapped individuals or the vocational rehabilitation of individuals with particular types of disabilities in a State or States, the Secretary may waive compliance, with respect to vocational rehabilitation services furnished as part of such activity, with the requirement of section 5(a) (3) that the plan be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State to the extent and for such period as may be provided in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, but only if the non-Federal share of the cost of such vocational rehabilitation services is met from funds made available by a political subdivision of the State (including, to the extent permitted by such regulations, funds contributed to such subdivision by a private agency, organization, or individual).

" 'NATIONAL COMMISSION ON AGRICULTURAL BARRIERS TO REHABILITATION OF THE HANDICAPPED

" 'SEC. 15. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Commission on Architectural Barriers to Rehabilitation of the Handicapped, consisting of the Secretary, or his designee, who shall be Chairman, and not more than fifteen members appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws. The fifteen appointed members shall be representative of the general public, and of private and professional groups having an interest in and able to contribute to the solution of architectural problems which impede the rehabilitation of the handicapped.

" '(b) The Commission shall (1) determine how and to what extent architectural barriers impede access to or use of facilities in buildings of all types by the handicapped; (2) determine what is being done, especially by public and other nonprofit agencies and groups having an interest in and a capacity to deal with the problem, to eliminate such barriers from existing buildings and to prevent their incorporation into buildings constructed in the future; and (3) prepare plans and proposals for such further action as may be necessary to achieve the goal of ready access to and full use of facilities in buildings of all types by the handicapped, including proposals for bringing together in a cooperative effort, agencies, organizations, and groups already working toward that goal or whose cooperation is essential to effective and comprehensive action.

" '(c) The Commission is authorized to appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants, and to establish such committees, as may be useful in carrying out its functions, to make studies, and to contract for studies or demonstrations to assist it in performing its functions. The Secretary shall make available to the Commission such technical, administrative, and other assistance as it may require to carry out its functions.

" '(d) Appointed members of the Commission and special advisory and technical experts and consultants appointed pursuant to subsection (c) shall, while attending meetings or conferences thereof or otherwise serving on business of the Commission, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expense Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

" '(e) The Commission shall, prior to January 1, 1968, submit a final report of its activities, together with its recommendations for further carrying out the purposes of this section, to the Secretary for transmission by him together with his recommendations to the President and then to the Congress. The Commission shall also prepare such interim reports as the Secretary may request.

" '(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $250,000 for carrying out the purposes of this section.'

"SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING TO EXPAND VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES

"SEC. 4. (a) (1) Section 4(a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 34(a)) is amended by striking out '(1)' where it first appears therein and inserting it immediately after 'the Secretary shall make grants'.

"(2) Clause (2) of section 4(a) of such Act is amended to read: '(2) (A) to States and public and other nonprofit organizations and agencies for paying part of the cost of planning, preparing for, and initiating special programs to expand vocational rehabilitation services in those States where, in the judgment of the Secretary, such action holds promise of yielding a substantial increase in the number of persons vocationally rehabilitated, except that sums appropriated for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1970, shall not be available for grants under this clause, and sums appropriated for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1970, for grants under this clause shall remain available for such grants until the close of June 30, 1971, and (B) to States (but not to exceed $100,000 for any State for any fiscal year) to meet the cost of planning for the development of a comprehensive vocational rehabilitation program in each State, with a view to achieving the orderly development of vocational rehabilitation services in the State (including vocational rehabilitation services provided by private nonprofit agencies), and making vocational rehabilitation services available to all handicapped individuals in the State by July 1, 1975, except that sums appropriated for any fiscal year beginning prior to July 1, 1965, or ending after June 30, 1967, shall not be available for grants under this clause, and sums appropriated for the period beginning July 1, 1965, and ending June 30, 1967, for grants under this clause shall remain available for such grants until the close of June 30, 1968.'

"(3) Paragraph (2) of section 4(d) of such Act is amended by inserting '(other than subsection (a) (2))' after 'under this section' where it first appears therein, and by striking out 'under this section' where it next appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'thereunder'.

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1965.

"RAISING OF LIMITATIONS ON TRAINING

"SEC. 5. (a) Section 4(a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 34(a)) is amended by striking out the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof: 'Grants for training and traineeships under clause (1) of this subsection may include training and traineeships in physical medicine and rehabilitation, physical therapy, occupational therapy, speech pathology and audiology, rehabilitation nursing, rehabilitation social work, prosthetics and orthotics, rehabilitation psychology, rehabilitation counseling, recreation for the ill and handicapped, and other specialized fields contributing to vocational rehabilitation. No grant shall be made under clause (1) or clause (2) of this subsection for furnishing to an individual any one course of study extending for a period in excess of four years'.

"(b) Section 7(a)(3) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 37(a)(3)) is amended by striking out all that follows 'any one course of study' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for a period in excess of four years, and such training, instruction, fellowships, and traineeships may be in the fields of physical medicine and rehabilitation, physical therapy, occupational therapy, speech pathology and audiology, rehabilitation nursing, rehabilitation social work, prosthetics and orthotics, rehabilitation psychology, rehabilitation counseling, recreation for the ill and handicapped, and other specialized fields contributing to vocational rehabilitation; and'.

"DELETION OF ECONOMIC NEED AS REQUIREMENT FOR SERVICES

"SEC. 6. (a) Section 11(a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 41) is amended by striking out 'in the case of any such individual found to require financial assistance with respect thereto,'.

"(b) Paragraph (6) of section 11(a) of such Act is amended by striking out '(except where necessary in connection with determinations of eligibility or nature or scope of services)'.

"RESEARCH AND INFORMATION

"SEC. 7. (a) Effective July 1, 1965, section 7(a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 37(a)) is amended by deleting paragraph (1); by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively; and by striking out, in the paragraph herein redesignated as paragraph (3), 'as to the studies, investigations, demonstrations, and reports referred to in paragraph (1) and other matters'.

"(b) Effective July 1, 1965, section 7 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 37) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(c) The Secretary is authorized, directly or by contract—

" '(1) to conduct research, studies, investigations, and demonstrations, and to make reports, with respect to abilities, aptitudes, and capacities of handicapped individuals, development of their potentialities, and their utilization in gainful and suitable employment; and

" '(2) to plan, establish, and operate an information service, to make available to agencies, organizations, and other groups and persons concerned with vocational rehabilitation, information on rehabilitation resources useful for various kinds of disability and on research and the results thereof and on other matters which may be helpful in promoting the rehabilitation of handicapped individuals and their greater utilization in gainful and suitable employment.

" '(d) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the purposes of this section.'

"FLEXIBILITY IN STATE ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 8. (a) Subsection (a) of section 5 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 35(a)) is amended by striking out paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" '(1) (A) designate a State agency as the sole State agency to administer the plan, or to supervise its administration in a political subdivision of the State by a sole local agency of such political subdivision, except that where under the State's law the State blind commission, or other agency which provides assistance or services to the adult blind, is authorized to provide them vocation rehabilitation services, such commission or agency may be designated as the sole State agency to administer the part of the plan under which vocational rehabilitation services are provided for the blind (or to supervise the administration of such part in a political subdivision of the State by a sole local agency of such political subdivision) and a separate State agency may be designated as the sole State agency with respect to the rest of the State plan;

" '(B) provide that the State agency so designated to administer or supervise the administration of the State plan, or (if there are two State agencies designated under subparagraph (A)) so much of the State plan as does not relate to services for the blind, shall be (i) a State agency primarily concerned with vocational rehabilitation, or vocational and other rehabilitation, of disabled individuals, (ii) the State agency administering or supervising the administration of education or vocational educaton in the State, or (iii) a State agency which includes at least two other major organizational units each of which administers one or more of the major public education, public health, public welfare, or labor programs of the State;

" '(2) provide, except in the case of agencies described in paragraph (1)(B)(i)—

" '(A) that the State agency designated pursuant to paragraph (1) (or each State agency if two are so designated) shall include a vocational rehabilitation bureau, division, or other organizational unit which (i) is primarily concerned with vocational rehabilitation, or vocational and other rehabilitation, of disabled individuals, and is responsible for the vocational rehabilitation program of such State agency, (ii) has a full-time director, and (iii) has a staff employed on such rehabilitation work of such organizational unit all or substantially all of whom are employed full time on such work; and

" '(B)(i) that such unit shall be located at an organizational level and shall have an organizational status within such State agency comparable to that of other major organizational units of such agency or (ii) in the case of an agency described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii), either that such unit shall be so located and have such status or that the director of such unit shall be the executive officer of such State agency; except that, in the case of a State which has designated only one State agency pursuant to paragraph (1), such State may, if it so desires, assign responsibility for the part of the plan under which vocational rehabilitation services are provided for the blind to one organizational unit of such agency and assign responsibility for the rest of the plan to another organizational unit of such agency, with the provisions of this paragraph (2) applying separately to each of such units.'

"(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall become effective July 1, 1967, except that, in the case of any State, such amendments shall be effective on such earlier date (on or after the date of enactment of this Act) as such State has in effect an approved plan meeting the requirements of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act as amended by subsection (a).

"SPECIAL SERVICES FOR THE BLIND AND THE DEAF

"SEC. 9. So much of subsection (a) of section 11 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 41(a)) as precedes paragraph (1) is amended by inserting after the second semicolon 'provision, in the case of handicapped individuals, of reader services for such individuals who are blind and of interpreter services in the case of such individuals who are deaf;'.

"SERVICES TO DETERMINE REHABILITATION POTENTIAL OF RECIPIENT

"SEC. 10. (a) Subsection (b) of section 11 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 41(b)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof: '; except that nothing in the preceding provisions of this subsection or in subsection (a) shall be construed to exclude from "vocational rehabilitation services" any goods or services provided to an individual who is under a physical or mental disability which constitutes a substantial handicap to employment, during the period, not in excess of eighteen months in the case of any individual who is mentally retarded or has a disability designated for this purpose by the Secretary, or six months in the case of an individual with any other disability, determined (in accordance with regulations of the Secretary) to be necessary for, and which are provided for the purpose of, ascertaining whether it may reasonably be expected that such individual will be rendered fit to engage in a remunerative occupation through the provision of goods and services described in subsection (a), but only if the goods or services provided to him during such period would constitute "vocational rehabilitation services" if his disability were of such a nature that he would be a "handicapped individual" under such preceding provisions of this subsection'.

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply in the case of expenditures made after June 30, 1965, under a State plan approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

"MANAGEMENT SERVICES AND SUPERVISION OF BUSINESS ENTERPRISES OF THE HANDICAPPED

"SEC. 11. Effective July 1, 1966, section 11(a)(7) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 41(a)(7)) is amended to read as follows:

" '(7) in the case of any type of small business operated by the severely handicapped the operation of which can be improved by management services and supervision provided by the State agency, the provision of such services and supervision, alone or together with the acquisition by the State agency of vending stands or other equipment and initial stocks and supplies; and'.

"TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

"SEC. 12. (a) Section 4(d)(3) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 34(d)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

" '(3) Appointed members of the Council, while attending meetings or conferences thereof or otherwise serving on business of the Council or at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.'

"(b) (1) The last sentence of section 4(a) the second sentence of section 4(d) (1), the first sentence of section 4(d) (2), section 5(a) (4), the paragraphs of section 7(a) redesignated (by section 7 of this Act) as paragraphs (1) and (3), the portion of section 11(a) preceding paragraph (1), paragraph (8) of section 11(a), section 11(b), and so much of section 11(c) as precedes paragraph (1), of such Act, are each amended by striking out 'physically handicapped individuals' and inserting in lieu thereof 'handicapped individuals'.

"(2) The third sentence of section 4(d) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out 'physically handicapped' and inserting in lieu thereof 'handicapped'.

"(3) Section 8 of such Act is amended by striking out 'Physically Handicapped' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Handicapped' and by striking out 'handicapped individuals' and inserting in lieu thereof 'individuals'.

"(c) Section 11(d) of such Act is amended by striking out 'severely handicapped individuals' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the severely handicapped'.

"(d) Subsections (a), (b), and (d) of section 11 of such Act are amended by striking out 'remunerative' and inserting in lieu thereof 'gainful'.

"FEDERAL SHARE

"SEC. 13. (a) Effective for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, section 11(i) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act is amended to read as follows:

" '(i) The term "Federal share" for any State shall be equal to its Federal share as determined hereunder for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, plus one-half the difference between such share and 75 per centum.'

"(b) Effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1966, such section 11(i) is amended to read as follows:

" '(i) The term "Federal share" means 75 per centum.'

"PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

"SEC. 14. The joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week', approved July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409), as amended, is amended by striking out '$400,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$500,000'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ADAM C. POWELL,
EDITH GREEN,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
CARLTON R. SICKLES,
SAM M. GIBBONS,
HUGH CAREY,
CARL D. PERKINS,
DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
ALBERT QUIE,
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN,
OGDEN REID,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LISTER HILL,
RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
HARRISON WILLIAMS,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
EDWARD KENNEDY,
JACOB JAVITS,
GEORGE MURPHY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8310) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment strikes out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below, except for minor, clarifying, or technical changes.

ALLOTMENTS UNDER SECTION 2

The House bill amended section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to change the method of allotting funds among the States for providing vocational rehabilitation services. Under the amendment of the House the allotments would be made according to a formula based on the relative population and per capita income with no floors or ceilings, except for a floor which merely assures that no State's allotment will be less than its allotment for 1965. The Senate amendment did not change existing law under which the funds are also allotted on the basis of population and per capita income. However, the existing law, through the device of squaring the allotment percentage, gives twice as much weight to the per capita income factor as was provided for in the House bill. The House bill did not include any of the built-in ceilings and floors which were present in the existing law.

The conference report contains the provisions of the House bill on this point, except that it contains the provision for squaring the allotment percentage, so that the weight given the per capita income factor remains the same as in existing law.

ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS FOR SECTION 3

The present law provides that funds available for carrying out projects under section 3 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of their relative populations. The House bill provided that per capita income should be one of the factors used in making these allotments. The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision. This change from existing law is not included in the conference report.

FEDERAL SHARE OF CONSTRUCTION COSTS

The House bill provided that the amount of a grant for the construction of a rehabilitation facility or workshop would be half of the cost of the project. The Senate amendment provided that the amount of such a grant would be equal to the same percentage of the cost of the project as the Federal share which is applicable in the case of rehabilitation facilities constructed under the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act. The Senate provision is included without change in the conference report.

GRANTS FOR INITIAL STAFFING

The House bill permitted grants for the initial staffing of workshops and rehabilitation facilities constructed after the enactment of the bill. The Senate amendment permitted such grants only for workshops and rehabilitation facilities constructed with funds provided under the act. The Senate recedes on this provision, but the managers on the part of both the House and Senate recognize that it might be appropriate for a preference to be given the staffing of facilities constructed with assistance under the act where funds are insufficient to permit grants for staffing of all new rehabilitation facilities and workshops.

TRAINING

The House bill, unlike the Senate amendment, listed a number of fields in which grants for training and traineeships might be made. The conferees accept this provision, but wish to state their belief that this listing of particular fields is not exhaustive and is not intended to limit training and traineeship to these fields.

COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

The Senate amendment increased the annual authorization of appropriation for the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped from $400,000 to $500,000. The House bill had no comparable provision. The section is included in the conference report.

ADAM C. POWELL,
EDITH GREEN,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
CARLTON R. SICKLES,
SAM M. GIBBONS,
HUGH CAREY,
CARL D. PERKINS,
DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
ALBERT QUIE,
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN,
OGDEN REID,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. **POWELL** (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **POWELL**. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to use any time, but I would like to yield to my distinguished colleague on the other side of the aisle [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. Speaker, the value of H.R. 8310, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965, is so clear that not a voice was raised against it when it came on the floor on July 29 in its original form. The bill as it has emerged from conference scarcely differs from the bill you passed so unanimously. Out of the 15 major differences between the House and Senate versions, the Senate agreed to recede on 13. Our conferees could not have been more fortunate. In light of the Senate's disposition to accept the innovations of our bill, we were willing to retain the Hill-Burton formula as a method of allocating the authorized funds among the States.

The changes in the old act devised by Congresswoman GREEN and her Special Subcommittee on Education will provide a major boost to vocational rehabilitation programs throughout the country. The sum of $300 million are authorized for fiscal year 1966 for grants to the several States to offer rehabilitation services. The Federal share of these grants will be raised to a flat, nationwide 75 percent to make the Federal financing of this program comparable to the Federal share of other manpower programs.

Another section of the act will make $5 million available this fiscal year for projects to introduce new methods and techniques for aiding the handicapped, particularly severely disabled persons. Federal matching for such projects would be at 90 percent for the first 3 years of their existence. Workshops and rehabilitation facilities would receive $1.5 million for construction and initial staffing expenses, while $80 million would go toward special projects for improving training, for research activities, and for the development of comprehensive State programs. Finally, $1.5 million would be authorized for expenditure this year for workshop improvement grants for training services projects on a 90-percent matching basis.

I am proud that our committee is able to close this, its most fruitful session in the history of this Congress, by offering for your approval such an excellent bill emerging virtually intact from a highly successful conference. I trust that the results of our deliberations next year will be equally as invaluable for the cause of better education in America so that those confined to wheelchairs or similarly incapacitated can look forward with renewed hope and self-respect toward a productive future.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me. I would like to direct a question to the chairman of the conferees on the part of the House. In this particular conference report there is a change as far as the Federal share of construction costs is concerned, applying the Hill-Burton formula for the first time on vocational rehabilitation facilities. In the Appropriation Act 2 years ago language was written into that act providing that private funds could be used to match Federal dollars as far as vocational rehabilitation facilities are concerned. This amendment has been referred as the so-called Laird vocational rehabilitation amendment. I wanted to clear up for the record at this time whether there was any intention on the part of the House-Senate conferees to change effect of the Laird amendment as far as its provision on the use of Federal funds to match private dollars in this vocational rehabilitation program.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, in response to my colleague's question, I would like to say first that this bill that comes out of conference is the House bill. The Senate receded on 14 points. The only thing we receded on was the Hill-Burton formula which has proven through the years to be very workable. Now, on page 6 of the conference report, section 13(a)(1) it reads:

> SEC. 13. (a) (1) The Secretary is authorized, during the period beginning July 1, 1966, and ending June 30, 1971, to make grants to States and public and other nonprofit organizations and agencies to pay 90 percentum of the cost of projects for providing training services to handicapped individuals in public or other nonprofit workshops and rehabilitation facilities.

Mr. LAIRD. Then, as far as the allocation going to the State is concerned, the States can apply private funds in matching vocational rehabilitation funding on the Federal level?

Mr. POWELL. That is absolutely correct. I am just as interested in the thrust of the gentleman's question as he is, because in New York we have one of the best private agencies in this country, the Lighthouse for the Blind. Under this bill they will still have the same access to matching funds.

Mr. LAIRD. I have in mind the Goodwill Industries and many of these fine organizations doing a tremendous job in vocational rehabilitation, which should be encouraged. I just wanted to make sure that there was no change in that as far as the conferees were concerned.

Mr. Speaker, the vocational education program is a program that is dedicated to preparing an individual to assume or regain control and responsibility for his own and his family's economic well-being. The vocational rehabilitation program which puts people back to work as functioning members of the community represents a combination of a constructive social policy for the individual and a constructive regard for the taxpayers' money, and I would like to take this opportunity to elaborate briefly on the history of the provision allowing States to apply private funds in matching vocational rehabilitation funding on the Federal level.

This significant breakthrough in the search for new sources of financing was developed as a result of my special interest in increasing the resources for rehabilitating handicapped people in workshops. Many local groups had raised funds privately for financing the building of these facilities. These contributed funds, however, were not entitled to "earn" Federal dollars until we obtained specific congressional approval in appropriations legislation last year for the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration to match such funds. This means that sizable amounts (for 1966 a total maximum allocation of $5 million) of Federal funds will be distributed to States for the purpose of establishing local rehabilitation facilities for which local private support can be developed. This new authority provides for our vocational rehabilitation programs the same kind of flexible matching of local private money which has characterized the Hill-Burton hospital and facilities program.

Miss Switzer tells me that 25 projects have been approved in 17 different States for financing in 1965. Total Federal funds for approved projects amounts to $1,661,016.

What does all this mean in services to disabled people? Let me illustrate by citing an approved project in Milwaukee, Wis. The Vocational Rehabilitation Division and the Milwaukee Public Schools developed a plan for providing concurrent academic and vocationally directed training for handicapped students. It was found that many of these young people needed more intensive and comprehensive evaluation of their capabilities before specific job goals could be set.

The Goodwill Industries agreed to establish an industry-oriented setting in which evaluations could be made. This unit will be able to serve 300 or more persons per year in about 20 different disability categories, helping the school authorities and the vocational rehabilitation agency to work out the most realistic and satisfactory plan for each of these young people.

It is my hope and expectation that voluntary groups and the State public agencies will continue to respond in the years to come, to this new opportunity to earn Federal moneys for much needed community rehabilitation services and facilities under voluntary auspices.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can all agree that we want a vocational rehabilitation program that is liberal in its regard for the needs of people; conservative in its use of public funds and the skills of scarce professional manpower and productive in its achievements for the society it serves—for the dollars spent we want at least an equivalent in measurable capacity of the beneficiaries to contribute to the social and economic life of the community.

I think the vocational rehabilitation program fulfills these conditions which should be applied to all Federal grant-in-aid programs.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's bringing this matter to the floor of the House. Mr. Speaker, this is the last piece of legislation coming from the Committee on Education and Labor, and I would like to ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for a minute.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank all the good people of my committee, including the staff, who have worked so hard in this session on the business of the Committee on Education and Labor. I include Members on both sides of the aisle, whether proponents or opponents. I feel that we can all go home to our districts proud of what we have done here during the past days. I think it is very important that the Members know and that the Nation knows that in the past 5 years we have upped the Federal commitment to education to slightly over $14 billion.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to yield to the distinguished author of this legislation, who has done such an excellent job on the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, conferees from the House and the Senate worked to resolve the differences between the House and Senate versions of H.R. 8310, my bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to provide for major improvements in and expansion of the vocational rehabilitation programs that restore disabled people to employment.

I am glad to report that the Senate conferees, and the Senate as a whole, have accepted with relatively minor changes the bill that was developed by the House. With some 15 points in conference, the Senate accepted the House position on all but 3 issues. The House maintained its position with regard to the basis for allotment of funds to States for the support of basic vocational rehabilitation services, with a modification that involved squaring the per capita income factor in the formula.

With respect to allocation of funds for innovation projects under section 3, the House agreed to the Senate formula for allocation of Federal funds. Without any change in the size or concept of the program for the construction of workshops and facilities, the House accepted the Senate's amendment for variable Federal matching of State funds. In addition, the House accepted the Senate amendment to authorize increased appropriations for the work of the President's Committee on National Employment of the Handicapped Week.

I believe that the House conferees are to be commended for insisting, as they did, on keeping the great new provisions in the House bill which will do so much to advance the vocational rehabilitation of disabled people this year and for years to come. Truly we can be proud of the work of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], and all members of the committees who labored to develop the new, forward-looking program that is outlined in this bill.

In his health message in January of this year, President Johnson recommended legislation to make improvements and to expand the Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation to restore disabled people to employment. He pointed out that we are now rehabilitating about 135,000 persons each year and that our goals should be at least 200,000 each year. Bills to carry out the President's proposals for amending the existing legislation were introduced by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. Subsequently other bills were introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] and me. I would like to commend the very able gentlewoman from Oregon, chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education, for work in this Congress, and in every other Congress she has served, in behalf of the handicapped. On this bill, as on all that she handles, her work has been outstanding. She should be commended, also, for her stanch support in the conference of the bill that the House passed. As I noted, the House bill was retained with but a few modifications.

As we act today on this bill, I am mindful, also, of the work of my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], who has consistently worked to keep our consideration of this legislation completely nonpartisan and directed to the mission that it must fulfill. I think, also, of the work of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] and Carl Elliott, our former chairman, whose labors over the years contributed much to the development of the legislation under consideration today.

Much has been said during this 1st session of the 89th Congress about the need for alleviating poverty, and while we have not always agreed on the best methods of ridding this Nation of poverty, we do agree upon the necessity for action in this area.

The main thrust of this bill is intended to rehabilitate many thousands of young people and adults each year and transform them into vital contributing members of our society. In so doing we are keeping people from going on the relief rolls, we are taking many of them off and we are producing new taxpayers. I am happy to say that we have had no disagreements from either side of the aisle, or from either body of the Congress with respect to the wisdom of these objectives and the capacity of this program to make an appreciable impact on this problem.

I recommend that the House accept the report of the conference and thus insure the first major amendment in 10 years to this well established and productive program of rehabilitating and returning disabled people to work.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the conference report containing the 1965 amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act which we are considering now is, I believe, one of the most important and humanitarian pieces of legislation to come before the House this session. Yesterday evening the other body approved the compromise bill without a dissenting vote. Now the Members of this body are being asked to approve a conference report containing substantially the same provisions as the bill that was approved earlier this year by this House without a dissenting vote. There were 15 major differences between the respective versions of the legislation. Of these differences the House has maintained its position on 12 of the items. The conference report, then, for the most part, represents the House bill—and also a culmination of the work of the Special Subcommittee on Education over the last 3 years—on a truly bipartisan effort—and to the members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle I wish to express my deepest thanks, particularly to the ranking minority member, Mr. QUIE, for his important contributions in this endeavor.

The conference report also represents the untiring efforts of those in the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and the efforts and arduous work of persons and associations in the field of vocational rehabilitation across the Nation.

The subcommittee, the full committee, and, I believe, the entire Congress owe their deepest gratitude to Mary Switzer, Commissioner of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration—not only for her efforts and cooperation with respect to this legislation but also for her wise leadership and excellent administration of what I believe to be the first and possibly the best antipoverty program.

Members of the Commissioner's staff have been of inestimable assistance throughout our consideration of these proposals and I should particularly like to thank Mr. Russell Dean, Kay Arneson, Emiley Lamborn, and George Arnold for their contributions. Also the cooperation and assistance rendered by the associations who speak for rehabilitation workers in the field has been greatly appreciated—Mr. E. B. Whitten, directer of the National Rehabilitation Association, Mr. John Harmon, of Goodwill Industries, Mr. John Nagel, of the National Federation of the Blind, Mr. Irvin Schloss, of the American Foundation of the Blind, and Mr. Antonio Suazo, of the National Association of Sheltered Workshops and Homebound Programs.

The tireless help given by these associations and persons has assisted greatly in bringing about what I consider to be an excellent piece of legislation—significant and meaningful improvements in the existing program.

The principal House provision and I believe the most significant feature of the entire bill was in conference as it was not included in the Senate bill. It provides for some favorable Federal financing of the Federal-State program of rehabilitation services provided under section 2 of the act. Mr. E. B. Whitten, director of the National Rehabilitation Association, was the first witness to call the question of financing to the subcommittee's attention. He said:

> The problem of vocational rehabilitation agencies has been complicated by the new grant-in-aid programs in the manpower field established during the last few years with higher Federal shares than are available under vocational rehabilitation legislation.

He added:

> We propose that the Federal share of the basic program under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act be 75 percent in all of the States.

Mr. Speaker, almost every witness who testified on the bill supported this position. And hundreds of letters from persons in the field of vocational rehabilitation were received by the subcommittee urging such an amendment.

Thus the conference report proposes to substitute for the existing variable Federal share which ranges between 50 and 70 percent for the section 2 program, a standard Federal share of 75 percent, applicable in all the States. This would go into effect in fiscal year 1967. For this present fiscal year each State's Federal share will be increased to a point midway between the State's 1965 share and 75 percent. Mr. Speaker, I should point out that this provision affects the primary, most important, and largest program under the act. The authorizations for section 2 for the next 3 years amount to $300 million for fiscal year 1966, $350 million for fiscal year 1967, and $400 million for fiscal year 1968. This House provision will do more than any other provision in help to meet the goal enunciated by President Johnson earlier this year—that we should be rehabilitating at least 200,000 persons each year.

The new financing system for grants to States under section 2 of the act goes into effect at once. Thus the States will have available for the present fiscal year allotments of Federal funds based on $300 million, rather than on $200 million as provided for in the fiscal 1966 Appropriation Act. Together with the increased Federal share called for in the new amendments for this year, the States will be able to begin expanding their programs and services immediately.

In connection with the increase in the Federal share, the House bill further proposed a simplification of the exceedingly complex allocation formula under which undue weight is given to the per capita income factor. The conference report provides for a simplification of the existing formula. However, the House allocation formula of population and per capita income has been modified. The Senate bill proposed no change in the existing formula. The resulting compromise provides for an allocation of funds based on two factors—population and per capita income—however the per capita income factor will be squared.

Mr. Speaker, the House conferees reluctantly receded to the Senate on this question—and it was only because of the risk of losing the entire bill that the modification was accepted. Many months of study by the subcommittee showed unquestionably that there is no real correlation between the need for vocational rehabilitation services and the squaring of the per capita income factor. One of the House provisions limited the authorizations in the act to the next 3 years. This limitation has been retained in the conference report.

Thus we will have an opportunity to once again reevaluate the effectiveness of the formula. Sentiments were expressed by conferees from both bodies and Members from both sides of the aisle that we must provide for a more equitable allocation of funds in the future. My approval of this conference report should in no way be interpreted as a relaxation of my determination to provide a more equitable allocation formula.

The House bill amended section 3 of the existing act which provides for a program of grants to the States for projects for the improvement and extension of rehabilitation services. The matching rate was 75 percent and the funds were distributed on a formula with only one factor—population. The House amendments to this section proposed:

First, to revise the formula to make it the same as the section 2 formula; Second, to increase the Federal share to 90 percent for the first 3 years of a project and 75 percent for the last 2.

Third, to revise the objective of the section so that the grants will be used for the development of new methods and techniques for providing vocational rehabilitation services for handicapped individuals, or for the development of new, specially designed services for groups of handicapped individuals having disabilities which are catastrophic or particularly severe.

With the exception of the first House provision all of the House amendments have been incorporated in the conference report. The House receded on the question of the allotment formula. Thus, the conference report provides for an allocation on the basis of population solely. While this is a recession to the Senate it is nevertheless in the spirit of the House bill in that the committee wished to provide an increased amount of Federal funds to those areas, particularly to urban areas, where there is the greatest need for vocational rehabilitation services.

Another House amendment has been retained which will permit the extension of rehabilitation services to greater numbers of disabled, particularly severely disabled persons, through a deletion of the economic need requirement now prerequisite for certain rehabilitation services.

A new program to assist in the construction and operation of new rehabilitation workshops and facilities and a new program of construction grants and initial staffing grants was proposed in both the House and Senate versions. However, there were differences in a number of details. With the exception of one provision the House version is retained in the conference report. Thus, grants may be used for the acquisition of existing buildings and the cost of land acquisition in connection with construction. The Federal interest in facilities constructed under the act will extend for a period of 20 years. Funds may be used for the construction of residential accommodations in workshops for the mentally retarded and other groups of disabled as designated by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Specific authorizations of appropriations are provided for the new programs. Recipients of workshop construction grants and improvement grants will be required to comply with regulations related to safety standards for workshops. Initial staffing grants will be allotted for all new workshops and rehabilitation facilities construction after enactment of this legislation regardless of whether Federal funds are involved in the construction costs.

The House maintained its position with respect to the training grants for workshops; that is, 90 percent rather than 75 percent of costs as proposed by the Senate will be covered with Federal funds. This makes the program, designed to provide training opportunities for handicapped persons, comparable to the community action program under the Economic Opportunity Act and retraining programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act where theirs is 90 percent Federal financing.

With respect to grants for the construction of workshops and rehabilitation facilities the House bill provided that the amount of a grant would be half of the cost of the project. The Senate amendment provided that the amount of such a grant would be equal to the same percentage of the cost of the project as the Federal share which is applicable in the case of rehabilitation facilities constructed under the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act. The Senate provision is included without change in the conference report. Thus the Federal share for an individual project in a State may be a flat 50 percent, a flat percentage between 33⅓ percent and the State's allotment percentage or it may be a variable percentage between 33⅓ and 66⅔ percent based on economic differences of regions within the State—the percentage which will apply will be dependent on the State's determination with respect to the Federal share for the construction of medically orientated rehabilitation facilities under the Hill-Burton Act.

The resulting programs affecting workshops and rehabilitation facilities will help to meet the tremendous needs of workshops and similar facilities which are important and often necessary instruments in the rehabilitation of handicapped individuals.

This new construction authority fills a serious gap in the Nation's efforts to build more and better workshops and rehabilitation facilities. Previously the only source of financial assistance was from the grants-to-States funds under what is popularly known as the Laird amendment, which assists in expanding and altering facilities and workshops but does not provide for any new construction. The Laird amendment remains in effect, and, along with the construction provisions in the 1965 amendments, will enable dozens of community and State groups to expand their facilities and workshops to meet the needs of the disabled.

In conjunction with these new programs for workshops and rehabilitation facilities both versions of the bill provided identical programs which are part of the conference report. Thus an advisory group is established—a National Policy and Performance Council—to provide assistance in the administration of the new programs.

To assist in making a concerted effort to remove architectural barriers to the rehabilitation of the handicapped there will be established a National Commission on Architectural Barriers to the Rehabilitation of the Handicapped. Frequently extremely capable and qualified persons are precluded from employment simply because a building or the place of employment is not accessible to physically handicapped men and women. Many new buildings are today being designed without regard to whether they are accessible or usable by the handicapped. The establishment of this Commission will provide high-level attention to this important question.

Provision is made to permit Federal financing both under sections 2 and 3 of the act in activities which are financed with local public funds rather than just State funds. The conference report also contains provisions which will make improvements in the ongoing programs of research, experimentation, and training carried on under the act.

The respective versions of the bill differed greatly in the provisions permitting more flexibility in the administration of the vocational rehabilitation programs at the State level. The House approach was accorded almost universal acceptance by persons in the field of vocational rehabilitation and this is included in the conference report. Thus there is no chance of the State's vocational rehabilitation agency losing its identity in a State organizational chart.

More or less technical amendments of the House not provided in the Senate bill will make still more improvements in the existing act.

The House receded to a Senate provision increasing the authorization of appropriations for the President's Committee on National Employment of the Handicapped from $400,000 to $500,000 per year. The excellent work and the increasing responsibility that will come to that committee because of the expanded Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program easily justified this provision.

Mr. Speaker—may I restate something I said during the House debate on this bill earlier this year—it cannot be reiterated enough that vocational rehabilitation economically, socially, and morally—is vital to our Nation.

Mary Switzer and her associates here in Washington and her colleagues throughout the States have restored the sense of self-worth and self-confidence to thousands and thousands of handicapped persons. Today we can help these public servants help thousands of presently idle citizens to become significant contributors to our national manpower needs, one of the finest, if not the finest, Federal welfare program can be greatly strengthened by our action today.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Edmondson). The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the conference report just agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

NORA ISABELLA SAMUELLI

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 619) for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli, with a Senate amendment to the House amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 6 and 7 of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out "(the date of the enactment of this Act,)" and insert "July 31, 1963,".

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, S. 619 as passed by the Senate gave Miss Samuelli permanent residence as of the date of enactment and also proposed that the requirements of residence and physical presence for naturalization be considered as complied with. The House amended S. 619 by deleting the provision which would make Miss Samuelli eligible for immediate naturalization.

The House amendment was not accepted by the Senate, and the Senate asked for a conference. The Senate thereafter agreed to withdraw the request for a conference and agreed to the House amendment with an amendment—which amendment confers permanent residence on Miss Samuelli as of the date of her entry into the United States—July 31, 1963.

The subject is a 50-year-old female, unmarried, and apparently stateless but a native of Rumania. In December 1945 she became an employee of USIS in Bucharest, Rumania, and continued this employment until on or about July 25, 1949, when she was seized by Rumanian authorities, accused of espionage, and incarcerated until her release in July 1961. In September 1961 the subject and her family, after payment of an unknown ransom by a distant relative in the West, were permitted to go to France where they were granted permanent residence. Subject, holder of a French travel document for refugees, valid until May 1965, was admitted to the United States July 1, 1963, as a visitor—deportation proceedings instituted January 1964.

The Senate amendment to the House amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELEASE OF ZINC FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9047) to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 1202)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9047) to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following: "two hundred"; and the Senate agree to the same.

L. Mendel Rivers,
Philip J. Philbin,
Charles E. Bennett,
L. C. Arends,
Charles S. Gubser,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Stuart Symington,
Howard W. Cannon,
Stephen M. Young,
David K. Inouye,
Jack Miller,
By J. G. T.
John G. Tower,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9047) to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both.

LEGISLATION IN CONFERENCE

On September 20, 1965, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 9047, to provide for the disposal of 150,000 short tons of zinc.

On October 1, 1965, the Senate considered the legislation and amended it by substituting the figure 225,000 in lieu of 150,000 as provided in the bill passed by the House of Representatives.

SUMMARY OF RESOLUTION OF DIFFERENCES

As a consequence of a conference between the House and Senate on the differences in H.R. 9047, the conferees agreed to authorize for disposal 200,000 short tons of zinc from the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both.

The bill as originally introduced provided for the disposal of 300,000 short tons of zinc to industry and 50,000 for direct Government usage. Favorable reports were received on this quantity from the executive branch of the Government.

When the committee first considered this matter, however, it was learned that there had been no meeting between the General Services Administration and industry to develop a disposal plan or to determine the quantity that was needed to be released. Action was deferred by the subcommittee until such a meeting could be held.

Subsequently, the committee was informed by a representative of the General Services Administration that it was the consensus of the 90 people attending the meeting representing producers and consumers, that the amount that should be disposed of in this release should be 150,000 short tons. This would have permitted an immediate release of 75,000 short tons upon enactment of this legislation and, after industry consultation early in 1966, a release of the second 75,000 short tons.

The producers of zinc felt that by April 1966, production in the United States would equal domestic consumption. The consumers of zinc agreed to the quantity and to the proposed plan of disposal. Thereafter, the House of Representatives, following the recommendation of the subcommittee and the full committee, authorized the disposal of 150,000 short tons of zinc.

The Senate, in authorizing the disposal of 225,000 short tons of zinc, provided for a larger quantity without receiving any additional evidence other than from a representative of the General Services Administration who stated that agency would be happy to have as much excess of any metal as the Congress would provide. Subsequent to the passage of the legislation by the House and Senate, General Services Administration provided the committee with a letter stating that they had had "an increasing number of pleas from representatives" of "the automotive, builders, hardware, appliance, and other industries" concerning the acute situation which has developed with respect to zinc in recent weeks, and stated further that "if these needs are not satisfied, many of the suppliers of zinc-bearing products will either have to shut down or adopt reduced schedules with adverse effects upon the economy."

While the larger amount agreed upon by the conferees; that is, 200,000 short tons of zinc, would not in any way alter the amount planned for disposal during the last quarter of 1965 or the first quarter of 1966, the House receded from its position in the spirit of a compromise. It was the belief of the House conferees that the present law which permits disposals only when markets will not be disrupted, is an adequate safeguard in providing the additional release of zinc.

However, the House conferees felt that the total additional amount provided in the Senate bill would have a tendency to discourage the producers from continuing to raise their limits of production to meet the current American consumption and, further, that 150,000 tons has been justified in the evidence before our committee.

Obviously, any disposals will be made in accordance with the law and only after consultation with industry.

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
CHARLES E. BENNETT,
L. C. ARENDS,
CHARLES S. GUBSER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] have permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, once again the Committee on Armed Services has demonstrated its ability to handle needed stockpile legislation expeditiously and wisely, with awareness of public needs and an informed concern for the needs of our domestic industry.

The able and distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] has won the high regard and genuine respect of our American mining industry, for his wise insistence that releases of minerals in the stockpile must be made with discretion and after consultation with industry representatives, to assure against disruption of markets as a result of unwise releases.

The conference report submitted by the House managers is consistent with Chairman PHILBIN's views and provides assurance of full consultation with industry in advance of releases authorized by this bill.

The bill is needed and should be approved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain briefly what transpired in the conference with respect to this bill?

Mr. PHILBIN. Yes; the House bill called for 150 short tons to be disposed of from the stockpile. In the conference, we considered the Senate bill which provided for 225,000 tons and we compromised at 200,000 tons.

The Senate had previously considered 300,000 tons, the original GSA measure. That figure was reduced during the hearings in the House after we had GSA conduct industry conferences, as is the custom of our committee.

So, Mr. Speaker, we feel that the compromise reached with the other body was an excellent one.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, did this represent a cut or an increase in the disposal?

Mr. PHILBIN. It represented an increase in the disposal amount.

Mr. GROSS. In the total amount to be disposed of?

Mr. PHILBIN. Yes, but not in the total amount as originally provided. There was a considerable reduction, a reduction of 100,000 tons, from the original proposal requested by the General Services Administration. But there was an increase of 50,000 tons in the amount as contained in the House bill.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I am glad to yield to the able, distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], that I believe that in the instance of these two bills the gentleman from Massachusetts has done an exceptionally fine job. I have had the pleasure of working with the gentleman and consulting with him about these matters. These bills should be immediately expedited. They are meritorious, they are desirable and needed.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman for his effective efforts in connection with these matters.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for his kind remarks and also for his very valuable assistance to the committee in these and in all matters.

And I thank the able committee, my esteemed, distinguished chairman, Mr. RIVERS, and the Members of the House for their helpful counsel, support, and assistance.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts for the excellent job which he has done in handling the stockpile disposals, not only in this instance, but in prior instances.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House that the gentleman and his committee stand between the consumers and the producers, and having the worldwide shortage of zinc that we have today and because of the lack of production in certain areas of the United States, it is necessary to firm up supply with these disposals. I want the Congress at all times to be cognizant of the fact that the stock of zinc and other metals hangs over the zinc market and the market of other metals such as nickel and lead.

Mr. Speaker, as we have said here at other times, we should supply this stock of material to its most judicious use, and I want to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts on his integrity in this area. Because of programed disposals, we have not had a break in the market and have had a continuing stable price for both zinc and lead.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the important consideration that both the zinc producers and zinc consumers need, a base on which they can project their prices and operations in the future.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I want to say the gentleman from Massachusetts has done an excellent job in this area and I shall be watching for further developments as stockpile disposals are carried out in the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSAL OF NICKEL FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10305) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 124,200,000 pounds of nickel from the national stockpile, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1203)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10305) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed six-month waiting period, of approximately one hundred and twenty-four million two hundred thousand pounds of nickel from the national stockpile, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment; strike out the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment; and on page 1, lines 4 and 5 of the House engrossed bill, strike out "one hundred and twenty-four million two hundred thousand", and insert in lieu thereof "two hundred million" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed six-month waiting period, of approximately two hundred million pounds of nickel from the national stockpile."; and the Senate agree to the same.

L. Mendel Rivers,
Philip J. Philbin,
Charles Bennett,
L. C. Arends,
Charles S. Gubser,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Stuart Symington,
Howard W. Cannon,
Stephen M. Young,
Daniel K. Inouye,
Jack Miller,
By J. G. T.
John G. Tower,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10305) to authorize the disposal, without regard to prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 124,200,000 pounds of nickel from the national stockpile.

LEGISLATION IN CONFERENCE

On October 16, 1965, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 10305 to provide for the disposal of approximately 124,200,000 pounds of nickel from the national stockpile. On September 24 (legislative day, September 20), 1965, the Senate considered the legislation and amended it by substituting the figure of 224,200,000 pounds in lieu of 124,200,000 pounds as provided in the bill passed by the House of Representatives.

SUMMARY OF RESOLUTION OF DIFFERENCES

As a consequence of a conference between the House and Senate on the differences in H.R. 10305, the conferees agreed to authorize for disposal 175,000,000 pounds of nickel from the national stockpile. The bill as originally introduced provided for the disposal of 224,200,000 pounds of nickel. This was introduced as an administration proposal. Prior to the time of the committee consideration of the bill, the General Services Administration held a meeting with representatives of the producing as well as the consuming industry for nickel, and the committee was informed that there was a consensus concerning the release of the total excess of 224,200,000 pounds from the stockpile.

At the committee hearings, one industry representative appeared in opposition to the proposed legislation and recommended release of no more than 100,000,000 pounds.

The committee, recognizing the fact that nuclear stockpile requirements had not as yet been determined and that the objective for nickel under the conventional war requirements had varied from 900,000,000 pounds in 1952 to 100,000,000 pounds in 1965, felt that the disposal of all excesses from the stockpile would be unwise until such time as the nuclear requirements were determined. It was recognized, however, that a sufficient amount should be provided so as to provide for an orderly long-term disposal program. Therefore, the figure of 124,200,000 pounds was adopted as the proper amount for disposal.

The Senate in authorizing the disposal of the total excess, heard testimony from the same Government and industry witnesses that the House committee had previously heard, but recommended disposal of the total excess.

The conferees in agreeing on the figure of 200,000,000 pounds, receded from their previous positions.

It is believed that the amount reached in the conference will alleviate the objections originally raised by the House of Representatives and yet will permit an orderly disposal of excess nickel from the stockpile. Obviously, any disposals will be made in accordance with the law and only after consultation with industry.

L. Mendel Rivers,
Philip J. Philbin,
Charles E. Bennett,
L. C. Arends,
Charles S. Gubser,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa and do so very gladly.

Mr. GROSS. I thank my friend from Massachusetts. Apparently there has been a rather substantial cut in the stockpile disposal of nickel of about 50 million pounds; is that correct?

Mr. PHILBIN. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think with that cut there will be sufficient nickel to take care of all of the "funny money" coins that this administration is going to have in circulation around Christmas time this year?

Mr. PHILBIN. I hope that this will make some little contribution to the wellbeing of the financial picture of our country and the budgetary situation.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I just want to be sure that the public is not shortchanged on "funny money" when it comes time to do some Christmas shopping.

Mr. PHILBIN. I hope the gentleman is right in his apprehension.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to belabor a point that we discussed at some length some time ago with respect to coinage, but at that time we were talking about the coinage, we were told that we would need imported silver with which to make silver coins, even of a reduced content.

Mr. Speaker, it seems rather interesting to me that we are going to have to import nickel to make—I shall not say "funny money"—but the cupronickel "hamburger" coins that we are going to have with us from now on.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent during rollcall No. 318 on September 22, and during rollcall Nos. 324 and 325 on September 24. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 318, "nay" on rollcall No. 324, and "yea" on rollcall No. 325.

AMENDING WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 2679) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Edmondson). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, were there any amendments adopted in conference on this bill?

Mr. POAGE. This is not a conference report.

Mr. GROSS. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. POAGE. This is a Senate bill. The House had reported a similar bill. The Senate passed this bill. This is a bill that originated in the Senate. This bill increases the watershed authority to build dams so that they can build dams ranging up to 12,500 acre-feet instead of 5,000 acre-feet. This is an old matter about which there has been considerable disagreement over the years. But now there has been an agreement between the Army Engineers and the Department of Agriculture and we know of nobody who is objecting to it.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, this bill is confined strictly to the subject that the gentleman has just explained?

Mr. POAGE. This bill does absolutely nothing except to change the figure 5,000 acre-feet to 12,500 acre-feet.

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my appreciation to my committee chairman, Mr. Cooley, and to my committee vice chairman, Mr. Poage, for their excellent work in bringing this legislation to the floor of the House in time for action this session.

The untiring and dedicated work of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Poage], in the field of watershed development is recognized and saluted all over the Nation and particularly in an area like my State of North Dakota where the small watershed program is used extensively.

S. 2679 is identical to my bill, H.R. 5149, and to Mr. Cooley's bill, H.R. 9141, reported out by the House Agriculture Committee.

The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act now limits the size of dams to a floodwater detention capacity of 5,000 acre-feet, forming an impediment to multipurpose development in many small watersheds—a good number of them in North Dakota. Corrective legislation has been strongly endorsed by the North Dakota Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

This amendment, by increasing flood-detention capacity to 12,500 acre-feet, would allow North Dakota and many other areas in the Nation to do a better job of providing a water supply for towns, irrigation, recreation and fish and wildlife development.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 2679.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 2679

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666), as amended, is amended by striking out "more than five thousand acre-feet of floodwater detention capacity" and inserting in lieu thereof "more than twelve thousand five hundred acre-feet of floodwater detention capacity".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

VALOR IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute; to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, before this session of the Congress adjourns, I would like to call to the attention of the House an incident involving the son of Cleveland Tucker, one of the Official Reporters of debates of the House. His son, 2d Lt. Phillip E. Tucker, a member of the U.S. Marine Corps, was first captain of the Corps of Cadets of Virginia Military Institute in 1963 and 1964. This well-known military institution is located at Lexington, Va., in my congressional district. Lieutenant Tucker had an outstanding record at VMI, both militarily and academically, and was cited as a distinguished academic student.

Upon graduation from VMI, Lieutenant Tucker became a regular officer in the Marine Corps. Recently in the name of the President, the Bronze Star Medal was awarded to 2d Lt. Phillip E. Tucker, USMC, for his heroic services as a platoon leader during operations of the U.S. Marines in defense of the Embassy of the United States in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic.

I felt that the Members of the House would like to be aware that the son of one of the reporters of debates commanded one of the first units ashore in the Dominican Republic and played such a key role in defending the U.S. Embassy there. I am sure all of us are proud and grateful for this young man's courageous and heroic service to his country.

I ask unanimous consent that Lieutenant Tucker's Bronze Star citation, submitted to the commanding general, 2d Marine Division, Fleet Marine Force, by the commanding general, Fleet Marine Force, Atlantic, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

BRONZE STAR CITATION

For heroic achievement in connection with operations in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, while serving with friendly foreign forces engaged in an armed conflict against an opposing armed force in which the United States was not a belligerent party. During the period April 28 to April 30, 1965, Second Lieutenant Tucker, platoon leader, 2d Platoon, Company "L", 3d Battalion, 6th Marines, organized and defended the U.S. Embassy from hostile forces. On the evening of April 28, 1965, he made a complete and detailed reconnaissance, and established a defensive perimeter despite intensive hostile fire. For the next 2 days he continuously inspected each man and his position to insure his well-being and alertness. Whenever sniper fire was directed at his positions, he personally went to the area receiving fire to organize and control the return fire. This was accomplished with considerable risk to his own life. When the hostile fire continued from houses located outside the established international safety zone, he organized and led each house clearing detail. He continued this action until the sniper fire was eliminated. Second Lieutenant Tucker's initiative and courageous actions were in keeping with the highest traditions of the U.S. Naval Service.

ZAMBIA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this coming Sunday will be the first anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Zambia and I am reminded of the very pleasant and profitable hours the members of the African Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs passed with the Honorable Kenneth Kaunda, then the president of the United National Independence Party of Northern Rhodesia, now the President of the Republic of Zambia, on April 18, 1961, when he was on a visit to the United States. The long acquaintance and warm friendship of members of our subcommittee, extending over the years of historic events, with many of the great statesmen of the developing nations, has built a bridge of personal understanding and enduring interest uniting the United States of America with the new nations of Africa. The visit of President Kaunda over 4 years ago stands out in our memory.

Zambia, the former British protectorate of Northern Rhodesia, is a high plateau country with an elevation of 3,000 to 4,000 feet above sea level. It is located inland in south-central Africa, bordered on the north by the Republic of the Congo, on the east by Tanzania and Malawi, on the south by Mozambique, Southern Rhodesia, and southwest Africa, and on the west by Angola. With a total area of 290,000 square miles, Zambia is about twice the size of the State of Colorado.

Zambia has many rivers; most of them flow south into the Zambezi. The Zambezi rises in the northwest corner and flows into Southern Rhodesia, through Mozambique and into the Indian Ocean. The Chambezi flows south into the great swamps of Bangweulu. These two rivers are broken by many waterfalls. Victoria Falls on the Zambezi is one of the most important waterfalls in Africa and one of the great wonders of the world.

The estimated population of Zambia is 3,587,000, comprised of about 3.5 million Africans, 76,000 Europeans, and 10,600 of other ethnic groups.

With the possible exception of a rare Portuguese explorer, the area lay untouched by Europeans for centuries. Only after the middle of the 19th century was the area penetrated by explorers, missionaries, and traders. Until that time it had been the scene of the ebb and flow of Bantu peoples from the north toward the south of Africa. Successive waves of these people supplanted the original primitive inhabitants and formed the foundation of today's population.

Cecil Rhodes, spearheading British commercial and political interests in central Africa, obtained in 1888 a concession from indigenous chiefs of mineral rights, and in the same year Northern Rhodesia and Southern Rhodesia were proclaimed a British sphere of influence. In 1953 Northern Rhodesia was joined with Nyasaland—now Malawi—and Southern Rhodesia in the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. On December 31, 1963, the federation was dissolved, and in January 1964 parliamentary elections were held. The elections resulted in a sweeping victory for Kenneth Kaunda's United National Independence Party. Zambia attained independence on October 24, 1964, and became a member of the United Nations in December 1964.

Zambia is one of the most richly endowed areas of Africa, containing a quarter of the world's known exploitable copper reserves. It is the world's second largest supplier of copper, the value of which is second only to the export value of South Africa's gold. It is in the area of the concentration of the copper deposits lying against the Congo border that the economic life of the territory is centered. The electricity needs of this area, termed the Copper Belt, were one of the important reasons for the construction of the Kariba Dam and hydroelectric project in 1960 and is the largest in Africa. Private U.S. investment in the country amounts to over $200 mil-

lion and there is heavy private American investment in one of the two copper companies operating in the Copper Belt.

As chairman of the Subcommittee of Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am happy to extend the congratulations and good wishes of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States to President Kenneth Kaunda, His Excellency Hosea Josias Soko, the able Ambassador of the Republic of Zambia to the United States, and to all the people of Zambia on the first anniversary of their independence.

ADDRESS BY MADAM CHIANG KAI-SHEK

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, Madame Chiang Kai-shek, wife of the Chief of State of the Republic of China, was honored at the fall convocation of Wesleyan College, Macon, Ga., on Wednesday, October 20, 1965.

As the principal speaker at such convocation, she gave a magnificent address unique for its beautiful choice of words and eloquent delivery. What she said and how she said it was enjoyed and appreciated by all who were present, and will be long remembered by all of us.

When her two older sisters came from China to attend Wesleyan College many years ago, Mayling Soong, then a little girl, came with them to Wesleyan. As a little girl far below college age, she received tutorial instruction from faculty members and from older students. She became adored by everyone who knew her. It is interesting to note that two members of the faculty of Wesleyan who were there at that time, were with Madam Chiang when Wesleyan honored her last Wednesday.

The president, the board of trustees, faculty, student body, and admiring friends joined to pay tribute to one of the outstanding women of this century.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to include her address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY HER EXCELLENCY MADAM CHIANG KAI-SHEK AT CONVOCATION, WESLEYAN COLLEGE, MACON, GA., ON OCTOBER 20, 1965

It was not without a melange of feelings, of wistful felicity speckled with joyful anticipation that I accepted the kind invitation extended to me by President Strickland and the thoughtful arrangement for my presence here made by my gallant and good friend Senator RUSSELL who also did me the signal honor of escorting me to my hometown of many years.

I say my feelings were mixed in that this would be a sentimental journey to these once familiar stamping grounds of happy and carefree childhood years—stamping grounds that are no longer so familiar due to human material endeavors known as growth and progress. And also the inevitable inexorability of life have transmuted many of my friends from this world of ours.

On my last visit some 22 years ago, I noticed even then that many familiar landmarks and friends had disappeared and departed with the passing years.

Julia and Mamie who rang the bell so vibrantly to wrench us from the arms of Morpheus at what we young girls regarded as an unearthly hour in the morning, and who protectively took care of us and chided us for our innocuously childish pranks are gone, and so has gray-grizzled Uncle Tom the ever-smiling and ubiquitous janitor, and my dear little playmate and constant companion Eloise Ainsworth as well as a host of others have departed from this very locale.

My last visit was brightened by the presence of Mrs. Ainsworth, Miss Margie Burks, and Miss Lucy Lester. Their very presence lent moral and physical support to me who was then plagued with neuro-dermatitis, and because of the nature of the illness and my own physical condition and fatigue which circumstance and work demanded of me, oftener than not it was enervating agony when I tried to reciprocate the cordiality extended to me. Now, too, Mrs. Ainsworth and Miss Margie are gone, but I am extremely glad that Miss Lester despite her illness is here today.

I remember vividly during those halcyon days here at Wesleyan, how some 20 of us, mostly little Macon girls, formed our own club adopting what seemed to us then to be high sounding and idealistic yet in retrospect the meaningful motto of "Esse Quam Videri." And the epitome of success and of total bliss to our young hearts was to dream that some day, some day, we would be invited and admitted into a sorority.

I remember, as if it were yesterday, Dr. Dupont Guerry's 15-minute daily chapel talks that were to us at times a drudgery—a cross to be borne in silence every morning of the semester; yet in retrospect they were veritable gems in thought for action, in presence of mind and correct bearing. There is no doubt that his many meaningful sermonettes molded our character and built our conceptual thinking.

His were many sterling aphorisms, tropes, ideas and ideals so overwhelming for a young head of 10 and older to comprehend yet because of a passable memory many of these thoughts were incused in my mind which later helped me in my own association of thoughts and integration of reasoning.

Over the span of years many were the times when I felt Dr. Guerry's rubrics of do's and don'ts have left a lasting impression on me who had heard him speak. Whether they resulted in immediate sensitivity in the sense of being immediately sensible to his words, or in delayed sensitivity, or even recalled sensitivity, they achieved the purpose I think he intended them to achieve: to arrive at an almost instinctive reflex, and I mean the proper instinctive reflex to a given situation to the manner born. Such was education in our day aside from the academic.

That seemingly trite and commonplace admonishment of his that ladies should be ladylike is indeed jejune and vapid as an exhortation yet it is this minimum of gentle behavior that is example par excellence so unobtaining in these times.

In the present world where there is a surfeit of timid thinking engendering timidity in taking necessary and sane actions together with a plethora of blatant blase behavior which becomes a fad, nay, more than a fad, but is "the style," one should appreciate the invaluable value of those trite commonplace words: ladies should be ladylike which he asseverated and reasseverated from time to time. For today's "style" is deliberately and purposely holding to a line that pursues no definite end. Having no conscious motivation except to be different for the sake of being different, it attains no real goal, and with the employment of means which serves no possible end.

True enough the contents of the variables are rational, but the constants are irrational. These "stylists" use every means to rationalize their beliefs, dogmas, creeds, and doctrines for their irrational behavior.

They reserve their instincts and talents for the purposes of decrying individual and group conformity to society, or negating group ideologies, and of resisting the innate tendency of individuals and groups to preserve social conditions that identify with their own existence and interests—in short, the iconoclasm of the so-called "ancien regime" good and bad.

In the same breath these "stylists" project and extend their own interests and whims, and derive satisfaction in self-expression by destroying indiscriminately ideas, ideals, conventions, and traditions not of their making.

It is true that every social system invites constant criticism, struggle, and turmoil in the changing course of development in promoting the welfare and well-being of society, communities as well as the Nation and the world. But it should be in healthy competition and constructive contribution that the system can hope to progress whereas the "stylists" with aimless but far from listless force enters in to take on the established order only to break it up without being able to replace what is acknowledgedly not a perfect, but at least, an orderly order. One can see how lethal and parlous it is when this negative nihilistic "soft thinking" pervades and permeates the social, religious, scientific, artistic and governmental life of a nation.

History has recorded subsidences and many trench on knowingly and authoritatively by ticking off the diseases of debacle and the tragic finale of an epoch or era to the reasons of duplicity, of debauchery, of treachery, of malfeasance, and general corruption. These deplorabilia heinous and wretched as they may be are maladies curable in themselves in that they may be resectioned and healthy tissues allowed to return with recuperation.

However, in the case of "softness of mind" and the debilitating affects thereof because of its built-in nature, it cannot be extirpated easily and will in time be fatal. I say fatal since the mind is the inseparable determinant as well as the primordial governor of our psychological, physical and physiological well-being and the integrant forces of human consciousness, sensation and "constructs of perception." They in turn shape the methods to the thinking process, the investigative processes of reasoning, the physiological accompaniments to thinking and creative imagination, and above all good sound judgment. In short, the physique, the chemique and psychique of man through their intricate ramifications together with occasional strands of stray thought that trail through the mind must also play their part in the pattern of life to be synchronized to creative and constructive purpose. To all these I must add the sine qua non to all worthy achievement: man's spiritual fulfillment.

Thus far I have spoken of my childhood spent in happy environs, my nostalgia, my gratitude to Wesleyan and to my preceptors. I have also mentioned briefly the serious malapropism that confronts our world today, and the saturnine side of my mixed feelings.

On the obverse side of my feelings I was buoyed up and heartened by the thought that I would have the opportunity to return once more to my alma mater of childhood days to see and meet you who are on the threshold of young womanhood. As I look at your fresh young faces still in the morn of life, so full of verve, élan and fulsome expectations that life could bring confidently and dauntlessly aiming at the pinnacles of your chosen callings, I wish you well and Godspeed.

At the risk of being labeled obdurate and "a square" I wish to share with you one principle and cardinal rule of mine which has disciplined my life: Work, yet work harder, and despair never. In the flux of life, and I think I have encountered and encompassed well my share of physical dangers, trials and tribulations, let alone frustrations and sorrows, yet through them all I have found the strength to go on with renewed conviction in God's goodness and what the future brings. When things seemed at their darkest and when I was near the point of complete exhaustion, by drawing from the power of prayer and contemplation which comes truly from the mysterium of faith, I have found courage to go on unquestioningly seeking and serving the will of God. For may it be the vaunted boast of the anti-Christ to destroy first in order to better change the world to his own evil image, I, on my part, remember and shall remember that it is the will of God to fulfill not to destroy. I rest content for the continued opportunity to be His instrument and as He has ordained me to serve—only this, and this only. And so may it be with you.

PUBLIC WELFARE AND PESTICIDES

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, most Members are familiar with my efforts to bring some sense of balance to governmental policy on the use of pesticides, and of the fact that we have provided increased funds for research in this field. Further, you are familiar with the staff report of the Appropriations Committee, made at my request, which appears in part I of our Agricultural Appropriations hearings of this year, which clearly supports the view that where properly used there is no evidence of injury by pesticides.

In preparing this report the staff of the Appropriations Committee interviewed over 185 outstanding scientists and 23 physicians. I shall soon release the names of those interviewed, with their permission, of course.

Almost everyone familiar with the problem was interviewed, including the leading scientists in the field. Insofar as I know, not one of the conclusions in the report has been successfully disputed or challenged. I recommend it as reading for anyone who wants to understand this controversy.

In summary, the report stated:

First. That no injury to human beings had been found from pesticides properly used.

Second. That the accumulation of pesticide residues in animal fat apparently poses no health hazard, either to wildlife or human beings.

Third. That modern agricultural production is impossible without pesticides.

Subsequent to the release of this report I received many favorable letters from outstanding scientists of the Nation, excerpts from which I quote:

Letters From Scientists

"I would like to compliment the staff on the general excellence of this report. It was objective, comprehensive, forthright, and fair and I believe has gone a long way toward setting the record straight on this important and complex subject."

"I have read your report and would like to congratulate you on a job well done. Other governmental agencies should operate on such objective principles rather than the crusader's urge which erodes the rights and privileges of the people."

"I think that this factual and objective report concerning pesticides will certainly clarify this too often misunderstood subject for the American people. I am glad that I could have participated in this effort."

"I have read the subcommittee's report on pesticides and feel that the investigations staff should be congratulated for a fine job and a truly objective report."

"First of all, may I commend you and the members of your committee for the outstanding job in preparing the report on pesticides. I think the report is truly objective and very splendidly prepared. Many of us consider this document a landmark because so many reports have been published which were biased either for or against pesticides."

"I have read this meticulously detailed and objective report and assure you I will be proud to have my name listed among those interviewed."

"In answer to your question, I would have no objection whatsoever in having my name listed among those scientists, et al., who were interviewed and, in fact, would be pleased to have my name included if so doing can contribute something to the objectives of the committee."

"I had the privilege of reading a copy of the report 'Effects, Uses, Control, and Research of Agricultural Pesticides.' I agree that this is an objective report. It appears to me to give a reasonable view of this very complex and involved group of problems."

"The staff has presented a comprehensive, truly objective report that should have a favorable influence upon public opinion regarding the pesticide problem. This report should help to alleviate the fears created by widespread, unrealistic publicity concerning the use of pesticides."

"This is a comprehensive and enlightening document, and I believe that it will have a very valuable effect in placing the problems in pesticide use in their proper perspective."

"May I express my deep personal appreciation of the efforts you have made to present an unbiased report on pesticides. Your report has been of immense value to agriculture."

"Thank you for your letter of June 10. I was indeed pleased to read the fine report prepared by your surveys and investigation staff on the use of pesticides and as you will note from the enclosed copy of our recent bulletin, we have quoted liberally from it. As a result we have had numerous requests for further information, particularly about obtaining copies. Inasmuch as my own copy is circulating among the members of our staff, I would appreciate receiving an additional copy if it is available."

"I wish to express our sincere appreciation of the excellent job which the staff committee did in gathering factual information on pesticides. We believe that this report will be of much value in making known the need for pesticides in American agriculture. Further, this report should make it clear to those who are not associated with agriculture that it is necessary to have pesticides if the American standard of living is to be maintained."

"I recall the very pleasant but searching interview with your two staff members last August. They indicated a wide knowledge but no bias and at the close of the interview we wondered what direction the report would go. I would wish to commend them both as highly talented interrogators."

THAT WE MAY LIVE

Mr. Speaker, there are many problems which follow from our urbanization. One of the chief ones is the fact that those few in our rural areas who are engaged in agriculture have to provide so much in the way of markets for industry and labor and in food supply for the many in our cities. To do this job pesticides are essential. Less well known, perhaps, is the fact that with millions of people living in crowded cities, pesticides are a must in everyday living, in the protection of the health of city people from insect and rodent carried diseases.

As pointed out in our report, most of the public furor and shortsighted action to restrict the use of essential pesticides came from the wonderfully written book, "Silent Spring," by the late Miss Rachel Carson. Despite the fact that scientists have almost unanimously agreed that "Silent Spring" is a mixture of fact and fantasy, the aftermath of this book lingers on.

Sometime in the spring I expect to release a book giving the other side, making the plea that we restore some sanity to our actions in the pesticide control field. The title of my book is "That We May Live."

In the meantime, I am glad to note that Mr. Wheeler McMillan, longtime editor of the Farm Journal, has just published a book, "Bugs or People," which does much to place the facts in this case in proper focus. If you have not read the book, you should.

RESOLUTION, STATE COMMISSIONERS OF AGRICULTURE

Recently the National Association of the State Departments of Agriculture held its annual meeting in Princeton, N.J. At that time they recognized the seriousness of our pesticide problems.

I would like to call attention to a resolution approved at the Princeton, N.J., meeting. It is very brief and will bear repetition:

Pesticide Residues

Whereas refinement and development of more sensitive analytical methods have made it possible to determine residues in finite quantities; and

Whereas such finite quantities make, in a strict legal interpretation, agricultural and food products subject to seizure even though the amount of residue may not be a hazard to health; and

Whereas the use of pesticides appears to be inevitable in producing food of acceptable quality and in sufficient quantities to meet the needs of the expanding population: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture in convention assembled in Princeton, N.J., October 3–7, 1965, go on record as supporting and endorsing the recommendations of the Pesticide Residue Committee of the National Academy of Science in its report to the United States Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and

Welfare and urge that each agency do everything possible to implement these recommendations with all expediency.

In my opinion, the importance of the work done by the State commissioners of agriculture often is overlooked. Yet I know of no group of men who are closer to the farmers of this country and who have their interests more at heart than the State commissioners of agriculture.

I regard this recommendation as a matter of extreme importance for reasons I shall try to state.

THE WORLD FOOD PROBLEM

Many persons do not realize that a major world problem, probably the major problem, is lack of food. We take plenty in the United States for granted, since our farm plant is unusually efficient. But all our efficiency and all our techniques will be needed to deal with the famine in other lands, a famine which is spreading like a deadly smog.

I am a member of the House Appropriations Committee and chairman of its Subcommittee for Agriculture. I have tried to study and familiarize myself with agriculture. Over the years the disproportion between the farm population and the urban population has grown steadily until today only about 8 percent of our people live in rural areas. Consequently, agriculture has lost much of its political influence. Furthermore, the Federal farm programs have been complex and controversial. This has led to an impression that agriculture as a whole is inefficient and a drain upon the taxpayers.

I do not propose today to discuss the farm programs and their details, some of which I disagree with. But I do want to reiterate that we have a marvelous farm plant, the best by far that the world has ever seen, and that it is a tremendous asset both externally and internally. Food in this country is a great deal cheaper, comparatively speaking, than it is in any major country of the world. Also, we have been supplying millions and millions of tons of foodstuffs to other countries over a long period of years. I have stated in the past that this food has been an instrument of foreign policy, and a recent incident proved my point in a somewhat dramatic fashion. A major factor in the recent truce between India and Pakistan after fighting broke out was the threat by this country to cut off the foodstuffs we had been supplying both countries. Neither India nor Pakistan could afford to have this happen. For example, we supplied India in 1964 with more than 6 million tons of wheat and other foods. Even so, there was hunger and starvation on a large scale in that vast country. Without the food supplied by the United States, there would have been famine and the loss of millions of lives. Red China might encourage Pakistan to continue hostilities with India, but Red China could not supply the food which Pakistan must have. We could supply it and have been doing so for quite a few years. When we told India and Pakistan that we might have to cease aid unless the fighting stopped, tempers cooled immediately. I am not belittling the part the United Nations had in arranging a ceasefire, but our food surpluses bolstered mightily the efforts of the U.N.

When the uproar over pesticides began after the publication of "Silent Spring," I became disturbed. Along with protection of public health we must protect agricultural productivity which requires the use of pesticides which combat the ravages of insects. Modern agriculture would be impossible without the use of pesticides, and even with them, it is estimated that insects do approximately $4 billion worth of damage to crops and livestock every year.

I have a great admiration for Rachel Carson. She had a marvelous way with words and undoubtedly was sincerely disturbed "at the change in our environment." Yet anyone who has studied the matter objectively must agree that "Silent Spring" is highly emotional and scientists say, unscientific. She took the attitude that the use of pesticides presents grave and accumulating hazards to wildlife and human beings. The evidence does not bear her out.

My concern over the campaign against pesticides grows out of my concern for the protection against insect borne diseases and the maintenance of an abundant and nutritious food supply. The average agricultural producer operates on a thin margin of profit, and anything which increases his costs unnecessarily is a serious matter. In the wake of "Silent Spring" a series of congressional hearings and inquiries took place. Pesticides definitely were on the defensive. The President's Science Advisory Committee actually recommended that a policy objective should be the elimination of the use of the persistent pesticides, the chlorinated hydrocarbons which include such chemicals as endrin, DDT, aldrin, heptachlor, chlordane and others which are well known, very effective, and widely used. In fact, about two-thirds of the pesticides used by farmers are chlorinated hydrocarbons. If a ban were put upon their use, as was proposed by the Science Advisory Committee, it would cost more to raise less.

EFFECTS OF GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. Speaker, although there is no evidence of injury to human beings from pesticides properly used, the restrictions governing their uses have increased since the publication of Miss Carson's book. The use of the chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides, the so-called persistent pesticides, has been banned on lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. The use of heptachlor and dieldrin on pasture has been prohibited following the discovery of pesticide residues in milk in Maryland, Pennsylvania, and other States. There are, if my information is correct, restrictions on pesticide uses which have hampered potato growers, and I am also told that the manufacturers of pesticides have cut back on research. Chemical company representatives say no major pesticide has been developed for several years, one reason being that the steady and systematic attacks on these chemicals and the increasing difficulty of getting official approval and acceptance for their employment has made investment in this area too great a financial risk. We, the public, are the losers. What makes this matter doubly bad is the fact that insects have almost unbelievable ability to build up resistance to pesticides or other of man's weapons against them. Thus it is that we must always be ready with new and better pesticides which we will not have if the Government continues to follow present policies.

One of the primary reasons for concern over the effects of pesticides was the discovery that residues do accumulate in animal fat. However, the scientific work done in this field indicates the buildup does not go beyond the danger point and that the residues, after a certain level is reached, are excreted. The work of Dr. Wayland J. Hayes of the U.S. Public Health Service has been outstanding in this field, and other scientists also have been active in this regard. While more work needs to be done, all the data assembled thus far belies the supposition, on which many of Miss Carson's conclusions rested, that the pesticide residues in the human body represent any real health peril.

Moreover, the flourishing state of wildlife, including fish, in areas where chlorinated hydrocarbons and other pesticides are widely used contradicts the theory that the chemicals may decimate our quail, doves, thrushes, trout, catfish, and the like. It might be pointed out also that general health in the United States has been excellent during the past 20 or 30 years, the period when pesticides have been used most intensively. Also, life expectancy has risen during that same period.

From time to time I have seen newspaper stories which quote the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to the effect that pesticides may be a factor in the decline of certain bird species and that they also are very toxic to fish and shellfish. I am not in a position to dispute these inferences, but I would say that I strongly suspect that some Government officials have already condemned pesticides and are looking for evidence to support their verdict.' For example, I have looked carefully into the charges by the Public Health Service that the persistent pesticide, endrin, killed 5,175,000 fish in the lower Mississippi River in the winter of 1963–64. There were charges and countercharges. Five million of the fish were menhaden, a salt water variety, and the staff report of the House Appropriations Committee states:

> PHS examined one menhaden, the results of which examination were inconclusive because of an insufficient sample of blood.

I submit that one fish, the examination of which apparently revealed little, is not a sufficient foundation for the sweeping conclusions made by the Public Health Service. I submit also that Government officials and agencies should be extremely careful about press releases which condemn pesticides by innuendo, by the simple process of stating they may be responsible for the decline in bald eagle population, et cetera.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES REPORT

In July 1965, the Pesticide Residues Committee of the National Academy of Sciences made public a report after a long and careful survey. The inquiry dealt with the "technical issues involved in the concepts of no residue and zero tolerance as they relate to the registration of pesticides, the setting of tolerances of pesticide residues, the enforcement provisions of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act relating to the residues in food, and the recommendations of the Federal and State agencies concerning pesticide uses."

The committee made a number of recommendations, all of which, in my opinion, were sensible.

But two recommendations interested me in particular. One was that the concepts of "no residue" or "zero tolerance" for pesticides are impractical and unworkable. By "zero tolerance" or "no residue" is meant that no detectable pesticide residues are permitted for certain foods, including milk. The other recommendation was, in substance, that tolerances for residues be arrived at on the basis of safety factors.

Already the zero tolerance concept has hurt the milk industry and has resulted in a situation which, bluntly stated, constitutes a real threat, not only to health but to the food producer, the consumer and businessman as well. New testing methods were found and, using these, residues were detected where none could be found before. As a result, milk was banned from sale in Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, and other States. The dairymen were not at fault and the Congress appropriated around $8 million to pay for their losses. But, as time went on, it developed that virtually no commodity could pass the zero tolerance test. By the new testing devices almost everything contained traceable residues. Today there is a sort of agreement to bypass the zero tolerance concept while some way out of the dilemma is found. In other words the producers are permitted to operate and the consumer to eat by sufferance.

As I have stated, there is a ban on the use of chlorinated hydrocarbons on all lands administered by the Department of the Interior. I am informed that damage to forests is increasing in consequence. The Department may have information which I do not possess, but it seems to me that the prohibition is based largely on supposition and conjecture.

I have already mentioned the world food deficit. Approximately half the world's 3 billion population suffers chronically from hunger and malnutrition. Ten thousand persons starve to death each day. We can help prevent famine with our food surpluses for a time, and we should do so. But obviously the needs are so great that agriculture in the underdeveloped countries must be upgraded and developed.

PESTICIDES, KEY TO OUR WELL-BEING

We take our good fortune for granted. Because of pesticides, malaria, yellow fever, sleeping sickness, and many other diseases today are virtually unknown in our country; yet throughout the world millions upon millions of people die each year of these and other diseases, which we control and can keep controlling if we make it possible for continued development and use of old and new compounds in this never-ending struggle between insects and man.

If present governmental policies are followed, we could drop back to the situation existing in many undeveloped countries of the world, where pesticides are not available and human diseases run rampant.

I have traveled in many of these countries. Their agriculture is primitive. The struggle to get enough to eat is constant. They need machinery, better seed, fertilizer, and other scientific techniques, but they must also have pesticides. Otherwise, the machinery, the fertilizer, and the better seed cannot provide food for harvesting.

As a step toward helping improve these countries and to promote peace, let us reexamine our own pesticide policies. The recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences should be carried out without delay. If we need legislation to accomplish this, that should be enacted as soon as is possible. If the matter can be handled through regulations, let us take that route without delay.

I know the feeling of some most sincere men who are afraid that pesticides will destroy wildlife and fish. We must use pesticides and use them wisely if millions of people are to be saved from disease and starvation.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced this can be done while at the same time fish and wildlife are protected for our sportsmen and the general public.

YOUNG DEMOCRATS NATIONAL CONVENTION ASKS FOR ADDITIONAL FEDERAL VOTING REGISTRARS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the National Young Democrats Convention, held in New York City last week, presented an excellent summary of America's unfinished business in assuring that equality and dignity can be a living reality for all Americans.

The Young Democrats passed resolutions calling for the appointment of many additional Federal voting registrars, the full enforcement of the 1964 Civil Rights Act requirement that Federal funds be withdrawn from segregated programs, urged President Johnson to extend the fair housing Executive order to cover all housing loans helped in any way by the Federal Government, and supported new legislation to make racial violence a Federal crime because of the racial bias in some southern State courts which denies the equal protection of the laws to Negro Americans.

YOUNG DEMOCRATS CHARTER FIRST INTEGRATED MISSISSIPPI YOUNG DEMOCRATIC ORGANIZATION

The chartering of the first integrated Mississippi Young Democratic Party organization demonstrated that the Young Democrats are giving priority to the guarantee of full equality in their own organization. As a member and former officer of the Michigan Young Democrats, I am particularly proud that it was the Michigan delegation which sponsored the unanimously passed resolution establishing special procedures to provide "every form of assistance necessary for the Mississippi Young Democrats to grow and flourish." Terming Mississippi "a politically depressed area," the resolution established a special committee and a special fund, both to be administered by the national young Democratic organization to provide expert help and to register voters and recruit young Democratic members in Mississippi. The resolution also called upon young Democratic groups around the country to similarly adopt and help particular units of the Mississippi Young Democrats.

Last week the Young Democratic Clubs of America fulfilled the special assignment given to them by Vice President HUMPHREY in his speech to the convention that they should be the conscience of the National Democratic Party. The Young Democrats have continued the Democratic Party tradition of always striving to better American life and build the Great Society in which all Americans can fully participate with equal dignity.

Following are the texts of some of the resolutions passed by the 15th biennial convention of the Young Democratic Clubs of America held in New York City at the Hotel New Yorker from October 12 to 16, 1965:

CIVIL RIGHTS RESOLUTION: INTRODUCED BY THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Whereas the recent dramatic advances in assuring equal rights have shown that equality and dignity can be a living reality for all Americans; and

Whereas this vital and noble purpose has been effectively advanced by President Lyndon B. Johnson whose breadth of vision and brilliant leadership in this field are acknowledged with gratitude and admiration by the American people; and

Whereas under President Johnson's outstanding effective leadership, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 have the potential to eliminate racial discrimination in many aspects of American life; and

Whereas the implementation of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 have not met the high standards established by President Johnson and the Congress; and

Whereas the high hopes of the American people are being frustrated by the slow implementation of these laws; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Young Democratic Clubs of America meeting in convention that:

Article 1. We call upon the Department of Justice to use its extensive powers under the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to assign additional Federal voting registrars in all the many counties where Americans are still denied the right to vote by unconstitutional means.

Article 2. We call upon all Federal agencies to implement title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which requires the withdrawal of Federal funds wherever racial discrimination exists in federally supported programs until that racial discrimination ends.

Article 3. The Young Democrats of America are encouraged to devise, implement and support programs which secure to all groups the right to share fully and equally, with dignity, in American society.

Fair Housing Resolution Submitted by the Young Democratic Club of New Jersey

Whereas in the 1960 election campaign presidential candidate John F. Kennedy pledged that, if elected, he would ban discrimination practices in the Government's housing operations with a "stroke of the pen"; and

Whereas on November 20, 1962, President Kennedy placed his signature on Executive Order No. 11063 banning discrimination in federally aided housing, and including a declaration that exclusion of Americans from such housing because of their race, color, creed or national origin is "unfair, unjust, and inconsistent with the public policy of the United States as manifested in its Constitution and laws;" and

Whereas the order, though an important advanced principle, is limited in scope and (1) fails to embrace existing housing, even if such housing is federally assisted, (2) fails to cover loans by federally aided savings and loans associations and other similar institutions, and (3) fails to protect against discriminatory practices by these lenders; and

Whereas housing segregation is tied directly to slums and slum conditions, to segregated schools, to inequalities in employment and to the poverty which haunts millions of Negro Americans and other minorities so movingly outlined by President Johnson in his Howard University speech in June 1965; and

Whereas it remains the responsibility of the executive branch of the Government to complete the task of prohibiting discrimination in federally assisted housing, which it set out to accomplish in 1962: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Young Democratic Clubs of America meeting in convention, That we do hereby respectfully urge the President of the United States to amend Executive Order No. 11063 as follows:

1. To prohibit discriminatory practices in mortgage loans by all banks and lending institutions which are subject in any manner to regulation, supervision or control by an agency of the Federal Government.

2. To cover all federally aided housing which was built or contracted for prior to November 20, 1962, and which continues to enjoy Federal assistance.

In addition to the foregoing recommendations, the YDCA also urges action on the following administrative matters:

1. The procedural power provided various Federal housing agencies to grant exemptions from the scope of the order should be withdrawn. Under this power the Federal Housing Administration has excluded the resale of single family homes. This exemption vitiates the reach of the order and minimizes its effectiveness.

2. The President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing should be directed to assume broad responsibility for the implementation of the order and should be provided with sufficient staff and budget expansion to administer an effective national program.

Racial Violence Resolution

Whereas in recent months lily-white southern juries, ignoring the overwhelming weight of the evidence, have in several cases, refused to indict or convict white southerners accused of serious crimes of violence against both Negro and white citizens denied the equal protection of the law; and

Whereas the punishment of those guilty of crime is essential to the protection of the rights of the innocent and the failure to punish persons guilty of crimes such as murder against any citizen is a denial of the equal protection of the laws promised all citizens; and

Whereas these recent events indicate that it may be impossible to obtain judges or juries in southern courts which are not biased against civil rights workers, and biased in favor of those who commit crimes against them; and

Whereas bias on the part of the court and jury in favor of accused defendants is as detrimental to the preservation of law and order as is bias against such defendants: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the YDCA strongly deplore the denial of equal protection of the law of these Southern States; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge that crimes of violence against civil rights workers and any other citizen denied the equal protection of the law be made Federal offenses, to be tried in Federal court after indictment by a Federal grand jury, in the hope that cases in these courts may be tried free of the racial bias which, in State courts, denies to civil rights workers the equal protection of the laws.

Mississippi Resolution—Introduced by Michigan

Whereas this 15th biennial convention of the Young Democratic Clubs of America has chartered a Mississippi Young Democratic organization which is racially integrated and broadly representative of all the people of Mississippi who support the national Democratic Party and the progressive programs of President Lyndon B. Johnson; and

Whereas the 1964 National Convention of the Democratic Party meeting in Atlantic City, N.J., declared its national policy to be one of requiring and encouraging all State Democratic Parties to be racially integrated and open to all loyal Democrats and the special Lawrence Subcommittee of the Democratic National Committee is now formulating a program to enforce this policy; and

Whereas Mississippi is a politically depressed area where the lack of a loyal Democratic Party organization and unconstitutional restrictions on the right to vote which meant that nearly half of all eligible Mississippians were not allowed to vote in 1964 elections resulted in the electoral votes of Mississippi being cast for the representative of rightwing reaction and negativism; and

Whereas the Voting Rights Act of 1965 sponsored by the Johnson administration has recently been signed into law which enforces the right of every American to register and vote regardless of race and which the Democratic Party and the Johnson administration are committed to vigorously and expeditiously enforce; and

Whereas the absence of any other affiliated Democratic organization in Mississippi which supports the national Democratic Party means that the Young Democratic organization of Mississippi must build an organization from the ground up; and

Whereas the members and officers of the young Democratic organization of Mississippi are to be particularly commended and are especially deserving of help by the Young Democratic Clubs of America because the current political situation in Mississippi means that it requires special acts of courage to affiliate with and support the national Democratic Party: Now be it hereby

Resolved by the Young Democratic Clubs of America meeting in convention that,

Article 1. The Young Democratic Clubs of America hereby pledge every form of assistance necessary for the Mississippi Young Democratic organization to grow and flourish so that it may build the Great Society in Mississippi.

Article 2. The President of the YDCA shall appoint a select committee to develop and administer a detailed program to implement article 1 which shall include but not be limited to the encouragement of nationally prominent Democrats to speak in Mississippi under the aegis of the Mississippi Young Democrats and the recruitment of Young Democrats who are expert in membership recruitment and voter registration to help the Mississippi Young Democrats. All aspects of the detailed program shall be at the request of and with the approval of the executive committee of the Young Democratic Clubs of Mississippi.

Article 3. A special Mississippi fund is hereby established which will be used to help the Mississippi Young Democratic organization to register voters, recruit members, and establish an active Young Democratic program in Mississippi. The national executive committee shall solicit contributions to the fund from regional, State, and local organization of Young Democrats and from groups sympathetic to a vigorous Young Democratic organization in Mississippi.

Article 4. The convention hereby calls upon its regional, State, and local organizations to adopt and help particular units of the Mississippi Young Democrats by providing funds, supplies, and expert help under the direction of the special Mississippi committee.

INTOLERABLE CONDITION OF SHAW JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, in recent months Members of Congress and the public have been greatly concerned about the intolerable condition of Shaw Junior High School. Anyone familiar with the condition of that school facility must agree that it should be abandoned at the earliest possible date and a new facility established.

This is easier said than done. A school even though in bad physical condition, which is serving several hundreds of students, cannot be summarily abandoned without providing another physical plant to accommodate the dispossessed students. In the case of the Shaw Junior High School many problems are presented which would not be present in a small town or rural area. There is the problem peculiar to a metropolitan area of finding a site within the service area of the school that is being abandoned, and this is particularly true in the case of Shaw.

Another problem that presents itself is that if a new site is located in the Shaw area it will be necessary to dispossess residents and small business operators who are currently residing and operating in the area to be used for a future school building.

These are real and existing problems which are much more difficult to solve than many are willing to admit. It is quite easy to be critical of the Board of Education, the District Commissioners, and the Congress for continuing to use this substandard school facility, but it is another thing to find a solution to the problem. This is particularly true in view of the fact that vacant land which the Board of Education already owns has recently been made available by the Board of Education to the Recreation Department for the John F. Kennedy Memorial Playground.

The playground is serving a very useful purpose, and the recreational opportunities it affords are badly needed.

So with these complex problems it appears that there can be no solution by any one department or agency of the government of the District of Columbia. In order to accomplish a proper solution without imposing undue hardship upon any segment of the local population it seems to me that the time has come when several agencies and departments must sit down and discuss this matter and undertake to work out a prompt solution.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the fact that Shaw Junior High School is located in an area which lends itself to urban renewal that the board of education, the District Commissioners, the Recreation Department, the Redevelopment Land Agency, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Capital Housing Authority, and the President's Special Assistant on District Affairs should immediately consider the possibility of instituting effective measures to correct the situation surrounding Shaw Junior High School and the area in which it is located. It seems to me that it may be possible for an urban renewal project to be planned which would make land available for the building of a new school facility while the present Shaw Junior High School is being used and then upon the completion of the new facility to convert the real estate upon which the school is located into housing or some other appropriate use.

I think the time has come when positive action must be taken. The need for such action should be clear to any observer. It is certainly clear to those of us who have had a close relationship to the many problems confronting the people of the District of Columbia.

As one Member of the Congress I express the hope that such action be forthwith considered and pledge my personal support in any way possible in accomplishing the elimination of an intolerable situation in our Nation's Capital.

CUBAN IMMIGRATION

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, while we all sympathize with the plight of the political refugees who want to escape Castro's communistic tyranny, the time would seem to be overdue when our friends and allies in the free world should share with us the responsibility for providing a home for these unfortunate people.

About a quarter of a million Cubans have already been admitted since Castro took over. Under the new program none in military age will be permitted to leave Cuba. Most of the new refugees will be the elderly, the young, the ill, and certain anti-Castro elements. The Associated Press has estimated that there are 50,000 of these people awaiting departure from the island. There may be more.

It would seem that the United States should insist upon other countries accepting more of the fleeing Cubans. What about Canada, Argentina, Australia, and many other nations which are quite capable of absorbing more immigrants? It will be recalled that we had a joint arrangement with other countries in the handling of European displaced persons following World War II. The United States accepted most of these refugees. That fact, plus the large numbers of Cubans already admitted, makes it even more imperative that our Government insist upon our allies sharing with us the solution of this problem.

LEGISLATIVE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE LAST 9½ MONTHS

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, at the close of this historic 1st session of the 89th Congress, most of the Nation's newspapers, magazines and journals have exhausted their glossaries of adjectives in describing the legislative achievements of the past 9½ months. "Hard working," "productive," "energetic," "imaginative," "precedent-shattering" are some of the terms used by the most respected and influential journals of the day in describing the 89th Congress, and although probably no single Member of the House is completely satisfied with everything that has been done in this Chamber since January, surely the overwhelming majority of the Members must be highly gratified at the manner in which the House and its great committees have handled this torrent of legislation. Surely it must be acknowledged that the House has worked its will on these great programs, and that the actions of the Congress have reflected quite accurately the judgment and decision of the American people at the polls last November.

The discussion and debate about this great legislative program—begun in the committees and in the well of the House—will and should continue in the months and years ahead in all sections of the land. But if we are to maintain our traditions as a representative democracy, and if we are to continue to give an example to the other nations of the world—and especially the newly emerging nations who are tentatively groping their way toward responsible self-government—it is essential that the continuing political dialogue in America be conducted in a manner befitting a proud and free people, who have a great tradition of responsible self-government to defend and build upon. The manner in which we debate the course our Government should take in the months and years ahead is of paramount importance; reasoned discussion, buttressed by the careful analysis of the facts, is the minimal standard the American people should require in the debate of public issues. Certainly, loose talk, appeals to prejudice, inflammatory statements, scurrility, the resort to epithets, which, while distasteful, might have been tolerable in an earlier age, can no longer be acceptable in the public arena. All of the verbal paraphernalia of the hate groups and the extremists of every description must be resolutely shunned if our citizens are to have the opportunity to understand the problems which beset our society, and be enabled to make a reasoned and reasonable choice of solutions.

As an example of the kind of discussion of public affairs which contributes very little to the understanding of the issues and problems which confront the American people, I would like to quote from an article which was published in the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star on October 19, 1965:

> Former Ohio Congressman Robert Taft, Jr., believes a major issue of the 1966 congressional campaign should be the abdication of its responsibility by the present "rubberstamp Congress."
>
> In a talk before the Republican Forum in Denver, Colo., last night, Taft charged the present Congress has meekly surrendered the rights and duties of the legislative branch to the executive.
>
> Congress has passed administration bills with little or no debate, Taft said, and has provided no effective examination or dissent of programs.
>
> "At times the conduct of the present majority in Congress seems more in the tradition of Hitler's Reichstag than the long record of independence we have had on Capitol Hill," Taft said.

My distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle can, I am sure, decide for themselves how appropriate, and how enlightening, and how ennobling it is to compare this ancient and honorable body to Hitler's Reichstag. They can further judge for themselves how edifying such a comment must seem to an audience when it is uttered by a former Member of this House, who is fully acquainted with the traditions and procedures of this great body, and who is the son of a man who served with great distinction for 15 years as a Member of Congress, and who is the grandson of a man who served in the Federal Government both as Chief Justice and as President of the United States.

WHY WHITES FLEE THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article from the U.S. News & World Report of October 25, 1965, entitled "Why Whites Flee the Nation's Capital."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence, editor of the U.S. News & World Report, deserves the thanks and commendation of the entire citizenship of this Nation for giving the people of our country the unbiased news on numerous problems confronting this country and important subjects pending before the Congress and the people of the United States.

I have read the U.S. News & World Report since its first issue and have always found the news items in this magazine giving both sides of the issue, and that is what I think the people of this country desire, as they are capable of analyzing the news if they have both sides of any issue.

I heartily recommend that every Member of Congress read this article:

WHY WHITES FLEE THE NATION'S CAPITAL

(In just 14 years, more than 200,000 white residents have fled from Washington, D.C. Now the Capital is a city 62 percent Negro in population and 90 percent Negro in public-school enrollment. The racial change is continuing. Why? What's going on? Is the U.S. Capital on its way to becoming a virtually all-Negro city? Look into what's happening in Washington, and you find a problem that is confronting other big cities in the northern United States of America. When Negroes move in, whites flee. Neighborhoods and schools become segregated. The question being asked: How can the flight of whites be stopped?)

White families are continuing to flee the Nation's Capital as more and more Negroes move in.

This flight has cost the city of Washington, D.C., a loss of more than 200,000 white residents.

Now, in the Capital City, the population is 62.5 percent Negro and 37.5 percent white.

Public-school enrollment is even more heavily Negro—about 90 percent Negro and 10 percent white.

These figures are a cause of growing concern, not only to some residents of Washington, but to Congress and the Nation. They were given openly as important factors in the recent decision of the House of Representatives to go slow in giving Washington residents authority to elect their own city government to replace the present Federal rule.

Washington is not the only big city losing white residents and gaining Negroes. You find this happening also in such cities as Baltimore, St. Louis, New York, and Chicago. But the exodus of whites from Washington has been on a larger scale than in most cities. Its percentage of Negroes is now the highest in any big U.S. city.

Yet Washington, not so many years ago, was a much different city. Before the flight of whites began, the population of Washington was only a little more than one-third Negro. Its schools were barely half Negro.

All this racial change has occurred in just 14 years.

BIG EXODUS BEGAN IN 1951

The mass flight of whites from the city of Washington into its suburbs began about 1951. It picked up speed with the Supreme Court ruling of 1954 that public schools in Washington and the Nation must be desegregated. It has been continuing ever since.

Why do so many whites flee Washington? A number of reasons are given.

One reason, often mentioned, is the rapid influx of Negroes into schools that were once white. Large numbers of white parents are pictured as seeking to put their children into schools where they will not be so greatly outnumbered by Negro pupils.

Year-by-year statistics tend to support this explanation of the white flight.

Flight of white pupils from Washington schools

In 1935 white enrollment reached its peak:

Whites	59,582
Negroes	33,498
Negro percentage	36

Last year of segregated schools—1953:

Whites	44,897
Negroes	58,936
Negro percentage	56.8

Schools had lost 14,685 white pupils in 18 years. Average loss of white pupils: 816 per year.

In 1954 schools were integrated—and flight of whites gained speed.

In 1964, after 11 years of integrated schools:

Whites	17,673
Negroes	125,016
Negro percentage	87.6

Schools lost 27,224 white pupils in 11 years. Average loss of white pupils per year: 2,475.

In 1965 the estimated Negro percentage of enrollment is 90 percent.

Source: District of Columbia Public Schools.

It was in May 1954, that the school desegregation order came from the Supreme Court. The white flight increased immediately and sharply. In just 3 years—1954 through 1956—Washington lost 86,400 white residents from its population and 10,139 white youngsters from its public schools.

Movement of white residents from Washington has tended to center in families with children. Whites who remain are for the most part those with few children of school age. Negroes who remain in the city tend to have large families, with many school-age children. Result is a school population that is much more heavily Negro than the population of the city as a whole.

NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS

Washington's schools are organized on the traditional "neighborhood school" pattern, with children going to the schools that are located in their neighborhoods.

Washington's housing pattern is like that of most northern cities, with neighborhoods tending to be either all white or all Negro.

Result: Today the schools of Washington, although fully integrated on paper, may be the most segregated schools in any large city outside the South.

Of 174 public schools in the city, in the 1964–65 school year 26 schools were all-Negro in enrollment and 98 others were 90 percent or more Negro.

This means that of 125,000 Negro pupils, 105,000—or 84 percent—attend schools that were, in effect, segregated, having at least 9 Negroes to 1 white.

There is some segregation for white youngsters, too. Last school year, two schools were all white and nine others were at least 90 percent white. Of the city's 16,673 white pupils, 5,241—or 30 percent—attended "segregated" schools where whites outnumbered Negroes at least 9 to 1.

However, what disturbs many white parents in this: There were 64 schools last year in which 10 or fewer white youngsters found themselves almost alone in a school among hundreds of Negroes. And 1,264 white youngsters were in schools where they were racially outnumbered at least 9 to 1.

A Washington school official comments:

"When a school becomes much more than half Negro, then whites tend to desert that school entirely."

It is getting harder and harder, however, for white parents to find a place in Washington where their children can go to school with other white children.

The city has some of the Nation's most extensive and fastest growing Negro "ghettos," and one neighborhood after another is experiencing an influx of Negro residents. Large areas in the center of the city are heavily Negro.

WHITE GHETTO

In Washington, people are beginning to speak of "white ghettos." The city's biggest "white ghetto" is an area called the upper northwest, lying northwest of Rock Creek Park.

Georgetown, one of the oldest sections of the District of Columbia, with many houses dating back to Revolutionary times, has also become a "white ghetto." Whites have crowded out Negro residents and turned it into a fashionable area popular among diplomats and Government officials.

Whites also are crowding out Negroes in what is known as Foggy Bottom, in the State Department area, and in a section around the Capitol, where old houses are being remodeled and modernized.

In recent years, there have been signs of a trend for whites to return to Washington from the suburbs after their children are grown. Big new apartment complexes are rising, filled mostly with childless white couples.

Yet, over all, the flight of whites from Washington is continuing. An estimate made for the National Capital Planning Commission is that by 1970 the Negro population in Washington will be about 71 percent of the total. School enrollment, on that basis, will be almost solidly Negro.

Businessmen have expressed alarm about the future of the city. This alarm grew recently when it appeared that Washington was about to be given home rule, with power to elect its own officials and school board, and levy its own taxes.

For the last 91 years, Washington has been governed by federally appointed officials, with Congress enacting the city's laws. Its residents have no local vote.

HOME RULE DISPUTE

It was anticipated that the Nation's Capital, if given home rule, would have a Negro mayor, a Negro majority on the city council, and a Negro majority on the school board.

The Washington Board of Trade, representing business, opposed the home rule proposal backed by President Lyndon Johnson. The board predicted that home rule would speed the flight of residents and businesses, and result in a decline in property values and a drop in business volume.

The Johnson plan for home rule was rejected by the House on September 29.

The alarm in business circles was related to what might happen to taxes in a city with a growing Negro population, dominated by relatively inexperienced voters and governed by inexperienced officials. There was concern about the costs of social services, welfare, and schools.

The city already is plagued with welfare problems. More than 10,000 Washingtonians are on relief—most of them Negroes. The cost of aid to dependent children is pushed up by the Nation's highest rate of illegitimacy. Of 4,529 illegitimate babies born in 1963 in the city, 4,145 were Negro. About 27,500 people are eligible for grants of surplus food.

RISING CRIME RATE

Washington's crime rate—high and rising fast—is given as a factor influencing many white people to flee the city. Washington ranks first among all cities of comparable size in aggravated assaults and robberies, and stands fourth in major crimes of all kinds.

In many apartment houses, doors are now being locked—even guarded—at night.

Street crimes are so numerous that many nurses and other nightworkers take training in self-defense. Tear-gas pens and burglar alarms are selling fast.

Says a suburban housewife:

"With things the way they are, I wouldn't live in the city. There you are afraid to walk on the street at night. Out here, I'm not afraid."

Some white people who fled Washington to the suburbs will tell you frankly, like this suburban widow:

"I moved out here from Washington to get away from the Negroes. They were all around me. It was a regular jungle, so much screaming and yelling you couldn't sleep. It became so unbearable I couldn't take it."

Some whites moved in fear that the value of their homes would decline as the neighborhood changed from white to Negro. The wife of a retired Army officer put it this way:

"Negroes were coming into the neighborhood. My husband thought it wise to move before it was too late."

A real estate dealer says:

"I think many whites run for fear that their property values will decline. Block busters come in, scare them, buy up their homes at low prices and then turn around and sell them at higher prices to Negro buyers."

"In some areas," this real estate man says, "prices have declined." Another real estate dealer says this, however:

"Prices no longer go down. We passed that problem years ago. Scare tactics no longer work."

In general, real estate dealers point out, housing prices in Washington have been rising steadily.

That is given as one reason why so many whites move to suburbs. There they often can buy or build a home more cheaply, with more room for their children.

A search for better schools is described as the big reason why some white parents leave Washington.

When Washington schools were integrated 11 years ago, masses of Negro pupils were found to be far behind most white pupils in scholastic achievement. A system of "ability grouping" was adopted so the more-advanced pupils would not be held back by slow learners. Large numbers of Negroes wound up in the lower groupings. Now the "ability grouping" is under Negro attack as "racial discrimination."

Many white parents fear changes will be forced on Washington schools that will further impair the quality of education. One Negro demand that frightens whites is for bus transportation of pupils to schools outside their own neighborhoods in an effort to improve "racial balance" in some school enrollments. Three-fourths of all Washington teachers are Negroes. But Negroes complain that whites dominate the school administration.

A prominent Washington real estate man summed up the causes of whites' movement from the city in these words:

"The flight of white families with children to the suburbs is due to a lot of things. Schools are the big thing. Then, they want their children to have some space to run around in—not to be playing in the streets.

"Undoubtedly, the Negro problem influences many whites. But even without that, families that want space and new homes would have to look outside the District."

Prof. Royce Hanson of American University, a political scientist who has been a student of Washington affairs for years, says housing is the key to the flight.

"Some people are motivated by their racial attitudes when they move out of the city," he says. "But I believe this is a relatively small factor."

HOW TO STOP EXODUS?

A question now being asked with growing urgency is how to stop the exodus of whites from Washington and keep the Nation's Capital from turning into a city of Negroes.

Massive changes are seen as needed, including: better schools, more middle-class housing, a greater acceptance by whites of Negroes as neighbors.

Washington has many highly educated Negroes and many well-to-do Negroes. With racial discrimination in housing forbidden by law, many such Negroes are able to live in fine homes in predominantly white neighborhoods.

Jobs are not scarce in Washington. The Government employs many thousands of Negroes. More and more are being hired in private business. Even though Negro businessmen—running their own business—are relatively few, Washington has a larger Negro middle class than most cities.

All in all, Washington is widely regarded among Negroes as one of the best cities in the country to live in.

Large numbers of Washington Negroes, however, are recent immigrants from the rural South, with no training for the kinds of jobs that Washington has to offer and not enough income to break out of deteriorating neighborhood.

For Negroes who can afford better homes, there is little room left in the city—and Negroes are seldom able to buy into suburban neighborhoods.

SUBURBS WILL OPEN

Robert Gold, chief of research and aid to the National Capital Planning Commission, sees one answer to Washington's problem in the opening of suburbs to Negroes.

"The suburbs will open," he predicts. "They've got to. In the long range, that will be the solution. Negro experts tell me that the move to the suburbs will be slow at the start, then gradually it will gain speed."

In the meantime, Negroes are multiplying inside the city and white families continue to flee the Nation's Capital.

BOON OR BUST?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article is in line with my bill pending before the House Administration Committee for repeal of Employees Classification Act on Capitol Hill:

BOON OR BUST?

(Can patronage be divorced from politics? The Employees Classification Act has stirred up a storm.)

(By Oscar Johnson)

On the day before it quit for last year's elections, Congress passed a law to provide "orderly and equitable" pay scales for key House employees.

The House Employees Position Classification Act, which took effect last January, was generally hailed as removing from politics the pay of some 400 to 500 aids—about 10 percent of the total House staff—working under the House Clerk, Doorkeeper, Sergeant at Arms, and Postmaster.

After a full session under the new system, however, doubts are being raised. Can any operation of Congress really be divorced from politics? And more fundamentally, should it be? Is the act successful in doing this? Should it be reconsidered?

To answer such questions, hearings on the system are slated for next January.

Some skeptics assert that all persons involved in the give-and-take of lawmaking on Capitol Hill are true political animals—that politics is the essence of the legislative branch, and that patronage and civil service are like oil and water.

This has been the previous basis for employment of the aids now covered by the act. Throughout House of Representatives history, central employees have been hired under the sponsorship of senior Congressmen.

The careers of those under influential lawmakers have flowered, as special resolutions were introduced to give them generous pay increases. Meanwhile, all too often, little was done to help others who might be just as capable.

Over the years, the system of pressure and favoritism produced what nearly everyone agreed was chaos. Some aids were paid more than supervisors. "We actually have people on the Hill who do not want promotions (in title) because a promotion would mean they would get less money," complained one Congressman.

Still, the system—or lack of one—seemed to work well enough until the last decade or so when Congress had to vastly expand its operation to handle increasing responsibility due to growth of the Federal Government.

As the staff grew, the obvious and glaring inequities in compensation relationships threatened to impede the critical functioning of the House. There were cries for reform.

Chairman Omar Burleson, Democrat, of Texas, and other members of the Committee on House Administration, agreed that the old haphazard system had its shortcomings.

"We are inclined to criticize the executive departments and the bureaus," Burleson noted, "but actually, just between us, I would not be surprised, if an objective appraisement were made, if we are not just about the greatest offenders in all Government because of the way we handle our affairs."

To correct the situation, the committee decided to install modified civil service principles of job classification and equal pay for equal work. Representative Sam Friedel, Democrat, of Maryland, chairman of the Accounts Subcommittee and reputed as a longtime friend of legislative aids, drew up the mechanics of a new system over a 5-month period with the help of personnel from the Civil Service Commission and General Accounting Office.

Friedel's plan made a big concession to the realities of Capitol Hill employment: it left unchanged the party patronage system under which central staffers are hired.

Moreover, it was restricted to one-tenth of House employees and was sweetened by inclusion of three or four personnel policy changes not directly related to classification but wanted by some lawmakers and staff members.

But the plan did have a raise system at least superficially businesslike: each covered employee was put in 1 of 13 job levels, which were rated by degree of skill and responsibility involved. Each level has 12 pay steps with promotions phased over 28 years.

The system provides a starting salary in HS Level 1 of $4,000 a year for the least demanding jobs, with a maximum of $5,950. Top HS Level 13 goes from $17,800 to $22,220—though, reportedly, no one is in this level.

Despite the system's scientific approach, a startling fact soon dawned on some staff members—for the first time, a limit was being clamped on their earning power. And the limit, or level, was far lower than they thought they deserved.

Also, decisions on who would go in what level were not made by the Congressmen or officers sheltering the aids, but by the more impersonal House Administration Committee. To forestall recalcitrance on this point, the system provides that no salaries will be lowered, but some were raised when jobs were put in higher levels.

Controversy has also developed over the provision that when an incumbent leaves his replacement will have to start in the lowest pay step. In one case, this will cause a drop to $11,000 from $18,000.

According to one official, when the system was implemented, "We felt the effect of this (downgrading) immediately." He warned that the difficulty in hiring qualified personnel at the lower levels will cause increasing future trouble as present staffers leave.

Ire has also been stirred by the practice of putting some employees in the top step of their level—thus blocking advancement for the rest of their careers.

Staffers have pointed to the generally strict pay ranges, including the top limit of $22,220, as lower than that made by other Federal employees. House committee staffers and executive branch classified workers can earn as much as $24,500.

"The old system at least didn't make second-class employees of us," said one aid.

Beyond this, the only official appeal of a job classification is to the committee which originally made it—and to the system's administrator, a former Civil Service Commission aid brought in by FRIEDEL.

The administrator, who had much influence in drafting the act, is serving as a scapegoat for opponents. House Clerk Ralph Roberts, a vocal critic of the act, has charged that the aid "possesses little or no understanding or desire to understand the process inherent in the legislative branch system."

Also, said Roberts, he appears "to lack the humanness to give patient consideration to appeals from decisions made, thus shutting the door to any hope of a successful appeal." However, according to another official, "If you create a lot of commotion, you can still advance."

Roberts, possibly with the less public backing of other House officers, would like to get back his previous influence over employees' salaries. Some lawmakers support this.

Representative JAMES KEE, Democrat, of West Virginia, a former House aid, said in a letter to Representative BURLESON: "This Classification Act is causing considerable confusion, and I have yet to find anyone on the Hill who is satisfied with this legislation.

"Actually," charged KEE, "what it does is to set arbitrary standards and interferes to a considerable degree with the authority of the officials of the House who we have elected in having their employees perform their duties with the same high standards which the House has enjoyed over the year."

Says Clerk Roberts: "A commingling of a partial Federal civil service system superimposed upon the political system of the legislative branch is not workable."

Some see the system as an indirect attack upon the ordinary taciturn Roberts, whose popularity has dipped a bit in recent years. The recent report of an appropriations subcommittee headed by Representative TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, criticized the Clerk's statements supporting money requests as devoid of substance.

If the officers had diligently pushed for raises for all who deserved them, it is claimed, there may never have been much pressure for reform.

The extent of sentiment against the new system is hard to determine. Those who received raises aren't complaining—but, says one critic, by far the greater number of covered employees "want to get out—and would do so if an election were held tomorrow."

One group—the House Press Gallery—did get out, in advance, through an amendment adopted on the House floor.

With some logic, Clerk Roberts asks: "If the virtues of this system are as advantageous to the employees of the officers coming within the purview of this act, why then are not its coveted positions made applicable to the other nine-tenths of the employees of the House?"

One answer is the suggestion that the system may indeed be expanded to cover all employees. Representative JOHN SAYLOR, Republican of Pennsylvania, even believes it is "the first step toward putting the legislative employees under the jurisdiction of the executive branch."

The program would not be so bad, some of its critics assert, if it were less restrictive in the salaries provided.

They charge it was pushed through the House in the adjournment rush when few Members were present, without the benefit of printed hearings; that it has depleted the contingency fund of more than $300,000; that the Senate abandoned a similar plan as a fiasco after a 3-month trial; and that officers were not counseled when it was being developed.

A chief critic, Representative JOHN L. McMILLAN, Democrat, of South Carolina, believes the program should be abolished entirely, and has introduced legislation to do just that. Representative FRIEDEL has promised a hearing on this bill early in January.

Others feel that the classifications could serve a useful purpose if liberalized and properly administered. One thing seems certain: somewhere along the line, now and then, somebody has to say "no." The question is, should this be done politically or scientifically?

ECUMENICAL COUNCIL TO ABSOLVE THE JEWISH PEOPLE

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is important in this era of intensifying hatreds to note when an event of major importance occurs which runs counter to this trend. I am speaking, of course, of the decision of the Ecumenical Council to absolve the Jewish people of the blame for the crucifixion of Jesus Christ and to deplore the practice of anti-Semitism. This decision will, I am sure, be eternally recorded as one of the bright moments of our era. It will stand as a milestone to the progress of the human conscience, in an age marked by too many milestones to evil.

The Ecumenical Council passed its decree by an overwhelming vote of 1,763 to 250. The decree now awaits the promulgation by Pope Paul VI, which is expected imminently, to become part of the official doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church.

I would like to quote pertinent passages of the decree:

> What happened to Christ in His Passion cannot be attributed to all Jews without distinction, then alive, not to the Jews of today.
>
> Although the Church is the new people of God, the Jews should not be presented as rejected by God or accursed, as if this follows from Holy Scriptures.
>
> May all see to it then that in catechetical work or in preaching the Word of God, they do not teach anything that is inconsistent with the truth of the Gospel and with the spirit of Christ.
>
> Moreover, the church, which rejects every persecution against any man, mindful of the common patrimony with the Jews and moved not by political reasons but by the Gospel's spiritual love, deplores hatred, persecutions, displays of anti-Semitism directed against Jews at any time and by anyone.

Like other members of the Jewish faith, I am somewhat disappointed that the council decided to diminish the strength of its decree by eliminating the word "deicide" from its absolution of the Jews and by voting to "deplore" rather than to "condemn" anti-Semitism. In my view, however, the council's decision to modify the wording of the decree was of small importance next to the overwhelming approval of the decree itself. I think we need not waste much remorse on what the decree might have said when, in fact, it does say so much.

It has taken the church almost 2,000 years to rectify the monstrous injustice inherent in the contention that all Jews are responsible for the death of Christ. There are some theorists who have said that it was impossible for the church to modify its position on anti-Semitism, for the church, to maintain its authority, needed to offer its members something to hate as well as something to love. We see now that these theorists were wrong. We see now that the Catholic Church is capable of rectifying injustices, even when they are 2,000 years old. By excising from Catholic teaching all suggestion that Jews are accursed, there will be a new beginning to relations between Christians and Jews throughout the world. I think the action of the Ecumenical Council is of incalculable importance to the Jews and Christians who, together, must continue to share our civilization.

I want to express my particular approval of the declaration by Bishop Francis P. Leipzig, chairman of the American Bishops Commission for Catholic-Jewish Affairs, that a program to implement the decree will begin within 3 months. I would like to offer my personal support to Bishop Leipzig and express my admiration for his eagerness to translate the abstraction of a decree into a reality that all men experience. I heartily concur with Bishop Leipzig's statement that a fresh dialog must get underway between Jews and Christians to remove anti-Semitic prejudices.

Mr. Speaker, Rome has shown the world once again that it can be a leader in the cause of righteousness. I and my fellow Jews are pleased with its leadership. I look forward to a new era of better relations between men of all faiths.

MASSACHUSETTS POLITICAL ACTION FOR PEACE

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues and of the Nation the existence of an organization called Massachusetts Political Action for Peace. It has sought to communicate its concerns, among Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, primarily through the traditional process of electoral politics. It has also been extremely active in the educational field working toward world disarmament under law and recognition of the demands of revolutionary peoples in the underdeveloped areas.

A free society requires free and open and intensive debate, most especially where issues of war and peace are at stake. Massachusetts PAX and its large and growing body of supporters have greatly enriched public understanding of these problems, and it is highly esteemed in the State by critics as well as friends. The organization is conscious of the legacy of the independent and critical spirit that has been characteristic of Massachusetts since our Revolution and during the struggle for Abolition.

I should like to insert in the Record the text of an informative and interesting feature article about their activities that has been appearing in newspapers throughout the Commonwealth.

The following article appeared in Massachusetts newspapers on October 7, 1965:

Massachusetts Political Action for Peace (PAX), 44 Brattle Street, Cambridge, a unique statewide political organization, moves this week into its fourth year of operation. Organized in 1962 as the result of three congressional campaigns with 1,600 workers and a small budget, PAX (the Latin word for peace) now has 6,000 supporters and an annual operating budget of over $35,000.

Jerome Grossman, of 115 Dorset Road, Waban, State chairman of PAX, states, "The threat of thermonuclear war is the greatest challenge of our age. The present arms race can lead the entire world only toward disaster. PAX therefore seeks to fulfill its responsibility to our society and world by developing and applying political power in order to bring the concerns for a disarmed world under law into the center of the political arena."

PAX focuses attention on the programs of candidates for public office by supporting candidates—Democratic, Republican, and independent—who constructively raise the issues connected with ending the arms race, and by making practicing politicians aware of the sentiment for peace and disarmament. PAX seeks to demonstrate ways whereby world and domestic conflicts can be peacefully resolved.

"World peace," said Robert Hanson, of Cohasset, PAX's director of organization, "can only be secured through the mobilization of massive popular support through political power. Since war begins in the minds of men," said Hanson, "it is there that PAX seeks to initiate the ferment for peace."

PAX offers a much needed voice in Massachusetts politics because its campaign activities are focused on the public discussion of peace issues rather than on highly publicized contests between well-known personalities. PAX believes that the people have the right to know how candidates stand on these essential issues affecting their hope for survival. "Because of the absence of public debate on the issues of war and peace," Hanson said, "the United States suffers from a bipartisan foreign policy, and government as a result of Gallup poll. Thus without the articulate opposition of the party not in power the public is led to believe that war as the United States employs it is "holy" and "just" and that peace efforts are propaganda fronts for an alien world.

Mindful of Albert Einstein's injunction "that since the atom bomb everything has changed but the minds of men," PAX endeavors to build political support for a more humane foreign policy on the city, State and Federal level. For example, in 1964 PAX solicited and transmitted to congressional and State candidates who constructively raised the peace issues the sum of $47,212.

PAX supporters believe in the democratic system of government, and include among their followers distinguished professors, internationally known writers and poets, artists, businessmen, union leaders, clergy, physicians, politicians, students, legislators, and housewives. For example, Nobel Laureate Albert Szent-Gyorgyi is the chairman of the PAX advisory board and one of the founders of Scientists and Engineers for Johnson-Humphrey. Jerome Grossman, State chairman, is a leading Boston businessman and has long been active in civic affairs including the Newton PTA, civil rights, and as manager of his community's Little League baseball teams. Other State officers bring rich backgrounds of legal, historical, economic, and political experience into PAX program planning.

Between elections PAX files bills in the State legislature. These have included a commission on radiation protection, a resolve to plan for the conversion of obsolete Massachusetts defense industries to peacetime production, and a bill for the revision of existing laws governing campaign expenditures. PAX provides research assistants for legislators who wish them; submits resource documents on foreign policy issues to the mass media; issues press releases on current crises, and holds meetings to inform the public about foreign policy problems.

For example, in the spring a statewide conference was held in Boston on United States-China problems, and currently PAX is conducting seminars and public meetings on Vietnam throughout the State.

Since early 1964 PAX has devoted most of its energies and funds to seeking alternatives to the present U.S. policy toward Vietnam. The organization has repeatedly urged strict U.S. adherence to the peace provisions of the U.N. Charter, the SEATO proscription against unilateral military involvement on the part of its members, the 1964 Geneva accords restricting escalation of armed forces, and the codes of international law governing the treatment of prisoners of war. PAX has distributed over 200,000 copies of pamphlets to national opinion makers arguing its view that American action in Vietnam violates these standards. A speaker's bureau meets requests by the mass media and other organizations setting up programs on Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, the U.N., NATO, the multilateral force, and other related issues.

On the homefront PAX has worked closely with the civil rights movement by assisting the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, the Northern Student Movement, and CORE, heralding the recent statements of Dr. Martin Luther King on the inseparable relationship between peace and civil rights movements, and by participating with the committee against political extremism in its efforts to oppose the Goldwater candidacy and to get strong civil rights statements from the contenders for the governorship in 1964. Recently the organization picketed Senator Leverett Saltonstall, protesting his ineffective record in civil rights and poverty legislation and also his failure to call for Senate debate on the Vietnam crisis.

PAX has long been a strong supporter of the United Nations, and in 1964 was the only voice in Massachusetts raised in protest to the U.S. threat to withhold assistance funds from that body until France and the U.S.S.R. had paid their arrears, believing that such an action would hurt the developing nations, would weaken the U.N. and would not increase the pressure on the negligent nations to pay. Since that time the United States has reversed its policy on this matter.

PAX has also protested the intrusion of the House Un-American Activities Committee on the civil liberties of citizens and has urged the committee's abolition.

Among members of the PAX boards are Pultizer Prize poet, Robert Lowell, Harvard historian and national SANE cochairman, H. Stuart Hughes, Novelist Kay Boyle, Artist Leonard Baskin, Universalist-Unitarian Association executive, Theodore Webb, Episcopal Minister Charles Tait, Rabbi Roland Gittelsohn, labor leaders Alfred Olerio and Julius Bernstein, the president of the American Academy, Hudson Hoagland, and Playwright William Gibson.

Financial support for PAX comes entirely from concerned citizens who feel the increasing urgency of initiatives for peace, who reaffirm their faith in the democratic process, and who believe that a disarmed world under law must be secured by working through the political process. PAX joins with Pope John XXIII when he said "Justice, then, right reason and humanity urgently demand that the arms race should cease."

JAMES ROOSEVELT MAKES U.N. DEBUT

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on October 15 our former colleague, James Roosevelt, made his first speech as U.S. Representative to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. The United States is ably represented by a dedicated public servant who throughout his career has demonstrated a deep devotion to social justice. The United Nations was the dream of his father, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the vehicle through which his magnificent mother made her influence felt around the world. Now James Roosevelt will, I am sure, make a lasting contribution to the United Nations which is the world's best hope for peace.

As the 1st session of the 89th Congress is about to adjourn, I want to express both my personal regret in James Roosevelt's departure from our ranks and my satisfaction in the knowledge that he will be representing our country at the United Nations. I was privileged to serve and work closely with him during three Congresses, and I know how much he will be missed.

James Roosevelt has been immersed in public affairs throughout his life. Commenting on his performance as administrative assistant to his father, President Roosevelt, Time magazine observed that he "had proved himself indispensable to the ablest politician in the United States, and in so doing had, at the age of 30, already lived one of the most remarkable careers in U.S. public life."

That was the story so far as the young Roosevelt was concerned. In maturity, the man has gained additional stature, until he stands today respected by many millions of Americans devoted to the cause of liberalism. He has stood up for principle when the chips were down. He shall be remembered for his unceasing war against the misdirected and misconceived operations of the House Un-American Activities Committee. For having the courage to make this fight, James Roosevelt has been vilified and maligned by many disturbed and excited persons. The fact is clear that James Roosevelt is, first and foremost, a patriot of high degree. Having served as a marine officer in World War II, receiving the Navy Cross and Silver Star for gallantry in action—holding today the rank of brigadier general in the Marine Corps Reserve, and working, first and last, for the improvement of the American society in every basic regard.

James Roosevelt's quality of service in Congress, from 1955 to the present earned him high praise, ranging from a spokesman of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to a spokesman of the AFL-CIO—ranging from small businessmen to Wall Street lawyers.

James Roosevelt understands that a nation cannot function at full capacity unless all its parts are in working order.

As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, he worked in behalf of the American student and the American working man and woman. And as chairman of the General Labor Subcommittee, he has exerted himself in behalf of many measures already enacted into law. During consideration of the minimum wage law of 1961 the work of James Roosevelt was instrumental in extending coverage of the law to an additional 3 million workers theretofore unprotected, and also to securing a raise in the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25. He fought to include in title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 a provision rendering illegal the practice of discrimination on the part of both employers and unions, in the matter of hiring workers or admitting them to union membership.

Another matter coming to the attention of James Roosevelt, as chairman of the General Labor Subcommitte, was the plight of the migratory worker who, in consequence of his wandering life, has no Congressman of his own to represent his interests. Advised that certain hiring practices were detrimental and grossly unfair to the migratory working class, he worked to include in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 a section protecting the interests of the migrant worker. James Roosevelt has acted in behalf of the weak and the oppressed, and, frequently against the interests of the powerful and the influential.

Now, with the appointment of James Roosevelt to the United Nations, we will see his concern for the weak and the oppressed once again. Throughout the world, people starve. Throughout the world, people die of terrible diseases. Throughout the world, people cry out for aid and attention. And there are few who listen, and fewer still who care. But here is a man—James Roosevelt—who will listen, and hear, and care. This we know.

This the world is sure to know in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD an article by Sam Pope Brewer in the New York Times of October 16, 1965, which discusses James Roosevelt's debut at the United Nations.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 16, 1965]

JAMES ROOSEVELT MAKES U.N. DEBUT—URGES INTENSIVE WORK TO BETTER LIVING CONDITIONS

(By Sam Pope Brewer)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., October 15.—The voice of a Roosevelt was heard again today in the United Nations.

James Roosevelt, eldest son of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, made his first appearance as a U.S. delegate, appealing to the Economic Committee of the General Assembly for more intensive work to improve living conditions everywhere.

The magic of the family name was generally considered here to have played a part in Mr. Roosevelt's nomination in August by President Johnson to be a delegate.

President Roosevelt's role in laying the groundwork of the organization and Mrs. Roosevelt's long work here for human rights and justice have left them as two names that are not attacked here even in bitter cold war exchanges.

PROGRAM STRESSED BY UNITED STATES

Their eldest son's first appearance in the world organization had been given intensive advance promotion by the U.S. mission to draw attention to the social program he was presenting.

However, he was speaking in a committee that draws little public attention. Its work is important but less exciting than political wrangles.

Mr. Roosevelt spoke in conference room 2—one of the bleakest of the United Nations meeting rooms but large enough to accommodate delegates from all 117 member nations.

He did not stride to the rostrum, because in the major committees delegates remain seated, speaking into microphones on their desks.

There was a normal attendance of committee members, but in the spacious press section, with about 150 seats, only two places were occupied, one by a reporter and one by a member of the United States mission.

It was not a commentary on Mr. Roosevelt or his message but on the relative interest aroused by his speech and one by the Cuban Foreign Minister, Raul Roa, in the General Assembly at the same time attacking "Yankee imperialism."

The tall former Congressman reminded some observers of his father by his smile and by his voice. Others remarked that he hunched forward over his microphone as he spoke, just as his mother used to do in the debates of the Commission on Human Rights.

PARENTS' INTEREST RECALLED

Mr. Roosevelt, who gave up his seat as a Democratic Representative from California to accept the United Nations post, reminded the committee today of his parents' deep interest in the world organization.

He said it had been "the dream of many men in many countries," and added: "If any man anywhere believed in that dream, it was my father. It was the vision, as I have much reason to recall, which stirred the last days of his life."

He said that his mother had devoted the rest of her life, after the President's death, to furthering those hopes for a better world order.

Mr. Roosevelt reviewed the topics the committee is dealing with before they go to the General Assembly.

He explained his Government's disappointment that the United Nations—halfway through its "development decade"—had not made as much progress as might have been hoped for.

"We in the United States are convinced that the effectiveness of the United Nations as an instrument of social and economic development can be greatly improved," he said.

He called for intensive efforts in increasing food production, in industrial development in new countries, in increasing the supply of potable water, in birth control, in eradication of disease and in better organization of world trade.

STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SCRANTON, SCRANTON, PA.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that, in the distant jungles of South Vietnam, American soldiers, sailors, marines, airmen, and coastguardsmen are shedding their blood in defense of freedom. They do this to aid the valiant fighters of South Vietnam. We are all aware also of the deplorable actions of a small minority who are undermining at home the bravery of our men abroad, and we are all frustrated by the sight of this stupidity at home.

At the University of Scranton, in Scranton, Pa., the students have decided to so something more than feel frustrated.

In a short time, the students of the University of Scranton are going to give blood as their testament of faith in our fight. They will donate their blood to the Red Cross bloodmobile to show their brotherhood with our fighting men abroad and with the people of Vietnam, and as a magnificent vote of confidence in our commitment to save a small nation from the oppression of communism.

A blind poet once said: "They also serve who only stand and wait." These young students are trying to do more than merely stand and wait.

It is time for the blind agitators to desist from their own follies, to step into line, and to serve with their brothers abroad.

I hope that every university in the country follows the example of the University of Scranton. We may thus show the world what these young men are showing us: that the youth of America is still brave, and is still willing to give its blood in defense of freedom.

The students and faculty of the University of Scranton deserve the highest praise from the Congress, and the thanks of all Americans.

The commendations are already beginning to arrive. A high-ranking spokesman for the State Department said:

It is gratifying to learn of the effort of the student body of the University of Scranton to make a mass blood donation as a gesture of support for the U.S. commitment in Vietnam and for the foreign policy of this administration.

Mr. Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense, has informed me that the Secretary of Defense was gratified to hear of the action taken by the students of the University of Scranton in support of their fellow Americans in Vietnam.

SOCIAL SECURITY REDUCTIONS IN PUBLIC WELFARE BENEFITS

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of my colleagues are aware of the fact that, as a result of the recent social security increase of $4 to $7 per month, approximately 20,000 low-income war veterans lost as much as $35 each month in pension benefits.

It has now been called to my attention the recipients of public welfare are having their assistance checks reduced by the amount of the social security increase. When the social security bill was being debated in the House these low-income poor families were led to believe that they would receive the increase without a reduction of other benefits.

With inflation increasing the cost of living almost every week, it seems ridiculous to penalize these unfortunate people.

I would like to include an article from the Knoxville News-Sentinel, dated October 20, 1965, on this subject:

STATE CUTS AID EQUAL TO SOCIAL SECURITY HIKE

NASHVILLE, October 20.—Some 9,000 Tennesseans who get State welfare aid, as well as social security, won't get a raise, after all. Congress raised social security checks, but the State is reducing the welfare checks in a readjustment that will leave the 9,000 at the same income as before the social security increase.

Tennessee Commissioner of Welfare Herman Yeatman today said recent adjustments in State financial assistance to several thousand social security recipients have been erroneously considered as a cut in State aid.

"There has been no reduction in funds," Yeatman said. "The people in question have the same level of income as before the adjustments."

He explained his action was necessary in complying with Tennessee laws. He said the adjustments were brought on when the recent Federal social security payment increase went into effect to offset the increased cost of living.

CONSIDERS ALL INCOME

"We are empowered by law to grant a maximum amount, $80 or less, depending upon the need of the individual," Yeatman said. "We handle each case on an individual basis. The law says we must consider all income and resources the individual has, including any wages received, help from relatives, social security payments, or anything else that may contribute to the individual's welfare."

He said that when the 7-percent social security increase went into effect September 1 it was necessary to adjust some State payments by a similar amount to keep individuals at the income level required by law.

"This is not unusual," he said. "We make adjustments all the time. It just happened that this made news because it included so many persons at one time." He estimated that about 9,000 persons were affected in Tennessee, but said they have maintained their monthly income level.

LETTERS SENT TO ALL

"They are not losing any funds," he said.

The commissioner said that letters were sent out to each individual explaining the necessary action.

Although the social security increase was retroactive to January 1, Yeatman said the State did not take this retroactive pay into consideration in making the adjustments.

"We feel that they should have this windfall," he said. "These people have a hard enough time living with what little they have."

THE 89TH CONGRESS—A REPUBLICAN VIEW: WAS RATIONAL DEBATE POSSIBLE?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, in reporting to my constituents at the close of this 1st session of the 89th Congress, I must say that after the major defeat which occurred in the last election, my primary task both as a member of the minority and as chairman of the conference of all 141 minority party members has been to battle to keep two party government alive and the Congress independent. I hope the battle has not been lost.

Certainly it is clear that the battle was and continues to be necessary. The President's majority leader of the Senate, MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, acknowledged the deep need for such a battle when he confessed the serious deficiencies contained in the laws passed by the Congress during this first session. He called on the second session to "spend less time on new legislation and more time correcting oversights in legislation we have just passed."

Speaking to a Democratic caucus of his Senate colleagues recently, Senator MANSFIELD said that the Congress "must tighten up the hasty enactments" and that it must eliminate from these recently enacted laws "a number of gaps and any number of rough edges, overextensions, and overlaps."

This is a startling admission from the lips of the President's majority leader in the U.S. Senate. But the implications to be drawn from this statement and, more importantly, from the record that gave rise to this remarkable confession go much deeper that the spectacle of a Congress that has acted too hastily and too much as a satellite of the President.

In essence, Mr. Speaker, this is just one more symptom of an affliction that is becoming widespread in our society. This affliction stems in large measure but not exclusively from the overwhelming dominance of one political party both in its control of all key governmental units and in its ability through the sheer power it controls to dominate all facets of the communications media.

This has led, wittingly or unwittingly, to a situation in this country where much more than the Republican Party is the loser—the real loser is the fundamental underpinnings of representative government—in short, the process of rational debate on public issues. I intend to demonstrate that this is fast becoming the rule rather than the exception through example after example of what went on during the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

But, before that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to develop exactly what I mean in a little more detailed examination.

Under our representative government, it has been traditionally the practice that the people adhere to the laws that they, in effect, have given themselves. The process through which the people evolve their own laws is a twofold process: they elect Representatives to Congress to represent their interests and to evolve in a formal sense the laws that will govern the people, but the people themselves also participate directly and indirectly in this evolution through communications with their Representatives, through public statements, letterwriting campaigns, and a host of other activities.

The elements contained in this twofold process can, in the final analysis, all be lumped together under the heading of "public discussion."

This process is faltering in America.

Meaningful discussion and public debate are losing ground to superficial but effective appeals to emotion and passion. Yes, we use more words than ever in what appears to be public discussion. But, in many instances, the profusion of words tends to hide rather than reveal the truth. The unfortunate tendency, fanned by a too powerful Central Government, is to label particular positions "good" or "evil" even before public debate on their merits has begun.

A good example of this is the recently enacted medicare legislation. There was little tolerance displayed for discussing the prudence of the particular solution proposed. Anyone who attempted to debate the specific aspects of the solution were automatically classed as calloused, reactionary, and, in general, against old people.

Nothing could be further from the truth as evidenced by the fact that a substantial portion of the legislation that was finally enacted was in fact the Republican alternative advanced and developed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Yet the general impression conveyed to the great majority of citizens was that Republicans in seeking to debate the provisions of medicare were in fact opposed to the enactment of any form of aid to our elder citizens for medical and hospital costs. This, of course, was not the case. Republicans sought to provide a solution that would not penalize young people and low income people through an oppressive payroll tax that taxed the first dollar of earnings. We recognized what Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York, later voiced as reported in the New York Times, that "we'll have to go to the general revenue for funds; we can't raise social security taxes." He pointed out:

> Social security benefits are inadequate and they should be doubled.

But he apparently recognized what Republicans have attempted to convey for a long time; that the oppressive payroll tax penalizes those who can afford it least. Social security was meant to be a retirement fund and, if confined to that, the system could handle its obligations without undue stress. Whether it can also handle other exceedingly costly benefits such as hospital care without imposing intolerable burdens on low income citizens is highly doubtful.

In an atmosphere of rational discussions, this would have been recognized and a more equitable and workable solution than financing hospital costs through a regressive payroll tax would most probably have been found.

The same kind of atmosphere prevailed in the evolution of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Unlike the other party, Republicans in their 1964 platform recognized that voting rights is the key to all other civil rights. The platform called for "such additional administrative or legislative actions as may be required to end the denial, for whatever unlawful reason, of the right to vote."

The other platform made no mention of voting rights.

Republicans in the House and the Senate introduced voting rights legislation in the last session before the administration even decided to present a bill.

The administration bill, when presented, provided a remedy for discrimination only in 6 Southern States and Alaska and in 37 counties in certain other States—including 1 county each in Arizona, Idaho, and Maine—a clear substitution of one form of discrimination for another.

Recognizing this, Republicans attempted to improve the administration legislation by providing a remedy for unconstitutional discrimination wherever it occurs and regardless of the device used to achieve discrimination.

The result? Loud charges and denunciations of Republicans as being against voting rights legislation.

Even the highest officeholder in the land contributed directly to this process when he said, on July 10, that the Republican substitute "would have seriously damaged and diluted the guarantee of the right to vote for all Americans."

No debate on its merits; just a flat denunciation.

The process I have described of labeling positions good or evil without any meaningful public debate on their merits often leads to a reluctance on the part of responsible citizens to engage in rational and meaningful debate on controversial issues.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, no one likes to place himself in the position of debating whether to adopt an evil policy.

The consequence is that the evil policy is automatically excluded from the discussion process.

And whole segments of opinion are systematically suppressed.

The respected columnist, William S. White, writing in the Washington Post deplored the atmosphere that is beginning to pervade this country. He deserves quoting:

> In short, a widely pervasive rhetoric among chic politicians and commentators is evolving a geometrically impossible figure. In their view of politics there is a right line—which, of course, is bad. There is then a central area in this absurd parallelogram—but there isn't any left line at all. In this wonderfully simplified arrangement everybody who is not a bad fellow on the bad right is simply a good fellow at the center; a "moderate," as the saying goes. Nobody remains to be on the left; because, like the right, the left is a term toward which the national mood is not kind.

White said that the Republican Party "in an institutional sense" is the principal victim of "this distortion of semantics and of definition, simply because it shelters more true conservatives and relatively more ultraconservatives than does the Democratic Party."

He goes on:

> But if the situation is unfair to the great bulk of the Republicans as men and women innocent of the slightest taint of far-right extremism—not to mention to millions of conservative Democrats—it is much more unfair to something more basic. This something which is being victimized is the inherent right of the people to a system of political discussion which at least in its definition of terms is intellectually just to all the participants, and not merely overly kind to one set of them.

A political dialog based upon oversimplified rubbish is not worthy of adult minds. Nor will it in the long run foster wise and grownup decisions on men and issues.

Mr. Speaker, the atmosphere which Mr. White describes is becoming more rather than less prevalent in this country. And it is evident not only in public policy areas dealing with domestic matters but in foreign policy considerations as well.

A particularly flagrant example occurred earlier in the year with regard to our actions in Vietnam.

In the example to which I refer, the majority leader of the U.S. Senate was quoted by the UP as having charged GOP leaders with "demanding an alternative more suitable to Genghis Khan or to the Communists than to the United States."

One would expect, Mr. Speaker, that the minority leader of the House had called on the President to launch a preemptive nuclear attack on the Soviet Union or Red China rather than to call merely for a better use of our air and sea power against more significant military targets in North Vietnam.

Because this example would serve as a useful case study of the kind of suppression of rational debate to which I refer, under unanimous consent it will be included in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. This case study will include my initial statements of June 14 and June 21, early statements by Minority Leader GERALD FORD, the intemperate remarks of Senator MANSFIELD and Senator CHURCH on the floor of the Senate, and my reply of July 16 to the Senate majority leader.

Mr. Speaker, an isolated instance of this kind could be overlooked if it were merely an isolated instance. But it is much more than that. It is merely one of the countless examples one could cite of the studied refusal of an overwhelmingly dominant party to engage in rational debate on the important issues of our time.

Subsequent events have vindicated the House minority leader's call for rendering the SAM missile sites ineffective before they became operational and before American pilots were lost.

Yet, the mere suggestion by the House minority leader that this country take certain actions—which as a matter of fact it later was compelled to take—called forth, not reasoned discussion of his proposal but abuse and denunciation.

Mr. Speaker, this is one aspect in the foreign policy area of the suppression of rational debate. There are certainly others. And, as we have seen they abound on the domestic level as well.

My remarks today in my report to my constituents was meant to deal primarily with the domestic issues that were hastily enacted by the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

It has been said that this Congress will go down in history as the outstanding example so far of a Congress that has wilfully given up its power to the Executive and that performed almost exclusively as a rubberstamp for the Executive.

In my remarks to this body on March 1, 1965, I said:

> The Congress of the United States exists to serve the citizens of the United States—not the executive branch of the U.S. Government. This body is a full partner in the process, not a poor relation.
>
> * * * * *
>
> I do not say that Congress should, or Republicans should automatically oppose every request of the Executive. I do say that Congress should, and I pledge you that every Republican will carefully weigh every, such request.
>
> We have heard the Chief Executive speak to the Congress and tell us of his plans and programs for the Nation. We know that many of his party in the Congress will support all of these as a matter of course. We know that the sheer mathematics of political reality means that most will pass.
>
> We also know, however, that there is danger that it will be only mathematics, and not political morality, that will guide many of these passages.

And so it was, Mr. Speaker. Sheer mathematics and an abrogation of its duties and responsibilities in this first session led to the passage of so many pieces of legislation without due reflection, without full hearings in committee and without sufficient debate on the floor that the President's own majority leader in the Senate was moved to call for a slowdown and a reevaluation of what had been hastily enacted.

What were some of these hastily enacted pieces of legislation that were steamrollered throughout the Congress?

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, of which Democratic Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, said during debate on the floor of the House:

> Today it seems to me we have in the House a determined effort to silence those who are in disagreement.

The bill was faulty, among other reasons, because it was reported out of committee in great haste. The Wall Street Journal noted that the committee "under prodding from an impatient White House * * * deliberated all of 20 minutes." The handling of this piece of legislation was called a mockery of the legislative process by Democratic Congressman PUCINSKI, of Illinois. At least 10 of 25 amendments were rejected on the floor without discussion due to the gag-rule limitation on debate.

The bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act was railroaded through a cowed and subservient Congress. No amendments were permitted on the floor of the House. An amendment which the Senate committee later adopted as germane—the religious conscience clause—was excluded from consideration in the House because it was said to be nongermane as were several other amendments designed to protect the rights of individual workers.

The Appalachia regional development bill was railroaded through the House without so much as a comma being changed because the word from downtown was to enact it without change.

The arts and humanities bill was forced through the Education and Labor Committee after about 15 minutes of consideration, reporting a bill the minority members had seen for the first time that day after the majority railroaded several significant amendments with no deliberation through the committee.

The Highway Beautification Act was considered by the Public Works Committee on July 20, 21, and 22. The hearings were then adjourned with the understanding that the complex proposals should be studied further and acted upon early next year. With no warnings, hearings were reopened on September 3 and 7, while the committee and its staff were absorbed with the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act. The act was debated and passed by the House on October 7 with the final vote being taken well after midnight. At one point in the proceedings the House voted 121 to 84 to allow but 8 minutes of debate on five separate amendments.

The voting rights bill was considered by the Judiciary Committee. Administration forces on that committee methodically rejected all significant amendments offered by Republicans. On the House floor the same general attitude prevailed. With the exception of the Cramer amendment to prevent election irregularities, any significant amendment offered by a Republican was blindly voted down.

Mr. Speaker, these are some examples. There are many more. Again, referring to my March 1 remarks when the handwriting on the wall could already be seen, I emphasized:

> We Republicans stand ready to work with all of our colleagues in the Congress to assure that the voice of the American people still may be heard at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue.
>
> And we warn all of our colleagues that, unless the legislative branch stands for something more than a rubber stamp, it is not Republicans who will be a minority—it will be the entire Congress, dwarfed and dragooned by a great and overbearing executive branch.

And so it is the Congress that is becoming, as one political scientist tells us, something like the House of Lords in the British system with little intrinsic importance and even less real power.

We have heard a great deal, Mr. Speaker, in this last session of Congress about the great American consensus that is being fashioned at the hands of our President. But our experience in the past 12 months should make clear to everyone that the great consensus of the great planned society really boils down to a great conformity.

And conformity precludes the exercise of rational debate which is one of the basic ingredients not only of a free society but of a representative government.

By precluding rational debate on measures which are to be enacted into law one obvious byproduct is that many inequities and defects will result because majority Members fall into the habit of taking everything the administration proposes on faith and by direction and because minority Members lack the votes to effect any changes or to force real deliberation.

It has been said that it is better to debate a problem without resolving it than to resolve a problem without debating it.

One obvious example which illustrates the results of resolving a problem without debating its ramifications fully flowed from the legislation which increased benefits for social security recipients. By not exploring all of the ramifications of its actions, the Congress inadvertently caused the termination or reduction of the pensions of tens of thousands of veterans.

The added social security payment meant a reduction of the income of these veterans. One hard-pressed constituent, for example, wrote:

> It just isn't right to increase his (her husband's) social security $73.68 a year and cut his (veterans) pension $300 a year.

No, it is not right but that is the price the little guy pays for a Congress that lets itself become a subservient arm of the executive.

And that is by no means the whole bill. That particular veteran and thousands like him are paying a lot more than the visible cut in his pension.

He is paying a national sales tax that will all but wipe out his 7-percent increase in social security benefits even if his veterans' pension is restored to full value.

That sales tax is inflation.

Inflation cuts the purchasing power of the dollar and for those, like this veteran, who are on fixed incomes, a few cents knocked out of the buying power of the few dollars he receives each month means a great deal.

And inflation is caused, among other things, by ill-advised Government policies that pump huge amounts of borrowed dollars into the economy.

Appropriations in this last session alone amounted to $119 billion. And the war in Vietnam has not been adequately financed yet.

This is $36 billion more than was appropriated by the last session of Congress under the Eisenhower administration. Add to the $119 billion, $7 billion in backdoor spending authorized by this Congress already and $5 to $7 billion still needed for the war in Vietnam which will be requested next January, and a more realistic picture of what this Congress has spent unfolds.

Where do we go from here, Mr. Speaker?

Some have said that this was a "do everything Congress."

Well, in terms of outspending every other Congress in history, it was.

In terms of injecting itself into practically every aspect of our citizen's lives, it was.

In terms of encroaching on the rights of the States and localities, it was.

In terms of a hundred other areas and actions of the Federal Government, it was.

But one major columnist has pointed out that in another sense the 89th Congress so far has been a "do-nothing Congress."

It did nothing to curb or stop the rise of serious crime in America.

It did nothing to stop the irresponsible spending of billions of dollars of taxpayer's money as the purchasing power of the dollar steadily weakened.

It did nothing to halt the reckless misuse of union power in the industrial field.

It did nothing to curtail the abuses that are going on abroad in the foreign-aid program.

It did nothing about trading with the enemy.

It did nothing about a lot of other top priority items in the domestic field and in foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, the record I have outlined of the 1st session of the 89th Congress which only treats selected highlights demonstrates, in my view, clearly and unequivocally the ill effects of a representative system of government that is heavily out of balance.

The traditional checks and balances of our system of government—the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government—were designed to serve as the brake system which would prevent the unchecked use or abuse of power under our system of government.

But as the historical record indicates, the brake system can only work when it is vitalized with the brake fluid of two strong and independent political parties.

When a heavy imbalance exists as is the case today, the whole system begins to break down.

All Americans, Democrats, Republicans, and independents have a vital stake in a restoration of a strong two-party system in this country.

Mr. Speaker, even with no chance of countering the mathematical superiority that faced us in this first session, Republicans were not idle.

Alternative proposals were offered to major bills proposed by the administration and although systematically rejected in most instances, a cohesive effort was made by Republicans to institute a public dialog and present their case in meaningful and rational terms.

The distinguished minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) has made an outstanding contribution in outlining much of the Republican record in his observations on the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

Republicans offered sound proposals, had some impact on legislation and executive actions, presented a cohesive front, reorganized the Republican conference, issued timely position papers and always attempted to be constructive in their alternatives. Their own initiated proposals and their critcism.

REPUBLICAN ALTERNATIVES

For six of the major bills proposed by the administration and passed in this session, there were alternative proposals supported by a majority of the House Republicans. In every case the Republican alternative dealt more adequately with the problem without unnecessary extension of Federal power.

VOTING RIGHTS

The administration's bill on voting rights (H.R. 6400), as originally introduced, provided as we have seen, a remedy for discrimination only in six southern States and Alaska, and in 37 counties in certain other States, including one county each in Arizona, Idaho, and Maine. These strange results were achieved by language which limited the application of the bill to places which used literacy tests or tests of moral character for voters and in which fewer than 50 percent of the voting-age population voted in the 1964 election.

Republican House Members and Republican Senators introduced voting rights legislation before the administration got around to deciding to present a bill.

The basic difference between the administration proposal and the major Republican alternative, the Ford-McCulloch bill (H.R. 7896), lay in the fact that the Republican bill provided a remedy for unconstitutional discrimination wherever it occurs and regardless of the device used to achieve discrimination.

The administration bill wiped out literacy and other tests wherever fewer than 50 percent of the voting-age population voted in 1964. The Ford-McCulloch bill did not disturb nondiscriminatory qualifications for voting established by States.

The administration bill required Federal court approval of any new voting laws passed by the States to which it applied. The Ford-McCulloch bill did not restrict State authority to enact new nondiscriminatory voting laws.

The administration bill, as originally introduced, approved of the poll tax, providing that Federal examiners would collect it in areas in which they operated to register voters. The Ford-McCulloch bill directed the Attorney General to initiate a speedy court test of the constitutionality of the poll tax.

MEDICARE

The medicare bill, included in the Social Security Amendments of 1965, is an amalgamation of the administration proposal and a Republican alternative offered by Representative JOHN BYRNES, of Wisconsin (H.R. 7057).

In contrast to the bill originally proposed by the administration early in the session, the Byrnes bill provided a system of insurance for the elderly.

First. Covering all medical expenses, not just hospitalization.

Second. Offering voluntary rather than compulsory coverage.

Third. Financed by a combination of general tax revenues and premium payments by the insured, avoiding the regressive social security tax.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL AID

The administration's bill to aid elementary and secondary schools (H.R. 2362), presented as a measure to assist poverty stricken children, is in fact the first general aid to primary and secondary schools passed by the Congress. Under this bill, $2.1 million will be granted by the Federal Government to Westchester County, the wealthiest in New York State, for the education of children from poor families. Sunflower County, Miss., with median family income only one-fifth that of Westchester County, will receive only $745,000 for the education of children from poor families.

Republicans sought to make it a bill which would do what it professed to do: aid poor children without undue Federal control of State, local, and private schools.

The Republican effort was directed toward, first, channeling Federal funds only into areas of need within each State; second, recognizing differences in financial ability and need among States; third, concentrating the program upon the needs of deprived children; and fourth, reducing the discretionary authority of the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

A Republican approach to the problem of expanding and improving elementary and secondary schools was incorporated in H.R. 6349, offered by Representatives WILLIAM AYRES, of Ohio, and THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri, and others. This bill relied chiefly on the device of tax credits for individuals who pay for schools through State and local taxes directly or indirectly as well as for those who incur expenses for students in higher education. This bill would have diverted $3 to $5 billion annually from the Federal Treasury and made it available for additional support for education at the State and local level.

In addition, H.R. 6349 provided $300 million annually to the States for the education of deprived children aged 3 to 7. Unlike Project Head Start under the poverty program, which provides uneven summer schooling for some deprived children, this bill proposed a systematic national effort to give preschool education to children who need it.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

The administration bill (S. 3), which became law, provided for an Appalachian Regional Commission with authority in 360 counties in 10 States to plan the expenditure of funds for various public works, particularly highway construction, in a region that includes many severely depressed areas.

The Republican alternative, offered by Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, of Florida (H.R. 4466), would have extended Federal assistance to all economically depressed areas throughout the Nation instead of to a single region. Unlike the administration bill, which provides aid to prosperous as well as depressed areas in the region to which it applies, the Cramer bill proposed to limit aid to places suffering economic distress and high unemployment.

The Public Works and Development Act of 1965—Public Law 89-136—is, like the Cramer bill, a measure intended to assist depressed areas throughout the Nation. It raises serious problems of duplication and conflict with the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

CABINET DEPARTMENT DEALING WITH URBAN AFFAIRS

The administration bill establishing a new Cabinet agency, the Department of Housing and Community Affairs (H.R. 6927), was defective in many respects. It did no more than confer a more prestigious title on certain existing agencies. It brought together in the new department less than one-third of the Federal Government's housing activities and only a minor fraction of Federal activities and funds aimed at assisting States and municipalities to solve the problems of metropolitan areas. As passed by the House of Representatives, it made no provision for the continued existence of the Federal Housing Administration, a defect which Republicans sought to correct and which was finally remedied in conference.

The Republican alternative, offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] (H.R. 5173), and several other Republicans, would have created an agency in the Executive Office of the President to deal with metropolitan area problems. This agency would have been a center of coordination and information for all Federal programs and activities relating to urban areas.

HOUSING

The administration's housing bill (H.R. 5840), as originally presented, offered a scheme of rent supplements for families whose incomes were above the levels set for public housing tenants. Under this plan, some families with an income of more than $11,000 in some places would be eligible to have a part of their rent paid by the Federal Government. Beyond this, the bill provided largely for a continuance of existing Federal housing programs.

A Republican substitute, offered by Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey (H.R. 9501), sought to modify existing housing policy in several important respects:

First. By giving residential redevelopment in urban renewal a higher priority.

Second. By stimulating rehabilitation of existing sound housing.

Third. By utilizing existing privately owned rental housing for low-income tenants.

Fourth. By lower interest rates on loans for college housing and housing for the elderly.

Fifth. By providing new FHA mortgage financing for veterans.

Many of the features of the Widnall bill were incorporated in the measure which was enacted.

REPUBLICAN IMPACT ON LEGISLATION

In spite of the fact that Republicans in this Congress hold only one-third of the seats, there were occasions when the Republican minority exerted an important influence on legislation.

A 7-percent increase in social security benefits was approved—a proposal which Republicans made in 1964, but which was voted down in the last Congress by Democrats acting on White House orders.

The repeal of Federal excise taxes—a step which Republicans have advocated for many years and which was called for in the Republican platform of 1964—was accomplished this session. In 1964, a Republican proposal to repeal retail excise taxes was defeated by Democratic votes.

Other changes made in the social security system were influenced by Republican initiatives and conform to longstanding Republican policy. One was the liberalization of the earnings limitation beyond which elderly pople become ineligible to collect their social security benefits. The other was the liberalization of coverage requirements for people over the age of 72 in order to qualify for benefits.

Similarly, Republicans took the lead in advocating changes in tax policy to lighten the burden of medical expenses. The Congress repealed maximum limitations on income tax deductions for medical care insurance and authorized a deduction of one-half the cost of medical care insurance up to $150.

The medicare bill passed by the Congress incorporates in its provisions much of the Republican bill offered by Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin. This bill is not limited to hospital care as the administration recommended. In its final version it covers doctors' bills and other medical costs in provisions borrowed from the Byrnes bill.

The Housing Act passed by Congress contains six significant features from the Republican substitute proposed by Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey:

First. Low-income private housing: This new program will provide immediate relief to low-income families who have been living in substandard housing in those areas where there is a long waiting list for public housing. It will use any adequate existing housing on a voluntary basis at a cost not exceeding present public housing rental levels, without the gigantic expense of constructing new public housing units.

Second. Veterans housing program: The first major veterans' benefits legislation affecting so-called cold war veterans ever to be enacted by the Congress, this will also apply to an estimated 21 million veterans who have failed to use or qualify for VA home loan benefits. Comprehensive benefits include no down payments for homes costing up to $15,000, with as little as $500 down on a $20,000 home.

Third. Low-interest-rate college housing: Conferees accepted this proposal, despite the firm opposition of the Johnson administration. It will provide $1.2 billion in lower rent college housing, avoiding an expensive Federal grant program.

Fourth. Low-interest elderly housing: To prevent the phasing out of a highly successful program administered by churches and other nonprofit organizations, a program with rents at a level they can afford will be available to elderly people of low income.

Fifth. Compensation for condemnees: This provides, for the first time, prompt and equitable compensation for homeowners and small businessmen displaced by urban renewal and other housing programs.

Sixth. Rehabilitation loan program: Sponsored by Republicans in the 1964 Housing Act, the low-interest loan program for tenants, homeowners, and small businessmen in urban renewal areas received a $400 million authorization. This was not requested by the administration.

A notable improvement in the housing bill was made with the adoption of an amendment offered by Representative JOHN C. KUNKEL, of Pennsylvania, aiding homeowners who became unemployed because of the closing of Federal installations. It placed a moratorium on FHA-insured loan payments of such persons and authorized the Secretary of Defense to acquire their properties for FHA disposal when the owners were unable to dispose of them on reasonable terms.

The Voting Rights Act as passed contains at least two provisions of Republican origin. One was the clean elections provision proposed by Representative WILLIAM CRAMER, of Florida, inserted in the bill over the opposition of a majority of the Democrats in the House of Representatives. The bill as finally passed dealt with the question of the poll tax by directing the Attorney General to secure a speedy court test of the constitutionality of the tax—the approach used in the Ford-McCulloch bill.

The immigration bill contains a ceiling on immigrants from the Western Hemisphere because of Republican effort. Because of opposition from the White House and the State Department, an amendment to bring such immigration under control, presented by Representative CLARK MACGREGOR, of Minnesota, was voted down by Democrats in the House. This provision prevailed in the Senate, however, and was incorporated in the final version of the law.

Republican initiative and solid Republican support saved for State Governors some power of veto over projects under the poverty program within their States in opposition to the effort of most Democrats to eliminate any vestige of State control over this program.

Republican initiative and solid Republican support led to the denial of funds for the rent supplement program under the Housing Act until guidelines in keeping with the intent of Congress are drafted by the Housing Administrator.

Republican initiative and solid Republican support led to the denial of funds for a federally directed National Teacher Corps because no hearings had been held in the House on this proposal.

On the other hand, an initial Republican success—the prohibition of the use of agricultural funds for aid to Nasser voted by the House at the motion of Representative ROBERT MICHEL, of Illinois, on January 26—was reversed under severe administration pressure on February 8.

REPUBLICAN INFLUENCE ON EXECUTION ACTION

In some instances the policy of the President and other executive agencies responded to Republican proposals.

On April 30, the House Republican leadership proposed the creation of an inter-American police force to restore peace and order in the Dominican Republic. On May 3, the administration offered this proposal to the Organization of American States.

The appropriation of an additional $700 million for defense as a means of emphasizing national unity and national resolve in the face of Communist aggression on two continents was suggested by Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD at a White House Conference on Vietnam problems. The administration subsequently requested the increased appropriation. It was granted with the unanimous support of Republican Members of both House and Senate.

Since mid-1963, Republicans in Congress have been urging the administration to take the lead in convening an international monetary conference to deal with the urgent balance-of-payments problem. In 1965, the urging was renewed by Representative ROBERT ELLSWORTH, of Kansas, and by the joint Republican leadership on July 1. On July 10, Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler announced that the U.S. Government would issue a call for such a conference.

Representative GLENARD LIPSCOMB, of California, WILLIAM MINSHALL, of Ohio; and I as members of the Defense Appropriations Committee brought to public attention the inadequacy of the administration's defense budget for the prosecution of the war in Vietnam. In order to give the appearance of holding Federal expenditure below the level of $100 billion in the fiscal year and to leave room for Great Society legislation, the administration devised its defense budget on guidelines set in 1963, which did not take account of the involvement of 150,000 and more American troops in a shooting war in Asia. The result, as the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee under Senator STENNIS has found, is a dangerous drain on personnel, equipment, and ammunition in other parts of the world.

REPUBLICAN SOLIDITY

Republican ranks in the House of Representatives held fast on important votes throughout the session. On the 26 rollcall votes in which a party position was formulated by the House Republican Policy Committee headed by Representative JOHN RHODES of Arizona, 87 percent of the votes cast by Republican Members were in support of the party position and only 13 percent in opposition.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PARTIES

During this past session of the Congress, there were 93 rollcall votes on which a majority of the Republican Members of the House voted in opposition to a majority of the Democrats. On these votes in the aggregate, 81.4 percent of the Republican votes were on the side of the majority of their party and 80.2 percent of the Democratic votes were in agreement with the majority of their party.

These 93 votes reveal some significant differences between Republicans and Democrats.

The general conclusions to be drawn from these votes is a Republican preference for a more discriminating approach to national problems. Republicans opposed and sought to modify the loosely drawn, ambiguous, blank check approach of the Democratic majority.

Republicans showed themselves more concerned than most Democrats about such things as prudent use of tax dollars, the danger of inflation fired by big increases in Government spending and unending deficits, the stifling of State, local, and private initiative by the spread of an overweening Central Government, the peril of runaway bureaucracy, and the application of the commonsense principles of good management in Federal programs.

For all of these reasons, a majority of Republicans in the House of Representatives, in contrast to a majority of the Democrats, voted against such things as—

Doubling the authorization for the poverty program at a time when loose administration prompted the Committee on Education and Labor to launch a full investigation of the program.

A rent supplement program whereby taxpayers would help to pay the rent of families earning in some areas more than $8,000 a year and possessing assets of as much as $25,000.

A foreign aid program of $3.2 billion which all agree needs dractic overhauling.

A farm bill which will mean that Government payments in 1966 will equal one-third of realized net farm income but will not solve the farm problem.

A Public Works and Redevelopment Act modeled after the discredited Area Redevelopment Act and the Advanced Public Works Act.

A Highway Beautification Act rushed through the House without adequate deliberation.

Republican Members even voted against a pay raise for themselves, again unlike a majority of the Democrats.

In order to provide a more consistent and vigorous foreign policy, Republicans unsuccessfully attempted to place restrictions of foreign aid funds so that the American taxpayer would not be financing anti-American regimes or assisting nations that are helping North Vietnam in the war in which 150,000 American fighting men are now engaged. For these reasons most Republicans supported a prohibition against American aid to nations engaged in supplying North Vietnam and against further shipment of agricultural commodities to Egypt's Nasser and Indonesia's Sukarno.

In order to preserve the integrity of State and local governments, most Republicans sought to—

Retain the veto power of State governors over poverty program projects.

Maintain the power of the States to forbid compulsory unionism.

Permit the people of each State to decide the basis of representation in one house of their State legislature.

Defeat appropriations for a federally controlled National Teachers Corp.

Secure legislative recognition of the rights of States to set standards of water purity in rivers instead of transferring this authority to the Federal Government,

Maintain State authority to determine the use to be made of areas adjoining highways.

Maintain the right of States to deny the suffrage to people unable to read or write the English language.

PLANNING AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Early in the session the Planning and Research Committee was established as an organ of the Republican Conference of the House of Representatives. This new agency was created to help mobilize activity toward the development of long-term solutions to national problems.

The Planning and Research Committee issued in August a report entitled, "Vietnam: Some Neglected Aspects of the Historical Record." Columnist Roscoe Drummond said of this report:

> This is loyal opposition at its best.

Headed by Representative CHARLES E. GOODELL, of New York, this committee supervises the activities of 13 task forces, each of which has spent this year in the study of major public policy problems in its field of jurisdiction.

Several of the task forces have made reports containing constructive proposals in 1965. All will make a substantial contribution to the positive Republican program in 1966.

The task forces and their chairmen are:

Agriculture, ODIN LANGEN, of Minnesota.

Congressional reform and minority staffing, JAMES CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire.

Economic opportunity, PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey.

Education, ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota.

Federal civil service, ANCHER NELSEN, of Minnesota.

Latin America, cochairman F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts, cochairman DONALD RUMSFELD, of Illinois.

NATO and Atlantic Community, PAUL FINDLEY, of Illinois.

Nuclear affairs, CRAIG HOSMER, of California.

Platform implementation, JAMES BATTIN, of Montana.

Unemployment compensation system, JOHN W. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

United Nations, JOHN B. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Urban and suburban affairs, CLARK MACGREGOR, of Minnesota.

Voting rights, WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio.

REPUBLICAN SUPPORT OF ADMINISTRATION BILLS

Several enactments of the past session received strong Republican support. Republican House Members judged each bill on its merits and gave approval to administration measures that served the public interest.

Among the bills that were given strong Republican support on final passage were the following: The higher education bill; vocational training loan bill; the immigration bill; the Export Control Act; constitutional amendment on Presidential succession; the Older Americans Act of 1965; various bills in the field of health; excise tax cuts; manpower development and training bill; expansion of veterans' benefits; various anticrime bills; pay raises for military and civilian personnel; legislation for the control of air and water pollution and water resources planning; and the voting rights bill.

A SAMPLING OF REPUBLICAN LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

Republican Members of the House of Representatives introduced bills which comprise a comprehensive, broad-gaged, and constructive legislative program.

At least 256 bills expanding and liberalizing social security were offered by Republicans. These bills dealt with such matters as reduction of the age requirements for beneficiaries, increasing the maximum age for eligibility of children, expansion of the system to groups not presently covered, and increasing the amount of earnings permissible without sacrifice of benefits.

At least 61 Republican bills were introduced for the reduction or repeal of excise taxes.

At least 59 Republicans introduced voting rights legislation, generally patterned after the Ford-McCulloch bill.

At least 54 Republicans introduced bills providing for a new program of medical care for the aged. The three major approaches were typified in the proposals of Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS (H.R. 3728); Representative FRANK T. BOW (H.R. 21), and Representative JOHN W. BYRNES (H.R. 7057).

At least 46 Republicans proposed a constitutional amendment to permit the people to employ factors in addition to population in the apportionment of one house of State legislatures.

At least 27 Republicans introduced bills to establish a coordinating office concerned with urban area affairs in the Executive Office of the President.

At least 28 Republicans introduced bills establishing a Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government to do the job which two Hoover Commissions did in the past.

Nine Republicans introduced a freedom of information bill defining the authority of Federal agencies and officials to withhold information in order to make available a maximum of information to citizens and taxpayers.

The House Republican Conference adopted the recommendation of its task force on education, headed by Representative ALBERT QUIE, of Minnesota, for legislation granting a tax credit against the costs of higher education. A large number of Members have sponsored bills like Mr. QUIE's which permits a credit up to an amount of $325 per student annually.

At least 78 Republicans have now introduced the Human Investment Act, a bill granting credits against the Federal income tax to business for the expenses of retraining present or prospective employees to upgrade their skills.

At least 60 Republicans have introduced legislation of the type recommended by the House Republican task force on agriculture, headed by Representative ODIN LANGEN, of Minnesota, to establish a World Food Study Commission to determine population trends and food needs for the future.

This list could be extended indefinitely. It is meant to be illustrative, not exhaustive.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that in the face of overwhelming odds Republicans gave a good accounting of themselves in the session just ended. But it is also clear that the future of the two-party system in this country and the restoration of meaningful public dialog in the hammering out of programs and solutions hinges most directly on the early return in this country to two strong and independent political parties.

The material referred to above follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE LAIRD, JUNE 14, 1965

We may be dangerously close to ending Republican support of our present Vietnam policy. This possibility exists because the American people do not know how far the administration is prepared to go with large-scale use of ground forces in order to save face in Vietnam.

The American people deserve an answer to this question. The Republican Party should base its future support on the nature of that answer.

In the absence of this answer, we can only conclude that present policy is aimed not at victory over the Communist insurgency nor at driving Communists out of South Vietnam but rather at some sort of negotiated settlement which would include Communist elements in a coalition government.

If such is the objective of the Johnson administration, then the charge can be leveled that this administration is overcommitting ground forces in this area of the world and needlessly exposing the lives of thousands of American boys.

In several public utterances, administration spokesmen have implied that the ground force buildup in Vietnam is Eisenhower or Republican policy. Such an implication is just the opposite of the truth.

The Eisenhower-Dulles policy scrupulously avoided a large-scale use of conventional ground forces in southeast Asia. As a matter of fact, at the time President Eisenhower left office, there were only 773 members of the U.S. military mission in Vietnam, and the situation at that time was much less critical than it is now, although we have more than 50,000 American troops there today. Indications are that the American troop buildup in Vietnam could go as high as 100,000 American boys.

Well over 2 years ago, interested free world Asian countries offered to assist U.S. efforts in that area of the world. This aid included the offer of ground troops and other assistance from such countries as South Korea, Formosa, and Thailand. This aid was rejected by the United States at that time.

Today, thousands of American boys are fighting a war and many are losing their lives because the U.S. Government has failed on occasion after occasion to make the right decision at the right time.

If our objective is a negotiated settlement, it is time to use other means than the needless sacrifice of American lives to attain that objective. Once American troops are committed in any situation, a top priority objective must be to take those steps necessary to protect American lives and minimize the number of casualties.

One such step, already long overdue, is to retarget our bombing raids on more significant targets in North Vietnam. A major transportation and supply area is the port city of Haiphong. To continue to allow the unhindered flow of war materials in and out of that area only insures greater American casualties in future Vietcong offensive actions.

Republicans will continue to support President Johnson when his actions in the Vietnamese situation serve American and free world interests and when they do not needlessly waste or endanger American lives.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD STATEMENT BY MR. LAIRD, JUNE 21, 1965

As can be seen from a reading of the (June 14) statement, my principal objective was to question sincerely and seriously the large-scale commitment of American lives to bring about a political settlement of the war.

Many have interpreted my remarks as a call for a total military victory in Vietnam. In point of fact, my statement did not address itself to the wisdom or folly of the President's stated objectives in Vietnam. It merely stated what seems to be an obvious conclusion that the President's policy is to obtain some sort of a negotiated settlement and it questioned the means the President appears to be taking to bring about negotiations.

To place this in perspective, let me make clear that it is my conviction that prior to the President's Baltimore speech of April 7, 1965, there were three options available to the United States in Vietnam: First, a military victory; second, a negotiated settlement; and third, withdrawal.

Since the President's very clear implications in his Baltimore speech in which he called for unconditional discussions, the options available to the United States have been reduced to two: a negotiated settlement or withdrawal.

This reduction to two options with its consequent ruling out of the option of a military victory is clearly deductible from the stated position of the President of the United States. My statement of June 14 did not address itself to the merits of the President's decision to rule out military victory as one of the options available to the United States. Rather, it concerned itself solely with the wisdom of the means the President is using to bring about his own stated objective of negotiations.

My statement of June 14 merely sought to question the wisdom of the large-scale use of American troops to bring about a political end when other means are clearly available.

It is my firm conviction that since we are bearing the brunt of world criticism anyway because of the President's decision to go north with air strikes, logic would seem to dictate that we make more effective use of these air strikes than we have to date in order to bring about the political objectives of the administration. I find it extremely difficult—as I am sure the American people do—to justify sacrificing American lives to attain political objectives when other means are available.

As suggested in my statement, it would seem far more logical to hit more significant military targets in our attempts to convince the Communists that it would be in their best interests to sit down with us at the conference table.

Mr. Speaker, on the morning of June 17, I participated in an interview on NBC's "Today" show, with Sander Vanocur, in which my views on the Vietnamese situation were again discussed.

Under unanimous consent, I place the interview on the "Today" show in the RECORD at this point.

The interview referred to follows:

"CONGRESSMAN MELVIN LAIRD IS INTERVIEWED

"Mr. HUGH DOWNS. In Washington, Congressman MELVIN LAIRD, chairman of the Republican conference in the House, said that he doubts the wisdom of giving full Republican support with no questions asked, to President Johnson's Vietnam policy. LAIRD suggests the Republicans should come up with their own policy for Vietnam, rather than following the administration down the line.

"Congressman LAIRD is in our Washington studios this morning with 'Today' program's Washington correspondent, Sander Vanocur. Gentlemen:

"(Congressman MELVIN LAIRD and Sander Vanocur are seen on TV screen, seated in studio.)

"Mr. VANOCUR. Good morning, Hugh. Congressman LAIRD, why have you come to this position now where you suggest that the Republicans who have supported the President on Vietnam are now, as you put it, perilously close to giving up that support?

"Congressman LAIRD. Well, Sander, I'd just like to say that we in the Republican Party in the House of Representatives, I think, have gone the extra step to support the President of the United States as far as the southeast Asia war is concerned. GERRY FORD, LES ARENDS, myself, and the other leaders of the House of Representatives on the minority side, have always gone the extra step to support the President of the United States, and we still support the firm action of the President in Vietnam. There are serious questions, however, as to whether we are fighting the proper kind of war, and there are questions about the future, and I believe that we in the minority party have a responsibility and duty to address to the President of the United States, and discuss from one end of this country to the other.

"The President chose, back late last year, to escalate the war as he has done to the use of bombing raids to the north, using air power. Now, the President is choosing to escalate the war on the ground in Vietnam. Personally, I think that this is the poorest choice of escalation that the President could possibly make, because we are choosing the very area where the Red Chinese, whom we are confronted with, and we have a confrontation with them in southeast Asia at the present time, are the strongest. And to imply that this is the policy of the former Republican administration, as a high administration spokesman did this past week, to accelerate and to escalate the ground war in Vietnam, is not the case, just because the Eisenhower-Dulles policy was just the opposite, that we should not tie down large-scale ground forces in southeast Asia.

"Mr. VANOCUR. Well, Congressman LAIRD, your statement of Monday seemed to suggest that the administration was remiss in not seeking total victory. Do you believe there is such a thing as total victory in that kind of a war?

"Mr. LAIRD. Well, first I'd like to say that there were three alternatives available to the United States prior to the Baltimore speech of the President. One of them was military victory, the win policy that Secretary McNamara outlined to the Defense Appropriations Committee on which I serve, in March. And this was the objective and the policy of the United States in March in the testimony of the Secretary of Defense.

"Mr. Vanocur. May I interrupt you just a second?

"Mr. Laird. Yes.

"Mr. Vanocur. Did he say in that testimony that the United States could win the war?

"Mr. Laird. Yes, and that was the objective of the United States in southeast Asia and Vietnam. The second alternative, of course, was a negotiated settlement, and the third alternative was to withdraw. But after the Baltimore speech of President Johnson, in which he said our objective was to negotiate a settlement, he gave that implied implication to the world that that was our objective as far as Vietnam was concerned, then there were only two alternatives left to us: a negotiated settlement or withdrawal. You cannot talk about military victory in Vietnam when you already have established your policy objective as a negotiated settlement, and this is the objective now of the administration, if they have an objective. It seems to me that they have not been fair with the American people, or fair with even those of us in Congress, by not clearly setting forth their short-term aims, and long-term objectives as far as Vietnam is concerned.

"Mr. Vanocur. What would be the aims of a Republican administration; what would be your aims in Vietnam?

"Mr. Laird. Well, I personally think that we cannot go back on the established policy set forth by the President of the United States as far as his Baltimore speech is concerned. So we cannot repudiate this position that has been taken by the leader of our country, and I do not want to be in a position at any time where I will cause the Red Chinese or the Soviet Union to miscalculate the intentions of the United States of America to defend freedom throughout the world. Now, our objective as stated by the President in his Baltimore speech now is for a negotiated settlement. It seems to me that the North Vienamese are not interested in negotiations today, because they feel that they are winning the war. Now if we choose, as the President has chosen, to escalate the war along the ground, I believe we are choosing the area in which the North Vietnamese and the Red Chinese are the strongest, and I do not feel that that is the best way to bring about this objective that has been set forth by the President. Since the President decided to escalate the war in the air back late last year, we have not hit any significant military targets in North Vietnam. We have gotten the criticism throughout the world for our bombing raids that we knew we would get, and we expect this from certain quarters, but we have not hit any significant military targets. We have allowed the Soviet Union to bring military personnel into North Vietnam to establish SAM sites; we have the Haipong port in which large scale military shipments are coming in at this very time, and we have not done anything about stopping these particular shipments, either by a sea blockade of this particular port, or by using any of the raids to knock out this very great movement of military supplies and equipment.

"Mr. Vanocur. But let's be candid. Doesn't this put you in a very enviable position for 1966, that if the war escalates on the ground, you can say, 'We in the Republican Party were against escalating the war, we didn't want American boys killed, and yet we were firmer than President Johnson about opposing the North Vietnamese?'

"Mr. Laird. Well, first I'd like to say that when I talk about these matters, I'm speaking as a member, a minority member, of the Defense Appropriations Committee. I do not know what the policy of my party will be in 1966's political campaign as far as this is concerned. But I'm sure that Republicans will be responsible in this area; they will put their country first and their party second, regardless of how that affects the political election. But I believe that discussion and dissent is important today in this area of foreign policy, particularly as we go forward and set future policies as far as it affects southeast Asia.

"Mr. Vanocur. Now, what does this do to your position vis-a-vis the Senate Republican block. Now, is Senator Dirksen following the policies which you have advocated, have you discussed them with him?

"Mr. Laird. I do not believe that there is any difference between my position and that of a majority of the Republicans in the House and in the U.S. Senate. I know that I talked with my leader in the House of Representatives, Congressman Gerry Ford, who's doing an outstanding job as our new leader in the House of Representatives, and there is no disagreement between Congressman Ford and myself. As a matter of fact, we work together in this particular area, and I have been in constant touch with Congressman Ford. Today we're filing the Defense appropriation report on the appropriation bill for 1966. We do not feel that the administration has faced up to its responsibilities even in this area. They have cut back on the amount of Defense requests, money requested for fiscal year 1966, so they could fund some other programs and come in with a budget under 100 billion. I know, as a member of this committee, that they'll have to come with supplemental appropriations during this year, to fund this Vietnam situation. They've already had to come with one for $700 million in 1965. They will have to come after January for further supplemental requests. They got the public reaction of a budget under $100 billion, they knew that Congress couldn't refuse to give them the funds to carry on the Vietnam war and we will give them these funds. But I think the American people should be advised of the fact that these supplemental requests for defense expenditures are forthcoming and the $100 billion budget figure was really a phony when it was submitted in January.

"Mr. Vanocur. Congressman, at what point will the Republican Party in Congress, at what point in commitment of men to Vietnam, do you think the Republican Party will say, we can no longer support this? Will this eventuality come to pass?

"Mr. Laird. Well, this is a very difficult question, Sander, to answer, because when it comes to the point, now is the time to question the commitment of ground forces in South Vietnam. I do not believe we want to be in a position if the President goes forward and commits several hundred thousand men to Vietnam—and it looks now like we're already programing a hundred thousand men there—I do not believe we want to be in the position at any time to cause any miscalculation on the part of the Soviet Union or the Red Chinese as to the intentions of the United States of America. This is important. So, to give you a time element in this area, I think it would be a grave mistake, as far as I'm concerned.

"Mr. Vanocur. Thank you very much, Congressman Melvin Laird, of Wisconsin, a very powerful member of the House Republican group."

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that this discussion has served to clarify exactly what I was talking about in my attempts to discharge my responsibility as a member of the minority party. It is, after all, the duty of the minority party to insure that legitimate public discussion of administration policies—both foreign and domestic—take place on a continuing basis in the interests of keeping the American people fully informed about public and important issues.

Statement by Representative Gerald R. Ford, Republican Leader, House of Representatives, on Vietnam, July 1, 1965

Republicans will continue to disregard partisan considerations in foreign policy. We will be guided by the national interest.

Like Senator Arthur Vandenberg at the time of the Yalta agreement, we will criticize administration policy when it fails to serve the national interest. We will make constructive recommendations that will bolster the President's firmness. No Republican has called this McNamara's war.

Several House Republicans, including myself, recently made the following points about Vietnam.

1. The objectives of our Nation's policy must be the establishment of conditions under which the people of South Vietnam may live in peace and freedom. This means a government of their own choosing. This means freedom from aggression—from within and from without.

2. We hope for negotiations to end the fighting—to assure the freedom and independence of South Vietnam. Let me clarify one point—the Communists are escalating the war. No American is. Moreover, Peiping and Hanoi spurn the negotiating table.

3. The United States cannot, without violating its word, agree to settlement which involves a coalition government with Communists. Such government makes a larger war inevitable at a later date. History proves a coalition government with Communists gives them unlimited veto power. Veto power scuttles any hope for permanent peace.

4. The administration must not sacrifice the freedom and independence of South Vietnam. To do so makes the loss of American lives purposeless. Some Democrats would abandon the free people of South Vietnam. The President must not yield to them.

5. In this crisis, some Republican leaders believe American air and sea power must be used more effectively in North Vietnam against significant military targets. We advocate greater Allied participation. We question the logic of committing U.S. ground forces on a large scale to fight a war in southeast Asia.

Statement by Gerald R. Ford, House Republican Leader, on Communist Missile Sites in North Vietnam, July 7, 1965

A dangerous buildup of enemy missile strength in North Vietnam demands immediate, effective U.S. air attacks against these significant military targets.

The construction of the missile sites is clear evidence of Communist escalation of the conflict.

Sites designed for firing surface-to-air missiles should be knocked out by U.S. air superiority before the enemy uses the weapons against the side of freedom. The sites are a threat to the lives of American military personnel.

I reaffirm my support of President Johnson's stand-firm policy against Communist aggression. However, the State Department's report of an enemy missile buildup indicates need for more effective air action against these significant military targets as quickly as possible.

Republican Support of President in Vietnam Crisis

Mr. Mansfield. Mr. President, until recently, leaders of the Republican Party—particularly those in the Congress—have given the President exceptional support in the Vietnamese crisis. I know the President is grateful for that support, and the Nation, similarly, has reason to be.

That is why I am somewhat confused by the rash of recent Republican statements hinting that continuance of Republican support is contingent on the President following a course which conforms to a particular course of policy which they advocate.

Now, Mr. President, leaving aside the nature of the course which is advocated for a moment—whether it is a good one or a bad one—the fact remains that support of the President is hardly support when the threat is made to withdraw it in midstream unless—a question arises at once as to who is supporting whom. Who is the Commander in Chief? Have we installed G–1 in a command post on Capitol Hill?

It may be that I have misunderstood what has been said to the press and radio and TV in the last few days by various Republican spokesmen. It may be that I have interpreted a vigorous and an appropriate contribution to the debate and discussion of the Vietnamese situation as the opening wedge of a political broadside against policies which the President has pursued or is trying to pursue to bring about a peace with some rational meaning in Vietnam. I hope that my own misinterpretation is all that is involved. I know that the distinguished minority leader—and I mean this without any qualification—has no other aim than to help the President in this critical national situation. But certain of the expressions of others continue to disturb me.

I am somewhat at a loss to understand public expressions from Republicans in which it is advocated, in view of the extent of the air and naval activity already pursued against legitimate military targets, what can only amount to an indiscriminate slaughter of Vietnamese by air and naval bombardment—a slaughter of combatants and noncombatants alike, of friend and foe alike. Now can one advocate the course of the bombing of Hanoi or Peiping or even Moscow and with or without nuclear weapons for that matter—in short, a course of virtually unrestricted violence as a suitable way for the United States to achieve some worthwhile end in Vietnam? If that course is advanced as a debatable proposition, as a contribution to public discussion, it is one thing; but it is another matter to say that unless the President adopts a military course more suitable to Genghis Khan or to the Communists in this situation than to the United States, he is not going to be supported.

And one can say, too, I suppose, that we want a total victory in Vietnam, but we want it at bargain basement rates in American lives. We want it by fire bombs or nuclear bombs and lead and steel or whatever but we do not want any talk about paying a bitter price in American lives on the ground. To advocate that course, too, may be a contribution to the debate and to public understanding of what is really involved in Vietnam, if the definition of contribution is stretched far enough. But it is one thing to say to the President: "Consider this course." It is another to say, "you get us a total victory in Vietnam and you get it cheap and with only a little American pain or else."

And I suppose, finally, Mr. President, one can say that negotiations are bad; that you cannot make peace by talking with the Vietcong or the North Vietnamese or anyone else for that matter; you can only make peace by war and more war. You can give the Vietnamese people freedom, but you had better dictate to them the terms of it and the forms of government which may emerge under it. That, too, is a debatable proposition. Mr. President, and I would see no objection to anyone arguing it. But I do see objection to requiring as the price of continued support, the foreclosing of any, repeat, any, possibility which the President may seek to explore to bring about a peaceful and constructive solution to this problem as soon as possible. I had thought that our purpose was to help the Vietnamese people themselves to find their way to peace and freedom, but not to decimate, destroy, and dominate them in the name of peace and freedom.

So, Mr. President, I repeat, I hope my interpretation of some of these recent statements by Republican leaders is faulty. I hope that I have misconstrued the vigor of their participation in the discussion of Vietnam as something more ominous.

But, at the moment, I must say that I do find in these recent statements a suggestion of something more ominous. Is it not a warning to the President that he play the game their way or they will not play? And, most unfortunate, that game, as I see it, whatever its intention may be, leads in the end to anything but a peace with meaning in 20th-century Asia or, indeed, in a 20th-century world. I hope I am wrong. I hope that as good Americans, which these leaders are, they will not seek to divide this Nation at a critical time. I hope that their support will be as warm for the President in November as it was in May. I hope that all that is involved is vigorous advocacy and not partisan politics because there is no room for partisan politics in this situation. With the familiar words being heard again, it is time to point out that the margin for catastrophic error has been cut sharply since Korea and, drastically, since China.

That may be ancient history, Mr. President, but the scars of partisan politics are still with us years afterward. Let no one doubt that we have paid a massive price for the politics of foreign policy of an earlier day. We have paid for its divisiveness with lives and with billions of dollars of foreign aid—much of which has vanished without a constructive trace into the maw of Asia—and I hope we are not now beginning to pay for it, once again, in many lives. So while we are concerned, as we must be, with what we do now, day to day, in Vietnam, some historic perspective is in order, recognizing with Santayana:

"Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

I repeat to the minority leader that I know that his concern is with the welfare of the Nation and that, insofar as differences may arise on this question, they are the differences of opinion and view—entirely to be expected in a complex situation of this kind. But I know that he subscribes fully to the principle that the interests of the Nation come first and that, in the end, the course by which these interests are safeguarded is set by the President. He needs advice and counsel from Congress. But he is not likely to win the fight for an effective peace in Vietnam with one hand tied behind his back by partisan politics.

Statement of Senator Mike Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana, on Floor of Senate, July 8, 1965

Mr. President, at first glance, it seems logical to say, there are missile sites around the Hanoi-Haiphong complex; we are fighting North Vietnamese; we have planes and missiles that can reach the sites and destroy them. Go ahead and bomb. Then there will be no more missile sites. Indeed, one might add: why not go the whole hog and use nuclear bombs to make doubly sure there will be no more missile sites in the Hanoi-Haiphong area. That, too, may have a certain logic.

But on second glance, it is also to be noted that there are missile sites in China and in Russia and the Chinese and Russians are helping the North Vietnamese who are helping the Vietcong in the South where Americans are fighting on the ground. Our planes and missiles can reach those more distant targets. Why not go ahead and bomb them too, with or without nuclear weapons? That has, in some ways, a greater logic because the Russian missile sites are a far greater threat than those clustered in the Hanoi-Haiphong complex. The Russian sites are zeroed in on the United States itself, whereas those in North Vietnam, so far as I am aware, cannot even reach our forces in South Vietnam and are not, in themselves, causing any casualties among American forces in Vietnam. The Hanoi-Haiphong missile sites become a threat to our forces, in short, only if it is intended to spread the war further and change its nature by massive air attacks on the civilian populations of the Hanoi-Haiphong complex, for, then, presumably the sites would be used against our planes. They become a threat, in short, if it is intended to deepen and expand the war.

If that is what is wanted, then the proposal makes sense. But I do not believe it was offered in that sense. As I understand it, the proposal was offered as a war-shortener, as an American casualty-reducer and, in that sense, it does not make sense. On the contrary, if it were followed it is more likely, by raising the level of the conflict another notch, to bring on larger American casualties and a much broader and deeper United States involvement in Asia. It may be that it will come to that. Circumstances may eventually compel such an action. But let there be no illusion about what the proposal implies. And speaking for myself I cannot understand the urgency in some quarters—the anxiety to speed up the process of a deeper American involvement which can only induce greater American casualties in this Asian war.

But if that is what is sought, this probable consequence of the proposal ought to be recognized outright. Otherwise the proposal is misleading and hardly constructive in its oversimplification of a complex problem. If for no other reason, it tends to stimulate false hopes and unwarranted expectation in this Nation. It implies great results at not too painful a cost.

Simple logic is not often as simple as it seems at first glance in critical international situations such as Vietnam. This situation lies in the shadows of all-out world conflict. The effort is being made by the President, in the interests of this Nation as well as the world, to prevent such a conflict. And I would hope that those who mount the civilian ramparts and cry: "Charge!" would bear that in mind.

The proposal which prompted this statement was, undoubtedly, intended to be helpful to the President, for, as stated by the distinguished minority leader of the House on July 1: "Republicans will continue to disregard partisan considerations in foreign policy. We will be guided by the national interest."

Whatever its intention, however, the issue raised by this undoubtedly innocent and nonpolitical proposal is far larger than whether to bomb or not bomb certain missile sites in the Hanoi-Haiphong complex. From an armchair, it is possible to outline a military strategy in an isolated situation of this kind and then pass on to other problems while the consequences unfold in a deepening crisis. The President does not have that luxury. He must continue to live every minute with the ticking clock of an overwhelming catastrophe, and it is brought closer to midnight with each proposal of this kind, if it is followed, whether it originates here or in Peiping or Moscow or wherever. The fact is that the President cannot afford to be either armchair general or politician in a situation of this kind. He can only be President. He cannot make a decision without a continuing awareness of other decisions which may flow from it. He cannot speak "only for himself." He cannot speak even for his party alone. In each decision, he speaks for the entire

Nation. This is one reality which all of us ought to bear in mind at all times if we wish debate on this most difficult and delicate situation to be helpful.

BOMB NOW, PAY LATER?

(By Senator FRANK CHURCH, Democrat, of Idaho)

The pressure is on in Washington to further expand the war in southeast Asia. "Bomb Hanoi." "Bomb Haiphong" the air hawks cry. Plaster North Vietnam from the skies, they say, and in the same breath criticize the sending of more American ground troops into South Vietnam, where the guerrilla war is being fought. The air hawks' prescription makes little sense, but it is cleverly designed to feed an underlying public demand for a quick, cheap victory in Vietnam. The truth is that no such easy solution exists.

The war in the south will never be won by a bigger bombing of the north. As Dean Rusk has correctly pointed out, "The basic problem, the central problem, is in South Vietnam * * *. No miracle in the north can suddenly transform or eliminate the problem in South Vietnam."

Accelerating the war northward through the air, however, could greatly aggravate the problem we face on the ground in South Vietnam. Indiscriminate bombing of the population centers of North Vietnam would almost certainly force Hanoi to launch some form of massive retaliation. Since we command the air, Hanoi's counterattack would have to come on the ground. The Saigon Government is up against the ropes now, desperately hanging on against the jabbing attacks of the Vietcong irregulars. If the disciplined armies of Hoi Chi Minh were to invade the south, Saigon's survival would hinge entirely upon an immediate and unlimited American intervention on the ground. It is not unlikely that a half million American troops would then be required to occupy and hold South Vietnam, while the remainder of Indochina would soon be overrun by Communist armies.

Even in open terrain, like that in Korea, bombing alone never stopped an army on the march. What chance would our planes have against vast numbers of trained troops advancing beneath jungle cover? Obviously, bigger bombing of North Vietnam won't extricate us from the jungle fighting in the south, but it could easily lead to an immense intensification of the ground war, and a precipitous rise in American troop casualties to the tens of thousands.

If this happens, the stage will be set for our Korean war experience to be repeated. Vietnam will soon be dubbed "Mr. Johnson's war," and, as the taste of it turns sour in the mouths of the people, there may come again a Republican candidate for President who will promise, as Eisenhower did in Korea, to bring an end to the attrition by accepting the stalemate and arranging a truce. By then, as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch recently observed, "The United States could destroy the North Vietnamese economy from the air, but to what end? It would only make it easier for China to pick the Vietnamese plum."

So, when Congressmen FORD and LAIRD, the Republican leaders in the House of Representatives, call for expanded bombing of North Vietnam, even while they position themselves to wash their hands of a spreading land war in southeast Asia, I hope that President Johnson continues to ignore them. He will be better advised to listen to the wise words of GEORGE AIKEN, the Republican dean of the Senate, who recently warned: "I too have been somewhat disturbed over reported statements of certain Republican leaders in recent days and weeks which might be interpreted as urging the President to broaden and intensify the war in Asia * * *. I hope that my own party, the Republican party will not acquire the title of 'War party' * * *. I hope the President will have the courage not to be needled into precipitating a great war."

I agree with GEORGE AIKEN, a man who steadfastly refuses to seek any partisan advantage from the war in Vietnam. Those who urge an expansion of aerial attacks on the north are actually inviting an expansion of the ground fighting in the south. The only country which will benefit from a widening war in southeast Asia is Communist China, not the United States, or South Vietnam.

The struggle against the Vietcong insurrection within South Vietnam itself may be long and frustrating, but it is preferable to a major American war on the Asian mainland. The clamor of the air hawks should be ignored.

REPLY BY REPRESENTATIVE MELVIN R. LAIRD, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN

Has critical bipartisan discussion about our policies in Vietnam been abandoned? It would seem so but I would hope not.

Certainly rational debate and reasonable discussion have been abandoned—not by Republicans, but by the leader of the President's majority in the U.S. Senate.

This fact is inescapable, and the situation it creates is deplorable.

The first attempt to scuttle bipartisan debate occurred on June 30, 1965. It was ignored by Republicans in the hope that the intemperate remarks in that speech were a mere lapse, an accident, and not a deliberate attempt to silence the dialog, impose conformity, and obliterate efforts to arrive at an informed and broadly supported policy toward Vietnam.

It was not a mere lapse.

Any doubt that it was was erased on July 8, 1965 when the majority leader of the Senate again launched a vituperative attack on the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

The natural reaction to the tone and innuendo of the majority leader's two recent speeches would be to reply in kind. This would be the natural reaction—and it would be fully justified.

But it would not be constructive.

Republicans could adopt similar tactics and join personalities rather than issues. We could attempt, for example, to impugn this particular spokeman's credentials to question criticism of foreign and military policy. For the Senate Democratic leader has himself contributed to the dialog—though not always in support of the President—and has himself participated rather fully in publicly questioning some of the actions taken in southeast Asia.

I suspect that the President may have wished at times that his majority leader had kept to himself such suggestions as the neutralization of all of southeast Asia.

The Senator's more recent statements concerning Republican contributions to the debate on Vietnam are confusing.

It would seem from the Senator's remarks that the distinction between statesmanship and political chicanery goes no further than the difference in party labels of those making the remarks.

If a Republican advocates a particular course, it is politics and irresponsible politics at that. If a Democratic President subsequently adopts that course, it is instantly transformed into statesmanship.

The President's decision last February to go north must have shocked and alarmed the Senator, for on "Meet the Press" just 1 month before (January 3), the Senator said: "I feel just as strongly that we cannot carry the war into North Vietnam because if you carry the consequences of that action to its ultimate conclusion, it means war with Communist China, and a situation will be created which will be worse than it was in Korea."

It should be remembered that at that time the suggestion to go north had been made by some Republicans. It was, in short, politics then. Only later did it become statesmanship.

The natural and certainly justifiable reaction to the Senator's recent statements could proceed along these lines.

But Republicans have proceeded in a reasonable and responsible manner. They have shown a spirit of fairness in standing up for administration policy against Democratic critics of that policy. In this spirit, I want to correct the blatant distortions which the President's majority leader of the Senate has given to Republican pronouncements:

Senator MANSFIELD. "I am somewhat at a loss to understand public expressions from Republicans in which it is advocated, in view of the extent of the air and naval activity already pursued against legitimate military targets, what can only amount to an indiscriminate slaughter of Vietnamese by air and naval bombardment—a slaughter of combatants and noncombatants alike, of friend and foe alike."

The truth: No Republican has advocated the "indiscriminate slaughter of Vietnamese." Some Republicans have suggested and still suggest the more effective use of our air and naval power against more significant military targets in North Vietnam in order to bring about the President's stated objective of bringing the Communists to the conference table. Our suggestions were designed to minimize the possibility of the slaughter of American soldiers when other steps are still available.

Senator MANSFIELD. "Now one can advocate the course of the bombing of Hanoi or Peiping or even Moscow and with or without nuclear weapons for that matter—in short, a course of virtually unrestricted violence as a suitable way for the United States to achieve some worthwhile end in Vietnam."

The truth: Any resemblance between this innuendo and the public statements of any elected national official in either party is so remote as to be totally nonexistent. Such a distortion could be expected from an overzealous freshman assemblyman in the heat of a bitter political campaign, but surely not from the majority leader of the greatest deliberative body in the world in a discussion concerning a situation that contains within it the gravest consequences for the entire world.

Senator MANSFIELD. "And one can say, too, I suppose, that we want a total victory in Vietnam, but we want it at bargain basement rates in American lives. We want it by firebombs or nuclear bombs and lead and steel or whatever but we don't want any talk about paying a bitter price in American lives on the ground."

The truth: No Republican since the President's Baltimore speech of April 7, 1965 has spoken of total victory in Vietnam. None has proposed using nuclear bombs. Many Republicans have hoped for victory there, as did President Kennedy when he said on September 12, 1963, "we want the war to be won * * *" as did President Johnson when he wrote on December 31, 1963 to Gen. Duong Van Minh, "We shall maintain in Vietnam American personnel and material as needed to assist you in achieving victory * * *" as did Secretary Rusk when he said on April 29, 1963, "* * * we have no doubt of ultimate victory." By victory, Republicans and these Democrats meant—not the military conquest of Vietnam—but the establishment of conditions of peace and security in South Vietnam and an end to aggression against it. Republicans do want to attain the national objective in South Vietnam with a minimum loss of American lives. Call this "bargain basement rates in American lives," if you will.

Senator MANSFIELD. "And I suppose, finally, Mr. President, one can say that negotiations are bad; that you can't make peace by talking with the Vietcong or the North Vietnamese or anyone else for that matter; you can only make peace by war and more war."

The truth: Every Republican statement to which the Senator's remarks refer were uttered in the context of the pursuit of negotiations. The Senator did not in either statement—nor could he—directly quote any Republican leader as having called for "total victory" as having said "negotiations are bad;" as having stated or implied that "you can only make peace by war and more war." This Republican would be very interested in seeing any quote that the Senator used upon which he based his gravely serious implications and charges.

The Senator's statements which I have quoted were all contained in his first speech, that of June 30, 1965.

They were met by Republican silence.

It was sincerely hoped that by ignoring this fantastically distorted presentation of the Republican position by the President's majority leader, responsible discussion could be resumed and bipartisanship in foreign policy could be restored.

These hopes received a setback on July 8, 1965 when the majority leader spoke out again—taking up where he had left off—with the same inattention to what had actually been said, thus making efforts at reasonable discussion impossible.

It would serve no useful purpose to respond, point by point and item by item, to the charges and innuendoes contained in the second speech for they are cut from the same artificial cloth as the first statement.

I have been listening in vain since the speeches of the majority leader for some voice of moderation from someone in his party—for calm and objective discussion of proposals made by some members of the minority party.

The stakes in southeast Asia are too high for any responsible official to seek partisan advantage from the situation there. Republicans who speak out on Vietnam are pointing out the course of action which they believe will promote the security of our Nation. If they were motivated by considerations of political gain, they would offer no suggestions. They would simply criticize the consequences of administration policy.

I still hope that someone in the administration will recognize the value of debate and discussion of foreign policy problems, and that Members of Congress again accord to each other the respectful hearing and the reasoned response without which debate cannot be conducted.

DISSENTERS VISIT PEACE CORPS

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I was somewhat shocked this morning to read in the paper that "Dissenters Visit Peace Corps."

The article says:

> Switching their role from critic to confidant were two officers of the Students for a Democratic Society, Paul Booth and Carl J. Oglesby, who had vowed to continue their campaign to encourage conscientious objection to the war in Vietnam.
>
> They gave to Deputy Director Warren W. Wiggins and other top executives their views on how the Peace Corps could be made more attractive and exciting to college activists like themselves.

Then the Vice President said:

> Enlisting the "sincere idealistic youth" who participated in the anti-Vietnam protests was encouraged yesterday by Vice President HUMPHREY.
>
> HUMPHREY told the Peace Corps National Advisory Council that "it is established beyond doubt that many of the demonstrations against U.S. policy in Vietnam are organized with the assistance of Communists."

Mr. Speaker, the article in its entirety is as follows:

DISSENTERS VISIT PEACE CORPS

(By William Chapman)

Two leaders of the campus antidraft movement, who blasted the administration's Vietnam policy at a news conference here Wednesday, went directly from that session to a private meeting with Peace Corps officials to discuss how their generation might be enlisted for peaceful duty overseas.

Switching their role from critic to confidant were two officers of the Students for A Democratic Society, Paul Booth and Carl J. Oglesby, who have vowed to continue their campaign to encourage conscientious objection to the war in Vietnam.

They gave to Deputy Director Warren W. Wiggins and other top executives their views on how the Peace Corps could be made more attractive and exciting to college activists like themselves.

"There was even some talk about someone in SDS writing a critique of the Peace Corps," said an officer of the National Student Association who also was present. "We suggested that one way they could get closer to the campus activist was to identify with the student reform movements going on."

It was part of the Peace Corps, new plan to enlist the energetic student idealists who are now wrapped up in antiwar demonstrations, civil rights protests, and campus education revolts.

"We want highly motivated people—people who would like to see the world a little different than it is now," Wiggins explained yesterday. "We have found that we're not communicating too well with this sort of student."

Several such meetings have been held with student leaders and faculty members, Wiggins said, including one with a group composed mostly of conservative Republicans.

Enlisting the "sincere idealistic youth" who participated in the anti-Vietnam protests was encouraged yesterday by Vice President Humphrey.

Humphrey told the Peace Corps National Advisory Council that "it is established beyond doubt that many of the demonstrations against U.S. policy in Vietnam are organized with the assistance of Communists."

But "many of those who demonstrate are sincere idealistic youth whose idealism could well be channeled into creative work in the valleys of the Indus and the highlands of the Andes," he added.

"It will not be easy to attract many of these, for they are individualistic, proud and independent," Humphrey said. "But many, if properly approached, would respond and go on to become outstanding volunteers."

The Peace Corps advisers generally agreed. However, Harvard Sociologist David Reisman said he hoped Humphrey's idea wasn't a scheme "just to get the students off the streets and put them into the Peace Corps—which would defeat the whole program."

RIOTS FOR PEACE?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the shrill cries in organized demonstrations against U.S. policy in Vietnam have attracted widespread attention both here and abroad. From all accounts these are not entirely expressions of sincerely motivated young people dedicated to the cause of peace. There is even less question about the spontaneity of these so-called peace spectacles. They are apparently well organized to achieve a maximum of noise. Many of those in positions of leadership in this movement have questionable records as to their purposes and their loyalty to any cause in which there is a clear choice between the interests of this country and the free world as opposed to the purposes of the international Communist apparatus.

This country has a history of dissent and people with dedicated loyalties to causes differing from the position of national consensus. It is a proud history of the right in this Nation to believe as we wish. Dissent of this kind has always prospered in our colleges and our intellectual community. These same communities profess a respect for facts and information. The present demonstrations are strangely out of character since they seem to ignore the clear challenge of Communist aggression and our solemn commitment to a small and relatively defenseless ally.

We can feel considerable relief that the vast majority of American college students are refusing to join in the present ruckus taking place on a number of American campuses. It is a tribute to their good sense and their willingness to see that the course of peace is best served by the difficult and painful policy we are pursuing in Vietnam.

The following editorial appeared recently in the Pfeiffer News, the student newspaper of Pfeiffer College at Misenheimer, N.C., which I believe reflects more completely the thinking of the great mass of American students. Lest there be any misinterpretation abroad among our friends or foes as to the purposes of this Nation's young people, I would commend to them the following thoughtful comments:

RIOTS FOR PEACE?

There are many causes to which college students are loyal. Some are active in political organizations which cultivate an appreciation and respect for such things as democracy, freedom, America. Yet there are others who do not share exactly the same feelings and such students made the headlines this weekend.

"Today's crop of college cut-ups are no longer content to swallow goldfish, crowd themselves into telephone booths or small foreign cars. They—and we refer to the minority that makes the majority of the voice—now insist on dictating government policies, and are ready to parade, to demonstrate, and sit-in at the drop of a cause."

This quote comes from a recent editorial in the Navy News and it seems to shed a different light on the mass demonstrations and anti-draft projects that took place this weekend. The writer of the editorial goes on to say that "the latest gimmick among these intellectual midgets is a campaign to urge all members of the armed services to desert their posts rather than fight in Vietnam."

The students who rioted for peace this weekend promoted nothing except disgust for the American college student. Soldiers in Vietnam have a reason to be bitter—more bitter than the other members of their generation in New York who formed a flying wedge to charge police lines.

Our hope is that college students will examine carefully the facts and the situation with regard to the U.S. stand in Vietnam. We must not follow blindly in any direction but think carefully and act responsibly as individuals concerned for our country and the future of the world.

There are real fights for freedom going on in Vietnam. Let it be known that there are college students now who share the bitterness of the American soldier in Vietnam.

POSTHOSPITAL EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that payments for skilled nursing home services under the medical care for the aged program be made on a reasonable charge basis rather than on a reasonable cost basis.

The hospitalization program under Public Law 89-97, in addition to the payment for basic hospitalization also provides for 20 days of posthospital extended care in a skilled nursing home without cost to the patient and for an additional 80 days at a maximum cost to the patient of $5 per day. In effect, therefore, we have provided for a total of 100 days of posthospital extended care.

The nursing home care was intended in Public Law 89-97 as a means of reducing the cost of hospitalization. We want to encourage the transfer of patients to the nursing home, if further hospitalization is not required, as a means of saving health insurance funds and costs to the patient. We will fail to accomplish this if there are not enough nursing home beds.

In the hospitalization insurance program, it is specified that the amount which will be paid for post hospital extended care shall be the "reasonable cost" of furnishing such care. In other words, the payment excludes any allowance for profit.

At the time this matter was before the Ways and Means Committee, seriously questioned whether there would be enough facilities offering extended care on a "no profit" basis. I had serious doubts that nonprofit organizations would be able to provide enough beds to meet the needs of the aged. I suggested that we should be prepared to pay "a reasonable and customary charge" for nursing home care, in order to provide an inducement for the expansion of proprietary nursing homes.

A recent survey in the State of Wisconsin shows that there is a serious shortage of extended care facilities. There simply are not now, and by January 1967 when this part of the program becomes operative, there will not be enough nursing home beds to take care of the aged patients. In fact, the Wisconsin survey shows that there are no facilities for extended care in 17 counties of Wisconsin. In many other counties, while there are facilities, the number of beds available are wholly inadequate in relation to the number of possible patients. Unless we can expand these facilities, the aged citizen in these counties will have to be kept in the hospital until fully recovered. This places an unreasonable burden both on the individual and on the program. Certainly this deficiency must also exist in a great many other States.

It is essential that the services, for which payments are to be made under the medical care for the aged program, be in fact available. We will be perpetrating a cruel hoax on our elder citizens if after the Congress has provided for the payment of various medical services for the aged there are no facilities or personnel offering such services. Our commitment to provide medical assistance for the aged under Public Law 89-97 will become an empty promise to pay for the cost of a service which cannot be bought.

It is apparent that if sufficient nursing home beds are to be made available by January 1, 1967—when this part of the program becomes operative—there must be a real expansion during the next 14 months. We will be foolhardy if we rely entirely on governmental and nonprofit organizations for this expansion. There must be encouragement for private initiative in this area. Under present law there is no encouragement for private endeavor because the law requires that for all intent and purposes extended care facilities must be operated on a nonprofit basis in order to be eligible under the medical care program.

My bill would amend the hospital insurance provisions to provide for the payment of a reasonable charge for such nursing home care. This will encourage the expansion of existing nursing homes and the erection of additional facilities by private capital.

While it might be argued that the per diem charge for the care would be greater than payment on a "reasonable cost basis," that argument is illusory. Better services will be available at a lower cost if there is a profit motive which brings about an expansion of facilities and gives the patient a broader choice.

SOUTHERN RHODESIA

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the world is watching with concern the growing crisis in Southern Rhodesia. The declaration of independence unilaterally by the Government of Southern Rhodesia will end the hopes of 4 million Africans to gain the civil and political rights which rightfully belong to every man and woman.

I am proud that our Government has given strong support to the British in their efforts to withhold independence from Southern Rhodesia until provision is made for all of their citizens. The probabilities are, however, that the whites in Southern Rhodesia—who are only one-sixteenth of the population—will proceed in defiance of Great Britain. This will pose a moral challenge to the entire world. My fervent hope is that the United States will act with its full resources to back up all measures taken by the British, including the use of force. The United States should use its position of world leadership to protect the right of all the people of Southern Rhodesia. Such action by the United States would be consistent with the resolution recently adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Such action would be consistent with our efforts in Vietnam and elsewhere to protect the right of people to choose their own destiny free of oppression. The employment by the United States of its full resources to give firm backing to a moral judgment concurred in by all of mankind will command the respect and support of the rest of the world.

NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF HUNGARIAN UPRISING

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, this week we commemorate the ninth anniversary of the Hungarian uprising of 1956.

Nine years have passed since the Hungarian people, in a display of courage and patriotism almost unequalled in the history of the world, succeeded in throwing off the chains of Soviet tyranny and established for a brief period a government which truly represented the national aspirations of the Hungarian people.

The government established by these Hungarian patriots was, to be sure, crushed by Soviet armor, but only men's bodies can be kept in chains. The minds and souls of the Hungarian people have not and will never be controlled by any oppressor. The spirit of freedom can never be extinguished in the Hungarian soul.

Mr. Speaker, it is well for us to pause in our deliberations to consider the events of 9 years ago. I am sure we have mingled emotions, mingled because while all Americans were thrilled by the courage of the people of Budapest we also have reason for shame because we did so little to aid these gallant patriots.

In conclusion, let us hope that someday in God's time, that we will be given another opportunity to assist the Hungarian people to become once again masters of their own destiny.

THE CREDIT UNIONS: FRONT-LINE FIGHTERS IN WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important roles in the war on poverty is being played by credit unions, and no one is more keenly aware of the outstanding services that are being performed by these credit unions than Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

It is extremely gratifying to note the number of credit unions that are being established in low-income areas, including one that will soon be established in the riot-torn Watts area of Los Angeles. I have long said that next to the church, credit unions have done more good in this country than any other institution. The work of credit unions in low-income areas bears out this belief.

I am including in my remarks a letter I received recently from Sargent Shriver outlining the work of credit unions in the war on poverty.

The letter follows:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C., October 14, 1965.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: Thank you for your letter of September 13. I regret that I have not been able to reply sooner.

I fully concur with you that credit unions can play an extremely valuable role in the war on poverty. Not only have credit unions been funded in Washington and Providence as you mentioned, but projects are underway in Guadalupe, Arizona, Tucson, San Francisco, and Sacramento. Many other cities—such as Chicago, New York, Detroit, and Cincinnati—are planning credit unions as well. In Los Angeles, local antipoverty planners are in the process of organizing credit unions in the riot-torn Watts area to deal with the kind of exploitation that Governor Collins spoke with you about. Rural areas such as Clarksdale, Miss., and Delano, Calif., are planning credit unions for farmworkers, and in San Antonio, Tex., a local migrant group is drawing up plans for an experimental mobile credit union to follow the migrant stream. I feel this is just a beginning.

For the past several months, we have had an informal working agreement with CUNA—the Credit Union National Association—to provide technical assistance to communities interested in organizing credit unions as part of their local antipoverty programs. Recently, we held a training conference in Washington for some 80 CAP's from across the country, to alert them to the need for programs to protect the low-income consumer. Among the subjects discussed in detail was the organization and operation of credit unions. In addition, the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions has provided special training in the organization of credit unions to the staff of some of our migrant projects, and to a number of VISTA volunteers who will be working in urban and rural areas across the Nation.

Thank you for your offer of support. You can be sure that in the future, as now, any community action program interested in organizing a credit union as part of its program will receive our wholehearted backing in getting started. We hope for greatly increased activity in this field in the next 6 months.

I appreciate your interest in our program.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER, *Director.*

INTERNATIONAL HOME LOAN BANK BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation for discussion purposes which would provide for the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank. Hearings on legislation to accomplish this matter have been previously held by the Banking and Currency Committee, and there obviously is a great deal of support for a program of this nature in the Congress.

This legislation would create a central organization which would provide seed capital loans for the creation of thrift and home financing institutions in the lesser developed nations of the world. Basically this proposed central organization or bank would secure its funds from savings and loan associations in the United States who would be authorized by this legislation to invest up to 1 percent of their assets in the stock of the international bank.

It is my understanding that the various agencies within the Government, including AID and the Home Loan Bank Board, have arrived at a proposal to create a bank of this nature to which they both agree. It is anticipated that at the start of the next session of Congress it will be possible to hold hearings on this matter and hopefully arrive at a positive program which will show these developing nations a successful way of developing free enterprise thrift institutions whose resources can be used to provide the needed funds to establish an institution of private home ownership.

ADDRESS BY MR. JOHN E. HORNE, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE 10TH CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF BUILDING SOCIETIES AND SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in order to bring a topic of importance to the attention of the Members of this body, I insert into the RECORD the remarks of Mr. John E. Horne, Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, before the 10th Congress of the International Union of Building Societies and Savings Associations meeting in London, England, October 6, 1965.

Mr. Horne's speech follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. JOHN E. HORNE, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE 10TH CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF BUILDING SOCIETIES AND SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS, LONDON, ENGLAND, OCTOBER 6, 1965

Chairman Dunham, distinguished platform guests and delegates, ladies and gentlemen: First, I want to express genuine pleasure that I could attend and participate in this great occasion. It is truly inspiring and satisfying to be a representative of the U.S. Government at such an important meeting.

And while language barriers have presented to me some difficulty and some frustration, I am glad to be able to say, to borrow a phrase from your gracious and distinguished President Newton, that I still recognize my sex.

Before getting into the body of my text I want express thanks to those of you who have so patiently explained to me the way your own system operates. Especially do I wish to express appreciation to representatives from Germany, Austria, France, and now Great Britain. I mention these countries because during the past 2 weeks I have had the privilege of visiting these nations and talking with some of their leaders in the savings industry. The discussions have been most helpful to me. And the courtesies showed me will never be forgotten.

It has been inspirational to learn of the great work being done by this movement in each country, in accordance with its own needs, to enable its people to enjoy good housing accommodations.

As you have been told, I have the honor of being Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Government agency that supervises and regulates the savings and loan industry in the United States.

I have not been Chairman or even a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for very long, but I have long been interested in and appreciative of the International Union of Building Societies and Savings Associations.

Your objectives as expressed in your constitution are a worthy challenge. Because of your accomplishments toward building a better society and deeper understanding among nations, you deserve thanks from all of us.

I am glad that organizations and individual associations in my country are among your members, and it is also with pride that I make reference to a fellow countryman, Raymond Harold, one of our most able industry leaders, and your present deputy president and heir apparent.

To Mr. Hubert Newton, your outgoing president, I extend my special thanks and my congratulations for his devotion to the cause of better understanding and cooperation during his term of office.

I feel especially honored to be in London. In visualizing this visit to one of the great cities of the world, my mind was inevitably drawn to the strength and courage of the British people as exemplified by the late Sir Winston Churchill, one of my personal heroes. As you know, he was much admired in my country and was made a citizen of the United States by special act of Congress.

It was here in the 1940's that Churchill, dressed in his air-raid suit, with his perennial cigar, carried on one of the greatest campaigns of all time to raise up the spirit of a nation and to inspire the world. For me London has an unequaled sense of history and tradition.

Incidentally, although I propose to do my best, and may even steal a Churchillian phrase or two, I do not really expect this address to obliterate completely all memory of his famous speeches. But perhaps my audience, composed as it is, of people to whom so many owe so much, will understand and bear with me.

And I feel sure that I speak the sentiments of everyone here when I pray that there will never again be such a war, and that soon there will be peace, permanent peace, in all parts of the world. I believe that what is going on here—helping every family to have decent housing—will contribute to that goal.

Last month the British Government loaned to the United States a rare copy of the Magna Carta, the guarantee of English liberties issued by King John in 1215. This document, one of the three existing copies of the great charter, is considered by scholars to be the basis of English law and history. It was loaned to the United States so that it might be part of an exhibit of historic legal documents displayed at the World Peace Through Law Conference held recently in the United States. The Magna Carta is as important to an American as it is to an Englishman. A vast amount of our American law and custom is based upon English law and custom which in turn stems from this famous document.

Just as we borrowed this famous copy of the Magna Carta, we have also borrowed other things from Great Britain. Our savings and loan system, for example, was originally patterned after English predecessors. As they grew from a modest start in 1831, American savings and loan associations became fairly influential in our national economy until the year 1929 when, because of a nationwide economic setback, they encountered serious adversity.

As many of you will recall, some from personal experience, in 1929 my country suffered a stock market crash that touched off a great depression. Although that depression brought anguish and personal tragedy to millions of our citizens, it can now be said that it literally catapulted us from a mood of complacency and focused our attention on our financial situation, both personal and national.

As a result of that depression we were forced to reexamine our savings institutions. Accordingly we began a determined effort, not only to improve the practices and procedures of these institutions, but also to strengthen them to the point that they could weather cyclical downturns in the economy.

To do this, it was necessary to create an institutional basis for confidence among savers. We approached this problem by providing a system to insure savings. We call it the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

It was also necessary to strengthen existing institutions and to regulate and supervise their methods of operations. Our purpose, in this respect, was to provide a safe depository for savers and a system of sound and economical home financing for borrowers. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board established regulations under which existing institutions, if they were federally insured, would operate and under which new institutions would be chartered. This function is still carried on by the Board.

A third step was to provide a source of liquidity as a protection for savers and savings institutions. To help meet this objective a system of Federal Home Loan Banks was established. We now have 12 such Federal Home Loan Banks which help to provide necessary liquidity and to meet other needs of savings institutions.

These features of our savings and loan system have had the desired effect. The confidence of savers was restored and savings levels have risen steadily. Our 12 Federal Home Loan Banks are in robust financial condition and well able to perform their function of providing readily available credit to member associations. The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation has performed well in every emergency and currently has reserves of $1½ billion available for future needs. Over 39 million people have savings accounts in our savings and loans associations. These savings amount to approximately $100 billion.

We in the United States are proud of our savings and loan industry and the job it has done in providing a safe, dependable method of saving and home financing on reasonable terms. I believe that if citizens of newly developing countries had access to sound economical thrift and home-financing institutions, not only they, but all of mankind would benefit.

One widely discussed method of providing such home financing to citizens of newly developing countries is an International Home Loan Bank. Briefly, this proposition as discussed in the United States has rested upon the assumption that it would be desirable to create a special private organization to raise funds from which "seed" capital and other type loans could be made. The purpose of these loans would be to assist in the creation of thrift and home-financing institutions in the less developed nations. The International Home Loan Bank would secure its funds from savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks—which would be authorized to purchase stock in the new institution.

As you know, the proposal for the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank has been before us for several years. It has not become law yet, but two significant events occurred this year which indicate a growing awareness in the United States for the need of more adequate tools to aid other countries, if they so desire, to establish a savings and loan industry. The first of these was an amendment to the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. This amendment was offered by Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, accepted by the Congress and made part of the bill. The Smathers amendment, for the first time authorized Federal savings and loan associations to invest in loans guaranteed under section 224 of the Foreign Assistance Act, provided that the total of such investments for each association did not exceed 1 percent of its assets.

The second event was a revision of section 224 of the Foreign Assistance Act which broadens investment choices. Prior to this revision, section 224 permitted the Agency for International Development to issue guarantees against specified risks of investments made by U.S. citizens or corporations in pilot or demonstration housing projects in Latin America. At that time, the total outstanding amount of these guarantees could not exceed $250 million.

Under the new section 224, our Federal savings and loan associations may invest not only in various types of housing projects in Latin America as spelled out by the new amendment, but may also invest in or lend to credit institutions in Latin America that are engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages. Such credit institutions include savings and loan institutions and other qualified investment enterprises. The total amount of guarantees provided under section 224 has also been increased from $250 to $400 million.

In view of these recent amendments, the question may be asked is there a real and present need for the International Home Loan Bank? I think there is. Years of experience by the Agency for International Development and the Inter-American Development Bank, both active in this field, support this conclusion. Both AID and IDB have already made noteworthy contributions, particularly in Latin America. Their record of accomplishment reflects the dedication of those agencies, but they are frank in saying that they cannot begin to satisfy the need.

I cannot say that I qualify as an expert in determining the extent of the housing deficit in other countries. However, all of the information which has come to me in various ways leads to the conclusion that there is a tremendous need for housing in practically every developing country in the world. The inspiring talk by President Newton gave some statistics showing definite proof of such a need.

In my talks with officials of the Agency for International Development, such as our previous speaker and with other sources of information, I have been informed over and over again that the market in Latin America, for example, is so strong that we need have little, if any, fear of serious loss through default and foreclosure. It is believed that within the foreseeable future, if indeed such is not already the case, there will be an eligible customer, standing in line, ready to purchase if for any reason default occurs on the part of an owner. The experiences of builders in Latin America indicate a sales market far in excess of the availability of houses.

But in addition to such an obvious demand for housing, there are several other important reasons for the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank.

First, the operation of an International Home Loan Bank would be beneficial to any developing nation. While we have committed ourselves to special assistance to Latin American nations under the Alliance for Progress, I believe, in the long run, we should not deny similar opportunities to other developing countries throughout the world.

Second, the amount of new guaranty authority now available under section 224 is only $150 million; the other $250 million having already been committed. While $150 million is a large sum, when we consider the extent of the need, it is obvious that this amount is inadequate. It is my conviction that the investment opportunities presented by the operation of an International Home Loan Bank could ultimately run far beyond this figure.

Third, the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank would provide another type of investment for U.S. savings and loan associations. With the proper safeguards and the proper terms and conditions the investor would be able to make investments in newly developing countries, while at the same time serving a very useful social purpose and contributing to foreign policy objectives. In fact, an International Home Loan Bank of the type discussed in the United States could provide up to $1 billion for home ownership purposes in new developing countries. This would not come overnight, of course. But the potential is there.

Fourth, a progressive savings system is a prerequisite to a vigorous economy. It can be demonstrated that where there is no efficient saving system, the pool of investment capital is often inadequate to activate a strong and progressive economy. Lack of mortgage funds prevents the development of a healthy construction industry and leads to underproduction of inadequate but expensive housing. Inadequate housing production, in turn, fails to stimulate development of those industries which produce the materials, goods, and equipment used in the manufacture and furnishing of houses. To the extent that these goods and equipment must be imported, there is a further drain on the economic resources of the country.

Fifth, the function of the International Home Loan Bank will not be solely to provide money or guarantees to developing countries.

Even more important will be its role in providing technical assistance and support. If we can find and develop the ability to understand our neighbor and the wisdom to help him solve his problems, we could through the operation of this bank, extend the hand of friendship to the less fortunate peoples of the world and make a genuine contribution to their economic growth and to world peace.

There are now a number of bills pending before the U.S. Congress each of which would authorize the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank. While the exact position of President Johnson's administration on these bills has not yet become firm—there has not as yet been presented to him an agreed-on plan by affected agencies—we do know that there is a great deal of support in the executive branch and in the Congress. For the first time, the two agencies directly concerned, the Agency for International Development and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, are now in substantial agreement and able to present a united front on this subject. I am sufficiently optimistic to predict that in the near future an International Home Loan Bank bill will be enacted by the U.S. Congress.

The savings and loan industry and the housing industry in the United States have been fortunate over the years in having farsighted leadership in the Congress and in the White House which has brought our industry to its present prosperous levels.

President Johnson, as a Member of the House, as a Member of the Senate, as majority leader, as Vice President, and now as President of the United States, has been one of the outstanding leaders in this field. The housing bills of 1964 and of 1965, both of which were enacted under the leadership of President Johnson, will help greatly to achieve the objective that was first announced in 1949, a decent home in a decent living environment for every American citizen.

I had the honor of working with President Johnson when he was a Member of the Senate, and I have firsthand knowledge of his devotion to the objective of providing decent housing for all our citizens. He has also given ample evidence of a deep personal commitment to provide assistance for citizens of newly developing countries. This commitment encompasses housing as well as other needs to help give people an opportunity to live in dignity and well-being.

In view of the objectives of the International Union, one of which is "to arouse and stimulate worldwide interest in thrift and home ownership," and in view of your continued support of the concept of an international home loan bank, it may be that this 10th congress will want to reaffirm its support and even advocate the establishment of additional international home loan banks by various countries represented here.

In the words of Mr. Gordon Collins, your distinguished past president, "the basis of our operations is the provision of shelter for men." The Federal Home Loan Bank Board is in full accord with this thought.

There are many worthy goals for men to achieve. One is to help mankind everywhere live in healthy and decent surroundings. As Her Royal Highness, the Princess Margaret, so eloquently said in the opening session, a home "contributes greatly to family contentment and, on a larger scale, brings stability to a nation." I congratulate you all on what you have done thus far. I assure you of my desire and of the desire of my Government to contribute to your efforts in the years ahead.

TRAINING FOR WORLDWIDE SERVICE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have always held the credit union movement to be one of the great financial institutions serving the public, especially those of modest means.

October 21 is Credit Union Day and a time to pause and salute this great movement. President Johnson and Prime Minister Lester Pearson, of Canada, have saluted credit unions on the celebration of Credit Union Day praising the progress of the movement and the aid that credit unions have provided to those of modest means. I am happy to see these two great leaders praise credit unions for this great service to the public and ask that President Johnson's and Prime Minister Pearson's greetings be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to have included in the RECORD an article on how a credit union sponsored by the Catholic Foreign Mission Society is being used to aid and train Latin Americans to provide greater economic progress for their people.

The Defense Department's recent directive urging that military installations strongly support credit unions for all military personnel has won praise from many quarters. I ask that a recent editorial on this subject appearing in the Credit Union magazine appear following my remarks.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
September 9, 1965.

Credit unions here and abroad are providing people of modest means with a way to accumulate their savings at ample interest, and with a reliable source of loans at fair interest rates. They are helping the poorer and less privileged to partake increasingly of the more abundant life. They are helping in our own fight against poverty under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. They are performing similar service for the needy abroad under the sponsorship of the Peace Corps and of the Agency for International Development.

I salute their progress, and congratulate the Directors of CUNA International on this traditional observance of International Credit Union Day.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

PRIME MINISTER-PREMIER MINISTER,
Ottawa, Canada, 1965.

This year's celebration of International Credit Union Day by 20 million people around the world is an occasion for special pride and satisfaction among three and a quarter million Canadians who own and operate their own credit unions.

This savings in these credit unions and their low-cost loans to fellow members contribute to a better and more satisfying way of life for them and their families.

Beyond that, they have a special feeling of pride that the development of credit unions internationally was really begun by a fellow Canadian. Sixty-five years ago, Alphonse Desjardins started this continent's first credit union in Levis, Quebec, and 9 years later he helped to organize the first credit union in the United States. The inheritors of his ideals have continued to share them with others.

In the developing nations today, credit unions make a special contribution, helping people improve their standards of living and introducing them to democratic ideals. The Canadian office of CUNA International and the headquarters of our credit union leagues across the country have helped to provide special training in credit union methods for men and women from these countries, many of them brought to Canada by our External Aid Office.

Spokesman for the Canadian credit union movement have assured us they want to work even more closely with the government in the war on poverty and with the Company of Young Canadians. We are pleased with this, as we are pleased with the progress Canadians credit unions have made over the years.

On the occasion of International Credit Union Day, 1965, I congratulate credit union members in Canada and around the world, and extend good wishes for their progress in the future.

L. B. PEARSON.

[From Credit Union magazine, October 1965]

TRAINING FOR WORLDWIDE SERVICE—MARYKNOLL'S CREDIT UNION ISN'T SUPPOSED TO BE "SUCCESSFUL" IT'S INTENDED TO BE EDUCATIONAL

Within the stone walls of an oriental-styled building overlooking the Hudson River near Ossining, N.Y., a most unusual credit union is in operation.

The normal consumer loans, as most credit unions know them, are highly unusual here.

Loans are seldom repaid on schedule, to no one's surprise.

Encouraging regular saving is impossible because the members have no regular earned income.

The money in the credit union and the loans for which it is used are almost incidental to the real reason for which the credit union exists.

Yet, this could become one of the most influential credit unions in the world.

It is the Maryknoll Federal Credit Union, and its officers and committeemen are destined to spend most of their lives in foreign lands of the free world. Among other things, they will be taking the credit union idea—as they learn it in their own credit union—to the inhabitants of such widely diverse places as Tanzania, El Salvador, and Korea.

The Maryknoll Credit Union was organized in May of 1964, mainly through the efforts of Father James St. Leger, M.M., now serving in the Philippines. At that time, however, he taught a course dealing with social action at the Maryknoll seminary. Credit unions were included in the course, and he arranged visits to the New York State League for the seminarians to learn as much as they could before beginning their missionary work abroad.

Through the urgings of the New York League, Father St. Leger got permission from the rector—at that time the Reverend Albert V. Fedders, now in Taiwan—to set up the credit union. They visualized it as an important training tool for mission work.

To get as many as possible active in the credit union, therefore, the board and committees have the maximum number of members allowed by the Federal Credit Union Act and the treasurer has two assistants. At the annual meeting almost all directors and committeemen are replaced and the treasurer is succeeded by one of his assistants. Serving in these positions are the seminarians and permanent staff—priests and brothers—at Maryknoll, N.Y.

From this 100-acre site in New York State's famed Westchester County are guided the worldwide activities of the Maryknoll missioners. In addition to missions in a dozen countries on four continents, Maryknoll has three high school seminaries and a college in the United States.

The main seminary at Maryknoll is a 4-year school of theology to prepare students for the priesthood and missionary work. All seminarians are already college graduates and about 95 percent of those completing the 4-year, post-graduate seminary will have earned their masters' degrees by the time they are ordained.

Also located nearby is the headquarters and training center for the hundreds of Maryknoll Sisters serving in foreign missions. They, however, are not eligible for membership in the credit union because the sisters are a society separate from the Maryknoll Fathers.

The credit union's potential is now about 1,400 but will increase each year as more and more young men enter the seminary. Presently there are 178 theology students, 191 brothers, 992 priests, and 16 bishops eligible for membership in the credit union.

Because the credit union is so new, most of the members are in New York State. But as the members of the deacon, or Fourth Theology, class are ordained, priests will become a bigger percentage of the membership. Last spring, 36 of the credit union's members were ordained priests.

Of the men in the missions before the credit union started, only one is a member. But Maryknoll Father Joseph Early is an active member who has shown that a credit union in a seminary more than a thousand miles away can serve in a wide variety of ways.

A missioner in Yucatan, Father Early was eager for funds to furnish the new church in his parish. The Maryknoll credit union supplied the necessary funds and the loan is being repaid through contributions of parishioners.

More missioners haven't joined the credit union probably because they belong to credit unions they organized in their own parishes.

However, the Maryknollers have proved a credit union can operate in a seminary, and now other seminaries are beginning to express an interest in the idea. The Maryknoll credit union has received requests for information from Catholic seminaries in Missouri and Ireland.

Maryknoll, properly known as the Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America, is the largest religious society in the United States devoted entirely to foreign mission work. Organized in 1911, Maryknoll sent forth its first "departure group" 7 years later—four missioners bound for China.

Each succeeding year additional groups of Maryknollers set sail for China, Korea, Manchuria, the Hawaiian Islands, and Japan. World War II, however, trapped many Maryknoll priests in the then unfriendly Orient.

Since new ones could not get in, the missioners turned their efforts to Latin America. A brief period after the war saw increased Maryknoll work in China again, but then the Bamboo Curtain closed off the area, suffocating most inside.

Now they have added Africa—Tanzania and Kenya—Hong Kong, Taiwan, and the Philippines to the list of places where they are active.

Their activities in these many places cover a wide range—from developing parishes, schools, and clinics, to teaching agricultural methods and cooperative principles.

In Hong Kong, for example, Msgr. John Romaniello of New Rochelle, N.Y., showed the people how to set up factories to make relief flour into noodles for poverty-stricken refugees. In Guayaramerin, Bolivia, Father Donald M. Steed, M.M., of West Medford, Mass., organized a housing cooperative which recently completed its 70th house. Throughout the altiplano of Bolivia and Peru, Maryknoll Father Robert E. Kearns of the Bronx, N.Y., established a system of radio instruction schools to teach some 700,000 Indians reading, writing, and Spanish. And in Peru, Father Daniel McLellan, M.M., of Denver, Colo., almost single-handedly started a credit union movement that has now swept over most of the continent.

It is because Maryknollers like Father McLellan, Brother Felix Fournier and Father Thomas Melville in Guatemala, and Father Joseph Beausoleil in Bolivia, have proved credit unions are effective in their mission work that the Maryknoll Federal Credit Union was founded. It will give the seminarians the necessary background information before they go out to the missions.

Many of the seminarians got their first taste of credit union work this past summer. Second- and third-year students spent 6 weeks between school years working in the poor parishes of such places as Chicago, New York's Harlem, New Mexico, and Texas.

This year many of the men took with them information on credit unions "to plant the seed." In most cases they planned to contact the State credit union league and gets its representative in touch with the people.

This is strictly an informal experiment being tried for the first time. The results, if any, will probably be a long time in coming. However, if the men attempt this at all, it can certainly be considered another important training tool for their future endeavors.

These summer assignments also create the need for loans from the Maryknoll credit union. Because the parishes these men go to are poor, the seminarians are sometimes required to pay their own transportation costs.

Other members have used their credit unions to buy books or to purchase equipment for student organizations. The photography club, for instance, can usually save by buying paper and chemicals in large amounts. The credit union enables the members to do this.

The Maryknoll credit union has also helped members of the aviation club purchase airplanes. A couple of students had instructor ratings when they came to Maryknoll and are now teaching their fellow students to fly. This mode of transportation is considered the coming thing in missionary work, especially in South America where surface travel is time-consuming and difficult at best.

The only income these credit union members have—whether they are priests, brothers, or seminarians—is gifts from relatives and friends. Some come from wealthy families and have put money in the credit union to help others. This means that less than 10 percent of the members own most of the shares.

It also plays havoc with any repayment schedule a borrower sets up. Only one loan in the first year of operation was repayed on schedule. The rest were either prepaid or late. Delinquency is highest in summer when the students are away, but drops sharply in the fall when they return. Between the end of their summer parish assignment and the start of the school term, the students often find regular jobs for pay. In this way they might accumulate enough money to repay their loan completely or at least bring it up to date.

Because this type of repayment condition is unavoidable, the credit committee's primary if not only condition in granting a loan is need.

Perhaps the most unusual loan was to one of the directors for $10. He didn't need nor want the money. The reason for the loan was to gain experience. He knew in theory how the credit union operated, but he wanted to go through the actual experience of applying for a loan, meeting with the credit committee, and receiving the check.

With such interest being shown in the credit union, it's difficult not to be optimistic about the economic future of the people around the world who will come in contact with Maryknoll missioners.

[From the Credit Union magazine, October 1965]

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT SUPPORTS CREDIT UNIONS

Strongly supporting credit unions at Armed Forces installations, the Defense Department issued in September a directive ordering all echelons of command to recognize and assist credit unions as important morale and welfare resources. The directive, signed by Deputy Defense Secretary Cyrus Vance, was issued only 4 days before the Defense credit union conference convened and received wide acclaim by the conferees and their special guests, including Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, and Leslie Dix, Director of Civil Affairs in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower).

Hearings before a subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee have revealed that loan companies—some of them operated by retired generals and admirals—have been charging servicemen short-term interest rates up to 50 percent a year.

According to a recent study by CUNA International's Research and Statistics Department, 460 credit unions were serving 1,327,700 civilian and military defense personnel at the end of 1963. This represented 2.15 percent of the credit unions serving 9.1 percent of the credit union members. These members had $478.39 billion in savings and $440.98 billion in loans.

Officers of the Defense Credit Union Council for 1966 are president, Richard Grant, Pease Air Force Base FCU, N.H.; first vice president, R. A. Tesdahl, Great Lakes Credit Union, Ill.; second vice president, Randall Latham, Robins Air Force Base FCU, Ga.; secretary, Lt. Col. George Jones, Marine Corps School FCU, Va.; and treasurer, Robert Schaffner, Fort Knox FCU, Ky.

WASHINGTON POST ANALYST CITES FEAR THAT BIG BANKS' CAMPAIGN TO CHARGE HIGHER INTEREST RATES "COULD DAMPEN THE ECONOMY LIKE A DRUNK AT A WCTU CONVENTION"

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, not satisfied with a brazen, but bumbling and unsuccessful attempt to force through the Banking and Currency Committee a bill to excuse banks from the antitrust laws so they can eliminate competition, the big Wall Street banks, with the help of the Federal Reserve System which they dominate, are busy as bees jacking up interest charges to all but a very select group of preferred borrowers.

Money has been made artificially scarce and therefore more expensive by this alliance of Government money managers and private money lenders. Neither has the American Bankers Association, a super-lobby if there ever was one, been inactive in the interest gouge picture. The very next day after Treasury Secretary Fowler, speaking for President

Johnson, stated to the ABA convention in Chicago 2 weeks ago that higher rates are a real threat to continued prosperity, the ABA without dissent passed a resolution calling for tighter money, higher borrowing costs to businessmen, consumers, and, last but not least, to the Federal, State and local governments for necessary public projects.

The cause of the present tight money crisis is not abnormal demand—not at all. The Kennedy-Johnson Democratic administration policies have resulted in a period of healthy, noninflationary prosperity of unprecedented duration. The real fault lies in the fact, as stated by Frank Porter in the October 21, Washington Post, that the Federal Reserve has allowed the supply of money in the economy to grow at an average annual rate of only 3.5 percent during the past year with virtually no growth at all in recent months. The economy has grown at a rate of 5 percent during the same period, but cannot continue to do so unless and until the Federal Reserve releases its choking grip on the supply of credit necessary to finance continued, noninflationary expansion.

Either the rate of credit growth must go up or the rate of economic growth must come down—it is just that simple.

What is really disturbing is the thought that as soon as Congress adjourns and leaves Washington, the Federal Reserve will really put the screws to interest rates and give us a recession like we have not had since the Eisenhower days.

With unanimous consent, I will insert at this point in the RECORD the article by Mr. Porter in its entirety.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 21, 1965]

(By Frank C. Porter)

Administration economists are in the anomalous position of almost—but not quite—hoping that the rapid pace of business expansion slows down for a while.

The reason is trouble in the money market.

Washington officialdom still has unpleasant memories of 1957 and 1960 when tight money received a major share of blame for choking off expansion and bringing on recession.

Administration fiscal experts, proud of their contribution to the longest peacetime business expansion in history, see credit pressures building up again.

The situation has not reached crisis proportions. But these economists fear any further increase in interest rates could dampen the economy like a drunk at a WCTU convention.

The result is a growing power struggle—so far more real than apparent—between the Johnson administration and the Nation's big bankers. Caught squarely in the middle is the quasi-independent Federal Reserve System.

The basic disagreement broke into the open a fortnight ago when Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler addressed the American Bankers Association in Chicago. He quoted President Johnson as saying in effect: "Why won't people stop, look, and listen and count three before taking steps that would change the mix of economic policy that has characterized this balance of expansion?"

If this was a veiled suggestion that bankers hold the line on interest rates, they weren't buying it—in theory at least. The next day they passed a resolution calling for a reduction in the rate of credit expansion and higher interest rates in response to "market forces."

Interest rates have been moving up over a broad range during the past year with most of the increases coming the last few months.

YIELDS INCH UP

The yield on Moody's A-rated corporate bonds, for example, has inched up to 4.70 percent from 4.58 percent in June. High-grade municipal bonds increased their yield from 3.06 percent at the beginning of the year to 3.32 per cent at mid-September. The Treasury 91-day bill rate has jumped from a bit over 3.5 to 4.0 percent in the past year.

A number of larger banks have raised their minimum charges on loans to sales finance firms by one-fourth of 1 percentage point. Earlier this month Chase Manhattan raised rates to nearly all business customers by one-fourth to one-half of a percentage point.

The banks' prime rate—the interest they charge their largest and best customers—has remained unviolated at 4½ percent. A year ago several banks rescinded increases on a direct appeal by President Johnson. But the banks have found ways of circumventing this admonition and the prime rate is rapidly becoming a myth: They merely grant this privileged rate to fewer and fewer customers and up the rate to others.

DEMAND CLIMBS

In every category except the mortgage market which recently has been reported as becoming firm, the demand for loanable funds has climbed at a heady pace. Commercial, industrial, and agricultural loans have jumped 20 percent in the past 12 months.

Whereas business was able to finance a large part of its expansion out of depreciation charges and undistributed profits a year ago, the greatly quickened pace of plant and equipment outlays has sent firms scurrying to the banks and to the bond market, where new corporate offerings are the highest in nearly a decade. And capital spending is only part of the story; the business expansion is putting new strains on the money market to finance inventories, purchase materials and extend customer credit.

Administration officials resolutely insist there is little danger of overheating the economy and cite several factors that may ease credit demand in the coming weeks: a working down of stockpiled steel, resulting in repayment of loans to finance these inventories; a continued lull in homebuilding; the deflationary effect of higher social security taxes next January 1.

CONTROL LOST?

Some analysts feel that Washington has already lost control of the money market. They point out that Government bond yields are already bumping their heads on the 4¼-percent statutory ceiling above which the Treasury cannot float new issues. This drives the Government into the short end of the market where the demand for funds has already pushed the 91-day Treasury bill rate above 4 percent. If it goes much higher the Federal Reserve System's discount rate—the interest it charges on loans to member banks—must be raised from its present 4-percent level. Otherwise the commercial banks can borrow from the Fed, buy Treasury bills and make a killing through arbitrage.

But if the Fed jumps the discount rate—say to 4½ percent—then the banks will have to pass on this added cost to customers through a wide range of interest increases. They are already in a net borrowed position, meaning that loans to them from the Fed are greater than their reserves in excess of those required by law to cover deposits.

RETURN MAY DROP

As these higher interest rates spread, what John Maynard Keynes called the marginal efficiency of capital will decline. Companies will discover that the return expected on their investment is not worth the high cost of investment funds. Then, theoretically, the economic expansion will slow or come to an end.

There are others—notably Prof. Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago—who feel interest rates will take care of themselves if the Federal Reserve encourages an orderly growth in the supply of money through its purchases or sales of Government securities.

The Fed's own figures show that while the economy is growing at a rate of 5 percent annually in real terms (after price corrections), the money supply (currency and demand deposits in banks) has increased only 3.5 percent over the past year. "The Fed has not quite financed the expansion," Business Week quotes a prominent New York bond dealer as saying. Others speculate that the Reserve Board may have helped bring on the tight credit situation by holding the money supply in the $159 to $161 billion range from November 1964 through May of this year.

But although the Fed continues to keep the banks in a net borrowed position, there is evidence it is loosening up on the money supply.

Since May it has let the supply grow by nearly $6 billion with the greatest increase coming in September and early October.

This may already have been reflected in a slight easing of interest rates over the past 2 weeks. At any rate, the eyes of both the administration and the financial community will be riveted in coming months on the Fed's Board of Governors, where their respective points of view have almost equal representation.

A CLEAR EXPLANATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE MECHANISM PRESENTED BY UNDER SECRETARY BARR

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, our recent problems with the balance-of-payments situation, international finance, and the strength of the dollar have caused this complex area of finance to become more clouded and more difficult to understand with each succeeding day.

I have recently read a speech delivered by Under Secretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr, a former Member of this body and a former member of your Banking and Currency Committee. I believe that this statement of fundamental explanations of recent international monetary developments is the most lucid and best thought out explanation that I have seen so far. Mr. Barr's insights and thoughtful analyses are a much needed companion to Members.

Under Secretary Barr presents a well-balanced discussion of the function of the American dollar, its role as a national currency, as a key or a vehicle currency in international trade, and as a reserve currency.

Perhaps the most informative part of Mr. Barr's speech is the discussion on the problem of world liquidity and the balance-of-payments problem, the two items thoroughly discussed last week at the meeting here in Washington of the International Monetary Fund.

Mr. Barr makes no pretense at providing complete answers for all our monetary ills, as the Republican white paper so recently attempted, but he clarifies and delineates the complicated problems that the present international monetary system presents the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Barr's speech to my colleagues and place it in the Record following my remarks:

Remarks by the Honorable Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury, Before the National Association of Manufacturers, at the Homestead, Hot Springs, Va., September 21, 1965

Time was when international finance was a subject confined for the most part to the officials of the larger banks, central banks and the Treasury. Not many people outside this small group understood or cared much about it. Not so today. It is one of the hottest topics going. It seems as though every publication has something to say at one time or another about our balance of payments, gold losses, and international liquidity.

This is a mixed blessing to us in the Treasury. On the one hand, a widespread interest among the public in this important national problem is an encouraging sign of an alert citizenry and ultimately it will be those outside the Government who will be responsible for the solution to our balance-of-payments problem.

On the other hand, the Treasury Department, having the primary responsibility for this area, is the focusing point for this intense public spotlight and we are frequently taken to task and called upon to account for our actions or inactions—as the case may be.

This is fair enough—6 years in American politics has convinced me that criticism and debate can be especially helpful in formulating our national financial policies. But I am concerned that this debate sometimes gets off the rails because the subject matter is novel and complex.

I would suppose that nearly every man and woman in this room has had some academic background in economics. I would suppose that most of us can carry on a good reasonable argument on monetary policy and on fiscal policy. But I wonder how many are fully grounded in the concepts of the international financial mechanism that has largely developed since World War II?

I would venture that most of us could discourse reasonably on the old gold standard that we were taught in college. But how many understand the workings of the International Monetary Fund, the concepts of liquidity, and the role of the dollar in international finance? I would suggest to you that these subjects are not academic curiosities. They are on the contrary issues that have an intensely practical application to your businesses and to the role this Nation will play in the world.

Therefore, my address today can be considered more as a paper on fundamentals rather than a statement of policy. Specifically, I will discuss the role of the dollar in the world today, the problem of our balance of payments, its relationship to world liquidity, the administration's approach to these matters and where we stand today.

As this address is designed more for information than for policy, I shall be delighted to answer any questions that may occur to you at the conclusion of my formal remarks.

THE ROLE OF THE DOLLAR

When we discuss the American dollar, I think it is important to bear in mind that the dollar serves three roles: as a national currency, as a key (sometimes referred to as a vehicle) currency, and as a reserve currency.

THE DOLLAR AS A NATIONAL CURRENCY

The first role, as a national currency, is I think obvious to everyone. The dollar in this historic role is our domestic medium of exchange, designed to meet the needs of our domestic financial transactions. Also, I think most people understand that our domestic money supply must grow over the years as our economy grows. There is some limit on how many times a year you can use a dollar for different transactions, and as the economy grows and transactions increase there is an obvious need for more dollars to keep things moving.

There is not such a clear understanding, however, of the second and third roles, and discussions of our balance of payments and world liquidity sometimes confuse the two.

THE DOLLAR AS A VEHICLE CURRENCY

We speak of the dollar as a vehicle currency; we refer to its use in financing international trade and payments. The dollar in this capacity is held by private banks, businesses and individuals throughout the world as a medium of exchange for their international transactions; they use it just as they use their own currencies for their domestic transactions.

Dollars held for this purpose—what we call private foreign dollar holdings—amount to over $11 billion.

How did it come about that the dollar should serve this role more than any other currency? Robert Roosa puts it succinctly in his new book:

Because the importance of the United States in world trade was itself very large, as seen from most other countries;

Because there were ample and versatile credit facilities available from which supplemental supplies of dollars could be obtained at short term;

Because accumulations held for transactions purposes could be readily invested in liquid form at reasonable rates of return;

Because foreign transactions form so small a part of the vast U.S. markets that foreign holders have little reason to fear that their operations would become conspicuous or subject to interference; and

Because the dollar had an established tradition—honored through various periods of stress—of maintaining open markets free of the dictation and the intrusions characteristic of exchange control.

And lastly a purely technical reason. There are 102 members of the IMF. If financial transactions were denominated in the currencies of every nation, a little simple arithmetic will show that you would raise the 102 currencies to the second power or a figure of 10,404 to arrive at the different methods in which a transaction could be accounted for. To avoid this chaotic situation, when a businessman in country A sells to a customer in country B the transaction usually will work like this: The customer in country B buys dollars; with the dollars he buys the national currency of country A and uses these funds to pay the seller.

This is why we sometimes refer to the role of the dollar as a vehicle currency. It is a crucial role and it acquired this role for the reasons I have listed above. Like its role as a domestic or national currency, the need for dollars as a vehicle currency increases as world trade and financial transactions increase.

To summarize, the dollar is available, it is safe, and it is enormously convenient to have one or (or if one includes the British pound and French franc) two or three currencies that many countries can use, in an infinite variety of bilateral trade transactions, as a kind of common denominator.

THE DOLLAR AS A RESERVE CURRENCY

The dollar's third role—that of a reserve currency—has developed for many of the same reasons that have made it a vehicle currency.

By a reserve currency we mean that dollars are held by governments and central banks as a highly liquid and dependable asset that they can use along with gold to carry them over times of temporary imbalance—precisely the way you, as businessmen, keep reserves for contingencies. But there is an important distinction between the role of the dollar as a vehicle currency and its role as a reserve currency. I have mentioned that probably the principal factor in the dollar's role as a vehicle currency is convenience. I believe that the principal factor in the dollar's role as a reserve currency is confidence—confidence in the ability to use it quickly and at an assured price. These are approximately the criteria most businessmen use in acquiring and holding assets as contingent reserves.

Those who hold the dollar as a reserve currency, central banks and treasuries, do so in the knowledge that these dollars are freely convertible into gold at the fixed price of $35 an ounce. The fact that we have not varied from this policy and this fixed price for over 30 years plus the fact that we are the only country which stands ready to exchange gold for holdings of its currency has made the dollar second only to gold as an international reserve asset.

Foreign monetary authorities hold about $14 billion in their reserves. These dollars are used to finance their balance-of-payments deficits and surpluses and as a cushion for the future.

While these two international roles of the dollars are interdependent—dollars flow back and forth between official and private hands—changes in the world's holdings of its vehicle currency dollars can have quite different implications than changes in the world's holdings of its reserve currency dollars.

To illustrate, the amount of dollars (or any other vehicle currency) held by banks and businesses for trade and finance will probably grow as world trade grows and develops. The dollars held for reserves can vary with the judgment of central banks and governments on (a) what amount of reserves they need and (b) their judgment as to the potential value and usefulness of the dollar.

One final note on our dollar liabilities. While the large amounts of dollars which foreigners now hold represent liquid liabilities and potential claims on our gold reserves, the fact that the world is willing to hold such large amounts of dollars is testimony to their confidence in the dollar.

The program to which I refer next is designed to make sure that the integrity of—and international confidence in—the dollar are maintained.

THE TWIN MAIN PROBLEMS OF BALANCE OF PAYMENTS AND WORLD LIQUIDITY

Most of the current discussions of international finance concerns twin problems: our balance-of-payments deficit and world liquidity.

I do not mean to insult your knowledge, but let's make certain of our definitions. First of all let's define the balance of payments. It is not as easy as it might seem because it is an accounting of our private and Government transactions with the rest of the world. In dangerously simplified terms the major transaction would be like this:

WHAT FUNDS GO OUT

1. Money spent to buy imports (including shipping costs to foreign lines).
2. Money spent by tourists.
3. Money spent by the United States in maintaining troops overseas.
4. Money loaned by banks and the Government to foreign borrowers.
5. Money invested in industries in foreign nations.

6. Money given as united grants under our foreign aid program.

7. Money spent abroad as payment of interest and principal due by U.S. borrowers.

8. Money remitted as dividend payments to foreign holders of U.S. securities, or as branch income of foreign corporations.

WHAT FUNDS COME IN

1. Money spent by foreigners to buy our exports.
2. Money spent by foreign tourists in the United States.
3. Money loaned by foreign banks and governments to U.S. borrowers.
4. Money invested by foreigners in U.S. industries.
5. Remittances of interest and principal payments on debts foreigners owe to U.S. lenders.
6. Remittance of dividend income and income of U.S. oversea branches to U.S. investors and corporations.

I have warned you that this is highly oversimplified accounting, but it does include the major items.

When the outgoing items exceed the incoming, we say that we have a deficit; when the reverse is true we say that we have a surplus.

Now some one at this juncture will say, "It is nonsense to keep accounts like these. You have current items such as funds spent on imports or money spent by tourists lumped together with capital items such as long-term loans and investments."

This is very true indeed and that is where the question of liquidity enters the picture. Just what do we mean by liquidity? The corporate explanation of liquidity is the relation between short-term liabilities and short-term assets. It seems to me that the international economists are much less precise in their definition. When they speak of liquidity, they usually refer to the official—government and central bank—holdings of gold and convertible currencies and the credit available on a rather automatic basis in the IMF. The relation of these assets to short-term liabilities is usually meaningless to most countries because their currencies are not used as a vehicle in commercial transactions or held as reserves.

However, in the United States the corporate definition of liquidity that relates liquid assets to near-term liabilities is more appropriate. It is, in fact, crucial because as I have pointed out $11 billion are held by private foreigners for trade and finance and $14 billion by official foreigners as reserves.

Thus, the proper definition of liquidity would probably be in three parts. For most nations it could be defined as their holdings of convertible foreign currencies, gold and their IMF position. For the United States it is more precise to define liquidity as the relation between these assets and our short-term liabilities. For the world as a whole, you would probably define liquidity as the amounts of acceptable international resources—gold, convertible currencies, and automatic credit at the IMF—available for trade, finance, and reserves.

Now let's look at our balance of payments. In essence, the balance-of-payments problem is one of U.S. liquidity. Our overall financial position is good and improving but our international liquidity has been deteriorating. To illustrate, at the end of 1964 our private foreign investments alone exceeded the total of all foreign claims on us—official and private—by over $18 billion. The comparable figure in 1958, when our balance of payments first became a serious problem, was less than $7 billion. This is without taking any account of our gold stock which at the end of 1964 amounted to over $15 billion and our Government claims on foreign countries which amounted to over $23 billion. Our overall position, therefore, is obviously immensely strong.

But in the process of building up these tremendous foreign assets, most of which are long-term assets, we have incurred large short-term liquid liabilities, which, while much smaller than our long-term assets, have been large in relation to our gold reserves.

At the beginning of 1958 our holdings of gold came to almost $23 billion. They now stand at less than $14 billion. Over the same period our dollar liabilities to foreign official institutions rose from less than $9 billion to over $14 billion.

It is obvious that this process of lending long and borrowing short cannot go on indefinitely, and I think that most responsible observers are agreed that our balance of payments must be brought into equilibrium to bring it to an end. But at this point the second of our twin problems comes into focus. If the dollar outflow from the United States is ended, how will the world's needs for a key currency and a reserve currency be met?

You will remember that I have earlier indicated that net outflows of dollars have not always been turned back to the United States. Some of these dollars have been retained by foreigners to increase working balances to finance an expanding level of trade and finance and some of these additional dollars have been held to build up official reserves.

On its face, it appears that we are faced with a dilemma. Actually, careful analysis leads us to believe that the ending of our deficit may not create a world liquidity problem for some time to come.

Over the past 4 years, while we have not changed the basic structure of the international payments mechanism, we have substantially fortified it. Just this year, the members of the International Monetary Fund agreed to support a general increase in IMF quotas of 25 percent or about $5 billion. In 1961, the 10 major industrial nations, known as the Group of Ten, negotiated with the International Monetary Fund a so-called general arrangements to borrow, whereby the 10 nations agreed to lend to the IMF up to $6 billion should this be necessary "to forestall or cope with an impairment of the international monetary system."

Added to this multilateral source of funds are the various bilateral arrangements whereby the major countries stand ready to swap their currencies with one or more of the other countries in time of need. The substantial support which the IMF and the leading countries have extended to the pound sterling in recent months is testimony to the strength of the present system.

In noting these strengths of the present international payments system, I am not arguing that nothing further needs to be done. I note them only because in recent months some people have unjustifiably jumped to the conclusion that an ending of the U.S. balance-of-payments deficits will immediately bring about a shortage of world liquidity and a crisis.

In addition to overlooking the very real strength of the current system, those who make the oversimplified argument that we should continue our balance-of-payments deficit to maintain world liquidity, overlook two other basic points. First, the dollar cannot continue to be a reserve currency if we continue a balance-of-payments deficit of the magnitudes that have prevailed in the past. Sooner or later our liabilities will become so large in relation to our gold reserves that foreign central bankers will no longer believe that the dollar is, in fact, as good as gold and they will not be willing to hold it.

Secondly, a deficit in our balance of payments does not necessarily and automatically increase world liquidity if the countries which are receiving the dollars cash them in for gold. Their reserves go up but ours go down, and the world total remains the same. To illustrate the point, in the first quarter of this year the deficit in our overall balance of payments, seasonally unadjusted, was $180 million. But these dollars did not become new additions to total world reserves. Rather, they came right back to the U.S. Treasury Department to be exchanged, along with dollars accumulated in past periods, for some $800 million worth of gold. A continuance of the dollar outflow would lead to more of the same, a transfer of gold from the United States to the European surplus countries with little or no gain for world liquidity as a whole but with continual decreases in our liquidity.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S APPROACH

The administration's approach to these twin problems is to move quickly and certainly to balance-of-payments equilibrium and at the same time to move forward in discussions on improving the world's monetary system.

I have pointed out why it is imperative for us to restore equilibrium in our balance of payments. But what, it is asked, do we mean by equilibrium? Is it an exact balance or does it allow for some deficit, say $500 million, $1 billion, or even more?

Our feeling in the Treasury is that equilibrium cannot be defined solely in terms of a figure; it is importantly a matter of confidence. Whether a given figure for the overall balance of our international transactions represents equilibrium depends on the particular circumstances at the particular time. But while we may not be able to define in precise numerical terms what equilibrium is, we can say that it does not exist when the United States is continually losing gold. Perhaps, then, the best indication of what equilibrium in the U.S. balance of payments is, is what the rest of the world thinks it is. The extent to which they cash in their dollars for gold is, in short, a very useful indicator.

We are seeking the long-run, basic solution to our balance-of-payments deficit through measures which are consistent with our domestic objectives and our foreign policy objectives, and consistent with a growing volume of world trade and capital movements. In brief, our long-run approach is to:

1. Continue to minimize the balance of payments impact of Government expenditures abroad.
2. Strive to increase our exports and receipts from foreign tourists.
3. Encourage other developed nations to take on more international financing to relieve us of a disproportionate share.
4. Take measures to encourage more foreign investment here.

To gain the necessary time for these longer run measures, we have undertaken shorter run measures which President Johnson outlined in his message last February 10. These consist of efforts to reduce foreign travel expenditures by U.S. citizens; the extension and broadening of the interest equalization tax; and, most importantly, the request that banks and corporations curtail or adjust their activities to lessen the balance-of-payments impact of capital outflows.

The key to success in this program, both in the short run and in the long run, is the business community. For the short run, we must have the effective cooperation of the business community to give us the time for our longer run measures to take effect. And in the long run, the competitive position of American business in relation to the other major trading countries will be critical.

First of all, we must maintain our good record of relative price stability. Secondly, American business must become more energetic and effective in finding and exploiting foreign markets for American exports.

Shortly after President Johnson announced his new balance-of-payments program on February 10, there was an encouraging swing to a surplus in our balance of payments. It is far too early, however, to conclude that this represents a permanent trend toward equilibrium. Some of the gains were due to special factors, some were one-time gains. We are by no means out of the woods yet. But we do feel that we have a program which is sound and can bring us to equilibrium if all of us follow through on it.

While the subject of world liquidity has only recently come into public prominence, the United States, several years ago, joined with other major countries in comprehensive studies of the international monetary system, its recent evolution, its present effectiveness, and its future. On June 1 of this year, this multilateral study group issued a report which exhaustively examines the possible ways to strengthen the system. In July, Secretary Fowler announced that the United States stood prepared to participate in an international monetary conference that would consider what steps we might jointly take to secure substantial improvements in international monetary arrangements.

On September 10, Secretary Fowler returned from a 10-day trip to Europe during which he exchanged views with officials of seven countries on how we might move ahead to improve the workings of the international monetary system. Secretary Fowler had earlier conferred in Washington with Canadian and Japanese officials.

He found agreement that present circumstances call for a reexamination of the free world's monetary arrangements; that we should begin contingency planning for the possible time ahead when new ways of providing for growth in monetary reserves will become necessary; and that active discussions on negotiations should begin in the near future at the level of policymaking officials.

The annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund beginning next week offers a logical opportunity to start putting the negotiating machinery in motion.

In both the case of the problem of the U.S. balance of payments and that of international monetary reform, therefore, there are signs of progress. I would rather close, however, on a note of caution. A basic change in the world's monetary system will not come about quickly or easily. To reach agreement among all the nations involved on anything so basic will require time and enormous effort.

A lasting improvement in our balance of payments—lasting enough to be meaningful in the context I have described—will also require time and effort.

The President's program is broad-gaged, requiring some sacrifice of many elements of the population but no unreasonable sacrifice, in our judgment, of any one element. Of course, more tourists would like to bring back more goods duty-free from abroad; of course, banks and other lenders would like to lend as freely as possible abroad; of course, businessmen would like to take advantage of every attractive overseas investment opportunity. Essentially, we are asking these groups to adjust—not halt—these practices, so that confidence in the dollar will be sustained.

If confidence in the dollar is sustained, if the international monetary system evolves in a sensible way, we will have created the best possible environment for the American economy—American businessmen—to demonstrate their formidable competitive strength in the world at large, in the years ahead.

WHERE IT BELONGS

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman legislator who is proud of serving in the lawmaking body of our Government, I was amazed to read last night's editorial in the Evening Star concerning the Federal minimum wage bill.

In this editorial the writer castigates a standing committee of the House of Representatives for drafting legislation.

The editorial reads:

> The whole question of extending minimum wage benefits and raising minimum levels got out of hand when the House Education and Labor Committee decided to ignore administration requests and write its own bill.

Since when, Mr. Speaker, has this or any other Congress not had the constitutionally established power to write its own bill? I am frankly flabbergasted that a reputable newspaper of the stature of the Evening Star would make such an arrogant assertion.

Perhaps I am old-fashioned, naive or unsophisticated in the ways of lawmaking. But I certainly resent the Star's arrogance. Perhaps the editorialist should dust off his Constitution and reread section 1, of article 1:

> All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Yes, the House of Representatives Education and Labor Committee decided to write its own bill. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, this great 89th Congress has written all of its own bills, and will continue to write them into history when we return in January.

[From the Evening Star, Oct. 21, 1965]

WHERE IT BELONGS

The Federal minimum wage bill is where it belongs—on the shelf. The whole question of extending minimum wage benefits and raising minimum levels got out of hand when the House Education and Labor Committee decided to ignore administration requests and write its own bill.

Originally, the White House requested that 4.6 million new workers be brought under the minimum wage laws. It made no recommendation about raising the hourly rate. The President even cautioned Congress to "consider carefully the effects of higher minimum wage rates on the incomes of those employees, and also on costs and prices, and on job opportunities."

Instead the committee boosted the rate from the present $1.25 hourly level to $1.75 and extended coverage to 7 million new workers. In effect, deliberation became a political contest to determine which committee member could come up with the most unrealistic suggestions. It is good that the whole package has been shoved aside. And the House next session should consider more carefully the arguments that made even the architects of the Great Society hold down their minimum wage recommendations.

THE TERROR OF BOGALUSA: A CASE IN POINT

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that the vast majority of southerners, white and Negro alike, reject the Ku Klux Klan. Southerners are generally law-abiding citizens, and terror and violence are abhorrent to the southern character.

How, then, it might be asked, can the Klan exert such influence on some southern communities? How can the Klan place itself in seemingly a controlling position in some cities of the South?

Bogalusa, La., is a case in point.

Bogalusa, a city of 30,000 people, was for many years called the "magic city." Unfortunately, the Klan has stripped away most of the magic and cast over it a pall that will endure for some years to come.

Here is how it happened.

The Klan in that area was originally chartered as the Original Knights of the Ku Klux Klan. Its leaders were Charles Christmas, of Amite, La.; Saxon Farmer, an oil distributor; Albert Applewhite; Marvin Foster, who ran unsuccessfully for the police jury; James M. Ellis, an auto repairman; Ovied Dunaway, a telephone employee; W. H. Burke, a city electrician; Charles H. Lane, an insurance representative; Johnny Magee, a part-time preacher; Hulon Dunaway, a carpenter; Dewey Smith, retired; and Murphy R. Williams, Jr.

Following investigations by the Federal court in New Orleans, the Original Knights of the Ku Klux Klan recently changed its corporate name to the Anti-Communist Christian Association.

The Ku Klux Klan uses three basic techniques—secrecy, terror, and intimidation. It attempts to infiltrate legitimate functions of government. Again Bogalusa is a case in point.

The mayor of that city, whether willingly or not, became subject to the influence of the Klan. His next door neighbor, Dewey Smith, was a member of the Klan and in close contact with the mayor. W. H. Burke, the city electrician, was to report on all activities taking place at the city hall, and Marvin Foster served as the city's liaison man for the Klan. A salesman for the Red Bird Ice Cream Co., owned by Mayor Cutrer—Mike Moody—is a member of the Klan.

The prosecuting attorney for the city, Mr. Robert Rester, who is duty bound to prosecute whatever crimes are committed in Bogalusa, is a member of the Klan. O'Neil A. Jones, brother of City Judge A. J. Jones, is a Klansman. The mayor appointed to the Bogalusa Housing Authority a member of the Klan, Devon Varnado.

A member of the fire department, Myrle Carriere, is a member of the Klan. Melvin R. Lloyd, a Klansman, is a city policeman.

In addition to infiltration of law enforcement agencies, the Klan has membership among other officials. They are: Ray Branch and Tom Bush, members of the police jury—or county commission—Spot Honaker, former member of the Bogalusa School Board; J. D. Shows, former State representative and former president of a paper mill union. Russell Magee, schoolteacher in Washington Parish, is also a member of the Klan.

With membership in high places, the Klan instituted a reign of terror, seeking completely to dominate the city of Bogalusa. By intimidation, coercion, and boycott, these men, then anonymous—were able to force many innocent people to do their bidding. They bragged about the boycott of one of the radio stations, and by terror tactics forced practically all its advertisers to cancel contracts. Having accomplished this, the Klan, by further threats of violence, tried to take over the Bogalusa News, the city's daily newspaper. Threats failing to accomplish this purpose, the Klan began a long siege of harassment—burning crosses on the owner's lawn, puncturing his automobile tires, and abusing him in unsigned letters and scurrilous circulars.

The mayor, following prolonged violence, asked President Johnson's help, and then became the Klan's bitter enemy. In an unsigned circular, the Klan demanded that Mayor Cutrer, Gov. John J. McKeithen, Senator Russell Long, Representative Sheridan, Senator "Sixty" Rayburn, Congressman Jimmy Morrison, and Sheriff Dorman Crowe be tarred and feathered.

The Klan's threats were singularly unsuccessful against the sheriff of the county, Dorman Crowe, because he proved to be a sincere law officer. His oath of office would not be broken by threats of violence by the Klan. Violence failed to spread beyond the city limits of Bogalusa largely because the Klan could not intimidate the sheriff.

The Klan campaign was also directed at the Crown-Zellerbach Corp., Bogalusa's major industry, in an attempt to prevent that company from complying with the civil rights law. Had it been successful, that company might have closed down, with chaos to the community's economy.

Some employees of the Louisiana Power & Light Co. and the Crown-Zellerbach Corp. are members of the Klan. Some who wanted to resign from the Klan at the onset of violence feared to do so because of possible Klan reprisals. They thus became unwilling captives of their own organization.

Was this terror inevitable? Had those elected and appointed officials of Bogalusa charged with the responsibility of law enforcement done their duty, this tragedy could have been avoided. With firm action at the outset, the Klan would probably have been ineffective, and recognized only as a small band of misguided and maliciously irresponsible men. Yet, they were hidden, anonymous, unidentified.

Mr. Speaker, I now place in the Record the names of members of the Ku Klux Klan of Bogalusa, and the Anti-Communist Christian Association. These names are derived from Federal court records, as submitted pursuant to court order:

Charles H. Lane, Johnny Magee, Jim Ford, Virgil Corkern, Robert Fuller, Royal Young, Delos Williams, Hardie Goings, Sr., Houston P. Morris, Esley Freeman, Zeke Freeman, Hardie Goings, Jr., James Hollingsworth, Jr., Randle Pounds, J. D. Swenson, James Burke, Billy Alford, Sidney Warner, Rawlin Williamson, Billy Skipper, Eugene Farmer, Billy Crain of Pine, La., R. L. Stallings, Sidney Brock, Colin Warner, J. M. Fisher, James Hollingsworth, Sr., Harold E. Smith, Carl Williams, Devon Varnado, Arvis Warner, Ray Ritchie, Rayford Dunaway, Ovied Dunaway, Hulon Dunaway.

Dave Kindy, Jack James, Bill Simmons, Clayton Hines, J. D. Creel, Albert Crain, Lobby Anderson, Jewell Freeman, A. F. Hancock, Silas Thomas, Marvin Tynes, Steve Moody, Harold E. Smith, H. E. Morris, Leslie Spears, Wallace Kimble, Rivert Roe, Howard Branton, Murphy J. Williams, Herbert Adams, Ray Parson, Robert Roy Jones, Jack Holliman, J. W. Mixon, Danny Miller, Hollie Martin, Hoyt Boyd, Carl Williams, James E. Cothern, Lamar Moody, Lucius Bateman, R. C. Alford, Burnin Martin, Roy Self, Willmer Creel, Joseph L. Adams, Louis Newman, Jr., Alvin K. Spears, Thomas Ray Stewart, Ernie D. Knight, Lavaughn Rawls, Rustin E. Duncan, Jim Barber, L. B. Thompson, Doyle Mizell, Myrle Carriere, Hollie Thomas, Marshall Walker, Buddie Thomas, Elmo Seal, Joseph T. Wheat, N. E. Crain, Walter Reeves, Charles Tulles, Homer Sheridan, Robert Middleton, J. D. Brister, James L. Bests, Glen L. Lott, Edwin Welch, Paul E. Coone, Tommy Bateman, Frank Bedwell, D. A. Walker, Elton Thomas, M. L. Breland, Sidney Warner, Argel E. Carroll, Delkus Landrum, Eddie Lawrence.

W. J. Williams, Jessie Pierce, Kenneth Wilson, Vexter Rester, Edmond Crain, Glynn Reid, E. Jones, Chess Adams, N. H. Branch, Talmadge Seals, Malloy Jones, L. Brumfield, Sam Seals, S. E. Hartzog, Colen Warner, Dewitt Mizell, Albert J. Branton, A. J. Foil, Buster Ellis, Devon Varnado, Marvin Sandifer, C. D. Wheat, Frank R. Misita, Ray Wheat, C. L. Smith, K. C. Morris, W. W. Merritt, Robert Overstreet, E. D. May, Burkett Stringer, Zeke Freeman, Noel Ball, J. D. Tynes, Pearlie Wheat, Richard Seale, Glynn Monasco, Jimmie Goss, J. D. Miller, J. W. Landrum, William W. Nielsen, Marvin C. Paige, Marion E. Williams, Moellerce Knight, Roy Lindsey, Willis Adams, T. B. Sumrall, S. W. Hamilton, Loran M. Passman, Richard Tynes, Huston Jordan, Fenon Jenkins, Rudolph Jenkins, Fred H. Magee, Lavell Knight, Woodrow Hopgood, Sanford Slade, Gerald P. Laurence, R. M. Freeman, Walter Gunn, J. J. Hilton, John D. Bush, C. L. Lott, W. E. Hill, W. J. Mixon, Robert R. Adams, Arthur Applewhite, Frank. L. Jenkins, O. S. Day, Frank Boyington.

I place these before the public so the public may know with whom it deals. I firmly believe that full information, amply imparted to the public, will be an adequate remedy. Now, when a decent citizen receives a threatening telephone call, he has an idea who might be calling. When he finds the now familiar leaflet, "The KKK Is Watching You," in his mailbox, he will know who is watching. When he finds a sticker proclaiming "Your Neighbor Is a Klansman" he can now judge the truth of that matter.

In his first inaugural message, in the year 1801, Thomas Jefferson proclaimed a government characterized by "diffusion of knowledge, and the prompt arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason." It is my fervent hope that this presentment might help restore reason, honesty, and harmony to the community of Bogalusa, and that that city may soon recapture the magic destroyed by the Ku Klux Klan.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, here at the close of the 1965 session of the 89th Congress I wish to express my satisfaction at having been the first Congressman to represent Georgia's new Fourth Congressional District and to make a few observations.

First, let me say that my experience as a Member of this body has enhanced my respect, which was already high, for our National Legislature.

Second, I am convinced that history will judge the work of this Congress favorably. After listening to part of the hearings on the Ku Klux Klan this afternoon it is more apparent than ever that every citizen of this country must have the benefit of a good education. Every citizen must understand the rights of the other fellow as well as his own if we are going to make secure the blessings of liberty for every citizen of the United States. In my opinion this Congress will be remembered for helping us move closer to the ideal of Thomas Jefferson that every citizen have the benefit of a good education.

Third, I am glad that this Congress decided that the full force and power of the Federal Government will be used to insure the right of every American citizen to register and vote.

Our representative democracy demands that each citizen have both the opportunity for an education and the right to freely express himself at the ballot box.

Fourth, I can see that the successful management of our society will require much innovation and a measure of intergovernmental cooperation never before achieved. There must be a strong partnership between local, State, and Federal officials and all of our citizens, based on mutual respect and understanding. If any one of the partners is weak, then the partnership will be weak. And each partner has a unique role to play. It will take much thought and discussion and some experimentation for us to determine the precise role for each level of government, and also how the citizen's role can become more effective in today's world.

Fifth, I can see that the role of the Congressman will become of increasing importance, particularly in urban areas, because he is the only elected political leader having a constituency which reaches across many political subdivisions. It will be increasingly his duty to inform his constituents and work with local officials about important programs enacted to strengthen our Nation by strengthening local communities.

Sixth, it is aparent to me that new Members of Congress could use more intensive training and, based on my experience this year, I feel that an intensive, official training program for Congressmen would improve our effectiveness. It should be done after the strain of the campaign and the novelty of taking office have worn off—perhaps in the summer of the first year in office.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives a new approach we are taking to effective citizenship in the fourth district. We have organized some 31 citizens panels for progress, on a nonpartisan basis, for all who are interested in our Nation's problems. They have been established somewhat parallel to the committees of Congress and they have provided a specific way in which citizens who wish to have a meaningful relationship with Congress can do so.

Our experience with these panels convinces me that the idea is sound and that we could strengthen the Congress and our democracy if this idea were put to work in districts throughout the Nation. The old town meeting has gone with the wind and nothing has taken its place. We need to provide an opportunity for citizens to have a means whereby they can get the same kind of information about our problems and opportunities which we have at our disposal here in Washington.

We need to provide more forums at the precinct level in which citizens can exchange views about proposed legislation and we need to provide a way in which citizens groups can more readily bring to the attention of Congress matters which deserve our attention.

Attached hereto, marked exhibit "A" is a list of our 31 panels and the names and addresses of the fine men and women who are helping me develop this idea.

Congress has enacted laws and passed appropriations which can greatly benefit local communities. But I have become more convinced than ever that our efforts will largely fail if we do not achieve a high degree of areawide cooperation in our rapidly growing communities. Because of this conviction, I wrote a letter to our three 5-county planning organizations in Atlanta proposing a conference to foster areawide cooperation, and to identify unprecedented oportunities for healthy growth.

I am pleased to be able to say that this proposal was accepted and we look forward on Monday, November 15, to this important conference. A copy of my letter proposing such a conference is attached, marked exhibit "B" and is included because its content should have application in urban areas throughout the land.

The healthy development of urban areas requires the provision of a surprising number of physical things, and it requires a great variety of skills and services. Furthermore, all of these must be put together in accordance with regulations and with specific plans.

Our Fourth District citizens panels have worked up a checklist of urban wants, a copy of which is attached, marked exhibit "C." This checklist illustrates how complicated our urban society is getting and when studied in the light of the fact that it often takes one or more units of government to deliver, it is quite an informative document.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the future of our Nation demands that Americans become better acquainted with each other and with the unique problems in each region. There are too many provincial viewpoints in our country. We need a "sense of nation" as never before simply for the practical reason of survival in the international jungle and for the equally practical reason that with the increasing mobility of our population any American possibly may live anywhere else in America and therefore each of us has a stake as to what happens anywhere in the 50 States.

The intelligence and authentic patriotism of the Members of this House and the vitality of my own constituency convinces me that our country will be increasingly worthy of its position of leadership in the free world.

EXHIBIT A

Citizens panels for progress for the 89th Congress, Fourth Congressional District, 116 Clairmont Avenue, Decatur, Ga., 377–6486:

1. Agriculture: Mr. Robert R. Croy, chairman, 617 Collingwood Drive, Decatur, Ga. (284–3122).

2. Arts, fine arts, public architecture and natural beauty: Dr. George W. Beiswanger, chairman, 2109 Spring Creek Circle, Decatur, Ga. (636–7056).

3. Child care, infant care, day care, and kindergarten: Mrs. William Buckley, chairman, 1713 Wayland Circle, NE., Atlanta, Ga. (636-1225).

4. Church-state relations: Mr. Kingsley Weatherly, chairman, 1311 Kelton Drive, Stone Mountain, Ga. (443–7300).

5. Civil and commercial aviation: Mr. J. Frank Putnam, chairman, 27 Spence Avenue, NE., Atlanta, Ga. (DR 8–1244).

6. Crime prevention, youth programs, and law enforcement: Mrs. Mamie K. Taylor, chairman, 1137 Briarcliff Road, NE., Atlanta, Ga. (TR 2–5358).

7. Education—College and university programs: Mr. John A. Crown, chairman, 358 South McDonough Street, Decatur, Ga. (378–3339).

8. Elementary and secondary education: Mrs. Harry Dewar, chairman, 2169 Spring Creek Road, Decatur, Ga. (634–7033).

9. Fiscal policy, taxation, banking and currency: Mr. James C. H. Anderson, chairman, 1593 Mason Mill Road, NE., Atlanta, Ga. (636–6936).

10. Government employees, active and retired, and Federal installations: Mr. Ralph D. Stancil, chairman, 686 East Side Avenue, SE., Atlanta, Ga. (622–3631).

11. Health professions, programs and services: Dr. John Godwin, chairman, 1164 Springdale Road, NE., Atlanta, Ga. 30306 (DR 8–4465).

12. Intergovernmental relations, city, county, metropolitan, State, and Nation: Dr. William G. Cornelius, chairman, 886 Lullwater Road NE., Atlanta, Ga. (373–4620).

13. International relations, the United Nations, international trade and tourism: Mrs. Fleming Law, chairman, 4050 East Brookhaven Drive NE., Atlanta, Ga. (233–9863).

14. Labor-management relations, automation, and unemployment: Mr. A. Waldo Sowell, chairman, 1296 North Decatur Road NE., Atlanta, Ga. (DR 7–3169).

15. Library services: Mrs. Otis Norcross, chairman, 2450 Clairmont Road NE., Atlanta, Ga. (634–2061).

16. Mental health: Mr. A. Paul Cadenhead, chairman, 1729 Wilmont Drive NE., Atlanta, Ga. (634–7029).

17. Municipal and urban affairs, private and public housing: Mr. Lewis Cenker, chairman, 2045 Manchester Street NE., Atlanta, Ga. (875–7255).

18. National defense and military affairs: Mr. Hugh H. Howell, Jr., chairman, 1505 Rock Springs Circle NE., Atlanta, Ga. (TR 4–4267).

19. Older Americans: Miss Allie B. Mann, chairman, 1097 Oxford Road NE., Atlanta, Ga. (DR 3–5191).

20. Planning, area, and regional development: Mr. Nelson Severinghaus, chairman, 213 Glen Circle, Decatur, Ga. (DR 8–3972).

21. Poverty, welfare, and the population explosion: Mr. John L. Glenn, chairman, 1021 Springdale Road NE., Atlanta, Ga. (378–2561).

22. Public Safety (water, traffic, and general): Mrs. Charles Huguley, chairman, 865 Clifton Road NE., Atlanta, Ga. (DR 3–3269).

23. Rapid transit, Federal and interstate highways: Mr. Rufus Camp, chairman, 130 Champlain Street, Decatur, Ga. (DR 3–4195).

24. Registration and voting: Mrs. Donald R. Green, chairman, 1419 Cornell Road, Atlanta, Ga. (DR 7–1069).

25. Science, research, and astronautics: Mr. M. Dale Henson, chairman, 715 Clifton Way NE., Atlanta, Ga. (636–0621).

26. Small business—Problems and opportunities: Mrs. Robert Serfling, chairman, 2328 Spring Creek Road, Decatur, Ga. (636–1938).

27. Veterans' affairs: Mr. John C. Poss, chairman, 4468 Doyle Street, Tucker, Ga. (938–3198).

28. Water resources and conservation: Mr. Caraker Paschal, chairman, 2821 Orion Drive, Decatur, Ga. (634–0978).

29. Young Americans: Mr. Randall Peek, chairman, 108 Turner Street, Conyers, Ga. (483–7878).

30. Mental retardation: Mrs. Philip Levetan, chairman, 1216 Biltmore Drive, Atlanta, Ga. (636–3704).

31. The blind and other physically handicapped: Mr. Ned E. Freeman, chairman, 136 Gee's Mill Road, Conyers, Ga. (483–7754).

EXHIBIT B

(A copy of this letter from Representative MACKAY, proposing a 20-county regional conference this fall to plan for the healthy urban growth of the Metropolitan Atlanta area, was sent to the chairmen of the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission, the Metropolitan Council of Local Governments, and the Community Council of the Atlanta Area, Inc.)

AUGUST 31, 1965.

DEAR FRIENDS: Confirming my recent conversations with you, I propose for your consideration and action that a 20-county Atlanta area regional conference be held this fall.

I believe that such a conference would be timely and productive of much good because of recent developments in Washington, at the State capitol, and in the metropolitan area.

Your three organizations are the logical sponsors to hold such a conference, because each has definite responsibilities and resources for leadership—notably outstanding professional staff, excellent voluntary leaders, and community acceptance and support.

On September 18, 1957, a similar conference embracing the 18 counties in the area was held under the joint sponsorship of the metropolitan planning commission and the Georgia Power Co. All of us who attended that conference got an impressive preview of what indeed has happened in the region and we have been able to work in a more cooperative way because of that conference.

An estimated 1,175,000 citizens now reside in the five-county area of Clayton, Cobb, De Kalb, Fulton, and Gwinnett. An additional 355,200 citizens live in the 15 counties of Barrow, Bartow, Carroll, Cherokee, Coweta, Douglas, Fayette, Forsyth, Hall, Henry, Newton, Paulding, Rockdale, Spalding, and Walton. An estimated total of 1,520,700 citizens reside in these 20 counties which are now designated as the standard statistical metropolitan region of Atlanta. I have attached a map of the 20-county area.

As this area moves toward a population of 2 million people, it is obvious that a substantial part of the growth will occur in the 15 counties surrounding the inner 5.

These 15 surrounding counties are closely interrelated to the 5 inner counties, and what happens in the 5-county area will affect the 15-county area for better or for worse and vice versa. I am satsified that there would be good participation from all of the counties. In a recent conference with officials of the city of Conyers and Rockdale County, I found deep interest on their part in regard to the implications of economic and population growth on water resources, sewage disposal and many other problems.

Continued spectacular population and economic growth is certain to occur, but there is no guarantee that this growth will result in our having a better region in which to live, work, and raise our families. Every good thing which has occurred in the past 20 years in this region has been the result of positive thought and action on the part of individuals or civic-minded groups.

Therefore, what happens in the future may well be determined by what we do now in response to significant developments. Other than the economic and population growth already noted, these are the most outstanding developments.

New Federal legislation: By adjournment, the 89th Congress will have acted upon more than 25 major pieces of legislation which can have important bearing on the social, economic, and environmental conditions of this 20-county area. Nearly all of this legislation requires local planning and response if we are to derive benefit from it. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary that all of our local officials be advised as to the contents of this legislation and what specific local action is required. The Housing Act of 1965 should be explained in detail. The Water Resources Act of 1965 is a good example of a measure that will require a regional response if it is to accomplish its objective.

The new legislature: Twenty State senators and 65 newly elected representatives from this 20-county area will take their seats in the 1966 general assembly. There will be a new response to the problems of this area, and a conference would get these new legislators and all of the rest of us closely acquainted with the big challenges and opportunities now before us.

Metropolitan and cooperative action: Each of your organizations is engaged in important and useful activity. It is important that everyone in the 20-county area learn who is doing what and why, and perhaps learn what is not being done. Cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments and public and private agencies is the key to regional progress.

All elected officials, members of boards, chamber of commerce officials, and many others would welcome the opportunity to attend such a conference. Attendance would give each of us a better awareness of these new developments, and we would become better acquainted with each other. This would foster and accelerate the fine spirit of cooperation which is characteristic of our region, and which has won our area national acclaim.

I am taking the initiative in suggesting such a conference, since 472,000 citizens of the area reside in my district. Actually, there are six members of Congress who represent some portion of this 20-county area and, from my knowledge of them, I am confident that you would have their support in undertaking such a conference. Furthermore, the appropriate Federal agencies have given me assurance that you would have their full cooperation in arranging such a conference.

If we take advantage of the unprecedented opportunities now at hand, we can seize the initiative and keep our region in the forefront of healthy urban growth and development. Our conference could benefit other urban centers in Georgia and elsewhere in the Nation by providing an affirmative approach.

I hope and trust that it will be possible for your organizations to go ahead with this conference. Please call on me to assist in any way possible.

Sincerely yours,

James A. Mackay,
Fourth District Congressman.

Exhibit C

What People Living in Urban Areas Want and Need

To get us about: streets, sidewalks, curbs, drains, street lights, street name markers, traffic lights and signals, traffic signs, parking, parking meters, bridges, culverts, expressways, expressway lighting, public comfort stations, interchanges, guard rails, rail transit, commercial airports, private plane airports.

To keep us safe: fire stations, firefighting vehicle and equipment, police station, police vehicles and equipment, armories, civil defense shelters and equipment, jails, workcamps, juvenile detention homes.

To guard our health: water supply, water treatment, water distribution, sanitary sewers, sewage treatment, sewage disposal, storm sewers, garbage collection equipment, garbage disposal, incinerators or land fill, hospitals, health centers and clinics, mental illness center, inpatient and outpatient alcoholic treatment center, convalescent homes, animal shelters.

To educate us: day care, kindergarten, elementary schools, high schools, community colleges, universities, library and books, places for exceptional children, vocational technical schools, job training.

For our leisure and recreation: Neighborhood parks and playgrounds, playground equipment, regional parks, nature preserves, zoos, golf course, tennis courts, swimming pools, little league and Babe Ruth baseball fields, playing fields, stadium, auditorium, community centers, museums.

For our general service: Public works equipment and storage, county and municipal buildings and equipment for general services, health, education, and welfare administration, court houses and equipment.

Utilities: Gas, electric power, telephone (skills and services are needed to maintain and operate all of these physical apparatus of urban communities).

Essential regulations: General, fire, police, building, traffic, zoning, health.

Plans for today and tomorrow: Land use, area transportation, sewer and water, schools, health, social service, open space, beautification, civil defense, and disaster.

SPEECH OF HON. WAYNE L. HAYS AT NATO PARLIAMENTARIAN CONFERENCE

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio, Representative Wayne L. Hays, chairman of the House delegation to the recent NATO Parliamentarians' Conference held in New York City, and one of the Vice Presidents of the Conference, made a very important speech during the debate on the Political Committee report. It was generally agreed that this debate was one of the most forceful and interesting in the 11 annual meetings of the Conference. The speech of Chairman Hays, which was made on Friday, October 8, 1965, in which he discussed the disruptive character of General de Gaulle's attitude toward NATO, was an outstanding contribution to that debate.

The speech follows:

Hon. Wayne L. Hays (United States): Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, first I want to apologize for the rather hectic situation that the American delegation has been in during this whole Conference. First, the Senators weren't here, then the Members of the House weren't here. The House sat for 13 hours yesterday and had the final vote on a bill about 1 in the morning, as you know if you read the papers. Then we had a jet plane to get up here this morning; my alarm clock didn't go off and that delayed us. Then we got up here in 30 minutes and took 1 hour and 10 minutes to get from Kennedy Airport to the hotel, so we do apologize.

I first want to say that I appreciate, and I'm sure we all do, the enormous amount of work done by M. Boscher and I commend him, as the Committee did, for the lucidity and phrasing of his report. I might say as a compliment to him that the other night at the dinner Secretary Rusk said to me, "Tell me about this man Boscher." He said, "He speaks the finest English I've ever heard a Frenchman speak in the many years I've known them." And I told him a little bit of the secret of it but I won't embarrass M. Boscher now.

I would like to say also that I'm sympathetic to some of the points he made. Maybe not many, but to some of them. It seems to be only natural, for example, that in an alliance in which one member happens to hold a preponderant military power, the other members may well be concerned—and rightly—that they may not be given an equal voice. But it seems to me that the desire of a country in this situation to insure that it participates in vital decisions, is one thing, while the policy of one member of an alliance opposing the general goals of cooperation and the community in contrast to policies of all the other members, as far as I can ascertain their views, is another. This is the source of my concern with respect to the Boscher report because it seems to be that this is the basic thrust of the two-pillar approach.

Furthermore, I see no evidence that the present French Government is pursuing a policy consistent with its declared aim of building the strength of the European pillar. I recall such French actions as blocking British membership in EEC, rejecting the MLF, preventing the adoption of a common agricultural policy by the EEC, and now, after General de Gaulle's most recent press conference, the question of the future of an integrated western defense system.

And let me interpolate from a few prepared remarks I had at this point, and say that I have the utmost admiration for General de Gaulle as a politician. As a practicing politician myself I recognize a master when I see one and I think in the art of getting a government and keeping it that he is excelled by no one, not even the President of the United States, who has some ability in that himself. And I have a deep sympathy, as all of you know, and I think a friendship for France as a nation and for the French people in general. And as President Moreau de Melen said the other night, and I appreciate his remarks, that you all know me and that I speak frankly and forthrightly, I feel in this case, that my French friends are just wrong about their approach. In fact I took M. Boscher to Ohio for a few days last year. And while I think I improved his geographic knowledge a little, I made absolutely no impression, as far as I can tell, on his philosophy of the situation within NATO. But we can still be friends.

The so-called two-pillar approach or the regionalization of NATO, it seems to me, was tried without the nomenclature, as I said, in the Committee the other day, in both World War I and World War II. And if you have any doubts about the bankruptcy of this approach, you only have to read some of the biographies, the autobiographies, the reminiscences and memoirs, of some of the generals; French, British, and American, who participated in those two wars, to find out the difficulties caused by the lamentable lack of communication between them. There was no prior planning, there was no contingency planning, there was no real organization. You had a French army operating on the one hand, a British on the other, an American somewhere in between, and really nobody knew what the others were doing. And I would suggest to you that in case of any kind of conventional war, this situation is likely to prevail to a greater or lesser degree. It seemed to me in World War I it prevailed to the point of chaos and to a lesser degree perhaps in World War II, once the invasion of the Continent was undertaken. But what it seems to me we ought to be working toward is trying to prevent as much chaos and as much confusion as we had in either of the other wars.

Now I haven't detected any great enthusiasm among either the delegates here or people that I've talked to in Europe this summer, and other trips that I've made there in the spring and in the winter, for what seems to be the French point of view, which is an European alliance dominated by one of the partners. It's a little inconsistent, isn't it, that the French Government objects to NATO on the grounds that it is dominated by one of the partners. It seems, if I can read what I hear coming out of Paris correctly, that they propose to set up the two-pillar approach only having one of the pillars dominated by the French partner. I couldn't agree more with the gentleman who preceded me from France, M. Faure, in his remarks. I think I could almost agree 100 percent with him. And it seemed to me that the tenor of his remarks was that we have to have cooperation on a basis of as near equality as we can get it.

And I liked especially what he said when he said that the Americans, at the moment, are the trustee who will push the button if it becomes necessary, but not without prior consultation, not without knowledge, not without the agreement of the partners. The last thing we want in America is to dominate this thing to the point of making everybody feel that they're just tagging along and we're making all the decisions. We don't want that. But I think you have to look at the practicalities of the situation. And we've had debates year in and year out in which we've all agreed fundamentally that you can't have 15 fingers on the trigger, if a nuclear war breaks out. You have to have a decision and you have to have it fast. It seems to me that the vulnerability of France itself would lead the great mass of French people to conclude that they didn't want to stand alone and that they couldn't stand with their own deterrent. Because as I said in the committee, it wouldn't take many bombs from Russia in the higher ranges, conveyed by missiles, to destroy France, as an entity. It wouldn't take too many to destroy the United States. But at least we're spread out over more territory and because of that we're not as vulnerable, it seems to me, as the countries of Europe.

Furthermore, I have a very uneasy feeling when I read about the impossibility of reforming NATO before 1969. As several speakers pointed out yesterday, NATO can be reformed now. As I understand it, the only significance of 1969 is that this is the year in which any party may denounce the treaty, provided 1 year's advance notice is given. Does this talk about reform not being possible before 1969 mean that the only reform in which M. Boscher is interested is the withdrawal of France? I don't think so, although I can't really say for sure. Or does it mean that only in 1969 does France believe that she will have the capability of forcing changes to her liking in the treaty?

So I would ask, and I understand this question was posed before in my absence, what specific reforms does France want now? It seems to me that it is important for all of us to know precisely what they are so we can discuss them as allies, not as antagonists. This would be far more productive than to continue to talk in generalities which cloud the issues and cause further misunderstandings.

Let me illustrate the danger of debate in generalities by referring to certain apparent contradictions in M. Boscher's report. On page 1, for example, he states, as I've noted before, that there is no possibility of reforming the alliance before 1969. But then he goes on to recommend certain reforms, although not in sufficiently precise form to permit us to grasp exactly what changes he has in mind.

To take another example, on page 4 M. Boscher urges the necessity of coordinating, indeed unifying, he adds, the policies of member countries, both inside and outside the present NATO area. But on page 6 he proposes regionalizing the Alliance by having each member define the area of his commitment. Isn't there a contradiction between these two proposals?

The contradictions in the report really seem to me to reflect the disarray caused by France's reluctance, her apparent reluctance—let me put it that way—to cooperate except on her own terms, and then we don't exactly know what those terms are. I think part of General de Gaulle's success is the mystery that he puts around his decisions, especially in domestic politics.

But let me say to you in all candor and in all sincerity, that mystery in domestic politics is one thing but mystery in foreign affairs is quite another. And if the President of the United States, who has, in my opinion, the great approval of the American people for his domestic policy, were to suddenly advocate a dissolution of NATO and a withdrawal into the old isolationist terminology, he would lose the support of the American people on that fundamental issue. This would not necessarily affect the President's position at the moment, because as a practicing politician of a quarter of a century's experience I know, and you must know, that the overriding thing with the man, to use a cliche, of the man in the street—the average citizen, is his immediate financial prosperity. But if that is threatened by a war or something else, he immediately wonders how his leaders got him into this situation and the leader's political base can disappear overnight. And while it's not for me to talk about French political matters, and I've put this in the context of American political matters, I would say that it would be my guess, not being Dr. Gallup, that the overwhelming majority of the French people think that General de Gaulle has brought a stabilization, which I think we can frankly say was needed, to French politics. But if you could poll them I should think a great overwhelmingly majority would be skeptical of his apparent desire to disrupt NATO.

And if I have misread this, and I hope I have, my sincerest apologies. But I do think, if this meeting is going to be of any value whatever, we should speak frankly. And if I have spoken too frankly, I'm sorry. If I have misinterpreted the French Government's position, I'd be delighted if somebody would put me right. Thank you, Mr. President.

LEGISLATION TO OUTLAW COMMUNIST PARTY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, and in the past two Congresses, I introduced legislation to outlaw the Communist Party, U.S.A., and I believe that recent events indicate the propriety and desirability of such legislation.

The argument is made that to outlaw a legitimate "political" party would be a violation of the Constitution and the freedoms guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

But, I submit that the Communist Party, U.S.A. is not a legitimate political party in any sense of the word, but exists, rather, as an appendage of a foreign government, whose ultimate goal, by any and all means, is the overthrow of our republican form of government.

Consider the comments of FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover, in a speech on October 19, entitled: "The Faith of Free Men."

Quoting from that speech:

> Communism is a vast international conspiracy which today dominates one-third of the earth's people. Here, in our own country, that conspiracy is represented by the Communist Party, U.S.A., a bold and defiant band of anti-American turncoats whose operations are directed and controlled by the Kremlin in Moscow.
>
> The Communists profess to be a legitimate political organization. This is not so. Actually, the party constitutes a foreign outpost on America's shores. Its members—knowingly, deliberately and willingly—are active tools of the Soviet Union.

In the FBI annual report for fiscal year 1965, there is the following description of Communist activities on pages 23 to 26:

> COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES
>
> An optimistic Communist Party, U.S.A., moved into more open activities during the 1965 fiscal year in its efforts to gain new influence and promote its programs. It pressed with renewed vigor in all areas of its operations, giving special attention to slashing attacks on American foreign policy, the infiltration of the civil rights movement and youth recruitment.
>
> Although the party loudly proclaims its independence of foreign control, its every action rends this facade to show clearly that it owes allegiance only to the Soviet Union

and is absolutely committed to the world Communist movement. Amply evident of this was the reaction of party leaders to the June 22, 1964, decision of the U.S. Supreme Court declaring unconstitutional the passport section of the Internal Security Act of 1950 which prohibited any member of the Communist Party, U.S.A. from applying for, using, or attempting to use a U.S. passport. As soon as passports became available to them under this ruling, many party functionaries traveled to the Soviet Union where they were feted, shown much favor, and indoctrinated for new assaults against their homeland.

The Communist Party's traditional opposition to any facet of American foreign policy which serves to impede international communism reached new levels of invective with all-out attacks on this country's commitments in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. Denouncing U.S. action in South Vietnam as brutal and barbarous, the party has instructed its members to cooperate with all protest groups in order to intensify these activities and weaken the Government's position. The party is making a concerted effort to exploit to its advantage the various demonstrations against American involvement in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

The Communists have been much encouraged by the current wave of social unrest in the United States. They view this situation as the development of a climate favorable to their operations and are constantly probing to exploit areas of discord. It is a rare civil rights activity, whether it be a voter's registration drive, a demonstration, march, or picket, that does not attract Communists to some degree.

A striking example of this was seen in the riots which erupted in the Harlem area of New York City in July 1964. The progressive labor movement (since renamed the Progressive Labor Party), a dissident and and highly militant splinter group of the Communist Party, U.S.A., was involved in prolonging these demonstrations by deliberate incitement of the rioters. Representatives of this group distributed provocative literature and delivered inflammatory street corner harangues which increased the tension in the riot area to a marked degree.

In general, legitimate civil rights organizations have been successful in excluding Communists, although a few have received covert counseling from them and have even accepted them as members. The Communist Party is not satisfied with this situation and is continually striving to infiltrate the civil rights movement at every level. The FBI does not investigate the legitimate activities of civil rights groups, but from an intelligence standpoint it is concerned with determining the extent of any possible Communist infiltration.

The 1964–65 school year was a busy time for Communist leaders in all areas of the country as the party intensified its efforts to attract young people through public appearances on college and university campuses. Party leaders, encouraged by earlier successes, spoke to more than 37,000 students in 56 appearances during this period. This concentration on college campuses was aimed at gaining acceptance for the party as a legitimate political activity, creating an aura of respectability and understanding for the party and spreading Communist propaganda. Communist Party leaders also appeared as guests on numerous radio and television programs.

Another major weapon which the Communist Party is directing against young people is the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America. This party-oriented youth organization, founded in June 1964, at a convention in San Francisco, Calif., which was dominated and controlled by Communists, has as its basic aim the promotion of Marxism-Leninism. The Marxists believe that these clubs, which are centered on college campuses, have great promise in reaching youth.

LEGAL ACTION

In June 1961, the U.S. Supreme Court uphelp the findings of the Subversive Activities Control Board that the Communist Party, U.S.A., was directed and controlled by the Soviet Union. The order for the party to register as required by the Internal Security Act of 1950 was openly defied, leading to the initiation of prosecutive action by the Government. The party was convicted in U.S. District Court, Washington, D.C., on December 17, 1962, on 12 counts of failure to register, and a maximum fine of $120,000 was imposed.

The District of Columbia Court of Appeals reversed this conviction on December 17, 1963, holding that the fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination was available to the officials of the party as a legal justification for refusing to register. The court further held that the Government could retry the case provided it could produce a volunteer who would offer to effect the registration if authorized by the party to do so. Otherwise, the Government was to move to dismiss the indictment. The Supreme Court declined to review this decision.

On February 24, 1965, the Government presented evidence to a Federal grand jury in Washington, D.C., that the party, subsequent to February 12, 1965, had knowledge of the identity and availability of an individual who was willing to sign the registration form and statement. A new indictment was returned on February 25, 1965. This was consolidated with the earlier indictment against the party, and trial was set for late 1965.

By June 30, 1965, the Department of Justice had petitioned the Subversive Activities Control Board to order 44 national and district functionaries of the Communist Party, U.S.A., to register as party members under the appropriate section of the Internal Security Act of 1950. Hearings have been held in all of these cases and, based upon the evidence developed and witnesses supplied by the FBI, registration orders have been issued by the Board against 37 of the respondents, all of whom have filed notices of appeal. On April 23, 1964, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, in a decision concerning two of these cases which had been consolidated for appeal purposes, upheld the registration orders but did not consider the constitutional issues involved. The Supreme Court has agreed to review this decision and argument has been scheduled for the fall of 1965.

Six officials of the International Union of Mine, Mill, & Smelter Workers were convicted in September 1963, of violating the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 in that they had conspired to defraud the Government by illegally obtaining the facilities of the National Labor Relations Board by means of filing false non-Communist affidavits. They were sentenced to 3 years' imprisonment and fined $2,000 each. Prosecution was initiated in November 1956, and the convictions were preceded by numerous reversals and retrials. The U.S. Court of Appeals affirmed these convictions on April 26, 1965.

The section of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947 which required union officials to file non-Communist affidavits with the National Labor Relations Board was repealed on September 14, 1959, and the statute of limitations barred all prosecutions under this section on September 15, 1964.

As a result of FBI investigations, Federal grand juries in Brooklyn, N.Y., returned indictments on September 27, 1963, and September 22, 1964, against a total of 11 individuals for conspiring to violate restrictions prohibiting travel to Cuba without a properly validated passport. These charges related to their travel to Cuba in the summers of 1963 and 1964 on trips organized by the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba. Prosecution in these cases was held in abeyance pending a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in a matter involving a suit to obtain a passport validated for travel to Cuba. On May 3, 1965, the Supreme Court upheld the authority of the Government to restrict travel to Cuba, and these cases were awaiting trial at the close of the fiscal year.

COMMUNIST FRONT ORGANIZATIONS

There is little of social or economic significance occurring in the United States which does not interest the Communist Party as a means of furthering its objectives. The party is continually striving to propagandize its programs through existing front organizations or by creating new ones. It pictures itself as the champion of Negroes and other minority groups by claiming that their interests are its own. Actually, the party has no real concern for these groups—but merely hopes to ensnare them to extend its own influence. Nonsubversive, legitimate organizations are constant targets for infiltration. The Communists aim at gaining control of the policymaking machinery of these groups for the purpose of injecting the party line without any open identification with communism.

U.S. DELEGATION DEMANDS U.N. SOLVENCY

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, three of our colleagues, Representatives O'Hara, Frelinghuysen, and Roosevelt, are serving as part of the U.S. delegation to the 20th General Assembly of the United Nations which convened in New York on September 21. On October 19, Congressman Frelinghuysen, a very able and respected member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, gave his maiden address before the General Assembly's 117-nation Budgetary Committee. Congressman Frelinghuysen, incidentally, has also been assigned by Ambassador Goldberg to the Special Political Committee which considers United Nations peacemaking matters.

I know my colleagues will be interested in Mr. Frelinghuysen's address which forcefully and pointedly puts in perspective the very vital problem of the financing and operations of the United Nations:

Remarks of Hon. Frelinghuysen

Before setting forth the general comments of my delegation on the budget estimates for 1966, I should like to express to the Secretary General our appreciation for his personal appearance before this committee and for the thoughtful statements he has made to us, both here in the committee on October 11 and in the foreword to his 1966 budget estimates. We are also grateful to the Controller, the Director of the Budget Division, and all their associates for the detailed manner in which the text and tables in the estimates have been prepared, particularly with respect to section 3. We recognize the magnitude of the effort which has gone into the production of the documents now before us.

I should also like to express the appreciation of the U.S. delegation to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions for a series of important recommendations to this committee. We owe a special debt of gratitude to the chairman of that committee for the very important statement he made in this committee on October 11. That statement reflected the independence and integrity of approach which have always been characteristic of the chairman of the Advisory Committee.

Turning now to the substance of the matter before us, let me say frankly that the U.S. delegation finds it more difficult this year than in the past to formulate its position on the annual budget estimates of the United Nations.

Our concern arises from several sources. First, the Secretary General in his statement to the committee on October 11, 1965 (A/C.5/1037), stated that for the first 9 months of 1965, only about one-half of the organization's estimated 1965 expenses under the regular budget and the special account for UNEF have been covered by the advance payments received pursuant to Resolution 2004 (XIX). Moreover, the Secretary General further pointed out that of the approximately $100 million which be estimated would be required to enable the organization to liquidate its past debts, to restore the working capital fund to its authorized level, and to cover amounts due to member States as adjustments on assessed contributions for UNEF and ONUC, to date only 15 member governments have made voluntary contributions totaling $20 million to assist in meeting this $100 million requirement.

These financial facts are extremely disturbing. Later in this statement, I shall comment further on this matter.

The second cause for our concern is the very significant increase in the 1966 estimates over the estimated expenditures for 1965. A large part of this increase is attributed to the fact that there is proposed for 1966 the largest staff increase in the history of the United Nations. We note that virtually all of the speakers to date have expressed concern about the magnitude of this increase and where it will lead.

The size of the proposed budget increase—from $107,642,800 gross to about $120 million gross—and particularly the magnitude of the proposed staff increase, require that the estimates be screened this year with special care to be certain that all proposed expenditures are absolutely essential. Also, in a number of areas of expenditure, we must await further explanations from the Controller and his associates before we can take a final position concerning them.

Let me begin by dealing with those items on which we do not have reservations.

First of all, there is the budget increase proposed for 1966 as a result of the recommendations made by the International Civil Service Advisory Board (ICSAB) for raising the professional salaries of employees of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. Despite the generally reserved attitude which the U.S. delegation believes must now be taken toward proposed budgetary increases for 1966, we will support the recommendations of ICSAB—which we regard as a single package—for the following reasons:

First, if member states wish—as they surely do—this Organization to continue as an effective international instrument, we believe it must have staff of the highest efficiency, competence, and integrity. In order to insure this, we must make certain that staff members are properly and fairly compensated. This we consider to be vital. Second, we recognize that the proposed salary increases have been recommended not only by the ICSAB—a highly competent independent body established to deal with the problems of this kind—but also by the Secretary General and the heads of all the specialized agencies. The increases also have the approval of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. Finally, we consider it essential that the integrity of the common salary system to which the United Nations and the specialized agencies adhere be preserved, and we recognize that the specialized agencies will undoubtedly be guided by the ICSAB recommendations in fixing salaries for their staffs.

Accordingly, we are prepared to vote for the budgetary increase proposed for professional salary adjustments.

For many of the same reasons which apply to the professional salary increases, the United States is prepared to vote for the proposed adjustments, recommended by the Joint Staff Pension Board more than a year ago, of pensions being paid to former staff members.

One further matter to which we give our full support is the proposal by the advisory committee for revised travel standards. We in the United States have established economy travel standards for all governmental travel. We consider that it is essential in this organization to adopt a similar policy. Given the vast needs of member governments, which we are all trying to meet through contributions to the United Nations and through bilateral aid, it does not seem sensible to provide United Nations funds for luxury-class travel. The several hundreds of thousands of dollars proposed in the estimates for this nonproductive expenditure can clearly be better spent.

Another proposal which has our full approval is the recommendation by the Secretary General that we not increase—that indeed we seek to decrease—the conference program of this organization. The Secretary General has pointed out that the available conference and supporting facilities are already overwhelmed by the present program. He has said in the introduction to the 1966 estimates:

"I would, therefore, once again appeal most strongly to member states to reconsider the need and desirability of maintaining a conference program as heavy as is currently envisaged for both 1965 and 1966. I for my part believe that some rationalization and curtailment is a real necessity not only in the interests of economy but to yield more qualitative and constructive results."

We fully endorse this statement.

As I mentioned at the outset, the major area of proposed expenditure which gives rise to serious question is that involving staff costs resulting from the proposed establishment of so many new posts. There are also the questionable proposals, referred to by the advisory committee in its report, for the upgrading of so many existing posts.

On the matter of establishing new posts, the remarks I am about to make are addressed only in small part to the Secretary General, who has prepared the budgetary estimates for 1966. It is true that we find several areas in the 1966 budget in which it appears that the estimates go beyond the bounds of prudence and let down the bars to demands for expansion which are unreasonable. Nevertheless, the Secretary General has prepared these estimates on the basis of what member States have asked—and indeed demanded. I recognize that he has been forced to reflect in his budget the will of member States that old programs be expanded or new ones initiated, and I also recognize that in many areas he has courageously pointed out the need for retrenchment.

As we understand it, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary General has requested in his 1966 budget estimates the establishment of 455 new posts. Of these, 368 are requested and described in section 3 of the budget, 14 are requested in section 18 (High Commissioner for Refugees), and 73 are requested under section 20 (UNCTAD). For its part, the Advisory Committee has recommended the establishment of 277 new posts under section 3 has reserved its position on the new posts requested under section 18, and while recommending some reduction under chapter 1 (salaries and wages) of section 20 (UNCTAD), has not recommended any specific reduction in the UNCTAD posts. Thus, the Advisory Committee appears to have approved for 1966 the establishment of 350 posts of the total of 455 posts requested.

This, however, is not the whole story. The new posts proposed for 1966 are, as we understand it, to be in addition to the established posts proposed by the Secretary General and recommended by the Advisory Committee for 1965. The documents before us would seem to indicate that, of the posts recommended by the Advisory Committee for establishment in 1965, 1,934 posts remain to be established, and that it is intended to establish these in 1966 in addition to the 350 posts to which I have referred in the preceding paragraph. If we are correct, this would mean the establishment in 1966 of 484 new posts.

It is likely that we will be told that, while it is true that 134 posts recommended by the advisory committee for 1965 have not yet been established, nevertheless there are already individuals "on board" who are destined to fill those posts and who are presently being financed from temporary assistance funds. Thus, it may be said that the establishment of these 134 posts in 1966 should not be viewed as a net addition to the staff. We would, of course, be interested in knowing what the actual situation is with reference to the employment on temporary assistance funds of individuals recruited for these posts. Whatever that situation may be, we note that there is in the 1966 estimates an even larger amount of money (about $2.5 million) for temporary assistance than was contained in the original 1965 estimates. Thus, we believe it would be sound to consider the 134 posts as a net addition to the staff if they are established in 1966.

The mere mention of the number of new posts intended to be established in 1966 should make clear to most members of this committee why we are concerned about this feature of the estimates. We cannot remember that ever before was a proposal of this magnitude made. Further, we believe that during 1965 the organization continued to function at a reasonably efficient level, despite the fact that only 66 of the 200 professional posts recommended by the advisory committee under section 3 of the 1965 budget were established in that year. It is difficult to conceive that it is really essential for the efficient functioning of this organization that all 484 new posts be established and filled during 1966.

As a matter of fact, we have considerable doubts about the wisdom of attempting to establish so many new posts. First of all, it is difficult to imagine how the proposed number of new posts could possibly be absorbed and integrated into the existing secretariat by the end of 1966. It would seem that such an influx of new staff would require so much of the attention of existing staff for briefing and training purposes, that the efficiency of the operations would undoubtedly be adversely affected. Apart from that fact, there is the even more serious question as to the possibility of recruiting within 1 year such a large number of qualified staff. Is it not likely that an attempt to recruit so many individuals in such a short period of time would either fail or would result in the acceptance of individuals without proper and adequate qualifications to do the job efficiently?

We have said enough, Mr. Chairman, to indicate that, while we are not yet prepared to take a final position concerning proposed staff increases for 1966, we are far from convinced as to the need for even those posts recommended by the Advisory Committee. We will await further explanations from the representatives of the Secretary General on this matter. Meanwhile, we will reserve our position.

I should add, Mr. Chairman, with respect to section 3 of the budget, that we share the misgivings of the Advisory Committee, set forth in paragraph 181 of its report (A–6007) on the proposed reclassification of posts. We would be glad to hear further explanations from the representatives of the Secretary General on this matter but at the present time are not prepared to go beyond the Advisory Committee recommendation to the effect that only 50 percent of the funds required for the proposed reclassifications be approved.

Before leaving the budget estimates for 1966, I should like to refer briefly to a proposal made to this committee on October 15 by the distinguished Representative of Argentina. He proposed to remove from the expenditure section of the budget chapter V of section 12, which provides for the financing of the interest and principal of United Nations bonds. We assume that the distinguished Representative of Argentina will elaborate more fully on his reasons for making this proposal at subsequent meetings of this committee, and accordingly the U.S. delegation will limit its comments at this time. We might point out, however, that we were pleased to note that this proposal is not intended to prejudice the financial obligations represented by the bonds and that it does not envisage financing based on voluntary contributions.

Mr. Chairman, the General Assembly authorized the sale of United Nations bonds in order to raise essential working capital and permit this organization to meet its obligations. Sixty-four governments bought bonds for this purpose. These bonds represent solemn obligations of this organization to repay those who loaned money to it at a time of financial crisis. As a Member of Congress, and a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, let me add that Congress authorized purchase of these United Nations bonds by the United States on the clear understanding that they would be paid off in a normal and regular manner. Any attempt to alter their terms and the conditions of repayment would destroy the confidence of governments and peoples in the financial integrity of the United Nations. Thus, while not attempting now to evaluate the specific proposal of the distinguished Representative from Argentina, let me say simply that we are not prepared to accept any proposal which would destroy confidence in the financial integrity of the United Nations, or lessen in any way the assurance that the bonds will be repaid.

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. delegation would now like to speak about the critical financial situation and the financial prospects facing this organization.

We must all ask ourselves two questions about the finances of this organization: (1) "Where are we today?" and (2) "Where are we going?" In dealing with both questions, the U.S. delegation will be completely frank. It is essential at this stage in the life of the United Nations that we face up squarely to the situation which confronts us.

Let me start with the present financial situation. The Committee of 33, on August 31, 1965, arrived at a consensus (A–5916) in the spirit of the Afro-Asian proposal which included the following elements:

"(a) That the General Assembly will carry on its work normally in accordance with its rules of procedure;

"(b) That the question of the applicability of article 19 of the charter will not be raised with regard to the United Nations emergency force and the United Nations operation in the Congo;

"(c) That the financial difficulties of the Organization should be solved through voluntary contributions by member states, with the highly developed countries making substantial contributions."

On September 1 the committee's report was adopted by the General Assembly. Accordingly, voluntary contributions should have been forthcoming promptly from appropriate quarters in sufficient magnitude to achieve solvency. Yet the sad fact is that no real progress has been made toward solvency.

The Secretary General informed us on September 3, 1965 (A–5917), that of the $100 million required to restore the solvency of this organization, only $18.4 million had been contributed. What has happened since that report? The Secretary General informed us on October 12 that only about $1.6 million additional have been contributed. In other words, about $80 million must still be raised to restore United Nations solvency.

In fact, instead of an improvement in the financial situation, there has been a worsening. In statements to this Committee at this session, several member states have reiterated their past objections to making full contributions to the regular budget of the United Nations. This means that, in financial terms, we are going even further downhill.

To the U.S. Delegation the present situation is one which calls for a sober appraisal on the part of all Members. Can and should our organization continue to go forward with new programs—no matter how desirable—unless and until we can put our house in order? The U.S. delegation finds it difficult to justify an affirmative answer.

I do not believe that anyone can challenge the propriety of this position. The United States has paid its share—and considerably more—of all United Nations expenses ever since this organization was established. We have contributed almost $2½ billion to the United Nations family of organizations in the last 20 years. We are clearly entitled to demand—as indeed are most members of this organization—that the United Nations as a whole face up to the necessity of financing its existing obligations before it embarks on new endeavors.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that in the course of this session, and indeed in the near future, the situation will so develop that the financial integrity of the organization will be restored. It is vitally important to all of us that the United Nations be placed once again in a sound position not only to finance essential peacekeeping operations but also to support the desirable and important new economic and social programs which we all favor. The United States has done its best. Now it is up to others to assume their share of the burden.

THE ELEMENTARY AND PRESCHOOL CHILD DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to help the children of America, the Elementary and Preschool Child Development Act. I am delighted to cosponsor this bill introduced and initiated by my distinguished colleague from Florida and a member of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. SAM GIBBONS.

At this time, I would like to add to the already enlightening remarks that others have made about this bill in order to stress why I think this proposal offers so much hope for America's troubled youth—and, indeed, for our Nation itself.

The Elementary and Preschool Child Development Act, as has been explained, would initiate a national program to place in the elementary schools of our Nation a much needed new sort of professional—the child development specialist. These child development specialists whose specialized training would be provided under the proposal, would be highly qualified to assist the teachers and other school personnel in elementary schools to discover and help out of difficulty those of our young children who showed signs of developing potentially disruptive social behavior.

Once identified, these young pupils and their families would derive the benefit of the excellent services of the child development specialist. This specialist would try to help, and aid teachers in helping, these youngsters. He would also aid the families of these youngsters to better deal with their children's problems and where necessary, would be able to refer families to other community agencies and services for further help.

The farsighted reasoning behind the program of the proposed Elementary and Preschool Child Development Act is that the best way we can help children who are headed for later trouble is before their problems have had a chance to grow into major and deep-rooted forms of disruptive behavior.

Clearly, if we can do this at these early ages, we will have done a lot to help modify the troubled behavior of children, which when left alone, so often grows into delinquency, criminality, and mental illness.

The bill, the Elementary and Preschool Child Development Act, offers a practical and realistic way of helping our elementary schools to strike at these behavior problems at a stage when they still can be helped. This program would contribute substantially to helping troubled American pupils to overcome their problems and also to be given the opportunity to realize the most of their potential.

And, for America, the Elementary and Preschool Child Development Act would be a potential weapon for effectively alleviating the causes of our devastating social problems—such as the crime and delinquency I have just mentioned.

At this time, I want to urge every American citizen who is concerned with solving these problems—and also with helping young children to overcome this debilitating personal problem—to eagerly support the Elementary and Preschool Child Development Act.

CITIES IN CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, citizen participation in Government is essential if we are to meet the challenges of our times at home and aboard. Public discussion and debate in major issues is the essence of democracy and should be encouraged by Members of Congress. Every effort must be made to bridge the chasm which too often exists between the citizen and his government.

In this spirit during my service in Congress I have sponsored an annual all-day community conference which brings together concerned citizens and the experts and policymakers for a sharing of knowledge and ideas. The nonpartisan conferences, which are free and open to the public, are also sponsored by the Reform Democratic Clubs of Manhattan's West Side as well as individual community sponsors.

On March 6, 1965, we sponsored our fifth annual all-day conference. Entitled "Cities in Crisis," it was attended by some 2,000 people who participated in the 5 panels and the plenary session at Riverside Church. Government officials, journalists, labor and industry representatives, university professors, and other experts contributed to a stimulating forum on the issues confronting urban society.

Mr. Speaker, we owe a deep debt of gratitude to Senator Joseph S. Clark and Whitney Young, Jr., executive director, National Urban League, for their superb presentations at the plenary session. Among the outstanding panelists were Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education; William Slayton, U.S. Commissioner of Urban Renewal; Jack Conway, Deputy Director, U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity; George H. Gaffney, U.S. Deputy Commissioner of Narcotics. We are indebted to these Government leaders for setting forth the administration's views in their respective areas.

In addition to the other panelists who will be named later, I want to note the valuable services of the journalists who acted as moderators of the various panels: Fred M. Hechinger of the New York Times; Woody Klein of the New York World Telegram & Sun; Mary Perot Nichols of the Village Voice and Ted Poston of the New York Post. Dean Mitchell I. Ginsberg of the Columbia University School of Social Work also served as a panel moderator.

Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to mention all the individuals who worked for the success of this conference. However, I do want to acknowledge and thank Daniel J. Nelson and Barbara Black, cochairmen, who planned and supervised the conference. Working with them were Alice Bunzl, secretary; Ira Zimmerman, treasurer; Susan Cohn, and David McGregor, club coordinators; Eileen Lottman, Burt Solomon, Anna Lou Pickett, and Carmen Pertierra, publicity; Edith Miller, arrangements chairman; Betty Jo Bailey, community relations; Robert V. Engle, program design; Elaine Cimmet, Rosemary Lattimore, and Jean Lerman, committee staff.

The club representatives were Ada Bass, Barbara Blake, Ralph Cohen, Susan Cohn, Charles Jurrist, Toni Neiger, Peter Osman, Leonard Plato, Charles Rodin, and Marilyn Schiff. The panel coordinators were Betty Jo Bailey, Carl Johnson, Nina Leichter, Alfred Shapiro, and Irving Wolfson.

I want to express my appreciation to all of the foregoing for their tireless efforts.

The participating clubs were: Ansonia Independent Democrats; Columbia-Barnard Democratic Club; F.D.R.-Woodrow Wilson Democrats, Inc.; Ft. Washington-Manhattanville Reform Democrats; Heights Reform Democrats; J.F.K. Mid-City Democrats; New Chelsea Reform Democratic Club; Reform Independent Democrats; Riverside Democrats, Inc.; West Side Democratic Club.

As in the past, in order to make the program available to the public without charge, a large number of community sponsors generously supported the conference, and we thank them.

Mr. Speaker, at the plenary session Senator Joseph S. Clark called for a "wholesale reexamination of social and political attitudes toward the metropolitan areas of the country." He warned that the central American city is "on the brink of becoming an ungovernable one-class ghetto" and listed the major priorities for a "National Policy for Urban Life" as:

1. New political arrangements for effective government of metropolitan areas.
2. Attention to human renewal as well as urban renewal.
3. More deft use of urban renewal techniques to replace surgery by bulldozer with more effective rehabilitation and code enforcement designed to wipe out the rats, dilapidation, and blight of the slums while preserving what is worth preserving in neighborhood society."
4. Special attention to the problems of slum schools.
5. A strengthening of urban universities and increased participation by the universities in solving community problems.
6. Efforts to encourage the well-to-do and moderate income families of the suburbs to shoulder the burdens of metropolitan living.
7. Make birth control information freely available to those women trapped in the bleak slums by the want of information which sentences them to an endless round of unwanted child bearing.
8. Urgent attention to the transportation chaos which is strangling metropolitan areas.
9. New attention to the profound environmental problems spawned by the enormous human and industrial concentrations of metropolitan regions.

He said that—

> The dimensions of the task make it imperative that the national government become a major participant in the effort to save our cities.

I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues excerpts from Senator Clark's excellent speech:

Remarks of Senator Joseph S. Clark to the Fifth Annual West Side Conference, New York, N.Y., March 6, 1965

CITY VS. SUBURB

Transportation, technology, and politics are conspiring to convert the heart of the American city into a one-class ghetto. The central cities of today have become the chief repositories of the Nation's destitute, its deprived, those victimized by discrimination, and the under-educated. The tragedy is that these enormous pockets of poverty and misery and discrimination are surrounded by the richest communities on Earth—the American suburbs.

In America today, our archaic political institutions allow the well-to-do elite to wall themselves off from responsibility for the city while at the same time drawing upon the metropolis to earn their daily bread. Altogether in the United States, there are 16,000 local governments in 180 metropolitan areas and the majority of them are designed by the more fortunate to keep contacts with and responsibility for the city's poor to a minimum.

The exodus to the suburbs has drained both taxes and talent out of the city. Political offices have been left, on the whole, to those whose chief interest is the embezzlement of political power for their own ends. And while the tax base dwindles, the municipal budget for combatting crime and delinquency and sustaining the poor goes up and up.

THE ALLEGORY OF RICHARD ROE OR "THE TRIALS OF METROPOLITAN LIVING"

Richard Roe, a successful attorney, 40 years of age, several years ago moved with his wife and two school age children from a small house in the city to a pleasant modern home in a new suburban subdivision which cost him $30,000. He is unhappy. Richard's reasons for moving were, first, that he wanted to get his children away from the city streets and into a good school. Second, the neighborhood in which the Roe family had formerly lived was beginning to run down. Professional and business people who were getting ahead were moving out. Minority groups were moving in, old houses were being cut up into apartments, the local schools had a high percentage of Negro pupils. It was hard to hold competent teachers. Finally, the house in the new subdivision was attractively planned with a lawn and a garden and a two-car garage, accessible to and yet removed from the highway system leading to the central city. It was occupied by families who provided a pleasant social life and appropriate children for the young Roes to grow up with.

At first it was fine.

One February morning, however, Richard awoke to find a blizzard had deposited 2 feet of snow on the subdivision. The township's snow plow didn't show up. Richard couldn't get his car out to the expressway, built largely with Federal funds, which had been cleared by the State highway patrol. He sloshed his way in his galoshes through the snow, carrying his briefcase in one hand and an overnight bag in the other, to a bus stop on the feeder highway built and maintained by the county with some State aid.

Before he left home word had come over the radio that school would be closed because the school busses, supplied by the consolidated school district administered by an elected school board, couldn't get out on the streets in the parts of the three townships over which the school district spilled.

When he got to the bus stop, Richard found a large group of angry fellow commuters cursing the fact that the private bus company, which many thought was about to go bankrupt, had not had a bus down the line for the last half hour. They complained that the suburban branch of the railroad no longer ran an adequate commuter service, and all a fellow would be able to do in a few years would be to creep, bumper to bumper, to town over what they called the "Surekill Expressway" because of the high accident rate.

Richard noticed that a good many of the men and women waiting for the bus were neighbors who worked in the oil refinery which was located down the road 2 miles in another township and a different school district.

He remembered that his school taxes had gone up 20 percent last year, but those of his partner, Peter Poe, who lived in the school district in which the oil refinery was located, hadn't gone up at all.

Peter had been a bit smug about the fact that he had moved into a school district which had a good deal of industry within its borders and hence did not have to rely on a school tax lexied entirely on residential property.

He remembered, also, that the prevailing wind blew up the road from the oil refinery across his subdivision, depositing smog and bringing smell. He had investigated what air pollution control measures could be taken against the refinery and found that there were none, other than a common law action for maintaining a nuisance which, as a lawyer, he felt would be unsuccessful because the refinery had been operating long before his subdivision was built.

While he waited in the cold for the bus, he noticed first smoke and then flames from a building located up the road in his township. One of the men waiting near him cursed again and ran off up the road toward the station of the volunteer fire company of which he was a member. Richard was standing uncomfortably in his late bus, trying to keep his balance and protect the other passengers from tripping over his suitcase, and well on his way to town long before the civic-minded volunteer firemen had assembled a crew to drive their engine through the heavy snow, only to find the building destroyed before they got there.

Traffic congestion on the expressway slowed the pace of Richard's bus to not much more than a walk. It was an hour before, in some disgust, he walked two blocks from the bus stop and rode 16 floors up in the elevator to his comfortable office with a view toward the suburbs from which he had just come. Inside the city limits his view was over block after block of slum dwellings, whose monotony was relieved by an occasional high-rise apartment—public housing built with Federal funds in an urban redevelopment area.

On his desk was a city wage tax form with a note from the office bookkeeper giving him the total of his withdrawals from the law firm the previous year so he could compute his self-assessing tax.

The telephone rang. It was his wife reminding him to make a substantial deposit in their joint bank account so she could pay the county personal property tax, the township real estate tax, the school district school tax. She also inquired whether she should make a contribution to the volunteer fire company. The morning mail had been delivered through the snow and she told him it contained his Federal income tax form and a notice that the township authorities were placing on the ballot at the spring primary a proposal to borrow $5 million dollars to build a sewer system and another $10 million for a sewage disposal plant to meet the requirements of the State sanitary water board which had found that overflow from the cesspools which serves the subdivision was polluting the water in the river from which the local private water company derived its water supply for the local residents and the oil refinery down the road.

He reached morosely for a cigarette, remembering as he did so that he had paid a State and Federal sales tax on the package he drew from his pocket. He remembered, with mounting fury, that, because of State expenditures, the bottle of whisky he bought at the State store the night before had cost him 50 cents more than it would have across the river in a neighboring State where the school system and State highways were notoriously bad but, by gosh he thought, they don't tax a fellow to death and industry is not moving out.

Then he remembered that John Doe, another of his partners, was about to move out of his suburb in the neighboring State because the local police were paid so little corruption was rife, trash collection was breaking down, there was no incinerator and nothing was being done to cope with rising juvenile delinquency. Moreover, this State across the river had no planning commission. No open space was being reserved for family recreation. Zoning was so primitive and corrupt that many owners of fine houses were being surrounded by suburban sprawl, commercial skid row and a chemical factory, cement plant, and tannery.

Well, he thought, I suppose we could always move farther out in the country. But then he reflected, we would no longer be able to come in town at night for dinner and the theater and my family wouldn't have the cultural exposure to the art museum, the orchestra, the free library, and the contacts with educational and civic organizations they now enjoy. And, moreover, getting back and forth to the office would drive me nuts.

That afternoon he set off with his bag and briefcase in a taxi to the fine new airport built by the city and the aid of a State and Federal subsidy (runways being extended to serve the new superjets) and flew across the country to Washington in 3 hours for a conference with clients over a Government contract which, if successful, would bring a new plant hiring 1,500 men into the township in which, by coincidence, he lived.

He ruminated, as the plane flew over the mountains, what additional complications a successful negotiation would bring to his private life. Perhaps, he thought, I ought to try to do something about the complication of living in a metropolitan area in the modern world. Surely the human brain can evolve a workable plan to bring some order out of this chaos.

GOVERNING THE METROPOLITAN AREAS

In the preautomobile world, a host of vested political interests grew up: townships, boroughs, third-class cities, counties, school districts, each a creature of the State. But none of these created serious roadblocks to government of the city.

All this has been changed by mass ownership of the automobile. Families of moderate means moved out of the city. Thousands of square miles of quiet countryside were turned into a jungle of housing and concrete—all of it as much a part of the metropolis as the downtown department store or slum.

Ancient Rome occupied 5 square miles. Greater New York occupies 2,500 square miles. The fortunes of every community in that vast area are linked indissolubly to the city, but they are governed as if they are at opposite ends of the earth. Water supplies, pollution problems, transportation, taxes, education, parks, and crime—all became matters of common concern to city dweller and suburbanite alike.

Although these intertwined concerns seem self-evident we have yet to devise any effective governmental arrangement by means of which the metropolitan areas of the United States can be governed. Like those jungle vines that strangle the tree that supported them until it dies and removes the support they need to reach the sunlight, the multitude of local governments which surround the cities are slowly strangling the city center upon which they ultimately depend for their own existence.

On Tuesday the President asked Congress to provide some modest assistance to local governments in metropolitan areas to get together and cooperate. On Friday I introduced a bill providing somewhat stronger incentives to encourage regional cooperation and planning. But several points must be borne in mind:

First, almost all local politicians are against a consolidation or annexation plan and sniff suspiciously at a federation plan because their power and prerequisites would be adversely affected. Local political party structures tend to control the thinking of State legislators, thus making State legislative action to override local political opposition unlikely. The structures of State and local political parties do not lend themselves readily to making metropolitan area government a partisan political issue.

Second, a citizen revolt against vested political opposition is hard to arouse and organize in a metropolitan area and even harder to finance.

Third, suburban citizens are suspicious of core city domination of any metropolitan area government.

The political facts of metropolitan area life appear, for the foreseeable future, therefore, to foreclose any annexation, consolidation, or even a federation of local governments in most large metropolitan areas. And as the areas surrounding, but not politically part of, the center area increase in size and wealth, the prospects of approval for a general across-the-board political combination with the core city, from which much of the leadership and wealth has already fled, become dimmer.

Are there, then, any politically feasible alternatives which might get the job done? The most promising line of progress would seem to be on an ad hoc functional basis. This is what my bill, which I will introduce on Monday, would encourage.

"HUMAN" AND URBAN RENEWAL

We are now at a major juncture in the development of a national policy for our urban areas. For 15 years we have been attempting to master the "mechanics" of urban renewal—how to assemble real estate, how to clear it and upgrade its use. The next 15 years must be devoted to "humanizing" our renewal programs. The emphasis will shift from real estate to people. This is what President Johnson's war on poverty is all about. This is what the new Federal aid to education bill is all about. This is what the new housing and urban renewal bill is all about. Each concentrates its attention on those who live at the bottom of the heap in this affluent society of ours.

We are past the days when amputation of neighborhoods through wholesale clearance seemed the only way to eliminate slums. The techniques of redevelopment have become more refined. Thus today neighborhood rehabilitation and more effective code enforcement are replacing surgery by bulldozer.

SLUM SCHOOLS

The worst slums and the worst schools coexist in a partnership of privation and despair. This creates the cruel circumstance which President Johnson described in his education message in which ignorance breeds poverty and poverty all too often breeds ignorance in the next generation. We might call this the life cycle of despair.

We must break this vicious cycle by an attack on ignorance and that means special concentration upon the slum schools of the Nation. The education bill now before Congress attempts to do just that.

URBAN UNIVERSITIES

We have entered a new era in which inventiveness, intellectual excellence, research and scholarship are the wheels which make society run. And it is in the city that the clash of ideas can be most effectively maintained. We may well be coming to the time when the true heart of a city is no longer its industrial, financial, or retail districts, but its university.

That university is a great source of intellectual leadership in the community. But few indeed are the urban universities which have committed their intellectual resources to helping their home city solve the acute human, physical, and political problems which it confronts.

The new Federal education bill helps finance their involvement under a new urban extension program.

POPULATION CONTROL

The tide of human numbers will rise by 160,000 today—more than 60 million this year. World population will double by the end of the century, if present birth rates continue.

But even while the crisis deepens, the climate for dealing with it—the weather of understanding and tolerance—improves. National leaders speak out. Not long ago Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston gave his support to the principle of legalizing provision of birth control information and devices in Massachusetts, on the ground that "Catholics do not need the support of civil law to be faithful to their own religious convictions, and they do not seek to impose by law their moral views on other members of society." All faiths agree on the principles of family planning and are working together to resolve their differences about the means. Our war on poverty, through local initiative in a growing list of communities, is incorporating birth control assistance. Here and abroad, planned parenthood is spreading the message of birth control to scores of millions.

There are a number of ways by which individuals can help: First, by standing up to be counted in support of governmental as well as private efforts in the field of voluntary fertility control; second, by urging all public health and welfare agencies to provide birth control to those who want it; and third, by urging expansion of research with Government funds to perfect a variety of simple and foolproof fertility control methods acceptable to all faiths.

ENVIRONMENT AND METROPOLIS

Unless we soon begin to cope with the profound problems in man's natural environment to which the mammoth modern metropolis gives rise, the city may become obsolete as an abode for civilized man.

Here in the heart of the Atlantic megalopolis, for example, Philadelphia and New York find themselves dependent on the same small river—the Delaware—for water. We found a solution to this critical problem. But as more and more cities compete for water to slake their thirst the problem will grow increasingly acute, particularly in those parts of the country not as blessed with an abundance of water as the humid East.

To compound the problem, we are sealing off the soil with asphalt and concrete, denying ourselves the chance to recharge our underground water supplies with rain. Instead, falling on pavement, the rain runs off quickly, causing floods as it wastes its way to the sea.

The pollution problem in our rivers grows more serious as we use them as sewers to carry away wastes that cannot be treated by any known process.

The pollution of the air we breathe poses more subtle problems. At the rate our industrial centers are pouring waste gases into the air, the carbon dioxide content of the earth's atmosphere will double by the year 2000. As the President just recently said in his conservation message "This generation has altered the composition of the atmosphere on a global scale through radioactive materials and a steady increase in carbon dioxide. This already has had decided effects on local weather. And climatologists are now asking urgent questions about the effects this will have, not only upon the air and climate over our cities, but upon the earth's atmosphere in general.

FEDERALISM AND THE CITIES

A visitor from another planet, studying the makeup of our Federal Government would surely conclude that ours is a rural nation. We have a Department of Agriculture with a budget of $6 million. We have a Department of Interior trying to protect our great landmarks and parks. But we have no department at the Cabinet level which represents the people who live in our most densely populated areas and where many of our most domestic problems are now located.

The President has asked once more for a Department of Housing and Urban Development. I have introduced a bill that would carry out that request. This year, I feel sure, Congress will at long last approve it.

I detect signs of progress toward solutions to the crisis in our cities. The question that remains is whether the progress will be fast enough. The great weakness of democracy and the ever present threat to its survival, is political lag. A dictatorship can quickly remold its institutions, save only the institution of dictatorship itself; a democracy can not. A democracy inevitably lumbers along, therefore, with outmoded and creaky machinery. Unfortunately, short of a crisis, it rarely modernizes its machinery. But those who see the need cannot do other than keep trying.

Mr. Speaker, under the able direction of John Friedman, a student at the Columbia University School of Journalism, the plenary session and the panels were covered by four students at the School of Journalism: David Beckwith, Joseph Drew, Richard Moore, and Douglas Watson. Mary Renner and John Grayzel also participated in reporting on the conference. I will include in the Record the reports on the plenary session and each panel as prepared by these reporters. I want to acknowledge our deep appreciation to them for their willingness to write up the conference.

I include at this point in the Record a report on the plenary session by Joseph Drew:

THE PLENARY SESSION

The plenary session featured speeches by Congressman William F. Ryan, Whitney Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, and Senator Joseph S. Clark.

"This conference," Congressman Ryan said in the keynote address, "is dedicated to the idea that citizens and experts should and must work together for the welfare of the Nation."

After touching on the topics of previous conferences, Congressman Ryan said that the crisis in New York City is "so vast, so overwhelming, so self-generating that we have all faced it in several ways."

"Of what does this crisis consist? The problems of crime, of slums, of lack of Government institutions to muster for the basic needs, of grinding poverty, of unemployment, of discrimination, and of loss of hope. By 1980, the population will grow to 240 million. This crisis is going to grow."

"The problems of our cities," Congressman Ryan noted, "deserve to be in the front ranks of Government."

Congressman Ryan outlined the forces in America which brought the attention of the Federal Government to agricultural problems. "These rural conservatives have proven we can fight for massive Federal aid, as they have done. Our Federal Government has been spending more for a few crops than for urban planning.

"Our urban Congressmen have failed to form a powerful coalition. If they would unite, I am sure they could provide the necessary force.

"In spite of all this," the Congressman concluded, "the question still is, 'Can we really do anything about the crisis?' I say we need massive planning, imagination, leadership, and action, action, and more action."

Whitney Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League was introduced as someone, according to Congressman Ryan, "who long before Washington discovered poverty, was there working to wipe it out."

"It was relatively simple for our forefathers to make statements about life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," Mr. Young said.

"It was easy to assure defense from foreign nations, and it was relatively simple to promise free public education in a period when it was not absolutely necessary to have one.

"But all of this has changed.

"The who concept of States' rights has no validity. People today on welfare and crime lists are white people from Kentucky, Tennessee, and West Virginia, and Negroes from Alabama and Mississippi, States which were told to handle their own problems. They handled them all right."

Mr. Young discerned a conflict which America must settle. "We must realize that we will either live together as brothers or perish together as fools. We have no other choice.

"The ultimate resolution of the problems of brotherhood begins in our own cities, our own neighborhoods. The destruction of a Malcolm X, the jailing of a Reverend Galamison, or the firing of a Dr. Gross will not change the problems I'm talking about. Until the society sets itself to a massive program of education, housing, and brotherhood, these problems will remain."

Mr. Young, noting that the problems of urban dwellers were "no longer just the problems of misery, but now also the problems of despair," said America could no longer afford the luxury of theoretical discussion on these pressing problems.

"The man who did not attend high school, who is a functional illiterate, 40 years old and without a job—what can the Federal projects we have today do for him?

"First, we have to have a massive public works program. Second, we need education, mass education. When I look over this Nation, I have to put my chances on education. To me it is a tragedy that the Federal Government gives $50 billion a year for defense, and only a few billion—at the best—for education.

"The struggle for better living today is not between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, or the black man and the white man, it is between the decent people, those who care, and the others, those who don't."

"The thing I deplore most about New York City," Mr. Young said, "is the failure of the business community to address itself to the serious problems of the city. In no other city would the business community be so silent. The time has come for businessmen, who have so much at stake in New York City to speak up. What I'm concerned about is the 'thunderous silence.'"

Mr. Young asked for relief of the problems of Harlem. "What I call for is this—nothing would give more hope to the people of Harlem than for the mayor of New York to announce a massive, major clean-up and paint-up month for Harlem. It could begin the week before school ended, and continue for 4 weeks. When the street becomes a cesspool, people think dirty. Let's mobilize, get the garbage off the street and money to the people.

"We may not be able to effect miracles overnight, but we could show, 'I'm concerned, I care.'"

"Our society," Mr. Young averred, "has the capacity, the genius, and the creativity to do anything it wants to do when it really wants to do it. The big problem in America is that we wait for the crisis."

"But given the history of our people, isn't it normal to assume that hungry people are going to cause trouble? We're problem solvers; we don't think about opportunity."

Senator Joseph Clark, of Pennsylvania, the final plenary session speaker, told the assemblage that the central American city is "on the brink of becoming an ungovernable one-class ghetto." He called for a "wholesale reexamination of social and political attitudes toward the metropolitan areas of the country, a national policy for urban life."

Senator CLARK noted that Americans must become aware of urban problems; they are inescapable to most Americans.

"The exodus to the suburbs has drained both taxes and talent out of the city," he said. "In America today, our archaic political institutions allow the well-to-do elite to wall themselves off from responsibility for the city while at the same time drawing upon the metropolis to earn their daily bread."

Noting that "ancient Rome occupied 5 square miles, but Greater New York occupies 2,500 square miles," Senator CLARK argued that the problem of governing today's metropolis was growing worse. He pointed out, "We have yet to devise any effective governmental arrangement by means of which the metropolitan areas of the United States can be governed. Yet the political facts of metropolitan area life appear, for the foreseeable future, to foreclose any annexation, consolidation, or even a federation of local governments in most large metropolitan areas."

Senator CLARK, touching on the problems of rural versus urban political organization, said that we should have urban agents as well as rural agents. The agents, he proposed, should reside in the urban universities, much as today's rural agents live in the rural universities.

Noting that the world population would double by the end of the century, he called for effective distribution of birth control information. He quoted the support for legalization of birth control information and devices in Massachusetts by Richard Cardinal Cushing:

"Catholics do not need the support of civil law to be faithful to their religious convictions, and they do not seek to impose by law their moral views on other members of society."

Senator CLARK, commenting on revenue sources, noted: "There is a limit to what the Federal Government can do. In many cities and towns the tax base isn't wide enough. The money can come from only one source—general and complete disarmament."

The audience responded with appreciative applause to the Senator's linking of urban problems to the question of disarmament.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the address which Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, made to the morning panel on education.

THE FIRST WORK OF OUR TIMES

(By Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education)

It is a great pleasure to be here in New York at this Fifth Annual West Side Community Conference. I am delighted to join your discussion at the invitation of Congressman RYAN who has been one of education's notable public supporters in this day when educational change is perhaps education's most abiding constant.

BILL RYAN has introduced several important education measures which have been incorporated into law. One of his educational efforts which particularly comes to mind is the leadership he has long given to the struggle for integrated education. His early efforts for civil rights in education helped notably toward the enactment of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

You have heard of many aspects of education as it affects community relationships at this meeting. The role given to me today is to speak of the new Federal legislation, what it would set out to do, its opportunities and its mission.

President Johnson has repeatedly spoken of education as a prime moving force in our decidedly moving decade. He has called it "the first work of our times and the first work of our society." He has said that, in his administration, education would be "at the very top of the American agenda."

The President's pledge is clearly and boldly asserted in his new education proposals to the Congress. Now we can take the measure of his extraordinary commitment to education.

How shall we do so? Part of the measure—the easiest part, in many respects—can be reckoned in money, in the expansion of Federal support for American education.

In a basic national enterprise which costs Americans, one way or another, more than $34 billion a year, the Federal Government—the only government we all have in common, is now increasingly recognized as a means, perhaps a major means, to help strengthen the independent structure of education in all our communities. Under the President's new program, we hope to increase this potential in meeting our national responsibilities.

To gain perspective and to measure this increasing responsibility, let's look at the recent ledgers of the Johnson administration. In fiscal 1964 total Federal funds for education, including services to the Government, came to roughly $4.5 billion. In fiscal 1965, they rose to around $6.3 billion. But in fiscal 1966, the President has proposed to raise the amount to about $8.6 billion. These are the funds which will be employed in all educational programs by all Federal agencies, among them Defense, NASA and the Atomic Energy Commission—a twofold increase in the total Federal commitment to education since 1964.

The major increase in these funds will be made within the Office of Education. In fiscal 1964, Office of Education appropriations came to about $700 million. In fiscal 1965, they reached $1.5 billion. In fiscal 1966, with the President's proposed $1.5 billion program, the total would come to almost $3.5 billion—nearly five times the amount of only 2 years ago.

A more important measure than money, however, is how it will be employed. Here the new program dramatically parts company with education proposals and policies of the past.

A major innovation is the focus of funds where the needs are greatest. As a matter of first priority, it provides aid to students in elementary and secondary schools—both public and private—with particular attention to the children of the poor who need the best our schools can give and often have received the worst.

Now let's examine the new ingredients, beginning with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. As you know, the House Committee on Education and Labor last Tuesday reported out the bill, with strengthening amendments, by a vote of 23 to 8. It now goes to the House Rules Committee.

This bill, as amended, calls for expenditures of $1.27 billion—about five-sixths of the new funds the President has called for. Of this amount, almost $1.1 billion is specifically directed to the education of children of low-income families—to more than 5 million out of our 48 million school-age children.

To help these children is the first goal of the President's program. His approach is not to take on all the problems of American education, but to take on the worst problem first—and to meet it not with token methods but with sufficient leverage to make a real difference.

I don't need to tell this audience of the toll of poverty in employment today. Our job market, we know, relentlessly discards those with a poor education. In the last decade, while jobs for high school graduates rose by 40 percent, jobs for those who failed to complete high school dropped by 10 percent.

But this is only a sampling of what we face. In the next 10 years, 30 million boys and girls are going to enter our work force—or be looking for work. Unless we act, 2 million of them will not see the inside of a high school and 7 million will not finish high school.

If we fail to spend enough on good education today—and spend where it counts most—we will spend many times more in social services tomorrow. We now spend, on average, about $450 a year per child in our public schools. But, as the President has reminded us, we spend $1,800 a year to keep a delinquent in a detention home, up to $2,500 a year for an unemployed family on relief, $3,500 a year for a criminal in a State prison.

We can no longer afford the drag of unemployment, nor should we content ourselves by covering it with welfare funds. But we are able—and at last we have the opportunity—to do something about it in the way we educate the children of our poor, to interrupt the cycle of poverty where we have a fighting chance.

The President's proposal uses a formula which would put money into school systems on the basis of the number of children from needy families, those with incomes of less than $2,000. A new congressional amendment will also provide additional funds for children of families on relief who may receive more than $2,000 a year. Through this formula and the new amendment, New York City, for example, will receive more than $55 million to help finance quality education for its poorest youngsters.

The proposal to help educate the children of poverty is the heart of the President's program. Around it, all the other elements were conceived: to strengthen the quality and equality of educational opportunity at points of critical weakness.

Now let me summarize briefly the rest of the program as it came out of the House Education and Labor Committee this week.

In the elementary and secondary education bill, there are four other elements:

There will be $100 million for better textbooks, teaching materials, and library books for children in both public and private schools. These books, of course, will remain as public property. Today the great majority of our schools have inadequate libraries, and two out of three elementary schools have none at all.

There will be $100 million for supplementary educational centers and services. These would be established under public auspices through the collaborative efforts of public and private schools, public and private agencies. They would provide vitally needed services, ranging from remedial instruction to adult education, from guidance and counseling to special classes in science or foreign languages or art.

There will be $45 million for regional educational laboratories to expand educational research and development in a day when more and better research and more and better ways of diffusing it are needed by the Nation's schools.

There will be $25 million to help strengthen our State departments of education, the pivotal agencies on which we must depend if we really mean to keep American education both strong and decentralized.

In addition to these measures, the President will also include in his budget up to $150 million for preschool programs to give economically deprived children a headstart.

About one-sixth of the President's new education program—or $260 million—is allocated to higher education. The 88th Congress adopted landmark measures to advance higher education, but more must be done to close remaining gaps.

Today we are wasting the talents of about 100,000 young high school graduates of demonstrated ability each year because they simply don't have the money it takes to go to college, even with the loan and work-study programs that the 88th Congress established.

They need scholarships—and the President is proposing a scholarship program. He is also proposing a plan for loans at low interest rates, subsidized in part and guaranteed by the Government.

In recent months, the President has spoken of the need to turn the attention of America's universities to the problems of our cities much as they turned so successfully 100 years ago to the problems of our farms. This creative concept is now embodied in community extension and continuing education programs through the universities.

Other parts of the proposed higher education program include:

Funds to help small and less developed colleges improve their programs through partnerships and interchanges with larger and stronger universities.

Funds to improve the library resources of our colleges and universities, and to train librarians for schools, colleges, and communities.

Extension and expansion of the program for training teachers of handicapped children.

Expansion of the present work-study program.

In its dramatic scope and promise, the new program calls clearly on America for a total, long-range program for education.

It is a program to meet today's critical educational needs and move beyond them.

It is a program that asks for fundamental, rather than piecemeal, solutions.

It is a program that can make education worthy of today's children and able to prepare them for the goals we aspire to reach tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the report of the morning panel on education which was prepared by Joseph Drew:

EDUCATION

The panel was moderated by Fred M. Hechinger, education editor of the New York Times. Panel members were Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education; Clarence Senior, a member of the Board of Education of New York City and a professor of sociology at Brooklyn College; Dr. Lawrence Plotkin, associate director of the Social Dynamics Research Institute of the College of the City of New York; and Mrs. Trude Lash, executive director of the Citizens Committee for Children of New York City.

Commissioner Keppel started the discussion, stating that, "The Government will help to strengthen the individual structure of education in our communities. The Office of Education will spend $8.6 billion during fiscal year 1966. The focus of the funds would be spent where the needs are greatest. The top priority will be for helping children of the poor. There are approximately 1.7 billion children of low-income families."

Commissioner Keppel stressed: "Unless we do something, in the next decade, 2 million students will not see high school. If we don't spend more on education, we shall spend more on social services. We can no longer afford to drag our feet, but we must try to interrupt this cycle of poverty wherever we have a chance.

"Nearly 100,000 students in the United States don't have money to go to college. Some of the new money will be used for loans and scholarships, funds for small and less-developed colleges and funds to improve the libraries of our colleges. This is a program that asks for fundamental rather than piecemeal solutions."

Dr. Clarence Senior said, "The New York City Board of Education has supported integration, and it has charged the administrative staff to work out the details for integration.

"The board has initiated in-service training programs. It has also sought to obtain better commercially printed textbooks that picture all of the members of our community.

"The board has initiated the so-called more effective schools program, a prekindergarten program so children can start developing at an earlier age, and teacher training institutes so teachers can secure more training in ghetto schools."

"We are not at all adverse to tackling the problems, but other sections of the city must also take part," Dr. Senior said.

Dr. Lawrence Plotkin said that education is not the major crisis of the day. He cited other important problems such as irregularity of income distribution, shift of political power from the farms to the city, and shift of power to nonwhite nations.

This is not a crisis, he said, but a long-term social problem. Use of the word crisis implies that it is bad. He rather prefers the term creative conflict as used by Dr. Martin Luther King. His term implies confrontation and solution.

Dr. Plotkin continued, "Minority youth have higher dropout rates, but the problem was a long time in the making and cannot be changed overnight. Minority group children fail to learn because teachers do not teach well and curriculums are not imaginative enough. More education is necessary for Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and Appalachian whites to compensate for their peculiar circumstances. However, cultural deprivation does not prevent a child from learning in school.

"It takes 9 to 10 years for cultural deprivation to make itself felt. That provides a built-in alibi school administrators can use to explain the failures. Poor children can learn, but there must be extras in their educational process."

Mrs. Trude Lash stated that it is possible and truthful to say that the board of education has done a great deal to improve education, but only if you consider that it is 10 years since 1954, and not if you consider the size of the program.

She said, "The board of education cannot be expected to solve poor housing and the problems of the people who are forced to live in this housing. But the board has to be alert enough to keep step with the knowledge and newly recognized goals of our Nation. The problem to be solved is the humane one.

"The greatest criticism seems to be that the board is concerned with education in a vacuum and the need not to rock the boat. Education should be run by educators. The complaint of political interference is the complaint of uncomfortable questioning by the community at large."

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the report on the morning panel on housing which was prepared by David Beckwith:

HOUSING

The panel was moderated by Woody Klein of the New York World Telegram and Sun. Panel members were Charles Abrams, former New York State Rent Administrator, and author of "Urban Land Policies and Problems"; Herbert J. Gans, Professor of Sociology, Columbia University; Donald MacDonald, vice president, real estate board of New York; and William Slayton, U.S. Commissioner of Urban Renewal.

Commissioner Slayton started the panel discussion by saying that it is evident that lower and middle-class housing problems are the biggest difficulties facing the cities.

He continued, "Our urban renewal program is aimed at the elimination of slum and blighted areas. The program is based on the assumption that slums are inherently bad. We work to clean up these slums in two ways: By eliminating and clearing them, and by rehabilitating those areas where buildings are in sufficiently good shape to be repaired.

"In addition to demolition, the Congress has provided for the replacement of those displaced by slum clearance into decent, standard housing—this we call a positive rehousing program. A 1961 law provided for moderate income housing, a cut above public housing rents. We are especially concerned with those people uprooted by renewal projects; and under the terms of the antipoverty bill, we now have the means to deal with all of a family's social problems previous to their relocation.

"We strongly believe that physical housing upgrading means a social upgrading for the residents of blighted areas. We are optimistic about the results in this direction of the antipoverty bill. We are also looking hopefully toward a favorable result in New York's West Side demonstration urban renewal project."

Mr. Donald Macdonald then said, "2 years ago, I would have said that the city's biggest housing problem was the oversupply of high-priced East Side apartments. Now, of course, I believe it is the blighted areas. And while I don't have quick answers to the complex problems of these slum-ridden areas, I do feel that a workable program can be constructed to relieve them."

He said that since 1947, equal amounts of low- and high-priced housing in New York City have been constructed. He believes that the ratio should be closer to or in excess of 5 to 1 in favor of low-priced housing.

He also commented, "I would also favor having the FHA stay out of the luxury housing field; in the past, it has participated in such projects, and I object to this."

Prof. Herbert Gans commented, "It is easy for me to name the biggest problem: It is the city's slums and its deficient housing."

"Our first concern," he continued, "must be to provide new housing, so that the residents of blighted areas have suitable new locations."

Professor Gans outlined three ways to accomplish this goal. First build public housing. Secondly, follow the traditional method and build more middle income housing, letting the poorer people take over the vacated rooms after the middle income residents move into their new homes. Thirdly, build good quality housing for both groups, letting the poorer people pay lower rents.

He continued, "Middle income housing projects, which have the virtue of being proven workable by tradition, do not solve the problem of people who don't have the money to afford the middle income residents' old apartments.

"Perhaps the only hope is middle and lower income housing under one roof, in now-vacant lands in the suburbs. We must integrate the suburbs, breaking down the color line there—it is a desperately needed measure."

Mr. Charles Abrams said that the biggest problem New York City faces in its housing crisis could be narrowed to three words: lack of objectives.

He pointed out that residents are living in a landlord-dominated situation, where the tenant has to use force to get a square deal. It is not a very happy and healthy situation. Rent control should be expanded as fast as possible, to include as many apartment buildings in the city as feasible.

Mr. Abrams said, "Many people think of housing problems strictly in terms of number of rooms. We think too much of bricks and mortar and not of the living that is done there. We must consider the area's trees, its parks, its neighborhoods. We must plan shopping areas, schools, parks.

"It is apparent that nobody has yet decided who should get the precious land of Manhattan. In addition, we have to plan integration of the city so that there will be no white minority, no Negro minority, but integrated neighborhoods. We must plan so that middle and lower income housing is furnished in the same building—white income is higher than Negro income, and so this is the only way integration can be accomplished.

"I personally don't believe that New York City can solve its problems without significant Federal aid. Since 1946, the per capita debt of the cities in this country has grown, while the per capita debt of the Nation has fallen. It is obvious that the cities are not able to cope with their problems without Federal support. The city must be allowed to break away from its subordinate position to State government.

"Unless we can solve the pressing problem of the central city, I believe that the United States is headed toward not only national monotony but also destitution."

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the report on the afternoon panel on poverty which was prepared by Richard Moore:

POVERTY

This panel was moderated by Mitchell I. Ginsberg, Associate Dean of the School of Social Work, Columbia University. Speaking were Jack Conway, Acting Deputy Director of the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity; Miss Antonia Pantoja, Director of ASPIRA and a member of the board of the Puerto Rican Forum; Cleveland Robinson, secretary-treasurer of district 65, Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union, AFL-CIO; and Richard A. Cloward, director of research for Mobilization for Youth.

Keynoting the meeting, Dean Ginsberg surmised that it is impossible today to have a conference without holding a discussion on poverty. "We are finally beginning today to talk about the size of this problem," he said.

Mr. Conway opened by declaring that there is more vested interest in poverty than in any other single thing in this Nation. And there are more groups fighting to preserve jurisdiction over poverty than any other matter.

Describing the formation of the Office of Economic Opportunity at the Federal level, Mr. Conway said that the office, created under the antipoverty program, actually became operative October 1964, with the allocation of $800 million. "Since then all nine parts of the program have been put into working order," he said.

He noted that Job Corps camps and aid to migratory worker had already begun.

"The success or failure of the entire program will depend on the ability of the community—whatever the locale—to organize itself to take advantage of the programs made available to it."

Mr. Conway concluded, "We'll be reviewing the extent to which people themselves are involved. The range is infinite; it's entirely up to the local community to decide where they want to place their chips. And within a decade—that's the commitment—we'll win this war on poverty."

Miss Pantoja at the outset said that in the present climate of deserved concern for the deplorable conditions of the American Negro in our city, there is widespread unawareness of the fact that in occupational status, family income, and educational achievement the Puerto Rican New Yorker is below the oppressive level of the Negro New Yorker.

"Ignorance of these facts is due in part to the powerlessness that accompanies conditions of poverty and, specifically in the case of the Puerto Ricans, that powerlessness results in the inability of the group to effectively present this situation."

She said that unemployment is 9.9-percent higher for Puerto Ricans than for other whites and Negroes. In addition, of the 613,000 Puerto Rican New Yorkers, 51.4 percent live in families with incomes below that considered the poverty level of $4,000. Puerto Ricans are employed primarily in the low income, low status occupations. Seventy percent of the men and 78 percent of the women work in such occupations, while 5.9 percent of the men and 4 percent of the women are in the upper income and high status occupations such as the professions, the technical, the administration, and managerial fields.

"These are serious facts to face," Miss Pantoja said, "and a responsible community looks bravely to its own needs and problems to find solutions. Though it is true that a small group of Puerto Ricans might say that one should not talk about these facts, it is also true that responsible groups of parents and other community leaders in the Puerto Rican community of New York are in search of answers to arrest these trends and to establish methods of self-help."

"Let it be clearly understood," Miss Pantoja said, "that we do not aim at segregating ourselves but only that Puerto Ricans must speak for Puerto Ricans, Puerto Ricans must represent Puerto Ricans, that we intend to take up courageously the responsibility of working at the solution of our own problems."

Cleveland Robinson said that what we are here discovering is an outgrowth of slavery—it's the same philosophy. The power structure does not intend to give up the hold it has on cheap labor.

"The fact is," Mr. Robinson averred, "that 17 million people are not covered by minimum wages. The big interests want to have their groups excluded. In too many instances, people who call themselves 'forward-looking' went along with this exclusion. So when we talk about poverty, we have to talk about the employed poor."

He cited as an example of the "employed poor" low paid workers in a nearby department store who were recently intimidated from forming a union. The owner, according to Mr. Robinson, employed several unfair devices to trick the workers against unionization.

"These are the owners who have a vested interest in poverty. And they're not going to give up unless we fight."

Dr. Richard A. Cloward said that his title for the War On Poverty is "Looking for the Front." He likened the present War on Poverty to aid stations and field hospitals behind the frontlines * * * which deal with the casualties of poverty. It would be no victory to shut off the causes of poverty, if we were to sacrifice a whole generation of victims in the process, he said.

Discussing power politics in New York City, Dr. Cloward said that there has never been a place in American life for groups that could not build and maintain power. No strategy can succeed, he said, that is not finally politically oriented—that fails to recognize that poverty is fundamentally a product of class interests, of dispossessed people.

Dr. Cloward concluded, "The price of genuine social change is that some men must surrender a measure of power if others are to share it, and the exchange is never voluntary."

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the report on the afternoon panel on narcotics which was prepared by Douglas Watson:

NARCOTICS

The panel was moderated by Ted Poston, reporter for the New York Post. Panel members were: George H. Gaffney, U.S. Deputy Commissioner of Naroctics; Dr. Robert Baird, director of Haven, Inc., a treatment center for addicts; Judge Morris Ploscowe, professor of law at New York University and author of "Organized Crime and Law Enforcement"; and the Reverend James Allen, director of Addicts Rehabilitation Center Fund, Manhattan Christian Reformed Church.

Reverend Allen began by saying that, although the narcotics problem might be called a minor one in terms of the total number of addicts in the country, it is a major problem in every social sense. People who seek to make drugs legal, hinder progress. No person under the influence of a drug can function as a normal human being.

Reformed addicts are told to come back and live in their deteriorated area and live normally. "You couldn't do it and I couldn't do it," said Reverend Allen in stressing the importance of greater assistance to the addict who has returned to his community from hospital or prison. He urged more community-centered after-care programs.

Judge Morris Ploscowe said that narcotics addiction was considered a minor problem in the thirties, but in the fifties, particularly, it became a major problem.

He disputed Reverend Allen's contention that an addict cannot function normally, advocating the legal maintenance of "incurable" addicts on drugs prescribed openly. "This ought to be tried on an experimental basis. I think it may be one of the answers to the problem."

Dr. Robert Baird said that never has so much been written or spoken by so many who know so little about the problem. There is a solution to drug addiction, he said, but too many people are more politically oriented than humanistically oriented.

Dr. Baird stated, "I am against dispensing narcotics on an ambulatory withdrawal basis. I am interested in getting the addict completely off drugs."

Dr. Baird called for outlawing the sale without prescription of all cough preparations containing codeine, the physical examination of all students three times a year to check for cases of addiction, and the revocation of the automobile licenses of any addicts involved in traffic accidents.

Commissioner Gaffney began his remarks with a review of the U.S. narcotics legislation. What was once universal throughout our 50 States is now a problem concentrated in our larger cities, he summarized.

During World War I the records showed 1 man out of every 1,100 was rejected for drug addiction. By World War II drug addiction had been reduced to the point where 1 in every 10,000 was rejected, said Mr. Gaffney in commenting that, although the problem is acute in New York City, it is not so in much of the Nation.

Commissioner Gaffney challenged Judge Ploscowe's position. "If some of the programs proposed by Judge Ploscowe were put in effect, it would have the end effect of putting the clock back 50 years," he said.

Commissioner Gaffney concluded, "The biggest problem today is in the rehabilitation field. We feel each one of the professions has its own role to play."

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the report on the afternoon panel entitled "Is New York City Governable?" The reporters for this panel were Mary Renner and John Grayzel:

Is New York City Governable?

The panel discussion was conducted by Moderator Mary Perot Nichols of the Village Voice. Panel members included Paul Goodman, coauthor of "Communitas"; Herbert Kaufman, Yale University, coauthor with Wallace S. Sayre of "Governing New York City"; Arnold Witte, general manager of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York; and Max Dombrow, of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees.

Arnold Witte declared that New York City is governable but in need of charter reform. He said this statement might come as a surprise to certain people under the impression that a recent revision of the charter had taken place. In truth, he averred, the 1938 charter is still in effect except for the one-third recently altered to the detriment of good city government.

Present changes have resulted in an unwarranted concentration of power in the mayor's hands, he claimed, while at the same time subordinate agencies have been left with multiple responsibilities but little actual power. The mayor has virtually all powers of patronage; he makes and adopts the city budget largely at his own discretion; he has all the powers of city government not granted to anyone else; and he can reappropriate all money within any department as he sees fit.

The city council now has the responsibility of the old board of estimate but has been deprived of all power of patronage, exercises no budgetary control, and has been increased in size, diluting the power of any particular person.

Mr. Witte noted that the Commerce and Industry Association was against the new charter from the beginning. The commission which ultimately drew up the new charter was given only 2 months at the height of the summer to produce the final product. There were no public hearings, and the charter was presented to the people on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

Mr. Witte asserted that the new charter is almost impossible to amend. He concluded that the only solution is the creation of an entirely new document.

Following Mr. Witte's remarks, Prof. Herbert Kaufman spoke. He stated, "New York isn't governable, but neither is any other community." Noting that the U.S. Constitution was drawn up during one hot summer and is a reasonably good document, he explained that New York City's governmental problems parallel problems developing in the areas of State and Federal Government.

He said that subordinate agencies still exercise great de facto power; that in the 36 preceding years during which they were more independent, very little had been accomplished, and that it is necessary to control these agencies to allow the public to know where the ultimate responsibility lies, i.e., in the mayor's office.

Ultimately, Professor Kaufman said, the choice between a strong mayor or powerful subordinate agencies will be determined by self-interest.

Those who want a dynamic and progressive government can and will not shrink from the growing extension and concentration of political power now taking place in all areas of government.

The next speaker, Max Dombrow, said the question is not really, "Is New York Governable?" but, rather, "Is It Governable in a Good Manner?" New York is so large, complex, and heterogeneous that recurring crises are unavoidable. However, if the city were governed in such a manner as to allow it to make continuous progress in erasing injustices that exist, it would be fair to say it is being governed well. At the moment this is not the case. He said, "What exists at the moment is a bureaucratic apparatus concerned with self-preservation, and so inflexible that it paralyzes all action. It is this bureaucratic rigidity obsessed with the sacredness of its own proceedings that prevents true progress. What is needed is an administration with the desire, willingness and energy to cut through the present entanglement before any definite improvements can really result."

Paul Goodman, who described himself as a "community anarchist a la Kropotkin," said that the difficulty in government stems in large part from a present-day obsession with massive planning. If liberals ever saw the result of massive planning, they would never vote another cent for it, he said. "Sometimes when they speak of education, I think they've never seen a child. Most of the money doesn't even go for the projects themselves but for the administrative cement that holds the bureaucracy together."

Citizen experimentation and neighborhood initiative is killed because higher-ups must get involved with everything, Mr. Goodman charged. He said government, as much as possible, should be returned to the community level, since present massive programs cause individuals to lose contact and identity with the city's problems.

In addition, Mr. Goodman felt that the question of urban congestion should be seen in a completely new light. He said that the Federal Government is now seeking to pressure 10 million marginal farmers off the land and into urban areas. He suggested that rural areas should be used to relieve urban congestion, not increase it. For example, students from the city could go to rural boarding schools. Mr. Goodman noted that wealthy parents already do this for their children. The money now spent in housing and welfare to support new arrivals would help defray the cost.

"Ultimately," Paul Goodman concluded, "while it may seem paradoxical, a little more creative disorder would actually result in a more governable city."

PURCHASE OF U.S. NAVY SHIPS FROM GREAT BRITAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to register again my strong opposition to the administration's plan—now far advanced—to permit certain Navy ships to be built in British shipyards. I oppose it—as I have since I first heard of it—because it is ill-conceived and contrary to the best interests of the United States.

I wish I could discuss this plan of the Department of Defense in full understanding of all of its details and scope. Unfortunately, the proposal is so vaguely formulated—and official information concerning it has been so misleading—that there is no way to report precisely what it is.

The proposal to buy Navy ships in Britain—a highly significant and momentous departure from historical policy—was conceived in secrecy during arms sale negotiations and its birth was never announced by the Department which fathered it. The news, I am certain, came as a surprise to the Defense officials who have the responsibility of procuring ships for our Navy.

The first public announcement was in the press—not the American press—but from British sources in the British press. We can be grateful to the British for bringing the plan to light. It otherwise might well have escaped public notice and congressional scrutiny in this country. Insofar as I am aware, neither the White House nor the Defense Department has ever made any official announcement of this unprecedented procurement program. The only information available concerning it is that which has been elicited by congressional inquiry or by citizens in response to specific questions.

As a consequence, we still do not know key details of this plan.

It has been difficult, for example, to learn the exact status of the proposal.

Back in July, Henry J. Kuss, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, told the Armed Services Committee that the Department of Defense was merely "considering the purchase of certain noncombatant ships from the United Kingdom."

The Director of Legislative Liaison, DOD, told me on July 30, 1965, that "no decision has yet been made as to whether any ships, and if so what type of ships. should be made available for bid by British concerns."

At a verbal briefing by Mr. Kuss on September 15, however, the Wisconsin congressional delegation was told that a definite agreement had been reached with the British earlier in the year committing this Nation to open up naval vessel procurement to British yards, and that the only condition under which contracts would not be awarded to the British, in the event they were low bidders, would be failure of the British to pick up its options to buy the F–111 aircraft—TFX.

Until Mr. Kuss was pinned down by direct questions, it is clear that misleading information was being furnished. Contrary to the impressions it has given, the Department of Defense has been committed to an agreement with the British since the negotiations earlier this year.

The Department has further misled the public by always referring to its proposal as a "competition," as the "opening up of ship contracts to British bidding." Technically speaking, this is true, but the Department is less than straight-forward when it resorts to this terminology. Because of the higher standard of living in this country and our higher wage levels, permitting the British yards to bid on these contracts is tantamount to placing the orders in British yards, and the Defense Department ought to acknowledge the fact that such "competition" is essentially meaningless.

Beyond this, it has been impossible to elicit from the Department of Defense any specific technical information concerning the nature of the "competition" between American and British yards for this business. Here are some unanswered questions:

For many types of small naval ships, American shipyards are required to have inspection and certification by the U.S. Coast Guard. Will this procedure be required of British yards? If it is not required, will the standards and quality reflected by this certification, a benefit to the U.S. Navy, be lost? If it is required, how will it be administered? Will additional U.S. Government personnel have to be moved to England to provide this certification and inspection, and if so, will this cost be included in judging the bids in the competition?

Will British yards be subjected to the Fair Labor Standards Act, or the Davis-Bacon Act, as American yards are, in order to have a fair competition?

Will British yards be subject to administrative controls set out in the armed services procurement regulations which include such requirements as bonding and adherence to priorities and allocation rules?

Who will pay the cost of security measures involved in the construction of ships and installation of classified equipment in ships that may well be built in yards which also are building Iron Curtain country ships?

As to each of these matters, and a host of other technical questions, we do not know precisely what will be required of British builders or whether they will be excused from any or all of these requirements. We do not know if the British yards will be required to adhere to the same laws, regulations, and other requirements that American yards must adhere to.

To these substantial and vexing problems, Mr. Kuss has advised, in a letter to me, "you should be aware that our technical advisers have given very careful consideration to these problems before even suggesting the possibility of ship purchases in Britain."

This is poppycock. Mr. Kuss is not able, nor is the Bureau of Ships able, to give answers to these technical questions right now. At least, they admitted they were unable to do so at the September 15 briefing when technical questions were asked and the uniform reply was that the answers had not "been worked out yet."

Mr. Kuss has promised that "all additional costs, including Government costs, will be considered in the competition." But, how can they? For example, I understand that only within the past few weeks a team of Naval advisers was sent to England for the purpose of looking into the mechanics and apparatus for putting this program into effect. Will the cost of that trip and others made before and to be made afterwards be taken into account in the competition? If so, by what accounting procedure and bidding rules?

We do not know the answers to any of these questions.

In addition to a lack of information, there has been serious misinformation spread about this proposal. All of the information the Department has furnished, for example, has referred to the proposal as a one-shot, fiscal 1966, procurement. There is more than a strong suspicion, however, that the program will extend beyond fiscal year 1966.

At the briefing, Mr. Kuss admitted that the procurement was not necessarily limited to fiscal year 1966, if the British went through with the F-111 aircraft purchase. He said that the "U.S. has not promised the British either to limit the procurement to fiscal year 1966 nor to extend it beyond that date" but he made clear that the only reason it would not be extended would be the failure of the British to purchase the F-111.

The public and the Congress have clearly been misled as to the duration of this program.

In addition, no one knows for certain which types of Navy ships will eventually be involved.

When first news of the plan came out, there was talk of including large noncombatant ships, notably a large refrigeration and stores ship. The Department's so-called original list apparently included a number of PGM's, or gunboats. Then, a list appeared which included large and small tugboats, minesweepers, and survey ships. Only last week, a speculative story by the Associated Press listed the minesweepers and tugboats but omitted the survey ships. Moreover, the AP story stated that "later, ship procurement is expected to include purchase of more than a dozen merchant-type ships for cargo transport."

Insofar as can now be learned, the Department's current plan, perhaps to still criticism from more powerful sources, is to confine the procurement to small ships produced by small shipyards—at least for the present.

To sum up, we do not know the scope, the duration, or the technical details concerning this program.

I believe the American public, and the Congress, have the right to know exactly what commitments the Defense Department has made for us. I have, therefore, asked the Secretary of Defense to furnish me with the text of the agreement with Great Britain relating to purchase of U.S. naval ships in that country.

I might add I have also tried to interest the proper committee of the House—the Committee on Armed Services—to inquire further into this matter. I have endeavored to keep the Chairman of that committee informed on facts not made available by the Defense Department and I have urged that answers to a number of questions be obtained through this committee. This matter should be subjected to the full-scale congressional inquiry its importance deserves.

Now, let me try to discuss the merits of the proposal. What is the official reason for this murky, unpublicized, and unprecedented plan to transfer American shipbuilding contracts and American shipyard workers' jobs to Great Britain?

Stripped to its essentials, the Department's position is that the purchase of $60 million of Navy ships in Great Britain will make possible the purchase of $2 billion worth of U.S. aircraft by the British.

From that erroneous statement of facts, the Department is then able to predict that almost every village and hamlet in America will be helped by the billions of dollars of aircraft orders that will be diffused throughout the economy.

If the issue were that simple, I would not be here today. The plain fact is, however, that the Department's position cannot withstand rational analysis and I am inclined to believe the weakness of its case is the real reason this proposal has been kept under wraps and out of the full glare of public scrutiny.

It is, of course, absurd to believe that the British are buying $2 billion in aircraft simply because we agreed to buy $60 million in naval ships.

It is impossible to believe that the British decision to purchase American aircraft is grounded upon any consideration other than her own national interests. We know this was a hard and difficult decision for Great Britain to make. It involved, in effect, a decision to cripple, and perhaps kill, her own defense aircraft industry. It involved the highest and most solemn kind of national decision—a decision to rely upon American superiority in research and development, and to realize the savings resulting therefrom, in the purchase of defense equipment vastly superior than anything Britain could hope to build herself in the foreseeable future. It is a decision which could only be made in the most sober atmosphere, in the face of heavy opposition from her domestic aircraft industry and from statesmen who held vastly different views on defense policy. It could only be made—in and of itself—because it was felt that Britain's national interest required it.

It is not for us to say whether the British made the right decision. But, it is to their credit that the Government did what it felt was right courageously and against popular public opinion, and it is demeaning for our Government to contend that such a momentous decision turned upon a "kickback" from this country in the form of $60 million worth of ship contracts.

I would wish our negotiators had acted with the same courage and view to American national interest. Mr. Kuss has finally admitted to me in a letter:

> The political and economic consequence of the British purchase of almost $2 billion in aircraft from the United States must certainly be defended principally on the basis of the savings that would accrue to the British defense budget.

He goes on, and here we evidently come to the real reason why this deal was made:

> However, some of the sharper political and economic criticisms of this United Kingdom purchase are definitely being blunted by the fact that the United States is willing to allow the United Kingdom industry to compete for some items required by the U.S. Defense Establishment.

I ask you to consider the significance of that statement. The reason this deal was made—jeopardizing the jobs of thousands upon thousands of American shipyard workers—was not the national interest of the United States. It was for the purpose of "blunting" British domestic criticism of a purchase the British Government felt it had to make if the British national interest was to be served.

What of the American national interest? What of our own national security?

Up until this proposal, the Navy has always felt it in the national interest to procure Navy ships in American yards. If that is not the case, then the Navy, by limiting procurement to this country, has been derelict in its duty to American sailors and to American naval defenses. But, there is nothing in the aircraft deal which affects the quality or the cost of the product produced by American shipyards for the U.S. Navy. There is nothing in the aircraft deal which promises a better ship from Great Britain; there is even suspicion to the contrary.

If it is better now to have American ships built in British yards, why was it not better 5 years ago during the Korean War, or during World War II? In all good sense, how could an offer to buy our aircraft change our policy as to where our naval vessels should be built?

The plain fact is that this deal was not instigated by the men in the Bureau of Ships who are responsible for determining where our ships, in the national interest, should be built. It was made by negotiators who were outfoxed by British negotiators looking for more frosting on the cake—highly advanced aircraft at a low price—which their national interest compelled them to buy in our country.

I want to make this point crystal clear. Except in the myopic eyes of the Defense Department's arms sale negotiators, there is no cause and effect relationship between the aircraft sale and the ship purchase. Unless the British Government is completely ignorant and irresponsible, the aircraft purchase will be made on its own merits, not because we buy some ships in Britain. And I might add, I deeply resent, as I know every shipyard operator and shipyard worker resents, the attempt of the Defense Department to make it appear that all of the benefits which will derive from the aircraft purchase are dependent upon the sacrifice of shipyard jobs in America. This simply is not so.

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin, my colleague, for his remarks today and for bringing this matter before the Congress. We in Wisconsin have many shipyards that could use these millions of dollars' worth of orders that are now going to Great Britain. I think it is a good time to bring this before the Congress so that we may do something in the 2 months we have to correct this situation. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank my colleague most warmly.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I, too, am very interested in this problem, being a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I want you to know that I have communicated with the Department of Defense with reference to this $60 million worth of ships being built over there. As you said a few moments ago, it will be smaller type ships. Since then I have contacted the Small Business Administration people, the day before yesterday, as there are some 20 small shipyards in this country that can use the small tugs they have reference to. They can be very helpful to the people of the United States. Also I am surprised at the fact that the Interior Department wants to build two fishing trawlers over in Russia.

I do not know what has happened to our Maritime people in our Government agencies. This task force report still maintains that they want to continue to carry on with the Department of Defense and have ships built abroad. Personally, I have been at them for the last 2 months and I am not going to let up. I think we need plenty of work in the shipyards of the United States. Up and down the east coast men are in need of work. There are two yards near my district in Maryland that could very well use some of this work.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for the remarks that he has made. I do not know of any truer words that have been spoken than those just spoken by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I think we should bear in mind—and I shall refer to this later in my remarks—that one industry in this country that is probably the most distressed and yet one of the most essential is our shipbuilding industry. This is one that suffers in terms of the negotiations that are apparently in progress. I should say to the gentleman that I have a great suspicion that it is not going to be limited just to these small vessels. The next step will be the merchant type, larger vessels, because that also has been intimated in a recent story from the Associated Press. It is not just the small yards currently affected by the list of ships presently announced that should be concerned. There may be other announcements forthcoming.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Wisconsin for bringing this matter out in the House today. This is something that has gone unsaid for a good length of time and needs to be clarified. The matters he has brought up in his excellent and detailed speech need to be answered by the Department of Defense. They have swept this matter under the rug for too long. The answers have not been forthcoming.

I am a member of the Defense Department Subcommittee on Appropriations and the gentleman from Wisconsin was one of the first who expressed his concern to me and to others in this regard. But we have not been able to come to any good decision or to get any good answers or to have this matter of such serious concern to our shipbuilding industry and our country rectified.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for his remarks.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for his forthright statement and for bringing this matter to the House today. One of the results which bothers me about these contracts is that our own shipyards in big San Francisco Bay area are in great need of work. Certainly if we do not maintain the skills in our shipyards we will not be able to build ships when we need them. And we are not going to get them from England when we need them. This is a very shortsighted policy on the part of our Government and a shortsighted policy so far as the defense of our country is concerned, to allow the skills in our shipyard industry to be dissipated and then to have to have a crash program to build ships when we need them. We have gone through that on two different occasions, and I think we should learn from experience so that we will not have to repeat that expensive operation again.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin on his statement.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in complimenting the gentleman now in the well of the House, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, for bringing this to the attention of the House in the waning hours of this session. We do not have many shipbuilders in Missouri, but I rise as a member of the Committee on Armed Services to ask some questions and to make one or two observations.

It seems to me unbecoming that we are regularly told about the ratio of public to private shipbuilding and how much that will be for our capital ships, to say nothing of our merchant marine and others, when we are sending overseas contracts to build ships of any type. We are doing this not only with the United Kingdom, but we have done it, as the gentleman knows, in the matter of building patrol boats, Coast Guard cutters and others to some of the shipbuilding yards of the northern countries.

I wonder if the gentleman knows if this particular treaty or deal—I know that it is not a treaty—or this particular order was negotiated by the Department of State or directly by the Department of Defense?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. No; this was the Department of Defense. It has been impossible for us to get the details of the agreement and of what it covered. I have asked the Secretary of Defense to furnish us with that information. The biggest difficulty here is to get down to what are the actual facts involved.

In my judgment I have never seen anything more misleading, or more attempts to mislead, in all my life.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, that is exactly the reason I raised the point. I wanted the gentleman from Wisconsin to restate that, as he did in his opening remarks in the well of the House.

The Committee on Armed Services has held hearings and has heard witnesses from the various districts of the elected Representatives in this Congress, who represent shipbuilding areas.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. First, one of the most misleading things has been the effort to make it look as though this is a quid pro quo trade of $2 billion worth of ships. If we built this $60 million worth of ships in Britain, we are told, we would have $2 billion worth of aircraft contracts spread all over the country.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will withhold for a minute, let me read from a letter which I received from the Department with reference to this specific question concerning the possible impact on yards in the States of Washington, New Jersey, New York, Texas and Wisconsin. Here is the kind of misleading information which is being handed out:

> It is important to note that these States will receive over $600 million in business directly from the United Kingdom in orders alone as compared to the $60 million worth of ship requirements on which United Kingdom shipyards may be allowed to compete with U.S. shipyards.

In other words, if we will only buy $60 million worth of ships, we will have $600 million worth of business in these same areas. Well, now, that is absolutely misleading and is not a factual answer. First, it infers that the aircraft purchased depends on the ship purchases, and this certainly I cannot believe is true and certainly is grossly exaggerated, with reference to the benefit ratio which would occur if the relationship did exist.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to say further to the gentleman that I desire to compliment him and I am sorry that the Committee on Armed Services of this House cut off its hearings and ceased and desisted in coming to a resolution of this problem. I would have much preferred that this would have come to a head.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen the same letter from which the gentleman quotes. I think the answer is not, well, albeit, that the Department of Defense did negotiate with the Republic of Germany some successful counter-related contracts to offset the cost of our occupation troops there.

However, Mr. Speaker, this should be a matter for the State Department until such time as it is determined that character and honor will prevail instead of love of image. Until we do this, we are in bad shape.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The Bureau of Ships had best get involved, because they will have to respond when a need for ships exists. We will not have yards here that can fulfill the orders and, particularly, with the speed and efficiency required.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I think we have had quite a bit of experience during the past several months in trying to get some of these ships out of the reserve fleet. We had quite a problem in getting the American ships busy in expediting the carrying of our freight, and some ships have refused to haul freight to Vietnam, as well as the ships of other countries.

But, Mr. Speaker, getting back to this question, I still do not have a clear answer in my own mind. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that there have been quite a few bills turned over to the Committee on Armed Services with the authorization to build ships overseas, but I have come to the conclusion that the gentleman from Wisconsin has the hammer in his hand in the Committee on Appropriations. I believe if there were some way possible to stipulate that none of the money appropriated shall be spent in those various countries, it may be the key to the whole situation.

I think that may be the key to the whole situation. You have that power, and I think that may be the answer.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I wish I did have the power but, unfortunately, I do not have the power. If I did have it, there would have been a limitation put in the appropriation bill we passed for the Defense Department in the last month, but it was impossible to get it in.

Mr. GARMATZ. We should have a poverty program for the shipyards. We have one for Appalachia, and other places.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I may say at this point that the two yards in the Eighth District of Wisconsin building these types of vessels until recently were both distressed areas. Recently, one of the communities was taken out of that classification. But if this program of transferring the building of ships to Great Britain takes place, then it will be right back in the distressed area classification. That can be the only outcome, because that is the county's principal industry.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for bringing this vital matter to the attention of the House.

I sincerely hope that his dedicated efforts will cause the Secretary of Defense to review his policies relative to the contracting for construction of small vessels. Because this policy is working such hardships on the small shipbuilding industry of this country it is imperative that it be corrected.

The gentleman from Wisconsin is to be commended for his succinct explanation of the important reasons why the small shipbuilding industry should not be forced out of existence. Those who advise and assist in the formulation of this policy have obviously lost sight of this industry's proven capability to support our defense needs with quality-constructed vessels. To seriously cripple that industry now could be disastrous. Beyond that, such a crippling blow could prove highly detrimental to our national interests for the future.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Prior to yielding, I was discussing the kind of misleading information which is being handed out to Members of Congress and others who inquire into the soundness of this proposal.

I referred to a letter Mr. Kuss wrote to me on October 6, and I quote:

> In reference to your specific questions concerning the business impact on yards in the States of Washington, New Jersey, New York, Texas and Wisconsin, it is important to note that these States will receive over $600 million in business directly from the United Kingdom orders alone as compared to the $60 million worth of ship requirements on which United Kingdom shipyards may be allowed to compete with the U.S. shipyards.

This is a devious answer on two counts: first, it infers that the aircraft purchase depends on the ship purchase, and this is not true. Secondly, however, it grossly exaggerates the benefit-ratio which would occur if the relationship existed.

Mr. Kuss, speaking for the Defense Department, chooses to ignore the fact that the aircraft purchases will be made over a 14-year period, from 1965 through 1978. While the $60 million naval construction figure he mentions is for only one fiscal year, the $600 million figure extends over a 14-year period. Simple arithmetic shows that these States would get $43 million in aircraft orders per annum over the 14-year period if the aircraft purchases are made. It is this figure which must be compared to the $60 million in shipyard orders which will be lost to American yards in 1 year, fiscal 1966.

The Department of Defense, in addition to falsely attributing the aircraft deal to the ship deal, and in addition to falsely maximizing the benefits of the aircraft deal, has attempted to minimize the effect of the ship deal upon the American shipyard industry.

Mr. Kuss states, in a letter to me, that the total of small ships procured in fiscal 1966 will be 20-percent higher than in fiscal 1965, exclusive of ships which will be procured in Great Britain. And, he adds, seemingly as an afterthought:

> At this date we are unable to forecast effects for budgets not yet developed.

In other words, the Department cannot, or will not, tell us whether, by virtue of the apparently larger 1966 budget, the 1967 or 1968 or subsequent budgets may be reduced. It cannot say whether the higher figures for 1966 will cause lower figures for 1967 and 1968. One thing, however, we do know. The astounding increase in small ship procurement in fiscal 1966 comes at a remarkably fortuitous time to minimize criticism in the United States of the initiation of a long-range program to transfer shipbuilding contracts to Britain, if that is the case.

Mr. Kuss, in actuality, downplays the full impact of the fiscal 1966 program. The following figures on small ship procurement are from the Department of Defense—Bureau of Ships:

Small ship and boat awards, Navy

Fiscal 1960	$24,411,000
Fiscal 1961	20,414,000
Fiscal 1962	52,887,000
Fiscal 1963	43,407,000
Fiscal 1964	32,292,000
5-year average (1960–64)	34,682,200
Fiscal 1965	59,700,000
Fiscal 1966 (less United Kingdom ships)	71,700,000
Fiscal 1966 (with United Kingdom ships)	131,700,000

Thus, it is true that the fiscal 1966 procurement, less the British ships, is 20-percent higher than in fiscal 1965.

But, including the British ships, it is well over 100-percent greater than in fiscal 1965 and it is very close to 400-percent greater than the average of the preceding 5 years.

Thus, we come to the crucial factor which the Department of Defense ignores and seems to hope will be forgotten:

If the fiscal 1966 procurement is untypical, if small ship procurement reverts to previous annual averages—or is reduced because of the unusual 1966 procurement—and if the British are to receive small ship contracts in future years approximating the size of those in fiscal 1966, what happens to the small shipyards of America who rely on Navy contracts for their existence?

The answer is obvious. Those small yards—the small business of the American shipyard industry—will be wiped out within 3 or 4 years.

Even, however, assuming that there is to be a permanent substantial increase in small ship procurement, is this justification for keeping this work from domestic yards and American workers?

It certainly does not come as news to this body that the American shipbuilding industry is one of our most distressed industries. For years, it has been trying to stay alive in period of famine. The Defense Department knows this.

Now, we are told, however, that there is more business than the U.S. shipyards have been accustomed to and, therefore, "to blunt" British domestic criticism of a good deal for Great Britain, it must share some of this business with British yards.

Why, after so many lean years, after merely staying alive, must the remaining American shipbuilding industry be deprived of business for which it has been waiting, which it is equipped to produce and for which its manpower has been magnificently trained?

What kind of power have we given to men in the Pentagon who can take action, in secrecy and for no compelling reason, to deprive one industry of the work it was created to produce, while other industries—big business industries—reap benefits? I warn this House, if it raises no protest against this kind of operation, that we will indeed have opened a new Pandora's box. This year, the small shipbuilding industry is sacrificed; next year, which one will it be?

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this proposal has not been thought through. It is ill-conceived. There is too much vagueness, inconsistency, and confusion. There are too many unanswered questions. There have been too many misleading replies.

But this plan is more than confused and ill-conceived. It is contrary to the best interests of the United States and should have been rejected out of hand, for that reason, by our negotiators when it was first proposed.

The adverse economic effect is most direct and immediate.

Transferring shipbuilding jobs to Great Britain can only be done by taking them away from American yards. This plan will strike a telling blow against the small shipyards in this country. Many will be forced to close down; for the few that stay open, the loss of capacity, know-how and skilled personnel will be substantial and major. The hardships which will be visited upon shipyard workers and their families will be severe and widespread.

In my own district, for example, there are three small shipyards which in the past have built one or more of the types of vessels that are now involved in this program. These yards employ almost 1,400 people. They are located in two Wisconsin counties—Door and Marinette. Marinette County at the present time is a redevelopment area under the Area Redevelopment Act. Door County was removed from that list only a short time ago. Because these yards are noted for the quality of their work, for their efficiency, and for the know-how and skills of their management and labor, there is no doubt these yards would obtain a healthy share of the Navy contracts in fair competition with other yards in this country subject to the same Federal laws and requirements. They cannot compete against the unfair advantages and low cost labor of British yards. The sad but reasonable expectation is that Door County will return once again to the distressed area list with Marinette County if this proposal goes through.

Let me read to you from communications I have received from these yards when I informed them of the scope of the proposed program. One wired:

> The types of vessels listed in your telegram have in large measure been the basis for our existence. Procurement of these vessels in Great Britain could curtail our operation after June 1966.

Another wrote:

> The yards affected are really the cream of the crop, as they are the only survivors in this competitive industry. They also have a fine reputation with the Navy in giving the Navy quality ships—on time * * *. The fact that many shipyards have gone out of business, and shipbuilding is so vital to our Nation, makes it imperative that the few remaining shipyards with this important knowledge and skill be kept in case of emergency.

Local Lodge 696 of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers, and Helpers, pointed out:

> We are sure that if all avenues of manufacture are explored, that some way will be found to help Great Britain and still not destroy the very industries that are striving to bolster the economy in the so-called distressed areas which encompass the Door, Wis., Menominee, Mich., and Marinette, Wis., Counties.

This problem, of course, is not confined to my own district or my own State. To name only a few, small shipyards in Washington, Massachusetts, Louisiana, New York, and New Jersey are involved. This proposal will create distressed areas from coast to coast and from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico.

How strange our Government is that, on one hand, it seeks to prefer economically distressed areas in the award of its contracts and, at the same time, it moves from the reach of those areas the very work which would relieve the distressed conditions?

While we are creating distressed areas in the United States, it would at least be comforting to know that we are reducing unemployment and creating prosperous areas in Great Britain.

But that is one of the paradoxes of this program.

The last figure I have seen on the unemployment rate in Great Britain was 1.2 percent of the labor force, meaning that there is a general shortage of workers. The latest figure on unemployment in the United States is 4.4 percent. To the best of my information, the British shipbuilding industry does not need the additional work and jobs which are being pressed upon it. British shipyards are working at full capacity. Their employees are enjoying full employment. Indeed, I understand that British shipyards are seeking skilled help from other countries.

The ABC of this matter is that if British aircraft work is being transferred out of Great Britain, it is not the labor-short British shipyard industry which needs help. It is the British aircraft industry. And, if an American industry is to be chosen from which jobs will be taken, it ought not be an industry like the shipyard industry which is finding difficulty keeping employed the trained work force it has on hand.

Nor should the impact fall so exclusively, as it does here, on small business. This country has a public policy in favor of the support and preservation of small business. The Small Business Act requires that the Government "should aid, counsel, assist, and protect, insofar as is possible, the interests of small business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise, to insure that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for property and services for the Government * * * be placed with small business enterprises."

The plan to buy small ships in Great Britain stands that national policy on its head. This proposal is not a help but an attack on small business. The small business segment of the shipyard industry is the bull's-eye at which this crippling shaft is aimed. This proposal goes contrary to national policy protecting small business. It is not in the public interest for that reason alone.

But, small business policy is not the only national policy under attack here. The most obvious congressionally declared national policy which is violated is the Buy American Act. To put this plan through, the Secretary of Defense will have to declare an exception to the Department of Defense's Buy American policy. Such exceptions can only be made when the national interest requires it. I believe I have demonstrated today that the national interest, far from requiring it, will be seriously harmed.

Furthermore, the Buy American Act requires that American contractors must use American materials and supplies in fulfilling their contracts. American shipbuilders are subject to that requirement in bidding upon these types of vessels. Would British builders be subjected to the same requirements? If not, or if American shipbuilders are to be free from the requirement in order to be on a fair competitive standing with the British, there will be an even wider breach of the Buy American Act. The lash of the Defense Department's proposal reaches further than just the shipyards.

The force of this plan, because of its precedent-creating nature, will have no boundaries. If, by placing aviation orders, the British may obtain American shipbuilding business, it would be hard to deny other friendly countries the same privilege. What we do for one ally we should, with even-handed consideration, be willing to do for another. Is Japan, or the Scandinavian countries, or West Germany, to be given the same opportunity to build American naval vessels? How far is this policy of using American defense industries as poker chips during arms negotiations going to be carried?

Bad as all these consequences are, the issues here go beyond them and bear upon our national security itself.

To understand that aspect, I must ask you to imagine what would now be happening if this proposal had been adopted 10 years ago. The Defense Department concedes that it has recently been forced to upgrade in priority certain small naval vessels which are comparable to those involved in this proposal. Within the past few months, a small American shipyard has been given a contract, on a crash basis, for the production of small patrol boats, because of emergency requirements in Vietnam. Again, the basic reason the PMG's or gunboats were taken off the list for procurement in Great Britain, was the need for speed in their construction which could not be met by procurement abroad. If American small yards had been snuffed out of existence during the last 10 years, where could those boats now be built with the speed our national security now requires? I well remember earlier rush contracts for small vessels during the Korean war. The small yards were ready then; they are ready now; they will not be ready in future years if they are put on the road to extinction through this buy-abroad program.

To place our major reliance upon foreign yards for American naval vessels, to be forced to go overseas for ships during some future crisis—that is the major thrust of this new innovation in procurement being forced down our throats by the Pentagon. I say it is against the national interest and inimical to the national security. I say it has been ill conceived and badly formulated. The Secretary of Defense should abandon it.

THE NEED FOR ATLANTIC UNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week a number of Members of the House and the other body introduced resolutions calling for the creation of an Atlantic union delegation which would meet with similar delegations from other North Atlantic nations to discuss the creation of a Federal union.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues, Congressman PAUL FINDLEY, Congressman DON FRASER, Congressman QUIE, and Congressman ELLSWORTH introduced resolutions because of a shared belief that efforts must be started to form "a more perfect union" between the United States and the nations of Western Europe for the mutual benefit and progress of all.

The North Atlantic Treaty since 1949 has been effective in helping its member nations—as the charter states—"safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law."

In 1969, any party is free to withdraw from the Atlantic Alliance. Unfortunately, we see forces of disintegration at work both in NATO and in Europe itself. The French have made it clear that their views on the future of both NATO and Europe are different from our own and from their neighbors.

The time has come to ask whether the NATO alliance shall be allowed to collapse, whether it should be continued as an essentially military and defense configuration, or whether it should provide the basis for a new structure of even closer cooperation and development.

We all are aware of the world conditions which gave rise to the NATO pact. The threat of Communist domination of Europe provided powerful impetus for the Western democracies to unite in collective security arrangements.

Yet while this was the primary incentive for the establishment of NATO, its proclaimed purposes were considerably broader and more ambitious. The parties to the treaty—to quote article 2—pledged that "They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them."

As we review what measures have been taken to implement that provision, it is evident that some steps have been taken within Europe itself to bring about closer economic cooperation. I refer, of course, to the Common Market, the European Economic Community, Euratom, the Iron and Coal Community. With a single exception of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), however, the United States has not drawn closer to Europe.

There is no doubt in my mind that we have tried. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 envisioned a customs union of the North Atlantic states which would have drawn the NATO countries closer together. We see these hopes breaking on the rocks of resurging French obstructionism at the current GATT conference and elsewhere.

Even the purely military aspects of NATO have caused contention between allies. The failure of the multilateral force to enlist the enthusiasms of some NATO countries has thrown most of the alliance into disarray. Perhaps the very future of NATO itself may hang in the balance.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the United States must take dramatic and determined steps toward convincing European nations that we conceive our future as being inextricably intertwined with theirs. We must demonstrate our willingness to join with them in fruitful collaboration.

The passage of an Atlantic union resolution by Congress would be such a step.

The resolutions which were introduced this week provide for the establishment of an Atlantic Union delegation of 18 citizens, 8 appointed by the President and 8 of whom shall be from the Congress, 4 appointed by the President of the Senate and 4 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The two living former Presidents, Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower, will be asked to be cochairmen of the delegation. Their participation is most fitting since they have both repeatedly called for the necessity of closer cooperation with Europe.

This delegation would be empowered to organize and participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies desiring to join in this enterprise.

The joint task of the convention would be to seek agreement to a declaration that the eventual goal of their respective states is to transform the Atlantic Alliance into a true, functional, Federal union; second, to draw up a tentative timetable for the transition to this goal; and third, to create interim institutions to hasten the progress of integration and provide a channel of continuing fruitful contact toward unity.

The recommendations of this convention would, by this resolution, be submitted to the scrutiny of Congress for action.

Mr. Speaker, we must move quickly on this worthy cause. The hour already is late. The tide of unity appears to be ebbing. Yet determined men, fired by the vision of a free and functioning unity of states in a federal system, may still win the day.

It is my hope that hearings on these resolutions can be scheduled early in the 2d session of this 89th Congress, and that passage can be effected sufficiently in advance of 1969 to allow an international convention which will reflect the best political thinking of the Western World and agreements which may be translated into positive action for unity.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I compliment my colleague from Wisconsin, the ranking majority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for taking the leadership position in regard to a resolution to establish an Atlantic Union Delegation, and furthermore, for taking the initiative to call this special order and to permit others to take part in a discussion of the resolution he has introduced.

I speak for my colleague on the Republican side of the aisle, the gentleman from Minnesota, ALBERT H. QUIE, who regretted very much that he could not be present personally and take part. He has introduced a resolution similar to the one introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

I am gratified to learn that on the other side of the Capitol similar resolutions have been introduced by Senator CARLSON of Kansas, a Member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and Senator MCCARTHY of Minnesota. I am hopeful that, just as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] will "give it a push," so to speak, in the Foreign Affairs Committee on the House side, Senator CARLSON will do the same on the Senate side.

I am also pleased to be associated in this endeavor with my able friends and colleagues, Mr. ELLSWORTH of Kansas and Mr. FRASER of Minnesota. Their identification with this resolution will aid tremendously in its favorable consideration. Both of them have been in the forefront as courageous and imaginative spokesmen for Atlantic Union. So has Mr. QUIE, who also distinguished himself as the first chairman of the House Republican Committee on NATO and the Atlantic Community.

It is important that we take note of just exactly how far this resolution would go. It would commit no one, of course, to any specific course of action, but it would authorize this delegation to explore possibilities with delegations from other NATO countries.

In 1962 a convention was held in Paris at which delegations from the NATO Nations were represented and took part. Unfortunately, after a rather brief convention, recommendations which the convention did adopt were not implemented. They were permitted to die on the vine, so to speak, so it becomes necessary, in my view, to take this new initiative.

I place in the RECORD at this point the language of House Joint Resolution 769.

H.J. RES. 769

Joint resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation

Whereas in 1969 any party may withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty, which was ratified in 1949 as a first rather than a last step toward unity;

Whereas since 1949 revolutionizing scientific, technological and other advance has outstripped the treaty and made union of these allies imperative for prosperity, peace and freedom;

Whereas the fragmentation of the world into new nations at a time when the strongest democracies cannot live alone, requires these democracies to build the pilot union government needed to spread liberty and union both by example and by admitting to their union other nations willing and able to uphold its principles;

Whereas these allies need but unite their gold and other resources behind a common currency to assure their citizens, and the developing nations, enduring monetary stability and liquidity, and to prevent another dictator-serving crash like the one of 1931;

Whereas our Original States, when beset with dangers caused by disunion under their confederation, sent delegates to the 1787 Convention, which traced their troubles to their confederal structure and invented federal union, which has enduringly safeguarded member States from domination by one another, equitably apportioned among their sovereign citizens voting power on common concerns—and the benefits and burdens of union—assured each State an independent government for State affairs, met other challenges similar to those facing the Atlantic allies, and thereby proved that free people thus united can work wonders;

Whereas distant though North Atlantic Treaty Organization's transformation may seem, these allies can greatly speed it now by officially declaring that federal union, within the framework of the United Nations, is their eventual goal, by setting a timetable—as we did for our moon target—and by providing democratic means for achieving the transition in safe time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, (1) the Congress hereby creates an Atlantic Union delegation, composed of eighteen eminent citizens, and authorized to organize and participate in a convention made up of similar delegations from such North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies as desire to join in this enterprise, to explore the possibility of agreement on:

(a) A declaration that the eventual goal of their peoples is to transform their present alliance into a federal union;

(b) A tentative timetable for the transition to this goal; and

(c) Democratic institutions to develop the ways and means for achieving the goal in time to save their citizens from another war, depression, or other manmade catastrophe, and let them enjoy, as soon as possible, the greater freedom and higher moral and material blessings which federation has brought to free people in the past.

(2) The convention's recommendations shall be submitted to the Congress for action by constitutional procedure;

(3) Not more than half of the delegation's members shall be from one political party, and all shall be citizens of high stature and wide influence, representing together a broad range of experience in the various major challenges facing this undertaking, and so conscious of its importance and urgency as to be willing to give it personally the necessary priority and time, in the spirit of 1787 which one member of that Convention thus expressed: "Inconvenient" as it was "to remain absent from his private affairs * * * he would bury his bones" in Philadelphia, if need be, to bring about the union;

(4) Eight of the delegation shall be named by the Congress and eight by the President of the United States, and all shall be as free to speak and vote as were the drafters of the United States Constitution;

(5) The Congress hereby requests former Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry S. Truman to serve as cochairmen of the delegation.

The Atlantic Union I visualize would have authority that is specific but very carefully limited. The specifics I prefer would be foreign policy, defense, monetary, and trade matters.

If adopted, this resolution and the similar resolutions could be a giant stride toward the peace-keeping and freedom-serving goal of the Atlantic Union, so well described by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Just beyond that goal could well begin the golden millennium of peace, prosperity, and progress of which mankind has dreamed ever since the day of the ancient Prophet Micah of Old Testament times.

The short-term benefits to the United States and to other free peoples are equally appealing.

The simple act of authorizing the delegation would put us in a positive position in the contest with communism. It would strengthen free world leadership and put the Communists in a difficult defensive position.

Since World War II, it seems, we have been hopping from one Communist-inspired crisis to another—Berlin, Quemoy, Cuba, Vietnam, and the Dominican Republic. It is high time that we take the initiative and put the Communists on the defensive.

An Atlantic Union Convention would do just that. Atlantic Union is an idea that is both powerful and peaceful, as American history itself attests.

The work our forefathers did at Philadelphia in 1787 in creating the U.S. Federal Union did more to strengthen freedom and to extend peace than any other act in history. Under the Constitution which came from that Convention, individual States which were beset with monetary, trade, and military problems, weakened by division, were brought together effectively and permanently.

Union was achieved through a system that gives the Central Government the strength it needs but which still protects the liberty of the individual citizens and the authority of local government.

The monetary, military, and trade problems which now confront the free nations parallel in many ways the problems the Thirteen Original U.S. States faced in 1787. Today, as then, division weakens the forces of freedom and unnecessarily magnifies the problems, internal and external, which beset us.

In his Farewell Address, on leaving the Presidency, George Washington uttered some oft-quoted words about entangling alliances, but he added some words which are not as often quoted, which are a part of the very same paragraph with the phrase "entangling alliances."

He said:

> To the efficacy and permanency of your—

That is, the United States—

> Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute. They must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which alliances in all times have experienced.

As it is presently constituted, the NATO Organization of today must be classified as one of the undependable entangling alliances about which Washington warned. Certainly it is far better than nothing, but certainly also it is doing no better than the Articles of Confederation, which failed to meet the problems of the Thirteen Original States in the preconvention period. Infractions and interruptions of the NATO alliance are apparent at almost every turn of the road, and a government for the whole of NATO, it seems to me, is just as indispensable today as it was for the Thirteen Original States in 1787 when a Constitutional Convention was called.

On March 13, 1950, a Member of the other body, Senator Kefauver of Tennessee, spoke on the Senate floor in answer to the position then taken by the State Department, a position very similar to the position still held by the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the text of Senator Kefauver's speech of that day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Moss). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

KEFAUVER'S REPLY TO THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, next to food and shelter, the most important concern of our people is that we discover an effective means of gaining the peace.

The issue of peace is basic. Americans all want peace, but we differ widely as to methods of achieving our mutual objective. The issue is not whether we should make the maximum effort, but how we shall make it.

The problems besetting our people and those of other democracies defy piecemeal solution. Since the end of hostilities in 1945, a gallant effort has been made to find the answers through the cooperation of national governments. With all our government-to-government efforts, the fact remains: Our peace is still precarious. Only a few express optimism regarding the ultimate effectiveness of our present policies.

We are burdened by heavy taxation. Our armaments expense pyramids. Living standards are threatened in half the Atlantic community. Our economies are weakened. The area of freedom in the world has shrunk, and still shrinks. The requirement of atomic defense promises to restrict freedom here in the United States. Only a small minority in America holds fast to the notion that America is capable, single-handedly, of arriving at a solution. Nearly every Member of Congress realizes the impossibility of any Nation's insuring its domestic tranquility and providing effectively its own defense solely by its own efforts, independently of all other nations. Most thoughtful Americans join in this firm conviction.

In this situation, many proposals for taking more effective steps toward peace have been proposed in Congress and out: means of strengthening the U.N.; means of bringing the free people of the world closer together in defense and economics. The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House have been holding extensive hearings on these plans * * * Many eminent citizens have testified before the subcommittees.

All this reflects the great concern about the state of affairs today; concern on the part of Congress and on the part of the people of the United Sttaes.

I regret the necessity of making this observation; but, Mr. President, the State Department's apparent lack of vision at this time is shocking and alarming to many of us. If there ever was a time when we were in urgent need of creative leadership, it is now.

Long ago it was said, "to govern is to foresee." If we drift into another war, it will be because those responsible for keeping the peace lacked vision; because they could not see the danger when the cloud was small; because measures were not taken to remove the cloud while there was still time. That cloud, unfortunately, grows bigger every day. It is so large now that it envelops us in a fog of cold war. Already, dictatorship has won vast areas without firing a shot in that cold war. Meanwhile, despite our efforts, our money, and other laudatory means, we merely hold our own in Europe, while we are losing much in Asia. Swiftly, the sands fall through the hour-glass. This is the time to foresee, if we would govern with efficiency.

I am proud, Mr. President, that many of our colleagues are aware of the exceptional dangers we face. Many Senators disclose an awareness of our particular responsibility for the peace of our people. More than a mere power to consent to or reject appointments of those who represent our Government in foreign affairs is vested in us by the Constitution. Rather, that honored instrument invests in us the responsibility of giving advice in foreign affairs and in making treaties. We should not be mere back-seat drivers. We are spokesmen of the people who own the vehicle and who ride in it. We cannot escape the responsibility of advising as to the route to be taken. After all, we are close to the people: so close to them, in fact, that we will be bumped out of our place if we disregard the people.

MUCH AND VARIED ADVICE OFFERED

Such is not the case with the personnel of the Department of State. Those career men, fine men, who owe in part their appointments to the Senate, are not so close to the people; therefore, they are not so acutely cognizant of the people's wishes. They have their duty; we have ours. Representatives of the people of two-thirds of the States of this Nation recently sought to do our duty. We suggested steps which the State Department might take to help solve our problem of peace.

Only a few days ago, the senior Senator from Maryland, Mr. Tydings, gave his advice. Like a noble voice in the wilderness he urged, for the third time, that we ask for a world disarmament conference. Mr. President, I am proud to belong to a body where the hardheaded chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services—to whose ability I can testify as one of its members—is disarmament's strongest champion in Congress. What a paradox.

I am proud also to belong to a body where the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is the one to take the initiative in urging new efforts to save humanity from the horrors of hydrogen war. Who can forget the generous proposal which the senior Senator from Connecticut, Mr. McMahon, advanced from this Chamber a few weeks ago, and in the second far-reaching and capable speech which he delivered in the Senate last week? The advice the two Senators gave was very far reaching, and who here will deny that we need far-reaching measures to meet the emergency we face?

They advised us to offer to sacrifice the major arms on which we now depend for the defense of our national sovereignty, if others would do the same; and provided, always, the acceptance of the strict inspection and control this would necessitate. This involves the sacrifice of some of our national sovereignty.

Other Senators put their advice in the form of resolutions they offered. Nearly all of these were far reaching, too. They departed substantially from the notions of national sovereignty which have previously prevailed.

The senior Senator from Utah, Mr. Thomas, has had an exceptional experience in this field. Like the other two Senators I have mentioned, he is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. He offered Senate Concurrent Resolution 52 in cosponsorship with the junior Senator from Illinois, Mr. DOUGLAS, upon whom he has left an indelible mark. They advised that we propose a widespread collective self-defense agreement under article 51 of the charter.

The junior Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Tobey, who has distinguished himself in many fields, together with other Senators, sponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 56. They advised by it that we seek to strengthen the U.N.—a goal that all the resolutions, to which I refer, seek also. These Senators would develop it into a world federation, and would have us declare this to be a fundamental objective of U.S. policy. Their resolution is known generally as the world federation resolution.

A number of Senators were so impressed by the need of far-reaching action that they sponsored both the world federation and the Atlantic Union resolutions.

One of them, the junior Senator from Alabama, Mr. SPARKMAN, whose statesmanship I learned to appreciate in the many years I served with him in the House, cosponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 133 with a group of 10 Senators. As were the two others I mentioned, this impressive group was quite bipartisan in character and drawn from many parts of the country. These Senators advised that we seek to amend the U.N. Charter. They would remove the veto in defined matters of aggression and establish an international police force under a reorganized Security Council.

Then I had the honor of offering Senate Concurrent Resolution 57 on behalf of a group of 20 Senators. They included such eminent members of the Foreign Relations Committee as the senior Senator from Georgia, Mr. George, who is chairman of the Finance Committee, and the junior Senator from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT, whose earlier resolution started the ball rolling into what became the U.N. organization. My cosponsors also included the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the senior Senator from South Carolina, Mr. Maybank, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the junior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy, and other distinguished Senators.

In this resolution, known generally as the Atlantic Union resolution, we advised that the President should invite the other six sponsors of the Atlantic Pact—Canada, the United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg—to meet with our delegates in a bipartisan Federal Convention. Just that. We would explore how far these people, and those of such other democracies as the convention might invite to meet with them, could apply among them, in the framework of the U.N., the principles of Federal union that are embodied in our own U.S. Constitution.

Still other resolutions were offered by still other Senators. I find that no less than 40 Senators have sponsored, or subsequently adhered to, one or more of these plans. They come from every region of the United States—from 32 of the 48 States—and represent every shade of opinion in both parties. May I list them?

"IMPRESSIVE" SPONSORSHIP LISTED

The gentlemen from Vermont, Mr. AIKEN and Mr. Flanders; the gentlemen from Washington, Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. Cain; the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Capehart; the gentlemen from Kentucky, Mr. Chapman and Mr. Withers; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. DOUGLAS; the gentleman from California, Mr. Downey; the gentlemen from Montana, Mr. Murray and Mr. Ecton; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Ferguson; the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. Frear; the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT; the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. George; the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Gillette; the gentlemen from North Carolina, Mr. Hoey and Mr. Graham; the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Hendrickson; the gentlemen from Alabama, Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN; the gentlemen from Minnesota, Mr. Thye and Mr. HUMPHREY; the gentleman from Wyoming, Mr. Hunt; the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Johnson; the gentlemen from South Carolina, Mr. Maybank and Mr. Johnston, the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. Kilgore; the gentleman from New York, Mr. Lehman; the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. LONG; the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. MCCARTHY; the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. McMahon; the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. MORSE; the gentleman from Florida, Mr. PEPPER; the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. STENNIS; the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. Taylor; the gentleman from Utah, Mr. Thomas; the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. Tobey; the gentleman from North Dakota, Mr. YOUNG; and myself.

This is, indeed, Mr. President, an impressive manifestation. It is quite an extraordinary demonstration of the Senate's concern for our future; its vision of the needs of our time; its willingness to shoulder its responsibilities and act creatively.

One would expect this to impress particularly the State Department. More than one Secretary of State has criticized the Senate as being too negative in its attitude; being more inclined to reject than to approve—let alone propose to create.

I expected a friendly, appreciative, cooperative, constructive reaction from the State Department to at least some of this good and wholesome advice from Senators.

Nearly all the Senators sponsoring these various plans had already supported the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, and other postwar measures the State Department favored. Some of us foresaw the Marshall plan would not be enough but supported it, nevertheless. And with some misgivings, some of us voted for the Atlantic Pact in the text the State Department recommended.

Many of us have continued through the years to vote for the State Department's policies, although we did it with grave doubt and concern. The Department brought us measures which soon turned out to be only a stopgap, and which required a greater stopgap to prop it up.

It will be recalled what the U.N. and the International Bank and Fund were supposed to do. But soon we were called upon to prop up these State Department plans with the British loan. Senators will remember the promises made about the British loan, until suddenly it broke down, and had to be followed by a guarantee to Greece and Turkey. This, in turn, had to be propped up with the Marshall plan. That left such a gap that Czechoslovakia and Hungary were lost to the Kremlin. To stop that gap, we were offered the Atlantic Pact. Shortly, the Atlantic Treaty had to be plugged up with the measure to rearm Western Europe.

I forebear to say more, or to speak of China or atomic developments.

I am the first to recognize that the Kremlin is an unreliable ally and a tough antagonist with which to deal. But, better foresight on the part of the State Department might have recognized this fact earlier, and made greater provision against it. Thereby, we would have gained a larger margin for safety.

I have sometimes questioned the State Department's vision, but I never expected it to turn against so many Senators who have supported it through thin and thinner. I did not anticipate that it would win it the plaudits of Colonel McCormick. But that is what it has now done.

Was it Walt Whitman who said, "They who see farthest have the most faith?" No matter who said it, the point is still good.

If we measure the vision of the State Department by the faith it is showing, what do we find?

We find it has no faith in the advice the chairman of our Armed Services Committee gave. We find it has no faith in the advice the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy gave. The Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, dealt harshly in the same press conference with the proposals of the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. McMahon, and the Senator from Maryland, Mr. Tydings.

The Secretary has not yet honored the rest of us with his personal attention. Instead, he sent two of his aids, Dean Rusk, a Deputy Under Secretary of State, and John D. Hickerson, an Assistant Secretary of State, to give the Department's views on the various resolutions.

We find the Department has no faith in any part of the major resolutions.

Mr. President, I cannot go all the way with some of the resolutions which have been proposed and discussed before the Foreign Relations Committee. At the same time, I know the motives of the sponsors are good. Some of the provisions are worthy and should be carefully considered. Yet the State Department finds nothing worthwhile about any of them. It merely concludes that it "must oppose passage of this resolution."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the members of the State Department all too often succumb to the occupational disease which sometimes characterizes executive officials, namely, that any suggestion made by a member of the legislative body is to be automatically turned down?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the distinguished Senator that apparently in this instance the State Department has very little confidence in the advice offered by Members of the Senate and by the public generally. It seems to have confidence only in its own opinions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the distinguished Senator from Tennessee agree that possibly the speech of Glendower recounted by Shakespeare in his play Henry IV is appropriate here? It will be remembered that the leader of the Welsh forces addressed the assembly and said:

"I am a blessed Glendower. It is mine to speak and yours to hear."

Does the Senator think that this sentiment describes the attitude of the State Department, namely, that it is theirs to speak and ours merely to listen and mutely acquiesce?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The distinguished Senator has had so much experience in this kind of a situation that he has very eloquently, I think, described the present attitude of the State Department, I say with much regret.

As for our Federal Convention to explore Atlantic Union, we were told that the Department cannot support this particular resolution, until we answered to its satisfaction a series of schoolteacher questions with a few $64 questions mixed up with them. I shall pay my respects to these questions somewhat later.

I take no personal umbrage at this, Mr. President. The matter is far too grave; and I take solace in the fact that the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Thomas of Utah himself, fared no better than did the rest of us. The Department had no faith in the resolution of the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Illinois.

Such is the faith the State Department shows in advice from the Senate. We find it has the same lack of faith in the views of the House.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to add one more instance with reference to the resolution which the Senator from Utah, Mr. Thomas, and I introduced some years ago with regard to the Federation of Western Europe. The response by the State Department was exactly the same as in the instance which the Senator has mentioned. My experience has been the same as has the Senator's.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator confirms the statement I have made, and it is a very interesting occurrence. I wish to observe that 4 years ago the distinguished Senator from Arkansas and the distinguished Senator from Utah presented a resolution asking that the United States try to use its influence, through the Marshall plan, if necessary, in order to bring about a breakdown of the barriers between the nations of Western Europe and the unification program which would eliminate customs and trade restrictions and bring about a real unity of Western Europe. The State Department turned thumbs down on the advice of the distinguished Senators. We now find, years later, after nationalization has risen again in many of the nations of Western Europe, when the leaders of some of those nations are distrustful of one another, at long, long last, 4 or 5 years later, the State Department finally recognizes the idea as being good.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee whether he would not suppose, in view of the dissatisfaction of the State Department with all the suggestions and recommendations made by distinguished Members of this body, it would have a great deal of satisfaction with itself?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that the State Department officials are men of great ability. I think they have dealt with the problem so long that they think they are the only persons who have any particular opinion or insight as to what the Congress and the American people are ready or prepared for. I hope that in some way we can persuade the State Department to see the point that the only way in which we may be able to proceed on some permanent basis is to have full discussion and consideration in Congress and before the people of the various proposals which have been made. When the State Department comes to that point of view, we shall have made considerable progress.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask the Senator whether he has felt that in what has seemed to be the most important public announcement made by the head of the State Department; namely, his talk with representatives of various newspapers, which was afterward released as a public statement, he detected any tremendous amount of self-satisfaction on the part of the Secretary over the progress which our foreign policy has been making?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I must say to the Senator that I am sure the Secretary of State is not very happy over the progress we have been making.

Mr. FLANDERS. That being the case, does not the Senator from Tennessee think that if the Secretary of State is not too happy with what we suggest and is not too happy with what he is doing, it might seem a good thing for him to take a wider circle of advice, including our own?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do, indeed, agree with the Senator from Vermont that, in view of the fact that even the Secretary of State and his colleagues are dissatisfied with the progress we are making in certain parts of the world—they admit that we are on only a day-to-day foreign policy—certainly they should be happy to have us bring certain proposals to the floor of the Senate, debate them, and have them considered by the American people in trying to get a long-range program in which we would not have to deal with these questions piecemeal.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was very glad the Senator from Tennessee mentioned the resolutions which the junior Senator from Arkansas has offered from time to time asking that the strength of the Marshall plan be used to stimulate the European nations into integrating themselves economically to a much greater extent than has been the case in the past. I was pleased also by the very accurate way in which the Senator from Tennessee pointed out that the State Department in the past has always turned thumbs down upon this proposal, but now has come around to believing that this is what should have been done.

By way of further background, I should like to say that we all remember that when the Marshall plan was under debate last year, the Senator from Arkansas offered another resolution calling for a financial reward to those nations which practiced integration, and once again at the behest of the State Department that resolution was voted down. But now, a year later, the European Cooperation Administration and the State Department come around and adopt the policy which the junior Senator from Arkansas advocated, and it is now their policy. Now I come to the question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, let me say, in that connection, that since the State Department has finally come around to the policy recommended by the Senator from Arkansas, that the nations of western Europe should federate, it is a rather strange thing that the State Department feels that federation would be a success in western Europe, and yet is unwilling that we also join in the enterprise. In other words, the Department is asking them to do something which it refuses to recommend even being brought to the floor of the Senate for consideration when it is made applicable to the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is the question I should like to ask. Has not the behavior of the ECA and the State Department in this matter of the economic integration of Europe been similar to that of an ungracious husband who turns down every suggestion which his wife makes, and laughs her suggestions to scorn, but who then after a period of time will put her suggestions into effect and pass them off as his own ideas which he has just originated?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The distinguished Senator from Illinois, it seems to me, cites a very clear parallel.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think we should recall that even in this last instance, when we have been saying that the State Department has accepted the principle which is now included in the ECA bill which has not yet been reported, actually the fact is that Mr. Hoffman, of the ECA, saw the light much sooner than did the State Department, and that he is the one who concluded, as long ago, I think, as September, that this is an essential, in fact, an indispensable, part of the EAC if it is to be successful.

I call attention to the initial statement made before the Committee on Foreign Relations by Mr. Hoffman and the Secretary of State. Mr. Hoffman had no qualifications about the absolute importance of bringing about a closer unification of Europe. The Secretary of State, in one very short and pointed paragraph, said something to this effect—though I cannot quote exactly the words—that there had been a great deal of talk in Europe about federation, but that neither the people nor the governments in Europe were yet ready for any action. It was rather a definite and flat statement that they are not ready for it, whereas when we ask any of the representatives of ECA, such as Mr. Zellerbach, from Italy, or Mr. Hanes, from Germany, as I did, whether they think the people of their respective countries are ready and willing to make such a move, they both say yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, that has been my experience in talking with some of the officials of the western European democracies. Whether the politicians are all for unification or not, the people certainly realize that if they are to get anywhere, if they are to have any protection, they must have some unification.

I think it is in point to make the observation that certainly the Senator from Arkansas appreciates the fact that unification in western Europe, when he first proposed it, would have been comparatively simple and easy of accomplishment, as compared with the many difficulties which would occur and are occurring in the effort now being made.

Similarly, at this time we might go far in trying to explore federation, and get away from the present piecemeal foreign policy with the nations of western Europe, if we do it now, but if we wait until next year or the year following, the longer we wait the more difficult it will be. I am sure the Senator from Arkansas agrees with that statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I certainly do agree, not only because of the attitude of the people involved, which has progressed, but we have expended our money, which should have been used to soften the difficulties and the changes. There is no question that many difficulties are involved in upsetting markets, and that was the primary purpose for which our money should have been used, but it was not, and now we are $10 billion behind in the schedule. That makes a great difference.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator for his observation.

The answer of the State Department to every proposal for peace, Mr. President, is that it needs time to consider the proposal. My heaven, Mr. President, the one thing we do not need is time to consider. We need to utilize the brief time we have, as has been said by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, to quit drifting and start moving. The State Department evidently does not realize that we cannot kill time; it is time which kills us. And, that was never more true than it is at this very moment. I am afraid the hydrogen bomb wears no wrist watch.

From the attitude of the Department of State, one might think we were too ambitious; that we were trying to do too much too quickly. Actually, it is not a question of the democracies doing too much, too soon, as it is a question of the slow-moving democracies coming up again with too little, too late.

The State Department, from the evidence of its expressions, has no faith in any of the various peace proposals.

What then does the Department have faith in, outside of itself? In the people of the United States? Hardly.

It would seem that a man need only leave the State Department for it to lose its faith in his advice.

Take Will Clayton, for instance. Less than 18 months ago he was Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs—the key position in the cold war.

While he was in the Department, Mr. Clayton's advice was considered with the great respect it deserves. After he again became a private citizen, and had more time to think of our affairs as a whole, he came out for a full-fledged Federal Union of the democracies as our only salvation.

Mr. Clayton became one of the founders and vice president of the Atlantic Union Committee. He is a very ardent and active supporter of the Atlantic Union resolution. He has made a number of warmly received and widely publicized speeches, particularly about its monetary and economic implications.

Mr. President, I have here a colloquy between members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and Mr. Clayton on January 23, in a meeting which lasted more than 5 hours. This is one of the most remarkable documents on this subject it has been my privilege to read.

A few weeks ago, Mr. Clayton testified for several hours before the Thomas subcommittee and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in favor of the Atlantic Union resolution.

Both times this statesman, who is at the same time a self-made, big agriculturist and businessman, answered numerous detailed questions on the implications of this resolution. He was queried as to its agricultural, business, and labor aspects, here and abroad.

He testified that the establishment of a full federal union of the Atlantic democracies particularly as regards the creation of a common market currency and a common market free of trade barriers, was to the great advantage of all.

Mr. Clayton further testified that this union with its vast competitive free market gave the best hope not only of ending the dollar shortage, but also of preserving our free-enterprise system from further invasion by Marxism.

He testified that the gravest, most immediate danger to us lay not in atomic attack, but in the cold war. The Kremlin's strategy, in his judgment, is to win through economic means of absorbing nations without a shot being fired—let alone a bomb being burst.

Mr. Clayton expressed the belief that communism is winning more and more of the world through the cold-war strategy. He thought communism would continue to win if we failed to form the Atlantic Union—despite the U.N., the Atlantic Treaty, the ECA, or any improvement of them short of union. He insisted repeatedly that none of these instruments could reach the heart of the danger. Remember, communism developed in each country as a domestic affair, not by military invasion. Let me quote briefly from what he said to the Thomas subcommittee:

"I am a great believer in the U.N. I think it has done a fine job. But the U.N. was not set up to deal with the cold war, and, in my opinion, it cannot deal with the cold war; and, no modification of the U.N. can deal with the cold war.

"To get the strength that we need, the economic strength that we need in this situation, we have got to bring these democratic countries together in a real union, the kind of union that we formed in 1787–89 in this country. It has to be a real union."

After remarking that he had "had some experience in negotiating with the Russians when I was in Government service," Mr. Clayton made this comment on Secretary Acheson's press conference:

"Mr. Acheson added that what we are trying to do is to strengthen the democratic world, particularly those areas of weakness in the democratic world, in order to create a firm foundation for agreement with Russia which would prevail. I think that is a very good statement of our foreign policy, I think the Secretary of State might have added, with credit and pride to himself and the country and the world, that the area of greatest weakness among the democracies is their disunity, the fact that they are not united, as is the Communist world, and that the most constructive thing by far which the democracies could do, more constructive than perhaps any other step they could take, would be to create among themselves that unity, which would bring about one foreign policy, one currency, and no customs houses between the members of the democratic world, so that they would have the strength and the mobility to resist the onslaughts of the Communist world."

"We have got to take a bold, constructive policy here, in my opinion, and make democracy work so that we have an affirmative situation instead of always a defensive position. Today we are always on the defensive. Stalin keeps the initiative—moves fast, moves with unity, with strength, and he is succeeding."

Mr. President, there is the statesmanlike thinking and speaking the people are longing to hear.

It seems to me that it is high time Mr. Clayton was drafted back into the Department of State.

His is not the only voice which failed to register with the State Department.

There is Dr. Harold C. Urey, who won a Nobel Prize for his work in atomic energy. In his testimony, Dr. Urey said there would be no place at all to hide if an effective quantity of hydrogen bombs were exploded over here. What was his advice? That Senate Concurrent Resolution 57 be considered and passed by the Congress.

Let me quote two brief pasasges from his testimony:

"There is a way out. That is the way of partnership and unity, the way of sharing responsibility for the defense of freedom—the way of Atlantic Union."

And, again—

"I believe that material force and economic arrangements, in themselves, are valueless in this crisis. If mankind is to save his freedoms, a value much higher must lead him. This is the spiritual, the moral.

"I refuse to believe that mere mechanical difficulties and obstacles can thwart man's attainment of a form of government which safeguards and promotes our way of life."

Mr. FINDLEY. When I first heard of the Atlantic Union idea I was a student at college. That was about 26 years ago. The idea seemed so logical to me that I thought surely a civilization that could accomplish the wonders that our Western civilization was accomplishing would surely see the wisdom in this act and Atlantic Union would certainly be around the corner. It seems just as logical to me today, but it still seems to be around the corner.

There are encouraging notes, however, and the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is one of the most hopeful events in those 26 intervening years.

This is not a partisan proposal. It is bipartisan on both sides of the Capitol. An indication of the bipartisan attitude was my referral to the excellent, courageous, and very important work done by the Senator from Tennessee, the late Mr. Kefauver. On the Republican side of the aisle we have recognized the problems of NATO and the need for a stronger Atlantic Community by establishing 3 years ago the NATO task force. Owen J. Roberts, an eminent and conservative Republican, who later served on the U.S. Supreme Court, was a strong supporter of the Atlantic Union idea and gave his declining years and his personal resources to this cause. Nelson Rockefeller, Governor of New York, has spoken out strongly for several years in behalf of the Atlantic Union idea. Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. QUIE, and myself on the Republican side have been on the record similarly for some time.

In less specific terms, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon has urged an Atlantic Confederation. Former Senator Barry Goldwater spoke hopefully of a "flowering Atlantic Community."

So, Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], and I look forward to the day when these hearings can begin, because certainly no time is to be lost in pursuing this desirable objective.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I want to commend him and can assure the gentleman that my interest has been sparked by his determination and his desire for the Atlantic Union resolution. He has done yeoman work in this regard and certainly has pursued it vigorously. I wish to thank him for it.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, my esteemed and distinguished colleague [Mr. FRASER].

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for the leadership which he has taken in offering a resolution in support of the development of a Federal union in the Atlantic community.

Mr. Speaker, the hardest lessons of history to learn are indeed the simple lessons of history. The simple lesson of the strength of the United States is the unity we forged from the 13 independent States. Our Nation is immeasurably stronger today because the 50 States are tied together through political integration.

Boldness, imagination, and determination marked the work of those who helped to weld together the beginnings of the mightiest Nation on earth.

In 1965 the need for boldness, imagination, and determination is greater than ever before. In the world of 120 nations, conflict spills from the cup in which is brewed national pride, zealous ideology, power ambitions, misunderstanding, and self-interest. The United States has helped to hammer out many alliances designed to control and confine such conflicts, but these alliances rest on shaky foundations.

The limited value of alliances is seen in the recent conflict over Kashmir, the inability of SEATO to respond to any current conflict, and the declarations of French leadership about NATO. The United States fights nearly alone to help the South Vietnamese. Great Britain remains committed alone to the defense of Malaysia. Great Britain alone is asked by the rest of the world to stave off the unilateral independence of Southern Rhodesia. The OAS is invited into the Dominican Republic only after we have intervened, and we continue to treat the Monroe Doctrine, a unilateral declaration of the last century, as a vital element in current U.S. policy.

Meanwhile vast sums are spent by nations to arm against potential and actual enemies.

If the Atlantic Community nations could unite to create a single political will in the international arena, the capacity of Western values to survive would be increased enormously. This increased ability to survive would not be the mere sum of the national strengths, but would be multiplied many times over because of unified decisions in actions which affect the world. Internally, of course, unrestricted commerce would stimulate new economic growth and enhance the well-being of its citizens.

What would this mean to the developing nations? It would mean an increased capacity on the part of the Atlantic Community nations to aid development of the developing nations. It would offer stabilized markets for their products. It would permit a downgrading of defense and military considerations in our efforts around the world and an upgrading of our commitment to self-government.

And last, it would enormously strengthen the United Nations in which the diversities of goals, understanding and national self-interest often inhibit effective action. As a strong United Nations supporter, I can state unequivocally that political unity within the Atlantic Community would greatly enhance the capacity of the U.N. to keep the peace and its ability to help the world evolve toward peace under the rule of law.

The time for imagination, boldness and determination has arrived.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman's mention of the United Nations may cause concern to some. As I interpret the effect of this resolution, and of the Atlantic Union which hopefully will some day follow, it would not impair the United Nations in any way; in fact, would it not tend to strengthen the United Nations?

Mr. FRASER. The gentleman is entirely correct. The charter of the United Nations itself contemplates the development of regional organizations. Our own policies toward the rest of the world have been to encourage economic and political integration. I think what is needed now is for us to apply to ourselves and to our neighbors across the Atlantic the same ideas that we have urged others to apply, particularly our support for the development of the Common Market.

But, if we can succeed, I deeply feel that the effect of this would be to strengthen the United Nations.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, one of the curious aspects of State Department policy through the years has been to encourage the merging of national sovereignty among European nations. But never have they suggested that the United States do any merging. It is always for the other fellow, which seems to me a rather dubious position to take.

Mr. FRASER. I think the comment of the gentleman is well taken. I am a great admirer of the work of the State Department, but sometimes it seems that some additional boldness and some more aggressive initiative would be fruitful in developing the kind of world in which we could find western values more likely to survive. In that connection it is my view that the time has arrived when we ought to use the boldness and the imagination and the determination which characterizes those who helped to bring together the Original Thirteen Colonies which founded this great nation.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] for his excellent remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I had in my own remarks referred to determined men that were fired with the vision of free and open unity of States in a Federal system. What I had in mind with reference to this idea, of course, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], has covered so well, and who has in the Foreign Affairs Committee contributed much to a better understanding of the important legislation that comes before that committee, and whose contributions in the past have been great and we look forward to the future.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I thank the gentleman for yielding and I certainly want to express my appreciation for and my recognition of the leadership and the courage of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], in taking the lead in introducing this resolution and in taking this special order and in setting the tone of the special order with his remarks which have been so much to the point and which have been so much appreciated by all of us who are interested in this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express appreciation also to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] for his longtime leadership in this important area and particularly since he has been a Member of this body, and most especially since he has served as the chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee Task Force on NATO Unity.

Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] has been a tremendous force not only in the House of Representatives but in the Nation in that capacity and has made many contributions, contributions of great substance, as well as the contribution of his own leadership in that area.

I want to express my own appreciation especially to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] who preceded me here in the well of the House, for his fine remarks. The gentleman from Minnesota sketched the global repercussions, the interests of the various nations of the Atlantic Community in global situations from Vietnam to Africa, to Latin America, and every zone and sector that affects the lives of people not only of those areas of the world but of the Atlantic nations as well, and recognized in his remarks the importance of developing a political structure for the working out of the interests of all of us in these critical areas of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I want to focus my own remarks this afternoon on the field of monetary and economic policy, and particularly want to stress the steps that have already been taken, structural steps, within the Atlantic Community to bring the interested nations of the Atlantic Community closer together, because important steps toward Atlantic unity have already been taken in the broad fields of monetary and economic policies. The sharp focus of attention on the U.S. balance-of-payments deficits, and the effects of those deficits on the entire Atlantic Community—including Japan—have already made a compelling virtue out of a cooperation among the nations involved.

Three concrete steps have been taken. First, the central bankers of Western Europe, the United States, Canada, and Japan, meet every month in Basle, Switzerland. Second, a "Working Party 3" was set up in 1961 within the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD—bringing together around the same table both treasury and central bank officials from most of the Atlantic nations at 4- to 6-week intervals to examine each other's progress toward balance-of-payments equilibrium.

And finally, in order to assure confidence and stability in all the principal currencies of the developed nations, the Group of Ten was formed. Within this Group have come additional possibilities for frequent interchange and review as well as action, by financial and monetary officials of the Atlantic nations. The Group of Ten has now recommended the establishment of an even closer watch—it is called multilateral surveillance—over the ways in which nations handle their monetary and economic policies.

Here, then, are the seeds for fruitful union among the free and advanced industrial nations of the world—the Atlantic nations, if you will, and Japan—in the critical and sensitive area of money and economics. In a free and peaceful community, few conditions are more important to human development than high and rising living standards, ample employment opportunities, price stability, and equitable distribution of income. We already know that nations require unity among themselves if these goals are to be achieved; and we now have the beginnings of political structure to achieve that unity.

In conclusion, may I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin once again how much we appreciate his leadership in this area. He is one of the most powerful and influential members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I hope he will schedule hearings on these resolutions at an early date in 1966.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I commend the gentleman from Kansas for his fine remarks, and assure him I will do everything within my power to see that the resolution will be heard as early as possible in the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], and many other colleagues who are so enthusiastically and effectively working for a stronger Atlantic Community.

I want to fully associate myself with the resolution sponsored in this body, proposing that an 18-man delegation meet with other NATO nations to explore the possibilities and timetable for the construction of Atlantic Union.

It is ironic that we must witness at this time the forces of disarray at work, at a time when unity of purpose remains as essential as ever. The United States must take the initiative toward Atlantic solidarity which has so obviously weakened in the past few years.

It would be tragic to drift back to the narrow nationalism of past years, forgetting the lessons of war and destruction which have too often been caused by petty bickering and false priorities.

We should not suppose that Atlantic Union can be brought about overnight, or by wishful thinking. We cannot ignore the present-day realities which undeniably inhibit the proposed creation of Atlantic institutions.

But it would be a serious, perhaps drastic, error to forsake this eminent objective now. Our hope for the future does not embody a host of suspicious national entities, all pursuing their divergent national interests without recourse to the interests of the whole.

The United States and the West European states share a common historical development. Their wealth, power, and prestige have increased enormously since the Second World War. It is a natural, and mutually beneficial, wish that the nations that ring the Atlantic combine together, not only for their own benefit but also for the benefit of the newly emerging nations.

With this resolution we can perhaps reinvigorate this great endeavor.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the subject just discussed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND ANTI-VIETNAM MOVEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOSS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members of this body have taken the floor in the last few days to express indignation over the current wave of demonstrations being waged in protest against American intervention in Vietnam. I, as much as any other Member of the Congress, deplore and resent these demonstrations. Surely, Mr. Speaker, at a time when Americans are fighting and dying to stop the enslavement of free people by predatory Communist forces, they need all the support that we can give them. Whatever mistakes may have been made in the past by those who formulate our foreign policies, the fact remains that we are in Vietnam; our boys are dying there, and our national honor and security are at stake. In the conduct of this mission, the President needs and deserves the support of every patriotic American citizen, and I, for one, am willing to give him my full support in this effort.

The wave of demonstrations and civil disobedience that spread throughout the country last weekend have all the earmarks of a highly organized Communist plot, designed to embarrass us in the eyes of the world, and to encourage Red China to redouble its efforts to push us out of Vietnam. These demonstrations, intended to serve the Communist cause by conveying a false picture of American disunity to the rest of the world, actually border on the side of treason.

These were not spontaneous, spur-of-the-moment manifestations of protest on the part of conscientious American citizens reacting to the danger of a war that might jeopardize the future security of our country. These demonstrations were obviously well planned in advance, well financed and well coordinated so as to gain for the demonstrators a maximum amount of publicity throughout the world. The participants were expert in the technique of civil disobedience through training and experience, as I will attempt to prove later in this dissertation.

To those of us who represent States and areas which have been subjected to the many massive so-called civil rights demonstrations during the last few years, Attorney General Katzenbach's recent public recognition of the role being played by Communists in these Vietnam demonstrations came as no surprise. What amazes many of us is the fact that General Katzenbach ignored this same Communist influence and participation in the wave of civil disobedience that lately has been going on in the name of civil rights. Those who, just a few weeks ago, were demonstrating for civil rights, are now in the forefront in trying to undermine our policies in southeast Asia.

General Katzenbach and other leaders in our administration gave the stamp of approval to the numerous civil rights protest marches, sit-ins, wade-ins, lie-ins, teach-ins, boycotts, law violations, and other forms of civil disobedience, on the premise that these people were exercising their constitutional right of petition. To the extent that they closed their eyes to the fact that much of this was Communist inspired, agitated and promoted, they have given license and encouragement to the same crowd, by and large, that is now creating trouble and dissension over our foreign policy.

It will be recalled that the hard-core anti-Vietnam protest groups demonstrated here in the shadow of the Capitol on August 9, 1965. They called their rally the Assembly of Unrepresented People. These professionals formed the vanguard of last weekend's demonstrations that were held throughout the country.

The leaders of the August 9 march on the Capitol were Robert Parish Moses of SNCC—Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—a militant leftwing pink tinged civil rights agitating outfit, and a man named Staughton Lynd, a member of the faculty at Yale University. Both Moses and Lynd have been active in creating racial strife in the State of Mississippi, and are ardent advocates of the use of civil disobedience to carry out their aims.

Robert Parish Moses, though not a Mississippian, was one of the organizers of the group that calls itself the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, a tightly knit but well organized and financed group of racial agitators, has involved itself recently in numerous mass demonstrations in Jackson and Natchez, Miss., as well as participating in other similar disturbances in other communities throughout Mississippi.

A large contingent of this organization spent the night of September 16, 1965, on the U.S. Capitol Grounds. Individual members made speeches and passed out literature, all in absolute violation of law, but no arrests were made. Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that this outlaw political group has immunity from Federal law, simply because they agitate in the name of civil rights?

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, quite a number of SNCC and FDP members were arrested on August 9, 1965, when they marched onto the Capitol Grounds in a demonstration opposing our Vietnam policy.

Staughton Lynd, the Yale professor, organized the so-called freedom schools in Mississippi in 1964, to train the local people in the fine arts of the sit-in, march-in, sit-down and go-limp techniques. Staughton Lynd also organized the student Vietnam protest in Washington last March when a sit-in was staged within the walls of the White House. And last May, at the University of California at Berkeley teach-in, this same Lynd advocated wholesale civil disorders throughout the country to force President Johnson's resignation.

Last weekend, Lynd was scheduled to appear at a Vietnam protest rally with James O. Williams, chairman of Philadelphia's Congress of Racial Equality, another civil rights agitating outfit.

Mr. Speaker, it is more than mere coincidence that the leaders in the civil rights demonstrations always turn up as leaders of the Vietnam protest demonstrations. I would point out that Dick Gregory, the alleged comedian, whose participation in civil rights demonstrations has been widely heralded throughout the country, is active, also, in the anti-Vietnam movement. In fact, this man was scheduled recently to speak at a Chicago Vietnam protest meeting.

And then, Mr. Speaker, there is the high mogul of all racial demagogues and racketeers, the recipient of the now tarnished Nobel Peace Prize, the most successful money collector of them all, the grand high priest of civil disobedience, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. This high and mighty emperor of discord, at whose feet worship thousands of cringing politicians, has publicly protested our war against Communist China's aggression, and has advocated the admission of Red China to the United Nations. That King should be parroting the party line comes as no shock to persons familiar with the background of support for pink-tinged causes and his association with known Communists, including participation in activities at pro-Communist Myles Horton's Highlander Folk School, the notorious Communist training school at Monteagle, Tenn.

It is becoming increasingly evident that those trained in civil rights subversion are now turning their attention to the Communist-inspired goal—United States withdrawal from Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, a great number of the professional marchers against Vietnam policy were trained for their present roles at the National Council of Churches' facility at Mount Beulah, near Edwards, Miss., financed partly with Federal funds channeled through the poverty program. This same Mount Beulah was headquarters for a Head Start project financed by OEO to the tune of $1,400,000, and under the sponsorship of a committee composed mainly of members of SNCC and the so-called Freedom Democratic Party. In the past few days, this Mount Beulah project has been the subject of a rather revealing and fruitful investigation in the other body, resulting in a shutdown of Mount Beulah's OEO project, and some red faces on the part of Mr. Shriver and his associates.

One of those who made the pilgrimage from Mount Beulah to participate in the August 9 anti-Vietnam demonstration in Washington was a woman by the name of Liz Fusco. In an interview at Mount Beulah last June, which appeared in a Memphis newspaper, Liz Fusco contended that there were no Communists in Vietnam, adding "That's just Government propaganda." When she was interviewed, Liz Fusco was attending an orientation session of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, also headquartered at Mount Beulah—along with the National Council of Churches and the Head Start program.

One of the most notorious of these protesting our policies in Vietnam is a young man named Mario Salvo. This man got his training in Mississippi in the civil rights movement before going to California to instigate the student riots at Berkeley as leader of the so-called free speech movement. Salvo has also been active in meetings protesting our Vietnam policy.

Mr. Speaker, of the 200 people arrested at the Capitol on August 9 in the anti-Vietnam demonstration, at least 10 percent are easily identifiable as having been civil rights workers in Mississippi. Undoubtedly there were many more who managed to escape arrest, who had come, also, from the ranks of Mississippi's civil rights agitators.

Mr. Speaker, I assert again that there is a direct connection between the civil rights demonstrations and the Vietnam demonstrations. This connection needs exploration and exposure.

Mr. Speaker, on October 18, 1965, Attorney General Katzenbach is quoted by the Associated Press as saying that the Justice Department has uncovered "some Communists and some persons very closely associated with Communists" working for the organization known as Students for a Democratic Society.

The February, 1964, SDS bulletin, published by the Students for a Democratic Society, 119 Fifth Avenue, New York City, contained the following article, written by Jim Monsonis:

> SNCC WILL INUNDATE MISSISSIPPI IN SUMMER CRASH PROGRAM
>
> Mississippi will be the main focus of attention this summer for SNCC. Plans are now being formulated, together with CORE and local movements in Mississippi, to try to force the issue on whether Mississippi will remain a closed society, with the movement chipping away gradually, or whether with Federal help (even if reluctantly) massive changes can occur. The program will be a three-pronged one of voter registration, freedom schools (for basic political education), and literacy and community center work. All people are invited to participate—SNCC wants as many workers as possible, especially those who can dig up the $200 or so it will cost to support oneself. For applications and further details, contact the Jackson SNCC office: 1017 Lynch Street, Jackson, Miss.—JIM MONSONIS.

This same Jim Monsonis has recently been on the Federal payroll, as an employee of the Head Start project at Mount Beulah, near Edwards, Miss. Before going to Mount Beulah he headed SNCC's Washington office. There is a definite link between SNCC and the organization known as Students for a Democratic Society so is it possible, as General Katzenbach charges, that they are infiltrated with Communists? And if so, should he not take a look, also, into the Red influences in SNCC?

Mr. Speaker, the notorious old time hard core Communists, Carl and Ann Braden, both of whom are active in the anti-Vietnam movement, have been active, also, in stirring up trouble in Mississippi under the guise of civil rights. In fact, Carl Braden helped bring the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party into being and has been active in supporting it. Carl Braden, also, chauffeured Robert Parish Moses all over Mississippi 3 years ago organizing civil rights cells, and fomenting racial trouble in general.

Mr. Speaker, on July 28, the Freedom Democratic Party newsletter, circulated generally among Negroes throughout Mississippi in a continuing attempt to generate unrest among our people, contained an article exhorting Negroes to refuse to support our Government in its Vietnam effort. For the information of Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, I include the text of this article:

> Here are five reasons why Negroes should not be in any war fighting for America.
>
> 1. No Mississippi Negroes should be fighting in Vietnam for the white man's freedom, until all the Negro people are free in Mississippi.
>
> 2. Negro boys should not honor the draft here in Mississippi. Mothers should encourage their sons not to go.
>
> 3. We will gain respect and dignity as a race only by forcing the U.S. Government and the Mississippi government to come with guns, dogs and trucks to take our sons away to fight and be killed protecting Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Louisiana.
>
> 4. No one has a right to ask us to risk our lives and kill other colored people in Santo Domingo and Vietnam, so that the white American can get richer. We will be looked upon as traitors by all the colored people of the world if the Negro people continue to fight and die without a cause.
>
> 5. Last week a white soldier from New Jersey was discharged from the Army because he refused to fight in Vietnam. He went on a hunger strike. Negro boys can do the same thing. We can write and ask our sons if they know what they are fighting for. If he answers "freedom," tell him that's what we are fighting for here in Mississippi. And if he says "democracy" tell him the truth—we don't know anything about communism, socialism, and all that, but we do know that Negroes have caught hell here under this American democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should be noted that the National Coordinating Committee To End the War in Vietnam published an appeal on September 13 for funds to aid the defense of Pvt. Winston Belton, noted in the press as a former civil rights worker. This man Belton staged a hunger strike at Fort Benning and refused to accompany his unit to Vietnam. For this act of insubordination and treason, this man was convicted by a court martial, sentenced to 5 years confinement and a dishonorable discharge. Before the trial, though, a deal had been made by General Colglazier, 4th Army Commander, who reduced Belton's sentence to a slap on the wrist demotion of one stripe in rank. No valid reasons have been given for this kid glove treatment as a reward for treason.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on showing examples of duplication in the personnel, aims and tactics of the anti-Vietnam movement, the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, various civil rights agitating groups, and the Communist conspiracy, but surely this information is readily available to the Attorney General. The American people are entitled to know the methods used in financing these well-organized demonstrations.

Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that the American taxpayers are helping support these organizations through tax exemption privileges? To what extent are we subsidizing these demonstrations through such programs as being carried on by the Office of Economic Opportunity?

Mr. Speaker, this administration and those which have preceded it have ignored too long the root of the problem that has manifested itself in the Vietnam demonstrations. The time has arrived when the Communist influence in all massive protests and civil disobedience campaigns should be thoroughly investigated and exposed to public view.

FREIGHT CAR SHORTAGE IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest needs in our country, and particularly in the field of transportation, to adequately serve our people, is additional freight cars, particularly in certain types of freight cars.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday I advised our distinguished majority leader [Mr. ALBERT] that I intended to call up under unanimous consent S. 1098, which would amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply. Mr. ALBERT announced that this bill would be called up today—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 20, 1965, page 27718. However, yesterday I was advised that an objection would be interposed if unanimous consent were requested, therefore, it will not be practicable to take this legislation up today.

I am not surprised, Mr. Speaker, that an objection would be interposed although I must say in all candor and frankness, I regret it very sincerely.

In view of the situation, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be appropriate to submit for the RECORD, S. 1098, as amended and reported by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—Report No. 1183, October 20, 1965. It might be helpful if at this time I make a short explanatory statement describing the action which we took in committee.

As most if not all of you know, there is quite a history to this proposed legislation. Ever since World War II we have had, particularly at the time of the fall harvest, serious shortages of freight cars. Legislative proposals to alleviate these shortages have been coming up before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, the Commerce Committee of the other body, or both, from time to time over the past 17 or 18 years. Almost 20 years ago, the Interstate Commerce Commisson issued an order in an attempt to improve the supply of freight cars which had in it what might be called a penalty provision calling for an increased charge which a railroad using another railroad's car would have to pay for that use if the car was not returned to its owner. A reviewing court, in Palmer against United States found that the Commission's order was not based on sufficient grounds and stated that the Commission's power to fix compensation for freight car use was not coextensive with the power to regulate the use of cars. This case was decided in 1947 and no appeal was taken from it. The Commission's interpretation over the years since then has been that its present powers under section 1(14)(a) are limited.

There is complete agreement in the Commission and throughout the railroad industry that there is a car shortage and it is also apparent that this chronic shortage is worsening rather than improving.

I can say to you that today it is worse than it was last week. It is worse than it was a month ago. It is worse than it was a year ago.

After the first of the year a rule will be sought for the purpose of calling up this program and clarifying the present situation giving the Commission authority to deal with it where shortages exist.

It used to be that the fall harvest season was the only critical period in a given year. More recently serious shortages have been occurring, particularly in the supply of grain and lumber and plywood cars at various times in the year.

The railroad industry may be split as to whether or not any legislative change is desirable, but it is crystal clear in my mind that if we are to get any improvement—and certainly an improvement is necessary—we will have to clarify the powers of the Commission. S. 1098, as amended, would do this. It is prospective in nature in the sense that the effective date for Commission action is September 1, 1966. This was considered and adopted so that the railroad industry through its trade associations will have one more opportunity to come to terms with itself.

The legislation is also a discretionary power. It provides that in setting rates of compensation to be paid for the use of any type of freight car, the Commission may include—rather than shall include—an incentive element or elements, when in the Commission's judgment such element or elements can contribute to sound car service practices—including efficient utilization and distribution of cars. By adding incentive elements to the compensation, the Commission could encourage the acquisition and maintenance of a national freight car supply adequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense. This amendment, if enacted, would become a part of existing section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, and thus any action which would be related to incentive elements would have to take place after a hearing. The requirement of a hearing is already in the statute.

One other point I might mention here, the Commission, under this amendment, would also be empowered to exempt from the compensation to be paid by any group of carriers, any incentive element or elements where such carriers are found entitled to such exemption by reason of the national interest. I would stress the point that this power would not involve the ICC and the railroad industry in a complete review of every type of car which exists. The Commission would be precluded from making any incentive element applicable to any type of freight car, the supply of which the Commission finds adequate.

I want to be completely candid with my colleagues. I do not claim that this amendment would be a panacea. If the railroads would modify their attitudes on this subject they may be able to solve the problem more promptly and more efficiently than could ever be done with additional legislation, but it appears just about certain that we are going to have to encourage the railroads to cooperate in striving to fill the car shortage by clarifying and strengthening the ICC's powers. The Commission believes, and a number of the railroads support the Commission in its belief, that S. 1098, as amended, will be of great assistance in relieving the shortage. We can't go on doing nothing; therefore, I hope that we can move forward on this proposed legislation promptly in the next session.

I sincerely believe we will then see more positive action throughout the railroad industry. If not, when the effective date of the act arrives, the Commission will be in a much better position to take steps to cure this problem.

Mr. Speaker, in order that those who are interested may have advance information as to what we propose to do, I include at this point the bill, S. 1098, with the amendment as reported by the committee, which is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO S. 1098

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" 'In fixing such compensation to be paid for the use of any type of freight car, the Commission shall give consideration to the national level of ownership of such type of freight car and to other factors affecting the adequacy of the national freight car supply, and shall, on the basis of such consideration, determine whether compensation should be computed solely on the basis of elements of ownership expense involved in owning and maintaining such type of freight car, including a fair return on value, or whether such compensation should be increased by such incentive element or elements of compensation as in the Commission's judgment will provide just and reasonable compensation to freight car owners, contribute to sound car service practices (including efficient utilization and distribution of cars), and encourage the acquisition and maintenance of a car supply adequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense. The Commission shall not make any incentive element applicable to any type of freight car the supply of which the Commission finds to be adequate and may exempt from the compensation to be paid by any group of carriers such incentive element or elements if the Commission finds it to be in the national interest.'

"SEC. 2. Any compensation fixed pursuant to the amendment made to the Interstate Commerce Act by the first section of this Act shall not take effect before September 1, 1966."

MAIL VOLUME AND PROSPERITY

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called my colleagues' attention to a press release of the Post Office Department dealing with the relationship between mail volume and the economy.

Mr. Nicholson, Assistant Postmaster General for Finance and Administration, wrote me on October 1, 1965, clarifying the Department's position on the mail volume-prosperity relationship and disagreeing with my conclusions.

My original remarks, the Department's press release, Mr. Nicholson's letter, and my reply to him follow:

MAIL VOLUME AND PROSPERITY

(Extension of remarks of Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN, of Montana, in the House of Representatives, Monday, September 27, 1965)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department for years has attempted to minimize the cause-and-effect relationship between mail volume and prosperity. This has been particularly true when the Department has been attempting to raise the postage rates.

It is gratifying, therefore, to read the Post Office Department's press release No. 141, dated September 26, which attributes the unexpected and unprecedented increase in mail volume during the past summer to "the stimulus of a strong national economy."

The fact is, the statisticians and prognosticators in the Department predicted only a normal volume increase of 2.7 percent over the summer of 1964, instead of which they have been confronted with a 5.1 percent increase. Since departmental officials had based their budget and their appropriations requests on the lesser figure, this has caused them considerable inconvenience in operating the service.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, the business users of the mails do stimulate and prime the national economy. And when the national economy is thriving, the usage of the mails increases proportionately.

This is a fact that has, in the past, been obvious to everyone except Government accountants. It is nice to see the Post Office Department finally admitting the validity of the obvious.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT RELEASE NO. 141

Mail volume, a traditional barometer of economic strength, surged far beyond expectations during the past summer, under the stimulus of a strong national economy, the Post Office Department reported today. Here are highlights, based on expert estimates:

1. For the first two accounting periods this summer, from mid-June to mid-August, mail volume jumped 5.1 percent over a comparable period last year.

2. The 5.1-percent increase was almost twice as much as a 2.7-percent increase previously forecast by Department experts.

3. The approximate 5-percent increase was uniform in major mail categories—letters, newspapers, and periodicals, advertising matter, reflecting uniformity of strength in many sectors of the national economy.

4. Mail volume for the two accounting periods of 4 weeks each rose from 9,521,117,000 pieces for last year to 10,003,028,000 pieces this summer.

5. Revenue this past summer was $627,301,000 for the two periods compared with $594,342,000 last year, an increase of nearly $33 million and $8 million more than anticipated earlier by expert projections.

History has demonstrated the validity of mail volume as a barometer of economic strength. In 1929, before the depression, for example, mail volume was nearly 28 billion pieces. It dropped steadily to 19.8 billion pieces in 1933, setting back the clock on mail volume to pre-World-War-I days.

A report from the Department's Bureau of Finance and Administration on the mail volume increase stated: "Instead of tapering off, as had been expected, the recovery seemed to gain renewed strength this summer. Sustained economic gains and the more optimistic tone that pervades spending plans have pushed mail volume and revenues well ahead of forecasts."

The Department pointed out that the increase in mail volume was not caused by any seasonal factors, and, in most years, it noted, the period is on the dull side because it occurs at the height of the vacation season.

The comparison between the summer periods in 1964 and 1965, however, is particularly noteworthy because mail volume last summer was at an exceptionally high level due to the mail generated all over the Nation by election campaigns.

Post Office Department, Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Finance and Administration,
Washington, D.C., October 1, 1965.

Hon. Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: It was good to see in the Congressional Record, of September 27 that you inserted the Department's release No. 141 dealing with mail volume and the economy.

I must respectfully disagree, however, with your conclusions. The Post Office Department is quite aware of the relationship between mail volume and prosperity. I personally have testified during the 5 years I have been here that gross national product, family income, and population are the main factors in our formula for estimating mail volume—and that the most important of these is family income.

Nor has the Department minimized the relationship when postage rate increases have been under consideration. The Department has taken the position that the response of mail volume to rate increases is minor and temporary at most—that mail volume follows the trend of the economy and is not significantly affected by rate increases.

You mention "the business users of the mail do stimulate and prime the national economy. And when the national economy is thriving, the usage of the mail increases proportionately." The latter sentence is certainly accurate—and has been obvious to Post Office accountants at least, if not to all Government acountants, for a long time. However, I believe the thriving economy does more to stimulate the business mailers than the other way around.

To the extent that business mailings involve sales promotion or advertising or direct mail solicitations, they do, of course, stimulate the economy. Such mail efforts are substantial, but still only a part of all business mail and a part of the total promotional effort affecting the economy. The total promotional effort consists of personal salesmanship, store displays, and advertising carried by mail, magazines, newspapers, radio, television, and outdoor signs among other things. To the extent such promotion stimulates the economy, the total response is caused by the total effort, including the effort by mail.

We share with you a feeling of pride in the important part the mail plays in all phases of our national activity. I hope this letter clarifies the Department's position.

Sincerely yours,
Ralph W. Nicholson,
Assistant Postmaster General.

House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Postal Facilities and Modernization of the Committee on Post and Civil Service,
Washington, D.C., October 20, 1965.

Mr. Ralph W. Nicholson,
Assistant Postmaster General,
Bureau of Finance and Administration,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Nicholson: Thank you for your letter of October 1, commenting on the statement I made on the House floor on the relationship between mail volume and prosperity and clarifying the Department's position on that relationship.

I agree that the gross national product, family income, and population are major factors in determining mail volume, and that the most important of these is family income. There are, however, other factors affecting mail volume, and the Department's formula does not give them proper weight. I believe you are overlooking the effect on mail volume of the quality of postal service offered, and the charges for that service, and the positive effect of business mail on the economy. Nor can I agree that "the response of mail volume to rate increases is minor and temporary at most" or that "mail volume follows the trend of the economy and is not significantly affected by rate increases."

The recent history of the parcel post service is a case in point. Four times in the past 14 years the Postmaster General has raised parcel post rates. And parcel post volume, by weight, has dropped 35 percent since 1951. In that same period the U.S. population increased 20 percent, and the gross national product rose almost 40 percent. And while parcel post volume dropped, the volume of other classes of mail climbed. Parcel post rates are too high, the service is not good. The gross national product, family income, and an increasing population have not kept the public from turning to commercial parcel delivery firms. Perhaps parcel post has discouraged these patrons.

The history of third-class mail from 1925 to 1928 is another case in point. In 1925 the Department recommended, as a revenue-producing measure, a 50-percent rate increase for third-class mail. The Congress went along with the Department's recommendation and, in the postal law of 1925, increased the third-class postage rate from 1 cent per 2 ounces to 1½ cents. Contrary to Department predictions, postal revenues immediately dropped as the higher rate drove mailers out of the postal service. The Department's report of February 1926, showed a decrease in the number of third-class pieces of over 400 million. Plagued by continuing losses to the Government and the economy, committees of both Houses worked on remedial legislation in the field of postal rates, and in 1928 Congress passed the bill which provided a special bulk rate for third-class mailers. Third-class mail, and revenues, immediately returned to the Department.

The Congress made a serious mistake when it divested itself of the ratemaking power in the case of parcel post, and that mistake may well result in the death of a very useful service to the public. The third-class increase of 1925 was an error. I also believe that the Department consistently underrates the positive effect of business mail on our economy. What, for instance, would be the effect on the gross national product if 10 million or more mail catalogs were banned from the mails for a 6-month period? Or if the Nation's department stores could not mail out their advertising notices? This mail generates sales; it contributes to the gross national product. New blood is pumped into the economic veins by encouraging, not discouraging, mail.

The preoccupation with so-called deficits has led many to believe that the true measure of the Department's worth lies in whether it takes in more money than it pays out. But is this the true measure? What would happen if we closed the postal service down for a week or a month? We know the answer. The economy would quickly grind to a halt. Is it really so bad that the Post Office pays only 90 percent of its way? This is a truly remarkable record, and one approached by no other Federal agency except the Internal Revenue Service.

I would like to get away from the practice of arguing the merits and failings of the Department's cost ascertainment system and, instead, have the Post Office and the Congress devote their energies to determining what the vast postal system does to tie the Nation together. I would like to see a concentration on the extent of the system's contribution to culture, education, and a well-informed citizenry, the amount of business it generates, its contribution to the gross national product and its concomitants, increased employment and a higher tax take. I believe we would find that this branch of the Government actually creates wealth in the billions.

We are inclined to be too impressed by charts and graphs and balance sheets and tend to forget the real purpose and the social significance of the postal establishment. No one can put a dollar value on the social gains which the Post Office makes possible. No one can put a price on the value of a fully informed population, a condition made possible by low second-class postage rates. No one can put a price on the value of the churches, orphanages, homes for the blind and the aged, and all the other nonprofit organizations which use the mails at a reduced rate. There is no way to compute the worth of the cultural explosion taking place, mainly because books and phonograph records are now more accessible, through low rates, than they have ever been before.

I welcomed the Department's press release and felt it deserved publication in the Congressional Record because it was a wholesome acknowledgment of the direct relationship between this country's strength and the volume of mail.

But I would like to see the Department go further than acceptance of the volume of mail as a barometer of economic health or a sign that business is good or bad. The postal service plays a far more positive role than this, and the Department must encourage mail through reasonable rates and improved services.

I am, of course, aware that even now the billions of pieces of mail are taxing the facilities of the postal machine and postal service is deteriorating. But the problem will not be solved by ever-increasing rates or cuts in service or limitations on the Department's social contribution. The only way to surmount the crisis is to supply the postal service with the proper machines and techniques, modernize its facilities and its transportation patterns, sharpen its supervision, solve its manpower problems.

This will require research, legislation, and money. It will be difficult, but it can be done. The Department and the Congress can work together in determining what is needed and in devising ways to do it. With the help of strong and positive thinking at the Department and here on Capitol Hill, the Congress can give you the tools you need to do the job.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Postal Facilities and Modernization.

TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the rapid changes in and demands upon Government service have caused persons from all sectors of our society to propose innovations and modifications which are required to keep that service up to date with the demands of the citizenry and the necessities of the modern world.

Mr. John A. McCart, operations director of the Government Employees Council, AFL–CIO, has worked with these changes and expansions for many years; his opinion and proposals on the present condition of Federal service bear close study by those of us responsible for future legislation. I would like to call attention to Mr. McCart's statement before the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' COUNCIL PREPARED FOR THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY, AUTOMATION, AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS

The National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress currently is engaged in a comprehensive examination of the social and economic byproducts of technological change in America. All thinking Americans must welcome this important effort by the Commission, whose activities grow out of a national imperative to obtain the maximum benefits from technological progress with the least possible harm to the United States or its people.

If a study of this magnitude is desirable, from the point of view of the private sector of the American economy, it is no less important from the aspect of employment in the service of the Government, itself. With some 2,500,000 employees, the Federal Government is the largest single employer in the country. What is more, technological change is no respecter of the distinction between employment in the private and public sectors of our economy. The introduction of machines and computers is just as prevalent in Government as in private enterprise; indeed, much of the pioneering in this field has taken place in the public sector.

The Government Employees' Council of the AFL–CIO—whose 31 member unions represent nearly 1 million men and women in the white-collar, blue-collar and postal services of the Federal Government—welcomes this opportunity to present its views to the Commission. On behalf, not only of the members of our constituent unions but also all the 2,500,000 Federal employees, we want to express our deep concern that the scope of the Commission's deliberation be broad enough, and its findings be specific enough, to include adequate safeguards for civil service employees, as well as for our fellow workers in the private sector of the economy.

It is of the utmost importance that the Government employee be considered in the same light as the employee of private industry. We have been distressed by the fact that many myths have grown up over the years concerning the allegedly "enviable" position of the men and women on the public payroll. The so-called "guarantee of tenure" which is felt to be inherent in our Civil Service System has given rise to the misconception that Government employees are forever secure in their positions. For years the Government employee has been considered by the general public to be immune to the economic laws so that he has a guarantee of employment, good or bad times notwithstanding. Another fallacy holds that Government employees also enjoy guaranteed regular pay increases, irrespective of what may happen in the private sector of the economy.

This out-of-focus picture of the Government employee—secure in a lifetime of employment made attractive by virtually automatic pay increases from the day he starts to work until the day he retires—does not, of course, square with reality. For too many years, Government employees have been compelled to plead for economic comparability with workers performing similar work in private employment. As for the so-called "guarantee of tenure," thousands upon thousands of former Government employees—dropped from Federal rolls because of base closings or consolidations, because of management decisions dictating reductions in force, or because of the introduction of new systems, new equipment, new ways of doing things—are grim testimony to the reality that looms far larger than the myth. In the year ended March 1964, for example, 16,639 Federal workers were separated because of reduction in the work force.

At no point in the career of the Government servant is he made more aware of how slender is the thread that binds him to meaningful employment than at this very moment, when the introduction of automation, cybernation, mechanization and technical change are moving forward at so rapid a pace within the Federal service.

His counterpart in private industry, protected for the most part by contractual relationships between union and management which provide an effective forum for safeguarding the worker's interest, is at a distinct advantage when it comes to working out the kind of procedures that are essential so that the introduction of machines and computers will not render the worker economically prostrated. By contrast, in the Federal service, the rights of workers to be represented by unions is permitted only because of Executive Order 10988—it is not the law of the land. Under this order, the management of each Federal agency is left a considerable amount of latitude in defining those areas in which "collective bargaining" can take place. Thus the Government employee is hardly in control of his own destiny—and particularly insofar as the onrush of technology is concerned.

The Government employee's plea for comparability with his counterpart in private enterprise, therefore, takes on added significance in the face of automation. Where once he sought primarily economic comparability, he now seeks full equality, including equality of safeguard against the adverse effects of automation. The great hope of the Government employee in this regard rests in the hands of this distinguished Commission. In its recommendations, proper stress should be placed on the need for protecting the Civil Service employee equally with the worker in private enterprise.

The need for action on the Government front is all too apparent. All Government agencies are attempting today to deal with an unparalleled upsurge in demand for services of all types. This demand is generated by a population that is growing at a rate unequaled in the Nation's history. It is being further stimulated by an administration concerned about the need for a continued expansion of the American economy and dedicated to a program of social and economic improvement for all of our people. As long as the population trend is upward, and as long as the administration continues to develop new programs to serve the American people better, it follows that demands on Federal agencies will continue to increase.

This is only natural. Ours is a dynamic country, seeking to remain in step with a dynamic world. In terms of defense, postal, and other civilian services, our Government must expand to meet the needs of this growing populace and to protect our citizens. To the extent that this objective can be achieved through improved work techniques, it should be done. But it is our unwavering belief that, in the process, neither "economy" nor "efficiency" should be sought at the expense of our citizens, in general, or the Government employee, in particular.

To meet the demands of the times, more and more Government agencies are turning to the use of automatic equipment, electronic machines, accelerated mechanization, and other industrial engineering techniques to perform production, maintenance, and clerical tasks. What, precisely, has been the progress in this direction?

The use of automatic data processing, one of the major forms of technology introduced into Federal service, is expanding rapidly today after a relatively slow start. The first computer was installed in 1949 at the Ballistics Research Laboratories in Aberdeen, Md., Use of such equipment expanded cautiously during the next 5 years, but by 1958 there were 250 ADP units operating Government-wide. Since then, the introduction of these and other sophisticated electronic devices has mushroomed. By the end of fiscal 1961, the Government had in use some 750 computers, to which some 35,000 employees were assigned. In 2 years time, the number had jumped to nearly 1,200 computers, involving 45,000 employees. By the end of fiscal 1965, Government figures showed that the number of computers in Federal service was around 2,000. There is no immediate data available on the number of employees assigned today to the operation and servicing of these ADP units.

From the period for which figures are available, however, a significant statistical picture can be drawn. Between 1961 and 1963, the number of computers increased 60 percent, while the number of employees needed to operate them increased less than 30 percent. In other words, some of the adverse employment effects flowing from the introduction of computers already had begun to take place, 2 years after their introduction.

This points up one of the most serious problems that arises from the introduction of technological change in general, and its introduction in Government service, in particular. Agency officials make much of the fact that, initially, the new equipment is installed without significant adverse effect on present employees, in terms of job loss or demotion. Often there is a transition period that lasts as long as 2 years, during which time the services of the workers continue to be needed in the activity being automated. At the end of that transition period, when the potential of these new systems and new machines is being utilized fully, the employees are faced with reductions in force, downgrading or relocation. By that time, the workers and the unions which represent them are largely foreclosed from pressing an effective case. The new machines are in place, they are functioning, and the skills of career civil servants are no longer needed. At that point, the worker and his union are faced with a fait accompli.

It is true, of course, that in some instances, promotions are made available to those selected for training in the technical and managerial functions associated with the new equipment. In addition, some jobs, instead of being abolished, have been converted to a new technology. Clerical workers, for example, become key-punch operators. Agency officials put considerable emphasis on this fact, pointing to it as an "upgrading" of skills for the workers which results directly from the introduction of technological change. To some extent this is true—but to those of us closest to the situation, there comes a disquieting feeling that this, like so many of the other remedies the Government says it is devising to meet the situation, is just a temporary phenomenon.

The Government is now experimenting with optical character recognition equipment for automatically reading printed and handwritten documents. Optical scanning has the potential for extending the capability of electronic data processing by speeding input data to computers while eliminating manual transcription. As the equipment scans documents, the characters read are transcribed onto cards or paper tape, or fed directly into computers. According to some of the projections made by the Civil Service Commission, itself, employment of key-punch operators could be cut back by as much as 50 to 90 percent in the foreseeable future as a result of the introduction of these optical scanning devices. What, then, are the future prospects for the ex-clerk, who has been upgraded to an ex-computer operator?

This use of ADP to replace virtually an army of clerical employees in the Federal service is only one phase of the onrush of technological change within the Government. It might serve to put the situation into greater perspective merely to highlight some of the other areas in which Federal agencies are making use of today's technology:

In the Department of Defense, automated materials handling equipment and electronic computers are being used extensively in supply operations to bring about substantial reductions in the work force.

In the General Services Administration's 11 major supply depots, an integrated order processing and materials handling system is in operation in supply distribution—from receipt of order to selection, packing, shipping, and billing. Computers in GSA regional offices automatically prepare bills of lading and provide automatic consolidation of shipments and automated routing. Modern conveyor systems used in GSA warehouses move goods with a minimum of manual handling.

The Federal telecommunications system now involves a network of leased long-distance circuits interconnecting Federal civilian offices in more than 400 metropolitan areas. Nearly all Government agencies are included in a system which provides capability for telephone, teletypewriter, data transmission, facsimile, and other communications media.

In addition to this Federal telecommunications system, a program is underway to consolidate switchboard facilities and to install automated Centrex telephone equipment. In one recent consolidation, 54 PBX stations were eliminated with a net savings of more than 80 operator positions.

In the blue-collar field, particularly at ordnance installations, tape-run machines are being introduced with increasing frequency to perform repetitive tasks, primarily those involving the production of large quantities of a single item. At the outset, these machines were converting production jobs to a like total quantity of maintenance and service jobs; but once the "bugs" are worked out of these automated machines, the demands for manpower will be sharply curtailed.

Rapid technological change is causing wholesale skill obsolescence, downgrading and job displacement among civilian mechanics and electricians. Thousands of jobs in Air Force and other defense installations have been made obsolete as weapons systems have become increasingly complex.

In the Post Office Department, mechanization of operations is underway to handle the growing workload generated by a growing America. Nearly 70 billion pieces of mail were handled in 1964 and the volume is projected to reach 90 billion pieces by 1970 and 125 billion pieces by 1980. Mechanization of mail handling and sorting, involving, as it does, 30 percent of the work force in a typical post office, is receiving particular attention. Research is underway to improve letter sorting machines by incorporating electronic memory equipment and optical scanning devices.

Improved parcel post and sacked mail sorting machines are being used more extensively in larger post offices. Mechanical canceling machines are replacing manual procedures. Magnetically controlled conveyor systems for transporting and sorting mail, and patron self-service devices, are being put into use. (The United Federation of Postal Clerks, AFL-CIO, one of the 31 affiliates of the Government Employees' Council, deals with the question of technological change in the Post Office Department in considerably greater detail in its presentation to this Commission.)

Another specific illustration of Post Office mechanization involves delivery of the mail. In 1957, mechanized delivery was confined to parcel post and mounted and rural mail. Today, 12,000 three-wheeled "mailsters" are in use by letter carriers. They were introduced into the service without prior consultation with the unions and the employees having a direct interest in the innovation. Despite repeated union objections that the vehicle is dangerous, its use continues to increase. Several deaths, hundreds of personal injuries, and expenditure of thousands of dollars because of accidents have resulted from their use. Additional thousands have been spent repairing "mailsters" involved in accidents.

Many of the effects of technological change are no different in Government service than they are in private industry. They are intensified, however, because of the large number of functions and people involved. Thus, the introduction of dictating machines curtails the increase in stenographic jobs requiring shorthand—whether these machines are used in the public or private sector. But it is particularly noticeable in Government offices where, more and more, dictation is being put on transcribing machines and stenographers are being replaced to a considerable extent by transcribing machine operators. In addition, advances in communications, which reduce the amount of written correspondence, are having a further impact on the demand for stenographers.

The same is true for typists. A large share of the growing workload of what once was the typist's exclusive domain is now being assumed by copying equipment, automatic typewriters, facsimile, data transmission, and other technological innovations. Again, the impact is usually greater in Government. Unlike private enterprise, which must show a profit figure every year, the Government agency is free to acquire new equipment at breakneck speed, thus intensifying the pace at which technological change is introduced in the Federal service.

In a report dated September 1965, on "Improved Management in the Federal Government," a congressional subcommittee cited use by one department of an automatic typewriter for preparation of replies to correspondence. Use of the automatic machine conserved the time of three typists, with annual savings estimated at $12,000.

These are some of the significant technological advances that have taken place, and are continuing to take place, within the Federal Government. In the face of these changes, we submit, the attitude of agency officials has been, on the whole, less than constructive. Concerned as they are with the mounting workload, they are introducing technological change virtually willy-nilly. Too little, if any, concern is given to the effects on employment over the long run. Instead, taking the short view, agency officials are willing to justify their actions in this field by pointing out that there is little or no initial adverse effect on present employment. It is an argument which fails to deal with reality—and, absents any substantive guidelines for agency officials, frustrating to Government unions seeking to protect the rights of the workers directly affected.

Agency officials, we are convinced, are pinning their hopes on attrition alone to bring about an eventual balance, employmentwise. These agency heads are relying on silent firings—a phrase used to describe those who would have been hired except for automation. The hard fact of the matter is that the accelerated pace of technological change is going to outstrip the rate of attrition, and Government workers will be faced—if, indeed, they are not already faced—with reductions in force and downgrading. We believe it is simply unwise to go one step further with the introduction of new technology in the Federal Government without first having a master plan that takes into account both the short-range and the long-range impact of these changes.

The experience in the Federal Government to date indicates strongly that agency officials have no clear view of where they are going, nor do they have a clear plan for meeting the inevitable problem of displacement as it arises. In instances where jobs have already been eliminated—either through technological advances or through such other circumstances as base closures and consolidations—the experience has been most disappointing, from the point of view of the workers involved.

For one thing, reassignment to other jobs is becoming increasingly difficult, for automation is eliminating many of the very jobs to which displaced employees had been reassigned in the past. For another thing, the expansion of automated processes poses a challenge in that old skills are not always adaptable to the new occupations that are being created.

Then, too, in those instances where workers are reassigned, supervisors and foremen are increasingly intolerant of the worker attempting to acquire a new skill and a degree of facility in what, to him, are alien surroundings. Under extreme pressure to get work out in the least possible time, these supervisory employees often are unwilling to take the time that is necessary to explain processes properly to the newly assigned worker, and are reluctant to allow the worker the time to learn the job properly so that his output will keep pace with that of seasoned employees on the job. This is particularly true in the case of the older worker who needs—but, for the most part, is not getting—special consideration.

Relocation is also spoken of by agency officials as a method already in use to help ease the impact on the workers affected adversely by personnel policy decisions. Noble in principle though relocation may be, it is far less than that in present-day practice within the Government. In the case of the Defense Department, where displacement of thousands of workers now is going on as a result of base-termination decisions, much has been made of the fact that, as a result of relocation technique, not a single employee has been separated from the Federal service without a job opportunity. This, we submit, is an exercise in semantics, for the cold facts are that, of the total number of employees thus far affected by base closures and consolidations, 11.3 percent of the workers whose jobs had been eliminated "declined" so-called "job offers," while another 8.2 percent resigned or retired after their old jobs were shot out from under them.

For the Defense Department to say, therefore, that no one was separated without a job opportunity is about as comforting as saying that "the operation was a success, but the patient died." For by the Government's own figures, nearly 20 percent of the workers affected by these personnel decisions to date have ended up on the scrap heap. The Department of Defense can offer figures in any manner it wishes, but the fact remains that one out of every five workers displaced by these changes lost his career status with the Government.

This stunning fact gives rise to some searching questions:

Were the offers of other jobs made on the basis of compassionate concern for the individuals, their skills and their personal problems or was the same job tendered to hundreds of workers as a formality, knowing none of them would accept?

Were jobs that were offered displaced employees in the same, or comparable, skills that they had been performing?

Were the jobs at the same rates of pay?

Did relocation involve prohibitive expenses for the worker, in terms of the cost of moving, in terms of the loss of equity in his present home, in terms of being moved to an area with a substantially higher cost of living?

The Government Employees' Council has been searching, for some time, for the answers to these, and related, questions. Agency officials have been, to say the least, reluctant to help us find these answers. It is our hope that, in addressing itself to the impact of technological change on the 2,500,000 employees of the Federal Government, this distinguished Commission will be more successful in the search for meaningful answers than we have been.

In sum, then, we in the Government Employees' Council are deeply concerned about the pace at which technological change is being introduced within the Government, for we are fearful that no reliable answers now exist within the executive branch as to the pace at which such change can be properly absorbed. We are concerned, too, about the unfavorable effects that rapid technological change can have on people. For that reason, we feel the need exists to control the pace of the introduction of technological change, in order to minimize its harmful effects on workers while assuring that its benefits are equitably shared.

To meet the challenge of technology, we seek—and we trust that this Commission will recommend—procedures that will make possible the involvement of unions in advance planning and consultation at all levels of employment. Nothing could be more helpful than effective prior joint consultation between management and labor in Government service to alleviate any of the ill effects which may arise. There are many facets of this problem which need to be explored, but which have, to all outward indications, thus far been ignored by Government officials.

New working conditions caused by technological change may give rise to new risks. No one has yet examined the ratio of on-the-job accidents to draw some comparison between the rate in an automated setup and the preautomation rate. In addition to a potentially higher accident incidence, there is the very real question of whether automated equipment, while eliminating the physical burden, may introduce new psychological strains that must be dealt with.

In addition, new technologies may change the job content so that wage scales and working hours may need to be readjusted. Further, new problems may arise because of excessive boredom on the job, with the result that there may be an immediate need for altering the use of working time to compensate for this factor.

These, and similar matters, are ones which can best be approached prior to the installation of new technology, not after it has become an accomplished fact and the problems have arisen. This calls for orderly involvement of the unions which represent Government workers. Further, it calls for recognition of the role which Government unions can play, so that agency management will be more receptive to working together with union representatives in the kind of climate in which reason and cooperation can flourish.

Beyond that, positive steps must be taken in Government—just as they must be taken in private industry—to help minimize the ill effects of technological advances. These should include, but should not necessarily be limited to:

1. Reduction of working hours.

2. Longer vacations, including periodic extended vacations.

3. Earlier retirement, without loss of benefits.

4. A total embargo on overtime.

5. Relocation allowances that will make the displaced worker whole for the losses involved in moving to a new locale.

6. Establishment of training courses to prepare displaced employees for different jobs, with adequate retraining allowances to protect the worker and his family during this period. Any retraining should initially be attempted for reemployment in the same agency and/or in the same Department. If that is not feasible, retraining should be given for employment with other Government agencies in the same labor market area, so that the impact of relocation will be minimized. (Under the Area Redevelopment Act, and under the Economic Development Act which supersedes it, emphasis has been on not forcing an unwilling worker into mobility. This philosophy grows out of the realization that both the well-being of the individual and the future of the community are best served by permitting people to retain their roots, if they so wish. Certainly in treating with its own employees, the Government should take no less enlightened an attitude.)

7. A minimum period of 2 years for advance planning before further introduction of technological changes.

8. Establishment within the Civil Service Commission of a special placement office to assist employees displaced by technological change.

9. Authority for the Civil Service Commission to "freeze" hiring in any or all agencies until displaced employees have been given an opportunity to fill vacancies.

10. Effective communications to keep all employees informed on the progress and implications of the agency's projected technological improvements, with trade unions recognized as one of the prime channels for communicating with employees and for assuring equitable treatment of workers affected by automation. To date, there has been a woeful lack of meaningful consultation with the unions affected during the advance planning stage. Hence, when the technical changes occur employees are distrustful and suspicious. Moreover, given an opportunity to confer effectively with sufficient advance notice, unions can propose methods and changes, which will eliminate hardship on individuals and improve the application of the new machinery or system.

11. Development of an accurate system of manpower forecasting, which will enable the Federal Government to anticipate its future manpower needs and insure workers of reasonable stability in employment.

12. Assurance that employees will share in the benefits derived from the introduction of new techniques and equipment by upgrading their skills, thus making them eligible for higher ratings.

These steps which need to be taken on behalf of Government employees should, of course, be augmented by actions taken to ease automation's impact on all workers—in private as well as in public employment. To this end, we enthusiastically join with our sister unions representing employees in private enterprise in calling for a national program to provide, among other things, a shorter statutory workweek, a higher minimum wage, a ban on overtime, a more meaningful financial cushion to aid workers who lose their jobs as the result of automation, an intensified job retraining program, establishment of a technological clearinghouse that can sound an early warning on impending technological changes and their potential impact on employment, strengthening of the U.S. Employment Service so that it will be better able to match available workers and available jobs, and such other steps as are essential to insure that technological changes will result in the greatest possible good for all concerned and a minimum hardship to those directly affected.

Speaking in particular for the nearly 1 million members which our 31 AFL–CIO unions represent in Government service—but speaking, as well, on behalf of the 2,500,000 men and women who have made a career of serving their fellow Americans through employment by the Federal Government—we plead in particular for establishment of a national policy that will clearly provide the safeguards that a concerned society demands. We feel it is imperative, at a time when the Government is urging restraint and compassion on the business community in the implementation of technological change, that the Government, itself, should set the pattern by its care and concern for its own workers affected by these dramatic changes in technology.

One of the major purposes of introducing technological change is to insure growth, productivity and an increasing standard of living. This is consonant with this administration's enunciated goals of establishing a Great Society—a social order marked by full employment and full utilization of the skills and potentials of all Americans. The Government Employees' Council of the AFL–CIO would remind the National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress that the need for full employment, and for full development of the potential of the individual, is no less important for the worker employed by the Federal Government than it is for the worker employed by private enterprise.

It is in this spirit of concern for the 2,500,000 employees of our Federal Government that we earnestly urge this Commission to give adequate consideration to their plight in the face of technological change, and to make it clear in its report that the Federal worker, no less than his counterpart in private enterprise, is entitled to all of the protections that a concerned and democratic society can devise.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 7 o'clock p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 509. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on crime in the District of Columbia and House Report No. 176, entitled "District of Columbia Crime";

H. Con. Res. 512. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearing on home rule for the District of Columbia;

H. Con. Res. 513. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of hearings on "Lower Colorado River Basin Project," 89th Congress, 1st session; and

H. Con. Res. 519. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on H.R. 2580 (89th Cong., 1st sess.), to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10281. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (7812) entitled "An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate has passed Senate Resolution 156 notifying the House of the election of Emery L. Frazier of Kentucky as Secretary of the Senate effective January 1, 1966.

FEDERAL SALARY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10281) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Salary Act of 1965".

EMPLOYEES SUBJECT TO CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

SEC. 2. (a) Section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (78 Stat. 400; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,507	$3,626	$3,745	$3,864	$3,983	$4,102	$4,221	$4,340	$4,459	$4,578
GS-2	3,814	3,943	4,072	4,201	4,330	4,459	4,588	4,717	4,846	4,975
GS-3	4,149	4,289	4,429	4,569	4,709	4,849	4,989	5,129	5,269	5,409
GS-4	4,641	4,797	4,953	5,109	5,265	5,421	5,577	5,733	5,889	6,045
GS-5	5,181	5,352	5,523	5,694	5,865	6,036	6,207	6,378	6,549	6,720
GS-6	5,702	5,894	6,086	6,278	6,470	6,662	6,854	7,046	7,238	7,430
GS-7	6,269	6,476	6,683	6,890	7,097	7,304	7,511	7,718	7,925	8,132
GS-8	6,869	7,097	7,325	7,553	7,781	8,009	8,237	8,465	8,693	8,921
GS-9	7,479	7,733	7,987	8,241	8,495	8,749	9,003	9,257	9,511	9,765
GS-10	8,184	8,464	8,744	9,024	9,304	9,584	9,864	10,144	10,424	10,704
GS-11	8,961	9,267	9,573	9,879	10,185	10,491	10,797	11,103	11,409	11,715
GS-12	10,619	10,987	11,355	11,723	12,091	12,459	12,827	13,195	13,563	13,931
GS-13	12,510	12,945	13,380	13,815	14,250	14,685	15,120	15,555	15,990	16,425
GS-14	14,680	15,188	15,696	16,204	16,712	17,220	17,728	18,236	18,744	19,252
GS-15	17,055	17,645	18,235	18,825	19,415	20,005	20,595	21,185	21,775	22,365
GS-16	19,619	20,297	20,975	21,653	22,331	23,009	23,687	24,365	25,043	
GS-17	22,217	22,994	23,771	24,548	25,325					
GS-18	25,382									".

(b) Except as provided in section 504(d) of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (78 Stat. 412; 5 U.S.C. 1173(d)), the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) of this section applies shall be initially adjusted as of the effective date of this section, as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding rate in effect on and after such date.

(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

(3) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate in excess of the maximum rate for his grade, he shall receive (A) the maximum rate for his grade in the new schedule, or (B) his existing rate of basic compensation if such existing rate is higher.

(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to section 2(b)(4) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208(b) of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111), plus subsequent increases authorized by law, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of his existing aggregate rate of compensation, on the day preceding the effective date of this section, plus the amount of increase made by this section in the maximum rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this Act or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purposes of section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing rate of compensation of the employee.

REDETERMINATIONS OF ACCEPTABLE LEVELS OF COMPETENCE

SEC. 3. Section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1121), is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(c) Whenever a determination is made under subsection (a) of this section that the work of an officer or employee is not of an acceptable level of competence, he shall be given prompt written notice of that determination and an opportunity for reconsideration of the determination within his department under uniform procedures established by the Commission. If the determination is affirmed upon reconsideration, the employee shall have a right of appeal to the Commission. If the reconsideration or appeal results in a reversal of the earlier determination, the new determination shall supersede the earlier determination and shall be deemed to have been made as of the date of the earlier determination. The authority of the Commission to establish procedures and the right of appeal by the officer or employee to the Commission shall not apply to determinations of acceptable level of competence made by the Librarian of Congress."

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE EMPLOYEES

SEC. 4. (a) Section 3542(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'PFS'. Except as provided in sections 3543 and 3544 of this title, basic compensation shall be paid to all employees in accordance with such schedule.

“PFS	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	$4,086	$4,221	$4,356	$4,491	$4,626	$4,761	$4,896	$5,031	$5,166	$5,301	$5,436	$5,571
2	4,424	4,569	4,714	4,859	5,004	5,149	5,294	5,439	5,584	5,729	5,874	6,019
3	4,780	4,941	5,102	5,263	5,424	5,585	5,746	5,907	6,068	6,229	6,390	6,551
4	5,181	5,352	5,523	5,694	5,865	6,036	6,207	6,378	6,549	6,720	6,891	7,062
5	5,536	5,722	5,908	6,094	6,280	6,466	6,652	6,838	7,024	7,210	7,396	7,582
6	5,941	6,138	6,335	6,532	6,729	6,926	7,123	7,320	7,517	7,714	7,911	8,108
7	6,361	6,573	6,785	6,997	7,209	7,421	7,633	7,845	8,057	8,269	8,481	----------
8	6,888	7,116	7,344	7,572	7,800	8,028	8,256	8,484	8,712	8,940	----------	----------
9	7,449	7,697	7,945	8,193	8,441	8,689	8,937	9,185	9,433	9,681	----------	----------
10	8,110	8,385	8,660	8,935	9,210	9,485	9,760	10,035	10,310	10,585	----------	----------
11	8,961	9,267	9,573	9,879	10,185	10,491	10,797	11,103	11,409	11,715	----------	----------
12	9,914	10,251	10,588	10,925	11,262	11,599	11,936	12,273	12,610	12,947	----------	----------
13	10,956	11,334	11,712	12,090	12,468	12,846	13,224	13,602	13,980	14,358	----------	----------
14	12,077	12,497	12,917	13,337	13,757	14,177	14,597	15,017	15,437	15,857	----------	----------
15	13,349	13,810	14,271	14,732	15,193	15,654	16,115	16,576	17,037	17,498	----------	----------
16	14,751	15,264	15,777	16,290	16,803	17,316	17,829	18,342	18,855	19,368	----------	----------
17	16,320	16,890	17,460	18,030	18,600	19,170	19,740	20,310	20,880	21,450	----------	----------
18	18,078	18,710	19,342	19,974	20,606	21,238	21,870	22,502	23,134	23,766	----------	----------
19	20,042	20,741	21,440	22,139	22,838	23,537	24,236	24,935	----------	----------	----------	----------
20	22,217	22,994	23,771	24,548	25,325	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------”.

(b) Section 3543(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedule and for which the symbol shall be ‘RCS’. Compensation shall be paid to rural carriers in accordance with this schedule.

“Rural Carrier Schedule

	“Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Carrier in rural delivery service: Fixed compensation per annum	$2,301	$2,412	$2,523	$2,634	$2,745	$2,856	$2,967	$3,078	$3,189	$3,300	$3,411	$3,522
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	86	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104	106	108
For each mile of route over 30 miles	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	24	25”.

(c) Section 3544(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Fourth Class Office Schedule and for which the symbol shall be ‘FOS’, for postmasters in post offices of the fourth class which is based on the revenue units of the post office for the preceding fiscal year. Basic compensation shall be paid to postmasters in post offices of the fourth class in accordance with this schedule.

“Fourth Class Office Schedule

“Revenue units	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
30 but fewer than 36	$3,906	$4,035	$4,164	$4,293	$4,422	$4,551	$4,680	$4,809	$4,938	$5,067	$5,196	$5,325
24 but fewer than 30	3,610	3,729	3,848	3,967	4,086	4,205	4,324	4,443	4,562	4,681	4,800	4,919
18 but fewer than 24	2,978	3,079	3,180	3,281	3,382	3,483	3,584	3,685	3,786	3,887	3,988	4,089
12 but fewer than 18	2,339	2,415	2,491	2,567	2,643	2,719	2,795	2,871	2,947	3,023	3,099	3,175
6 but fewer than 12	1,687	1,741	1,795	1,849	1,903	1,957	2,011	2,065	2,119	2,173	2,227	2,281
Fewer than 6	1,359	1,403	1,447	1,491	1,535	1,579	1,623	1,667	1,711	1,755	1,799	1,843”.

(d) The basic compensation of each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or the Fourth Class Office Schedule immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall be determined as follows:

(1) Each employee shall be assigned to the same numerical step for his position which he had attained immediately prior to such effective date. If changes in levels or steps would otherwise occur on such effective date without regard to enactment of this Act, such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion.

(2) If the existing basic compensation is greater than the rate to which the employee is converted under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the employee shall be placed in the lowest step which exceeds his basic compensation. If the existing basic compensation exceeds the maximum step of his position, his existing basic compensation shall be established as his basic compensation.

POSTAL SERVICE OVERTIME AND HOLIDAY COMPENSATION

Sec. 5. (a) Section 3571 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 3571. Maximum hours of work

“(a) A basic workweek is established for all postal field service employees consisting of five eight-hour days. The work schedule of employees shall be regulated so that the eight hours of service does not extend over a longer period than ten consecutive hours.

“(b) The Postmaster General shall establish work schedules in advance for annual rate regular employees consisting of five eight-hour days in each week.

“(c) Except for emergencies as determined by the Postmaster General, the hours of service of any employee shall not extend over a longer period than twelve consecutive hours, and no employee may be required to work more than twelve hours in one day.

“(d) To the maximum extent practicable, senior regular employees shall be assigned to a basic workweek Monday through Friday, inclusive, except for those who express a preference for another basic workweek.”

(b) Section 3573 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 3573. Compensatory time, overtime, and holidays.

“(a) In emergencies of if the needs of the service require, the Postmaster General may require employees to perform overtime work or to work on holidays. Overtime work is any work officially ordered or approved which is performed by—

“(1) an annual rate regular employee in excess of his regular work schedule,

“(2) an hourly rate regular employee in excess of eight hours in a day or forty hours in a week, and

“(3) a substitute employee in excess of forty hours in a week.

The Postmaster General shall determine the day and week used in computing overtime work.

“(b) For each hour of overtime work the Postmaster General shall compensate an employee in the ‘PFS’ Schedule as follows:

“(1) He shall pay each employee in or below salary level PFS–7 compensation at the rate of 150 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by two thousand and eighty.

“(2) He shall grant each employee in or above salary level PFS–8 compensatory time equal to the overtime worked, or in his discretion in lieu thereof pay such employee compensation at the rate of 150 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation of the employee or of the hourly rate of the basic compensation for the highest step of salary level PFS–7, whichever is the lesser.

“(c) For officially ordered or approved time worked on a day referred to as a holiday in the Act of December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 862;

5 U.S.C. 87b), or on a day designated by Executive order as a holiday for Federal employees, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, an employee in the PFS schedule shall receive extra compensation, in addition to any other compensation provided for by law, as follows:

"(1) Each regular employee in or below salary level PFS–7 shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 100 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by two thousand and eighty.

"(2) Each regular employee in or above salary level PFS–8 shall be granted compensatory time in an amount equal to the time worked on such holiday within thirty working days thereafter or, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, in lieu thereof shall be paid extra compensation for the time so worked at the rate of 100 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by two thousand and eighty.

"(3) For work performed on Christmas Day (A) each regular employee shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 150 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step, computed by dividing the scheduled annual rate of basic compensation by two thousand and eighty, and (B) each substitute employee shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 50 per centum of the hourly rate of basic compensation for his level and step.

"(d) The Postmaster General shall establish conditions for the use of compensatory time earned and the payment of compensation for unused compensatory time.

"(e) Each regular employee whose regular work schedule includes an eight-hour period of service any part of which is within the period commencing at midnight Saturday and ending at midnight Sunday shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 25 per centum of his hourly rate of basic compensation for each hour of work performed during that eight-hour period of service.

"(f) If an employee is entitled under this section to unused compensatory time at the time of his death, the Postmaster General shall pay at the rate prescribed in this section, but not less than a sum equal to the employee's hourly basic compensation, for each hour of such unused compensatory time to the person or persons surviving at the date of such employee's death. Such payment shall be made in the order of precedence prescribed in the first section of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 61f), and shall be a bar to recovery by any other persons of amounts so paid.

"(g) Notwithstanding any provision of this section other than subsection (f), no employee shall be paid overtime or extra compensation for a pay period which when added to his basic compensation for the pay period exceeds one twenty-sixth of the annual rate of basic compensation for the highest step of salary level PFS–17.

"(h) For the purposes of this section and section 3571 of this title—

"(1) 'Annual rate regular employee' means an employee for whom the Postmaster General has established a regular work schedule consisting of five eight-hour days in accordance with section 3571 of this title.

"(2) 'Hourly rate regular employee' means an employee for whom the Postmaster General has established a regular work schedule consisting of not more than forty hours a week.

"(3) 'Substitute employee' means an employee for whom the Postmaster General has not established a regular work schedule."

(c) Section 3575 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3575. Exemptions

"(a) Sections 3571, 3573 and 3574 of this title do not apply to postmasters, rural carriers, postal inspectors, and employees in salary level PFS–15 and above.

"(b) Sections 3571 and 3573 of this title do not apply to employees referred to in section 3581 of this title.

"(c) Sections 3571 (a), (b), and (d), and 3573(e) of this title do not apply to substitute employees.

"(d) Section 3571(b) of this title does not apply to hourly rate regular employees."

POSTAL EMPLOYEES RELOCATION EXPENSES

SEC. 6. (a) That part of chapter 41 of title 39, United States Code, which precedes the center heading "Special Classes of Employees" and section 3111 thereof, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 3107. Postal employees relocation expenses

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each employee in the postal field service who is transferred or relocated from one official station to another shall, under regulations promulgated by the Postmaster General, be granted the following allowances and expenses:

"(1) Per diem allowance, in lieu of subsistence expenses, for each member of his immediate family while en route between his old and new official stations, not in excess of the maximum per diem rates prescribed by or pursuant to law for employees of the Federal Government.

"(2) Subsistence expenses of the employee and each member of his immediate family for a period of not to exceed thirty days while occupying temporary quarters at the place of his new official duty station, but not in excess of the maximum per diem rates prescribed by or pursuant to law for employees of the Federal Government.

"(3) Five days of leave with pay which shall not be charged to any other leave to which he is entitled under existing law."

(b) That part of the table of contents of such chapter 41 under the heading "Employees Generally" is amended by inserting

"3107. Postal employees relocation expenses."

immediately below

"3106. Special compensation rules.".

EMPLOYEES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 7. Section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, relating to grades and pay scales for certain positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"(a) The per annum full-pay scale or ranges for positions provided in section 4103 of this title, other than Chief Medical Director and Deputy Chief Medical Director, shall be as follows:

"SECTION 4103 SCHEDULE

"Assistant Chief Medical Director, $25,382.

"Medical Director, $22,217 minimum to $25,325 maximum.

"Director of Nursing Service, $17,055 minimum to $22,365 maximum.

"Director of Chaplain Service, $17,055 minimum to $22,365 maximum.

"Chief Pharmacist, $17,055 minimum to $22,365 maximum.

"Chief Dietitian, $17,055 minimum to $22,365 maximum.

"(b)(1) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"PHYSICIAN AND DENTIST SCHEDULE

"Director grade, $19,619 minimum to $25,043 maximum.

"Executive grade, $18,291 minimum to $24,024 maximum.

"Chief grade, $17,055 minimum to $22,365 maximum.

"Senior grade, $14,680 minimum to $19,252 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $12,510 minimum to $16,425 maximum.

"Full grade, $10,619 minimum to $13,931 maximum.

"Associate grade, $8,961 minimum to $11,715 maximum.

"NURSE SCHEDULE

"Assistant Director grade, $14,680 minimum to $19,252 maximum.

"Chief grade, $12,510 minimum to $16,425 maximum.

"Senior grade, $10,619 minimum to $13,931 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $8,961 minimum to $11,715 maximum.

"Full grade, $7,479 minimum to $9,765 maximum.

"Associate grade, $6,540 minimum to $8,502 maximum.

"Junior grade, $5,702 minimum to $7,430 maximum.

"(2) No person may hold the director grade unless he is serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, center, or outpatient clinic (independent). No person may hold the executive grade unless he holds the position of chief of staff at a hospital, center, or outpatient clinic (independent), or the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic, or comparable position."

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS; STAFF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

SEC. 8. (a) The fourth sentence of section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended to read as follows: "The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

"Class 1	$23,465	$24,284	$25,382				
Class 2	18,954	19,612	20,270	$20,928	$21,586	$22,244	$22,902
Class 3	15,395	15,929	16,463	16,997	17,531	18,065	18,599
Class 4	12,510	12,945	13,380	13,815	14,250	14,685	15,120
Class 5	10,303	10,661	11,019	11,377	11,735	12,093	12,451
Class 6	8,594	8,889	9,184	9,479	9,774	10,069	10,364
Class 7	7,262	7,506	7,750	7,994	8,238	8,482	8,726
Class 8	6,269	6,476	6,683	6,890	7,097	7,304	7,511".

(b) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 415 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 870(a)) is amended to read as follows: "The per annum salaries of such staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

"Class 1	$15,395	$15,929	$16,463	$16,997	$17,531	$18,065	$18,599	$19,133	$19,667	$20,201
Class 2	12,510	12,945	13,380	13,815	14,250	14,685	15,120	15,555	15,990	16,425
Class 3	10,303	10,661	11,019	11,377	11,735	12,093	12,451	12,809	13,167	13,525
Class 4	8,594	8,889	9,184	9,479	9,774	10,069	10,364	10,659	10,954	11,249
Class 5	7,749	8,013	8,277	8,541	8,805	9,069	9,333	9,597	9,861	10,125
Class 6	6,998	7,231	7,464	7,697	7,930	8,163	8,396	8,629	8,862	9,095
Class 7	6,428	6,640	6,852	7,064	7,276	7,488	7,700	7,912	8,124	8,336
Class 8	5,688	5,880	6,072	6,264	6,456	6,648	6,840	7,032	7,224	7,416
Class 9	5,190	5,361	5,532	5,703	5,874	6,045	6,216	6,387	6,558	6,729
Class 10	4,641	4,797	4,953	5,109	5,265	5,421	5,577	5,733	5,889	6,045".

(c) Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates provided by section 412 or 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall receive basic compensation, on and after such effective date, at the rate of their class determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of State.

SEVERANCE PAY

SEC. 9. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, this section applies to each civilian officer or employee in or under—

(1) the executive branch of the Government of the United States, including each corporation wholly owned or controlled by the United States;

(2) the Library of Congress;

(3) the Government Printing Office;

(4) the General Accounting Office; or

(5) the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

This section also applies to persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h (b)), and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operations of the provisions of this section with respect to such persons.

(b) This section does not apply to—

(1) an officer or employee whose rate of basic compensation is fixed at a rate provided for one of the levels of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule or is in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended:

(2) an officer or employee serving under an appointment with a definite time limitation, except one so appointed for full-time employment, without a break in service or after a separation of three days or less, following service under an appointment without time limitation;

(3) an alien employee who occupies a position outside the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Canal Zone;

(4) an officer or employee who is subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, or any other retirement law or retirement system applicable to Federal officers or employees or members of the uniformed services, and who, at the time of separation from the service, has fulfilled the requirements for immediate annuity under any such law or system;

(5) an officer or employee who, at the time of separation from the service, is receiving compensation under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, except one receiving this compensation concurrently with salary or on account of the death of another person;

(6) an officer or employee who, at the time of separation from the service, is entitled to receive other severance pay from the Government;

(7) officers and employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority; and

(8) such other officers or employees as may be excluded by rules and regulations of the President or of such officer or agency as he may designate.

(c) An officer or employee to whom this section applies who is involuntarily separated from the service, on or after the effective date of this section, not by removal for cause on charges of misconduct, delinquency, or inefficiency, shall, under rules and regulations prescribed by the President or such officer or agency as he may designate, be paid severance pay in regular pay periods by the department, independent establishment, corporation, or other governmental unit, from which separated.

(d) Severance pay shall consist of two elements, a basic severance allowance and an age adjustment allowance. The basic severance allowance shall be computed on the basis of one week's basic compensation at the rate received immediately before separation for each year of civilian service up to and including ten years for which severance pay has not been received under this or any other authority and two weeks' basic compensation at such rate for each year of civilian service beyond ten years for which severance pay has not been received under this or any other authority. The age adjustment allowance shall be computed on the basis of 10 per centum of the total basic severance allowance for each year by which the age of the recipient exceeds forty years at the time of separation. Total severance pay received under this section shall not exceed one year's pay at the rate received immediately before separation.

(e) An officer or employee may be paid severance pay only after having been employed currently for a continuous period of at least twelve months.

(f) If an officer or employee is reemployed by the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia before the expiration of the period covered by payments of severance pay, the payments shall be discontinued beginning with the date of reemployment and the service represented by the unexpired portion of the period shall be recredited to the officer or employee for use in any subsequent computations of severance pay. For the purposes of subsection (e), reemployment which causes severance pay to be discontinued shall be considered as employment continuous with that serving as the basis for the severance pay.

(g) If the officer or employee dies before the expiration of the period covered by payments of severance pay, the payments of severance pay with respect to such officer or employee shall be continued as if such officer or employee were living and shall be paid on a pay period basis to the survivor or survivors of such officer or employee in accordance with the first section of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 61f).

(h) Severance pay under this section shall not be a basis for payment, nor be included in the basis for computation, of any other type of Federal or District of Columbia Government benefits, and any period covered by severance pay shall not be regarded as a period of Federal or District of Columbia Government service or employment.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION COUNTY COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

SEC. 10. The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act for corresponding rates of compensation.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SEC. 11. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government, whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 3.6 per centum of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law).

(b) The total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section of each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House and is not increased by reason of any other provision of this section, shall be increased by an amount which is equal to the amount of the increase provided by subsection (a) of this section; except that this section shall not apply to the compensation of student congressional interns authorized by H. Res. 416 of the Eighty-ninth Congress.

(c) The rates of compensation of employees of the House of Representatives whose compensation is fixed by the House Employees Schedule under the House Employees Position Classification Act (78 Stat. 1079; Public Law 88-652; 2 U.S.C. 291-303) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by subsection (a) of this section; except, that this section shall not apply to the compensation of those employees whose compensation is fixed by the House Wage Schedule of such Act.

(d) The additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 and the following).

(e) Section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 31), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $30,000 per annum each. The compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $43,000 per annum. The compensation of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $35,000 per annum each."

(f) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator is hereby adjusted, effective on the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act, to the lowest multiple of $60 which will provide a gross rate of compensation not less than the gross rate such employee was receiving immediately prior thereto, except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any employee if on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act, the Senator by whom such employee is employed notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he does not wish such provisions to apply to such employee. No employee whose basic compensation is adjusted under this subsection shall receive any additional compensation under subsection (a) for any period prior to the effective date of such adjustment during which such employee was employed in the office of the Senator by whom he is employed on the first day of the month following the enactment of this Act. No additional compensation shall be paid to any person under subsection (a) for any period prior to the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act during which such person was employed in the office of a Senator (other than a Senator by whom he is employed on such day) unless on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act such Senator notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he wishes such employee to receive such additional compensation for such period. In any case in which, at the expiration of the time within which a Senator may give notice under this subsection, such Senator is deceased, such notice shall be deemed to have been given.

(g) Notwithstanding the provision referred to in subsection (h), the rates of gross compensation of the Secretary for the Majority of the Senate, the Secretary for the Minority of the Senate, the Chief Reporter of Debates of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Senior Counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the Chief Clerk of the Senate, the Chaplain of the Senate, and the Postmaster and Assistant Postmaster of the Senate are hereby increased by 3.6 per centum.

(h) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading "SENATE" in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (74 Stat. 304; Public Law 86–568), is amended by striking out "$22,945" and inserting in lieu thereof "$23,770".

(i) The limitation on gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the Senate is hereby increased by 3.6 per centum. The amount of such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent. The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to employees whose compensation is subject to such limitation.

FEDERAL JUDICIAL SALARIES

SEC. 12. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a)(2)), section 3656 of title 18, United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, sections 671 to 675, inclusive, or section 604(a)(5), of title 28, United States Code, insofar as the latter section applies to graded positions, are hereby increased by amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees holding ungraded positions and whose salaries are fixed pursuant to such section 604(a)(5) may be increased by the amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by amounts which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) Section 753(e) of title 28, United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts), is amended by striking out the existing salary limitation contained therein and inserting a new limitation which reflects the respective applicable increases provided by section 2(a) of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

INCREASED UNIFORM ALLOWANCE

SEC. 13. The Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, as amended (68 Stat. 1114; 5 U.S.C. 2131), is amended by striking out "$100" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$125".

MAXIMUM SALARY INCREASE LIMITATION

SEC. 14. Except as otherwise provided in section 11(e), no rate of salary shall be increased, by reason of the enactment of this title, to an amount in excess of the salary rate now or hereafter in effect for Level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARY RATES FIXED BY ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

SEC. 15. (a) The rates of basic compensation of assistant United States attorneys whose basic salaries are fixed pursuant to section 508 of title 28, United States Code, shall be increased by 3.6 per centum effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after October 1, 1965.

(b) Notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rates of compensation are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law and are not otherwise increased by this Act are hereby authorized to be increased effective on or after the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after October 1, 1965, by amounts not to exceed the increases provided by this Act for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to authorize any increase in the rates of compensation of officers and employees whose rates of compensation are fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates or practices.

(d) Nothing contained in this section shall affect the authority contained in any law pursuant to which rates of compensation may be fixed by administrative action.

TRAVEL ON OFFICIAL DUTY TIME

SEC. 16. Section 204 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (68 Stat. 1110; 5 U.S.C. 912b), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "To the maximum extent practicable, the head of any department, independent establishment, or agency, including Government-owned or controlled corporations, or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, or the head of any legislative or judicial agency to which this title applies, shall schedule the time to be spent by an officer or employee in a travel status away from his official duty station within the regularly scheduled workweek of such officer or employee.".

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 17. This title shall become effective as follows:

(1) This section and sections 1, 9, 13, 15, 16, and 18, and section 3107(3) of title 39, United States Code, as contained in the amendment made by section 6(a) of this Act, shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Section 5 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) Sections 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, and 14 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after October 1, 1965.

(4) Section 3 shall become effective on the ninetieth day following the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) Section 6(b), and section 3107 (1) and (2) of title 39, United States Code, as contained in the amendment made by section 6(a) of this Act, shall become effective as of July 1, 1965.

(6) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this Act shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of such enactment.

PAYMENT OF RETROACTIVE SALARY

SEC. 18. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or employee who retired during the period beginning on the effective date prescribed by section 17(3) and ending on the date of enactment of this Act for services rendered during such period and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, Eighty-first Congress), as amended (5 U.S.C. 61f–61k), for services rendered during the period beginning on the effective date prescribed by section 17(3) and ending on the date of enactment of this Act by an officer or employee who dies during such period. Such retroactive compensation or salary shall not be considered as basic salary for the purpose of the Civil Service Retirement Act in the case of any such retired or deceased officer or employee.

(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL (interrupting the reading of the Senate amendments). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 382]

Abbitt
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Annunzio
Aspinall
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Bell
Berry
Bingham
Blatnik
Bolling
Bonner
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Burton, Calif.
Cahill
Callaway
Cameron
Cederberg
Celler
Chelf
Clausen, Don H.
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cramer
Culver
Curtis
de la Garza
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnum
Feighan
Fino
Fogarty
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Henderson
Holifield
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Keith
Keogh
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Landrum
Leggett
Lennon
Lindsay
Long, La.
McCarthy
McDade
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
Michel
Miller
Mize
Monagan
Mosher
Nix
O'Konski
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Poage
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Quie
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Roudebush
Roybal
Saylor
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Scott
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Staggers
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Tuck
Tunney
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vivian
Watson
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wyatt

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 279 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the amendment.

The Clerk resumed the reading of the Senate amendment.

Mr. MORRISON (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Senate amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Mr. Speaker, I would feel that the bill should be explained, at least in the important differences between the Senate bill as sent to us here and the House bill as previously passed sometime last sumer, since this is a new bill that very few Members of the House have had an opportunity to see or read.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the House bill provided for a 4 percent pay increase. The 4 percent pay increase in the House bill has been reduced by the Senate amendment to 3.6 percent. The second pay raise provision has been omitted. This second year pay raise was in the House bill. The overtime pay for postal workers on Sundays has been replaced so that instead of time and a half it is time and a quarter differential. The overtime pay for postal substitutes in excess of 8 hours a day has been omitted. The $150 uniform allowance has been cut to $125. The commission to review the salaries of Federal officials, executives, judges, and Members of Congress has been eliminated.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman further, since all these items were considered to be so good when the House passed the bill nearly 370 to 7 and when we felt they were necessary to maintain the principle of comparability and when we felt that certain cost-of-living increases must be met, what has happened in the intervening period of time to show that these things are no longer necessary or desirable?

Mr. MORRISON. I am sure the gentleman takes the position that they are necessary, and I likewise do, also. However, the Senate saw fit to do otherwise and we are faced with the situation here at this time where we have to take the Senate amendments. The Senate did not see fit to go along with the House.

Mr. CORBETT. I recall, and I know that the gentleman does, also, that we have been in disagreement with the Senate before and we have insisted on our position. We even made so bold, when Mr. Eisenhower was President of these United States, to override his veto on the pay raise. Now it seems the mere hint from the other end of the avenue causes the Senate to cut our bill and causes us to come in here and say, well, we will recede and concur in the Senate provisions. If comparability was a good thing before, it is a good thing now. If the cost of living has gone up, it is still up. If the pay raises were necessary and desirable in August, why are they not today?

Mr. MORRISON. The gentleman is certainly taking a very logical position as far as I see his position, and I am in accord with it, but the Senate did not decide to go along with our position.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The cold fact of life is that the President sent word to the Congress that he would veto anything above 3.6 percent.

I join the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] in asking what has happened to the pay provision of the bill, other than the threat of a veto, to cause the abdication of the House position that was taken by an almost unanimous vote on September 30. What has happened to change the situation?

Mr. MORRISON. The Senate delayed taking up the bill until today. That is the reason why it is before us now. I think this: Had the Senate taken it up earlier, we would not be in quite the position we are in tonight.

Mr. GROSS. So we are commanded here tonight, in the closing hours of this session, to bend the knee to the White House and cut back on this bill simply because the President wants it that way. I would remind the House that when the military pay bill was passed the word came down from the White House that there would be a veto of anything above 5 percent. The House passed a bill calling for 10 percent. It was not vetoed, because Lyndon Johnson knew it would be passed over his veto.

I only wish there was the time here and now; that the other body had moved to dispose of this bill as it should have done, days and days ago, so that we could have sent this bill to the White House to learn whether Congress was going to cringe and bend the knee to the President or whether we are still in possession of our independence and freedom of action—whether we still have any independence of mind and body. I regret that this bill comes to the House under the circumstances that it does here tonight.

Mr. MORRISON. There has been a great deal of discussion about whether the President would sign the bill or whether he would veto the bill and all that I think is a matter of opinion. I think that the House acted in plenty of time in passing this bill. I think our committee performed a long, hard job in going over this bill to the fullest possible degree. We acted on it in time. The Senate did not see fit to take action on it until today. That is the reason we are in our present position.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska, a member of the committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to follow up what was said by the gentleman from Louisiana. The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has worked long and hard on this bill. I have been a member of this committee for 9 years. I have seen some pay bills go through haphazardly. But this bill was very carefully worked out, primarily under the direction and supervision of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

I have not known of a bill in the 9 years that I have been here that has been so carefully worked out. I am very disappointed that the other body has emasculated this bill so that we have to start all over again, so to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to congratulate the gentleman from Arizona for his leadership. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana for his leadership, and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN], for his leadership, as well as many other Members who worked months and months and months on this bill.

And while we have worked months and months on this bill the other body has worked days. I certainly am disappointed that we are confronted with this situation at this time.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the gentleman from Louisiana may be performing a rather unpleasant task here, and I would like to ask him just this question, and then I shall yield further.

Does the gentleman from Louisiana believe that in accepting the Senate bill we have for the predictable future repudiated the principle of comparability?

Mr. MORRISON. Well, I believe that is certainly a debatable question and I think it could be debated for a long time. I believe the Senate certainly cut out a lot of comparability features of the bill on which we worked so hard and long to try to incorporate in our bill that we sent over to the other body.

Mr. CORBETT. Well, there have been many famous retreats in history.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding and I would like to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania and other members of the committee for bringing this back to us. I believe the question before the House here tonight, on the eve of adjournment, is whether we are going to capitulate and whether we will accept the Senate version being rammed down our throats.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make simply two inquiries:

First, do I understand from the statement of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] in opening this discussion and colloquy here tonight that the congressional pay raise, including automatics, future considerations clause or otherwise, is out of the bill as passed by the other body?

Mr. MORRISON. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Secondly, has there been a promise on the part of the other body or the potential conferees, or the leadership, or any others, that there will be consideration of an additional pay raise next year in the 2d session of the 89th Congress?

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I believe the chairman of the committee of the other body in his speech today on the floor of the other body said that next year the other body would have ample time in which to go into all comparability features of the problem.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me, and I compliment the gentleman.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], before I do yield to him, if the gentleman would not agree that the other body really had ample time in which to act on these features? Was not this bill finally reported and passed here in the House of Representatives about September 13?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, September 30 was the day of its passage.

Mr. CORBETT. But we had been working on the bill practically all year; is that not true?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, this is correct.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, now I would be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and let me say, before we take final action on this, we may not be fair to the Federal employees and honest with the Federal employees, and we are not in this bill but we ought to be fair and honest with ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, before we take action on this matter we ought to know what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, this bill left the House of Representatives as one of the best pay bills that has ever been carefully drafted and sent to the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I was the "father" of it, because it had my name on it, although it should have carried the names of many other sponsors of this legislation.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I was the proud parent. But this bill comes back tonight, as a watered down, toothless, illegitimate, emaciated, outrage. That is about all I can say about it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I am going to deny paternity but perhaps I ought to do so.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the Members of the House another thing about this bill and what the other body has done to us. They have deliberately put us in a situation here tonight where we have to take it or leave it.

First, Mr. Speaker, this is not a compromise. It is a total capitulation. The House of Representatives has been had. We have not had an opportunity to work on it. They have sent it back to us in a situation where we have no choice but to accept it.

Second, Mr. Speaker, this is not a bill that has been written by the Congress. This is a bill that was written by the Bureau of the Budget and the White House. It was passed under pressure and under the threat of veto.

Mr. Speaker, when we accept this monstrosity tonight we have abrogated our function in formulating pay legislation for some 2 million Federal employees.

In this bill, as the gentleman stated a moment ago, in my judgment this great, glorious principle of comparability is dead. Four years ago we said to the Federal employees "This is what we are going to do. Now we have a standard of pay. It is equality with private enterprise." By this bill we postpone any action. The second phase we had for next year would go about one-half the way toward comparability. We say now "Wait until next year. Maybe we will begin to move." I do not think we will then if the actions of this year are any indication.

The next thing we ought to keep in mind is the point about passing a pay bill in an election year. For 10 years we have had a Federal pay bill in every election year. We could have avoided this situation. Now this, too, goes down the drain. Next year we will be back here with a good old election year bill. I can say to the people in the Budget Bureau they will not save any money, because it is going to cost more, it will be a bigger bill, and I will probably support it in light of what has occurred.

One more point. The attempt to make some sense out of keeping the judicial and congressional and executive pay in line with the other pay in the four Federal pay systems has gone down the drain. We did do it in the House when we knocked out the automatic feature to keep it in line with the GS-18 scales. But we did say every 4 years we would take a look at the military pay and other pay systems, and attempt to make some recommendations and keep them in line. The administration wanted this. But the Senate threw this overboard, too.

We tried to adjust some overtime inequities among the classified. This went overboard also. The things we carefully put together over the weeks of study and hearings have been thrown overboard also.

So tonight, if we approve this, we bow to the guidelines. The guidelines are apparently sacred and all important. The guidelines didn't mean anything, however, when we passed the military pay bill. It was a half billion dollars more than the administration recommended, but tonight the Federal employees have to make way for the guidelines.

So I am not at all happy about the bill. I am somewhat like the small-town editor who was asked if he had any opinion on a burning issue and he said, "Well, I have not made up my mind, but when I do I will be bitter."

I have made up my mind about this thing. I am bitter, I guess, but I am not going to object. However, when you go home tonight or tomorrow, and meet with your postal employees, do not brag about this bill. The average letter carrier is going to get about $3 a week increase, although he is entitled to a minimum of $700 a year. As I stated, I am not going to object. Maybe I ought to, but in light of the realities of the situation we ought to know what we are doing tonight.

I think we all will agree with the thoughtful comment of a great statesman that the key to successful legislation is the art of compromise. To be perfectly blunt, what we have done here is substitute capitulation for compromise in accepting the amendment written in the other body that masquerades under the guise of a reasonable Federal Salary Act.

I hasten to say that all the blame should not be placed on that body. There is plenty to go around among the bureaucrats, advisers, and self-styled experts who helped shape the aborted form of H.R. 10281 that was laid before this House—on a take-this-or-nothing basis—in the dying hours of this session of the 89th Congress. The one bright ray in an otherwise dismal prospect is the wise judgment of the House of Representatives in passing H.R. 10281 by an overwhelming vote on September 30.

Our House bill was a good bill, a statesmanlike bill—indeed, a bill that exemplified the art of legislative compromise in its best sense. It was the refined product of careful and extensive consideration in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and thorough debate in the House. No one gained everything asked or wanted, and everyone had to yield something in a spirit of give and take to work the will of the House. The result was an act that was meaningful and encouraging to 1.8 million employees and promised even greater value in the management of the vast affairs of our National Government.

The bill was reported to the House only after careful and exhaustive hearings before our standing Subcommittee on Compensation. The subcommittee members applied themselves with utmost diligence and attention to develop all of the information and evidence needed by the committee and the House to make sound decisions. The subcommittee met in a number of executive sessions, as well as in informal conferences and meetings with both administration and employee representatives, and the committee itself deliberated extensively over a period of 8 days before reporting the bill on a vote of 20 to 3.

Mr. Speaker, Federal salary policy is not only complex, it is critically important to the success of our defense effort and other domestic and worldwide commitments of the Government. It is a matter—like marriage vows—not to be entered into lightly. The determination of a sound and useful salary policy is a thing you have got to give your whole mind to.

Our House bill was a sincere, moderate, and wholly reasonable attempt to move toward comparability between Federal and private enterprise salaries, in accordance with the congressional policy laid down in Public Law 87-793, and to remedy certain long-standing inequities in the pay statutes. I will not say the path was easy or deny that a good deal of courage was required in the face of pressures that were just as heavy here as in the other body. It is to the eternal credit of our Members that the House produced a bill that at least met the minimum standards we were in honor bound to observe. We kept the trust imposed on us when we committed ourselves to the comparability principle 3 short years ago.

Now, I ask, where does our magnificent comparability policy stand in the bill forced on us today? Were all of the great principles of Public Law 87-793 mere platitudes, to lull postal and other Federal employees—to say nothing of Members of Congress—into a false hope that we had finally laid the foundation for a sensible and workable salary system? Is Federal salary comparability, after all, only a myth?

We were happy and proud when our 1962 and 1964 salary bills were hailed as great advances in public administration. Should we take equal shame when we hear this measure described, on all sides, is at best woefully inadequate and at worst a breach of trust and a miserable abomination?

In the House, public hearings were conducted on 11 separate days extending over a period from June 1 to June 29. The subcommittee met in executive session three times over a 7-day period, and the committee met in executive session on July 29, August 3, August 4, and August 5, to perfect the bill finally reported to the House. There were, as I have noted, many other informal meetings between our Members and representatives of the administration and employee groups. I think it is fair to add that the vast majority of my personal time and attention throughout this session has been devoted to this Federal salary legislation.

The committee in the other body, in sharp contrast, held only 2 days of public hearings on the House bill, into which all of the testimony and the views of interested parties were crammed. With this attenuated public exposure the Senate—under harsh threat of veto and unrelenting pressures—struck out all of the carefully prepared House bill and in its place wrote an amendment that leaves the whole subject of Federal salary policy in utter chaos. I forecast, with no hesitancy, that it will work out more to the detriment of the Government—and the taxpayers—than to the employees, whom it also cheats.

In the first place, one of the most obvious practical advantages of the comparability policy adopted in 1962 was its promise of orderly and precise salary adjustments to go hand in hand with those in the private sector, thus avoiding the danger of over-liberal and distorted pay raises enacted during election years under the attendant pressures and influences. With H.R. 10281 in the shape enacted by the other body, no one is so naive as to believe there will not be a pressure-laden salary bill enacted by the Congress next year—with great acclamation.

For another thing, this aborted version of a pay bill is pennywise and pound foolish. Our House bill provided a 4 percent general increase this month, and a second-phase increase a year later that would have averaged out at approximately 4¼ percent, with the latter covering only three-fourths of the fiscal year 1967. With that second-phase raise removed from our bill, and in the light of past experience, it is a foregone conclusion that next year will see a pay raise of 6 percent or more taking effect for the full 1967 fiscal year. The meager four-tenths of 1 percent saving which the Senate amendment purports to achieve will be far outweighed by next year's handsome increase.

But, however those practical aspects may be, the most damaging loss from the striking of the second-phase increase is that it may be the death-knell of Federal salary comparability in our time. One of the great values of the second-phase increase was its movement of middle- and upper-level Federal salaries toward reasonably current comparability with private enterprise salary rates for positions of equal levels of responsibility. The Senate's 3.6 percent increase leaves the lower salary grades and levels roughly comparable with private enterprise rates for February–March 1964, but relegates the middle and upper grades to 1963 and 1962 comparability, respectively. If we are unable to correct even a part of these glaring deficiencies in the middle and upper grades as part of a bill granting but a 3.6-percent general increase, how in the name of logic can we hope to improve the situation next year along with a far more costly general percentage increase?

Mr. Speaker, to this point I have dealt only with the impact of our Federal statutory salary systems of the toothless and watered down version of our pay bill that came back to us today. The crowning irony of the Senate amendment is that, in its blunderbuss efforts to pacify administration objectors, it has not only destroyed comparability, but for all intents and purposes, it has knocked out even those things the administration agrees to or most dearly desires.

The first of these is the Federal Salary Review Commission. John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, appearing before our Compensation Subcommittee, stated:

> The quadrennial reviews by a Federal Salary Review Commission should result in reduction of the time-lag in statutory schedule adjustments, substantial saving of the time of Congress, and more orderly relationships among top Federal salaries, career-level civilian rates, and compensation of the uniformed services.

I agree with Chairman Macy, and the House Members must agree with him since they included this section in the House-passed bill. But the Senate rejected the opinion of both the administration and the House of Representatives.

Next is the perplexing problem in connection with the salaries of Members of Congress, Federal executives, and judges.

In submitting its salary recommendations to the Congress the administration had recommended that we include in our bill a provision that would set up an automatic salary adjustment procedure for the officials on an orderly and timely basis. Our bill, as reported from the committee, modified the administration's proposal but did establish a responsible method of dealing with this problem. It was a well-considered procedure that we are confident would have eliminated the chaos we confront approximately every 20 years when it becomes necessary to jump the salaries of Members of Congress, executives, and judges in a high percentage amount.

Last year the Congress was forced to face this dilemma because of the compression that existed in the statutory salary systems and the Congress was forced to raise the salaries of its own Members, Federal executives, and judges by $7,500. The Congress simply had no choice in the matter.

However, the other body saw fit to reject any proposal in its bill that would attempt to solve the agonizing problem of keeping the salaries of Members of Congress in an orderly relationship with all other salary systems.

Mr. Speaker, it was my earnest hope, and one that I am sure most Members of the House shared with me, that here in the closing days of this session of Congress, we would be implementing and enunciating anew the cherished promise of comparability. The nearly 2 million citizens of this country who have chosen a career of service to their Government have been looking to us for further assurances that they would not be treated as second-class citizens and that they would not have to suffer economically simply because they chose to work for the Federal Government rather than for private enterprise.

Unfortunately, no other conclusion can be reached today than that we have forsaken the promise of comparability and that we have bowed to the expediency of simply granting another across-the-board pay raise.

If we cannot be fair and honest with our Federal employees, we have simply got to be fair and honest with ourselves. We have got to admit our complicity in the collapse of comparability.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?•

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusettts. I would like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana what happens to the pay raise we had in the original bill concerning the members of the Parole Commission?

Mr. MORRISON. The Senate took that out too.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the position of the subcommittee chairman [Mr. UDALL]. I feel precisely the same as he does.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana a question: If this bill is so bad, which I think it is, we had it under consideration over

10½ months. What is wrong with sending this bill back to conference, and staying here another day? We have been meeting 10½ months. One day longer is not going to be a hardship.

Mr. MORRISON. As I say, the bill is not what we want, but I think at this time we have to take this bill or nothing.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. This was my reaction originally. I have spoken as the gentleman from Louisiana has, in the last few hours, to the leaders of the employee organizations who came in here asking and justifying, perhaps, a 6-percent or a 7-percent raise. We put it to them cold turkey—do you want this watered-down bill or do you want to come back next year and try to improve it? It is the recommendation and judgment of the leaders of the major Federal employee organizations that they would rather have this than to go in the other direction. That is the main reason I am taking the position I am taking tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks as I have some more things I want to say about this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in what the gentleman from Arizona just said. This is a bad bill. It is a watered-down bill. I have, as he has, been in touch with the leaders of the postal unions and the other Federal civilian employee organizations. I guess we are going to have to take this or nothing. So I guess we are going to have to take this.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Arizona if it is fair to say that the postal workers and the Federal workers are going to have to pay part of the bill for the war on poverty in Appalachia?

Mr. UDALL. This is precisely the case. We have increased Federal spending this year by some $4 or $5 billion. No one raised these guidelines when these bills were up. But the guideline question came up and the brunt of it all is borne by the Federal workers who already are 3 to 5 years behind the pay scales in private industry. This is the thing I do not like about it.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. I want to tell my colleagues the true story of what has happened in the State of Pennsylvania. In 1913 the first workmen's compensation act was passed in the State of Pennsylvania. Every 2 years in the biennial session of the State legislature a modest increase was asked for in the workmen's compensation act. But certain very good friends of the workingman always tried to double or triple the amount of benefits that were asked for. So for 20 long years not 1 cent of increase was ever given to the workingman of Pennsylvania because when their friends—their real friends—wanted to give them a little, some of their enemies wanted to give them too much—and so for 20 long years they never got anything.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Folks, the hour is getting late. I think we ought to get back to the real central point. The real central point is that we only have one thing left that we really can support and that is the annual review of the salaries and wages of Federal employees. However, my dear friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall], does not like this bill. I want you to know I dislike it more than he does. But I do like the proposition—and it is a good proposition—that we are going to establish a precedent tonight that we are going to review the wages and salaries of Federal employees just as often—and not more often—but just as often as they are reviewed in private employment.

So while I do not like the terms of this bill, I am going to support it. I recommend everybody here now—let us take it. Then let us follow the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall] again next year when he calls his committee together and we will review the whole situation all over again. Please vote for this bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias] for what he promises will be the shortest speech of the session.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, to what has been said by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Corbett], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall], and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen], I merely say, "Amen."

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say finally that these gentlemen have told us one thing one time and another thing another time. I hope next year they will be able to tell us which time they mean it and which time they do not mean it.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, a man—or a woman—is worth his pay. As much so in government as in private employment. From the recitals which we have heard on the floor tonight of the changes made by the Senate in the bill which passed the House, apparently at the instigation of the Bureau of the Budget, little remains of the carefully thought-out work of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall] and his colleagues.

The Senate version appears to meet with universal condemnation by the members of the House committee. Yet we are urged to accept it with the alternative being no bill at all.

I raise no objection solely because the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Morrison], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall], and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] indicate their judgment that the Senate amendments should be accepted.

My own judgment is that it should not be done but we should refuse to concur in the Senate amendments and request a conference. Though everyone in the House is anxious to adjourn, similar conditions must and do exist in the Senate; the same pressures that affect us here tonight will, likewise, affect them. In any event, anxious as I am to adjourn, I do not want to adjourn such an outstanding session on a sour note, leaving behind us a job which we know is not well done. For my part, I am prepared to stay in session until this matter is not just resolved but resolved properly. I recall the late, great Ambassador Stevenson's reply to the Russian delegate during the Cuban confrontation where he said words to this effect: "I am prepared to sit here till Hell freezes over waiting for your answer." I am prepared to sit here for a similar period while we negotiate a satisfactory compromise to this disagreement over the Federal pay bill rather than capitulate, simply to adjourn.

I am constrained, nevertheless, to bow to the judgment of the gentleman from Arizona and to follow, not the leadership of the Bureau of the Budget nor the leadership of the Senate, but the leadership of our own House who have spent infinite amounts of time and study on this matter. I do so, however, with regret.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Morrison]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the pay raise bill that we have just discussed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO WAIT UPON THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 623) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 623

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as Members of the committee on the part of the House to notify the President the gentleman from Louisiana Mr. Boggs, and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 49 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 49

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (66 Stat. 204; 8 U.S.C. 1251):

A–8249034, Pilch, Jan.
A–4291563, Placzkiewicz, Stanley James.
A–12358710, Hoy, Hom Fook.
A–2563752, Ninomiya, Issaku.
A–4291730, Palumbo, John.
A–5972279, Rieger, Ferenz.
A–4262857, Rosen, Morris.
A–7962109, Tomczak, Michael.
A–1149855, Bohun, Sil.
A–5829164, Gricus, Franciskus.
A–4986241, Jiminez-Gomez, Rafael.
A–11199183, Kong, Dunn Chong.
A–11928583, Louie, King Fong.
A–4169178, Mejia-Cortes, Anacleto.
A–1614102, Rosenberg, Ben.
A–13165748, Wong, Wing Art.
A–4705363, Lubin, Irving.
A–3840332, Sanchez-Monroy, Jose.
A–5055592, de la Trinidad-Berroteran, Jesus.
A–1565564, Vargas-Barrera, Pedro.
A–7930331, Altman, Nathan.
A–7222730, Bach, Harry.
A–10162061, Goon, Phillip Que.
A–12360130, Som, Tom.
A–5848373, Arroyo-Olague, Pedro.
A–6777333, Cornez, Edward A.
A–4360830, Pulido-Hernandez, Julie.
A–3925714, Sobona, Karl.
A–13020489, Suey, Fun Jung.
A–6008514, Vda De Delgado, Antonia Rios.
A–5399916, Pospasil, Rose Antoinette.
A–5621715, Remenyfy, Alajas Aladar.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATION FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE VICTIM OF CRIMINAL ASSAULT

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the victim of a crime is in a very real sense a double victim. He is attacked by the assailant, often brutally beaten, left senseless by the criminal, stripped of his possessions, his body battered and torn. At times, there is death or permanent injury to one who supports a family or is responsible for the care of children.

The assault victim also loses in another way. Society, which takes upon itself the responsibility of repressing crime and prosecuting those who violate its law, at present shows little concern for the victim of the mugger, the rapist, or the murderer. Too often, the only interest in the victim is that he is in good enough condition to be a possible witness in a prosecution.

While the criminal is given every protection of the Constitution and the law and free legal counsel—if he needs it, the victim is afforded little, even though it is he who has suffered the most.

The distinguished Senator Yarborough, of Texas, has introduced legislation to better balance the values of police protection and constitutional rights for the accused and community care for the victim. The theory under which this legislation is introduced—to compensate the victims of crimes of violence for injuries to the person—is fairly new in this country. Great Britain and New Zealand already have compensation plans, and the State of California recently embarked on such a program. The distinguished Senator from Texas, Mr. Yarborough, has introduced similar legislation.

Compensation plans have the backing of some of the Nation's most distinguished jurists. As former Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg pointed out, the victim of a violent crime "has been denied the protection of the laws in a very real sense, and society should assume some responsibility for making him whole."

This legislation proposes setting up a Federal Violent Crimes Compensation Commission, a three-man tribunal chosen for their legal prowess, which would consider the claims of those who suffer physical injuries during the commission of crimes. The Commission will decide if the victim is actually an innocent party and it will determine the level of compensation. In setting the compensation the Commission will provide only for actual medical costs suffered by the victim, including rehabilitation services involved. In the event of a murder, the victim's dependents would be paid, but in no event would the compensation exceed $25,000. A victim of a crime of violence, to receive compensation, would have to give notice of intent to submit his claim within 1 month of injury. The Commission would set up the standards of evidence. There would be no appeal from the decision of the Commission.

Such a law, it seems to me, is the very least that we can do for those who innocently suffer from the wanton assaults of those who have no respect for law or authority—or who decide to take the law into their own hands. So far, society has shown little concern for those who pay the most. There are the days lost from work, the medical costs of recuperation. There is the pain and suffering. There may be years of physical and psychological torment. It is hoped that in a small way this bill can start the national effort necessary to insure that victims of crimes are protected by society and returned to their jobs and families as quickly and painlessly as possible.

I am introducing similar legislation to Senator Yarborough's on this, the closing day of the 1st half of the 89th Congress, hoping that some staff work will be done during the recess and that the attention of the committee can be directed to it early next year.

MILTON J. SHAPP, PENNSYLVANIA INDUSTRIALIST AND PUBLIC SERVANT, SPEAKS ON THE PROPOSED PENN-CENTRAL RAILROAD MERGER

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when my friend, Milton Shapp, a successful businessman with a heart, speaks or argues on a matter of public concern, I generally have but one observation to make—he is a serious student of whatever he undertakes and the public interest is his.

Yesterday, he appeared before the Interstate Commerce Commission, to argue against the proposed Penn-Central Railroad merger. I have not studied firsthand this most involved question. At this moment, I cannot even say whether I believe Milton Shapp is right or wrong in his viewpoint. I do know that he is now and will always remain a singular businessman.

He knows the value of business profit. He also knows the profit that comes from correctly evaluating that which affects all our daily lives. This includes economics that are affected by such gigantic joining together of two giant transportation systems such as the Pennsylvania Railroad with the New York Central Railroad.

The Washington Post this morning ran a story which mentioned Milton Shapp's testimony as well as that of Leon Keyserling, the chief economist of former President Harry Truman, as well as Joseph J. Saunders, who spoke for the Justice Department.

With permission of the House, Mr. Speaker, I include Milton Shapp's testimony and the Washington Post article:

ORAL ARGUMENT BEFORE THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, BY MILTON J. SHAPP, OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

(Finance Docket No. 21989, Pennsylvania Railroad Co., merger, New York Central Railroad Co., Finance Docket No. 21990, Pennsylvania Railroad Co., stock issuance, October 21, 1965)

During the past 15 years I have visited almost every community in Pennsylvania, devoting considerable time to studying the problems of the Commonwealth and working on plans to redevelop its failing economy. For the last 3 years I have followed closely the proposals advanced by the PRR–NYC railroads to merge their companies, and have analyzed in depth the effect such a merger would have upon the economy of the Commonwealth.

Since I have been allocated only a few minutes to outline my strong views of oppotion to the PRR–NYC merger application before this Commission, please pardon if I substitute brevity for modesty, and state firmly that I doubt if any organization, institution or any other individual has gathered as much material on this subject or studied the economic aspects of the problem in the depth that I have.

I have submitted four separate documents into the record of this docket. Copies of these are before you. They include:

1. My direct testimony before the Examiners, contained in the pamphlet entitled "PRC+NYC Spells Economic Ruin for Pennsylvania," (S–96).
2. "New Growth—New Jobs for Pennsylvania," which is listed as exhibit H–104 in the record.
3. Exceptions to the recommended report.
4. Reply to exceptions.

I have also placed before you a copy of a letter written by me on June 14, 1963, to Dr. Charles Potter, who was chairman of the transportation subcommittee of the Governor's Council of Business and Industry.

Much of the data to support the views I express in this statement are contained in these five documents. If the Commission should desire clarification of any of this data or any additional evidence to substantiate the statements I am about to make, I shall be glad to furnish this material.

MERGER GREAT THREAT TO PENNSYLVANIA

The proposed PRR–NYC merger is the greatest single economic threat facing the Commonwealth today—greater than any other single event it has faced in the past. It will have serious adverse impact on all businesses in the State—manufacturers and Main Street merchants alike. It will virtually cripple the port of Erie and seriously handicap the port of Philadelphia in its unending battle with Baltimore and New York for general cargo.

The drastic curtailment of freight service throughout Pennsylvania contemplated by the applicants, combined with the ensuing reduction in service by independent carriers, that will of necessity follow in the wake of the merger, will seriously reduce transportation in the Commonwealth. I state without any reservation whatsoever, that not only will Pennsylvania lose many of its existing employers, but future industrial redevelopment for most areas of our State can be written off.

Despite a 56-month sustained national boom, Pennsylvania is still in the grip of a serious economic crisis. Bureau Employment Security statistics reveal there were 7,044 fewer employers in Pennsylvania in July 1965 than in December 1962.

In "New Growth—New Jobs for Pennsylvania" (exhibit H–104), the history of Pennsylvania's economy is traced from the beginning of the 20th century. Chart No. 3, on page 5 of that report shows how Pennsylvania's employment as a percentage of national employment fell steadily between 1900 and 1960.

The map on page 19 of "New Growth—New Jobs for Pennsylvania" shows that 11 States had a lower rate of population growth than Pennsylvania between 1940 and 1960. Pennsylvania's downward trend is still continuing. Chart No. 20 which is attached shows that between 1960 and August of 1965, employment in Pennsylvania continued to trail that of the Nation and the adjacent Eastern industrial States of New York, New Jersey, Maryland, and Delaware. Since 1960 Pennsylvania has slipped to 48th in the Nation in rate of population growth, with only Iowa and West Virginia trailing.

In charts 1 through 18 (which are attached to this document) compare Pennsylvania's rate of population growth between 1957 and 1965 with that of the Nation and with the surrounding Eastern States, and shows clearly how badly the Commonwealth fares in this respect.

Even more serious, the bottom six charts (see attached) show that while the size of the national labor force and that of our eastern neighbors is increasing steadily, Pennsylvania's labor force is declining.

The recommended report in this docket makes the assumption that because of the decline of economic growth in the eastern district of the United States, that eastern railroads face a serious continuing decline in business in the future. The examiners profess their inability to understand the reasons for this decline in eastern district growth (report, p. 195–199).

On page 27 of my exceptions to the recommended report, I show clearly that prior to 1960 the failure of the eastern district to grow apace with the other areas of the Nation was due fundamentally to the economic decline of Pennsylvania.

The series of 21 charts attached to this document show clearly that since 1960 other major Eastern States are growing with the Nation, and that if there is any lag now in economic growth of the eastern district this is still due to the dismal state of economic affairs within the Commonwealth.

PENNSYLVANIA LACKS TRANSPORTATION

One of the main reasons Pennsylvania has slipped as an industrial power and is continuing to fall behind the Nation, is its failure to maintain the competitive forms of transportation required to support modern industry. Between the mid-1920's and 1958, highway construction in Pennsylvania lagged 15 to 20 percent behind the Nation. It is still too low to meet modern needs. Only two major river development projects have been completed in Pennsylvania since the Civil War. Strange as it may seem, only two airports in this State of 11,500,000 people—at Pittsburgh and Philadelphia—are capable of handling modern high-speed jets.

And ever since World War I, the railroads of Pennsylvania, built primarily to carry minerals and products for the steel industry, have been contracting both passenger and freight service to communities throughout the State.

Transportation is the lifeline of industry. Pennsylvania at this hour needs a major transportation building program, yet it is faced with the PRR–NYC merger which would strip away its vitals. The merger would be Pennsylvania's coup de grace.

The merger plan calls for increasing operating efficiency of the applicants by diverting all freights trains originating west of Columbus, Ohio from the PRR to the NYC tracks up to Cleveland and Buffalo, thence over the water level route through New York's Mohawk Valley to Selkirk, just below Albany. The Mohawk Valley tracks will be improved in order to operate these trains at 60 mile minimum speeds. At Selkirk, the through trains would be split and various cars sent to their destination in New England or to New York City or northern New Jersey down the east or west banks of the Hudson River.

On page 122 of the recommended report the examiners say:

"The construction of the yard at Selkirk is the single most significant change in terminal operations and, in essence, is the key to the merger program."

This is the key that locks the door of doom in Pennsylvania's future. Although the applicants claim that only 31 daily freight trains will be diverted from Pennsylvania and that the tonnage carried in Pennsylvania will be reduced only 20 percent over the main line between Pittsburgh and the East, 26 of the 31 trains to be diverted are the general cargo and merchandise trains that Pennsylvania needs if it is to attract the modern industries so essential to maintain employment. (See p. 24, S–96; also read my letter to Dr. Potter for a more detailed description of the 31 trains being discontinued in Pennsylvania.)

My calculations shown at the bottom of page 12 of S–96, indicate that this contemplated diversion of about 10 million annual freight miles of traffic from PRR to NYC tracks, represents a slash of about 35 to 40 percent of daily freight trains now serving Pennsylvania communities. The examiners in the recommended report attempt to minimize the effect of the traffic diversion and claim it would result in merely a 9-percent reduction in the number of through trains operating in Pennsylvania. Be it 9 percent or be it 35 percent or 40 percent—this initial reduction in freight service to a transportation-starved State such as Pennsylvania can only result in making the State a less desirable place in which to either transact business, to continue business, or to inaugurate new business.

The bulk of the trains remaining in service between Pittsburgh and the East will be carrying coal, ore or steel products, so that Pennsylvania will be right back where it was earlier this century with its main transportation service devoted almost exclusively to the steel and coal industries.

However, this time Pennsylvania's problem is much more complicated than in previous years. Now the steel industry is preparing to pull a large portion of its production—and traffic—from the Commonwealth, as new, more efficient steel plants begin operation in Ohio, Illinois and Indiana.

So, Pennsylvania is faced with the dual prospect of having general cargo trains diverted through New York State and a declining volume of the bulk traffic it formerly owned. The present PRR main line east of Pittsburgh reduced to secondary status by the merger, would eventually become nothing more than a glorified spurline in the giant PRR–NYC combine.

ADVERSE IMPACT OF MERGER ON PHILADELPHIA PORT

In the October 17th Sunday Philadelphia Bulletin, Mr. Frederic Potts, president of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce described the grandiose new plans to rebuild Philadelphia's port facilities. He said:

"The prosperity of Greater Philadelphia rests on waterborne commerce. The port has been a most important factor in stimuating industrial development, employment and tax revenues.

"Since World War II, the port has had a substantial increase in total tonnage but this boost has been only in bulk cargo, things like oil, iron ore, and coal. The picture for general cargo—this is the packaged goods which produce so much employment in the port—has been gloomy. That category has gone downward."

With all general cargo trains originating in St. Louis, Cincinnati, Chicago, Indianapolis and all other cities west of and including Columbus, Ohio; with all interchange freight carried by the merged PRR–NYC railroad from cities on the west coast, from Denver, Omaha, etc. scheduled to be routed through New York State and thence to the Ports of Boston or New York, the PRR–NYC merger can spell only disaster for Philadelphia's future port activities. Promises to the contrary that may have been made to the chamber of commerce, port, and city of Philadelphia officials by PRR officers are in direct variance to the operational plans submitted by the railroad to this Commission.

NORTHWEST PENNSYLVANIA TO BE SEVERELY HARMED

In addition to the diversion of all East-West traffic through New York State, the operating plan of the PRR–NYC calls for the elimination of all freight service between Pittsburgh and Erie through Pennsylvania. Hereafter shipments from Pittsburgh will be routed via Youngstown and Ashtabula and thence to Erie, with Ashtabula replacing Erie as the main port on Lake Erie. Already, the PRR is closing down its iron ore and coal docks operations at Erie in preparation for this move.

The PRR–NYC merger would leave all of the Northwest area of Pennsylvania served by nothing but spur lines.

However, much worse is in store for Pennsylvania. The initial reduction of freight service created by the PRR–NYC merger would be but the beginning of a long series of further service cuts, many of which would occur rather quickly. The examiners in the recommended report recognize that almost all of the independent railroads serving the Commonwealth, particularly the Erie-Lackawanna, the Lehigh Valley, the Reading, the Central of New Jersey, and the Delaware and Hudson would be harmed by the diversion of freight and would find it necessary to reduce service to the Pennsylvania communities they serve. It is also certain that the Pittsburgh and Lake Erie and Western Maryland (particularly if the latter were to be controlled by the C&O) would suffer severe losses in service if the PRR–NYC merger should be consummated.

Attempts to "save" the independent railroads operating in Pennsylvania by merging them into the PRR–NYC, the N&W system or the newly proposed N&W–C&O offer no solution to the problem. Stockholders and bondholders of these independent railroads may salvage part or all of their investments. But there is no assurance, in fact there is little likelihood, that if these independent lines were to become merged into larger carriers, that service would be improved or even offered at present levels to Pennsylvania's communities.

REASONS FOR MERGER NEED ARE SPECIOUS

Thus, on the premise that the PRR–NYC merger is needed because eastern economic growth does not match national growth and therefore the future operation of eastern railroads is imperiled, the State that has been the drag on the eastern economy would be squeezed dry of vital transportation service and would sink to even lower economic depths. What is being suggested is that the way to get out of a hole is to dig it deeper.

The further irony of this situation is that the applicants claim their future is gloomy because highway, water and air services are heavily subsidized by the Government, and yet they plan to strip rail service in Pennsylvania where these other competitive services have been minimal.

To all of this, the examiners close their eyes. They view the economic chaos to be created in Pennsylvania by the PRR–NYC merger as having no bearing on the public interest.

On pages 281, 282, and 283 of this report, the examiners state:

"* * * viewed in light of our basic authority as circumscribed by law, we find no foundation to consider such arguments (economic factors) and proposals in determining whether the merger is or is not in the public interest.

"It is eminently clear that * * * the level of employment in a given area * * * bear(s) no relationship to transportation, nor can we find any provision of the act or in its legislative history that permits us to measure the impact of the proposed merger in relationship to such effects upon economic, political, or geographic areas or individual businesses located therein."

Will Rogers once remarked that you can always tell when large sums of money are at stake. That is when people start talking about the public interest. In view of the tremendous economic stakes involved, it is perhaps important to examine the public interest aspects of this merger in substantive fashion.

A BROADENING VIEW OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Over the years concepts of public interest evolve and change. Witness today's attitudes toward education, welfare, civil rights, civil liberties, and many other facets of American life which have altered under the impact of growth and change in the Nation.

Congress and the executive branch of the Government in 1940, looking back upon 10 years of deep depression, considered underutilized industrial capacity as an economic danger. They conceived programs "in the public interest" to reduce capacity to meet existing demand levels even though these levels were depressed below the needs of the people. Little pigs were slaughtered and plowed under to prevent cluttering the marketplace.

No wonder, when Congress drafted the 1940 act, it looked upon existing railroad overcapacity as a serious menace to rebuilding the economy of our country. Had not about two-fifths of our railroads gone into receivership or bankruptcy during the decade of depression?

And so, in its wisdom and within the framework of concepts of public interest that existed in 1940, Congress passed the Transportation Act that established guidelines to reduce rail capacity—guidelines that govern the pending application of PRR–NYC railroads to merge.

In essence, Congress decreed in 1940 that the public interest would be served if:

1. Workers of merged railroads received job protection of some sort.
2. Competing carriers were not harmed.
3. Sufficient operating savings could be projected for the merged companies.
4. Rail transportation would at least not be impaired below existing levels, and, if possible, improved.

Within a year the United States was at war. Suddenly, instead of overcapacity in the railroad industry, great expansion of rail service was required.

Postwar economic conditions of the Nation changed so dramatically that not for 17 years after the Transportation Act of 1940 has been passed—virtually as an emergency measure—would the management of any railroads seek to merge under its terms.

Since then, numerous mergers have been proposed, of which (until last week) the PRR–NYC was the largest.

Although the transportation law controlling mergers is that of 1940, America has undergone many changes in the intervening period. All laws in a democracy are living documents. Public interest concepts must be interpreted by modern guidelines. As our postwar economy has expanded, so have our concepts of living; and our concepts of government and its role in relation to people.

The conditions that guided Government under Coolidge, Hoover, and even Roosevelt no longer apply, and all Government agencies—including the Interstate Commerce Commission—must be guided by these changing concepts in their interpretation of policy.

A whole series of laws has been passed since the end of World War II that reflect the changing concept of public interest and our Government's role in protecting, enhancing and furthering the public interest.

In 1946, in the Employment Act of 1946 Congress declared:

"* * * it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government * * * to promote maximum employment, production and purchasing power."

With the passage of this law it became national policy for the Government to help build greater demand for products to increase gainful employment rather than to stand by and permit (or actually assist) reduction of capacity to meet depressed demand levels.

In 1961, Congress went further in redefining and shaping concepts of public interest. The first bill signed into law by President Kennedy established the Area Redevelopment Administration. Congress declared:

"* * * that the maintenance of the national economy at a high level is vital to the best interests of the United States * * * and that the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic redevelopment; that Federal assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in areas needing redevelopment should enable such areas to achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies * * *."

In 1962, the concept of public interest was again broadened in passing the Manpower Development and Training Act. Congress declared:

"* * * that it is in the national interest that current and prospective manpower shortages be identified and that persons who can be qualified for these positions through education and training be sought out and trained as quickly as reasonably possible in order that the Nation may meet the staffing requirements of the struggle for freedom."

In 1964 Congress passed the Economic Opportunity Act which stated boldly:

"It is, therefore, the policy of the United States to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty in this Nation * * * The United States can achieve its full economic and social potential as a Nation only if every individual has the opportunity to contribute to the full extent of his capabilities and to participate in the workings of our society."

Then in March 1965, Congress went far beyond even these concepts, when it passed the Appalachian Regional Development Act:

"The Congress hereby finds and declares that the Appalachian region of the United States (of which Pennsylvania is a part) while abundant in natural resources and rich in potential, lags behind the rest of the Nation in its economic growth and that its people have not shared properly in the Nation's prosperity. The region's uneven past development, with its historical reliance on a few basic industries and a marginal agriculture, has failed to provide the economic base that is a vital prerequisite for vigorous, self-sustaining growth * * * It is, therefore, the purpose of this act to assist the region in meeting its special problems, to promote its economic development, and to establish a framework for joint Federal and State efforts toward providing the basic facilities essential to its growth and attacking its common problems and meeting its common needs on a coordinated and concerted regional basis. * * * As the region obtains the needed physical and transportation facilities and develops its human resources, the Congress expects that the region will generate a diversified industry, and that the region will then be able to support itself, through the workings of a strengthened free enterprise economy."

As the major part of this law, under title XII, the Federal Government has undertaken to build over 2,000 miles of highways (plus access roads) in the Appalachian region. It recognizes clearly that existing transportation facilities, built to handle the needs of now-declining industries, can never provide the basis for bringing new industries into the area if economic redevelopment is to be successful.

Then, a few weeks ago Congress passed the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to:

"Provide a means by which certain areas of the Nation which are lagging behind the general economic growth of the Nation can be helped to improve their physical and social structure and thereby stimulate economic growth."

The legislative history of this latter bill is extremely important as it bears on the instant matter of the merger application of the PRR–NYC railroad.

In his report to the Senate, Chairman McNamara of the Committee of Public Works stated:

"The full potential of the Nation's economy cannot be realized as long as there exist numerous areas where the economic growth rate is substantially behind national averages * * * instead of contributing to the total public good these areas detract from national welfare and prosperity."

Further, and of greatest significance, his report stated: "* * * that once an area is bypassed, its chances of recovery diminish as the tax base diminishes, its people begin to move out, investment evaporates, commercial activity dies out, community services and facilities became inadequate and inertia sets in * * * and who moves out? Generally it is the young people seeking better opportunity and those who can afford to move. What happens? The tax base is reduced below the critical level at which existing scale of community institutions can be sustained."

A description of what is happening in present day Pennsylvania could hardly be stated more precisely.

It is obvious that the effects that would be created by the PRR–NYC merger are drastically opposed to the public interest concepts expressed by Congress since World War II. The limited scope under which public interest determinations are defined by the examiners in their recommended report and as interpreted by the Commission in previous merger decisions must be thrust aside.

The National Transportation Policy, formulated by Congress "* * * requires the Commission to promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service * * * to foster sound economic conditions in transportation * * * to the needs of commerce of the United States."

It is crystal clear, that today, the needs of commerce in the United States must help fulfill the goals set forth by Congress to stimulate economic growth; to help rebuild depressed or underdeveloped areas of the Nation; to increase industrial expansion and employment opportunities.

This Commission cannot approve a railroad merger that would strip away vitally needed transportation facilities in the third largest state of the union and by so doing further reduce economic levels, employment and industrial redevelopment opportunities for over 11,500,000 people in direct opposition to the announced public policy of this Nation to build "The Great Society."

ANTITRUST ASPECTS OF THE MERGER

Lastly, I should like to deal with the subject of monopoly and the antitrust implication of the proposed merger.

The recommended report fails to delineate the manifold antitrust aspects of the merger. The report grudgingly concedes that the PRR–NYC merger may lessen competition and couples that with the declaration that this is not part of the Commission's concern; and, in addition, that antitrust policy cannot fully function in the rail industry. The conclusion is inescapable, therefore, that the report is at most only giving lip service to the legal requirement that consideration must be given to antitrust policy.

True, the report states the general conclusion that antitrust considerations are outweighed by merger benefits, even though the report completely fails to make a real analysis of the antitrust consequences. I cannot understand how anyone can say that item A is outweighed by item B if he has failed to make any determination as to the depth and scope of item A; and talks only about the depth and scope of item B. You can weigh "B" from today until tomorrow, but you can't say it outweighs "A" if you haven't weighed "A." It is most obvious that the recommended report has no sound foundation for claiming that purported benefits of the merger outweigh antitrust considerations.

A second point with respect to antitrust deals with references in the recommended report designed to meet the purported "failing enterprise" exception to the Clayton Act. The cases are discussed in many of the briefs, but the reason for that exception has no application to these proceedings.

No one can reasonably claim that the Pennsylvania Railroad or the New York Central will just have to go out of business if this merger is not approved, since it cannot be said that these going concerns cannot stay in business. Hence, the failing business doctrine does not apply and cannot be used to justify the merger.

On the other hand, there is no doubt that approval of the PRR–NYC application for merger would create the greatest monopoly since Lenin, Trotsky, and Stalin amalgamated all Russian industry under single management. It would give the new Penn Central railroad a death grip over all heavy industry, particularly in Pennsylvania, and over all shippers attempting to reach national markets. The directors and officials of the PRR–NYC Co., although not elected by the public, would have more power to determine future economic policies of Pennsylvania and of its towns and cities than the Governor or any other elected officials. Day-to-day decisions, setting of tariffs, rates, schedules, and utilization of rolling stock would accomplish this effect without the need for overt use of power.

For make no mistake about this. Despite any conditions that might be imposed by this Commission, once the merger were consummated, almost every shipper in the Commonwealth—and in many other States—from steel company to soap producer would be at the complete mercy of the PRR–NYC railroad.

This Commission in its wisdom—in consideration of all the facts and factors involved—has but one decision to make in this case. The application of the PRR and NYC railroads to merger must be denied.

Enclosures.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 22, 1965]

"FAIRY TALE" ECONOMICS HIT AT MERGER HEARING

(By Frank C. Porter)

Leon H. Keyserling charged yesterday that "upside-down assumptions" of continued national economic stagnation and constant or declining freight revenues are responsible for the recommendation to merge the Pennsylvania and New York Central Railroads.

Instead, the freight volume, operating income and net profits of both roads have risen substantially, making the analysis of two Interstate Commerce Commission examiners read "like a fairy tale," said Keyserling, former President Truman's chief economic adviser.

Keyserling's attack came during the second and final day of oral arguments before the full ICC on the examiners' recommendation. A final decision is expected early next year.

If approved, the combined road would be the Nation's largest and the third major system in the East. The other two, the B. & O.–C. & O. and the Norfolk & Western complex are products of earlier mergers.

"The eastern district can and will support four major rail systems," said Joseph J. Saunders, of the Justice Department, in reiterating his agency's opposition to the Penn Central combine. The merger, he said, would "be contrary to the public interest and must be denied."

Milton J. Shapp, a Philadelphia businessman and Pennsy stockholder, told the Commission the merger would compound Pennsylvania's economic troubles by stripping the State of much of its main-line freight service. "What is being suggested is that the way to get out of a hole is to dig it deeper," he said.

Contending every shipper in the State would be at the mercy of the Penn Central, Shapp said, "There is no doubt that approval of the PRR–NYC application for merger would create the greatest monopoly since Lenin, Trotsky, and Stalin amalgamated all Russian industry under single management."

Of 32 witnesses in 2 days, Shapp, Saunders, and Keyserling were the only ones who opposed the merger per se. The only other dissent came from those who wanted the plan delayed or amended to protect smaller railroads and insure certain service.

On Wednesday attorneys for the roads asked quick approval of the plan to avoid "deterioration of the eastern railroads' financial status and ability to compete."

Keyserling, representing six Pennsylvania towns and cities, contended the "deterioration" theme has been proved "egregiously wrong" by the dramatic turnaround in the fortunes of the two railroads since 1961.

Since then combined net income for the two roads has risen from a deficit of $9 million to after-tax profits of about $65 million annually on the basis of the first half of 1965, he said. And combined ton-miles of freight have risen 22 percent, about in line with projections he made before the examiners 2 years ago, in contrast to forecasts of a 6.5-percent drop used in the examiners' report, said Keyserling.

THE PASSING OF ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL SALVADOR A. ANDRETTA

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was with a very heavy heart that I replaced the receiver of my telephone last Monday afternoon after having been informed that my good friend Hon. Salvador A. Andretta, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Justice Department's Administrative Division, had just succumbed to the rare muscular disease for which they had been treating him at the National Institutes of Health. On Wednesday morning it was my sad privilege to attend the requiem mass said for him at St. Matthew's Cathedral.

The responsibilities of heading the Administrative Division of the Department of Justice are involved and many, but Sal Andretta performed them with great distinction. As chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations which considers the budget requests for the Department of Justice, I shall miss his frank and thorough presentations before the subcommittee. I shall miss him as a personal friend.

Sal faithfully served his fellow man for about 30 years in the Department of Justice. Fifteen of those years were as the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Administrative Division—a tribute in itself.

I am sure that all who knew the late Sal Andretta share to some extent in the sorrow felt by his lovely wife, their two sons, and his mother. I take this opportunity to again offer my deepest sympathy and condolence to them.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I should like to include the following article published in the New York Times of Wednesday, October 20, regarding the late Assistant Attorney General:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 20, 1965]
1965]

S. A. ANDRETTA, 67, JUSTICE AID, DIES—ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL BEGAN SERVICE IN 1935

WASHINGTON, October 18.—Salvador A. Andretta, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Justice Department's Administrative Division died today at the National Institutes of Health. He was 67 years old, and had been ill for several months with a rare muscular disease.

Mr. Andretta was born in Hartford. He receiver a bachelor of arts degree from Dartmouth College in 1920, and a law degree from Yale University in 1923. He joined the Justice Department in 1935.

He is survived by his widow, Mrs. Patricia Collins Andretta, and two sons, Daniel B. of Casper, Wyo., and Gage of Rumson, N.J.

PLEADED FOR LESS PAPER

A notion of what it meant to be Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Administrative Division was suggested in an article in the New York Times magazine in 1963 by Theodore Irwin.

The writer said that "to the flood of memoranda, letters, reports, and sundry communications that inundates governmental desks in Washington a querulous missive was recently added" by Mr. Andretta.

"The Department," wrote Mr. Andretta in his memorandum to heads of departmental divisions and offices, U.S. attorneys and Marshals, "is being drowned in paper. The introduction of copying machines has created a monster that is feeding on itself. The growth in the use and number of copies is fantastic. It seems now that we have gone from the sublime to the ridiculous and that apparently everything is being copied by machine. The practice of typing an original document and then reproducing it on a copying machine must be discontinued."

SOUGHT MORE MARSHALS

In 1952, when the Justice Department sought money from Congress to recruit and equip more deputy U.S. marshals to strengthen law enforcement in Alaska, Mr. Andretta told a House Appropriations Subcommittee that Alaska was then much like "the old pioneer days when the only law west of the Pecos was the U.S. marshal."

"West of the Pecos," a river in Texas and New Mexico, was a phrase used at the turn of the century to describe the wild, mountainous region of the west tip of Texas.

Mr. Andretta served in the Navy in World War I. From 1926 to 1931 he was vice president and a director of the Riverside Trust Co., Hartford.

In 1935 he became Special Assistant to the Attorney General, in 1944 Executive Assistant, in 1945 Administrative Assistant, and in 1950 Assistant Attorney General in Charge of the Administrative Division.

APPROVAL BY COMPTROLLER SAXON AND FEDERAL RESERVE OF CHASE MANHATTAN BID TO ACQUIRE STOCK OF LARGE BUFFALO BANK CLEARLY ILLEGAL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, twice in the same week it has become necessary for me to denounce on the floor of this House outrageous violations of clear congressional intent as expressed in our banking laws. This past Monday I brought to the attention of my colleagues in the House the disclosure that commercial banks appear to be making clear headway to reenter the securities business from which they have been banned for over 30 years. Commercial banking and investment banking were separated by law in 1933 because of the disclosure of shocking abuses which had resulted from affiliations between banks and their stock operations.

Today I rise to protest a different but equally harmful maneuver which can only result in undermining our dual system of privately owned and freely competitive independent banks.

Although the law is perfectly clear that national banks may not purchase the stock of other corporations (12 U.S.C. 24 (Eighth)) this is exactly what Chase Manhattan proposes to do in taking over the Liberty National Bank & Trust Co. of Buffalo, N.Y., a huge bank in its own right with over a third of a billion dollars in resources.

What is so discouraging, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that instead of protecting the public interests first and foremost in their bank supervisory decisions the banking agencies, in this case the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Reserve Board, appear to be more interested in serving the wishes of the big banks of the Nation. Time and again I have brought attention to my colleagues in the House the shocking conduct of the banking agencies in issuing invalid regulations obviously in response to big bank pressures.

The way these agencies conduct their supervisory activities is an affront to Congress and betrayal of a public trust. How much longer we will stand for this is the question I raise today. The situation has become so serious that I have taken the liberty of communicating with Attorney General Katzenbach, expressing my views and requesting that the Department of Justice consider taking action, in this case under its authority to enforce the antitrust laws as well as to protect violations of the National Bank Act.

My letter of October 21 to the Attorney General follows in its entirety.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
October 21, 1965.

Hon. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
The Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KATZENBACH: I am deeply concerned by press reports that the Chase Manhattan Bank, National Association, is proposing to acquire stock in the Liberty National Bank & Trust Co. of Buffalo, N.Y.

I am, therefore, requesting your personal attention to this matter because of the adverse and far-reaching effects on the future course of commercial banking in the United States, particularly with respect to maintaining privately owned and competitive independent institutions.

Chase Manhattan is a giant corporation with assets of approximately $14 billion and does business throughout the State of New York, although its actual banking offices are located in the metropolitan area only. Liberty National is a small bank in comparison to Chase Manhattan, yet it too is one of the very largest banks in the State of New York. I, therefore, raise the question of the application of the stock acquisition provision in the Clayton Act which provides that any such transaction, the effect of which "may be substantially to lessen competition and to tend to create a monopoly," is unlawful.

As the Government official charged with the responsibility to prosecute violations of the National Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as well as the antitrust laws, I also ask you to consider the legal question raised by 12 U.S.C. 24 (Eighth) clearly stating that national banks are not authorized to "purchase * * * shares of stock of any corporation." In fact, Congress has found it necessary to incorporate in 12 U.S.C. 24 (Seventh) an express authorization permitting national banks to invest in a corporation organized to conduct a safe deposit business. Furthermore, there is the long line of judicial precedents to the effect that national banks are competent to invest in the stock of other corporations only to the extent that such investments temporarily serve to enable these banks to minimize or avoid losses on outstanding loans. (*Charlotte First National Bank* v. *National Exchange Bank* 92 U.S. 122 (1875); *Commonwealth Trust Co.* v. *First-Second National Bank of Pittsburgh* 260 Pa. 223; 103 A. 598 (1918).)

It would seem that the proposed acquisition by Chase of any stock of Liberty is clearly a violation of the law, entirely apart from the antitrust question.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE PHARR MUNICIPAL BRIDGE CORP. TO CONSTRUCT, MAINTAIN, AND OPERATE TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10779) to authorize the Pharr Municipal Bridge Corp. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Pharr, Tex., with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SELDEN, FASCELL, MCVICKER, MAILLIARD, and GROSS.

REDUCTION OF GOVERNMENT EXPENSES

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House, to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, because of the great burden being placed on the Federal budget from both the Vietnam war and the necessary but costly new domestic programs, it has become even more important that we concentrate every effort toward reducing needless expenses throughout the Government.

Those in the Government who have been able to cut costs deserve to be brought to the attention of both Congress and the people for their commendable work.

I would like to point out such a person. Mr. Frank Memmott, the acting director of the Bureau of Mines, through careful financial management and budgetary control, has set an example for other departments to follow.

Mr. Memmott was educated at Brigham Young University, at the University of Idaho and the University of Geneva. His experience is in administration. Mr. Memmott learned much through his Utah background, particularly how to save and cut costs at every turn. He has achieved an excellent record of trimming costs in the Bureau of Mines, particularly in the area of travel expenses.

By careful and constant supervision of all Bureau travel, Acting Director Memmott was able to reduce the Bureau's travel costs some 11 percent for fiscal year 1964. Even more impressive was his feat of reducing the 1965 fiscal year travel expenses a full 23 percent; which was a savings of more than $171,800 for the year.

The Members of Congress, and the American taxpayer, owe Frank Memmott our commendations for his fine work.

MISUSE OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House, to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Daniel Webster once referred to Congressmen as "Sentinels on the watchtower of liberty." The statement is more than good rhetoric. It is an expression of one of the most enduring realities of American political life. Our Founding Fathers well understood that the function of Congress was not alone to enact laws. It was also to serve as an effective countercheck against the abuses and excesses of executive power. By its very nature, the vast Federal bureaucracy, numbering over 2½ million civilian employees, can seldom be expected to prune its own vineyard. It would run contrary to human nature for a man to set into motion self-destroying reforms. To believe otherwise, is to believe in miracles.

Years of experience have demonstrated that Government functionaries, when confronted with in-house scandals, have had a tendency to sweep them under the rug of tight Government censorship. Unless the most extraordinary measures are resorted to, the taxpaying public will never know the facts, and inefficiency, waste, and corruption involving billions of dollars will go unexposed.

To be sure, there are exceptions. History furnishes us with occasional examples of heroic souls who fly in the face of their own self-interest, and expose what needs to be exposed, regardless of the consequences. But these examples are so infrequent as to offer no guarantee, by themselves, of a scandal-free bureaucracy.

So this is where the Congress must come into the picture. It is not that Congressmen are necessarily freer from taint than other members of the Federal Establishment, although I believe that their record of performance can stand up favorably under scrutiny. It is that Members of Congress, being answerable to the people and only to the people, are beholden to no hierarchial superior. They have no "establishment" which the ethics of their employment relationship require them to defend; no "boss" to whom they must toady for favors. As nearly as it is possible for responsible men to be free, they are free: free to inquire, to praise, or to condemn, as the circumstances require.

As a member of the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives, and, more particularly, of the Government Information and Foreign Operations Subcommitte, I have a deep interest in the manner in which Uncle Sam's dollars are being used. My investigation has convinced me that many of those dollars have been misspent.

It is my purpose to make public the results of some of the investigations recently conducted by the General Accounting Office, all of which are unclassified. I do this because I feel that unless such exposure is made, the facts will remain concealed, our money will be wasted, and our costly lessons will remain unlearned.

It is for this reason that I rise today. I wish to point out to both the Members of Congress and the people of our country a series of incidents that have been both wasteful and foolhardy. Moreover, these incidents occurred despite specific congressional instructions designed to prevent their occurrence. The agencies involved seem to have deliberately flouted the wishes of Congress.

The incidents I refer to involve four major development projects built with assistance from the United States for the Central Treaty Organization countries in the Middle East.

Funds obligated for assistance under the four projects totaled about $28.7 million. This was part of a total of about $33.3 million provided by the United States to CENTO member countries for various regional projects sponsored by CENTO, beginning at the initiation of the aid program in 1957, and extending to June 30, 1962.

The United States is not a member of CENTO but has supported its purposes and has participated on its committees. The current alignment of CENTO countries succeeds the Baghdad Pact Organization, created in 1955 by Turkey, Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, and the United Kingdom, for collective regional defense, as well as improved internal security and joint regional economic development, for purposes of restricting the advance of communism in the Middle East. After the revolutionary coup of July 1958, Iraq withdrew from the organization, and the headquarters were moved from Baghdad to Ankara, Turkey.

United States economic and technical assistance to CENTO began in 1957 under Public Law 85-7, which authorized the President to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance for the development of economic strength and national security.

In May and June 1957 the International Cooperation Administration, later succeeded by the Agency for International Development, entered into agreements with the governments of Turkey, Iran and Iraq for the construction of four communications projects among those countries. These projects consisted in a Turkey-Iraq highway, a Turkey-Iran highway, a Turkey-Iran railway and a 3-country telecommunications system.

Specific instructions were given that these projects should be activated when it was demonstrated that they were economically feasible and beneficial to the development of the three named countries, and to the advancement of communications among them. In all cases, both the letter and the spirit of the authorizing congressional enactments required that funds be spent in accordance with the strictest rules of sound financial management.

The record is clear that such rules were not followed. Furthermore, Congress was misled as to the nature and the progress of the projects during the course of their development.

Since the questionable aspects of the various development projects need to be considered individually, I here enter the statements contained in the General Accounting Office Report, No. B-146849 and dated March 5, 1964. I again point out that this report is open and nonclassified. It is specifically a general report to the Members of Congress.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our examination disclosed several basic deficiencies in the four major projects previously noted and in their administration. With respect to the highway and railway projects, sufficient consideration was not given to local resources with the result that more than $8 million of grant and loan funds obligated for these projects was not required because the recipient countries had adequate equipment, productive capability, and engineering skills to construct these projects. These unrequired funds were used for purposes other than those for which they were originally obligated and for financing the import of commodities which were already available or could be produced locally.

The economic need for the highway and railway projects as programed was so dubious that they were considerably cut back and that, except for one of the highways, they no longer had the characteristics of regional benefit required to qualify for financing under the Agency's prescribed requisites. Moreover, the highways were being constructed to much lower standards than originally programed.

The annual presentations to the Congress on the foreign aid program gave a more favorable picture of the progress of the highway and railway projects than was actually the case and did not sufficiently disclose unusual and significant circumstances of these projects.

More than $8 million of grant aid for the telecommunications project was obligated long before it could be used as a result of which most of the funds were immobilized for almost 2 years.

INADEQUATE CONSIDERATION OF LOCAL RESOURCES

Grant and loan funds aggregating more than $8 million were obligated for the highway and railway projects to finance imports of commodities and services which were already available or could be produced in the recipient country, and thus the funds were not needed for these projects. As a consequence, $2.2 million of grant funds obligated for the highways was diverted therefrom and released for nonproject use by Turkey thereby supplementing aid provided under the regular country assistance program and resulting in erroneous reporting to the Agency management and to the Congress on the use of these funds; $1.9 million of grant funds originally obligated for the railway project to finance external engineering and construction supervision, for which it was found that Iran had adequate skills, was given to Iran as a cash grant to finance local currency costs; most of the construction equipment for which $1 million of loan funds was released for a segment of the railway in Turkey will be delivered after the segment has been substantially completed; and $3.4 million of loan funds for the same segment of the railway was released to finance the import of track material which could have been produced in Turkey.

The record indicates that some of the above actions of the agency were taken to alleviate frictions in political relations with the recipient countries growing out of discussions of the availability of local resources and the economic feasibility of the highway and railway projects.

AID claimed that the $2.2 million and $1.9 million of grant funds were obligated on the basis of commitments made in the light of special political circumstances then existing in the Middle East and that subsequent diversion of these funds to other purposes was in the United States interest. AID further stated that the loan funds ($4.4 million) were not obligated on political grounds but were approved after application of regular Agency review procedures.

DOUBTFUL ECONOMIC NEED FOR HIGHWAY AND RAILWAY PROJECTS DELAYED AND CURTAILED IMPLEMENTATION

There was not reasonable assurance that the highways and railway were economically feasible. Because little traffic was expected, the highways were being constructed to lower standards than originally planned. The refusal of Iraq to commit itself to any financial outlay and that country's withdrawal from the Baghdad Pact removed any reasonable prospect that the Iraq segment of the Turkey-Iraq highway would be constructed; the Turkish segment, when and if completed, will terminate at a river which is the natural boundary between the two countries. The Turkey-Iran railway project—a link of 272 miles—was deemed economically unjustified and only portions thereof—62 miles in Turkey and 37 miles in Iran—are being constructed. These sections when completed will leave a gap of 173 miles between the railway systems of the two countries. As conditions presently exist, only one project—the Turkey-Iran highway—has the regional characteristics of linking transportation between the two countries.

The approval to proceed with these projects in spite of their doubtful economic need—particularly with respect to the Turkey-Iraq highway as Iraq, from the beginning, refused to assume any financial obligation and later withdrew from the Baghdad Pact—appears to have been warranted principally, if not solely, as the fulfillment of political commitments and then only if it was found that these projects could not have been substituted for by other regional projects of higher economic merit.

Construction of the highways lagged considerably behind the utilization by Turkey of the aid funds initially obligated for them and subsequently authorized for commodity imports. The commitment by the United States of aid in stated amounts for the highway projects while the costs to be borne by the recipient countries were left for subsequent determination was not consistent with acceptable programing standards and was disadvantageous to the negotiating position of the United States particularly in view of the several issues which attended the implementation of the highway and railway projects.

With respect to the highway projects, AID emphasized that the basis for the commitment of the funds for these projects was primarily political rather than economic. AID also pointed to certain economic and military considerations in favor of these projects; however, the Agency's evidence on these considerations was not persuasive. Regarding the Turkey and Iran railway segments, the Agency contended that the two segments were justified on separate bilateral bases. We believe these segments to be ineligible for financing on such bases since the criteria for financing CENTO projects require that they advance regional economic cooperation.

SUBSTANTIAL GRANT FUNDS OBLIGATED LONG BEFORE THEY COULD BE USED

In May 1957, grant funds in the amount of $8.4 million were obligated for a regional telecommunications system to link the member countries of the Baghdad Pact, although it was evident at that time that the project could not be implemented beyond the preliminary survey for a long time. As a result, about $8.1 million was tied up unproductively for almost 2 years before the scope of the system was defined and specific cost estimates were made on the basis of the preliminary engineering survey. Before the survey was completed, an additional commitment of $10 million was made by the then Secretary of State to this project. Extended controversy over the type of system to be used and difficulties with construction bids and specifications delayed award of a construction contract until September 1961.

AID stated that the funds were obligated for foreign policy reasons with full recognition that the funds would not be disbursed for construction until engineering was completed. The Agency said that the obligation served a foreign policy objective of the former president's program at that time.

INCOMPLETE AND INACCURATE DISCLOSURE TO THE CONGRESS OF HIGHWAY AND RAILWAY PROJECTS

Mr. KING of Utah. The most distressing aspect of this entire series of incidents, however, concerns the failure of the agencies to keep the Congress properly informed about the progress of the projects supported by U.S. aid funds.

The annual statements to congressional committees concerning proposed mutual security programs have not disclosed the unusual circumstances and problems which attended the highway and railway projects outlined above.

Moreover, the statements covering fiscal years 1960 and 1961 indicated that the aid provided for these projects had been more effective than it actually was.

I present five examples of inaccurate reporting to Congress concerning these problems.

First. The statements for both fiscal years 1960 and 1961 indicated that good progress was being made on all three highway and railway projects. These reports were given although, as indicated earlier, the construction of the Turkish segment of the Turkey-Iraq highway had only reached its initial stages in April 1962, and the Iraq segment showed no prospects for being constructed. In April 1962, the Turkish segment of the Turkey-Iran highway was not expected to be completed before the end of the 1962 construction season; and the project for a completed 272-mile link of the Turkey-Iran railway had been determined to be economically infeasible. Construction of those partial segments which were decided to be built was not begun until May of 1962.

The General Accounting Office concluded that this state of affairs did not justify the optimistic reporting given to the Congress of the United States, as above indicated.

No indication had been given to Congress that these problems had been encountered, and changes occurred, and the impression had been erroneously made that everything was on schedule and according to plan.

Second. None of the statements mentioned that the $2.2 million obligated to finance the purchase of equipment, supplies, and services for the Turkish segment of the two highway projects had been diverted to nonproject financing for Turkey's own benefit. Furthermore, the presentations did not disclose that these highways would be constructed according to much lower standards than were contemplated in the project agreements.

Third. None of the presentations disclosed that only one of the projects—the Turkey-Iran highway—served the purpose of linking the transportation systems between two or more nations within a region, despite the fact that the funds were originally authorized by Congress for the express purpose of improving communications between the countries in the CENTO alliance.

Fourth. There was no indication given to Congress that the nature and amount of contribution by the recipient countries for the highway projects was to be determined at a later date, although the amount of the U.S. contribution was specifically fixed in the agreements. This whole procedure showed faulty management on the part of the AID mission, and could only result in agreements which were, in the long run, more expensive for the United States.

Fifth. Although the 1962 statement to Congress referred to a $2 million grant to finance the Iran section—136 miles—of the entire rail link, no indication was given that over $1.9 million originally obligated to finance foreign exchange costs in connection with that project was found to be unnecessary for that purpose and was turned over to Iran as a cash grant. Only 37 miles of the railway in Iran were finally completed.

Members of Congress must agree that it is absolutely imperative that it receive full and accurate information from all agencies if it is to function properly.

In fact, the House Committee on Government Operations said quite clearly in a report issued in May 1957 concerning the budget information and presentation practices of the International Cooperation Administration:

> The Congress must be supplied with all information which will permit it to judge the size and character of foreign aid components and the effectiveness of ICA in accomplishing foreign aid objectives.

It is the refusal to follow this explicit directive that most distresses me. It is this which should distress all Members of Congress and every taxpayer who expects Congress to keep a careful watch on the foreign aid program which our country is now administering.

I do not think that any business as large as the U.S. Government can be expected to operate without making mistakes. It is true, we are dealing here with millions of people and billions of dollars, and mistakes are to be expected. But mistakes must not be allowed to go uncorrected.

That is why Congress must constantly perform its duty to the American taxpayer by ascertaining and correcting the errors and misjudgments of the functionary who otherwise would have little incentive to periodically clean his own house.

The ICA, predecessor to AID, was specifically charged by statute with the responsibility of giving complete information to Congress concerning the programs it administered. In addition, the Comptroller General has officially notified AID repeatedly that existing practices involving both mismanagement and incomplete disclosure must be discontinued.

I am not satisfied that this has been done. Even though ICA was instructed to furnish complete information to Congress about its activities, it failed to do so. In fact, in answer to inquiry from the General Accounting Office in March 1964, the AID office replied that it was "not the custom to report such diversions of funds" as were reported above in the CENTO projects. The fact that it is "not the custom" does not make it right. I submit that it should "become the custom" to keep Congress constantly informed.

I do not here question the wisdom of the general foreign aid program. Numerous examples can be given to show its success in combating and containing world communism, and in improving the living conditions and the economic prospects for many people of the world. But I cannot tolerate evidence that the Congress and the American people are being misled about the effectiveness of these aid programs.

AID officials have further reported that many of the decisions reached concerning the CENTO aid projects were required as a result of the political developments in the CENTO countries. This may be the case. Congress must, however, be given complete information concerning these political developments, and the steps needed to be taken to meet them.

Congress must always be kept abreast of international developments. When foreign activities involve financial outlays by the United States, Congress must understand them completely and must give its approval to all significant changes.

I am writing to the Secretary of State to ask for a complete explanation of the CENTO incidents. I am also asking for assurance that this kind of inaccurate and incomplete reporting to Congress will not continue.

It is only by unremitting vigilance on the part of the Members of Congress that our Nation can retain the strength necessary to remain, as it now is, the greatest and most effective exponent of freedom throughout the world.

THE APPROPRIATION BILLS, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tables and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it is standard procedure at the end of the business year for every company to close its books, draw off a trial balance of the accounts, render a profit and loss statement and a balance sheet, and submit an interpretative evaluation of the results to the management and to the stockholders. It is a necessary procedure, and equally appropriate to the business of Congress. Following longstanding custom, I am submitting a résumé of the appropriations business in this 1st session of the 89th Congress and some statistics and commentary on certain related fiscal matters. Interim, periodic résumés have been supplied to the House in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on some eight or nine occasions during the session.

Preliminary to that, Mr. Speaker, may I say that some distinguishing things mark the work of this Congress. We have had a great year this session. The President has provided magnificent leadership. No President in history has had such a remarkable batting average with his legislative program. It has been a highly productive session—productive of perhaps even more new legislation than was enacted in what someone called the energetic 2d session of the 88th Congress. Too productive, in the opinion of some; probably not enough so, in the opinion of others.

New legislation is the principal source of seed for the proliferation of the Federal domain of activities and the consequent enlarged appropriations; the two go virtually hand in hand. More and larger authorizations for new programs, new activities, new endeavors are straws in the wind and barometers of things to come. And not untypically, much of last year's new legislation calls for higher appropriations this year just as this year's enactment of new programs will generate even higher calls next year.

Of course, the almost unbroken record—and this extends as far back as the early days of the Republic—is that growth of the country and its population and changing conditions more or less automatically generate demands for new legislation and higher public service expenditures at one level or another. And national security, the high cost of preparedness, as well as the economic costs of current military efforts and past wars, whatever the necessary price, take first priority and bulk large in the total picture.

Big budgets are a political fact of life. And big spending is not inherently bad; much of it is essential. It is useful to a good perspective in this connection to consider that nearly 75 percent—it has been even higher in some recent years—of today's Federal budget spending is for broad functions engaged in by the Government from the beginning—national defense, conduct of foreign affairs, the postal deficit, aid to veterans, interest on the debt, internal revenue operations, and administration of justice and alien control.

Moreover, in a government by majority, what will satisfy one may dissatisfy another; what one may regard as a highly desirable or even essential undertaking another may regard as only desirable at best—and therefore dispensable—or even wasteful, or wrong. Interests and philosophies have a way of influencing our perspectives; where one stands can determine to a large degree what one sees.

While we as a Nation have an overabundance of problems, and have been in the process of legislating in abundance to deal with them, we do not, unfortunately, have an overabundance of money. There never is enough public money to cover all of our wants and not always enough to cover our needs. Therefore, some choices have to be made. Somebody has to draw a line between what the country stands in need of and what it can afford. And making choices and drawing lines means some exercise of restraint, some denial.

Nearly everyone agrees that the President has presented an ambitious program—too ambitious for some. A look at the record reveals that in some respects Congress has gone far beyond the President's recommendations in supporting certain programs. It would seem that the outer spending authorization limits called for by the President's ambitious program would have been just that—the outer limits. But not so. Several examples are pertinent to the consideration of appropriation totals because authorization bills are the forerunner of appropriation requests, the beginning point in the legislative spending process. No authorization, no appropriation. No appropriation, no spending.

Congress outdid the President in regard to programs for medicare, antipoverty, housing, economic development, higher education, and military pay. I believe there are others.

In the antipoverty program, the President recommended $1.5 billion for fiscal 1966. Congress authorized $1.785 billion. But Congress actually appropriated only $1.5 billion.

The President's general housing legislation involved about $6.4 billion but the bill Congress enacted involved some $8.2 billion—some of which is back-door spending.

Under the economic development program Congress authorized $760 million for fiscal 1966 as against $510 million in the administration's bill. But the actual budget appropriation request was $393 million which we further reduced to $332 million in the closing supplemental appropriation bill.

The President's military pay raise recommendations were estimated at about $447 million annually but the bill finally enacted was more than double—$991 million annually.

Of course, all decisions of the House and of the Congress find their sustenance and their root in the attitudes of the people. A majority of the Congress tends to follow the path which a majority of the people seem to favor—"government by the people" at its classic best, or sometimes its classic worst, depending on one's point of view.

But regardless of the prevailing philosophy or the wisdom or lack of wisdom of some of these actions and programs, it is, I think, undeniable that we as a nation have, over the last 20 years or so, considerably relaxed our standards of admissibility for new governmental programs and activities.

In consequence of such considerations, the appropriations rise, and as they do, the actual expenditures, which in due course of time ensue, also inescapably rise. Increased Government spending is a phenomena so predictable as to constitute a third dimension of the law of inevitability. And it knows no party lines. President Eisenhower put it well in his message on the budget for 1960:

> Inescapable demands resulting from new technology and the growth of the Nation, and new requirements resulting from the changing nature of our society, will generate Federal expenditures in future years * * *. We must not forget that a rapidly growing population creates virtually automatic increases in many Federal responsibilities.

It is a relentless thing, reflecting the relentless growth—for the better or for the worse—of centralized government in response to the demands of a majority of the people. Enough new legislation has been adopted to probably bring the historians to judge the 89th Congress one of the most significant and noteworthy since 1789. Costs sometimes seem to be a secondary consideration.

There is no ground swell of sentiment for fiscal restraint from across the country—certainly I have not seen strong indications of it. And the authorization bills do not reflect it.

There is, in fact, considerable unanimity on the objectives of much of the new legislation. The dissents and the apprehensions arise more from such questions as what levels of government should undertake the programs and what techniques and policies should be followed.

Nor was there great dissent as measured by the votes on final passage of the appropriation bills in the House. Of the 17 bills considered during the session, 8 were adopted on rollcall votes and 9 otherwise. Only 1 of the rollcall votes registered in excess of 100 in the negative—that was the Foreign Assistance bill, always somewhat unpopular. Another drew 100 negative votes; another 62; another 60; another 41; 2 others, 7 each; and the regular annual defense bill, none. I seek not to be political but only factual in citing these votes; final passage votes are one indicator of the strength of sentiment about the course and direction of Federal affairs.

It is generally pertinent to note that one of the distinguishing features of the President's budget, submitted last January, was that it proposed to spend a smaller proportion of the GNP—gross national product, the measure of goods and services produced by the economy—than was the case last year or the year before. In fact, it proposed the smallest proportion in 15 years—a little below 15 percent of the GNP. It is pertinent to note that through both Democratic and Republican administrations in the last 10 or 12 years the spending budget, while climbing, has ranged around 16 percent or so of the gross national product. For example, in fiscal year 1955—the year of President Eisenhower's lowest expenditure budget—the figure was just over 17 percent of GNP.

SCHEDULING AND ACTION ON THE BILLS

Mr. Speaker, getting to the main business at hand, all regular appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1966 were scheduled to clear the House before July 1 under a program developed in cooperation with the leadership and announced by the committee earlier in the session. A similar schedule met with such good reception last year that we thought it well to repeat it. As shown in the schedule following, all except two of the regular bills went through on schedule; in both cases, they were held up because of delay in enactment of the related authorization bills which under the rules precede the appropriations.

We hope to be able to follow a similar plan in the next session, and to improve on this year's performance.

Congress seems tending to long sessions. We do not now adjourn "on time." For years Congress has failed to get most of the appropriation bills signed into law by the beginning of the fiscal year on July 1. Perhaps study ought to be given to the desirability of changing the Government's fiscal year to a calendar year basis.

The regular annual appropriation bills for fiscal year 1966

Bill	Original reporting schedule (Mar. 10, 1965)	Revised reporting schedule (May 18, 1965)	Reported to House	Passed House	Passed Senate	Final congressional action
District of Columbia	Mar. 18	----------	Mar. 18	Mar. 23	June 22	July 13
Interior	Mar. 25	----------	Mar. 25	Mar. 30	May 26	June 15
Treasury-Post Office	Apr. 1	----------	Apr. 1	Apr. 5	June 8	June 28
Labor-H.E.W	Apr. 29	----------	Apr. 29	May 4	Aug. 5	Aug. 17
Independent offices	May 6	----------	May 6	May 11	July 13	Aug. 5
Defense	May 13	June 18	June 17	June 23	Aug. 25	Sept. 21
Agriculture	May 20	----------	May 20	May 26	July 13	Oct. 21
Legislative	May 20	June 3	June 3	June 8	July 12	July 21
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	May 27	----------	May 27	June 1	Aug. 12	Aug. 24
Military construction	June 3	June 10	Aug. 6	Aug. 10	Aug. 20	Sept. 21
Public works	June 10	June 17	June 17	June 22	Aug. 23	Oct. 15
Foreign assistance	June 17	June 24	Sept. 2	Sept. 8	Sept. 23	Oct. 5

NOTE.—A special Labor-H.E.W. supplemental and the usual "end-of-the-session" supplemental, for which no reporting dates were shown in the schedule, are not listed.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ACTION ON THE BILLS

The committee, in all bills of the session—both in deficiencies and supplementals for fiscal 1965, as well as in bills for the current fiscal year 1966, considered budget requests for appropriations, submitted by the President, of $105,486,336,365—a sum nearly $8 billion more than the committee was asked to consider in the session last year. The total divides between fiscal years as shown on tables I am inserting and in fact includes $926,000,000 advance funding on three programs for fiscal 1967. And to this total must be added, for a complete picture of appropriation totals, the so-called permanent appropriations that recur automatically under prior permanent law—principally interest on the national debt—tentatively estimated in the budget last January at $12,270,000,000 but which could go higher when it is later reestimated by the Treasury.

The 50-member Committee on Appropriations cut the funds requested by the President in connection with every bill of the session except for a special supplemental for additional funds for Vietnam. The aggregate committee cut was $2,624,009,365—divided $242 million, plus, against 1965 supplementals and $2,381 million, plus, in the 1966 bills. Committee totals are traditionally the most conservative, the lowest of any stage of the legislative consideration. Though the committee tends to be relatively conservative, being a creature of he House and part of the House, a majority of the members tend to follow the majority sentiment of the whole House.

Thus, the affirmative, though more restrained, response by the committeee to many of the enlarged applications for appropriations to give substance to new and expanded undertakings earlier authorized by the House.

SUMMARY OF HOUSE ACTION ON THE BILLS

The House accepted the money figures recommended by the committee in 13 of the bills and made changes in the other 4—2 were reduced slightly and 2 were raised. The net change was small—an increase of $41,115,000.

As sent to the other body, the 17 bills totaled $102,903,442,000, an aggregate reduction of $2,582,894,365 from the President's budget requests submitted to the House.

As with the committee bills, the total of every bill except a special Vietnam supplemental was below the corresponding requests of the President. In virtually every session within memory—and in every modern session without exception in the case of the traditional appropriations process—the Congress, usually on initial recommendation of the Committtee on Appropriations, finds itself in disagreement with the President on appropriation requests. This session was no exception. We did not agree with the amount of many of his budget requests, a circumstance wholly in harmony with our independent legislative responsibilities. Independent evaluation and judgment on these budget requests by the Congress is imperative in keeping with our responsibility to the taxpayers.

SUMMARY OF SENATE ACTION ON THE BILLS

Customarily, the Senate must consider larger budget amounts than does the House. The President not infrequently sends supplemental requests directly to that body after the House has acted. That was the situation on several bills this year, and the amounts in two instances were quite substantial. Total budget requests for appropriations considered in the Senate during the session were $109,448,074,896, some $3,961,738,531 more than the House.

The bills as passed by the Senate—reflecting significantly the direct supplements to it—totaled $107,912,532,034—$5,009,090,034 above House totals. Many supplements not considered by the House were included by the Senate. Noteworthy to a better perspective of the large Senate increase are two items: $1,700,000,000 added to the defense bill toward our efforts in Vietnam, and $1,035,000,000 in the Treasury bill for additional subscription capital to the International Monetary Fund. The Senate also added $926,800,000 above the House bill as additional reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation capital structure. And of course the necessity of a terminal date on admission of additional estimates to the House committee so as to permit the closing supplemental bill to come to the House floor caused the Executive to send a number of supplemental requests to the Senate.

Otherwise, the increases above the House are somewhat characteristic; the Senate usually tends to more generous allowances, but it did, this year, depart from the pattern by cutting the foreign assistance bill below the House amount.

SUMMARY OF FINAL CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON THE BILLS

Conference totals are nearly always compromised somewhere between the House and Senate positions—some give, and some take. The whole complex range of governmental endeavor comes to a focus in the appropriations process and inescapably invokes compromise in the resolution of differences.

The session bills tentatively aggregate $107,037,566,896 in appropriations, an overall reduction of $2,410,508,000 below the budget requests of $109,448,074,896. To this must be added, for a complete picture of the appropriations situation, the so-called permanent appropriations, tentatively estimated in the January budget at about $12,270,000,000 for fiscal 1966 giving, in all, for the session, tentative total appropriations of $119,307,566,896, which breaks down about as follows.

1. For fiscal 1965, but during this session, including $700,000,000 for the war in Vietnam, and $1,035,000,000 for the IMP in the 1966 Treasury bill	$5, 562, 564, 000
2. For fiscal 1966, including the tentative permanent appropriations amount	112, 819, 003, 000
3. For fiscal 1967, advance funding for airport, mass transit, and urban renewal grant aids	926, 000, 000

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS UNDER PRIOR LAWS

Mr. Speaker, permanent appropriations for the fiscal year 1966 were tentatively estimated in the January budget at about $12,270,000,000. Likely, upon reestimation, they will be higher. Interest on the national debt is by far the largest and only a fractional variation in interest rates in refunding portions of the debt can substantially affect the ultimate interest cost. Other items—some 75 in number—include such activities as disposal of surplus nonbasic agricultural commodities, administration of the National Wool Act, wildlife management and improvement projects—duck stamp fees and taxes on certain sporting goods—interest on Internal Revenue refunds, payments to States from certain receipts of the National Forest, and sundry other purposes identified in the annual budget. These automatic appropriations flow from basic laws carrying permanent arrangements enacted in years gone by. Congress is not required to reenact them in the annual bills each session. But they are a charge upon the Treasury, just as are the annually enacted appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I include a summary of the session appropriation totals:

Summary of totals of the appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 1st sess., to Oct. 22, 1965

[NOTE.—Treasury loan authorizations, roughly approximating $900,000,000, are not in this summary. Nor are undetermined "backdoor" appropriations. Nor are permanent appropriations not requiring action in the session, roughly approximating $12,270,000,000]

	All figures are rounded amounts		
	Bills for fiscal 1965	Bills for fiscal 1966	Bills for the session
A. House actions:			
1. Budget requests	$4, 668, 000, 000	$100, 818, 000, 000	$105, 486, 000, 000
2. Amounts in bills passed by House	4, 418, 000, 000	98, 485, 000, 000	102, 903, 000, 000
3. Reduction below corresponding budget requests	−250, 000, 000	−2, 333, 000, 000	−2, 583, 000, 000
B. Senate actions:			
1. Budget requests	4, 722, 000, 000	104, 726, 000, 000	109, 448, 000, 000
2. Amounts in bills passed by Senate	4, 558, 000, 000	103, 355, 000, 000	107, 913, 000, 000
3. Reduction below corresponding budget requests	−164, 000, 000	−1, 371, 000, 000	−1, 535, 000, 000
4. Above House amounts in these bills	+139, 000, 000	[1] +4, 870, 000, 000	[1] +5, 009, 000, 000
C. Final actions:			
1. Budget requests	4, 722, 000, 000	104, 726, 000, 000	109, 448, 000, 000
2. Final amounts approved	4, 528, 000, 000	[2] 102, 510, 000, 000	[2] 107, 038, 000, 000
3. Comparisons—			
(a) With corresponding budget requests	−194, 000, 000	−2, 216, 000, 000	−2, 410, 000, 000
(b) With corresponding fiscal 1965 amounts		+3, 660, 000, 000	
(c) With bills of the last session			+13, 238, 000, 000

[1] Include two unusually large budget items not considered originally in the House: $1,700,000,000 on the Defense bill and $1,035,000,000 on the Treasury bill (this latter item being classified as a supplement to fiscal 1965 rather than a fiscal 1966 appropriation).

[2] Include $926,000,000 for fiscal 1967 (grants for airports, mass transportation, and urban renewal.)

TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Total appropriations of all kinds—those in the annual bills and the permanent appropriations, all of which constitute a license to draw on the Treasury—have exceeded $100 billion in each of the last four sessions as shown below:

The 87th, 2d (1962)	$102, 661, 536, 000
The 88th, 1st (1963)	103, 798, 634, 000
The 88th, 2d (1964)	[1] $106, 070, 110, 000
The 89th, 1st (1965) (tentative)	119, 307, 567, 000

[1] Subject to slight revision.

Thus the aggregate net appropriation increase, this session over the session last year, is approximately $13,238,000,000. This is, as stated, on a session basis. On the more frequently used fiscal year basis, the fiscal 1966 appropriation amounts of $112,819,003,000—including permanents on a tentative basis—are only about $3,660,000,000 above corresponding fiscal 1965 amounts. Substantial supplementals made in this session, but for the fiscal year 1965 that closed on June 30—midway the present session—affect the comparisons, and when joined with the adjusting facts that the 1966 bills include fiscal 1967 advances for certain programs, and in one case a large item marked as a 1965 supplemental, account for the large difference between the two comparisons of $13.2 billion-plus on a session basis and $3.6 billion-plus on a fiscal year basis.

Mr. Speaker, the following tabulation identifies the major areas accounting for the increase of $13.2 billion in appropriations this session over the session last year:

Nature of increases in appropriations in this session over the session last year, 89th 1st versus 88th, 2d

[In billions of dollars]

Appropriations, 88th Congress, 2d session (including tentative amounts for permanent appropriations)	$106.1
Selected major programs:	
Education (mainly elementary and secondary education; higher education; and defense education)	1.3
Welfare (mainly public assistance and maternal and child welfare)	0.7
Health (mainly heart, cancer, and stroke including regional medical centers; waste treatment; drug abuse control; air pollution including solid waste disposal; hospital construction; and staffing for community mental health centers)	0.4
Housing (includes urban renewal; rural housing insurance; water and sewer grants; rehabilitation loans; open space; and public housing)	0.6
Economic Opportunity (antipoverty)	0.7
Economic development (formerly area redevelopment, accelerated public works, and Appalachia aid)	0.3
Appalachia (fiscal 1965 supplemental—see preceding item)	0.3
Mass Transportation (includes $130 million advance funding for 1967)	0.2
Land and Water Resources	0.1
Highway Beautification	0.1
Subtotal	4.7
International funds:	
Contribution to International Monetary Fund (of which only $258.7 million was expected to be spent)	1.0
Contribution to Inter-American Development Bank	0.5
Public Law 480 and other foreign export programs	$0.2
Subtotal	1.7
Special-use fund financing:	
Repayable advances to Highway Trust Fund	0.2
Past obligations of the Commodity Credit Corporation (restoration of capital)	2.3
Appropriation to eliminate "backdoor" financing of urban renewal (includes $725 million advance funding for 1967)	1.5
Small business loan capital	0.4
Subtotal	4.4
Department of Defense ($2.4 billion for southeast Asia buildup, offset in part by fiscal 1966 budget decreases in procurement)	0.2
Veterans	0.4
Post Office (mostly pay increases)	0.5
Interest on the public debt (tentative, subject to revision)	0.3
All other miscellaneous (many scattered increases; some decreases)	1.0
Subtotal	2.4
Net increase in appropriations in this session over the session last year	13.2
Appropriations, 89th Congress, 1st session (including permanent appropriations, the amount for which are subject to revision)	119.3

For the benefit of those who may try to make direct comparisons of these totals with the President's January budget appropriation requests—more commonly called "new obligational authority"—we should say that such direct comparisons are precluded by historical conceptual differences. New obligational authority is a budget term not quite the same as "appropriations" although with a few exceptions they are synonymous. The largest single difference is the postal deficit. The budget tabulates only the net postal deficit, whereas we count as appropriations the gross amount of the appropriations. Other principal differences are appropriations to liquidate previously granted contract obligational authority; reappropriations; and loan authorizations. The differences are not vast but they do preclude simple direct comparisons.

FISCAL 1965 BUDGET PERFORMANCE

Mr. Speaker, the old axiom that credit should be given where credit is due has applicability to the performance of the executive branch in administering budget affairs of the Government during the fiscal year 1965 which closed this past June 30.

A distinguishing feature of the President's original fiscal 1965 budget, submitted in January 1964—a feature that met with widespread acceptance—was the indication of intent to so manage budget expenditures that they would, contrary to the general tendency, be less than expenditures then estimated for the preceding fiscal year 1964.

The books have now closed on fiscal 1965 operations. The results are available—and they disclose that not only were budget expenditures held below those of the year before—nearly $1.2 billion below—but the budget deficit of $3.5 billion represented a three-fifths reduction from the year before. And the $3.5 billion contrasts to the original 1965 budget projection of a $4.9 billion deficit. Fiscal 1965 was the first year in 5 years that there had been a year-to-year overall expenditure reduction. The President's continuing insistence that the departments and agencies get a dollar's value for every dollar spent got results.

The President's fiscal 1966 budget, submitted last January, pointed to further progress toward a balanced budget. It reflected many hard decisions. It reset many priorities. It weeded out some low-priority items. And the search continues as the President oversees the preparation of next year's budget while this year's budget is being administered.

The budget revenue outlook for the current fiscal year 1966 has recently improved somewhat. But the situation in Vietnam has been and continues to be an upsetting circumstance on the expenditure side of the budget. "War overturns all ordinary calculations," as James Garfield once said while serving here in the House. It has certainly introduced some uncertainties in the present budget situation, but I remain wholly confident—and I think the great body of the American people share the feeling—that the President will be unrelenting in insisting the departments pursue every avenue for potential savings, of getting the most for the least.

I submit a comparative table on the 1965 budget results:

Federal administrative budget totals—Fiscal 1965

[In millions of dollars]

	Actual results, fiscal 1964	Fiscal 1965			Actual 1965 results compared to—	
		Original budget, January 1964	Revised January 1965	Actual results	1964 results	Original 1965 budget
1. Net budget receipts	$89,459	$93,000	$91,200	$93,044	+$3,585	+$44
2. Net budget expenditures—						
(a) National defense (official budget classification)	54,182	53,979	52,160	50,143	−4,039	−3,836
(b) Nondefense	43,502	43,921	45,321	46,375	+2,873	+2,454
Budget expenditures (net)	97,684	97,900	97,481	96,518	−1,166	−1,382
3. Net budget deficit (−) or change	−8,226	−4,900	−6,281	−3,474	+4,751	+1,426

NOTE.—Actual results for 1965 are from Treasury "preliminary actual" report.

BACKDOOR APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Speaker, some further progress was made during the session in abating the flow of money through the backdoor of the Treasury. While the general housing bill continued the multibillion-dollar backdoor arrangement on the urban renewal program, the Congress, under an arrangement incorporated in the independent offices appropriation bill for 1966, provided that henceforth the program should be provided for in advance, in the manner customary for most other programs of Government in the annual appropriation bill. That was done for this session in the closing supplemental.

Otherwise, there were no major backdoor actions that I am aware of; there may have been one or two minor items.

In connection with some observations submitted earlier this year to the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, I suggested deep study and thought be given to backdoor spending practices. In my judgment they are indefensible. No study of ways to strengthen congressional control of the purse can justifiably exclude the question.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. Speaker, paying our way as we go in public expenditures is not nearly as popular in the country generally as it once was—though it is still popular with many people, myself included.

Surely, we ought to try to pay our way in times of flood tide national incomes and record prosperity. But failure to live within our national revenues, as we have failed to do in 29 of the last 35 years—good times and bad—inescapably means hiking the national debt and borrowing the money to pay the difference. The gross Federal debt a few days ago—on October 19—stood at $320,104,946,548.31. It will go higher this fiscal year with the budget again in the red. Currently, the Federal debt is equivalent to over $1,600 for every man, woman, and child in the Nation. It takes about 11 cents of every budget dollar just to pay the interest on it.

Of course, the great bulk—about two-thirds—of the present Federal debt was incurred in defense of our freedom during World War II, but a good deal has been accumulated in prosperous non-war years. It is useful to a better perspective about the debt to point out, as is frequently done, that on a per capita basis, the Federal debt is less than it was, for example, at the end of World War II, a fact accountable solely by an exploding population. And the Federal debt in relation to the Gross National Product as an indicator of the ability of the country to shoulder it has a far less burdensome look than it did when the Gross National Product was much smaller.

I append a Treasury statistical tabulation on the Federal debt as of September 30, 1965:

Summary of direct and guaranteed debt on significant dates

[Based upon statement of the public debt published monthly; consequently all figures are stated as of the end of a month]

Date	Classification	Total debt (including interest-bearing debt, matured debt on which interest has ceased and debt bearing no interest)				General fund balance [2]
		Direct debt (gross)	Guaranteed debt [1] [2]	Total direct and guaranteed debt	Per capita [3]	
	WORLD WAR I					
Mar. 31, 1917	Prewar debt	$1,282,044,346.28		$1,282,044,346.28	$12.36	$74,216,460.05
Aug. 31, 1919	Highest war debt	26,596,701,648.01		26,596,701,648.01	250.18	1,118,109,534.76
Dec. 31, 1930	Lowest postwar debt	16,026,087,087.07		16,026,087,087.07	129.66	306,803,319.55
	WORLD WAR II					
June 30, 1940	Debt preceding defense program	42,967,531,037.68	$5,529,070,655.28	48,496,601,692.96	367.08	1,890,743,141.34
Nov. 30, 1941	Pre-Pearl Harbor debt	55,039,819,926.98	6,324,048,005.28	61,363,867,932.26	458.47	2,319,496,021.87
Feb. 28, 1946	Highest war debt	279,213,558,897.10	550,810,451.19	279,764,369,348.29	1,989.75	25,960,900,919.30
June 30, 1946	Debt at end of year in which hostilities ceased	269,422,099,173.26	476,384,859.30	269,898,484,032.56	1,908.79	14,237,883,295.31
Apr. 30, 1949	Lowest postwar debt [4]	251,530,468,254.82	22,851,485.16	251,553,319,739.98	1,690.29	3,995,156,916.79
	SINCE KOREA					
June 30, 1950	Debt at time of opening of hostilities in Korea (hostilities began June 24, 1950)	257,357,352,351.04	19,503,033.97	257,376,855,385.01	1,696.74	5,517,087,691.65
Dec. 31, 1952		267,391,155,979.65	53,969,565.31	267,445,125,544.96	1,687.90	6,064,343,775.84
Feb. 28, 1965	Highest debt [5]	319,882,530,632.59	692,713,100.00	320,575,243,732.59	[6] 1,653.54	7,942,025,838.72
Sept. 30, 1964	Debt a year ago	315,609,514,255.78	886,190,100.00	316,495,704,355.78	[7] 1,641.17	10,189,275,350.68
Aug. 31, 1965	Debt last month	318,240,070,811.80	502,084,900.00	318,742,155,711.80	[6] 1,634.42	7,627,425,868.27
Sept. 30, 1965	Debt this month	316,747,554,727.00	521,997,400.00	317,269,552,127.00	[6] 1,624.96	8,637,206,327.85

[1] Does not include securities owned by the Treasury.

[2] Includes outstanding matured principal of guaranteed debt of U.S. Government agencies for which cash to make payment is held by the Treasury of the United States in the general fund balance.

[3] Based upon estimates of the Bureau of the Census.

[4] Represents the lowest point of the debt at the end of any month following World War II. The lowest point of the debt on any day following that war was on June 27, 1949, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)	$251,245,889,059.02
Guaranteed debt of U.S. Government agencies	23,876,001.12
Total direct and guaranteed debt	251,269,765,060.14

[5] Represents the highest point of the debt at the end of any month. The highest point of the debt on any day was Mar. 15, 1965 when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)	$320,009,959,698.91
Guaranteed debt of U.S. Government agencies	705,287,300.00
Total direct and guaranteed debt (includes $285,168,332.26 not subject to statutory limitation)	320,715,246,998.91

[6] Subject to revision.

[7] Revised.

A good picture of the public debt situation requires State and local government debt to be taken into account. Collectively, the same people are liable for all public debt at all governmental levels. On this basis, even with the exploding population, the per capita debt figure is climbing, not falling, according to the following figures:

Federal, State, and local debt—on a per capita basis, selected fiscal years

Year	Per capita				Percentage distribution			
	Total	Federal	State	Local	Total	Federal	State	Local
Gross debt:								
1940	$479	$326	$27	$127	100	67.9	5.7	26.4
1946	2,037	1,924	17	97	100	94.4	.8	4.8
1950	1,861	1,702	35	125	100	91.4	1.9	6.7
1953	1,895	1,682	49	164	100	88.7	2.6	8.7
1960	1,979	1,591	103	286	100	80.4	5.2	14.4
1961	1,988	1,579	109	301	100	79.4	5.5	15.1
1962	2,041	1,604	118	319	100	78.6	5.8	15.6
1963	2,085	1,622	123	341	100	77.8	5.9	16.3
1964 [1]	2,117	1,629	131	357	100	76.9	6.2	16.9

[1] Data for 1964 estimated by Tax Foundation.

Source: Tax Foundation "Facts and Figures," 13th ed.

APPROPRIATIONS DETAILS BY BILLS

Mr. Speaker, for the reference of those who may have need of the figures on the individual appropriation bills, I include a tabulation in the customary form:

The appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 1st sess., as of Oct. 22, 1965

[Does not include back-door appropriations, or permanent appropriations [1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Title and bill No.	House				House action compared with—	
	Budget estimates to House	Amount as reported	Amount reported compared with budget estimates	Amount as passed	Budget estimates	Amount reported
1965 SUPPLEMENTALS						
Agriculture, CCC (H.J. Res. 234)	$1,742,209,000	$1,600,000,000	−$142,209,000	$1,600,000,600	−$142,209,000	
2d supplemental bill, 1965 (H.R. 7091)	2,226,456,933	2,125,833,083	−100,623,850	2,118,333,083	−108,123,850	−$7,500,000
Defense (H.J. Res. 447)	700,000,000	700,000,000		700,000,000		
Total, 1965 supplementals	4,668,665,933	4,425,833,083	−242,832,850	4,418,333,083	−250,332,850	−7,500,000
1966 APPROPRIATIONS						
District of Columbia (H.R. 6453)	(387,467,800)	(356,300,500)	(−31,167,300)	(356,300,500)	(−31,167,300)	
Federal payment	53,122,000	44,122,000	−9,000,000	44,122,000	−9,000,000	
Loan authorization	(26,311,900)	(26,311,900)		(26,311,900)		
Interior (H.R. 6767)	1,240,849,500	1,184,090,300	−56,759,200	1,184,090,300	−56,759,200	
Loan authorization	(16,780,000)	(16,000,000)	(−780,000)	(16,000,000)	(−780,000)	
Treasury-Post Office (H.R. 7060)	6,708,510,000	6,604,404,000	−104,106,000	6,604,404,000	−104,106,000	
Labor-HEW (H.R. 7765)	8,293,814,000	7,964,034,000	−329,780,000	7,964,034,000	−329,780,000	
Independent offices (H.R. 7997)	14,531,023,000	14,086,408,000	−444,615,000	14,109,908,000	−421,115,000	+23,500,000
Agriculture (H.R. 8370)	5,815,134,000	5,692,537,000	−122,597,000	5,717,832,000	−97,302,000	+25,295,000
Loan authorizations	(787,000,000)	(787,000,000)		(787,000,000)		
State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary (H.R. 8639)	2,167,735,600	2,085,689,900	−82,045,700	2,085,689,900	−82,045,700	
Legislative (H.R. 8775)	204,872,222	150,589,107	−54,283,115	150,589,107	−54,283,115	
Public works (H.R. 9220)	4,373,805,000	4,241,636,500	−132,168,500	4,241,636,500	−132,168,500	
Defense (H.R. 9221)	45,272,844,000	45,188,244,000	−84,600,000	45,188,244,000	−84,600,000	
Military construction (H.R. 10323)	2,049,000,000	1,755,495,000	−293,505,000	1,755,495,000	−293,505,000	
Labor-HEW supplemental, 1966 (H.R. 10586)	1,553,918,000	1,223,181,500	−330,736,500	1,223,181,500	−330,736,500	
Foreign assistance (H.R. 10871)	4,188,923,000	4,001,453,000	−187,470,000	4,001,453,000	−187,470,000	
Supplemental, 1966 (H.R. 11588)	4,364,120,110	4,214,609,610	−149,510,500	4,214,429,610	−149,690,500	−180,000
Total, 1966 bills to date	100,817,670,432	98,436,493,917	−2,381,176,515	98,485,108,917	−2,332,561,515	+48,615,000
Total, all appropriations to date	105,486,336,365	102,862,327,000	−2,624,009,365	102,903,442,000	−2,582,894,365	+41,115,000
Total, loan authorizations	(830,091,900)	(829,311,900)	(−780,000)	(829,311,900)	(−780,000)	

Title and bill No.	Senate		Senate action compared with—		Final appropriation	
	Budget estimates to Senate	Amount as passed	Budget estimates	House action	Amount as approved	Final action compared with budget estimates
1965 SUPPLEMENTALS						
Agriculture, CCC (H.J. Res. 234)	$1,742,209,000	$1,600,000,000	−$142,209,000		$1,600,000,000	−$142,209,000
2d supplemental bill, 1965 (H.R. 7091)	2,280,251,327	2,257,869,415	−22,381,912	+$139,536,332	2,227,563,977	−52,687,350
Defense (H.J. Res. 447)	700,000,000	700,000,000			700,000,000	
Total, 1965 supplementals	4,722,460,327	4,557,869,415	−164,590,912	+139,536,332	4,527,563,977	−194,896,350
1966 APPROPRIATIONS						
District of Columbia (H.R. 6453)	(389,346,800)	(364,358,347)	(−24,988,453)	(+8,057,847)	(360,228,500)	(−29,118,300)
Federal payment	53,122,000	49,122,000	−4,000,000	+5,000,000	46,122,000	−7,000,000
Loan authorization	(26,311,900)	(26,311,900)			(26,311,900)	
Interior (H.R. 6767)	1,241,549,500	1,230,802,770	−10,746,730	+46,712,470	1,212,739,070	−28,810,430
Loan authorization	(16,780,000)	(16,000,000)	(−780,000)		(16,000,000)	(−780,000)
Treasury-Post Office (H.R. 7060)	[2] 7,749,770,000	[2] 7,698,669,000	−51,101,000	[2] +1,094,265,000	[2] 7,669,444,000	−80,326,000
Labor-HEW (H.R. 7765)	8,293,814,000	8,023,101,500	−270,712,500	+59,067,500	8,011,331,500	−282,482,500
Independent offices (H.R. 7997)	14,566,023,000	14,299,897,980	−266,125,020	+189,989,980	14,246,167,800	−319,855,200
Agriculture (H.R. 8370)	[3] 6,282,634,000	6,713,983,800	+431,349,800	+996,151,800	6,242,929,500	−39,704,500
Loan authorizations	(787,000,000)	(852,000,000)	(+65,000,000)	(+65,000,000)	(837,000,000)	(+50,000,000)
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary (H.R. 8639)	2,171,935,600	2,052,471,800	−119,463,800	−33,218,100	2,057,597,150	−114,338,450
Legislative (H.R. 8775)	243,261,617	190,840,167	−52,421,450	+40,251,060	189,993,297	−53,268,320
Public works (H.R. 9220)	4,387,616,000	4,327,589,000	−60,027,000	+85,952,500	4,292,866,500	−94,749,500
Defense (H.R. 9221)	[4] 46,972,844,000	[4] 46,877,063,000	−95,781,000	[4] +1,688,819,000	46,887,163,000	−85,681,000
Military construction (H.R. 10323)	2,049,000,000	1,759,504,000	−289,496,000	+4,009,000	1,756,635,000	−292,365,000
Labor-HEW Supplemental, 1966 (H.R. 10586)	1,553,918,000	1,407,181,500	−146,736,500	+184,000,000	1,223,181,500	−330,736,500
Foreign assistance (H.R. 10871)	4,188,923,000	3,857,188,000	−331,735,000	−144,265,000	3,932,188,000	−256,735,000
Supplemental, 1966 (H.R. 11588)	4,971,203,852	4,867,248,102	−103,955,750	+652,818,492	4,741,644,602	−229,559,250
Total, 1966 bills to date	104,725,614,569	103,354,662,619	−1,370,951,950	+4,869,553,702	102,510,002,919	−2,215,611,650
Total, all appropriations to date	109,448,074,896	107,912,532,034	−1,535,542,862	+5,009,090,034	107,037,566,896	−2,410,508,000
Total, loan authorizations	(830,091,900)	(894,311,900)	(+64,220,000)	(+65,000,000)	(879,311,900)	(+49,220,000)

---

[1] Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about $12,270,000,000 for fiscal year 1966.

[2] Includes $1,035,000,000 supplemental estimate for 1965 (S. Doc. 31).

[3] Includes supplemental estimate of $500,000,000 for Commodity Credit Corporation contained in House Doc. No. 307, dated Oct. 20, 1965 (submitted after bill had passed the House, therefore not originally considered there).

[4] Includes $1,700,000,000 additional estimate for 1966 (S. Doc. 45).

CONGRESS LEADS THE WAY

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, another session of Congress draws to a close. I am proud to have had the privilege to serve under you as our distinguished Speaker, while Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY presided over the Senate and with our great President, Lyndon B. Johnson, showing the way.

The march of history is uncertain and unpredictable and, while we may speculate about the reasons for momentous events and movements in the affairs of a people, we rarely know the subtleties which give birth to them at a particular time and place.

I will not speculate on why this session of Congress was the place and our generation the time for the making of so much important American history. Suffice it to say it happened and we are all grateful.

For too many, the great war, the pitched battle, the devastation of the land, the enslavement of the people and the destruction of their homes is the march of history. For us this is the backward slide of history to primeval time, when man lived in the dark cave with his club as his constant companion and dared to venture forth only in daylight. For me, history is the story of man, his emergence from ignorance to enlightenment and his forward stride toward social responsibility. In terms of these values, this session of Congress is America on the move.

I shall not detail all the things this Congress did, rather will I paint its accomplishments in broad strokes.

Since its first and foremost consideration was the people, the story of this Congress is the story of its concern for people, all people. We have proved that we are our brother's keeper.

This Congress gave us medicare, not merely as originally conceived, but improved and broadened as proposed by the best minds available. For the first time hospitalization and voluntary medical care are provided for our older people. All social security payments as well as payments under assistance programs for the dependent children, blind, and disabled were increased.

We remembered to care for our children. This Congress authorized $1.3 billion to improve elementary and secondary grade school education. It set up a 3-year program to aid school districts on the basis of the percentage of pupils from lower income families attending school in these districts. It also set up a 5-year program for supplemental educational centers, textbook and testing aid purchases, research in education, and help for State education departments.

Higher education was provided for our children. The Higher Education Act is a 5-year $5.5 billion program to help States support community service programs of colleges and universities, for grants to their libraries for training, research, and acquisition of materials, for teaching fellowships to raise the quality of instruction at smaller colleges and for scholarship grants and low interest loans to graduate and undergraduate students.

Without an educated electorate, democracy perishes—the victim of demagogues and other self-seekers. Educated children mean educated adults able to live finer lives as better citizens.

We improved our laws to get decent housing for our people; $7.5 billion is authorized for a 4-year housing program. The program includes urban renewal, housing for the elderly, college housing, 60,000 new units of public housing annually, and matching grants to communities for water and sewer facilities. A new program is initiated for rent subsidies for some of our elderly, handicapped, and displaced low-income families. No downpayments are required of veterans buying homes.

Decent housing for our people is essential. If democracy requires respect for the individual and opportunity for fulfillment of his aims in life, he must have the privilege to acquire a decent home. Hovels, squalor, and overcrowding in impoverished quarters are not the soil in which respect and fulfillment are attained. These are signs of democracy's decay and unless corrected threaten its survival.

A new Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development will give us better administration of housing matters and closer cooperation with our cities in relieving distressful conditions.

A healthy mind needs a healthy body. This Congress authorized special controls over depressant and stimulant drugs with strict penalties for offenses involving young people. Every package of cigarettes must carry the statement "cigarette smoking may be hazardous to your health."

While we like to see our business community earning healthy profits, the health of our people is more important.

Grants have been authorized to our communities for mass immunization programs against polio, diptheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and measles. Provision was made for a national technical institute to educate our deaf people. Grants were authorized for community mental health centers and for training of teachers for our mentally retarded and otherwise handicapped children. Regional medical centers, research laboratories, and health facilities to combat heart disease, cancer, and other maladies will be established with Federal money.

We have helped to continue prosperity for our people. We are in the midst of the longest continuous period of peacetime prosperity in our country's history. This, I believe, is the result of our better understanding of our economy and the enactment of appropriate measures to insure its continued expansion.

Among the things this Congress did to insure continued prosperity for our people was to reduce excise taxes by $4.6 billion a year. I have been urging such enactments in every Congress since 1947. Levies on such items as furs, jewelry, radios, TV sets, cameras, household appliances, musical instruments, and on cabarets and general admissions were repealed. The 10-percent tax on automobiles is to be gradually reduced.

One billion one hundred million dollars was authorized to institute and coordinate public works and other programs among the Federal, State, and local authorities to revive the economy and improve the skills and health of Appalachian area residents.

To help meet our gold outflow problem, the Congress repealed the requirement that Federal Reserve deposits shall be backed by 25 percent gold reserves. This freed our gold to meet foreign demands and served notice on the world that we intend to honor our commitments without resorting to devaluing the dollar.

The Manpower Development and Training Act was extended for 3 years and the training period was extended from 52 weeks to 104 weeks.

A 4-year $3.3 billion program of public works by loans and grants to local governments and other public or private groups in economically deprived communities to develop industries, facilities, and to create jobs was authorized. Additional millions were authorized for the Small Business Administration revolving fund to assist those struck by floods, tornadoes, and other disasters.

One billion eight hundred million dollars was authorized for antipoverty programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This will help the less fortunate to become productive citizens.

Our natural resources will be preserved. Nature has been good to our land with its bountiful blessings. In the past we have been careless with them. We should remember that they do not belong to us. We are only trustees who are privileged to enjoy them during our lives and are responsible for their preservation so that they may be turned over to our children and those who come after them for their enjoyment.

The Congress implemented this principle by establishing a Federal Water Resources Council and River Basin Commission to coordinate planning for maximum use of resources and to assist the States in such planning. It fixed uniform policies for recreation facilities, fish and wildlife preserves and also for multipurpose water-resource projects. Nine hundred forty-four million dollars was authorized for flood control and navigation improvement projects in 13 river basins.

It expanded and extended for 5 years research and development programs for conversion of saline water; it extended loan programs to commercial fisheries; it increased aid to communities to combat water pollution and established a Water Pollution Control Administration.

All of those matters were important but more important were the laws enacted which dealt with human rights rather than material privileges.

The improved voting rights law and the new immigration law that does away with the obnoxious and inhumane quota system were among the high spots of the accomplishments of this Congress.

Some will argue that all this impoverishes initiative and makes for a listless and dependent citizenry. The reverse is true. Relieved of the threat of an unfriendly and overpowering fate, man is freed to contribute his talent and effort to the community to make it a better place for him and his family, and to strive toward self-fulfillment and for meaning in his life, secure in the knowledge that his community stands with him in his fight against the common enemies, disease, poverty, ignorance, natural and man-made disasters, and other calamities to which he may fall prey.

In foreign affairs, the Congress has steadfastly supported the President. The anti-Arab boycott legislation, which I sponsored, was enacted. The foreign aid program was strengthened. Our participation in the World Bank and its affiliates was increased.

Our involvement in southeast Asia, while unfortunate, was not of our doing. Our national security, indeed that of the free world demands that we successfully fulfill our commitments there and everywhere. We can and will do no less.

I have outlined some of the more important legislation that has been enacted by Congress to improve the well-being of the Nation.

The well-being of our people is a proper concern of our Government. Our older citizens remember the depression of the 1930's when our Nation was gripped by despair, its banks shut, its industrial machine creaking along at a fraction of its capacity. Our people dreaded the day and feared the future. There are still some who argue that our free enterprise system should be free of Government interference. These people object to legislation which seeks to eliminate poverty, squalor, ignorance, disease, and all the other indicia of a malfunctioning economy.

I disagree with them. Whenever our economy develops these symptoms, remedial action must be taken to eliminate their causes. Such action does not interfere with the system, rather it insures its survival. To ignore them could be fatal. We must care less for profits and more for the survival of a truly free enterprise system that creates those profits and gives to all of us the highest standard of living the world has ever seen.

When individuals cannot or will not do what is necessary and essential, government must step in and do it.

No one, I am certain, agrees with every last detail of all the laws we enacted. In fact, some even disagree with the principles involved. This right to disagree and to express that disagreement is what makes our country strong and so powerful.

But I daresay, that all these laws initiated by the Congress and by the President will serve and serve well the too long neglected needs of our country.

The job is not done. It probably never will be. God willing, we will continue to stride forward next year in the best interest of the greatest number of our great country.

I must conclude this statement on a personal note and with a well deserved tribute to our Speaker, a truly wonderful Christian gentleman, a devoutly religious man who does not wear his religiosity on his sleeve but practices its highest moral principles in his daily life.

Since I came to Congress in 1947, I have had the finest cooperation from our Speakers and from the leadership of both major parties in arranging to accommodate my coreligionists of the Jewish faith so that we have never had a rollcall on a Jewish holiday that coincided with a legislative day.

This year the Rosh Hashana holidays—the Jewish New Year—fell on legislative days. Unfortunately, the parliamentary situation was such that it was impossible to extend the courtesy to the Jewish Members—15 of them—of foregoing rollcalls on those 2 days.

If we attended religious services either in our places of worship in our home districts or in the temples and synagogues which welcomed us in Washington, D.C., we could not possibly get to the floor of the House on time each day without violating our traditional practices.

With the warmly sincere and hearty cooperation of our distinguished Speaker, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, we were permitted to temporarily convert the nondemoninational congressional prayer room in the Capitol to a synagogue for our prayer services. We were then enabled to attend to our religious duties as well as our governmental obligations, serving both and doing violence to neither.

While keeping church and state completely separate, each gave the other full respect and obeisance.

Finally, I extend sincere thanks to my constituents for having elected me to the 89th Congress, which President Johnson named "the greatest in American history."

TRIBUTE TO POSTMASTER GENERAL (DESIGNATE) LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, after nearly 5 years of distinguished public service as special presidential assistant in charge of congressional liaison, Lawrence F. O'Brien, an affable and able son of Massachusetts, will soon take the oath as Postmaster General of the United States.

He will bring to his new responsibilities the wisdom gained in his years of intimate knowledge of both the legislative and executive branches of our Federal Government. He has organized political campaigns that were models of efficiency and organization and monuments to his understanding of the wishes, emotions, and ideals of the voters to whom he appealed.

He was once described as the Jim Farley of the Kennedy administration; it is appropriate that he should now hold, in the Johnson administration, the office which Jim Farley occupied with such success. Larry O'Brien will no doubt administer the Post Office Department with tact, zeal, and high ideals. He is known as one of the hardest working men in Washington. His ardor for hard work will find an appropriate field of action in the Post Office Department.

It was a personal tribute to him that members of both parties on the Senate's Post Office and Civil Service Committee joined together in unanimously recommending Mr. O'Brien's confirmation. The Senate, knowing full well his outstanding qualifications, immediately confirmed him by voice vote. It was an even greater tribute to him that the Members of Congress honored him at an appreciation reception last Tuesday evening.

It was said of his appointment by the chief Washington correspondent of the New York Times that it was "in the finest tradition. He has shown two Presidents that he knows how to deliver the goods." If anybody can, this whirlwind of energy and efficiency will be able to deliver the mail.

Speaker MCCORMACK has said that in his almost 40 years in Congress he has never met "a more sensitive, kind, and understanding person who has coordinated action between Congress and the White House." When the President announced his appointment of the new Postmaster General, he said that, "Lawrence O'Brien will continue to be a very strong right arm to the President." We join the President and the Speaker in saluting this extraordinarily competent and totally dedicated public servant.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE FOR THE REPUBLIC OF ZAMBIA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the 24th day of October marks the first anniversary of independence for the Republic of Zambia.

The people of what was once called Northern Rhodesia have come a long way since the days of David Livingstone's famous explorations in the 19th century.

Today the Republic of Zambia is one of the most economically prosperous and politically stable nations on the continent of Africa. The efficient exploitation of its famous "copper belt" makes it the third largest producer of copper in the world and has netted Zambia a balance of payments surplus that may well be envied by many nations considered economically more developed.

During its first year of independence the young republic has begun a concerted effort to diversify and balance the economy and at the same increase the overall economic welfare of the entire population.

Zambia's close association with the United Nations and its willingness to cooperate with the West in foreign affairs have already earned the respect generally accorded those nations which are considered to have gained international prowess.

The first year of independence has marked an illustrious beginning for the Republic of Zambia. It is with great pleasure that I take this moment to offer my congratulations to the people of Zambia on their first anniversary.

AN INSPIRING EXAMPLE OF PERSONAL INITIATIVE AND ENTERPRISE

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include here a very timely feature story, by Martha Mason, that appeared in the magazine section of a recent issue of the Worcester, Mass., Telegram newspaper.

At a period in which there is so much fear about the loss of personal initiative and ingenuity in modern society this article graphically demonstrates, in the life of Mrs. Carol Lebeaux, that a young mother, while fully discharging her household duties, can still exercise her talents and ambition, through persevering, study, and industrious application, for personal satisfaction and family development which is worthy of wide imitation.

The article follows:

Calendar Girl Carol Lebeaux

(By Martha Mason)

"Calendar art"—It's a term to conjure up images of comely females in varying degrees of dishabille.

Not so with the crisp, imaginative woodcut-on-cloth calendars from the workshop of Mrs. Maxim Lebeaux of 15 Monadnock Drive, Shrewsbury.

An attractive former New York professional model, nightclub performer, artist and jewelry maker turned housewife, Carol Lebeaux has developed her calendar making from a kitchen hobby to a growing nationwide business.

She produced her first batch of calenders—a mere 30—to give as Christmas presents in 1957; and, just like topsy, the idea growed and growed.

It's no surprise then, that Carol woke up one morning to the realization that she had a full-scale, if modest, business on her hands.

Those first 30 calendars were a far cry from the ones Carol turns out these days. It took 1 hour and the body English of her children, Annie and Roy, now 16 and 12, respectively, to print each calendar.

Though her enthusiasm for woodcuts dated from elementary school days, Carol was unfamiliar with the silk-screen process which now simplifies production for her.

Since she knew nothing of the method, Carol saw but one way to reproduce each woodcut on the cloth calendar—by spreading each block by hand, or, in this case, by foot.

"I balanced both children on tiptoe on the surface of the woodblock and had them totter there for several minutes. Some process."

But when calendar requests flocked in for the following year, Carol set about finding a better method.

"Someone suggested silk screen," she said, "but no one in the family knew a thing about the process, so I went to the public library and studied all the books on the subject. It turned out to be ideal."

A silk screen is basically a stencil drawn on a drum-tight sheet of silk stretched on a wooden frame. The screen is placed on top of the fabric to be printed and a special printing ink is poured on one end of it.

The actual printing is accomplished by pulling a squeegee the length of the screen, forcing the ink to print through the open areas of the stencil—et voila.

Carol doesn't make the actual silk screens. She designs the calendar, carves the art work on the block, and then makes a print of the entire layout on a 20-by-32-inch sheet of paper. The layout is then taken to a craftsman who transfers it to the silk by a modern photographic method.

So, having found someone to make the silk stencils, the Lebeauxs armed themselves with squeegees and set to work printing.

But where to work? Carol needed a large enough table in a room that wouldn't cry over spilled ink. Only one place filled the bill—the kitchen.

The result was that calendar output boomed, but cooking met with production setbacks, and the Lebeauxs lived on soup and sandwiches eaten alfresco in the living room until the 1958 batch of 130 calendars had been finished.

Thirty of the 130 were a repeat of the Christmas gifts; the remaining 100 had been ordered by Carol's father, in the textile business in New York City. In filing his first order, Carol began her practice of individualized designs for each major customer.

The 1958 calendars produced the same flood of requests for the following year as had the 1957 edition. But this time her father was also besieged with requests from business associates to whom he had given the calendars as token gifts.

From them came mock-anguished cries about how they would have to redecorate their offices if not supplied with the latest calendar of likesize to cover the spot on the wall left by the existing hanging. And so, once again, kitchen-produced calendars.

The orders were music to Carol's ears. "But when I got a good order from a local drug distributor in 1960, the thought of another siege in the kitchen was more than the family could bear. So we simply had to find some other place to work."

A recent addition to the animal hospital which her husband then operated provided it. Carol stole one room, and her husband constructed a suitable table so that the kitchen would not have to go tableless for the duration. For 2 years, then, calendars were turned out to the tune of barking dogs and meowing cats.

It wasn't until about 2½ years ago, when the family moved to their present home, that Carol finally acquired a proper studio of her own, and her husband, Maxim, built another new table for her.

Instead of requiring the squeegee to be pulled with two hands the length of the silk screen, an exhausting and backbreaking process, the new setup involved a lever device called a one-arm squeegee which permits much easier operation by one person.

Meanwhile business boomed. "One thing always seemed to lead to another," Carol said. "For instance, while I was talking about my work with the owner of a men's speciality shop, I met two more prospective clients—a Worcester restaurant man, and the owner of a truck sales agency and I got two new orders.

"One was a heraldic design for a Tudor-style restaurant, and the other an antique truck motif for the truck dealer."

For a stamp and coin shop in Springfield, supposed to be the oldest and largest of its kind in the country, Carol designed an exclusive calendar depicting early American coins. And while visiting Old Mystic seaport in Connecticut, she was so impressed with the potential of the nautical scenery that she employed it in a calendar. The Old Mystic gift shop has reordered it every year since.

The College of the Holy Cross is equally pleased with the calendar designed for it, showing scenes in and around the college.

Carol became interested in woodcuts when she used that art form to illustrate some creative writing she had done in the 8th grade. She developed an instinctive liking for the block prints, a liking that endured despite the fact that she did nothing with them for quite a number of years. "I think the woodcut is the best medium for me—I get the most satisfying effect with it."

Carol studied at New York City's Music and Art High School, and at the famous Art Students' League under such lights as Sculptor William Zorach and Painter Yasuo Kuniyoshi.

But after completing her studies she turned to the other side of the easel, as it were, becoming a photographer's model with the Harry Conover Agency.

A year and a half later a chance meeting with Comedian Wally Cox, a former costudent at Music and Art High, started her on the road to a successful nightclub act.

"At a party where both Wally and I had been invited, he entertained with a phony palmistry routine. So I got the idea for a comic character-reading act." With Cox's blessing, Carol went on to make a name for herself as "Lorelei," a rather kooky clairvoyant.

In 1950, however, the siren call of palmistry began to pall, and Carol returned to her original love—art. Not woodcuts yet, but attractive handmade ceramic jewelry, a pursuit she could follow and still care for her young daughter. She sold her baubles, bangles, et al., to the chains of Elizabeth Arden and Helena Rubinstein shops.

But the birth of son Roy in 1952, and the press of her husband's recently acquired veterinary practice in Leominster, caused the creative arts to take a back seat, and I became a sort of chief cook, bottle washer, and veterinary assistant until 1957.

Then the creative urge became too persistent to ignore, and those first fateful calendars were laboriously stomped out.

Her most extensive recent commission is tied in with Worcester Polytechnic Institute's centennial celebration. As part of the commemorative events, WPI paid tribute to one of WPI's most illustrious graduates, Dr. Robert H. Goddard.

To celebrate National Goddard Day, March 16, WPI held a formal banquet, and gracing the cover of the banquet program was a woodcut portrait of Goddard carved by Carol. Mrs. Goddard, widow of the doctor has also requested that a print of the woodcut be given a permanent place in a room dedicated to Goddard memorabilia in the proposed Goddard Library to be built at Clark University.

Carol also has done a woodcut portrait of the late George C. Gordon, Tech graduate, who for 92 years was notoriously camera shy. Gordon bequeathed $5 million to WPI to be used to build a library, and the portrait will be on both the ground breaking and building dedication programs.

For Paxton's Anna Maria College, Carol is doing a series of woodcuts of campus scenes to be used for brochures and newsletters.

With increasingly larger orders, she has found it necessary to remove part of the production from her home studio. For orders larger than 300 she does the designs and woodcuts, but has the actual printing done by Worcester's Silpro Co., Inc.

But the smaller orders are still strictly a family affair. Roy and Annie help by taking up finished prints and transferring them, with agonizing care so as not to smudge the wet ink, to the drying racks. Later, they insert sticks and hooks into the top hem of each calendar, roll it up and slip into an individual mailing tube.

"With the children's help, we can print about 200 calendars an hour—that's something compared with the 1-an-hour rate during the old foot pressure days."

Of course, this home-based enterprise is not without certain side effects—some scratchier than others.

"You take one cat, half Burmese, half Siamese, dip well in printing ink, and the result is one very substantial mess," Carol said ruefully.

Kittan, the cat in question, walked across a silk screen not long ago, and then proceeded to paint the house in a trail of colored paw prints alternating with tail swishes.

Carol and Roy mistakenly used turpentine to remove the ink. The result was one hysterical cat—howling and scratching until finally let outdoors. Cat streaked off in such a fine frenzy that no one expected ever to see him again. But 3 hours later he returned, purring like a kitten and apparently none the worse for the dye job.

But Carol and her family have learned to take such minor crises in stride.

"There's a satisfaction to working in a medium you enjoy, and producing art that pleases the public," she said.

"It's even worth a technicolor cat."

A FEDERAL TAX-SHARING PLAN WITH THE STATES SHOULD BE EXPLORED

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, one of the increasingly important challenges facing us today is to searchingly examine and prudently move toward achieving a more wholesome and even balance and separability between and among the units and powers of government at the National, State, and local levels.

Many authorities have voiced their concern at the accelerating temptation and tendency of the State and community units to surrender too many of their responsibilities and energies to the influence and direction of remote planners and consulters within the agencies of the Federal Government.

This tendency is perhaps a natural development in connection with the huge Federal assistance appropriations going to the State and community operations in concert with the duty of the Federal Government, in this nuclear age, to encourage and inspire working partnerships with the States and communities in the common objective of national progress. The fear is that these partnerships, admittedly in good cause, may unwittingly become unhealthily disjointed and eventually operate against the best whole interest, if we do not watch out.

Money may be, as in other things, at the root of this unhappy tendency of the States and local governments to give up too much of their community home responsibility and independence but the evil is not inevitable if we are wise enough to recognize its approach and take effective steps against it.

It is precisely in order to initiate and develop effective ways and means to restrain this situation, while retaining and promoting the wholesome and dynamic cooperation of the Federal Government with other levels below in obvious areas of essential need, that I have introduced a bill, H.R. 11770, to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States.

Mr. Speaker, the traditional principle, that the best government is the government closest to the people, still remains true. It is to that fundamental truth and purpose this bill is directed. I hope that early in the next session the Congress will devote itself to the increasingly imperative need to encourage local government responsibility and independence in matters of home concern while preserving the coordinated energies and vision of wholesome partnership that has brought this country to the pinnacle of free world leadership, seeking only peace on earth and health and progress for all, everywhere.

A SUMMARY OF THE HISTORIC 1ST SESSION OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the President has termed the 1st part of this 89th Congress as "the greatest session in the history of our Nation." Most authorities agree this session has been the most productive in all of our national legislative history. Unquestionably it has been the most consistently industrious and effective of any in which I have been privileged to serve.

Even the statistics of this first session are more than usually impressive. Over a period of 10½ months more than 13,000 bills and resolutions were introduced in the House of Representatives and some 3,000 more in the Senate. The House considered some 1,000 of these legislative proposals. Out of this number some 300 have become public laws which include about an 85-percent implementation of the administration's legislative recommendations and programs.

However, legislative effectiveness and merit must be judged more by quality and beneficial range than mere quantity. It is exactly by these standards of real substance and great national impact that this congressional session seems to have widely surpassed the accomplishments of any other congressional session in the past. I think any objective assessment of the bills that were adopted will clearly show that tremendous legislative strides forward were made in practically all the basic areas of human needs, human rights, human development, economic stimulation and conservation, of our natural resources.

The most outstanding legislative breakthroughs came about by the approval of new programs providing medical care for the elderly, aid to all the children in the elementary schools and the elimination of the discriminatory national origins quota system from our immigration laws. These three legislative goals have been much debated in past Congresses but never achieved until this session.

I am particularly gratified by the passage of this new immigration law. I was among the first advocates of this bill and it was originally approved by the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration of which I am a Member. This new law besides outlawing the national origins principle creates a revised system of equitable preferences for relatives of American citizens and, while strengthening the protection of the American worker against any possible competition in his employment, also grants preferences to prospective immigrants whose special skills are urgently required here.

High on any listing of approved measures in the area of human needs we would have to mention, besides medical care for the aged, social security benefits expansion; extending the antipoverty program to insure the continued operation of such provenly effective projects as Head Start, community action council, the Job Corps, the neighborhood youth corps, and the works study program; providing special Federal assistance, in the elementary grades, to educationally deprived children from the lowest income families; the creation of a new Administration on Aging to initiate and develop programs of interest and value to our increasing numbers of older citizens; a new housing bill that includes particular consideration of the decent housing requirements of low-income families and the approval of a 3-year program of Federal grants to develop a series of regional medical centers throughout the country to fight the three worst afflictions of our modern society—heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

Of course, as soon as we mention the area of human rights we have to immediately emphasize the enactment of the historic voting rights measure of 1965. This act, finally and forever, provides that every citizen anywhere in this country can exercise, as fully and freely as is humanly possible, his privilege to participate in all public elections. Also in this area we would have to list legislative actions taken to implement such essential objectives as fair employment practices, equal employment opportunities, equal wages for similar work, the so-called equal rights for women amendment and, in this category, I think we would have to add the immigration reform bill.

In the area of human development we would have to place foremost those measures providing a new system of student loans and scholarships to give every qualified student a chance to continue his higher education if he so desires; expansion of the manpower development and training program to assist the unemployed to learn new skills to qualify them for new jobs; extending the vocational rehabilitation program and including special consideration and assistance for the disabled veterans and the mentally retarded; enlargement of the war orphans educational assistance program; a new military pay incentive program; disabled veterans cost of living compensation increases; and creation of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

In the economic field we would have to give prominent mention to the elimination of a burden of more than $4 billion of excise taxes on the American consumer; the Public Works and Economic Development Act providing assistance to economically distressed regions; the State Technical Services Act to make the findings of modern science and technology more readily available to American industry and commerce; major improvement and expansion in the loan procedures and amounts available to small business; approval of a Federal program of research and development in high-speed rail transportation, so vitally important to our State and region, and a host of less publicized measures.

The Congress further devoted particular attention to the conservation of our natural resources by authorizing new measures for water resources development, expanding recreation facilities and wildlife benefits in connection with watershed projects, water pollution control, conversion of saline water, air pollution research, highway beautification and many other supporting programs.

This recital is necessarily restricted to a summary of the more important legislative actions of the session but I believe that most of our people will judge it to be an extraordinary record of solid achievement by an industrious Congress working with an energetic President for the national benefit.

I think the tremendous record of the Congress this year can be attributed to three fundamental factors. The people and the Congress, shocked by the almost unbelievable assassination of President John F. Kennedy, were in a mood for action to implement and expand his original legislative recommendations. The vigorous successor to President Kennedy, President Lyndon B. Johnson, possesses a unique knowledge of the workings of the Congress and the executive department of the Government; he believed in and was dedicated to the accomplishment of the legislative plans of his predecessor and some new ones of his own and he provided the inspiring leadership to obtain their approval.

Last, but not least, the patriotic, nonpartisan cooperation of many members of the minority party without whose effective help many of the most important programs could not have been approved, particularly those historic measures involving tremendous advances in civil and voting rights for all of our citizens and greater educational opportunities for all our children.

A JOURNEY FOR PEACE

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include at this point a most timely and inspiring editorial delivered over the Mutual Broadcasting System recently, graphically describing and reminding us of Pope Paul's historic visit to this country and the United Nations on a mission of peace with a message of faith and love that is so sorely needed in this confused and distressed world.

The editorial follows:

In 14 magnificent hours, there was for the world a period of history for present and future that will be remembered as the magnificent journey.

Pope Paul journeyed from Rome as a messenger. His climax, following the stirring plea for peace at the United Nations, was a magnificent emotion packed moment of history at Yankee Stadium as he stood on a red carpeted platform before a spotless white altar and brought his message to the world. A message of faith and love.

He told his audience that there are three rules if there is to be peace. First, to love peace. Second, to serve the cause of peace. Third, peace must be based on moral and religious principles.

He was not loved and honored just because he was the leader of his church. There were thousands—millions—of others outside his church who looked upon this man and his journey as a symbol of something that is needed at this crucial moment in our lives.

It was a magnificent journey—a simple, dedicated man of the church who took 14 hours of his lifetime to bring a message of peace to a world. A message that could, if followed, mean millions and millions of hours of the future for all mankind.

Pope Paul is truly a man of peace.

ASIAN PEOPLES' ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, last month, the 11th Annual Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League Conference was held in Manila, Philippine Islands. I was privileged to attend this conference and serve as chief delegate of the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Red China to the United Nations. This group is one of the observer units which participates in this conference although the regular delegates are those from Asian nations alone.

It was a very informative conference and I had the opportunity to meet with many government leaders from the Asian nations. I was called upon to make a report and the following was made to this conference:

REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN M. ASHBROOK, REPRESENTATIVE OF THE COMMITTEE OF ONE MILLION AGAINST THE ADMISSION OF COMMUNIST CHINA TO THE U.N., SEPTEMBER 8, 1965, MANILA, PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. Our committee is once again happy to participate with you in your important work, to note your serious deliberations and to encourage your efforts. We believe that the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League serves a very valuable purpose and your history and ours serve to illustrate the diligent work of freedom-loving people to stem the tide of communism, tell the world of communism's repressive and uncivilized policies and to promote governmental ideals which encourage, not shackle, strengthen, not subjugate, the peoples of the world. Your work in the East, ours in the West, started 11 years ago although indeed the battle against communism started with the inception of its tyrannical regimes.

You have already received some of the representative materials of our Committee of One Million. While we primarily stress the importance of keeping Red China, a bandit nation, from receiving the respectability of a seat on the world body we are dedicated to an even higher purpose, that of exposing to the people of the United States the fallacies of Communist ideology and life. The people of America are steadfastly opposed to the admission of Red China to the United Nations. This is also the present position of our Government and we trust that this will be a firm stand for the future. Communism has little support in our Nation. Unfortunately, however, there is an educational task which must be accomplished there as in the rest of the world. While most Americans look upon godless communism as "that other way of life" all too many are inclined to disbelieve the diabolical nature of communism and Communist tyrants. They tend to believe that Communists "just can't be that bad." We at this conference know that they are evil and must never relent in our determination to expose their ways to the good people of the world.

PARALLEL TO HITLER IS DRAWN

Here we see an unfortunate parallel with the situation in the thirties. Most Americans are inclined to believe the best about their fellow man. This is a virtue, I believe. It was difficult to argue then that Hitler planned aggression. When his tanks moved, Americans thought he only wanted what was really Germany's and he would stop there. When he committed further acts of aggression, the United States more or less shrugged its shoulders and said, "Oh, well, that's all he wants." When his greed proved insatiable and he went on and on, it was argued, "Yes, he has gone too far but after all he is a man just like us and we should be able to reason with him." The stench of Buchenwald and Auschwitz didn't shake most Americans from this state of mind. The truth of the matter, fellow delegates and observers, is that there are some people who are different and they must be recognized for that difference. The Communists, like Hitler, are not people just like us—they are barbarian, cruel, deceitful. They employ tactics which no civilized people use as government policy.

Communists use deceit, bribery, murder—any means or exploitation to further their goals. Most people are not aware of the true nature of their subversion and deceit nor the brutal means they employ. As an instrument of their plans for world conquest, they utilize a means which is outside of the political, military and social policies of the member nations of APACL and the rest of the free world. I am speaking, of course, of their willful use of terror—sheer, naked terror—to achieve their ends.

SUBVERSION IS THEIR GOAL

The attention of this conference and the world is properly directed at Communist aggression in Vietnam. This is as it should be. However, we must never lose sight of the fact that Communist conspiratorial plans for conquest are global, not regional and no local involvement, however significant, should divert our attention from the overall picture. While attention of the world was focused on mainland China some 20 years ago, Communist efforts to take over Eastern European nations were silently going forth. While the world attention was focused in Korea, Communists were fomenting riots and laying the ground work in Latin and South America.

While Cuba, Berlin, the Congo, Lebanon, Laos have been the crucial points in Communist strategy at specific moments in the history of the past 10 years, at all times their behind the scenes efforts have gone forward on every continent. Indeed, I can say as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, that while world attention, including ours, has been directed at these so-called hot spots their subversive plans have gone forward in the United States of America which, after all, in their scheme of things remains the top prize to be won.

Thus we must encourage a vigilance which is uncommon because the danger is uncommon. We cannot grow weary in our task. Most importantly, we the people of the United States must not grow weary of our global commitments to help the free people of the world sustain their freedom. In Vietnam at the present there is a fundamental American commitment which serves as an inspiration to all of the people of Asia. We will support you in your efforts to improve your standards of living and develop free governments.

COMMUNIST LEADER WEARS TWO HATS

One more point should be made about the Communist world leadership. The leader of the Soviet Union wears two hats. He is the master of the Kremlin but he also is the leader of the world Communist movement. This is a readymade tool for deception. Wearing his first hat he can make peaceful gestures, sign test ban agreements and appear to be compromising. Directing the world Communist conspiracy with his second hat, he can continue the campaign of aggression and subversion through terror, hate and discord which effectively promote the Communist cause. This is true whether the wearer of the hat happens to be a Malenkov, a Khrushchev, or a Kosygin.

SUMMARY

Our goal is a splendid one, promoting the orderly building of free societies throughout the world where people can achieve their just aspirations and governments are subservient to the people, not their masters. While Communists talk of hate we talk of compassion for our fellow man on every continent, on every island which dots the earth. We are on the right path but we must readily admit that the forces of tyranny have been too successful for us to take any pride in our accomplishments to date. The wave of the future is clearly freedom and we pledge our every effort to promote its cause. We of the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the U.N. hail APACL as an effective force for mobilizing the moral, economic, political, and military might of the free peoples of Asia. We support your Freedom Center in Seoul, Korea, and will work with you for its successful future. All of this we do gladly for we are eminently aware of the obloquy and retribution which would be ours, East and West, if future historians should ever note that a people who were dragging their chains overtook and passed a people who were dragging their feet. Thank you.

BOATERS AND RECREATION

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is now cognizant of a calamity that is growing constantly; namely water pollution. The public is now knowledgeable of the ramifications that are attendant with the destruction of our water resources; the Congress has reacted to their concern with legislation to reduce this pollution and hopefully to eliminate it completely.

Today I have introduced a piece of legislation which will increase the arsenal of methods necessary to combat water pollution. We are experiencing a pleasure boat boom in our country. More and more families are turning to our public waters for recreation. My own community which borders on the Long Island Sound abounds with boat and bathing enthusiasts. The boaters in my District have access to several States such as Connecticut and Rhode Island and the more adventuresome can navigate to New Jersey or Delaware. In fact, our location permits our seafarers to visit, through the use of various routes, many of our Nation's States.

Unfortunately, in the near future, my seafaring constituents will be limited in this travel. As the number of pleasure craft increases, so does the pollution that is attendant with the use of these craft.

Many of the boats have enclosed heads or lavatories, but with no treatment facilities; and, therefore, raw sewage is being pumped into the waters. There are now some water areas contiguous to my District which are polluted; thus restricting the bathing public and the boaters themselves from taking full advantage of the water.

Recognizing this factor several States have passed laws which require treatment of boat sewage. These restrictions are increasing; but, unfortunately, they are not uniform. Boaters may find that their State may require one type of sewage treatment restriction and a neighboring State still another type of treatment. This variance in the laws will deny the free movement of the boats between the various State waters for compliance with various laws may be impossible.

My bill presents a method to increase the use of sewage treatment, but also to attain a uniform law to insure free movement. Both of these factors are necessary for effective water pollution control and the concomitant full use of our water ways by all. Under my bill standards will be set and compliance with this standard will allow all boats to move freely.

While it is true that boats are not a major contributor to water pollution, it is still an important factor. This is borne out by the increasing State laws and the statements by the American Boat and Yacht Council, the Yacht Safety Bureau and the Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control of the U.S. Public Health Service.

I have had contact with various boating groups and boat manufacturers and I am extremely impressed with their desire to eliminate their contribution to the pollution. The boaters recognize the need for clean water more than most groups in our country and they have responded with an earnest attempt to control pollution.

This legislation I am proposing will lead to uniform law in boat sewage treatment and effectively aid our recovery of the water resources for recreation.

VOTING RECORD, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 89th Congress is now history and it is appropriate to make a report on what has transpired. There were many constructive legislative proposals which I supported. One of the highlights was the inclusion of the clean elections section to the voting rights bill. I coauthored this section with other colleagues who felt that equal attention should be given to fraudulent election practices in Chicago and other northern cities. On the manpower training program bill, it was my privilege to play an important part. I handled the bill on the floor for the minority and helped cut out overlapping and duplication in this program by consolidating other retraining efforts into this fine program. Some of the many measures which I supported were:

Water resources planning legislation, especially necessary at this time when water shortages are threatening many of our big cities.

Water pollution control funds to continue the drive for clean water in our rivers and streams.

Mental health grants to help pay the salaries of professional technical people to assist the mentally ill at community mental centers.

A voluntary medicare program to help older people meet the costs of hospitalization and many other medical expenses.

Drug abuse control legislation to tighten controls over distribution of goof balls and pep pills.

Excise tax reduction which removed nuisance taxes on many household items.

Voting rights bill which extended additional protections to the right to vote.

Manpower training program which helps unskilled workers obtain training for more skilled jobs.

Presidential disability amendment which, when ratified, will amend the Constitution to provide more orderly succession.

Higher Education Act with student assistance and funds for construction of academic buildings.

Small Coal Mine Safety Act which provides for improved standards in coal mining operations.

Vocational student loan insurance which assists students going to trade or vocational schools.

Rural water and sanitation loan program which assists local governments to meet problems of providing these services.

Armed services pay increase legislation which gave our servicemen a long overdue pay hike.

These are but a few of the constructive proposals I voted for. Many more were passed on a nonrecord vote which received my support. At the same time, this session was known for its waste and extravagance, and I opposed many measures which called for excessive and in many cases unneeded expenditures. Others such as the farm bill and aid to education established more control over independent citizens and local school districts and were vigorously opposed. The Democratic majority of 293 to 140 is so excessive that many of these bills received rubberstamp approval with little effort to improve or alter them. Some of the many legislative proposals which received my opposition were:

Administration effort to cut $120 million from the vital conservation program which is so valuable to our rural areas and which has compiled such a splendid record;

Foreign aid to Communist countries, Nasser and Sukarno and other tyrants who are undeserving of American financial assistance;

National debt increases—we now have increased the debt eight different times during the Johnson and Kennedy administration;

New Cabinet level post for housing and urban development which I predict will grow like weeds and waste hundreds of millions of dollars.

Removal of gold reserve requirement and coinage debasement proposals which start us down the road to printing press money.

Increase of $1 billion in U.S. contribution to the International Monetary Fund.

International Coffee Agreement which subsidizes foreign interests and forces the American consumer to pay for it.

Poverty program which has compiled a positive record of waste and inefficiency.

Bread tax proposal of Johnson administration which would add 50 cents more per bushel of wheat to the bread tax first passed in 1964.

Socialistic rent supplement program which subsidizes rent for people who earn as much as $11,200 per year.

Effort to remove 14(b) of Taft-Hartley law and thereby deny States the privilege of enacting labor legislation their citizens deem appropriate.

On the whole there were many constructive legislative enactments. I was very pleased to play a part in the passage of these and even in the case where legislation received my negative vote, in most cases there was an affirmative effort to improve the legislation. However, it has been my contention that those who say there is always an alternative or a middle of the road are wrong. There usually is but in some cases there is just no middle of the road and no way to improve a bill. A good example of this is the effort to take 14(b) out of the Taft-Hartley law. That deserved a "no" vote. Some issues just cannot be compromised. This Congress will be known for the basic compromises it made in issues which should not be compromised.

NOT ALL GOOD MEASURES HAVE PASSED

After 9 years of legislative experience, I have found that new ideas sometimes take a while to catch on. Several measures which have received my special attention were not adopted but I feel they will pass sooner or later. Conservation and education have always been two special areas of interest. You may recall that the wilderness bill took many years to culminate in passage. I was one of the first sponsors of the tax credit approach to assist colleges and high schools. It is especially important to adopt the tax credit to assist our private universities who need the stimulus this legislation could bring. It would also be very beneficial to parents who would get a tax credit for tuition and college expense. I also favor legislation which would return 2 percent of Federal income tax to States for educational purposes. This would help share the huge Federal tax take with local schools and not bring about any bureaucratic controls. Other hopeful bills include the Freedom Academy and improved benefits for veterans who are not getting a fair break. My efforts on these bills will continue in the next session.

SERVICE TO DISTRICT

Voting on legislation, however important, is but one phase of the Representative's activities. Our office is a virtual service agency to 400,000 constituents who call upon us for a great variety of matters—everything from assistance in veteran claims to the fourth grader's request for information about their Congressman. This office is the link which the citizen has to the vast Federal Government and as such we are counsel, advocate, reporter, correspondent, servant in our many capacities. We received over 10,000 letters in this session which is exclusive of more than 5,000 individual requests for bulletins, bills, and printed items. It is also exclusive of the 22,474 replies we received to the fifth annual questionnaire which was sent out in January.

During this year, hundreds of personal appointments have been held with constituents who have specific problems. Scores of groups sent their representatives to the Nation's Capital to confer with their Congressman on legislation. Already this year I have attended over 100 meetings in the 17th District at which legislation was discussed. Courthouse conferences have been scheduled to give many more citizens a chance to meet with their Congressman. Long sessions such as this year cut down on the time which a Member has to meet with his constituents back home.

District problems take a precedence over other endeavors. Flood control legislation receives more time and effort than any other single problem facing the 17th District. The Kokosing and Licking projects are moving along although not with the speed which most of us would like. It has been my experience that these comprehensive programs receive the diligent attention of the Corps of Engineers and they are proceeding on a methodical basis. The dredging of the Black Fork near Loudonville, airports, post offices—these are but a few of many areas of special attention. The Newark Air Force Station continues to grow and our office works closely with the officers and employees to assist them in the many problems which arise in a new installation.

Another link with the district is communication from my office. Regular radio programs are carried on almost all of the District stations. A weekly newsletter is sent to every daily and weekly newspaper in the district and a bi-weekly newsletter is sent out on a regular basis to anyone who desires it. My firm belief has always been that the people who elect a Congressman have an unquestioned right to know his opinions on public matters. Many political incumbents hesitate to take a stand or announce their opinions. No one has ever suggested this of me and, in fact, the only complaint I receive on this score is that I am too candid. The entire voting record of this session, exclusive of dilatory and procedural votes which have no bearing on legislation is included after these remarks. It has been necessary to make the summarization brief in the interest of conserving space. However, I will be very glad to give further information or explain my position on any issue which might elicit the further interest of any constituent who reads this record. Just write to me at House Office Building, Washington, D.C., 20515, and I will give you a prompt reply.

The new 17th District includes Ashland, Coshocton, Guernsey, Holmes, Knox, Licking, Muskingum, and Wayne Counties. It has been gratifying to get such a fine response from our new counties—Guernsey, Muskingum, and Wayne. Already I have received several thousand letters from these three counties and our office has been able to serve them in many ways.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Completing 5 years as your Representative to Congress, I have drawn very definite conclusions as to the course of events here. Many constructive actions have been taken but too many have been wasteful and destructive to our free enterprise system and the individual taxpayer who is trying to remain self-reliant. There is a trend toward bigness and our policies in the fields of agriculture, tax, trade, and labor seem to encourage this trend. Bigness and monopoly should be checked.

In the field of finance, the Federal Government is growing far beyond any reasonable need and deficit spending is becoming a way of life. We had assurances that spending would be under $100 billion this year but instead we passed the $118 billion mark. This means that there has been close to a 50-percent increase since the 1961 budget of $80 billion. The public debt was $289 billion at the start of the Kennedy administration and in this session the eighth straight increase brought it to a staggering $328 billion. There is no effort to be honest with the people on this score. In January 1964 the President stated that the Great Society could live within a $309 billion debt ceiling. Tax cuts and the growth of the economy were supposed to take up the slack of deficit spending. It did not, it has not, it will not because we are spending far more than we should on the basis of tax receipts and the result must be inflation. Six months after he made this flat statement, a rubberstamp Congress was responding to his urgent plea to increase the debt to $324 billion.

Inflation looms as a major problem. Rarely is there an effort to adopt policies which help keep a dollar which will retain its purchasing power. This is absolutely essential to assure the standard of living of those living on fixed incomes such as retired persons with social security. What has happened is shown graphically in this table.

Drain of purchasing power of social security recipient

Year	Annual social security payment [1]	Purchasing power of dollar compared to 1939 dollar worth 100 cents	Real value of social security
		Cents	
1940	$499.20	99.2	$495.20
1950	870.00	57.8	502.86
1952	930.00	52.3	486.39
1954	1,062.00	51.7	449.05
1958	1,140.00	48.1	548.34
1965	[2] 1,219.80	44.2	539.15

[1] The annual pension is shown for a worker having a $3,000 annual income base, single at retirement, and fully covered, commencing with 1940, the (first year social security pensions were paid, and for each year in which Congress has enacted an increase. The results of inflation would have a comparable impact on all other social security pensions.)

[2] With 7-percent increase.

Instead of helping the situation, our spending policies along with those in the field of trade, foreign aid, and currency are such that more inflation is bound to result. Hundreds of housewives have written to protest the increase in the cost of groceries and other items which reflect this inflation.

In agriculture, trade, and finance the answer seems to be to add one more program and hope for the best. We have been getting too many political answers to these problems. We need a more constructive approach which will look ahead and chart a course away from the shoals of inflation and bankruptcy.

Managed news, bureaucratic control over schools and States and an intensified concentration of power in the Federal Government are major problem areas that I see. On the foreign scene, Vietnam holds the center of attention. I have strongly supported the President's action but here it has been noted that we have an unrealistic approach, too. In a major speech on the floor of the House, I pointed out that 401 ships flying the flag of our allies have been engaging in shipping to North Vietnam, supplying materials to the enemy which is endeavoring to subvert a free people. Stronger leadership is needed in this field—indeed, in the entire field of dealing with world communism.

My committee assignments have been very interesting. I am ranking Republican on an important subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee and the ranking minority member on the House Committee on Un-American Activities. For 10 months, the latter committee has been investigating the Ku Klux Klan and we are currently conducting public hearings. It is my pleasure to meet regularly with the House minority leadership and this has enabled me to get an added insight into the many legislative matters which are not always known by most Members. All in all, this ninth year of legislative capacity has been a rewarding one though many frustrations could be recited from a firsthand view of a rubberstamp Congress which seems to bow to the wish of the Chief Executive. From January when the House retreated on its vote to withhold aid from Nasser (see rollcall votes 7 and 10) after White House pressure, to the very last day of the session when the House retreated from its position of giving Federal employees comparability pay, the story has been the same. Arm twisting from the White House brought the vote the President wanted. As one who has always believed in the separation of powers and the importance of representative government, this trend is very disturbing indeed.

My voting record follows. It contains all record votes except those of a dilatory and procedural nature. Important committee assignments have made it necessary to miss a few votes as did my 1-week trip to Asia. My record continues as one of the best for attendance on the floor during debates and votes. All votes are shown. In the case of absences, these votes have been marked NV for not voting, and then it has been indicated how I would have voted if present:

Voting record, 89th Cong., 1st sess.

Rollcall No.	Issue	Vote
2	Election of Speaker. Jan. 4, 1965. The Democrat majority (289) voted for Representative John W. McCormack of Massachusetts and elected him Speaker of the House. The Republican minority (139) voted for Representative Gerald R. Ford.	Ford.
3	Seating the Mississippi delegation (H. Res. 1), Jan. 4, 1965. After an objection had been made to the seating of Mississippi's Congressmen-elect, H. Res. 1 was introduced directing the Speaker to administer the oath of office to the Mississippi delegation. Their election had been challenged by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party on the grounds of denial of voting rights to Negroes. Passed 276 to 149.	Yea.
4	House rule changes (H. Res. 8), Jan. 4, 1965. Adopted the rules of the previous Congress with some changes concentrating power in hands of the Speaker. Passed 224 to 202.	Nay.
6	New York Election Contest (H. Res. 126), Jan. 19, 1965. The House adopted this resolution to dismiss a contest of the election of Richard L. Ottinger, Democrat, of the 25th New York District, on the basis that the notice of contest was filed by a person who did not run for Congress in that election. Passed 245 to 102.	Yea.
7	Supplemental Agricultural Appropriations (H.J. Res. 234), recommittal motion against aid to Egypt, Jan. 26, 1965. A "yea" vote on this recommittal motion was a vote in favor of barring use of funds to finance exportation of surplus U.S. agricultural commodities to Egypt. Passed 204 to 177.	Yea.
10	Supplemental Agricultural Appropriations (H.J. Res. 234), motion to insist on disagreement with Senate amendment, Feb. 8, 1965. On this vote after administration pressure the House reversed its position and refused to disagree with a Senate amendment to allow Presidential discretion in regard to aid to Egypt in the form of bargain sales of farm goods under Public Law 480, title 1. A rubberstamp vote. Defeated 165 to 241.	Yea.
12	Federal Reserve Bank Gold Reserves (H.R. 3818), recommittal motion, Feb. 9, 1965. A "yea" vote on this motion to recommit was in effect a vote to kill the bill. Defeated 93 to 289.	Yea.
13	Federal Reserve Bank Gold Reserves (H.R. 3818), Feb. 9, 1965. Eliminated the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain reserves in gold certificates equal to at least 25 percent of the commercial bank deposits held by them. Nearly $5,000,000,000 in gold was earmarked for these reserve requirements. Passed 300 to 82.	Nay.
16	Arms Control Authorization (H.R. 2998), Feb. 17, 1965. This bill extended the life of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for 3 years with a $40,000,000 authorization for that period. Passed 302 to 63.	Nay.
19	Inter-American Development Authorization (H.R. 45), Feb. 18, 1965. A "yea" vote on this recommittal motion was a vote to reduce a proposed $750,000,000 authorization by $25,000,000 to $725,000,000. It was suggested in the course of debate that $25,000,000 could be better spent in keeping open the veterans' hospitals the administration was proposing to close. Defeated 142 to 237.	Yea.
20	Inter-American Development Authorization (H.R. 45), Feb. 18, 1965. The bill authorized a $750,000,000 increase in the U.S. contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank's fund for special operations in Latin America. Passed 288 to 93.	Nay.
23	House Un-American Activities Committee funds (H. Res. 188), Feb. 25, 1965. This recommittal motion was with instructions that open hearings be held on the justification for funds for the House Un-American Activities Committee. Defeated 58 to 333.	Nay.
24	House Un-American Activities Committee funds (H. Res. 188), Feb. 25, 1965. This resolution authorized the expenditure of $370,000 by the House Un-American Activities Committee. Passed 360 to 29.	Yea.
28	Appalachia bill (S. 3), Mar. 3, 1965. This recommittal motion was with instructions to substitute the provisions of H.R. 4466, which would have extended eligibility for special aid to all 50 States. Defeated 100 to 323.	Nay.
29	Appalachia bill (S. 3), Mar 3, 1965. Established an Appalachian Regional Commission and authorized $1,100,000,000 for special aid in 11 States in Appalachian areas. Mostly roadbuilding and needed public works. Passed 257 to 165.	Yea.
31	Drug abuse control (H.R. 2), Mar. 10, 1965. This bill was designed to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs and counterfeit drugs. Passed 402 to 0.	Yea.
33	Arts Council Authorization (H.R. 4714), Mar. 15, 1965. The bill proposed an authorization of $150,000 per year for expenses of a National Council on the Arts. Failed to pass 217 to 113.	NV—Nay.
35	Congressional Redistricting (H.R. 5505), Mar. 16, 1965. By a voice vote, the House passed this bill providing standards for congressional districts of contiguous territory "in as compact form as practicable," and with a population varying not more nor less than 15 percent from the average for a district in the State. The amendment which was the subject of this record vote proposed permitting at-large elections under certain circumstances. Defeated 147 to 255.	Yea.
38	Supreme Court Pay Raise (H. Res. 276), Mar. 17, 1965. Vote on the rule for consideration of H.R. 5374, the Supreme Court pay raise bill. Passed 202 to 183.	Nay.
39	Supreme Court Pay Raise (H.R. 5374), Mar. 17, 1965. This bill proposed raising the pay of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court from $40,000 to $43,000 per year and that of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court from $39,500 to $42,500. Defeated 178 to 202.	Nay.
42	District of Columbia Crime (H.R. 5688), Mar. 22, 1965. Motion to recommit was with instructions to the House District of Columbia Committee to hold public hearings on District of Columbia criminal legislation. Defeated 166 to 216.	Nay.
43	District of Columbia Crime (H.R. 5688), Mar. 22, 1965. The bill proposed allowing District of Columbia police to detain suspects for questioning for up to 6 hours; giving District of Columbia police greater leeway in obtaining voluntary confessions from criminals; attempting to somewhat limit insanity defenses by District of Columbia criminals; increasing penalties for certain crimes; suppressing the distribution, etc. of obscene materials. Passed 251 to 131.	Yea.

Voting record, 89th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Rollcall No.	Issue	Vote
45	Acreage-Poundage Tobacco Quotas (H.R. 5721), Mar. 23, 1965. Acreage-poundage quotas for tobacco growers instead of present acreage quotas were proposed in this bill. Passed 206 to 170.	Nay.
52	Federal School Aid (H.R. 2362), Mar. 26, 1965. This recommittal motion failed and language was left in the bill under which rich States would receive more per low-income family pupil than poor States, for example, $352 in New York, $120.50 in Mississippi. Defeated 149 to 267.	Yea.
53	Federal School Aid (H.R. 2362), Mar. 26, 1965. The bill proposed Federal aid through the States for local elementary and secondary schools with broad powers vested in U.S. Commissioners of Education. Passed 263 to 153.	Nay.
57	Grants To Help Older People (H.R. 3708), Mar. 31, 1965. This bill proposed providing assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older people through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and establishing an Administration on Aging with the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. Passed 396 to 1.	Yea.
58	Water Resources Planning (H.R. 1111), Mar. 31, 1965. Establishment of a Federal Water Resources Council was proposed in this bill which authorized $11,500,000 per year for 10 years and provided Federal matching grants for water resources development program planning. Passed 384 to 0.	Yea.
60	Manpower Training Program Extension (H.R. 4257), Apr. 1, 1965. Extended for 2 years and expanded the manpower development and training programs. Improved by amendments based on experience. Passed 395 to 0.	Yea.
62	Obscene Mail Return (H.R. 980), Apr. 5, 1965. This bill was to permit any person to return any mail which he considered to be obscene, indecent, or vile, etc., to the Postmaster General with a request that the sender be notified not to send any unsolicited mail to him or his children. Passed 360 to 21.	Yea.
63	Saigon Chancery (H.R. 7064), Apr. 5, 1965. Authorized a $1,000,000 appropriation of funds to build a new U.S. Embassy building in Saigon, Vietnam, to replace the one bombed by terrorists. Passed 378 to 0.	Yea.
64	Treasury-Post Office Appropriations (H.R. 7060), Apr. 5, 1965. Appropriated $6,600,000,000 for the Treasury, Post Office Department, Executive Office of the President, etc., for fiscal 1966. Passed 347 to 7.	Nay.
66	Second Supplemental Appropriations (H.R. 7091), Apr. 6, 1965. Appropriated $2,100,000,000 for a variety of agencies, mostly for fiscal 1965. It included money for the Appalachia program, for pay increases, for the Inter-American Development Bank, Veterans' Administration, Small Business Administration, for public assistance payments, etc. Passed 348 to 62.	Yea.
70	Medicare (H.R. 6675), Apr. 8, 1965. The object of this recommittal motion was to substitute an improved voluntary medicare plan, the text of H.R. 7057, sponsored by many Republicans, to replace compulsory plan proposed by the administration. Defeated 191 to 236.	Yea.
71	Medicare (H.R. 6675), Apr. 8, 1965. As passed by the House, the medicare program was based on a compulsory health insurance plan, financed through an additional payroll tax on employees and employers. Passed 313 to 115.	Nay.
72	Arms Control Authorization (H.R. 2998), Apr. 13, 1965. The conference report authorized $30,000,000 for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency over a 3-year period. Passed 316 to 65.	Nay.
74	Presidential Inability Amendment (H.J. Res. 1), Apr. 13, 1965. This amendment proposed that in case of a vacancy in the Office of Vice President, the President would appoint a new Vice President subject to confirmation by a majority vote of each House. Passed 368 to 29.	Yea.
76	Ku Klux Klan Investigation Funds (H. Res. 310), Apr. 14, 1965. This resolution provided $50,000 for additional expenses of the House Un-American Activities Committee for investigating the Ku Klux Klan. Passed 313 to 43.	Yea.
78	International Monetary Fund (H.R. 6497), recommittal motion, Apr. 27, 1965. A "yea" vote on this recommittal motion was in effect a vote to kill the bill authorizing an increase of $1,035,000,000 in the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund. Defeated 113 to 275.	Yea.
79	International Monetary Fund (H.R. 6497), Apr. 27, 1965. On passage of H.R. 6497 authorizing the $1,035,000,000 increase in the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund. Passed 301 to 88.	Nay.
82	Water Pollution Control Funds (S. 4), Apr. 28, 1965. The bill authorized $20,000,000 per year for 4 years for grants to States and localities to develop projects to demonstrate new or improved methods of controlling waste discharges from storm sewers or combined storm and sanitary sewers. Passed 396 to 0.	NV—Yea.
84	Second Supplemental Appropriations (H.R. 7091), Apr. 29, 1965. The House adopted the conference report on this bill appropriating $2,200,000,000 for various programs for fiscal year 1965. Passed 316 to 55.	NV—Yea.
85	Second Supplemental Appropriations (H.R. 7091), Apr. 29, 1965. A "nay" vote on this motion to recede and concur with a Senate amendment was a vote against spending $942,000 for subsidies for helicopter service in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. Defeated 144 to 228.	NV—Nay.
86	Arts Authorization (H.R. 4714), Apr. 29, 1965. This bill authorized $150,000 per year for the National Council on the Arts, instead of a one-shot $150,000 authorization previously voted. Passed 239 to 116.	NV—Nay.
87	Community Health Services (H.R. 2986), May 3, 1965. Extended and amended certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act such as vaccination of preschool children, health services for migrant workers, grants for health assistance to the States, and community health services grants. Passed 347 to 0.	NV—Yea.
90	Mental Health Grants (H.R. 2985), May 4, 1965. This bill authorized Federal grants for meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for community mental health centers. Passed 389 to 0.	Yea.
92	Vietnam Military Appropriation (H.J. Res. 447), May 5, 1965. This supplemental appropriation of $700,000,000 for military operations in southeast Asia was voted at the special request of the President. Passed 408 to 7.	Yea.
94	Military Procurement Authorization (H.R. 7657), May 5, 1965. The bill authorized $15,300,000,000 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces. Passed 395 to 0.	Yea.
96	Space Program Funds, NASA authorization (H.R. 7717), May 6, 1965. This was a vote on an open rule for consideration of and debate on H.R. 7717, the NASA authorization bill. Passed 389 to 0.	Yea.
97	Space Program Funds, NASA authorization (H.R. 7717), May 6, 1965. The bill authorized fiscal 1966 appropriations totaling $5,200,000,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and for administrative operations. Passed 389 to 11.	Yea.
99	Health Research Facility Grants (H.R. 2984), May 10, 1965. The program of Federal grants for construction of health research facilities was extended for 3 years and its authorization increased. Passed 334 to 4.	Yea.
101	Coffee Agreement (S. 701), May 12, 1965. Implemented the International Coffee Agreement of 1962 to stabilize world coffee prices to detriment of consumer. Passed 300 to 97.	Nay.
104	AEC Authorization (H.R. 8122), May 20, 1965. Had instructions to delete a section of the bill relating to cooperative research and development of a large "seed blanket" reactor because of Federal subsidization of the development of a power source. Defeated 43 to 313.	Yea.
105	AEC Authorization (H.R. 8122), May 20, 1965. Authorized appropriations of $2,560,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1966. Passed 352 to 1.	Yea.
109	Foreign Aid Authorization (H.R. 7750), May 25, 1965. To reduce the proposed development loan fund authorization by $131,000,000. Defeated 178 to 219.	NV—Yea.
110	Foreign Aid Authorization (H.R. 7750), May 25, 1965. Authorized $3,370,000,000 in foreign aid for fiscal year 1966. Passed 249 to 148.	NV—Nay.
112	Agriculture Appropriations (H.R. 8370), May 26, 1965. Vote to bar bargain sales of farm products to Sukarno and Nasser. Defeated 187 to 208.	NV—Yea.
113	Agriculture Appropriations (H.R. 8370), May 26, 1965. Appropriation of $5,700,000,000 for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for fiscal year 1966. Passed 354 to 41.	NV—Nay.
116	State, Justice, Commerce Appropriations (H.R. 8639), June 1, 1965. Appropriated $2,100,090,000 for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, the judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1966 and authorized appropriations of $3,900,000,000 from the highway trust fund. Passed 322 to 60.	Nay.
117	Small Coal Mine Safety (H.R. 3584), June 1, 1965. Extended Federal safety requirements to cover about 7,000 small coal mines employing fewer than 15 persons each underground. Passed 336 to 42.	Yea.
119	Excise Tax Reduction (H.R. 8371), June 2, 1965. Reduction and/or abolition of numerous excise taxes was proposed by this legislation. In 1964 the Democratic administration had fought against excise tax reduction and most Republicans favored reduction. Passed 401 to 6.	Yea.
121	FAA Administrator (H.R. 7777), June 3, 1965. This bill authorized the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee (U.S. Air Force, retired) to the Office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency under conditions such that this general would retain part of his military retired pay. The question was raised whether a military man should be appointed to this position, contrary to present law. Passed 228 to 137.	Nay.
123	Railroad Retirement (H.R. 3157), June 7, 1965. Proposed amending the Railroad Retirement Act to eliminate an annuity-reduction provision. Under this proposal, the spouse of a retired railroad worker could draw the entire amount of social security or railroad retirement benefits earned by her own employment, without any reduction in the spouse portion of her husband's railroad retirement benefits. Passed 323 to 0.	Yea.
126	Legislative Appropriations (H.R. 8775), June 8, 1965. Recommittal motion was designed to strike out the money to pay 16 elevator operators (patronage employees) to operate automatic elevators in the new Rayburn House Office Building. Defeated 149 to 244.	Yea.
127	Export Control Continuation (H.R. 7105), June 8, 1965. Extended the Export Control Act for a 4-year period. Passed 388 to 1.	NV—Yea.
129	National Debt Limit Increase (H. Res. 413), June 9, 1965. This vote ordered the previous question thus cutting off debate on H. Res. 413, the closed rule waiving points of order against the national debt limit increase bill. Passed 273 to 109.	NV—Nay.
130	National Debt Limit Increase (H.R. 8464), June 9, 1965. Increased the national debt limit by $4,000,000,000 from $324,000,000,000 to $328,000,000,000. This was the seventh national debt limit increase bill to pass Congress during the Democrat Kennedy-Johnson administrations. Passed 229 to 165.	Nay.
131	Kennedy Film (H. Con. Res. 285), June 9, 1965. Vote was on an amendment to prevent the charging of a fee to viewers of the film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums." Defeated 174 to 216.	Yea.
132	Kennedy Film (H. Con. Res. 285), June 9, 1965. The bill proposed allowing the showing in the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film on John F. Kennedy, which had been prepared for use abroad. Passed 311 to 75.	Nay.
141	Housing and Urban Development Department (H.R. 6927), June 16, 1965. This recommittal motion was to substitute the text of a Republican proposal which instead of setting up a new Government Cabinet-level department would have established an Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development in the President's Executive Office. Defeated 141 to 259.	Yea.
142	Housing and Urban Development Department (H.R. 6927), June 16, 1965. Set up a new Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development. Passed 217 to 184.	Nay.
143	Congressional Interns (H. Res. 416), June 16, 1965. Authorized each Congressman to hire a summer intern at $300 per month in addition to his regular staff. Passed 229 to 153.	Nay.

Voting record, 89th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Rollcall No.	Issue	Vote
145	Vocational Student Loan Insurance (H.R. 7743), June 21, 1965. Proposed a system of loan insurance and a supplementary system of direct loans to assist students to attend business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools above the high-school level. Passed 300 to 0.	Yea.
146	Agriculture Disaster Relief (H.R. 8620), June 21, 1965. Farm price-support payments were extended by this bill in cases where farmers who were participating in voluntary acreage reduction programs were unable to plant certain crops due to floods or other natural disasters, in effect providing price-support payments on these unplanted crops. Passed 297 to 2.	Yea.
147	Baltic States (H. Con. Res. 416), June 21, 1965. Urged that the President direct the attention of world opinion at the U.N. and other international forums, etc., to the denial of the rights of self-determination to the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, which were taken over by Russia during World War II. Passed 298 to 0.	Yea.
153	Defense Appropriations (H.R. 9221), June 23, 1965. Appropriated $45,200,000,000 for the Defense Department for fiscal year 1966. Passed 407 to 0.	Yea.
155	Area Redevelopment Extension (H.J. Res. 541), June 24, 1965. Extended the Area Redevelopment Act for a 2-month period, pending congressional consideration of further area redevelopment legislation. Passed 224 to 167.	Nay.
157	Housing and Urban Development (H. Res. 425), June 28, 1965. This was the vote on an open rule for consideration of the housing and urban development bill, H.R. 7984, including rent supplement provisions. Passed 230 to 115.	Nay.
162	Housing and Urban Development (H.R. 7984), June 30, 1965. Separate vote on amendment offered to save the rent supplement provision in the bill. Passed 240 to 179.	Nay.
163	Housing and Urban Development (H.R. 7984), June 30, 1965. A "yea" vote on this Republican-sponsored recommittal motion was a vote to take the rent supplement proposal out of the bill which would pay rent for many people who have incomes as high as $11,200. Defeated 202 to 208.	Yea.
164	Housing and Urban Development (H.R. 7984), June 30, 1965. As passed by the House, in addition to its rent supplement provisions, the bill extended and/or amended laws pertaining to public housing, community facilities, urban renewal, FHA insurance, college housing, open-space acquisition and urban beautification, rural housing, FNMA mortgage purchases, etc., and it authorized various new programs and increased the cost authorizations of various present ones. Passed 245 to 169.	Nay.
167	Voting Rights (H. Res. 440), July 6, 1965. Vote on adoption of a rule to consider H.R. 6400, the voting-rights bill, and providing for 10 hours of debate on the bill. Passed 308 to 58.	Yea.
175	Voting Rights (H.R. 6400), clean-elections amendment, July 9, 1965. This Republican sponsored clean-elections amendment provided penalties of fines and/or imprisonment for giving false information for registration or voting eligibility, for conspiracy to encourage false registration or illegal voting, for paying or accepting payment for votes or registration in regard to elections where voting for Federal offices takes place. Passed 253 to 165.	Yea.
176	Voting Rights (H.R. 6400), July 9, 1965. The purpose of this amendment was to allow termination of the Federal registrar procedure, etc., in areas when more than half of their voting-age Negro population was registered to vote and various other conditions were met. Defeated 155 to 262.	Nay.
177	Voting Rights (H.R. 6400), July 9, 1965. The purpose of this amendment was to add a stipulation that no person be denied the right to vote because of inability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter in the English language, if he had an education in another language under the American flag, in most cases through the 6th-grade level. Defeated 202 to 216.	Nay.
178	Voting Rights (H.R. 6400), July 9, 1965. A "yea" vote on this recommittal motion was a vote to substitute the text of a Republican bill, H.R. 6400 which applied equally nationwide. Defeated 171 to 248.	Yea.
179	Voting Rights (H.R. 6400), July 9, 1965. This was the vote on passage of the Democratic version of the voting rights bill after defeat of the move to substitute the Republican bill. However, this bill included the Republican clean elections amendment. Passed 333 to 85.	Yea.
181	AEC Powerlines (H.R. 8856), July 12, 1965. The object of this bill was to clarify the rights of the AEC in regard to land condemnation so that it could condemn land to build above-ground high-voltage lines. Failed to pass 216 to 139.	NV—Nay.
182	Summer Government Jobs (H.R. 242), July 12, 1965. This bill proposed that temporary summer Government jobs in Washington, D.C., be apportioned among the residents of the States, territories, and District of Columbia. Passed 336 to 22.	NV—Yea.
185	Cigarette Labeling Act (S. 559), July 13, 1965. This bill required cigarette package labeling as follows: "Caution: Cigarette Smoking May Be Hazardous To Your Health." It also prohibited requirements for health warnings on cigarette advertising during the following 4 years. Passed 285 to 103.	Yea.
188	Coinage Debasement (H.R. 8926), July 14, 1965. A "yea" vote on this amendment was a vote to retain silver in our dimes and quarters, to the extent of a 40-percent silver content. Defeated 187 to 218.	Yea.
189	Coinage Debasement (H.R. 8926), July 14, 1965. Authorized a new coinage of cupronickel dimes and quarters "sandwich coins" described by some as "funny money" with a layer of copper between two layers of nickel, and a coinage of 40-percent silver half dollars. Passed 255 to 151.	Nay.
193	Armed Services Pay Raise (H.R. 9075), July 20, 1965. Proposed an armed services pay increase averaging 10.6 percent. Passed 410 to 0	Yea.
196	Poverty Program Expansion (H.R. 8283), July 22, 1965. This recommittal motion was with instructions to hold the 1966 poverty program authorization at the 1965 level of $947,500,000 instead of more than doubling it to $1,900,000,000. It also proposed cutting out a provision to allow Federal bureaucrats to override the veto by a State Governor of certain poverty projects in his State. Defeated 178 to 227.	Yea.
197	Poverty Program Expansion (H.R. 8283), July 22, 1965. Provided a vastly increased $1,900,000,000 authorization for 1966 for the poverty program. It rejected numerous amendments including ones to prohibit political discrimination and activity in programs, to limit administrative and salary costs to 10 percent of appropriations, and to limit pay of Job Corps enrollees to prevailing wage rates. Passed 245 to 158.	Nay.
199	Ending State Action on Closed Shop (H. Res. 437), July 26, 1965. This was the vote on the rule for consideration of H.R. 77 to repeal sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which permitted States to enact "right to work" laws. The rule was so worded as to prohibit significant amendments to the bill, as it provided that the only amendments permitted were those the presiding officer decided were germane to the bill. Passed 248 to 171.	Nay.
203	Medicare (H.R. 6675), July 27, 1965. Vote on the conference report on the medicare bill. Passed 307 to 116	Nay.
204	Housing and Urban Development (H.R. 7984), July 27, 1965. Adopting conference report on the housing and urban development bill with its "rent supplement." Passed 251 to 168.	Nay.
205	Mental Health Grants (H.R. 2985), July 27, 1965. Adoption of the conference report on the Community Mental Health Centers Act. Passed 414 to 0.	Yea.
208	Ending State Action on Closed Shop (H.R. 77), July 28, 1965. Vote to return the bill to committee for further action. Defeated 200 to 223.	Yea.
209	Ending State Action on Closed Shop (H.R. 77), July 28, 1965. Vote to take away from people of the several States the option they had under sec. 14(b) of Taft-Hartley to enact laws regulating or prohibiting the closed shop which in effect forces a worker to join a union in order to keep his job. Passed 221 to 203.	Nay.
212	AEC Powerlines (H.R. 8856), July 29, 1965. Clarified the rights of the AEC in regard to land condemnation for aboveground powerlines in regard to a dispute with California communities which wanted underground lines within their limits. Passed 275 to 125.	Nay.
214	Highway Funds Authorization (S.J. Res. 81), Aug. 2, 1965. Authorized the apportionment of $3,000,000,000 for the interstate highway for fiscal year 1967. It also provided that no Federal-aid highway funds be apportioned to any State after 1967, unless that State has a highway safety program approved by the Secretary of Commerce. Passed 314 to 11.	Yea.
215	Police Training (H.R. 8027), Aug. 2, 1965. Law Enforcement Assistance Act, authorized Federal grants for programs to train local law enforcement personnel, etc. Passed 326 to 0.	Yea.
216	Prisoner Rehabilitation (H.R. 6494), Aug. 2, 1965. This bill authorized the use of work-release furloughs, emergency leaves for Federal prisoners, and prerelease "halfway houses" to help them adjust to impending freedom. Passed 324 to 0.	Yea.
218	Voting Rights (S. 1564), Aug. 3, 1965. The Senate had added a provision to the voting rights bill which the House had previously voted down to allow termination of the Federal registrar procedure in areas when more than half of their voting-age Negro population registered to vote and various other conditions were met. This recommittal motion was with instructions to conferees to insist on getting this provision out of the bill. Defeated 118 to 284.	Yea.
219	Voting Rights (S. 1564), Aug. 3, 1965. Adoption of the conference report on the voting rights bill. Passed 328 to 74	Yea.
220	Retirement Increase (H.R. 8469), Aug. 3, 1965. This bill proposed increasing civil service retirement annuities, in most cases by 11 percent for those who retired before Oct. 2, 1956, and by 6 percent for those retiring later. Passed 394 to 0.	Yea.
221	Military Construction Authorization (H.R. 8439), Aug. 4, 1965. Approval of conference report. Passed 389 to 0	Yea.
222	International Banks (S. 1742), Aug. 4, 1965. This bill permitted U.S. Governors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation to agree to amendments to the articles of agreement of these institutions to let the bank increase its capital stock and lend to the International Finance Corporation, which, in turn, leads to foreign businesses for foreign industrial development. Could be detrimental to U.S. industry and labor. Passed 330 to 54.	Nay.
224	Interest Equalization Tax Extension (H. Res. 498), Aug. 5, 1965. Vote on a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 4750, the interest equalization tax extension bill. Passed 329 to 44.	NV—Nay.
225	Interest Equalization Tax Extension (H.R. 4750), Aug. 5, 1965. Extended for 17 months and broadened the coverage of a tax on the purchase of certain foreign securities by Americans. Passed 274 to 97.	NV—Nay.
228	D.C. Auto Insurance (H.R. 9918), Aug. 9, 1965. Substituted a new text for this bill on the subject of protection against uninsured motorists. Passed 173 to 156.	Nay.
230	Draft Card Mutilations (H.R. 10306) Aug. 10, 1965. Made it a crime to forge, alter, knowingly destroy or mutilate a draft card with penalties of a fine up to $10,000, or up to 5 years in prison. Passed 393 to 1.	Yea.
234	Regional Development (S. 1648), Aug. 12, 1965. This amendment proposed authorizing $500,000,000 for 4 years, instead of $400,000,000 a year for 5 years for the public works and development facilities programs in the bill. It might be described as an accelerated spending amendment. Passed 196 to 194.	Nay.
235	Regional Development (S. 1648), Aug. 12, 1965. This Republican-sponsored recommittal motion was with instructions to include a buy American provision, to provide for an annual congressional review of the Economic Development Loan Fund, to cut out a provision allowing Federal loans for guarantees for buying or developing land or facilities. Defeated 163 to 224.	Yea.
236	Regional Development (S. 1648), Aug. 12, 1965. Extended and broadened the Area Redevelopment and Public Works Acceleration Acts and extended to other areas part of the aid programs previously voted for Appalachia, with a several year authorization of $3,250,000,000. The annual authorization was even greater than that requested by the administration. Passed 246 to 138.	Nay.

Voting record, 89th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Rollcall No.	Issue	Vote
238	Nickel Duty Suspension (H.R. 6431), Aug. 16, 1965. Amended the Tariff Act to allow the duty-free import of certain kinds of nickel. Passed 297 to 48.	NV—Nay.
239	Federal Boxing Commission (H.R. 8635), Aug. 16, 1965. Proposed establishment of a Federal Boxing Commission with the aim of curbing racketeering in boxing. Passed 346 to 4.	NV—Yea.
242	Foreign Aid Authorization (H.R. 7750), Aug. 19, 1965. Authorized $3,360,000,000 in foreign aid for fiscal year 1966. Passed 244 to 150.	Nay.
243	Agriculture, Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 (H.R. 9811), Aug. 19, 1965. Motion to recommit. Farm bill with increased reliance on controls and doles. Direct payment provisions in cotton program as well as sale or lease of cotton allotments. Bread tax was extended although the administration proposal to increase it by 50 cents a bushel was taken out of the bill. Improved cropland retirement program included in bill. 4-year cost of $16,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000. Defeated 169 to 224.	Yea.
244	Agriculture, Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 (H.R. 9811), Aug. 19, 1965. Passage of same bill as described in roll call No. 243. Passed 221 to 172.	Nay.
246	Labor-HEW Supplemental Appropriation (H.R. 10586), Aug. 24, 1965. Recommittal motion which urged that all supplemental appropriations requests should be considered in 1 bill instead of piecemeal, with a reexamination of domestic spending in view of increased spending needs for the war in Vietnam. Defeated 139 to 263.	Yea.
248	Immigration (H.R. 2580), Aug. 25, 1965. Separate vote on amendment to limit immigration into the United States from Western Hemisphere countries to 115,000 persons per year. Defeated 189 to 218.	Yea.
249	Immigration (H.R. 2580), Aug. 25, 1965. Completely revised our immigration laws. It abolished the national origins quota system and established a new set of priorities for admission to the United States. Passed 318 to 95.	Yea.
252	Higher Education (H.R. 9567), Aug. 26, 1965. Extended previous programs and authorized new programs in the field of Federal aid to colleges. It covered student assistance, community service programs by colleges, aid in constructing college buildings, programs aimed at increasing college academic quality, college library assistance. The estimated cost for fiscal year 1966 ran to $600,000,000. Passed 367 to 22.	Yea.
253	School Aid Liberalization (H.R. 9022), Aug. 30, 1965. Granted Federal aid to schools in areas where schools have been damaged or destroyed by natural disasters, retained Federal impacted area school aid in various localities affected by military base closings, liberalized the requirements for eligibility for Federal aid to impacted areas making several of the largest cities eligible for this aid. Passed 305 to 37.	Yea.
254	Removing Tariff on Canadian Autos (H. Res. 551), Aug. 31, 1965. Vote on a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 9042 to authorize the President to remove the tariff on Canadian autos and automotive parts. Passed 363 to 23.	Yea.
255	Removing Tariffs on Canadian Autos (H.R. 9042), Aug. 31, 1965. Allowed the implementation of an agreement made by the President with Canada for removal of such duties by both countries. Bill discriminated against American manufacturers of auto replacement parts who were not benefited by the trade agreement and was of special benefit to companies with plants on both sides of the border to the detriment of smaller independent parts manufacturers. Passed 280 to 113.	Nay.
257	Health Education Aid (H.R. 3141), Sept. 1, 1965. This bill extended and broadened programs of Federal aid for building health professions teaching facilities, for training and student loans in health fields. It authorized new programs of health profession scholarships and for improving teaching programs. Passed 340 to 47.	Nay.
259	High-Speed Transportation (H.R. 5863), Sept. 2, 1965. Authorized the Commerce Secretary to undertake research and development of high-speed ground transportation, a 3-year program with an authorization of $90,000,000. Passed 317 to 24.	NV—Yea.
262	Military Construction Authorization (H.R. 8439), Sept. 7, 1965. The House adopted a motion to table a motion to discharge the House Armed Services Committee from further consideration of H.R. 8439, the fiscal 1966 military construction authorization which had been vetoed by the President.	NV—Yea.
	This tabling had the effect of preventing a direct House vote on the question of overriding the Presidential veto. The President had objected to limitations in the bill on future closings of military installations. Passed 320 to 19.	
263	Military Construction Authorization (H.R. 10775), Sept. 7, 1965. The House passed the military construction authorization bill to replace H.R. 8439. (See previous vote.)	
	This bill included provisions for an extremely watered down congressional review of military base closings to replace the stronger limitations in the vetoed bill. Passed 347 to 0.	NV—Yea.
264	Veterans Compensation (H.R. 168), Sept. 7, 1965. Bill was to raise compensation rates for veterans with service-connected disabilities by approximately 10 percent. Passed 348 to 0.	NV—Yea.
265	Crime Commission Funds (S.J. Res. 102), Sept. 7, 1965. Bill authorized $1,500,000 for the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice and the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia. Passed 338 to 0.	NV—Yea.
269	Foreign Aid Appropriation (H.R. 10871), Sept. 8, 1965. Appropriated $3,300,000,000 for foreign aid plus $716,000,000 for related programs for fiscal year 1966. Passed 239 to 143.	NV—Nay.
296	Park Service Concessions (H.R. 2091), Sept. 14, 1965. Granted concessioners at areas administered by the National Park Service "possessory interest" in improvements made at their concessions and provided for compensation to them if these improvements are taken by the Government. Defeated 73 to 298.	NV—Nay.
299	Poverty Program Expansion (H.R. 8283), Sept. 15, 1965. Recommittal of the conference report on the poverty program expansion bill with instructions to conferees to insist on including a provision for vetoes by State Governors on certain projects within their States, but allowing Federal officials to override such vetoes. Passed 209 to 180.	Yea.
301	Arts and Humanities Foundation (H.R. 9460), Sept. 15, 1965. This bill established a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities with $20,000,000 per year authorized for 3 years for grants, loans, fellowships, etc. Recommittal vote to check wide discretionary authority of the Director. Defeated 128 to 251.	Yea.
303	Patronage Employee Name Disclosure (H. Res. 574), Sept. 16, 1965. This resolution directed the Postmaster General to furnish a complete list of temporary summer employees to the House. Vote occurred on motion to table. Passed 185 to 180.	Nay.
304	Nuclear Accident Indemnification (S. 2042), Sept. 16, 1965. This bill extended the authority of the AEC to indemnify licensees and contractors under the Atomic Energy Act for liability and limiting Federal indemnification to not more than $500,000,000 per accident. Passed 337 to 30.	Yea.
306	Defense Appropriations (H.R. 9221), Sept. 17, 1965. Vote on the conference report on the defense appropriations bill with a $47,000,000,000 price tag. Passed 381 to 0.	Yea.
307	Mississippi Contested Elections (H. Res. 585), Sept. 17, 1965. This resolution dismissed a challenge against the election of the Mississippi House delegation. Passed 228 to 143.	Yea.
309	Servicemen's Life Insurance (H.R. 10873), Sept. 20, 1965. This bill made group life insurance coverage of $5,000 or $10,000 available to servicemen on active duty. It also provided death gratuity payments available to survivors of certain servicemen who died between Jan. 1, 1957, and the effective date of this new insurance program. Passed 362 to 0.	Yea.
310	Anti-Communist Intervention (H. Res. 560), Sept. 20, 1965. The resolution expressed the sense of the House that in case of the intervention of international communism in any American nation, another American nation or nations may take steps to forestall or combat Communist intervention, domination or control which steps could go so far as resort to armed force. Passed 312 to 52.	Yea.
313	Water Pollution Control Funds (S. 4), Sept. 21, 1965. The House adopted the conference report on the water pollution control funds and water quality standards bill. Passed 379 to 0.	Yea.
315	Rivers and Harbors (S. 2300), Sept. 22, 1965. The House approved this amendment which deleted the $217,000,000 Dickey-Lincoln School power project on the St. John's River in Maine from the bill. Passed 207 to 185.	Yea.
316	Cultural and Trade Center (H.R. 30), Sept. 22, 1965. This bill provided for U.S. participation in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla. Passed 254 to 113.	Nay.
318	Adjournment Motion, Sept. 22, 1965. The House defeated this motion to adjourn. Defeated 89 to 204	Yea.
320	Bank Holding Companies (H.R. 7371), Sept. 23, 1965. This amendment proposed repealing more exemptions from coverage by the Bank Holding Company Act than had been proposed in the unamended bill. After adoption of the amendment, the bill repealing most exemptions from coverage by the Bank Holding Company Act passed by a voice vote. Passed 199 to 178.	Yea.
321	Rural Water and Sanitation Loans (H. Res. 580), Sept. 23, 1965. The House ordered the previous question on H. Res. 580, the rule for consideration on H.R. 10232, the rural water and sanitation loan bill. Preceding this vote, there was debate on the question of why the rule provided that all points of order against the bill be waived. Passed 280 to 70.	Nay.
322	Rural Water and Sanitation (H.R. 10232), Sept. 23, 1965. This bill expanded a Farmers Home Administration water systems program to provide for loans and grants for both water and sewage systems for small towns and rural communities. Passed 326 to 10.	Yea.
324	Air Pollution (S. 306), Sept. 24, 1965. This recommittal motion was with instructions to remove the solid waste disposal program from the bill. Defeated 80 to 220.	Yea.
325	Air Pollution (S. 306), Sept. 24, 1965. This bill authorized the Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary to set standards on exhaust products from new motor vehicles. It also authorized appropriation of $92,500,000 over a 4-year period for research and development regarding the disposal of solid wastes and for Federal aid to State and local governments for solid waste disposal programs. Passed 294 to 4.	Yea.
327	District of Columbia Home Rule (H. Res. 515), Sept. 27, 1965. The House approved a motion to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of H. Res. 515, the open rule providing for the consideration of, waiving points of order against, and 5 hours of debate on H.R. 4644, a District of Columbia home-rule bill. Passed 213 to 183.	Nay.
328	District of Columbia Home Rule (H. Res. 515), Sept. 27, 1965. This was the vote to approve the bill described in the preceding vote. Passed 223 to 179.	Nay.
330	District of Columbia Home Rule (H.R. 4644), Sept. 27, 1965. The House passed a motion to resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House for consideration of H.R. 4644. Passed 234 to 155.	Nay.
336	District of Columbia Home Rule (H.R. 4644), Sept. 29, 1965. The House defeated this motion to strike the enacting clause, which would have killed the bill. Defeated 179 to 219.	Yea.
337	District of Columbia Home Rule (H.R. 4644), Sept. 29, 1965. The House by approving this amended amendment substituted a proposal which provided for District of Columbia charter commission and local referendum. Passed 227 to 174.	Yea.
338	District of Columbia Home Rule (H.R. 4644), Sept. 29, 1965. Motion to recommit the bill. Defeated 134 to 267	Yea.
339	District of Columbia Home Rule (H.R. 4644), Sept. 29, 1965. This was the vote on passage of the District of Columbia home rule bill as amended to provide for an elected charter commission to draft a home rule proposal. Passed 283 to 117.	Yea.

Voting record, 89th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Rollcall No.	Issue	Vote
341	Immigration (H.R. 2580), Sept. 30, 1965. The House adopted the conference report on the immigration bill. Passed 320 to 69	Yea.
342	Federal Pay Raise (H.R. 10281), Sept. 30, 1965. The recommittal motion was with instructions to remove provisions which provided for a congressional pay raise and future automatic congressional pay raises whenever general Federal pay raises would be granted. Passed 238 to 140.	Yea.
343	Federal Pay Raises (H.R. 10281), Sept. 30, 1965. This bill granted a Federal pay increase of 4 percent as its principal provision. Passed 370 to 7	Yea.
345	Madison Memorial Library (H.J. Res. 642), Oct. 1, 1965. This recommittal motion was with instructions to study the feasibility of a visitors center in or near the proposed Madison Memorial Library. Defeated 17 to 321.	Nay.
346	Madison Memorial Library (H.J. Res. 642), Oct. 1, 1965. This bill authorized construction of a 3d Library of Congress building to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall. Passed 328 to 5.	Yea.
347	Foreign Aid Appropriations (H.R. 10871), Oct. 1, 1965. The House had inserted language in the foreign aid appropriation bill which in effect prohibited foreign aid to countries whose ships carried goods to North Vietnam. In conference, a Senate amendment was accepted which watered down this provision to the point of ineffectiveness. A "yea" vote on this recommittal motion with instructions to disagree with the weak-language Senate amendment was, in effect, a vote for a strong prohibition against aid to nations trading with North Vietnam. Defeated 164 to 174.	Yea.
348	Foreign Aid Appropriations (H.R. 10871), Oct. 1, 1965. The House adopted the conference report on the foreign aid bill appropriating $3,200,000,000 for foreign aid and $714,000,000 for related programs. Passed 204 to 127.	Nay.
349	Medical Library Facilities (H.R. 3142), Oct. 1, 1965. This bill provided for a program of Federal grants to assist in meeting the needs for adequate medical library services and facilities. Passed 296 to 3.	Yea.
350	Jefferson National Expansion Memorial (H.R. 6519), Oct. 1, 1965. This bill increased the authorization for Federal contributions to the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis. Passed 250 to 12.	Yea.
353	Ryukyu Islands Damages (S.J. Res. 32), Oct. 7, 1965. This bill authorized $22,000,000 to pay Ryukyu islanders for damages by the U.S. occupation forces. Passed 312 to 55.	NV—Yea.
354	Nevada Water Project (H.R. 2020), Oct. 7, 1965. This bill authorized an $81,000,000 southern Nevada water project. The bill gave the Nevada area special treatment not available to other communities. Passed 239 to 134.	NV—Nay.
356	Highway Environment Control (S. 2084), Oct. 7, 1965. Recommittal motion was with instructions to insert language providing in effect that States under their own zoning laws would determine the areas to be covered by the bill. Defeated 153 to 230.	Yea.
357	Highway Environment Control (S. 2084), Oct. 7, 1965. This bill provided for the use of Federal funds to help States control billboards and junkyards along interstate and primary highways, with the threat of loss of part of Federal-aid highway funds as a club to compel compliance with Federal regulations. The bill authorized $80,000,000 over a 2-year period for the Federal share of compensation to billboard and junkyard owners whose signs come down or whose operations are screened. It also authorized $240,000,000 for payments to the States for landscaping, etc., along Federal-aid highways, plus $5,000,000 for administrative expenses under the bill. Passed 245 to 138.	Nay.
363	Sugar Bill (H. Res. 598), Oct. 12, 1965. Vote on closed rule on H.R. 11135, the sugar bill. Passed 253 to 80	Yea.
366	Sugar Bill (H.R. 11135), Oct. 13, 1965. Recommittal motion was with instructions to impose an import fee on most foreign sugar imports, so that the U.S. Treasury would get part of the revenue from the artificially high price paid to foreign producers. Defeated 160 to 230.	Yea.
367	Sugar Bill (H.R. 11135), Oct. 13, 1965. This bill proposed foreign and domestic sugar quotas for the period extending through 1971. This legislation continues a longtime policy under which the U.S. sugar market is divided between domestic and foreign producers by means of quotas with U.S. growers receiving very little of the additional quota available. At the time this bill was passed, the U.S. price of sugar was more than double the world price due to policies of limiting imports and domestic production and imposing a processing tax on raw sugar. Passed 246 to 147.	Nay.
376	Higher Education Act (H.R. 9567), Oct. 20, 1965. Motion to recommit conference report to delete section authorizing National Teachers Corps. Failed 152 to 226.	Yea.
377	Conference report (H.R. 9567), Oct. 20, 1965. Passed 313 to 63	Nay
378	Rivers and Harbors conference report (S. 2300), Oct. 20, 1965. Senate added Dickey-Lincoln project which had previously been deleted by House. Separate vote on this project. Passed 221 to 139.	Nay.
380	Conference report (H.R. 11588), Oct. 21, 1965. Supplemental appropriation, $4,700,000,000 bill. Passed 251 to 84	Nay.
381	Conference report (H.R. 11588), Oct. 21, 1965. Separate vote on Dickey-Lincoln project appropriation in supplemental bill. Passed 165 to 162	Nay.
383	Conference report on Sugar bill (H.R. 11135), Oct. 22, 1965. Passed 174 to 88. Bill referred to in rollcall No. 367	Nay.

RETIREMENT OF F. S. MILBERG AND ALBERT SCHNEIDER AS OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised that if we adjourn this evening this will be the last day of duty for two of the most faithful employees of the House.

Mr. F. S. Milberg, dean of the Official Reporters of Debates of the House of Representatives, and Mr. Albert Schneider, Official Reporter of Debates of the House of Representatives, are retiring after long years of loyal and dedicated service to this House.

Mr. Milberg came to his service in the House of Representatives in 1935, and has served 32 years in his official capacity covering the debates. Prior to his service for the House he had more than 20 years of experience in shorthand reporting all over the United States and in Canada.

Mr. Milberg, who lives in Maryland, exercises his prerogative as a constituent, making criticisms and suggestions he feels appropriate. He has been one of the most faithful and most popular of the employees of the House.

Mr. Albert Schneider is now completing 42 years of service to the House of Representatives as one of its Official Reporters. For 30 years he served as an Official Committee Reporter of the House, and for the past 12 years he has served as an Official Reporter of Debates. He came to this House in 1923. He had previously served as a reporter for Al Smith, the late Governor of New York. He has served this House well and faithfully as long as he has been here in an official capacity.

Mr. Milberg, who plans to divide his retirement time between Florida and Washington, D.C., cites as one of his most memorable experiences the incident when the Puerto Ricans shot up the House of Representatives while it was in session.

Albert Schneider has the oustanding distinction of being the world's champion shorthand reporter, in tests conducted in 1921. He is a protege of John Robert Gregg, the founder of the Gregg shorthand method of verbatim reporting.

These are two men we will miss, two men to whom we wish the very best of luck in their retirement, two men we will remember when we no longer see them here every day.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE UNITED STATES

The **SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, certain events of the past few weeks concerning Edward Grady Partin, admitted informer in the Hoffa case, raise questions of serious concern to me regarding the administration of justice in the United States.

It has come to my attention that one of the Partin indictments which was pending against him at the time he volunteered to become an informer for the United States, first-degree manslaughter and leaving the scene of an accident in the State of Alabama—was nolle prossed. Ten days later, the Alabama jury in the civil case awarded a verdict of $150,000 in damages to the mother of the young airman who was killed in the accident which led to the manslaughter charge and from which Partin fled and attempted to conceal his automobile causing the accident.

Another indictment against Partin which was pending at the time he became a Government informer involving 26 counts of embezzlement of union funds and falsifying records in violation of the Landrum-Griffin Act is still pending.

I am not concerned with Edward Grady Partin as such nor am I assessing the guilt or innocence of James R. Hoffa. I am concerned, however, with a system of law enforcement in which the Government participates in rendering an individual immune from prosecution for alleged crimes committed in return for cooperating in "getting" another person.

Serious questions arise surrounding the circumstances of Partin's continued immunity:

Why was Partin released from his Baton Rouge cell where he was incarcerated because his bail bond had been canceled?

Why has the Department of Justice granted him its protective mantle when he was faced with at least three lifetimes in jail under the four indictments that were then pending against him?

Why does the Department of Justice continue to afford Edward Grady Partin the protection of U.S. marshals even when he is engaged in racing automobiles in various States in the Union?

Why does Partin receive the protection of marshals while he is engaged in a strike at this very moment with Bulk Transport in Louisiana and where Partin and his local have been enjoined from all picketing because of the violence that has erupted in the course of the strike?

Why should U.S. marshals be provided at taxpayers' expense in a situation where attempts have been made to blow up gas tanks, where the cabs of trucks have been riddled with bullets, where drivers have been severely beaten?

Why should this protection be afforded at taxpayers' expense when we have lost marshal protection in southern Illinois?

Why does the State of Alabama refuse to intervene in prosecuting Partin in a case which has already resulted in a damage suit of $150,000 assessed against Partin and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters?

Why did the Department of Justice avidly seek the indictment of Partin on 26 counts of Landrum-Griffin violations encouraging witnesses to appear before the grand jury at the risk of their lives for testifying against Partin and now engages in a series of requests for postponement of the trial for an indefinite period?

A major purpose of the Landrum-Griffin law in 1959 was to protect the rank-and-file trade union member against misuse of his union dues by union officers. The Justice Department supported passage of that legislation. They asserted that it was urgently required. Yet here we have the Justice Department sitting for over 3 years on 26 counts of an indictment for embezzlement and falsification of union accounts against a trade union official.

Today that official is still operating as the secretary-treasurer of local No. 5 of the Teamsters Union.

Yet, this man, Edward Partin, is alleged to be an embezzler. At least, that is the view of a grand jury which looked long and hard into his affairs. Thirteen counts of embezzlement were handed down against him. Was not the Landrum-Griffin law passed, in part, because of allegations of corruption being backed up by violence to silence internal critics where embezzlement of union funds was taking place? Such specific allegations have been made in regard to Partin's local. The two chief critics of Partin, and the early voices to allege the embezzlement which was confirmed by the grand jury, were set upon and savagely beaten as a reward for their vigilance. A 600-pound safe, with all the local's books and records then disappeared from the union hall and was found empty in the river. One of Partin's two major critics was killed in an unusual industrial accident.

Is this not the pattern of events that we set out to cure in 1959 by passage of the Landrum-Griffin law? Then the Justice Department said "Give us the tools and we will finish the job." We gave them the tools but they have lain down on the job.

What use is it for us here and for our friends in the other body to hold hearings, to write reports, to attend debates and to work to perfect a law to minimize trade union corruption if that law is not going to be enforced in so flagrant a case as this? Here we have 13 counts of embezzlement, 13 more counts of falsifying accounts, records have been destroyed, critics have been beaten and one has even been silenced forever by a strange accident, yet—for more than 3 years now—the indictments have been in suspense.

There is an affidavit alleging that Partin told a cellmate that he was prepared to testify to anything that the Government wanted him to testify to if "he could be sprung."

What was Edward Grady Partin facing when he told the district attorney in Baton Rouge that he had evidence that would get Hoffa?

Here are the facts.

On October 5, 1962, Edward Grady Partin, a Teamster official in Baton Rouge, La., lay in jail facing the following charges:

First. Forgery of a union withdrawal card. Trial date had been set for October 23 in district court.

Second. Embezzlement and falsifying records, 26 counts in all, 13 of falsifying records and 13 of embezzlement. Partin was expecting to go to trial in the Federal court and could have been fined $260,000 and sentenced to 78 years in prison on these counts.

Third. Manslaughter—Partin also faced first degree manslaughter and leaving the scene indictments in the State of Alabama.

Fourth. Kidnaping—Partin was under indictment on the charge of aggravated kidnaping and trial had been set for the jury week of November 12 in district court.

Three damage suits totaling $400,000 were also pending against Partin in connection with the Alabama incident which was the basis of the manslaughter indictment.

Two days later, October 7, 1962, Partin walked out of jail. He has not been back. Today he is the secretary-treasurer of Local No. 5 of the Teamsters Union in Baton Rouge, La.

On October 5, 1962, when Partin lay in jail over these multiple, serious indictments and facing civil suits claiming heavy damages, his prospects were further darkened by a New York bonding company revoking his $50,000 bailing bond. Two days later Partin went free on three new bonds totaling $60,000. In the following 2 weeks the trials of Partin on various charges were postponed by Government request.

Evidence by Justice Department Lawyer A. Frank Grimsley, at the Chattanooga trial, makes it plain that Partin's sudden change of fortune took place after he had contacted the Justice Department in late September through a police investigator. Grimsley testified that he met Partin "at least two times. Possibly three." These conferences Grimsley admitted, under strong cross-examination, "probably started in late September (1962)." Grimsley made no bones about the matter that Partin was operating as a Federal undercover agent in the Hoffa case the day after he was released from jail. On the day, October 8, 1962, Partin made a telephone call to Hoffa in Newark, N.J. The telephone call, with Partin's cooperation but unknown to Hoffa, was recorded by Justice Department investigators. The tape recording of the telephone conversation became a part of the record of the Chattanooga trial. Why did the Justice Department introduce that record after Partin had left the witness stand and leave defense attorneys unable to question Partin about this basic and critical piece of evidence?

In the course of the October 8 telephone call Partin requested to see and discuss with President Hoffa the problems of his Baton Rouge Teamster local. Partin came to Nashville, where Hoffa was about to go on trial, and stayed for 2½ months. He ingratiated himself into the inner counsel of the Hoffa group, listened in on consultations between Hoffa and his lawyers, and even—according to sworn testimony—made suggestions to Hoffa lawyers that they appoint him (Partin) to take part in extra-legal activities in order to help Hoffa. These suggestions by Partin were rebuffed, Teamster lawyer William Bufalino testified.

Throughout this period Partin reported regularly to Justice Department lawyers who worked on the prosecution of Mr. Hoffa. Does not the record of the Chattanooga trial support 100 percent the defense contention that Partin was a paid informer of the Justice Department planted upon the defendant and his lawyers?

THE PARTIN RECORD

What sort of a man was Edward Grady Partin that the U.S. Justice Department should grant him immunity from a series of felony prosecutions and then present him as the key witness in a most important national trial?

Partin has other criminal records besides the indictments for embezzlement, falsifying records, forgery, kidnaping, and manslaughter which stood against him at the time the Justice Department employed him. In 1943, Partin was sentenced in the State of Washington to serve 15 years for burglary. He twice escaped from jail during the serving of the sentence. FBI records show Partin—FBI No. 2249716—was arrested some 15 times between 1941 and 1948 on a variety of charges including burglary, robbery, and auto theft, larceny, theft, robbery with firearms, etc. When faced with this record by Hoffa attorneys, Partin, on the witness stand, pleaded, "I don't remember, I certainly don't." Partin insisted he had no memory of his burglary conviction and 15-year sentence but finally conceded "* * * it must have been it, I don't remember the name of the place or who was there or whatever it was." Is it not ironical that the prosecutor in the Hoffa trial rested his case largely upon the claim that this same man, Partin, could recall in exact detail conversations he had had with Hoffa a year earlier?

PERJURY CHARGES WARRANTED

During the Hoffa trial in Chattanooga, both Partin and Walter Sheridan of the Justice Department swore under oath that Partin had not been compensated in any way for his service as a Justice Department informer. The judge asked Partin:

> Was there any arrangement for the Government paying any of your expenses and compensating you in any way in your trip to Nashville?

Partin answered:

> No, sir.

Sheridan was asked by Hoffa defense counsel:

> Have you ever authorized any payment to Mr. Partin?

Sheridan answered:

> No, sir.

Sheridan then denied that any promise had ever been made to Mr. Partin. The defense then produced a confidential memorandum of the Justice Department which authorized the payment of $300 a month to Partin's wife for an extended period of time. Partin admitted that these payments were made in return for his service to the Government. Agent Grimsley also admitted that the arrangement was to make a flat payment of $300 a month indirectly to Mr. Partin.

WAS CAUSE OF JUSTICE SERVED?

I have laid out in some detail here the facts on Edward Grady Partin and his relationship to the Justice Department and his role in the Hoffa trial in Chattanooga.

I raise the question of the character and activities of Partin because, to me, they go to the root of the problem of how the quality of justice is affected once confidential funds are set up inside the Justice Department to hire paid informers.

To what extent has Federal law enforcement become a law unto itself?

In what prosecutions is the order given "no holds barred?"

What standards are considered before a decision is taken to use the services of a paid informer?

What pressures are felt before a decision is taken to use a paid informer who is already a convicted felon and is under indictment and near to trial for an alleged series of other felonies?

What funds are presently available for this purpose?

The House Judiciary Committee passed a resolution, by a vote of 20 to 13, almost a year ago, calling for an investigation into the operations of the Justice Department. Almost a year has gone by since that resolution was passed but no funds have been authorized and no staff has been obtained to conduct this inquiry.

The facts I have outlined about Mr. Partin and his relationships with the Justice Department are, to me, strong evidence that action is required in this case. Among other things, I think that an inquiry should go into the following questions:

First. Was a deal made between the Justice Department and Partin?

Second. If so, what are the terms of that deal and how do they reflect upon the standards by which the Justice Department operates?

Third. If no deal was made, then why has there been no prosecution of Partin in the courts on the indictments that he was under over 3 years ago?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I have listened in complete amazement to the charges made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] this afternoon. The fact that such statements are made on this floor should be of grave concern not only to the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate, but more so to the Department of Justice. Without any question, the proper committee of the House should investigate this matter and ascertain whether or not justice is being meted out, and whether or not the law is being warped by those more interested in the individual charged with violations than the violations themselves.

The charges against James Hoffa, president of the Teamsters, it appears, have been pursued rather relentlessly and publicly over a number of years. The gentleman from Illinois has called to the attention of the Congress that Edward Grady Partin, self-confessed informer in the Hoffa case, has been granted immunity from prosecution on charges that could result in three lifetimes in the penitentiary. He pointedly asks the question, "Has there been a deal made between the Justice Department and Partin whereby Partin is granted this immunity and in return he cooperates with the Department in their drive to 'get Hoffa'?"

I am certain that no one in this House knows the answer to this question. But it is certainly a question that should be looked into by the Department of Justice and particularly the House Judiciary Committee, which has been directed by the McCulloch resolution adopted by the Judiciary Committee by a vote of 20 to 13 in September 1964, calling for an investigation of the Justice Department including the Hoffa case.

No Member of this House wants anyone to be exonerated from a violation of the law in any respect; but by the same token, no one in this House can afford to sit idly by if there is any suspicion justice is being toyed with. Not being an attorney, I cannot judge the merits of this case, although as a public servant I have tried, with many teamsters in my district, to keep abreast of this case. I find it alarming, to say the least, when I read that certain statements admitted into the court proceedings by the defense have been treated lightly.

The problem is not strictly Mr. Hoffa's or the Teamsters; nor is it solely a problem of individuals or groups of individuals. It is a case of whether or not an organized move is underway to discredit a union representing hundreds of thousands of workers. In the early days in coal mining communities, the first leaders of the mineworker unions were held up to public scorn and persecution. Thankfully, we have outlived that day and now have a whole series of labor-management laws to protect management, labor, and the public. One wonders even, whether the real damage being done in this instance is being done to the Teamsters with a fallout damage to other unions.

Many members of the Teamsters I have known for many years in my community approached me on this subject. They have expressed the fear that it was a move to discredit and, in time, destroy the effectiveness of their union.

I wish to say now, as I have told my constituent teamsters, that I have no way of knowing the merits or demerits of the Hoffa case nor is this the proper tribunal for going into the case. But I have expressed deep concern with charges dealing with the maladministration of justice, and it is for this reason that I have on two previous occasions on the floor of this House called for an investigation of these charges.

Our Department of Justice must be above any charges of bias or prejudice. So long as there is a question as to the fairness of the prosecution of this case, the question must be resolved. The most important tool in the arsenal of democracy is equity under the law.

We cannot allow the judicial procedures of our Government to look away from the protection of all citizens and from granting all citizens equity by law to the fullest extent. Above all in this matter, we must insure that the dignity of the Federal Government, and all of its branches, including the Department of Justice, stands above any hint of inequity and prejudice.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois relative to a most important aspect of the administration of justice in our Nation. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for calling this matter to the attention of the House of Representatives.

From the freedom and the luxurious life that is being enjoyed by a person who has committed almost every sort of crime, it makes people wonder just how such a thing can happen. This is a matter which ought to be looked into from every angle. The Congress has authorized and directed that a committee be set up for this purpose.

With the information brought out by the gentleman from Illinois, I cannot see how this committee can avoid investigating this matter thoroughly. If this committee fails to do this, I believe that Congress has evaded its responsibility. I urge that in the light of what the gentleman from Illinois has brought out, that this committee start investigating this matter at the earliest possible time.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, if what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] says is true, then there is definitely "something rotten in the state of Denmark." The allegations are such as to shock the sense of justice of any American. The question here is not the guilt or innocence of James Hoffa, but an even greater one—one which affects the very integrity of our system of justice. If this august body fails to take any action after having been apprised of the situation by one of its own respected Members, we will have sown the seeds which will grow into an ever increasing distrust of our Government. I join the gentleman from Illinois in urging that the House Judiciary Committee institute a complete investigation at the earliest possible moment.

AUTHORIZING LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. FISHER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 7812) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1208)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7812) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
MELVIN PRICE,
O. C. FISHER,
WILLIAM H. BATES,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the Part of the House.
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HARRY F. BYRD,
JOHN STENNIS,
STUART SYMINGTON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7812) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

BACKGROUND

House action

On August 30, 1965, the House passed the the following three ship loan bills:

H.R. 7811, which would authorize the loan or sale of ships to South American countries as follows: Argentina, three destroyers; Brazil, four destroyers; Chile, two destroyers; Peru, two destroyers; Venezuela, one submarine.

H.R. 7812, which would authorize the loan of ships to Italy and Spain as follows: Italy, two submarines; Spain, one helicopter carrier.

H.R. 7813, which would authorize the loan of ships to China, Turkey, and the Philippines as follows: China, one destroyer and two destroyer escorts; Turkey, two destroyers; the Philippines, one destroyer escort.

Senate action

The Senate passed only one bill, H.R. 7812. As amended, the Senate bill included all of the House version of H.R. 7812 and parts of H.R. 7811 and H.R. 7813 as follows:

Country	House bill	Senate bill
Argentina	3 destroyers	2 destroyers.
Brazil	4 destroyers	3 destroyers.
Chile	2 destroyers	Eliminated.
Peru	do	Do.
Venezuela	1 submarine	Do.
Italy	2 submarines	2 submarines.
Spain	1 helicopter carrier	1 helicopter carrier.
China	1 destroyer and 2 destroyer escorts.	Eliminated.
Turkey	2 destroyers	2 destroyers.
Philippines	1 destroyer escort	1 destroyer escort.

In summary, then, the Senate action eliminated China, Chile, Peru and Venezuela and would permit one less ship each to Argentina and Brazil.

Conference action

Prior to the conference, it became evident that a full and free exchange of views between the Senate and House conferees was impossible in view of the parliamentary situation. Briefly stated, the Senate through its action in selecting only one of the three House bills for amendment and passage precluded the insertion by the conferees of any of the countries not included in the original version of H.R. 7812 as passed by the House. No meaningful discussion could be had, therefore, with respect to China, Chile, Peru or Venezuela, these countries having appeared in either H.R. 7811 or H.R. 7813.

Notwithstanding the inhibiting character of the parliamentary situation, the conferees agreed that they should meet and, regardless of the inadvertently created technical difficulty, discuss the total program of ship loans originally submitted by the executive branch.

The House conferees agreed that in view of the importance of the ship loan program, the Senate version of the bill should be accepted. The only alternative, in view of the imminence of the adjournment of Congress, would be no ship loan legislation at all. This was a wholly unacceptable eventuality.

The House recedes.

It was agreed in conference that the Senate conferees will give serious and sympathetic consideration to the ship loan program as passed by the House early in the next session of the Congress.

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
MELVIN PRICE,
O. C. FISHER,
WILLIAM H. BATES,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of yesterday, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7812) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The clerk read the statement.

Mr. FISHER (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with and it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman as to whether there is any provision for the loan of these destroyers to the South American country of Peru.

Mr. FISHER. There is nothing in the pending bill or in the conference report for Peru, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say I am advised the Peruvian Navy has chased our fishing vessels. I am very glad we are not turning any destroyers over to them so that they can use them to apprehend our vessels and take them into custody. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the same query for informational purposes about the submarine, I believe it was, that was in this bill, for Venezuela. Has that been removed?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I will advise the gentleman that there is nothing in the conference report regarding the loan of any vessels to Venezuela.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, because with what they have taken from the American investors in Venezuela in recent months I am sure they should not be in a position, for mutual protection or any other reason, of being given unusual ships of our Navy at this time. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 309)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics, and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

This report to the Congress describes a 6-month period of impressive accomplishment by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In a larger sense, however, this report describes America on the move.

The story of man's advancement through the ages is the story of man's victory over the forces of nature. The health and comfort he enjoys, the leisure he possesses, and the abundance of the food he eats are all the result of his unending determination to probe the secrets of the world around him.

In 1958, it was my privilege to introduce the legislation to create the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I stated then:

> I confidently believe that the developments of the space age will bring the beginning of the longest and greatest boom of abundance and prosperity in the history of man.

Time is bearing out that belief.

And so I take pleasure in submitting this report to Congress. It chronicles a great and exciting period of accomplishment and foreshadows an even greater one. In commending this record, I also commend the men principally responsible for making it possible. Dr. James Webb and Dr. Hugh Dryden have guided and directed our Nation's space program for nearly 5 years—and they have a grateful nation in their debt.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 22, 1965.*

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

According (at 8 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 9 o'clock p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On October 15, 1965:

H.J. Res. 695. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

On October 19, 1965:

H.R. 724. An act to authorize the transfer of certain Canal Zone prisoners to the custody of the Attorney General;

H.R. 3045. An act to authorize certain members of the Armed Forces to accept and wear decorations of certain foreign nations;

H.R. 5665. An act to authorize disbursing officers of the Armed Forces to advance funds to members of an armed force of a friendly foreign nation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6165. An act to repeal section 165 of the Revised Statutes relating to the appointment of women to clerkships in the executive departments;

H.R. 7329. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of San Diego, Calif.;

H.R. 9336. An act to amend title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 relating to certain claims against the Government of Cuba;

H.R. 9975. An act to authorize the shipment, at Government expense, to, from, and within the United States and between oversea areas of privately owned vehicles of deceased or missing personnel, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10234. An act to amend section 1085 of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the reimbursement procedure required among the medical facilities of the Armed Forces under the jurisdiction of the military departments.

On October 20, 1965:

H.R. 1805. An act to amend section 5899 of title 10, United States Code, to provide permanent authority under which Naval Reserve officers in the grade of captain shall be eligible for consideration for promotion when their running mates are eligible for consideration for promotion;

H.R. 5571. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payments of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders;

H.R. 6726. An act for the relief of William S. Perrigo;

H.R. 6852. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 97 million pounds of abaca from the national stockpile; and

H.R. 7059. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 724; 20 U.S.C. 79–79e), so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to the Smithsonian Institution for use in carrying out its functions under said act, and for other purposes.

On October 21, 1965:

H.R. 6819. An act for the relief of Dr. Orhan Metin Ozmat; and

H.R. 7707. An act to authorize the appointment of crier-law clerks by district judges.

On October 22, 1965:

H.R. 3141. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7169. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933 with respect to certain registration fees;

H.R. 7484. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the rank of lieutenant general or vice admiral of officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force while serving as Surgeons General;

H.R. 7743. An act to establish a system of loan insurance and a supplementary system of direct loans, to assist students to attend post-secondary business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools;

H.R. 9247. An act to provide for participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held at San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10238. An act to provide labor standards for certain persons employed by Federal contractors to furnish services to Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

AMENDING AND EXTENDING THE PROVISIONS OF THE SUGAR ACT OF 1948, AS AMENDED

Mr. COOLEY submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, which was ordered to be printed.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1209)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Sugar Act Amendments of 1965'.

"SEC. 2. Section 201 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out of the first sentence the words 'month of December in' and substituting the words 'last three months of'; and (2) by striking out of the second sentence 'October 31' and substituting 'September 30'.

"SEC. 3. Section 202 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(1) Paragraphs (1) and (2) (A) of subsection (a) are amended to read as follows:

" '(a) (1) For domestic sugar-producing areas, by apportioning among such areas six million three hundred and ninety thousand short tons, raw value, as follows:

" 'Area	Short tons, raw value
Domestic beet sugar	3,025,000
Mainland cane sugar	1,100,000
Hawaii	1,110,000
Puerto Rico	1,140,000
Virgin Islands	15,000
Total	6,390,000

" '(2) (A) To or from the above total of six million three hundred and ninety thousand short tons, raw value, there shall be added or deducted, as the case may be, an amount equal to 65 per centum of the amount by which the Secretary's determination of requirements of consumers in the continental United States pursuant to section 201 for the calendar year exceeds ten million four hundred thousand short tons, raw value, or is less than nine million seven hundred thousand short tons, raw value. Such amount shall be apportioned between the domestic beet sugar area and the mainland cane sugar area on the basis of the quotas for such areas established under paragraph (1) of this subsection and the amounts so apportioned shall be added to, or deducted from the quotas for such areas.'

"(2) Subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

" '(b) For the Republic of the Philippines, in the amount of one million and fifty thousand short tons, raw value, plus 10.86 per centum of the amount, not exceeding seven hundred thousand short tons, raw value, by which the Secretary's determination of requirements of consumers in the continental United States pursuant to section 201 for the calendar year exceed nine million seven hundred thousand short tons, raw value.'

"(3) Subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

" '(c) (1) For foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines, an amount of sugar, raw value, equal to the amount determined pursuant to section 201 less the sum of the quotas established pursuant to subsection (a) and (b) of this section.

" '(2) For the calendar year 1965, for individual foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines, by prorating the amount of sugar determined under paragraph (1) of this subsection among foreign countries on the basis of the quotas established in sugar regulation 811, as amended, issued February 15, 1965 (30 F.R. 2206).

" '(3) For the calendar year 1966 through 1971, inclusive, for individual foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines, Ireland, and the Bahama Islands, by prorating the amount of sugar determined under paragraph (1) of this subsection, less the amounts required to establish quotas as provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection for Ireland and the Bahama Islands, among foreign countries on the following basis:

" '(A) For countries in the Western Hemisphere:

" 'Country	*Per centum*
Cuba	50.00
Mexico	7.73
Dominican Republic	7.56
Brazil	7.56
Peru	6.03
British West Indies	3.02
Ecuador	1.10
French West Indies	.95
Argentina	.93
Costa Rica	.89
Nicaragua	.89
Colombia	.80
Guatemala	.75
Panama	.56
El Salvador	.55
Haiti	.42
Venezuela	.38
British Honduras	.22
Bolivia	.09
Honduras	.09

" '(B) For countries outside the Western Hemisphere:

" 'Country	*Per centum*
Australia	3.60
Republic of China	1.50
India	1.44
South Africa	1.06
Fiji	.79
Thailand	.38
Mauritius	.33
Malagasy Republic	.17
Swaziland	.13
Southern Rhodesia	.13

" '(4) For the calendar year 1966 and each subsequent calendar year, for Ireland, in the amount of five thousand three hundred and fifty-one short tons, raw value, of sugar; and for the calendar year 1968 and each subsequent calendar year, for the Bahama Islands, in the amount of ten thousand short tons, raw value, of sugar: *Provided,* That the Secretary obtains such assurances from each such country as he may deem appropriate prior to January 1 of each such calendar year that the quota for such year will be filled with sugar produced in such country.'

"(4) Subsections (d), (e), and (f) are hereby amended and subsection (g) is added to read as follows:

" '(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

" '(1) (A) During the current period of suspension of diplomatic relations between the United States and Cuba, the quota provided for Cuba under subsection (c) shall be withheld and a quantity of sugar equal to such quota shall be prorated as follows:

" '(i) any quantity of quota withheld from Cuba at a determination up to and including the amount of ten million short tons, raw value, under section 201 shall be prorated to other foreign countries named in paragraph (3) of subsection (c) on the basis of the percentages stated therein; and, in addition,

" '(ii) any quantity of quota withheld from Cuba at a determination in excess of the amount of ten million short tons, raw value, under section 201, shall be prorated to other foreign countries named in paragraph (3) (A) of subsection (c) that are members of the Organization of American States on the basis of the percentages stated therein.

" '(B) Whenever and to the extent that the President finds that the establishment or continuation of a quota or any part thereof for any foreign country would be contrary to the national interest of the United States, such quota or part thereof shall be withheld or suspended, and such importation shall not be permitted. A quantity of sugar equal to the amount of any quota so withheld or suspended shall be prorated to the other countries listed in subsection (c) (3) (A) (other than any country whose quota is withheld or suspended) on the basis of the quotas then in effect for such countries.

" '(C) The quantities of sugar prorated pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall be designated as temporary quotas and the term "quota" as defined in this Act shall include a temporary quota established under this subsection.

" '(2) (A) Whenever the Secretary finds that it is not practicable to obtain the quantity of sugar needed from foreign countries to meet any increase during the year in the requirements of consumers under section 201 by apportionment to countries pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) and the foregoing provisions of this subsection, such quantity of sugar may be imported on a first-come, first-served basis from any foreign country, except that no sugar shall be authorized for importation from Cuba until the United States resumes diplomatic relations with that country and no sugar shall be authorized for importation hereunder from any foreign country with respect to which a finding by the President is in effect under paragraph (1) (B) of this subsection: *Provided,* That such finding shall not be made in the first nine months of the year unless the Secretary also finds that limited sugar supplies and increases in prices have created or may create an emergency situation significantly interfering with the orderly movement of foreign raw sugar to the United States. In authorizing the importation of such sugar the Secretary shall give special consideration to countries which agree to purchase for dollars additional quantities of United States agricultural products. In the event that the requirements of consumers under section 201 are thereafter reduced in the same calendar year, an amount not exceeding such increase in requirements shall be deducted pro rata from the quotas established pursuant to subsection (c) and this subsection.

" '(B) Sugar imported under the authority of this paragraph (2) shall be raw sugar, except that if the Secretary determines that the total quantity is not reasonably available as raw sugar, he may authorize the importation for direct consumption of so much of such quantity as he determines may be required to meet the requirements of consumers in the United States.

" '(3) No quota shall be established for any country, other than the Bahama Islands, Bolivia, Honduras, and Ireland, for the year following a period of twenty-four months, ending June 30 prior to the establishment of quotas for such year, in which its aggregate imports of sugar equaled or exceeded its aggregate exports of sugar from such country to countries other than the United States.

" '(4) Whenever in any calendar year any foreign country fails, subject to such reasonable tolerance as the Secretary may determine, to fill the quota as established for it pursuant to this Act, the quota for such country for subsequent calendar years shall be reduced by the smaller of (i) the amount by which such country failed to fill such quota or (ii) the amount by which its exports of sugar to the United States in the year such quota was not filled was less than 115 per centum of such quota for the preceding calendar year: *Provided,* That (i) no such reduction shall be made if the country has notified the Secretary before August 1 of such year (or, with respect to events occurring thereafter, as soon as practicable after such event), of the likelihood of such failure was the Secretary finds that such failure was due to crop disaster or other force majeure, unless such country exported sugar in such year to a country other than the United States, in which case the reduction in quota for the subsequent years shall be limited to the amount of such exports, as determined by the Secretary, and (ii) in no event shall the quota for the Republic of the Philippines be reduced to an amount less than nine hundred and eighty thousand short tons, raw value, of sugar.

" '(5) Any reduction in a quota because of the requirements of paragraphs (3) and (4) of this subsection shall be prorated to other foreign countries in the same manner as deficits are prorated under section 204 of this Act. For purposes of determining unfilled portions of quotas, entries of sugar from a foreign country shall be prorated between the temporary quota established pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection and the quota established pursuant to subsection (c).

" '(6) If any foreign country fails to give assurance to the Secretary, on or before December 31, 1965, that such country will fill the quota as established for it under subsection (c) (3) and paragraph (1) of this subsection for years after 1965, the quota for such country for such years shall be reduced to the amount which the country gives assurance that it will fill for such years. The portion of the quota for such country for which such assurance is not given shall be withdrawn for such years and a quantity of sugar equal to such portion shall be prorated to other foreign countries in the same manner as deficits are prorated under section 204 of this Act. For purposes of applying paragraph (4) of this subsection, any reduction in the quota of a foreign country under this paragraph shall be disregarded.

" '(e) Whenever the President finds that it is no longer contrary to the national interest of the United States to reestablish a quota or part thereof withheld or suspended under subsection (d) (1) of this section, and, in the case of Cuba, diplomatic relations have been resumed by the United States, such quota shall be restored in the manner the President finds appropriate: *Provided,* That the entire amount of such quota shall be restored for the third full calendar year following such finding by the President. The temporary quotas established pursuant to subsection (d)(1) shall, notwithstanding any other provision of this section, be reduced pro rata to the extent necessary to restore the quota in accordance with the provisions of this subsection.

"'(f) Whenever any quota is required to be reduced pursuant to subsection (e) or because of a reduction in the requirements of consumers under section 201 of this Act, and the amount of sugar imported from any country or marketed from any area at the time of such reduction exceeds the reduced quota, the amount of such excess shall, notwithstanding any other provision of this section, be deducted from the quota established for such country or domestic area for the next succeeding calendar year.

"'(g) The Secretary is authorized to limit, through the use of limitations applied on a quarterly basis only, the importation of sugar within the quota for any foreign country during the first and second quarters of any calendar year whenever he determines that such limitation is necessary to achieve the objectives of the Act: *Provided,* That this subsection shall not operate to reduce the quantity of sugar permitted to be imported for any calendar year from any country below its quota, including deficits allocated to it, for that year.

"'(h) The quota established for any foreign country and the quantity authorized to be imported from any country under subsection (d)(2) of this section may be filled only with sugar produced from sugarbeets or sugarcane grown in such country.'

"SEC. 4. Section 204 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary shall from time to time determine whether, in view of the current inventories of sugar, the estimated production from the acreage of sugarcane or sugarbeets planted, the normal marketings within a calendar year of new-crop sugar, and other pertinent factors, any area or country will be unable to market the quota for such area or country. If the Secretary determines that any domestic area or foreign country listed in section 202(c)(3)(A) will be unable to market its quota, he shall revise the quota for the Republic of the Philippines by allocating to it an amount of sugar equal to 47.22 per centum of the deficit, and shall allocate an amount of sugar equal to the remainder of the deficit to the countries listed in section 202(c)(3)(A) on the basis of the quotas then in effect for such countries: *Provided,* That any deficit resulting from the inability of a country which is a member of the Central American Common Market to fill its quota shall first be allocated to the other member countries on the basis of the quotas then in effect for such countries: *And provided further,* That if any quota is restored to Cuba, the maximum per centum of 47.22 of the deficit to be allocated to the Republic of the Philippines shall be reduced to a per centum equal to that which the Philippine quota under subsection (b) of section 202 bears to the sum of such Philippine quota and the quotas then in effect for all foreign countries pursuant to subsection (c) of section 202. If the Secretary determines the Republic of the Philippines will be unable to fill its share of any deficit determined under the foregoing provisions of this subsection, he shall allocate such unfilled amount to the countries listed in section 202(c)(3)(A) on the basis of the quotas then in effect for such countries. If the Secretary determines that neither the Republic of the Philippines nor the countries listed in section 202(c)(3)(A) can fill all of any such deficit, he shall apportion such unfilled amount on such basis and to such foreign countries as he determines is required to fill such deficit. If the Secretary determines that any foreign country with a quota established pursuant to section 202(c)(3)(B) or section 202(c)(4) will be unable to market the quota for such area or country, he shall revise the quota for the Republic of the Philippines by allocating to it an amount of sugar equal to 47.22 per centum of the deficit, and shall allocate an amount of sugar equal to the remainder of the deficit to the countries listed in section 202(c)(3)(B) on the basis of the quotas then in effect for such countries: *Provided,* That if any quota is restored to Cuba, the maximum per centum of 47.22 of the deficit to be allocated to the Republic of the Philippines shall be reduced to a per centum equal to that which the Philippine quota under subsection (b) of section 202 bears to the sum of such Philippine quota and the quotas then in effect for all foreign countries pursuant to subsection (c) of section 202. If the Secretary determines the Republic of the Philippines will be unable to fill its share of any deficit determined for any country listed in section 202(c)(3)(B), he shall allocate such unfilled amount to the countries so listed on the basis of the quotas then in effect for such countries. If the Secretary determines that neither the Republic of the Philippines nor the countries listed in section 202(c)(3)(B) can fill all of any such deficit, he shall apportion such unfilled amount on such basis and to such foreign countries as he determines is required to fill such deficit. If the Secretary determines that the Republic of the Philippines will be unable to market its quota, he shall allocate an amount of sugar equal to the deficit to the countries listed in section 202(c)(3) on the basis of the quotas then in effect for such countries. Deficits shall not be allocated to any country whose quota has been suspended or withheld pursuant to subsection (d)(1) of section 202. The Secretary shall insofar as practicable determine and allocate deficits so as to assure the availability of the sugar for importation during the calendar year. In any event, any deficit, so far as then known, shall be determined and allocated by August 1 of the calendar year. In making allocations for foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere under this subsection, special consideration shall be given to those countries purchasing United States agricultural commodities. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, if the President determines that such action would be in the national interest, any part of a deficit which would otherwise be allocated to countries listed in section 202(c) may be allocated to one or more of such countries with a quota in effect on such basis as the President finds appropriate.

"'(b) The quota established for any domestic area or any foreign country under section 202 shall not be reduced by reason of any determination of a deficit existing in any calendar year under subsection (a) of this section: *Provided,* That the quota for any foreign country shall be reduced to the extent that it has notified the Secretary that it cannot fill its quota and the Secretary has found under section 202(d)(4) that such failure was due to crop disaster or other force majeure.'

"SEC. 5. Section 205 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended, (1) by inserting after the third sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'The Secretary is also authorized in making such allotments of a quota for any calendar year to take into consideration, in lieu of or in addition to the foregoing factors of processing, past marketings, and ability to market, the need for establishing an allotment which will permit such marketing of sugar as is necessary for the reasonably efficient operation of any nonaffiliated single plant processor of sugarbeets or any processor of sugarcane and as may be necessary to avoid unreasonable carryover of sugar in relation to other processors in the area: *Provided,* That the marketing allotment of any such processor of sugarbeets shall not be increased under this provision above an allotment of twenty-five thousand short tons, raw value, and the marketing allotment of a processor of sugarcane shall not be increased under this provision above an allotment equal to the effective inventory of sugar of such processor on January 1 of the calendar year for which such allotment is made, except that the marketing allotment for 1965 of any processor of sugarcane, other than a processor-refiner, may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be increased by an additional six thousand two hundred short tons of sugar, raw value: *Provided further,* That the total increases in marketing allotments made pursuant to this sentence to processors in the domestic beet sugar area shall be limited to twenty-five thousand short tons of sugar, raw value, for each calendar year and to processors in the mainland cane sugar area shall be limited to sixteen thousand short tons of sugar, raw value, for each calendar year, and (2) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following sentence: 'If allotments are in effect at the time of a reduction in a domestic area quota for any year, the amount marketed by a person in excess of the amount of his allotment as reduced in conformity with the reduction in the quota shall not be taken into consideration in establishing an allotment in the next succeeding year for such person, and any allotment established for such person for the next succeeding year shall be reduced by such excess amount.'

"SEC. 6. Section 206 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 206. (a) If the Secretary determines that the prospective importation or bringing into the continental United States, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico of any sugar-containing product or mixture will substantially interfere with the attainment of the objectives of this Act, he may limit the quantity of such product or mixture to be imported or brought in from any country or area to a quantity which he determines will not so interfere: *Provided,* That the quantity to be imported or brought in from any country or area in any calendar year shall not be reduced below the average of the quantities of such product or mixture annually imported or brought in during the most recent three consecutive years for which reliable data of the importation or bringing in of such product or mixture are available.

"'(b) In the event the Secretary determines that the prospective importation or bringing into the continental United States, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, of any sugar-containing product or mixture will substantially interfere with the attainment of the objectives of this Act and there are no reliable data available of such importation or bringing in of such product or mixture for three consecutive years, he may limit the quantity of such product to be imported or brought in annually from any country or area to a quantity which the Secretary determines will not substantially interfere with the attainment of the objectives of the Act, provided that such quantity from any one country or area shall not be less than a quantity containing one hundred short tons, raw value of sugar or liquid sugar.

"'(c) In determining whether the actual or prospective importation or bringing into the continental United States, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico of a quantity of a sugar-containing product or mixture will or will not substantially interfere with the attainment of the objectives of this Act, the Secretary shall take into consideration the total sugar content of the product or mixture in relation to other ingredients or to the sugar content of other products or mixtures for similar use, the costs of the mixture in relation to the costs of its ingredients for use in the continental United States, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, the present or prospective volume of importations relative to past importations, the type of packaging, whether it will be marketed to the ultimate consumer in the identical form in which it is imported or the extent to which it is to be further subjected to processing or mixing with similar or other ingredients, and other pertinent information which will assist him in making such determination. In making determinations pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall conform to the rulemaking requirements of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act.'

"SEC. 7. Subsections (d) and (e) of section 207 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, are amended as follows:

"'(d) Not more than fifty-nine thousand nine hundred and twenty short tons, raw value, of the quota for the Republic of the Philippines may be filled by direct-consumption sugar.

"'(e) None of the quota established for any foreign country other than the Republic of the Philippines and none of the deficit prorations and apportionments for any foreign country established under or in accordance with section 204(a) may be filled by direct-consumption sugar: *Provided*, That the quotas for Ireland, and Panama may be filled by direct-consumption sugar to the extent of five thousand three hundred and fifty-one short tons, raw value. for Ireland and three thousand eight hundred and seventeen short tons, raw value, for Panama.'

"SEC. 8. Section 209 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended by striking from subsection (e) thereof the words 'any sugar or liquid sugar' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'any sugar or liquid sugar in excess of one hundred pounds in any calendar year.'

"SEC. 9. (a) Section 212 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', or for the production (other than by distillation) of alcohol, including all polyhydric alcohols, but not including any such alcohol or resulting by-products for human food consumption'.

"(b) Section 6418(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended—

"(1) by inserting 'OR PRODUCTION' after 'DISTILLATION' in the heading of such section, and

"(2) by inserting after 'the distillation of alcohol,' in the text of such section the following: 'or for the production of alcohol (other than alcohol produced for human food consumption),'.

"(c) The heading of section 6511(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by inserting 'OR PRODUCTION' after 'DISTILLATION'.

"SEC. 10. Section 213 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is repealed.

"SEC. 11. Section 302 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"'(b)(1) The Secretary shall determine for each crop year whether the production of sugar from any crop of sugarbeets or sugarcane will, in the absence of proportionate shares, be greater than the quantity needed to enable the area to meet its quota and provide a normal carryover inventory, as estimated by the Secretary for such area for the calendar year during which the larger part of the sugar from such crop normally would be marketed. Such determination shall be made only with respect to the succeeding crop year and, beginning with the 1966 crop year, only after due notice and opportunity for an informal public hearing. If the Secretary determines that the production of sugar from any crop of sugarbeets or sugarcane will be in excess of the quantity needed to enable the area to meet its quota and provide a normal carryover inventory, he shall establish proportionate shares for farms in such areas as provided in this subsection, except that the determinations by the Secretary of proportionate shares for farms in Hawaii and the Virgin Islands in effect on January 1, 1965, shall continue in effect until amended or superseded. In determining the proportionate shares with respect to a farm, the Secretary may take into consideration the past production on the farm of sugarbeets and sugarcane marketed (or processed) for the extraction of sugar or liquid sugar (within proportionate shares when in effect) and the ability to produce such sugarbeets and sugarcane.'

"(2) The first sentence of paragraph (3) of subsection (b) is amended to read as follows: 'In order to make available acreage for growth and expansion of the beet sugar industry, the Secretary in addition to protecting the interest of new and small producers by regulations generally similar to those heretofore promulgated by him pursuant to this Act, shall reserve each year from 1962 through 1966, inclusive, from the national sugarbeet acreage requirement established by him, the acreage required to yield sixty-five thousand short tons, raw value, of sugar.'

"(3) Paragraph (5) of subsection (b) is amended by striking the words 'In determining farm proportionate shares' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'Whether farm proportionate shares are or are not determined'.

"(4) Subsection (b) is amended by adding new paragraphs (8) and (9) as follows:

"'(8) In order to protect the sugarbeet production history for farm operators (or farms) who in any crop year, because of a crop-rotation program or for reasons beyond their control, are unable to utilize all or a portion of the farm proportionate share acreage established pursuant to this section, the Secretary may reserve for a period of not more than three crop years the production history for any such farm operators (or farms) to the extent of the farm proportionate share acreage released. The proportionate share acreage so released may be reallotted to other farm operators (or farms), but no production history shall accrue to such other farm operators (or farms) by virtue of such reallocation of the proportionate share acreage so released.

"'(9) The Secretary is authorized to reserve from the national sugarbeet acreage requirements for the 1966, 1967, and 1968 crops of sugarbeets a total acreage estimated to yield not more than twenty-five thousand short tons, raw value, for each such crop to provide any nonaffiliated single plant processor of sugarbeets with an estimated quantity of sugar for marketing of not to exceed twenty-five thousand short tons of sugar, raw value. The Secretary is also authorized to reserve from the acreage which would otherwise be allocated to sugarcane producers in the mainland cane sugar area for the 1965 and 1966 crops of sugarcane a total acreage estimated to yield not more than sixteen thousand short tons of sugar, raw value, for each such crop, which shall be allocated to relieve hardship on the part of new producers in such manner as the Secretary may determine: *Provided*, That acreage allocated hereunder for the 1965 crop shall be in addition to the total acreage heretofore allocated in such area for the 1965 crop. The Secretary shall allocate the acreage provided for in this paragraph to farms on such basis as he determines necessary to accomplish the purposes for which such acreages are provided under this paragraph.'

"SEC. 12. (1) Subsection (b) of section 402 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended by adding the following sentence thereto: 'The Secretary is authorized to use the services, facilities, and authorities of Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of making disbursements to persons eligible to receive payments under title III of this Act: *Provided*, That no such disbursements shall be made by Commodity Credit Corporation unless it has received funds to cover the amounts thereof from appropriations available for the purpose of carrying out such program.'

"(2) Subsection (a) of section 408 of such Act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: 'During any period that the operation of the provisions of title II is so suspended by the President, the Secretary shall estimate for each year the amount of sugar needed to meet requirements of consumers in the United States and the amount the quota for each country would be if calculated on the basis as provided in section 202 of this Act. Notice of such estimate and quota calculation shall be published in the Federal Register. If any country fails to import into the continental United States within the quota year, an amount of sugar equal to the amount the quota would be as calculated for such country by the Secretary for such year, the quota established for such country in subsequent years under the provisions of title II shall be reduced as provided in section 202(d)(4) of this Act: *Provided*, That quotas for subsequent years shall not be reduced when quotas are suspended under this subsection and reestablished in the same calendar year.'

"(3) Subsection (b) of section 408 of such Act is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and substituting in lieu thereof the following: 'Any quantity so suspended shall be allocated in the same manner as deficits are allocated under the provisions of section 204 of this Act.'

"(4) Subsection (c) of section 408 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) In any case in which a nation or a political subdivision thereof has hereafter (1) nationalized, expropriated, or otherwise seized the ownership or control of the property or business enterprise owned or controlled by United States citizens or any corporation, partnership or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens or (2) imposed upon or enforced against such property or business enterprise so owned or controlled, discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions not imposed or enforced with respect to the property or business enterprise of a like nature owned or operated by its own nationals or the nationals of any government other than the Government of the United States or (3) imposed upon or enforced against such property or business enterprise so owned or controlled, discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions, or has taken other actions, which have the effect of nationalizing, expropriating or otherwise seizing ownership or control of such property or business enterprise or (4) violated the provisions of any bilateral or multilateral international agreement to which the United States is a party, designed to protect such property or business enterprise so owned or controlled, and has failed within six months following the taking of action in any of the above categories to take appropriate and adequate steps to remedy such situation and to discharge its obligations under international law toward such citizen or entity, including the prompt payment to the owner or owners of such property or business enterprise so nationalized, expropriated or otherwise seized or to provide relief from such taxes, exactions, conditions or breaches of such international agreements, as the case may be, or to arrange, with the agreement of the parties concerned, for submitting the question in dispute to arbitration or conciliation in accordance with procedures under which final and binding decision or settlement will be reached and full payment or arrangements with the owners for such payment made within twelve months following such submission, the President shall suspend any quota, proration of quota, or authorization to import sugar under this Act of such nation until he is satisfied that appropriate steps are being taken. Any quantity so suspended shall be allocated in the same manner as deficits are allocated under section 204 of this Act.'

"(5) Section 412 of such Act (relating to termination of the powers of the Secretary under the Act) is amended by striking out '1966' in each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1971'.

"SEC. 13. Section 4501(b) (relating to termination of taxes on sugar) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out '1967' in each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1972'.

"SEC. 14. Except as hereinafter provided, the provisions of this Act shall become effective January 1, 1965. The amendments made by section 4 of this Act shall become effective January 1, 1966. The amendments made by section 9 of this Act shall become effective on the date of the enactment of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
THOMAS G. ABERNETHY,
GRAHAM PURCELL,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA,
PAUL B. DAGUE,
PAGE BELCHER,
CHARLES M. TEAGUE,
Managers on the Part of the House.
HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11135) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The amendment of the Senate struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substituted language which generally followed the structure of the House bill but was different in numerous substantial respects. The following summary indicates the major differences between the House version of the bill and the substitute to the Senate amendment agreed to by the conferees.

FOREIGN QUOTAS

The conference substitute makes no change in the quota provisions of the House bill with respect to domestic areas (including Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands) and the Republic of the Philippines.

The House bill set the Cuban share of the foreign quota, other than that for the Philippines, at 44.25 percent. The Senate bill set the Cuban quota at 55.77 percent of the foreign share. The substitute agreed to by the conferees places the Cuban quota at 50 percent of the total foreign share, other than that allotted to the Philippines.

So long as Cuba is not in diplomatic relations with the United States, the entire Cuban quota is held in reserve and allocated to other foreign countries, other than the Republic of the Philippines, on a pro rata basis. The effect of the conference action with respect to the Cuban quota is that exactly 50 percent of each foreign quota listed in the following table will be statutory quota for the life of the act and the other 50 percent will be its allocation of the Cuban reserve. The latter is subject to reallotment to Cuba in the event that diplomatic relations with that country are resumed.

The following table shows, at the consumption level of 9.7 million tons the approximate tonnage of the quota allotted to each foreign country under the conference agreement with the exception of Cuba and the Philippines.

Basic quotas and participation in the Cuban reserve for foreign countries at sugar requirements level of 9,700,000 tons

[In short tons, raw value]

Countries	Conference agreement	House bill	Senate bill
A. For countries in the Western Hemisphere:			
Mexico	348, 501	340, 925	390, 135
Dominican Republic	340, 925	340, 925	422, 512
Peru	272, 013	272, 013	272, 013
Brazil	340, 925	340, 925	272, 013
British West Indies	136, 000	150, 397	122, 017
Ecuador	49, 770	50, 267	49, 770
Colombia	36, 000	42, 970	27, 829
Costa Rica	40, 000	42, 159	34, 786
Nicaragua	40, 000	38, 511	40, 672
Guatemala	34, 000	32, 836	35, 321
Venezuela	17, 000	30, 809	2, 676
El Salvador	25, 000	30, 403	17, 125
Haiti	18, 731	28, 782	18, 731
Panama	25, 134	25, 134	14, 449
Argentina	42, 000	21, 485	63, 685
British Honduras	10, 000	19, 864	4, 281
Bolivia	4, 054	4, 054	1, 000
Honduras	4, 054	4, 054	1, 000
French West Indies	42, 970	42, 970	42, 970
Subtotal	1, 827, 077	1, 859, 483	1, 832, 985
B. For other countries:			
Australia	162, 152	162, 152	162, 152
China, Republic of	67, 431	67, 293	67, 431
India	64, 861	64, 861	64, 861
South Africa	48, 000	29, 593	66, 584
Fiji Islands	35, 489	24, 323	35, 489
Thailand	15, 000	19, 864	------------
Mauritius	14, 985	14, 188	14, 985
Swaziland	6, 081	6, 081	6, 081
Southern Rhodesia	6, 081	6, 081	6, 081
Malagasy Republic	7, 492	6, 081	7, 492
Ireland	5, 351	------------	2, 141
Belgium	------------	------------	1, 605
Turkey	------------	------------	1, 605
Subtotal	432, 923	400, 517	436, 507
Total	2, 260, 000	2, 260, 000	2, 260, 000

DURATION OF FOREIGN QUOTAS

The present act terminates December 31, 1966. Under the House bill the quotas for all foreign countries would be in effect through 1971. Under the Senate amendment, the quotas for foreign countries other than the Philippines would be in effect only for 1966 and 1967. The conference substitute follows the House bill in this respect. All quotas, both foreign and domestic, established by the bill will be in effect through the calendar year 1971.

COUNTRIES WHICH ARE NET IMPORTERS OF SUGAR

The House bill prohibits the establishment of a quota for a country for any year if, during the 24-month period ending June 30 preceding such year, it has been a net importer of sugar. The conference substitute continues this provision but exempts Ireland, Bolivia, Honduras, and the Bahamas from application of its provisions.

MAINTENANCE OF A RESERVE

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment encouraged foreign countries to maintain a reserve of not less than 15 percent of their quota. The House bill also contained a provision requiring countries with quotas of more than 200,000 tons to retain a reserve of up to 30 percent of their quota until July 1 of each year. The conference substitute has omitted this 30-percent provision of the House bill.

ADVANCE ASSURANCE BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The Senate amendment included a provision requiring each foreign country other than the Philippines to give assurance to the Secretary of Agriculture prior to December 31, 1965, that it would fill the quotas assigned to it for subsequent years. The quota of any country failing to give such assurance would be reduced proportionately. The House bill contained no such provision. The conferees agreed on this provision of the Senate amendment.

QUARTERLY LIMITATION OF IMPORTS

The conference substitute includes a provision of the Senate amendment authorizing the Secretary to limit the amount of sugar which may be imported during the first two quarters of any year. The House bill did not contain this provision.

ALLOCATION AND PRORATION OF DEFICITS

The provisions of the conference substitute to the Senate amendment relating to the proration and allocation of deficits follows in general the provisions of the House bill. The conferees have retained a provision of the present law requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to give special consideration to those countries purchasing U.S. agricultural commodities.

This provision appears in the conference substitute ahead of the provision, which was common to both bills, authorizing the President, in the national interest to disregard pro rata allocation of deficits and assign deficits to any country which has a quota in effect. Thus, it is clear, that the President's authority to make such special assignment of deficits is not restricted by the provisions relating to purchase of agricultural commodities.

It is the intention and the request of the committee of conference that the President should use this authority to assign about 3,000 tons of deficit to Bolivia, a sufficient amount of deficit to Venezuela to bring its quota up to 25,000 tons or an amount above that comparable to other countries in its vicinity, and to provide a substantial amount of additional quota to the Dominican Republic, in line with the discussion of the Dominican quota in the House report, if the political situation in that Republic warrants such action.

NEW SUGARCANE MILL

The House bill provided for a reserve of 25,000 tons for a new sugarcane processing facility after 1966 and after the consumption estimate had exceeded 10,400,000 tons. This provision is omitted in the conference substitute.

NATIONAL RESERVES

The House bill contained a provision establishing a national reserve of 25,000 tons of the beet quota and 25,000 tons of the mainland cane quota to be used by the Secretary to alleviate hardship and inequities. The Senate amendment retained the national reserve with respect to beets but did not include a national reserve with respect to cane.

The conference substitute has reinstated the House provision relating to a national reserve of the cane quota with amendments reducing the amount of the reserve to 16,000 tons and making certain other modifications in its provisions.

It is the intention of the Committee of Conference that the national reserve provided for cane should be used first for the purposes outlined in the House report on the bill (6,200 tons for a Louisiana processor and the acreage to produce 2,000 tons for a Louisiana producer) and that the balance of such reserve should be used to alleviate hardships and inequities in other areas. Conforming changes with respect to proportionate shares are also made in the conference substitute.

INDUSTRIAL ALCOHOL

The Senate amendment permits the use of sugar (without regard to quota restrictions) in the production of alcohol, except alcohol and resulting byproducts for human food consumption. The quota exemption under present law applies only to sugar used in the distillation of alcohol, not in the production of alcohol by methods other than distillation. The conference substitute includes this provision of the Senate amendment.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
THOMAS G. ABERNETHY,
GRAHAM PURCELL,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA,
PAUL B. DAGUE,
PAGE BELCHER,
CHARLES M. TEAGUE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of yesterday, I call up the conference report on the bill, H.R. 11135, to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The **SPEAKER.** The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief.

First, I want to congratulate and commend the members of the Committee on Agriculture and particularly the House and Senate conferees. This is one bill that has been completely free from partisan politics as it should be and as it always has been up to now.

I want to assure the Members of the House that during the entire time that I have served on the Committee on Agriculture under my predecessor chairman, this committee has followed exactly the same pattern that I have followed as chairman of this great committee.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is vital to the welfare and happiness of all of the people of America. It is presented here not only on behalf of the producers of sugarbeets and sugarcane and the refiners of sugar, but this is a consumer bill. For more than 25 years the sugar program operating under a country-by-country quota has operated so well, as I have said before, that the average housewife has not been aware of the fact that we have had such a program in existence.

Under the program we have always had a stable supply of sugar at reasonable prices both in time of war and in time of peace.

Of the 35 members of the Committee on Agriculture, only 3 or 4 members have sugar in their districts and in their States. But realizing and appreciating the importance of sugar to the American economy, we have worked diligently and faithfully long hours, weeks, and even months in drafting this bill.

Without a sugar program, the domestic producer could not survive. They would face bankruptcy because they cannot possibly compete with foreign producing areas, with low-cost production and low labor costs.

As I have said, we conducted conferences in January, February, and March while the domestic industry, working through its leaders—lobbyists, if you please—tried to compose their differences. When they first came to me, they were in disagreement. I suggested to them that they go downtown and compose their differences and reach agreement. After that they had long conferences. They then came back to me and said that they were in agreement. I said, "Go back down and talk to the State Department, the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Agriculture, and other agencies of the executive branch and see if you can bring them around to your way of thinking."

That they did. So we had additional weeks and months of conferences.

Finally, after waiting all through the 88th Congress for recommendations and having received none, and having waited from January until about May of this year for recommendations from the executive branch and receiving none, we finally let it be known that we were going to write a sugar bill.

Then they came up in complete agreement. When the domestic industry spoke to our committee of 35 members, they were in complete agreement. They selected one spokesman, a very distinguished man from Colorado by the name of Mr. Frank A. Kemp, who spoke for the whole industry. Within 30 minutes he had presented the industry's case to us.

The administration took only about 30 minutes in presenting its recommendations. We had only about 20 minutes of questioning in the committee. We then disbanded. Then we started to consider the foreign quotas. We had a fight over the proposed import duty, what they call a recapture fee. Finally that question was decided. Everybody in the administration and, so far as I know, everybody in the industry, and certainly the representatives of all foreign countries, abandoned the idea of an import fee.

Then the question arose as to how long the bill would extend. We proposed that it should continue for 5 years as it had been recommended to us by the domestic industry and by the administration. So after much consideration, the bill was adopted by a vote of 33 to 2 of the committee of 35 Members.

We brought the bill to the House under a closed rule, except that the rule provided that two amendments should be in order. Those amendments were offered and they were overwhelmingly defeated.

Then the House passed this bill by a margin of 99. We sent it on to the Senate.

The Senate considered all the provisions we had in our bill, and they struck out everything after the enacting clause and inserted their own bill.

After that bill passed the Senate, we agreed to a conference and we went to conference.

Now we bring back to the House the conference report, which I believe was unanimously approved by the conferees on the part of the Senate and the conferees on the part of the House, including Members of both parties.

I might pause to say that I am not quite certain about a unanimous vote by the conferees on the part of the Senate. I understand that perhaps one Member of the Senate conferees could not be located and did not sign the report.

I want to sum up by saying I believe this conference report is a complete vindication of the House Committee on Agriculture. It is a complete vindication of the House of Representatives. By all means it should be overwhelmingly adopted.

I say, not in defense of our committee but by way of explanation, it has become almost a tradition that the last bill of any session, just before adjournment, is the sugar bill. The House Committee on Agriculture is not responsible for that. We have acted faithfully and diligently. We have a bill here with which apparently everybody is pleased. Perhaps every petitioner was not given everything that he wanted. We had to compose differences and compromise our views, and in some instances we split the difference, but overall this bill is a well-rounded bill that will provide a sugar program based upon country-by-country quotas, which has always been successful.

Only when we had the global quota experience did we get into trouble. The prices then skyrocketed to 12 or 14 cents a pound. The global quota program, I thought, was ridiculous.

You and I know that we got into this trouble when Cuba was taken over by communism and Castro. Up to that time we had acquired about 3 million tons of our foreign sugar from the beautiful island of Cuba, which tonight is a stronghold of communism. So we had to look out across the world to find other sources of supply, and we did. At the time we were assured that there was an abundance of sugar in the world. As the months passed it developed that there was a shortage of sugar, so the price of sugar went up and up and up. Everybody suffered. The housewives suffered.

If we pass this bill there will be a stability of prices and a stability of supply and we will be back to the old program which operated so well for so long.

I do not wish to continue this discussion. We will be prepared to answer any questions which may be propounded.

I ask that Members read and consider the statement, which is very brief, in support of the report we now bring to you.

I would like to further explain the intent of the conferees concerning the application of the provisions in this bill dealing with needed relief for small nonaffiliated single sugarbeet processors. Identical provisions were included in both the House and the Senate bill.

It is the clear intent of the conferees that these provisions be implemented promptly. We certainly intend this bill to be used to afford the appropriate relief that was well documented during the hearings on this legislation. As we pointed out in the House report on this bill, it is situations such as those presented during the hearings that these provisions of the bill are designed to correct.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I should like to clarify a few points in regard to the conference report.

Am I correct in the belief that this is a 5-year bill in respect to both domestic and foreign quotas?

Mr. COOLEY. Exactly.

Mr. FINDLEY. The probability, then, is that we will not take up the foreign quotas again unless we also at the same time take up the domestic quotas?

Mr. COOLEY. We probably will not take up either until 5 years have passed.

I will say this to the gentleman: This Congress cannot bind the next Congress. We can talk all we want about 5-year plans, but there is nothing the 89th Congress can do to obligate a Congress which will succeed this Congress.

Mr. FINDLEY. I have another question with respect to the Philippines. Are the Philippine sugar interests created in this conference report exactly the same as they were in the House version of the bill?

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct.

Mr. FINDLEY. There has been considerable controversy over the quotas assigned by the House to Argentina and Venezuela. Will the gentleman clarify what was done on those quotas and how the agreement was arrived at?

Mr. COOLEY. I will take them one at a time.

My recollection is that the House gave Argentina a quota of 21,000 tons, which was the very first quota Argentina had ever had. There was a lot of talk in the newspapers about what we were talking away from Argentina.

We did not take anything away from Argentina. We gave them a quota for the first time. They had no quota whatever in the 1962 act.

Mr. FINDLEY. If the gentleman will permit me, I thought in 1962 by separate legislation a quota was given to Argentina.

Mr. COOLEY. No. They have no statutory quotas. That was in the honey bee bill.

Mr. FINDLEY. Was that not a statutory act?

Mr. COOLEY. No.

Mr. FINDLEY. It was not a piece of legislation at all?

Mr. COOLEY. Of course, it was legislation. But it was a bill authorizing the President to exercise his discretion. It went to the Senate and the Senate tied on this amendment which provided something for Argentina and something for the Dominican Republic but not by statutory quota.

Mr. FINDLEY. You are not suggesting this so-called action on the honey bee bill was any different in substance than any other conference, are you?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. Of course. There were no conferences on the honey bee bill. I hope you understand that this bill, the sugar bill, can only originate in the House Committee on Agriculture. It cannot originate in the Senate as an original bill nor by an amendment to a honey bee bill. That came over because the Senators realized they had forced us under a blackjack, almost, to capitulate on 1.5 million tons or something like that of the Cuban quota.

Mr. FINDLEY. In any event, in 1962 Argentina did get a quota.

Mr. COOLEY. They did not get a quota. They got an allocation under the honey bee bill.

Mr. FINDLEY. They have a history of shipping sugar.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. FINDLEY. Under the sugar program.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Perhaps in answer to the gentleman from Illinois I can say that the House thought for good reasons they should allocate 21,000 tons to Argentina. The Senate allocated 63,000 tons. We split the difference, which is a good compromise, it seems to me, under all the circumstances, and we allocated 42,000 tons to Argentina.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, sir, I yield.

Mr. FINDLEY. As I understand it, as recently as 4 months ago the administration was recommending an import fee under the sugar program. Is there any import whatever in this conference report?

Mr. COOLEY. There is not any in this conference report, and if you had been listening to me when I was talking, you would know it.

Mr. FINDLEY. I was doing my best.

Mr. COOLEY. I told you the import fee is not in here.

Mr. FINDLEY. There is no import fee in the bill?

Mr. COOLEY. It was not recommended by the President or anybody else except the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I heard it recommended by a good many other people.

Mr. COOLEY. But it is not in the bill.

Mr. FINDLEY. I appreciate the clarification.

Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that this session of Congress which has produced some excellent legislation should end with this dismal specimen.

This is a sad moment for American consumers and taxpayers. They are being saddled for 5 years with a program which is unnecessarily costly. In my view, the powerful vested interests of the sugar industry have clearly overwhelmed the broader public interest.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. This is a fine bill. Is there anything in the bill which would permit the President, if he found it to be in the national interest, to eliminate or vary any quotas?

Mr. COOLEY. It is very definitely in the bill. He can eliminate any quota when it is found to be in the national interest.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HANNA. I should like to commend the gentleman and the conferees, for I see that Ireland now has 5,351 tons. That is certainly an improvement over the other situation.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. I understand the conferees did add to the section dealing with the assignment of sugar deficits, a provision with reference to giving special consideration to countries that purchase U.S. farm commodities. I would call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this amendment is similar to the one I offered in the House committee and which the distinguished gentlelady from Washington [Mrs. MAY] and I discussed in our views in the report on H.R. 11135. I understand that the amendment adopted by the conferees incorporates the language of present law in regard to deficit allocations. It will, I hope, be of considerable benefit.

Mr. COOLEY. It is now definitely in the bill as a part of the bill. I share the gentleman's views that we should trade with countries that trade with us.

Mr. DOLE. And a similar provision appears in the "little global quota" part of the bill?

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell us why there would be any quota to Venezuela which is continuing to expropriate American investments?

Mr. COOLEY. This was fully explored, and if they expropriate foreign property, it will then become the duty of the President completely to withdraw that quota.

He has the authority in this bill to do that. What the gentleman is talking about I think is some controversy which is now pending in the courts with which, frankly, I am not familiar. But the President has the power in this bill and the responsibility to withdraw the quota.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I had a telegram only a short time ago from an industrialist in this country who was complaining about the taking over of his property. For the life of me I cannot understand why we should give a sugar quota of any kind, even a single pound, to any country that expropriates the property of an American investor.

Mr. COOLEY. The author of that telegram was trying to try his lawsuit here in Congress. I want to conclude by telling my friend that if the implication of that telegram were true then the White House has the responsibility to withdraw that quota and has the authority under the act to do it. You will notice that when the bill came out of the House we gave them 30,000 tons. We have now reduced it to 17,000.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 174, nays 88, not voting 170, as follows:

[Roll No. 383]

YEAS—174

Abernethy
Adams
Addabbo
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Baldwin
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callan
Casey
Chamberlain
Clark
Clawson, Del
Colmer
Cooley
Craley
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Dole
Donohue
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Oreg.
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Everett
Fascell
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Griffin
Hagan, Ga.
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kornegay
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
McFall
McMillan
McVicker
Machen
Mackay
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Mink
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Price
Randall
Redlin
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rosenthal
St. Onge
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stubblefield
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Ullman
Utt
Vigorito
Waggonner
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Williams
Willis
Wolff
Young
Younger

NAYS—88

Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Ashbrook
Bow
Brademas
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Clancy
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Corbett
Cunningham
Davis, Wis.
Dulski
Duncan, Tenn.
Dyal
Farbstein
Farnsley
Findley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Gibbons
Goodell
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Harsha
Hechler
Helstoski
Huot
Irwin
Joelson
Jonas
Karth
King, N.Y.
Krebs
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McClory
McCulloch
McDowell
McEwen
McGrath
Mackie
Marsh
Minish
Minshall
Moeller
Moorhead
Nedzi
O'Hara, Mich.
Patten
Pike
Pucinski
Quillen
Race
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Robison
Rodino
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Secrest
Skubitz
Todd
Udall
Van Deerlin
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Weltner
Yates
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—170

Abbitt
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Annunzio
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Bell
Berry
Bingham
Blatnik
Bolling
Bonner
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Burton, Calif.
Cahill
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Cederberg
Celler
Chelf
Clausen, Don H.
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cramer
Culver
Curtis
de la Garza
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnum
Feighan
Fino
Flynt
Fogarty
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Grider
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hutchinson
Jacobs
Jennings
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Kastenmeier
Keith
Keogh
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Landrum
Leggett
Lindsay
Long, La.
McCarthy
McDade
Macdonald
MacGregor
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
Michel
Mize
Monagan
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Multer
Nelsen
Nix
O'Konski
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Patman
Poage
Powell
Purcell
Quie
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Tex.
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roybal
St Germain
Saylor
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Scott
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Staggers
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Tuck
Tunney
Vanik
Vivian
Watson
Watts
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Schmidhauser against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Schisler against.

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Vivian against.

Mr. Rogers of Texas for, with Mr. Roybal against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Ottinger against.

Mr. Hawkins for, with Mr. Reuss against.

Mr. Sweeney for, with Mr. Corman against.

Mr. Monagan for, with Mr. McCarthy against.

Mr. Patman for, with Mr. Resnick against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Vanik against.

Mr. Annunzio for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Hungate for, with Mr. Fogarty against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mrs. Sullivan against.

Mr. MacGregor for, with Mrs. Griffiths against.

Mr. Mize for, with Mr. St Germain against.

Mr. Horton for, with Mr. Cameron against.

Mr. Morse for, with Mr. Howard against.

Mr. Burton of California for, with Mr. Kastenmeier against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Denton against.

Mr. Friedel for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee for, with Mr. Diggs against.

Mr. Albert for, with Mr. Broomfield against.

Mr. Bingham for, with Mr. Kunkel against.

Mr. Jennings for, with Mr. Erlenborn against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Derwinski against.

Mr. Leggett for, with Mr. Devine against.

Mr. Landrum for, with Mr. Springer against.

Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Schweiker against.

Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Whalley against.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia for, with Mr. Cramer against.

Mr. Poage for, with Mr. Bray against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Watts for, with Mr. Glenn Andrews against.

Mr. Whitener for, with Mr. Cahill against.

Mr. Tunney for, with Mr. Jacobs against.

Mr. Culver for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Edwards of California for, with Mr. Carter against.

Mr. Matthews for, with Mr. Morton against.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mr. Fuqua for, with Mr. Chelf against.

Mr. Tenzer for, with Mr. Martin of Alabama against.

Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Roudebush against.

Mr. Quie for, with Mr. Wydler against.

Mr. Shriver for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Gubser for, with Mr. Widnall against.
Mr. Conte for, with Mr. Reifel against.
Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Nelsen against.
Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Mosher against.
Mr. Martin of Nebraska for, with Mr. Michel against.
Mr. Reinecke for, with Mr. Curtis against.
Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Dickinson against.
Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Berry against.
Mr. Carey for, with Mrs. Dwyer against.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Farnum against.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Jacobs against.
Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Jones of Alabama against.

Until further notice:

Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Martin of Alabama.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. McDade.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Tuck with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Thompson of Texas.
Mr. Thomas with Mr. Slack.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Sisk.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.
Mr. Hagen of California with Mr. Grider.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Henderson.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. George W. Andrews.

Mr. BOW changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO INFORM PRESIDENT CONGRESS IS READY TO ADJOURN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join a committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and to ask him if he has any further communications to make to the Congress, has performed that duty. The President has directed us to say that he has no further communication to make to the Congress.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 527) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 527

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, October 22, 1965, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 528) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 528

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE 2D SESSION, 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 788) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 788

Joint resolution establishing that the second regular session of the Eighty-ninth Congress convene at noon on Monday, January 10, 1966

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second regular session of the Eighty-ninth Congress shall begin at noon on Monday, January 10, 1966.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 624) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 624

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, reports of the Comptroller General of the United States made to the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841 et seq.) shall be printed during such adjournment as House documents of the second session of the Eighty-ninth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES DEMOCRATIC STEERING COMMITTEE AND HOUSE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 625) and ask for its immediate consideration.

H. RES. 625

Resolved, That, effective November 1, 1965, there shall be payable from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at a basic rate not exceeding $4,180 per annum to one additional employee of each of the following:

(1) the House Democratic Steering Committee; and

(2) the House Republican Conference.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to inquire of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. GROSS], as to the situation next week in regard to fishing in the vicinity of Waterloo, Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that I am afraid that fishing would be through the ice out there. What I plan to do, with this late adjournment of Congress, is to go fishing for a few more votes than I got last year.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to suggest that that would be a splendid idea.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLERK AUTHORIZED TO RECEIVE MESSAGES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the 1st session of the 89th Congress, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations, and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PRINTING OF REPORTS FILED BY INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the Clerk following the sine die adjournment by committee authorized by the House to conduct investigations may be printed by the Clerk as reports of the 89th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF MEMBERS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege, until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the Congressional Record on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extensions of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred, or to any speech delivered, subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS TO CHAIRMEN OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBERS THEREOF

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the chairmen of all the standing committees and subcommittees of the House may extend their remarks up to and including the publication of the last Record and to include a summary of the work of their committees; also that the ranking minority member of such standing committee or any subcommittee may have the same permission to extend their remarks and to include a summary, if they desire, from their point of view, separately from that of the chairman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that I appreciate the excellent job which he has done in bringing these usual closing resolutions to action on the floor of the House. However, I would like to say that I miss the distinguished floor leader, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert], and his usual manner of presenting these closing resolutions.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And, I wish for the gentleman from Oklahoma a rapid and complete recovery from his ailment.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

CAPITOL GROUNDS AND FACILITIES

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to plan and construct a Visitor's Center in the Capitol or in the vicinity of the Capitol grounds.

This is a convenience we owe to the citizens of our country, and it is long overdue. Washington has more to offer in the way of scenic attractions and historic sites than any other capital in the world. Yet it seems that we have done less to prepare for our tourists than any other major capital.

Citizens come here to see the Capitol and show their families how their Government works. One of the first things to greet them is the lack of adequate parking. After being shoved about by a policeman, they might find a parking space 4 or 5 blocks away. Then they are told they cannot park there, because that space belongs to Congressman or Senator So-and-So or some other VIP. When they finally reach the Capitol, they have difficulty finding water fountains, restaurants, restrooms, and other facilities.

A tourist center would solve many of these problems. Besides the facilities I have mentioned, it could include maps and other travel information, pictures of Senators and Representatives, charts of the two Chambers, a display of congressional history, and other features to make the stay of visitors both educational and enjoyable.

My bill provides for the Architect of the Capitol to carry out this authority under the joint direction of the House and Senate Office Building Commissions. It is written in general terms to permit these distinguished and dedicated leaders to use their own good judgment in planning and constructing a facility in keeping with the finest traditions of the U.S. Congress.

Mr. Speaker, millions of visitors come to Washington every year, and the numbers are increasing. They should receive a warm and friendly welcome to their Nation's Capitol, but instead, the situation is getting more and more congested. Something needs to be done now. I am hopeful that hearings can be held on my bill early next year and that we will soon find a solution to this problem.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment my able and esteemed colleague from Texas on taking an interest in a matter which seems to me deserves the consideration of the Congress.

It is really a shame when people coming from all parts of this Nation to visit their Capitol—and, after all, they own it—have no place to be accommodated. There is no place for them to eat unless a Member takes them some place, there is no place for the kids to go to the bathroom, and as my colleague has said, no place to park—and incidentally, if a place is found to leave a car there are odds that it will be broken into before they get back to it.

As visitors multiply year after year, it seems to me this is a matter which deserves the attention of everyone, and I join the gentleman in trusting that in the next session serious consideration may be given to his proposal.

Mr. PICKLE. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Washington is probably the most beautiful city in the world, yet we provide less accommodations in this Capital than any nation in the world.

I hope early hearings will be held on this matter next year.

THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this day marks the end of the 1st session of the 89th Congress. What we have done this year will be the subject of comment and comparison for 100 years. Historians will judge our handiwork, and rightly so, in the light of its effect upon the strength of our Nation and upon the welfare and prosperity of our country. Whatever the judgment of time may reveal, I predict historians will agree that the 1st session of the 89th Congress had greater capacity to legislate than any Congress during this century.

This Congress moved to new zeniths in more legislative fields than any Congress in 176 years, scaled more legislative heights, accomplished more congressional breakthroughs, stood up to more national problems, settled more persistent issues, than any Congress in the history of our country.

In health, education, conservation, agriculture, urban affairs, civil rights, economic opportunities, this Congress has surpassed them all. The work of this session is a monument to every Member who has served in it.

Above all, it testifies to the great skill and dedication of our beloved Speaker. He has been our pilot and our captain. He has worked with patience and determination through every waking hour of every day since this session convened. His accomplishments during the past 10 months established his place among the greatest Speakers ever to have served in the history of this body.

May I confide in my colleagues that no experience in my lifetime has been more rewarding than the opportunity I have had during this Congress and the preceding Congress, to labor at the side of the gentleman from Massachusetts, John McCormack. I extend to him my deep gratitude for the many, many considerations he has shown me.

I feel confident that I express the feelings of the Members of both sides of the aisle when I say that the Speaker has served each of us with fairness, impartiality, and dedication.

I know I express the recognition and gratitude of President Johnson when I say that the Speaker has given him and his administration unending devotion at every turn.

I also recognize my deep debt of gratitude to our distinguished Democratic whip, HALE BOGGS. It has been a genuine pleasure to have worked with HALE during the past 10 months as we dealt with the legislative problems of this session. Without him and his hardworking assistant whips, a vital element would have been missing in the procedure which lead to our record of solid accomplishments.

I must also express the appreciation of all of us for the quality of leadership which our committee chairmen have given this year. The real heroes of the great legislative battles which we have won are they and the members of our congressional committees. These are the ones who have laid the groundwork of this productive session.

I also wish to state, although I find no adequate words, my deep sense of gratitude toward the Members of the House, both Democrats and Republicans, for the many kindnesses they have shown me. The Members of my own party have given me continuous support on many issues in larger measure than I could have hoped to receive. I am particularly grateful for the dedication and loyalty of our new Members who have demonstrated from the outset their ability to make significant contributions to our work.

My Republican friends also have shown me many kindnesses, and I extend my thanks to all of them. I have enjoyed working with my good friend, the able and distinguished minority leader, Mr. FORD, who has been most cooperative and helpful at all times. I have also enjoyed my association and work with the very able and beloved minority whip, LES ARENDS, as well as with other members of the Republican leadership. Although we have differed on occasion, I cannot hesitate to acknowledge that our Republican friends have aided substantially in achieving the success of this session, especially in the most important fields of national defense and foreign policy, demonstrating our common purpose to serve America first.

The Members of the House, its officers and employees, all have given unstintingly of their time and energy during this long and arduous session. Our Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler, has again been a mainstay and a reassuring compass in charting our course. He is both towering in his personal qualities and in his professional status, and as is well known, his services are essential to the functioning of the House.

All have labored hard, productively, creatively. All are entitled, and I hope will enjoy over the next few months, some relaxation for their duties. Again, I thank you for your friendship and your help.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that "there is a tide that runs in the affairs of men."

Viewed in these terms, it may well be said that the 89th Congress of the United States—surging to a higher crest of achievement than any other in its 176 years—has left a mark upon the shores of time not to be erased easily or soon equalled.

In the short space of 10 months, we have legislated upon the problems of decades—some new, some accumulations of the past. With giant strides, we have moved along the path of progress toward those higher goals that have always characterized and distinguished our free society: Peace, national security, equal justice and opportunity, health and prosperity in the pursuit of happiness.

To these ends we have labored long and arduously. Every member of this body can be proud of having participated in and individually contributed to its monumental list of precedent-shattering accomplishments.

I will not attempt to list at this point all the major laws enacted in this first session. I will undertake to do this under leave to extend my remarks in the first CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to be published subsequent to adjournment. For the present, suffice it to say that the widespread and beneficial effects of our accomplishments, touching the lives of millions of people throughout the Nation will be felt and seen for years to come.

They will be felt and seen—

As educational opportunities and facilities expand at every level, from prekindergarten to postgraduate, and in every branch of learning from the humanities to every field of science;

As our social structure is strengthened by improvement of the well-being of the aged, the underprivileged, the handicapped and the ill, through hospitalization and medical care, better housing, increased social security benefits and more aid to State welfare agencies;

As the Nation's health improves and the life span lengthens with purification of our streams and the very air we breathe, and under the impetus of vast funds for medical research programs and facilities;

As our national economy grows through full use of heretofore wasted human resources, now being provided with productive employment opportunities through vocational training or retraining, and through programs of public works and economic redevelopment of depressed areas;

As the political patterns of the country change when, for the first time, a host of our fellow-citizens exercise their long-denied right to register and vote for candidates of their choice;

As our scientific research and explorations attain new goals, reaching to the heights of universal space and unplumbed depths of the oceans, advancing knowledge, discovering possible new sources of food or minerals for the peaceful enrichment of all mankind;

As we intensify conservation of natural resources in forests, streams, wilderness areas and beaches to preserve outdoor recreation space for our increasingly urban and growing population, and erase blights by beautifying our roadside scenery.

All this and more has this great representative body accomplished under the eye and guiding hand of our wise and beloved Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Yet in our pride of service, we also are reminded by voices from the past—the Founders who saw the visions of our Nation's potential greatness and the poets who sang of its future glories—that what we do here is but the expression of the will of the people we represent.

Their needs, their hopes, their yearnings were the spur to the vast new undertakings we have launched in cooperation with the administration under the inspiring leadership of President Johnson.

It was the venerable Walt Whitman, poet of the people of the 1800's, who identified the tides then running in America with the single word—Democracy. He declared that "its doctrines will only be effectually incarnated when their spirit is at the root and center.

> Far, far, indeed, stretch in distance our vistas. How much is still to be disentangled, freed. How long it takes to make this American world see that it is, in itself, final authority and reliance.
>
> Did you too, O friend, suppose democracy is only for election, for politics, and for a party name? I say democracy is only of use there that it may pass on and come to its flower and fruits in manners, in the highest forms of interaction between men and their beliefs * * * it has been and is carried on by all the moral forces and by trade, finance, machinery, intercommunications, and, in fact, by all the developments of history, and can no more be stopp'd than the tides, or the earth in its orbit.

Woodrow Wilson echoed this thought that democracy flourishes only as it is nurtured from its roots. He urged us to remember that "a people shall be saved by the power that sleeps in its own deep bosom or by none. The flower does not bear the root, but the root the flower."

THE END OF A GREAT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, we have come now, at 10 o'clock on the night of October 22, in the year of our Lord 1965, to the end of a great session of the Congress, the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this session has established a record that every Member of this body can be and will be proud of as it enters the annals of the history of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to first express to you on behalf of the Members of the House the profound appreciation and gratitude of all of us on both sides of the aisle for the manner in which you have conducted the affairs of this great body.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful that the majority whip, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], has yielded to me.

Mr. Speaker, I too want to join in the words that the gentleman from Louisiana has said concerning our distinguished Speaker. I feel it is important that I indicate my approval of what the gentleman has said at this point, because I have some apprehension that later in his remarks the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] and I may have some difference of opinion. But in this, our feeling toward the distinguished Speaker, I can say without hesitation or qualification, Mr. Speaker, you have been fair, objective, and all of us on our side of the aisle are grateful for your leadership during these difficult months since January 4, and we wish you well and the best of health and happiness between now and January 10.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is a great institution, because there are men like the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Speaker is a hard worker, he is a hard fighter, he believes in what he advocates with great passion, with great devotion. Yet he is one of the most understanding men in this body. I have seen the Speaker in the middle of a most difficult proceeding help a colleague, regardless of what side of the aisle he might sit on. I think each one of us is a better man and a bigger man because we have had the fine influence of John McCormack.

I also have a duty to perform here tonight in expressing the profound and the keen regret of our majority leader, Carl Albert, who is not with us this evening. His absence is accounted for only by the fact he has worked himself so hard that on yesterday at the insistence and demand of his physician he went to the Bethesda Naval Hospital for a series of tests; but I am happy to report to all of you that I have just spoken with him, and while he is very sad, indeed, that he cannot be here for this eventful occasion, his prognosis is excellent, and he hopes to be out of the hospital very shortly, and to be in Oklahoma on Tuesday next where there will be a great Carl Albert appreciation dinner, to which I hope all of you will go.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to learn today that Carl Albert was in the hospital. I called him this morning, and he said at that time he hoped to be out on tomorrow or the next day. All of us have appreciated his help and understanding. I am sure each and every one of us is hoping for a quick recovery, and the best between now and January 10. I intend to call him on tomorrow and express again from everyone on our side of the aisle the hope for a quick recovery.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman. In behalf of the Speaker and the majority leader, I would like to express to the minority leader [Mr. Ford], our appreciation for the cooperation he has shown through this long, hard session.

We live in this country of ours sometimes in a spirit of controversy, but the things that unite us are so much more binding than those that divide us it makes it relatively easy to govern in our country. But without the assistance of men like Jerry Ford and my counterpart on the Republican side, Les Arends, the Republican whip, it would be very difficult for us to function.

How do we thank everyone—the committee chairmen who have worked so hard night and day to produce this magnificent and monumental session of the Congress, the 1st session of the 89th Congress?

Each one of them has been a dedicated, productive Member of this great deliberative body to which the American people look for leadership and guidance.

I should not forget—what should I call it—the watchdog party—our good friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], and his majority and minority whip, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall].

And last but not least we all know that we could not function without all of the people who work with us here all day long every day, Fishbait Miller, the clerks, the pages, the directors of the pages, Turner N. Robertson and Thomas H. Tear, and certainly last but not least the Parliamentarian. It would be impossible to conduct the business of the Congress without Lew Deschler.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. I think the gentleman from Louisiana has well expressed the sentiments and the feelings of all of us here tonight in that we are all representatives of the people and that we all try to do our jobs in the best possible way.

I have never been one to carry a grudge in his heart and I certainly do not. I respect every Member of the Congress. Sometimes I am a little envious of you, Hale—you have so many horses to whip and I have so few.

On occasion when I go home at night feeling as if I had been run over by a Mack truck, not once but maybe two or three times when I look over a vote and think that just with 30 or 40 or 50 more horses, the result might have been different. But the next day I come back and our friendships are renewed and we start again. It is a pleasure to do business with you.

Mr. BOGGS. Thank you, Les. It is a great pleasure to work with you, but my office could not function except for the fine work of my Deputy Whip John Moss and the 18 zone whips who work so hard as well as the staff in the whip's office.

Mr. Speaker, finally, as I look above me here, I doubt if any of us could get here and stay here, or maybe even want to stay here, if we did not have the press.

So this has been really a constructive and a productive Congress. I am sure that my good friends and colleagues on my left will not object if I point with pride to the Congress. I really do think that people will point to this Congress and say—this has indeed been a monumental Congress. I really believe that those of us who have served here regardless of what side of the aisle we serve on will look back at these last 10 months and say that this is a job that was well done. In every field of endeavor we have attempted to meet the challenges that have confronted us.

I remember just a few months ago some commentators, regardless of what economic or political persuasion they subscribed to, were saying that the Congress was ineffective and that we are not able to function in this the last half of the 20th century. I think this Congress has given the lie to that assertion for once and for all. I think we have shown that we are able to perform in the best traditions of this great democratic form of Government and in the best traditions of the American people.

You know, Mr. Speaker, a long time ago there was a congressman here from the great State of Massachusetts. His name was Fisher Ames. Speaking of the Congress which met in 1789 he wrote a letter to his constituents and this is what he said about his colleagues who served in the Congress of 1789 in describing them. He said:

> On the whole they were very good men, not shining, but honest and reasonably well informed.

I believe it is a very apt description because we come from the people and we are of the people, and, thank God, we have a system that makes that possible.

Alexander Hamilton, one of the great men in the early history of the Congress and the country very forcibly and succinctly described Congress when he said, "There, sir, the people govern."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has been very kind in things that he has said about Members of the House and the staff of the House. May I say to the gentleman that Ohio is very proud of the Parliamentarian whom the gentleman has praised tonight. Since the days of Nick Longsworth, who occupied the seat of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, our good friend Lew Deschler, who comes from Ohio, has been our Parliamentarian and has done a magnificent job. I think he has made a great contribution to Government, and Ohio is very proud to have him as a native son.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Ohio delegation, I should like to pay tribute to this great son of Ohio, Lew Deschler.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, before yielding back my time, I wish for each and every one of the Members just as much success as our good friend from Iowa will have on that fishing expedition that he said he is going on when the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] asked about his plans.

We are pleased that our great President is recovering from his operation. He has given the Nation courage when it needed it. He has given us magnificent and inspired leadership. Tonight, I know, is a happy one for him and God bless him and his lovely wife and family.

I yield back the balance of my time.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN MATTERS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by authority of the Committee on Rules, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 616), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 616

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 94, Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on Education and Labor is authorized to send not more than four members of such committee, and not more than two staff assistants to Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and the United Kingdom for the purpose of conducting a full and complete investigation and study of manpower policies and programs, including the operation of public and private employment services, and the organization and operation of occupational training and retraining programs.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88–633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country where local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROCLAMATION OFFICIALLY DESIGNATING NOVEMBER 27, 1965, AS A NATIONAL HONOR DAY

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 626) on behalf of myself and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas American men and women are serving in distant lands of the world in support of the cause of peace and freedom; and

Whereas the overwhelming majority of Americans support the principles of this Republic and its efforts to maintain and secure peace and freedom; and

Whereas it would be fitting to set aside a national day of remembrance dedicated to, and in support of, those Americans who are committing their lives, blood, and energies in the defense of world peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should issue a proclamation (1) officially designating Saturday, November 27, 1965, as a national honor day for the commemoration of the efforts by American men and women abroad in Vietnam who are carrying forward the struggle to maintain and secure peace and freedom; and (2) inviting the governments of States and communities and the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities to the end that our people may reaffirm their support of the role of this Nation in the cause of peace and freedom.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Housing Act of 1954 directs that I transmit to Congress the Annual Report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, covering activities for calendar year 1964.

This report confirms the wisdom of 15 Congresses and 5 administrations going back to 1934. The great Franklin D. Roosevelt first pleaded with the Congress to approve housing measures for the good of all Americans.

Consider what has been done for America by the U.S. Government's housing programs:

One hundred billion dollars of FHA mortgage insurance loans has been written, covering more than 7 million homes and more than 1 million rental units.

Seven hundred thousand public housing units have been constructed since the start of that program in 1937. Two million people are living in those units in more than 2,000 communities.

More than 600,000 college students are living in dormitories made possible by Government loans.

$4.3 billion has been made available for urban renewal.

Four thousand five hundred communities—mostly small towns—have received urban planning assistance.

Three hundred million dollars of Government credit has gone into small town water and sewer facilities.

These programs were not easily begun. Cries of "socialism" and "waste" surrounded them at their birth. False propaganda and misrepresentation were used to discredit those who were to administer them. Cynicism and self-interest preyed on fear of the new and the imaginative.

But without these programs we would never have been able to push back the frontiers of blight, disease, and ugliness that 30 years ago afflicted one-third of a nation. Without them the task of building a clean and safe America would have been impossible.

Today our people accept these programs. Private enterprise and public well-being depend on them. We know now that these programs—and new approaches demanded by logic and vision—are needed to meet the challenges that confront us as hour by hour we become a more urban nation.

In 1965 I requested authority for a new means of housing low-income families. We proposed to encourage private organizations to build thousands of new apartments and houses for poor people who could not afford safe or decent housing. We proposed to help these private builders provide housing for the elderly, the poor, and the handicapped, so that they might live with safety and dignity.

Congress accepted this proposal.

Yet when the time came to provide the funds for this program, the old voices of doubt and misunderstanding were raised once more. Allegations were made that had no basis in fact. Insinuations were raised that obscured the basic purposes of the act.

For the time being, those voices have prevailed. No program funds were granted.

The national interest demands that the matter not stop there. Thousands of American families need this housing now—today. Thousands of poor children who should grow up in a world of safety and decency and promise are being treated with indifference by an affluent nation.

Next January I shall once more ask for the initial $30 million necessary to make bricks and mortar out of a promise. I am confident that the Congress will cut through the propaganda of fear and mistrust to provide shelter for the families who need it now—today. We who have raised up hopes have a duty to bring them to tangible reality.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 22, 1965.*

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in reviewing my voting record, I find that I am not recorded as voting on Rollcall No. 283, I would like the record to show that had I been present I would have voted "no."

ZINC PLANT AT SPELTER, W. VA. SAVED

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I called to the attention of the House the circumstances which threatened the jobs of 350 employees of the Matthiesson-Hegeler Zinc Plant, located at Spelter, Harrison County, W. Va. To me it represented total disregard for the jobs of the employees of this zinc smelting plant.

I continued to press the administration for a decision which they had delayed over a period of 4½ years. This delay practically brought this zinc plant to its knees as November 1 represented the last day they could continue operations. As it is they have lost valuable customers and their employees will have lost wages in an undetermined amount.

However, I am pleased to announce to the House that the President has finally acted and by proclamation has today implemented the recommendations of the Tariff Commission. Import quotas on zinc ore and zinc concentrate have been immediately terminated. The Spelter, W. Va., zinc plant can now continue its operations. For this I am pleased and happy, especially for each family whose job was in jeopardy. I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a release I made on this action.

ZINC PLANT AT SPELTER, W. VA., SAVED

Congressman Arch A. Moore, Jr., announced today that the President has issued a proclamation implementing the recommendations of the Trade Commission with respect to lifting import quotas on lead and zinc.

Moore indicated that the recommendations have been implemented in two stages. First, there is the immediate termination of the trade quotas on lead and zinc ore and lead and zinc concentrate. This immediate termination of import quotas in this area is of tremendous significance and importance to the Matthiesson-Hegeler zinc plant which is situated in Spelter, Harrison County, W. Va. The recommendations of the Trade Commission which would immediately terminate these lead and zinc import quotas had been called for by Congressman Moore in a speech on the House floor.

"This decision by the Trade Negotiation Board to lift the import quotas on zinc means that the jobs of 350 employees at Matthiesson-Hegeler plant will be saved," Moore said, "and the company itself will be spared the experience of closing down their installation—perhaps to the extent of relocating their manufacturing facilities in some other State." The company had earlier announced it would close down November 1 unless these quotas were lifted and they could get the ore.

Moore praised the decision of the trade negotiation review board as a "good one" but he was extremely critical of the board's long study of the matter. "The Tariff Commission last June 8—more than 4 months ago—had recommended that these import quotas on zinc be lifted," Moore said. "Yet the executive review board tarried and tarried while the people whose jobs were in jeopardy worried and worried. This decision could just as well have been made last June and everybody would have been much better off."

"In order to get this thing moving," he said, "it was necessary, I believe, to bring this matter to light as I did in a speech on the House floor October 13." Moore said that he had been advised that this had "shocked" the review board into action. Thus, another threat to the economy of Harrison County has been averted through the collective efforts of management, labor, and interested individuals in the community. Another offensive has been successful against the high-handed trade policies which hurt this Nation.

"It is my sincere hope that it won't be necessary in the immediate future to again point up the manner in which the trade policies of this Nation are not in the best interests of the people of this Nation." Moore said that it is conceivable that a matter as important as this to the economy of the State of West Virginia which virtually touches the families of over 350 employees of the Matthiesson-Hegler zinc plant in Spelter should be allowed to hang fire so long. This in itself indicates disinterest in the employment problems of people who are fighting to preserve their jobs in an area of the country in which the economy is seriously impaired.

LOUIS A. JOHNSON VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to designate the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Clarksburg, W. Va., as the Louis A. Johnson Veterans' Administration Hospital.

Louis Arthur Johnson has been acclaimed as one of the 20th century's great Americans and has brought exceptional honors to Clarksburg and West Virginia. For over 50 years, he has practiced law in Clarksburg after graduation from the University of Virginia. In 1916, he was elected to the West Virginia House of Delegates and in 1917 served as majority floor leader, and as chairman of the house judiciary committee.

In August 1917, shortly after the United States entered World War I, he attended officers training camp at Fort Benjamin Harrison and was commissioned a captain of infantry. He was asigned to the 80th Division at Camp Lee and sailed for France in May 1918. During the Meuse-Argonne offensive, he saw action with the 4th, 5th, 80th, and 90th Divisions, he served with the Army of Occupation in Germany after the Armistice and was decorated by France with the rank of commander of the Legion of Honor. He now holds a Reserve commission as colonel of infantry.

He took an active part in organization of the American Legion, eventually serving as national commander. He led the West Virginia delegation at the Legion's first national convention and was elected a member of the national executive committee. Thereafter, he served as chairman of the West Virginia delegation to the 1927 Paris convention and in 1930-31 as commander and judge advocate of the West Virginia department and chairman of the Legion's National Legislative Committee. In 1932, he was elected national commander of the American Legion for a year's term, and he remains a life member of the Legion's national executive committee. In 1933, he was chosen American Vice-President of the Federation Interalliee des Anciens Combattants, international organization of World War veterans. In 1943, he headed the Legion's commission on postwar America.

Louis A. Johnson served as civilian aid to the Secretary of War for West Virginia from 1933 to 1937 and was a member for several years of the Federal Advisory Council of the United States Employment Services. In 1924, he was delegate to the Democratic National Convention and in 1936, he was made chairman of the veterans' advisory committee of the National Democratic Committee. President Roosevelt appointed him Assistant Secretary of War in 1937, a post he held until 1940. During his term in the War Department, he favored an expanded air force for the United States and participated actively in formulating and carrying out a program of industrial mobilization. In 1942, the President sent him to India as his personal representative. He remained there for a number of months, both during and after the Cripps mission which was studying the question of Indian independence.

On March 28, 1949, he was chosen as Secretary of Defense in the Cabinet of President Truman. He sought the maximum Military Establishment commensurate with the national economic health because he believed that the prime military weapon of the United States was the ability of its economy to outproduce any potential enemy under the stress of total war. His creed was "A strong America is, indeed, our greatest assurance of a peaceful America." He was passionately devoted to the gospel of action, and approached the delicate problem of unification in a heavy-fisted manner. He was responsible for the establishment of a separate U.S. Air Force and for the initiation of Armed Forces Day. He was a Secretary of Defense who will never be forgotten. His work toward strengthening our national security was arduous and effective. This rugged and resourceful man has served his country with dignity and dedication and his loyalty and devotion to duty has served as an inspiration to all who have come to know him during his colorful career, and by his actions he has reflected great glory on himself, his family, his home city of Clarksburg and the State of West Virginia.

Therefore, because of Louis A. Johnson's many achievements, his noble character and his friendship and help to others, and because I feel that it is most fitting and proper, I urge my colleagues on the Veterans' Affairs Committee to give this measure their favorable consideration.

PRESSURES ON U.S. FARMER

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, there is deep concern within the Republican Party over the mounting pressures on the U.S. farmer exerted by the manifold economic and social problems which presently confront him. One result of this concern has been the organization this year of an instrument for a comprehensive investigation of the U.S. agricultural situation, and the plight of the American farmer.

This instrument of investigation is the House Republican task force on agriculture. The task force was organized March 1, 1965, for the purpose of providing a forum for a complete analysis of today's deplorable farm conditions and an exploration of every possible means for the improvement of the many faults and failures of past and present farm programs.

A major goal of the task force has been a search for new ideas and new approaches to the problems of U.S. agriculture—ideas which may be developed in Congress, in the universities, by farm organizations, by foundations, by businessmen, by farmers and private citizens.

During the few short months since its creation, the agriculture task force has been active in this endeavor in several different ways. The group has made a careful study of several aspects of the U.S. farm problem, and has issued statements and made recommendations concerning these vital issues—recommendations designed to improve farm income, reduce Government costs, and substantially benefit the American farmer, taxpayer, and consumer.

Based on the results of its research activity so far, the task force has made the following recommendations:

1. Congress must act to strengthen farm income and raise farm prices by increasing the Commodity Credit Corporation minimum resale price.

2. Action must be taken to effect basic changes in U.S. agricultural trade policy—specifically:

a. The expansion of U.S. agricultural exports for dollars through the adoption of a more realistic and positive U.S. bargaining position at the trade negotiation tables of the world, and

2. Congressional action to insure administration compliance with the congressional directive expressed in section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to coordinate import policy with domestic price-support programs.

3. Congressional action should be taken to establish a U.S. world food study and coordinating commission to study world food and agricultural needs, to coordinate present U.S. efforts toward meeting these needs, and to evaluate the future role of U.S. agricultural and other resources in the light of present and projected world food and population trends.

These recommendations were presented along with other research findings in the form of statements issued from time to time by the task force. In order to summarize the research activities of the task force, I will briefly identify those statements and the press releases which have been issued by the group.

First. March 1, 1965: Organizational statement by task force, outlining subjects for study and research.

Second. March 23, 1965: Conflicting Government programs detrimental to U.S. farmer. Task force statement of research findings, consisting primarily of a review of the confusion of Government programs working at cross-purposes to the detriment of the American farmer, with emphasis on several of the most glaring faults of the administration's present farm policy, including the cost-price squeeze and low-farm income.

Third. April 16, 1965: Farm debt. Task force statement of research findings consisting of a preliminary analysis of the farm debt situation and a look at the alarming increase in total farm debt and the decrease of farm income.

Fourth. May 17, 1965: "Migrate" society for rural America. Task force statement of research findings, consisting of an examination of the administration's policy to encourage and facilitate the migration of farmers from the land.

Fifth. June 21, 1965: Commodity Credit Corporation resale prices. Task force statement of research findings, consisting of an analysis of sales by the CCC and their depressing effect upon farm prices. The task force recommends legislation to raise CCC resale prices in order to stop this harmful policy, and provide increased income for the American farmer.

Sixth. August 5, 1965: Task force hears Gunlogson proposals to revive rural America. At a task force luncheon meeting, guest speaker G. B. Gunlogson stresses the need for economic diversification in rural America.

Seventh. August 27, 1965: Farm editor sees end to farm problems. At a task force luncheon meeting, guest speaker Wayne Darrow said that the next 10 or 15 years may bring the solutions to many of our present farm problems.

Eighth. September 9, 1965: Need "forward look" in agriculture, says farm editor. At a task force luncheon meeting, guest speaker Earl W. McMunn urged forward looking farm programs and more bargaining power for the U.S. farmer.

Ninth. September 13, 1965: Agriculture trade policy a key to U.S. farmer survival. Tast force statement explored problems of U.S. agricultural trade, and recommended some basic changes in policy.

Tenth. September 16, 1965: Agriculture editor calls for bipartisan farm bloc. At a task force luncheon meeting, guest speaker John Harms recommended a bipartisan farm bloc to work for the farmer in Congress.

Eleventh. October 14, 1965: Task force urges world food study. Task force recommends the establishment of a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to plan the future U.S. role in the approaching world food crisis.

Twelfth. October 19, 1965: Support for food commission concept. Task force Chairman LANGEN reports that commission legislation has the support of over half the House Republican membership, and that much favorable comment is coming from outside the Congress.

The task force has also conducted a considerable amount of research on other issues, such as the farm labor problem, rural economic development, farm production costs, and others. It has, in the process of its study, collected a small library of agricultural statistics and information from many sources.

The agriculture task force has also been active in other ways. The group has, through its guest speaker series of breakfast and luncheon meetings, listened to and exchanged views with prominent individuals who are making significant contributions in various areas of the field of agriculture—men of varying political beliefs and affiliations, but who share a common vital interest in agriculture.

The task force has met with such men as:

Leon Keyserling, economist and former Chairman, President's Council of Economic Advisers;

Clarence D. Palmby, executive vice president, U.S. Feed Grains Council;

G. B. Gunlogson, agricultural engineer and former business executive;

Wayne Darrow, agricultural writer, editor of the Washington Farmletter;

Earl W. McMunn, agricultural writer, editor of the Ohio Farmer;

John Harms, agricultural writer, editor of the Kiplinger Agricultural Letter.

These meetings, to which other Republican Members of Congress were invited, have been most valuable, and the task force is indeed grateful to the guest speakers for their willingness to meet and share with us their observations and ideas concerning the agricultural problems of this Nation.

In addition, the agriculture task force has listened to the pulsebeat of agricultural America through letters requesting the views of farm newspapers, radio and TV editors, editors of agricultural publications, and deans of all the land-grant colleges and universities in the United States.

The response to these inquiries was excellent, and the task force is deeply appreciative of the serious interest and splendid cooperation of those who contributed to this project. Large amounts of background material, books and special project papers were forwarded to the task force, and the work on anlaysis and compilation is still underway. A report on the results of this survey will soon be forthcoming.

Cnosiderable interest in task force functions and activities has been generated outside of Congress. Correspondence from organizations, businesses, private individuals and others writing about the task force arrives daily in the Members' mail. This correspondence is indicative of the widespread national concern over the present U.S. agricultural situation, and interest in what we in Congress are doing about it.

On behalf of myself and the other members of the task force, I wish to express our sincere gratitude for the invaluable assistance to our efforts which has been rendered by the Republican National Committee, the Republican congressional committee, and the many others in the absence of whose help the task force would have been far less viable.

Although the task force has achieved a good beginning, it is only a beginning. The work required in this area is enormous, and makes great demands on time and resources. But the need is great, and it is our responsibility to look long and hard for workable solutions to the manifold problems with which the American farmer is faced from day to day.

The task force program for the future is presently being planned, Mr. Speaker, and it is even broader in scope and more demanding than in the past—for the sake of our Nation and our Nation's agriculture, it must be.

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING NASA

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, on the 13th day of October, 1965, I reported to Congress—p. 26922 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—some recommendations regarding the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

One of these recommendations was to the effect that the unusual relationship existing between the Jet Propulsion Laboratory and the NASA should be ended.

This relationship is unique in that a Government-owned facility, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, is run by the California Institute of Technology as an independent contractor. No other NASA research center is run in this fashion.

Recently, as a member of the Subcommittee on NASA Oversight, then was brought to my attention the serious difficulties being encountered in Project Surveyor, which is a program to obtain vital information about the make-up of the lunar surface. This information is necessary for a successful Apollo mission.

It appears this program is currently 4 years behind schedule and its costs are 10 times the original estimate. The program has been under the direction of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

The report being issued by the Subcommittee of NASA Oversight is very critical of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, of NASA direction in Washington, and of the Hughes Aircraft Corp.

Mr. Speaker, I did not recommend that the relationship between NASA and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory be normalized because of the difficulties of Project Surveyor. In fact, the contents of the report were not then known to me.

I do believe, however, that the breakdown in communications and coordination between NASA headquarters, the Hughes Co., and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory results in part from the unusual relationship that exists between the Jet Propulsion Laboratory and NASA.

To put it concisely, if this type of relationship is advantageous to the Government, then I believe that all of the NASA research centers should be run in this fashion. If it is not advantageous, then I believe that the relationship with the Jet Propulsion Laboratory should be put on a normal basis.

The contract under which the Jet Propulsion Laboratory is now being run by the California Institute of Technology terminates at the end of 1966. It, therefore, becomes evident that the Science and Astronautics Committee must take some action in this area this coming spring and I believe that we should.

In the last 3 years, NASA has paid to the California Institute of Technology "institutional indirect costs" totaling $850,000 for 1962, $900,000 for 1963, and $1,005,000 for 1964. In addition, they have paid the California Institute of Technology "fixed fees" of $1,250,000 in 1963, $1,250,000 in 1964, and $1,530,000 in 1965. At the same time, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory is letting subcontracts in the sum of almost $2 million a year.

I believe all of these matters deserve the attention of Congress.

I am not proposing this change in relationship as a punishment to the men of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory who have performed outstanding services for our Nation's space effort. I can see no reason, however, why this facility could not be run under the restraints of civil service, as are all other facilities of the NASA.

DEVILS JUMPS RESERVOIR PROJECT, KENTUCKY

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, as the 1st session of the 89th Congress prepares to finally adjourn, I would like to pay tribute to a freshman Member who has made a very favorable impact upon Members on both sides of the aisle, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the Honorable TIM LEE CARTER.

Dr. CARTER took the seat of another fine gentleman, our former colleague, the Honorable Eugene Siler, and shares the same high qualities of character of his predecessor.

In a modest and unassuming way Dr. CARTER has created an unusually good impression that is a credit to his district and the great State of Kentucky.

He has been particularly active in acquainting House colleagues with the proposed Devils Jumps Reservoir project that would be constructed on the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River in McCreary County, Ky. This project would appear to be a most worthy one, in terms of flood control, power, and recreation benefits.

While this project was not included in the rivers and harbors omnibus bill this session, Dr. CARTER has done a tremendous amount of essential preliminary work, informing Members of the great advantages that will accrue to his State and its people from this project, and its feasibility. Eventually the Devils Jumps Reservoir will be constructed—through the outstanding efforts of our esteemed colleague from Kentucky's Fifth District.

LOYAL AMERICAN SPEAKS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. REID] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter which was written to me by a resident of my congressional district, along with a letter which he sent to his son. This is just one loyal American speaking up for America, but I know his views are shared by the overwhelming majority of Americans in the 15th District of Illinois and throughout our great land.

ELGIN, ILL.,
October 19, 1965.

Congresswoman CHARLOTTE T. REID,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN REID: As a parent of a young man in college, I'm more than usually interested in the tragedy of last weekend. I am disgusted with the fact that publicity media has afforded such time to this fraction of young America which has been led down the garden path to rebellionism without a cause—and the "fellow travelers" who rejoice in their misguided noise.

I thought perhaps you would be interested in one dad's letters to his son at college on the subject. I would hope the ground swell of disapproval from other moms and dads would echo throughout the land.

At the same time, we are veterans of World War II—10 years in the Marine Corps. I carry a piece of Japanese shrapnel and the Purple Heart—and I wear two Presidential Unit Citation Stars, four Combat Stars, including Saipan and Iwo Jima.

Last November we had our chance to express our opinions in the only place we have where our free America is perpetuated as a result of World War II—the polling place.

The choice now is not "whether" but rather "how" we can maintain our freedom and contain communism. For my own, I would rather draw the line in southeast Asia than in Elgin, Ill.

More than this, as Commander in Chief, our President is attempting to end this war as quickly as possible with the minimum of American lives lost.

Ours is now a commitment not a policy to dispute—a combined commitment of both Republican and Democrat citizens alike—Americans all. When our Armed Forces are involved, we must—all of us—back them up with every fiber we possess. To this end we must all be dedicated.

Activities to "beat the draft" are treacherous—truisims, clichés, etc., notwithstanding.

My son, and his fellows by the thousands, understands this—as do we who stand behind as "veteran" parents.

Let's rent Soldier Field—fill it with 100,000 Americans and parade a pageant of college bands, scholars, football teams, ROTC cadets, just plain students who would be happy to "volunteer" for instead of against.

Let's not have another Korea—let's let the world see the real young Americans who are to inherit this country from this generation. Let's show "objectivity"—not bearded rebels without a cause. Let's put the "Red" back in "Red-blooded"—let's debate on issues—not immature idealism. No one, especially me, was in favor of World War II—who was? Who wants to die? But in the Marine Corps we have a motto "Semper fidelis," always faithful, faithful to our flag, our country, our democracy, even though we would debate as to its domestic application, at times.

Now is a time for unity. Now is a time to stand behind the man with the gun—as my letter to my son suggests—not because he is a gunfighter, but because he is carrying out our declaration of commitment, our country, our flag, our future.

Let's get the VFW and the Legion on their feet (I should say on our feet). Let's close ranks, let's disavow these "T" shirted souls with no purpose.

I hope the day never comes when it is unfashionable or improper to "rally 'round the flag, boys."

Sincerely,

Roy Protzman.

Elgin, Ill.,
October 16, 1965.

Robert Protzman,
Theta Chi Fraternity,
Ripon College,
Ripon, Wis.

Dear Son: The attached front page story in today's Chicago Sun-Times about the national organization set up to assist young men "Beat the draft" must concern you and your fellow students as much as it does those of us who, as parents, sit in amazement at what a tiny fraction of young unwashed, misguided beatniks and their fellow travelers are doing to discredit the strong red, white, and blue backbone that has been this Nation's heritage since 1776 and has made possible the position prominence we hold in the world today.

Usually, my letters to you are of your progress in school, and what Mom and the kids are doing, personal interest bits as you would say. Today, I think I'm writing not only to you, my son, but also to your brothers at Theta Chi, your fellow students at Ripon College, the young Republicans on campus you have been elected to represent, and to the 99.9 percent of young America who are going about the process of education in whatever manner it is available to them to better equip themselves for a life of contribution.

As has been documented at the Federal and local level, much of this business tagged as "student activity" is a highly organized national—probably international—program designed to undermine the genuine issues of our commitment in Vietnam.

I think the idea of debates as this SDS outfit suggests is good; not with the draft board members, or R.O.T.C. officers, not with recruiting personnel or others obviously doing a job as professional soldiers or support activities, but with "guys" like you, Larry, Bill and all equivalent inheritors of whatever this Nation is going to be in the next quarter century. I should like to see such debates, and I'd be proud, not ashamed, to see you "guys" in shirts, jackets, and ties as you represent your fellows, the status of the bearded, unwashed, T-shirt boys might just lose a little lustre in the bright light of genuine exposure to you fellows, and thousands like you, who are not too tired after 15–30 hours of regular work, and a full week of studying to apply that which you are learning in a manner which might make at least a few of the discs in that red, white, blue backbone show themselves to the pride of all of us.

Next week is homecoming at Ripon. I'm sorry that Mom and I cannot be there, but as you know we too have to portion our money carefully as we both work our way through the school of life.

May I suggest a couple of ideas for your consideration at this time, nonetheless?

Why not add to your house outside decorations, a big sign saying, "Theta Chi is mighty high—on the good old U.S.A.". An inside placard might say "Theta Chi has 36 ROTC cadets active on campus, and we're proud of every one of them." Why not ask your ROTC company officer if those of you who cared to could wear your uniform next Saturday? There's a lot of alumni our age and younger and older who would like to see that the Nation is preparing young men for the defense of the country if necessary with some order, and hope, not as a growing aggressive armed force, but a Reserve (that's what ROTC means, Reserve Officers Training Corps) and further that Ripon College is proud to wave the flag a little.

How about a telegram to every Ripon alumni in Vietnam right now to arrive next Saturday "Sorry you can't be here today at homecoming, but we're thinking of you, and thanking you for holding the line over there. The Redmen will hold the line against Lawrence a little better today because of you."

These young people who are too agitated to study, too sophisticated to sing "Fight team fight", too spineless to put on the pads of life, and feel the impact of that tackle across the way, are the same people who in the next few years will bemoan the fact that you fellows have taken all the good jobs. What a pity. Theodore Roosevelt once said, "Show me not the critic who sits in the arena and denounces those upon the field, but rather show me the man who has the dirt of combat in the arena upon him, who at best, knows the sweet smell of success but for a second, and at worst rises only to be smitten again in effort. To him will I listen."

You know your dad. You can take the boy out of the Marine Corps, but not the Marine Corps out of the boy. I hope I never fail to tingle when the flag goes by, or never fail to wipe a tear when the globe and anchor is displayed.

It may be "corny", Semper fidelis, always faithful, but can anyone aspire to more?

Let's go, Ripon. Let's win, Redmen. Stand up, the flag is passing by.

Much love,

Dad,
Roy Protzman.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON NEW ROUTES NORMAL PROCEDURE OF STATE

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, the reply of the New York State Superintendent of Public Works, Mr. J. Burch McMorran, to one of our colleagues should, I believe, be a matter of public record. I ask unanimous consent to place it in the Congressional Record.

Public Hearings on New Routes Normal Procedure of State, Superintendent Notes

The following statement was issued today (October 15, 1965) by Superintendent of Public Works J. Burch McMorran in response to an announcement by Representative Richard L. Ottinger of Westchester (on October 12) that he had been "assured" by the U.S. Secretary of Commerce no Federal funds will be committed for the proposed new north-south route in Westchester, Putnam and Dutchess counties until studies are completed and a public hearing held on the proposal:

"Mr. Ottinger's service in Washington obviously has taught him nothing regarding the State's procedures for planning and financing construction of new highways on the urban and primary systems such as that authorized by the legislature last spring. His announcement was not news in any sense, since it is our standard practice to hold public hearings on preliminary plans and seek Federal funds for construction only after final plans are completed—some time after hearings have been conducted.

"Mr. Ottinger also was quoted as saying the proposed highway would destroy settled communities, bar access to the Hudson River and create traffic problems on routes into or in New York City. These are spurious arguments. Rather than destroy local communities, the new route will assist them by relieving existing roads of much of their heavy traffic, promoting highway safety, and enabling orderly growth and development of the area. Access to the river already is barred—and has been barred for years—by the existence of the railroad tracks along the shore. The route as now proposed, with railroad crossovers and attendant recreational development is, in fact, the best guarantee that the people will have increased and improved access to their river. The riverside location proposed for about 5 miles of the route in Westchester would bypass such communities as Philipse Manor, Scarborough and Sleepy Hollow Manor, whose scenic areas Mr. Ottinger claimed would be destroyed.

"As to the funneling of vehicles into New York City, I have previously pointed out that greater capacity can and will be provided along present major traffic corridors below the Tappan Zee Bridge in Westchester. Additional capacity in New York City is being provided or planned to meet both current and future needs, which will continue to grow with or without the Hudson Valley route.

"In maintaining that the proposed highway should be built along Route 9A, Mr. Ottinger demonstrates his unawareness of or his unwillingness to recognize the fact this would not provide ready access to the riverfront communities, their industry or their shoreline, and would not solve the really pressing traffic problems on Route 9, particularly in Tarrytown. Traffic volumes on much of Route 9 between Tarrytown and Ossining have increased an average of 59 percent—21 percent above the Statewide urban area average—in the past dozen years. Route 9 traffic at several points in the area is already greater than that on much of the Thruway, and unless we provide an improved route—where the need exists—the communities of western Westchester will become hopelessly strangled in their congestion. This is a matter of such critical importance it should transcend all political goalsmanship."

CONTRIBUTION OF WOMEN TO OUR WORLD

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to say a word about the contribution women make to our world. But I do not wish to discuss myself or the women of this Congress, I want to talk about a very young woman. Miss Linda Samples of Brunswick Center, Ohio, is only 16 years of age. She is a junior in high school, an outstanding student, and even while she learns her lessons well, she does not wait for her working mother to supply funds but she earns money cooking and cleaning.

Linda has the kind of loyalty to her country that is an inherent quality, and she has the kind of love and understanding of her fellowman that makes me proud to say—"she is a woman"—though she is a very young woman.

Like some of the rest of the women of our country, Linda has been worried about evidences of disloyal people who have the freedom of America. But Linda did something about it. She wrote a letter "To the Men in Vietnam" and not knowing just how to post it, she asked the Cleveland Press to handle it. I know how the editor must have felt when he read it, for Linda's letter appeared on the front page of my hometown paper yesterday. The message is clear and I want to share it with you:

To the Men in Vietnam:

Today is a beautiful fall day. The trees are changing color, the sky is deep blue. Many Americans are enjoying this Sunday. Why?

Because you are there in Vietnam, fighting, being wounded, and even dying, for us—for our freedom.

You have said that you feel the people of the United States do not think you are fighting for a worthwhile cause. I can think of no better cause than freedom. Our God-given freedom is our most precious earthly possession.

America could not be what she is without the freedom you are preserving.

I know that I am not the only person in the United States who prays for you daily and gives thanks you are there protecting with your lives our freedom, our Nation and our existence.

Thank you, every one, and may God keep and bless you all.

Sincerely yours,

LINDA SAMPLES.

FEDERAL PAY RAISE BILL

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States said on May 12:

> We do not have two standards of what makes a good employer in the United States: One standard for private enterprise and another for the Government. A double standard which puts the Government employee at a comparative disadvantage is shortsighted.

I fully agree. I believe that the Government employee pay increase passed by the House of Representatives will help to eliminate the double standard between private and Government employment.

I regret that I was unable to return to Washington for the vote on the salary raise bill September 30. Had it not been for prior commitments in New York, I would have been able to vote for this needed and equitable legislation.

The bill, in my judgment, translated into action the very words of the President. It keeps faith with the principle of comparability; that Federal employees should receive the same salaries paid in private employment for the same skills, experience and responsibility.

The 4½-percent general salary increase will, perhaps, not achieve full comparability. But it moves in the right direction. Had the increase been higher, it would have had my wholehearted support.

Among the 1.7 million Federal employees who will benefit from the pay raises are those in the Post Office Department. Some of these workers walk 10 miles a day with a 35-pound bag, need to memorize 900 pages of regulations and know 3,000 names and addresses. For this work, the typical postal employee makes about $5,400 per year. The AFL–CIO estimates that it requires an annual salary of $6,400 for a family of four in the Nation's major cities for a modest, but adequate standard of living.

Accordingly, postal workers in New York City, which have one of the highest cost-of-living indexes in this country, are most deserving of the increase provided in the bill.

In conclusion, then, my absence from the floor when the vote on the salary bill was taken September 30 did not reflect a disinterest in this legislation. I would have returned to Washington if it had been at all possible. I would have argued in favor of this bill and cast my vote for passage.

INTIMIDATION OF ITS BEST POTENTIAL CUSTOMERS APPEARS TO BE THE NEW POLICY OF OFFICIALS OF KENNEDY ARTS CENTER; WHITE HOUSE ARTS ADVISER ENDORSES THREATS OF REPRISALS AGAINST WASHINGTON'S CULTURAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned by a letter I have received from Roger L. Stevens, the White House Special Assistant on the Arts. Under date of October 11, he refers to and adopts as his own a statement which appeared on October 7, 1965, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This same statement is being currently and widely circulated by Mr. Stevens in his role as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Through these communications, direct, bald threats are being made against the tax-exempt status and municipal financial support of several cultural organizations in the District of Columbia. These organizations include the American Light Opera Co.; the National Symphony Orchestra Association; the Opera Society of Washington; the Washington Ballet; and the Washington Civic Opera Association. Their offense, according to the statement adopted and given wide circulation by Roger L. Stevens, is that they permitted me to poll their customer lists in my own name and in the pursuit of objective and legitimate information related to legislation.

The results of this survey have not been welcomed by Mr. Stevens and the executive committee of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. The heavy response proved that 70 percent of the Washington area concert and theater audiences want the controversial question of the Center's site considered in open public hearings at which qualified experts can help Congress reexamine the site for the Kennedy Arts Center. Return cards are still arriving daily and, despite the barrage of propaganda, the overwhelming vote remains in the same ratio and is greater than that enjoyed by President Johnson himself in his landslide victory last November.

Because their customers, the same customers who will spell success or failure for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, "voted wrong," Washington's leading musical and performing arts organizations are now being endangered by the threat of, first, losing their tax-exempt status; second, being deprived of the pitifully small payment for their services that some of them receive from the municipal government of the District of Columbia; and, third, the likelihood that they are disqualified from receiving assistance under the new National Endowment for the Arts to be administered, it appears, by the same Roger L. Stevens.

Mr. Stevens' public and private communications appear to give White House approval to this statement:

> It may well prove that these organizations have done themselves the greatest disservice of all. Section 501(c)(3) denies tax-exempt status to organizations which substantially

attempt to influence legislation. And loss of tax exemption seriously endangers the sources of charitable contributions. In addition, the National Symphony, the Washington School of Ballet, and the Washington Civic Opera received from the District of Columbia Recreation Board over $49,000 of public funds appropriated by the Congress and a similar amount is provided in this year's budget. It is hardly appropriate for these funds to be used to support opposition to the Kennedy Center site when that site has been endorsed by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia as well as the recreation board.

As well as to the proposition that these leading cultural organizations, which have outstanding and unblemished records of public service, should be deprived of their tax-exempt status and municipal support as a punishment for allowing their customers to express opinions. The proposition is based on, and reference is made to section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue law, which denies tax exemption to organizations which substantially attempt to influence legislation. All but one of Washington's cultural organizations are completely blameless under the Internal Revenue law. This one exception is the Kennedy Arts Center itself, a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution, which has spent, and is spending, thousands of dollars in lobbying for legislation, and to influence the public and the Congress. The White House and the trustees, including the ex officio members of the Board of Trustees many of whom are top administration officials, of the Kennedy Arts Center have been put in the impossible position of lobbying against Washington's leading cultural organizations and not, mind you, because these organizations have expressed their opinions, which they have not, although they have every right to do so. No, these performing arts organizations of the Nation's Capital are facing intimidation and threats regarding their tax-exempt status, as well as loss of their municipal financial support, because they permitted their customers to be polled in a conventional consumer research poll. This is nothing less than thought control and, if it indeed has the support of the administration and the President it will quickly spread throughout the Nation and affect disastrously both the arts and the humanities by means of such powerful instrumentalities of the Federal Government as the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965.

I find it hard, even impossible, to believe that this sort of bald threat and intimidation, though endorsed and circulated by a White House Special Assistant, really represents the considered arts policy of President Johnson himself. I hope that the President agrees with me that we owe the affected art organizations of the Nation's Capital a prompt and immediate clarification of top-level White House policy on freedom of expression as it relates to citizens who support the performing arts by buying tickets and making contributions of time and money in support of the arts and performing arts organizations of the Nation's Capital. If there is intimidation and threats to the arts from the White House, the Kennedy Arts Center, or the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, how long will it be before such intimidation and threats spread throughout the Federal Government? Attention to this matter by an immediate clarification of Federal and administration art policy is urgent, for Washington's volunteer-operated cultural institutions can no longer continue their history of fine public service if the administration successfully sponsors moves, such as this, to cancel their tax-exempt status and otherwise harass them by halting their municipal support and by other equally reprehensible means.

How curious it is that those forces which are now attacking the resident performing arts organizations of the Nation's Capital have consistently sought, and frequently obtained, their direct intervention in legislative matters. Some of the very art organizations now being intimidated and threatened for allowing a simple consumer research poll to be made of their customers, a survey which did not involve them by name, were often requested and encouraged in the past to take organizational positions before Congress regarding legislation sponsored and supported by many of these same forces. Apparently the awesome power of the tax laws and the power to end municipal support of Washington's performing arts organizations is to be used to make them conform to the current views and positions of certain top administration art officials in positions of great power within the White House and the Smithsonian Institution. The hard core fact of the matter is that these organizations now have a directive from their own supporters that the site of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts should be reexamined immediately, and, possibly, be relocated. There is every reason under the law, and the Constitution, for Washington's art organizations to intervene directly in a matter which so directly and closely affects them. They are made up of first-class citizens, who have every right to speak their mind and to be heard with respect by the administration's top art officials. I certainly would not press them, or even request them, to speak up. However, if they wish to be heard on the matter of the site of the Kennedy Arts Center, or any other subject, for that matter, they may rest assured that I and an overwhelming majority of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the Senate and the House of Representatives will vigorously defend their rights of free expression and speech, which are among the most precious and fundamental of our constitutional liberties.

One of these art organizations, the Washington National Symphony, has such high standing with the people of the National Capital area whom it serves, as well as in other great metropolitan centers, such as New York City, that it has just been reported by the press that it is a serious candidate for a grant of $2,500,000 under the new orchestral program of the Ford Foundation. The Washington National Symphony is so highly respected that it was one of the major symphony orchestras chosen by the Ford Foundation's art experts for a depth study which led to the decision to set up a highly significant and generous program which will provide a total of $85 million in support for American symphony orchestras. The Ford Foundation is to be commended and congratulated for this decision. It has brought to reality the essential and dominant support that private enterprise should and must devote to the fine arts under the American free enterprise system. The Ford Foundation agrees, as I do, with President Johnson that Federal Government involvement in the arts should be supplemental to existing private efforts and must not supplant or try to suppress or control art organizations, such as the Washington National Symphony, that have, through their own public service over many, many years, made our lives so much more significant and meaningful.

I include, as part of my remarks, an excellent newspaper story on the Ford Foundation grant by the distinguished and learned music critic of the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, Mr. Irving Lowens:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star]

SYMPHONY HERE TO ASK $2.5 MILLION FORD GRANT—ORCHESTRA MANAGER CONFIDENT OF SUPPORT

(By Irving Lowens)

The National Symphony Orchestra will apply for a $2.5 million grant under an $85 million program of aid for American symphony orchestras announced today by the Ford Foundation.

Matching funds are required under the program. The total effort is expected to result in $165 million in new support for symphonic development throughout the country.

The $2.5 million grant to be applied for by the National Symphony is the maximum allowable under the program. M. Robert Rogers, the orchestra's manager, said the basic presentation of the application has been in preparation for more than a year and will be presented to the Ford Foundation next week.

FIFTY TO GET GRANTS

Some 50 major and metropolitan orchestras, among them the National Symphony, will receive grants, the smallest of which will be $600,000.

One-fourth of the total sum ($21 million) will be dispersed on a nonmatching basis. The remainder ($64 million) will consist of endowment funds which the orchestras must match with funds in ratios of from 1 to 1 to 2 to 1.

NOTABLE RECORD

When asked how soon he felt a $2.5 million grant could be matched locally, Rogers said it is "the orchestra's belief that community support is so favorable here that the Washington National Symphony could be one of the first nonendowed orchestras in the country to succeed."

The National Symphony has a notable fundraising record: nearly 70 percent of the $1,088,000 budget of 1964–65 was accounted for by community support. The 1965–66 budget shows a spectacular increase to $1,311,000, with the entire additional sum directly related to the production of music. It is anticipated that at least two-thirds of this sum will be raised.

In regard to the possibility of year-round employment for the orchestra's players in the near future Rogers said that "with a major grant from Ford, the National Symphony can make giant steps in that direction within the next labor agreement, to start next season."

He also said that the first tangible evidence Washington would see if the application was successful would be a regular summer season, probably of 8 weeks' duration. Negotiations for an appropriate site are now approaching a successful conclusion, he said.

DISCUSSIONS SLATED

The Ford Foundation expects to begin detailed discussions with orchestras immediately and to arrange the details of the program within the next several months.

Washington's orchestra was one of the country's 25 major symphonies (classified by the American Symphony Orchestra League as those in which players have seasonal contracts and whose annual budget is $250,000 or more) studied by the Ford Foundation in preparation of its program.

Foundation officials have had extensive interviews here with Howard Mitchell; Osby L. Weir, president of the Symphony Association; Rogers, and other officers.

MATERIAL FURNISHED

The symphony's office supplied the foundation's staff with substantial documentary material for use in the preparation of recommendations which were adopted last month by Ford trustees. Local research was supervised by Edward F. D'Arms, associate director of the foundation's program in humanities and the arts.

Despite the extraordinary amount of new money expected for symphonic music, foundation officials cautioned against any belief that the program will solve all the problems of orchestras, pointing out that the sum of all annual income from expected endowments would be hardly more than 10 percent of what the orchestra would need a decade from now.

If all income were applied exclusively to raise salaries of players in the 25 major orchestras, the average annual increase would be only $725, and the average salary would rise only to approximately $6,225.

To endow a program calling for salaries of $15,000 per annum in the majors, and of $5,000 per annum in the metropolitan orchestras, would require a capital sum of about $775 million even making no provision for such other operating expenses as travel, programs, music, halls, and administration, to say nothing of soloists and conductors.

CURTIS' ADVICE TO THE DENTISTS

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I insert in the RECORD an editorial in the St. Louis Globe Democrat of October 13, 1965, entitled "CURTIS' Advice to the Dentists":

CURTIS' ADVICE TO THE DENTISTS

Representative TOM CURTIS, of Webster Groves gave some sound advice over the weekend to the Nation's dentists. He told them to get cracking on a privately financed national dental insurance program. It could be handled by the American Dental Association.

It is in the dentists' long-term interest, we think, to take the Congressman's advice to heart. For, if the dentists do not come up with a program of their own for dental insurance, they shall very likely have one yoked upon them by social reformers who spend their days thinking up just such Federal schemes.

We hope the dentists will not have to learn the hard lesson the doctors learned through "medicare."

The medical profession of this country saw for years the mounting efforts being made to put medical care for the aged under social security. If the doctors had only come up in time with an acceptable and comprehensive national program of their own, and pushed for its passage, they would have cut the ground from under the advocates of socialized medicine.

Indeed, if the doctors had written and effected passage of their own program, they might not be facing, as they are today, the prospect of an increasingly socialized medicine.

PROPOSING RECOGNITION OF THE VILLAGE OF WHITEHALL, WASHINGTON COUNTY, N.Y., AS THE BIRTHPLACE OF THE U.S. NAVY

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the first proposals I introduced in this session of Congress was House Concurrent Resolution 94, proposing the recognition of the village of Whitehall, Washington County, N.Y., as the birthplace of the U.S. Navy.

The fleet constructed at Whitehall, N.Y., and referred to in my resolution, played an extremely vital role in delaying the invasion of General Burgoyne's army until after the Battle of Valcour Island fought on Lake Champlain in October 1776. This delay led to the decisive British defeat at Saratoga the next year.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an excellent article which appeared recently in the Times-Union newspaper, Albany, N.Y., entitled "U.S. Navy Born, Baptized in Fire at Whitehall." As mentioned in the article, the historic Revolutionary War ship *Philadelphia*, the most remarkable vessel ever built and used by this country, is now permanently moored at the Smithsonian Institution and is termed a "traffic stealer."

I think the story gives substantial credence to the claim that Whitehall, N.Y., is the birthplace of the U.S. Navy and I am happy to call this article to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the Albany (N.Y.) Times Union, Sept. 26, 1965]

U.S. NAVY BORN, BAPTIZED IN FIRE AT WHITEHALL

(By Barnett Fowler)

No one on that day of October 11, 1776, quite knew where it came from, but its source was unimportant compared to the result; the 24-pound solid cannon ball burst with fury from the muzzle of a British cannon, flew its inexorable, graceful trajectory across the waters of Lake Champlain, thudded deep into the starboard side of the *Philadelphia* at water line level.

As thick and well braced as the *Philly*'s oak timbers were, they couldn't stand that kind of shock and water poured into opened crevices.

The small American gunboat promptly began to settle; there was no deep throb of engines as she began to sink into the twilight of New York State's 140-mile-long lake; there was, at first, a shocked silence, then shouts of the frightened living as they kicked off their shoes and leaped from the tiny gunboat. For background there was the incessant and savage pounding of British naval cannon.

The *Philadelphia* went 60 feet down to Champlain's bottom, carrying not only her dead, but every single item of ordnance and personal gear left behind by those who abandoned her. So gently did she move into the liquid embrace of her tomb that even the dead were not disturbed from their grotesque positions; even loaded cannon were not jarred as the cold waters poured into gaping muzzles. Nor were piles of neatly stacked cannon balls disturbed, nor did utensils in the brick fire pit on deck move an inch. And the British cannon ball which hulled her remained embedded in the freshly cut Adirondack oak, the British mark of the arrow visible.

EXTRAORDINARY DAY

On this extraordinary day in America's Revolutionary War history, the *Philadelphia* landed on Champlain's bottom like an autumn leaf, and there she lay for 159 years, a submerged tomb reflecting America's early greatness, lustiness, and heartbreak * * * a tribute to a man then a patriot, later a traitor; one Benedict Arnold by name, admiral of the fleet which contained the *Philly* and 14 other vessels hastily built, hastily manned, and fed to the British lion to stop him in his tracks.

Of all the vessels ever built and used by this country, the *Philadelphia* is the most remarkable and of this there is no question. Today she stands on the third floor of the Hall of Ordnance in the new Museum of History and Technology at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, within sight of the Washington Monument.

And, according to Dr. Philip K. Lundeberg, curator of naval history at the Institution, only one other exhibit outranks her in this section interest—and that exhibit is the original Star-Spangled Banner which flew over Fort McHenry.

Smithsonian's gain is certainly New York's total loss for rightfully, the *Philadelphia* is a New York State product; she is the only remaining vessel from the first American Navy, and aside from the weathering the old girl took in years of entombment it is as complete today as it was when built of oak and pine cut from the hills around Skenesborough, the name of Washington County's Whitehall in Colonial days.

WHITEHALL'S HONOR

All other 14 vessels of that first Navy either rest in Champlain or, having been raised or pilfered over the years, are destroyed by the elements.

Today Whitehall is fully aware of the distinction the *Philadelphia* bestows upon it; that village is seeking congressional recognition as the official "Birthplace of the American Navy," and probably will get it. Who can dispute it?

Of the 15 vessels that battled the British invasion forces from October 11–13 in 1776 at Valcour Island, 12 were constructed from green Adirondack timber. And astonishingly enough, the vessels were constructed—and later commanded—by Arnold, whose treason at West Point was yet to come: who at this time was foremost amongst American generals.

His job was no easy one. The British, well equipped with sailors, money, and ships, planned to split the Colonies by a waterborne invasion south on Champlain. Another British force was due from the south. Thus

Washington's army would be caught in a pincer move. It was Arnold's job to stop the northern invasion and, typically, Congress held off until early 1776 to order him to prepare a fleet. By October this fleet had been constructed literally from forest to ship and included eight gundelos (gunboats), four row galleys. A reconstructed sloop was also on hand.

MANPOWER PROBLEM

Manning the fleet proved a chore. American archives reveal in this year at least 5,000 qualified deep-water seamen served in our Continental Army. But not all were available to the impatient Arnold.

Actually, he had only 70 experienced seamen with him when after one short shakedown cruise he took to the lake to meet the British.

The task of building ships proved a brutal one. Arnold cursed the New Englanders for putting all their cannon and shipbuilding efforts into the high payoffs of privateering instead of extending a helping hand to defend the country which allowed them to become privateers. For manpower he depended upon drafted groups sent to him from Fort Ticonderoga, and records of this fort, seen by the writer, reveal daily roll calls wherein men were "assigned to the fleet." His need was desperate. He acted with desperation. It is probable that the first seeds of treason or rebellion were sown in Arnold at this time, based upon the lack of cooperation he received in this venture. But if so, they did not show; he drove his men mercilessly until by early October he had 15 ships, if one could call them that.

The flagship, the *Royal Savage,* was a British sloop captured the year before and repaired. The other 14 consisted of the sloop *Revenge;* row galley, *Washington;* gundelo, *Philadelphia*; row galley, *Congress*; gundelo, *Jersey;* sloop, *Lee;* gundelo, *Boston;* gundelo, *Spitfire;* gundelo, *New Haven;* gundelo, *Providence;* sloop, *Enterprise;* row galley, *Trumbull;* schooner, *Liberty;* and the row galley *Gates*—which actually was never completed.

FIRST U.S. "NAVY"

This, in effect, is what the Americans of those days viewed as their Navy. This, then, was the spawn of a growing country as compared to the giants that prowl the world today on all oceans; juggernauts, self-contained cities, airfields, and arsenals. Compared to the Seventh Fleet of today, the original American Navy of wooden hulls and sails and oars was a minnow destined in time to come to grow into a killer whale.

When the sailor of 1776 was hungry, he cooked his meals in a brick fire pit on deck. He slept where he could. To prevent British and Iroquois Indian scouts from using his head as a target, he festooned the gunwales of his tiny ships with underbrush—and tried to keep out of gun range from shore. His ships were of green timber and leaked and warped. His instruments were as primitive as his weapons. He scrounged for most of both.

How did the British compare?

On the Richelieu River (Lake Champlain's outlet into the St. Lawrence River) Carleton, the Canadian governor, was putting a squadron together. Naval stores, seamen, trained builders were abundant. His vessels, the *Inflexible, Maria, Carleton,* and *Loyal Convert,* for instance, were built in such a way that they were capable of being dismantled. After being carried around rapids they were easily reassembled.

These were men-o-war, some with 16 or more cannon in position, some of them 24 pounders. Then there was the *Thunderer* with 18 cannon. Then there were 20 oar propelled gunboats, each with a single brass cannon in the bow, some of which were 24 pounders.

The American ships, *Enterprise, Liberty, Royal Savage,* and *Revenge* were armed with 6.4 and 3 pounders. The *Philadelphia* contained two 9-pounders (one on each beam) and a 12-pounder on a slide carriage in the bow. The rest weren't much better armed.

OUTGUNNED, OUTNUMBERED

The Americans thus were outgunned, outweighed and outnumbered—there were 700 highly trained British sailors and soldiers against 500 Americans. And as was the case in those days many had almost a hydrophobiac's fear of water. One destroyer today could have blasted both the British and American fleet to splinters. One PT boat could have sunk the entire fleet in minutes. One machine gun could have won the entire war then and there.

The British moved their forces south, met the Colonials at Valcour Island. The *Royal Savage* and the *Philadelphia* were promptly sunk; the *Congress* was hulled time and again and the *Washington* was barely afloat from the blasting she absorbed. Two gundelos were broken and swamped.

No American ship escaped harm and the "rebels" retreated during the night. For some obscure reason the British did not pursue for 24 hours.

Behind Schuyler Island, Arnold patched up his hulls, sinking the *Providence* and one other, both beyond repair. The British thereupon pounced upon the remnants and the *Washington* struck its colors; the gundelo was next and both were sunk near Split Rock. Fifteen miles from Valcour, the *Lee* had enough; it was beached and deserted, its crew preferring prowling Mohawks and the tomahawk to British cannon.

Arnold had switched from the *Royal Savage* to the *Congress;* this ship moved stubbornly on, mothering survivors. He finally turned into a bay later named for him, fired the *Congress,* burned other craft, then took to the forest. Years later the *Congress* was visible in low water and those most indefatigable of all later-day Americans, the souvenir hunters, removed armament and other articles.

ADVANCE DELAYED

Was the battle a defeat for the Americans? It was considered as such in those hectic days but history has a way of evaluating such clashes. True, the British suffered little damage. True, the Americans lost everything. But one solid fact remains: Had Arnold's fleet not been in existence, the British advance would have been uncontested. The presence of the American Navy proved a nuisance, but fanged, and it forced the British to build more ships to meet it.

British clumsiness delayed total destruction. But the point is that time, precious time, was gained.

Adm. A. T. Mahan, who made an exhaustive study of the battle, has written:

"That the Americans were strong enough to impose capitulation of Saratoga was due to the invaluable year secured to them in 1776 by their little Navy on Lake Champlain, created by the indomitable courage of the traitor, Benedict Arnold."

Who can argue the point? Who wants to?

HISTORIC DISCOVERY

The point today is that the *Philadelphia* is the only surviving vessel from this first American Navy; that it was located 159 years after its sinking by the late Maj. Alonzo Hagglund of New York and Willsboro (Essex County), a deep sea salvage expert. He first removed the cannon, then raised the small ship itself, placed it on display in a barge shed at Willsboro on the shores of Lake Champlain, and it remained there many years, a priceless, seldom-visited relic.

Major Hagglund told this writer he had discovered the ship after studies of the battle led him to believe in its approximate location; he said that as he approached the vessel it "loomed" in front of him; that as he boarded it in his hard-hat diving gear he disturbed inches of cinders which shrouded its decks, the funnel discharges of later-day passenger and freight vessels which often steamed over its grave. Skeletal remains were found by Major Hagglund and a sand clock (which worked) and hundreds of colonial relics from belt buckles to shoe buckles, from musket balls to pots and pans, and firewood under the foredeck.

At the Smithsonian today, the *Philadelphia* is termed a "traffic stealer." She has been sprayed with polyethylene glycol and has a surface coating of liquid nylon. She is mounted before colored maps and sketches of the battle—one of them done by a British officer, H. Gilder, the original of which is now in Windsor Castle.

Her cannons have been weighed; the bow 12-pounder runs 3,400 pounds; the two 9-pounders are 1,500 pounds each. They are of Swedish manufacture, were probably "borrowed" by Arnold from Fort Ticonderoga. Temperature and humidity in her display room are carefully managed; showcases display articles found aboard her. A portside ramp gives the public a superb view of her inside.

She would have, indeed, made a fine exhibit at the New York State Museum in Albany. But the Smithsonian got to her first and there she will remain, truly extraordinary, a tiny boat which literally lived only a few days but which today bluntly and silently tells visitors that America today is strong, but the country wasn't too bad in the early days either.

THE 89TH CONGRESS: A RECORD SESSION

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, Willard Edwards, of the Chicago Tribune Press Service, has presented a comprehensive recounting of the activities of the 1st session of the 89th Congress. His newspaper devoted two entire pages to the story in its edition of Sunday, October 17, 1965.

The Tribune assessment of the first session follows:

LEGISLATION POURS OUT IN PEAK VOLUME

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, October 16.—The 1st session of the 89th Congress is certain to be recorded as epochal in its impact upon American citizens and the way they live.

The legislative record is so staggering in volume, so revolutionary in nature that it defies comparison with the achievements of any earlier Congress. In its full import, it marks a turning point in the history of the Republic.

The United States saw one-man government in a form never contemplated under the checks and balances restraints of the Constitution. Both Houses of Congress dominated by 2-to-1 Democratic majorities, succumbed to the demands of President Johnson for a program unprecedented in scope and almost boundless in its implications for the future.

PRESIDENT USES POWERS TO ACCOMPLISH HIS WILL

The President intervened personally on scores of occasions to accomplish his will, not hesitating to exercise his vast political and economic powers upon wavering legislators when the gentler arts of persuasion had failed. He insisted not only on passage of his "must" measures but on passage by sweeping majorities without amendment. Almost invariably, he got his way.

The lawmaking pace was so swift and violent, as a result, that major bills, admittedly deficient in nature, were forced to passage with little debate and under gag rules preventing alterations. An embarrassed leadership pledged later action to plug gaps obvious to all.

Congress, as a coequal branch of the Government created to curb the monarchic tendency of any Chief Executive who might be intoxicated by power, ceased to function.

The House, traditionally jealous of its exclusive revenueraising authority, became an automatic stamping machine for spending bills drafted in the White House.

The Senate, designed to advise and consent to the conduct of foreign affairs and as a Chamber where legislation would be subjected to painstaking scrutiny devoid of emotional public pressures, voluntarily reduced itself to the status of an indulgent house of lords. It sought to exceed the House in hasty indorsement of measures bearing the Presidential imprimatur.

MANY MEMBERS WORRIED OVER EXPANDING BUREAUCRACY

As this session neared an end, many Members were uneasily conscious of this surrender. They were aware that they had initiated programs carrying built-in provisions for expanding a Federal bureaucracy, not responsible to the people, to enormous proportions. The new spending authorized, approximately $9 billion the first year, would mushroom in future years to incalculable heights.

Some serious problems had been ignored or attacked with stopgap methods. The balance-of-payments deficit continued to stir alarm despite passage of some money-tinkering bills admittedly expedient. Talk persisted of an "overheated" economy, resulting from the push of rising costs and the pull of inflationary pressures, which could explode in coming months, further destroying the value of the dollar.

Whatever the consequences, good or bad (only the future could determine), the lives of 195 million citizens and those of coming generations would be affected. The political, social, and economic face of the Nation was sure to be altered. Supporters of the program outlined an imminent utopia; a minority voiced alarm about its gigantic costs and a racing economy fueled by tax cuts, deficit spending, and a steadily soaring national debt. All joined in agreement, however, that none, young or old, rich or poor, would escape the thrust of new laws almost countless in number.

There were many "firsts" recorded at the session. Legislation, experimental in nature and repeatedly pigeonholed by past Congresses over the years, received easy approval. Old laws were abolished. Ancient traditions were ignored and precedents established.

Federal influence was expanded to long-forbidden areas. The church-state issue was bypassed to permit aid to elementary and secondary schools where religion is taught. Federal scholarships for college students received indorsement for the first time.

The American system of medical care underwent a radical change, including hospital care underwritten by Federal money, after a quarter century of controversy.

A voting rights bill for Negroes, destined to change the political face of the South, was approved after a lackluster filibuster in the Senate had been killed by invocation of cloture.

NEW PLAN OF SUCCESSION TO PRESIDENCY APPROVED

The Constitution was rewritten to provide a new system of succession to the Presidency and the new language in the form of a constitutional amendment sent to the States for ratification.

Congress decreed an end to almost all excise taxes, cutting Federal revenue by nearly $5 million.

It increased the national debt limit to a new record high.

A new Federal department at the Cabinet level was created to deal with city problems. Predictably, it would be one of the biggest in a few years.

The silver coinage system was drastically altered and the required gold backing for Federal reserve deposits was repealed.

RENT SUBSIDIES APPROVED; IMMIGRATION LAW CHANGES

An extraordinary plan for Federal rent subsidies became law.

However, the House voted on Thursday not to appropriate funds for the rent subsidy program.

An immigration quota system of 40 years standing was ended.

Laws were passed to restrict tourist spending, to place a warning label on cigarette packages, to beautify highways, and to experiment with high-speed railroad systems under Federal financing.

Federal aid for the arts was legalized for the first time. The President announced plans for creation of a national repertory theater, support for national opera and ballet companies, and grants for artists at a cost of $63 million in the next 3 years.

An unprecedented bill authorizing creation of regional medical centers to fight heart disease, cancer, and stroke became law. It will cost $340 million in its first 3 years.

The major costs of the Vietnam war were ignored until the next session in order that the $100 billion budget ceiling set by the President, already breached, might not be further exposed as fiction.

Antipoverty bills under various labels poured billions into selected areas despite mounting evidence that the funds were under political control.

Setbacks for the President were rare. A notable one was rejection of a plan for local self-government in the Capital, where the population is 58 percent Negro. Johnson intervened personally and lined up 218 signatures, a House majority, to force a bill to the floor.

A 3-day battle ensued, and the House substituted a bill delaying election of a mayor and city council for at least a year while citizens voted on a charter form of government.

Shelved for consideration until next year were:

1. A bill to raise the minimum wage to $1.75 an hour and extend coverage to 7,900,000 more workers.

2. A consular convention (treaty) which would have permitted the United States and Russia to expand their consular forces in each other's countries. It also would have extended immunity from criminal prosecution to all consular employees. Senate ratification was postponed by testimony from J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that the treaty would be an aid to Soviet espionage in the United States.

A merger of the National Guard and the Army Reserves, urged by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, was stymied by congressional opposition.

In the closing days of the session the Senate killed the bill to repeal State right-to-work laws. The measure had passed the House.

The repeal had been demanded by the President to redeem his campaign promises to labor bosses. However, it ran into a filibuster led by Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, the Senate Republican floor leader.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, the Senate Democratic floor leader, sought to break the filibuster by invoking cloture but was beaten 45 to 47. Thus, he was unable to muster even a simple majority, much less the two-thirds majority required for cloture.

Faced with renewal of the filibuster, which would have blocked the administration's legislative program, MANSFIELD then withdrew the repeal bill. Specifically, the bill would have repealed section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. The section permits States to enact right-to-work legislation which outlaws labor contracts requiring workers to join unions.

These were some of the more notable features of the session. It began January 4 with the effects of President Johnson's sweep in the previous November elections evident in both Houses. The lineup was 295 Democrats to 140 Republicans in the House (2 Democratic seats were vacant at the end) and 63 Democrats to 32 Republicans in the Senate.

The President's state of the Union address announced his intention to improve "the quality of life" for all in the Great Society. He outlined a staggering array of proposals. He also made it clear that he wanted fast action with the objective, he confessed later, of outdoing Franklin D. Roosevelt's famous "first 100 days" in 1933.

As Johnson's first 100 days ended April 13, he boasted to his Cabinet that Congress had written "a record of major accomplishments without equal or close parallel in the present era." The boast was a little extravagant at the time but Congress then went on to legislative experiments unmatched in this century. Johnson offered to bet that it was the greatest Congress in history.

DEMOCRATS ALTER RATIOS TO PACK TWO COMMITTEES

Not content with 2-to-1 majorities to facilitate legislation at a dizzy pace, Democratic leaders realined committees, breaking tradition to alter ratios on the Ways and Means and Appropriations Committees and thus increase control. The Ways and Means Committee, for example was packed with three new members to insure approval of the medicare bill, which had been resting on a committee shelf since 1964.

Republicans, meanwhile, ousted their leader, Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, and replaced him with Representative GERALD R. FORD of Michigan. The vote was close, 73 to 67, leaving some wounds and some doubts. As the months passed, however, FORD emerged as an aggressive leader, one of the few in Congress who dared to dispute with the President.

The shadow of war in Vietnam hovered over Washington from the first days of the session and darkened as the months passed. On January 13, the United States acknowledged that two Air Force bombers had been shot down in a raid over Laos. The disclosure was the first public admission that U.S. forces were engaged in attacks on Communist supply lines outside South Vietnam. From that point, the war steadily expanded until it became apparent that another Korea was in the making.

Johnson was sworn in for his first elected term on January 20. "Is our world gone?" he asked in his inaugural address. "We say farewell. Is a new world coming? We welcome it—and we will bend it to the hopes of man."

The bending, so far as Congress was concerned, came quickly. The budget for the fiscal year starting July 1 arrived on Capitol

Hill—$99.7 billion, a fraction under the $100 billion level which the President had decreed, and $5.3 billion more than expected revenues. This deficit would mean that the national debt limit would again have to be raised. The White House avoided stress on the fact that actual cash outgo, as the result of other types of spending such as trust fund outlays, would be a record $127.4 billion.

REDUCTIONS OF $4.7 BILLION IN EXCISE TAXES VOTED

The President proposed excise tax cuts totaling $1.75 billion. Congress leaped on this proposal with such enthusiasm that the tax cuts totaled $4.7 billion when the bill reached final passage 5 months later.

In the first 30 days of the session, the House displayed a small measure of resistance to White House dictation. In passing a $1.6 billion bill replenishing funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation, it placed a ban on shipments of surplus food to Egypt. President Gamal Abdel Naser had just replied to an American protest against mob-burning of the John F. Kennedy Library in Cairo with the Egyptian equivalent of "go to hell." Indignation was high and 76 Democrats joined 128 Republicans to approve an amendment, 204 to 177, which cut off supplies to Nasser.

Johnson acted quickly to squelch this minor uprising, reminiscent in some respects of operations by the old coalition of conservative Democrats, largely from the South, and northern conservative Republicans, which had operated to frustrate many Presidents in the past.

The President asked the Senate to remove the Nasser amendment. With the assistance of DIRKSEN, the Senate bowed, 44 to 38, to the President's will. Then pressure was put upon the House to reverse its previous action. Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL, Republican, of Illinois, led the fight against this surrender but the number of Democrats opposing the White House dwindled from 76 to 37. All Republicans except one stood firm but the House defeated an amendment, 241 to 165, which it had approved only 13 days earlier. Surplus food shipments would continue to Nasser as long as the President decided it was in the national interest to send them.

Little more was heard of the Republican-Democratic coalition. Thus, early in the session, was established the trend which became popularly known as "What Lyndon wants, Lyndon gets." He had demonstrated that he could crush opposition quickly and ruthlessly whenever he saw congressional action as an affront to his authority.

JOHNSON PLEASED BY ACTION IN HIS FIRST 100 DAYS

As the end of the 100-day period approached, Johnson was justifiably elated. His euphoria was based on enactment of these measures:

1. Passage by both Houses, for the first time in history, of a bill which in effect authorized funds for general use for elementary and secondary education, including schools where religion is taught. Although directed primarily at aiding educationally deprived children from low-income families, the bill authorized grants to school districts in approximately 95 percent of the Nation's counties.

By placing the major emphasis on assisting schools with many children from low-income families, sponsors of the measure successfully avoided the controversy over Federal aid to parochial schools which had blocked such legislation for many years. But a paradoxical feature (essential to secure the needed votes) was noted: The bill poured more money into rich States than into poor States where the need was greatest. Total first-year cost of the legislation was estimated at $1.3 billion. Projected 5-year cost for the authorized life of the measure is $6.5 billion.

2. Passage of the first so-called Great Society measure, pumping $1.1 billion into the mountainous 11-State Appalachian region. Most of the money was for 10,000 miles of new highways. The rest was for health facilities, vocational schools, reclaiming of mining areas, and development of timber and water resources. Authorized to continue until 1971, the program had an estimated overall cost of $6 billion.

3. House passage of medicare, the health-care insurance program for persons 65 and over, an increase in social security cash benefits, and expanded medical assistance to the indigent aged. It was the first time the House had ever approved such a program, which had been the subject of violent controversy for 25 years.

It was the costliest and most sweeping welfare program since the original Social Security Act of 1935. The vote was 313 to 115.

Senate approval, never in doubt, came July 9 by a 68 to 21 vote. The Senate made 513 changes in the House bill, increasing its annual cost to $7.5 billion. A conference agreement reduced the cost to $6.5 billion, to be financed largely by increased payroll taxes, taking a $275 yearly cut from the salary of wage earners with a $6,600 income. The bill was sent to the White House July 28.

CONGRESS VOTES TO END GOLD RESERVE REGULATION

These were the three major actions of Johnson's first 100 days. There were other important bills cleared in a period when Congress customarily is engaged in committee work designed to detect flaws in administration proposals. These included:

A bill eliminating the requirement in existing law that each Federal Reserve bank maintain gold certificate reserves valued at not less than 25 percent of the amount of its commercial bank deposits. This legislation freed about $5 billion in gold to meet international claims on the dollar and to allow the Nation's money supply to expand. Its stated purpose—to gain time for the administration to take steps to reduce the continuing U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

Legislation extending for 3 years the Manpower Training Act, authorizing $454 million in the first year for a program designed to relieve the persistent unemployment problem. Full Federal financing was authorized for another year, killing a provision under which States would have been forced to pay one-third of the training costs beginning July 1, 1965.

A bill authorizing a $750 million increase in the U.S. contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank for low-cost loans to other countries.

A bill proposing a constitutional amendment to permit the Vice President to become Acting President if the President is unable to perform his duties. Both Houses passed it in differing versions; the differences were finally ironed out July 6 and the amendment sent to the States for ratification. If ratified by three-fourths of the States (38) within 7 years, it will become the 25th amendment to the Constitution.

The story of Johnson's first 100 days, however, was not so much one of great legislative achievement, although the output was indeed phenomenal for an early period. It was the manner in which these bills were pushed to passage under gag rules in the House and voluntary curbs in the Senate which violated century-old traditions.

MEDICARE GAINS OK UNDER GAG RULE

The medicare bill, for example, a 294-page document of infinite complexity, was swept to passage in the House in 3 days. Not a word was changed as the result of floor debate under a gag rule prohibiting most amendments.

The Senate, in the same week, approved and sent to the White House an 80-page bill equally complicated, launching the Government program of Federal aid to education in elementary and secondary schools. Again, not a solitary change was permitted.

Both Houses were working under White House orders, demanding speed. Gag rules in the House are not unusual but the Senate's voluntary surrender of its cherished tradition of unlimited debate was extraordinary. The Senate has always been proud of its reputation as the body which subjects all bills to the closest scrutiny.

The Appalachia bill was similarly steamrollered to passage. President Johnson told House leaders he wanted it on his desk on the weekend of March 5–6. Any changes would have required sending it back to the Senate for concurrence, causing a delay of 2 or 3 days. Amendments, some of them widely recognized as beneficial, were impermissible. The Great Society, said Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, had yielded to "The Great Stampede." All protests were suppressed and the President got his weekend gift.

After an Easter recess, the Senate plunged into debate on the Negro voting rights bill which had been made the pending business on April 13. Final passage did not come until May 26 and followed the invocation of cloture (curb on debate). It was only the second time in history that the Senate had voted such a restriction on a civil rights measure.

The long weeks in between could not be called a filibuster. The Senate at times took up and passed other legislation. Long sessions, beginning in the morning and lasting until late at night, were never ordered.

SENATE VOTES 70 TO 30 TO ADOPT CLOTURE RULE

In the end, however, MANSFIELD, blocked in efforts to get unanimous consent for the final passage vote, proposed cloture and it was approved, 70 to 30, 3 votes more than the necessary two-thirds majority. The bill was then passed, 77 to 19.

Six weeks later, the House, by a 333 to 85 rollcall vote, passed a similar measure. The bill, after differences had been eliminated in conference, went to the President and he signed it on August 6. Twenty weeks had passed since he requested the bill to "strike down restrictions to voting in all elections—Federal, State, and local—which have been used to deny Negroes the right to vote." Congress gave him a bill which went significantly beyond his requests, particularly with respect to State poll taxes.

The legislation, aimed particularly at seven Southern States, swept away the literacy tests for voters in those States and authorized the registration of Negroes by Federal examiners. It directed the Attorney General to challenge the constitutionality of the poll tax as a condition to voting in the four States which still impose it for State and local elections. He promptly initiated these lawsuits.

The major action in June was passage of a $4.7 billion excise tax reduction bill, almost $3 billion more than suggested by the President in his January budget message and $700 million more than he proposed in a special excise tax message in May.

The cuts began with elimination of $1.8 billion in taxes the day after enactment and will continue with a reduction of $1.6 billion on January 1, 1966, and $1.3 billion in successive cuts on January 1, 1967, 1968, and 1969. A Government survey indicated that about 75 percent of the initial savings were being passed on to the consumer.

TAXES ON LIQUOR, GAS, AND CIGARETTES UNTOUCHED

By 1969, all Federal excises will be gone except user, regulatory, and sumptuary levies, and a 1 percent manufacturers' tax on passenger automobiles. The list of these emergency taxes, dating back to the Korean war, was almost endless. Scheduled for immediate or eventual discard were taxes on furs, jewelry, luggage, handbags, cosmetics, air conditioners, cameras, musical instruments, and a host of similar luxuries.

Those faithful revenue producers—the taxes on liquor, cigarettes, and gasoline remained untouched.

Supporters of this big slash in Federal revenue argued that it was essential to sustain the momentum of the $11.5 billion income tax cut of 1964. A few die-hard opponents assailed it as a reckless gamble with the stability of the American dollar.

Twenty-four hours before the tax cut bill was given final approval, Congress cleared another measure closely related to dollar stability. The administration was given authority to increase the national debt limit to $328 billion. This ceiling would have slipped back on July 1 to the permanent statutory limit of $285 billion fixed in 1959. Temporary increases have been permitted each year since then, Congress never having been quite willing to relinquish a forlorn hope that debt reduction might some day be initiated. The new debt limit was essential to accommodate an expected national debt of at least $326 billion in the current fiscal year.

As a followup to elimination of the gold reserve clause, two more measures designed to alleviate the disturbing balance-of-payments deficit were whipped through Congress. No heed was given to protests that these bills were merely expedient and only delayed the day of reckoning when the United States would have to face up to the disciplines (such as cutting foreign aid spending) required for meeting the problem.

The President was authorized to increase the U.S. contribution to the International Monetary Fund by $1.35 billion, bringing the total U.S. obligation to the Fund to $5.16 billion. The Fund was established in 1944 to deal with problems of foreign exchange. It helps countries to finance temporary balance-of-payments deficits without resorting to measures restrictive of trade. The United States was never forced to use this Fund until 1963.

A $100 CEILING APPROVED ON DUTY-FREE IMPORTS

A second measure attracted much more publicity, most of it critical. Sent to the White House June 30, it fixed a $100 ceiling on the value of foreign goods which could be brought home duty free by returning American citizens after October 1. The restriction was made tougher by providing that the exemption would be computed on the higher retail value rather than the wholesale value of imported goods, the current practice. The bill also reduced the amount of duty-free foreign alcoholic beverages that could be brought back from 1 gallon to 1 quart.

The $100 figure was $50 more than that requested by President Johnson in his message stressing the need to cut tourist spending abroad and thus alleviate the balance-of-payments deficit. The estimated improvement of $55 million a year in the deficit picture was assailed in Senate debate as picayune and a penalty on low-income tourists.

Late in the session, Congress extended the tax on purchase by Americans of certain foreign securities, scheduled otherwise to expire December 31. Continuation of the levy, supporters said, was crucial to attempts to adjust the balance-of-payments deficit. Opponents said the deficit was created by huge Government expenditures around the world and that the tax was a deterrent to private investment abroad which generated U.S. exports and eased the payments problem.

A historic change in the Nation's coinage system was authorized because of a shortage in silver; the Treasury was instructed to mint new dimes and quarters with no silver in them. New half dollars would have only 40 percent silver. All these coins currently have a 90-percent silver content. Silver dollars were not affected.

Approximately 9 million of the new dimes and quarters, now being minted for distribution in the future, will be copper with a coating of nickel alloy like the present 5-cent piece.

CREATE U.S. DEPARTMENT TO HANDLE CITY PROBLEMS

Another "first" was the creation of a new Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development, designed to deal with the problems of American cities which have a projected 100-percent increase in population in the next 35 years. A similar proposal had failed to pass in 1962, largely because of controversy over reports that a Negro would be appointed Secretary of the Department.

The new Secretary will have all the functions, powers, and duties of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Federal Housing Administration, Public Housing Administration, and Federal National Mortgage Association. He will be the 11th member of the President's Cabinet. Predictions were made in debate that the new Department would expand to gigantic proportions. It starts with 13,600 employees and a $4.4 billion budget.

Foreign aid, a subject of bitter dispute over the years, was again the center of a battle which went on through most of the session. A long deadlock between the House and Senate committees was eventually broken in late August and a bill authorizing a 1-year appropriation of $3.36 billion in spending abroad was approved. The Senate retreated in its demands for a 2-year authorization, an end to the program in 1967, and a study group to recommend a new program.

After a 2-year delay, caused by worry that it would increase the price of coffee to the American consumer, both Houses agreed to legislation enabling U.S. participation in an International Coffee Agreement designed to stabilize world coffee prices at the general 1962 level. The President was forbidden to take any action under this agreement unless he could assure Congress in a report that it would not result in an unwarranted increase in coffee prices.

ENLARGED U.N. COUNCIL WINS SENATE RATIFICATION

The Senate ratified by unanimous vote amendments to the United Nations Charter which would enlarge the Security Council from 11 to 15 members and the Economic and Social Council from 18 to 27 members. These amendments reflected the increase in U.N. membership from 51 to 114 nations and the desire to give African and Asian nations greater representation on the two councils.

The Senate, in acting on the foreign aid bill, rejected, 59 to 27, an amendment, offered by Senator JACK MILLER, Republican, of Iowa, which would have prohibited aid to any country more than 1 year behind in payment of its U.N. dues. The dues problem continued to agitate Congress for months until the United States on August 16 dropped its fight to make Russia, France, and other nations pay up more than $100 million in delinquent dues under penalty of losing their votes. This reversal of policy caused some bitter remarks about surrender from MILLER and a few others but the issue was soon forgotten in Congress.

The Senate's constitutional role as the President's adviser and partner in foreign policy was subdued during the session. Most Senators shied away from discussing the expanding war in Vietnam. Senators WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, and a small group fulminated almost daily against White House policy while Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, and a few others defended it. Late in the session, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, reportedly brooding over his failure to be named Secretary of State, indulged in an outburst against the armed intervention in the Dominican Republic authorized by the President 4 months earlier. This spurred some indignant replies. But the great majority of Members in a body designated as the Chief Executive's partner in foreign policy, remained discreetly silent.

SUM OF $700 MILLION REQUESTED AS VIET EMERGENCY FUND

On May 4, President Johnson used the device of requesting $700 million as an emergency fund for Vietnam war spending in order to secure a congressional indorsement of his policies in southeast Asia. He announced frankly that it was not a routine appropriation, that each vote for the money would be a vote to continue the efforts to halt Communist aggression.

Within 53 hours, the appropriation bill was on the President's desk, swept through by virtually unanimous rollcall votes in each House (408 to 7 in the House, 88 to 3 in the Senate).

Four months later, the President requested an extra $1.7 billion for emergencies in southeast Asia and Congress tacked it on to the general Defense Department appropriation bill totaling approximately $47 billion. But the total was deceptive, congressional leaders agreed. The bill should have contained another $10 or more billions for the actual cost of the Vietnam war. The administration asked that action on this amount be postponed until next January in order to avoid shocking the taxpayers by revealing the actual cost of the jungle war.

The cost of military defense in a hostile world was given another boost when more than 4 million uniformed members of the Armed Forces were given basic pay increases totaling a billion dollars a year, double the amount the President had suggested. Raises were given for the first time since 1952 to enlisted men with less than 2 years' service. For personnel with more than 2 years' service, given their third increase in 3 years, the increase was 11 percent for enlisted men and 6 percent for officers.

In view of darkening war clouds, the President's request for a 4-year, $55 million extension of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency struck many in Congress as ironical. This Agency makes long-range plans under which all nations, including the United States and Russia, would agree to disarm. Congress eventually authorized a 3-year, $30 million extension of the Agency as a symbolic gesture of peace aims.

The administration came close to defeat on a major proposal in connection with the so-called rent supplemental section of a bill authorizing $7.8 billion for public housing expenditures over a 4-year period.

RENTICARE PLAN DRAWS ATTACKS IN BOTH HOUSES

This $150 million rent subsidy plan, promptly dubbed "renticare," was assailed in both Houses as one of the most far-reaching experiments submitted in a generation. It survived in the House by 6 votes, 208 to 202, and in the Senate by 7 votes, 47 to 40.

Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, confessed that the task of swinging Members into line for this proposal was "the toughest in a quarter century." When it appeared at one time that the plan would lose by some 30 votes, President Johnson personally telephoned an estimated 30 Members. The President had called it a crucial new instrument to fight slum conditions in big cities.

In addition to the rent supplements plan, the bill authorized huge sums for housing programs, low-rent public housing, housing for the elderly, college housing, and urban beautification. In size and scope, it was one of the most comprehensive housing bills ever written by Congress.

APPALACHIA SUPPLEMENT OF $3.25 BILLION VOTED

Congress pumped another $3.25 billion into the economy by passage of a Regional Development Act which supplemented the Appalachia program passed earlier in the session. This measure was, in effect, a reenactment and broadening of the scandal-ridden Area Redevelopment and Public Works Acceleration Acts of 1961 and 1962, although the Johnson administration claimed it as part of the new antipoverty program.

The money will be spent over a 5-year period on public works designed to lure business into economically depressed areas and relieve unemployment. Government officials conceded waste, ineffectiveness, and failure in past operations of the program but pledged a cleanup. Opponents said the legislation was a prime example of how a discredited spending program could be revived by giving it a new title and a higher price tag.

A companion bill, carrying the antipoverty label, added another $1.65 billion to funds of the Office of Economic Opportunity. This was more than double the first year appropriation of $785 million which financed the Job Corps, community action, and training programs. Senator DIRKSEN called it "the greatest boondoggle since bread and circuses" in the Roman Empire and proclaimed that the Nation was on a "binge" which couldn't last.

In a compromise, House and Senate conferees agreed that the Governors would retain the power to block proposed community action and Neighborhood Youth Corps programs in their States. But the poverty program—the Office of Economic Opportunity—would have authority to override the veto if it was found to be based on partisan, racial, or other considerations contrary to the purposes of the law.

THE SUM $600 MILLION APPROVED TO EXPAND HEALTH WORK

In 2 days late in July, both Houses passed and sent to the President three measures providing more than $600 million for health programs which had taken months to reach final form. These bills expanded construction of health research facilities, extended programs for children and migrant workers, and authorized grants to organizations at community mental health centers.

Federal controls over depressant and stimulant drugs, sometimes known as "goof balls," were expanded.

After next January 1, Congress decreed, all cigarette packages and cartons must bear the following statement: "Caution: Cigarette smoking may be hazardous to your health." But the same bill also prohibited until July 1, 1969, any requirement that cigarette advertising include a similar statement.

Near the end of the session, the House attempted a second rebellion, minor in nature, against Presidential authority. It was crushed as quickly as the first, 6 months earlier.

A bill authorizing $1.7 billion for construction of military installations carried a provision requiring congressional review of any plan for closing military bases. Johnson promptly vetoed the bill as "repugnant to the Constitution."

Both Houses folded up under the White House reprimand. Nobody dared suggest an attempt to override the veto. The bill was repassed without the offending stipulation.

Johnson reacted in similar fashion when Congress sent him an emergency relief bill providing $70 million for repair or reconstruction of highways damaged by floods, specifying that certain funds could not be spent except with the prior approval of the House and Senate Public Works Committees. The President glimpsed "improper encroachment" on his powers by Congress and vetoed the bill. The restriction was deleted, the bill passed again and it received the President's signature.

All through the session, Congress was disturbed by repercussions of Supreme Court decisions requiring both houses of State legislatures to be apportioned on the one-man, one-vote principle. DIRKSEN, unable to secure Senate Judiciary Committee approval of a constitutional amendment permitting the people of a State to apportion one house on the basis of geography and political divisions as well as on population, forced the issue to the Senate floor in August.

DIRKSEN had a Senate majority with him but a constitutional amendment requires a two-thirds majority before it can be submitted to the States for ratification. The vote was 57 to 39, 7 votes shy of the necessary margin. DIRKSEN warned that he would keep battling until adjournment to secure, at the least, another vote early in the next session.

One of the historic actions in Congress was a sweeping revision of the immigration law. For more than 40 years, immigration into the United States had been based on the so-called national origins quota system which sought to retain the racial balance existing in the United States in 1920.

Under Johnson's prodding, the quota system was wiped out under a bill passed by the House August 25. The Senate set a limit of 120,000 on immigrants from the Western Hemisphere, a proposal killed in the House.

The bill establishes a new set of priorities which favors close relatives of American citizens and those with special skills. After it becomes fully effective July 1, 1968, about 340,000 persons a year are expected to enter under its terms, the largest increases being permitted for Greece, Italy, and Poland.

SECOND EDUCATION AID BILL OK'S $4.7 BILLION OUTLAY

In the closing days of the session, Congress completed action on a second aid-to-education measure carrying authorized spending over a 3-year period of $2.5 billion. This measure, supplementing the bill for support of elementary and secondary schools with a projected $6.5 billion cost in the next 5 years, was designed to strengthen institutions of higher education, colleges, and universities.

A general program of Federal scholarships for college students, repeatedly blocked in earlier years by House resistance was approved.

Most debate on the Senate floor dealt with an amendment by DIRKSEN to a provision stipulating that no part of the bill could be construed to authorize any Government control over the curriculum instruction, administration, personnel, or selection of library resources of any educational institution. DIRKSEN sought to insure the independence of fraternal and social organizations on the campus from Federal intrusion. The Senate accepted the amendment, 60 to 28.

Another major measure left until near the end was the farm bill, costing $4.5 billion, to authorize 4 more years of Government support payment and loans for wheat, cotton, rice, wool, dairy products, and feed grains.

The Senate bill contained a provision designed to make sales to Russia of bread grains possible. Under present law, half of wheat shipments must be transferred in American ships.

TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH PROGRAM GAINS APPROVAL

Congress authorized a $72 million research program that could lead to revolutionary changes in ground transportation. The Government will pour money into eastern railroads to promote faster service and will explore more radical forms of transport such as trains running on air cushions and interurban pneumatic tubes.

In the closing days Congress passed the bill designed to please as many Members as possible—the so-called pork barrel bill carrying $1.7 billion for rivers and harbors projects in 41 States. Its highlight was the first installment ($83 million) on a billion-dollar project to make Fort Worth, Tex., a seaport by dredging the Trinity River for 360 miles from the Gulf of Mexico. The President's home State was not neglected during the session.

Congress also increased the President's authority to investigate pollution of the air and launch an attack on automobile and truck exhaust fumes. It provided funds to improve garbage disposal methods. A law increasing Federal authority to stop pollution of rivers was passed. It increased grants for municipal sewage treatment plants.

After months of squabbling, the President's highway beautification bill was approved. It gave the Secretary of Commerce authority and funds (estimated at $300 million in the first 2 years) to remove unsightly billboards and automobile junkyards along interstate and primary highways.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, on six occasions during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, rollcall votes developed at a time when it was necessary for me to be out of town. Had I been present, I would have voted as indicated below:

On rollcall No. 7, motion to recommit House Joint Resolution 234, supplemental agriculture appropriations, to bar the use of funds to finance exports of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 196, motion to recommit H.R. 8283, Economic Opportunity Act amendments, to delete provisions for review of Governors' vetoes of projects and reduce authorization of funds to current level, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 246, motion to recommit H.R. 10586, supplemental appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, I would have voted "nay."

On rollcall No. 249, final passage of H.R. 2580, Immigration and Nationality Act amendments, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 253, final passage of H.R. 9022, elementary and secondary school aid in areas affected by major disasters, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 259, final passage of H.R. 5863, high speed ground transportation research, I would have voted "yea."

MEETING A COMMON FOE IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, 1 week after the approval by this body of House Resolution 560—the Selden resolution—I introduced a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 516, which, when approved, would reaffirm the faith of the Congress in multilateral action by the nations of the Western Hemisphere to maintain peace and fight Communist subversion.

It seemed imperative to me to clean up the record—to proclaim the sense of the Congress for the policy of the United States in this hemisphere in terms open to no misinterpretation and needing no extenuated legislative history for clarification.

The Selden resolution is open to an interpretation that, I believe, no majority of this House would want to endorse. Need anyone say it another time—we have endorsed unilateral intervention by any country of the Western Hemisphere against any of its neighbors, virtually without qualification, and in contradiction of the terms of the Rio Treaty, the charter of the Organization of American States, and the United Nations Charter.

We need not resort to nor sanction unilateral intervention to meet the common foe of the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

We need not fear our shadows if we vote against a measure that declares the policy of the United States to be that of unilateral intervention—simply because that intervention is to be used against communism.

We were not voting for or against communism in the Western Hemisphere on Monday, September 20.

We were not voting for or against an ex post facto mandate for the actions taken by this country in this hemisphere in the past.

We were not voting for or against the inherent right of self-defense of the United States, or Canada, or Venezuela, or Chile, or any nation of this hemisphere.

We were voting for or against a resolution, the terms of which were so loosely phrased that a substantial portion of the severely limited debate time was needed by the proponents of the resolution to say what they meant the resolution to say—even if it did not really seem to say that at all.

We were voting for or against a resolution that had been given the emotional label of being anti-Communist. The sense of this body seemed to be that you did not dare say "nay" to it, for in doing so you must be saying "aye" to communism.

Not 1 of the 52 Members of this House, and I was one of them, who voted against the Selden resolution cast a vote in favor of communism. Our negative votes were, in fact, much more positive denouncements of Communist subversion in this hemisphere than all those cast in favor of the resolution. The resolution does not serve as a clear warning to Russia and China to keep hands off the nations of the Western Hemisphere. It tantalizes them with the possibility that, at their provocation, the United States would step in unilaterally in a country of the Western Hemisphere and, in doing so, stand vulnerable to the worldwide harangues of the Communist propaganda mills.

Mr. Speaker, I do not put the Selden resolution in the category of finished business of the 89th Congress. If there had been a sufficient period of time to debate that resolution and if amendments had not been proscribed, I believe the language of the Selden resolution would say what the majority of this House would want it to say—and without resort to implication or inference or innuendo.

The first session of the 89th Congress could have included in its impressive roster of prideful accomplishments an affirmation of the need for and the ability of the nations of the Western Hemisphere to maintain a common defense against aggression and subversion within the Americas.

The resolution I have introduced seeks to do just that. Since the introduction of my resolution, I have been asked if this matter might not escalate to a war of the resolutions. If I could be assured of waging as successful a legislative battle with my resolution as has been waged in this session's war on poverty, ugliness and every other domestic foe by the veteran warrior downtown, I would say, here and now, the war of the resolutions is declared.

It is never easy to march up the hill and then march back down—and this House is no exception to that. But, in this instance, at the end of the march are the people of the Western Hemisphere and our common hope for the future.

We need not only a common defense against the common foe of peace in this hemisphere. We are striving to achieve a better way of life for all of our neighbors.

Under the Alliance for Progress, agrarian reform, housing programs, community development, tax reform, and educational opportunities are coming to the people of Latin America—in many instances for the first time.

Unilateral intervention is as inconsistent with the Alliance for Progress as it is with the international agreements between the countries of the Americas for keeping the peace. As sorely needed as a common defense against communism is this common goal for economic development. But, I believe the latter can come only at a time when the former is assured to these developing countries.

It has been said—and wisely—that the making of peace is not a matter of the nations looking at each other but of their looking together in the same direction. So it can be said, too, of the making of a better way of life for this hemisphere's people.

THE "ROARK"

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased to receive word from the Secretary of the Navy that a Navy escort destroyer ship will be named the *Roark* in recognition of the dedicated and distinguished service of Lt. William M. Roark of Omaha, Nebr. This fine young American, whom I have known since he was a small boy, died in air combat over Vietnam in April of this year.

Many of my distinguished colleagues may remember that following notification of Lieutenant Roark's death, I called to their attention a letter this young man wrote his wife and children shortly before his Navy plane was shot down.

His letter contained several statements which I will never forget:

> I don't want my sons to fight a war I should have fought. I wish more Americans felt that way.
>
> I will not live under a totalitarian society and I don't want you to, either. I believe in God and will resist any force that attempts to remove God from society, no matter what the name. This is what we all must do if we believe in what our Founding Fathers stood for.

His words stand out more now than they did when he wrote them in view of the recent disgraceful demonstrations and "draft-card burnings" by the so-called peace marchers and those who oppose our strong stand in Vietnam for their own personal gain.

Lieutenant Roark was a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy, was commissioned in June, 1960, and designated a naval aviator in April 1962.

The *Roark* is currently under construction in Seattle, Wash. The keel of the ship will be laid on December 1, 1965, and is scheduled to be launched on November 1, 1966, with commissioning to follow shortly thereafter.

Escort destroyers are designed for locating and destroying submarines. They are equipped with the most advanced antisubmarine detection devices and weapons available, including antisubmarine rockets and a drone antisubmarine helicopter. The normal complement of this type of ship consists of 12 officers and 204 enlisted men.

I am sure all of the residents of Nebraska's Second Congressional District, as well as good Americans everywhere, join me in saying we are very proud that this new naval vessel will carry the name of a fine young American from Omaha who was willing to die for his country in order that his children might know the meaning of freedom and liberty.

POST OFFICE HELPS SEND PASSENGER TRAINS INTO OBLIVION

Mr. **BROYHILL** of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CUNNINGHAM**. Mr. Speaker, I have fought the curtailment of railway post offices for the past 9 years as a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I have stated before, and I will state again, the curtailment of en route distribution on railway post offices and the elimination of railway mail terminals around the Nation will certainly not improve the mail service.

There is another very important aspect to the curtailment of railway post offices. This loss of operating revenue to the railroads is leading to the elimination of rail passenger service in many parts of this Nation.

Many of us voted, just this year, to set up a program for high-speed rail transportation and put the Nation's rail travel back on its feet. While this legislation was being enacted into law the Post Office Department was busily engaged in taking mail franchises away from the railroads.

This action by the Post Office Department is affecting trains and the communities they serve all over the Nation. I think many of my colleagues are aware of the problems they face as their own communities are affected, but I would call their attention to a very detailed article on this subject which appeared in the October 12 edition of the Wall Street Journal. Reporter Burt Schorr details how passenger runs and the communities they serve are being dealt a deathblow:

MAIL TRAIN BLUES—POST OFFICE'S SWITCH TO TRUCKS SPURS RAILS TO END PASSENGER RUNS—ATLANTIC COAST LINE DROPS EIGHT LOCALS—C. & O.–B. & O. SEES 40 PERCENT OF RUNS JEOPARDIZED—MRS. WARD'S CHICKEN WOES

(By Burt Schorr)

WASHINGTON.—Even as the Government moves to invest millions in improving rail passenger service in the Washington–Boston northeast corridor, its Post Office Department is helping to send many a passenger train highballing into oblivion.

More and more passenger runs in many parts of the land are receiving a financial death blow as the Department diverts mail and important mail-hauling payments from passenger trains to highway trucks and piggyback rail-truck service. In consequence, many ordinary travelers and some businessmen are being discomforted.

The sole aim, postal officials insist, is to obtain the most efficient and economical transportation. "The Post Office Department has no legal right to continue the transportation of mail on trains when it has been established that better service can be provided at less cost by highway transportation," asserts Assistant Postmaster General William Hartigan, who heads the Department's Bureau of Transportation. "It's up to regulatory agencies to determine whether a railroad company shall be permitted to discontinue train operations."

Almost inevitably, however, loss of mail revenues pushes a train operation deep enough into the red for the line to convince State public service bodies or the Interstate Commerce Commission it must be continued.

MILWAUKEE ROAD ACTION

Just the other day, the Commission agreed with the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad that its trains Nos. 219 and 220, running 181 miles daily between Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and Manilla, Iowa, with connections to Chicago, unduly burden interstate commerce and should be removed. Both trains averaged some 40 coach and Pullman passengers per trip in 1964 and produced an out-of-pocket loss of $188,000. But it wasn't until last March, when the Post Office Department removed mail worth approximately $102,000 annually in revenues, that the Milwaukee road acted to drop the runs.

Currently, the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad is earmarking four pairs of local trains for extinction because of lost mail. For the same reason, the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad has announced discontinuance of a pair of trains running through Wyoming, and the Louisville & Nashville is proposing to drop a pair operating between Atlanta and Evansville, Ind. The Chesapeake & Ohio–Baltimore & Ohio is considering canceling its night express between Detroit and Cincinnati; spokesmen contend mail losses since last May jeopardize no less than 40 percent of the lines' 54 remaining intercity passenger trains.

For the year ended last June 30, the Post Office Department counts 61 passenger trains nationwide which lost their railway post office service, and railroad men say current experience indicates that some three-fourths of the affected trains will be discontinued because of the revenue loss. Only 25 mail-carrying trains were killed during the same period at the instigation of the operating carriers themselves because of poor passenger patronage alone. By contrast, between July 1, 1959, and June 30, 1964, the 225 railroad-initiated cancellations were more than double the railway post office operations eliminated by post office action.

PASSENGER CRISIS?

Intercity passenger trains now number less than 1,100 on all U.S. railroads, it's estimated, against some 3,400 as recently as the early 1950's; transportation experts chiefly blame the automobile for this nosedive. Recently the decline in passenger patronage has begun to level off, offering railroaders hope that many remaining trains could survive. But now, with the shift of mail from train to truck accelerating, the Association of American Railroads gloomily forecasts the doom of over two-thirds of existing runs should they lose mail revenues.

Just how much mail the passenger trains can expect to lose in coming years, postal officials won't predict. But other forecasts suggest a passenger service crisis is brewing. "Ten years ago we had over 20,000 men working in railway post office (RPO) cars and today there are half that number," says Henry Anglim, administrative vice president of the United Federation of Postal Clerks. "In 2 years the figure will be down another 50 percent and the way things are going, in 5 years there won't be any RPO service at all."

Loss of mail can be fatal to a train operation simply because mail represents the relatively profitable side of passenger service. There's no separate tally on profit from mail alone. But last year combined railroad mail revenues equaled $329 million against passenger revenues of $578 million, and the cost for hauling humans was obviously far higher than for sacks of mail. Though down in recent years, the mail revenues in 1964 were $22 million above a decade earlier and this income is chiefly credited for holding the year's total passenger deficit to $410 million.

FALLING DOMINOES EFFECT

Even a modest reduction in trains traceable to mail losses can cause a "falling dominoes" effect as cancellation of one passenger run cuts into revenues on a connecting line.

A case in point: Trains 94 and 95 formerly operated over the Chicago & Eastern Illinois and Louisville & Nashville lines between Atlanta and Chicago. Last August the C. & E.I. discontinued its portion of the run between Chicago and Evansville, Ind., when the mail carried was shifted to piggyback service. The L. & N.'s 94–95 operation immediately suffered a "substantial" mail loss and the Southern carrier now is seeking discontinuance of its trains too. "It's a chain reaction," says an L. & N. passenger official, "and once it begins, it's impossible to stop."

There is a strong suggestion, moreover, that more than a few trains will be affected by the realinement of mail distribution now going on under Post Office ZIP code planning. The concept of sorting mail aboard trains for distribution to towns along the line is giving way to sorting at sectional postal centers from which the mail goes out to satellite post offices. Because many of the 553 sectional centers are located in suburban areas to reflect post-World War II population shifts, the most efficient routes between them, ZIP planners maintain, are highways rather than rail lines linking older downtown areas.

Currently some railroads are feeling the impact of a wave of mail cancellations that began building earlier this year as use of the sectional centers expanded. Especially hard hit is the C. & O.–B. & O. system, which seeks to lure passengers with midweek fare reductions, $1 dining car meals and movies on trains. Since May, it has lost postal business worth $975,000 annually. This amounts to less than 8 percent of the system's total mail revenues, but Passenger Service Director Paul Reistrup figures some 40 percent of C. & O.–B. & O. intercity passenger trains are imperiled by the loss.

It's true that many trains affected by Post Office action mainly served mail needs and attracted few riders with their slow, off-hours schedules. Lately, though this has been less true. The C. & O.–B. & O.'s night express between Detroit and Cincinnati with Southern connections, for example, has a high-seat occupancy in the two modern coaches it usually carries and formerly turned a small profit on its yearly gross of $1 million. But since it lost one of its RPO cars a few months ago, the train is operating at a $150,000 yearly loss and is being considered for possible cancellation.

NOTHING MORE CONVENIENT

A pair of trains running between Montgomery, Ala., and Waycross, Ga., marked for discontinuance by the Atlantic Coast Line because of lost mail, actually have posted a 25-percent gain in passenger revenues since the beginning of this year. The reason: Inauguration of a Montgomery-New York through coach which couples onto the ACL's crack East Coast Champion at Waycross. One recent user of this service was Mrs. W. G. Sellers, Sr., wife of a Ramer, Ala., pulpwood dealer who made an 8-day train excursion with 10 other women to see the New York World's Fair and Broadway shows. "We got on in Ramer and we got off in Ramer and we all sat together," says Mrs. Sellers. "Nothing could be more convenient than that."

Travelers with a penchant for trains aren't the only ones facing inconvenience. In Torrington, Wyo., Mrs. Clarence L. Ward worries about the effect of an announced ending of a pair of Burlington trains on the chick hatchery she operates.

"Normally we mail out 25,000 chicks a year and most of them travel north on that rail line to the Big Horn Basin," Mrs. Ward says. "The rail cars were heated but the trucks that replaced them aren't and with the severe weather we have here, the chicks would freeze to death. It looks as though we're going to lose a lot of business."

LATE NEWSPAPERS

In Live Oaks, Fla., RPO service removed last July used to allow business firms until 9 p.m. to get to the post office with outbound mail. "Now we have to get to the post office by 5:30 p.m. to catch the truck," complains Louis Wadsworth, owner of the weekly Suwannee Democrat. To meet the changed schedule, Mr. Wadsworth says he is paying an extra $50 weekly in overtime wages to rush the Wednesday printing of his paper. Even so, the publisher adds, nearly all his 3,100 subscribers formerly got their copies Friday, but "at least 25 percent are getting them the following Monday now and some as late as Tuesday."

Such hinterland complaints thus far have stirred little response in Washington, perhaps because much of the inconvenience affects rural areas with relatively sparse populations. It's true Democratic Senator Gale McGee, of Wyoming, whose State faces drastic RPO curtailment, has introduced a bill that would establish a commission to study the sectional postal centers' impact on railroad service. But a Senate staffman confides there's little congressional interest in the topic "because the Post Office Department has been pretty persuasive in winning people over to its side."

WRITE TO AN AMERICAN SERVICEMAN

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a very worthwhile project recently initiated by the University of Omaha Young Republicans Club. It was called "Write to an American Serviceman Week," and all of the students at the university were asked to write a letter to any American serviceman on active duty and pay their respects to the men who defend our country and guard our way of life.

I would like to congratulate Miss Nancy Schneiderwind, president of the University of Omaha Young Republicans, and Mr. Rick Reeser, chairman of the "Write to an American Serviceman Week," for initiating this project.

These young people have urged that other colleges and universities throughout the United States take similar action to let our American forces around the world know that we support them and that recent unpatriotic anti-American demonstrations do not represent the majority of public opinion.

As our Omaha University students pointed out, all that is required is an 8-cent airmail stamp, an envelope, paper, and a few minutes of your time to participate in this tribute to the American men at arms. Students were asked to write to a serviceman they knew personally or write to one of the following:

An American (Soldier or Airman),
U.S. Army and Air Forces, Vietnam,
Care of U.S. MAAG Headquarters,
San Francisco, Calif., APO 96307

An American (Sailor or Marine),
U.S. Navy and Marines, Vietnam,
Care of Chief, Navy Section,
U.S. MAAG Headquarters,
San Francisco, Calif., APO 143.

In view of the recent disgraceful demonstrations I hope many other good Americans will begin similar writing campaigns to let our servicemen know we are standing behind them.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as an advocate of improved mail service, I have long felt that the people of this country—the mail users—have a right to know what is wrong with our postal system and what should be done to correct it.

I have found, through discussions and correspondence with postal workers throughout the United States, that they feel the same way. The postal employees of today, who are as dedicated as those of Jim Farley's time, should be allowed, through their union publications and through other media, to speak out about the new, and in many cases, unworkable postal programs that have been instituted recently and are costing untold dollars and a loss in service to the public.

In this regard I would call attention to a letter I recently received from a postal worker who is not from my State but who is editor of his union publication:

September 6, 1965.

Congressman Glenn Cunningham,
House Post Office Committee
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: As a union member and an editor of a union publication of the United Federation of Postal Clerks, I ask that you do what you can to correct a sickening situation which exists today in the Government. That is the limited freedom of speech and press that we are subjected to.

We can't inform the public of the programs of the Post Office Department that are costing untold dollars for "ideas" which, in all probability, will never work. I speak of the ZIP code, WMS, POMSIP, ABCD, NIMS, etc., etc.

As a taxpayer and a public servant I want to tell the people just what is happening with their tax dollars as regards the Post Office Department. They are entitled to know because they are the government.

Take the WMS system. This system is to measure the production of the individual. Nothing is said of the fact that with a 2-foot tray of mail, before it is completely distributed is counted four times: (1) Initial primary distribution; (2) secondary handling in one of two route distribution cases; (3) secondary handling in a "Capitol holdout" case; (4) secondary handling in an alphabetical "business firm" case. To me this seems like a waste of time and money. Did you know that the supervisor counts the number of men under his jurisdiction every 6 minutes? A waste of time? Certainly. And people wonder why their mail is late and service is lousy. If they only knew half the story. But, unfortunately, they don't know any of it. And we're not supposed to "tattle."

ZIP code: Our local has been informed by local management that we must ZIP–ZIP our mail by 1967 or face paying first-class postage. To ZIP–ZIP our plates would cost us quite a sum of money and we cannot afford it. If the ZIP did any good maybe then we would, but the mail doesn't get delivered any sooner with the ZIP than without it. Mail can be ZIP'ed to death but it won't make it to the grave if there is no one to take it there. What the POD needs is people. They are what you might call "people who need people."

I feel, as a taxpayer and as a servant of the people, that it is my duty to bring these facts to the attention of the public. Can I bring these facts to their attention without fear of loss of my job? Can I enjoy the right to criticize the programs of the POD publicly?

The questions need to be answered. I'm sure that you, more than anyone else, judging by your statements in the Congressional Record, are aware of the poor postal service and the need to have it corrected.

Respectfully,

——— ———.

FOR SHAME, JIM FARLEY

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, former Postmaster General James Farley, who is now chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Co., may have a remarkable memory for faces but his judgment clearly "ain't" what it used to be.

The thought comes to mind in reading over his recent pronouncement in my hometown of Omaha that today's postal employees are not as dedicated as they were in his time.

Addressing the National Association of Postmasters, he was quoted as saying:

> Prior to and during the time I was head of the Department, we had excellent postal employees. But times have changed, and the employees today are not as dedicated as they were then, despite attempts made by the postmasters.

Whether he was shooting from the hip, voicing a considered judgment, or merely pandering to his audience, Mr. Farley is guilty of trying to indict a whole body of Federal employees.

As a student of politics, Mr. Farley has forgotten the immortal words of Edmund Burke, some 200 years ago, who told Parliament:

> I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people.

His ill-considered statement indeed has evoked resentment throughout the postal service, as well it should, for it constitutes in fact an irresponsible slander against the motivations of half a million postal employees. Perhaps, as the official organ of the United Federation of Postal Clerks observed editorially this month, Mr. Farley had one Coca-Cola too many. In any case his statement cannot be permitted to stand unchallenged.

George A. Bang, an Omaha letter carrier for the last 36 years and a national officer of the National Association of Letter Carriers, stated:

> Speaking on behalf of the Omaha and Nebraska letter carriers and all letter carriers in the Nation, I must say that we were terribly hurt and chagrined at the statement made in the October 10 issue of the Omaha World Herald wherein former Postmaster General James Farley was quoted as saying "that postal employees today are not as dedicated as they were then." Insofar as I am concerned the current letter carriers are truly dedicated and loyal members of the Post Office family.

As a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for 9 years, I think I know something about the problems, the aspirations and, yes, the dedication of today's postal employees as they go about their daily business of moving 70 billion pieces of mail—a volume more than double what it was in Mr. Farley's time although the total number of employees is not very much greater. These two facts, in themselves, tell us much about the productivity of today's employees compared with those of a quarter century ago.

Let Mr. Farley tell us how this amazing increase in the per capita productivity of individual employees has been achieved without dedication—if he can.

I will not argue, of course, that there are not a few time servers or deadbeats in the ranks of postal employees any more than we can say that there are no deadbeats or time servers in the ranks of any craft or profession—including ex-politicians and the Coca-Cola Co. But if they were not a tiny minority, as they are in all crafts and professions, how would the work of the Nation ever be accomplished whether it is moving the mail or growing food or building automobiles or providing the myriad services that have made our society the richest and most efficient on earth?

The real wonder in the postal service is that there is so much dedication among so many employees considering the disadvantages in wages and working conditions under which most of them are required to function.

In Mr. Farley's day, not because of him, but due to the general economic conditions of the time, the wages and working conditions of postal and other Federal employees were by and large far superior to equivalent jobs in private industry. World War II changed all that. Yet postal workers stuck to their dedicated tasks when most of their friends and neighbors moved into the shipyards and great defense factories at wages far more attractive and rewarding.

Postal employees have been trying to catch up ever since.

Even with the latest postal pay increase, enacted a few days ago by Congress which included—for the first time in history—overtime pay for thousands of postal employees who have never before received a penny of overtime, although they have been working 50, 60, 70, and even 80 hours a week, the Nation's postal clerks and letter carriers are still substantially below the income levels of workers in private industry. These are facts which Mr. Farley's offhand views cannot alter or erase.

There have been changes since Mr. Farley's long ago day but they are not in the hearts and minds of our postal employees.

The changes have been in the degree of automation being developed with little or no concern for the future of the men and women who are being displaced.

The changes have been in the attitude of postal management which, more and more, has placed emphasis on costs rather than public services.

The changes have been in dubious new patterns of mail distribution which have sought to replace human skills and human hands with an alphabet soup of ZIP codes and stopwatch measuring techniques like the hated work measurement system and by POMSIP, ABCD, VIMS, and other methods of trying to wring an extra ounce of standardized work out of men and women regardless of the God-given diversity of human beings.

Yet with all of the difficulties brought on by change and growth, the one continuing thread has been the very dedication of employees which Mr. Farley professes to find lacking.

I suggest to Mr. Farley that he read some of the essays produced a couple of years ago by more than 600 postal clerks from every State in the Union as part of the national essay contest sponsored by the United Federation of Postal Clerks on the broad question of why they found fulfillment in their jobs.

Three eminent Washington newspapermen who judged that contest each wrote later public tributes of their own to the astonishing level of dedication revealed in the avalanche of responses.

I commend to Mr. Farley the winning entry penned by a 26-year-old San Francisco postal clerk of Chinese ancestry, Mr. Robert David Wong, which reads as follows:

> It is not the thought of being a public servant in a Government postal installation as much as it is the chance and privilege of serving others through my job as a postal clerk.
>
> It is the knowledge that what I am doing is essential to the happiness and well-being of my community and my Nation—for to millions joy is imparted each day through letters they received from friends and loved ones who wrote a thought, and in faith, placed a postage stamp on an envelope—which eventually passed through my hands and on its way.
>
> It is the assurance that these letters will reach their destination; for somewhere, a letter of my own is intermingled within millions of parts of machinery and of human hands—and I am confident that this combination of automation and the untiring efforts of the human heart—working together—will bring the mail to its goal.
>
> It is the way of life that I have chosen for mine own. As the privilege of voting is inseparable from a democratic government, so also is my indisputable right to voice my thoughts through my postal union, and through its legislations, better my working conditions, benefit from health and sickness insurance plans, receive reasonable living wages, as well as representation that will continually seek to further my welfare while I am serving the public.
>
> It is a warm feeling to know that as a postal clerk I am doing my duty well, and through faithfulness excel. In giving a part of myself, I am doing the best I can—I am being a good and useful citizen—I am serving my fellow man.

For shame, Mr. Farley.

UNITED STATES MUST CRACK DOWN ON DRAFT EVASION

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the wave of draft evasion attempts by groups of misguided young people is incensing America. So-called pacifists encouraging others to evade the draft are taking actions which fly in the teeth of the principles which have made this Nation great.

At the University of California, and on other campuses, highly organized movements are circulating written instructions on ways to beat the draft. Some of these instructions are particularly offensive to American patriotism.

Section 12 of the Selective Service Act gives authority to local draft boards to declare any registrant who aids or counsels another individual or draft evasion as delinquent. Many of those spreading draft evasion methods are students, deferred from military service by virtue of their 2-S classifications, or student deferments.

The local boards of the Selective Service System must be urged to crack down on those working to undermine the youth of America. Any registrant deferred from military service by student classification and who endorses draft evasion campaigns through active participation should be immediately reclassified as delinquent and marked for priority induction.

If the case is particularly flagrant, the Justice Department has the authority and should prosecute under 50 Appendix United States Code 462, which carries criminal penalties of up to 5 years imprisonment, $10,000 fine, or both, for aiding or counseling draft evasion.

These provisions of the law must be administered fully and promptly to stop these disgraceful protests against America.

TOWARD THE GREAT SOCIETY: U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity in the closing days of the 1st session of the 89th

Congress to briefly review the major points of U.S. foreign policy.

It is now 26 years since the beginning of World War II. America swung the balance against the forces of fascism, saving Western culture and democray in Europe and elsewhere.

When the war ended, we sought only peace and an end to strife. The United States demobilized. We put our fleet in mouthballs and cut back sharply on all military production. But the peace we earnestly sought was not to come easily. It took the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and NATO to preserve peace and stem the tide of communism in Europe. We attempted to end aggression by preventing it, and we were successful. Elsewhere we had to defeat aggression by direct military means—such as the historic decision to repeal the attack against South Korea.

But our foreign policy has not been simply a negative response to the forces of communism. We have been at work helping the underdeveloped nations of the world. The United States—through its foreign assistance programs—has undertaken a global campaign against the traditional enemies of mankind—hunger, disease, poverty, and ignorance.

Our motives have been a mixture of humanitarianism and enlightened self-interest. We know that until people have enough to eat and their standard of living is improved, conflict and instability will remain with us.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Our country also has attempted to achieve world peace and global prosperity through active participation in the ever-growing complex of international organizations. This is, I believe, our best hope for a peaceful and prosperous world.

We have worked toward strengthening the U.N. as an effective forum for world opinion and a peace-keeping agency that rises above East-West conflicts. We have been the principal contributor to the U.N.'s subsidiary agencies which are devoted to international economic and social development, such as the World Health Organization, the World Bank, the Food and Agriculture Organization and the U.N. Special Fund.

While recognizing the flaws inherent in the structure of the United Nations, we have, nevertheless, striven to perfect it, and to encourage regional organizations of economic and political cooperation, such as the European Common Market, the Organization of African Unity and the various agencies of the Western Hemisphere.

These, then, have been our broad policy aims since the end of the Second World War:

To contain Communist aggression.

To assist the economic and social development of other free nations.

And to foster organizations of international cooperation among sovereign countries of the world.

For almost a generation now—under four Presidents of both political parties—we have followed these broad aims.

SUCCESS IN FOREIGN POLICY

How well have we succeeded? Let us take a quick look around the globe:

Western Europe thrives on a wave of unparalleled prosperity. Its ability to stand independently of the United States politically and economically is well recognized—as is sometimes all too painfully pointed out to us by President de Gaulle, of France.

In the Middle East, there are constant threats of crisis. Despite the conflicts in Yemen and on Cyprus and the threatened crises between the Arab States and Israel, the situation seems more stable there than it did a few years ago.

In Africa, several dozen new nations have been created from the old European colonial empires during the past decade. Because of the lack of experience in self-government and the low standard of living of the people, it was felt that communism would find these countries easy prey. These fears have not substantially materialized. The emerging African nations, for the most part, still look to the West for assistance. They want nothing to do with the kind of neocolonialism which comes wrapped in the Red flag.

Despite the presence of Fidel Castro, the situation in Latin America looks steadily better. Through our Alliance for Progress programs the United States has stimulated trends toward internal reform, economic progress, and true democracy in many of our hemispheric neighbors.

In south Asia, both India and Pakistan appear to be making some progress toward creating a better life for their millions of citizens. At the present time, however, those gains are in jeopardy because of the recent warfare between the two nations. Through the United Nations, the United States has been working to restore peace to the Indian subcontinent. With peace, or Nation will resume its economic and technical assistance to India and Pakistan in order to aid the people of that area.

In the Far East, once the site of major East-West conflict, there is relative stability and calm. Japan is prospering and fully cooperating with the West. South Korea is in the process of building a new society. On Formosa, the Nationalist Chinese Government has progressed to the point where it no longer needs our economic assistance.

Let us turn to southeast Asia. There, of course, the situation is least encouraging. It is the major battleground with Communist forces.

The situation in Indonesia is very unstable and events which have just taken place there are not yet clear. We can only hope that realinements in the Indonesian Government will halt the slide toward a Communist-controlled government, allow restoration of friendly relations with all nations, and permit reentry into the United Nations.

In Vietnam, the United States is directly committed in an intense and serious conflict. Our commitment in Vietnam began 10 years ago. It is a commitment not only to end aggression but it is, in President Johnson's words, a commitment to "create a better life for all of the people of southeast Asia."

The form of this commitment has changed drastically in recent months until we have now almost 150,000 soldiers committed to combat in South Vietnam.

I think all Americans can agree on the desirability of achieving our objective in southeast Asia as stated by Secretary of State Dean Rusk in his appearance before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on August 3, 1965:

> Our objective * * * is peace—a peace in which the various peoples of the area can manage their own affairs in their own ways and address themselves to economic and social progress.

But how to achieve this peace has been the Gordian knot of our Asian policy.

The United States and many other countries have attempted to find a path to a peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam. I support President Johnson in his efforts to bring about meaningful discussions that could lead to such a settlement.

WHAT LIES AHEAD

We cannot afford to become complacent. Our biggest hurdles are still ahead:

The threat of continuing proliferation of nuclear weapons must be met with intensified efforts to secure a treaty against such proliferation.

The further weakening of NATO must be met with new, more imaginative initiatives which took toward political integration among Atlantic community members.

The millions of Africans who are deprived of their political and social rights in southern Africa must continue to challenge our conscience and our will to act.

The aspirations of billions who live in the developing world need to be met with more sensitivity on our part, matched with an increasing competence to assist in the political development of their societies leading to responsive and responsible governments.

Our policies encouraging more open societies within the Communist bloc must be continued. We should not lessen our resistance to expansionist aims where they exist, but we must always demonstrate that doors to cooperation exist and can be opened.

And finally, we need always to remember that as members of a human family traveling through space on a single vehicle, a tiny speck in the vastness of the universe, we must all become engaged in a mutual venture to build the kind of world society in which our sons and daughters and their children can find peace and expanding opportunities. Thus we must continue to build the United Nations at every turn and recognize that only as the U.N. is used, will it grow.

URBAN POPULATION

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the urban population of the United States will double by the year 2000.

As the President told the Nation at the signing of the bill to establish the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs:

> In the next 35 years, we must literally build a second America—putting in place as many houses, schools, apartments, parks, and offices as we have built through all the time since the Pilgrim arrived on these shores.

We will have considerably more than 200 million people 35 years from now, according to the best estimates based on trends.

In addition to the myriad other services that must be in existence to accommodate a large population, we must devise ways of transporting the people at a cost we can afford, with efficiency and speed.

The answer to the transport problem in this large Nation cannot simply be more cars and more highways. We already have recognized the pollution of the air by vehicles, and the dwindling of our land supply because of highways and roads.

When we build roads and streets and freeways in our cities, we generally take away land that could be used for industry, business, schools, parks, and homes. And once a horde of cars and trucks arrives in an already congested downtown area, where do we park them?

Most city streets are narrow; cities have gone away from the use of streets for vehicle storage. Unless multistory aboveground or underground parking stations are built, more land is taken away from business and industry.

The answer to the problem is a form of mass transportation to supplement the automobile.

In that field, the 89th Congress has passed two important laws. One is the mass transit system, for subway and aboveground rail travel, in the District of Columbia, which is a day-to-day example of the Nation's traffic jam.

Mr. Speaker, the other major law is the High Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965, which will entail much research and development in rail and other forms of surface travel. I was pleased to be a sponsor of this bill. We will be investigating all new and promising concepts of ground travel, as the President noted when he signed the bill into law. We must and will move forward in the field of intercity transit, as we are now doing in the intracity field, through the Urban Mass Transit Act of 1964, passed by the 88th Congress.

We have made great advances everywhere but on the ground. We can send men through space at 17,000 miles an hour; our airliners can fly at 650 or more miles an hour; we have high-speed hydrofoil and hovercraft boats that go 70 miles an hour over water.

But on the dry ground, we are limited to the same speeds as 40 years ago. With the present traffic congestion, Mr. Speaker, it is in many places difficult to travel by auto at the speeds of 40 years ago.

A few years ago, Time mazagine waggishly suggested a way to solve the traffic congestion problem: to let the Nation's traffic jam reach its logical goal—a complete tieup, and then to employ crusher machines to pack down the millions of vehicles where they stand, to repave the streets over the crushed vehicles, and start all over again.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have found a more attractive alternative in the transportation programs we have passed in the 89th Congress.

SUBWAY SERVICE TO JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Giaimo] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 so as to require the National Capital Transit Authority to provide direct subway service to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. This measure does not specify a particular location for a Kennedy Center subway station but does direct the transit agency to include as part of the system which Congress approved last summer "such rail rapid transit lines and related facilities as may be necessary to provide direct service" to the Center. I intend to ask for consideration of this bill immediately upon our return in January. I believe that at that time the NCTA should be fully prepared to discuss specific plans for providing this service.

I have introduced this legislation because I believe it is incumbent upon Congress, having established the John F. Kennedy Center, to insure that all necessary steps are taken to remove any potential obstacles to its success. This Center is a living memorial. By this I mean that the John F. Kennedy Center is intended to enshrine the memory of our late President not only in bricks and marble but in a program which we all hope will make a continuing contribution to the lives of our citizens. To accomplish this, the activities of the Center must be available to all at a reasonable cost. Unless adequate public transportation facilities are made available, I fear that the cost of getting to and from the Center may make a visit to its halls prohibitively expensive for many people.

The Center, the site and concept of which Congress has approved, is still to be built. Construction of a much needed rapid transit system for the District and its environs, which Congress recently directed, is yet to begin. The proper time, therefore, to mesh these two programs is now.

I have followed with great interest the controversy which has arisen over the present site. I share the concern expressed by many that the Center might be remote and isolated from people who should be encouraged to experience its enriching productions. However, I do not agree that, at this date, it is necessary to alter site plans for the Center. The approval of a subway system for the District has changed the situation. A purpose of providing a rapid transit system for the city is to bring presently remote areas into easier reach of the District's population. My bill will assure that the system will serve this function for the Kennedy Center.

The debate over the site has raised many constructive questions. I believe that those who raised them are sincerely interested in the Center and in the immense contribution it can make to our Capital City, to the Nation, and to the world. I believe that my bill provides an answer to the question of how we can increase accessibility to the Center. And, therefore, I ask those of my colleagues and of the public who have expressed concern with the site because of this factor to give me their support in having this measure considered and enacted as speedily as possible. In this regard I am pleased that the able gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman William B. Widnall, has agreed to support my bill and has today introduced an identical measure.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keogh] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 11765 and Representative Schneebeli, of Pennsylvania, has introduced a companion bill, H.R. 11766. These bills amend section 1234 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that income realized upon the expiration of an option that was originally granted as part of a "straddle" shall be considered short-term capital gain rather than ordinary income. Under Revised Ruling 65-31 a taxpayer who grants a straddle—that is, an option to sell (put) and an option to buy (call) covering the same amount of the same security (usually a stock listed on a stock exchange) extending for the same time and granted at the same time—is required to allocate a portion of the premium he receives to each option. In the usual case the taxpayer grants the straddle to a put and call broker or dealer who sells the put and the call to different purchasers and one of the options that originated as part of the straddle will be exercised and the other will expire. Under this bill the income on the lapse of the option that was not exercised will be regarded as income from the sale of a capital asset held for less than 6 months on the date that the option expires.

Revised Ruling 65-31 is applicable only to options granted on or after January 26, 1965. This bill is also applicable only to options granted after January 25, 1965.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT IN CANAL THREATENED WITH EXTINCTION

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in my press release of September 27, 1965, published in the RECORD of September 30, I stressed that among the agencies of our Government that would be taken over by Panama in event of ratification of the proposed treaties would be the U.S. District Court for the Canal Zone. An informative article on this subject, quoting Judge Guthrie F. Crowe of this court, follows:

[From the Miami Herald, Oct. 16, 1965]

AMERICAN COURTS IN CANAL ZONE TO PHASE OUT, JUDGE BELIEVES

(By Ralph K. Skinner)

ANCON, CANAL ZONE.—"I believe that, with the turn of events whereby the authority of the United States will terminate and a new Canal Zone authority will be set up, the American courts in the Canal Zone will phase out."

This is the opinion of Judge Guthrie F. Crowe, of the U.S. District Court in the Canal Zone. He was interviewed concerning projected changes in the Canal Zone in connection with negotiation of a new Panama-United States Treaty.

Asked about the possibility of joint United States-Panama courts in the Canal Zone, the judge replied, "I do not expect there will be joint courts. I don't think they would be feasible. Having two or more judges of different nationalities and differing legal backgrounds would not work out here.

"I believe that the United States would terminate its civilian courts here because that would be the only way, as I see it, to recognize effective sovereignty of Panama over the Canal Zone."

(Recognition of effective sovereignty of Panama in the Canal Zone was mentioned in the joint statement of Presidents Johnson and Robles on September 24, referring to the treaty negotiations.)

Judge Crowe expected that "the courts in the Canal Zone will remain separate until there is a concrete plan wih a Status of Forces Agreement, coming into effect. Under a Status of Forces Agreement, U.S. military personnel would be tried by U.S. military courts, for offenses committed on military bases, and not by the courts of the host country, in this case Panama."

Under a Status of Forces Agreement, U.S. military personnel locally would not be tried by Panama courts for offenses committed on military bases, even though Panama courts were operating in the Canal Zone. Judge Crowe said that in countries where there is a Status of Forces Agreement, host countries try military personnel for offenses committed elsewhere than on military bases.

Asked if the U.S. district court could continue here under what he understands to be the changes proposed for the Canal Zone, Judge Crowe said:

"I don't see how the U.S. Federal court could continue here, unless it abandoned its relationship with the Federal court system and the court reverted to some system such as existed in the early days of the Canal Zone. To do this, it would be necessary to abandon the Canal Zone Code."

Although the judge said he expected American courts in the Canal Zone to phase out under the predicted new joint authority, he said specifically. "I have no official news on this. This is based on what I have read in the papers and heard."

The Canal Zone courts are based on the English common law whereas Panama's court system is largely based on the Napoleonic Code.

PANAMANIAN OBJECTIVES: HIGHER TOLLS AND CONTROL OF BUSINESS OPERATIONS IN THE CANAL ZONE

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, among recent news stories originating on the Isthmus of Panama, the objectives of Panama in the current diplomatic negotiations are being clearly revealed in the form of their demands.

Among these are calls for the fixing of higher transit tolls and for control of all activities in the Canal Zone except those of military character and those connected with the transit of vessels—factors of great significance to vessels using the Panama route. In these connections, attention is invited to my statement to the House in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 20, 1965, entitled, "Panama Canal: Grave Hargress Involved."

The following two news stories by Ralph Skinner, a longtime resident of the isthmus, who knows the canal question thoroughly, are quite timely:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Oct. 10, 1965]

"DON'T SUBSIDIZE UNITED STATES": PANAMA NEGOTIATOR URGES NEW BASIS FOR CANAL TOLLS

(By Ralph Skinner)

PANAMA, PANAMA.—"Tolls at the Panama Canal always have been set to subsidize U.S. shipping and commercial interests and have failed to consider the economic and commercial needs of Panama," a member for Panama's treaty negotiating team charges.

"Panama wants this to be changed in any new treaty with the United States" says Dr. Diogenes de la Rosa, in connection with current treaty negotiations underway in Washington between the two nations.

The well-known intellectual is the spokesman for the Panama negotiating team consisting of himself, Richard Arias E. and Roberto Aleman.

De la Rosa said that Panama has not actually suggested a raise in tolls but "we believe that tolls must be fixed on a new basis which recognizes that the canal is an instrument of exploitation of the geographical position which is Panama's leading natural resource.

"We think tolls have not been fixed on the basis of our economic and commercial consideration," he said.

"Historically, the United States has never considered Panama in the Panama Canal tolls," according to De la Rosa. "I recall that in the beginning the United States wanted coastwise shipping of the United States to use the canal free of charge, but England stopped this.

"Then, originally, tolls were set on a basis of a 3-percent interest recovery on the original investment in the enterprise," the negotiator added.

"Many years this amount was not recovered because the prime basis of assessing tolls was to benefit the shipping industry of the United States. We oppose this thought of gearing tolls to benefit the shipping interests of the United States. Our position is that Panama is not obliged to contribute to this subsidy," declares De la Rosa.

Ambassador de la Rosa said there were several possibilities for toll changes. It is necessary he said, to consider alternate methods of fixing tolls because "the present system is neither satisfactory nor a sensible one, and it should be revised."

Dr. de la Rosa has studied the method used at the St. Lawrence Seaway which uses two different categories of tolls according to cargo. He thinks a commodity-based toll system might be applicable to the Panama Canal.

ENVOY SPELLS OUT PANAMA'S GOAL

(By Ralph K. Skinner)

PANAMA, PANAMA.—The goal of Panama is to operate exclusively all activities in the Canal Zone except military activities and the actual transiting of ships through the Panama Canal.

The operation of the waterway would be under a joint administration shared by both the United States and Panama.

The Panamanian negotiating team in the current United States-Panama Treaty discussions has told the U.S. negotiating team of this goal.

Ambassador Diogenes de la Rosa, spokesman for Panama's negotiating team, revealed these facts. He said that Panama had "a plan encompassing all activities in the Canal Zone except items pertaining to the military and activities directly connected with the transiting of ships."

De la Rosa said, "All things in the Canal Zone directly connected with the operation of the waterway will be handled by a new joint administration, with Panama and the United States sharing this administration.

"All other activities in the Canal Zone, except those connected with the military, will be operated exclusively by Panama. This includes housing, utilities, and the general type of activity now conducted by the Panama Canal Company. Included will be all commercial activities presently conducted in the Canal Zone."

The Panamanian negotiator pointed out that "This is Panama's goal. I want to make it plain that this is not an ultimatum which we have delivered to Washington because our method of negotiating does not include delivering ultimatums to the United States."

But Dr. de la Rosa made it clear to this correspondent that the United States has been made cognizant of Panama's goal.

DENTISTRY AND THE HEALTH OF THE NATION

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a speech which I delivered at the workshop

actualizing the potential of preventive dentistry, Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D.C., August 10, 1965:

DENTISTRY AND THE HEALTH OF THE NATION

(By Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, Second Congressional District of Rhode Island)

Let me, first of all, say how pleased I am to participate in this conference. I think it is an important meeting and I want to extend to you personally my best wishes for its success.

You come to Washington at an appropriate time; appropriate, that is to say, in terms of the underlying purpose of this meeting. I think many parallels can be drawn between the mood of the leaders of the dental profession today and the mood of the leaders of the Nation as a whole. It is hard to characterize it in a single phrase but perhaps it can be stated as a mixture of hopefulness and impatience. Hopefulness because of the realization that we now have many of the tools necessary to enable us to move toward our domestic health and welfare goals. Impatience because we haven't yet achieved the momentum that we know is possible.

The 89th Congress has, during 1965, done a good deal, I believe to put the emphasis on hopefulness. A remarkable number of measures designed to improve the quality of life in these United States have been brought before Congress since January. Many have already passed and others undoubtedly will follow before this first session ends. The new social security bill is, of course, one example. So are measures relating to better control of drugs, to efforts lessening air and water pollution, to additional research especially in the key areas of heart disease, cancer and stroke. We have seen a massive infusion of Federal funds for the first time into elementary and secondary schools. A wide range of activities under the War on Poverty are well underway.

I think it is entirely probable that the next generation, looking back at the sixties, may see more clearly than we do today that this is a time of peaceful, domestic revolution; a revolution against poverty, against disease, against ignorance. Few generations have the opportunity given to us to move forward so swiftly and progressively. This is an important and exciting time in which to live.

Improvement of dental health is a part of this movement. I'm sure you know that. You are here today, I think, because you want to see dentistry even more firmly in the mainstream of this movement. Everyone who cares about the future of dentistry can agree on that point. Already much is being done.

Dental research is contributing at a remarkable rate to what is known about the nature, etiology, treatment, and prevention of oral diseases. The story of fluoridation, a pre-eminent result, has become a modern classic in the annals of public health. Developments in dental materials, equipment, and technology in the past decade have been all but unprecedented. Progress in clinical measures forecasts new vistas for the control and prevention of disease.

One of the prime reasons for this progress was because your profession has been historically willing to look at itself through unbiased eyes, to face up to the challenges that must be met if we are to solve the dental disease problem in this country.

The survey of dentistry, undertaken at the request of the American Dental Association and conducted by a Commission of experts under the direction of Dr. Byron S. Hollinshead, your next speaker, was a significant appraisal of the Nation's oral health status, its needs and resources.

When published, the survey brought home to many the true magnitude of oral disease and neglect in the United States. It alerted us to a shortage of dentists that, complicated by increasing demands for oral health care, was becoming increasingly critical. The recommendations of the Commission were forthright and substantial.

Perhaps the single most significant theme of the report was the recognition that prevention of oral disease was dentistry's best hope for the future.

That prevention is the soundest approach to disease is not a novel concept. This is how we conquered smallpox, cholera, yellow fever, malaria, and polio. It has been as well the basis of significant reductions in tooth decay through the acceptance of community fluoridation and topical fluoride applications.

This objectivity, these accomplishments are a matter of considerable pride to those of us interested in the Nation's dental health and committed to its progress. But at the same time, we all recognize that it isn't enough. There is still much more that can and must be done in placing increased emphasis on preventive concepts both in education and in practice. Such is the task of this workshop. The Council on Dental Education of the American Dental Association and the American Association of Dental Schools have, of course, already done much of significance in this area and both agencies will be, I know, deeply interested in your work here.

That we have been able to come thus far in this peaceful revolution is testimony not only to the dedication and skill of scholars and scientists, but also to an enlightened people and to a way of life which makes it possible for such a people to provide the means for progress.

At the end of World War II, this Nation began to commit and mobilize its private and public resources in order to improve the quality of life in this country, to raise our standards of health and see to it that health care was accessible to everyone. Dentistry shared in that commitment and has been a beneficiary of it. Personally, I am not persuaded that we have ever pushed that commitment to the fullest possible extent but no one can reasonably deny that we have accomplished much in the past two decades.

This score of years has seen the founding of the National Institute of Dental Research and a level of funding for it that now exceeds $20 million a year. It has seen the Division of Dental Public Health and Resources come into being with authority to pursue programs in a great number of areas and funds now exceeding $30 million a year. We have seen the establishment of such landmark legislation as the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act and Federal support for health research facilities. We have seen Cabinet-level recognition being given to the fields of health, education, and welfare. We have done these things—and many more—in such a way as to refute thoroughly the contention of some that Federal support would mean Federal dictatorship or that Federal support would in some strange way inhibit or contaminate scientific progress. I prize more highly than I can say the opportunity I have had to participate in and even help shape these events.

The work of the 89th Congress, as I have said, has done much to further this trend. I have already listed some of its accomplishments. I would like to tell you briefly about three bills I have introduced that will also, I hope, be listed among its accomplishments before it adjourns.

The first would help establish regional medical complexes for research and treatment in heart disease, cancer, and stroke. These are our major killers; these are the diseases that together account for 7 out of every 10 deaths in the United States. These centers will be a first step in bringing the benefits of research on a large scale to those suffering from heart disease, cancer, or stroke. The preventative nature of such centers is, of course, obvious as is the fact that they will enable us to mobilize our resources more efficiently and effectively. Dentistry will have a stake in the establishment of such centers since they could well provide the framework for more vigorous study of the early detection and treatment of oral cancer.

The second bill I should like to bring to your attention deals with the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act. This act will expire next year. It is essential, in my view, not only to extend it in duration but to extend its benefits. The bill I have introduced would provide special and basic improvements grants to the health professions schools and thus enable them both to improve their present educational program and also introduce into it new elements. Certainly one area of study that could be most usefully amplified is that of preventive health practices both in dentistry and medicine.

The final bill I want to mention is directed toward improving dissemination of information in the health field. It calls for Federal assistance in rehabilitating existing medical libraries and constructing new ones. It calls for assistance in research and training for library science and for supporting nonprofit, biomedical publications. Dentistry would have full equality in the provisions of this measure.

I mention these proposals not only because I want you to know about them but also because they illustrate the point that much still remains to be done before we have arrived at a point where our resources are mobilized as fully as they can be. This is true in all of the health sciences. This is true of dentistry.

Dentistry, like the other health sciences, needs to continue to give intensive attention to the availability of care, the quality of care, and to new techniques of care arising from the discoveries made in the laboratory. The concept of preventive dentistry is too basic and essential to be limited to any one of these areas; it permeates all three.

When I speak of the availability of care, I am thinking first of all of the availability of professional manpower. We can all agree that we are faced with a prospective shortage of dentists in terms of the growing population and the growing demand for dental services. Passage of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act has done much to change this situation, but I doubt that it is the final or sole solution. It is my hope, as I have said, that when Congress considers extension of the law that it will at the same time broaden its provisions in terms of scholarship support and operating assistance. At the same time, I think the profession is well-advised to be considering additional methods of meeting this challenge: methods including examination of the duties of the dental hygienist and assistant with the possibility that they may be revised or even broadened and also including continued emphasis on expansion of dental public health activities on the State and community level.

Local and State dental public health activities have never, as you well know, been given the attention they rightfully should have. In the last session of the 88th Congress, however, a real beginning was made when a dental health category was established under the grant-in-aid authority of the Public Health Service Act. Thus far, only $500,000 has been made available, a sum that falls far short of the demonstrated need. The American Dental Association has been most articulate in coming before Congress and documenting this need. The association's approach has already borne fruit in having the category established and I think there is every possibility that a more generous level of funding may be available in the relatively near future.

When we talk about availability of care, we must also talk about cost of care. I am well aware of the fact that over the past quarter century the cost of dental care has risen less than most other aspects of the cost of living. Dental care, nonetheless, can be expensive and we should explore all the potential ways and means of moderating its impact. I am thinking here of your profession's vigorous investigation of prepayment mechanisms. You are to be commended for your efforts thus far and, I hope, will continue them until the most viable methods are found.

The second category demanding continuing attention is quality of care. It is less boasting than stating a fact to say that the United States today has a quality of care that is all but unprecedented historically. Nonetheless, what is best today may be not so good tomorrow. We accept as a truism the statement that each new graduating class is just a little bit better educated than its predecessor. But that isn't necessarily so. It is true only as long as we are willing to work at making it true and only as long as we are willing to devote a sufficiently large share of our resources to this end. Of all the men in the world, you are probably the ones who least need to be told that a professional education is an expensive education. And you know as well as I that it is going to become more expensive in the years ahead. We aren't yet at the end of the knowledge explosion. The National Institutes of Health alone allocates more than $1 billion a year to seeking new knowledge. Hundreds of millions of dollars go into this field from other Government agencies. The results, I would submit, have more than justified the spending of such amounts of money. I don't know that you can put a price tag on the health of a nation but even if you can, I think we are paying a bargain price. But knowledge isn't something to be contemplated like a statue or a picture. Knowledge is finally justified only when it gets into the hands of a man who can use it.

The rate at which we have been accumulating knowledge in the health field has admittedly raised a problem of communication. We haven't yet solved it in an entirely satisfactory way. The keys here are the professional schools and their affiliated libraries, hospitals and clinics. I have been saying for years that the Federal Government has an urgent responsibility to assist these institutions to do their jobs even better than they are doing them today. In the past few years, the Federal Government has begun to accept that responsibility. And it has done so while respecting the prerogatives of the educational institutions themselves. I hope that we will in the near future be doing even more than we are doing today. I hope, for example, that we will be assisting in the construction of medical libraries and the training of medical librarians. I hope, for example, that we will be offering more general assistance to the schools by means that I have already outlined. This is the only way I know to maintain and improve the quality of care. This is the only way I know to make sure that the fruits of research are given to the practitioner and, through him, to the patient.

Finally, if I may, I would like to add one last brief comment about health research. I think my position is fairly well known to all of you. My commitment to it is without reservation. I know there are those who want to look at this question solely from the perspective of budget balancing. I think that is a mistake. The Federal Treasury, of course, is not inexhaustible. We must always, of course, take a hard look at the dollars and cents we spend in this or any other area. But this is a great country. This is a country with great resources and I believe we can afford to do what we ought to do. If we had spent 10 percent less than we have, I wonder if we would know today what we do know about the transmissibility of caries and all of the public health potential that knowledge offers. Or I wonder if we would know today about the oral cytology technique that has already yielded such great dividends in terms of early detection of oral cancer.

In this great research effort, of course, the schools of the Nation are the senior partners. Ideas are always harder to come by than dollars. By and large, the schools have fulfilled their role remarkably well. They—and all of us—will continue to do so as long as we keep in mind the worth of what is being done, the importance of what is being done. A conference such as this one is evidence, I think that you are well aware of the importance of your work and are willing to continue your urgent commitment to it. I want you to know that you have many friends in Congress who are anxious to assist you in every way possible. It has been a pleasure to be here with you today and, again, I hope this meeting has all the success it deserves. Thank you.

FRAGMENTATION IN THE HEALTH SERVICES: THE PROBLEM AND ITS SOLUTION

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include a speech which I delivered before the American Association of Public Health Physicians, Chicago, Ill., October 18, 1965:

FRAGMENTATION IN THE HEALTH SERVICES: THE PROBLEM AND ITS SOLUTION

(By Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY)

As many of you here today know, public health has long been a prime concern of mine. Even before I had the honor to serve on, and then chair, the House Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee, the methods and problems of public health long interested and sometimes disturbed me.

I am, therefore, most grateful for this opportunity to speak with you men and women who have foregone the material rewards of private medical practice, to undertake careers in what I believe to be a more broadly challenging and gratifying branch of medicine—public health.

Yet, the service of public health—as all of you well know—does present its own peculiar frustrations. Chief among these are those caused by fragmentation—the dispersal of health services among many different Government agencies.

Fragmentation has led to the confusion of those seeking health services, a decrease in the quality of those services, and the delegation of health functions to agencies neither created for these purposes, nor staffed by persons qualified to administer them.

But fragmentation, unlike many other problems encountered in the health professions, is manmade—and so can be "man-undone." I know that your association has been in the forefront in the drive to reverse fragmentation that has already occurred and to prevent the further dispersal of health services. Unlike many who also deplore fragmentation, but do little but talk about it, the American Association of Public Health Physicians has been particularly active in working with government and private health agencies to remedy fragmentation situations which often border upon the scandalous.

In a recent issue of the Bulletin of your association there was a fine editorial by Dr. Ben Freedman who has been unusually astute in pinpointing some of the real reasons why fragmentation has occurred.

I was particularly interested to see that Dr. Freedman laid the chief blame for fragmentation at the door of the physician himself. As he recalls, when State and local governments began to develop medical service programs, shortly after World War I, the medical profession, carrying out the feeling of the American Medical Association hierarchy, turned its head when called upon for guidance and support. As Dr. Freedman pointed out, even public health physicians shared the apathy of their colleagues in private practice out of professional sympathy or fear of ostracism.

Local governments and voluntary health groups were then forced to turn to other, nonmedical sources for support—and they got it.

It is a credit to your organization—which for over two decades has promoted the cause of public health—that it has elected a leadership perceptive enough to acknowledge these truths and courageous enough to admit them publicly.

And, I am glad to say, in recent months there has been a heartening indication that even in the AMA doldrums, a fresh wind is stirring. After spending millions of dollars opposing medicare, the AMA has accepted the facts of life and has indicated that it will cooperate with the plan. The AMA has been even more conciliatory with the new heart disease, cancer, and stroke program and helped work out a compromise version which is now law.

All of this is encouraging to me, for, as your own president has said, it is not too late for the medical profession to regain its former influence and to reassume leadership in the public health field. If the admission of a mistake is to be considered a first step in this direction—as I truly believe it is—then your profession is at last on its way to constructive corrective action.

But—many of you may ask—how will this leadership be regained? What is the way to regain lost prestige?

That is what I would like to briefly discuss tonight. For right now the time is ripe for the medical profession to reassert itself. As a result of new far-reaching Federal public health legislation—physicians now have a golden opportunity to again take up the reins of leadership.

The medicare program is one example. The provisions of the Medicare Act specifically charge the State departments of health with the responsibility for accrediting hospitals and nursing homes for the program. Here is a readymade opportunity for leadership in one of the boldest public health programs ever enacted. Physicians must not fail to assume this leadership now, or—as history has shown us—someone else surely will.

Medicare itself is a great force against fragmentation for it takes the care of our elderly out of the hands of local welfare departments. Under medicare, elder citizens do not have to prove need or indigence to qualify for medical services. Under medicare it is the physician who makes the decisions. To begin with, the physician determines if hospitalization is needed. It is the physician's duty to see that essential services are provided, once the patient is admitted. It is the physician who determines the proper length of his patient's stay.

I emphasize that these are the duties of the physician and no one else.

Another national program which affords great opportunities for the medical profession to reassume leadership and prominence, has only just recently been signed into law.

I speak of the national program to establish regional arrangements for research, diagnosis, and treatment of the three major killer diseases: heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

As you will remember, the impetus for this program came from the report of a commission appointed by the President of the United States. This Commission, chaired by and made up in part by some of this Nation's most distinguished physicians was charged with assessing the current state of medical knowledge and its potential application for our continuing war on disease. Based on this assessment and on bold, imaginative thinking, the Commission then formulated a broad plan of attack.

As never before, the medical profession is being called upon for its wholehearted support and cooperation. I am not speaking merely of cooperation between community physicians and administrators in Washington—though this often-sought working relationship is always essential.

But, I also refer to cooperation among the various elements of the medical profession itself, on regional and local levels—cooperation between physicians in private practice and those in public health; and cooperation among medical schools, hospitals, State health departments, and State medical societies. In fostering this spirit the killer disease program offers great promise of bringing together the so-called opposing poles of "town and gown."

The machinery has been set up. All that remains is for old animosities to be buried—petty jealousies to be set aside—and for a return to the old-fashioned idea of service to humanity.

I am proud that in my own home region of New England, progress toward this end has already been made. The Bingham Associates program has been active for a number of years in New England in establishing relationships between the Boston Medical Center and community hospitals in other parts of New England. The Vermont State health department has already begun making arrangements with local medical schools to work out the details of a killer disease program.

But, as much as I take pride in these achievements, such progressive thinking is far from common. The State health departments are still not in close partnership with academic medicine and the major hospitals within the States. To my knowledge, North Carolina and Virginia are about the only States outside New England where similar progress is underway.

In calling upon physicians to rally under the banner of these new and exciting national health programs, I do not mean to imply that we should abandon efforts to correct the fragmentation in areas not embraced by medicare and the killer disease programs.

Far from it. Like all of you, I am appalled by the situations which exist in the organization and administration of health services in many of our communities. I know well of instances where families in desperate need of quick medical attention are shunted around from agency to agency—many of which are staffed with personnel who do not have the slightest concept of medical care requirements. I am also aware of the negligence of many hospitals in reporting cases of persons treated by them for communicable diseases, such as tuberculosis and syphilis, to local public health authorities.

The efforts of your association, the American Public Health Association, and the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers to remedy situations like these are highly commendable. I know that many victories that have been won over the forces of fragmentation are the direct results of your diligent efforts.

I particularly applaud your attempts to overcome these pressures that would split mental health programs from the rest of community health services to which they are so closely allied.

No, I certainly do not call for the abandonment of these worthwhile efforts. But I say, that swift, effective action on the part of physicians in leading these new national health programs is of great importance to assure the attainment of the highest possible professional medical standards in these programs and to prevent further inroads by the forces of fragmentation.

Once physicians have clearly demonstrated their intention to throw off their reluctance to lead, once it is seen how much better it is to have medical men and women at the helm of medical service programs, then, I am confident, the way will be paved for consolidation of all health services under health-oriented leadership.

Full cooperation between all the branches of the medical profession—between "town and gown," between public and private—this is the wave of the future. Physicians must not duck this wave but, rather, meet it and ride it out. There will never be a greater opportunity than now for physicians to regain the leadership of the health services they formerly chose to shun. I urge all of you now to seize and make the most of it.

We have learned much in recent decades of medical research. The time has come for us to bring this knowledge out of the laboratory and into the hospitals, to the bedside of every person who has been disabled with cancer, heart disease, stroke, and other diseases. The time has come to bring the benefits of modern medicine to our elderly who have heretofore been denied them because of inability to pay.

Congress has shown its clear recognition of these needs. It has acted swiftly and well to meet them. All of us now turn to you and your colleagues—the men and women of medicine—to set the machinery going and to work the marvels of which modern medicine is capable.

With physicians in the forefront of the national health programs, fragmentation will be surely doomed. Under the knowledge and guidance of medical men and women, health services will become easily accessible to all who need them. They will improve in quality, and decrease in cost.

We simply have to accept the idea that fragmentation is but a sympton of a lack of effective medical leadership. It will cease only when that leadership is provided—for the ultimate benefit of us all.

REPUBLIC OF ZAMBIA

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Zambia had an eventful history before attaining complete independence and full sovereignty a year ago. From 1911 until early 1964 the territory was part of Northern Rhodesia. Then for about 10 months—until late October 1964—it became part of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. But this brief period was unsettled and not at all to the liking of the Zambian people. They wanted to break away from the Federation and constitute their own sovereign state. This they did a year ago, on the 24th of October, by proclaiming the establishment of the Republic of Zambia.

Today this Republic in southeast Africa, one of the youngest of the newborn African independent states, is on its way to becoming a force for stability and peace. With its 3,500,000 population, and an area of about 300,000 square miles, its democratic and popular government is doing its best to maintain the country's independence and safeguard the well-earned freedom of its people. Its independence was duly recognized by other sovereign states and it has already been admitted to the United Nations, where it is ably represented by the Honorable F. M. Mulikita. Mr. Hosea J. Soko represents the Republic of Zambia in the United States with the full rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. The present government of the Republic is headed by Dr. Kenneth D. Kaunda as its President, with Mr. Simon Kapwepwe as its Minister of Foreign Affairs.

The Republic of Zambia is one of the developing countries. Its economy is based largely on agriculture and its principal products are maize, tobacco, millet, and groundnuts. Rhodesian "redwood" is its most important timber product. Its mineral resources are being developed and utilized, with copper being the most important mineral.

At the end of its first year of independence, we wish peace and prosperity to the industrious and freedom-loving people of the Republic of Zambia.

TOWARD THE GREAT SOCIETY—CONSERVATION

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, our air, our water, our land, our vegetation, our minerals: how these elements essential to our environment are used provides the key to our well-being as a Nation.

Resources conservation is a basic tenet of the Democratic Party philosophy. It means conserving for future generations, utilizing for the present generation, harnessing nature's forces for service to mankind, and preserving the delicate balance of nature from destruction.

The problems of conservation have become more acute as our population has expanded and as our consumer society has made ever-greater demands for raw materials. Since 1946, the American population has grown more than 50 million. In the next decade, the increase will be the equivalent of the present population of New York and Pennsylvania.

Water is the key to our future, and we must expand all efforts to protect and utilize it properly.

The air we breathe must not become so polluted that it causes our people to suffer chronic ills, brought on by small doses of toxic matter over long periods.

And polluted air causes great damage to the buildings of our cities.

Our fish and wildlife are precious resources whose conservation has been accelerated in the years since 1961. Indicative of the concern of the 89th Congress was a final passage on October 14 of H.R. 23, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to start a cooperative State-Federal program of conservation and development of the Nation's anadromous fish—migratory fish.

A significant concept in conservation has been acquisition of Assateague Island, on Maryland's Eastern Shore. This 33-mile-long stretch of land is the last significant undeveloped seashore on the eastern seaboard. It is easily accessible from the large metropolitan centers of New York, Philadelphia, New Jersey, Baltimore, Washington, Norfolk, and Richmond. Congress acted promptly to prevent despoilment of this land, and the State of Maryland is anxious to move ahead with its plans to develop the State-owned portion of the island.

When we push for continued research in insecticides, the game we seek to save is not just some Latin name in a zoology book. It is a soft whir of wings, a flash of startled feathers, the thrill of chase and capture. One of this session's laws calls for increased study in use of insecticides.

The program of wise and prophetic stewardship being forged by this Democratic Congress and the Johnson administration is both careful and daring. Conceived on a truly national scale, it runs deeper than soil conservation, broader than wildlife preservation, more penetrating than forest husbandry, more encompassing than control of air and water pollution.

Mr. Speaker, against the picture of unplanned sprawl and planned ugliness, Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, with the assistance of the Congress, have moved toward order and meaning in the conservation efforts.

One of the main provisions of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 was of great interest to conservationists—the cropland adjustment program. It will allow farmers to take land from production and grant the public its use for hunting, fishing, trapping, hiking, wildlife, and recreational uses. For his participation, the farmer will receive subsidies, much like the Soil Bank of 1956, which is replaced by the cropland adjustment program.

When this Congress passed the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, it provided a major step toward saving an area heretofore bypassed by progress. The bill authorized a program of land conservation, timberland development, mining area restoration, water resources, and pollution measures and planning for the future. The Appalachia program will affect 16 million of our people, much of whose poverty is due to poor resource use—or in a better word, abuse.

Down through our Nation's history, Mr. Speaker, we have seen many examples of abuse of resources of all kinds. Our task in the Congress is to make sure that our resources do not go by default. The 1st session of the 89th Congress has made giant strides in safeguarding our precious national heritage.

TOWARD THE GREAT SOCIETY—MANPOWER TRAINING

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the national unemployment rate is 4.4 percent (September 1965), the lowest in 8 years. Teenage unemployment rate is 13.0 percent compared with 15.0 percent a year ago. The unemployment rate for Negroes is down to 8.2 percent compared to 9.9 percent for a year ago. The strong overall employment situation is due in part to recent legislation such as the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Vocational Education Act of 1964, the Equal Opportunity and Civil Rights Acts of 1964, and the Economic Opportunity Act.

The Manpower Development and Training Act enacted in 1962 represented the first comprehensive peacetime effort to assess manpower needs. The primary objective of the original act was to retrain workers with inadequate or obsolete skills. A vocational education program and an on-the-job training program were established to train an estimated 400,000 insufficiently skilled workers. A basic allowance is paid to unemployed heads of families while undergoing training. A supplementary subsistence and transportation allowance is also paid trainees.

In 1963 the act was greatly expanded to provide basic education courses for the unemployed who were under educated and unable to participate in job retraining programs, and to provide training programs for out-of-school, out-of-work youths age 16 and over. The 1963 amendments permitted the training of an additional 93,000 persons.

The 89th Congress has extended the successful Manpower Training program providing 2-year courses—where necessary—and broadens the training allowance provisions. Most important, it directs Secretary of Labor Wirtz to assist a job development program—to develop jobs to fill service needs currently unmet because of lack of trained workers. The program has met with spectacular success and has far exceeded the goal of 10,000 jobs developed per month. To date, over the first 6 months of the program, 62,213 potential jobs in the service occupations have been developed. Over 53 percent of the jobs are in the medical and health services, maintenance services, personal services, food and lodging services. Private industry has shown interest in the program and is providing some of the on-the-job training.

Overall, since the Manpower Training program began in August 1962, almost $612 million has been committed to MDTA programs in all 50 States. A total of 539,252 workers have been trained or are in training as of October 1965. On the average, 72 percent of those completing institutional training, and 94 percent of those completing on-the-job training are placed in jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the Manpower Act has made a noticeable dent in our unemployment rate, but the road to full employment is still a rugged one. Some 2.9 million Americans are still looking for jobs. Most of them are from the ranks of our hard core unemployed—the school dropout, the poorly educated adult, the displaced farmer, the low-skilled worker. These are the individuals this Act is out to help. America cannot afford the waste of man's potential not fully developed, nor can our economy afford the loss that waste brings about.

TOWARD THE GREAT SOCIETY—DEMOCRATS REDEEM CAMPAIGN PLEDGES

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the 1964 Democratic Party platform adopted at our convention in Atlantic City last August was entitled "One Nation, One People." It was a positive,

---

IMPLEMENTATION OF 1964

THE PLATFORM

Appalachia

We will move forward with programs to restore those areas, such as Appalachia, which the Nation's progress has bypassed.

Department of Housing

We believe a department devoted to urban affairs should be added to the President's Cabinet.

Drug controls

We will continue to insist that our drugs and medicines are safe and effective.

Elementary-secondary education

The demands on the already inadequate sources of State and local revenues place a serious limitation on education. New methods of financial aid must be explored, including the channeling of federally collected revenues to all levels of education.

Excise tax reductions

We should carefully review all our excise taxes and eliminate those that are obsolete.

Immigration

The immigration laws must be revised * * * to eliminate the discriminatory provisions which base admission upon national origins.

Manpower retraining

We must develop fully our most precious resource—our manpower. Training and retraining programs must be expanded.

Medicare and social security

We will continue to fight until we have succeeded in including hospital care for older Americans in the social security program.

forward-looking statement of goals and principles which our party has long espoused. It was drafted under the chairmanship of our distinguished majority leader of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] and adopted by the delegates to the convention.

Platform Chairman ALBERT, in his introductory remarks accompanying the platform recommendations, said:

> This platform builds on the great pledges made 4 years ago. It addresses itself to the hard problems and new challenges of our time. The oldest political party in the free world, in the pages of this platform, demonstrates its fresh and vigorous spirit in the service of peace and freedom.
>
> Our platform expresses consensus of the Democratic Party. It reflects a program on which this united, prosperous, and free Nation can continue to grow.

In his role as majority leader he has worked tirelessly to help translate the 1964 Democratic platform pledges into legislative reality.

Working together as a team with President Johnson, Vice President HUMPHREY, and under the brilliant leadership of Speaker MCCORMACK and Majority Leader ALBERT, Democrats in the House can take pride in the historic accomplishments of the 1st session of the 89th Congress. Major campaign pledges contained in our 1964 platform have already been enacted into law. Still others will become law next year.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point a chart showing the outstanding Democratic record of performance this year in redeeming these major pledges of our 1964 platform:

DEMOCRATIC PARTY PLATFORM	LEGISLATION ENACTED IN 1965
	A 6-year, $1 billion economic development program for the depressed 12-State Appalachia region.
	Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development to administer Federal housing and urban development programs.
	Place stricter controls on the possession, distribution and disposal of depressing barbituates and stimulating amphetamines.
	$1.3 billion in the first year for aid to educationally deprived children from low-income families and grants for books, research and training.
	Excise tax reduction totaling $4.6 billion by January 1, 1967, on automobiles, jewelry, furs, cosmetics and many other items.
	Replacement of discriminatory national origins system with a system of preferential admissions for immigrants with advantageous skills, education or training, or close relatives in the United States.
	Extension and expansion of the Manpower Development and Training Act and a job development program to stimulate on-the-job training.
	A basic hospital insurance program under social security, a voluntary health insurance program, and a 7-percent increase in old-age and survivors benefits.

IMPLEMENTATION OF 1964 DEMOCRATIC PARTY PLATFORM—Continued

THE PLATFORM	LEGISLATION ENACTED IN 1965
National Arts Foundation	
We will encourage further support for the arts, giving people a better chance to use increased leisure and recognizing that the achievements of art are an index of the greatness of a civilization.	Established a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities and providing $63 million through fiscal 1968 for endowments in creative and performing arts and scholarships in humanities.
Older Americans	
We will enhance the security of older Americans by * * * offering opportunities like those provided for the young under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.	Creation of an Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and a 2-year, $17.5 million authorization for developing programs for the aged.
Omnibus housing	
The goal of our housing program must be a decent home for all Americans.	An expanded housing program, including rent supplements for low-income families, housing rehabilitation grants and public housing for the handicapped.
Regional development	
We will continue to assist broad community and regional development.	Grants and loans for public works, development facilities and other projects to aid economically depressed areas and to encourage regional economic development planning.
Regional medical centers	
We will further expand our health facilities * * * especially * * * research laboratories.	Twenty-five multipurpose regional medical centers to fight heart disease, cancer, stroke and other major diseases.
Saline water conversion	
We shall intensify our efforts to solve the critical water problems of many sections of this country be desalinization.	Extension of the Federal saline water program through 1972, increasing fund authorization to $185 million.
Voting Rights	
The rights of all our citizens must be protected. * * * We are firmly pledged to continue the Nation's march toward the goals of * * * equal treatment for all Americans.	Authorization of Federal registrars where local officials discriminate against potential Negro voters and provisions to enforce the 15th amendment.
Water Pollution Control	
We shall * * * continue the attack * * * on eliminating the pollution of our rivers and streams.	A 4-year, expanded $180 million program to combat water pollution in interstate waters and increase Federal grants for research and construction of water pollution control projects.
Air pollution control	
We shall * * * continue the attack we have launched on the polluted air that envelops our cities.	Authorization for Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to recommend means to control pollution from automobile exhausts, and for construction of a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory.
Antipoverty	
We will carry the war on poverty forward as a total war against the causes of human want.	Authorization of $1.7 billion for fiscal 1966 and extension and expansion of Federal antipoverty programs under the Economic Opportunity Act.
Higher education	
In order to insure that all students who can meet the requirements for college entrance can continue their education, we propose an expanded program of public scholarships, guaranteed loans, and work-study grants.	Scholarships for needy undergraduates and insured, reduced-interest private loans to graduate and undergraduate students.

GREGORY LOY

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the meritorious conduct of one of my constituents, a 13-year-old lad named Gregory Loy.

Last August, Gregory, risking his own safety, saved the life of a young girl, 8-year-old Karen Gardener. While by the side of a pool in southwest Los Angeles, Gregory noticed that Karen was staying underwater too long, but was told by other youngsters around the pool not to worry about her as she frequently stayed underwater a long time and could take care of herself. Loy, a good swimmer, ignored their assurances and dove in. He found Karen floating unconscious near the bottom of the pool.

After bringing her to the surface, he and a neighbor administered artificial respiration, and the girl was brought back to consciousness. Meanwhile, the fire department rescue squad had been summoned, and they said that Loy's fast thinking and heroic actions already had saved Karen.

Though he has received a letter of commendation for his conduct from the chief of the fire department, I wish to add my personal commendation of this young lad for the good sense and bravery he displayed. His saving of another life at the risk of his own is an unselfish act which deserves the highest praise.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND PERSONAL SECURITY

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to protect the personal security of individuals seeking their civil rights from assault and intimidation. My bill makes it a Federal offense to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person for reasons of race, and that term is defined to include "hostility to the victim's race, or racial association, or support of racial equality, or with intent to discourage racial equality."

It is a terrible time in our country when we see the law enforcement and judicial process helpless in the face of flagrant brutality. The historic civil rights legislation of 1964 and 1965 will serve little purpose if those seeking their civil rights are not protected by Federal officers and Federal courts.

I recently received a resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the Unitarian Universalist Association calling for Federal action. It expresses the feelings and conclusions of many people. I include the resolution along with the bill introduced by me yesterday:

RESOLUTION: PROTECTION AGAINST RACIAL ASSAULT

Whereas enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 has made possible great advances toward equality of rights and opportunity for all Americans in the areas of education, public accommodations and facilities, employment, Federal-aid programs, and the exercise of the franchise; and

Whereas the full and free exercise of these new rights and opportunities is dependent on the safety of the individual from intimidation, coercion, and bodily harm, or threats of bodily harm; and

Whereas many brave men and women, including ministers of this free faith, working to secure these rights and opportunities for themselves and their fellow men, have suffered bodily harm and even death in the effort; and

Whereas the board of trustees of the Unitarian Univercalist Association is mindful of its responsibility to those of its own ministers and laymen who are risking their lives in the cause of racial justice and brotherhood, and is mindful of its concern for the safety and well-being of all those engaged in the movement for equal rights and opportunities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of trustees of the Unitarian Universalist Association urges the Justice Department to press with renewed vigor the prosecution under existing law, of those guilty of the beatings, the shootings, the bombings, and the killings; and be it further

Resolved, That the board of trustees of the Unitarian Universalist Association urges the President to recommend and the Congress to enact new Federal legislation at the earliest moment to protect the security of the individual from assault or threatened assault upon his person or property, where that assault has a racial purpose or effect; and to provide civil damages for the victim of such assault.

H.R. 11742

A bill to amend chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, to provide additional protection for civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, to prescribe additional penalties for violations of civil rights, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 241 and 242 of chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, relating to civil rights, are amended to read as follows:

"§ 241. Deprivation of rights by persons not acting under color of law

"No person, acting otherwise than under color of law, shall injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate another in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege which the Constitution or laws of the United States secures against violations by persons not acting under color of law, or because of his having exercised or been about to exercise the same; nor shall any such person injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate another for reasons of race.

"The rights and privileges protected by this section shall include, but not be limited to, the right to speak, write, assemble, petition, or lawfully and peaceably march and demonstrate, or otherwise publicize opinions, on matters of Federal concern; the right to travel from State to State and to be free from violence on the streets and highways and other instruments or instrumentalities of commerce; and all rights created, secured, or protected by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

"Any violation of this section which results in death or maiming or was intended so to result is a felony and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $20,000 or imprisonment for any term of years or life, or both.

"Any violation of this section which is carried out with a deadly weapon or which causes or was intended to cause bodily harm is a felony and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $15,000 or imprisonment for not more than ten years, or both.

"Any other violations of this section is a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

"If any provision of this section or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the section and the application of the provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"As used in this section, 'for reasons of race' shall mean because of hostility to the victim's race, or racial associations, or support of racial equality, or with intent to discourage racial equality.

"§ 242. Deprivation of rights by persons acting under color of law

"No person, acting under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom established by or having the force of law, or in conspiracy with or in aid of another, so acting, shall injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate another in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege which the Constitution or laws of the United States secures against violation by persons acting under color of law or otherwise, or because of his having exercised or been about to exercise the same, or for reasons of race.

"The rights and privileges protected by this section shall include, but not be limited to, all of the rights and privileges set forth in the previous section; the right to be free from discrimination under color of law on account of race or religion; and all rights secured by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and by the fifth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

"The following actions are included within, but are not exclusive of, actions prohibited by this section:

"(1) Subjecting any person to physical injury for an unlawful purpose;

"(2) Subject any person to unnecessary force during the course of an arrest or while the person is being held in custody;

"(3) Subjecting any person to violence or maliciously subjecting such person to unlawful restraint in the course of eliciting a confession to a crime or any other information;

"(4) Subjecting any person to violence or unlawful restraint for the purpose of obtaining anything of value;

"(5) Refusing to provide protection to any person from unlawful violence at the hands of private persons, knowing that such violence was planned or was then taking place; or

"(6) Aiding or assisting private persons in any way to carry out acts of unlawful violence.

"Any violation of this section which results in death or maiming or was intended so to result is a felony and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $5,000, or imprisonment for any terms of years not less than five, or for life, or both.

"Any violation of this section which is carried out with a deadly weapon or which causes or was intended to cause bodily harm is a felony and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $1,000 nor more than $20,000 or imprisonment for not less than one year nor more than fifteen years, or both.

"Any other violation of this section is a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not less than $300 nor more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not less than thirty days nor more than one year, or both.

"If any provision of this section or of the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the section and the application of the provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"As used in this section, 'for reasons of race' shall have the same meaning as in section 241 of this title.".

A THREAT TO OUR RUBBER FOOTWEAR INDUSTRY—TO COTTON FARMERS AND THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago, on August 19, 1965, a short official notice concerning a proposed revision of tariff policies appeared among the regulations in the Federal Register. This notice was published to advise all interested parties of the Customs Bureau's intention to change the long existing standard of interpretation of the basis for establishing the tariff on imported rubber-soled footwear.

This change would be effected through the application of prevailing ad valorem rates to an American selling price which would be based on the lowest sales price of U.S. shoes—instead of the highest price—which had obtained since 1930. This action would in effect reduce the existing tariff to one-third of its present level, and it would undoubtedly stimulate a massive increase in the present importation of highly competitive rubber footwear.

Since a large segment of our domestic rubber-soled footwear industry is located in my congressional district, and since the proposed tariff reduction would seriously jeopardize the continued existence of this industry and the jobs it provides for thousands of my constituents, I am deeply concerned with the effect of this proposal.

I have conferred with many representatives of labor and management in this industry, including the labor relations supervisor of the Naugatuck, Conn., Footwear Division of the United States Rubber Co., Mr. Thomas J. Nelligan, and with labor officials, Mr. George T. Froehlich and Mr. Richard C. McGown of the United Rubber Workers, and I am convinced that the situation raises substantial issues which deserve the attention of Congress and the Executive. I have discussed this proposal with the heads of the executive departments concerned, and I have advised the Secretary of the Treasury, as well as the heads of other departments which will have a voice in this matter, of my objections to the proposed interpretation.

While this is a matter of most significance to the rubber industry, I want to point out that this proposed change would vastly increase the import of foreign-made canvas uppers and these imports would markedly affect present domestic sales of U.S. cotton farmers and textile producers.

I hope that this threat can be eliminated by administrative action. If not, I am prepared to file remedial legislation.

For the information of the Members of Congress, I am including a copy of my letter to the executive departments and a sampling of the letters I have received from groups and individuals who will be affected by the Customs Bureau's action. In conjunction with these letters, I am including pertinent editorials which appeared in the October 13, 1965, edition of the Naugatuck News and the October 18, 1965, edition of the New Haven Register.

OCTOBER 15, 1965.

Hon. HENRY H. FOWLER,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On August 19, 1965, the Bureau of Customs published a proposed new standard for the use of Customs officials in valuing imported rubber-soled footwear. (Department of the Treasury, Bureau of Customs, (332.1), appraisement of footwear subject to American selling price—notice of opportunity to present views regarding proposed interpretation of 'Like or similar' merchandise as it relates to appraisement on the basis of American selling price under sec. 336, Tariff Act of 1930.)

The Bureau's proposal is designed to effect a major reduction in the tariff of these articles by reversing a policy of tariff adjustment which was initiated by Presidential proclamation in 1933 and which has prevailed with full congressional approval and judicial confirmation up to the present time.

This Presidential proclamation of 1933 applied the ad valorem rate on imported goods to the American selling price of similar domestic goods. In those instances where there is more than one similar domestic article, the tariff has been based on whichever product was highest in price.

The proposed standard would reverse this policy and establish a new system whereby appraising officers would select among similar domestic articles, that product which was lowest in price as the basis for adjusting the tariff rate. Obviously, adoption of this policy would restrict tariff protection to low-cost producers who least need protection and would leave the high-cost producers who are presently unundated by imports disarmed in competition with low-wage foreign producers.

I have made a thorough study of this problem and I am confident that the proposed action demands broader scrutiny than that afforded by an administrative ruling. Grave issues are involved in this proposal, and its potential affect upon labor and industry deserves the careful consideration of Congress and the executive. Appearance of this proposal in the shape of an administrative "guideline" indicates that insufficient attention was given to its long-range consequences.

In considering our domestic producers' need for reasonable protection, it is essential to point out the meteoric rise of imports of fabric rubber-soled footwear which has occurred in the past few years despite our present protective measures. In the period between 1955 and 1963, imports of rubber-soled footwear increased from 115,183 pairs to 28,675,619 pairs. In 1960, the imports totaled 30,435,481 and in 1962 the figure was 29,225,176 pairs. In an even shorter period, the importation of foreign-made canvas uppers intended for attachment to American-made rubber soles has climbed to over 10 million pairs.

These developments raise even more serious questions when considered in the light of the new proposal. If the new guidelines are adopted and the "lowest type and price" of domestic articles are selected for the tariff base, it is entirely probable that the "lowest priced" domestic products will be those with the imported foreign uppers which are growing in volume. In addition, therefore, to eliminating the 32-year old American selling price system, the proposed standard will seriously damage the American textile industry and the cotton farmers who now provide the U.S. produced canvas uppers.

In assessing the effect of these proposals upon the congressional district which I represent, I have conferred with labor and management officials of the U.S. Rubber Co. plant in Naugatuck, Conn. I have learned that the Naugatuck plant alone has laid off about 300 workers in its canvas footwear department as a result of the pressure of foreign competition under existing protective measures. Moreover, the plant has reduced the workweek to 32 hours and was forced to shut down one week because of this competition. I will not speculate on the ultimate potentials of damage to the economic well-being of employees and owners of fabric rubber-soled footwear plants if the proposed formula is applied. That it will be considerable and hazardous is obvious in the comparison of the high and low costs of production prevailing and the volume of import competition under current tariff rates.

These facts and figures point up the magnitude of the problem we are dealing with and they provide ample evidence that the Customs Bureau proposals are poorly timed and ill advised. I oppose the proposals of the Customs Bureau and I strongly urge that serious consideration be given to their recall.

I shall appreciate your support and assistance and I hope that you also will see fit to recommend against the adoption of these proposals.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN S. MONAGHAN,
Member of Congress.

[From the New Haven (Conn.) Register, Oct. 18, 1965]

NAUGATUCK FIGHTING AGAINST IMPORT THREAT

All of Naugatuck is united in a campaign to guarantee its economic future from serious harm by cheaper foreign imports.

If the Bureau of Customs, a division of the Treasury Department, goes through with its plan to drastically reduce the tariff on canvas shoes with rubber soles, the impact could be disastrous to the U.S. Rubber Co.'s footwear division in the valley community.

U.S. Rubber and other American manufacturers of this type of footgear are already hard pressed to compete with products from foreign nations, particularly in Europe, where materials and labor are much cheaper. Customs now sets the tariff on the basis of American-made shoes selling for $2.65. Customs proposes reducing the figure to 90 cents.

Management, labor, civic leaders, public officials, and others are united in their position that Naugatuck industry should not be jeopardized.

Cheap imports have been flowing into this country since shortly after World War II. Some have not been injurious to the general economy. Others have.

We recognize the merit of the organized opposition in Naugatuck. We can also recall what a tariff change did to the clock industry here in New Haven. A once prosperous industry died. The footwear business so important to Naugatuck and Connecticut should not be strangled with the same tariff noose.

[From the Naugatuck (Conn.) News, Oct. 13, 1965]

WE FACE A CRISIS

If the Bureau of Customs has their way, Naugatuck's Footwear Division of U.S. Rubber Co. might well be out of business in several years.

For more than 30 years, the Bureau of Customs has been using a shoe like that manufactured in Naugatuck, selling for about $2.65, as the basis for establishing tariffs on rubber and canvas footwear. The Customs Bureau now proposes to change this, and base the tariff on the price of an American-manufactured shoe which sells for about 90 cents.

Even under the present tariff, Naugatuck Footwear officials report they must struggle to hold a portion of the market. Should the drastic reduction, as proposed, be put into effect, it is doubtful that U.S. Rubber could hold any of the market. Foreign made goods are already providing very stiff competition, and the reduction of the base for tariffs by nearly two-thirds would certainly induce a virtual flooding of the market by foreign-made goods.

Certainly, the Footwear Division of the U.S. Rubber Co. is facing a crisis. For that matter, the entire Naugatuck economy is facing a crisis, since the Footwear Division forms the very backbone of Naugatuck's economy, providing jobs for many boroughites and paying a large slice of the local tax dollar each year. Most merchants have geared their business to meeting the needs of the people employed here.

At the present time, George Froehlich, president of Local 45, and Thomas Nelligan, a representative of the Footwear Division of U.S. Rubber Co., are in Washington, D.C., meeting with Congressmen, officials of the Labor Department and officials of the Bureau of Customs in an effort to head off the impending economic disaster.

It may well be that special legislation will be required, but it is also possible that this may not be able to be accomplished until the next session of Congress. The Congress is moving swiftly toward adjournment and many speculate there is not enough time to head off the tariff reduction with special legislation.

Reports are, too, that the Bureau of Customs is not inclined to changing its mind in the matter. Apparently nothing short of Presidential intervention will stop the reduction at this time.

Many see the reduction in tariff as another step in the liberals' plan to seek free world trade certainly is the idealistic method of the most economical method of producing and marketing goods and might in the long run serve everyone to best advantage.

But. What happens in the meantime. Will it take 100 years for the world to adjust? Where will the jobs be for those who are thrown out of work in this country as foreign made goods take over the market?

It is the immediate consequences we must concern ourselves with. We must preserve the jobs that are now available.

The Bureau of Customs must consider its position.

We call upon all residents of Naugatuck to actively participate in the effort to maintain tariffs at the present level. Write to your Congressmen, write to the Bureau of Customs—let them know just how you feel about the matter.

WATERBURY, CONN.,
October 20, 1965.

DEAR SIR: I am employed at the U.S. Rubber Co., Naugatuck, Conn.

This is to protest reducing the tariff rate on canvas and rubber footwear. We hear so much about the war on poverty, so why isn't something being done to protect us and our jobs? Is it logical to put thousands of Americans out of work and on relief, just to bolster a foreign country's economy?

Our first thought should be to do what's best for us first.

When you contact the Bureau of Customs please let them know how we feel. Thank you.

Very truly yours,
EDWARD J. MARIANO,
Member, United Rubber Workers, Local 45.

NAUGATUCK, CONN.,
October 15, 1965.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: I am writing this letter in regards to the present crisis facing me in the Naugatuck footwear plant and Naugatuck as a whole.

According to the information available to me, I feel this unfair competition from abroad should be curtailed to the point where it does not threaten any American's job here in this country.

We not only have to contend with automation, but now competition from countries who would not exist if it were not for our generosity as a country to feed money and know-how into their industries.

I believe in helping the poor and oppressed, but who is going to help me? Who is going to pay my taxes? Who is going to feed and clothe me? Who is going to pay for my home?

I don't want Uncle Sam to. I just want him to see that I don't lose my opportunity to work to be independent and to be able to keep shouldering my responsibilities as an American and as a mother.

As my Representative in Congress, Mr. MONAGAN, I certainly hope that you will do all in your power to prevent foreign imports from being the cause of unemployment in Naugatuck, as well as any other part of our country.

I place my hopes and confidence in you.

Sincerely yours,
MRS. HELEN SPECK.

DEMOCRATIC TOWN COMMITTEE,
Naugatuck, Conn., October 14, 1965.
U.S. Congressman JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Refer to copies of letters received concerning revised method of applying tariff to canvas rubber-soled shoes.

The entire Naugatuck Valley is vitally concerned with this issue as it means direct support and a livelihood to approximately 20,000 persons.

The Democratic town committee and the party wishes your wholehearted support in this critical matter.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK J. KLONOSKI, *Chairman.*

UNITED RUBBER, CORK, LINOLEUM, AND PLASTIC WORKERS OF AMERICA, LOCAL NO. 45,
Naugatuck, Conn., October 1, 1965.
The Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: I am enclosing copies of letters which I have sent to Deputy Assistant Secretary Weiss of the Labor Department and Assistant Secretary Davis of the Treasury Department, in an effort to get across to them the problem we are confronted with if the Customs Department goes ahead and revises its present method of figuring tariff on fabric rubber-soled footwear.

The letter outlines our position and I would appreciate it if you would contact these gentlemen in our behalf on this very important matter. October 18 is the deadline for getting information into the Customs Department relative to our position, so you can see this does not allow us very much time.

Tom Nelligan and I will be in Washington the week of October 11, at which time we will discuss the problem with you at greater length. In the meantime, any additional information that you desire on the subject we will be glad to furnish.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE FROEHLICH, *President.*

OCTOBER 1, 1965.

Mr. HARRY WEISS,
Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Labor, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to our attention that regulations are being proposed by the Bureau of Customs to revise the present method for figuring tariff on fabric rubber soled footwear. Presently, the tariff is based on an American made shoe which is like or similar to the imported product. The proposed regulations would change this so that the tariff would be based on the lowest priced fabric shoe made in this country. This would eliminate the present comparison now being used and successfully defended in the courts, whereby the shoe used for setting the tariff is made by a high paying union organized plant and, in its place, the Customs Department would use a shoe made by a low paying unorganized company.

We are aware of the tremendous impact that the importation of fabric shoes has made at Naugatuck. We constantly see our membership rolls declining, and fabric shoe workers in our union for the past 5 weeks have only worked 30 to 32 hours a week, following a 1 week layoff. If aid is given to the importers of these shoes, it stands to reason that more cheap imported fabric shoes will be coming into the country and the economic level of our people will deteriorate. It is very difficult for us to understand why this change should even be discussed in light of the present economic problems of the domestic rubber footwear industry.

We would respectfully request that in deliberations on this proposal, you take into consideration the plight of our members as it will affect their livelihood if such regulations are adopted. We are certain that their adoption will practically destroy the industry which has been providing the wages and benefits we, in the organized plants, have negotiated over the years.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE FROEHLICH,
President, Local 45, URW, AFL-CIO.

OCTOBER 1, 1965.

Mr. WILLIAM TRUE DAVIS, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of Treasury, Treasury Department, Bureau of Customs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to our attention that regulations are being proposed by the Bureau of Customs to revise the present method for figuring tariff on fabric rubber soled footwear. Presently, the tariff is based on an American-made shoe which is like or similar to the imported product. The proposed regulations would change this so that the tariff would be based on the lowest priced fabric shoe made in this country. This would eliminate the present comparison now being used and successfully defended in the courts, whereby the shoe used for setting the tariff is made by a high paying union organized plant and, in its place, the Customs Department would use a shoe made by a low paying unorganized company.

We are aware of the tremendous impact that the importation of fabric shoes has made at Naugatuck. We constantly see our membership rolls declining, and fabric shoe workers in our union for the past 5 weeks have only worked 32 hours a week following a 1-week layoff. If aid is given to the importers of these shoes, it stands to reason that more cheap imported fabric shoes will be coming into the country and the economic level of our people will deteriorate. It is very difficult for us to understand why this change should even be discussed in light of the present economic problems of the domestic rubber footwear industry.

We would respectfully request that in deliberations on this proposal, you take into consideration the plight of our members as it will affect their livelihood if such regulations are adopted. We are certain that their adoption will practically destroy the industry which has been providing the wages and benefits we, in the organized plants, have negotiated over the years.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE FROEHLICH,
President, Local 45, URW, AFL-CIO.

WOODBURY, CONN.,
October 15, 1965.
Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Reducing the tariffs on rubber and canvas footwear will greatly curtail and possibly doom the now thriving footwear industry in Naugatuck. A failure of the footwear division of the U.S. Rubber Co. would spell disaster to the entire Naugatuck economy. Must the rise of free world trade scatter in its wake the skeletons of once prosperous American communities? We the educators of Naugatuck urge that action be taken to maintain tariffs at their present level.

CHARLES E. COSGRIFF, *President,*
Naugatuck Teachers League.

THE NAUGATUCK VALLEY LABOR COUNCIL, AFL-CIO,
Naugatuck, Conn., October 18, 1965.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN: The Naugatuck Valley Labor Council has gone on record as endorsing the course of action taken by you on the following items:

We here in Naugatuck realize the splendid job that you have done on the rubber tariff, and we know that you will continue to do so in this behalf.

We also realize that you have taken a strong position on the Dirksen amendment, and we know that you will continue to do so in opposition to this bill.

Hoping that this will find you before adjournment, and hoping that you and the family have the happiest of the coming holidays.

Sincerely and fraternally yours,
WALTER LANTIERI,
Recording Secretary.

NAUGATUCK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Naugatuck, Conn., October 18, 1965.
Mr. LESTER JOHNSON,
Acting Commissioner of Customs,
Bureau of Customs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As president of the Naugatuck Chamber of Commerce I am protesting the proposed tariff reduction on canvas and rubber footwear. The fact that foreign imports of canvas and rubber shoes has risen from 115,000 pairs in 1955 to 28 million pairs in 1962 makes it obvious that the foreign manufacturers are not being hurt by the present tariff. Naugatuck is a town of about 21,000 inhabitants and over 5,000 people are employed at the U.S. Rubber Co., footwear plant in Naugatuck.

We have recently had a week's layoff at the footwear plant due to lack of orders, and several hundred employees are now on a layoff status. The workers at Naugatuck Footwear enjoy top wages and excellent fringe benefits. A lowering of the tariff base would mean that foreign shoes, made by low paid labor, could be sold in the United States at lower prices. This, of course, means that not only would there be an adverse economic effect in Naugatuck, Conn., but also in other communities in the Nation that manufacture canvas and rubber footwear. It is my earnest hope that your department will reconsider the decision to figure the tariff base on a 90 cents a pair of shoes rather than on a $2.65 pair of shoes as at present.

Yours truly,
GEORGE F. KENNEDY.

OCTOBER 14, 1965.

CUSTOMS BUREAU,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: As mayor of the town of Naugatuck, Conn., I am writing to vigorously protest the planned reduction on tariffs on rubber and canvas footwear which would cripple and probably end the long thriving Naugatuck footwear industry which is, without doubt, the backbone of this town's economy.

This is a most drastic action as planned, since it can affect the lives of all Naugatuck residents within a brief period of time. The action would also have an adverse effect upon a number of other nearby communities which supply a sizable portion of our footwear plant labor force.

I strongly appeal to all concerned to review all aspects of the economy in Naugatuck and other parts of this country before final action is taken to reduce footwear tariffs.

Sincerely,
JOSEPH C. RAYTKWICH,
Mayor.

UNITED RUBBER, CORK,
LINOLEUM, & PLASTIC WORKERS
OF AMERICA, AFL–CIO, CLC,
Akron, Ohio, October 8, 1965.

Re proposal to issue new guidelines for use by appraising officers in appraisement of imported rubber-soled and rubber footwear.

Hon. LESTER D. JOHNSON,
Commissioner of Customs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has been brought to my attenion that the Bureau of Customs has given notice of its proposal to issue guidelines for the use by appraising officers in valuing imported rubber-soled and rubber footwear.

This organization represents in excess of 20,000 men and women engaged in the production of rubber-soled and rubber footwear in the United States. It is our sincere and considered opinion that the issuance of the proposed guidelines would seriously and adversely affect the job security, the wages, and the employment of the people we represent who are engaged in this type of production.

There has been submitted to you a comprehensive and well-reasoned brief on behalf of the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N.Y. We have caused a careful review of that brief to be made and we agree with and subscribe to the arguments made therein and the conclusions therein set forth.

We submit that the adoption of the arguments and the conclusions contained in the memorandum brief of the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., will be beneficial to the industry and to the employees engaged in production therein.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE BURDON,
International President.

CARL ALBERT

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, we can be justly proud of our majority leader, CARL ALBERT. During this session of the Congress, he has been one of the busiest men in the free world. Though weighted down with the tremendous burdens, CARL ALBERT has always been attentive to the wishes of his colleagues. A whisper in the ear during debate, a phone call from those at the bottom of the seniority ladder on either side of the aisle has always received his earnest attention. CARL ALBERT has never been too busy to meet the constituents of colleagues or friends. CARL ALBERT is a leader of great understanding and deeply humility. In his leadership role, he has been sustained by dignity, a sense of humor, devotion to this great institution of Congress and an abiding faith in the destiny of our country. CARL ALBERT is completely devoted to the principles and ideals that made this Nation great. CARL ALBERT has played a leading role in our Nation's economic, educational, spiritual, and military growth.

Some years ago Khrushchev, of Soviet Russia, boasted that he would bury America in the field of economic competition. Khrushchev has been buried politically forever by his own Government because he failed in his feeble effort to outproduce the United States. Under the leadership of men like CARL ALBERT we are winning the economic war. We are in the 57th month of a continued increase in our gross national product. We have created 6 million new jobs. We are winning in Vietnam and our space program is advancing rapidly. His lovely wife, Mary, has sustained and encouraged CARL during this momentous and historic session as always. She is a South Carolinian of whom we are proud. Until next session of this Congress, Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for them some rest and the very best always.

JERRY FORD

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, this is a great Congress. The 80th Congress was a great Congress. Future leaders abounded in the 80th Congress. President Johnson, the late President Kennedy, former Vice President Nixon, and many others served in that Congress with honor and distinction. A young man who served in that illustrious group—and also marked for leadership—was JERRY FORD, the distinguished and able minority leader of this House.

JERRY FORD, in this Congress, has been the epitome of statesmanship. He has fought as an American and has placed the welfare of his country ahead of partisanship and personal ambition. He has offered constructive opposition and has made possible, by his cooperation, some of the greatest achievements of this Congress.

JERRY FORD could have stayed on the sidelines and criticized when America's destiny was being shaped in southeast Asia. Mr. Speaker, JERRY FORD supported our Vietnam policy and helped mold the united backing necessary for a winning team which has halted Communist aggression.

HALE BOGGS

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished and illustrious whip, HALE BOGGS, has been the fullback on the greatest legislative team in the history of the world. He drove across many scores from the 1-yard line where the opposition was the toughest. He drew the defense in close in the middle of the field making possible the touchdown passes and long runs of fantastic legislative achievement.

This House experienced more rollcalls and quorum calls than any legislative body in 1 year in all history. It has been a trying and challenging session for our leadership. HALE BOGGS has taken his rightful place in the legislative hall of fame through outstanding and distinguished legislative leadership.

HALE BOGGS played a major role in adopting a great program which will make it possible for the United States to come alive and meet the challenges of the space age.

JIMMY ROOSEVELT

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Dorn] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a pleasure for me to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our beloved friend, Jimmy Roosevelt.

In my 17 years in the Congress, I have never known a more affable, hardworking, and dedicated Member of the Congress. Jimmy Roosevelt's warm smile and sense of humor have become a tradition in this great institution. It is always refreshing to meet Jimmy Roosevelt in the corridors and on the floor of this House. He always had a relaxing influence on us during debate and times of tension.

Jimmy Roosevelt represented his district with dedication, devotion, and ability. The United States and the free world are fortunate that Jimmy Roosevelt will now help carry the banner of freedom in the United Nations. While we will miss him here and hope for his return, nonetheless we will gladly share his talents in the cause of world freedom.

SPEAKER JOHN McCORMACK

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Dorn] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our beloved Speaker, John W. McCormack, is one of the very ablest Speakers in the history of the U.S. Congress. As Speaker, he has guided us through the most momentous and historic session in the history of Congress. This session will largely determine the course of history in the Western World for the next 100 years.

Speaker McCormack has presided over this House with a dignity, dedication, and loyalty so reminiscent of the Founding Fathers of our country. He has presided over the House as Washington presided over the Constitutional Convention, as John Hancock over the Continental Congress, and as the late Sam Rayburn. I believe that history will record John W. McCormack's name alongside these illustrious leaders.

May I remind my collegaues that for 14 months our distinguished Speaker was next in line for succession to the Presidency. During this period he was a tower of strength and reassurance to the American people during a trying and tragic hour. Speaker McCormack sustained and supported the President and earned the gratitude of all those who love freedom throughout the world.

American prestige, economic growth, and U.S. military strength is now at an alltime peak. This alltime high is due largely to the illustrious leadership of our beloved Speaker, John W. McCormack.

LES ARENDS

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Dorn] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Les Arends himself is an institution in this the greatest legislative institution in the world.

From the day I entered this body, Les Arends has stood out in appearance, in ability, and leadership. I wish to commend the people of his district in Illinois for their good judgment to send him to the Congress where he has ably represented his country and his State.

Les Arends is first a great American, loyal to the ideals and principles that made this Nation great. Then he is a great Republican who has earned the respect, admiration, and esteem of all of us in the Democratic Party.

This House is a better House because of Les Arends. Les Arends' name will be listed with those outstanding leaders who have made this House the greatest legislative body in the history of the world. I am proud to call Les Arends my colleague and friend.

OREN HARRIS

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Dorn] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, this House is a better House because Oren Harris served here for a quarter of a century. This Nation is a stronger and a better country because Oren Harris was a Member of Congress. The free world and Western civilization is stronger and more secure because of Oren Harris' dedication to the great principles and ideals of individual liberty.

Mr. Speaker, this is an age of public relations, advertising, and salesmanship. Oren Harris has been a great salesman for our private enterprise system, for our form of government and for the image of America. As chairman of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Oren Harris has improved commerce, foreign and domestic. He has improved broadcasting and resisted any monopoly or censorship of news.

Oren Harris has been one of the outstanding leaders not only in this historic Congress but a great leader in an important and crucial era of world history.

Oren Harris is a devoted Christian. He dedicated much of his time and talent to the Vaughn Bible class at Calvary Baptist Church in Washington.

He ranks as one of the greatest teachers in the history of this great class which is one of the oldest and largest in the world. We are going to miss Oren Harris at the Vaughn Bible class where he was always an inspiration to me. I am going to miss him here in the House. Our loss here is Arkansas gain. He will grace the U.S. district court with dignity, with ability, and integrity. Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for Oren Harris a long and distinguished career on the bench and our love and best wishes always.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Vivian] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received some information on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission from Chairman Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.

I was surprised to find that in its first 100 days of operation Mr. Roosevelt and his staff have handled a total of over 1,380 individual complaints alleging discrimination in employment. This is an extraordinary workload for an agency in operation slightly over 3 months, and it certainly demonstrates the faith and trust the minority groups of our Nation have in Mr. Roosevelt and his fellow Commissioners and employees.

Mr. Speaker, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is performing an important task. I commend Mr. Roosevelt for sending information on its operations to Members of Congress; I hope it is widely read and used. A fact sheet on the Commission follows:

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was established under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In May of 1965 President Lyndon B. Johnson appointed its five Commissioners—Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. (New York), Chairman; Dr. Luther Holcomb (Texas), Vice Chairman; Richard A. Graham (Wisconsin); Aileen C. Hernandez (California); and Samuel D. Jackson (Kansas).

Under title VII, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission will be concerned with four major groups—employers, employment agencies, labor organizations and joint labor management apprenticeship or training programs. The Commission's job is to see to it that all employees, prospective employees and trainees are treated without regard to race, color, religion, sex or national origin. The act covers employers of 100 or more people, labor unions with 100 or more members or who operate hiring halls, employment agencies dealing with employers of 100 or more people as of 1965. On July 2, 1966, the provision applies to those with 75 or more employees or members; on July 2, 1967, to those with 50 or more employees or members; and on July 2, 1968, to those with 25 or more employees or members.

The act provides that the Commission must defer investigation of a case arising in a State with an enforcible fair employment practice law for a period of not less than 60 days, and in the case of a newly established Commission for a period of 120 days. There are 28 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico which have fair employment practice laws substantially similar to title VII of the Civil Rights Act and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission will defer to these agencies for the required period in order to give them an opportunity to resolve complaints under State law. Three States have laws which provide only for criminal remedy. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission will not defer to these States but will assume immediate jurisdiction when a complaint is filed.

The law also provides that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission may enter into agreements with State and local agencies enforcing fair employment practice laws to cede full jurisdiction and to reimburse these localities for services on behalf of the Federal Commission.

Complaints may be filed by:

1. Any individual who believes he has been discriminated against in an employment situation.
2. By a Commissioner who has reasonable cause to believe that an unlawful employment practice has been committed by a company, union, employment agency or apprenticeship or training program.

The Commission investigates complaints, and, where there appears to be reasonable cause to believe that discrimination actually occurred, proceeds to conciliate with the respondent party. If conciliation does not produce satisfactory results within 60 days, the complainant may seek redress in the courts. The Commission may ask the Attorney General to take court action where a pattern or practice of discrimination appears.

KENYA'S SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE—DECEMBER 11

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations and best wishes to the people and leaders of Kenya as they prepare to celebrate, on this coming December 11, their second anniversary as an independent nation. To the people of Kenya and to His Excellency, the Prime Minister, Mzee Jomo Kenyatta, and to His Excellency, the Kenyan Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Burudi Nabwera, I wish to express my best wishes for a joyous celebration.

Like other new nations, Kenya is faced with many difficult problems. Even the most affluent states are still struggling with the ancient evils of poverty, ignorance, and disease. Just as the United States seeks to solve this problem through the war on poverty, Kenya too has assumed responsibility for these monumental tasks. In addition Kenya must also overcome a tradition of tribal rivalries and a narrow economic base. The population of Kenya is almost 9 million people of many diverse backgrounds. Each group has a tradition and culture of its own, with the main ones being the Kikuyu, Luo, Baluhya, Kamba, and Meru. In addition there are a significant number of Kenyans of Somalian, Asian, and Arabian descent. Under the leadership of Mzee Jomo Kenyatta, Kenya has initiated a strong governmental program to unify the country and accelerate economic development in every region of the country. An article in a recent edition of the Sunday New York Times magazine, which I will insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following my remarks, details the very interesting story of Prime Minister Kenyatta and the long struggle for Kenyan independence. One of the most interesting statements of Jomo Kenyatta's is from a speech he gave shortly before Kenya gained its independence in which he explained the importance for Kenya of national unity and vigorous economic development:

> Where there has been tribal animosity, it will be finished. Let us not dwell upon the bitterness of the past. I would rather look to the future, to the good new Kenya, not the bad old days. If we can create this sense of national direction and identity, we shall have gone a long way toward solving our economic problems. We hold out no empty promises of achieving utopia overnight. What we hold out to every citizen is the prospect of work, justly rewarded.

Kenya's road to independence and democratic government was a long and difficult one. It was not until 1944 that the first African was nominated to the Legislative Council. Prior to that time Africans had no direct participation in governmental affairs. In the years ranging from October 1952 to December 1959 the country was in a state of emergency arising out of the Mau Mau rebellion. This emergency and the power of the European settlers contributed to the slow pace of constitutional development in Kenya. In 1960 a constitutional conference in London finally gave the Africans a majority in the Legislative Council. Constitutional talks in 1962 were complicated by differences between the Kenya African National Union—KANU—which has the support of the larger tribes and the Kenya African Democratic Union—KADU—representing the smaller tribes. The complex constitution written at that time established a quasi-federal system providing regional and local governments with considerable powers. A Council of Ministers holds executive power while legislative power lies in a two-chamber parliament consisting of a House of Representatives and Senate. After victory in the 1963 elections, KANU, under the leadership of Jomo Kenyatta, established the first government.

Kenya has been quite active in the international trade union movement. One of Kenya's main labor leaders is the young and energetic Tom Mboya whose visits to the United States have made him quite well known here. As someone who was born and raised in the labor movement and who has been deeply involved in union affairs, I am very aware of the crucial role which a free and vigorous labor movement can have in developing a strong and growing economy. The members and officers of the Kenyan labor movement can be proud of the great progress they have made in such a short time in building an outstanding trade union organization.

Relations between the United States and Kenya are quite good. The United States has extended technical assistance and other development aid to Kenya—particularly in the areas of agriculture, education, community development, and public administration. Also the Peace Corps has been quite active in Kenya. Each year a great number of young Kenyans come to study in the United States. In fact, except for Nigeria, Kenya sends more students to the United States than any other African country. These Kenyan students have been excellent ambassadors of good will for their country and we are proud to have them with us.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is proud to have the friendship of Kenya. I would like to extend my congratulations to the people and leaders of Kenya for their past achievements, and best wishes for further successes in their upcoming third year of independence in establishing a unified and prosperous nation which will make Kenya one of the outstanding new countries in Africa and in the world.

The article is as follows:

"HARAMBEE," SAYS KENYATTA—"LET'S ALL PULL TOGETHER"

(By Lawrence Fellows)

NAIROBI.—When Jomo Kenyatta was a boy in Ichaweri, he used to herd cattle on the pasture around Mogumo-wa-njathi, the only sacred tree left in his neighborhood. There were other trees around, but no sacred ones, for the British settlers, in clearing their newly acquired plots for cultivation had cut down all the sacred ones except Mogumo-wa-njathi. It was the only tree left around Ichaweri where the Kikuyu could make sacrifices for rain, or where communion of any sort could be had with Ngai, the Divider of the Universe.

People would come to the tree and lament: "Gikuyu harea keari kianoimaho." (The Kikuyu are no longer where they used to be.) The restless, hot-tempered little cowherder would sometimes run from the pasture in anger and shame for his tribe, and wonder how long Ngai, sitting up there on his resting place atop Mount Kenya, would put up with the intruding whites.

The land was eventually to be handed back, but not until after Jomo Kenyatta had developed a fearsome, somewhat overstated reputation as the evil-eyed leader of Mau Mau, a wenching, hard-drinking, bloodletting terrorist bent on plunging Kenya back into the abyss of primitive and debased tribalism. Sir Patrick Renison, a British Governor of Kenya in Mau Mau days, accused Jomo Kenyatta of leading his people into darkness and death.

Yet, as though some splendid Kikuyu magician had filled his horn with the secret ingredients of the love potion they call monyenye and spread it around the world—at least around the Western part of the world—Kenyatta, now President of independent Kenya, has become the image of stability and sweet reasonableness in a continent sorely in need of just those virtues.

And Kenya, as much as any place in black Africa, holds out the prospect of a stable, more prosperous future. On vast dun-colored plains and in hot valleys scoured deep in the earth's crust, primitive tribesmen still herd their tiny humpbacked cattle as they have for centuries, but more and more of their children are being lured into school. On red, eroded hillsides, smoke rises through the thatch of clustered mud-and-wattle huts, but roads now wind up to some of them. And some of the farmers are beginning to plant not just enough corn and beans to keep alive but crops to sell as well.

In Nairobi, tall hotels and modern office buildings have sprouted from an underbrush of close-packed Indian shops and tin-roofed shacks, and African policemen direct the choking traffic with cool efficiency. Gradually, Africans are taking over jobs in the banks, the shops, customs, the post office, and elsewhere. But Kenyatta is holding back the impatient tide of envious Africans wanting the jobs that white men still hold, and is thereby keeping a modicum of efficiency that other newly independent African countries might well envy.

In the cool, rolling hills of the Highlands, Africans have been settled on more than 1,000 farms that used to belong to white men. The farms were bought by the Kenya Government, with the help of loans and grants from the British Government, and in most cases broken into smaller units and resold to Africans with generous loans to get them started. On some of these farms, what used to be lawns and flower gardens are now planted with corn; what used to be smooth meadows or rich fields of grain are now reverting tragically to bush. But more often the farms are being run as well by the Africans as they ever were before.

Perhaps 500 white farmers have found buyers on the open market, but close to 1,000 remain, many of them beset by problems of thieving and drunken vandalism and by squatters inching in on the edges of the fields. There is no official pressure on the farmers to leave. Indeed, Kenyatta wants the process to be gradual, so that the inevitable temporary dislocations in food supply will not cause his people to go hungry, or seriously crimp Kenya's earnings from agricultural exports. Lesser politicians than Kenyatta are telling the squatters that the land is theirs by right, but the President is firm in his insistence that none of the farms will be had unless they are paid for.

In a basic policy statement on Kenya's brand of African socialism, Kenyatta has moralized on how public ownership is as prone to abuses as is private ownership. He has also said that nationalization does not always lead to additional resources, and that there will be no nationalization in Kenya without full compensation.

He has faced up to the political extremists in his country, and taken steps to cut off their supplies of Chinese and Russian money. He has suppressed the Lumumba Institute, a political training center established this year mainly through the efforts of Vice President Jaramogi Oginga, with help from the Soviet Union. It had a faculty of two Russians and eight Moscow-trained Africans, and a student body drawn from branches of the Kenya African National Union, the country's only political party; Kenyatta reckoned it would be only a matter of time before the party machinery was in the hands of Communists and their sympathizers.

When a team of Russian military advisers wanted to stay in Kenya longer than Kenyatta deemed appropriate, he sent them packing. When Chou En-lai resurrected his famous remark about how Africa was ripe for revolution, Kenyatta replied sharply: "Kenya intends to avert all revolutions irrespective of their origins."

He has taken his campaign against communism—and against all he thinks threatens to undermine the country—through the ranks of the politicians, to the elders of all the tribes, and to the people. Not long ago, before tens of thousands of his countrymen who had gathered in Nairobi to hear him, Kenyatta declared that there was no place for communism in Kenya, that communism represented no less a threat to the freedom of Africans than did imperialism in its heyday. "It is naive to think that there is no danger of imperialism from the East . . .," he said. "This is why we reject communism. It is, in fact, the reason why we have chosen for ourselves the policy of nonalinement and African socialism."

"It is a sad mistake to think that you can get more food, more hospitals, or schools by crying 'communism.'" Kenyatta went on. On the platform, shifting the weight of his elephantine frame from one foot to the other, waving his fly whisk lazily to emphasize a point, he seemed huge, relaxed, powerful. This was Mzee—the old man—as the people call him with all the respect that accrues to age in this part of the world. (Kenyatta himself is not sure of his age; he thinks that "about 75" is close.) His bleary, slow-moving eyes went back and forth over the audience, and the crowd hung on every word.

His target was those who have been building a following for themselves by preaching that all the things the people want will be theirs if they just hold out for communism. "There is no room here for the lazy or idle," Kenyatta said. "There is no room for those who wait for things to be given for nothing. There is no place for leaders who hope to build a nation on slogans."

He also was after those in Kenya who seek to follow more closely the examples set by Tanzania and Uganda. To Kenyatta's way of thinking, the union of Tanganyika with Zanzibar, and Tanzania's commitment to the various liberation movements she harbors, reflect a preoccupation with the old perils of imperialism and opened new lines of Chinese penetration—just as Uganda's dispute with the Congo led to the shipment of Chinese weapons into Uganda. While Tanzania and Uganda made overtures to the East, Kenyatta did his best to tighten Kenya's connections with the West. He does not see nonalignment achieved best by breaking all the old bonds.

"I must warn those in our country who seek to create confusion," he said. "It is true that we have passed through many years of Western imperialism. It is natural that we should detest Western colonialism, and associate the word 'imperialism' with the West. But if we are truly nonalined we must not avoid making friends with those Western countries which extend an honest field of cooperation and trade. To do this is just to prove that we are not free and cannot separate good from bad. It proves that we still suffer from a colonial mentality."

Kenyatta had been up that morning since 6 o'clock, pulling weeds out of a field of corn by his new house in Ichaweri. As usual, one of his aids had to get up early, too, and talk to the President about his program for that day. "I know about communism," Kenyatta said. "I've seen it, and cannot be fooled." By 8:15 his aids and his five bodyguards were ready to start the 30-mile trip they make every morning down to Nairobi, and Kenyatta was still on the subject of communism. "I know how it works," he insisted.

He had been exposed to it only marginally at first soon after he landed a job in Nairobi in 1921, as an inspector of water supplies. He was burning with ambition to do something about emancipating his people. He began promoting the idea of independent schools for the Kikuyu (he himself had attended a Church of Scotland mission school), and was brushed almost immediately into the turmoil of politics.

By 1928, Kenyatta was general secretary of the Kikuyu Central Association, and emerging as the real leader of the first nationalist movement in Kenya.

A group of Indians with Communist connections put up the money and legal help Kenyatta needed to go off to London and plead the Kikuyu case with Britain's Colonial Secretary. The Indians, with a larger community in Kenya than the British, calculated that if Kenyatta could wangle some advantages for his people, they were bound to benefit as well.

Kenyatta never got to see the Colonial Secretary, but fell in with the League Against Imperialism, a Communist group with headquarters in London. He paid a quick trip to Moscow, was given a handful of introductions to Communists whom he looked up in Berlin, and went to Hamburg to play a minor role at the Communist-sponsored International Negro Workers' Congress. After 18 months, Kenyatta's Indian backers tired of supporting him. He returned to Kenya in 1930, but only to bounce back to London again the following year.

This time he stayed away from his homeland for 15 years, presenting petitions to the Colonial Office, writing letters to the newspapers, ventilating African grievances in Trafalgar Square to anyone who would listen. In 1933 he spent 4 months in the Soviet Union absorbing a little more about the tactics of revolution, meeting new friends.

For a while, in London, he shared a flat near Charing Cross with Paul Robeson, the American singer and actor, and even appeared with him in a film version of Edgar Wallace's "Sanders of the River." Kenyatta played the part of a native chief, and before long he discovered that his African robes were good not only for film work, but for invitations to cocktail parties. It seemed just the thing for a man who had to scratch around both for jobs and for people to hear out his grievances against colonial rule.

Kenyatta lectured on the Workers' Educational Association circuit, and landed a job on the faculty of a Quaker college in Birmingham. Although he never got an undergraduate degree, he completed a graduate course in anthropology at the London School of Economics, and wrote a book, "Facing Mount Kenya," a pioneering study of the customs of his people.

When the war broke out, Kenyatta took a job as a farm laborer in Sussex, and was promptly given the nickname "Jumbo" because of his bulk. He is remembered there as a good-natured chap, given to reciting verses from Rudyard Kipling—of all people—and to reading from Shakespeare's "Othello."

Kenyatta had left two wives behind in Kenya, where polygamy is an accepted practice, and he took another while he was working in Sussex. She was Edna Grace Clark, whom he had met when they were on the same lecture circuit, and who was working then at a school in the neighborhood. She bore Kenyatta a son, but both wife and child stayed behind when Kenyatta returned to his homeland in 1946 to get back into the swim of politics. He took a fourth wife, Ngina, soon after his return.

His devotion to Ngina is almost legend. He hurries out of his office each day by 4 p.m., unless there is a real crisis to keep him longer, and he does not take his work home with him. He has no really close friends outside his family, and spends all his affection on Ngina and their four children, though he has not forsaken his other wives and keeps in close touch with them and with his other children.

During his long absence in England, Kenyatta had become established as a symbol of African nationalism. Tens of thousands of Kikuyu came to know the name of the man who was the champion of their cause and gave what money they could to keep the struggle alive. Now, upon his return, he led the demand for elected African representation in the Legislative Council. He wanted African voters on the electoral rolls. He wanted all manifestations of color discrimination abolished, and he wanted Africans back in the highland preserves of the white farmers.

But the Colonial Government was making no concessions, and while Kenyatta was talking of constitutional change, many of his followers were taking gruesome oaths to kill the white man, or terrify him into leaving the country. Inevitably, Kenyatta was singled out by the Government as the mastermind of Mau Mau, the terrorist movement that engulfed Kenya in the early 1950's. In the predawn hours of October 20, 1952, the police, thinking to surprise him in his sleep, found him fully dressed and waiting stoically to be arrested. They bundled him off by airplane to Lokitaung, a tiny, desert post in the contorted, lifeless landscape of Kenya's north.

To hear him tell of his 7 years of imprisonment at Lokitaung, they must have been the most harrowing of his life. When their frustrations piled up, he and his fellow prisoners brawled until the sun burned the energy from them. Then they would sink into apathy. Kenyatta lived in fear that he would be poisoned by the British. At night he would lie in terror, watching for scorpions or snakes, finally drifting off to sleep, as he puts it now, "hoping for the best." The worst terror, as he often recalls, was having to dig what he was told was to be his own grave.

When his sentence was completed, he was moved to Lodwar, still in the remote north, and given a little cottage and even an allowance with which to buy approved newspapers and books. From Lodwar he was eventually flown to Maralal, a mountain oasis closer to Nairobi, and then to Kiambu, which is his home district.

On August 15, 1961, when he was finally released, he was a personality towering above all others. A whole generation had grown to manhood without ever seeing Jomo Kenyatta, but they accepted him as the leader of the country, the symbol of an emerging nation. His home at Ichaweri had been razed, and turned by the British into an experimental farm, but it remained a shrine the whole time. Thousands of Kikuyu cheered his return, and brought him gifts of goats, pigs, sheep, cows, and baskets of corn. The British speeded the transfer of power to the Africans and on independence day, December 11, 1963, the man who had gone to jail before the Mau Mau committed their first white murder was able to say to a mass of cheering people: "I have snatched you out of the lion's belly."

Since then, he has striven to keep his people from falling into anyone else's clutches. He has created a one-party state to transcend tribalism, to build a national unity that would offer security and opportunity to Africans of whatever tribe, to Indians, Arabs, even to Englishmen who are prepared to identify themselves with Kenya. He wants a nation impervious to the divisions which foreigners from East or West might be tempted to exploit.

He has taken on a monumental task, for the mass of Africans in Kenya have little in common beyond poverty, ignorance, and disease—the three things Kenyatta describes as the greatest enemies of the country.

There are probably close to 9 million Africans in Kenya of diverse origin, tradition, even language. There are Bantu, like the Kikuyu, who wandered into Kenya from West and Central Africa centuries ago. But the Bantu vary from the tall, proud Baluhya near Lake Victoria to the short, introverted Nyika of the coast. The Nilotic tribesmen who came up the Nile Valley from the Sudan are spread through Kenya from Uganda to Tanzania. Hamitic tribes like the Somali have penetrated deep into the country from the rugged northern desert. The Wanderobo, unrelated to any of the others, are the hapless indigenous remnant of Kenya's forest hunters.

In all the years the British were here, their language never penetrated deeper than the houseboys and a thin veneer of officialdom. Swahili, a Bantu-based language laced with Arabic, English and half a dozen other tongues come closer to being a generally used language. Not everyone speaks Swahili, but in nearly every village there is someone who understands it.

Kenyatta is using these two languages to forge unity of a sort in his country. Now even a Kikuyu boy who lapses into his own language in a classroom is likely to get his knuckles rapped by a Kikuyu teacher.

As proud as Kenyatta is of his own tribal heritage, he feels that eventually it will have to be trampled on if the old tribal arguments are to be forgotten, and if feelings of insecurity are not going to be aroused among the country's 49,000 Europeans, or among the 183,000 Asians whose forebears came from the Indian subcontinent at the beginning of the century to help build the railway, or among the 36,000 Arabs whose ancestors had been traders and merchants along the coast for centuries. The services of these people are still needed in Kenya. For the Asians and Arabs, at least, there is really nowhere else to go.

"Where there has been racial hatred, it must be ended," Kenyatta said in a broadcast before independence. "Where there has been tribal animosity, it will be finished. Let us not dwell upon the bitterness of the past. I would rather look to the future, to the good new Kenya, not to the bad old days. If we can create this sense of national direction and identity, we shall have gone a long way toward solving our economic problems. We hold out no empty promises of achieving Utopia overnight. What we hold out to every citizen is the prospect of work, justly rewarded."

The call for hard work is a main brace in Kenyatta's domestic program. It is his answer to the whisperings of other politicians that there are still some splendid properties that could be had from the Europeans and Asians for the taking. Hard work, according to the President, is the way to keep the people out of the clutches of the young radicals. It is the way to political stability, which is prerequisite to attracting foreign investment. It is necessary medicine in a country still too full of subsistence farmers, too close in memory to the time when outsiders initiated all progress.

On his weekend tours of the country, Kenyatta makes a point of visiting village "self-help" projects for schools, clinics, roads, and the like, renewing the demand for greater effort, lecturing pointedly to the crowds on the particular sins of the neighborhood, whether drinking, cattle thieving, fighting between tribes or whatever. They come from miles around for a glimpse of Mzee, and to be caught up in his spellbinding oratory. "Harambee," he always shouts at the end of his talks. This is Kenyatta's slogan, drawn from the loggers' Swahili word for "Let's all pull together." "Harambee," the crowd invariably shouts back.

His position at home is unassailable, in spite of some setbacks. He had to call in the British last year to help him suppress a rebellious army, an act that hurt his standing in the rest of Africa. The American-Belgian rescue mission at Stanleyville last year was carried out when Kenyatta thought he still had a chance to persuade the Congolese rebels to release their hostages, and that hurt his pride. His dream of an East African political federation has slipped into oblivion.

Kenyatta's idea of nonalinement is not, as it is elsewhere in Africa, to court the East, either to make up for the old injustices of the West, or to balance a preponderance of Western influence. His idea is to keep his nose out of sensitive points in the cold war where they do not affect Kenya. Thus, he would not be likely to make quick, unsolicited pronouncements on the American involvement in Vietnam or the Dominican Republic.

Yet he does demand stronger measures from the British against Rhodesia. He offers his support to the "freedom fighters" picking at Mozambique. He may be disillusioned with the Congolese rebels, but he is still unreconciled to the use of white mercenaries by the Congolese Government, or to the help the American Government gives it. Still, taking all his problems into consideration, Jomo Kenyatta would seem to be as good a man to be holding the reins of power in Kenya as any westerner could hope to see.

Some of his Western admirers would like to see him step more firmly on what would appear to be the almost contemptuously insubordinate activities of Vice President Odinga. But their differences are more tribal and personal than ideological, in spite of the friendship Odinga professes for the Russians and Chinese, in spite of his statement that communism is "food" to him. The Vice President is first and foremost a Luo, the leader of Kenya's second biggest tribe. If Kenyatta were to step on him, he would risk bringing to life the ogre of tribalism he is working so hard to destroy. Instead, he has worked assiduously to isolate Odinga and to pull the rug from under his supporters in other tribes.

Kenyatta has not had to worry much about Parliament, which is elected only once in 5 years, and where support for him is overwhelming. Only once did Odinga make some inroads into Kenyatta's majority, when the President was asking for support for an East African Federation. As soon as Kenyatta saw the danger signs he began an enormous personal effort to win over the back benchers, and did so with amazing success.

Odinga can now hardly work up the nerve to attend Cabinet meetings, where the President leans heavily toward the ministers most suspicious of communism, and shows most demonstratively his desire to rise above tribalism. Tom Mboya, his Minister for Economic Development, is a Luo. James Gichuru, the Finance Minister, is a Kikuyu, as are Dr. Gikonyo Kiano, the Minister for Commerce, and Attorney General Charles Njonjo. Lawrence Sagini, the Minister for Local Government, is a Kisii, Dr. Njoroge Mungal, the Defense Minister, is a Kikuyu. Daniel Arap Moi, the Home Affairs Minister, is a Kipsigis.

Among them they have built what would appear to be an interest in the West in investing in Kenya, and an interest in Kenya in looking to the West for security. Since the army mutiny, Kenyatta has built up a paramilitary police force far more formidable than the army, and he feels surer of the loyalty of the police. The United States is equipping this force with its own air transport so that it will be independently mobile.

Curiously, even the reasons Kenyatta gave last year for wanting a one-party state had a ring of friendliness to the West. "We reject a blueprint of the Western model of a two-party system of government," he said, "because we do not subscribe to the notion of the government and the governed being in opposition to one another, one clamoring for duties and the other crying for rights.

"Nor are we prepared to justify our predilection for a one-party system of government by using the fragile argument that parties are the expression of social classes and that therefore there must be only one party. The theory of class struggle has no relevance to our particular situation here. In a one-party state such as we envisage, we hold that politics is a potent instrument: it is through our political institutions that we influence economic trends, and not the other way around.

"Don't be fooled," a member of his Cabinet said a while ago. "Mzee was an African nationalist in the days of Mau Mau and he still is. He does not stand in East or West, even if it seems that way. He stands in Africa with both feet, and he cares for the people of Africa as he does for his own children."

WHAT IS WRONG WITH OUR YOUTH

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, we seem to be going through an agonizing period where a great many people are going around wringing their hands and asking what is wrong with our youth—how can they participate in teach-ins, sit-ins, and demonstrations against the policies of our Government when other young men are dying to protect this country?

Well, I do not think there is anything basically wrong with our youth or that they as a collective group are basically different than the generations that preceded them. They are different in some respects. There are more of them and they are better educated, more sophisticated and faced with more problems than in any other period in history. This is the generation that grew up under the still existing shadow of possible nuclear annihilation. They grew up amidst the moral questioning of our society and its race mores. They are caught up in the ferment of efforts to gain equality and freedom and have been encouraged to participate. Old values have been displaced but have not been replaced. We encourage learning, but are we ourselves sufficiently learned to offer proper answers to the questions resulting from their wisdom? Does not our Government have a grave responsibility to answer the questions that our people, young and old, ask about its policies? Of course there are those who want no answer but this is as it has always been. Some people will never allow facts to interfere with their argument or line of thought. This, too, is their right.

I am not now discussing the professional anti-Vietnam demonstrators to whom "demonstrationship" is a way of life, a social outlet, even a financial success as in a great many demonstrations when the hat is passed for contributions. I am not discussing the hard-core Communist who would corrupt or pervert the truly inquisitive mind to purposes adverse to our Nation's interest. It is sometimes shocking to see the beatniktype, the modern-day drifter, who wanders from one teach-in to the next, or demonstration. Perhaps they could better help their cause by occasional participation in a "wash-in" or a "bath-in." But they wear their filth as the uniform of their nonvocation. And they certainly have a right not to wash, not to shave or have their hair cut and put even the strongest deodorant beyond its maximum tolerance. Perhaps this is why they remain intent on togetherness. It is a little like couples eating garlic together.

My own personal view is that these so-called peace demonstrations serve the opposite purpose. Nothing can prolong the war and delay peace more than the Communists believing we are about to reward their aggression. President Johnson has continually indicated our desire for peace but it takes two to "twist" or negotiate.

So far the Communists are unwilling to negotiate but have twisted the purpose of peace demonstrations. Can these demonstrators, no matter how sincere, really believe that the credibility of the U.S. commitment to defend freedom can be abandoned?

I am convinced that there are Communists who use these demonstrations to bolster the fading morale of the Communist aggressors in Vietnam. I am certain that they incorrectly convey signals to Hanoi and Peiping that insure a prolongation of the war and the killing in Vietnam. The coordination of last week's demonstrations in different parts of this country and in Peiping and Hanoi goes beyond the point of coincidence. I have checked and I am convinced that our Department of Justice and the FBI know who the troublemakers are and are exercising an admirable caution and prudence in their assessment of the situation.

Perhaps it is unfortunate that less attention was paid to the fact that 280,000 young men volunteered for military service this year. In September alone over 50,000 volunteered for service, all with the certain knowledge that we have a war in Vietnam which might require the sacrifice of their life. Can they really be different than earlier generations of Americans? Can their patriotism be questioned?

A great deal more attention was given to the fact that countrywide demonstrations took place by students protesting our policies in Vietnam. According to the most reliable news sources, the maximum number that participated was 25,000. Assuming that most of these are legitimate students, which I do not accept as a valid assumption, this represents one-half of 1 percent of America's 4,987,000 college and university students. To my mind this does not indicate any "large percentage" or "near majority" that the Communist press reported in Hanoi and Peiping.

In fact, it dramatically points up that the overwhelming number of American students are a very conscientious and responsible segment of our society. To label them otherwise because a few seriously and soberly question our Government policies both here and abroad is doing them and this country a great disservice. To condemn any college student because he questions or inquires is counter to his own and his Nation's best interest. He has a right to question and he has a right to be provided with answers if he is being called upon to accept his responsibility as a citizen.

Even so, almost every day we read about some incident involving college student reactions against our Government's policies, against the restraints traditionally imposed by college administrations on student behavior, or against the moral and even legal foundations of our society. To be sure, there is much on the plus side to be thankful for: in our colleges and universities we are educating more and better prepared students than ever before; reports from the colleges indicate that our students work harder and take their studies more seriously than has traditionally been the case; our students are very active in support of the two major political parties; they have contributed much to the civil rights movement and have contributed much to the success of the Peace Corps. So, I am not ready to condemn the present generation of college students or young people who are out of the student category. But, serious and disturbing questions remain in my mind as to a segment of this generation and its rebellion against authority at all levels.

While my basic concern is with the frame of mind and behavior of some college students, perhaps a very small minority, I cannot hide my shock at the seemingly cavalier fashion in which college administrators have been exposed and have bowed to student pressures demanding ever more and more freedom, extending, to my mind, dangerously close to the area of license. The colleges seem to be redefining the tenets of academic freedom under pressure in ways that smack more of irresponsibility than of rational accommodation to new ideas. And what of the conduct of such professors who advocate victory for those killing American soldiers? Have the colleges no responsibility for taking steps to curb the purposeful indoctrination of their students by those who would subvert our laws and the policies required for meeting our responsibilities as a world leader and for protecting our security?

These questions trouble me deeply. I am disturbed to have to raise them because I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, that they involve vital issues of academic freedom. I believe in academic freedom for its own sake and because its existence and maintenance are closely related to the preservation of individual freedom in our society. We will be in a sad state, indeed, if we should move to constrain academic freedom so that the scope of free-ranging inquiry in our schools is reduced or its exercise weakened. So, I find myself in an unhappy quandary.

I have been asking myself whether there are limits in principle to academic freedom and if so, what those limits are. I do not here refer to the problem of faculty or student incompetence, or evident lack of integrity. No one would seriously attempt to protect these with the mantle of academic freedom. The real and difficult issue here relates on the one hand to student behavior and organization for illegal or antisocial purposes, and on the other hand to the just degree of protection that should be extended to faculty members who use their positions to indoctrinate students against their Government and/or aid and abet them in illegal and antisocial activities.

I am struck by the fact that these questions seem to arise every generation or so. It seems that as our society progresses and changes, the content and limits of academic freedom need reexamination. In all too many cases this reassessment is carried out via a hot-blooded battle between extremists in which the calm judicious voice of moderation is too faint to be heard. Perhaps this is inevitable, but I don't accept this conclusion. I believe that America is entering the stage of reexamination of academic freedom and I feel strongly that by acting responsibly to analyze the issues before the storm breaks, we can conduct the discussion on a more useful basis than typically.

Before going further, let me say that in all probability what is really going on in our colleges is largely unknown to us. How large a proportion of our college students could be properly classed as radical, as antagonistic to our Government and its policies, as irreligious, as given to license in the moral sphere? The newspapers give us instances of such behavior and attitude each day, but we must remember that our college population totals millions. To what extent are student riots and other extremes of student behavior a reaction to overly hasty and disproportionate actions and responses by college administration to the behavior of a handful of students?

What do we really know about our present college generation in an objective way? Not much, I'm afraid. Are we producing more atheists than in the past?

I found when I visited Moscow University that Communist students were having different problems. The cultivation of the inquisitive mind of Russian students required to solve the problems of space triggered other questions. They found you can't educate half the brain. They found the other half asking about God and his relationship to man and asking the age-old questions that students have always asked. So pure socialism has problems of a different kind. Student questioning is a plus for mankind not a minus. It is a sign of hope where many thought there was no hope in the perfect Communist plan.

Is sexual promiscuity more prevalent than in the past? As we begin to provide the great mass of American youth with opportunities for higher education, are we improving the quality of education or worsening it and to what extent? What is happening to the average background level and capabilities of our undergraduates? Can we trust the average student of today to be as competent to resist indoctrination as the student of former years?

Can it be said, in other words, that today's college student is more or less trustworthy in the free wheeling atmosphere of our colleges than in the past? I am far from satisfied that we even begin to know the answers to such questions as these, yet much depends on them. If my generation has done such a poor job of bringing up our children that we cannot permit them to be educated under the terms of freedom we ourselves enjoyed, I think we ought to know this. We ought to know in what ways we failed and the reasons for this. On the other hand, it may well be that when all the facts are in, we will learn that this generation is after all a chip off the old block—no more or less rebellious and seeking for ephemeral causes to take up spleen than mine was.

What I am really trying to say is that it takes more than a few swallows to make a spring. If the extremist professors, whom we have always had, are no more prevalent in the academic world than in the past, I am not about to take their puling inanities seriously. If our students are as grownup as in the past, I am not afraid that these essentially silly men can make a real dent in their basic patriotism.

We must, after all, distinguish between the fads of the moment that have swept college campuses from time immemorial only to disappear as we begin to get alarmed about them, and more basic movements and reactions which bite deep and lastingly into the thinking and consciousness of a generation. Are these things which so disturb us of only passing moment, or is there reason to believe that they reflect a lasting malaise in at least a significant part of our undergraduate population?

Mr. Speaker, I have been raising a large number of questions which I believe to be very important. I know that my constituents and most citizens of my State think these are important. I believe they are bothering most Americans. If the answers to these questions indicate there is fire under the smoke we find in the newspapers, I believe the American people must be told of this in detail. On the other hand, if there is no more than the traditional degree of flame we all are concerned but woefully ignorant of the facts.

Instantaneous communications makes instant celebrities, for better or for worse. Thus an unrecognized, unexalted, and most times unenlightened college instructor can become known to more people instantly than existed in Aristotle's world. Of course he just as quickly passes from the scene but to his little group he has achieved a fame or notoriety that is compensation for his essentially ridiculous posture, assuming he was not intentionally serving the adversaries of his Nation.

I suggest that a great contribution could be made by taking steps designed to bring a searchlight to bear on the behavior and attitudes of our present college generation and on the vital dimensions of thinking, expression, and behavior in the American college community. I believe that a broadly representative group of our most distinguished and responsible minds from the academic world, from Government, from the professions, from the business community, and the labor movement should be drawn together with student council groups and assume the task of giving the Nation a detailed and judicious report, assessment, and set of recommendations on these matters.

Such a report would provide us all with the basis for a meaningful evaluation of our policies connected with the education of our youth. It would give us a far better basis for discussions of academic freedom, its virtues and drawbacks, its proper limits and conditions than is or will be available to us without such a study. Let us not take the risk of falling into the trap of confusing smoke and fire, of mistaking a handful of well publicized malcontents for a Trojan horse. Equally, let us not be guilty of letting our ignorance blind us to a real danger to our children and institutions if it in truth exists.

These issues are serious; our ignorance about their dimensions is profound, yet they are of concern to all Americans. I respectfully urge that they be studied by a group of Americans in whose judgment and probity we all may have confidence. I suggest that such a study be made by one of the Nation's great private foundations, or by a combination of several foundations, because I believe that in this fashion the study would be carried out free of invitation to a witch hunt in a meaningful, judicious manner free of the emotion of the moment. Once its report is available, the Congress may well want to study its findings and recommendations.

Perhaps we will find after all that the young American of today is not a cause of worry or misgiving. I think we will find that a source of pride and the greatest asset we possess is the American student with his inquisitive mind ready to meet the complex world that he shall inherit. And perhaps we will find he is better equipped to search the seventies for the way to peace and a more meaningful life for all than were his predecessors.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, on October 19 a "gathering" of members of the Committee on Banking and Currency took place in the committee room. Although I am a member of that committee, I was not invited to this get-together. After I was advised that an exchange of views was taking place in the committee room, I went over and noticed that a majority of the committee was not present. Thinking that we might by then be having a true committee meeting, I made the point of order that a quorum was not present, only to be advised by the chair that no official meeting was in progress. At this point I retired from the committee room.

What may best be termed "comments" on the bank merger hearings were subsequently filed on October 19 as a purported committee report. In order that there be no misunderstanding, and that these "comments" not be construed to represent the intention or feelings of the committee, I should like to make the following observations:

First. Procedures earlier adopted by the committee permitted amendments to the subcommittee bill, with 5 minutes debate. Discussion in the full committee had not proceeded beyond consideration of the amendments offered by the first individual to be recognized for this purpose, and had not reached the point of discussion of retroactive immunity to banks now in litigation.

Second. Sections of the subcommittee bill had not yet even been discussed. Intense issues were certain to be raised if the regular procedures adopted by the committee would have followed; these were not brought up, and differing points of view on them were not debated.

Third. Although it was felt by some members of the committee that there was urgency in securing passage of the legislation in order to provide retroactive relief to banks already held to be in violation of the antitrust laws—since they are facing imminent divestiture orders in the courts—and although this sense of urgency held by some members was apparent to all members of the committee, a quorum did not appear for our scheduled meeting on Monday at 10:30 a.m., when the bill was to have been duly considered. The absence of a quorum on Monday sustains the impression that the feeling of urgency in the matter was not held by a majority of the committee.

The absence of a quorum on October 18 further sustains the belief that there is an increasing realization on the part of committee members that the interrelated matters of bank mergers, supervision of our banking system, and the proper application of our antitrust laws, has become so complex that further hearings and deliberations are called for. Certainly the numbers of substantive changes in earlier proposals, which have been made within the last 2 weeks, leads to the conclusion that the opinions of many members of the committee are shifting, and that no prediction of the committee's recommendations can be offered. It should be recalled, in this connection, that the 1960 Bank Merger Act was the result of 5 years of effort, that it obviously was not written as clearly as it might have been, and that undue haste in the drafting and definition of a new law, if one is found desirable, can only lead to further confusion.

Fourth. The "comments" of the "gathering" order to be printed on October 19 may convey the impression that the committee views are actually expressed therein. It has been my observation that under normal committee procedure an opportunity is granted to individuals who disagree with the majority of the committee to express their points of difference in the same report. No such opportunity was granted to me by the members of the gathering.

Fifth. The "commentary" does make, for example, a serious misstatement of fact when, on page 5, it states that the committee has "considered carefully" the cases of the banks in litigation under our antitrust laws. The committee has not yet reached the part of the subcommittee bill dealing with this litigation, and it has not yet considered it. The committee has not yet had called to its attention the statements of the banks, that they were willing to assume the risks of divestiture if the antitrust case went against them, and has not yet learned that the Comptroller of the Currency has stated that divestiture was an adequate remedy to an antitrust violation. The committee has not considered the implications for our system of law of a bill which would grant retroactive relief in a civil case to corporations who took a certain course of action, knowing well that they took a risk, and who now ask Congress to relieve them of their risk.

The committee did not consider whether "equal justice under law" allows banks to get private relief and not face the penalty of divestiture which they had accepted while pleading that they be allowed to merge, now that the decisions of the courts have gone against them.

I have heard suggestions that the comments which the gathering had printed will be used to argue that due process of law should be delayed as far as current litigation is concerned. Such a proposal that litigation be suspended was not accepted in a legal Committee meeting. To even suggest that the commentary could be an excuse for delay in court proceedings would imply, to me, a contempt for both the judicial and legislative process. This is even more evident if one takes into consideration that a quorum was not present at our last regular meeting, although members were aware of the implications of an absence of a quorum on passage of this legislation at this session, and particularly upon the litigation now in process.

I make this statement, Mr. Speaker, so that I will not be identified in any way with the "gathering" or the "comments" in the nature of an alleged report which were produced by it.

TOWARD THE GREAT SOCIETY—WATER RESOURCES

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, although three-fourths of the earth's surface is covered by water, most of it has become unfit for human consumption, industrial use, or recreational areas. Indeed, fish and wildlife resources are being threatened by the absence of pure water.

In our own country, the pollution of our Nation's water resources is increasing at an alarming rate and without significant steps to abate this pollution, we would have a national wasteland. Every major river system is now polluted as are most of our lakes.

At the same time, our demand for clean water is growing so rapidly that water from running streams and storage wells will have to be reused six to eight times in the near future. In the last couple of decades the problem of water pollution has reached the critical stage. Billions of gallons of waste are discharged daily into our Nation's streams and rivers. Pollution from bacteriological, chemical, physical and biological sources are steadily defiling our waters.

More than two decades ago, the more perceptive of our citizens foresaw the problem and urged action. Their cries went unheeded. Meanwhile, our cities, our paper mills, our poultry and livestock processing plants, our petrochemical and other industries poured out untreated liquids into our streams at an unbelievable rate. We changed from the use of soaps in our kitchens to detergents—substances that do not break down in the treatment process—so that our rivers at times look like gigantic glasses of beer, with heads of foam serenely floating downstream.

Aware of the critical nature of this problem and the gravity of its proportions, the 89th Congress took positive action to renew and conserve the streams and rivers of America. In quick succession it passed:

The Water Resources Planning Act, to provide for the maximum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and water-related resources, through the establishment of a Water Resources Council and River Basin Commission, and to provide financial aid to the States in order to increase State participation in such water resource planning. Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House unanimously.

The Federal saline water conversion program, to expand, extend, and speed up the saline water salvage program conducted by the Department of the Interior.

The Federal Installations, Facilities, and Equipment Pollution Control Act, to require our Federal activities to be subject to the same antipollution regulations as the public at large.

The Water Quality Act of 1965, to provide for water quality standards in interstate streams, increase Federal aid for construction of sewage treatment plants, and to create a Water Pollution Control Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Rural Water and Sanitation Facilities Act of 1965, to help provide water supply and waste disposal systems in rural communities.

The Northeastern United States water supply program, which is title I of the omnibus public works-rivers and harbors bill. This section of the bill will provide for a system of reservoirs and conveyance facilities in the Northeastern part of this Nation, where the water shortage has become so severe that the possibility of having no water at all in some cities could become a reality.

All of this adds up to a major concern over our future. The first session of the 89th Congress has acted wisely and promptly by initiating these programs directed toward insuring an adequate supply of pure, clean water for future generations of Americans.

TOWARD THE GREAT SOCIETY—HOUSING ACT

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, since 1937, the Federal Government has accepted an economic and social responsibility in the field of housing. Accounting for 5 percent of our gross national product, the residential construction industry is a vital element in achieving a high employment rate and healthy economy.

Under Democratic leadership in recent years, the Federal Government has placed more emphasis on the social aspects of providing good housing for all in desirable surroundings. Great concern has been shown in the interrelated problems of rising population, crime, increased congestion, suburban growth, and decaying central cities.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, passed during this 1st session of the 89th Congress, continued the progress in this field. The 1965 act also authorizes a new program of rent subsidies for families in low-income categories, but whose incomes do not allow for decent housing since the incomes are above the maximum for public housing.

The act provides a 4-year extension of the very popular and beneficial mortgage-insurance programs of the FHA, the college housing loan program, urban renewal, and urban planning assistance programs, the farm housing program, public housing on an enlarged basis, the new rehabilitation loans program authorized in 1964, and the programs for public works planning, open spaces, and the mortgage-purchase operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

It establishes matching grants for local public bodies to help finance basic water and sewage treatment facilities, and enlargement or modernization of those facilities.

Another new program is authorization for the FHA to insure mortgage loans for developing residential neighborhoods adequately served by schools and other needed community facilities.

Federal assistance is provided by the act for acquisition of parks and playgrounds, and for beautification of such areas. Mr. Speaker, this ties in with the President's highway beautification program, to help enhance appearance of the community.

For our young veterans, who have not had the benefits of the VA mortgage insurance program, the FHA will help them in purchasing or building their homes through a liberalized FHA mortgage insurance program.

Another new program in the act is for grants of up to $1,500 to very low-income homeowners in urban renewal areas to enable them to repair and rehabilitate their homes to bring them up to local building and health code standards.

Mr. Speaker, the pressures on our urban areas are great. In the next 15 years, we can expect urban area population to increase by 30 million—equal to the present population of New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit and Baltimore.

By 1970, this Nation will need more than 2 million new homes a year.

This legislation is a landmark bill ranking in scope with the great housing acts of 1949, 1955, and 1961. It represents another great step forward toward the goal set by the Congress in the 1949 act—a decent home and a suitable environment for every American family.

It was truly a committee bill and truly a bipartisan bill, based on the President's message to the Congress on the cities. The new housing act will serve as a most useful series of guideposts for the new Department of Housing and Urban Development.

A BILL WITH REFERENCE TO BANK MERGERS

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on October 20, 1965, I introduced a bill, H.R. 11697, to change the criteria to be considered with reference to proposed bank mergers. If enacted it will eliminate some of the existing differences of opinion about which bank mergers are good and which should be prohibited.

This bill is the amendment that I offered to S. 1698 in the Committee on Banking and Currency. My amendment will be the pending business when S. 1698 is again taken up by the committee. I have introduced H.R. 11697 so that everyone who has an interest in this problem can have it readily available for study and comment.

NATIONAL BANKS AND INTEREST RATES IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in 1963 the Texas Legislature passed a law permitting small loan companies and consumer finance companies to charge rates of interest higher than the 10 percent rate allowed under State law. Previously, the 10 percent rate of interest had been uniform and an inviolate rule. For many years bills to permit an exception to this law for the benefit of the small loan companies had been introduced and pushed in the State legislature. Some people referred to them as "loan shark" bills. When I was a member of the State legislature from 1957 to 1961, many such bills were introduced. I fought against raising the rates of interest then as I would today. Unfortunately, the vested interests were able to prevail 2 years ago, in 1963. Since that time, the fears that had been expressed by myself and others who opposed raising the interest rates have come to pass as the rates have soared to as high as 320 percent on certain small loans.

What was not foreseen was the fact that the Federal Government would permit these appallingly high rates of interest to be charged by the national banks. This, it now appears, is the case.

As further background for those who wish to understand this situation in Texas, it should be pointed out that last spring, in its regular session, the Texas Legislature again carved a gaping hole in the Texas law on interest rates. This time it passed a bill to permit the State banks to charge higher interest rates. I, along with several others, led the fight against this bill becoming law and turning Texas into the "loan shark" State. I personally asked the Governor to veto the bill. The Governor wisely vetoed the bill.

But now the Federal Government has done by administrative fiat what the State banks and the State legislature could not do through the legislative process. The U.S. Comptroller of the Currency has ruled that national banks in Texas "may lawfully charge the highest rate permitted to any competitor, including a lender licensed under the Texas Regulatory Loan Act." This is the act passed in 1963 and known by some as the Loan Shark Act. Apparently, the Federal Government has decided to go into the loan shark business.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been of the opinion that the Federal Government would set the standards for others to follow, in the activities in which it engages, and that these standards would be models of fairness and equality. In the fields of labor relations, civil rights, commerce and many other fields, the Federal Government has set minimum standards to insure just and decent treatment for the American citizen. The Federal Government has always sought to uplift the people, to set goals for others to follow, to improve the condition of the workingman, to get a better deal for the consumer, to protect the public from the gouging and unfair practices which sometimes prevail. On this issue, however, the Federal Government follows; it does not lead. It is apparently the policy of the Federal Government that the banks to which it issues national charters may seek out the highest and worst interest rates charged by any lender—small loan company, consumer finance company, individual loan shark, or what have you—and the national bank may then descend to that level.

I am told that the Comptroller of the Currency is merely construing title 12, section 85 of the United States Code. This section provides, in part:

> Any association may take, receive, reserve, and charge on any loan or discount made * * * interest at the rate allowed by the laws of the State.

I am also told that this rule has been applied for several years in other States. This may be true. But it does not make it right.

The existence of the rule the Comptroller of the Currency is following in this instance does not justify it. It is a bad rule. If it is correctly based on the law, then the law ought to be changed. The Federal Government should not permit itself to be used and dragged down to the lowest level of lending activity in each of the States.

In my judgment, a uniform rate of interest for national banks is long overdue. We have uniform wage and hour legislation, uniform food and drug legislation, and uniform standards in many other areas of Federal activity. Why, then, should not the national banks be required to adhere to a uniform standard of maximum interest rates charged to the consuming public?

With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the Record the article on this subject from the October 15 issue of the Texas Observer. The author of the article and editor of the Texas Observer, Ronnie Dugger, is one of the dedicated breed of journalists in the truest tradition of American journalism.

Comptroller Saxon So Rules—U.S. Banks in Texas To Get Small Lenders' Same Interest

Austin.—A startling ruling by the U.S. Comptroller of the Currency that national banks in Texas "may lawfully charge the highest rate permitted to any competitor" opens up the possibility, perhaps the probability, that the "small lender" rates up to 320 percent that the Texas legislature has authorized on small loans and the higher-than-banks' rates provided for consumer finance companies may now be charged by the banks also.

On August 13, the Observer can report, Jack Adams, first vice president of the Austin National Bank, wrote James J. Saxon, the Comptroller, saying that until 1960 the maximum interest rates in Texas was 10 percent, and that while in 1963 the legislature passed a law legalizing higher charges on loans of $1,500 or less (including very small loans), banks were excluded from the law. Texas also permits credit unions to charge 1 percent a month on the unpaid balance of loans, Adams said.

Adams called attention to a paragraph in the Comptroller's Manual for National Banks that says, "A national bank may charge interest at the maximum rate permitted by applicable State law to any competing State lending institution." Adams asked Saxon to "confirm to us * * * our understanding" that "a national bank in Texas can make loans of $1,500 or less at the same rates of interest as are authorized by the Texas Regulatory Loan Act" of 1963 and for credit unions.

Saxon, on September 26, 1965, wrote to Adams that national banks making loans "do so exclusively under the authority of Federal legislation. Therefore * * * a national bank may charge interest at the maximum rate permitted by applicable law to any State institution.

"A national bank in Texas may lawfully charge the highest rate permitted to any competitor, including a lender licensed under the Texas Regulatory Loan Act, even though the national bank is not similarly licensed. Any provision in such act which purports to exclude a national bank from its rights under Federal law is inoperative and ineffective," Saxon ruled in his letter to Adams.

Sam Kimberlin, executive vice president and chief Austin lobbyist of the Texas Bankers' Association, wrote to his association's member banks sending them copies of Adams' and Saxon's letters and observing:

"This very important administrative ruling by the Comptroller of the Currency affects current operations of national banks in Texas. Your TBA office is studying its effect, if any, on State bank operations, but certainly it will ultimately be of benefit to State banks also."

As the Observer went to press this issue, these events and their apparently sweeping import for interest rates in Texas banking had not received attention in the Texas press.

In Dallas late last month, the Dallas News reported, Leonard Passmore, secretary of the T.B.A., said that national banks may charge the higher interest rates set for finance companies, and that if allowed to continue, the resulting disparity between legal rates for National and State banks "would be ruinous to our dual banking system." The News said Passmore made these remarks to the T.B.A. installment credit section at the Statler Hilton Hotel.

However, apparently the News reporter misunderstood Passmore, for the story said that, "In effect, Mr. Saxon stated that the Small Loan Regulatory Act passed by the Texas Legislature 2 years ago does not apply to national banks." The Saxon ruling, a copy of which the Observer has in hand, says just the opposite—that this 1963 act does apply, as to its interest rates, to national banks in Texas.

Otherwise, the Observer's staff have found no notice of these events in the Texas press.

Gov. John Connally, having vetoed the 1956 legislature's bill to give banks higher interest rates, asked the State finance commission to study and report to him on interest rates before the 1967 legislature.

The News quoted the substance of Saxon's letter to Adams, but the earlier inconsistency in the story cast doubt on its plain meaning. The News story (which appeared September 28) quoted Passmore as saying, "I am neither elated nor depressed by reason of the [Saxon] decision, but it is of supreme importance to the study of the finance commission which now is underway. I feel confident * * * that the legislature will correct the disparity that now exists."

Thus, 2 days after Saxon made his ruling, the Texas Bankers' Association spokesman was calling on the 1967 legislature to pass a law to extend the 1963 law's interest rates for consumer finance and small loan companies to State as well as National banks.

UNPRECEDENTED ATTEMPT TO INFLUENCE JUDICIARY IN BANK MERGER CASES

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn today that six ranking Members of the other body had sent a letter to the Attorney General asking that the normal business of the courts of the United States be interrupted because of the consideration of a bill before the Congress of the United States. This is an unprecedented attempt to put pressure on the chief law enforcement officer of the Nation to have the wheels of justice slowed long enough for certain banking interests to receive the benefit of special interest legislation forgiving them for violations of Federal law.

I am putting in the Record at this point a copy of my letter to Attorney General Katzenbach concerning the letter sent by Senators Mansfield, Dirksen, Eastland, Robertson, and Bennett. I am also including a copy of the Senators' letter to the Attorney General.

House of Representatives,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
Washington, D.C., October 22, 1965.

Hon. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach,
Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Katzenbach: I have been informed of the fact that today you have received a letter signed by Senators Mansfield, Dirksen, Eastland, Robertson, and Bennett. This letter is an obvious outright, blatant attempt to pressure both the judicial and executive branches of Government. It is my understanding that this letter directs you as Attorney General to abandon your constitutional duties in enforcing the laws of the United States.

The thrust of this letter obviously is to forgive previously adjudicated antitrust violations committed by a number of large banks. The pressures that have been brought to bear on your office and the Congress by Manufacturers Hanover and other banks having special interests in this matter represents the most flagrant violation of due process that I have witnessed in my 37 years in Congress.

The very suggestion that you as the chief law enforcement officer of the U.S. Government ask the courts to bow to unwarranted political pressures repudiates the very principles that govern our country, including the fundamental principles of separation of powers and the independence and integrity of the judiciary.

To accede to these demands made by Members of the Senate who have asked you in their individual capacities to present their views on this matter to the several courts would be tantamount to abdicating on the part of the chief legal officer of this Nation his responsibility to represent the Nation as a whole. It would also have a generally unwholesome effect on respect for law and order among the general public and would amount to an official seal of approval on improper lobbying by parties directly interested in the outcome of these cases.

Also, it should be pointed out that the Senators signing the letter of October 22 have been misinformed and inadvertently have therefore furnished you erroneous information. Contrary to the statement in their letter, no legislation on bank mergers of any nature has been passed by the House Banking and Currency Committee. Furthermore, there can be no assurances that the House of Representatives will act with the degree of haste indicated in the Senators' letters and as desired by Manufacturers Hanover and other banks who have vested interests in this matter. In fact a number of members of the House Banking and Currency Committee are insisting upon additional hearings on this issue.

It should also be pointed out that there were no hearings on the bank merger bill (S. 1698) as passed the Senate nor was there any substantive discussion on this bill either. I am assured by several Members of the Senate that if and when a bank merger bill passes the House of Representatives and goes to the Senate for their consideration that a real fight will take place on this matter. There are many Senators who feel that this matter was inadequately considered on the Senate side and they wish to explore such legislation that would remove the effectiveness of the antitrust laws from the banking industry in detail.

I draw your attention to the fact that it was 2 years after the Philadelphia decision and 4 years after the Manufacturers Hanover case was originally brought that it was decided by this fourth largest bank in the country that they would run to the Congress for forgiveness from antitrust prosecution. Manufacturers Hanover did not even exhaust its legal remedies in this matter—rather they ran to the Congress for special relief.

Finally, I draw your attention to page 27445 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 19, pages 27731 and 27732 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 20, and pages 27838 and 27839 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 21, 1965, wherein you will note a complete refutation of the position taken by all of the Republican members of the House Banking and Currency Committee and a handful of Democrats that a bank merger bill and report was passed by the House Banking and Currency Committee. It is inconceivable that either the Rules Committee or the House leadership will consider this outrageous action by a minority of the Banking and Currency Committee as being a lawful and proper report of a House bill from the Banking and Currency Committee. Therefore, at this point the Banking and Currency Committee still has before it S. 1698 and related bills for consideration in the next session of Congress.

Sincerely yours,
WRIGHT PATMAN, *Chairman.*

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
October 22, 1965.

Hon. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: It had been our earnest hope and expectation that by the conclusion of the first session of this Congress action would have been completed on a measure clarifying the existing confusion with regard to bank mergers. Such a bill, S. 1698, passed the Senate without dissent last June, and a somewhat different but equally effective measure was reported by the House Banking and Currency Commitee just this week—but not in time for final floor action by the House and Senate.

It is our expectation that we will have enacted such a measure in the early days of the forthcoming session of Congress. This being so, we are deeply concerned that during this interim period, action might be taken with regard to several of the bank mergers now challenged by your Department which might prejudice the application of the new law. As you know, two such merger cases are now in the final stages of settlement by divestiture, and the four others are in various pretrial or trial stages. All of these cases will be basically affected by new legislation which, as we have noted, we expect to be enacted shortly. For example, the bill passed by the Senate would terminate all six pending cases; all versions of the bill considered by the House Banking and Currency Committee would terminate three mergers consummated before the decision of the Supreme Court in the Philadelphia case; and the bill reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee would also provide new standards to be applied in the cases involving the three mergers consummated after the Philadelphia decision.

We take this occasion to express our concern lest what seems clearly to be the sense of Congress in the area of bank mergers be frustrated by action taken in any of the six pending cases.

Accordingly, we urge that you refrain from any further steps in these cases, particularly the two which are now in the final stages of divestiture, until the Congress has had an opportunity during the coming session to conclude its consideration of the pending bank merger legislation.

In addition, in view of the fact that these cases are pending in the judicial branch, we request that on our behalf you respectfully bring our views to the attention of the several courts having jurisdiction over these six pending cases.

Respectfully submitted,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate.
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN
Minority Leader,
U.S. Senate.
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman,
Committee on the Judiciary.
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman,
Committee on Banking and Currency.
WALLACE F. BENNETT.

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 24—UNITED NATIONS DAY

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is about to complete a long and fruitful session. The atmosphere is filled with the packing of bags and saying of goodbyes. But, before we leave this historic Chamber, I would like to take a moment to reflect on the significance of a special day, this Sunday, October 24, which is United Nations Day.

As we all know, the United Nations has had a 20-year history marked by some noteworthy successes and some rather dismal failures. We know the names of both. The India-Pakistan dispute, Cyprus, Korea, the Congo, and of course, Vietnam. It has been characterized by trust and derision. By both hope and fear. The hope is embodied in its great potential for peace and the fear is that of the terrible gnawing of total stalemate which could cause it to watch impotently while the world burns to a crisp in a nuclear holocaust.

We live today in a vastly changing society, one which sees everything in a constant state of flux. Today, every man, no matter where he may live—in the isolated hamlet in the deepest reaches of darkest Africa, or along a noisy, rushing Manhattan street—is only hours and minutes away from each other. And who really knows what tomorrow may bring? Only seconds away. Neighbors in a crowded space-age neighborhood.

Today, in virtually every conceivable field of human endeavor, man surges ahead. It has been predicted that within the relatively short span of 30 years—one generation—we will see 5,000-mile-an-hour commercial aircraft, freight shot across the continent by missile, electronically controlled highways and underground transportation system shrinking the world of Marco Polo to Lilliputian dimensions. Into one great, big overgrown backyard.

Man can conquer space, overcome cancer and other diseases and provide enough food and shelter for all of the world's population before the end of the 20th century, a leading scientist has recently pointed out. But, he also is capable of the "complete destruction of civilization," he added. He noted that "the conquest of space will be easier than the banishment of war."

As an illustration, look at the phenomenal progress we have made in only one field, medicine. Cancer survival rates have improved from the 1937 rate of 1 in 7 to today's 1 in 3. Early diagnosis, better surgical and radioactive techniques and more than a dozen new therapeutic agents are responsible. Seven out of ten prescriptions today are for drugs not even known in 1950; over 300,000 babies born last year are alive today as a result of the great advances in medical care of the last 45 years; today's babies will live at least 10 years longer than their 30-year-old parents, and be productive longer; more than 4.5 million Americans, living today, would be dead if the U.S. death rate had remained at the 1935 level.

Additionally, in only the short time of 10 years—by 1975—the average American family will be earning $9,525 a year; the average wage earner will be working 37 hours a week, and the chances are good that half of us will be under 26 years of age.

Yes, we are making great progress. But, in one particular field, we are barely above the level of the stone age. The field of living together—in peace and mutual respect—as free human beings and responsible nations.

Today, the world's peoples are becoming increasingly more interdependent and less self-sufficient. The bare facts of life tell us we cannot afford to hide behind "fortress America" or be isolationists ever again.

I believe the late Adlai Stevenson summed up what I am attempting to say rather well when he cautioned:

> Most of us recognize that a real withdrawal from the affairs of the world is impossible. We killed isolationism at Los Alamos, for ourselves, and for everybody else. Our planetary society is now one, even if only in the unity of potential destruction. We cannot get off and float outside this particular spaceship. We and the human race are going to survive—or not—together.

Today, it is more important than ever before that nations talk over their differences. For today, as imperfect an organization as it may be, the United Nations, nevertheless, stands as a useful forum for discussion and reason among nations, for the airing of tensions and age-old hatreds and misunderstandings so that peaceful settlements may be order of the day rather than the disastrous terror and human misery of resort to the habits of the stone age.

And what is the alternative to this? To peaceful settlements and a policy of remaining strong on the one hand, while maintaining a powerful and ready retalitory force on the other? To pursuing peace, while ready to defend it at the same time?

Nuclear holocaust. That is the alternative. The American battle deaths of World War I totaled 53,000. In World War II, 291,000 died. By comparison, a full-scale nuclear exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union today, lasting less than an hour, could kill almost 100 million Americans and over

100 million Russians. This nuclear toll of Americans alone would be equal to 300 World War II's.

Today, the military might of the United States is terrifyingly overwhelming. Our forces are so large as to be able to survive a sneak nuclear attack on this country, and survive with such sufficient force to literally blow the society of the attacker off the face of the map. Our adversaries know this full well. And we are confident in our awareness of this, too.

General Curtis Lemay put his finger right on the heart of the matter when he said:

> No one actually wins a modern war.

We must learn to live together in our constantly shrinking little terrestrial ball. Ready and alert, we are willing to negotiate in Vietnam. And I am happy to say we are also anxious and willing to pursue peace in the councils of the United Nations. For, as imperfect as it may be, it is also our only hope for a world body with the majority of responsible nations sitting in it, and where the weight of world opinion watches as a silent, but ever-present and ever-important ingredient.

Mr. Speaker, I am far from being a one-worlder. But, I believe I am an optimist. The world today is not yet ready for an effective, strong world government, but we continue to need the services and the forum presented by the United Nations. Perhaps, someday man will have learned enough in the ways of living together to want to live under one. While today, the world is far from a perfect place in which to live, I sincerely believe it is a far better place in which to live because of the presence of the United Nations.

I believe Americans, in all walks of life, should reflect, even for a moment, this Sunday, October 24, United Nations Day. Reflect on what kind of world we live in now. And, whether we are willing to acknowledge it or not, what kind of place it might have been or would be today without this imperfect, yet hopefully struggling world body.

As the late beloved President John F. Kennedy pointed out:

> We seek a relaxation of tensions without relaxing our guard.

Today our guard is up and ready. And just as surely as the great American eagle on our national seal holds the arrows of war in one claw, he also tightly grips the olive branch of peace in the other. And if you look closely, you will note that he is looking in the direction of the olive branch and away from the former. This symbolizes what this Nation has attempted to do, and what I firmly believe we must continue to do. No, the United Nations is not perfect. Neither is man himself.

But an important ingredient of man's climb from the cave of the stone age to today's radiant promise has been hope. And I find reassuringly that it is also an important part of the atmosphere at the United Nations. The historic visit of Pope Paul VI dramatized that. All Americans should support their Nation's continued dedication to the pursuit of peace.

Let us all hope and pray that the men and women meeting at the United Nations will be divinely inspired and guided. The very future of mankind may well hang in the balance of their deliberations.

Let us hope and pray that it will be strengthened and improved and thus become an even more potent force for lasting world peace.

And finally, let us as Americans, always recall the American eagle and the arrows and the olive branch he clutches. And the balance between the two.

GALLANT GI DIES WORRYING ABOUT VIET PROTESTS IN UNITED STATES

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, in the Wednesday, October 20 edition of my hometown newspaper, the Tampa Tribune, appeared an Associated Press story by Hugh A. Mulligan. It is about Vietnam, and why a young American U.S. naval officer was willing to risk his life trying to help the people of South Vietnam.

Today, protests and counterprotests are much in the news. I would hope all Americans could read Mr. Mulligan's story about Navy Lt. Ray Ellis and what he died for.

The story speaks for itself:

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, Oct. 20, 1965]

GALLANT GI DIES WORRYING ABOUT VIET PROTESTS IN UNITED STATES

(By Hugh A. Mulligan)

SAIGON.—The last time I saw Ray Ellis he was sitting on the deck of his RAG (river assault group) boat deep in the mangrove swamps and talking earnestly about college kids tearing up their draft cards and picketing the Army terminals.

Dawn was just breaking over the Mekong Delta, and Vietnamese infantry troops were piling off the little steel river boats and hacking their way into the swamps. It was one of those exquisite delta dawns, with a vast flamingo sky swallowing up the morning star and luminous white clouds already puffing up into thunderheads far out over the South China Sea. Ray loved the beauty of it all as much as he hated the horror of war.

"If only these kids could come out to Vietnam and see for themselves what it's all about," he was saying in the quiet, patient way he had of making a point, without rancor, without argument.

"If they could see how nothing moves on these rivers once the sun goes down because of the Communists, and what it means for a peasant to give half his rice crop to a roving Vietcong tax collector, and what calculated terror and murder can do to disrupt any semblance of government control in even the humblest fishing hamlet. If they could just spend a few hours on my boat talking to these Vietnamese sailors, they might learn why these people still go on fighting after 20 years of it."

But, no, that wasn't the last time I saw Ray Ellis.

I saw him once again as his coffin passed through Tan Son Nhut airport in Saigon on its way to his home in Cape May Court House, N.J.

The delta that Ray Ellis had loved so much, the lovely, lethal delta, had exploded all around him.

The recommendation for a posthumous Silver Star, now before the President of the United States, tells how Lt. Ray Ellis, U.S. Navy Reserve, gave his life to save the Vietnamese navy boat and the Vietnamese sailors he had come to aid.

It tells how at 5:55 one sunlit afternoon RAG Unit 27 was caught in an ambush in a narrow bend of a stream, and hit from both sides by mortars, recoilless rifles, and .50 caliber machineguns.

It tells how Ellis made his way across the deck from the pilothouse to the radio through that curtain of fire to call for an airstrike, made his way back again to take command of the ship when the entire pilothouse was wiped out, and was venturing across the deck once more to help a wounded Vietnamese sailor when a .50 caliber machinegun ripped into his hip, cut in two the hunting knife hanging on his belt and drove the shards into his body so that he died almost before the cry escaped his lips.

Two boats were sunk that day, and two more put out of commission. In addition to Ellis, the only American on the operation, 44 Vietnamese soldiers and 13 Vietnamese sailors gave their lives in that crooked bend of a narrow, muddy river. The Vietcong dead numbered 83.

The citation will attest to the bravery and competence of Lt. Ray Ellis, but it won't say anything about what he did for the Vietnamese people and what they thought of him.

The citation is no place to tell how Ellis came 40 miles by helicopter twice a week from his base in My Tho to teach English at the Vietnamese school in Saigon.

The citation is no place to tell about the nights he spent dining in the homes of his Vietnamese sailors, and about how he organized them into a volleyball team and the hours he put in trying to learn their language.

No citation will tell about the flowers the people of My Tho heaped on his coffin, and the delegation they sent to Saigon for his final rites on this side of the world.

The citation attests that Ray Ellis was a member of the Naval Reserve. It doesn't say that he had been accepted into the Regular Navy 2 days before he was killed but, because he was out on that delta operation, had not got around to signing the final papers.

Maybe people on the picket lines would have a hard time understanding why a former teacher from Gettysburg, Pa., would want to make a career out of the Navy, but if Ray was around he'd explain it to them. He had a teacher's patience with those who couldn't understand.

LACK OF ADEQUATE ATTENTION TO EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that there are over 500,000 emotionally disturbed youngsters in the United States today. If this fact were not shocking enough, the sad fact that only about 2 percent of them, or less than 10,000, are today receiving any form of treatment, should be even more shocking and disheartening. Lee Harvey Oswald was once one of these youngsters. And we all know what kind of member of society that name represented. It brings back a sickening memory for most Americans.

For some time, I have been greatly concerned with this problem and the possibility of early detection and prevention of these emotional problems in the preschool and first three grades of elementary school early enough to do something about it before it turns into violence typified by Oswald, or the school dropout, the unemployable person, the juvenile delinquent, the maladjusted, the criminal or the psychotic.

On September 30, I introduced a bill, H.R. 11322, to provide a program of federally assisted early detection and prevention of this type of behavior through child development specialists in the school systems of the country. Just this week, hearings were held by the Subcommittee on General Education of the House Education and Labor Committee. At that time, several experts in the field testified in favor of this legislation.

In the Thursday, October 21, edition of the Washington Post, there appeared an outstandingly perceptive article by Mr. George Lardner, Jr. It dramatically portrays the problem we face in the Nation from lack of adequate attention to emotionally disturbed children. Mr. Lardner has made a distinct contribution to the ultimate solution of this whole troublesome matter by focusing public attention on it.

I commend the article to my colleagues:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 21, 1965]

City Lags in Meeting Pupil Behavior Problems

(By George Lardner, Jr.)

It is usually estimated, says city health director Murray Grant, that about 1 of every 10 youngsters of school age is emotionally disturbed.

With more than 145,000 students enrolled in Washington's public schools, that can spell a lot of trouble.

Their problems may seem small at first. They may be easy to treat, but unless the disturbed youngsters are given the attention they need, Dr. Grant says, they could eventually wind up in institutions such as St. Elizabeths.

"Take a child with a speech defect," he says. "He finds himself ostracized by other children. They won't play with him; instead they make fun of him. The child gets a feeling of insecurity.

"And if he already has some inherent personality weakness, the feeling builds up and up. If you don't work with the child, or at least correct his speech, it's going to get worse. These are the kind of things that we believe cause the youngsters to end up in institutions."

So far neither the city's schools nor the Health Department has been able to do more than scratch the surface of behavior problems of the young that range from minor to psychotic.

"It's a hit or miss proposition now," Dr. Grant says. "We try to consult with the schools, help the teachers, have nurses visit the homes and treat some of the children at our three child guidance clinics."

But little more than 400 youngsters are carried on the clinics' rolls as active cases. They range in age from 2 years old to teenagers. Most are referred to the clinics by the public schools.

The public schools, in turn, refer only a small fraction of the emotionally disturbed youngsters in their classrooms.

According to the District of Columbia Association for Mental Health, 7,282 schoolchildren were singled out by their teachers last year for psychological study by the school system's pupil appraisal service. About 1,200 were diagnosed as having severe emotional problems. But, the association says, about 2,000 others suggested for study each year aren't tested at all, because of staff shortages. And, Dr. Grant says, "psychological testing by itself does not reveal emotional disturbance."

"Many teachers do not even bother to refer children unless they are disrupting the classroom," adds Jonas V. Morris, of the Mental Health Association. "They know years can pass before the child is seen. This means there are in our schools many quiet, withdrawn, disturbed children who are being neglected."

In a section of the antipoverty program's Operation Head Start for preschool children this past summer, the association also reports, 100 children were found with suspected mental problems, 30 of them severe.

One of them, Morris says, as an example, was "a 6-year-old who had beaten a puppy to death with a club 'because he felt like it.' " Had all Head Start youngsters here been screened, some experts feel, 500 cases would have been found.

To get its workers into the schools and the homes instead of concentrating on psychological testing downtown, school officials asked for an additional staff of 71 in the 1966–67 budget for the pupil appraisal service. This, they estimated, would produce four full teams of psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers—with each team serving 36,000 students.

Budget cutters in the District Building chopped the request down to 22 new positions. School officials have asked the District Commissioners to come to the rescue.

Dr. Grant seems to be faring somewhat better at his end. Next month he hopes to start a child-care unit at the new Community Health Center on the grounds of the District of Columbia General Hospital. Funds are available, but other health workers have been using the space, with only four child guidance workers squeezed in.

When the others move out, a full-fledged day-care program with a staff of 19 will be started almost immediately, Dr. Grant said. A 20-bed residential treatment center providing round-the-clock care for more serious disturbed youngsters should be ready next spring. By then, he hopes, a special school for both day-care patients and those needing full-time attention will be in operation.

After that, Dr. Grant has a $50,000 request riding in the new budget to start a program for mentally retarded youngsters. The Center's staff also will work with families and teachers of youngsters who may need only an occasional visit.

But that's just a beginning. Located in an old, refurbished building, the Center is designed to take care only of the central chunk of the city, including some 241,000 residents. Dr. Grant hopes to set up three others.

"These services we are proposing for the emotionally disturbed are practically nonexistent," he says. "You can hardly get them around Washington even if you want them privately."

But the Health Department can't do it all. It's likely to wind up concentrating on the most serious cases, such as the 11-year-old boy recently found sleeping with dogs, and the 6-year-old who killed one. The School Board's request for beefing up its own staff at least deserves to get out of the District Building intact. It's bad arithmetic to save money on "little problems" and pretend they won't get bigger.

REPORT ON THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, a generation from now, the 89th Congress will be remembered as one of the greatest of all meetings of this legislative body. This Congress has provided measures whose full impact may not be felt for years to come; it has enacted laws that will benefit every segment of society, laws that will ultimately bring the American dream closer to full fruition. I have been proud of the achievements of this Congress, and believe that the country will be well pleased with the reports that Members will take home at the end of the session, for we have responded to the clear mandate given in last November's historic election, when reaction was abandoned for reality by the overwhelming majority of voters.

This Nation, as the premier power of the world, is involved in an inextricable manner with the affairs of the world; any major event that takes place in almost any country in the world affects our interests in one way or another, and virtually every major event in this country affects in one way or another the vital interests of practically every other power in the world, both great and small. The leadership offered by our President in conducting the intricate foreign affairs of the United States has been excellent, and I believe that our people are confident that his wisdom will continue to steer a safe course for the United States in these perilous times. Thanks to his leadership, our world position is safe, and we are safe, and I pray that matters will continue to remain so; I know that under President Johnson's hand they will.

If these times are notable for foreign affairs, that is the inevitable concomitant of world leadership. But for many years, while we have been overwhelmingly concerned about foreign affairs, we have paid too little heed and too little attention to our domestic affairs; this session of Congress is historic because in these past months we have enacted domestic programs that have been called for and needed and debated for years, but never acted upon until now.

The programs of this Congress affect every sphere:

DEFENSE AND NATIONAL SECURITY

This Congress has been unstinting in its support of a Defense budget that will continue to strengthen our military power and enable us to meet threats of whatever scale, in any place in the world.

We will spend better than $46 billion in this fiscal year for the Armed Forces; and we will spend $2½ billion for atomic power research, development, and construction. To care for the veterans of past wars, we are providing new facilities and programs, and these facilities and programs will accrue to the benefit of veterans of the twilight wars we are presently engaged in, and for the unknown engagements that we may be called upon to participate in the future. Veterans programs will consume $5½ billion this fiscal year; and this will include some $800,000 for the planning of a new, advanced veterans hospital to be built in my district. That new hospital will meet the needs of 700 patients, and will provide general medical and surgical care, and psychiatric care for the veterans of south Texas.

San Antonio and Bexar County house a gigantic military complex; I am proud that my district plays a vital role in national defense. It has traditionally had a strong military interest and influence, that continues today as it did in 1718.

San Antonio contributes mightily to our national defense and security, and I am proud to report that this mighty complex has been maintained in full operation by this Congress.

The great achievements of this Congress lie in the field of new legislation, however, and I am proud to be among the authors of this grand effort to improve the quality of life in America.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

Laws enacted this year include extensive revision of the Social Security Act; new measures in education, in civil rights, in fiscal policy, in urban affairs, in beautification and conservation, in immigration and in economic opportunity.

THE TAX CUT

Last year, for the first time, Congress voted to reduce income taxes, even though the Federal budget was running a deficit; the reasoning was that the tax cut would spur the economy to new growth, with the ultimate result that Federal receipts would increase. The policy paid off; Federal receipts in 1965 were $2 billion above what they had been in 1964, although the tax cut had reduced taxation by $11 billion. The gross national product is now expanding at 7½ percent annually—the best growth rate in years; and 72 million Americans are fully employed. There is still unemployment in the land, but the growth of the economy promises improvements in the days to come.

This year, the excise taxes imposed by the Federal Government were cut by $4.6 billion, and the bulk of that tax reduction has been passed on to consumers, and has resulted in the continued expansion and upsurge in our economy. Times are good, and getting better for all of us, doomsayers and gloomers notwithstanding. I have confidence in the strength of the economy, and am proud to have supported the fiscal policy that has helped to make our prosperity possible.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

Even if times have never been better, there are still those who suffer; and in San Antonio there are about 120,000 persons who live in families that have annual incomes of less than $3,000. Because there is deprivation in the midst of prosperity, and because human needs must be met, and because we do not believe that poverty is inevitable, we have instituted great new programs to make economic opportunities available to all. In Bexar County this year, thousands of people, from pre-school youngsters in Project Head Start, to Neighborhood Youth Corps men, to migrant workers—all benefited from the war on poverty. Youths earned money to enable them to stay in school, and at the same time learned job skills and the discipline needed to stay on the job; and pre-school-age children got the training that they desperately needed to enable them to have a chance to compete in the classrooms with their more fortunate fellows; and migrants began learning how to live better, and perhaps to break out of the cycle of misery in which they are captured. Job Corps men are learning skills and becoming productive citizens. All told, the war on poverty will spend $2,600,000 or more in Bexar County by the end of this fiscal year. The beneficiaries include the whole community. Just as we in the sixties are the beneficiaries of the depression programs of 30 years ago, so will these people be the beneficiaries tomorrow of what is being done now; and the whole country will be better off for having given them a chance to win in life.

EDUCATION

The surest way to maintain our national strength is to develop as fully as possible our greatest single resource—our people. Education is the key to the future, and this Congress has supported education through a wide range of new legislation. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 will pour some $2 million into impoverished schools in Bexar County this year, so that every child can get a good education, even though his parents may live in a poor neighborhood. The schools of my district will benefit through older programs, as well, like the Federal impact money of Public Laws 815 and 874, which provide millions to our schools every year. College dormitories, classrooms, and laboratories are constructed through loans and grants; research is supported; scholars are helped by grants and loans; and students who are working their way through higher education are helped by the work-study program. The educational programs enacted by this and preceding Congresses have helped to insure the future of all our citizens, and I am certain that the quality of schools in San Antonio would be much less than it is now, were it not for this legislation, and that a great many students are being helped today who might not otherwise have ever had the chance to gain a complete education. I believe that everyone should have a full opportunity to absorb as much knowledge as he can—and I am proud to have supported measures that will help make this possible.

MEDICARE

If we must see that our youth are prepared for tomorrow, we must also see to the needs of your parents, who after all have left us with the heritage that we enjoy; they should not be deprived of a decent life, after what they have done for us. This year, Congress has passed a measure that will prevent our parents from having to fear financial disaster from the diseases that plague us all, but more especially those who are more than 65 years of age.

Social security recipients this year were given a 7-percent increase in their benefits; this will aid them in keeping up with the rising cost of living, and help them maintain independence in their postemployment days. But most important to them, and to their families, is medical care provided under social security.

Soon, anyone covered by social security, who is receiving pension benefits, will be able to enter the hospital for 90 days at a time, or receive 180 days of nursing home care. Hospital bills will be paid in full after the first $40; and certain hospital service will also be covered. This bill should end forever the specter of ruin for elderly persons and their families as the result of disease, and will permit virtually all of our elderly citizens to receive adequate medical care.

This means much to citizens in Texas, and in Bexar County. The typical Texan over age 65 in Texas had a median income of just $1,300 in 1959; with that kind of income, he could hardly expect to pay hospital costs ranging upwards of $30 or $40 a day, not when annual medical costs for persons in this age bracket are now averaging $442 a year. Nobody can afford a third or a half of his annual income for medical care alone—and that is why medical care for the aged under social security will be a great blessing to the 26,000 persons on social security pensions in my district.

Hospital payments alone will not cover the needs of these elderly citizens; and Congress has wisely made available to them medical insurance through social security at the rate of $3 monthly.

VOTING RIGHTS

This Congress has passed legislation that assures that every person in the land can have access to the ballot box—by outlawing discriminatory and unreasonable tests, and by instructing the Department of Justice to attack in the courts the poll tax still used by a few States as a bar to the franchise. I have long opposed and fought the poll tax, and my first official act was to sponsor a constitutional amendment to prohibit poll taxes as a requisite to voting in any election; I supported the amendment which was enacted to outlaw such taxes in Federal elections. I am now glad to see that the State poll taxes are also under attack under this new law, and firmly believe that this final bar to the electorate, this final pratfall in front of the voting booth will soon disappear. Everyone should participate in our free government, and thanks to this Congress, I believe that soon everyone will have the right to so participate, without fear of intimidation and without needless interference.

HEMISFAIR 1968

I have sponsored and supported HemisFair 1968, a project of great importance to my district and I believe of great significance to the Nation. HemisFair 1968 will be an Exposition of the Americas, in celebration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio. In this old city the two great cultures of this hemisphere have met and united in a great city, and the exposition will denote this meeting, and this confluence of civilizations.

By passing H.R. 9247, this Congress has recognized that HemisFair 1968 has national significance, and by appropriating $125,000 to study U.S. participation in the event, has enabled a start to be made on planning how the Federal Government may participate in the exposition. H.R. 9247 also authorized the President to issue invitations to other countries to participate, and with this recognition and authority, HemisFair 1968 has made a firm and auspicious step forward toward reality.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

For many years, this country has practiced racial discrimination in the matter of immigration; our immigration law for years barred people from entering solely because of their national origins. Under the immigration reform bill, this practice was done away with, and we now welcome to the United States a limited number of people, based on their quality rather than on their race. I was disappointed in this bill in only one respect, and that was the poorly thought out and ill-advised amendment that placed a limit on the number of immigrants that could enter this country from other parts of the Western Hemisphere. This limitation had never been in the law before, and I opposed it, but supported the bill in all other respects.

ADJOURNMENT

I have not mentioned highway beautification, air pollution and water pollution measures, water desalinization gains, and numerous other important items; the record of this Congress is too great to attempt to convey or recite in a single statement. As adjournment draws near, however, I think that it can be truly said that the record of this Congress is unsurpassed by that of any other.

I will soon report back to my district, and though I return there every weekend that I can—some 40 or more occasions this year—I will look forward to spending time with my constituents, learning what they think and learning more about their problems so that I will be better equipped to help resolve those difficulties.

My home office is open the year around, but these coming days of the short recess will enable me to personally be in the district and see and talk to people; I will be able to be on the ground to inspect installations at leisure, and to see how well the various Federal agencies are translating into action and reality the programs that we have engendered.

I hope to find much progress at home, and expect to see much improvement, and to report fully on the past session to everyone who has an interest and a concern in it, and find new answers for the problems of this decade.

REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND MOVEMENTS

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as the work of the Congress draws to an end, I am pleased to submit a report of the activities of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The following is an accounting of our activities during the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

WINNING THE COLD WAR: THE U.S. IDEOLOGICAL OFFENSIVE

Three years ago, the subcommittee initiated a comprehensive inquiry into the challenge which confronts the United States in the third dimension—the ideological and psychological—of foreign policy operations.

The subcommittee undertook, first, to examine the nature and the scope of the ideological challenge which springs from and forms a part of the cold war;

Second, to review and appraise the tools which the U.S. Government uses to meet that challenge and to provide support for the military and economic components of our foreign policy; and

Third, to explore the contributions of private American citizens and organizations abroad to the advancement of U.S. foreign policy objectives.

The subcommittee's hearings entitled, "Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive," volumes I–VIII, and the subcommittee's three reports issued during the 88th Congress, concentrated on the first two aspects of this undertaking.

THE PRIVATE AMERICAN EFFORT OVERSEAS

During the fall of 1964 and the early part of 1965, the subcommittee made a careful inquiry into the role which private American individuals and organizations play in the cold war confrontation between the forces of freedom, led by the United States and the international Communist movement, spearheaded by the Soviet Union.

The subcommittee could not, of course, survey the entire range of this private effort. We therefore concentrated on the activities abroad of private, nonprofit American organizations. In the course of our study, we contacted some 1,600 organizations in this category, including approximately 250 colleges and universities. The results of our survey appear on pages 1–13 in a report entitled "Overseas Activities of Private, Nonprofit American Organizations," issued by the subcommittee as a committee print on April 29, 1965—House Report No. 368, 89th Congress, 1st session.

Our report, and the directory appended to it, contain a wealth of information about the whole range of the overseas and overseas-oriented activities of private nonprofit American organizations. They contain a description of almost 600 such programs, and analyze them from the standpoint of their geographical and functional distribution. The report also presents some conclusions regarding the relationships between the Federal Government and these private efforts, as well as the impact of these activities on U.S. foreign policy. These conclusions can be summarized as follows:

First. The astounding variety of private American efforts overseas defies complete description. As we have said already, it constitutes a living testimonial to the ingenuity and humanitarianism of our free society.

Second. The scope and the impact of private American activity abroad are extremely broad. The one segment of this activity surveyed by our subcommittee—the overseas programs of private, nonprofit American organizations—had a direct manifestation in 1963 on six continents and in virtually every foreign country, exclusive of the Communist countries. During that year, the overseas programs of nonprofit American organizations entailed program expenditures in excess of $500 million. This is exclusive of the funds involved in several other types of private undertakings directed at overseas audiences.

Third. According to information supplied by private American organizations responding to the subcommittee's questionnaire, the geographical distribution of their programs does not always correspond to the areas of greatest need abroad. Traditional patterns of overseas interests, political and security conditions in given foreign areas, unawareness of the particular needs of a given area, are among the factors which apparently produce these results.

Fourth. Traditional forms of assistance still largely influence the functional composition of programs conducted abroad by private nonprofit organizations. The channeling of greater effort and resources to other areas of need in receiving countries appears indicated.

Fifth, a large majority of organizations responding to the questionnaire indicated a strong desire to avoid having their programs tagged with ideological objectives having any political connotation. They wish to maintain the very nonpolitical image which they have established abroad, and which is generally considered essential to the success of their overseas activities.

Sixth, improved communication among private American organizations engaged in overseas programs is a goal which finds strong support among such organizations. Periodic consultation, improved compiling of information about private overseas activities, and systematic exchange of such information, are among the remedies proposed to correct shortcomings which currently exist in this area.

Seventh, in the view of the responding organizations, their relationships with Federal departments and agencies, both in Washington and abroad, are generally satisfactory. The Department of State has been singled out by the largest number of respondents as being "very helpful" and "helpful." Yet some criticism of Federal agencies has been voiced and, in this subcommittee's view, merits prompt attention by the agencies involved.

Eighth, the furnishing of information by the Federal Government to private organizations with programs abroad is minimal. This applies to information about conditions in foreign countries which may affect such private operations, U.S. programs in such countries, our Government's view of the impact or of the results of private activity abroad, as well as to U.S. foreign policy objectives.

Ninth, in the opinion of most of the responding organizations, there is a legitimate and proper role the U.S. Government should play in assisting in the coordination of their activities and enhancing their effectiveness. It was indicated, for example, that the Government should attempt to aid private activities by disseminating more information about the programs of private organizations operating abroad, about the needs of particular countries, about the overseas programs of the U.S. Government, and the goals which our Government is trying to attain through them. It should also attempt, in cooperation with representatives of private American organizations, to focus attention on particular problems or tasks as they might arise in specific overseas areas.

In this subcommittee's view, these findings should be of interest to all Americans engaged in or contemplating overseas activities, and to the U.S. Government. We strongly recommend that the appropriate agencies of the executive branch take cognizance of the suggestions brought together in the course of this survey. In particular, we wish to emphasize the need for establishing an adequately staffed and automated central facility for the collection, analysis, and dissemination of detailed information about overseas activities funded or conducted by private American citizens and organizations. Such a central informational clearinghouse will be of considerable benefit to this private effort. It will also help the Federal Government avoid duplicating privately sponsored undertakings. The information collected by this subcommittee in the course of its survey should make a welcome contribution to the informational "seed capital" of such a clearinghouse.

BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES AND THE NATIONAL SECURITY

In our report No. 2, entitled "Ideological Operations and Foreign Policy," issued on April 27, 1964, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements raised some serious questions regarding the deficiencies in the U.S. Government's research program in the behavioral sciences.

After looking into this subject, the subcommittee concluded that behavioral sciences research can contribute substantially to the effectiveness of U.S. efforts designed to meet the challenge which confronts our Nation on the international scene.

We also pointed out that the U.S. Government has been late in acknowledging the importance of behavioral sciences research, that the bulk of such research relating to foreign affairs was being sponsored by our military establishment, rather than by the civilian agencies responsible for the conduct of our foreign relations, and warned that the heavy concentration of effort in this particular area may lead to overmilitarization of our foreign policy.

Finally, the subcommittee called attention to the pressing need to improve the coordination of Government-sponsored behavioral sciences research in the field of foreign affairs, and urged the executive branch to devise appropriate means for the assignment of responsibilities, and allocation of resources, to the various agencies active in this field, in these words:

> Effective methods must be evolved to insure that the results of research conducted by Government agencies are promptly made available to all agencies concerned with foreign policy operations. Other arrangements must be worked out to divide research assignments and make certain that all requirements are covered to the extent that funds are available. A system of priorities must be established and enforced to insure that scarce resources—human and financial—are applied first to the most urgent tasks.

PROJECT CAMELOT

Unfortunately, the subcommittee's recommendations evoked only a modest response from the executive branch. Many of the shortcomings which we called to the attention of the executive branch were not remedied. The continuation of this state of affairs led to some less-than-welcome developments, including the recent controversy over Project Camelot.

In July and August of the current year, the subcommittee again turned its attention to the Government's research program in the behavioral sciences. An impressive list of witnesses, headed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, testified before the subcommittee on the condition of our Government's effort in this field. Other departments and agencies, also involved in research relating to foreign affairs, submitted detailed descriptions of their programs. The record of those hearings, entitled "Behavioral Sciences and the National Security," is about to be published by the subcommittee.

The subcommittee has also prepared, and will shortly release, a report of our findings with respect to Project Camelot and the entire governmental effort in the field of the behavioral sciences research as it relates to our foreign policy operations. The subcommittee has some further recommendations to make on this subject. These, too, will be outlined in our report.

II. LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In addition to its continuing studies, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements held hearings and acted upon a number of legislative measures. Almost all of these measures were subsequently approved by the full Committee on Foreign Affairs, the House of Representatives, and the Senate, and signed into law by the President. A brief description of each of these bills follows:

SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

The South Pacific Commission was established in 1948 and includes in its current membership the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Australia, New Zealand, and Western Samoa—the countries which have territories or possessions in the South Pacific. The Commission's main task is to serve as a clearinghouse for the exchange of information about the problems of that area, to study and suggest to the governments concerned, ways and means in which such economic and social problems may be solved.

The United States contributes 20 percent of the Commission's budget. For the fiscal years 1965 and 1966, the statutory ceiling of the U.S. contributions amounted to $150,000.

The subcommittee took a careful look at the Commission's operations 2 years ago, and again this year. The subcommittee became convinced that the Commission is performing very valuable service, at small expense to the participating countries. Inasmuch as the work program of the Commission is expanding, the subcommittee agreed to recommend an increase in the U.S. contribution, raising the statutory ceiling thereon from $150,000 to $200,000 annually. This increase was approved by the Congress and became law.

For background, see Public Law 89-91 (S.J. Res. 71), the hearings held before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, and House Report 531, 89th Congress, 1st session.

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC UNIONS

The International Council of Scientific Unions came into being in 1931 and is currently composed of 14 autonomous international scientific unions. In addition, the Council has some 57 national members, each of which is a leading national scientific institution which broadly represents scientists in a country or other geographic area. The individual scientific unions also have national members which may be either the same scientific institutions holding membership in the Council, or others.

The principal functions of the Council fall into four categories:

First, to organize and coordinate scientific meetings;

Second, to establish agreed standards, units, and nomenclature, which are fundamental for meaningful international communication, cooperation and comparison of results;

Third, to disseminate new scientific information; and

Fourth, to sponsor and coordinate international cooperative programs such as the International Geophysical Year which included international cooperation in oceanography, Antarctic research, and space research.

The law in effect at the beginning of the current calendar year, authorized an appropriation of not more than $65,000 annually for the payment of U.S. dues to the Council, and to each of its affiliated international scientific unions. By 1964, however, the total amount of such dues exceeded the statutory ceiling by almost $10,000. Further, projections submitted in the course of a hearing before our subcommittee indicated that the level of dues to these organizations is expected to continue to increase during the next few years. The subcommittee therefore agreed to recommend that the statutory ceiling be increased to $100,000 a year. This recommendation was enacted into law.

For background, see Public Law 89-104 (H.R. 8862), the published record of a hearing held before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, and House Report 518, 89th Congress, 1st session.

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

The International Committee of the Red Cross, founded in Geneva in 1863, is the mother organization of all Red Cross societies and Red Cross principles. The committee is an all-Swiss body which supervises the application of international conventions on the treatment of wounded and sick in the Armed Forces in the field, and at sea; the treatment of prisoners of war, and the protection of civilian persons in time of war. The committee acts as a neutral organization and serves continuously in the troubled spots of the world, performing the type of humanitarian missions which the national Red Cross societies—such as the American Red Cross—are unable to perform.

The committee receives its financial support from voluntary contributions made by governments, by national Red Cross Societies, and by private individuals and organizations. The bulk of this support comes from the Swiss Government, and the Swiss public.

Although the American Red Cross has contributed annually to the support of the International Committee of the Red Cross, the U.S. Government has never provided financial assistance to that organization. With the increasing number of calls for its services, however, the committee has encountered serious difficulties in meeting its operational budget requirements and appealed to all governments and national Red Cross societies for help.

The U.S. Government and the American people have benefited substantially from the varied services of the International Committee of the Red Cross. During recent years, for example, the committee responded to our requests for assistance during the Congo crisis, after the outbreak of the hostilities in Cyprus, and during the conflicts in Laos and Vietnam.

After careful deliberation, the Subcommittee recommended that the U.S. Government contribute up to $75,000 annually to the operating budget of the International Committee. The U.S. Senate approved a contribution of $25,000 annually. A compromise authorization of not to exceed $50,000 annually was ultimately enacted into law.

For background, see Public Law 89-230 (H.R. 8715), the published record of the hearing held before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, and House Report 548, 89th Congress, 1st session.

UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT AMENDMENTS

The act which authorizes U.S. participation in the United Nations Organization also provides for the appointment of U.S. representatives in various U.N. bodies and organs. Legislation approved by our subcommittee, which subsequently became law, revised the act to provide the principal U.S. Representative in the United Nations—currently Ambassador Goldberg—with increased flexibility in the assignment of duties to his colleagues. This change was recommended by the executive branch and by Members of Congress who served as U.S. delegates to the United Nations. Its only purpose is to promote more effective utilization of the top personnel at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations in New York City. The new amendments do not increase the number of U.S. representatives in the principal organs of the United Nations; neither do they weaken in any way the requirement that all such appointees must be subject to Senate confirmation.

In addition, this legislation provided statutory authority for the existing position of the U.S. representative to the European Office of the United Nations in Geneva.

For background, see Public Law 89-206 (S. 1903), the published record of hearings held before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, and House Report 707, 89th Congress, 1st session.

HEMISFAIR 1968

In 1968, the city of San Antonio, Tex. will celebrate the 250th anniversary of its founding. To commemorate this occasion, and to provide a forum for a display of the cultural and economic heritage of Pan America, the city of San Antonio decided to sponsor an international exhibition, named HemisFair 1968, and to invite the U.S. Government to participate in it.

Legislation approved by the subcommittee—and then by both Houses of Congress—extended congressional recognition to HemisFair 1968 and authorized the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate therein. In addition, the bill directed the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a study to determine the manner in which and the extent to which the U.S. Government shall be a participant in the fair. An appropriation of not to exceed $125,000 was also authorized to carry out the foregoing provisions.

For background, see published record of the hearing held before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, and House Report 975, 89th Congress, 1st session.

INTERAMA

The State of Florida, together with public officials and the citizenry of Dade County and the city of Miami, has been endeavoring to establish "a permanent year-round, nonprofit, self-sustaining enterprise for the development of improved relations and increased trade with the Republics of Latin America," known as the Inter-American Trade and Cultural Center—Interama—a State authority whose members are appointed by the Governor. In recent years, considerable progress has been achieved on the State and local levels to bring this project into fruition. The concept of the project and U.S. Government participation in it, were previously approved by the U.S. Congress and endorsed in a Presidential proclamation.

The Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, and subsequently the House of Representatives, approved legislation to authorize the President to provide for U.S. participation in Interama. The bill also authorized an appropriation of not to exceed $11 million for this purpose, together with not to exceed $1 million annually for fiscal years 1967 through 1970 for the maintenance of U.S. installations and exhibits at Interama. This legislation is currently pending in the U.S. Senate.

For background, see H.R. 30, the published record of hearings held before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, and House Report 974, 89th Congress, 1st session.

WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY

House Joint Resolution 403, endorsed by the subcommittee and approved by the House of Representatives, authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $500,000 to defray the expenses incident to organizing and holding the 22nd World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969. This authorization is intended to enable the executive branch to invite the World Health Organization to hold its 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, and to pay for the additional cost of holding such a meeting away from WHO headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland.

The World Health Organization came into being on the American soil and held its 10th anniversary commemorative session in Minneapolis, Minn. All of its other annual World Health Assemblies were held in Switzerland or in other foreign countries. The subcommittee was of the opinion that a useful purpose would be served by having the organization meet at least once every decade in the United States. The State of Massachusetts will celebrate the 100th anniversary of the establishment of its modern department of public health in 1969, and this event will provide a suitable opportunity for inviting WHO to meet in our country.

For background, see House Joint Resolution 403, the hearing held before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, and House Report 709, 89th Congress, 1st session.

OTHER LEGISLATION

In addition to the above-described legislative accomplishments, a number of members of the subcommittee were instrumental in proposing, and securing the approvel of the Congress, for two significant resolutions:

The first resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 36, commemorated the 20th anniversary of the United Nations Organization, granted congressional recognition to the International Cooperation Year, and authorized the appointment of a delegation from the House of Representatives to participate in the White House Conference on the International Cooperation Year. I was honored to have been appointed chairman of that delegation.

The second resolution extended congressional greetings and welcome to the 2,000-some jurists and lawyers who traveled to Washington from many foreign countries—and from many parts of the United States—for the Washington World Conference on World Peace Through Law.

In addition, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements continued its legislative task of overseeing the activities of the United Nations, and of over 50 other international organizations, in which the United States holds membership.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, in concluding this report, I want to pay my tribute, and to express my deep appreciation, to the membership of the subcommittee who have worked many, many long hours to discharge with distinction the various legislative responsibilities assigned to our subcommittee. Their devotion to this work, and their many contributions to its fulfillment, deserve the gratitude of our Nation.

The Members of Congress who serve on the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements are:

Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, of North Carolina.

Hon. OMAR BURLESON, Democrat, of Texas.

Hon. DONALD M. FRASER, Democrat, of Minnesota.

Hon. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, Democrat, of New York.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYBAL, Democrat, of California.

Hon. H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa.

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, Republican, of New Jersey.

Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Republican, of Illinois.

LEGAL AND MONETARY AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as the first session of the 89th Congress moves toward the completion of its work, I am pleased to submit a résumé of the activities and accomplishments of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations in this session.

Shortly after the Congress convened this year the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations, appointed the following Members of the Congress to the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, of which I am chairman: TORBERT H. MACDONALD, Democrat, of Massachusetts; CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, Democrat, of New Jersey; JOHN G. DOW, Democrat, of New York; DONALD RUMSFELD, Republican, of Illinois; and WILLIAM L. DICKINSON, Republican, of Alabama. Mr. DICKINSON has since resigned his membership on the subcommittee and in his place ROBERT DOLE, Republican, of Kansas, has been appointed. I am deeply indebted to the members of the subcommittee for their diligent and constructive efforts, and the valuable contributions they have made to the work of the subcommittee.

A prime responsibility of the House Committee on Government Operations is to examine and evaluate the efficiency and economy of the operations of the executive branch departments and agencies. Among the departments and agencies whose efficiency and economy of operations the subcommittee is concerned with are the Treasury Department, Department of Justice, the Federal banking regulatory agencies, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Summaries of some of the subcommittee's investigations in this year are reported below. I believe the subcommittee can take justifiable pride in the results of its efforts. Not only have they accounted for the institution of various economies in agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction, including significant savings, but also for improvements in agency operations through the adoption of more efficient procedures.

The hearings held by the subcommittee in this year have been limited, chiefly because the subcommittee's efforts to instill efficiency and economy in certain agency operations were successful without the necessity of public hearings. Some of the more significant of the subcommittee's studies are discussed below.

COIN SHORTAGE, PART 1

Between 1959 and 1964 the country was faced with such serious shortages of coin as to interfere with the normal business practices. Businessmen, banks and the public in general at times were quite hard put for coin in quantities adequate to carry on usual and normal transactions. The Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee conducted intensive investigations into the shortage, its causes, its effects and means for remedying it. In public hearings businessmen and bankers discussed the difficulties they encountered in obtaining sufficient coin to meet their demands, and the means which many of them resorted to to obtain coin.

Supermarkets, for instance, bought up church collections, and the collections which were made by newsboys. Banks offered premiums for coins. It was not unusual to see advertisements by banks offering a dollar bill for 97 pennies.

The subcommittee's interest was in ascertaining with what degree of efficiency and economy the Federal monetary agencies were moving to relieve the shortage. We asked officials of the Treasury Department, the Mint, and the Federal Reserve System to tell us how the shortage developed, whether they could have anticipated it and what they were doing to stop it. Some of our findings are quite astounding.

We developed, for instance, that neither the Mint nor the Federal Reserve System had any scientific or technological means of determining future coin needs, and that the standards they relied on for that purpose, that is population growth, the increase in gross national product, and barometers of that kind, proved insufficiently reliable to prevent the coin shortage.

The shortage apparently arose because of the increases in population, the increases in the country's prosperity and in the rapidly expanding uses of vending and other coin operated devices for almost every conceivable purpose. Another very large factor was the tremendous growth in coin collecting and coin hoarding, by speculators who took coin out of circulation by the roll and by the bag and even by the ton. The general shortage so created fed on itself.

Two contributing factors intensified the shortage. The Kennedy half dollar was manufactured in large quantities by the Mint, but because it so closely followed the President's assassination coins bearing his likeness were treated as memorials and not as money. They never actually got into circulation, which accounted for a great dearth of half dollars.

For another thing, the Treasury, in an almost circuslike atmosphere, divested itself of almost its entire stock of silver dollars, none of which went into circulation. They became collectors' items and speculators' merchandise.

In these circumstances businessmen who acquired excess coin did not, as formerly, return them to their banks. Many held onto them, for fear that they might not be able to acquire coin when they needed it in their businesses. The banks consequently were not getting back enough coin to fulfill the needs of their customers. While the mint's production had greatly increased, a point had been reached when its production was not large enough to meet requirements.

A whole new circulation of coin grew up outside of banks. Those who had excess supplies of one coin would trade for other coin they needed. Coin brokerage became a profitable business, and businessmen and even banks paid premiums to acquire coin.

Following the subcommittee's announcement of its initial hearings into the shortage, in the summer of 1964, the Treasury Department announced a crash program of coin production which was designed to so expand coinage as to break the shortage. The details of the program were reviewed by the subcommittee, as were all other aspects of the shortage, as a result of which, to assure adequate supplies of coin to meet all needs, a report was issued which contained the following recommendations:

> The Treasury Department, the Bureau of the Mint, and the Federal Reserve System collaborate on a widespread program of public relations, emphasizing the temporary nature of the coin shortage, and that increased production would again make coin freely available for all needs; and on appeals to businessmen and the public to assist meanwhile in relieving the shortage by depositing or exchanging for currency the coin they held which was in excess of their normal business and personal needs; and to invoke the cooperation and assistance of news media, and business, civic, and commercial organizations in making these appeals throughout the country.
>
> The Treasury's crash program, which the committee hoped would be adequate to relieve the shortage, be vigorously pursued notwithstanding its higher costs and lower efficiency, until sufficient supplies of coin were available and in circulation.
>
> The mint and the Federal Reserve System should maintain inventories of coin adequate to prevent recurrence of any serious shortages.
>
> The mint should use the facilities of private industry, to the fullest extent practicable in alleviating the shortage, including the purchase of strip and blanks; and should consider the advisability of legislation which, at least on a standby basis, would authorize the mint, in an emergency, to contract for the minting of coin by private industry under the mint's supervision.
>
> If and when estimated future needs for coin were indicated to be such that coin could not be produced efficiently and economically by the existing facilities of the mint, consideration should be given to the timely construction of a new mint, at a location which would be determined upon such economic factors as concentration of population, distribution and transportation costs, commercial convenience, and availability of labor.
>
> The Mint should promptly resume its proof set and mint set operations when their suspension was no longer required by reason of the shortage, and should allocate orders for such sets on a basis which will assure their distribution to all coin collectors. Consideration should also be given to the opening of a numismatic sales office so as to provide collectors and dealers with coin upon payment of the face value and transportation charges and under such regulations as would permit the Mint to exercise some degree of control over coin speculators.
>
> If the 45 million silver dollars then recently authorized were to be minted, the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System should give consideration to their issuance and distribution on a fair and equitable basis and take such steps as may be practicable to assure that they remain in circulation.
>
> The Mint should give consideration to discontinuing publication of the monthly statement of coin production by denominations.
>
> The Mint should consider and formulate plans for, decreases in production of coin when the present needs and inventory requirements had been met, including the termination of any uneconomic steps undertaken during the crash program to alleviate the existing shortage.

That report, Coin Shortage, part 1—Preceding Treasury's Crash Coin Production program, House Report No. 194, 89th Congress, 1st session, has been printed, as has the transcript of the hearings, which preceded the report.

COIN SHORTAGE, PART 2

In February 1965, the subcommittee again held public hearings to evaluate the coin situation. The Treasury's crash program had been in successful operation and was meeting its goals. However, an ever intensifying critical silver shortage was complicating the program. Many more dimes, quarters, and halves would need to be produced to assure plentiful coins being in circulation; however, the Treasury had only about a 3-year supply of silver to meet all purposes.

Although the Treasury had known that its stock of silver was rapidly diminishing it had made no efforts to curtail drains on the supply, and the Treasury was being faced with the necessity of making suggestions to the Congress on what need be done about coinage because of the deteriorating silver situation.

The mint was operating on an around-the-clock, 24-hours-a-day, 7-days-a-week basis and its production capacity had been doubled from about 4½ billion coins to 9 billion coins annually.

To further assure that adequate supplies of U.S. coin would be available to meet all needs, particularly in the light of the Treasury's diminishing silver stock the report which resulted from these hearings—Coin Shortage, part 2—Treasury's Crash program—Silver and Its Relation to Coin Production, House Report No. 195, 89th Congress, 1st session—recommended that:

> The Treasury Department, the Bureau of the Mint, and the Federal Reserve System, should in their efforts to devise more exact means for determining coin needs and fostering the equitable distribution of coin, jointly explore the possibilities of obtaining assistance in those regards from extragovernmental sources, and determine if the coin holdings of commercial banks should be inventoried periodically.
>
> The Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System should consider appealing to the utilities and industries which handle large amounts of coin to deposit coin directly with Federal Reserve System for fair and equitable distribution by the System to commercial banks and devising procedures for similar direct deposit of coin from operations conducted by or on Government installations.
>
> The Treasury Department should consider the advisability or necessity for legislation to prevent, minimize, or regulate the hoarding of, or speculation in large quantities of coin, and the export and melting down of coin.
>
> The Treasury Department should delay minting the 45 million silver dollars then recently authorized by the Congress, until decision was reached on new coin alloys.
>
> The Treasury Department should report its recommendations to the Congress resulting from its silver and coin alloy studies at the earliest possible date; and that in arriving at its recommendations, it fully consider:
>
> (a) The effects which changes in coin content would have on the efficiency and economy of coin-producing operations, including preparing for the period in which new-content coin would be put into circulation, and in planning production at the new Philadelphia Mint facilities which will soon be constructed;
>
> (b) Whether the stockpiling, hoarding, or exporting of, or the speculation in, silver need be prohibited or regulated in any measure, in the interest of conserving the Treasury's silver stock; and
>
> (c) The manifold interests, public and private, which could be expected to be affected by changes in coin content.
>
> The report also recommended that pending congressional action on coin alloys, the Congress, and the Treasury take steps to conserve the silver supply against depletion by extensive redemptions of silver for stockpiling, hoarding, export, or speculation.

A benefit resulting from the subcommittee's concern with the coin situation was the stimulation of the Treasury's crash program of coin production. The program's success averted a disastrous shortage which could have slowed the economy and resulted in extreme losses to individuals, businesses, and the Government. The recommendations also laid the foundation for the inauguration of efficiency and economy in the estimating of future coin needs and the planning and execution of future production.

The subcommittee's efforts also focused attention on the Nation's silver situation and supplied a background for legislation for the new clad dimes, quarters, and halves which will soon be introduced into circulation. In that connection there have been estimates that the Treasury's profits on manufacture of the new coin—seigniorage—will be about one-half billion dollars in fiscal year 1966 and about three times that amount in fiscal year 1967.

THE U.S. GOLD SITUATION

Contemporaneous with the subcommittee's inquiries into the coin shortage, many news items and comments about drains on the country's gold stock through international transactions were being reported. Communications received by the subcommittee indicated that there was considerable concern on the part of many citizens that the U.S. gold supply was being drained away, and that adverse effects were inevitable. Quite often the communications indicated that there was confusion and lack of understanding of the technicalities and even the nomenclature employed by the experts and technicians who deal with the problems.

A report entitled "The Gold Situation" (House Rept. No. 702) was issued on July 30, 1965. At the time the report was issued the United States held gold worth some $14.3 billion. Five years earlier its holdings were worth almost $18 billion, and 10 years ago nearly $22 billion. The U.S. stock of gold declined some $8.5 billion in the years since 1957, years in which the United States annually had had deficits in its balances of international payments.

The report is a factual, objective review of the country's gold reserves, in the light of the drains thereon through the redemptions of dollars by foreign countries, brought about chiefly through deficits in U.S. international payment balances. It treats of such subjects as U.S. policy as regards the redemption of dollars for gold, the adequacy of U.S. gold reserves, the strength of the dollar, the remedies applied to stem the imbalances of U.S. international payments, speculation in gold, and suggested curbs on speculation, and the various plans that have been suggested for improving international monetary arrangements.

The prime purpose of the report was to examine the gold situation of the United States as regards international demands, and to provide a better understanding of the situation. Large numbers of requests for copies have been received from Members of Congress, libraries, schools and universities, business establishments, and the public.

OTHER STUDIES

In the course of the year numerous studies were conducted in which no public hearings were held and no reports were issued. For example, the rulings procedures of the Internal Revenue Service were studied from the standpoint of the length of time which was entailed in the processing of the applications of taxpayers for rulings on tax consequences. So, too, a study was made of the procedures which the Internal Revenue Service applies in determining whether to acquiesce or nonacquiesce in adverse opinions of the U.S. Tax Court. Also, several specific complaints of improper actions by the IRS were investigated, covering alleged improprieties in the assessing and compromising of income tax liabilities.

Two physical security matters involving the Treasury Department were investigated, one as regards measures taken to prevent the theft of currency from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the other in respect of an allegation that ordinary silver dollars had been substituted in the Treasury's vaults for silver dollars of high numismatic value.

A complaint that the Department of Justice was delaying the trial of certain land condemnation cases with the objective of forcing property holders into settlements of the cases was investigated and found to be without merit, in that the delays were due to the unavailability of trial judges.

Studies involving the Federal banking supervisory authorities included such subjects as the investigation of a complaint that illegal dividend restrictions were imposed upon newly insured savings and loan associations by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; the possible annual savings of about $800,000 through the adoption of legislation which would permit the Federal Reserve System to destroy unfit Federal Reserve notes locally rather than sending them to Washington for destruction; and a complaint that excessive protest fees and service charges by banks were authorized by the Federal supervisory agencies.

GAO REPORTS

In this year the subcommittee received and reviewed 16 reports of audits by the GAO. Ten are being held for further study; six have been closed, among which were the following:

A report that the Coast Guard carried an excess inventory of some $900,000 worth of buoy bodies was closed after Coast Guard assurances of the establishment of adequate guidelines for determining requirements and inventory controls, with large savings to the Coast Guard.

A report that the Coast Guard incurred, and would incur additional, unnecessary costs in procuring power unit clamps without competitive bids was closed on the assurance of the Coast Guard that it would maximize competitive procurements, with savings indicated as being in the area of 30 percent in future procurement of the items to which such procedures apply.

A report that the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice charged its employees inadequate rentals was closed on the Bureau's assurance of complying with appropriate directives which will result in additional rental income to the Bureau estimated at between $338,000 and $749,000 per year.

Reports that the Federal Home Loan Banks of San Francisco and Cincinnati could have saved the Government large interest costs totaling about $600,000 by depositing their excess funds with the Treasury rather than with commercial banks have been closed on the assurance by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board that maximum use of Treasury accounts, so far as practicable, will be made. Although these reports are closed, the entire subject remains of interest to the subcommittee.

PRIOR ACTIVITIES OF CONTINUING INTEREST

In the 1st session of the 88th Congress, House Report No. 1147, "Crimes Against Banking Institutions," resulted from the subcommittee's studies of the operations of the Federal bank supervisory agencies insofar as they pertain to the reduction of crimes against banks. The subcommittee's interest in the subject in general is a continuing one. It is gratifying that many of its recommendations have been implemented, both by the supervisory agencies and by the enactment and calls for enactment of legislation which will aid in protecting the security of bank funds. That report, for instance, had urged that consideration be given to legislation which would permit the supervisory agencies to approve major changes in management arising from changes of control or ownership. A major step in that direction has been taken by the enactment of legislation which provides for the filing of reports of changes in control of insured banks.

In the 2d session of the 88th Congress, House Report No. 1640 entitled "Judgment Collection Practices and Policies of the Department of Justice," summarized the subcommittee's findings in its study of that subject and recommended means of improving collections. The Department has indicated the intention of complying with those recommendations, and some indication of its success is noted from the fact that its collections have improved some $23 million in an 18-month period.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on September 30 I spoke out on the floor of this house to protest the failure of the State of Texas to properly implement the Manpower Development and Training Act in Texas. This constructive and highly successful program was designed to equip unemployed men and women with the skills they must have to find employment. The success of the program is demonstrated by the fact that cumulative data through June 30, 1965 indicates that 74 percent of these persons trained under the program throughout the Nation have been placed in jobs. Clearly this is a program which should be supported, expanded and fully implemented.

In the State of Texas, I am sorry to say, the manpower training program is not being properly or fully implemented. In fact, State officials responsible for the operation of the program in Texas are today willfully violating the intent of Congress in passing the act and the Federal policy. Specifically, non-compliance with Federal policy consists in the total exclusion of all private business and training schools from participation in Manpower Development and Training Act programs. Contrary to the plain language of the act, and particularly the amendment to the act passed this year, Texas State officials have taken the position that the public schools shall have a monopoly in the field of manpower training and that the private business and training schools, who are in the taxpaying sector of the economy, shall be excluded. This situation is well documented and I have been complaining about it and bringing it to the attention of the appropriate Federal and State officials for more than 5 months.

Some time ago I received a letter from the U.S. Office of Education, in response to an inquiry I made, stating that:

> "* * * responsible State officials are now giving active consideration to the involvement of private schools in manpower training.

I was gratified to learn that after almost 3 years from the time the act was first passed that the State of Texas was now giving consideration to proper implementation of the act. But I served notice on the Office of Education as well as the State agencies involved that I would not be satisfied until private schools in Texas were in fact given an opportunity to contribute to the program.

Today, I am pleased to report that after additional inquiries from, the Office of Education has informed me that it has notified all the States that Federal approval and funding of projects will be withheld where the State refuses to permit private business and training schools to participate in Manpower Development and Training Act programs. It should be noted that Manpower Development and Training Act is funded 100 percent with Federal funds. This fact should be marked with more than passing interest by all the Federal and State officials concerned with the program.

I have also been informed that a meeting has been scheduled by Texas State officials with the private school community at Austin, Tex., on November 2, to resolve the question of utilization of private schools in the manpower program.

It should be remembered that the act was amended this year for the specific purpose of establishing guidelines for the States to follow in determining whether to use public or private schools, and to further encourage the use of private schools where they can provide equipment and training not available in public schools, or where at comparable cost they can provide substantially equivalent training, or, an expanded use of the individual referral method, or, aid in reducing more quickly unemployment or current and prospective manpower shortages.

State and Federal officials throughout the Nation, not only in Texas, should take cognizance of these guidelines. This is no time to smother our manpower program under clouds of regulations interpreted with narrow vision. It is my hope that the letter being circulated by the Office of Education will serve to invigorate the manpower program and to encourage State officials to make full use of it.

With unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of the circular letter of the U.S. Office of Education, dated October 14, 1965.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C., October 14, 1965.

C.L. 4093

Sent to: State directors of vocational education.

Sent by: Walter M. Arnold, Assistant Commissioner for Vocational and Technical Education.

Subject: Use of private educational or training institutions for manpower training.

Statutory provisions and congressional intent:

Section 231 of the Manpower Development and Training Act as amended provides that "* * * State agencies shall provide * * * training through public educational agencies or institutions or through arrangements with private educational or training institutions where such private institutions can provide equipment or services not available in public institutions, particularly for training in technical and subprofessional occupations, or where such institutions can, at comparable cost, (1) provide substantially equivalent training, or (2) make possible an expanded use of the individual referral method, or (3) aid in reducing more quickly unemployment or current and prospective manpower shortages."

Senate Report No. 123 contains the following explanation of this action:

"The committee adopted an amendment setting forth specific guidelines for the States to follow in determining whether to use public or private facilities for institutional training. The committee feels that the present requirement that private facilities can only be used if they make possible reduced Federal expenditures is too restrictive and tends to discourage the States' use of private institutions where existing private facilities might have advantages over public facilities. Specifically, private institutions may have equipment or services not available in public facilities. Furthermore, training of individuals may be facilitated where a particular training course is available at a private school."

House Report No. 170 states:

"Congress, when it passed the act in 1962, intended that the facilities of properly qualified, private training institutions could be used for Manpower Development and Training Act training. In 1963, Congress reemphasized its desire to have private institutions participate in the program by specifically amending the act to authorize the State vocational education agencies to contract for training with such institutions where they 'can provide substantially equivalent training with reduced Federal expenditures'."

"Hearings on this bill indicated that private training institutions have so far played a small but valuable role in the Manpower Development and Training Act program. These institutions can be especially helpful in achieving the purposes of the program in certain situations. One of these situations arises when private institutions possess more modern equipment and facilities than public training institutions. Another exists when a private institution can readily absorb into one of its ongoing programs an individually referred Manpower Development and Training Act trainee, or a small group of Manpower Development and Training Act trainees, and thus prevent these approved trainees from waiting until a specific new Manpower Development and Training Act project can be gotten under way in a public institution. An additional case is found when the capacity of public vocational schools and other public institutions in an area becomes too fully utilized to allow them to take on the desired number of Manpower Development and Training Act trainees. * * * In certain States, however, legal or other barriers may prevent a State's contributing (after June 30, 1966) the required 10 percent of training costs to a Manpower Development and Training Act project assigned to a private institution. In view of this situation, the committee has acted to authorize full Federal financing, where necessary, of training projects that can best be carried on in private institutions."

Project development and approval procedures:

To insure that the intent of the Congress is complied with Office of Education regional Manpower Development and Training Act representatives may not approve projects unless the project application contains a statement signed by the State director of vocational education, or his authorized representative, documenting: (1) the names of private training institutions or agencies contacted to provide training; (2) that when the State agency proposes to award the training project to a private agency or institution, it is because of a finding that such institution can provide equipment or services that are not available in public institutions, particularly for training in technical and subprofessional occupations, or that such institution or agency can, at comparable or reduced cost;[1] (a) provide substantially equivalent training or, (b) make possible expanded use of individual referral procedures or, (c) aid in reducing more quickly unemployment or current and prospective manpower shortages.

This statement is to be inserted in each project file presented for final review and funding immediately before the training plan (Form OE-4014).

General or blanket certification to the effect that alternate facilities were considered in the selection of the training facility will no longer be accepted as meeting the requirement of article II-C of the agreement.

This procedure is to become effective immediately.

Copy to circular letter sent to chief of State school officers.

FEDERAL URBAN RENEWAL AND RELATED SUBJECTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the work of Subcommittee No. 4, of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, and its investigation of Federal urban renewal and related subjects in the District of Columbia, matters have come to my attention which I feel should be brought to the attention of the House for consideration of possible remedial action.

There is an FHA regulation which is being so construed, in the District of Columbia, at least, in such way as to work hardship on homeowners who wish to improve their homes. Several years ago, Congress made provisions for FHA home-improvement loans not exceeding $3,500 at a rate of interest approximating 10 percent simple interest, the Government guaranteeing the loan to the extent of 90 percent. Under the construction of the regulation in question, owners who otherwise qualify for this home-improvement loan are forced to go to second mortgages, at a much higher interest rate, to borrow money to improve their homes. One local company claims to have been forced out of business because of this higher cost to the homeowners, and their efforts to aid homeowners in securing lower cost money and to avoid the use of second mortgages which are subject to large discount.

This questionable FHA regulation has to do with what FHA calls split financing, and the resulting hardship to the borrowing homeowner can be, best described by an illustration.

The homeowner has a mortgage or lien on his property, styled in the District of Columbia a "first trust," which was originally in the sum of $10,000; having lived in the house and made his monthly payments, the secured balance has been reduced to $7,500, on which the monthly payment is $75. He desires to make improvements on his home in the amount of $3,500; this can be financed by FHA insured loan, payable over a period of 60 months at $72.30 per month. Under this procedure, the homeowner's combined or total monthly payment amounts to $147.30.

However, this is a larger installment commitment than the homeowner can undertake, therefore, it would seem reasonable to suppose that the homeowner could go to the holder of his "first trust" lien, the balance of which is $7,500, and assuming the willingness of the holder thereof, could refinance and increase the amount thereof to the original $10,000. The monthly payment would remain the same $75, and homeowner would have $2,500 to help finance his home improvements. He would only require an FHA insured loan in the amount of $1,000 to complete the job, and the monthly payment on this FHA insured loan would approximate $21 per month, a total of $96 per month, rather than $147.30 under the first financial arrangement. Furthermore, it should be borne in mind that the interest on the "first trust" debt is 6 percent straight interest, while interest on the FHA insured loan is 10 percent straight interest. Therefore, the owner is paying 10 percent on only $1,000, rather than on $3,500.

---

[1] Training cost comparisons of public and private agencies or institutions considered shall be documented in terms of cost per trainee hour of instruction as well as total project costs.

But this is a crime, apparently, under the FHA regulation here in question—the law has been broken, and the homeowner, the contractor and the FHA-dealer bank have each committed a Federal crime. Rather than serving the purpose intended by Congress, to aid in the war on poverty, by helping people improve their homes, a regulation has been drawn, with penal provisions, to force homeowners to pay higher interest rates and incur monthly payments in excess of their means, to improve their homes—and, instead of the Government assuming a guarantee of 90 percent of $1,000, a higher liability is assumed of 90 percent of $3,500, with a much greater likelihood of being called upon to back the guarantee, because of the higher monthly payments demanded of the debtor.

Of course, there is another means of financing the required additional $1,000, but it costs the homeowner even more than the suggested $3,500 FHA-insured loan. This is to finance through the use of a second mortgage, or "second trust" as it is designated in the District of Columbia. The going rate for "second trusts" seems to be at 50 percent discount; therefore, the homeowner, to obtain the needed additional $1,000, would be required to sign a "second trust" note in the amount of $2,000, calling for at least 8 percent interest on the $2,000; the proceeds to him, under this arrangement, would be a mere $1,000, for which he would pay at the rate of $20 per month for nearly 12 years, whereas the same $1,000, if obtainable from FHA-insured loan, he would pay $21 per month for only 5 years, a total cost to him of less than one-half as much as for the "second trust."

It is my impression that it was the intent of Congress to help homeowners improve their properties, and that it was not the intent of Congress by its action to force such homeowners into paying higher interest rates, and have their mortgages discounted, for the benefit of moneylenders. The effect of the regulation which we have been here discussing is to the disadvantage of the borrower, makes money cost him more, and is of great benefit to the moneylender, particularly to the usurer. This hardship should not be imposed upon the Nation's homeowners, and they should not be placed under the heels of the heartless gougers. This regulation places a burden, as well, upon the banks and lending institutions throughout the land who desire to loan money at a reasonable rate of interest, to deserving homeowners who want to improve and save their own homes and communities.

ADDRESS BY JAMES H. BOREN—READER'S DIGEST PRESENTATION NATIONAL AWARD DINNER

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, many rewards have come to Florida over the years because of interest our citizens hold in international affairs. Our proximity to Latin America has given the people of our State an added opportunity to become participants in programs geared to promote better understanding and cooperation among the peoples of the hemisphere. Floridians have always taken a leading and productive role in seeking to broaden the scope of their involvement with Latin America. I want to address myself briefly to two of these endeavors.

On October 19, 1965, a coveted award came to the people of Coral Gables. Selected by the Reader's Digest Foundation as the outstanding people-to-people program in the class of 15,000 to 75,000 population, from among 16,000 such programs in the country, Coral Gables' citizens received high recognition for their outstanding achievements in applying the principle of helping people help themselves. Through their program with Cartagena, Colombia, the citizens of Coral Gables brought merit to themselves and Florida by sending technical publications to the University of Cartagena; by providing scholarships and medical equipment; by sending doctors; by providing technical assistance in traffic problems; and by always seeking to focus on people.

Mr. James H. Boren, director of the Partners of the Alliance program in Washington, D.C., was invited to make the principal address in Coral Gables on the occasion of the presentation of the award. This was a happy selection. I ask that the text of Mr. Boren's outstanding speech to the people of Coral Gables be printed at the close of my remarks. It is the Partners of the Alliance program that I want to call to the attention of my colleagues as another worthy endeavor currently underway in 27 of our States in partnership with 27 areas in 12 Latin American republics.

Less than 2 years in operation, the Partners Program has steadily progressed from an idea developed by Mr. Boren during his tour as U.S. Deputy Mission Director of our economic program in Peru to a dynamic inter-American program that has captured the imagination and the desire of the American people to personally participate in a grassroots direct alliance with the people of Latin America. It is a program of people in the private sector, both here and in our sister Republics, working together to establish meaningful and true partnerships to create better understanding and cooperation. This is a program in which service clubs, trade, labor and professional groups, as well as schools and individuals can participate in a variety of activities with private citizens in Latin America.

I am very proud that the people of Florida, on a statewide basis, are taking an active part in the Florida-Colombia Alliance, a partnership program between our State and the northern coastal states of Colombia. Under the leadership of Florida's Secretary of State Tom Adams and Larry Benson, the executive secretary of the Florida-Colombia Alliance, increasing numbers of our citizens are becoming directly involved in activities, designed by they themselves, to produce some measurable results of interaction between peoples of the two partner areas. The range of activities runs from impact type projects in the rural and slum areas in Colombia to technical assistance donated by private firms to developing commercial ties and a greater flow of goods and people between Florida and Colombia.

Florida's educational institutions have responded generously in support of the Partners Program. Florida leads the Nation with a total of 90 scholarships having been made available for Colombian students. Many of these scholarships are for full tuition, room and board. An ever-expanding base is being developed in the educational field under the Florida-Colombia Alliance to increase the interaction among people. Also, an agricultural committee of prominent Floridians has recently been appointed to inaugurate a special program of cooperation between the partners. It will seek to expend the technical know-how of our agricultural experts upon the problems of production and distribution present in parts of Colombia.

I predict with all confidence that the Florida-Colombia Alliance will generate ever-increasing traffic of people, both here and in Colombia, working together on common problems, sharing knowledge, exchanging culture and transporting a multitude of goods between our coasts in the months and years ahead. The increasing activity in which our people are daily becoming involved necessitates means for this interaction to occur in a methodical and efficient way. As the Florida-Colombia program expands and opportunities for new programs grow, a more urgent need arises to service and facilitate an orderly flow between these partner areas. To this end, I am continuing my efforts to have a U.S. consular agency established at Cartagena. I am pursuing this matter with the Department of State at the present time because of the growing evidence of its need.

The original Cartagena consulate, established in 1823, was one of the first such consulates in all of Latin America. It was discontinued in 1946. Because its historical importance coupled with future need makes a strong case for the new assignment of a consular agency in Cartagena, I feel it should be done. Provision to restore service at Cartagena can be effected at a minimum cost.

I salute the people of Coral Gables on their singular achievement in meriting outstanding recognition for their endeavors. And I congratulate all the people of Florida for their bold adventure in direct partnership with the people of one of our neighbors. These programs—the city of Coral Gables' people-to-people effort and the Florida-Colombia Alliance on a statewide basis—will have my continued praise and admiration and active support. For these two endeavors embrace the noble principle of help with dignity and will produce in the years ahead a climate for an era of friendship and achievement toward happier times.

The address by Mr. Boren follows:

ADDRESS BY JAMES H. BOREN AT READER'S DIGEST PRESENTATION NATIONAL AWARD DINNER HONORING CORAL GABLES PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM, CORAL GABLES, FLA., OCTOBER 19, 1965

The recognition being given to Coral Gables this evening reflects that this is not only a progressive city on the march but also that it is a city with understanding and with a heart.

I feel that I am no stranger to Coral Gables because I have heard much about your city, your people and your program from your advocate and Congressman DANTE FASCELL. Congressman FASCELL serves, as I am sure you know, as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. He is particularly interested in broader private participation in the Alliance for Progress, and I can assure you that I personally know of his interest from the penetrating questions which he has directed to me. So, I have been on the receiving end of his "to the point" questions and through our discussions of important issues relating to our country's foreign affairs, I know him not only as a great Congressman But I am proud to say that I know him as a friend. Also, through Congressman FASCELL and through his capable administrative assistant, John Buckley, I have felt that prior to coming to Coral Gables I have had a special introduction to many of the fine citizens of your city.

President Johnson has stated twice, in recent weeks, his strong belief that we must focus our attention on man and his position in the development process if progress is to be made in the cause of peace. On August 17, President Johnson spoke to the Latin American ambassadors to the United States. He said:

"Misery and pain and despair exist in the present; and we must fight them in the present as best we can. This is not only the command of compassion. It is the counsel of wisdom. For factories and banks and dollars do not build a nation. People build a nation. On those people—their health and knowledge and faith; their participation and their sacrifices—rests the future of all of us and all our nations."

The Charter of Punta del Este, which is the great charter of the Alliance for Progress, stressed that the Alliance effort must involve "the full energies of the peoples and governments of the American Republics." The Alliance is therefore a joint effort which requires positive action of both governments and private citizens. Your efforts in Coral Gables are helping to translate this principle into an operating reality.

I should like to share with you this evening some experiences of a newly developing activity which is emerging as an organized private sector effort within the concept of the Alliance for Progress. I am referring to the Partners of the Alliance which is very similar to your effective Coral Gables program but which differs primarily by functioning on a statewide basis.

Private citizens and civic, trade, labor, and professional groups in 27 States of the United States have organized statewide Partners of the Alliance Committees. These committees are working in a direct grassroots alliance with the citizens of 27 major areas or regions of 12 Latin American Republics. These partnerships normally revolve around five types of activities:

1. Helping local groups complete self-help projects.
2. Technical assistance.
3. Educational exchanges.
4. Cultural exchanges.
5. Joint venture investments and commercial relationships.

Let me outline a few of the partnership activities.

In the Andes of southern Peru, the village of Navan had been isolated for years with a narrow mountain trail being the only outlet for the products of the valley. The people of Navan provided the initiative, the plan, and the labor and the Texas AFL-CIO provided the picks, wheelbarrows, and shovels. An article in the July 31 issue of the Dallas Morning News, with a dateline of Lima, Peru, described the scene as that road was opened: "Last May they finished the job. A truck loaded with potatoes chugged up the narrow, lumpy road to commemorate the event. Church bells rang, people cheered, and dogs barked. For Navan it was the greatest day in its history."

Following the opening of the road, a special ceremony was arranged in which the village council passed the tools to a neighboring village which is now working on a 2-mile road to connect with Navan. Commenting upon this project, Carlos Boza, of the Peruvian Partners of the Alliance, said, "Texans have not made this an 'old clothes' program. They have helped us without making us feel like beggars and taking away our dignity as human beings."

This is the spirit of the alliance; this is a partnership response to a community self-help effort in a program which recognizes the importance of human dignity.

Pumps have been provided for community wells.

Medical equipment has been made available to small hospitals and medical posts. Over $100,000 in hospital equipment has been provided for a children's hospital and the Texas Partners committee is currently organizing a similar $100,000 medical equipment drive. Ohio, Colorado, and other State committees are arranging for equipment, much of which is new.

Joint venture investments and other commercial relationships are developing as a natural outgrowth of the relationships.

High school and college students in several States have provided the funds to place roofs, doors, and windows on schools constructed through the self-help efforts of villagers; 150 high schools are involved in one State alone.

Cement mixers have been provided—as have blockmaking machines, chain saws, handtools, and other equipment to enable slum improvement associations to complete community buildings, schools, and medical posts.

An accomplished young concert pianist from Texas, Monte Hill Davis, returned to her home 8 days ago after having performed 8 benefit concerts in Peru and 10 in Brazil. The funds raised are being applied to local Partners projects.

The people of one Andean village are separated from the small plots of land which they till by a rapidly flowing river. They hand-walk a steel cable stretched high over the river in order to plant, tend, and harvest their crops. At this very moment, 1,200 feet of 1½-inch steel cable is on its way to that village. With it they will construct a suspension bridge—a bridge to their land—and a bridge of communication on the people-to-people basis which you in Coral Gables understand so well.

Here in Coral Gables you have established an interesting doctor-to-doctor program. Of a similar nature, the Arkansas Partners of the Alliance fielded a team of doctors 2 days ago to work with doctors in the State of Santa Cruz, in Bolivia. Within a few weeks, the Texas Partners also will field a medical team to Peru.

Of particular interest to you in Florida may be the recent assistance provided by the Florida-Colombia Alliance committee to the people of the Barranquilla area of Colombia. A number of children had died from dehydration and many more were seriously ill and at the point of death. The stock of dextrose and saline solutions had been depleted and the Colombia Partners contacted their Florida counterparts. Colombia dispatched a plane to Florida and within hours after the first contact was made, the life saving solutions were delivered in Barranquilla.

Last month a rural nutritionist from Rio Grande do Sul in Brazil walked out of a hospital in Indiana following successful open heart surgery.

Arrangements were made between the two Partners committees and the entire medical bill was handled by the Indiana Partners. At the time of the operation, donations of blood were made in Rio Grande do Sul as a symbolic replacement of the blood used in the Indiana operation. The Texas Partners of the Alliance are now making arrangements for a similar heart operation on a young newspaper boy from Peru.

As a result of the partnership arrangements, many joint venture investments are in the mill and some negotiations already completed.

The Pennsylvania Partners have established 30 scholarships; Texas, 20; Indiana, 12; Illinois, 12; and Florida, including important junior college-level scholarships, has arranged for 80. Many scholarships are for full tuition, room and board.

The Florida-Colombia Alliance, incidentally is evolving into a very effective partnership. Several projects have been completed and many more are in the mill. As this program expands, I know that there will be opportunities for collaboration with your Coral Gables people-to-people program. One item of great interest to the Florida-Colombia Alliance is one in which you also are interested. I am referring to efforts to have a U.S. consular agency established at Cartagena. By combining forces perhaps you can be successful in this effort. Congressman FASCELL is pursuing this matter with the Department of State at the present time.

One of the most important aspects of the partnership program, however, is the fact that it is a two-way program.

Two weeks ago, through arrangements made by the Tennessee Partners of the Alliance and the Neumann Foundation of Venezuela, an outstanding collection of 58 Venezuelan paintings, valued at $100,000, was shown in Knoxville. They will be shown in seven galleries over a period of 9 months. Venezuela is making the first contribution in this new partnership.

A collection of Inca gold from Peru presently being exhibited at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington will be shown in Texas later this year. This is the first time this collection has been shown outside of Peru.

Twelve educators from Costa Rica upgraded the teaching of Spanish and assisted in social studies classes in 12 Oregon school districts.

High school science classes in Colorado will be assisted with mineral specimens provided by the Partners committee in Minas Gerais, Brazil.

A few weeks ago, a number of high school teachers of Spanish completed a program at Miami University in Ohio through which they were introduced to the Portuguese language. The Ohio partnership is with the State of Parana in Brazil, and by enabling the professor of Portuguese, Dr. Navarro, to make the trip to Ohio, Parana was making a contribution to its U.S. partner State. This month some 90 students are enrolling in Portuguese classes, or more than double the number expected prior to this summer's Portuguese session.

The partners program is not a charity program, but rather it is a channel through which people can work on projects of mutual interest. The partners of the Alliance focuses on helping those who are helping themselves and it seeks to translate into reality the stated principle that we in the United States can learn as well as teach and receive as well as share.

You, the citizens of Coral Gables already have demonstrated that you believe in this basic principle. You have sent technical publications to the University of Cartagena and you have made arrangements for sending medical publications. From baseball teams, initial scholarships and medical equipment to technical assistance in traffic and professional participation with doctors, you are focusing on people.

This is an hour of triumph and an hour of recognition for the citizens of Coral Gables. Your successes have been many and I am not here this evening to recount them to you who have been the instrument of those successes. I am here, rather, to congratulate you on your achievements and issue to you the challenge of even greater accomplishments in the period ahead.

Again recalling the words of President Johnson, "For factories and banks and dollars do not build a nation. People build a nation. On those people—their health, their knowledge, and their faith; their participation and their sacrifices—rests the future of all of us and all our nations." From great beginnings, we must move forward to a higher level of accomplishments. And I am confident that the recognition being given you tonight by the Reader's Digest Foundation will be considered by you as one milestone in the journey toward greater accomplishments.

Thomas Babbington Macaulay once said "The hearts of men are their books; events are their tutors; great actions are their eloquence." For me, it has been a privilege to share with you in this honoring of the eloquence of Coral Gables.

SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASES NULLIFIED BY ACTION OF STATES

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, this year this Congress increased social security benefits by 7 percent or a minimum of $4 retroactive to January 1, 1965.

Mr. Speaker, it was the clear intention of this Congress to increase the income and purchasing power of those who rely on social securtiy as the mainstay of their income. It is not clear, to say the least, Mr. Speaker, whether the intention of Congress is being carried out.

A news article from the Miami Herald of October 20, 1965, indicates that a reduction in State assistance to the elderly is nullifying the intent of Congress to raise their income both in my own State of Florida and throughout the Nation.

Furthermore, the Veterans' Administration in a letter to me indicated that they expect more than 29,000 VA pension payees may not benefit by the increase in social security payments.

Mr. Speaker, it clearly was not the intent of Congress to leave incomes unchanged as a result of a rise in social security benefits. I, therefore, request that the President direct the appropriate executive agencies to immediately make every effort to insure that the intent of Congress to raise income is carried out and that the executive branch immediately undertake a study on how best to insure that increases in Federal social security benefits result in a rise income and are not nullified by State, local, or private action.

Further, I ask that the appropriate committees of Congress now make all necessary studies in order that they may report to the Congress immediately following the opening of the second session, on what action by Congress, if any, is necessary to insure that the intent of Congress is carried out.

Mr. Speaker, I request that the Miami Herald article and the Veterans' Administration letter be printed at this point in the Record:

[From the Miami Herald, Oct. 20, 1965]

Relief Gains for Aged Nullified by State

(By Jim Strothman)

The State welfare department has nullified financial gains thousands of indigent Floridians expected to receive when Congress increased social security payments 7 percent, the Herald learned Tuesday.

Frank M. Craft, State welfare director, confirmed that his department is considering additional social security payments "as income," and that recipients of old age assistance are finding their relief checks reduced by a like amount.

"That's certainly contrary to the spirit of the law," declared Congressman Claude Pepper. The State should increase payments "instead of flaunting the intention of Congress," he said.

Congressman Dante Fascell, who voted with Pepper for increasing social security payments, said he was also "upset" over the State's action.

"We wanted to increase the benefits to the individual recipients," Fascell said in Washington.

He conceded that the State has power to make decisions on how to administer its own welfare payments, but said the State is "defeating the whole purpose" of the Federal law by cutting old age relief.

Sources in Washington confirmed a statement by Craft that Florida is not the only State reducing old age relief payments. "It is being done nationwide," Craft said.

According to the welfare department, the State considers all sources of income when it figures what an individual should receive from the State. Increased social security is a new source of income.

If, for example, social security payments to John Doe increase by $4, the State lowers its payments $4—freeing that amount for use in other welfare programs.

Mrs. Hazel Adams, head of the State welfare unit here, and Marshall Wise, head of the social security office here, said they recall nothing in debates leading up to the 7-percent increase showing Congress intended to make the raise "over and above all total relief previously received."

Craft said he did not know exactly how much money would be freed for State welfare programs, since October is the first month the change has taken effect and the department does not have any "experience" on which to base such a computation.

The money—in addition to contingent appropriations approved by the State legislature—could eventually lead to additional benefits to the aged, he said. No decision has been made and any change would not occur until January, he added.

The welfare department is considering increasing the maximum for its adult programs—old age assistance, aid to blind and aid to permanently and totally disabled—from $70 to $75 monthly, Craft said.

If funds prove available, relief to families with dependent children may increase from an $81 maximum to $85, nursing home care assistance could go up from $100 to $125 monthly.

Max Friedson, director of Dade's Senior Citizens Service Center, Tuesday notified the State cabinet and other officials of the reduction in old age assistance, saying he is "positive" it was the intention of Congress that increased social security benefits were supposed to benefit people receiving old age assistance.

Veterans' Administration,
September 29, 1965.

Hon. Dante B. Fascell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Fascell: The Social Security Amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89–97), approved by the President on July 30, 1965, provide, among other things, for an increase of approximately 7 percent in payments to those persons receiving Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance benefits. A minimum increase of $4 monthly is provided. This increase is retroactive to January 1, 1965. The specific effect of this increase on the amount of pension payable depends on the facts in each individual case.

Some Members of the Congress had expressed a desire in this first session of the 89th Congress, and in the second session of the 88th Congress, that any law increasing social security benefits be so worded that it would not cause the discontinuance of or reduction in any disability or death pension payments under laws which we administer. It was for this purpose that an amendment was introduced in the Senate to the bill H.R. 6675, 89th Congress. That amendment would have provided that the increase in social security payments not be counted as income for Veterans' Administration pension purposes. However, the House and Senate conferees rejected the amendment and the bill was enacted without it as Public Law 89–97.

In anticipation of an increase in social security payments based on a bill then pending, the 88th Congress enacted Public Law 88–664. Among other things, this law provides for a 10 percent exclusion of all retirement income in computing annual income for pension purposes. This exclusion applies to annual income computations under both the present and the prior pension programs. It was anticipated that the social security increase would also be approved by the 88th Congress and have the same effective date as Public Law 88–664. As events transpired, however, the bill relating to pension was passed by the 88th Congress and approved October 13, 1964, with a January 1, 1965 effective date, while a bill increasing social security payments from January 1, 1965 was not approved until July 30, 1965.

As a result, some persons became entitled to pension payments and others received an increased rate of pension from January 1, 1965, solely by reason of the 10 percent retirement income exclusion. Because of the approximate 7 percent increase in social security payments some members of the first group will lose their pension and some persons in the second group will lose the increased amount of pension they have been receiving since January 1, 1965. However, the date of discontinuance or reduction of pension (whichever is appropriate) will be September 30, 1965. This is in accordance with the law (38 USC 3012(b)(4)), which provides that reduction or discontinuance of pension by reason of change in income shall be the last day of the month in which the change occurred. Social security payees will receive an adjustment check in September 1965 covering the increased amount of benefits from January 1, 1965.

It could not be validly maintained that a 7-percent increase in social security payments would operate adversely to pension payees if the effective date of the 10-percent retirement income exclusion had been deferred to coincide with date of approval of the social security increase, July 30, 1965. The prior enactment and application from January 1, 1965, of the exclusion feature will operate to the advantage of some pension payees. It permits payment of more pension to these persons during the first 9 months of 1965 than would have been permissible if either enactment or application of the exclusion feature had been deferred until enactment of Public Law 89–97, increasing social security payments. No one will receive less pension in 1965 than he received in 1964, solely by reason of the increase in social security payments. Therefore, the earlier existence and application of the exclusion feature cannot be made a sound basis for a contention that the increase in social security payments will be detrimental to pension payees.

We have estimated that no more than 29,000 pension payees are potentially affected and that a lesser number, who commenced receiving pension January 1, 1965, or at a later date, will lose all or a part of their pension solely because of the social security increase. This is less than 1.5 percent of the total number now receiving pensions. To further minimize the effects of this loss we will identify the payees who may be affected, review their cases, and make timely adjustments to avoid overpayments. Current plans call for all identifiable cases to be adjusted prior to October 30, 1965.

Thank you for the opportunity to furnish this report.

Sincerely,

A. W. Stratton,
Chief Benefits Director.

MINIMUM WAGE BILL

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Morris] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, on October 15, I had the pleasure of speaking at the New Mexico AFL–CIO Convention. During the course of my remarks, I expressed concern about the minimum wage bill. Unfortunately, time limitations prevented my making as full an explanation as the matter warrants. My statement questioned the desirability of a $1.75 minimum wage at this time chiefly because we have not yet evaluated the overall effects of this proposal which includes an increase in the number of workers covered.

The benefits expected to result from the enactment of the minimum wage bill could be completely dissipated by adverse reactions in other areas of the economy. Inevitably when the lower end of the wage scale is raised, it creates an upward pressure which raises wages at all levels. Less than 60 days have passed since a substantial number of employees have come under full coverage of the last raise in minimum wage. Thus we must determine if the economy can at this time absorb the newly proposed increases through advances and efficiencies in production, or if these increases will cause higher prices. The legislative inquiry to date has not adequately examined this area of concern.

If increasing minimum wage and extending the coverage causes inflation in our domestic economy, the benefits will be very short lived to millions of the consuming public. For them, the benefits of 1964 and 1965 tax cuts could go down the drain. If business, on the other hand, tries to absorb more of the higher costs than practicable, the result will be lower profits with less funds for expansion and new jobs.

In my talk I referred to the problem of the marginally employable and the risk of their being squeezed out of the labor market. There are also students whose needs and responsibilities are less, and therefore the present minimum is not intolerable. The proposed increases very likely could price these people out of their jobs.

The administration and Congress has closely watched the balance-of-payments situation all year long. I believe we can breathe a bit more easily now. But U.S. exports and their continued vitality are crucial to the long and short run solution of this problem. An excessive increase in the labor cost would reduce our competitiveness. In present tariff negotiations, our bargaining hand is immensely weakened by a loss of competitive position.

I do not mean to imply that all these evils will occur. I just do not know. I do not think the Congress knows yet. But we should consider these risks and examine the alternatives available to us. Perhaps a lesser increase would have preferable effects. Perhaps a reduced extension of coverage would be more reasonable at this time. And, whatever the action taken, it may be better for everyone to extend it over a longer period of time.

I have had made available to me a set of statistics about retail stores and the impact of increase in minimum wage and in coverage; 663 stores in 463 towns in 37 States were identified as being covered for the first time by the new proposed legislation. Even at $1.50 minimum, the increase would eliminate 62.5 percent of their 1964 profits and at $1.75, 93.5 percent of 1964 profits would disappear. I realize that the economy is more than just retailing and that our sample may be small. Nevertheless, I believe these figures illustrate the powerful impact of this legislation.

Certainly $70 a week—$1.75 times 40—represents a sound goal for a family breadwinner. But it is essential to the continued vitality of our economy that we carefully pace the speed at which we approach this goal. This also poses problems which, along with the others I have reviewed, must be thoughtfully resolved before making final conclusions.

CITATIONS FOR CONTEMPT BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Burton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have previously spoken in Congress with respect to the citations for contempt by the House Committee on Un-American Activities of Dagmar Wilson, Donna Allen, and Russell Nixon. These three have since been convicted in the U.S. district court for refusing to testify before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in executive session. The case will be appealed and I am confident that the district court's decision will be reversed on appeal. In fact this has been the pattern for all of the contempt cases brought to the courts by the House Committee in recent years. The citations were upheld in the lower courts only to have the decision reversed on appeal.

What I am concerned about, however, is the role of the House of Representatives in this matter. The decision of the district court was a very narrow one. It held only that the committee had the power to proceed as it did. The question of the wisdom of the exercise of that power and whether it was employed for purposes that should be sanctioned by the House of Representatives was neither considered nor approved by the court.

The proceedings in the district court revealed the following facts. According to the staff director of the committee, Francis McNamara, the committee's interest was aroused by the fact that Professor Yasui, the dean of a leading Japanese law school, had been invited to come to speak in this country and had been admitted for that purpose by the State and Justice Departments. The committee disapproved of this action. In addition, the committee's interest was aroused by the fact that he had been invited to the United States by a weekly publication, the National Guardian. The committee, according to Mr. McNamara, had previously "cited" this publication as "subversive." Further, the committee had sought to obtain from the State Department information as to the events leading up to the admission of Professor Yasui, information which was refused by the State Department. Having been turned down by the State and Justice Departments, the committee then subpenaed these three witnesses who have now been convicted for contempt for refusal to answer the committee's questions.

The defense showed that Professor Yasui's tour in the United States had been sponsored by a committee of over 200 leading American citizens headed by our only double Nobel Prize laureate, Dr. Linus Pauling and Mrs. Cyrus Eaton. The committee included among others Presidential Medal of Freedom holders, the late Dr. Alexander Meikeljohn, and Lewis Mumford; Dr. Benjamin Spock, the foremost pediatrician in the country; Nobel Price laureate, Dr. Szent-Gyorgyi; the famous dancer Gwen Verdon; and our own colleague, the Honorable JOHN CONYERS, of Michigan. Dr. Pauling, Mrs. Eaton, and Dr. Spock all testified for the defense stating the reasons for their interest in Professor Yasui's tour and what he said while he was here. Professor Yasui was understandably concerned with efforts to bring an end to the threat of nuclear war. He spoke on the need for international efforts in this direction, for an effective international agreement barring further nuclear tests or the use of nuclear weapons. He spoke also on the importance of Japanese-American understanding.

Several questions are raised by these proceedings which I think require full examination by the House.

First. When and where have we as a body given authority to the House Committee on Un-American Activities to investigate speeches which follow a "peace line"? No suggestion was made by the committee that there was anything unlawful in these speeches or that Professor Yasui engaged in any activity while he was in this country other than the appearance in public forums and expression of views which are clearly protected by the first amendment. Did we, when we established the House Committee on Un-American Activities, intend to set it up as a censor of speeches by anyone, citizens or foreign visitors?

Second. When and where did we authorize the House Committee on Un-American Activities to cite publications or organizations as subversive? The defenders of the committee have told us here in the House that the committee engages only in investigations for legislative purposes. What legislative purpose is served by citing organizations? Moreover, according to Mr. McNamara, the citation was made in the absence of any hearing or opportunity for the organization to defend itself. This practice of the committee has only recently been condemned by the Supreme Court. See *Dombrowski* v. *Pfister*, No. 52, October term, 1964, decided on April 26, 1965.

The committee boasts of its great legislative achievement in having Congress enact the Subversive Activities Control Act which set up an administrative agency for the purpose of citing organizations as subversive. Leaving aside for the moment the merits of having any body cite organizations as subversive, I think it is interesting to examine Mr. McNamara's views on that act which according to the defenders of the committee is its greatest achievement. Mr. McNamara testified on the witness stand that he felt that despite this act the committee itself should engage in the same function because under the procedures set forth in that act the administrative agency was bound by legal technicalities; and accordingly many organizations would not be cited by that agency because of the inability to prove a case against them. The committee, on the other hand, according to Mr. McNamara, is not hamstrung by these same requirements. The committee therefore, has cited, and apparently intends to continue to cite, organizations which it believes to be subversive although admittedly under administrative procedures, the evidentiary requirements to prove a case could not be met. Is it the purpose and the intention of the House of Representatives to continue to permit this committee to cite organizations as subversive on the basis of the committee's disapproval of its views and without any evidence of the kind that could stand up even in an administrative proceeding?

Third. As I have already indicated, Mr. McNamara stated that the State Department refused to give the committee the information it requested concerning the circumstances leading to the admission of Professor Yasui into this country.

I fail to understand the basis for punishing three private citizens for contempt of Congress because they took the same position as that taken by the State Department. Moreover, if the executive branch of our Government believed that this was not an appropriate matter for investigation by the House Committee on Un-American Activities when information from the State Department was requested, how could it consistently with that view, then turn about and prosecute three private citizens who agreed with the State Department?

The fact that the United States District Court here has found for the committee on the narrow question of its exercise of power does not, I believe, absolve the House of Representatives for its action. It remains our responsibility to determine whether we sanction this procedure and the action taken by the House committee in our name. As I pointed out in my speech to the House on February 10, the House was never given an opportunity to vote on these citations and to indicate its approval or disapproval. I think that what has happened at the trial only demonstrates the necessity that the House reexamine this question.

My colleagues may ask whether, under my bill, H.R. 3784, when a resolution requesting certification of a report of a violation of section 102 of the Revised Statutes made after a sine die adjournment of a Congress, either House of the subsequent Congress can adopt an effective resolution certifying the report.

The Office of the Legislative Counsel has advised me that such a resolution would be effective.

The Legislative Counsel points out that this is not a case where a House of Congress is attempting itself to punish a contempt of an earlier Congress. Instead, the resolution merely causes a report of a criminal violation to be reported to the appropriate United States attorney. The Legislative Counsel knows of no principle of law which prohibits either House during one Congress from making a report with respect to events which occurred during a preceding Congress.

I ask, therefore, that all of you join with me in supporting my bill H.R. 3784 and ask that hearings be held on it by the House Judiciary Committee so that the full circumstances underlying the prosecution of these witnesses for the exercise of their first amendment rights may be explored by the House.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, under a special order on Tuesday, October 19, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] took the floor to denounce what he characterized as a "rump session" of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. I want to take just a few moments to set the record straight.

Rule I of the rules of the Banking Committee provides that the committee shall meet every first and third Tuesday of the month, unless the meeting is canceled by the chairman. When Chairman PATMAN did not cancel last Tuesday's meeting, the committee met and, in the absence of the chairman and pursuant to clause 3 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives—which provide that in the temporary absence of the chairman the next ranking member shall preside—I called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m. on Tuesday, October 19.

The committee first adopted a detailed procedural resolution offered by our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD]. Subsequently, when the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] entered the meeting, he was offered and took the chair as ranking member, again in accordance with clause 3 of rule X. When the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] ruled that the meeting was not duly constituted, the ruling was appealed and the members of the committee voted overwhelmingly to sustain the appeal.

The committee then voted down an amendment which had been offered at a previous meeting by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER]. I then offered a substitute to the bank merger bill that was reported by the Domestic Finance Subcommittee on October 1, 1965. An amendment was offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] and, when this was accepted unanimously, the Ashley substitute was adopted also unanimously.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GETTYS] then moved to direct the chairman or a member in favor of the bill to submit a report of the committee to the House of Representatives and a second motion to direct the members supporting the motion to take all necessary and desirable parliamentary steps to insure early and favorable consideration by the House. These latter two motions carried by a vote of 17 to 1 with the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], present but not voting. Two of the votes in favor were cast by proxies held by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

When the House convened at noon on October 19, I obtained unanimous consent to have until midnight that night to file the report of the committee.

In an effort to support his charge that this meeting was illegal, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has stated publicly that first, the regular meeting of the committee had been canceled; and second, that a quorum was never present at the meeting.

With respect to the alleged cancellation of the meeting, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] relies upon his memorandum to Paul Nelson, clerk of the committee, dated October 18, which reads as follows:

> Rule I of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee on Banking and Currency for the 89th Congress states that the committee shall meet at 10 a.m. on the first and third Tuesdays of each month unless canceled by the Chairman.
>
> The Banking and Currency Committee will not meet on October 19, 1965, which is the third Tuesday in the month.
>
> Since it is customary only when a committee meeting is scheduled to notify the members, it will not be necessary for you to notify the members that the meeting has been canceled.

The last sentence, of course, is all important. Clearly, what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] contends is that the cancellation provided for in rule I of the committee's rules can be accomplished by the chairman's not taking action to schedule a meeting, rather than by affirmative action notifying the members that a meeting will not take place.

We submit that this interpretation is totally unsupported by accepted legislative construction.

With respect to the presence of a quorum, 16 members of the committee have affixed their signatures to tally slips used to record the votes on the two motions made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GETTYS]. In addition, at that time the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] himself was present and in the chair but did not vote. He claims that although he was physically present, he was not present in any official capacity and, therefore, cannot be counted for purposes of a quorum.

One cannot help but be reminded of the nursery rhyme which goes:

> Yesterday upon the stair
> I saw a man who wasn't there;
> He wasn't there again today,
> Oh, how I wish he'd go away.

In all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, we submit that the committee meeting on October 19 was in strict conformance with rule I of the committee's rules, that a quorum was present and that S. 1698 with amendments was passed and properly reported to the House.

In order that the House may be fully informed, I believe the following brief chronology of events will prove helpful:

On June 11, 1965, the Senate passed by voice vote S. 1698, a bill to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers.

On June 14, 1965, S. 1698 was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

On July 19, 1965, 26 of the 33 members of the House Banking Committee, after being informed by the committee staff that no hearings were contemplated, directed a letter to Chairman PATMAN asking that hearings on S. 1698 be scheduled promptly.

On August 3, 1965, Chairman PATMAN announced that the Domestic Finance Subcommittee, of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is chairman, rather than the Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance, would hold hearings commencing on August 11 on S. 1698 and related measures.

On August 11, 1965, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] issued the first of many statements, accompanied by a press release on committee letterhead, openly critical of the bank merger legislation before his committee.

On September 13, 1965, after more than a month of hearings on S. 1698, I introduced H.R. 11011 and identical bills were offered on the same date by 18 other Members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

On September 17, 1965, I directed a letter to the gentleman from Texas, Chairman PATMAN, referring to a discussion earlier that day in which he indicated his willingness to respect the majority sentiments of the committee with regard to concluding hearings on the bank merger legislation. I informed the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] that I had talked to 22 members of the committee, each of whom expressed their judgment that the current hearings should be concluded no later than September 24, and that the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance report promptly thereafter to the full committee, in no event later than September 28.

On September 21, 1965, the gentleman from Texas, Chairman PATMAN, replied that first, the subcommittee should continue to hold complete and extensive hearings on the bank merger bill; and, second, that when the subcommittee had done this and reported to the full committee, he would "at that point certainly yield to the desires of the majority of the full committee in this matter."

On September 24, 1965, a letter was directed to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], as chairman of the Banking Committee, from Attorney General Katzenbach expressing the views of the Department of Justice, the Department of the Treasury, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation on the subject of bank merger legislation. Briefly stated, this letter expressed unanimous agreement among the above-mentioned departments and agencies that, first, past mergers should not be subject to the retroactive application of section 1 of the Sherman Act or section 7 of the Clayton Act, and second, that "the banking factors taken into account by the banking agencies under the Bank Merger Act of 1960 should also be taken into account by the courts—the proposition which underlies H.R. 11011." Attorney General Katzenbach objected to forgiveness of past mergers already found by the courts to be in violation of the antitrust laws; the Comptroller of the Currency disagreed with the Attorney General; the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the FDIC stated that they believed the matter to be within the purview of the Department of Justice.

On September 27, 1965, Chairman PATMAN called Democratic members of the Banking Committee into caucus in an effort to reach agreement on a draft bill which he outlined to the members present. No mention was made of the contents of the Katzenbach letter which had been delivered by special messenger to the Banking and Currency Committee on September 25, 1965.

On September 29, 1965, 19 members of the Banking Committee directed a letter to the gentleman from Texas, Chairman PATMAN, pursuant to section 25 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, requesting that, within 3 days, he call a special meeting of the committee for the purpose of acting upon S. 1698 and related or similar bills.

On October 1, 1965, the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance met and reported by a 7-to-5 vote S. 1698, as amended, a bill which differed widely from the suggestions contained in the Katzenbach letter of September 24.

On October 1, 1965, the gentleman from Texas, Chairman PATMAN, issued a committee notice advising members that the full committee would meet in executive session on Tuesday, October 5, to consider S. 1698, as amended and reported to the full committee.

On October 1, 1965, I sent to the gentleman from Texas, Chairman PATMAN, and to each member of the committee a copy of the substitute which I said I intended to offer, representing the position on bank merger legislation agreed upon by the Department of Justice, Department of the Treasury, Comptroller of the Currency and FDIC, with one exception—my substitute would validate all mergers occurring before the Philadelphia case was decided—June 17, 1963; others would be held to the criteria set forth in my original bill, H.R. 11011, and agreed upon by the above department and agency heads. With respect to validation of mergers prior to the Philadelphia case, this is essentially the same position taken by the gentleman from Texas' [Mr. PATMAN] subcommittee bill.

On October 4, 1965, without prior notice to or approval of the committee membership, the gentleman from Texas, Chairman PATMAN, announced by press release that he would "insist" that the

October 5 session be open to the public as a result of "arbitrary attempts by some committee members to rush through legislation without adequate hearings." The release stated that the Ashley bill introduces "totally new standards" on bank mergers and that my bill "would virtually eliminate the application of the antitrust laws to bank mergers." Mr. PATMAN was perfectly well aware, of course, that the standards contained in my bill are identical with those set forth in the Bank Merger Act of 1960 and you also knew that Attorney General Katzenbach had explicitly agreed that the courts should consider the same standards as the banking agencies, including the antitrust laws, in determining the validity of bank mergers. Mr. PATMAN also felt impelled to repeatedly impugn the motives of members who introduced H.R. 11011 and he even went so far as to charge that this constituted a "revolt against antitrust laws" and "an attack upon the Kennedy-Johnson administrations."

On October 5, 1965, the gentleman from Texas, Chairman PATMAN, directed that the executive session called for in the committee notice of October 1 be open to the press and public. When members pointed out that section 25 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives provides for a "special meeting of the committee," and despite a rule of both the House and our committee that executive sessions shall be held in private except when the committee by majority decision decides to admit the public, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] insisted that it was within his prerogatives as chairman to hold a public session. When appeal was sought to be taken from this ruling, the gentleman from Texas, Chairman PATMAN, dismissed it summarily, again in clear violation of the Rules of Procedure by which the committee is meant to operate. Instead, he insisted that a motion be made by members wishing to go from public session, where pursuant to the Rules of the House and committee we never should have been, into closed session, where we should have been in the first place. Based upon the chairman's comments at the time, it is clear that these efforts were intended to cast members in disagreement with him in the worst possible light with the press. A reading of the transcript also reveals clearly that subsequent efforts to reach agreement on duration of debate were held to be not in order, again with no appeal from these erroneous decisions by the Chair.

On October 8, 1965, the committee met, considered S. 1698 as amended, and then voted to recess until 10 Monday morning, October 11.

On October 11, 1965, consideration of S. 1698 as amended continued. At the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] urging, a motion was offered that the committee recess to Thursday, October 14, because of Columbus Day—October 12—and to accommodate speaking engagements of the chairman—October 13—but the motion was voted down. A preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] was then pending which would have recessed the committee until Tuesday morning, October 12. However, when the House went into session at 12 noon, the Moorhead motion could not be voted upon. Despite the chairman's earlier protestations that the next session would be scheduled at the convenience of the committee, he thereupon adjourned the session subject to the call of the Chair.

On October 11, 1965, because of Chairman PATMAN's failure to set a time and date for the next session, a second letter was directed to him pursuant to section 25 of rule XI requesting that a date be set for continuing consideration of S. 1698 as amended.

On October 13, 1965, the gentleman from Texas, Chairman PATMAN, returned from his speaking engagement in Texas. A session of the committee could have been scheduled for Thursday, October 14, or Friday, October 15. Instead, Chairman PATMAN called a meeting for 10:30 a.m. on October 18.

On October 18, 1965, Chairman PATMAN, the gentleman from Texas, called the meeting to order and, establishing that a quorum was not then present, he adjourned the committee subject to the call of the Chair. Within a matter of minutes, additional members arrived and a quorum would have been available but Mr. PATMAN refused to reconvene the meeting.

These are the events, Mr. Speaker, which led to the committee session on October 19. From the very beginning the members of the committee who repeatedly have urged legislative action in the bank-merger field have done so because of their honest conviction that it is highly important to the entire financial community that the procedures be clarified which govern approval of proposed bank mergers.

Far more important than the legislative issue at hand is the question of whether majority rule is to be respected in the House of Representatives or, alternatively, whether a House committee is to be allowed to be treated by its chairman as his own private domain for whatever purposes he may choose. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the action by the House Members last Tuesday represents a forceful response both to this question and to the issue of bank-merger legislation.

BORDER TRADE AREAS ACT

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

In the interest of promoting U.S. trade and friendly relations with her neighbors Canada and Mexico, with whom our own economy is directly and closely tied, I am today introducing legislation to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the exemption of duty on tourist goods purchased in border trade areas.

These border trade areas would extend 5 miles beyond the international boundary into Mexico, and 5 miles beyond the international boundary into Canada. Any tourist goods purchased by U.S. residents within these 5-mile border trade areas, would be subject to a different exemption from duty than tourist goods purchased by U.S. residents further within the interior of these countries. In the border trade areas the limitation on articles that would be duty exempt would be $200 in aggregate fair retail value in the country of acquisition, and the alcoholic beverage limitation would be 1 wine gallon.

A returning American tourist would have the option of taking the exemption for the border trade area, or the established exemption for the rest of that country, but in all cases he could not take both exemptions.

We who live on the borders of our country are acutely aware of the close economic relation between the United States and those Mexican and Canadian communities located just over the international boundaries. It can be truthfully said that our economy is as directly tied to these neighbor cities as it is to other U.S. cities. Therefore, I introduce this legislation to assure the continuation and encourage the expansion of our border trade, which substantially affects our own economy. The creation of such border trade areas will further the traditional friendly relations our country maintains with her good neighbors directly to the South and the North.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, following a practice adopted in 1963 and repeated last year, I am placing in the RECORD today my annual statement of personal financial condition. In so doing, I would like to reiterate briefly comments made in the past in the House and in reports to constituents of Wisconsin's Second Congressional District. Members of Congress and holders of high elective office in general ought to make public disclosures as a matter of course. I would hope that ultimately both bodies of Congress would adopt a standing rule providing a periodic report of outside interests and income. Only in such a way will conflict-of-interests questions be best satisfied.

I would further hope that the second session of the 89th Congress, which has been so productive in its first session, will take up the question of a disclosure rule as one of the first items of business.

Mr. Speaker, my personal statement follows hereunder:

ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL CONDITION, SEPTEMBER 30, 1965

Cash on account with the Sergeant at Arms bank, House of Representatives	$103.83
Securities	None
Residential real estate:	
House, Arlington, Va.: Purchase price	28,000.00
Less mortgage	18,177.18
Equity	9,822.82
Lot (cost less unsecured notes applied against purchase price)	4,500.00
Household	4,200.00
Miscellaneous assets:	
Deposits with U.S. civil service retirement fund through Sept. 30, 1965; available only in accordance with applicable laws and regulations	11,803.55
Cash surrender value of life insurance policies:	
On the life of Robert W. (2)	0
On the life of Dorothy C.	270.43
Total	270.43
Automobiles:	
1963 Oldsmobile	2,000.00
1965 Chevrolet	2,100.00
Total	4,100.00
Total miscellaneous assets	16,173.00
Total assets	34,800.63
Liabilities	None
Income for calendar year 1964 excluding congressional salary and expenses: speaking honorariums	850.14

REMARKS OF HON. ALTON LENNON

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration. This bill is identical to others that have been introduced by Members of the House on both sides of the aisle.

The promotional functions relative to the maintenance and development of an adequate American-flag merchant marine are presently vested in the Secretary of Commerce and redelegated, to some extent, by him to a Maritime Administrator appointed by, and serving at the pleasure of the President. The vitally important quasi-judicial, quasi-legislative matters dealing with construction and operating subsidies and other forms of aid are supposed to be under the determination of a so-called Maritime Subsidy Board. The Board is composed of the Administrator and two subordinate employees of the Maritime Administration, currently, I believe, the General Counsel and the Comptroller. For a while it was the Deputy Administrator, rather than the Comptroller.

This arrangement developed out of Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961, which also modified the previously existing organizational structure dealing with maritime affairs by creating a new completely independent five-man Federal Maritime Commission to handle all regulatory matters.

At the time Reorganization Plan No. 7 was before the Congress, most everyone, I believe, recognized the need for separating the regulatory from the promotional functions and the need for creating an independent commission for the regulatory portion.

But the part of the plan dealing with promotional matters abolished the previously existing Maritime Board created under Reorganization Plan No. 21 of 1950, which in its time had abolished the independent five-man U.S. Maritime Commission created in 1936.

In his statement the other day when he introduced a bill identical to mine, the distinguished chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, HERBERT C. BONNER, commented:

> During its period as an independent agency, the original Maritime Commission revitalized the merchant marine and produced a miracle of ship construction and operation which contributed so heavily to our victory in World War II.

He further noted that following the war criticisms of activities of the then existing membership of the Commission brought about the 1950 Reorganization Act. To similar effect, in a letter to President-elect Kennedy, dated December 15, 1960, Chairman BONNER stated:

> I believe the need for the 1950 reorganization of the original Commission into the present Board and Administration arose more from the executive appointment of misfits than from any inherent weakness in the system of organization prescribed in the 1936 act. This is not critical of the individuals but only of the inappropriateness of the particular appointments.
>
> I believe it is true of all the regulatory agencies, but I know it is true of the maritime agency, that qualifications such as experience, and willingness to give nonpartisan, objective tenure of service are vital.

Because of our great concern for the proper and effective administration of our national maritime policy, our Committee held a rather full series of hearings in July of 1961 to determine the effect of Reorganization Plan No. 7. Of course, these hearings were purely advisory since committee action on the plan itself was under the jurisdiction of the Government Operations Committee.

At the time of our hearings, I examined the witnesses carefully and in detail in an effort to receive satisfaction that part II of that plan would work effectively relative to the all important aspects of determining operating and shipbuilding subsidies and the other promotional responsibilities necessary to carry out our national policy. Though I sincerely sought to be convinced, I could not conclude that that plan would help the maintenance and advancement of the American merchant marine. My key difficulty with the proposal was the diffusion of responsibility, the lack of independence of the decisionmakers, the lack of bipartisanship, and the lack of tenure of office for the members of the so-called Maritime Subsidy Board.

Our committee took what might be called "a straw vote," or an advisory vote, as a guide to the direction in which our members should vote when the plan came to the floor of the House. I cast my vote against the plan, even though there was much sentiment in favor of giving it a try on the basis of assurance of the very fine and able officials of the Government who testified in favor of it.

Mr. Speaker, I will not recite the recent history of the current status of our merchant marine policy and its implementation. This has been done adequately by others in the recent past.

I will conclude by saying that Reorganization Plan No. 7, insofar as it applied to the administration of the promotional aspects of American maritime policy, has been a failure.

I think the time has come for us to again restore these activities to the administration of a completely independent agency.

MISS MARJORIE SAVAGE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, it is with extreme reluctance that I announce to the membership that Marj Savage, a most important member of my staff on the Committee on House Administration, has decided to retire at the end of this session. Marj was the first chief clerk of this important House committee when it was organized back in 1947. She brought expert competence to this assignment which she had developed through years of experience in both the legislative and executive branches. She departs with the best wishes of all who knew her, which includes Members of Congress and myriads of friends throughout the Federal Government.

DRUG SAFETY

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the thalidomide tragedy of 1962, the Congress passed the Kefauver-Harris amendments to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in order to provide consumers greater protection against unsafe, impure, or ineffective drugs. Although this legislation did much to provide adequate legal authority for effective regulation of the testing, manufacture, and marketing of drugs, it necessarily left a great deal of discretionary authority to the administering agency. Consequently, in order to determine whether the intent of the Congress in passing this legislation is being fully realized, we must know how the Food and Drug Administration is administering the law.

Until recently, the Congress had relatively little specific information on how this very important law is being administered. However, I am pleased to say that the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, under the able leadership of my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, the Honorable L. H. Fountain, has been working diligently to provide this much needed information.

It is my understanding that the subcommittee, in examining the Food and Drug Administration's operations, has studied a number of actual case histories of drugs subject to FDA regulation. One of the interesting cases unraveled by the subcommittee is described by Mr. James Ridgeway in the September 25, 1965, issue of the New Republic magazine.

Mr. Speaker, I include this interesting article at this point in the Record, and I recommend it to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the New Republic, Sept. 25, 1965]

Feeling Dizzy?

(By James Ridgeway on Drug Labels)

The amendments to the drug law which the late Senator Estes Kefauver fought so hard to get through Congress are supposed to better protect the public by tightening the Food and Drug Administration's regulatory powers. The burden of proof for a drug's safety and efficacy now falls on the manufacturer.

Hubert Humphrey, who tracked around after the drug people following Kefauver's death, now is safely tucked out of harm's way. And it has fallen to L. H. Fountain, a North Carolina Congressman, and his staff, to find out whether the drug laws are being administered properly and whether they are sufficient. In 2 years of hearings, Fountain has picked up several interesting odds and ends of information, but nothing quite so strange as the history he unraveled this spring of two drugs, called meclizine and cyclizine, which the FDA has had some reason to suspect were associated with birth deformities.

Meclizine and cyclizine are antihistaminic drugs that have been sold over the counter since the early 1950's for treatment of nausea, dizziness, and motion sickness. The FDA also has approved their use for nausea in pregnancy. Meclazine is sold under the trade name of Bonine by Charles Pfizer & Co.; cyclizine is sold as marezine and is made by Burroughs Wellcome & Co.

In December of 1962, a number of cases of birth deformities seemingly associated with meclizine were reported abroad, and as a result Sweden, Australia, Denmark, and Germany put the drug on prescription. Italy placed a warning on the label. Pfizer passed along these reports to the FDA, but said it had no reports that its meclizine product was involved in deformities.

The next April, Dr. C. T. G. King of the National Institute of Dental Research wrote to FDA Commissioner George Larrick, describing studies he had carried out which showed meclizine to be teratogenic in rats, causing cleft palates, and incomplete calcification of the vertebral column, femur, humerus, and skull.

This was soon after the thalidomide tragedy and the FDA was keeping a sharp eye out for drugs that might cause birth defects. FDA officials decided to pull together the available scientific data that would have bearing on whether these two drugs caused fetal defects. A number of specialists were called in, and the manufacturers' data assembled for study. On May 7, 1963, the medical bureau of the FDA, which supervises this sort of work, sent the following recommendations to Larrick: "In view of (1) the occurrence of fetal abnormalities in experimental animals when meclizine is administered during pregnancy in larger than therapeutic doses, (2) instances of fetal abnormalities associated with its use, and (3) after consulting with experts, it is the considered opinion of the Bureau of Medicine that all meclizine preparations should be restricted to prescription use. Further, the labeling should include a warning statement, 'Safe Use in Pregnancy Has Not Been Established.' It should also be pointed out in the labeling that serious consideration should be given to the advisability of prescribing the drug for women of childbearing age. * * *"

The same recommendations were made for cyclizine.

About 3 months after these recommendations had been sent to the Commissioner's office, the assistant to the medical director called both manufacturers, told them the Commissioner had cleared the recommendations and asked whether they would comply voluntarily. If not, he said, the FDA might have to begin regulatory proceedings. A meeting between the FDA officials and company representatives took place in August. The manufacturers said they would not voluntarily comply.

The matter remained stalled until October, when another memo from the medical bureau went up to Larrick, reminding him of its original recommendations and asking him to carry them out. In November, Assistant Commissioner Winton B. Rankin sent back a memo to the bureau making it clear he felt the FDA would be on shaky legal grounds because there was doubt that the 15 experts consulted would come forward to testify if the matter reached the courts. Instead, he asked that an ad hoc committee of experts be formed to go over the drugs and present the Commissioner's office with a formal recommendation. (In fact, the Fountain subcommittee staff turned up a memo at the FDA dated in April 1963, which specifically stated that the original 15 experts had been contacted and were willing to stand in court if need be.)

Nonetheless, the medical bureau followed Rankin's directive and formed an ad hoc committee which met April 20, 1964. Its conclusions were virtually the same as those of the preceding group; that is, it recommended the two antihistamines be sold only on prescription and the labeling be changed to read that safety in pregnancy had not been established. These recommendations were forwarded to Larrick May 6. On June 11, Dr. Matthew Ellenborn, then Chief of the Drug Surveillance Branch, phoned Larrick's office to find out what had happened to them. He was informed that the summary of the committee meeting which had been submitted as a report could not be considered an official committee recommendation. It was suggested that a member of the committee be appointed to prepare a draft report, circulate it among the committee members for their review and approval, and then send it back up to the Commissioner's office as a formal recommendation.

This must have been a complicated business, since it took 7 months to prepare the formal recommendation. It was on January 18, 1965, that FDA's Medical Director, Dr. Joseph F. Sadusk, Jr., sent a memo to Larrick endorsing the committee report which had not changed in substance. Dr. Sadusk's memo advised the Commissioner to tell the companies to comply or face regulatory action.

Then, quite suddenly and mysteriously, Dr. Sadusk changed his mind. Within 72 hours of sending up the report, he called the Commissioner's office to ask to have it sent back for further and final consideration.

Looking back on it, Dr. Sadusk told Fountain, there had been a number of things troubling him about the intended course of action. For one thing, it had been nearly a year since the first ad hoc committee met and during that time more scientific information on meclizine and cyclizine was becoming available. Moreover, he thought that placing the drugs on prescription might be too drastic, since he felt there was little data to demonstrate a cause-and-effect relationship between the drugs and birth defects in humans. The available data concerned animals, and since there were a number of other drugs where animal data suggested teratogenic effects, it might well be better to make a more general and thorough study of them all before arriving at a considered policy. Moreover, thousands of people had been taking meclizine and cyclizine for several years, and at best the FDA only had reports of 100 or so birth defects in connection with their use. If there had been real cause for alarm, the FDA and the manufacturers would have received thousands of reports.

Actually, as the subcommittee staff brought out, there are thousands of children born deformed every year, but little accurate information as to why they are born that way. Information on what drugs the mothers took in pregnancy appears scant. However, it is not as if meclizine and cyclizine are the only drugs available for nausea, dizziness and motion sickness. There are several other products available whose safety has not been questioned. The FDA, of course, knows this. At any rate, Dr. Sadusk decided the matter needed going into once more, and he convened a second ad hoc committee. Scientific evidence seems to have accumulated along three fronts. For one, a study in California of pregnant women on the drugs indicated no cause for worry, although as the subcommittee staff showed, this study covered about 160 women, which it was suggested might be too small a sample to be significant. Another study underway at the National Institutes of Health was said by its sponsors to be, as of then, inconclusive. Dr. King, however, had been carrying forward his work with the drugs in animals where they continued to appear teratogenic.

The meeting of the second ad hoc committee was held late this April. Under new rules established by Dr. Sadusk, representatives from the manufacturers participated in the deliberations. They were, however, asked to leave the meeting when it came time to make a decision. (A tape recording of the session was made, but the Food and Drug Administration refused to make it available to the Fountain subcommittee on the ground that disclosure to the subcommittee would unsettle the scientists.)

This committee's recommendations were considerably milder than those of the two preceding groups. It proposed that meclizine and cyclizine be left out for sale over the counter without a prescription, but that labels be changed to carry the statement: "This drug shall not be taken during pregnancy without the advice of a physician." This proposal was sent to Larrick.

All of this has led to a certain amount of confusion. When reports about the possible danger of these drugs to pregnant women first were circulated, the Public Health Service removed stocks of meclizine and cyclizine from 40 clinics where Government employees are treated. But the public at large knows little of the controversy that has occupied the FDA for 3 years.

When asked for something to alleviate air sickness, airlines still give out Bonine and

Marezine as well as other drugs. But in Washington last week one druggist refused to sell Bonine to a young lady who said she was nauseated, dizzy, and thought she might be pregnant. He said he heard it might result in birth defects. In three other instances, however, druggists recommended Bonine and Marezine to women who complained of nausea and dizziness. When the women said they might be pregnant and asked whether the drugs would be safe in that case, the druggists said both products were perfectly safe.

Dr. Sadusk made it clear he felt women who are pregnant ought to know enough not to take just any drug. Their doctors would have told them that. Presumably a warning on the label would be an additional warning to such women. It was unclear what women should do if they were nauseated but did not believe themselves pregnant.

DELAY IN PROCEEDINGS AGAINST SIX BANKS ASKED

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Todd] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I presented to the House a statement concerning actions and comments made by a gathering of some members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency last Tuesday. Since making that statement, I have become aware of communications addressed to the Attorney General of the United States requesting him to delay proceedings presently instituted against six banks, two of which have been tried and found guilty under our antitrust laws.

This is my first term in Congress, and it is with some temerity that I rise in objection to these requests. Before I became a Member of this distinguished body I believed that a rule of law should be impartial, that it should be applied with equal force, speed, and justice to weak and strong alike, and that a law, until changed, continued to exist. I believe the same today.

From the vantage of one who may still look at Congress as others see us, I look with dismay upon this effort to direct the Department of Justice to delay its proceedings, to request the courts to delaying imposing sentence upon parties already found guilty, and to imply that Congress will take this or that course of action, when in fact it has not in spite of opportunity to do so.

We have witnessed a travesty on the legislative process, which did not succeed. I hope that strong and powerful interests will not be successful in bringing about a traversy on the system of laws upon which our competitive economy and freedoms depend.

The impropriety of these importunities that the course of justice be stayed is highlighted by the simple fact that those who now ask to be relieved from justice publicly accepted the possibility of penalty, that is, divestiture, when they took the action, that is, merger, for which the courts have now found them guilty. Both banks held in civil violation of the antitrust laws pleaded, prior to merger, that they be allowed to merge pending the outcome of the antitrust suits, since divestiture would be an adequate remedy if the cases went against them. It is totally inappropriate, in my opinion, to stay the execution of the laws which they in fact accepted. They, like any good citizen, should keep their word, and accept the law as the Supreme Court finds it to be.

The pleadings that the imposition of the penalties decided by the courts is harsh can be argued by anyone who has felt the force of law. In these cases, it is particularly inappropriate because divestiture takes away nothing that they had prior to merger, and simply prevents them from retaining the benefit of restraining competition, or tending toward monopoly, as the court decided. Should they be allowed to retain such a benefit, they would gain at the expense of their competitors and a free economy, as defined by the courts. I can find harshness of remedy no better argument for a multibillion-dollar bank than for a housewife who must pay a traffic ticket.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include statements made by counsel for the banks when they pleaded that they not be restrained from merging, as the Department of Justice requested, prior to the outcome of the antitrust suits.

Counsel for Manufacturer's-Hanover said:

> Mr. Seymour. The Government has an ultimate remedy if it prevails. * * * They have got a divestiture relief, and there are decisions to that effect.
>
> Mr. Drye. That sure there are always some problems about divestiture, if they win, but we are willing to assume those problems. They are much more serious to us than they are to the Government, but their only relief and the only procedural relief they are entitled to is a suit for divestiture.
>
> There are scores of divestiture cases * * * If we have to face that * * * we will take our risk.

Counsel for the Lexington banks said:

> Mr. Park. I may say at this time that we recognize the possibility that at the end of the litigation we may have to restore these banks to their former status and we recognize that for our own protection we must do everything that we can to keep the assets segregated and identifiable so that they can be restored. That we expect to do. That is our position, your honor.

REPORT ON 11TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE ASIAN PEOPLES' ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the 11th annual Conference of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League was held in Manila during the week of September 7. The Conference was organized by the Philippine Anti-Communist Movement, which is headed by Senator Ramon Bagatsing, president, and Dr. Jose Ma. Hernandez, general secretary.

One hundred and thirty-two representatives from various part of the world attended the Conference. In the speeches which followed in the plenary session, the speakers concerned themselves with the position in their respective countries, with the Communist threat from Soviet Russia and Red China, and with the possibilities of meeting this danger effectively.

Under unanimous consent, I include the report of Jaroslav Stetsko, president of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations—ABN—and former Prime Minister of the Ukraine, which he gave to the Conference on ABN activities behind the Iron Curtain and in the free world:

ABN Report

(By Jaroslav Stetsko, president of the anti-Bolshevik bloc of nations (ABN), former prime minister of Ukraine, to the XI Conference of the Asian Peoples' anti-Communist League (APACL), held in Manila from Sept. 7 to 12, 1965)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, dear friends of our struggle for national independence, personal freedom and human dignity, it gives me great pleasure and it is an honor to be able to extend the warmest greetings to you on behalf of the Central Committee of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN), which is a coordinating center of revolutionary organizations, dedicated to the liberation of the nations subjugated by Russian imperialism and communism.

I should like to wish complete success to the XI APACL Conference in the name of the following liberation organizations and liberation committees:

Committee "Free Armenia," Bulgarian National Front, Byelorussian Central Council, Cossack National Liberation Movement, Croatian National Liberation Movement, Anti-Communist League of Cuba, Czech National Committee, Estonian National Council, Georgian National Organization, Hungarian Freedom Fighters, Latvian Association for the Struggle against Communism, Lithuanian Rebirth Movement, Polish Christian Social Movement, Rumanian Free Front, Organization of Serbian Nationalists, Slovak Liberation Committee, National Turkestanian Unity Committee, Ukrainian Hetman Union, Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists.

I should like to express our special thanks and gratitude to our Philippine hosts for making our participation in this Conference possible. We are happy to be able to visit this beautiful country of yours and to pay tribute to your hospitable people, who have fought so bravely for their freedom. Upon our return we are looking forward to publicizing the achievements which have been made by the Philippine nation in national, cultural and social spheres and the steadfastness of its anti-Communist fight.

Before reporting on ABN activities behind the Iron Curtain and in the free world, I should like to acknowledge and express our admiration for the heroic people of Vietnam in their fight for existence. By helping them, the free world helps itself.

The national liberation movements of our peoples are of great significance to the free world, for they continually frustrate the Kremlin's imperialistic ambitions to dominate the world.

Following the open guerrilla warfare in our subjugated countries between 1943–53, numerous strikes and uprisings took place in Soviet concentration camps. The most notable of those were organized and executed by non-Russian prisoners in Vorkuta, Norilsk, Karaganda, Kinguirs, Tayshet, and others between 1953–59. It goes without saying that they greatly contributed to the strengthening of the resistance to Russian domination in the home countries.

Since 1959, however, a new stage in the national liberation movements is evident. The strikes and mass demonstrations in the heavy metal industry of Ukraine (located in the Donbas) and the open revolt in Temirtau (Kazakhstan), were followed by widespread riots in Novocherkask and acute disturbances in Odessa, where longshoremen refused to load ships destined for Cuba. Underground organizations are constantly at work in Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Turkestan, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Byelorussia, and other countries. The Soviet press itself carries reports on their activities (example, the trial of OUN members (Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists)), and the former editor of a Soviet periodical, Dr. Alexander Rathaus, who has escaped to the West and is now living in Israel, has also acknowledged the existence of underground organizations.

Active resistance against foreign domination is also to be found in Rumania, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, Bulgaria, East Germany, Albania, Croatia, and other subjugated countries.

The actions of these national liberation movements clearly refute Lenin's thesis that under "proletarian" rule, revolutionary activities would be impossible. In all the so-called Soviet republics and the satellite countries, the actions of the national liberation movements proved that there is a limit to the terrorization of the peoples by the Soviet Russian regime. Moreover, their actions dispelled the fear of the large masses.

In fact, as a direct result of the revolutionary activities of the national liberation fronts, the Soviet Russian regime was frightened into initiating a relaxation policy, generally known as de-Stalinization. This policy contains the seeds of destruction of Soviet Russian rule in the subjugated countries.

Some people might feel that this relaxation policy will lead to the democratization of communism and that the Russian empire can become democratic. This can never be the case, for it would lead to the dissolution of the Russian empire as such. But Moscow will never willingly give up its present hold over the so-called Soviet republics and the satellite states; hence it will never become democratic.

A new stage in the national liberation movements is marked by an increase in psychological warfare techniques. Technically educated youth build and employ shortwave senders to spread anti-Communist and anti-Russian propaganda. Illegal broadcasting has become the order of the day in the Soviet Union and the satellite countries—a fact which is directly confirmed by the Soviet press, which complains of "air hooligans." According to Soviet press information, the so-called "air hooligans" have been broadcasting anti-Soviet songs, poems, political commentaries and satires, sensational and exaggerated news reports on events in the Kremlin, and so forth. A trial of "air hooligans" was reported in Kharkiv (Ukraine).

There is evidence in the Soviet press too, that the population is endeavoring to arm itself, especially the young workers and the students. This is done by stealing weapons from the State arsenals, by building them at home, by purchasing them illegally from State depots and by taking them from representatives of the Soviet authorities and even from military troops.

The widespread ideological and cultural offensive on the part of writers, artists, and intellectuals especially of those of the young generation is another form of revolutionary activity which is not to be underestimated.

The ideas they mainly represent are love of country and God, justice, truth, human dignity, and freedom. The young artists flatly reject so-called socialist realism and look for new forms of artistic expression. A cultural renaissance on traditional and historical principles is the dominant motive in which the younger generation is interested. One finds neither dialectical materialism nor negation of one's fatherland. On the contrary, there is a fanatic faith in, and fanatical love of one's country. No internationalism, no Soviet patriotism. The young people do not shrink from writing anti-Russian and anti-Communist poetry, even if they are imprisoned for doing so. This refutes the allegations of some "experts" on Soviet affairs that our subjugated peoples, and especially the young, have become sovietized.

Owing to the limitation of time at our disposal, I shall refer to one example only, the young Ukrainian poet Vasyl Symonenko. His verses, which are charged with accusations against Russia and demand resistance, have become the inspiration and battle cry of the young. He looked into the "tortured eyes of Mother Ukraine," which seemed like wounds to him—yet wounds "flashed with blood-red lighting of upheavals and fights at the barricades." He pledged:

> "Ukraine, you are my prayer,
> My eternal desperation,
> For your holy name I am ready
> To pour forth my last drop of blood."

The voices of poets like Vasyl Symonenko are heard from Turkestan to Rumania and Bulgaria, from Georgia to Estonia and Latvia.

The 1959 Soviet census showed convincingly that the Soviet Russification policies which have been employed in the U.S.S.R. for more than 40 years, were not able to Russianize non-Russians. More than 85 percent of the non-Russians listed their national language as their native language in the census.

At the same time, however, new developments have been taking place in the Soviet Government. These developments are grave and dangerous for the West. At present Deputy Prime Minister Shelepin, the man who controls the KGB and the Communist Party, is on the march to absolute power in the Kremlin.

In its June 19, 1965, issue, a newspaper Radianska Ukraine (Soviet Ukraine) published an article by the chief of the KGB in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, General Nikitchenko. In this article General Nikitchenko praises the present and former members of the KGB, who rule and contral the whole complex of Soviet life: cultural, economic, and administrative. The chief of the KGB in the Soviet Union, Semischasny, writes in the same tenor in Pravda.

A new generation of fanatical Russian chauvinists, with KGB mentality, are preparing to take over in the empire. It is our duty to unmask and reveal the true faces of these criminals headed by Shelepin, especially as the new Shelepinites and national independence for the young developing countries.

In this connection I wish to recall to mind, that according to the verdict of the German Supreme Court in Karlsruhe in 1962, Shelepin is the man who gave the orders for the assassinations of Stefan Bandera, leader of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), and Dr. Lev Rebet, the anti-Communist writer and publicist. Both assassinations were carried out on the sovereign territory of the German Federal Republic.

I accuse Shelepin, the present Vice Premier of the Soviet Union and probable future dictator of the Soviet Union, of being responsible for an attempt on my own life, too.

We call upon the leaders of the free world not to cooperate with these murderers and tyrants, lest freedom and liberty lose their meaning value.

Parallel to its liberation fight behind the Iron Curtain, ABN carries on widespread activities in the free world. These are mainly in the form of mass demonstrations against Russian foreign rule and against Communist subjugation of our countries.

One of the largest and most notable of ABN's actions in this form took place in Scandinavia as a protest against Khrushchev's visit. Thousands of young Swedes and Danes marched under the ABN banner. This was an unmistakable sign of the support which the ABN front receives. While denouncing Khrushchev, ABN paid special tribute to Charles XII, who, in 1709, allied himself with the great Ukrainian statesman, Hetman Mazepa, against Russia. In his speech in Goeteborg, Khrushchev not only severely attacked ABN's goals and ideas, but addressed angry epithets against me, as president of ABN.

Just as in past years, ABN organized mass demonstrations in West Germany, Canada, Australia, Latin America, and elsewhere in connection with Captive Nations Week this year also.

It is also part of our aim to contribute to the rebirth and strengthening of patriotic feelings, to devotion to heroic humanism, and to religious beliefs, which are all necessary for the West's success in the struggle against communism. A union of men of free spirit, the martyrs of Russian and other concentration camps, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, the heroic Hungarian revolution, as well as other freedom fighters, must be established in the West also.

We are living in an ideological age, which, however, is also the age of thermonuclear weapons. It is a revolutionary age. Ever since the days of the Paris Commune, wars have been more and more decided by revolutions and not by battles. Russia was defeated in the Russo-Japanese war of 1904–05, not only by Japanese attacks on her fronts, but also by the fear of internal revolutions. In 1914–18 it was actual revolution that put an end to the Russian Czarist Empire.

During World War II Hitler failed to support national revolutions within the Russian Empire, and Churchill and Roosevelt failed to support the anti-Nazi revolt in Germany. By giving all possible support to Stalin, they enabled him to win the war. Once won, he immediately set to work to undermine all non-Communist governments. This is what is now called the cold war. Yet the Western Powers fail to realize that it is the real war in a revolutionary age, and that the nuclear war they fear and are preparing for is nothing other than the old fashioned outer front type of war raised to the *n*th degree. Once again they are preparing to fight the last war over again, while the Kremlin is fighting the real war and winning it.

There is an alternative to nuclear war for the West also. This alternative is support for the national liberation movement in the U.S.S.R. and the satellite countries. This support must be given in a similar way that Moscow and Peiping give support to their brand of national liberation wars and revolutions. Under this condition, Moscow and Peiping could easily be defeated from within, without running the risk of a nuclear war.

History has taught us that Russia only responds to force—never to a policy of leniency. Hence, support of national revolutions by the West is bound to succeed, on condition, that is, that it does not leave those who have taken up arms against Russian tanks in the lurch, as was done in Hungary. The spirit of Yalta must be banished once and for all.

It is a mistake to concentrate solely on Communist China and to underestimate the Russian Communist danger by regarding it as of secondary importance. In support of this, I should like to quote the view of the U.S. admiral, Mahan. He analyzes from geopolitical point of view: "He who rules Eastern Europe commands the heartland. He who rules the heartland commands the world island. He who rules the world island commands the whole world. The heartland means European and Asiatic countries of the Russian Empire. The world island consists of Western Europe, Asia, and Africa. The rest of the world is a smaller island comprising the Americas, Great Britain, Japan, Australia, Indonesia, New Zealand, and New Guinea. Russia commands the heartland because she rules eastern Europe. Therefore, she is on her way to ruling the world island (Western Europe, Asia, and Africa)."

The complete dissolution of the Russian Empire is therefore a necessity for integral and indivisible freedom and lasting peace in the world.

I am optimistic about the future. At the time of the French Revolution, the great British statesman, Edmund Burke, stated with regret: "The age of chivalry is gone. The age of sophists, economists and calculators is coming." Today it can be said that precisely the opposite tendency is observable. The modern mind has been closed to God for a long time, but it seems now that God is finding His way back—back through closed doors.

The traffic of ideas is duty free.

EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN OF FATE

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the following poem which was written by my good friend David Gimbel and which he has dedicated to our beloved friend, His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing; who Dave describes as "the chosen shepherd of the Lord who is leading exceptional children into a new world of love, understanding and hope."

EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN OF FATE

(By David Gimbel)

Oh, why are they exceptional? The answer is very clear,
Because to the parents of these angels they are so sweet and dear.
They're usually not expected, and from the very first breath of life,
All parents' hearts are filled with pain that cuts just like a knife.

You just build your world around them and perhaps your troubles mount,
But somehow with love and kindness you make each moment count.
They penetrate your hearts with their innocent, childish touch,
And with their wide, expressive eyes it can mean so very much.

Their words and steps come very slow, each day just seems like years,
And how many times you pace the floor and eyes are filled with tears.
At night you tiptoe in their room, your compassion is so deep,
You cover and you kiss them while they are fast asleep.

Execptional children may never know the meaning of shame or hate,
While some parents of normal children sit up at night and wait.
Then comes the dawn, and hearts are broken with some beyond repair,
Oh, those shattered dreams and agony that loved ones then must share.
But all exceptional childern, no matter where they be,
Are a pattern for love and kindness for the entire world to see.
Today we see some nations who are filled with lust for power,
And who can destroy the world in the matter of an hour.

So let's take a leaf from these exceptional children of fate,
And learn the lesson that they teach before it is too late.
Then the calm of peace will set the stage from the ashes or rubble and dust,
As men and nations all join hands in honor, love and trust.

THE DEMISE OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following article which I received today from Mr. Joseph Curran, chairman of the AFL-CIO Maritime Committee:

THE DEMISE OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE—NICK JOHNSON STYLE

The administrative changes to section 804 of the 1936 act by the Maritime Administrator to permit the use of foreign-flag ships to fulfill the trade route commitments of the subsidized lines may signal the beginning of the phasing out of subsidized American-flag shipping.

Section 804 of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act states:

"It shall be unlawful for any contractor receiving an operating-differential subsidy under title VI or for any charterer of vessels under title VII of this Act, or any holding company, subsidiary, affiliate, or associate of such contractor or such charterer, or any officer, director, agent, or executive thereof, directly or indirectly to own, charter, act as agent or broker for, or operate any foreign-flag vessel which competes with any American-flag service determined by the Commission to be essential as provided in section 211 of this Act: *Provided, however,* That under special circumstances and for good cause shown the Commission may, in its discretion, waive the provisions of this section as to any contractor, for a specific period of time, by affirmative vote of four of its members."

Section 211 authorizes and directs the Administrator to investigate and determine the ocean services, routes and lines from the United States to foreign ports which are or may be determined by the Administrator essential for the promotion, development, expansion and maintenance of the U.S. foreign commerce.

The Maritime Administrator is directed by the 1936 act to "study all maritime problems arising in the carrying out of the policy set forth in title I of this Act; (b) to study and to cooperate with vessel owners in devising means by which (1) the importers and exporters of the United States can be induced to give preference to vessels under United States registry." This specific directive is flagrantly disregarded in the granting of these waivers.

Section 804 has only one proviso and this is included for the specific purpose of permitting the Government to grant exemptions in the most unusual circumstances only. The words, "in its discretion," "under special circumstances," "for good cause shown," "for a specific period of time," "by affirmative vote of four of its members,"—all of these protective phrases attest to the seriousness with which the Congress treated this subject.

The discretionary phrase places an obligation upon the Government to exercise the utmost care in administering this proviso. The "good cause" provision means just what it says. There must be overwhelming evidence of the needs of the Nation's commerce to justify an exemption.

The overwhelming evidence position is further substantiated by the fact that the Congress was even unwilling to leave the decision to the more normal administrative processes so a vote of four out of five members of the Commission was provided. Further, the Congress was fearful of the damage to the American merchant marine inherent in any exercise of such an exemption so it provided for specific time period limitations.

No one familiar with the legislative processes of enacting our laws can fail to escape the meaning here. It is generally unlawful for any contractor under title VI or title VII of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to own, charter, act as agent or broker for, or operate any foreign-flag vessel competing with an essential American-flag service. This is the meaning of the act.

The Maritime Administration has now changed all this. This change has been made because of the failure of the Administrator to carry out the policy of the act. Also, we fear that this making of new law by the Administrator is all part of the general drive to eliminate the American merchant marine. The new law follows:

"Application for waivers under Section 804 for the charter of foreign-flag ships by subsidized operators with ships under charter to the military should be supported by the following information:

"(1) A showing that the sailing to be made by the chartered ship is one which would, but for a lack of subsidized ships due to the charter of ships to the military, normally be made in the applicant's regular commercial service;

"(2) the applicant's assurance of the non-availability of U.S.-flag ships for operation under charter without subsidy;

"(3) the applicant's assurance that other U.S.-flag lines providing service in the particular trade have been contacted and have indicated that they do not object to the proposed charter;

"(4) the applicant's assurance that it has consulted the labor unions manning its ships, and has been advised that they do not object to the charter;

"(5) the applicant's agreement that any profits realized from the voyages made with the chartered ship shall be included for subsidy accounting and that any losses will be for the sole account of the applicant.

"In addition to the foregoing, all applications will, of course, include information as to the name and flag of the foreign-flag ships, the type, rate, and duration of the charter, ports of loading and discharge, and estimated voyage results."

The present condition of our merchant marine is surely highlighted when it becomes apparent that we do not have enough U.S.-flag ships to carry the less than 9 percent of our imports and exports because of the commitments in Vietnam. The Administrator and the Under Secretary, and the Department of Defense have just told the Maritime Advisory Committee that we have sufficient ships now for any emergency and for our domestic needs under emergency conditions.

Under what authority the administration can change the law as enacted by Congress is a mystery. This action was taken in the greatest of secrecy. Probably, because it contradicts their advice to the Maritime Advisory Committee.

In the interagency report there is a reference that the transfer-out of the *America* was the beginning of the phasing-out of the U.S.-flag passenger ships. This statement is contributed to Nicholas Johnson.

Does this change in section 804 to allow the use of foreign-flag ships by the subsidized operators mean the beginning of the phasing-out of the subsidized liner companies?

Is this in agreement with the task force recommendations which the Department of Commerce portrays as the answer to promoting U.S.-flag shipping?

There is no question but that the subsidized companies are in a box in fulfilling their regular trade commitments because of their participation in Vietnam. The fact that they are short on ships is not their fault. The fault rests squarely on the failure of the Department of Commerce to administer the shipping policy.

We must, and we do, oppose any action of the Department of Commerce to excuse its maladministration of our shipping laws in this fashion.

THAT PROLIFIC WRITER, EX-AMBASSADOR HENRY S. VILARD

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the January 1964 issue of Harper's magazine, Ex-Ambassador Henry S. Villard wrote an open letter to me, published in that issue. Shortly after its publication, I received a letter under date January 8, 1964, addressed to me by Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration William J. Crockett. I have never released this letter, which has been in my files since that date, and would not do so now were it not for the fact that the ex-Ambassador's literary talents have been expanded to the point where he has now written a book, "Affairs at State," which does a great disservice to the men and women of the American Foreign Service.

The letter addressed to me by Secretary Crockett reads as follows:

DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF
STATE FOR ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, January 8, 1964.

DEAR MR. ROONEY: The Department appreciates the opportunity to comment on the article by former Ambassador Henry S. Villard in the January issue of Harper's magazine.

It is a helter-skelter piece of literary fantasy.

The former Ambassador's story of the bathroom windows at Dakar illustrates the point. The "picture window" he refers to is, in fact, a pair of French doors leading onto a small balcony extending the length of the master suite. These doors match those of the master bedroom and are an integral part of the architectural treatment of the exterior of the official residence. Both openings have full-length louvered shutters which can be closed to prevent visibility from the outside.

The absurdity of the situation is that an Ambassador, earning at least $20,000 a year, and having a representation allowance, a Government-furnished chauffeur-driven car, a Government-furnished house, filled with Government furniture, Government china, Government glassware and silverware, and staffed with Government-paid servants, would find it necessary to ask the Department for funds to buy a set of bathroom curtains, even if the Department failed to furnish them in the first place.

The Ambassador's treatment of the problems of the Foreign Service and the management complexities within the State Department follows this pattern throughout the article.

Certainly no one would quarrel with the statement that the Department has grown in size since Cordell Hull became Secretary of State in 1933. This is because its functions and responsibilities have increased—enormously so since World War II as the United States assumed leadership of a free world beset by a multiplicity of problems alien to Mr. Hull's era.

There is no denying the fact that the world's problems are a great deal more complex today than they were in the days of "Old State," and no matter how nostalgically former Ambassador Villard or anyone else longs for those days, they won't return. The world is what it is and that is the way the State Department and the rest of the U.S. Government must deal with it.

Going back just 10 years ago, the United States had representation in 73 countries and operated 227 posts abroad. In 1954, we issued 434,644 passports and operated the Department in Washington with an authorized strength of 3,691 officers and clerks. Now we have representation in 109 countries with operations at 274 posts. In 1963, we issued 1,018,488 passports. In 1964, our authorized employment in the Department is 4,404 positions or an increase over the 10-year period of about 20 percent in staff to handle operational increases of more than 50 percent in the case of countries with which the United States maintains diplomatic relations, and of over 100 percent in passport issuances. These two statistics are representative of the overall increase in workload that has been achieved with minimal increases in Washington staffing.

The Ambassador points to the African Bureau as an example of "that bureaucratic behemoth on the banks of the Potomac." As a matter of fact, not literary fancy, the African Bureau now has responsibility for policy with respect to U.S. operations in 39 countries. We are represented in these countries by 34 embassies, 7 consulates general, 14 consulates, one consular agency, and 2 branch offices for a total of 58 locations. The total number of officers and clerks in the African Bureau backstopping this operation in Washington at the present time is 148. In addition to supervising and supporting the 540 Americans running our overseas establishments in that part of the world, the African Bureau must coordinate and furnish policy guidance to 10 other U.S. agencies that have operations in Africa. These other programs have a total of more than 3,300 American employees in Africa.

The African Bureau, in addition to conducting its own operations, must consult frequently with other agencies. And this is true of other geographical bureaus. Virtually every agency of Government has a legitimate interest in some aspect of foreign affairs, and a vital concern in foreign policy decisions. The Department is not the sole dispenser of foreign policy; it is the coordinator of an ever-increasingly complicated set of multiagency operations. Under these circumstances decisions do take more time. Many also require difficult interagency clearances, but the State Department's affairs are not conducted by committee consultation and decision.

By and large, the Department's work in relation to U.S. operations in the field is expeditiously handled, partially because we have, to the maximum extent possible, decentralized operations and management to the field. But, of course, there are occasions when Washington and only Washington can make a final decision because of the interagency complexities of a problem.

The Department of State has been a good manager in the utilization of the funds and positions granted to it by Congress. We have always endeavored to put whatever is necessary of our money and people on the front lines of our farflung activities in the field. At the same time, we must insure that field activities are adequately supported by Washington staff.

The 1965 submission of our budget will represent the fourth year in which the Department has not requested (or received) a net increase in staff.

Certainly there have been times when we have been forced to curtail travel and to give overseas operations less than our people have requested, but the essential needs of the Department and the Foreign Service have been met over the years.

Insofar as the personnel of the Foreign Service are concerned, they have fared well at the hands of Congress. We have received a fair hearing for our legislative proposals and to illustrate our budgetary support there is enclosed a 10-year table showing the increase of differentials and allowances paid to the Foreign Service from 1955 to 1964. There is more than a 100-percent increase in these allowances, while total American employment abroad on State Department rolls increased from 3,443 Americans in 1955 to 4,735 in 1964 or about a 40-percent increase in personnel staffing. This speaks rather well, I believe for the support we have sought, and that Congress has provided, for Foreign Service personnel stationed abroad.

Mr. Villard's description of congressional travel is as absurd as the rest of his article. We in the Department believe that it is vitally important to the national interest for Members of Congress to travel abroad as extensively as possible, both during and after the sessions of Congress. We also believe that it is right and proper that members of the Foreign Service meet, greet, and entertain Members of Congress. In this way, Members of Congress see and evaluate the men and women of the Foreign Service who are representing America abroad.

Ambassador Villard's complaint that Foreign Service officers must occasionally personally pay for this kind of hospitality is, to my mind, uncalled for. A Foreign Service officer does not decline an overseas assignment because he cannot afford to serve. Nor do most Foreign Service officers feel they must be reimbursed for every act of hospitality.

We fully support the case for larger representational allowances, but a look at other allowances and differentials paid to the American Foreign Service today would convince almost anyone that our most essential needs are covered and that an officer might well afford an occasional act of hospitality—cocktails, lunch, or even a dinner—for a visiting Congressman or an official of the local government without expecting U.S. reimbursement. I am certain most of the responsible officers of the Foreign Service share this feeling.

In closing, we assure you that the problems of organization, operation, and staffing in the Department have our constant attention. We don't know all the answers—perhaps we don't even know all the problems—but we are making consistent progress in reducing staff and in cutting costs at every opportunity. There are places where aditional improvement can be made, and we need both the understanding and support of the Congress, of the press, and of the public, rather than irresponsible attacks such as the line taken in the Villard article.

We enclose for your further information a list of management improvements made in the past year in the operation of the Department, with an estimated saving for each of these items.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM J. CROCKETT.

(Enclosures: Summary of Overseas American Differential and Allowances. List of Management Improvements. Statement on Dakar Residence.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Summary of overseas American differentials and allowances, fiscal years 1955 through 1964

Allowances	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
Post	$772,143	$814,623	$858,774	$709,346	$706,967	$727,885	$775,096	$882,195	$1,029,212	$1,101,300
Quarters	2,100 943	2,230,380	2,527,528	3,249,128	3,246,278	3,319,129	3,633,309	3,628,220	3,805,054	4,008,300
Temporay lodging	259,614	254,051	340,098	384,794	356,672	374,159	377,625	386,373	520,908	544,100
Supplementary post	----------	----------	13,302	18,082	25,950	47,721	50,735	64,795	90,726	98,600
Separate maintenance	22,141	18,038	21,450	16,397	12,660	9,806	20,454	58,540	34,194	35,400
Marine guard	560,534	568,658	642,657	676,104	584,116	513,180	491,687	488,855	449,331	464,700
Transfer	75,890	63,768	295,387	75,105	75,000	70,403	81,768	98,943	89,746	92,300
Education	----------	234,200	306,750	397,650	398,000	486,628	700,866	651,200	875,263	920,300
Home service transfer	----------	40,145	139,425	61,880	62,000	63,028	64,228	57,662	76,665	77,000
Subtotal, allowances	3,791,265	4,223,863	5,145,371	5,588,486	5,467,643	5,611,939	6,195,768	6,316,783	6,971,099	7,342,000
Differentials	504,151	932,774	1,192,973	1,541,461	1,510,288	1,539,045	1,854,743	2,277,915	2,367,757	2,456,000
Representation	503,720	606,698	794,191	598,909	748,590	823,103	867,985	925,000	949,660	973,000
Official residence	421,873	433,331	506,279	498,208	545,460	572,415	611,003	695,957	885,751	929,595
Total	5,221,009	6,196,666	7,638,814	8,227,064	8,271,981	8,546,502	9,529,499	10,215,655	11,174,267	11,700,595
Overseas medical costs for Foreign Service personnel	189,489	226,916	310,800	316,370	516,784	546,408	660,876	494,393	744,744	757,612
Rest and recuperation travel	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	52,874	260,900

DECEMBER 11, 1963.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: COST REDUCTIONS

Your memorandum of November 30 to the heads of departments asks for a report of major cost reduction actions taken during the past year and the steps proposed for next year to tighten operations and effect savings. This memorandum deals with the regular operations of the Department of State. Separate reports are being submitted to you on the operations of the Agency for International Development, the Peace Corps, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The appropriations for this Department, as is the case with all Government agencies, are continually increasing. Although I see no prospect of overall reductions in our expenditures, we have made substantial progress in reducing costs and effecting economies to assure that the Government receives a dollar's value for every dollar spent. In this rapidly changing world, we need to constantly assess priorities—to eliminate the marginal to provide for the essential—to hold expenses to reasonable limits.

During the past 2 years, the Department has conducted diplomatic and consular activities throughout the world without any increase in manpower. To achieve this, we have streamlined procedures, reduced reporting requirements, closed marginal consulates, and eliminated low-priority functions. The manpower reductions achieved by these actions have enabled us to assign additional personnel to the crises areas of the world, to new or expanding activities, to staff new consulates and embassies, and to meet increased consular and other workloads.

The following are examples of major actions taken during the past year to reduce costs:

1. Thirteen consular posts have been closed, reducing costs by $500,000 a year.

2. Regulations requiring the use of economy air travel have been applied, reducing costs substantially.

3. Political and economic reports of marginal utility have been eliminated. In Germany alone reductions in political reporting have resulted in reductions totaling $113,000 a year.

4. Administrative staffs of State, AID, and USIA have been consolidated in six countries in Africa, resulting in substantial economies. In the Sudan, reductions total $200,000 a year; in Ivory Coast, $78,000.

5. In 13 countries in Africa, the responsibility for administering the AID program has been assigned to the Ambassador, eliminating the need for a separate AID country program director. This action has made it unnecesasry to establish AID positions, resulting in economies totaling $240,000.

6. Regional offices of our security and foreign buildings' programs, as well as certain attachés with regional responsibilities, have been consolidated or moved to excess currency countries, with the combined objective of reducing costs and dollar outflow.

7. Intensive efforts have been made to increase the use of foreign currencies in our educational exchange programs. These efforts have resulted in increased use of excess currencies, by conversion to hard currencies and by other special arrangements. In fiscal year 1963 more than $29 million—about 50 percent of the total educational exchange program—was spent in foreign currencies. This was $10 million more than in any preceding fiscal year. About $11 million was in excess currencies.

These actions are illustrative of the Department's efforts to reduce the costs and effect economies. A more detailed listing has been included in our reports to the Bureau of the Budget on the manpower utilization program and the special balance-of-payments review.

Our plans for the coming year center primarily on continuing the efforts of the past year. Responsible officials of the Department and our missions abroad have been instructed to be constantly on the alert for ways of carrying on their operations with prudence and effectiveness.

Several actions we are planning are especially significant:

1. The Department, in close cooperation with Treasury, is working out plans to centralize in Washington or at regional Treasury offices overseas the disbursing now performed by 66 individual embassies. We expect that cost reductions totaling $376,000 will result.

2. We plan to extend the use of economy air travel. Our current estimate of additional cost reduction is $450,000 annually.

The attachment to this memorandum gives other examples of actions the Department has taken in the past year, as well as those planned for the coming year.

I assure you of my full support in conducting the business of the Department of State in the spirit of prudence and economy which you have pledged to the Congress and the American people.

(Enclosures: (1) List of actions taken in the past year to reduce costs, (2) steps to be taken in the coming year.

Department of State—List of actions taken in the past year to reduce costs

	Reduction in costs (annually)
1. 13 consulates closed (Europe: Salzburg, Austria; Edmonton, Canada; Manchester, England; LeHavre, France; Cork, Ireland; Venice, Italy; Basel, Switzerland; Geneva, Switzerland;* Cardiff, Wales; Sarajevo, Yugoslavia; Latin America: Santos, Brazil; Near East: Haifa, Israel; Far East: Penang, Malaya)	$500,000
2. 6 consolidated administrative management organizations (CAMO) established: Abidjan, Ivory Coast; Freetown, Sierra Leone; Khartoum, Sudan; Libreville, Gabon; Yaounde, Cameroon; Léopoldville, Congo (cost reductions estimated for Abidjan and Khartoum. Other estimates of reduction being developed)	278,000
3. Responsibility for AID programs assigned to Ambassadors in 13 countries, eliminating need for AID country director. The countries are: Chad, Central African Republic, Congo (Brazzaville) Upper Volta, Niger, Dahomey, Togo, Malagasy Republic, Senegal, Algeria, Ivory Coast, Gabon, Cameroon	240,000
4. Regulations requiring economy air travel applied. All domestic flights and all overseas flights of less than 6 hours duration are made economy class	(1)
5. Office of protocol handled increased work (created by expanding diplomatic missions in Washington and more visits of foreign officials) without increased staff, by simplifying procedures	(1)
6. The Office of Public Affairs reassigned personnel from functions of lower priority to meet new needs in the Department's public information program	(1)

*U.S. Mission remains in Geneva.

See footnotes at end of table.

Department of State—List of actions taken in the past year to reduce costs—Continued

	Reduction in costs (annually)
7. The historical office, by new procedures, reduced the premium costs of handling classified documents in compilation printing of foreign relations volumes	(1)
8. The foreign reporting staff in the Bureau of Economic Affairs has eliminated 1,000 marginal economic and commercial reports per month. This means 1,000,000 less documents a year coming into Washington from missions abroad	(1)
9. The manpower devoted to the Cuba visa waiver program was reduced because of declining workload	$50,000
10. Paperwork reduced by reducing the number of mandatory visa opinions referred to Washington by posts abroad	(1)
11. Paperwork reduced by delegating to posts abroad authority to seek routine waivers direct from INS field offices, rather than through the Department in Washington	(1)
12. The visa lookout books of the Department and INS have been merged into a single reference book for posts abroad, using automatic data processing methods. This simplifies the name check of visa applicants by visa officers abroad	(1)
13. Consular reports from posts abroad reduced by 30,000 documents annually	--------
14. Passport issuances were further decentralized to U.S. field offices	(1)
15. Surplus equipment of the Department used in passport agencies	--------
16. The Bureau of African Affairs reorganized, abolishing one office and redistributing functions. This action permitted meeting new demands for manpower devoted to southern Africa (totaling $100,000) without increasing total personnel	(1)
17. The Bureau of African Affairs eliminated lower priority positions abroad to provide personnel for new posts at Lusaka, Northern Rhodesia, and Blantyre, Nyasaland; and for establishing an Embassy in newly independent Zanzibar	(1)
18. Fiscal work for 7 African posts centralized in Nairobi, Kenya	18,000
19. Twelve local national positions eliminated from other African posts to provide new needs of the Embassy in Léopoldville	(1)
20. The Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs abolished 33 lower priority positions to meet urgent new requirements at posts in the Far East	(1)
21. A regional supply center in Tokyo serviced nearby posts, with reductions in commodity and shipping costs	15,000
22. Marginal political reporting eliminated in posts in Germany	$113,000
23. Personnel reduced in the Bureau of Administration by streamlining procedures and improving manpower utilization	314,000
24. Improvements in routings effected in the worldwide courier service. Even with cost reductions service was provided to 4 new posts and services improved to 6 others	40,000
25. Improved operating procedures have made it possible for the board of examiners to process an 81 percent increase in applications for Foreign Service appointments without increasing personnel	(1)
26. Format of biographic register and foreign service list revised to achieve reductions in publication costs	50,000
27. Methods of handling truck and ocean freight shipments unaccompanied baggage and shipment of household effects improved	82,000
28. The library increased borrowing from other libraries and arranged for free acquisition of telephone directories for distribution to overseas posts	35,000
29. Old furniture refinished and 9 pieces of switchboard equipment removed	30,000
30. New supply system established for U.S.-manufactured office machines for posts abroad	30,000
31. Exhaustive operational appraisals to assure maximum efficiency were made of the following offices: Reproduction and distribution, publications, library, budget and finance, and security	(1)
32. Travel cost of the security program reduced by improving itineraries of investigators, eliminating team-travel abroad to the full extent possible, realinement of geographic areas served by regional offices	(1)
33. Realinement consolidation or elimination of regional foreign buildings offices, field service engineers and interior design functions	200,000
34. The Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs abolished 18 lower priority positions (costing $148,000) to meet urgent needs at other posts in the area	(1)
35. Cost-sharing agreements have been negotiated with Austria, Germany and Sweden under which these countries contribute to the exchange of persons program	750,000
36. The passport office issued or renewed 1,018,000 passports in fiscal year 1963, compared with 867,000 last year. Issuances per man-year increased from 2,286 in 1962 to 2,605 in 1963	(1)

[1] No estimate.

Department of State—Steps to be taken in the coming year

ACTION	*Estimated reduction in annual costs*
1. Centralized disbursing by Treasury for 66 Embassies	$376,000
2. Extension of economy class air travel	450,000
3. Extensive review of consular operations in Mexico to determine whether consular offices there should be eliminated or consolidated	(1)
4. Continued application of automated data processing facilities—11 projects now underway	(1)
5. Elimination of the microfilming of telegrams	(1)
6. Completion of extensive surveys now underway jointly with AID and USIA to reduce or halt the continuing rise of joint administrative costs abroad	(1)
7. Continued alertness by all officials to ways of economizing in day-to-day operations	(1)

[1] No estimate.

DAKAR RESIDENCE

The residence in Dakar was completed in 1960 at a cost of $260,095; the land was a gift.

The picture window referred to in the article is in fact a pair of French doors leading onto a small balcony which extends the length of the master suite. The doors match those of the master bedroom and are part of the architectural treatment of the residence. Both openings have full length louvered shutters which can be closed to prevent visibility if desired.

In addition, curtain material was purchased and shipped to Dakar to adequately provide coverage for all window and door openings. The actual making of the curtains was performed at Dakar to insure proper fitting. It appears that the material was not economically used and the bathroom opening was not originally curtained. This was subsequently corrected.

The present Ambassador has found the house most satisfactory both from a personal point of view as well as for his official entertainment purposes.

Mr. Speaker, now as the result of some recent impartial reviews of "Affairs at State," written by the same Henry S. Villard, I have asked a highly cultured American Ambassador to review this book using his professional knowledge as a basis. The following is his unedited report:

"Affairs at State," a new book by former Ambassador Henry Serrano Villard, has been described as "a career diplomat's candid appraisal of the U.S. Foreign Service."

A reader who knows the facts closes the covers of that book with sadness and disappointment.

Everyone can agree with Villard's premise that "the hard core Foreign Service officer would like nothing better than to see the quality of the service he performs for his fellow Americans improved by adequate funds, by the elmination of politics, by a high standard of entrance requirements, and by a topnotch organization in which the human equation in his profession is not sacrificed to the Moloch of bureaucracy" (p. 240). But Villard, in his own inimitable fashion, cannot escape many distorted statements of fact and many half-truths.

They cry for correction.

Villard uses his book to attack members of the House Subcommittee on State Department Appropriations—and veteran Chairman JOHN J. ROONEY.

Villard denounces that group for its appropriations for the State Department and for funds for official representation—which, he asserts, "ROONEY and his associates find as hard to swallow as a cup of hemlock" (p. 107).

He further alleges that "the Rooney rulings on how the State Department spends its money—and how much it gets—are absolute. None of his colleagues cares to cross him; there is no appeal from his decisions; and no one actively connected with the Foreign Service would dare to offend him for fear that the State Department's budgetary request might be adversely affected" (p. 108).

He attacks ROONEY's Irish immigrant background; denounces a "representative" Foreign Service; scores minority groups, such as Negroes, Indians, and Puerto Ricans; flays administrators and managers; and wants to turn the clock back to a Foreign Service comprised of an Ivy League "elite."

Now, many people are devoted to the Foreign Service of the United States. "Of the United States" means just that—not the Foreign Service of the Eastern seaboard; not of the west coast; not of the Southwest.

The record will show that ROONEY and his colleagues regard the Foreign Service of the United States as the first point of contact with other nations of the world; that it must represent the United States at its best.

ROONEY's experience with the Department of State and the Foreign Service spans a period of more than 20 years. During this time he has observed innumerable members of the Department and the Foreign Service in Washington and at posts throughout the world.

As chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of State and the Foreign Service, he has participated in scores of congressional actions involving foreign affairs operations.

"We in the Congress, like our constituents, want capable men and women running our foreign affairs," he has said. "We want only the best—loyal, diligent, patriotic Americans with ability and skill.

"I have seen the great strides which have been made over the years to attain this goal. As a Congressman and as a citizen I salute this progress.

"I salute the dedicated men and women of the Foreign Service who serve our Nation around the world."

Obviously, there is, and will continue to be, resentment of Villard's unfounded charges.

Let's take up a few of his misstatements:

The author asserts that "congressional niggardliness in the annual appropriations for the Foreign Service is notorious. Despite the most painstaking estimates of the minimum amounts it considers necessary, the State Department is regularly denied what it asks for. Its supporters and defenders, wherever one looks, seem always absent" (p. 2).

Let's look at the record for the past 10 years:

In fiscal year 1956 the regular State Department appropriation was $147,200,000. In fiscal year 1966 the estimate had jumped to $396,400,000—or almost $400 million.

And during that same year the item on "Salaries and expenses"—the lifeblood of the budget—had jumped from $79 million in fiscal year 1956 to an estimated $182 million in fiscal year 1966.

A net increase, it should be noted, of $103 million. Hardly "niggardly."

Then there is the author's charge that the Department's "representation allowance" has been wholly inadequate (p. 109). That representation allowance—which runs to almost $1 million a year—is for official, foreign representation, not for entertaining visiting Americans or former college classmates junketing abroad. The House Appropriations Subcommittee has increased the amount year after year.

It is the view of ROONEY and his colleagues that a million dollars or so should buy quite a few drinks and quite a few dinners. It might be added that no Member of the Congress receives any official representation funds for entertaining visiting constituents who come to Washington.

The State Department is allowed this item in the budget because it reimburses in part those expenditures authorized by law which Foreign Service officers incur. Incur, it should be pointed out, in establishing and maintaining contacts with local government officials and prominent members of local groups.

In 1956 the Department was allowed a total of $575,000.

The House Appropriation Subcommittee has increased those representation allowances over the years.

In 1961 it had jumped to $872,000.

In 1965 it had jumped to $993,000.

And it was estimated that the representation allowances for 1966 will be well over a million dollars—or $1,050,000.

No American taxpayer considers these sums "niggardly." Nor does the State Department consider them "niggardly."

The State Department's official representation fund should be used sparingly. Its purpose is not to "wine and dine" the world.

It will be a sad day indeed—and a sad commentary on America's bountiful generosity to peoples everywhere—when, as Villard contends, "the day may come when the battle was lost for the free world for want of a caviar canape" (p. 115).

Despite Villard's contemptuous "niggardliness" statement, the Department proceeded to do its business. Of course, it has tightened its belt, but it has operated with millions of dollars from the taxpayers' pockets. Let's see how well it managed:

The distinguished Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, told members of the House Appropriations Committee how the Department got along each year on nearly $400 million:

"During the past 4 years," he told the chairman and members of the committee in February 1965, "we have succeeded in making significant improvement in the management of the Department both at home and abroad. We have streamlined many activities. We have eliminated marginal functions. We have made economies. We have strengthened our organization, and improved our facilities and the quality of our personnel. * * *

"We have met our many problems and heavy workload without increases in personnel," the Secretary continued. "The number of people in the Department today is approximately the same as it was 4 years ago—indeed 12 years ago. This has been possible because we—with the help and understanding of this committee—have improved the management of the Department. It has also been due to the hard work of our personnel.

"I am satisfied that we have pursued a hard-hitting and consistent attack on inefficient, out-dated and marginal operations. We have increased productivity in passport and consular activities, closed marginal posts, automated routine work, trimmed publications and reporting requirements. We estimate that improvements of this kind have made it possible to reprogram some $4.5 million to new or higher priority work. Most of these actions have been reported to this committee previously. We will continue to improve our operations and increase efficiency. * * *"

Secretary Rusk told members of the House subcommittee:

"Mr. Chairman, I am proud of what we have accomplished in the past 4 years. I am proud also of the personnel of the Department, both at home and abroad. They have willingly assumed greater individual workloads. They have maintained a high degree of morale and esprit de corps. They have unstintingly served our Nation and the cause of peace.

"I am also greatly appreciative of the support we have received from you and other members of this committee. * * * In summary, Mr. Chairman, with the sympathetic understanding and cooperation of this committee, we have made solid progress. We are—to use the President's inaugural words—'always trying and always gaining'."

The State Department apparently got along very well with the money the committee allowed. The Secretary wasn't complaining.

Now, let's take another charge in Villard's book:

The former Ambassador asserts, on page 6, that "from the moment a young Foreign Service officer enters the confines of bureaucracy, he feels the disciplines of caution and conformity. * * *"

Villard conveys a totally false impression of the dedicated men and women of the Foreign Service.

The Director General of the Foreign Service of the United States, Ambassador Joseph Palmer II, recently told the distinguished members of the 19th selection boards, who are now reviewing the records of 5,200 officers that the Service is "staffed * * * by men and women of the highest standards of excellence. * * *"

"We need only to look at the recent examples of Mike Hoyt and the members of the Stanleyville staff who, despite the mental and physical strains to which they were subjected for months on end, put service above self with dignity, courage and professional skill.

"Or take John Clingerman who, without thought for himself (the Director General continued), volunteered to go into Stanleyville in the first waves of airborne forces to contribute his unique knowledge of the local scene to the effectiveness of the rescue operation. Or think about the young officers in the Vietnam village program who daily risk their lives for the opportunity to apply their professional competence to the solution of the dangerous and stubborn problems of that explosive situation. * * *"

Caution and conformity indeed.

Or, let's take another of Villard's half-truths about today's State Department—this one on page 12: " * * * its top posts bartered away for political purposes, its career men ignored in ambassadorial appointments."

At the present time, there are 79 career officers serving as Ambassadors, or 74 percent of the total. This is an alltime high.

Director General Palmer has drawn attention to the fact that it has been a long time since Foreign Service officers have served simultaneously as Chiefs of Mission in Paris, Rome, Moscow, Mexico City, and a considerable number of other missions around the world.

President Johnson himself has declared—at his press conference on March 19 this year—that "I believe the quality of the talent and capacity in the top positions of the Federal service, and in the other positions as well, is without parallel in modern times. This high level of quality is going to be maintained. I am determined that the

American people shall be served by the very best talent available, chosen on the basis of principles and performance—not politics or speculation."

But Villard maintains that the "ultimate prizes" of the career service are "carried off by politicians" (p. 15).

He also discusses "the lengthy, unwieldy administrative tail, which, to the detriment of efficient operations, threatens to wag the politico-geographic dog" (p. 19).

Now, it can be said, based on the record, that some highly capable administrative people in State have played a vital role in attempting to eliminate duplication and inefficiency, and to reduce costs.

Director General Palmer has said that the business of foreign affairs is not the sole responsibility of the professional diplomat.

"Let me be specific," Ambassador Palmer says. "We all—or most of us—instinctively recognize and accept that knowledge of the art of managing a post overseas—or a unit at home—is essential to the successful accomplishment of our mission. And yet I sense that many of us are uncomfortable with modern management concepts, primarily because we have difficulty in understanding them."

Villard decries the "watering down" of the Foreign Service by hiring Negroes and other minority groups to staff the posts at home and abroad.

His apparent prejudice is showing when he contends (p. 29), "But padding the rolls with Negroes under the impetus of civil rights is another matter * * *." "Even the Puerto Rican and Indian minorities now have their claimants for a place in the sun of foreign affairs, and if room must be made for them, somebody else must move over" (p. 30).

Thank God this is a democracy, where everyone—regardless of his race or the color of his skin—can have an opportunity to represent the United States abroad.

And thank God that even though ROONEY's parents were immigrants, and even though he was born in Brooklyn, he has been given the opportunity to represent millions of constituents in the great Halls of Congress.

The author reports that "The old service of the Rogers Act was frankly an elite corps" (p. 152). He laments the fact that "the Department instead of searching for candidates trained only in political science, wants men and women with 'broad' training who can fill positions in administrative, consular and economic affairs" (p. 157).

Well, what's wrong with that?

Mr. Palmer, the Director General of the Foreign Service, hits the nail on the head when he says that some of the members of that Service "are so substantively oriented in the field of foreign affairs, that we have difficulty in comprehending, absorbing, and adapting new ideas and concepts in other fields that may be of great value—and even essential—to use in the conduct of our business."

Villard is nostalgic for the good, old days. So are many of us. But they are gone forever.

He wistfully says that "of late the rich old blood has been further diluted" (p. 175) by opening the Foreign Service to other groups, such as personnel from the U.S. Information Agency, and to civil service personnel in foreign affairs agencies.

It is difficult to buy the statements by the author (p. 200) that "dispossessed career men roam the corridors looking for employment commensurate with their rank and experience" and (p. 202) that "* * * on leaving the Department's payroll, an Ambassador is consigned to oblivion."

Only recently Secretary Rusk invited more than 1,000 retired Foreign Service officers to attend a Foreign Service Day conference on November 12 to map plans for utilizing the services of retired personnel. Many distinguished officers have been called back for special assignments.

Who would want to subscribe to the author's recommendation that we should "look for candidates among the qualified few rather than the geographically distributed thousands" (p. 221)? Let us not turn this great Nation into a "silk stocking district."

The Foreign Service should be strengthened and supported to meet the challenge of our times. But it must be built on the foundations of democracy.

OBSERVANCE OF THE MILLENNIUM OF POLAND AS A CHRISTIAN NATION

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in our rush and preoccupation to accomplish so much in such a short time, I feel it is highly important for all of us not to lose sight of certain significant events which will transpire in the coming months.

I am particularly concerned that this U.S. House of Representatives assume convincing leadership in stimulating the people of our country to recognize and participate in the worldwide observance of the millennium of Poland as a Christian nation. Therefore, I hope that as we reconvene on January 10, 1966, exactly 1,000 years after the birth of the Polish nation, we will enact appropriate legislation in recognition of this historic event.

The millennium observances have great meaning not only for the more than 8 million loyal Americans who pride themselves in their Polish ancestry, but for all who enjoy independence and liberty today. No American can but recognize the importance of his debt to the many generations of Polish patriots who for a full 1,000 years have kept the torch of freedom burning and the banners of the Christian church flying.

It is important that all of us of every faith and creed—Americans of all racial and ethnic backgrounds, join with the people everywhere throughout the world in commemorating this great event.

It is important for this country to attribute the same significance to this event which His Holiness Pope Paul VI does in planning the building of a new church in Rome and a possible visit next year to Poland as a part of the millennium observance.

It would be my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the members of this body, joined by the members of the other body would take whatever action is necessary to use the millennium to demonstrate our love for the Polish people by supporting fully the efforts of our President, Lyndon B. Johnson, in "building bridges" between ourselves and these people who now observe under restrictive Communist conditions their 1,000th anniversary. As a matter of fact the dedication of the new American Research Hospital for Children in Krakow, Poland, should properly take place during the year of the millennium of Poland, next spring, when it should be fully completed, with as many Members of the Congress present as wish to attend.

As we return to our own homes and abide a short time among old friends and relatives may we prepare ourselves for our return to our duties here to expedite proposals and give support to essential measures which will assure America's full participation in the millennium observances.

BANK MERGER LEGISLATION—SENATE LEADERS URGE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT RESTRAINT

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Members of the House a letter on the subject of bank merger legislation addressed to the Attorney General and signed by five distinguished Members of the other body. The letter urges the Attorney General to refrain from any further steps in certain bank merger cases in view of the passage of S. 1698 by the Senate without dissent and the fact that "an equally effective measure was reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee just this week."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the letter at this point in the RECORD:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
October 22, 1965.

HON. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: It had been our earnest hope and expectation that by the conclusion of the first session of this Congress action would have been completed on a measure clarifying the existing confusion with regard to bank mergers. Such a bill, S. 1698, passed the Senate without dissent last June, and a somewhat different but equally effective measure was reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee just this week—but not in time for final floor action by the House and Senate.

It is our expectation that we will have enacted such a measure in the early days of the forthcoming session of Congress. This being so, we are deeply concerned that during this interim period, action might be taken with regard to several of the bank mergers now challenged by your Department which might prejudice the application of the new law. As you know, two such merger cases are now in the final stages of settlement by divestiture, and the four others are in various pretrial or trial stages. All of these cases will be basically affected by new legislation which, as we have noted, we expect to be enacted shortly. For example, the bill passed by the Senate would terminate all six pending cases; all versions of the bill considered by the House Banking and Currency Committee would terminate the three mergers consummated before the decision of the Supreme Court in the Philadelphia case; and the bill reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee would also provide new standards to be applied in the cases involving the three mergers consummated after the Philadelphia decision.

We take this occasion to express our concern lest what seems clearly to be the sense of Congress in the area of bank mergers be frustrated by action taken in any of the six pending cases.

Accordingly, we urge that you refrain from any further steps in these cases, particularly the two which are now in the final stages of divestiture, until the Congress has had an opportunity during the coming session to conclude its consideration of the pending bank merger legislation.

In addition, in view of the fact that these cases are pending in the judicial branch, we request that on our behalf you respectfully bring our views to the attention of the several courts having jurisdiction over these six pending cases.

Respectfully submitted.

Mike Mansfield,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate.
Everett McKinley Dirksen,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate.
James O. Eastland,
Chairman,
Committee on the Judiciary.
A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman,
Committee on Banking and Currency.
Wallace F. Bennett.

THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1965

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Hagen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 is one of the most important, and most helpful pieces of farm legislation since the far-reaching measures of the 1930's. It is important to farm and city people alike.

For more than three decades we have been working to develop farm programs which will do three things:

First. Provide full abundance of food and fiber for consumers at fair prices.

Second. Provide balanced abundance so that farmers can achieve a fair return for their magnificent productive achievements.

Third. Provide this at the lowest possible cost to taxpayers.

The farm bill enacted by this Congress brings these three goals clearly into sight:

It will enable consumers to enjoy full abundance for a steadily decreasing proportion of their take-home pay. This year we are spending less than 18.5 percent of our after-taxes income for food, compared with about 22 percent only 10 years ago. In the next 10 years we may be able to cut the cost of food to less than 15 percent of our consumer dollar. This, in effect, would add $15 billion to the buying power of American consumers.

The new act assures a further rise in farm income. From 1960 to 1964 this Nation enjoyed the longest period of peacetime farm income stability in half a century. This year farm income is surging ahead—to $13.5 billion, more than $1.8 billion above 1960. Net income per farm this year will be one-third higher than in 1960. These gains have been achieved largely through the success of the wheat and feed grain programs. The Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 improves these programs and extends them for 4 years. Further, it applies the successful approach of these programs to rice and cotton on a 4-year basis. It extends the wool program also for 4 years. It helps to insure stability for dairymen and dependable supplies of quality dairy products for consumers. Efficient family-size farms will be able, in the next 4 years, to achieve full parity of income with other economic groups. Operators of small farms will also improve their income—or if they seek to leave farming, the new bill will help them get fair compensation for their assets.

The bill will reduce the cost of farm programs by making greater use of the marketplace in domestic and export sales.

The ultimate goal of any farm program always is to insure that the farmer has enough income. The means generally is regulation of the production; the only alternative is complete collapse of the commodities market.

The Farm Act contains a cropland adjustment program. This will enable farmers and local communities to make long-range plans for converting unneeded cropland to conservation, wildlife and recreational uses. Some land could even be shifted permanently into parks and natural beauty areas for the benefit of all our people.

This Congress has enacted more good legislation—more legislation that is meaningful to more people—than any prior session of Congress in history.

I am proud of it all, but nothing we have done will give me any greater pride than the enactment of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. This is consumer legislation—farm legislation—legislation for all Americans.

TOWARD THE GREAT SOCIETY—HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the 89th Congress has built dramatically upon the foundation laid by the 88th Congress, which President Johnson aptly described as "the Education Congress." In addition to passing the pioneering Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the first bill enacted in history which provides general financial assistance for elementary and secondary education, Congress this year approved another milestone measure, the Higher Education Act, which will provide a number of programs to strengthen the colleges and universities of the Nation.

Enrollment on the American college campus is now at 5.4 million, up 8 percent from a year ago. By 1975, 10 short years from now, college enrollment is expected to reach 8½ million or more and expenditures needed for the expansion of higher education facilities to meet this increased burden have been estimated at $33 billion. The Higher Education Act of 1965 will be of immense help to our colleges and universities in meeting these new demands.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation touches on another important problem. Rising costs have put a college education out of the reach of many able young Americans and made it an onerous burden for many others. The act provides new programs of financial assistance for both exceptionally poor students and those from middle-income families.

SUMMARY OF HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. Speaker, I want here to summarize the major provisions of the landmark Higher Education Act of 1965.

First. As I have indicated, the act establishes for the first time a program of educational opportunity grants, ranging from $200 to $1,000, for able but exceptionally needy undergraduate students. Thousands of bright young Americans who would otherwise be denied a college education will have that opportunity and thereby enrich the life of the Nation as well as their own lives.

Another new program authorized by the act provides for guaranteed reduced interest student loans which will be of great help to middle-income families. Students can obtain loans from banks, credit unions, or other commercial sources, and the loans will be insured regardless of family income. For students from families with an adjusted gross income of $15,000 or less, the Federal Government will pay the interest on the loans up to 6 percent during college and 3 percent thereafter.

The law also broadens the existing work-study program to include middle-income students although low-income students will continue to receive preference.

NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS ESTABLISHED

Second. The act authorizes a 6,000-member National Teacher Corps composed of experienced teachers and teacher-interns who will serve for up to 2 years, at the request of and under the control of local school authorities, in both city slums and areas of rural poverty.

Third. The act will help poorer, developing colleges to improve the quality of their offerings by authorizing cooperative programs with established universities as well as fellowships for talented graduate students and junior faculty members to teach in struggling institutions.

Fourth. The act authorizes grants to enable colleges and universities to purchase books and materials for their libraries, and also provide training for librarians. The Library of Congress will also be strengthened to enable the Library to acquire and catalog scholarly materials from throughout the world.

Fifth. The act will support community service and university extension programs to enable our institutions of higher learning to tackle more effectively such pressing problems as poverty, transportation, unemployment, air and water pollution.

Sixth. The 1965 act will double the funds authorized for the construction of undergraduate and graduate academic facilities by the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. The 1965 law also authorizes funds to help colleges and universities purchase television and other equipment and for minor remodeling of buildings.

FELLOWSHIPS FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLTEACHERS

Seventh. The act provides a new program of up to 24,500 fellowships for graduate study for persons now pursuing or who plan to pursue careers in elementary and secondary education. These fellowships will significantly raise the quality of our school by improving the quality of education of their teachers in their subject matter fields.

Mr. Speaker, the 89th Congress began with the passage of the extraordinary Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965 represents a tremendous victory for the young people of America in the closing days of the first session of Congress. By providing new programs of student financial assistance, increased funds for facilities and by authorizing other new programs, this legislation will do much to strengthen the colleges and universities of this Nation.

TOWARD THE GREAT SOCIETY—ECONOMIC PROGRESS

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to return to our home districts, we should note that the current period of economic expansion is now 56 months old. This growth and health of our economy have not occurred by accident; our economy is too complex an instrument to be healthy without some guidance.

Ever since the days of the New Deal, when our Nation's economy was in a state of flabby dissolution, governmental policies have increasingly affected our national economy. The Employment Act of 1946 reaffirmed governmental responsibility in the economic advancement of our Nation.

It takes a number of preliminary steps to cause our economy to expand or contract. Today's high levels have been caused, in part, by several factors:

The renewal of confidence in America's future by the people and the business world after President Kennedy took office, and the reiteration of that confidence after President Johnson took over the Nation's destiny 2 years ago.

The Revenue Act of 1962 providing investment tax credits and the Revenue Act of 1964, which made major reforms in the tax structure, except in the area of Federal excise taxes.

The Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, which reduced the excise tax burden by a rate of $4.7 billion a year when fully effective. In fiscal 1964, the excises had been $13.9 billion, a rather sizable 2 percent of the total gross national product.

In his May 17 message to the Congress, asking for the excise tax reduction, President Johnson said:

> The proposed program of excise tax cuts and revisions will spur growth and move us closer to full employment by removing an unnecessary drag on consumer and business purchasing power.

The Council of Economic Advisers has released the figures for September disclosing the highly encouraging news that the third-quarter gross national product has climbed to a rate of $677 billion.

That means, Mr. Speaker, that in that 3-month period, the GNP rose by $11 billion a year. Consumer spending increases caused more than 70 percent of the rise.

Employee pay in that period went up at a $6.5 billion rate; net interest, and business-professional income each rose by a $300 million rate.

Personal income rose sharply, due to a retroactive lump-sum social security payment and military pay increase. Exclusive of those two items, the rise still was at the rate of $1.7 billion a year.

Disposable personal income rose $3 billion for the quarter—a rate of $12.5 billion annually—and the private savings advanced from 5 to 5.8 percent of disposable income.

Corporate profits for the quarter are estimated at $73.7 billion before taxes and $44.4 billion after taxes, both on an annual basis, for a healthy advance over the second quarter.

Business investments in new plant and equipment in 1965 are expected to total some $51 billion, a rise of 13.5 percent over 1964—up from the two previous surveys made by the Council earlier this year.

The unemployment rate declined to 4.4 percent, the lowest since September 1957, the month before a recession began. Meanwhile, average weekly earnings in September in manufacturing industries were $108.09—up $3.50 from the year before. The industrial production index was 6.5 percent over September 1964.

Mr. Speaker, the policies fostered by the Democratic administration and the 89th Congress will enable the growth to continue, as it must in the face of an ever-growing population.

ACTIVITIES OF THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMMITTEE, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting for printing in the Record a list of committee bills which became law or were otherwise acted on during the 1st session of the 89th Congress by the Banking and Currency Committee of the House:

Major Bills Considered by the House Committee on Banking and Currency During the 1st Session of the 89th Congress

BILLS ENACTED

Gold reserve requirement

H.R. 3818 (S. 797). To eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities, but does not eliminate a similar reserve requirement with respect to Federal Reserve Notes. Hearings held by full committee and in executive session, February 1, 1965, and reported to House. House Report 14, rule granted February 8, 1965. Passed House February 9, 1965. Reported to Senate (S. Rept. 65), February 10, 1965. Reported out of Senate committee February 10, 1965; passed Senate February 18, 1965. Approved March 3, 1965 (Public Law 89–3).

Inter-America Development Bank

H.R. 45: To amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations in the Inter-American Development Bank. This act authorizes the U.S. Governor of the Bank to vote in favor of the resolution proposed in April 1964 to merge the Social Progress Trust Fund into the Fund for Special Operations and to increase the resources of the FSO by $750 million over a 3-year period, 1965–67, at the rate of $250 million a year. The adoption of the resolution called for an increase equivalent to $900 million in resources of the Fund for Special Operations. Hearings held by full committee February 3, 4, and 5, 1965. February 5, 1965, reported out of committee with amendment (H. Rept. 27). Rule granted February 16, 1965. Passed by House technically amended February 18, 1965. Passed Senate with amendments February 25, 1965. Conference requested March 1, 1965; conference report filed March 3, 1965 (H. Rept. 137). Conference report adopted by House March 4, 1965. Senate adopted March 8, 1965. Approved March 24, 1965 (Public Law 89–6).

Increase in International Monetary Fund

H.R. 6497. To amend the Bretton Woods Agreement Act to authorize an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States. This act authorizes the U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund to consent to an increase of $1,035 million in the quota of the United States in the Fund and to authorize the appropriation of this amount to pay the additional subscription to the Fund. This increase in the U.S. quota is part of a proposed increase of 25 percent in quotas of all members with additional increases for 16 countries. Hearings of full committee, March 23–24, 1965. Reported to House March 24, 1965 (H. Rept. 222). Rule granted April 14, 1965. Passed by House April 27, 1965. Reported to Senate May 24, 1965. Approved June 2, 1965 (Public Law 89–31).

Extension of Area Redevelopment Act

H.J. Res. 541. To extend the Area Redevelopment Act for a period of 2 months. The 2 months' extension of this act is to provide sufficient time for congressional action on the Public Works and Economic Development Act, incorporating many programs provided under the Area Redevelopment Act. The act provides for continuation of loans and grants for public facilities and the rendering of information and technical assistance, urban redevelopment, planning, and occupational and retraining programs. Rule granted June 23, 1965 (H. Rept. 545, H. Res. 433). Passed House June 24, 1965. Passed Senate June 24, 1965. Approved June 30, 1965 (Public Law 89–55).

Assistance for Disaster Victims

H.R. 8060 (S. 1796). To amend the Small Business Act to provide additional assistance for disaster victims. This act amends the Small Business Act to provide additional assistance to victims of natural disasters, increasing the maturity of SBA disaster loans from 20 to 30 years, and providing for a suspension of up to 5 years on the payment of principal and interest on disaster loans at the discretion of SBA upon showing of need. Hearings, Small Business Subcommittee, May 12, 1965. Subcommittee reported favorably to full committee May 12, 1965. Full committee reported to House May 17, 1965. Passed House under suspension of rules June 21, 1965. Passed Senate May 19, 1965. Approved June 30, 1965 (Public Law 89–59).

Extension of Export Control Act

H.R. 7105. To provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports and for other purposes. The original act furnished basic authority to control exports to Communist bloc countries. This act extends the Export Control Act of 1969, authorizing civil penalties not exceeding $1,000 for violations of the act. This act also declares it the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts by foreign countries friendly to the United States and to encourage American firms to refuse to cooperate with restrictive trade practices and boycotts. Hearings held by Subcommittee on International Trade, May 13, 20 and 21, 1965. Reported favorably to full committee May 21, 1965. Full committee reported to House, with amendment, May 25, 1965 (H. Rept. 434). Rule granted June 7, 1965. Passed House June 8, 1965. Reported to Senate (S. Rept. 363), June 23, 1965. Passed Senate June 30, 1965. House concurred June 30, 1965. Approved June 30, 1965 (Public Law 89–63).

Amend Small Business Act

H.R. 7847. To grant SBA authority to lend to SBIC's and State and local development companies. This act increases by $120 million the portion of the Small Business Administration's revolving fund which may be loaned to small business investment companies and State and local development companies, raising the present ceiling of $341 million to $461 million. Hearings held and reported out, May 11, 1965, by full committee (H. Rept. 353). Rule granted May 26, 1965. Passed House June 10, 1965. Reported to Senate June 30, 1965 (S. Rept. 382). Passed Senate July 7, 1965. Approved July 21, 1965 (Public Law 89–78).

Interest rates of foreign official time deposits

H.R. 5306. To continue the authority of domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign governments at rates differing from those applicable to domestic depositors. This authority is confined to time deposits of foreign governments, central banks, or other monetary authorities and international financial institutions of which the United States is a member. The objective of this act is to assist in encouraging foreign governments and monetary authorities to maintain dollar accounts in this country rather than convert dollars into gold or transfer the funds to other financial centers. Hearings held May 4, 1965, and bill reported with amendment by full committee May 5, 1965 (H. Rept. 336). Rule granted May 26, 1965. Passed House June 10, 1965, with committee amendment. Reported to Senate (S. Rept. 385), June 30, 1965. Passed Senate July 7, 1965. Approved July 21, 1965 (Public Law 89–79).

Coinage Act of 1965

H.R. 8926 (S. 2080). To provide for the coinage of the United States. This act is intended to conserve the Nation's dwindling supply of silver, superseding and eventually replacing existing dimes, quarters, and half dollars made of traditional coinage alloy of 90-percent silver and 10-percent copper; the act provides for minting 10- and 25-cent pieces containing no silver, and 50-cent pieces of 40-percent silver content. The new coins will be legal tender and circulate together with existing coins. To discourage hoarding of silver coins, the price of silver will continue to be pegged at silver's monetary value of $1.29 per fine troy ounce. Reported to House by full committee in executive session with amendments June 11, 1965 (H. Rept. 509). Rule granted June 23, 1965. Passed House July 14, 1965. Passed Senate July 15, 1965. Approved July 23, 1965 (Public Law 89–81).

Housing Act of 1965

H.R. 7984. To assist in the provision of housing for low and moderate income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities. This act provides additional authorization and funds to continue federally assisted housing and urban development programs for 4 years and makes improvements affecting nearly all housing programs. Title 1 of the act authorizes a new program of rent supplement payments for disadvantaged persons, paying the difference between one-fourth of the occupant's income which he would pay as rent as fair market price. Subcommittee on Housing hearings held March 25, 26, 29, 30, 31; and April 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7, 1965. Hearings full committee in executive session May 17, 18, 19, 1965. Reported to House May 21, 1965 (H. Rept. 365). Rule granted June 16, 1965. Passed House with amendments June 30, 1965. Passed by Senate July 15, 1965, with amendments. Conference requested July 19, 1965. Conference report filed July 23, 1965. Senate adopted conference report July 26, 1965, and House adopted July 27, 1965. Approved August 10, 1965 (Public Law 89–117).

IBRD and IFC Articles of Agreement

H.R. 8816 (S. 1742). To authorize the U.S. Governor to agree to amendments to Articles of Agreement of International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation and for other purposes. This act authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, as U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, to agree to an amendment to the Articles of Agreement to permit loans to the International Finance Corporation. It also permits the IFC to lend to or borrow from the IBRD within specified limitations. The U.S. Governor is authorized to vote in favor of increases in the Bank's authorized capital stock without express congressional approval, providing it involves no such change in U.S. subscription. Hearings held by full committee July 8, 1965. Reported to House by full committee July 8, 1965 (H. Rept. 644). Rule granted July 29, 1965. Passed by House August 4, 1965. Reported to Senate June 28, 1965 (S. Rept. 372). Passed Senate June 30, 1965. Approved August 14, 1965 (Public Law 89–126).

BILLS PASSED BUT NOT SIGNED

To Amend the Small Business Act

(H.R. 11306) S. 2542. To increase SBA revolving fund by $120 million, to provide funds for more disaster loans. The devastation incurred by Hurricane Betsy caused great need for disaster fund loans. Hearings held S. 2542, October 21, 1965, by full committee. Reported to House October 21, 1965 (H. Rept. 1188). Passed House October 21, 1965. Reported in Senate (S. Rept. 794). Passed Senate October 1, 1965.

BILL PASSED BY HOUSE—IN SENATE

Amending Bank Holding Company Act

H.R. 7371. To amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. The purpose of this act is to preserve the traditional American system of locally owned independent banks serving local needs, the avoidance of concentration of banking power, to keep banks from competing unfairly with nonbanking businesses and to minimize self-dealing practices. This bill amends the Bank Holding Company Act to include partnerships, nonprofit, charitable, educational, or religious organizations and trusts, except trusts established for named beneficiaries terminating within 25 years or upon death of named beneficiaries. Hearings held by full committee May 27, June 14, and 15, 1965. Reported to House June 16, 1965, with amendments (H. Rept. 534). Rule pursuant to clause 23 of rule XI, September 13, 1965. Passed House, September 22, 1965, after adoption of a committee substitute amendment, supplying new text.

Commemorative Medal for San Antonio

H.R. 7526. To provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of San Antonio. Reported favorably to House by full committee on October 5, 1965 (H. Rept. 1136). Rule, October 11, 1965. Passed House October 18, 1965, with amendment.

BILLS REPORTED BUT NOT ENACTED

Study of Federal financial assistance to natural disaster victims

(H.R. 7397) S. 408. To authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future natural disasters. The bill directs the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to undertake immediately such a study to include alternate methods of Federal disaster insurance, as well as existing flood insurance. Hearings held by Small Business Subcommittee June 24, 1965. Reported to full committee July 6, 1965. Reported to House by full committee July 13, 1965 (H. Rept. 632). S. 408 incorporated in H.R. 11539, Committee on Public Works. Passed House, October 18, 1965. Passed Senate, October 21, 1965.

To amend Bank Holding Company Act of 1956

H.R. 7372. To amend Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. This bill would repeal the provision of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 exempting from regulation under that act any company, or its affiliates, registered before May 15, 1956, under the Investment Company Act of 1940 which do not directly own 25 percent or more of the voting shares of two or more banks. The bill specifically provides for divestment of all interests in banks acquired after May 9, 1956, by companies becoming bank holding companies under this act if the Federal Reserve Board finds on hearing within a 1-year period from enactment that retention is not in the public interest.

Hearings held by Subcommittee on Domestic Finance, June 2, 3, 22, and 23, 1965. Reported to full committee, June 23, 1965. Hearing by full committee, July 13, 1965; reported to House by full committee with amendments, July 13, 1965 (H. Rept. 680).

The amendatory effect of H.R. 7372 to the Bank Holding Company Act would also be accomplished by enactment of H.R. 7371, which passed the House on September 23, containing a similar provision to H.R. 7372.

International Wheat Agreement

(H.R. 10110) S. 2294. To amend section 2 of the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949. The bill would extend for an additional year U.S. participation in the International Wheat Agreement, participating countries agreeing to buy an average of 81 percent of their commercial wheat imports from the United States and nine other wheat exporting countries. Hearings held by Subcommittee on International Trade, July 29, 1965. Reported to full committee, July 29, 1965. Reported to House by full committee, August 4, 1965 (H. Rept. 723). Reported in Senate, July 22, 1965. Passed Senate, July 23, 1965. Rule granted, September 1, 1965.

Commemorative medal for Poland

H.R. 139. To provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 1,000th anniversary of the founding of Poland. Full committee approved, October 5, 1965; reported to House, October 22, 1965 (H. Rept. 1206).

Commemorative medal for Secret Service

H.R. 10357. To provide for striking of medals to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Secret Service. Approved by full committee, October 5, 1965; reported to House, October 22, 1965 (H. Rept. 1207).

BILLS CONSIDERED—NO ACTION

To amend Bank Merger Act of 1960

S. 1698. To establish a procedure for review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes. Reported to Senate (S. Rept. 299), June 8, 1965. Passed Senate, June 11, 1965. Hearings Domestic Finance Subcommittee, August 11, 13, 16–20, 23–27, 30–31; September 1, 2, 14–17, 22–24, 27, and 28, 1965. Reported with amendment to full committee, October 1, 1965. Full committee in executive session, October 5, 8, 11, 1965. No final action.

COMMITTEE INVESTIGATIONS

Federal Services Finance Corporation

The Subcommittee on Domestic Finance conducted an investigation of Federal Services Finance Corporation, a worldwide lending operation primarily engaged in the business of financing automobiles and making small loans to enlisted military personnel. The subcommittee investigation uncovered a multitude of evidence of worldwide abuse of military personnel in the form of usurious interest rates, falsification, and duplication of contracts, highly irregular repossession procedures, hidden add-on charges and phony insurance fees, and unethical use of military facilities in forcing payments from military personnel.

Federal Services had nearly $33 million worth of loans from banking institutions across the country; these banking connections with the unethical operations of Federal Services were carefully investigated. The subcommittee is continuing its investigation into Federal Services. Hearings were held June 9, 16, 17, 18; July 14; and September 13, 1965.

Crown Savings Bank

Pursuant to its responsibility of determining whether existing laws are adequate to the task of providing the Nation with a sound and progressive banking system and seeing if these laws are being properly administered by the Federal supervisory agencies, the Banking and Currency Committee, through its Domestic Finance Subcommittee, looked into the failure of the Crown Savings Bank of Newport News, Va. The subcommittee sought to determine whether there was a pattern in the increasing rate of bank failures during the past year, of which the Crown Savings Bank was a part.

After a thorough subcommittee investigation and hearings, the subcommittee found gross mismanagement on the part of Crown officers, serious misuse of certificates of deposits, fraudulent loans, misuse of cash items, infiltration of criminal elements into the banks' operations, and the use of the bank's facilities as a clearinghouse for phony companies operated by criminal elements. The subcommittee also found the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's examination and supervision policy preceding the closing of the Crown Savings Bank to be inadequate and faulty. The FDIC's operations, as receiver of the bank, came under careful scrutiny by the subcommittee when discrepancies and questions were raised concerning the handling of the closing.

Hearings were held July 20–23, 27–30; August 3–6, 1965.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE BANK MERGER BILL

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my deep concern over a widening attack on the Nation's antitrust laws. As you know, the Banking and Currency Committee has before it S. 1698, a bank merger bill, which would in effect wipe out the antitrust laws for the banking industry. This far-reaching legislation is almost certain to be a major item of controversy in the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

The bill, on its face, goes only to the question of the application of antitrust laws to banks. However, the legislation is unquestionably an opening wedge in a general weakening of the antitrust statutes under which our American competitive free enterprise system operates.

I know that many groups throughout the country are greatly disturbed about this bank merger bill and its effect on the business community and the public generally.

The antitrust laws traditionally have been the bulwark protecting small business and preventing the domination of our economy by a few big businesses. Even with our present antitrust laws, we still find widespread instances of price fixing, anticompetitive practices, and a steady wave of mergers leading to bigger and bigger monopolies. Free enterprise cannot exist without strong antitrust laws fairly and thoroughly administered.

Congressional intent in favor of these antitrust laws has been plain ever since the passage of the Sherman Act in 1890. This policy was reemphasized with the passage of the Clayton Act in 1914, and has been strengthened by the passage of many amendments and laws since that time. In addition, the enforcement of antitrust laws is a bipartisan belief. Strong antitrust laws that would protect our economic system from domination by undue concentrations of power have long been the goals of all political parties.

Now, proponents of S. 1698 and similar bank merger bills propose that the Congress turn its back on this longstanding policy and return the banking industry and eventually the whole business community to the law of the jungle.

Without question, the banking industry has tremendous impact on all businesses. Therefore, the question of antitrust application to banks takes on added meaning in this field. Since all business is vitally dependent on the commercial banking system, a competitive marketplace in which the bank customer can choose the institution which best fits his needs is imperative. But if a small group of big banks dominates the availability of credit to businessmen, then freedom of choice is destroyed and, in effect, the bank can control the entire business community. Already in this country 100 of the Nation's 14,000 banks control approximately half of all commerical bank deposits, and those huge institutions also have interlocking directors with the Nation's largest nonbanking corporations.

In addition, there is an illegal but growing trend among the larger banks to enter into an ever-increasing number of nonbanking businesses, such as the selling of insurance, automobile and other equipment rental, travel agencies, credit card business, computer services, and securities underwriting, to name only a few. The list of nonbanking services being provided by banks grows longer every year. All of the nonbanking services which banks now offer are also performed by independent businessmen. The businesses providing these nonbanking services are subject to the full force of the antitrust laws. If S. 1698 were passed, it would clearly put these competitors of banks at a further disadvantage because the antitrust laws would not apply equally to all. Is this equal justice under law?

Elimination of the antitrust laws is also a big threat to the small independent banks. Enactment of the bank merger bill would, of course, provide a field day for the large banks, which seem to have an endless appetite for swallowing up their smaller competitors.

As banks disappear in these mergers, the sources of credit for small businesses and the consumer shrink. Unlike big businesses, the consumer and the small business must usually depend on sources of money close to their home areas. Concentration of banking facilities eliminates competition, raises the cost of money, and limits the supply of credit for these small borrowers. It is an unfortunate fact that big banks prefer to deal with big customers.

Passage of S. 1698, effectively exempting banks from the antitrust laws, could lead ultimately to the end of antitrust application to all businesses and finally the demise of our American free enterprise system.

During the closing days of the first session of this Congress, a group of members of your Banking and Currency Committee met in an illegal rump session. Following this rump session, they illegally reported a bank merger bill, S. 1698, and without properly informing this body sent the bill and an alleged committee report to the Rules Committee.

If an attempt is made to obtain a rule on this illegally reported bill, S. 1698, from the House Rules Committee when the Congress meets in January, I shall request an appearance before that body and state that this legislation was not legally reported from the Banking and Currency Committee. In addition, if S. 1698 should reach the floor of the House, I shall make a point of order against this bill and show that the conduct leading to the presentation of this bill to the House constitutes violations of a number of rules of the House and of the Banking and Currency Committee.

I know that this body shares my concern over this bill and its long-range implications in the antitrust area. What the Members of this 89th Congress do about this legislation undoubtedly will affect the American people and the American economy for years to come.

To inform the House of the real impact of this legislation—indicating how far it goes in eliminating the antitrust laws—I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a series of questions and answers concerning S. 1698 and related bills:

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE BANK MERGER BILL—66 QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

I. How S. 1698 would exempt bank mergers from the antitrust laws.

II. Why the antitrust laws should continue to apply to the banking industry.

III. The real reason why the banking lobby wants to amend the bank merger laws.

IV. What would happen to all of our antitrust laws if S. 1698 became law?

V. Can the Federal bank supervisory agencies be counted on to protect the public interest in supervising the banks?

I. HOW S. 1698 WOULD EXEMPT BANK MERGERS FROM THE ANTITRUST LAWS

1. What is a bank merger?

A merger is a transaction whereby two or more banks combine or consolidate so that only one bank remains, thus reducing competition.

2. What is S. 1698?

S. 1698 is a very important bank merger bill that passed the Senate on June 11, 1965, and was sent over to the House of Representatives where it was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3. How would S. 1698 change the law if enacted in the next session of Congress starting in January?

S. 1698 would excuse from the application of the antitrust laws more than 2,200 bank mergers since 1950, even including illegal mergers reducing competition and leading to monopoly.

4. Would S. 1698 affect bank mergers already in the courts, even cases where the mergers have actually been found illegal by the judge?

Yes, it would. S. 1698 as it passed the Senate and as now under consideration in the House Committee on Banking and Currency excuses even those bank mergers adjudged illegal, except where final action undoing the merger has already taken place.

5. Would S. 1698 change the antitrust laws as to future bank mergers?

Yes, the bill as it passed the Senate would give the Attorney General only 30 days in which to file an antitrust suit following banking agency approval of a merger.

6. If S. 1698 becomes law, who will have the primary responsibility for approving bank mergers?

The authority will rest with the three Federal bank supervisory agencies, the Federal Reserve Board for State banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System; the Comptroller of the Currency for national banks; and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for State-chartered banks which are not members of the Federal Reserve System.

7. Can the public expect its interests to be protected by the three banking agencies in approving bank mergers?

There is little evidence to show that the three bank supervisory agencies are presently operating in the public interest or that they will operate in the public interest in the future unless Congress changes certain laws to make them more susceptible to control by the executive and legislative branches of Government. The bank supervisory agencies do not come to Congress for appropriated funds, but obtain their funds from the banks, the institutions they are supposed to supervise. There have been numerous cases in the past in which the bank supervisory agencies have placed the interests of the bankers ahead of the public interest.

8. Will the passage of S. 1698 preclude the possibility of private antitrust suits brought against a bank merger?

Yes. S. 1698 states that no action, public or private, may be brought under the antitrust laws to overturn a bank merger after a 30-day period.

9. If S. 1698 became law would all future mergers be protected against antitrust attack by the Justice Department forever?

Yes. If the Justice Department does not bring an action against a merger within 30 days of the time the merger is approved by the appropriate bank supervisory agency, an attack on that merger would be barred forever regardless of the anticompetitive effects which were an outgrowth of that merger.

10. Since there would be no possibility of rectifying a merger which did, in fact, violate the antitrust laws, but had been approved by the bank regulatory agencies, will there be a provision for public hearings before these agencies prior to approval of the merger?

No. No adversary-type hearings are required under the legislation nor are they contemplated by the bank regulatory agencies, which traditionally have conducted their affairs in secret.

11. Would passage of S. 1698 increase merger trends in banking?

Most probably, yes, because S. 1698 would give greater weight to the judgment of the bank supervisory agencies, which have approved over 90 percent of all bank merger applications since 1960, and less weight to the judgment of the Justice Department which traditionally has responsibility for enforcement of the antitrust laws.

12. If S. 1698 makes bank mergers easier, will this create an incentive for other banks to merge?

It is true that mergers of banks in particular communities have encouraged other banks in the same community to merge in order to keep up with the larger bank created by the original merger. Thus, concentration in banking becomes greater and greater until only a few banks in the community control the entire banking business.

13. Will S. 1698 set precedent for further bank legislation to remove that industry from all forms of governmental safeguards?

Definitely. Once banks have been excused from prosecution under the antitrust laws in the area of mergers, there is every reason to believe that the next step would be to remove banks from all coverage of the antitrust laws. For example, such a move would allow banks to conspire to fix service charges and interest rates, and to determine among themselves who would obtain loans and who would not.

14. What other adverse effects would ensue if banks were exempted from all antitrust laws?

One very important effect would be to put nonbanking businesses which compete with banks at a disadvantage. There has been a growing trend among banks to enter into an ever-increasing number of nonbanking businesses, such as the selling of insurance, automobile and other equipment rental, travel agent services, the credit card business, computer services, and investment management. Nonbanking competitors which compete with banks would clearly be at a disadvantage because the antitrust laws would not apply equally to all competitors.

15. May a national bank own any amount of nonbanking corporate stock, including a controlling interest? May a national bank own other banks in foreign states? May a national bank own investment banking or brokerage corporations? May a national bank own finance companies? May a national bank, either directly or indirectly, own automobile dealerships? May a national bank own savings and loan companies? May a national bank own a chain of drugstores? May a national bank own a chain of gasoline stations?

According to a ruling of the Comptroller of the Currency, a national bank may own any amount of corporate stock—including a controlling interest—"or purposes properly incident to its banking business." Moreover, the Comptroller claims that "what is 'properly incident' to banking would be determined by the 'Comptroller in light of developments of banking and banking services.' "

Based on the Comptroller's ruling, justification can be found for any business as being incidental to banking if that business uses or borrows money. The Comptroller's rulings have put banks in the insurance business, in the automobile and equipment rental business, in the travel agent business, in the credit card business, in the computer services business, and in the investment management business, among many others.

16. If banks were exempt from the application of the antitrust laws, would nonbanking companies which are controlled by a bank be exempt from the antitrust laws? For example, if the Chase Manhattan Bank acquired control of Esso and the First National City Bank of New York acquired control of Texaco and the two banks merged could these oil companies violate the Sherman and Clayton Acts without fear of prosecution?

Under the proposed legislation, the possibility of obtaining such an exemption from the antitrust laws for nonbanking businesses certainly exists.

II. WHY THE ANTITRUST LAWS SHOULD CONTINUE TO APPLY TO THE BANKING INDUSTRY

17. How do bank mergers harm the public and why are the antitrust laws important to protect the public?

Bank mergers harm the public by permitting big banks to gobble up smaller competing banks. Without effective competition, banks can charge higher interest rates on loans, and higher service charges and other fees; they can also pay lower interest rates on savings and time deposits. The antitrust laws are the only protection the public has to assure sound and healthy competition between banks so that the public is not "gouged."

18. Have banks gouged the public through secret agreements or by otherwise eliminating competition in recent years?

Yes. In 1964 about one dozen banks in Minnesota were found guilty of a criminal conspiracy to fix interest rates, service charges, and loan conditions, in violation of the antitrust laws, and were fined hundreds of thousands of dollars.

19. How serious has the merger trend been in the banking industry in this country?

This is a very serious problem. Since 1950 there have been over 2,200 bank mergers. Because of this Congress passed the Bank Merger Act of 1960, which was intended to stem the steadily rising tide of bank mergers. Because of the lack of effective administration of this law by the Federal bank supervisory agencies the trend in bank mergers has continued virtually unabated.

These agencies have approved over 700 bank mergers in the last 5 years. Commercial bank mergers averaged 166 a year in the 4 years 1956 through 1959, and 151 a year from 1961 through 1965.

In addition, it should be noted that 5 banks control over 50 percent of the deposits in each of 23 States; 5 banks control over 70 percent of the deposits in each of 11 States; and 5 banks control over 90 percent of the deposits in each of 5 States. Thus, in each of 39 States 50 percent or more of the commercial bank deposits are controlled by only 5 banks.

20. What is a specific example of increased concentration of banking since World War II?

One of the most important examples is what has taken place in New York City, probably the most important banking market in the world. In 1946 there were 25 banks in New York City which were members of the bank clearinghouse. Through more than a dozen mergers over the last 20 years this figure has been cut by more than half. Today there are only 10 banks in New York City that are members of the clearinghouse.

Another example is the fact that the Bank of America alone holds 38.6 percent of the deposits of all commercial banks in the State of California, the largest and fastest growing State in the Union.

21. Why should the consumer be concerned over bank mergers and concentration of banking in the hands of a few institutions?

The whole reason for our antitrust laws is the protection of the consumer, the American public, from all unfair and anticompetitive practices. Concentration in any industry, including banking, inevitably causes rise in prices, increasingly poor quality of goods and services, the concentration of economic and political power in the hands of a few, and exorbitant profits made at the expense of the consuming public.

22. What about farmers—how does the increasing concentration of banking affect the farming community?

One of the trends in bank mergers has been that city banks have been rapidly absorbing rural and smalltown independent banks. Therefore, the alternative credit sources which are essential to the farmers have shrunk tremendously in the face of the large number of bank mergers which have taken place in the last 15 years. Thus, the farmer is today more than ever at the mercy of the big city banker, who traditionally has never been responsive to the farmer's needs.

23. What other groups should be concerned about the weakening of the antitrust laws as they apply to banking?

Among others, those who would be adversely affected by weakening the application of the antitrust laws to banking include small businessmen, wage earners, savings and loan associations, credit unions, and all other financial institutions.

24. Can the antitrust laws stem the tide of bank mergers?

Yes, if enforced vigorously by the Justice Department. The only bulwark against this trend has been the Department of Justice's action against eight bank mergers under the antitrust laws. Even though the Justice Department has been extremely cautious in bringing such cases, it has brought cases against the most outrageous bank mergers, those which created undue concentrations in such large banking centers as New York, Chicago, the State of California, St. Louis, Philadelphia, and Lexington, Ky. The bank supervisory agencies responsible for passing on these mergers had previously approved each one of them.

25. Is it important to the public interest that the antitrust laws be applied to the banking industry?

There is no better answer to this question than that given by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Philadelphia National Bank case when the Court said: "We reject the position that commercial banking, because it is subject to a high degree of governmental regulation, or because it deals in the intangibles of credit and services rather than in the manufacture or sale of tangible commodities, is somehow immune from the anticompetitive effects of undue concentration. * * * There is no reason to think that concentration is less inimical to the free play of competition in banking than in other service industries. On the contrary, it is in all probability more inimical. For example, banks compete to fill the credit needs of businessmen. Small businessmen especially are, as a practical matter, confined to their locality for the satisfaction of their credit needs. If the number of banks in their locality is reduced, the vigor of competition for filling the marginal small business borrowers' needs is likely to diminish. At the same time, the concomitantly greater difficulty in obtaining credit is likely to put him at a disadvantage vis-a-vis larger businesses with which he competes. In this fashion, concentration in banking accelerates concentration generally."

26. How much concentration actually exists in the commercial banking industry in this country today?

The banking industry is one of the most highly concentrated industries in the United States. As a matter of fact, only 14 commercial banks in this country control approximately 25 percent of all commercial bank deposits, and only 100 commercial banks control 50 percent of all commercial bank deposits in the United States. Therefore, it is important that further concentration within the banking industry be prevented.

27. Is there any evidence of tangible adverse effects to the public when mergers create a concentration of banking in a particular community?

Yes. A recent study of bank concentration in various communities across the country shows that in areas where competition is lacking, interest rates on savings and time deposits are lower and interest charges on loans higher than in areas where there is healthy competition among banks. In addition, it was shown in the Philadelphia National Bank case, in which the Supreme Court ruled that the merger of two large Philadelphia banks violated the antitrust laws, that subsequent to the merger the merged bank in every case chose to charge its customers the highest of the rates and service charges charged by the separate banks before the banks merged. There have been similar complaints after other recent mergers such as one in St. Louis, Mo., in June of 1965.

28. What about the argument that, because banks are strictly regulated by both Federal and State agencies, they need not be subject to the antitrust laws?

This argument is not valid. Banking is a supervised industry, not a strictly regulated industry. There is no similarity at all between bank supervision, which is carried out to insure the financial soundness of banking institutions, and the strict governmental regulation of public utilities, such as telephone companies and electric power companies. Government agencies do not set bank charges, interest rate charges, or other fees. Neither do they determine the quality or the quantity of banking services that must be offered the public. Furthermore, banks are perfectly free to choose with whom they wish to do business. These choices are not available to fully regulated industries, which in return have a territorial franchise, must charge rates fixed by the Government, provide services determined by the Government, and serve all comers. The strictly regulated industries are to some extent relieved from the application of the antitrust laws, but the price they must pay is a fixed rate of return on their capital investment and a semigovernmental status. On the other hand, banking is a competitive free enterprise industry with no such restrictions.

29. When applying the antimerger provisions of the antitrust laws to banks, have the Justice Department and the courts only considered the narrow economic impact of a reduction in competition in an area or have they taken a broader view, considering such matters as the effect of the merger on the convenience and needs of the community?

The Justice Department and the courts have always viewed the application of the antitrust laws broadly and have considered the convenience and needs of the community as one aspect of the overall impact of a proposed merger on competition. Therefore, when a court rules that a merger violates the antitrust laws, it does so after carefully considering all aspects of the public interest involved.

30. What about the problem of divestiture? Isn't it very difficult to split up a bank, creating much hardship for the investors, depositors, and the public?

There is no doubt that divestiture creates serious problems, but this is true in all antitrust cases in which a court orders the breaking up of a business enterprise, not only in the case of banks. In order to eliminate the need for divestiture there have been proposals to permit the Justice Department to obtain automatic injunctions against mergers pending completion of litigation in antitrust cases. The banks have opposed these proposals. It should also be noted that divestiture is not a new remedy but is a traditional and well-established one in the field of antitrust. Without the power to order divestiture, the antitrust laws would be useless because there would be no effective way to enforce statutes which restrict mergers and prohibit tendencies toward monopoly.

31. Are the banks which are presently involved in litigation over the legality of their mergers being treated unfairly?

These banks most definitely are not being treated unfairly. When the Justice Department brought action against these six mergers the banks argued against the Court granting an injunction which would prevent the banks from merging pending final determination by the Court. The banks argued that the proper and feasible remedy for the Government if the mergers were found illegal was divestiture. Therefore, the banks themselves agreed to divest if they lost the cases. As Attorney General Katzenbach stated in his testimony before a subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, it ill behooves these banks now to claim that divestiture is impossible when at the time the cases were brought they themselves stated that this was a suitable remedy. Thus, there is no question that these banks are being treated fairly in every way.

32. Has the Justice Department used the antitrust laws to unduly handicap legitimate mergers in the bank industry?

Definitely not. Since 1950 there have been 2,200 bank mergers. The Justice Department has taken action against only eight of these mergers. If the mergers challenged had involved small banks, there would have been no great lobbying campaign for this legislation. However, the six mergers now under challenge involve some of the most powerful banks in the country.

33. Who opposes S. 1698?

Some of the strongest opposition to S. 1698 has come from objective observers such as professors of law and economics at universities around the country. A number of them testified against S. 1698 before the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee. In addition, a special subcommittee of the American Bar Association, after carefully studying S.

1698, wrote a report strongly opposing all aspects of S. 1698, as well as any attempt to weaken the antitrust laws as they apply to banking. The Independent Bankers Association of America, the largest association representing small banks in this country, has also strongly opposed the adoption of S. 1698. Others opposing the passage of S. 1698 include the AFL–CIO, the Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO, small business groups, and the National Farmers Union.

34. Was the Attorney General of the United States invited to testify on S. 1698 before the House Committee on Banking and Currency?

He certainly was and his testimony was in strong opposition to all the provisions of S. 1698. Also, several prominent Senators testified in opposition to S. 1698.

III. THE REAL REASON WHY THE BANKING LOBBY WANTS TO AMEND THE BANK MERGER LAWS

35. What is the real reason behind the tremendous pressure for the adoption of S. 1698?

The Justice Department has six cases pending against bank mergers for violations of the antitrust laws. In two of these cases, the Manufacturers Hanover merger in New York City and the Lexington Bank merger in Lexington, Ky., Federal courts have already found that the mergers violated the antitrust laws. These six banks are trying to obtain special treatment; that is, forgiveness for themselves for violations of Federal law that everyone else must obey.

36. Is S. 1698 essentially private or special interest legislation for the benefit of six banks?

This is correct. As a matter of fact, Congressman TODD, Democrat, of Michigan, who opposes S. 1698, has introduced six private bills for relief of these banks for consideration as private legislation before the House Judiciary Committee.

37. Is it unusual for private businesses to come to Congress seeking special exemption from Federal laws which are already on the books?

This is, indeed, an unusual request. A number of witnesses before the House Banking and Currency Subcommittee, including Attorney General Katzenbach, Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, and Federal Reserve Governor Robertson deplored such a blatant attempt to obtain special treatment. As Governor Robertson pointed out, such action breeds disrespect for our laws and for the judicial system, which is supposed to provide under our Constitution equal protection of the laws for all, not special treatment.

38. Is there any legitimate need for S. 1698?

The hearings held by the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, indicate that there is no legitimate need for amending the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

39. What are the arguments used by the banks respecting their need for this legislation?

The proponents of S. 1698 claim that the law is confused and that the banks are uncertain as to the application of the antitrust laws to banking.

40. Is this a legitimate claim?

Not at all. It is only a smokescreen. In plain fact, since the Supreme Court decision in the Philadelphia National Bank case in June of 1963, it has been clearly understood that the antimerger provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Antitrust Act do apply to banking. It has always been understood that the Sherman Antitrust Act applies to banking. Therefore, the plain truth is that it is not lack of clarity that the big banks are really complaining of. What disturbs the big banks is the fact that the Supreme Court has clearly stated that all the major antitrust laws can be brought to bear against the banking industry as it does to other industries. What the big banks really want is to obtain special treatment; that is, exemption from the antitrust laws.

41. Did the Attorney General of the United States testify on S. 1698 before the Senate?

Although the Attorney General has the responsibility to enforce our antitrust laws, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee did not have the Attorney General testify on S. 1698. His views were, therefore, not made known to the Senate.

42. Is not the American Bankers Association lobbying vigorously for enactment of S. 1698?

Yes, the American Bankers Association, dominated as it is by the large, big city banks, is lobbying vigorously for S. 1698. They and individual member banks have spent large sums of money and distributed thousands of pamphlets in support of S. 1698.

43. What other forms has the lobbying pressure in favor of S. 1698 taken?

The Continental Illinois National Bank, one of the banks whose merger would be forgiven under S. 1698, reported that it spent over $5,000 in lobbying expenses in support of S. 1698. There have also been reports that businesses which have received loans from some of the banks seeking forgiveness for violation of antitrust laws were requested to pressure their Congressmen to support S. 1698. Attorneys for five of the six banks seeking forgiveness attempted to suppress a report of a special subcommittee of the American Bar Association by unfairly attacking the members of this subcommittee as having conflicts of interest or being biased. This American Bar Association subcommittee had recommended unanimously that Congress defeat S. 1698.

44. Why is the American Bankers Association so interested in bank merger legislation such as S. 1698?

The Supreme Court case nailing down the application of the antitrust laws to bank mergers was decided back in June 1963, over 2 years ago. The ABA annual resolutions adopted in convention in 1963 did not even mention bank mergers. In early 1964, another bank merger was held illegal by the courts, yet the 1964 ABA convention still did not adopt a resolution calling for changes in the antitrust laws. Furthermore, on February 3, 1965, the executive manager of the ABA, speaking in Dallas, Tex., predicted, "Not much major banking legislation, whether good or bad from the industry's point of view, is to be expected from Congress this year." What happened to make the ABA change its mind concerning major banking legislation in 1965?

On March 10, 1965, a U.S. district court in New York rendered its decision that the merger creating the Manufacturers Hanover Trust, a $6 billion Wall Street bank and the Nation's fourth largest, violated the antitrust laws.

45. Would S. 1698 excuse Manufacturers Hanover from this court ruling?

Yes, S. 1698 would forgive all past mergers where "unmerging" has not yet been accomplished, which includes Manufacturers Hanover.

46. When was S. 1698 introduced in the Senate, and who introduced it?

S. 1698 was introduced in the Senate by the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on April 5, less than 1 month after the Manufacturers Hanover decision, but approximately 2 years after the famous Supreme Court case holding that the Bank Merger Act of 1960 did not exempt banks from the antitrust laws.

IV. WHAT WOULD HAPPEN TO ALL OF OUR ANTITRUST LAWS IF S. 1698 BECAME LAW?

47. Are strong antitrust laws important in industries other than banking?

Yes, the antitrust laws protect the public against unfair and anticompetitive practices in all other industries, not just banking, and it can truthfully be said that our free enterprise system depends on the survival of the antitrust laws.

48. What would happen if S. 1698 becomes law and all the other powerful industry groups, such as automobiles, steel, rubber, petroleum, as well as service industries, succeeded in repealing the antitrust laws?

Without question the ultimate result of repealing the antitrust laws would be the total monopolization and control of the entire economy by a few giant financial and industrial corporations and the men who run them. It should be as true today as it was in 1914 when President Wilson stated in support of the antitrust laws: "We are all agreed that 'private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable.'" The repeal of the antitrust laws would result, as President Wilson put it, "* * * in making those who borrow and those who lend practically one and the same, those who sell and those who buy but the same persons trading with one another under different names and in different combinations, and those who affect to compete in fact partners and masters of some whole field of business."

49. How important is the banking industry to the rest of the American economy?

Since all business is vitally dependent on the commercial banking system, a competitive marketplace in which the bank customer can choose the institution which best fits his needs is imperative. But if a small group of big banks dominates the availability of credit to businessmen, then freedom of choice is destroyed and, in effect, the bank can control the entire business community. Therefore, banking is one of the most important, powerful, and pervasive elements in our entire economy.

50. What could ultimately happen to the antitrust laws of this country if banks are granted an exemption from antitrust laws as envisaged by S. 1698?

Passage of S. 1698 could ultimately lead to the repeal of all antitrust laws to the ruination of small business, the consuming public, and the free enterprise system. This is true for two reasons. One, banks are going into an ever-increasing number of nonbanking businesses in competition with other businessmen. If S. 1698 were passed, it would clearly put these competitors of banks at a disadvantage because the antitrust laws would not apply equally to all competitors. Secondly, once one industry gains immunity from the antitrust laws, every industry will immediately seek similar consideration. There can be no question that this will soon lead to an erosion, if not elimination, of our antitrust laws, and, as a result, the death of our American free enterprise system.

51. Does concentration in banking foster concentration in other industries, thus causing concentration of economic power in the hands of a few?

Yes. This is done in large part by establishing interlocking directorates between the large banks and large business concerns. As mergers mount both in banking and in other industries this trend is accentuated.

52. Do large commercial banks already have a voice or position of authority in other large financial institutions, such as insurance companies?

Although insurance companies and banks are in direct competition as far as credit extension is concerned, a recent study disclosed that the 10 largest life insurance companies had more than 195 direct interlocks with banks and that the 10 largest fire and casualty companies had more than 160 direct interlocks with commercial banks.

The Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., the largest life insurance company in the United States with assets of over $20 billion, had four direct interlocks with the Chase Manhattan Bank, the second largest bank in the United States with assets of over $14 billion.

Metropolitan had two interlocking directorates with First National City Bank of New York, the third largest bank in the United States with assets of $14 billion.

The Prudential Life Insurance Co. of America with assets of $19 billion had direct interlocks with First National City Bank, Manufacturers Hanover, Chemical Bank New York Trust, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., and Bankers Trust Co. The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, the third largest life insurance company with assets of over $12 billion, had three direct interlocks with Chase Manhattan, one with Manufacturers Hanover, three with Chemical Bank New York Trust, and one with Republic National Bank of Dallas.

The fourth largest insurance company, New York Life Insurance Co., assets of $9 billion, had direct interlocks with Chase Manhattan, First National City Bank, Manufacturers Hanover, three with Chemical Bank New York Trust, and two with Morgan Guaranty Bank.

These are just a few of dozens of examples of such interlocks between two industries that control the use of billions of dollars of credit in this country.

53. What about corporate interlocks between large commercial banks and industrial and commercial corporations—how extensive is this and does this also concentrate tremendous economic power in the hands of a few?

This practice is quite widespread and serious. A recent study made by the House Judiciary Committee shows that there are more than 1,200 management ties between the 15 largest commercial banks in this country and large industrial and commercial concerns. For example, interlocks exist between these 15 huge banks and such corporate giants as General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, A.T. & T., B. F. Goodrich, Sears-Roebuck, International Harvester, Swift & Co., Inland Steel, and Commonwealth Edison, just to name a few. Such practices indeed place fantastic economic power in the hands of a very few groups.

54. What would happen to our competitive free enterprise system if the antitrust laws, including restrictions on mergers, were weakened or repealed, the ever-increasing trend toward mergers continued, and the pattern of interlocking control of large industrial, commercial, and financial institutions were allowed to stand uncontested?

The inevitable result would be the complete control of the entire American economy by virtually a handful of bank and industrial corporation presidents and directors. This in turn, would spell the death knell of the American competitive economic system as we know it today.

55. What is the position of the Democratic Party as to the antitrust laws?

The 1964 Democratic Party platform stated, "The antitrust laws must be vigorously enforced."

56. What is the position of the Republican Party as to the antitrust laws?

The 1964 Republican Party platform called for "improvement, and full and fair enforcement of the antitrust statutes * * *" and "constant opposition to any form of unregulated monopoly."

57. What has the President's Council of Economic Advisers had to say about the importance of competition and the antitrust laws, and the dangers of concentrations of economic power in our economy?

The annual report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, made in January of 1965, stated: "Decentralization of economic power has long been considered desirable for social and political reasons, as well as for its contribution to an efficient economy. Absence of active competition tends to result in higher prices and lower output, and thus in a less efficient allocation of resources." "Legislative, judicial, and enforcement activities have all contributed to the strengthening and clarification of our antitrust policies in the postwar period. Enforcement activity has been vigorous during each of the postwar administrations, attesting to the bipartisan nature of the Nation's belief in maintaining maximum competition consistent with a productive and efficient economy."

V. CAN THE FEDERAL BANK SUPERVISORY AGENCIES BE COUNTED ON TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC INTEREST IN SUPERVISING THE BANKS?

58. What was the purpose of the Bank Merger Act of 1960?

Congress had become alarmed at the great trend toward centralization of banking from mergers starting in the 1950's, which threatened to destroy competition in that very important industry. The Bank Merger Act of 1960 was the culmination of 5 years of work by Congress on the bank merger problem.

59. What was the intent of Congress in passing the Bank Merger Act of 1960?

The intent of Congress in passing the Bank Merger Act of 1960 was clearly to make bank mergers more difficult. This was stated by the sponsors of the bill, as well as others.

60. Have the Federal bank supervisory agencies successfully carried out the intent of Congress in enforcing this act?

Not at all. The Bank Merger Act of 1960 gave the three Federal banking agencies, the Federal Reserve Board, the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation the responsibility to screen mergers of banks under their jurisdiction and to deny mergers clearly not in the public interest, including those that adversely affected competition. Since 1960, the banking agencies have considered approximately 700 bank mergers and have approved over 90 percent, including a number of mergers now being challenged in the courts as in violation of antitrust laws. If anything, the trend toward concentration in the banking industry has quickened since 1960, not diminished.

61. Do the Federal bank supervisory agencies actually regulate banks in the same way that Government regulatory agencies regulate public utilities?

No. Banks are not regulated at all in the same sense that public utilities are regulated. There are no restrictions governing the charges that banks make on their customers for services or regulations on the amount of interest that banks can charge on loans. In truly regulated industries all charges must be approved by the regulatory agencies. Furthermore, banks are not obligated as public utilities are to serve all who desire service on a nondiscriminatory basis.

62. Do the three Federal banking agencies have close, intimate ties to the commercial banking industry?

Yes, unfortunately. Both the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation receive their financial support from the commercial banks. Also, the Federal Reserve Board's interest rate committee is dominated by representatives of the large commercial banks when it meets in secret every 3 weeks to fix interest rates and the availability of credit for all borrowers. Furthermore, the Federal Reserve System's banks are dues-paying members in good standing of the American Bankers Association, paying $50,000 a year of the taxpayers' money in dues to the ABA, thus helping to finance the ABA lobbying effort to pass S. 1698.

63. Are these Government agencies required to appear each year before the Congress to seek appropriation of funds and to submit themselves to an official Government audit by the General Accounting Office?

Not at all. None of the three agencies must justify their expenditures before the Congress or seek their money from Congress. Neither the Federal Reserve System nor the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency are audited by the General Accounting Office, the official Government auditor.

64. Does the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, which supervises savings and loan associations, appear before Congress each year to justify its expenditures of funds, and is not that agency audited by the General Accounting Office?

Yes; the Federal Home Loan Bank Board appears before Congress annually to justify its expenditures, and it is also audited by the General Accounting Office.

Needless to say, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board's ability to do its regulatory job has not been impaired by these restrictions.

Most competent analysts of banking agree that the same rules would have no adverse effect on the operations of the Federal Reserve System, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the FDIC.

65. Can the bank supervisory agencies be relied upon to protect the public interest in enforcing the antitrust laws?

No. Because of the close relationship between the bank supervisory agencies and the banks, we must rely on an agency that takes a broad view of the public interest, is not tied in with the banks, and has experience with enforcing the antitrust laws. This job can only be done by the Justice Department, the chief law enforcement agency of the U.S. Government.

66. Would S. 1698 severely limit the applicability of the antitrust laws to banking? Would it place the authority to approve bank mergers in the bank supervisory agencies rather than in the Justice Department and the courts of law?

Yes, and that would be like sending the goose to guard the shelled corn.

FACTS CITED IN SPEECH BY J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues in the waning hours of this session of Congress a few facts cited in a recent speech by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover.

I take this opportunity, for I presume that many of my colleagues, like myself, hope to join thousands of other Americans in the great sport of hunting. And if they do, they will find their fellow hunters expressing great and vocal concern over the pending firearms control measures.

My colleagues will find that their fellow hunters have not created the Nation's most pressing domestic problem—the illegal use of firearms. And they will be asked, as I have been, why penalize millions of decent, law-abiding citizens with harsh restrictions and increased fees—when the problem is caused by the criminal. They will be asked why this Congress is reluctant to enact legislation striking at the criminal use of firearms as a first step—and then, if the problem is not curbed, consider other measures.

As I have told this House on many occasions, it is the repeat offender who uses firearms to prey on businessmen and innocent citizens that is generating the call for Federal action. I have a bill pending before the Ways and Means Committee, H.R. 11427, which in my judgment would do much to curb this national disgrace. It is an easy bill to understand: it provides that anyone who uses or carries a firearm which has moved in interstate commerce during the commission of a robbery, murder, rape, assault, or kidnapping will be sentenced for not less than 10 years for the first offense, and not less than 25 years for a subsequent offense.

The facts are plain. They are there for anyone to see in the rapidly increasing crime statistics.

In Philadelphia, a recent 6-month survey by the police department showed that 7 out of every 10 persons arrested for a crime of violence was a repeat offender. Many had records of 10 or more arrests.

Listen to what FBI Director Hoover said in his October 19 speech:

> In complaining last year of what it termed "turnstile justice," a major newspaper in New York demanded, "It's time that the public was told just why so many young criminals and terrorists are passed through this turnstile and sent back to the streets to kill, rape, rob, and assault the innocent."
>
> Exaggerated charges? Not in the least. From 1960 through 1964, no less than 225 police officers were killed in the line of duty. Nearly one-third of the hoodlums arrested in connection with these murders were on parole or probation when the killings occurred.
>
> The lives of six of these officers were claimed by criminals who had been paroled for a prior murder. Eleven lives were taken by offenders who had been paroled after confinement for felonious assault, and 32 of these officers were killed by paroled robbers.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues that it is time that we remove this scum from society—if necessary, for life. The decent people in this country have the right to expect this Government to protect them, and there is a growing demand for this Congress to act.

If those gruesome statistics do not show the fallacy of leniency by the courts to criminals—listen to other facts cited by Mr. Hoover:

> We recently completed an examination of the records of nearly 93,000 criminals who were arrested in 1963 and 1964. This disclosed that 76 percent—more than three-quarters—had been arrested on at least one previous occasion. Over one-half of them had received lenient treatment, including parole, probation, and suspended sentences, at some point in their criminal careers—and these criminals recorded an average of more than three additional arrests after their first encounter with the school of soft justice and official leniency.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues that it is high time we crack down on the criminals. There are some, I know, who still hold to the great theory that we should reform the criminals—that society is at fault. The facts show this to be a fallacious theory, and this Congress will not long be able to withstand the demand from the citizens that these people be put out of circulation through harsh, swift justice.

> Forty-one years ago—

Said Mr. Hoover—

> an experienced attorney and jurist in New York issued the strong warning: "It is not the criminals, actual or potential, that need a neuropathic hospital. It is the people who slobber over them in an effort to find excuses for their crime." The demand of the hour in America, above all other countries, is for jurors with conscience, judges with courage and prisons which are neither country clubs nor health resorts.
>
> The same demands of the hour continue to exist today. Tragically, the atmosphere of many courtrooms is still polluted by some jurors who deliberately close their minds to the evidence before them. Too many of our judges seek out technicalities rather than guilt or innocence. A trial should truly represent an enlightened search for truth so that deception, surprise, technicalities and delay will be obliterated. The jousting in legal mumbo-jumbo resorted to by too many of our judges makes a farce of our judicial system.
>
> But even if he should be convicted—

Said Mr. Hoover—

> the criminal knows that regardless of his past record there is steadily increasing hope for a suspended or a probationary sentence or an early release on parole.
>
> The decent people in all sections of the country—East, West, North and South—have suffered too long at the hands of terrorists set free with little more than a pretext of impartial consideration of their guilt.
>
> They have tired of the street brawl tactics displayed of those lawyers-criminal who employ any means the court will tolerate to defeat the interests of justice.
>
> They are losing patience with systems of parole and probation that are little more than conveyor belts from our prisons and court chambers to the underworld.

These, Mr. Speaker, are solemn words of warning from one of the world's great criminologists. I urge my colleagues to take heed.

Let me state that I support many of the pending provisions on firearms legislation. Sure, let us curb the indiscriminate sale of firearms to juveniles, felons, the mental incompetents—whether by mail order or personal sale. Let us stop the traffic in bazookas and other military surplus weapons of destruction.

But most of all, Mr. Speaker, let us crack down on the criminal who uses a firearm to rob and kill. I know full well that the Casey firearms bill is not going to stop all crime. But I know that it will put these punks away for 10 years and make it a long time between robberies—and that is what the decent citizens of our country are calling for us to do.

If we stop the criminal in his illegal use of firearms—there will be no need for many of the harsher restrictions on sale and licensing now proposed, that in my judgment will do little to curb crime.

I say to my colleagues: go home. Join the thousands of your constituents in the fields and enjoy with them the peaceful and lawful use of firearms. And listen to their sound advice. I have found that they have the clearest conception of the type legislation needed to curb the illegal use and traffic in firearms, and I hope their arguments to you are convincing.

GO AFTER THE CRIMINAL—NOT THE GUN

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the proponents of the bills to regulate commerce in firearms frequently make the claim that guns are too easy to obtain under present law, that there is nothing to prevent criminals or irresponsible individuals or crackpots from obtaining them. They argue that availability of weapons itself is so important a contributing factor to crimes of violence that the sale of weapons ought to be rigidly controlled. They cite the assassination of President Kennedy by a mail-order weapon and other sensational incidents as prima facie evidence that firearms ought to be made less available to the general public.

By and large, this argument cannot withstand the scrutiny of careful analysis. In the first place, the availability factor is overstated considerably, and in the second place, the provisions of S. 1592 overreact to the availability factor to such an extent that they do constitute an infringement of the right to bear arms. A listing of a few simple points should demonstrate amply just what I mean.

First, it is important to ask the question, Available to whom? If the purpose of firearms regulations is to limit the sale of firearms to known criminals or to juveniles, the law ought to be drawn so that it has maximal impact on these groups without adversely affecting, more than absolutely necessary, the availability of firearms to others having a legitimate need or use for them.

For instance, S. 14 explicitly prohibited mail order sales of firearms to persons under indictment or convicted of Federal, State, or local crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year. Since an estimated 25 percent of all mail-order guns are shipped to persons with known criminal records, and since it is well established that persons with known records are more likely than other segments of the population to commit crimes, including crimes of violence, it is quite reasonable to restrict the sale of weapons to these persons.

Similarly, it would seem reasonable to enact tighter regulations governing the sale of large-scale combat weapons or gangster-type weapons such as machineguns, since the legitimate purposes, if any, for which they might be purchased are severely limited in number. Certainly if existing law has done little or nothing to stop the growth of heavily armed bands of superpatriots or extremists, such as the Minutemen, it should be changed by the Congress.

I would also assert that we should continue to maintain the distinction between rifles or shotguns and concealable hand weapons and to maintain differing regulations for each basic type of weapon. It is not at all unreasonable for the Government to keep close track of the sale or transfer of pistols or other weapons so eminently suited to use by the criminal.

At the same time, there are persons who have a legitimate need to purchase rifles or shotguns by mail, and the Congress should also be concerned about their needs.

Consider the person who lives in a remote or rural area and who must secure a gun for protection or hunting, by parcel post. Under the other Dodd bill, S. 1592, the purchase of guns from mail order houses by individuals would be absolutely prohibited.

Thus it is evident that there may be some groups to whom certain types of firearms ought to be denied, but it is equally evident that there are a large number of individuals—indeed, the overwhelming majority of persons now accustomed to purchasing firearms by mail—who have legitimate needs to purchase rifles or shotguns in commerce.

It seems quite obvious and quite desirable that any firearms regulation statute ought to be framed with this basic distinction in mind. There is quite a difference in my mind between a law which stringently and rigidly prohibits the sale by mail of weapons to all individuals, and one in which the essential distinction between denying the sale of weapons to persons of known irresponsible character and permitting the sale of weapons to other, responsible persons is maintained. Quite interestingly, the earlier Dodd bill, S. 14, maintained the distinction, but the later bill, S. 1592 does not.

Second, even if the above distinctions are maintained both in argument and in the law itself, it is still important to point out that the relationship between accessibility of weapons and the incidence of crimes of violence may be overstated. A number of points will illustrate what I mean.

First, in the emotional atmosphere created by the assassination of John F. Kennedy the relationship between guns and crime has been greatly exaggerated. Some newspapers have chosen to take every isolated instance they can find of violence committed using firearms and blow it up into gargantuan proportions.

Yet the facts are different. Most of the crime in the United States either does not overtly involve firearms, or else it involves other weapons such as knives and other cutting instruments.

It is certainly not the gun alone that leads to crime, but it is the individual of criminal intent. Such a person will find a way to commit his crime whether he uses a gun or not.

In the second place, it is not at all clear that a bill prohibiting mail order sale of guns to known felons will have the desired effect of cutting off the number of guns available to the underworld. Yes, it will make it more difficult for criminals to obtain weapons, but criminals have always had covert or blackmail supplies of guns available to them. Gun controls neither keep guns out of the hands of criminals nor stop crimes from being committed.

In the third place, even if it were good legislation—and it is not—it is not obvious that the tougher Dodd bill would reduce substantially the incidence of criminal or noncriminal violence.

A nut or crackpot like Lee Harvey Oswald would still be able to purchase a rifle at his local sporting goods store. Other persons could also purchase weapons to be used for unlawful purposes; the only difference would be that they must not have been in trouble before. This lack of efficaciousness must be taken into account when talking about a bill that will go so far in infringement of the 2nd amendment. Is such a limited gain really worth the high price that must be paid in the dear currency of liberty?

This leads me to a third general point about the regulation of firearms by the Federal Government. If there are many people who have legitimate needs to secure or transport firearms by mail or in commerce, and if restrictions on the availability of firearms will not only have undesirable side effects but will also not be very effective in stopping the flow of guns to criminals, perhaps we should seek another approach to resolving the problem.

Perhaps my good friend and colleague BOB CASEY has come up with the best alternative to restrictive firearms laws. He has quite properly suggested, following the general line taken by the courts in making previous interpretations of the right to keep and bear arms, that there is a clear distinction in theory and in practice between the possession of firearms—which is guaranteed by the Constitution—and their use for an unlawful purpose. The point at which firearms become illegal is the point of their illegal use. The law should punish the criminal use of weapons, rather than the possession of weapons.

What the gentleman from Texas proposes is to increase the penalties for the use of firearms in connection with crime so much that they will deter all but the hardened professional criminal from using them. He and other Members of Congress have introduced legislation making it a Federal crime punishable by imprisonment of 25 years to commit certain crimes, including larceny, burglary, and murder using firearms transported in interstate commerce.

Now I would not be willing to give a blanket endorsement to the Casey bill as it now stands, for there might be difficulties associated with its enforcement and its adjudication. But I am willing to assert categorically that it represents one of the most creative and fruitful proposals put forth to date. I would be willing to wager heavily that a moderate increase in penalties for the unlawfulness of firearms would be far more effective than a moderate decrease in their availability.

I would also be willing to assert that moderate regulations of interstate commerce in arms, such as S. 14, if enacted in tandem with a stiff penalty for unlawful use of arms transported in commerce would be a far more effective means of controlling armed violence than the simple enactment of a stringent, harsh, and possibly unconstitutional bill like S. 1592. It would also have the desired effect of not unnecessarily restricting the availability of shotguns and rifles to the responsible sporting public.

A fourth general point I would like to raise about the approach of S. 1592 and other bills like it is the connotation which it seems to place on hunters, sportsmen, and collectors of guns.

There is a curious line of argument here which has become more and more prevalent as a justification for the enactment of laws over the past several years. The form of the argument runs: Criminals use guns; they can purchase guns through the mails; therefore, no guns should be sold through the mails. A similar argument of this form runs: Some State legislatures are really quite sorry institutions; the worst of them are malapportioned; therefore, no factor other than population should ever be taken into account when districting State legislatures.

Now if you will think for a moment you will see both examples suffer from the same kind of fatal flaw. They find a specific category of abuse that is sometimes related to a contributory factor such as availability of guns, or apportionment on the basis of factors other than population. Then they proceed to talk about the factor as if it were the only contributory factor and suggest that the factor ought to be eliminated or reversed.

Unfortunately, such an argument suffers from two obvious fallacies. In the first place, there are other contributory factors which help to produce the particular social evil being discussed which are glibly ignored. And in the second place, the proponents usually forget about the other, positive aspects of the so-called contributory factor they seek to change.

For instance, in the case of firearms legislation, not even the FBI in its uniform crime reports lists the availability of firearms among its long list of factors contributory to the high incidence of crime in the United States. The only negative references in these reports are largely associated with murder, a crime which typically involves a certain degree of premeditation and planning. Any real attempts to get at the roots of crime will not be able to start or end with the control of sales of firearms. There are too many other environmental factors which support the criminal in his activities.

Similarly, to cite the second fallacy, the proponents of radically tougher firearms control laws tend to ignore the legitimate needs of noncriminals in their efforts to do battle with organized crime. It does not seem to make any difference to them that such laws will impose hardships on many legitimate purchases of firearms. All that matters to these singleminded individuals is that criminals be denied the possibility of purchasing guns. But, as I have already shown, there are many ways in which S. 1592 will impose hardships on sportsmen and gun collectors.

I should like to state most emphatically that I find the notion that the majority should be made to suffer penalties and deprivations for the sake of prosecuting a small minority of lawbreakers quite repugnant. It is doubly repugnant when applied in a situation in which alternative, nonrepugnant methods could be used to solve the problem.

I do not see why the hunter or the gun collector or the marksman should be treated as if he were a common criminal. I do not see why his rights and privileges should be restricted because a bunch of rotten apples have abused the right to keep and bear arms by using them for unlawful purposes.

If we must stop just short of the conclusion that honest sportsmen are in effect being called criminals, we certainly are not overstating the case when we say that their legitimate needs are being ignored and disregarded.

You and I know that Anglo-Saxon law is based on the premise that a man is innocent of a crime until he has been proven guilty. This fundamental rule has been applied over and over again in protection of fundamental civil rights and liberties, as well as to the procedures used in our courts.

Let me say that to establish such broad restrictions as contained in the Dodd bill on the sale of firearms is to treat sportsmen as if they were already felons.

I say that we should be concerned about any line of argument that claims that the "availability" of firearms permits "potential" criminals to obtain weapons which might be used in crimes of violence. One need only substitute "free speech" or "the right to assemble" in place of the terms availability of firearms and the danger becomes obvious.

These arguments are too reminiscent of the old Nazi idea that an arbitrarily selected group of people can be "objectively" guilty because they are "likely" to commit a crime against society, or the Communist notion that there is such a thing as a "class criminal." Both of these kinds of notions—not too far removed from the arguments presented for restriction of firearms—were the rationalization used to murder millions of human beings. I say that we should think twice before we give the State the power to treat owners of firearms as if they were common criminals.

That brings me to my fifth general point; namely, that the Dodd bill could be used as the core legislation for a complete system of registration of all firearms in the United States, and all that such a system could entail. This bill not only would have the immediate effect of reducing the availability of firearms to criminals and noncriminals alike, but it also could be slightly modified to eliminate the availability of weapons.

This bill affects all firearms that move in commerce, and that includes virtually every piece produced. It prohibits the purchase of firearms by individuals through the mails or through other carriers in commerce. Only dealers are permitted to ship arms, and they must be in accordance at all times with Federal, State, and local ordinances governing the sale and use of firearms. Only the addition of a registration statute would be necessary to complete a system of total firearms registration and de facto weapons control.

Now I will grant that under current situations, such a system probably would not be used adversely against the citizens, but I ask you, wouldn't it be tempting to use such information in a national domestic crisis? Wouldn't it be nice for some man with dictatorial ambition to be able to pull out the list of gun registrants and say "There's the guns, boys, round them up?" I ask you, do we even want to create the temptation for someone to go that far?

As a final thought I would like to make the observation that since it is pretty generally accepted that a desperate criminal is going to get hold of a firearm one way or another, should weapons be the exclusive possession of criminals? Should the common citizen be denied a ready means of self-protection just because a high rate of crime creates the increasing likelihood that he will have to use it?

My hope is that both bodies of the Congress will try to eliminate some of the confusion that accompanies consideration of gun control. There may be room for some firearm legislation but firearm control should be put in the proper perspective. It is the criminal that is the perpetrator and not an inanimate object such as a gun. A careful, deliberate consideration is called for. Let us go after the criminal and not the gun.

MAJORITY WHIP HALE BOGGS—A CREDIT TO HIS COUNTRY

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are thrilled at the splendid remarks made here this evening by our majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS]. He was most generous in praising all of those in the Congress who have played a key role in writing the spectacular record.

But gentleman that he is, HALE BOGGS left out the keystone of the leadership team—himself.

This is typical of HALE BOGGS.

He has never been known to engage in self-praise even though we all know—on both sides of the aisle—that without the dedication of HALE BOGGS an important spoke would have been missing in this American wheel of progress—the 89th Congress.

Throughout the long and arduous session, it has been HALE BOGGS who quietly and painstakingly marshaled the troops in support of Mr. Johnson's program.

It was HALE who time and again on the cliff hangers—the really close ones—who was able to swing those three or four votes to save victory from defeat.

Our Nation and the whole free world is that much the richer because we have been fortunate to have one as dedicated as HALE BOGGS as majority whip in these critical times.

His eloquent recital and tribute to all the others who played so important a role in this Congress could not be complete without a standing tribute by the rest of us to his own contribution.

History will record that as new and living meaning was being written in the era, HALE BOGGS was one of its most influential and significant architects.

May the Good Lord bless him with good health and his unbending courage so he may lead us for many years to come.

THE 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, as we return home to report to our constituents upon our stewardship, we who have been privileged to serve in the 1st session of the 89th Congress are entitled to pride and satisfaction upon what has been accomplished to make life better for all Americans.

As a freshman Member of the 88th Congress, I was proud of its outstanding record under the forceful leadership of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. An even more impressive record has been made by this "do everything" 1st session of the 89th Congress. We have discharged with deliberate speed and great effectiveness the mandate given the Congress by the people in the last election to shape constructive, affirmative programs to move the Nation toward the goals of a Great Society, toward "a more perfect Union."

The Great Society envisioned by President Johnson is concerned with improving the quality of life for all, with giving all our people the opportunity to share in the American dream. The programs enacted at this session will improve the quality of life for all Americans, specifically—

OLDER AMERICANS

It is a tribute to the national character that the problems of our older people were given high priority in this session. As a longtime advocate of including basic protection against the health hazards of old age in our social security system, I am delighted at the adoption of the comprehensive medicare program. No longer must our people depend upon the goodness of their own families or the charity of strangers when major illness strikes.

The increase in benefits, liberalization of the retirement test, and other improvements in the Social Security Amendments of 1965; the establishment of the Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the special benefits for the aged contained in the housing, antipoverty, and other programs will also help to create a whole new day for older Americans.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES

Extension of benefits to children attending school up to age 22; lowering of eligibility age for widows to 60; improvements in disability program; and the other provisions of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 will enable the system to meet more effectively the problems of the aged and the disabled, the widows, and orphans. This is not a handout, but a cooperative program with both economic and moral objectives. My father's premature death, leaving a widow to provide unaided for five young children in pre-social-security days, made me an early and enthusiastic supporter of this noble program.

YOUTH

Basic to our democratic way of life and to our national future is the principle that every American child is entitled to as much education as he wants and can usefully absorb. The educational accomplishments of the 88th Congress merited it the proud title of "the Education Congress," but the 89th Congress has made even greater progress toward insuring quality education to all our children. The historic Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the first general elementary and secondary school aid bill to become law, will help our hard pressed urban areas meet the mounting costs of offering a good basic education to every child.

Ability to learn, rather than ability to pay, must be the standard of education opportunity at all levels.

The Higher Education Act will assist colleges and universities in improving classroom, library, and laboratory facilities, and will provide loans and scholarships to students. This legislation will do much to give our young people an equal opportunity for higher education and a fair chance in the increasingly scientific and intellectual society of the future. It is important that graduate and undergraduate students and their parents inform themselves about the new loan program.

Another splendid program is the Vocational Training Act to expand the existing program and to provide loan insurance to high school graduates to finance technical and trade training.

The juvenile delinquency amendments will assist communities in the development of new programs to prevent or control juvenile delinquency and youth crime.

DISENFRANCHISED

The free and secret ballot is the foundation of our democracy and is the key to achieving other rights of citizenship. Every American citizen is entitled to an equal right to vote. The tragic events in Southern States underscores the necessity for determined action to insure that right to Negro Americans. I am proud that Congress enacted the Voting Rights Act and thus fulfilled the century old promise of emancipation.

DISADVANTAGED

No other program is more exacting or more promising than the campaign against poverty. This is a program for the reform of our society, for breaking down the obstacles that prevent one-fifth of our people from enjoying the blessings of liberty, equality, and opportunity promised by our Declaration of Independence and Constitution. The tremendous response to Project Head Start, VISTA, to the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the community action programs, and the other economic opportunity projects indicates the urgent need and desire to enable our deprived and disadvantaged to break out of the vicious cycle of despair.

The war on poverty is a war against the enemies of man—want and ignorance and disease—and its success will depend upon the united efforts of all groups in our society. Based upon the first year's experience with this pioneer experiment, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965 will expand the war and increase its effectiveness.

WORKERS

The Manpower Development and Training Amendments extends for 3 years and expands assistance to unemployed in learning new skills to qualify for better jobs.

ILL AND HANDICAPPED

A mere listing of the measures enacted in this important field gives a good idea of the tremendous steps taken by this Congress to make the marvelous advances in medical science available to all our people: Expands program to construct health research facilities; extends programs for public health services providing vaccinations, immunization, other preventive treatment of diseases, migrant health clinics, and grants to States for general health services; provides initial staffing grants for personnel serving in community mental health centers; expands Federal control over certain depressant and stimulant drugs to reduce the illegal use of these dangerous drugs that affect the central nervous system; authorizes 3-year program of Federal grants to plan and develop a series of regional medical programs to fight heart disease, cancer, and stroke; extends and expands program of construction grants to medical, dental, and similar educational institutions; establishes new program of scholarship grants for needy students, increases students' loan program.

SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS

Congress acknowledged the national debt to our valiant defenders by granting justly deserved increases in military pay and benefits to disabled veterans and their dependents; national life insurance for servicemen; special allowances for evacuated dependents.

URBAN DWELLERS

With over 70 percent of our population living in cities, and with those cities suffering from blight and overstrained, obsolete facilities, it is past time that urban affairs received equal consideration to the perennial farm problem. I am delighted at the significant strides taken to regenerate our great metropolises into places worth living in as centers of civilization. The establishment of the Cabinet level Department of Housing and Urban Affairs will permit cooperation and cohesiveness among all levels of government and with private forces in raising the quality of urban life in all respects. No single community can meet its growth demands alone and without help. Federal, State, and local governments must act as partners in solving the complex problems facing the city.

The omnibus Housing Act, which was under the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee on which I serve, will accelerate our reaching the goal of a decent home for every family, improve our urban renewal and community facilities programs, and otherwise help our cities overcome their current predicament.

The High Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965, authorizing research and development in rail and other forms of surface travel, will, hopefully, lead to a solution of the traffic congestion problem. A nation that can send men through space surely can devise better ways of transporting people on ground.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act, the successor to the area redevelopment program which has already provided invaluable aid to Newark and other hard-hit areas, is of immense importance in stimulating economic development in depressed areas.

NEWCOMERS

The policy of democracy of opportunity, reflected in the various programs to improve the lot of our citizens, was demonstrated in another way in the historic immigration and nationality amendments. As the son and grandson of immigrants from Italy, proud and grateful for the opportunity given them many years ago to become good and loyal Americans, I strongly supported this new law. The tragic separation of families incurred under the rigid national quota system will now be happily ended. The quality—but not quantity—of immigrants will be raised since an applicant will be judged, no longer on his birthplace, but on what he can contribute to our national strength and progress.

SMALL BUSINESS

Legislation was enacted to increase the highly useful Small Business Administration's loan funds for small-business investment companies and State and local development firms.

Of course, small business, as well as large corporations and consumers, benefit from repeal and reduction of the various excise taxes. The first session proved how singular it was by removing taxes.

The economy of our Nation has reacted buoyantly to the can-do Democratic policies as evidenced by its sustained expansion for 55 months. Corporate dividends are up 30 percent; corporate profits after taxes are up 88 percent; consumption is up 27 percent.

CONCLUSION

Every group will profit from such measures as highway beautification; conservation of our precious natural resources; air and water pollution controls; water resources development—including a program to plan a water supply system for the Northeastern United States; National Foundation on Arts and Humanities to foster artistic and cultural activities and thus elevate the whole society.

The foregoing summary indicates that this Congress has acted upon the words of Thomas Jefferson:

> The care of human life and happiness is the first and only legitimate object of government.

Impressive as are these achievements, much remains to be done to build the kind of society envisioned by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, a society in which every American has the opportunity to carve out a rewarding and satisfying life. When we return to Washington for the second session in January, let us carry forward the task of shaping the Great Society with the vigor, concern, and vision that have characterized this first session in compiling its notable record.

TRIBUTE TO SPEAKER McCORMACK

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, before this session closes I would like to join my colleagues in saluting our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN McCORMACK.

In the words of our President and people, few citizens will disagree this has been a historic year. It is perhaps, from a legislative view, the most productive Congress in recent history. But let that history include that if it were not for the truly great leadership of Speaker JOHN McCORMACK in the Congress, and his ability to resolve what at times appeared to be impossible legislative impasses, the record of this Congress would have passed unnoticed.

If this legislative record ranks as one of the greatest in our Nation's history so it must follow that the outstanding legislator of this session, JOHN McCORMACK, must go down as one of the great Speakers of our Nation.

The decisions on crucial issues were decided by a mere handful of votes. But somehow Speaker McCORMACK knew where they were and he permanently secured the victory in many a legislative skirmish.

Our Nation owes him a great debt. Future generations who will be the beneficiaries of our actions in the days ahead when they consider how it was done, should realize that it could not have been done without JOHN McCORMACK.

THE PROGRESSIVE XDR SYSTEM OF ATHLETIC TRAINING

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that we will all agree that physical fitness is a prerequisite for success—be it as a Congressman, a banker, or a farmer. And there should be no dissenter when I say that adequate exercise, proper diet, and sufficient rest are the three basic ingredients that comprise a system of physical training in the attainment of good health. These fundamentals of good health have been acknowledged by people of all ages—and yet, man continues to suffer from being physically unfit. Twenty-five percent of our young men are being rejected for military service. I believe, therefore, that we all need to be reminded occasionally of the importance of physical fitness and to take renewed interest in the techniques by which we may attain maximum physical fitness.

One such system is the progressive XDR system of athletic training developed by Honolulu's Dr. Richard W. You. It is a progressive training program based on exercise—X, diet—D, and rest—R which has been used successfully in the training of U.S. athletes. As physician for the U.S. Olympic team in 1952 and 1956, and as a physician-trainer for the U.S. Pan American team of 1955, Dr. You with his XDR system has helped many athletes capture world championships and other titles.

I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dr. Richard You's informative article on "The Progressive XDR System of Athletic Training":

AUGUST 1, 1965.

THE PROGRESSIVE XDR SYSTEM OF ATHLETIC TRAINING

(Prepared by Richard W. You, M.D., Honolulu, Hawaii, physician, U.S. Olympic team, 1952 and 1956; physician and trainer, U.S. Pan American team, 1955)

To all my friends and acquaintances throughout the universe—of all races and climes—I extend to you my warmest personal greetings and sincerest wishes for a unified, happy, healthy, and physically fit existence:

Leaders in every field of endeavor are groomed for success, seldom are they born with it; and to be successful one must be mentally and physically fit in order to rise above or grow within his environment, and in the process help himself, his family, and his friends.

Good health nourishes a sound philosophy of life. As a wise man once said: "There is a tide in the affairs of man which, taken at the flood, will lead to fame and fortune."

Being healthy and physically fit can make a champion of a man when the opportunity comes, whether it be in business, sports, medicine, law, entertainment, politics, or any other line of endeavor.

Good health and physical fitness can be achieved by properly supervised training.

In the field of athletics, which I feel qualified to discuss because of a life-long and satisfying association both as a competitor, coach, and trainer, I am convinced that any person endowed with good reflexes and coordination can become an inspiring leader and prolong his championship years beyond the so-called natural peak through the application of my progressive XDR training program.

What do the letters stand for? Allow me to explain. "XDR" means exercises, diet, and rest: Exercising daily and regularly, and extra daily requirements of food and food supplements.

First, let's talk about exercise. All basic physical deficiencies should be corrected with the proper exercise in order to develop a strong healthy body that can withstand the stress and strain of any kind of competition. It is wise to start with light exercise; then gradually work toward increased resistance and weights in order to promote greater strength, agility, and flexibility. I have found that the best method of correcting deficiencies and improving athletic ability is through the use of progressive weight training such as barbells, dumbbells, pulleys, and other gymnasium apparatus.

Next, let's analyze the letter "D" (diet) in my XDR program. Diet is very important in competitive athletics. Many athletes who possess the physical attributes and natural coordination to become great champions never realize their maximum potential because of poor nutrition. The common signs and symptoms of nutritional deficiencies and unbalanced diet are overweight, underweight, high blood pressure, low blood pressure, low hemoglobin, dermatitis, high and low basal metabolic rate, low red blood cell count, impaired growth, nervousness, and frequent colds. The normal diet of the competing male athlete should always be high in proteins, vitamins and minerals with a moderate amount of fats and carbohydrates.

The average athlete should have a daily intake of at least 125 to 150 grams of good protein, light on fats and carbohydrates (about 3,000 to 4,000 calories), high in vitamins, especially vitamin A (25,000 units), vitamin B complex (especially vitamins B–1 and B–12), vitamin C (500 Mgm.), and vitamin E (100 Mgm.); plus high minerals, primarily calcium, iron, iodine, and phosphorus.

In the case of the female athlete, her nutritional intake is usually lower than that of the male. Her daily diet should be fortified with certain supplements and should contain at least 110 grams of good protein, moderate fats and carbohydrates (about 2,000 to 3,000 calories). The diet should also be high in vitamins, especially vitamin A (20,000 units); vitamin B complex including vitamin B–12; vitamin C (500 Mgm.) and vitamin E (50 Mgm.); plus minerals, especially calcium, iron, iodine, and phosphorus. Diets should be individualized because each woman participant varies in her ability to digest, absorb, and utilize the various foods. Nutritional requirements will vary from day to day, so the diet and food supplements must be flexible and various nutrients must be increased or decreased in order to attain the highest benefits. This also applies to the male competitor.

The exact quantity and type of food and food supplements needed each day depend on physical activity, climatic conditions, weight, individual response, and tolerance to the various nutrients and food factors. Always keep this in mind, that nutrition is the sum total of those processes by which the living organism receives and utilizes the materials necessary for the maintenance of life which includes growth, the repair of worn out structures, and the liberation of energy. And here's something else that's mighty important to every individual, whether an athlete or not: too much food is just as detrimental to a person as too little nourishment. The important thing to remember is to consume adequate and proper nutrients on a balanced basis.

And now let's briefly discuss the letter "R" (rest) in my XDR program for athletes. Rest is so important to all mankind. The more strenuously an athlete trains, the more rest and relaxation is required to restore the human body to its normal condition and to replenish those cells which have been destroyed by overactivity.

My progressive training program was developed nearly 35 years ago, and has improved with the years in the development of new ideas, techniques, and procedures to meet the complex requirements of the 1960's.

After many years of continuous research, I have found that my XDR program is one of the finest and most productive in the world today in developing champions in every field of athletics.

Here is something very important to keep in mind: Athletes require various methods of training and conditioning, but in general the athletes should be on a progressive, training program, which consists of sprints for speed, distance work for stamina, and progressive resistance work for power. All athletes should gradually increase their daily workouts and correct their weak points until they develop a maximum of speed, stamina, and power. Many people do not realize that most "burnt-out" athletes can be brought back through correction of the various deficiencies and proper training.

Always remember—natural ability alone will carry an athlete a long way, but the super performance and world record achievement can only belong to the star who trains himself into perfect condition.

My convictions are based on factual findings in the case histories and performances of more than 50 athletes who have been under my XDR nutritional and training program. Many of the athletes who have conscientiously followed this program have gone on to become national and world champions in their specialties—breaking many records along the way. When first examined by me, more than 90 percent of these athletes had physical and nutritional deficiencies, varying in degree from slight to severe. The most common nutritional deficiencies were in proteins, vitamins (especially B-complex) and in minerals (notably iron).

Among the athletes who have developed into nationally and internationally known champions by following the XDR training programs are:

Weightlifting:

1. Tommy Kono: Multidivision Olympic and world champion. Beside winning eight world titles in three weightlifting classes, Kono has won the "Mr. World" title in 1954, and the "Mr. Universe" title in 1955, 1957, and 1961. Kono has officially exceeded 26 world, 7 Olympic, 8 Pan American, and 37 American records in 4 different weight classes.

2. Isaac Berger: 1956 Olympic champion and 1961 world champion. Berger has broken many world records.

3. Charles Vinci: 1956 and 1960 Olympic champion. Vinci has broken many Olympic and world records.

4. Emerick Ishikawa: Former world record holder. National champion and member of the 1948 U.S. Olympic team.

5. Richard Tomita: National champion and member of the 1948 and 1952 U.S. Olympic team.

6. Harold Sakata: Runnerup in the 181-pound class at the 1948 Olympic games.

7. George Yoshioka: National 132-pound titleholder in 1951.

8. Ed Bailey: Second place winner, National AAU 198-pound championship, 1952.

Swimming:

1. Ford Konno: 1952 Olympic 1,500-meter champion. Konno has broken numerous American and world records from 200 meters to 1,500 meters.

2. Dick Cleveland: Many times national sprint champion and former holder of numerous world records.

3. Evelyn Kawamoto: Many times national women's champion and record holder. Winner of the U.S. final Olympic 400-meter tryouts and third place winner in the 400 meters at the 1952 Olympic games.

4. Yoshinobu Oyakawa: 1952 Olympic 100-meter backstroke champion and former world record holder. Oyakawa has broken many American and world records.

5. Robin Moore: Former 100-yard freestyle world record holder.

6. Shelley Mann: 1956 Olympic 100-meter butterfly champion.

Boxing:

1. Johnny Santos: Hawaii's most promising junior welterweight at the age of 20. Undefeated since 1963 with 20 straight wins.

2. Gaspar Ortega: World welterweight contender with a recent record of 12 consecutive KO's scored since April 22, 1964.

3. Stanley Harrington: Popular local fighter and world welterweight, world junior middleweight and world middleweight contender.

4. Frankie Fernandez: One of Hawaii's greatest fighters and former world welterweight contender.

5. Phillip (Wildcat) Kim: Former world ranking welterweight great.

6. Eddie Pace: World welterweight and world junior middleweight contender.

7. Norvel Lee: 1952 Olympic light heavyweight champion, and voted the most outstanding Olympic champion.

8. Edward Sanders: 1952 Olympic heavyweight champion.

9. Charles Adkins: 1952 Olympic light welterweight champion.

10. Roy Kuboyama: 1952 National intercollegiate flyweight champion.

11. Nate Brooks: 1952 Olympic flyweight champion.

12. David Moore: Member of 1952 Olympic team and former world featherweight champion.

Golf:

1. Tura Kahaleanu: 1956 women's Hawaiian champion at the age of 18.

2. Edna Lee: 1954 Hawaiian titleholder.

Long distance running:

1. Norman Tamanaha: Undefeated Hawaiian marathon champion and 5th place winner at the 1952 Boston marathon when he was 45 years old.

Track and field—Men:

1. Lindy Remigino: 1952 Olympic 100-meter champion.

2. Milton Campbell: 1956 Olympic decathlon champion.

3. Tom Courtney: 1956 Olympic 800-meter champion.

Track and field—Women:

1. Mildred McDaniels: 1956 Olympic high jump champion and world record holder.

2. Leah Bennett Ferris: Two time All-American, 1962 winner of the 880-yard national indoor and outdoor championships, setting a new world record in the indoor meet. Mrs. Ferris won the 1963 indoor 880-yard national championship and placed second at the 1963 Pan American games. She is the present holder of the American record in the 800-meter run (2:08.8).

3. Cindy Wyatt: Twice an All-American, national women's indoor shotput champion, in 1961, 1962, and 1963.

4. Karen Mendyka: 1962 national javelin champion.

5. Cynthia Hegarty: Placed second in the 1963 national 880 indoor championship. Miss Hegarty was a member of the 1963 U.S. Pan American team.

6. Lacey O'Neal: Third place winner in the 80-meter hurdles at the final U.S. Olympic tryouts, and member of the 1964 U.S. Olympic team. She placed in the semifinals in the 80-meter hurdles at the 1964 Olympic games in Tokyo, Japan.

Here are the important training and dietary rules for the average athlete:

1. Correct all physical and nutritional deficiencies first, before going into the preliminary phase of training and conditioning.

2. Take up a well planned preseason weight training course.

3. Set a high goal and work diligently toward it.

4. Experiment with yourself and make out a scientific and progressive training system which is most suitable to you.

5. Train for speed (repetition sprint work), stamina (long distance work), and power (progressive resistance work).

6. Train regularly, but not to the point of complete exhaustion.

7. The coach and trainer should supervise the athlete's workouts.

8. Try to get at least 8 to 10 hours of sleep every day.

9. Avoid tobacco, alcohol, and poor health habits.

10. Again I must stress—eat a large amount of good protein daily, such as: meats, fish, poultry, fresh milk, powdered milk, buttermilk, eggs, cheese, soybeans, nuts, legumes, and seed cereals.

11. Eat a large amount of foods rich in vitamins and minerals daily, such as vegetables and fruits.

12. Eat some fats and vegetable oils daily.

13. Eat seafoods at least four times weekly.

14. Drink about 1 quart of milk daily.

15. Drink at least three glasses of fruit juices daily, especially the juices from citrus fruits.

16. Eat foods rich in vitamin B-complex daily, such as Whole-grain cereals, brewer's yeast, meats, fruits, and vegetables.

17. Increase the intake of proteins and fats during cold weather.

18. Increase the intake of water soluble vitamins and minerals in hot weather to replace the excessive loss caused by perspiration.

19. Avoid excess of carbohydrates (starches and sugar) in the diet.

20. Increase the intake of vitamin B-complex when your diet is high in carbohydrates.

21. Do not combine high protein foods (meat, cheese, fish, poultry, eggs) with large amounts of high starches (potatoes, rice, bread, spaghetti) in the same meal.

22. Always include in your daily diet the necessary food supplements, such as: High protein tablets and powder, multiple vitamin and mineral concentrates, liver, vitamin B-12 and iron tablets.

DRAFT LAWS MUST BE UPHELD

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. McVicker] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, the overt defiance of our selective service laws by some misguided youths has stirred up much indignation and concern throughout the Nation.

Many rash and punitive remedies have been suggested. I have always maintained that the only proper place to deal with lawbreakers is in the courts. That position has been very forcefully and succinctly stated in an editorial in the Denver Post of October 21.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to enter a copy of that editorial in the Record and I recommend it to the perusal of my colleagues:

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Oct. 21, 1965]

The Draft: Enforce the Laws

There is one fundamental test the Government can use in handling the noisy protests about the military draft and the war in Vietnam. If people are breaking laws, put them in jail. If people are simply using their constitutional right of free speech, let them alone.

We concede that enforcing the laws and interpreting the Constitution aren't always simple. Sometimes there is a very fine distinction between free speech and criminal acts.

In some cases the Department of Justice, as the prosecuting agency, will have to decide whether specific cases warrant prosecution. Sometimes it will take a judge and jury—and maybe the Supreme Court—to decide. It is important, though, that decisions be made promptly and positively. The great majority of the American people are in no mood to play pattycake with draft laws or the Vietnam war.

Some recent cases illustrate the problem:

Case No. 1: A young man of draft age deliberately burned his draft card at a public rally in violation of a Federal act. In cases like this, the Justice Department should (and did) move immediately.

Case No. 2: Demonstrators in many parts of the country paraded peacefully down city streets with signs sharply criticizing U.S. foreign policy. However, obnoxious these persons may be to many others, they are entitled not only to freedom but also to police protection from abuse and assault.

Case No. 3: Antiwar demonstrators attempted to invade a military base in Wisconsin with the announced purpose of arresting the base commander as some sort of military criminal. They were arrested—and properly so.

Case No. 4: Pacifist organizations supposedly are advising and encouraging young men to evade military service by pretending to be conscientious objectors, alcoholics, drug addicts, or sex deviates. The only answer to this agitation is criminal prosecution.

U.S. draft laws recognize conscientious objectors, of course, and excuse them from military duty (but require them to participate in specified civilian jobs "serving humanity").

A young man can't qualify as a conscientious objector overnight, or on his 18th birthday, simply by deciding he'd rather not go into the Army. Selective Service for a long time has had tests and standards for dealing with this issue. It isn't enough for the draftee to say he's philosophically opposed to war.

Some pacifist groups reportedly hope to tie up Selective Service by encouraging a host of young men to apply for classification as conscientious objectors. We doubt that many will fall for this questionable scheme. We trust those who do will be dealt with quickly and fairly.

Criticism of our Vietnamese policy is one thing. Defiance of the draft is something quite different.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON MASTER ARCHITECT OF NEW HOPE FOR AMERICA AND THE WORLD

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the spectacular accomplishments of the first session of the 89th Congress and all of the acalades are well deserved.

But as we prepare to adjourn this session, let us pause briefly enough to pay tribute to President Johnson, who as leader of the majority party, was able to steer a course for all to follow.

It was President Johnson who last November captured the imagination of the American people by his overwhelming victory and with his victory carried into office a sufficient number of Congressmen who support his views and with their support was able to chart a legislative program which gives mankind new hope and confidence in the future.

President Johnson can rest during his convalescence confident that he has provided a degree of leadership unparalleled in American history—both at home and abroad.

I am proud to be a Member of this Congress and to have supported the President in his program.

We can look to the future, Mr. Speaker, that the Great Society charted by President Johnson shall be the keystone for man's survival.

If we were to summarize President Johnson and the record this Congress has written in his support, we could do so with these few words: "It has served the needs of the people."

Mr. Speaker, many societies have failed during the recorded history of civilization because they failed to serve the needs of their people.

How significant it is to history that at a time when America is experiencing its 58th consecutive month of prosperity—the longest sustained period of economic growth ever recorded by man, President Johnson and the majority of the Congress concerned itself with the plight of our unfortunate poor; our senior citizens; our young people who need help in obtaining an education; our poorly housed, and yes, Mr. Speaker, with the taxpayer who received two tax cuts.

Each piece of legislation proposed by President Johnson and approved by this Congress was designed to serve the needs of our people.

Whether it was to fortify our troops in Vietnam and assure victory for freedom or whether it was to help youngsters prepare themselves for schooling with Head Start, in each instance, our hope, our declaration, and our determination was to meet the needs of the people.

As we adjourn the session, may we join in wishing President Johnson a speedy recovery and a successful return in January to all of our colleagues.

We shall carry on the rich tradition of the Congress by continuing to fill the needs of our people.

May we also see our distinguished Speaker, John McCormack, continue in good health so he may reflect in the House those rich attributes which have helped the Congress write its spectacular record.

PETROCHEMICAL COMPLEX BY PHILLIPS 66

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Pickle] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in recent months about the arrangements granted by the Interior Department and approved by Puerto Rico with reference to the construction of a petrochemical complex by Phillips 66 in Puerto Rico. Though there have been many charges and accusations, I can only assume that our Government granted a contract to Phillips based on a complete proposal by Phillips and approved by Puerto Rico and that negotiations for this complex are properly being carried forward.

I am sure, however, that our Government must recognize that there may be other companies which might likewise wish to establish a petrochemical plant in Puerto Rico because of its location and tax advantage. It is my understanding that the Interior Department is considering other possibilities, and it may well be that further similar developments in this field will take place within Puerto Rico. This, then, would become an even more important matter to the petroleum industry of this country and to the general well-being of Puerto Rico itself.

For that reason, I wish to recommend that if any other major petrochemical plants are established in Puerto Rico that our Government require that any such plant use at least 25 percent American crude in the processing of any petroleum products. We face a grave crisis in the import of oil in this country, and our petroleum industry has suffered greatly because of this heavy flood of oil imports. Something must be done to bolster the general petroleum industry and particularly the independent's position. If we allow gigantic plants to be constructed near our borders—and their products to flood our markets—then it seems to me only fair that our Government require that at least a portion of this crude be American oil. This, Mr. Speaker, would put a desirable new twist to the imports of oil and perhaps for the first time allow us to see American crude from our States go to Puerto Rico for refining. It should also be insisted that no new or special quotas be changed or granted to any such refinery so that no undue amount of manufactured petroleum products would be dumped on our shoulders.

If the Interior Department is seriously considering the granting of additional rights or permits for major companies to establish industries in Puerto Rico, then I say that a vital part of that contract be the requirement that at least 25 percent of such products be American crude.

THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 89TH CONGRESS—A REPORT TO THE PEOPLE

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 9, the House of Representatives approved the voting rights legislation, and the Senate took action on the medicare bill. President

Johnson, in commenting on these historic actions the next day, called July 9 the "Everest" of the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

The President was referring to the peak—the legislative high point of 1965. Indeed it was. The approval of these two bills by any standard would have to be ranked as among the most important actions of this or any year.

But if July 9 was the peak of the year, it was a high point surrounded by many other noteworthy accomplishments which, taken together, represent an impressive record of legislative accomplishment.

I am proud, as the Representative of Michigan's 12th Congressional District, to have had an opportunity to participate in building the record of this 1st session of the 89th Congress—the Congress President Johnson has called "the most effective and the most rewarding in the history of our Nation."

In the words of Vice President Humphrey:

> No Congress in American history has enacted more legislation, in less time, for the good of more people—and with wider consensus of public support—than the present 89th Congress.

Let us look at the record of the 89th Congress thus far, keeping in mind that the second session—the 1966 session—still lies ahead of us.

ONE MAN, ONE VOTE

This session of positive accomplishments may, however, be remembered best for something it refused to do. In August, the Senate defeated an all-out effort to amend our Constitution to permit State legislatures to be apportioned on factors other than population.

It is a matter of pride to those of us from Michigan that our two great Senators, Pat McNamara and Phil Hart, played key roles in defeating this effort to weaken the provisions of our Constitution which guarantee us all equal protection of the laws. We in Michigan have had an opportunity to see what a "one-man, one-vote" legislature can do.

Our present State legislature, the first elected on a population basis in more than 30 years, has compiled a remarkable record of accomplishment, particularly with regard to long-ignored urban and suburban problems. I am certain that the constitutional reapportionment of other State legislatures would produce similar benefits.

It now appears that the U.S. Senate will have to consider this amendment again next year, but I am confident that the result will be the same.

FAR-REACHING RECORD

The record of this session includes so much important legislation that it is difficult to summarize. But certainly the rules changes adopted by the House at the beginning of the session were essential to the making of that record. These changes, which limit the power of a minority to obstruct the wishes of the majority, were an important step in making the House of Representatives more responsible and responsive to the needs of today.

In the voting rights and medicare bills, the two bills which President Johnson described as the high point of the legislative year, Congress acted to meet the needs of two large groups of American citizens.

Passage of the social security-medicare bill—providing hospital care insurance for Americans 65 and over, optional insurance to help meet other medical expenses and an across-the-board increase in monthly social security cash benefits—marked a real breakthrough for America's senior citizens. It represented the end of a 20-year effort to expand our social security program to include hospital care insurance for older Americans.

A second important action, especially for our 20 million senior citizens, was the passage of the Older Americans Act setting up an Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop programs to assist older persons.

The voting rights bill was enacted to secure, for once and for all, the right of every American citizen to vote. The right to vote—the most basic and most precious right of citizenship—is now protected by outlawing the devices through which discrimination in voting has been practiced and by providing for Federal supervision of registration and elections in those areas in which such discrimination has been a problem.

HEALTH LEGISLATION

The health record of the 89th Congress did not stop with medicare. In addition, Congress approved a number of other measures representing a substantial increase in the Federal investment to improve the health of this and future generations of Americans. These new laws:

Set up a 3-year program of Federal grants to plan and develop a series of regional medical programs to fight heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

Extend and expand the program of construction grants to medical, dental, and related educational institutions and continue the program of assistance for medical and dental students.

Extend the program for construction of health research facilities.

Continue the program providing vaccinations, immunization, and other preventive treatment of diseases, building migrant health clinics and providing funds to the States for general health services.

Provide grants for staffing community mental health centers.

Improve Federal control over certain depressant and stimulant drugs to reduce their illegal use.

"EDUCATION CONGRESS"—NUMBER TWO

President Johnson labeled the 88th Congress—the 1963–64 Congress—the "Education Congress" for its record in this important field. Many assumed the 89th Congress would focus its attention on other areas. This was not the case.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I am particularly pleased with the education legislation enacted the past several months. Included under the broad heading of education for the 1965 legislative year are these major actions:

Elementary and Secondary Education Act to improve the quality and quantity of elementary and secondary education available to our young people with particular emphasis upon the educational needs of children from low-income families.

Higher Education Act providing Federal aid for scholarship and loan assistance to help college students finance their educations, construction grants for classrooms and laboratories, assistance to libraries and developing colleges, as National Teacher Corps, fellowships for teachers and university community service programs.

Manpower Act of 1965 extending for 3 years, broadening and improving the program originally set up by the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

Economic Opportunity Act amendments broadening the scope of the antipoverty programs authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to reach more families now living in poverty.

In at least two ways, the education record of the 89th Congress broke new ground:

First, it enacted the first general education legislation in our Nation's history—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—and secondly, it wrote into our Nation's laws the first Federal program of college scholarship assistance for undergraduates, although such assistance is earmarked for exceptionally needy students.

Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the schools in Michigan's 12th Congressional District will be eligible to receive $1 million in Federal assistance during this fiscal year.

MORE TAX RELIEF

Congress in 1965 followed up its 1964 income tax reduction by eliminating or sharply trimming almost all of the excise taxes imposed by the Federal Government.

Assuming these reductions will be passed on to the consumer—an assumption which guided the President and Members of Congress in enacting the excise tax reduction legislation—this action should result in a $4.7 billion tax break for the American consumer.

I hope and urge that all manufacturers and retailers return these savings to the consumer as we expected when we voted for the excise tax legislation.

CONGRESS ACTS ON CITY-SUBURBAN PROBLEMS

The year 1965 saw Congress take two noteworthy steps to help meet the needs of Americans living in cities and suburbs—the areas in which more than 7 of every 10 Americans now live.

The first of these was the passage of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 including several provisions which will help rapidly growing areas such as the congressional district which I represent.

The second was the authorization of a Department of Housing and Urban Development. This measure elevates the Housing and Home Finance Agency to full departmental status, giving the cities and suburbs of America the same recognition which rural America has enjoyed since 1862 when the Department of Agriculture was established.

DEPRESSED AREAS ASSISTANCE

For those areas which have not shared in the comparative prosperity now enjoyed by most Americans, the 89th Congress inaugurated two new programs:

First, it enacted the Appalachian Regional Development Act providing extensive Federal investment to spur the development of the 11-State mountain area commonly referred to as Appalachia.

Congress followed this up by passing what is known as the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, extending the Appalachian concept of regional development and assistance to other chronically depressed areas.

MILITARY AND FEDERAL PAY

Congress did not ignore the members of the armed services. It passed and President Johnson signed legislation to improve the pay of our servicemen.

The bill—representing the third pay hike for the military since 1963—increased the pay of military personnel on active duty, in the Reserves and retired. It provided an average 10.4 percent increase for all officers and enlisted men and women. Enlisted personnel with more than 2 years' service received an average 11 percent boost in their pay.

Then Congress took another step toward making the salaries of postal and other civil service employees more comparable to those paid in private industry.

The legislation agreed upon by the House and Senate means a 3.6 percent increase, on the average, in pay for 2½ million employees of the Federal Government.

Also of importance to present and future retired Federal workers is a new law increasing the retirement pay for retirees and survivors by between 6 and 11 percent. The retirees will get their first checks reflecting the increases on January 3, 1966.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

This year Congress finally acted to eliminate the arbitrary and discriminatory national origins quota system from our immigration laws without increasing substantially the total number of immigrants permitted to enter the United States in any one year.

Under this important reform, a person's skills, how he will fit into our economy and his family ties will be given primary consideration in deciding whether he may be admitted as an immigrant. His birthplace, a factor over which he has no control, will be much less important than before.

WATER AND AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

The Federal Government took another step forward in its continuing campaign to clean up our Nation's lakes, rivers, and streams with the Water Quality Act of 1965.

As signed into law by President Johnson, the Water Quality Act includes several new weapons for our Nation's water pollution control arsenal—among them these:

First, it asserts that the purpose of the legislation is to enhance the quality and value of water resources and set a national policy for the preservation, control, and abatement of water pollution.

Second, it creates a new Federal Water Pollution Control Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Third, it authorizes a 4-year program for demonstration grants to control pollution from storm sewers or combined storm and sanitary sewers.

Fourth, it increases the authority for Federal waste treatment plant construction and extends Federal pollution control enforcement authority to additional waters.

Finally, the Water Quality Act provides for a Federal-State system of setting water quality standards applicable to interstate waters and their tributaries.

Along with water pollution, contamination of the air we breathe would have to be counted as one of the most serious domestic problems facing our Nation. And in this area too, the 89th Congress moved forward. It passed legislation to authorize a further Federal investment to step up air pollution control programs.

PRESIDENTIAL CONTINUITY AMENDMENT

Congress this year came to grips with a constitutional dilemma which has plagued our Nation since its very earliest days—the problems of Presidential disability and succession.

The constitutional amendment would set up a procedure for the transfer of power from an ailing President to the Vice President and would provide certain congressional safeguards against abuses. It also authorizes a procedure for filling vacancies in the Office of the Vice President.

Before the new amendment can take effect, it must be ratified by three-fourths of the States. So far, eight State legislatures, including Michigan's, have approved the amendment.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

Congress responded to President Johnson's call for greater attention to highway beautification by approving legislation to promote more effective control of outdoor advertising signs and junkyards near Federal highways.

This new law contains provisions to ban outdoor advertising alongside Federal-aid highways except in commercial and industrial areas, requires screening or removal of junkyards from Federal-aid highways and increases funds available for landscaping and scenic enhancement of highways.

In another action to help improve the appearance of our cities, as well as the countryside, Congress approved legislation to step up research into the disposal of solid waste—such things as garbage, rubbish, demolition debris, and abandoned automobiles.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS—14(b), MINIMUM WAGE

Even with its remarkably productive legislative year, the 89th Congress closed up shop for this year with some important unfinished business.

For instance, there is the question of the repeal of section 14(b)—the so-called right-to-work section—of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The House approved the 14(b) repealer in July but a coalition of Senators, opposed to repeal of section 14(b), staged a week-long filibuster against the parliamentary motion to take up the bill, and the Senate leadership decided to leave this issue until 1966 to be resolved.

Section 14(b) has authorized the States to enact laws forbidding union shop agreements between management and labor. These are the so-called right-to-work laws. Repeal of section 14(b) would return the question of whether to have union shops to the bargaining table to be decided by representatives of management and labor.

Another important measure awaiting further action as we adjourn this session of Congress is the bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act extending the wage and hours protections of the act to additional workers and increasing the minimum wage. This bill, which has been approved by the House Education and Labor Committee, should be one of the first considered by the House of Representatives after we reconvene in January.

Well up on the list of unfinished business will be the cold war GI bill providing benefits patterned after those provided by the World War II and Korean war GI bills.

This legislation, already passed by the Senate, will provide readjustment benefits to veterans of U.S. military operations in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, Berlin, Cuba, and other cold war activities. It will bring educational, vocational training and housing assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, the date the Korean war GI benefits expired, and July 1, 1967, the expiration date of the current draft law.

HISTORIC SESSION OF CONGRESS

This legislative summary does not begin to exhaust the list of bills which are awaiting action when we reconvene. Neither does it include all of the bills which have passed both the House and Senate in the last 9½ months.

But it does, I think, give a good idea of the wide range of legislation considered and disposed of already by the 89th Congress. Whether one agrees with all the details of the legislative record of the 89th Congress, I think we can all agree that it has been one of the busiest—and one of the most productive—congressional sessions in our Nation's history.

SALUTE TO THE CAPITOL HILL TELEPHONE OPERATORS

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as we come to the closing moments of this historic congressional session, I tip my hat to all of the legislative employees for the fine way in which they have carried out their tasks over these past 10 months.

Particularly do I single out the telephone operators who daily handle the thousands of calls that come and go from Capitol Hill. These are the unheralded and unsung heroines of this fantastically busy place. Their splendid service makes our task a bit easier. I know my colleagues share my sentiments when I say that they are the most competent and most pleasant people in the legislative establishment. Few of us know them by name but we honor all of them for their patience and graciousness. Included among their pleasing voices is one of the sweetest of all. Her salutation of "Capitol" and "Thank you" help to make our arduous days a bit easier and a bit brighter. I know all of the Members recognize her greeting and I am sure that few know her by name. She is Katherine Mendenhall and she reflects the best of everything in the fine field of telephone operators. All of us appreciate her personality as we appreciate her competence.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues of the House salute all of these devoted, dedicated telephone operators. All of them are a credit to the Congress of the United States.

TOWARD THE GREAT SOCIETY—HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the 89th Congress has taken a major step toward beautification of America's interstate and primary highways through passage of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965. This legislation is part of the Johnson administration's outstanding conservation and natural beauty enhancement programs.

The key date is July 1, 1970, and by that time the States must have effective control established over outdoor advertising—billboards and the like—within 660 feet of interstate and primary highways. On January 1, 1968, the Secretary of Commerce is directed to withhold 10 percent of Federal-aid highway funds to States that have not made provision for effective control of such advertising.

The States also must prohibit junkyards to be established within 1,000 feet of interstate and primary highways, or provide for their effective screening.

The new law also directs the Secretary of Commerce to withhold 10 percent of Federal-aid highway funds payable after January 1, 1968, if the States have not made provisions for screening off junkyards from the motorist's view, except in industrial areas. By July 1, 1970, junkyards which cannot be screened off must be moved, in order for the States to get the full payment of highway aid.

The act provides for just compensation for all concerned. The act has plenty of commonsense as an ingredient.

President and Mrs. Johnson, by their support for the highway beautification bill, demonstrated deep concern for preserving the scenic beauty of our Nation. They deserve praise for their leadership in this area; coming generations will be grateful for their pioneering efforts in this field.

Under the Highway Beautification Act of 1965, funds equal to 3 percent of each State's apportionment for Federal-aid highways are authorized to the States in fiscal 1966 and 1967 for acquisition and improvement of scenic land strips and for roadside development.

This money, to be appropriated out of general revenues, will enable the States to acquire scenic corridors and easements along the highways. The total amount would be $112.5 million in fiscal 1966 and $118.2 million in fiscal 1967.

Mr. Speaker, the program also will allow acquisition and development of publicly owned rest and recreation areas and sanitary and other facilities reasonably necessary to accommodate the traveling public.

Enactment of the beautification bill is another step toward leaving to the future generations of Americans, in President Johnson's words: "a glimpse of the world as God really made it, not just as it looked when we got through with it."

THE GOOD WORK OF THE SEARS FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, in the summer of 1964, my hometown, Plain Dealing, La., had no doctor. Its 1,237 residents—according to the 1960 census—and a surrounding population of another 2,500 had to drive from 15 to 40 miles for anything from a minor complaint to a major emergency. Plain Dealing was not alone among rural communities in this regard. There was reflected here a not unusual situation which causes concern and inconvenience for inhabitants and additional burdens on the hospital and other medical facilities of neighboring cities. In addition, such conditions inhibit the furtherance of preventive medicine and its marvelous potential for anticipating and relieving human ills.

As a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee, I have had an opportunity to observe and learn first hand the many new developments in space medicine. Our astronauts, as they should, have available to them the most current refinements in medical knowledge and skills. What a pity that so many areas of the country do not have even a small percentage of these benefits near at hand and ready to serve the needs of the local population.

Fortunately, Plain Dealing did not choose to abide its "no doctor" status. Rather the people recognized that for the community to survive or better yet, to grow, adequate medical facilities and services were essential. But what could a small town do to attract and hold a doctor? Where were the guidance and resources to initiate the achievement of such an objective? In their search for the means, the citizens of Plain Dealing encountered the Sears, Roebuck Foundation.

The foundation, first started in the early 1920's, enjoyed a strong reputation for interest in rural problems. In its early days, many a young farmer had received the nucleus of his herd of livestock from the Sears, Roebuck Foundation. The only requirement of the foundation was that a similar animal be given to another young farmer so that he too could start his herd. The principle was quite simple. With a relatively small investment of seed money, the foundation could achieve a remarkable multiplication of benefits far beyond the initial recipient. A further extension of this idea found expression in an agricultural scholarship program which was established throughout the land-grant college system. The scholarships were for the freshman year only, since it was thought that once started in college, the student could thereafter make it on his own. Again this method permitted a much larger number of awards each year. Much of the history of the foundation centers around the theme of helping others to help themselves.

In later years, the foundation has directly stimulated interest in community improvement programs in cooperation with the Grange and Greater Federation of Women's Clubs. I am pleased to note that just this year they have announced a major program in the field of conservation in conjunction with the National Wildlife Federation.

The foundation community medical assistance program has many of the same characteristics.

An illustration of its workings can be seen in our small Louisiana community. When interest was first evidenced by the citizens in the establishment of a medical facility, contact was made with the foundation. In response to this initial inquiry during the summer of 1964, the foundation provided to the people of Plain Dealing the necessary materials for making an economic survey of their community. The purpose of the survey was to determine the potential of the residents—after consideration of their population, their income, and the availability of another doctor—to support a medical establishment. The survey was taken and the data sent to Chicago where they were tabulated and evaluated by members of the foundation. The results were positive, indicating the potential of the town to support a doctor or doctors.

A town meeting was held and a member of the foundation presented the full story of what the town could expect from the foundation and what the citizens had to do for themselves. In effect, the foundation would provide the community with the knowledge, skills and materials for raising money; further it would provide complete architectural plans and services for building a medical clinic; and it would take it upon itself to obtain the services of a doctor or doctors. The last service was made possible through close cooperation with the American Medical Association. Once the construction was completed, the foundation would also assist the doctors in obtaining the financing required for medical equipment such as X-ray machines and the like.

The town, for its part, would be obliged to provide the local leadership and to raise the funds necessary to construct the clinic. What was sought in the case of Plain Dealing was a two-doctor unit which would cost approximately $40,000.

The foundation has devised a most ingenious way of enabling the citizens of a community to raise funds. The people subscribe to certificates of indebtedness. There are limits, however, on the amount to which any one individual may subscribe. A nonprofit community organization is formed which in effect assumes the indebtedness. The revenues obtained from doctors paying rent on the facility are used to liquidate the indebtedness. As a footnote, it might be added that in evaluating the economic survey such factors as the rent are taken into account in reaching a level of income satisfactory to attract and support a doctor.

I am happy to say that the fundraising effort was a complete success. Late last year we began groundbreaking, and a short 3 to 4 months later the town of Plain Dealing had a brandnew medical clinic. For this small town, the clinic is a wonderful addition. Its clean lines outside harmonize well with its surroundings. And within is an array of modern medical equipment for X-rays, electrocardiograms, and laboratory tests. The interior space is efficiently planned with a more than adequate waiting room and a central reception area, which allows access to the waiting patients as well as to the doctors.

It is comforting to be able to say that Plain Dealing was very fortunate to obtain the services of two topdrawer doctors who were on hand even before the clinic opened. I might say that today it is not always easy to obtain the doctors we would like for such facilities.

The ratio of patients to doctors in the rural areas is increasing. And there is no apparent end to this development. Today over 75 percent of the graduating medical students elect to pursue specialties. The only place to obtain specialist training and to practice such work is in or near the large cities. Few doctors seem to want to move out to the less populous regions. The opportunities in an urban complex are greater for research, teaching, and greater concentration on a specialty. Conversely, the rural life is often very demanding and unlikely to afford the specialist with the degree of challenge he would like.

The foundation program has taken steps to increase the attraction of a rural medical practice. The economic survey assures a reasonable level of income. And where possible, every effort is made to locate two doctors rather than one so as to ease the burden. The equipment is new and modern and allows the doctor to utilize the basic facilities normally available in a city.

The foundation has also embarked on an interesting program which in the long run may have some favorable effect on the balance of doctors in rural and semirural areas. As a part of the medical assistance program, they have established a preceptorship plan which enables medical students, while they are still in medical school, to spend their summers working in one of these foundation clinics so that they may learn something of the practice of medicine and something of the rural life. It is too early to learn whether there have been any converts from the specialist route, but already word of the program has reached well into the ranks of students and doctors alike.

As I said, the citizens were lucky to obtain the services of two young, extremely able and promising doctors so that they may be reasonably assured that medical services will be available to the community for a long time into the future. Tragically, a doctor previously committed to practice there—as a matter of fact he was already practicing—was by the death of his wife impelled to make other arrangements.

What has preceded has not given full weight to the determination and efforts of the citizens of Plain Dealing. In the last analysis, it has been their own resources which have made this clinic possible. Two desirable human qualities have made this dream come true. Leadership and hard work, both qualities characteristic of so many of the citizens of Plain Dealing have been essential. These are the ingredients which will not only result in a medical clinic such as we now have in Plain Dealing, they will also provide a way to solve our community problems. The people of Plain Dealing are now talking of a smaller hospital, of a nursing home and there is a good possibility that one or more new industries are becoming interested in locating nearby.

I have consistently opposed the extension of Federal welfare programs in the belief that an informed local populace could handle most, if not all, of its problems if it is encouraged and allowed to do so. I have always maintained that, if we are constantly catered to and given our every want, it will not be long before we no longer have the initiative and energy even to determine what we want. It will but remain for someone else, most likely the Federal Government, to measure our daily pablum and inform us that this is the right amount and it is good for us. I cannot be persuaded that this is the kind of spiritual and moral climate in which our enormous responsibilities and opportunities can be met intelligently and energetically.

In a further extension of these ideas, I think that society can ill afford to turn its back on rural America and say that all the problems of the 20th century are to be found in the cities. The concentration of population and low-income families in the cities inevitably causes greater impact. But the cities themselves can ill afford further immigration from the rural area. It will only complicate their problems and lead to further ills. In the less populated parts of the country, we have a chance to build up the economies through careful planning and development. If new industries can be persuaded to reexamine the potentials of the rural areas, we may yet have a chance to arrest the movement to the cities and even achieve a reversal of the trend. The establishment of a medical clinic serving a rural population which numbers 4,000 people will not achieve these results by itself. But it has helped to give a rural community a basic service without which it could not effectively survive and serve as an attraction to others.

It would be difficult if not impossible for me to assess the credit due each component half of the team which put together this success story and I will not attempt it.

The Sears, Roebuck Foundation would not have brought about this clinic without the initiative of the people of Plain Dealing. At the same time, the people of Plain Dealing probably would not have succeeded without the contribution and guidance of Sears.

If every corporation were as unselfishly interested in the welfare of the people as is Sears, the image of big, heartless corporations would no longer exist. The people of Plain Dealing appreciate what Sears has done to help them help themselves. I would like to join with them in their expression.

PROTECTING THE INTEGRITY OF OUR SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on September 16, I reported to this body my fear of the Government entering into the sphere of influencing the writing of textbooks through the office of the Community Relations Service. Any present threat of that proposed program is "nipped in the bud." I am most happy to report that I have had a meeting with the Acting Director, Calvin Kytle, and he has assured me that his office would not carry out this ill-advised idea and that the confidential memorandum suggesting the rewriting of history textbooks was the brainstorm of a new staff member.

However, Mr. Speaker, this is not to say that there are not individuals or agencies within the Federal Government who favor curriculum planning at the national level, as part of a design for Federal direction of the education of our children. I strongly believe that it is the constitutional obligation of every Member of Congress to protect and safeguard the independence and integrity of local school boards, and I am sure that there is no need to remind anyone that one of the important factors involved in making America great was the philosophy of a free educational system, to be supported by taxes and controlled at the lowest possible level of government, close to the parents—by the local school board and not by a Federal bureaucrat.

Mr. Speaker, let me cite what U.S. News & World Report had to say in its October 18 issue:

> Misgivings already are felt about the new Federal aid to local schools.

> Washington crackdown on Chicago's school system hardly waited for ink to dry on the new law.
>
> Crackdown in Boston, denying funds, has been rumored.
>
> A Democratic mayor, with a call to a Democratic President, kept Chicago from losing $30 million right away.
>
> Many other cities, wanting to run their own school systems without interference on details, do not have the same sort of political influence over the bureaucracy in the Nation's Capital.
>
> Textbook content is beginning to be looked over in Washington, too.
>
> Localities will learn that when Washington pays the piper it usually will want to call the tune, down to the shape of local school districts. Also, people will learn that political influence plays a big part.

These plans to use the power of the purse strings to force an educational system to accept a federally centralized school system is of tremendous concern to the citizens of this Nation—my mail shows this without one iota of doubt—and they should be concerned. To persons who say, "It can't happen here," I say it is happening here and, as has been said before, one of these years we may wake up and see that the only school board member is Uncle Sam.

This Federal control, as I have stated on another occasion, was one of the main reasons why I had qualms about the massive Federal aid bill, sending billions to our elementary and secondary schools. The larger the sums, the more local school boards come to depend upon them.

During debate on the bill, supporters of Federal aid said Federal control would be impossible. One of the strongest of these supporters, incidentally, was the Washington Post—which now says:

> Local control over education is one of the fundamentals to which a vast majority of Americans cling. Yet it is obvious that this control cannot be absolute if the local communities are to draw substantial sums from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, along the same line as textbooks and Federal control, there has recently been discussion over a current Federal test or survey program.

Because I remember well the great upheaval caused over questions which were asked in 1961 and 1962 in tests given in various schools throughout our Nation, I felt that I should personally investigate the current Federal surveys. In the 1961 and 1962 tests, questions such as the following were asked, with a "Yes" or "No" answer expected:

> I am ashamed of my father's job.
>
> I am ashamed of my parents' dress and manners.
>
> I think about sex a good deal of the time.
>
> Is there a conflict between the Bible and your school subjects?
>
> I'm losing faith in religion.
>
> Is it wrong to deny the existence of God?

Many tests called for difficult or impossible answers—in some cases pitting loyalties of religion, home, and parent against each other. One "moral value" inventory examination asked:

> Which is worse: (1) spitting on the Bible; (2) spitting on the American flag?
>
> Which is more important: (1) Taking the oath of allegiance to the United States; (2) joining a church?

Questions such as these on the previous test—and letters from constituents, expressing concern—prompted me to look into the current tests of the Department of Education.

I found that an "Educational Opportunities Survey" is presently being conducted. In section 402 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Public Law 88-352, the Congress ordered:

> The Commissioner (of Education) shall conduct a survey and make a report to the President and the Congress, within 2 years of the enactment of this title, concerning the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin in public educational institutions at all levels in the United States, its territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

After securing copies of the present survey questions, I reviewed them and can report that I was gratified to find that they were not repulsive—as were the questions in previous tests quoted above. Also, Mr. Speaker, it is entirely up to local school officials to decide whether or not they wish to participate in this survey.

It is my understanding that approximately 10 percent of the school districts contacted by the Federal Government refused to take part in this survey. Furthermore, in checking with the Washington State Department of Public Instruction, I find that in Washington State six school districts were asked, none refused to participate, and there were no known problems encountered in administering the survey.

The Supreme Court has made it clear that the Federal Government has a clear responsibility to maintain "strings" on Federal dollars. That is why, throughout my service in Congress, I have bent over backward to try to leave the management of schools to State and local authorities. Meanwhile, Federal assistance has expanded so that this year the Federal Government is allocating a total of more than $8 billion for education. This growing support constitutes a danger, which, as I said, must be safeguarded by Congress and Representatives such as myself.

The newly authorized Teacher Corps has been created to give local schools control over hiring and firing. At the moment, this program would appear to have safeguards. But the inherent danger of using Federal funds to train and maintain teachers cannot be overlooked.

After years of observing Federal Government programs and those who direct them, I scrutinize all school legislation with extreme caution and care. Increasing authorized Government programs cannot help but increase the danger of centralized control. This invariably happens and those who have had to deal with Federal agencies in connection with other programs, such as highways, housing and, in fact, most federally financed programs, will know exactly what I mean.

That Federal dollars are absolutely necessary for education under existing conditions, I fully recognize. In this connection, there is more and more support, both inside and outside Congress, for legislation calling for a return of Federal taxes to the States in a way that assures that full control over the spending of these funds is vested in the States themselves, and in their State legislatures. As one of the originators of this type of school financing, I can report widespread support by my colleagues for this idea, in one form or another. A new formula, to recognize the differing capacities of the respective States, has been worked out and I am hopeful that greater support by school officials will be forthcoming.

I have satisfied myself that—at least for the moment—the threat of federalized curriculums and the invasion of family privacy by nationalized pupil tests is not present. A House Subcommittee on Education is shortly to look into some of these aspects of Federal aid to schools. The chairman of this committee, Representative EDITH GREEN, is a lady for whom I have great respect. A previous report of this subcommittee, on duplication of Federal school programs, is valuable and shows that more than 40 Federal agencies are involved in educational grants of one kind or another—and financing research. I think a new investigation along these lines is needed, with special attention given to the amount of control and direction over local schools.

But, as I said, for the moment it appears that parents need not be too alarmed. Rather, it is a case that calls for eternal vigilance.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes a.m., Saturday, October 23, 1965.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, joint and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

> H.R. 4845. An act to provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies;
>
> H.R. 9830. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize reimbursement to a State or political subdivision thereof for sidewalk repair and replacement or to make other arrangements therefor;
>
> H.R. 10878. An act for the relief of Anderson G. Matsler, senior master sergeant, U.S. Air Force, retired;
>
> H.J. Res. 788. Joint resolution establishing that the 2d regular session of the 89th Congress convene at noon on Monday, January 10, 1966; and
>
> H. Con. Res. 528. Concurrent resolution establishing that the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the

Senate be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed and found truly enrolled.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 527. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment sine die of the first session, Eighty-ninth Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 149. An act for the relief of Benjamin A. Ramelb;

S. 1320. An act to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 1647. An act for the relief of Kim Sung Jin.

S. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a Senate document of ten thousand copies of a study entitled "The Anti-Vietnam Agitation and the Teach-In Movement," prepared for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (11135) entitled "An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following concurrent resolution, with a Senate amendment thereto.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives (H. Con. Res. 527) entitled "Concurrent resolution establishing that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, October 22, 1965, they stand adjourned sine die", do pass with the following amendment:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "Friday, October 22, 1965," and insert "Saturday, October 23, 1965,".

The House concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

THANKS TO THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following letter from the President of the United States:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., October 22, 1965.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As you know, I have stated publicly my firm belief that the 1st session of the 89th Congress will be recorded as the greatest session of Congress in the history of our Nation. To that statement I would now like to add my own personal thanks to you for the major part you played in making that record possible. You have earned the gratitude not only of your President, but what is more important, of the entire Nation as well.

This session of the Congress passed 86 major administration measures, but there were other important items on which the Congress did not complete action.

The final record of this Congress is unusually productive. The big job that remains before us is to make certain that what Congress has passed will be carried forward efficiently, with dispatch and with economy and good judgment. The unfinished work on our agenda will be our first task in the next session of this enlightened and progressive Congress.

Again, the gratitude of the Nation and the President goes to each Member who made his contribuition to this record. What you have done will find a shining residence in the history books.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear the letter from the President of the United States paying respect to the great Speaker of the House of Representatives who has rendered such magnificent service to his country during this session of the Congress.

I am particularly interested in hearing the President say that in the next year he hopes the work of the Congress will be done with economy.

I agree with both of the sentiments expressed, I agree with the accolades to our distinguished Speaker and I agree when he says that we should proceed with economy in the next session.

I appreciate our distinguished Speaker recognizing me at this time.

THE 1ST SESSION, 89TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. My distinguished colleagues and dear friends, I am deeply touched by the manifestations of friendship and respect on your part which you have so clearly evidenced for me during the period of time that I have served as majority leader and now as Speaker of the National House of Representatives and for your kind and very generous remarks, which I feel I do not deserve but which I value very much, which were made earlier in the evening by my distinguished friends, the Democratic whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] and by the distinguished minority leader, my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], and other Members of the House. I deeply appreciate your very generous expressions of respect and friendship and I can assure you that being human, as I am, it touches me deeply.

This has been a great session of the Congress. It has made history. It is probably one of the most historic Congresses.

I think the Members of the House of Representatives, of both branches of the Congress, can leave with the knowledge and the satisfaction that they have performed their duties well. They can go back to their districts with the knowledge that the people of their districts will recognize the fact that they have performed their first duty as Members of the Congress of the United States during these long months that have passed since this first session of the Congress met last January.

I am not going to recount the history of the legislative accomplishments of this Congress at this time because they are fresh in your mind as they are in my mind; except to repeat that this has been a historic Congress and that all of us have played our part, Democrats, Republicans, chairmen of committees, and the members of the various committees.

We have brought about accomplishments that will strengthen our Nation and will be very beneficial for countless decades to come.

I wish to express my sincere thanks for the many courtesies extended to me by all Members of the House. As Speaker, I have tried to be fair to every Member, to perform the parliamentary duties of Speaker, and not to recognize party differences, but to respect the fact that we are all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and elected by the people of our respective constituencies, and always to see that the rules of the House of Representatives were operated to protect the rights and privileges of all Members.

Particularly I have always felt as majority leader and as Speaker that the duty of the majority leadership, whichever party is in control—my party now being in control, but when the Republican Party was in control also—is to emphasize strongly the importance and necessity of protecting the rights of the minority.

I am particularly appreciative of the loyal cooperation of my dear friend, the majority leader, CARL ALBERT, and my dear friend, the majority whip, HALE BOGGS, and all my Democratic colleagues.

I am also particularly appreciative of the kindness, cooperation, courtesies, and the consideration of my dear friend, the minority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. FORD], and my dear friend, the minority whip, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. When I mention their names in position of leadership, I have in mind each and every one of you. I express my sincere thanks to you for your kind consideration of me, overlooking my weaknesses, and I hope that you have found in me some strength.

The best accolade I could receive is to receive the commendation of my colleagues that I have been fair, and that I have alway tried to protect the rights of every Member under the rules of the House of Representatives.

I wish to express my thanks to all employees of the House, to the officers of the House, to our beloved Chaplain whose prayers have inspired us.

I also wish to express my sincere thanks to one of the greatest men that I have ever met, one who has been alluded to this evening by several Members, particularly by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], and whom I consider to be one of the most brilliant men I have ever met, and yet one of the most humble men I have ever met—the No. 1 Parliamentarian of the world, a man of wisdom, Lew Deschler.

I hope that some day someone will write a book about Lew Deschler and the important part that he has played in the conduct of Government. Lew might write such a book but his modesty would probably forbid him. For many years he has served the House and has been devoted to everyone who has been Speaker of this body, without regard to party during his period of service as Parliamentarian of this great body. His loyalty and his devotion is something that has endeared him to everyone of us and everyone who has served in the House of Representatives.

So I express my sincere thanks to all of you, my dear colleagues, and I wish for you every happiness during the months that lie ahead. I hope that we shall all come back with renewed vigor to carry on with our duties and responsibilities during the 2d session of the present Congress.

From the depths of one who tries to be humble, from the depths of my heart and mind, I extend to each and every one of you my sincere thanks for the courtesies and the considerations that you have extended to me, not only during this session, but since I have been Speaker of this great body.

GODSPEED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this half-minute prior to adjournment of this historic Congress to wish Godspeed to the President of the United States and to his lovely wife as they return to their native State of Texas, as the President recovers from a serious operation. He has given us leadership and inspiration. His wife, standing by his side, has been a model for wives all over our country.

All of us on both sides of the aisle, regardless of whether we may have agreed or disagreed with the President, I believe wish for him a speedy recovery and a happy season all through the fall ahead.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RYAN, for 30 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LAIRD, for 60 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. PELLY, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. WILLIAMS, for 25 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAY, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. WAGGONNER (at the request of Mr. DYAL), for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. DYAL), for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2394. An act to provide for the acquisition of an official residence for the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 619. An act for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli;

S. 919. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. William T. Schuster, U.S. Air Force (retired);

S. 1004. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and services by executive agencies, and for other purposes;

S. 2118. An act to amend sections 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and subsection O of the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920;

S. 2150. An act to discontinue or modify certain reporting requirements of law;

S. 2542. An act to amend the Small Business Act; and

S. 2679. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution, of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2303. An act for the relief of Ernest J. Carlin;

H.R. 4170. An act to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system;

H.R. 8370. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9567. An act to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education;

H.R. 11539. An act to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane;

H.R. 11588. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 671. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of November as "Water Conservation Month".

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills, and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1317. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer which was imported during May 1963 for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.;

H.R. 1386. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Pooma College;

H.R. 1393. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Eduvigis Aran Heffernan;

H.R. 1781. An act to amend section 113(a) of title 28, United States Code, to provide that Federal District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina shall be held at Clinton;

H.R. 2565. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of the University of Chicago;

H.R. 2578. An act for the relief of Maxie L. Rupert;

H.R. 2762. An act for the relief of Manlio Massimiliani;

H.R. 2906. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lily Ning Sheehan;

H.R. 3126. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the University of Washington;

H.R. 3905. An act for the relief of Bibi Dalject Kaur;

H.R. 4832. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of St. Louis University;

H.R. 5006. An act for the relief of Diosado F. Almazan;

H.R. 5217. An act to permit the vessel *Little Nancy* to be documented for use in the coastwise trade;

H.R. 6312 An act for the relief of Mario Menna;

H.R. 6655. An act for the relief of Pieter Cornelis Metzelaar;

H.R. 6720. An act for the relief of Ping-Kwan Fong;

H.R. 6906. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer and one split pole spectrography for the use of the University of Rochester, N.Y.;

H.R. 7282. An act for the relief of Richard D. Walsh;

H.R. 7357. An act for the relief of Doctor Felipe V. Lavapies;

H.R. 7453. An act for the relief of Margaret Elizabeth and Frederick Henry Todd;

H.R. 7608. An act to provide for the free entry of one automatic steady state distributing machine for the use of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.;

H.R. 8135. An act for the relief of Jennifer Rebecca Siegel;

H.R. 8232. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer-gas chromatograph for the use of Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla.;

H.R. 8272. An act to provide for the free entry of an isotope separator for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.;

H.R. 8646. An act for the relief of Rifkin Textiles Corp.;

H.R. 9351. An act to provide for the free entry of one shadomaster measuring projector for the use of the University of South Dakota;

H.R. 9495. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9587. An act to provide for the free entry of a Craig countercurrent distribution apparatus for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.;

H.R. 9588. An act to provide for the free entry of an electrically driven rotating chair for the use of the Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, La.;

H.R. 9811. An act to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10198. An act to amend the requirements relating to lumber under the Shipping Act, 1916;

H.R. 10256. An act for the relief of James D. W. Blyth, his wife, Jean Mary Blyth, and their daughter, Penelope Jean Blyth;

H.R. 10292. An act for the relief of Hilda Shen Tsiang;

H.R. 11096. An act to authorize the disposal of graphite, quartz crystals, and lump steatite talc from the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both;

H.J. Res. 397. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District; and

H.J. Res. 597. Joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of rocketry.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, there being no further business, it is my great honor and privilege to move that this House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 527, the Chair declares the 1st session of the 89th Congress adjourned sine die.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m.), Saturday, October 23, 1965, the House adjourned sine die.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION ENROLLED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that on the following dates, that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On October 22, 1965:

H.R. 168. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 227. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to entitle the children of certain veterans who served in the Armed Forces prior to September 16, 1940, to benefit under the war orphans educational assistance program;

H.R. 797. An act to establish the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1778. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended;

H.R. 2571. An act for the relief of Ralph S. DeSocio, Jr.;

H.R. 5493. An act to provide that the flag of the United States of America may be flown for 24 hours of each day in Lexington, Mass.;

H.R. 5597. An act to relieve physicians of liability for negligent medical treatment at the scene of an accident in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 7475. An act to name the authorized lock and dam No. 6 on the Arkansas River in Arkansas and the lake created thereby for David D. Terry;

H.R. 8353. An act for the relief of Becky Jo and Charles R. Smith;

H.R. 9047. An act to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both;

H.R. 10097. An act for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co.;

H.R. 10305. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period of approximately 200 million pounds of nickel from the national stockpile;

H.R. 11267. An act to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove certain limitations; and

H.J. Res. 641. Joint resolution authorizing Father Flanagan Boys' Home to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

On October 23, 1965:

H.R. 4421. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.;

H.R. 4845. An act to provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies;

H.R. 5026. An act to authorize the Burt County Bridge Commission, a public body politic and corporate in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, to refund the outstanding revenue bonds of said Burt County Bridge Commission heretofore issue to finance the cost of the construction of a bridge, together with the necessary approaches and appurtenances therefor, from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebr., across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa;

H.R. 7812. An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8310. An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9830. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize reimbursement to a State or political subdivision thereof for sidewalk repair and replacement or to make other arrangements therefor;

H.R. 9903. An act to provide for the free entry of certain scientific instruments for the use of certain universities;

H.R. 10281. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10878. An act for the relief of Anderson G. Matsler, senior master sergeant, U.S. Air Force, retired;

H.R. 11135. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 786. Joint resolution establishing that the 2d regular session of the 89th Congress convene at noon on Monday, January, 10, 1966.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 528, 89th Congress, he did on the following dates sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On October 22, 1965:

H.R. 168. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 227. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to entitle the children of certain veterans who served in the Armed Forces prior to September 16, 1940, to benefit under the war orphans educational assistance program;

H.R. 797. An act to establish the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1778. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended;

H.R. 2571. An act for the relief of Ralph S. DeSocio. Jr.;

H.R. 5493. An act to provide that the flag of the United States of America may be flown for 24 hours of each day in Lexington, Mass.;

H.R. 5597. An act to relieve physicians of liability for negligent medical treatment at the scene of an accident in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 7475. An act to name the authorized lock and dam numbered 6 on the Arkansas River in Arkansas and the lake created thereby for David D. Terry;

H.R. 8353. An act for the relief of Becky Jo and Charles R. Smith;

H.R. 9047. An act to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both;

H.R. 10097. An act for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co.;

H.R. 10305. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period of approximately 200 million pounds of nickel from the national stockpile;

H.R. 11267. An act to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove certain limitations; and

H.J. Res. 641. Joint resolution authorizing Father Flanagan Boys' Home to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

On October 23, 1965:

H.R. 4421. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.;

H.R. 4845. An act to provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies;

H.R. 5026. An act to authorize the Burt County Bridge Commission, a public body politic and corporate in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, to refund the outstanding revenue bonds of said Burt County Bridge Commission heretofore issued to finance the cost of the construction of a bridge, together with the necessary approaches and appurtenances therefor, from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebr., across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa.

H.R. 7812. An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8310. An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9830. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize reimbursement to a State or political subdivision thereof for sidewalk repair and replacement or to make other arrangements therefor;

H.R. 9903. An act to provide for the free entry of certain scientific instruments for the use of certain universities;

H.R. 10281. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10878. An act for the relief of Anderson G. Matsler, senior master sergeant, U.S. Air Force, retired;

H.R. 11135. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 788. Joint resolution establishing that the 2d regular session of the 89th Congress convene at noon on Monday, January 10, 1966.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 528, 89th Congress, he did on October 25, 1965, sign enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 149. An act for the relief of Benjamin A. Ramelb;

S. 1320. An act to amend certain criminal laws applicable to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 1647. An act for the relief of Kim Sung Jin.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 27, 1965, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 168. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 227. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to entitle the children of certain veterans who served in the Armed Forces prior to September 16, 1940, to benefit under the war orphans educational assistance program;

H.R. 797. An act to establish the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1778. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended;

H.R. 2303. An act for the relief of Ernest J. Carlin;

H.R. 2571. An act for the relief of Ralph S. DeSocio, Jr.;

H.R. 3079. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eleni Bacola Ciacco, doctor of medicine;

H.R. 4170. An act to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system;

H.R. 4421. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.;

H.R. 4845. An act to provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies;

H.R. 5026. An act to authorize the Burt County Bridge Commission, a public body politic and corporate in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, to refund the outstanding revenue bonds of said Burt County Bridge Commission heretofore issued to finance the cost of the construction of a bridge together with the necessary approaches and appurtenances therefor, from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebr., across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa;

H.R. 5493. An act to provide that the flag of the United States of America may be flown for 24 hours of each day in Lexington, Mass.;

H.R. 5597. An act to relieve physicians of liability for negligent medical treatment at the scene of an accident in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 6666. An act to provide for the free entry of a 90-centimeter split-pole magnetic spectrograph system with orange-peel internal conversion spectrometer attached for the use of the University of Pittsburgh;

H.R. 7475. An act to name the authorized lock and dam No. 6 on the Arkansas River in Arkansas and the lake created thereby for David D. Terry;

H.R. 7812. An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8310. An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8353. An act for the relief of Becky Jo and Charles R. Smith;

H.R. 8370. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9047. An act to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both;

H.R. 9567. An act to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education;

H.R. 9830. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize reimbursement to a State or political subdivision thereof for sidewalk repair and replacement or to make other arrangements therefor;

H.R. 9903. An act to provide for the free entry of certain scientific instruments for the use of certain universities;

H.R. 10097. An act for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co.;

H.R. 10281. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10305. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 200 million pounds of nickel from the national stockpile;

H.R. 10878. An act for the relief of Anderson G. Matsler, senior master sergeant, U.S. Air Force, retired;

H.R. 11135. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended;

H.R. 11267. An act to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove certain limitations;

H.R. 11539. An act to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane;

H.R. 11588. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 641. An act authorizing Father Flanagan's Boys' Home to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs;

H.J. Res. 671. An act to authorize the President to proclaim the month of November as "Water Conservation Month"; and

H.J. Res. 788. An act establishing that the second regular session of the Eighty-ninth Congress convene at noon on Monday, January 10, 1966.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On October 20, 1965:

H.R. 10871. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

On October 21, 1965:

H.R. 9042. An act to provide for the implementation of the agreement concerning automotive products between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes.

On October 22, 1965:

H.R. 7919. An act to provide for the establishment of the Roger Williams National Memorial in the city of Providence, R.I., and for other purposes.

On October 23, 1965:

H.R. 5457. An act for the relief of Maria del Rosario de Fatima Lopez Hayes;

H.R. 5554. An act for the relief of Mary Frances Crabbs;

H.R. 5904. An act for the relief of Nam Ie Kim;

H.R. 6229. An act for the relief of Kim Sun Ho.

H.R. 6235. An act for the relief of Chun Soo Kim;

H.R. 7888. An act providing for the extension of patent numbered D–119, 187;

H.R. 8457. An act for the relief of Robert G. Mikulecky;

H.R. 9521. An act for the relief of Clarence Earle Davis; and

H.J. Res. 571. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the week beginning October 25, 1965, as National Parkinson Week.

On October 26, 1965:

H.R. 1319. An act for the relief of Joseph Durante.

H.R. 3515. An act for the relief of Mary Ann Hartmann; and

H.R. 9526. An act for the relief of Raffaella Achilli.

On October 27, 1965:

H.R. 1311. An act for the relief of Joseph J. McDevitt;

H.R. 1836. An act for the relief of Constantinos Agganis;

H.R. 2005. An act for the relief of Miss Gloria Seborg;

H.R. 2285. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Cioffi Carson;

H.R. 2557. An act for the relief of Frank Simms;

H.R. 2757. An act for the relief of Maria Alexandros Siagris;

H.R. 2853. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, with relation to the fees to be charged;

H.R. 3288. An act for the relief of Hwang Tai Shik;

H.R. 3669. An act for the relief Emilia Majka;

H.R. 3770. An act for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Navy at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, Calif.;

H.R. 4078. An act for the relief of William L. Minton; and

H.R. 4203. An act for the relief of Alton G. Edwards.

On October 28, 1965:

H.R. 1409. An act for the relief of Louis W. Hamm;

H.R. 5167. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the administrative settlement of tort claims arising in foreign countries, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9220. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

On October 29, 1965:

H.R. 1644. An act for the relief of 1st Lt. Robert B. Gann, and others;

H.R. 4137. An act for the relief of Dr. Jan Rosciszewski;

H.R. 4194. An act for the relief of Angelica Anagnostopoulos;

H.R. 4464. An act for the relief of Michael Hadjichristofas, Aphrodite Hadjichristofas, and Paniote Hadjichristofas;

H.R. 8350. An act for the relief of the successors in interest of Cooper Blyth and Grace Johnston Blyth otherwise Grace McCloy Blyth; and

H.R. 10281. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

On October 30, 1965:

H.R. 23. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1386. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Pomona College;

H.R. 2578. An act for the relief of Maxie L. Rupert;

H.R. 4832. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.;

H.R. 4845. An act to provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies;

H.R. 8272. An act to provide for the free entry of an isotope separator for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.;

H.R. 8646. An act for the relief of Rifkin Textiles Corp.;

H.R. 9495. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9588. An act to provide for the free entry of an electrically driven rotating chair for the use of the Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, La.; and

H.R. 10198. An act to amend the requirements relating to lumber under the Shipping Act, 1916.

On October 31, 1965:

H.R. 168. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1393. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Eduvigis Aran Heffernan;

H.R. 2762. An act for the relief of Manlio Massimiliani;

H.R. 2906. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lily Ning Sheehan;

H.R. 3126. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the University of Washington;

H.R. 4170. An act to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system;

H.R. 6312. An act for the relief of Mario Menna;

H.R. 6655. An act for the relief of Pieter Cornelis Metzelaar.

H.R. 6720. An act for the relief of Ping-Kwan Fong;

H.R. 7282. An act for the relief of Richard D. Walsh;

H.R. 7357. An act for the relief of Dr. Felipe V. Lavapies;

H.R. 7608. An act to provide for the free entry of one automatic steady state distribution machine for the use of the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.

H.R. 8135. An act for the relief of Jennifer Rebecca Siegel;

H.R. 10256. An act for the relief of James D. W. Blyth, his wife, Jean Mary Blyth, and their daughter, Penelope Jean Blyth;

H.R. 10292. An act for the relief of Hilda Shen Tsiang;

H.R. 11096. An act to authorize the disposal of graphite, quartz crystals, and lump steatite talc from the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both; and

H.R. 11588. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

On November 1, 1965:

H.R. 1218. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.;

H.R. 5217. An act to permit the vessel *Little Nancy* to be documented for use in the coastwise trade;

H.R. 6906. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer and one split pole spectograph for the use of University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.;

H.R. 7453. An act for the relief of Margaret Elizabeth and Frederick Henry Todd;

H.R. 8232. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer-gas chromatograph for the use of Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla.;

H.R. 9022. An act to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; to eliminate inequities in the application of Public Law 815 in certain military base closings; to make uniform eligibility requirements for school districts in Public Law 874; and for other purposes;

H.R. 9351. An act to provide for the free entry of one shadomaster measuring projector for the use of the University of South Dakota;

H.R. 9587. An act to provide for the free entry of a Craig countercurrent distribution apparatus for the use of Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.;

H.R. 10369. An act to give the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become parties to title II of the Compact on Taxation of Motor Fuels Consumed by Interstate Buses and the agreement relating to Bus Taxation Proration and Reciprocity;

H.R. 11303. An act to amend section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended; and

H.R. 11420. An act to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

On November 2, 1965:

H.R. 1317. An act to provide for the free entry of a mass spectrometer which was imported during May 1963 for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.;

H.R. 1781. An act to amend section 113(a) of title 28, United States Code, to provide that Federal District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina shall be held at Clinton;

H.R. 2565. An act to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of the University of Chicago;

H.R. 3905. An act for the relief of Bibi Daljeet Kaur;

H.R. 4088. An act for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc.;

H.R. 5006. An act for the relief of Diosdado F. Almazan;

H.R. 8370. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9545. An act providing for the acquisition and preservation by the United States of certain items of evidence pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy; and

H.J. Res. 397. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District.

On November 3, 1965:

H.R. 9811. An act to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 597. Joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of rocketry.

On November 4, 1965:

H.R. 9047. An act to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both.

On November 5, 1965:

H.R. 7812. An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10305. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 200 million pounds of nickel from the national stockpile.

On November 7, 1965:

H.R. 1778. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of

Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended;

H.R. 3079. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eleni Bocola Ciacco, doctor of medicine;

H.R. 5026. An act to authorize the Burt County Bridge Commission, a public body politic and corporate in the county of Burt and State of Nebraska, to refund the outstanding revenue bonds of said Burt County Bridge Commission heretofore issued to finance the cost of the construction of a bridge, together with the necessary approaches and appurtenances therefor, from a point located in the city of Decatur, Burt County, Nebr., across the Missouri River to a point located in Monona County, Iowa;

H.R. 8353. An act for the relief of Becky Jo and Charles R. Smith;

H.J. Res. 641. Joint resolution authorizing Father Flanagan's Boys' Home to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs; and

H.J. Res. 671. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of November as "Water Conservation Month."

On November 8, 1965:

H.R. 227. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to entitle the children of certain veterans who served in the Armed Forces prior to September 16, 1940, to benefit under the war orphans educational assistance program;

H.R. 797. An act to establish the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2303. An act for the relief of Ernest J. Carlin;

H.R. 2571. An act for the relief of Ralph S. DeSocio, Jr.;

H.R. 4421. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.;

H.R. 5493. An act to provide that the flag of the United States of America may be flown for 24 hours of each day in Lexington, Mass.;

H.R. 5597. An act to relieve physicians of liability for negligent medical treatment at the scene of an accident in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 6666. An act to provide for the free entry of a 90-centimeter split-pole magnetic spectrograph system with orange-peel internal conversion spectrometer attached for the use of the University of Pittsburgh;

H.R. 7475. An act to name the authorized lock and dam No. 6 on the Arkansas River in Arkansas and the lake created thereby for David D. Terry;

H.R. 8310. An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9567. An act to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education;

H.R. 9830. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize reimbursement to a State or political subdivision thereof for sidewalk repair and replacement or to make other arrangements therefor;

H.R. 9903. An act to provide for the free entry of certain scientific instruments for the use of certain universities;

H.R. 10097. An act for the relief of North Counties Hydroelectric Co.;

H.R. 10878. An act for the relief of Anderson G. Matsler, senior master sergeant, U.S. Air Force, retired;

H.R. 11135. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended;

H.R. 11267. An act to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove certain limitations;

H.R. 11539. An act to provide assistance to the States of Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent hurricane; and

H.J. Res. 788. Joint resolution establishing that the 2d regular session of the 89th Congress convene at noon on Monday, January 10, 1966.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1701. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting draft of proposed legislation to place meat and poultry inspection programs on a self-supporting basis; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1702. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a report of a violation occurring in a fund under the control of the Agency for International Development, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1703. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1704. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of questionable basis for approving loans for the construction of three motels, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1705. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of savings resulting from elimination of the requirement that general office desks be equipped with locks, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1706. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for strengthening controls over sick leave, Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1707. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings by direct rather than indirect purchase of selected major subsystems for A-6A type of aircraft, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1708. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of causes for overpayments and underpayments of mileage reimbursements for travel of service members and their dependents, Department of the Army and Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1709. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report of possible savings through purchasing rather than leasing certain copying machines, Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2600. A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site; with amendment (Rept. No. 1205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 139. A bill to provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 1,000th anniversary of the founding of Poland; with amendment (Rept. No. 1206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 10357. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the U.S. Secret Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FISHER: Committee of conference. H.R. 7812. An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1208). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee of conference. H.R. 11135 (Rept. No. 1209). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 616. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 1210). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 11764. A bill to provide for the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 11765. A bill to amend section 1234 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 11766. A bill to amend section 1234 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 11767. A bill to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 to require direct service to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 11768. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that payments for skilled nursing home services under the hospital insurance benefits program shall be made on a reasonable charge basis rather than on a reasonable cost basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER (by request):

H.R. 11769. A bill to amend sections 1(19), 5, 32a, 64a(1) and 67d(4) of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 11770. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal tax receipts with the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 11771. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 11772. A bill to provide a program of Federal assistance to elementary schools throughout the Nation to improve educational opportunities through provision for the services of child development specialists and to provide a program of Federal assistance for the training of such elementary school personnel in the institutions of higher education, and for other educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 11773. A bill to amend section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to coordinate the hiring of experts and consultants by the executive departments and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 11774. A bill to require the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to use certain property for public market purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 11775. A bill to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11776. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain real property to the government of Guam, to repeal section 26(c) of the Organic Act of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11777. A bill to provide for the popular election of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 11778. A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act to eliminate or modify certain requirements thereof with respect to the making of affidavits and the filing of copies of certain information; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11779. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for the collection and publication of Federal Government statistics by the Secretary of Commerce, to redesignate the Bureau of the Census as the Bureau of the Census and Government Statistics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 11780. A bill to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct a visitor's center in, or in the vicinity of, the Capitol Grounds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 11781. A bill to improve and clarify certain laws of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 11782. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for additions to a reserve for certain guaranteed debt obligations and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.R. 11783. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission to study and investigate problems relating to the export of beef from the United States and to consider ways and means of increasing the export of beef from the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H.R. 11784. A bill to amend the tariff schedules to provide an increased exemption from duty for goods purchased in a contiguous country and within 5 miles of the U.S. border; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 11785. A bill to amend the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 to provide direct service to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in order to make the performing arts easily accessible to all of the people; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 11786. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to redefine "earned income" and to remove certain limitations on the amount of deduction for contributions to pension and profit-sharing plans made on the behalf of self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 11787. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the millennium of the Polish nation in the calendar year 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 11788. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11789. A bill to clarify and otherwise amend the Meat Inspection Act; to extend Federal meat inspection; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 11790. A bill to amend title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to increase the authorization of appropriations and to provide increased Federal matching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11791. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.R. 11792. A bill to require the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to use certain property for public market purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 11793. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to make discrimination because of age in employment an unlawful employment practice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 11794. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act in order to promote the detection of phenylketonuria and other inborn errors of metabolism leading to mental retardation or physical defects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 11795. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit certain increased amounts received as a result of enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 to be disregarded in computing income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a veteran's or widow's pension under title 38; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 11796. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of statutory subsistence allowances received by law enforcement officers and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 11797. A bill to require certain vessels operating on the navigable waters of the United States to conform to certain standards of waste disposal; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 11798. A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 11799. A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 11800. A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 11801. A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 11802. A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 11803. A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 11804. A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of interstate commerce to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 11805. A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of interstate commerce to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 11806. A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of interstate commerce to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 11807. A bill to regulate and foster commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of interstate commerce to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 11808. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules with respect to the tariff treatment of semiprocessed picker sticks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 11809. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Taxicab Insurance Act of 1958 to provide that persons qualifying as self-insurers shall not be subject to the insurance requirements of that act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 11810. A bill to require the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to use certain property for public market purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 11811. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a liberalized child care deduction as a trade or business expense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 11812. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the millennium of the Polish nation in the calendar year 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 11813. A bill to require the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to use certain property for public market purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 11814. A bill to prescribe penalties for shoplifters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 11815. A bill to establish an experimental program for employment of workers unemployable in existing labor markets; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11816. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher educaton in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 11817. A bill to provide for specific employment policies in order to promote maximum employment, to reduce unemployment to its minimum acceptable levels, to promote an adequate rate of economic growth, and to preserve reasonable price stability; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 11818. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 11819. A bill to transfer control of Pershing Hall to the Secretary of State; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 11820. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes;to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 11821. A bill to authorize the sale of certain commemorative coins by the Historical Society of Washington County, Md.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11822. A bill to amend and extend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11823. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer or spouse who has had a laryngectomy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 11824. A bill to require the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to use certain property for public market purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 11825. A bill to provide for the holding of a term of court for the western district of Kentucky at Hopkinsville; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 11826. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 11827. A bill to provide for the suspension of dumping duties on portland cement from Sweden; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 11828. A bill to provide for specific employment policies in order to promote maximum employment, to reduce unemployment to its minimum acceptable levels, to promote an adequate rate of economic growth, and to preserve reasonable price stability; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 11829. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to make discrimination because of age in employment an unlawful employment practice; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 11830. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Clarksburg, W. Va., as the Louis A. Johnson Veterans' Administration Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.J. Res. 783. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.J. Res. 784. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.J. Res. 785. Joint resolution designating a navigation lock and water control structure of the central and southern Florida flood control project as the "W. P. Franklin lock and control structure"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.J. Res. 786. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the reprinting of Consumers All, the Yearbook of Agriculture, 1965; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.J. Res. 787. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation for the commemoration and observance of the millennium of the Polish nation in the calendar year 1966; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H. Con. Res. 526. Concurrent resolution to encourage all States to test newborn infants for phenylketonuria; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H. Res. 621. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE:

H. Res. 622. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation and study of the Office of Education; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause I of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 11831. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosalina Estrera Beltan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 11832. A bill for the relief of Castrense Valencia Mationg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 11833. A bill for the relief of Rev. Phillip Mayfield, Mrs. Wendy Joy Mayfield, and Miss Debra Kaye Mayfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 11834. A bill for the relief of Maria Mourkiotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 11835. A bill for the relief of Susan Lauchengco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 11836. A bill for the relief of Dr. Susumu Kuwayama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 11837. A bill for the relief of Cornelis De Hart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 11838. A bill for the relief of Teresa Pappalardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 11839. A bill for the relief of Christos Charakas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 11840. A bill for the relief of Norman N. Nilsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 11841. A bill for the relief of Czeslawa Jarosiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 11842. A bill for the relief of Hazel Ann Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 11843. A bill for the relief of Sumio Yasutake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 11844. A bill for the relief of Maria Guiseppina Innalfo Feole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 11845. A bill for the relief of Agostino, Antonina, Santi, and Concetta Greco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11846. A bill for the relief of Samuel Constantine Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11847. A bill for the relief of Calogero Governanti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11848. A bill for the relief of Gene R. Hugh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11849. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Carollo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11850. A bill for the relief of Marjorie Ackel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 11851. A bill for the relief of Christina Melak and Stanislaw Melak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 11852. A bill for the relief of Mr. Corrado Maucieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H.R. 11853. A bill for the relief of Elias Nassif Sacre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 11854. A bill for the relief of Devereen Moody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 11855. A bill for the relief of George Panourgias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 11856. A bill for the relief of Satya Paul, Suchitra, Rohid, and Rashmi Khanna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

285. By Mr. MOORE: Petition of West Virginia Wildlife Federation at its annual statewide conference on September 11, 1965, regarding recreational development in West Virginia; to the Committee on Public Works.

286. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Department of Massachusetts Marine Corps League, Westfield, Mass., relative to support of the policy of the United States in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach to the Banquet Honoring the 85th Anniversary of the Polish National Alliance in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday a huge gathering of Chicagoans who assembled to honor the Polish National Alliance on its 85th anniversary had the distinguished privilege of hearing Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach join in the tribute.

Attorney General Katzenbach's address was received with a tremendous ovation; and I should like to share his remarks with my colleagues today.

I believe Mr. Katzenbach's inspiring message belongs among the great speeches of our time. It is for this reason that I am including it into the Record today.

Mr. Katzenbach's remarks follow:

Address by Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach Before the Polish National Alliance, 85th Anniversary Dinner, Hotel Sherman, Chicago, Sunday, October 17, 1965

President Rozmarek, Governor Kerner, Mayor Daley, ladies and gentlemen, it is always a pleasure for me to come to Chicago for any reason. As you may know, I taught here for 4 years before going to Washington and returning here is very much like coming home.

But it is a particular pleasure to come to Chicago to address such a distinguished and resourceful organization. I say resourceful because who else but a Polish group could bring together in such good spirit Governor Kerner, a Bohemian; Mayor Daley, a Hibernian; and myself, a Bavarian.

Our attention has been drawn in recent weeks by the end of a remarkable baseball season. The win streaks, the clutch pitching, and the close finishes in both the regular season and in the World Series have heightened our taste for statistics, records, and box scores.

While not much of this appetite could relate to the Washington Senators, it does, however, most certainly apply to the Congressmen and Senators still at work in Washington—and to President Johnson, who has in the past year put himself in the record book as the man with the highest batting average in the history of legislation.

At least that is the way President Johnson's accomplishments are often presented—on what the columnists call his box score of major legislation. One count of legislation shows that he has secured 38 priority items on his legislative agenda. Another count, of general legislation urged by the administration, shows that the President's record in the win column is 101 new laws.

Such a statistical approach to the legislative program is certainly justified. These victories include old measures, which had been sought repeatedly and unsuccessfully, and include creative, even startling new measures. They include bills on which he mustered overwhelming majorities; they also include very close votes on which he has shown the fruit of legislative skills honed for 30 years. In the baseball metaphor, he has thus broken records both for home runs and for clutch hitting.

Nevertheless, without any disrespect for the sport, this isn't baseball. The significance of President Johnson's performance is not so much that it demonstrates his mastery of the art of government. The significance, rather, is the content of all those bills—content that will mark the 1st session of the 89th Congress as the most important legislative session in our history.

I would be happy to have that taken as a plug for three distinguished Democratic Congressmen—John Kluczynski, Dan Rostenkowski, and Roman Pucinski.

What the legislation of the 89th Congress will mean to the lives and future of American citizens will be remembered long after the scorecard is gone. It is on such ground, of substance rather than technique, that the President and our generation will be gaged by history.

Think of medicare, a measure that will often mean the difference between fear and assurance—indeed, the difference between life and death to 19 million Americans, a 10th of our population, not to mention the millions more young people relieved by medicare of unpredictable burdens they could not bear.

Perhaps no measure could have more sweeping impact on our personal security, yet perhaps no measure has been more effectively obscured by the language of legislative gamesmanship. Too often our attention has been diverted by strategy rather than substance.

Similarly, are we thinking too little of the impact of other major bills. This year's Housing Act is another example. Federally supported public housing projects need no longer look or feel like fortresses. The public housing of the future, under legislation the President signed in August, will be scattered in smaller, less visible units.

Through the innovation of direct rent supplements, public housing will not need to herd its tenants, like victims, into ghettos of despair, but will offer a more flexible support, sufficient to bring our needy back into society.

A triumph in legislation: yes; but much more important, for you and me, a bold step toward restoring the vital social and economic diversity of our city neighborhoods.

On the subject of the President's highway beautification bill, what we still hear most about is the bout with the lobbyists and the President's predawn victory. In future years, however, we will discover its real meaning when we notice that the commercials will be taken out of driving.

In the same way, the headlines concerning the National Arts Foundation so far have focused on the absence of celebrated figures from a White House ceremony. But it is not that minor tempest which is important. The significance of the creation of this foundation will be better documented when a talented boy receives a grant to develop his musical gift; when we recognize this as the historic moment when, for the first time, the United States committed public support to the creative quality of our society.

Within my own area of responsibility, also, Congress has enacted legislation of far-reaching importance. I am particularly proud of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which honors a principle that was first established in this country—even before the landing of the Pilgrims—by Poles.

The "gentlemen adventurers" and fortune seekers who had come with Capt. John Smith from England to Jamestown, Va., were no match for the rugged job of clearing the land and building a colony out of the wilderness. The reinforcements that Smith desperately sought from his backers in England—the handful to whom Smith later gave credit for saving the colony—were not Englishmen at all. Their names were Lowicki, Stefanski, Mata, Bogdan, Zrenica, and Sadowski.

A few years after their arrival when Virginia's Governor authorized the election of the first legislative body in America, he declared that only natives of England would vote. The same handful of Polish artisans dropped their tools and declared indignantly, "No vote, no work."

The first strike in the New World successfully established the principle of full suffrage. The records of the Virginia colony note that "upon some dispute of the Polonians, it was agreed that they shall be enfranchised and made as free as any inhabitant whatsoever." As far as I know, no Polish American's right to vote was ever challenged on the grounds of nationality after the year 1619.

Some 251 years later and some 95 years ago, the 15th amendment to the Constitution established that America's Negroes should not be denied this same right to vote. Yet even after the 15th amendment, and after the civil rights legislation of 1957, 1960, and 1964—two-thirds—or 2.2 million—of the Negroes of voting age in the South were not registered.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 makes into law our promise that they can register and vote freely.

Under the act we have sued to abolish all poll taxes—an irrelevant and discriminatory requirement that one buy an American birthright. More important, the Voting Rights Act has suspended literacy and character tests where they were used as devices of discrimination, and we have sent Federal examiners so far to 20 counties where officials have not obeyed the law.

In the future, as in the past, where local authorities refuse to meet their responsibilities under the act, we shall meet ours.

The Voting Rights Act is one of many new expressions by the 89th Congress of our belief that the test of a democratic society's vitality is not the prosperity it offers to most of its citizens, but the promise it offers to all.

Also within my area of responsibility, we have begun to develop effective and creative weapons against crime. In addition to the commission now at work evaluating the workings of our entire administration of criminal justice, Congress has enacted several warmly promising anticrime programs.

Just 3 weeks ago, President Johnson signed into law the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, which opens a new avenue of Federal leadership and assistance to embattled local police, courts, and correctional officials.

And the new Prisoner Rehabilitation Act, designed to help make productive citizens rather than repeaters out of Federal inmates, goes into effect tomorrow when the first prisoner will be released from full-time custody in order to work at an outside job—thus gaining work skills, self-respect, and social confidence.

As the President observed recently:

"We labor for that day when every man can satisfy his basic needs and those of his family; when every child has a chance to develop his mind and enlarge his spirit to the limits of his being; when the slow killers—want, ignorance, and prejudice—are finally contained. But if we reach that day and still walk in terror through the public streets, our labors will have been futile. The control of crime is a major target of this administration."

Whatever the importance of all these measures, however, none is more fundamental and none is more significant than those President Johnson and this Congress have made in the direction of improving the level of education in America.

Your own dedication to the goals of education—expressed in your generous support of Alliance College and in your guardianship of a proud cultural tradition—set an example for the Nation. Yet clearly the energy of private institutions like Alliance College and hundreds of our older universities, and even the resources of our locally supported schools, have not been enough.

Education until very recently has been a stepchild of the richest nation in the world. Booming American communities have blithely ignored the irony, as President Kennedy defined it, of "paying those to whom they entrust the minds of their children a smaller wage than is paid to those to whom they entrust their plumbing."

A principal factor in all our domestic problems, whether unemployment or racial unrest or crime or poverty, is the deficiency of our educational system. None of our problems can be separated from education; indeed, perhaps all of them can be solved, in part at least, through education.

Last week, Gardner Ackley, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, reported on economic studies which show that the largest single factor in our past growth in labor productivity was not the increase in invested capital per worker; it was not improved technology. It was the improved educational level of our labor force. At the same time, the penalty for lack of education becomes steadily more severe.

Our present unemployment figure is low, yet there are still some 4 million Americans seeking employment and unable to find it. As our society becomes more complex, their search becomes harder—unless we act militantly and promptly to improve the level of education—offered in our cities and towns.

A recent business survey disclosed that many companies now will not hire persons even for assembly line jobs unless they have high school diplomas. The companies are willing to pay more, but they want better workers.

The rate of unemployment among those who have graduated from college is 1.4 percent. The unemployment rate among those who did not finish high school is six times higher—8.1 percent.

At present, automation is eliminating more than 4,000 jobs a day—precisely the kind of jobs which unskilled or semiskilled people can fill. Approximately 10 percent of the work force today is employed in unskilled jobs. By 1970, the figure will be down to 5 percent.

In short, a more direct relationship between education and unemployment exists in modern America than ever before. A very real cycle of ignorance and poverty is at work throughout our country.

The education acts which the 89th Congress is enacting can help break this cycle. The use in poorer districts of supplementary Federal funds from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the availability of banks of new teaching tools, and the enthusiasm of roving National Teacher Corpsmen through the Higher Education Act can help us to make all our schools superior.

There is one further legislative accomplishment I would like to talk about tonight—one which has particular relevance to this organization—the administration's Immigration Reform Act.

The bill President Johnson signed 2 weeks ago in the wind and sunshine at the foot of the Statue of Liberty is not the most radical legislation this Congress has passed. It will not greatly increase the number of immigrants to America. But it will affirm in law what we believe in spirit: that this country judges men individually on their merits, not on their religion, color, or national origin; that this country was built by men and women from all the nations of the world and that we still value that truth for the future; that we are interested in the spirit in which men and women come here, not in the identity of the country they come from.

For 40 years, we knew that the national origins system was cruel in practice and wrong in spirit. Now at last, we have abolished its unworthy proclamation—that individual worth could somehow be established by quotas; that the contribution Polish immigrants could make to this country could somehow be specified mechanically at 6,488 persons each year.

To the members of the Polish National Alliance, we all owe a debt of gratitude, not only for the very practical support that you rallied on behalf of the Immigration Act in Congress this year, but even more for your faith, through many reversals, that America would finally repudiate a policy that denied our history and our ideals.

You have confronted and prevailed over the prejudice that brands and deprives a man on the basis of his name, or his origin, or his color. At the same time, this organization evidences the richness of diversity in our population.

You have shown that this society can be tolerant and open without being homogenized. You have shown that this country's valid differences of culture and identity need not be nursed by hate or walled around by artificial barriers.

The same hostility to such artificial barriers that inspired the Immigration Act also impelled passage of the Voting Rights Act and is at work in every part of President Johnson's program.

You have won a place of leadership in the fight against those barriers, and I know that you will not relinquish that place as long as the fight goes on.

Statement on Behalf of Bernard L. Boutin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. OLIVA HUOT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago President Johnson nominated Mr. Bernard L. Boutin to become the Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, an extremely important and sensitive post in the war on poverty. The strongest testimony to Mr. Boutin's qualifications is the fact that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee did not require hearings before approving his nomination. For this reason, I was unable to testify on behalf of my longtime friend. I therefore place in the RECORD, the statement I had prepared on his behalf:

> Mr. Chairman, my name is J. OLIVA HUOT, Congressman from the 1st Congressional District of New Hampshire.
>
> It is a distinct privilege and honor for me to appear before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee in support of the nomination of my longtime friend, Bernard L. Boutin, as Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.
>
> When I served on the school board in the city of Laconia, N.H., Bernard Boutin was the mayor. This gave me an excellent opportunity to observe closely the outstanding administrative ability and selfless devotion to public service that are the hallmarks of this man.
>
> From the mayor of Laconia, Bernard Boutin was picked by the late President John F. Kennedy to become the Administrator of the General Services Administration. This was a remarkable jump—from mayor of a city of 15,000 to management of a billion-dollar agency. Yet, I have heard nothing but praise and admiration for the job he did—both from those who served under him and those who were affected by the activities of GSA.
>
> More recently, as executive vice president of the National Association of Home Builders, his guidance and leadership significantly contributed to the passage of the housing bill of 1965 and the bill to establish the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs.
>
> Bernard Boutin is unquestionably qualified for this job. He is also unquestionably devoted to service of his country and particularly aware and sensitive to the acute human problems with which he will be dealing.
>
> The people of New Hampshire are justifiably proud of Bernard Boutin. I am proud of him and I know that as Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity the entire country will be equally proud.
>
> I urge speedy confirmation of this outstanding appointment.

Report on 1st Session, 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 89th Congress is nearly at an end and I intend at this time to summarize the important legislative accomplishments that Congress has made in the last 10 months.

Naturally, I cannot include every bill enacted into law this year, but I do want to take note of the legislation now on the statute books that is important nationally and to the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa.

Some bills have passed either the House or the Senate, but not both, and may receive final approval next year. However, I am including in this summary only the legislation that passed both Houses and was signed into law by the President.

This has been one of the most productive sessions of Congress in history, although many of the proposals enacted into law this year have been pending for several years.

A summary of congressional activities this year should be of interest to all citizens, and I plan to reprint these remarks at my own expense and mail them out to the people of the Fourth District.

It is important to note that many of the laws passed this year, while of long-range significance, will not go into effect immediately. One of the major tasks of Congress next year, and in the years following, will be to check closely to see that these new laws are carefully and efficiently administered.

AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The Food and Agriculture Act extends the voluntary feed grains program through 1969, continues other Government farm programs and provides for a cropland adjustment program designed to take about 40 million acres out of production. The administration originally recommended only a 2-year extension of the feed grains program, which was due to expire this year. However, the House Committee on Agriculture, of which I was a member, revised the bill to provide for a 4-year extension and this was approved by Congress as a whole. The feed grains program has stimulated the Fourth District economy, both rural and urban. During the 1964 crop year, for example, the program brought more than $25 million in price support payments to the farmers of the district and has improved the economy of every city and town.

Congress also passed emergency legislation to aid some farmers who signed up for the 1965 feed grains program. After the heavy spring floods in Iowa, I introduced a bill providing that farmers under the program would not lose price-support payments if floods kept them from planting their corn in time, and a modified version of this bill, the first introduced in Congress, later became law.

Congress established a new program under the Farmers Home Administration to assist rural communities of 5,500 population or less in constructing sewer and water facilities. This law, a modified version of legislation I introduced in May, provides for Federal grants to cover up to 50 percent of the local project cost, and also expands the authorization for loans by the Farmers Home Administration to aid rural areas.

Congress provided funds to continue the food stamp program under the Department of Agriculture. The program, operated in cooperation with regular retail and wholesale outlets, is designed to help low-income families increase their food consumption. It was expanded this year to include Appanoose, Lucas, and Wayne Counties, marking the first time any area in Iowa has participated.

EDUCATION

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act authorizes a 3-year program of Federal aid to local school districts to finance special education programs for pupils from low-income families. The funds will be distributed according to a formula taking into account the number of low-income pupils within the school district. The allocation to the Fourth District for the 1965–66 school year totals about $2.8 million.

The Higher Education Act provides for loans and scholarships to college students, grants for construction of classrooms and laboratories, expansion of the college work-study program to aid low-income students, assistance to college libraries for purchasing books and other materials and establishes a National Teachers Corps to aid local school districts with a high concentration of low-income families. According to preliminary estimates, Iowa is to receive a total of nearly $8.5 million under first-year authorizations in the law. The final amount, however, will depend on appropriations made later.

HEALTH AND MEDICAL

The Social Security Amendments of 1965 provide for two related health insurance programs for persons 65 or older. The basic program, under the social security system, offers hospitalization benefits to the elderly beginning July 1, 1966, and benefits for care in hospital-related nursing homes effective January 1, 1967. The supplemental program provides for a voluntary health insurance plan, effective July 1, 1966, to cover the cost of physicians' fees and other services. Most of the cost of the basic program will be financed by an increase in socal security taxes. Those enrolling under the supplemental plan will pay a $3 monthly premium, matched by an equal contribution from the Federal Government.

The same law provides for a 7-percent, across-the-board cost-of-living increase in social security benefits retroactive to January 1, 1965, and also for increased payments under Federal-State assistance programs for the blind, disabled and others.

It is estimated that about 55,000 persons in the Fourth District will be eligible under the basic health insurance program, and that benefit payments will total about $3 million from July through December 1966, and about $6 million during 1967. Benefit payments under the voluntary plan are estimated at about $1 million for July through December 1966, and at about $3 million for 1967. The increase in social security benefits, according to current estimates, will bring an additional $5 million to the Fourth District in 1966, and an additional $6 million in 1967.

Congress authorized a 3-year program for matching grants for the planning, establishment and operation of regional medical programs to combat heart disease, cancer and stroke. The program is designed to link medical schools with local hospitals, clinics and physicians to provide a more effective flow of information on diagnosis and treatment of these diseases, which cause more than 70 percent of the deaths annually in the United States.

Congress extended for 5 years the Community Health Services Act, which authorizes grants to States and local communities for mass immunization programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and measles.

The Drug Abuse Control Act prohibits the illegitimate sale and distribution of depressant and stimulant drugs, which can be harmful to health, and fixes strict penalties for offenses involving persons under 21.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The Public Works and Economic Development Act authorizes a program for grants, loans, and technical assistance to areas with chronic unemployment and economic growth problems. This program expands the Area Redevelopment Act, under which Appanoose and Monroe Counties were eligible for assistance, by adding provisions for regional economic development and aid for construction of public works facilities. Overall planning for the new program was put under a newly created Economic Development Administration.

The Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965 authorized expansion of the war-on-poverty program. Among other things, the new law extends through August 20, 1967, the 90-percent Federal contribution to local community action programs. It also directs the Office of Economic Opportunity to take measures insuring that antipoverty funds are equitably distributed between rural and urban areas.

HOUSING AND TRANSPORTATION

The Housing and Urban Development Act expands and extends programs for public housing, urban renewal, FHA insured home loans, construction of college housing, as well as authorizing matching grants for urban water and sewer projects.

This law contains an amendment, which I offered on the floor of the House, to make the Marina Gateway urban renewal project in Ottumwa eligible for noncash grant-in-aid credit for city-financed flood control work. This credit will offset the local cost of the Marina Gateway project and result in a substantial property tax savings to the people in the city of Ottumwa.

Congress increased from $2.9 to $3 billion the amount authorized for the Interstate Highway System during fiscal year 1967. With this increase, it is hoped that the presently planned Interstate System can be completed in the next 5 years.

Congress authorized a 3-year program of research and demonstration projects for the development of high-speed, intercity railroad transportation.

BUSINESS AND FINANCE

The Excise Tax Reduction Act cut Federal excise taxes by about $4.6 billion annually through repealing or reducing levies on such items as telephone service, automobiles, household appliances, and others. Tax cuts on many items went into effect on July 1, 1965, and there will be a gradual reduction on other taxes over the period ending January 1, 1969. It is estimated that Iowa will receive $47 million in excise tax reductions in 1966.

The State Technical Services Act establishes a new 3-year program of matching grants to the States for assistance in programs to provide local business and industry with the latest scientific and technological information. The law is aimed at giving businessmen assistance in the same fashion as the Agriculture Extension Service aids the farmer.

The Coinage Act eliminates silver from dimes and quarters and cuts the amount of silver in half dollars to 40 percent. This law was needed to free more silver for industrial uses and to permit expansion of the coin supply.

Congress repealed the requirement that 25 percent in gold reserves be held against deposits in the Federal Reserve System in order to free more gold for the United States to meet its foreign claims on the dollar, part of the balance-of-payments problem. The law does not affect gold reserves held against Federal Reserve notes, the major form of U.S. currency.

Congress increased by $120 million the amount the Small Business Administration may lend to small business investment corporations and to State and local development firms.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The Voting Rights Act was passed to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution, which declares that the right to vote shall not be abridged on account of race. The new law prohibits restrictive regulations on voting, and authorized the use of Federal examiners in areas where there is evidence of discrimination against qualified voters.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Congress extended for 3 years the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the research arm of the Government in searching for new methods to promote peace, and authorized $30 million annually to finance its operations.

The Immigration and Nationality Act abolishes the national origins quota system, as of July 1, 1968, and establishes a new policy under which persons are admitted to the United States on the basis of their skills and professional abilities. It fixes an annual ceiling of 170,000 immigrants from outside the Western Hemisphere and an annual limit of 120,000 on immigration from Western Hemisphere countries.

The Foreign Assistance Act extends for 1 year the U.S. program for foreign economic and military aid. Included is a provision terminating aid to any nation failing to take preventive action against destruction of American property.

Congress authorized $115 million to finance operations of the Peace Corps during the 1966 fiscal year. This law will expand the program so that about 15,000 Peace Corps volunteers will be serving abroad next year.

GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

Congress authorized a new Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development to deal more effectively with problems affecting urban and suburban areas. It is the 11th Cabinet post created and the first since the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was established during the Eisenhower administration.

Congress approved and sent to the States for ratification a constitutional amendment on Presidential disability and continuity. It fixes procedures for the Vice President to serve as Acting President if the President cannot perform his duties, and for the filling of the office of Vice President if it falls vacant.

In the area of congressional reform, the House of Representatives adopted rule changes in January to facilitate consideration of legislation that otherwise might have remained buried in the Rules Committee. A joint House-Senate committee was also formed to make the first comprehensive study in 20 years on methods to streamline and improve the work of Congress.

Congress created an Administration on Aging as a coordinating center for information and service to State and local governments concerned with the problems of the elderly.

Congress made it a Federal crime to assassinate, kidnap, or assault the President, President-elect, Vice President, Vice-President-elect and other officers in line of succession. Formerly, these crimes were punishable only under State law.

LABOR

Congress extended for 3 years programs under the Manpower Training and Development Act, designed to provide the unemployed and underemployed with the skills needed for obtaining work in a more complex and automated economy.

Congress amended the Railroad Retirement Act by eliminating a provision that reduced annuities of spouses of retired employees eligible for social security benefits.

Congress amended the Landrum-Griffin Act by providing that a bond fully protecting union funds against loss due to fraud or dishonesty is sufficient, thus eliminating a requirement for excessive coverage that was causing unnecessary premium payments.

Congress approved a 3.6-percent pay raise for Federal employees, designed to bring Government salaries more in line with those paid by private business and industry. The House rejected a proposed pay boost for Congressmen.

CONSERVATION

The Water Quality Control Act strengthens the program to check pollution of streams and rivers and sets procedures for establishing uniform national standards on regulating water pollution. It also expands the Federal program for assistance to local communities in constructing sewage treatment plants.

Congress authorized a 4-year program to control air pollution caused by gasoline- and diesel-powered vehicles, and also authorized a research program for the disposal of solid wastes discarded by individuals and manufacturers.

The Federal Water Project Recreation Act fixes uniform policies for utilization of recreational facilities and fish and wildlife benefits at multi-purpose reservoirs.

Congress established a Federal Water Resources Council and a River Basin Commission to coordinate planning for maximum use of water resources and to assist States in such planning.

Congress authorized establishment of the Herbert Hoover National Historical Site at West Branch, Iowa, the birthplace of the 31st President.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Congress appropriated about $49 billion this session for defense purposes, but a Defense Department cost-reduction program, base closings, and other economy moves have kept the overall cost for defense about the same.

Congress appropriated an additional $700 million for the 1965 fiscal year for efforts against Communist aggression in Vietnam.

Congress approved a pay raise, averaging about 10.4 percent, for officers and enlisted men in the Armed Forces, and also provided for low-cost life insurance for servicemen on active duty.

Congress approved an increase in veterans' disability compensation to reflect the rise in living costs.

PUBLIC WORKS

Congress made public works appropriations and authorizations for several projects affecting the Fourth District.

A $15 million appropriation was made to continue work on the Red Rock Dam and Reservoir, now under construction on the Des Moines River between Knoxville and Pella. This project, which includes an 8,900-acre reservoir, is planned for completion in 1969.

A $6 million appropriation, the largest to date, was made for initial construction work on the Rathbun Dam and Reservoir, being built north of Centerville on the Chariton River. The 11,000-acre reservoir, which will cover portions of Appanoose, Lucas, Monroe, and Wayne Counties, will provide extensive recreational facilities and serve as an economic stimulus to south-central Iowa.

Congress authorized construction of a $3.1 million flood control project at Marshalltown to control high waters on the Iowa River and Linn Creek and also appropriated $50,000 for planning work on the project.

Congress also authorized construction of the $12.9 million Skunk River Dam and Reservoir north of Ames. This project will control flooding in the Skunk River Valley, which includes portions of Jasper, Marion, Mahaska, and Keokuk Counties.

A $40,000 appropriation was made for a comprehensive flood control survey in the Iowa and Cedar River Basins. Part of these funds will be used to study the possibility of flood prevention on the Cedar River near Vinton.

FEDERAL BUDGET

As always happens, Congress spent much of its time this session carefully scrutinizing appropriation requests submitted by the administration.

In some cases, where a genuine need was evident, Congress appropriated funds over and above the administration recommendation. On other items, Congress rejected or scaled down administration requests.

The funds appropriated by Congress are the maximum amount that can be spent. However, because of economy efforts within the Government and for a variety of other reasons, the expenditures actually made run below the funds appropriated by Congress.

This session, Congress appropriated about $1.5 billion less than requested by the administration. Excluding last-minute requests and appropriations, the overall status on appropriations at the close of the session is as follows:

Total administration requests	$103, 083, 378, 055
Total appropriated by Congress	101, 522, 219, 794
Total reduction by Congress	1, 561, 158, 261

The following table gives a detailed breakdown on these figures:

Appropriation bills, 89th Cong., 1st sess.

Title	Budget requests	Amount as passed (House)	Amount as passed (Senate)	Amount enacted
Agriculture, 1965 supplemental	$1, 742, 200, 000	$1, 600, 000, 000	$1, 600, 000, 000	$1, 600, 000, 000
District of Columbia	389, 346, 800	356, 300, 500	364, 350, 347	360, 228, 500
Interior	1, 270, 129, 500	1, 200, 090, 300	1, 246, 752, 770	1, 212, 739, 070
Treasury [1]	1, 219, 400, 000	1, 272, 252, 000	1, 304, 014, 000	1, 291, 239, 000
Post Office	5, 383, 000, 000	5, 313, 400, 000	5, 340, 850, 000	5, 324, 400, 000
Executive Office of President	15, 805, 000	15, 752, 000	15, 805, 000	15, 805, 000
Independent agencies	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000
2d supplemental, 1965	2, 226, 456, 933	2, 118, 033, 083	2, 257, 869, 415	2, 227, 563, 977
Defense supplemental, 1965	700, 000, 000	700, 000, 000	700, 000, 000	700, 000, 000
Labor	588, 144, 000	537, 460, 000	557, 607, 500	547, 607, 000
Related agencies	36, 867, 000	36, 825, 000	36, 825, 000	36, 825, 000
Health, Education, Welfare	7, 652, 014, 000	7, 323, 020, 000	7, 411, 940, 000	7, 410, 170, 000
Independent offices	14, 566, 023, 000	14, 109, 908, 000	14, 253, 364, 000	14, 246, 167, 800
Agriculture [3]	5, 815, 134, 000	5, 717, 832, 000	6, 711, 908, 800	[2] 6, 210, 000, 000
State	404, 210, 000	388, 202, 000	390, 125, 000	389, 602, 000
USIA	173, 249, 100	171, 871, 000	171, 617, 000	171, 617, 000
Justice	373, 834, 000	370, 819, 000	370, 919, 000	370, 869, 000
Judiciary	76, 616, 500	81, 111, 900	80, 693, 900	80, 693, 900
Commerce	937, 030, 000	889, 522, 000	851, 122, 900	856, 851, 250
Related agencies [4]	191, 547, 000	184, 164, 000	187, 734, 000	184, 814, 000
Legislative [5]	204, 872, 222	150, 589, 107	190, 840, 167	189, 993, 297
Defense	46, 948, 844, 000	46, 888, 244, 000	46, 877, 063, 000	46, 887, 163, 000
Public works [6]	4, 373, 805, 000	4, 241, 636, 500	4, 327, 589, 000	4, 292, 866, 500
Military construction	2, 049, 000, 000	1, 755, 496, 000	1, 759, 504, 000	1, 756, 635, 000
Labor—HEW supplemental, 1966 [7]	1, 553, 918, 000	1, 223, 181, 500	1, 407, 181, 500	1, 223, 181, 500
Foreign aid	4, 188, 923, 000	4, 001, 453, 000	3, 857, 188, 000	3, 932, 188, 000
Total [8]	103, 083, 378, 055	100, 650, 161, 890	102, 275, 864, 299	101, 522, 219, 794

[1] Does not include permanent appropriations for debt service, tax refunds, trust fund payments, etc.

[2] Estimated and includes several hundred million dollars for CCC that will not be spent this year.

[3] Includes credit agencies and corporations (Rural Electrification Administration, Farmers Home Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation, etc.) and special functions and programs, such as school lunches, foreign assistance, etc.

[4] Includes Small Business Administration, Civil Rights Commission, Maritime Commission, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Tariff Commission, and U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

[5] Includes funds for Architect of the Capitol, Library of Congress, Government Printing Office, Botanic Gardens, joint committees, in addition to the House of Representatives. Appropriations for the Senate added there.

[6] Includes funds for Atomic Energy Commission, Army Engineers' projects for navigation improvements and flood control, Tennessee Valley Authority, Bureau of Reclamation and power agencies of the Interior Department, Panama Canal, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and Delaware River Basin Commission.

[7] Includes funds to finance elementary and secondary school programs, medical centers for heart disease, cancer and stroke, and manpower development program.

[8] Does not include last minute supplementals for the newly passed education and other bills.

Lowering the School Age for American Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to address the National Education Association in Chicago on Sunday, October 17, and I took the opportunity to suggest a seven-point program through which I believe the cause of American education may be considerably advanced.

It is my firm belief that our Nation must not stop with the considerable progress which has already been achieved in education in the last few years. Because of the urgent demands being made upon our system of education by the rapidly expanding population, we must revise our traditional ways of thinking and give serious thought to investigating new paths.

We have no more urgent domestic problem before us and I believe it is incumbent upon all Americans to turn their attention to increasing and stimulating educational opportunities for the Nation's children.

In the words of a great American of a century ago:

> It was in making education not only common to all, but in some sense compulsory on all, that the destiny of the free Republics of America was practically settled.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks follow:

Remarks of U.S. Representative Roman C. Pucinski to National Education Association, Chicago, Ill., October 17, 1965

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am sure that when the program chairman assigned tonight's title to me as a guideline for my remarks to this distinguished audience, he did not anticipate the celebrated "Keppel affair" in the city of Chicago which involved the withholding of some $30 million of Federal aid to education from this city.

And I hasten to add that until the Keppel affair, I was somewhat hard pressed to crystallize my own thinking for tonight's remarks.

The paramount question which arises from this dispute is what role is the Federal Government to assume in providing such aid?

There can be no question that the Federal Government must come to the assistance of the hard-pressed local communities if we are to meet the challenges of our mid-20th century education needs. Those who argue against Federal aid to education programs on the grounds that Federal aid means Federal control are missing the mark.

Federal aid will mean Federal control only if local communities forfeit their responsibility of unyielding vigilance to insure that the Federal Government is, at best, only a partner in the educational venture, but never its master.

This organization, the National Education Association, must share in the responsibility of such vigilance. This organization has been in the forefront in support of the various programs enacted by Congress, but with this support comes a responsibility which is awesome indeed.

You, as educators, must continue to pave the way toward a strong partnership between the Federal Government and local communities in the educational venture. Yet your voice was conspicuous by its silence in failing to join in a strong repudiation of the so-called Keppel affair here in Chicago and its nationwide implications.

We in the Congress have charted a new course in Federal aid to education; a course long overdue and one which holds our great promise for millions of American children attending public schools. We charted this course with a solemn pledge to the American people that Federal aid would not mean Federal control of the educational institution.

This pledge was made by the Members of Congress and reaffirmed by the President himself when signing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act into law.

Yet, literally before the ink was dry, the Office of Education, in a completely arbitrary and capricious manner, cut off the funds to Chicago's school on a vague charge that there was a possible violation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

Now, mark carefully what I am saying: No one questions the right of the Federal Government to cut off funds for any program in which the evils of discrimination deny recipients complete equality.

The majority of Congress clearly stated in title VI of the Civil Rights Act that "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

I unequivocally support this doctrine.

But this was not the issue in the dispute with the Office of Education. Indeed, if the Chicago school system violated the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act, this city's funds should be withheld as they would be in any other city guilty of a similar offense.

In title VI, however, the Congress very carefully laid down the procedures to be followed by the Federal Government in cutting off funds for violations of the Civil Rights concept. The Congress went to great pains to spell out these detailed procedures specifically to preclude the very kind of arbitrary action taken against Chicago.

The issue, then, is whether or not steps provided by Congress for such a denial of funds will be carried out by the Office of Education or whether these steps can be completely ignored and funds cut off without informing the community of the specific nature of the complaint.

I believe Commissioner Keppel is to be congratulated for reversing this decision. It takes a great man to admit a mistake. More important, by reversing his Department's position and releasing the funds—at least until such time as an investigation is completed—Commissioner Keppel has reaffirmed President Johnson's solemn pledge that Federal aid will not mean Federal control.

It is perhaps fortunate that the Keppel affair occurred. It is my hope that this incident will help clear the air and reassure the Federal bureaucracy that both the Congress and the President were not engaging in mere lipservice to the cause of community responsibility for these programs.

This dispute graphically demonstrated to local communities that while they should be encouraged to accept Federal assistance, they must be ever ready to oppose with all of their vigor, Federal control.

I believe this partnership between the Federal Government and local government is absolutely necessary if our youngsters are to obtain the education they need in today's world. It has been said that human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe. It is my hope that those who have opposed Federal aid will now join with us in perfecting the machinery of implementation of that aid to insure that Federal aid does not mean concomitant Federal control.

The job ahead of us is monumental. In order to meet the requirements of title VI, we must face up to the fact that we cannot continue to give millions of youngsters in minority groups a second-class education. As chairman of a task force now studying the school system in Washington, D.C., I can tell you that there are those in the education community who too often fail to meet the needs of these minority groups on the completely specious and indefensible theory that because their home environment is bad; because their study habits are bad; and because they are culturally deprived, we ought just to tolerate them until they reach the age of 16 and then push them out of our educational complex.

I say this attitude is completely indefensible because in this great day of economic opportunity, no youngster—black, yellow, or white—should be denied an opportunity to develop his talents to the full. We need each of these children and we need them as productive Americans.

I am mindful of the extent to which this problem is complicated by de facto segregation and I should like to suggest some steps to improve this situation in peripheral areas of America's urban communities.

You cannot have an integrated school without white students and nonwhite students. The fact of the matter is that in city after city, including Washington, areas may shift virtually overnight from a segregated, all-white community, to a segregated, nonwhite community.

It is an indisputable fact of our time, rightly or wrongly, that a vast segment of our white population fears that integration means a reduction in educational standards in the local schools. Tragically, in too many instances, this fear is founded on facts.

I have proposed to Commissioner Keppel that he lead the way in suggesting to school administrators that some of the Federal funds available for education programs be used to develop highly motivated educational task forces that could be sent into schools about to be integrated.

Such task forces would include extra teachers, special teachers, counselors, and all the other instruments that we need to maintain the high standards of quality in an educational institution, so that parents who too often flee a neighborhood the moment they hear the word "integration" would have their fears alleviated and be assured that there will not be any reduction in the quality of education in the local schools.

On the contrary, they would be reassured that the quality of education actually would be upgraded.

The greatest problems we must overcome in these changing communities are failure to understand facts and panic. I submit that the schools can become the catalyst for holding together a changing community and this can be done by strongly reassuring the residents of a community that educational opportunity will remain at the highest standard.

We have funds for such programs now. It is my hope that local schools administrators will not delay in organizing these educational task forces to supplement improvements in educational methods otherwise provided for in titles I, II, and III of the Aid to Education Act.

Assuring neighborhoods of continuity in educational progress is not enough, however. It is my hope that the Federal Housing Administration will make loan insurance available to these changing areas, particularly to young families—both white and nonwhite—who want to replace the normal attrition rate in a changing community.

I know of nothing that changes an integrating community faster than the failure of conventional lending institutions to make money available for mortgages. In our country about 20 percent of our population moves every 12 months for various reasons. Not all moving in changing areas is caused by a fear of integration. People die; they retire and move in with their children or to new neighborhoods; they move because of changing jobs.

There are many reasons why they move and many of them have nothing whatever to do with fear of integration. A problem, however, frequently arises when new families try to move into homes being vacated by old families in a changing community.

I believe the time has come when the Federal Housing Administration—through its mortgage insurance program—must provide sources of financing for home purchases in these changing communities.

There are thousands upon thousands of young white couples that have no objection to buying a home in an integrated community, but cannot do so because of the freeze put on mortgages by conventional lenders.

There are thousands upon thousands of young nonwhite couples who want to purchase a home in a changing community and maintain the property in its traditional high standards—perhaps improve it. They, too, are victims of a financing ban and too often must enlist the help of several families in order to pool their resources for housing originally intended for single-family residence.

As educators, you must take a more than passing interest in this problem. The great breakthroughs in understanding must first come in these peripheral areas. When it can be shown that capacity for intelligence is not measured by the color of one's skin or his religious beliefs or his ethnic background, we will have taken a giant stride forward in the history of civilization. We need your voices, your talents constantly reminding us of our potential for growth.

So much for the changing areas. We also must ask ourselves what more can the Federal Government do in the low-income areas of our country—usually the nonwhite areas of our large cities—which for years have been sadly neglected in the educational process for lack of sufficient motivation.

We have already appropriated a $1.5 billion Federal program of aid to low-income groups. This tremendous effort from the Federal Government will make an impressive contribution, in my judgment, toward upgrading the quality of education in these low-income community schools.

Title I of the Federal Aid to Education Act provides great promise for children who heretofore have been denied the tools with which to overcome the shortcomings in learning capacities with which they may be afflicted.

I am proud to have played a role—a key role—in the formulation of this program of Federal aid to low-income communities. I might add here that some of you who were in Washington during the great debate on this bill recall how hard the Office of Education protested my amendment to have title I apply not only to youngsters of families with an average income under $2,000, but also to all youngsters receiving some form of public assistance.

I am happy to tell you that we carried the amendment despite great objections from the Office of Education, and, as a result, the State of Illinois, as an example, will receive $61 million of Federal aid under title I, instead of the $31 million proposed under the original bill.

In order to do an even better job in these low-income communities, I believe we should enact as quickly as possible a proposal I submitted to provide an additional 2 months' salary to local school districts to pay teachers who will devote the summer months to teaching in schools receiving title I assistance.

It is a tragedy of our time that those youngsters most desperately in need of expert educational guidance are daily forced to receive their education, in too many instances, from the least experienced teacher.

You and I know that because of the seniority system the best teachers, the most experienced teachers, and those highest on the seniority ladder, too often avoid accepting assignments in these poverty areas.

You and I also know that those teachers with advanced degrees, for perfectly obvious reasons, often transfer into those school areas with the highest scholastic standards.

I have proposed that as an inducement to our more experienced and better-trained teachers, we pay them a full 12-month salary instead of the present 10-month salary. It is my firm conviction that by providing a 12-month salary base in these areas, we would attract more men into the teaching profession, for we know that the male teacher is extremely important in these low-income areas where often the teacher in the classroom provides the male symbol which is lacking in the broken home.

A school administrator, under my proposal, could if he wished, use part of this additional Federal money to provide teachers in poverty areas with up to a 1-month paid vacation as an added inducement to bring these highly qualified teachers to these areas of special need.

I believe this and existing programs would go a long way in helping upgrade the educational standards and help motivate youngsters in those low-income areas.

I have also proposed that under the poverty program, we make funds available to the schools to set up a Classroom Aid Corps—not to be confused with the President's National Teacher Corps—which would permit school administrators to hire retired, qualified older people—perhaps even including retired teachers—and possibly college students seeking part-time employment as Classroom Aids.

These people would relieve teachers of such tasks as monitoring lunchrooms and assembly halls and much of the clerical work that is of an impersonal nature. Classroom aids could also be used to maintain normal order in the classroom, to enable the individual teacher to provide individual assistance to his or her students.

I believe that one of the great tragedies of America is that we have burdened our teachers with so many extracurricular obligations and paperwork that less and less are they able to devote their time to that profession in which they excel—the instruction of our children.

It would be my hope that the Classroom Aid Corps would be used in all American communities, wherever needed, and not be limited solely to low-income areas.

We must be careful in this great venture in education against becoming so obsessed with the problems of the poor that we ignore the problems of the rest of America's educational communities.

I hope that under title III we will develop the special educational centers as quickly as possible so that all the youngsters of a given community—whether attending public or private schools—could receive the compensatory education which they need at these centers.

I believe these special educational centers can constitute one of the most significant academic achievements in the history of this country. These centers can be of significant value to the so-called late bloomers who too often get lost in the shuffle of track systems and other ability groupings.

Finally, we who are charged with the responsibility of recognizing the educational needs of America's children cannot ignore the profound contribution which our private school system makes to this education process.

Title III permits experiments in shared-time proposals which I believe hold out great promise for building a bridge—a constitutional bridge—between the public schools and the private schools.

It has also been my hope that parents who choose to send their youngsters to a church-related school should be permitted, through the tuition paid toward the maintenance of that private system, a tax credit just as they would for any other religious contribution.

I trust that my remarks here this evening will be able to stimulate further discussion on this urgent problem of meeting our greatest educational needs. In closing, let me submit for you here this evening a concept which I think is long overdue and, frankly, inevitable.

After serving on the House Education Committee for the past 7 years and participating in exhaustive and intensely rewarding studies, I have come to the conclusion that the time has come when we must abandon the completely arbitrary concept that children should enter kindergarten at the age of 5 and first grade at the age of 6.

The only way that I believe we can solve the dropout problem is to start in earliest childhood to capture the imagination of these children and interest them in the learning process. I submit for your consideration my proposal that we enter youngsters in our kindergartens at the age of 3 and have them commence their first-grade experience at the age of 4.

Every youngster in this country would thus complete his high school education at the age of 16. He would then decide whether they wanted to go into vocational training programs for the next 2 years or go on to college.

One of the most successful programs this past summer in the war on poverty has been Operation Head Start. We appropriated vast sums of money to sustain the theory that too often it is too late to reorient a child by the time he or she enters first grade. If this is true for children in poverty areas, why isn't it also true in every community in America?

I feel very strongly that we would be developing a much more alert and better prepared generation of youngsters if we started them in their formal school experience earlier than we do now.

The Federal Government is concerned with the problem of expanding the educational opportunities of every child in America. We are committed to this program and we need and urgently require the help of State and local governments, and knowledgeable educators, to implement our ideas into flexible, workable programs. Yet, the local communities in America must remain alert to the fact that there are those in Washington who think they can do the job better. It is up to you to see to it that this program remains out of the hands of the bureaucrats and in the hands of people who are best able to determine their community's needs in the area of education. You, more than anyone, know best what Dr. Conant meant when he said:

"The primary concern of American education today is not the development of the appreciation of the 'good life' * * *. Our purpose is to cultivate in the largest possible number of our future citizens an appreciation of both the responsibilities and the benefits which come to them because they are Americans and are free."

Gen. Robert E. Wood Warns Against Release of Panama Canal Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Robert E. Wood, who resides in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois, is one of the most honored Americans of our time.

As a young Army engineer, he served for more than 10 years in the Canal Zone between March 1905 and May 1915 as chief quartermaster and director of the Panama Railroad Company in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal. General Wood knows something of the hardship, the sacrifice, and the individual effort, genius, and investment of our Nation which led to the successful completion of the Panama Canal.

It is common knowledge that others had failed before our Nation succeeded. It is also common knowledge that the entire world has benefited from the economic, defense, and political advantages which have flowed from this great engineering accomplishment. Certainly, General Wood knows a great deal about the Canal Zone and the formal treaty and relationships which have existed since the canal was first opened in 1915.

As my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] as well as my colleague, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] have declared in such articulate fashion, any decision to abandon our national control of the Panama Canal should be resisted. My friend, General Wood, has written to me that he "Hopes the President will not do what was stated in the press."

He wrote further:

> It may be all right to make some minor concessions on payments, but we have been more than generous to Panama; and if we allow the Panamanians any share whatever in the operations and administration of the canal itself, it will be a disaster.

Mr. Speaker, I call these observations to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and to the President and others in the executive department as knowledgeable statements emanating from one who served our Nation in the Canal Zone during the long years when the Panama Canal was transformed from jungle, rock, and water into a gateway joining the Atlantic and the Pacific. I hope that the words and recommendations of General Wood will be considered carefully and heeded faithfully in any decisions affecting our national interests and the interests of the free world with respect to future ownership, management, and control of the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal.

Toward the Great Society—Elementary and Secondary Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, shortly after taking office President Johnson laid the cornerstone for the Great Society: "We begin with learning."

Today, more than one quarter of the American population is enrolled in schools or colleges—a total of 54.2 million students, with 35.9 million in elementary school, 12.9 million in secondary school, and 5.4 million in college.

The statistics are startling and our responsibilities immense, for no longer is education the business solely of educators. It is everybody's business. Nothing matters more to the future of our country. Without brain power to build a world of peace—armed power would be worthless. Without trained manpower—our productive economy could not be sustained. Without educated citizens—our democratic system of government would crumble.

Education is a $39 billion a year business with only 10 percent of this being met by the Federal Government through the U.S. Office of Education. Whereas the Federal Government invests less than 8 percent of its gross revenues for all educational purposes, the States invest 35 percent, and the local governments invest 45 percent of their gross revenues for the schools. With education still dependent on real estate taxes, the gap between rich and poor school districts grows wider every year. The resulting educational inequalities are enormous. Experience has shown that these inequalities are beyond the corrective powers of the State and local governments acting alone.

To break the vicious cycle of poverty, poor education, and still more poverty, the Democratic administration proposed and the 89th Congress enacted the first bill ever approved by Congress to provide general financial assistance for elementary and secondary education. Although directly aimed at the 5.4 million poverty-stricken schoolchildren in the United States, funds are going to local public school districts in 95 percent of all U.S. counties.

Under this act, $1.3 billion will come into the U.S. school system this year to improve our elementary and secondary school education. $1.06 billion will be used to meet the special educational needs of disadvantaged children. Specific types of programs are left to the discretion of the local public educational agency but may include such programs as remedial reading, preschool training, additional teaching personnel, language labs, and classes for talented students. $100 million will be used for purchase of school library books, instructional material and textbooks which will be available on an equitable basis to all elementary and secondary school children and teachers. Another $100 million will be used for the establishment and operation of supplemental educational centers to provide special educational services which otherwise would not be available to all children in need of such services.

Special services may include courses in science or language not taught in local schools or better taught on a centralized basis; school health services, and development of TV programs for classroom use. Funds are also available to improve educational research and to strengthen State departments of education.

Because of the tremendous record of the 1st session, 89th Congress, greater progress in education is presently being made than in any comparable period in our history. But the needs are also greater today than ever before. There must be no slackening in the Nation's total educational effort until every American has the opportunity to acquire all the education he wants and needs to meet the demands of an increasingly complex world. A full commitment to that goal is a full commitment to the future progress and strength of America.

Will All of the Aged Get Medical Care Benefits?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 89-97, which provides hospital insurance and other medical services for our elder citizens, became law on July 30, 1965, or more than 2½ months ago. I am shocked and amazed to find that, during that time, practically no effort has been made to determine whether the services provided for under the hospitalization insurance program will, in fact, be available to the aged.

The House will recall that while Public Law 89-97 provides for up to 90 days of hospitalization, it also provides for 100 days of extended care in an expert nursing home, and for posthospital home health services of up to 100 visits by visiting nurses, physical therapists, and other health workers. This was supplemented under the voluntary health insurance programs to cover not only physicians' and surgeons' services, but other medical and health services not related to hospitalization.

In other words, Congress fully provided for the medical needs of the aged. Provision was made for hospital care, doctors' and surgeons' bills, outpatient care in a clinic or a hospital, and a wide variety of diagnostic and therapeutic services. The aged were told that all that need be done to obtain this complete package of medical care, in addition to automatic coverage under the hospital insurance program, was to sign up for the voluntary insurance program and pay $3 a month.

Shortly after passage of the law, the Wisconsin State Commission on Aging took an inventory to determine which services provided for under Public Law 89-97 would be available to older persons in the State of Wisconsin. The commission found that for many of our elder citizens in Wisconsin, the services provided under the program do not exist. There simply were no agencies, facilities, or personnel in many counties offering such services. I include a copy of this very revealing survey as part of my remarks.

While I recognize that every medical service might not be available conveniently to everyone in my State, I was surprised at the extent to which many of the services would not be available at all because there were no facilities or qualified personnel out where the old people are. I am certain that Wisconsin is not unique in this respect. The same must be true in most, if not all, of the other States.

Post-hospital extended care is of no benefit to a person who resides in an area where there is no extended-care facility.

Provision for home health visits is no help to an elderly person who resides in an area where there is no agency performing this service.

The aged have been told that the Federal Government will pay for certain medical services, but it is up to the individual to go out and find those services if available—and they are not available. It thus becomes a cruel hoax when the Congress passes a bill to cover the costs of a service for the aged which the aged cannot in fact purchase because it is not available.

On receiving the report of the Wisconsin survey I contacted the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to find what steps were being taken in order to assist local agencies in preparing for the onslaught of the aged who will be entitled to medical care. I discovered that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare apparently had nothing to offer. No attempt had been made to gather together the information with respect to the various forms of Federal assistance which might be available in setting up the type of services which were provided for in the program. Without some research, the Department was not in a position to supply me with a list of the Federal programs which might be available such as the Hill-Burton program for financing hospital and extended care facilities, the FHA-insured mortgage program for an extended care facility, programs for training qualified personnel, and the like. I include as part of my remarks a letter I have written to Mr. Wilbur I. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of HEW, urging action and leadership by HEW to assist States, local governments, and private enterprise to remedy this deficiency.

I would urge the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare not to waste any more time. For the immediate future, a concentration of effort should be directed toward the development through local agencies and at the local level of the facilities and services which the Congress and the administration have promised our elder citizens in the medicare bill.

WISCONSIN STATE COMMISSION ON AGING,
Madison, Wis., September 28, 1965.

Representative JOHN W. BYRNES,
8th District, House of Representative,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BYRNES: Enclosed is our recent report dealing with the availability of medical services to be provided under the recently passed medicare program.

You will note the introduction emphasizes that lack of definition at this point makes an exact estimate of available services impossible; however, indications are that in large areas of Wisconsin, many older persons will not be able to secure some of the medicare services unless immediate action can be instituted to develop the now nonexistent or skeleton services in those areas.

If we can be of any further assistance to you in this matter, please let us know.

Sincerely,

JAMES F. MCMICHAEL,
Executive Director.

STATE COMMISSION ON AGING,
CAPITOL BUILDING,
Madison, Wis., September 14, 1965.

AVAILABILITY OF HEALTH SERVICES AS PROVIDED UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965—INTRODUCTION

Passage of the 1965 social security amendments have constituted one of the major areas of interest in the field of aging for the past several years. Passage of this act, commonly known as medicare, has been signaled as a great achievement in the provision of health services for older people in the United States.

Basically the act provides a funding mechanism to purchase health services, which, to be effective, would require that the services as provided for under the act are available to be purchased. We know this is not the case for many older persons in Wisconsin and therefore have examined the availability of services specified in the act.

The following analysis of these services by counties shows, to the best of our available information, the extent of these services. Many factors can change the accuracy of these figures. For instance, Federal standards will probably use different definitions than those assumed to be meaningful for the purposes of this report. However, regardless of definitions or any other factors, the report does indicate gaps in services as far as many older people in Wisconsin are concerned. For these people, some of the services provided by medicare will simply not be available. In these areas, action must be taken to provide such services to assure full benefits under the law.

Availability of health services as provided under the social security amendments of 1965

County	(1) Population 65 or 65+	(2) Hospitals		(3) Outpatient clinics	(4) Home nursing agencies	(5) Therapists	(6)	(7)	(8) Medical social workers	(9) Health aid agencies	(10) Extended-care beds	(11) M.D.'s
		Number	Beds			Physical	Occupational	Speech				
Adams	1,300	1	32								38	2
Ashland	2,300	2	67									17
Barron	4,400	4	195	1							88	21
Bayfield	1,650	1	29	1					1		29	2
Brown	11,250	3	724		VNA	10	3	3	5		128	106
Buffalo	1,700	1	49		PHN				3		26	6
Burnett	1,450	1	13									5
Calumet	2,250	1	60			1					24	8
Chippewa	5,000	3	227	1	VNA		1		1		10	26
Clark	4,050	1	56	1							109	15
Columbia	5,100	3	212	1	PHN							32
Crawford	1,900	1	46			1						9
Dane	20,650	7	260	3	VNA, PHN, hosp.	50	31	19	21	1	527	532
Dodge	7,400	2	245	1	PHN	1	2				249	41
Door	2,650	1	67					1				11
Douglas	5,450	3	295			3			2		74	27
Dunn	3,250	1	85			1					66	13
Eau Claire	6,350	3	583	2	PHN, VNA	7	1		1		220	66
Florence	400											1
Fond du Lac	9,400	3	450		VNA	4	1		4		213	70
Forest	950	1	20									4
Grant	5,700	5	214	3			1		2		126	33
Green	3,400	1	170	1		2		1				36
Green Lake	2,250										30	11
Iowa	2,550	2	109	1	Hospital						51	10
Iron	950											4
Jackson	2,000	1	50	1		1	1				65	6
Jefferson	6,850	2	177			8	6				256	38
Juneau	2,400	33	1								59	10
Kenosha	10,500	2	533	2	VNA	5	2		2		325	69
Kewaunee	2,050	2	75	1								11
La Crosse	8,250	4	609	2		5			1		390	92
Lafayette	2,200	1	36								60	10
Langlade	2,550	1	84									14
Lincoln	2,800	3	136			1					125	17
Manitowoc	8,050	3	338		VNA, PHA	1			3		120	52
Marathon	8,600	4	579	2	PHN, VNA	6	4		1		28	62
Marinette	4,400	1	79								40	16
Marquette	1,500											4
Menominee	300											
Milwaukee	103,900	30	10,098	21	3 hospitals VNA	61	62	38	64	Hosp.	1,348	1,450
Monroe	3,950	4	1,470	1	Hospital		1				121	15
Oconto	3,050	3	92	1			1				30	9
Oneida	2,500	2	160	1							24	21
Outagamie	9,000	5	451		VRA, PHN	12	2				167	84
Ozaukee	3,350	1	120			3						21
Pepin	1,000	1	35								30	4
Pierce	3,000	1	32						1		83	12
Polk	3,350	4	131	1							70	22
Portage	4,050	2	215	1								25
Price	2,000	1	35								75	5
Racine	14,400	6	1,163	1	VNA	14	10	4			275	125
Richland	2,200	1	64			1					61	11
Rock	12,150	4	541	1	VNA	7	1	1	3		169	110
Rusk	1,800	1	71								75	6
St. Croix	3,500	4	208	1							98	20
Sauk	4,750	4	187				1				135	23
Sawyer	1,400	1	29									7
Shawano	3,950	2	89			2					20	14
Sheboygan	10,400	3	439	1	VNA	3	1	Audio clinic.	2		293	72
Taylor	2,050	1	50								13	5
Trempealeau	3,350	1	34								50	15
Vernon	3,400	2	237			1					114	17
Vilas	1,200	1	18								20	7
Walworth	6,950	1	123			3		1	2		193	41
Washburn	1,400	2	64								43	6
Washington	4,800	2	162	1		1	1				60	9
Waukesha	13,750	4	481	2		16	8		5	1	260	110
Waupaca	5,450	3	142	1		1					57	22
Waushara	2,100	3	110	1								9
Winnebago	11,700	2	550	1	VNA	9	3		12		11	98
Wood	6,850	2	383	1	Hospital	3		1	2		165	66
Total	430,850	179	23,921	62	29	244	144	70	128	3	7,536	3,990

DEFINITIONS

1. Population statistics: Number of persons 65 and over per county, in Wisconsin, 1963.

2. Hospitals and hospital beds registered by the American Hospital Association.

3. Out-patient clinics: Organized out-patient clinics offering diversified services.

4. Home nursing care: That care given to a patient after discharge from hospital to his home, under supervision of a physician and an agency with trained staff; i.e., registered nurses, trained practical nurses, or home aids to provide this service. In some instances this service is conducted by the public health nurse; usually this is a program purchased through the visiting nurse service.

5 and 6. Physical and occupational therapists include those employed by long-term care facilities, special clinics, and outpatient departments, especially those offering rehabilitation services.

7. Speech therapists: Found in clinics and under rehabilitation service units; not known whether these are registered as both speech and hearing therapists except as shown.

8. Medical-social workers: All agencies offering services to the aged employing medical-social workers have been included; i.e., hospitals, guidance centers, welfare departments, family service, Catholic apostate, Salvation Army, rehabilitation centers, curative workshops, county health centers, outpatient departments, clinics, mental health centers.

9. Health aid: An individual trained by an agency or institution to perform specific duties within her capabilities under both agency and physician supervision; this entails simple nursing procedures such as making a bed without moving patient from bed, household duties covering shopping, cooking, assisting patient in ambulation, some recordkeeping, reporting, etc.

10. Extended care facilities: All multistore facilities designed, constructed, or converted for long-term purposes that comply substantially with appendix A, title VI of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, and the Wisconsin Administrative Codes. In general, buildings falling within this category must be of fire-resistive construction. Single-story facilities same as above except

may be of ordinary or frame construction; however, hazardous areas must be enclosed with at least 3-hour fire-resistive construction.

11. Physicians: All those in Wisconsin in 1960 listed by place of residence.

OCTOBER 21, 1965.

Mr. WILBUR J. COHEN,
Assistant Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR WILBUR: Following up my telephone conversation with you, I am enclosing a copy of a recent report by the State Commissioner on Aging for the State of Wisconsin, with respect to the availability of medical services to be provided under Public Law 89–97.

As you will note from this report, many of the services provided for in the medical programs for the aged are not available throughout the State of Wisconsin. Out of 72 counties in Wisconsin, only Dane County and Milwaukee County have facilities and personnel to provide all the various types of medical services specified in Public Law 89–97. In view of the population of those counties, the adequacy of those facilities is highly doubtful.

In Public Law 89–97 we provided as an alternative to hospital care, for a period of post-hospital care in a skilled nursing home—an extended care facility—followed by home health visits. These services were intended to reduce the cost to the Government, where further hospitalization was not required, and to reduce the burden on the elder patient where the period of hospitalization had been exhausted and some part of the cost might otherwise be chargeable to the patient.

The Wisconsin survey shows that there are no facilities for extended care in 17 counties of Wisconsin. Over half of the counties do not have any agency or personnel for home health care visits In these counties, therefore, the aged citizen might have to be kept in the hospital until fully recovered. This places an unreasonable burden both on the individual and on the program. Certainly, this deficiency must also exist in a great many other States.

Upon checking with your department, I was shocked to find that practically no effort has been made to inventory the medical services that may be available to the aged throughout the country, and that no steps have been taken to assist local agencies in making provisions for such services. It certainly would be a cruel hoax, after the Congress has provided for the payment of various medical services for the aged, if the services should not, in fact, be available in a great many areas. Many of our aged will find that the commitment of the Federal Government to give them medical assistance under Public Law 89–97 is an empty promise to pay for the cost of a service which the aged cannot buy because the service is not available to them.

Under the circumstances, I think that it is absolutely imperative that your Department undertake immediately to have a survey made on a State-by-State basis to determine which services may be available, and simultaneously to offer technical assistance to the local authorities and groups in meeting any deficiency. As the first step, it is suggested that you make a study to determine what forms of Federal assistance or programs are available today in setting up the various medical services. For example, it is my understanding that hospital and extended care facilities may in some cases be financed under the Hill-Burton Act or that such financing may be insured under FHA. There must also be Federal programs which could be utilized to train some of the personnel that will be needed if we are to give the medical services that are provided for in Public Law 89–97.

I certainly urge that without further delay you undertake a crash program to assist State and local groups in the development and expansion of those services for which payments will be made under health insurance for the aged.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Congressman,
Eighth District, Wisconsin.

Vice President Humphrey Gives a Vote of Confidence for the Youth of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we are daily reminded of the troubles that exist in the world we live in. The news reflects violence, poverty, hate, misunderstanding, economic and political upheaval. Young Americans have lived most of their lives being aware of these unrests. They have lived in times fraught with tension. It is with too much ease that they are criticized for their reactions to these situations. They are too often labeled en masse as lazy, fad-minded, irresponsible individuals. It is about time that the adult members of our society take a good look at the American youth of today and realize that these judgments are erroneous. There are indeed young people who, due to an inability to cope with the pressures under which they live, have made mistakes and chosen to react without good judgment—no society has ever been totally free of this element—but this is no license to condemn in a body our young people. For every case of delinquency we read about in the papers or see in our television newscasts there are hundreds of upstanding youngsters who are working to educate themselves and prove themselves to be worthwhile members of their communities.

Vice President HUMPHREY, in an article he wrote entitled "What's Right With Today's Youth," which appeared in the Parade supplement of the Miami Herald on September 5, 1965, offers some profound insights into the situation of our youth today. In the article he recognizes and gives credit to those young Americans who, through their efforts, are making America a better place to live.

I feel that the Vice President has truly performed a great public service by writing this article. His has been an inspiring stand on the problems as well as the merits of today's youth. His interest and concern for this, one of America's greatest natural resources, has been an inspiration for all of us who see the need for a fuller understanding of the problems that young people face today. His leadership and the programs that he has supported to meet these problems deserve our fullest support. Cooperation and understanding are important keys, keys that can solve many of our problems. The article follows:

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH TODAY'S YOUTH—SOME RIOT; OTHERS DO GOOD DEEDS—THE VICE PRESIDENT LOOKS AT OUR CONTROVERSIAL YOUNGER GENERATION

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Young Americans give their lives for freedom in South Vietnam, while other young Americans demonstrate against our involvement there. Some young people rip apart seaside resorts, others work night and day to repair the flood-ravaged dikes of the Middle West. Our universities turn out the brightest, best-educated graduates in history, but at the same time we face a problem of school dropouts.

Which is the true picture of the younger generation? Are more and more young people finding their release in rioting, protests, and crime? Or is the trend upward toward honor and achievement? Will they send America into decline, or will they build a greater, more dynamic Nation?

I believe the latter is true, and I can back up my belief with facts and personal experience. This is no reason for complacency. For we cannot allow even a fraction of our youth to squander themselves while we, who like to boast that we are older and wiser, stand by lamenting.

My interest in youth is by no means academic. As the father of four children (three still in school), I am concerned at the increase in juvenile crime not only in the slums, where there is the goad of dismal poverty, but among children who have never known want, children who should know better.

Like any other father of my generation, I have my share of skepticism about Beatle mops and dances like the swim, the frug, and the watusi. But then I find myself asking: Was there ever a young generation that didn't have crazes, and was there ever an old one that approved of them? What of the flappers of the Roaring Twenties, many of them now sedate grandmothers? What of the grandfathers who once sported Rudolph Valentino sideburns and those wide trousers known as Oxford bags? What about the black bottom and the charleston? But we grew out of them.

I do not condone the excesses of youth. I don't mean the fads; I mean the rioting, violence, and crime that cause us worry in our society. But again, I must ask how much we, the older generation, are responsible for the startling increase in juvenile lawlessness?

The war broke up families and reduced parental discipline. Then came the postwar years of the "fast buck" with an inevitable eroding of morality and family responsibility. Children were left to bring themselves up while their parents made up for lost time.

Now we are in a period of unprecedented prosperity, and I cannot help feeling that prosperity is a more severe test of character than adversity. Hard times, as I remember from my own youth, bring families together. In good times, it is all too easy to drift apart. Though the young people today enjoy luxuries never known to their parents, they are also exposed to pressures and frustrations their parents never encountered.

MORE PEOPLE THAN JOBS

Our youth are quite conscious they live in a world that has the capacity to destroy itself and that the detonators are in the hands of the older generation. They are also conscious of the fact that, in our affluent society, there are more people of their age than there are jobs to go around. The number of workers 18 and 19 years old is expected to increase by half a million this year—twice the increase of last year. Before 1970, more than 3 million young people will swell the labor force each year.

Those without training and skills will face a bleak future. The unemployment rate for the young already is more than three times as high as for older workers. We are past the time when a living, even a humble one, can be made without anything but willing hands.

Our country does not owe anybody a living, but it does owe its youth at least the opportunity to work. Government and private industry are now alert to this problem, and we are doing everything we can to help these young people. There are Youth Opportunity Centers, the poverty program, the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Community Action programs.

Of course, youth must be willing to work, and most of them are. I have spoken to thousands of young people at Job Corps camps and other training centers. Many come from broken homes; many are barely able to read and write. Almost all have been bitterly disappointed in their short lives. Yet most are determined to pick up their second chance, acquire new skills and face the world with hope.

Even more impressive are the thousands of young Americans who have an acute conscience about their own generation and want to help the less fortunate. They are intelligent, courageous, well-informed young people, willing to work long hours for little or no pay to correct what they feel is injustice.

Some of the student protests, picketing, marches, sit-ins have caused dismay among us older folk. Frankly, I have shared it because some of the issues, in my view, have been false. But I must admit that America today might be a better place if the people of my generation had shown the same awareness. Fiery speeches and angry placards on the campus are to my mind far less dangerous to the Nation's future than the silence that stifles new ideas. Age in itself is no guarantee of wisdom. In a world changing as rapidly as ours, there can be as many old fools as young fools. Young Americans who get into trouble, who kick against the established order, are often the most alert.

Who of our older generation has not been a rebel? I have been one, and so has our President. Lyndon Johnson was a school dropout who left his native Texas to work with his hands in the fields of California. But he returned to enter college and begin his career as a teacher in a Mexican-American public school. His former students still remember him as a man who gave them knowledge and encouragement to face a world that all too often seemed stacked against them.

Lyndon Johnson held his first Presidential appointment at 27, his first political office at 29. He has said: "No one knows better than I the fires that burn in the hearts of young men who yearn for the chance to do better what they see their elders doing not well * * * or not doing at all."

FAMOUS BEATNIKS

Today's young people—as students, as citizens, yes, even as demonstrators—are showing that they, too, want to do better. Of course, we have our beatniks. There have been beatniks in every age. Some of them are now listed among the world's leading artists, writers and musicians. Gauguin was a beatnik. So were Van Gogh and Edgar Allan Poe.

But I am less concerned with the eccentricities of genius, which can flower in the most unlikely soil, than I am with the mass of our young people today. I don't find them a "beat" generation at all, and I have met them by the thousands across this great country.

Our young people are a healthy and wholesome generation, less hypocritical, more frank than we were at their age. They speak more openly about sex, religion, politics, and other subjects that used to be taboo. In the age of computers, satellites, and almost instant communications, they are also more intelligent and competent. For this is the age of excellence.

Not long ago, I visited the nuclear aircraft carrier *Enterprise* and was amazed to find boys under 20 manning consoles of multimillion-dollar radar equipment. They were responsible for the safety of American pilots and million-dollar aircraft miles away at sea. At Loring Air Force Base, I talked with a grease-stained enlisted man whom I found working under a jet plane. "I understand you are pretty good," I said, "at keeping these planes in tiptop shape."

"No, Mr. Vice President," the GI replied. "We're not pretty good. We're the best." His commanding officer, Brig. Gen. Frank Elliott, completely agreed. "I have been in the Air Force for a long time," he said. "This crop of youngsters is the best yet. They are more responsive and responsible."

No fewer than one-quarter of the members of our armed services are under 20. Our generals and admirals agree they are the finest young fighting men this country has ever produced, as tough as their fathers of World War II and Korea, more alert and adaptable and so more fit to use the complex weapons of the space age.

If I had to give the younger generation a label, I would call them, as the President has, Volunteer Generation. I may not always agree with the causes they serve, but I must always admire the spirit with which they fight. It could shame some of us older people who pride ourselves on being concerned citizens.

HOW FAR?

For example, a poll in a national news magazine asked American students how far they would go—beyond mere talk—to support a cause in which they believed. Some 93 percent said they would sign a petition; 72 percent had already done so. Some 87 percent said they would contribute money; 58 percent had already done so. An amazing 43 percent were even ready to go to jail.

More than 10,000 young volunteers are now serving in the Peace Corps. Another 3,000 have already returned after tours of duty. But most significant, more than 100,000 have asked to take part in this bold and idealistic experiment. When VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America—the domestic Peace Corps) was launched, more than 3,000 inquiries were received from young people on the first day of business.

When Parade's own editor, Jess Gorkin, had the inspired idea to ask the young people of America to "Work a Day for J.F.K.," the response was staggering. They went out by the thousands to mow lawns, clean cars, run errands, sell cookies and lemonade so they could donate their earnings to the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library. There was no compulsion such as is brought by the commissars in a Communist society. It was merely a suggestion in one magazine for young people to accept or reject.

All it takes to rouse today's young people is motivation. They need to know that their contribution has a purpose. I grew up when it was important to help the family. It was important that we dug vegetables out of sand and stored them in the root cellar. It was important that we earned money to help feed the family. Now in our prosperous suburbs, it is no longer important for young people to contribute to the livelihood. They are inclined to look upon the daily chores as merely an exercise in discipline.

I have complete faith in our young generation. Whenever I am weary or worried, I seek out young people. Many times I have walked out of a meeting, depressed and discouraged, looking for some teenagers. I have found them to be a tonic; they rekindle my spirit and sharpen my wits. I am able to go back refreshed and revitalized.

We parents expect the young to learn from us and from their teachers. But this holds good only if we are prepared to learn from the young—to probe their problems and to admit, as history has proven time and again, that the "follies" of today can be the truths of tomorrow.

Toward the Great Society—Urban Affairs Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, while we are recalling the outstanding works of this first session of the 89th Congress, we ought to note the very important new Cabinet Department of Housing and Urban Development, which will coordinate Federal efforts in urban programs. The Federal Government has more than 60 programs for urban areas.

Establishment of the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs was long overdue. It is the first step in a project whose goal is improvement in the lives and living areas of 70 percent of the Nation's population. The debate and legislative history of the bill to create that new Department record deep awareness of the enormous problems of today's American city by members of both parties.

In his remarks on September 9, after signing the act creating the Department, President Johnson told the Nation:

> In less than a lifetime—in less than my own 57 years—America has become a highly urbanized Nation, and we must face the many meanings of this new America.
>
> Social change in our country is often faster than the mind of a generation can comprehend. But the pace of our urbanization has been stunning. It will move still faster in the immediate years ahead.
>
> Between now and the end of this century, our urban population will double. City land will double.
>
> In the next 35 years, we must literally build a second America—putting in place as many houses, schools, apartments, parks, and offices as we have built through all the time since the Pilgrims arrived on these shores.

Perhaps the key statement in the President's remarks was this paragraph:

> Our cities and our new urban age must not be symbols of a sordid society. The history of every civilization teaches us that those who do not find new means to respond to new challenges will perish or decay.

The first need in meeting the crisis of our cities is enlightened planning. The urban area is such a sensitive mechanism that to tamper with one component is to affect and possibly upset an unpredictable number of other seemingly independent components.

For example, how wide will the streets in an area be built? If too narrow, there will not be enough parking for vehicles. Then offstreet parking will be required. If the parking is offstreet, the residential lot must be made larger. With larger lots, multiplied a couple of thousand times over, more curb and gutter, more water main, more sewer, more storm drainage, and, in many cases, more annexation are imperative. Each of these factors is a major consideration in city finances. Each must be thought through fully by responsible local agencies.

Creating the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Mr. Speaker, goes a long way toward implementing the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. It coordinates related authorities, responsibilities and functions which have been placed in various officials.

Mr. Speaker, our Democratic platform of 1964 called for establishing the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Two-thirds of us in this House were elected on the basis of that platform. Most citizens must have felt that the Democratic platforms gave a clear choice.

In establishing the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and in our other actions, we simply made performance follow promise.

An Enormous Task Well Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, one of the major accomplishments of recent years is the Interstate Highway System, a 41,000-mile network of well-engineered roads affording safe and rapid transportation throughout the Nation.

We are at the halfway point in this new highway system, authorized by the Congress in 1956.

A true expert in the interstate highway program, my friend and able colleague, JOHN BLATNIK, of Minnesota, who has served as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on the Federal Aid Highway Program, spoke to the National Highway Conference here in Washington during July.

Congressman BLATNIK described the work thus far on the interstate system and the problems encountered in this massive public works project which his subcommittee was directed to investigate.

JOHN BLATNIK's remarks are reprinted in the October 1965 issue of Constructor, the management magazine of the construction industry. While we are looking back on the works of the 1st session of the 89th Congress, we also ought to recognize earlier noteworthy efforts resulting from the hard work and determination of men like JOHN BLATNIK, who is among the most respected and best-liked Members of this House. It has been a privilege to serve as a member of the Blatnik committee and at this time, Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to include Chairman BLATNIK's remarks in the RECORD:

AN ENORMOUS TASK WELL DONE

(By Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK)

I am proud, as I know many of you are, to have been associated with the highway legislation passed in 1956. It is the keystone of the most ambitious public works undertaking in world history. And yet it is more than that. It recognized the direct relationship between the orderly development of national highway systems and our expanding economy, our increased productivity, and our growing population. It recognized that modern highways are the backbone of this tremendous growth.

Instead of highway construction programs being developed on a stopgap, piecemeal basis, we are now able to plan ahead as far as we can see. Highway needs can now be forecast, and construction can be planned and executed in a smooth orderly fashion. As this concept is developed further with either new programs, or extensions of the present ones, we will be able to avoid waiting until the need is painfully apparent and we are forced to resort to crash programs. Highway departments, contractors, suppliers and equipment manufacturers in turn, will be able to rely on some sustained and stable rate of expenditures.

I am pleased to be with you because I realize that it is rare to have together in one meeting such a large segment of distinguished and talented leaders from the roadbuilding fraternity. The very fact that this body is made up of representatives of the States, contractors and the Bureau of Public Roads is significant. It is recognized that the Federal-aid roadbuilding program can only be carried out through the combined and coordinated efforts of these groups.

Your being here together enables me to say some things which I would like each of you to know.

AN ENORMOUS TASK

Many of us realize now, much better than we did in 1956, what an enormous task was undertaken in the construction of an Interstate System while carrying out, at the same time, an expanded ABC program (primary, secondary and urban road extensions).

Congress had asked a whole industry to accelerate in a manner unprecedented in our peacetime history to a production workload hitherto unknown. The way in which it was done is a great credit to the industry. I am truly amazed at the developments in techniques and equipment.

Equipment manufacturers tooled up, produced, and have constantly improved the equipment necessary for the task; and contractors bought the equipment, hired the people to operate it, and put their enlarged organizations to work.

These two segments of the highway family are profit motivated and that is as it should be. This is in the great American tradition of free enterprise.

RESULTS TREMENDOUS

State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads, representing the governmental authority, responded creditably in providing the planning, design, and engineering.

What has been the result?

When viewed in the light of the difficulties encountered, the overall performance has been tremendous.

I think some people feel that because it has been my task to Chair a subcommittee to inquire into the way in which the program is being carried out, that I am indifferent to the many great accomplishments which have been made.

Let me say here and now—once and for all, that nothing could be further from the truth.

I am not unaware of the trials to which highway personnel, the engineers, right-of-way, fiscal, or management people have been subjected in trying to find acceptable soluitons to problems which seemed to have no solution.

I know, too, the great effort and strain it has been to Bureau of Public Roads people in attempting to keep everything on an even keel.

I am also aware that many contractors have done more than they were obliged, or told to do, in building projects just for the personal satisfaction of having built something in which they could take pride.

We cannot, and we do not, want to overlook these notable contributions and achievements, even though we must, at times, point to areas of weakness.

CONGRESS MUST FIND MONEY

Congress has an abiding role in this overall picture.

For one thing, more legislation to provide additional mileage to our systems will be needed. This legislation will require a continuing flow of money from highway users.

In addition to legislation, Congress also has the obligation and duty to determine that programs are carried out in accordance with law and policy. This brings us to our subcommittee and I am delighted to have this opportunity to clarify certain misconceptions and misunderstandings which I feel exist in the minds of some people.

In 1959, wihle the interstate program was still in its infancy, Congress had to consider increasing the gasoline tax 1 cent, to insure completion of the system as originally conceived. The alternative was to accept the suggestion that the program either be curtailed or drawn out over a longer period of time. None of us who are familiar with this porgram wanted a cutback.

At least some of the opposition to the program stemmed from a lack of confidence that it was being carried out properly.

There were charges made, some on the floor of the House, that the highway program was fraught with mismanagement, overdesign, incompetence and waste, and there were even suggestions of fraud and corruption.

Although these allegations were generally unsubstantiated and vague, they posed a serious threat to the program.

CHARGES MUST BE RESOLVED

Charges of this nature cannot be ignored. They have to be met and resolved. To do otherwise would lead to a continual weakening of congressional and public confidence. In time this would seriously jeopardize the continuation of the program.

It was in this climate, a little more than 5 years ago, that our subcommittee came into being.

Our mandate was clear: inquire into the practices, policies and procedures followed in the Federal-aid highway program.

I think it should be recognized that this necessary inquiry was entrusted to Members whose dedication to this fine program is not surpassed by anyone. It has been with this same spirit of dedication that this subcommittee has gone about its task.

From the beginning, committee policy has been that our inquiries would be thorough, fair and objective. That pledge has been kept. We have consistently held to the policy of not proceeding with public hearings on any matter until there has first been a detailed, exhaustive examination of whatever subject matter happened to be before the committee. From an operational standpoint such a policy is time-consuming but fully justified by what has since transpired.

We are always conscious that personal and business reputations are at stake. We also recognize that remedial legislation requires a solid record of fact.

COMPLAINTS DIMINISH

In this way the subcommittee has helped to bolster confidence in the program. Some proof of this, which shouldn't pass unnoticed, is the fact that since the establishment of the subcommittee there has been no outcry on the floor of the House against the program such as there was in 1959.

We have proceeded on the theory that things can always be done better. Once again that is not to say we are not aware of the tremendous achievements which have been made and which have made this country the recognized leader in roadbuilding throughout the world. That is as it should be, and is consistent with this country's leadership in many other fields.

I am convinced that the real appreciation for the construction of our highways will flow naturally and easily through the years as the American economy reaps the benefits from them, and as the American motorist conserves his time and money and broadens his horizon through their use.

The first step toward bringing about improvement is to define the problem. That is basic. We help to do this through our hearings; highlighting situations by developing them factually; choosing for subjects those matters which are of importance and which have broad application, even though the applicability varies in degree in different places.

In some of our hearings we have heard testimony from a number of witnesses about falsification of tests and samples, and building projects in a substandard fashion. These witnesses came to Washington, usually with some personal embarrassment, frequently with considerable courage, and testified as to what they had done.

COMMITTEE SEEKS "WHYS"

Now, when such practices are recognized, the matter isn't solved by discharging employees or suspending contractors. That is too easy a solution and does not do justice to the problems which have brought these matters to pass. It only treats the symptom and ignores the illness.

We need to go behind these happenings and discover their underlying causes—why did they happen?

The uncovering of wrongdoing was inevitable in a program of this size and scope. I believe we can all understand how a program which involves so much money and so much work was bound to attract some unscrupulous people. Unfortunately, this is the type of thing that makes headlines. More attention is paid to what has developed in this particular area than is paid to the solid accomplishments and the corrective measures invoked to cure the shortcomings.

Unquestionably this has contributed to the impression in some quarters that the subcommittee's main objective is to pursue culprits and to inspire punitive action.

Those who are conversant with what we have done and are trying to do, and who have digested our transcripts and reports know that this is a vast misconception of our function.

Ours is not a hunt for wrongdoers. We examine at length and in depth, not to uncover culprits, but to pinpoint the underlying cause of unsatisfactory conditions and poor practices, the source of procedural weakness, the reason for manifest ineffectiveness.

In short, our prime concern is not with what has occurred but rather why it has occurred.

PINPOINTING THE PROBLEMS

We say if projects are not being built to specifications because the specifications are not good, let's improve the specifications; if contractors are being required to work to unreasonable and costly limits, let's find out what the proper requirements should be and incorporate them in the specifications; if there is not a sufficiency of able, competent people to provide the engineering services and testing required by both the contractor and the State, then let's train them and assign them in sufficient numbers so they will be able to do their work.

We submit that you cannot assign one project engineer to eight widely separated jobs and then be surprised that he does not adequately supervise them.

You cannot assign one or two untrained and unqualified inspectors to a project 7 miles long which has three contractors placing culvert pipe and doing embankment work in the middle and at each end while another contractor is building forms and pouring concrete; and then require the inspectors to set slope stakes and inspect and test all this work and have the right to be surprised that something went wrong.

When specifications are evaluated in retrospect and found to be impossible to meet, who can be surprised that they were not complied with?

These are not imaginary examples. They come from testimony before the committee.

Can we seriously expect to find anything other than loose practices, falsification, and failure to build to requirements when these and like conditions exist which virtually assure it?

PROBLEMS ARE REAL

You cannot transfer those impossible situations to the field personnel and expect that, somehow, they will be able to overcome them.

These are some of the real problems that have concerned the subcommittee. They go to the very heart of highway construction.

We must admit such problems do exist and address ourselves to their solution.

We must allow for wholesome, healthy evaluation of what is done, particularly when it is offered in an honest spirit of helpfulness and cooperation.

We cannot be so sensitive that the price to be paid for harmony is silent acquiescence of the status quo.

There is one point that I'd like to emphasize.

I know that many of you contractors feel that you have been caught in a squeeze because of our insistence on adequate management controls, particularly those at the project level. I am well aware of the fact that to a contractor, time is money. I am also not unmindful of the fact that contracting is a risky business.

This is the point I want to make clear and which I hope is carried on down to the field level. The committee has never advocated exactness or absoluteness either in the framing of specifications or in the enforcement of them. The members of the committee are fair, reasonable-minded men. At all times we have been on record as advocating reasonable, realistic specifications, and intelligent practical execution.

PROMPT DECISIONS A MUST

Also this program demands that, when the facts are known, judgments be given without delay or hesitation. We cannot totally succeed unless there is prompt decision making at all levels.

COMMITTEE'S CONTRIBUTIONS

I must say I feel a sense of pride in having seen a number of significant improvements instituted and to know that our committee has contributed to their accomplishment.

I also know that considerable effort is constantly being made by the Bureau of Public Roads, AASHO, the States individually, AGC, and other responsible organizations, independently of any suggestion made by our committee, to better the administrative and technical aspects of roadbuilding.

This is most gratifying, and I have confidence it will continue.

All of us, each in our way, need to operate and cooperate on the premise that improvements can and will be made.

Finally—what does the future hold? Well, regardless of how one analyzes the reports concerning the status of construction of the Interstate System, it is obvious that the tempo and rate of production must be increased in order to bring about completion on schedule.

SAFETY IS GREAT FACTOR

One very compelling reason for finishing the Interstate on time or even ahead of schedule is the safety factor. This is a matter of utmost concern to many on Capitol Hill today where the frightful toll of deaths and injuries in automobile accidents is a subject for almost daily discussion.

It is an awful thing to contemplate when we realize that more Americans die on highways on one holiday weekend in this country than have been killed during our years of involvement in the Vietnamese struggle.

I think it is imperative for the people to be aware of the death rate on other highways compared to the toll on the Interstate sections now open to traffic.

The Associated Press made a survey on the Memorial Day weekend and found that of the 474 fatalities reported, 12 occurred on the Interstate.

The Bureau of Public Roads received a congressional request to make a survey over the July 4 weekend. Its analysis showed 34 of the 555 deaths reported occurred on the interstate. Thirty-eight States reported no deaths, and 20 out of the 34 fatalities occurred in just 3 States.

The Bureau's analysis estimated that Interstate freeways carried approximately 12 percent of all the holiday traffic but accidents of all the other roads accounted for 94 percent of the deaths.

Thus, when I add my voice to all the others exhorting you to greater effort in the years ahead, it is with the thought that the Interstate will give Americans assurance that the lives of thousands will be saved.

I am convinced that there does exist among you the capacity for peak performance.

I am convinced there is commensurate determination to reach the objective.

In succeeding you shall have gained the trust and appreciation of Congress and the American people, and, thereby, have laid the foundation for major new programs which will naturally follow.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Vote

Roll call No.	Date	Bill No.	R.B.C.	Yea	Nay	Not voting	Brief description
198	July 26		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican, of Illinois. (22 Members absent.)
199	July 26	H. Res. 437	Yea	248	171	14	To permit consideration of H.R. 77, repealing sec. 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act.
200	July 26		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Griffin, Republican of Michigan. (27 Members absent.)
201	July 26		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Rhodes, Republican of Arizona. (32 Members absent.)
202	July 27		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Ashbrook, Republican of Ohio. (17 Members absent.)
203	July 27	H.R. 6675	Yea	307	116	11	Acceptance of conference report on Social Security Amendments of 1965, including hospital and medical care.
204	July 27	H.R. 7984	Yea	251	168	12	Acceptance of conference report on Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.
205	July 27	H.R. 2985	Yea	414	0	19	Acceptance of conference report on Mental Facilities and Centers Construction Act.
206	July 28		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Ford, Republican, of Michigan. (20 Members absent.)
207	July 28		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Younger, Republican of California. (14 Members absent.)
*208	July 28	H.R. 77	Nay	200	223	10	Motion to recommit bill to repeal sec. 14(b) of National Labor Relations Act.
*209	July 28	H.R. 77	Yea	221	203	8	On passage of bill to repeal sec. 14(b) of National Labor Relations Act.
210	July 29		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican of Ohio. (24 Members absent.)
211	July 29		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Baldwin, Republican of California. (30 Members absent.)
212	July 29	H.R. 8856	Yea	275	125	34	To amend Atomic Energy Act to permit construction of overhead transmission lines.
213	Aug. 2		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican of Iowa. (95 Members absent; RBC at lunch with constituents.)
214	Aug. 2	S.J. Res. 81	Yea	313	11	110	Apportioning funds for Interstate Highway System and establishing highway safety programs.
215	Aug. 2	H.R. 8027	Yea	326	0	108	On passage of Law Enforcement Assistance Act.
216	Aug. 2	H.R. 6964	Yea	323	0	111	To facilitate the rehabilitation of Federal prisoners.
217	Aug. 3		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Conte, Republican of Massachusetts. (34 Members absent.)
218	Aug. 3	S. 1564	Nay	118	284	32	Motion to recommit conference report on Voting Rights Act.
219	Aug. 3	S. 1564	Yea	328	74	32	On acceptance of conference report on Voting Rights Act.
220	Aug. 3	H.R. 8469	Yea	394	0	40	To provide increases in annuities paid to Federal civil service retirees.
221	Aug. 4	H.R. 8439	Yea	389	0	45	On acceptance of conference report on military construction authorization bill.
222	Aug. 4	S. 1742	Yea	330	54	50	To permit World Bank to make loan to International Finance Corporation.
223	Aug. 5		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican of Iowa. (57 Members absent).
224-239	Aug. 5-16		Absent				During this period there were 7 quorum calls and 9 rollcalls. (R.B.C. was under official leave of absence from the House to attend to legislative and other matters in California.)
240	Aug. 17		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Boland, Democrat of Massachusetts. (49 Members absent.)
241	Aug. 18		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Griffin, Republican of Michigan. (36 Members absent.)
242	Aug. 19	H.R. 7750	Yea	244	150	40	Acceptance of conference report on foreign assistance authorization bill.
*243	Aug. 19	H.R. 9811	Yea	169	224	39	Motion to recommit farm subsidy bill.
*244	Aug. 19	H.R. 9811	Nay	221	172	37	On passage of farm subsidy bill.
245	Aug. 24		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Albert, Democrat of Oklahoma. (49 Members absent.)
246	Aug. 24	H.R. 10586	Nay	139	263		Motion to recommit supplemental appropriation bill for Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare.
247	Aug. 25		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hays, Democrat of Ohio. (28 Members absent.)
*248	Aug. 25	H.R. 2580	Nay	189	218	19	To revise amendments to Immigration and Nationality Act by placing quota limits on nations of Western Hemisphere.
*249	Aug. 25	H.R. 2580	Yea	318	95	19	On passage of amendments to Immigration and Nationality Act.
250	Aug. 26		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Collier, Republican of Illinois. (34 Members absent.)
251	Aug. 26		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican of Iowa. (39 Members absent.)
252	Aug. 26	H.R. 9567	Yea	367	22	41	On passage of Higher Education Act of 1965.
253	Aug. 30	H.R. 9022	Not voting	304	37	91	To provide financial assistance for construction of public schools affected by major disasters. (R.B.C. at dentist; would have voted yea.)
254	Aug. 31	H. Res. 551	Not voting	364	23	46	To permit consideration of H.R. 9042, to provide for implementation of agreement concerning automotive products between United States and Canada. (R.B.C. at luncheon; would have voted yea.)
*255	Aug. 31	H.R. 9042	Nay	280	113	39	On passage of Automotive Trade Act of 1965.
256	Sept. 1		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Joelson, Democrat, of New Jersey. (43 Members absent.)
257	Sept. 1	H.R. 3141	Yea	340	47	45	On passage of Health Professions Educational Assistance Amendments of 1965.
*258-293	Sept. 2-13		Absent				During this period there were 15 quorum calls and 21 rollcalls. (R.B.C. was in California to deliver a speech in Glendora and attend to various district matters.)
294	Sept. 14		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Roudebush, Republican of Indiana. (54 Members absent.)
295	Sept. 14		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican of Missouri. (64 Members absent.)
296	Sept. 14	H.R. 2091	Nay	73	298	61	Motion to recommit bill relating to concession policies in areas administered by National Park Service.
297	Sept. 15		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gibbons, Democrat, of Florida. (46 Members absent.)
298	Sept. 15		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican of Missouri. (68 Members absent.)
299	Sept. 15	H.R. 8283	Nay	209	180	43	Motion to recommit conference report on Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965.
300	Sept. 15		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican of Iowa. (47 Members absent.)
*301	Sept. 15	H.R. 9460	Nay	128	251	53	Motion to recommit bill to establish National Foundation on Arts and Humanities.
302	Sept. 16		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican of Ohio. (52 Members absent.)
*303	Sept. 16	H. Res. 574	Yea	186	180	66	Motion to table directive that Post Office Department furnish the House with names of all temporary employees during summer of 1965.
304	Sept. 16	S. 2040	Yea	337	30	65	To amend indemnity provisions of Atomic Energy Act.
305	Sept. 17		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat of Florida. (65 Members absent.)
306	Sept. 17	H.R. 9221	Yea	380	0	52	On acceptance of Department of Defense appropriations conference report.
*307	Sept. 17	H. Res. 585	Yea	228	143	51	To dismiss election contest against members of Mississippi delegation.
308	Sept. 20		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Goodell, Republican, of New York. (79 Members absent.)
309	Sept. 20	H.R. 10873	Yea	360	0	72	To provide group life insurance to Armed Forces personnel.
*310	Sept. 20	H. Res. 560	Nay	312	52	65	Declaration relative to U.S. policy in Latin America.
311	Sept. 20		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Goodell, Republican, of New York. (68 Members absent.)
312	Sept. 21		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Rumsfeld, Republican, of Illinois. (54 Members absent.)
313	Sept. 21	S. 4	Yea	379	0	53	Acceptance of conference report on Water Quality Act of 1965.
314	Sept. 22		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri. (50 Members absent.)
315	Sept. 22	S. 2007	Nay	207	185	39	On amendment to river and harbor bill calling for special survey on project in Maine.
316	Sept. 22	H.R. 30	Yea	254	113	64	To provide for U.S. participation in Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center.
317	Sept. 22		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Waggonner, Democrat, of Louisiana. (123 Members absent.)
318	Sept. 22		Not voting	89	204	139	Motion to adjourn (R.B.C. attending to office matters).
319	Sept. 23		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (51 Members absent.)
*320	Sept. 23	H.R. 7371	Nay	199	178	52	To greatly expand scope of original proposed amendment to Bank Holding Company Act.
321	Sept. 23	H. Res. 580	Yea	279	70	83	To permit consideration of H.R. 10232 regarding rural water and sanitation facilities.
*322	Sept. 23	H.R. 10232	Nay	325	10	97	To provide Federal aid for rural water and sanitation facilities.
323	Sept. 24		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican, of Ohio. (104 Members absent.)
324	Sept. 24	S. 306	Nay	80	220	132	Motion to recommit amendments to Clean Air Act.
325	Sept. 24	S. 306	Yea	294	4	133	On passage of amendments to Clean Air Act regarding antismog devices for certain motor vehicles.
326	Sept. 27		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hays, Democrat of Ohio. (51 Members absent.)
327	Sept. 27	H. Res. 515	Yea	213	183	36	Motion to discharge Rules Committee from further consideration of resolution to permit House to take up District of Columbia home rule bill.
328	Sept. 27	H. Res. 515	Yea	222	179	31	To permit consideration of District of Columbia home rule bill.
329	Sept. 27		Present				Quorum call by Mr. McMillan, Democrat of South Carolina. (41 Members absent.)
330	Sept. 27	H.R. 4644	Yea	234	155	44	Motion that House adopt procedural motion to permit consideration of District of Columbia home rule bill.
331	Sept. 27		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hays, Democrat of Ohio. (54 Members absent.)
332	Sept. 28		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat of Florida. (35 Members absent.)
333	Sept. 28		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Waggonner, Democrat of Louisiana. (54 Members absent.)
334	Sept. 28		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Abernethy, Democrat of Mississippi. (36 Members absent.)
335	Sept. 29		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican of Missouri. (38 Members absent.)
*336	Sept. 29	H.R. 4644	Nay	179	219	32	Motion to strike enacting clause (kill) home rule bill.
*337	Sept. 29	H.R. 4644	Nay	227	174	30	On acceptance of Sisk amendment to home rule bill.
*338	Sept. 29	H.R. 4644	Nay	134	266	30	Motion to recommit home rule bill as amended.

Vote—Continued

Roll call No.	Date	Bill No.	R.B.C.	Yea	Nay	Not voting	Brief description
*339	Sept. 29	H.R. 4644	Yea	283	117	31	On passage of home rule bill, as amended.
340	Sept. 30		Present				Quorum call by Mr. MacGregor, Republican of Minnesota. (45 Members absent.)
341	Sept. 30	H.R. 2580	Yea	320	69	42	Acceptance of conference report on immigration reform bill.
*342	Sept. 30	H.R. 10281	Nay	238	140	53	Motion to recommit Federal Salary Adjustment Act.
*343	Sept. 30	H.R. 10281	Yea	370	7	54	On passage of Federal Salary Adjustment Act.
344	Oct. 1		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Jones, Democrat of Missouri. (96 Members absent.)
345	Oct. 1	H.J. Res. 642	Nay	17	321	93	Motion to recommit bill authorizing construction of Library of Congress building.
346	Oct. 1	H.J. Res. 642	Yea	328	5	98	On passage of bill authorizing construction of Library of Congress building.
347	Oct. 1	H.R. 10871	Nay	164	174	94	Motion to recommit conference report on foreign aid appropriations bill.
348	Oct. 1	H.R. 10871	Yea	204	127	101	On acceptance of conference report on foreign aid appropriations bill.
349	Oct. 1	H.R. 3142	Yea	296	3	123	On passage of Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965.
350	Oct. 1	H.R. 6519	Not voting	250	12	168	Providing for construction of Jefferson National Expansion Memorial (R.B.C. attending to office matters).
351	Oct. 5		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican of Iowa. (132 Members absent.)
352	Oct. 6		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri. (118 Members absent.)
353	Oct. 7	S. J. Res. 32	Yea	312	55	65	To authorize payments for property damage to certain inhabitants of Ryukyu Islands.
354	Oct. 7	H.R. 2020	Nay	239	134	58	To authorize construction of southern Nevada water project.
355	Oct. 7		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Mathias, Republican, Maryland. (54 Members absent.)
*356	Oct. 7	S. 2084	Nay	153	230	49	Motion to recommit Highway Beautification Act of 1965.
*357	Oct. 7	S. 2084	Yea	245	138	49	On passage of Highway Beautification Act of 1965.
358	Oct. 8		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Pelly, Republican, Washington. (62 Members absent.)
359	Oct. 8	H.R. 9811	Nay	219	150	63	On acceptance of conference report on farm subsidy bill.
360	Oct. 11		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Pelly, Republican, Washington. (109 Members absent; R.B.C. attending to office matters.)
361	Oct. 12		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Bell, Republican, California. (86 Members absent.)
362	Oct. 12		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Teague, Republican, California. (100 Members absent.)
*363	Oct. 12	H. Res. 598	Nay	253	80	99	To permit consideration of H.R. 11135, Sugar Act amendments.
364	Oct. 12		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Utt, Republican, California. (110 Members absent.)
365	Oct. 13		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Ashbrook, Republican, Ohio. (46 Members absent.)
*366	Oct. 13	H.R. 11135	Yea	160	230	41	Motion to recommit Sugar Act amendments.
*367	Oct. 13	H.R. 11135	Nay	246	147	39	On passage of Sugar Act amendments.
368	Oct. 14		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Erlenborn, Republican of Illinois. (72 Members absent.)
369	Oct. 14	H.R. 11588	Nay	185	162	83	To delete rent subsidy funds from supplemental appropriations.
370	Oct. 14	H.R. 11588	Yea	242	100	89	On passage of supplemental appropriations.
371	Oct. 18		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Schmidhauser, Republican of Iowa. (117 Members absent.)
372	Oct. 19		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Pelly, Republican of Washington. (78 Members absent.)
373	Oct. 20		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida. (59 Members absent.)
374	Oct. 20		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri. (58 Members absent.)
375	Oct. 20		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (62 Members absent.)
376	Oct. 20	H.R. 9567	Nay	152	226	54	Motion to recommit Higher Education Act to kill provision for National Teachers Corps.
377	Oct. 20	H.R. 9567	Yea	313	63	57	On acceptance of conference report on Higher Education Act.
378	Oct. 20	S. 2300	Yea	221	139	67	Acceptance of conference report on Rivers and Harbors Act.
379	Oct. 21		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Wydler, Republican, of New York. (77 Members absent.)
380	Oct. 21	H.R. 11588	Yea	251	84	97	Acceptance of conference report on supplemental appropriation.
381	Oct. 21	H.R. 11588	Yea	165	162	105	To concur with Senate on appropriations for power project in Maine.

*Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance, and a brief explanation is included herein.

Tionesta, Pa., Protests Vietnam Demonstrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks we have all been shocked by the demonstrations by beatniks, the uninformed and the misinformed protesting our policy in South Vietnam.

To show the world that there are still more sound Americans than otherwise, Tionesta, a small community in my congressional district, became the first town in the United States to openly protest the various demonstrations.

These wonderful, patriotic Americans are doing this by having businesses, industries, and individual homes fly the American flag each day for a period of 30 days.

Mr. Rendall B. Agnew, a Tionesta merchant and county director of civil defense, is the organizer of the flag-flying movement and he has stated that he is not trying to sway people's minds on the Vietnam situation but is merely asking the people to support and back their country as Americans have done since the founding of our Nation.

The demonstrations and speech making have all been on one side and it is time that the sound, solid American citizen is heard from to offset the current movement and show our troops in Vietnam that we are behind them and to show the world that the great majority of Americans do back their Government.

Communities across the Nation have adopted the flag-flying movement and Mr. Agnew and the people of Tionesta are to be congratulated by all of us on taking the lead to show that we must all stick together and stand back of our Government in these very critical days in our fight against communism.

Congressman Harold R. Collier Reports to the People of the 10th District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of this 89th Congress, which ran from early in January through October, established new legislative records which may never be equaled in history. It surpassed the previous record for total number of rollcall votes and bills passed into law. It set a record for the greatest number of rollcalls in a single day—on September 13. It established a new record for Federal spending in a single session of Congress and for the legislative enactment of new domestic programs. It also established an all-time record on the number of bills brought to the floor by discharging the Rules Committee, which serves as a "traffic cop" in the normal process of reporting legislation to the floor with set rules of procedure and time allotted for debate.

If the activities of this past Congress are to be measured solely in terms of quantity of legislation approved, it was indeed a fruitful one. In my opinion, however, if we are to evaluate this Congress on the basis of the quality of its legislation, its performance was less than mediocre.

Throughout this session I pointed out as bills were being rushed through the House of Representatives and the Senate that I felt we were acting in haste and would repent at leisure. It is interesting to note that Democratic Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD recently stated publicly that he thought in future Congresses we would be obliged to spend a great deal of time amending and correcting many of the Federal programs which this Congress has passed.

The record-high budget for the current fiscal year, which was $98.8 billion, will be out of balance by more than $5 billion, notwithstanding the fact that tax collections have been better than even the most optimistic expectations. But many of the programs instituted by the Johnson administration and pushed through by the Congress are so new that it is difficult to see what the ultimate costs will be. In fact, in merely projecting some programs as the war on poverty, the so-called highway beautification program, Federal aid to education and many of the others, it becomes a little frightening, particularly since we had put a tax cut bill through in 1964 and then removed or slashed excise taxes just this year.

The U.S. Government today, as the result of what has been happening in the past few years, and particularly the last 10 months, reaches into every home, every business, every farm, and virtually every neighborhood area. The expansion of bureaucracy to conduct these programs is reflected in a soaring Federal payroll. There is hardly an operation of any government or community which does not have Federal money made available for it with the U.S. Government as the overseer of the use of these funds in shaping the policies, functions, and even philosophies of groups and individuals. Local communities and States become subservient because they need Federal money and because they cannot afford to spend more than their tax revenues, whereas the Federal Government rather uniquely expends much more than its tax revenues and goes into debt further and further each year. Presently the Federal public debt is $320 billion and is certain to break through the $324 billion ceiling within a matter of a few months.

Sadly, there is apparently no way to turn back as long as the party in political power can perpetuate itself through the public largesse and increased dependency of everyone and everything upon it.

Included in the bills passed by this Congress are:

Establishing a new Department of Housing and Urban Development: Creates a new Cabinet post to place the functions of housing and urban development under the direction of the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development. The bill also provides for establishing and operating a central staff for investigation and compliance functions of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Medicare and social security: Limited medical benefits for both doctor bills and in-hospital and nursing home care; would be financed both out of the social security fund and, temporarily, general revenues; will cost $2.8 billion, starting July 1, 1965, and will be increased to $6.3 billion by the following year. This will increase payroll taxes starting January 1, 1966, with further increases scheduled automatically in 1967, 1973, 1976, 1980, and 1987, with the base upon which the present tax will be levied to also be increased to $5,600 by next January and $6,600 by 1971.

Aid to education: On a formula based upon half of the cost of education, multiplied by the number of children in a school district coming from homes with incomes of less than $3,000 per annum, Federal aid to education at the primary and secondary school levels, finally became a reality this year. The cost beginning July 1, 1965, will be $500 million and will rise to approximately $1.2 billion beginning July 1, 1966.

Foreign aid: The foreign aid bill which provides U.S. assistance to 70 nations of the world was approved at $3,662,077,000. It follows pretty much the same lines as the aid bills in previous years although it gives the President the right to bar sale of surplus foods to the United Arab Republic if he determines it is essential to the U.S. national interest.

Debt ceiling increase: With Federal spending continuing at a rate in excess of Federal income, it became necessary for Congress to again raise the national debt ceiling by $4 billion, carrying it from $324 to $328 billion for the fiscal year ending July 1, 1966.

Repeal of excise tax: A reduction of $4.6 billion in excise taxes through repeal of levies on furs, jewelry, and other luxury items, as well as on radios, TV sets, cameras, household appliances, musical instruments, records, sporting goods, bowling alleys and on general admissions, effective July 1, 1965, was effected through enactment of a bill reported by the House Ways and Means Committee. It also provides for cuts of the 10-percent tax on automobiles gradually to 1 percent and eliminates communications tax effective January 1, 1969.

Economic opportunities amendments of 1965: Better known as the antipoverty program, this legislation authorizes $1.8 billion for fiscal 1966 which will cover a multitude of programs ranging from preschool training to Job Corps and youth opportunities projects.

Voting rights bill: This legislation to effectuate and enforce the 15th amendment of the Constitution authorizes the appointment of Federal voting registrars in certain areas where discrimination prevails, bars literacy and other tests, and directs the U.S. courts to invalidate poll taxes.

Appalachia: The Appalachia bill is actually a geographical antipoverty bill which establishes a regional commission to initiate and coordinate public works and other programs in the general location of the Appalachian Mountains. It authorizes $1.1 billion for 1966.

Silver coinage: This law eliminates silver from dimes and quarters and cuts proportionately the amount of silver in half dollars from 90 to 40 percent. The new hybrid coins are presently being minted and will probably be in circulation by the time this report reaches you.

Housing and rent subsidy: This bill authorizes $7 billion for housing programs for 4 years, including FHA, urban renewal, housing for the elderly, 60,000 new units of public housing and $800 million annually in matching grants to communities for water and sewer facilities. This bill also authorizes the Federal Government to subsidize rents for families paying rentals in excess of a certain percentage of their income.

Immigration and naturalization: Amending the national origin quota systems in immigration, the new law provides for admission of immediate relatives of American citizens and fixes the annual limit of 170,000 from all former quota countries, 120,000 from the Western Hemisphere, giving preference to persons with skills and professional abilities.

Farm subsidy program: The new agricultural bill will provide for an increase in wheat subsidies of 15 cents a bushel although it will lower the support on next year's cotton crop from 30 cents to 21 cents a pound. The catch is that the Federal Government will make payments to growers who agree to limit production. The cost of the bill is about $4 billion, which is approximately the annual price tag on the messy farm surplus situation that has existed for the past several years.

Highway beautification: Legislation designed to beautify the Nation's interstate and primary highways passed after long hassles in both the House of Representatives and Senate. As a billboard and junkyard control program, it will affect 266,000 miles of highways in the country. It provides for the Federal Government to pay losses to the billboard and junkyard people. No one has the least idea what the program will cost and there is just no way of figuring it out. The bill also permits the Secretary of Commerce to veto, if he chooses, State or local moves to rezone for industry and commerce along highways not now zoned in that manner.

College aid: The Federal college aid bill provides for $670 million the first year and will cover everything from loans and grants to students to a wide variety of funds for institutions of higher learning.

Since it is impossible in this report to go into detail on these major items of legislation, the constituents wishing copies of the public laws need only write my office either in Washington or in the district.

PERSONAL REPORT

During the 1965 session more than 600 residents of the 10th District visited my office in Washington. My staff arranges tours of the White House for our visitors, provides gallery passes for both the House and Senate, and schedules tours of many other places of historical interest in the Nation's Capital.

Early in this session of Congress, I took a public opinion poll in my district to determine how the majority of my constituents felt about many issues of current importance.

During this 1st session of the 89th Congress, I have introduced 33 public bills, as follows:

H.R. 2183, a bill to provide for the rights of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies.

H.R. 10495, a bill authorizing a survey of the DesPlaines River, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes.

H.R. 10945, Human Investment Act.

H.R. 4146, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act; amends benefits for a person forced to retire at 60 years.

H. Res. 194, a resolution prohibiting the closing of Veterans' Administration hospitals until the Veterans' Affairs Committee determines whether such proposed closings are in the best interests of this Nation.

H.R. 4619, a bill to increase benefits under social security, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60, and so forth.

H.R. 4150, a bill to allow deductions for expenses incurred by the taxpayer for education of a dependent.

H. Res. 91, a resolution establishing a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

H.R. 6679, a bill to increase the basic pay for members of the armed services.

H.R. 5561, a bill to increase widow's benefits under social security.

H.J. Res. 165, a resolution proclaiming the second Sunday in September Bataan Day.

H.R. 2181, a bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday.

H.R. 4145, a bill authorizing sale without regard to the 6-month waiting period of lead disposed of pursuant to Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act.

H.R. 2182, a bill amending the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the rate of duty on brooms made of broom corn.

H. Con. Res. 87, a resolution requesting the President to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations.

H.R. 98, amending the rules of the House with regard to appropriations.

H.R. 6225, a bill for the relief of military personnel whose personal property was damaged or lost by fire while stored in commissioned warehouse pursuant to Government orders.

H.R. 6692, a bill to repeal the retail excise taxes on luggage, handbags, et cetera.

H.R. 7463, a bill to provide continuation of duty-free reciprocity with Canada in case of parts for farm equipment.

H.R. 7838, a bill amending the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain coprecipitates of major milk proteins shall be admitted duty free.

H.J. Res. 457, a resolution providing for equal rights for men and women.

H.R. 8513, a bill to amend the Anti-Dumping Act.

H.R. 8277, a bill providing Federal contributions to State water resources projects.

H.R. 10295, a bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act.

H.R. 10710 and H.R. 10711, bills for the relief of River Forest for complying with civil defense regulations.

H.R. 4147, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, permitting deduction for student spouse, when supported by the taxpayer.

H.R. 4148, a bill to repeal the excise tax on communications.

H.R. 4149, a bill to terminate the retailers excise tax on cosmetics and other toilet preparations.

H.R. 4355, a bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over.

H.R. 4477, a bill to insure availability of certain critical materials during a war or national emergency by providing a reserve of such materials.

H.R. 4478, a bill to amend the Federal Employees Compensation Act to remove certain inequities in rates of payment to survivors.

H.R. 4620, a bill to remove the excise tax on entertainment equipment.

Keynote Address by Senator Walter F. Mondale at the 15th Biennial Convention, Young Democratic Clubs of America, October 12, 1965, New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the Congressional Record the text of an outstanding address given by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, the Honorable Walter F. Mondale, at the 15th biennial convention of the Young Democratic Clubs of America on October 12, 1965, in New York City.

Senator Mondale's address, which was the keynote address at the convention, follows:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE AT THE 15TH BIENNIAL CONVENTION, YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF AMERICA, OCTOBER 12, 1965, NEW YORK

As a young Democrat in the Senate, I am deeply honored to have this opportunity to speak to you this evening. Like so many of you, I got my start in politics before I was old enough to vote. I started by helping a young mayor of Minneapolis who decided to run for the U.S. Senate. I was given the job of managing his campaign in our Second Congressional District in Minnesota, and I have been deep in politics ever since.

It has been my honor to succeed this man—Vice President Hubert Humphrey—in the U.S. Senate. And, when he was forced to remain in Washington because of the President's operation, I was very happy to come to New York to fill in for him. I cannot be called a substitute, because no one could equal the magnificence of our Vice President, as a speaker, and as one of the great American statesmen of our generation. But I know also that we all feel better that he is in Washington at this time, as always serving our country as only he can. We hope he can fulfill his plans to be here later this week.

We can all rejoice that the President is recovering so quickly. Once again we are getting fresh evidence of what an extraordinary human being he is.

I would like to pay a special tribute to Mayor Wagner, one of America's great Democrats, now completing his 12th year of service to the people of New York. When the history of our time is written, I have no doubt that he will be ranked among the greatest mayors since the Dutch bought Manhattan Island from the Indians.

SALUTE TO BEAME

And I would salute, also, Comptroller Beame, the next mayor of New York, who will continue the tradition of Democratic progressive government in this great city. And with him, the next president of the New York City council, Frank O'Connor, and the future comptroller, Judge Procaccino. We all await that day eary next month when we will be celebrating their victory.

And heading up the Young Democrats, we have your national president, Al House, who has carried on your tradition of liberal commitment and service, who spearheaded your most effective effort during the last campaign. And John Kearney, host chairman of this convention and president of the New York Young Democrats. And if you will forgive me, I would like to make special reference to the Young Democrats from Minnesota, headed by President Robert Owens. I know a lot about their work, because I was a member not so long ago. I remember representing Minnesota at the Young Democratic Convention at Chattanooga in 1949, being one of those fighting to win convention support for President Truman's civil rights program. And I remember the hard work put in by Young Democrats in Minnesota last year to assure an overwhelming victory for Lyndon Johnson and Hubert Humphrey.

And let me say a word about my colleague, Senator Bob Kennedy, who will be here later this week. Seldom has a freshman Senator had as much influence on legislation as the Senator from New York. I consider it a privilege to sit next to him on the Democratic side of the Senate Chamber.

I think you made a wise choice in holding your convention in New York, for Democrats have long been welcome here. I regret we can't say this for the other party. There seems to be a real question about which way John Lindsay is running harder—away from his own party or toward the office of mayor of New York.

And from what I've heard, it looks like he's going to lose both races.

PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP

But we are not here to worry about the Republicans, but to pay tribute to a year of great liberal achievement, and to the Presidential leadership which made these achievements possible.

Just a short time ago, the noted political scientist, James MacGregor Burns, expressed the viewpoint of scholars everywhere, when he called for dynamic political leadership at a time when a deadlock of democracy was choking off needed, liberal legislation. "The cure for democracy," he said, "is leadership, responsible, committed, effective, exuberant leadership. The man and the party who take the lead in modernizing our political system will have helped put an end to the dangerous cycle of drift and deadlock in our national affairs. They will have enabled Americans to regain control of their national politics and to define and assert their national purpose."

Today, we Democrats have found this leadership in our President, Lyndon B. Johnson. More than any other President in our history—and we have had some great ones—he has broken through the deadlock of democracy.

Lyndon Johnson and the 89th Congress have transformed the executive-legislative relationship from a deadlock of democracy to a partnership for progress.

Indeed, the achievements of this administration and this Congress have been so overwhelming, that the frustrated Republican wreckers and spoilers, who once engineered the deadlock, are now crying out against a "rubberstamp" Congress. Their position is unique in American history. They are calling on us to vote against everything we've fought for—and everything the people of this country voted for—in order to prove our independence.

PARTNERSHIP FOR PROGRESS

But let me be very clear. I am proud, and I know that you are, to be a part of this partnership for progress. For when we have a President who calls on us to enact a desparately needed program of hospital and medical care for the aged—when we have a President who asks us to pass an Elementary and Secondary Education Act for educationally deprived children—when Lyndon B. Johnson wants us to break down every barrier to the right to vote—when we have a President who supports a bold new housing bill, including a creative program of rent supplements for low-income families—when he calls on us to establish an urban affairs department to fight the chaos of our cities—to enact a forward-looking, 4-year farm program—or a program to turn the corner in our fight against our worst killer diseases—or to give economically depressed regions a chance to share in American prosperity—or to redouble our efforts to break the vicious cycle of poverty—or to provide scholarships, loans, and work-study programs for needy college students—or to end the unjust national origins system in immigration—or to combat air and water pollution and promote national beautification—or to reduce excise taxes to maintain our unprecedented economic growth—or to provide needed financial support to our arts and humanities, as other civilized countries have long done—when we have a President who fights for legislation such as this, then I am proud to say "yes" along with you and with the many Senators and Congressmen who have worked with our President to win these victories for the people of America.

This entire speech—and many more like it—could be spent talking only of the overwhelming liberal accomplishment of 1965. But the party which looks only into the mirror of its achievements—dazzled with self-admiration—will soon grow blind to challenges which lie ahead. It is better—far better—that we look to the future, to the important, unanswered questions which we as Democrats and Americans still must face.

MEANING OF THE INDIVIDUAL

And so, for this very special audience, I would like to discuss one of the deep, fundamental problems in our society—the question of the meaning of the individual human life in 20th century America.

This problem is at the very center of any hope for the Great Society. It has been summed up admirably by a young man, Richard Goodwin, when he was special assistant to President Johnson. "There is," he said, "one central cause for our condition. It is the fear of the individual that he has become meaningless in the great human enterprise."

Men feel lost in a bigness beyond their power to shape or control, while the old human ties seem no longer to serve so well in telling men who they are or how they ought to live, or in giving men a sense of their importance and worth.

And, we find that this human loneliness, this lack of identity and meaning, is starting to surface. Berkeley is an example of this—and just last week in Washington, the "Berkeley syndrome" dominated a conference of educators. They were asking, "What does this mean?" and "What can we do about it?"

Much of our liberal legislation has been devoted to providing men more meaningful lives. We have fought, and we will continue to fight, against all barriers which block men from full participation in our society. We must continue the battle for equal rights and equal opportunity for Negroes and other minorities. We must redouble our efforts in the poverty program, to remove the economic and cultural barriers to individual achievement. We must break down geographical barriers to opportunity through intensified efforts in economically depressed areas. And, we must make sure that every American has a real chance for a good education.

All of these battles are far from won. We liberals are sometimes guilty of thinking that when we have passed a law, we have solved a problem. But it is not that easy. You don't win a war just by giving your troops some uniforms and ammunition. This Congress has drafted many charters of national progress this year, but making laws is only the first step in the resolution of national problems.

LAWS TO ACCOMPLISHMENTS

These laws must be transformed by dedicated people at all levels, into solid accomplishments. A voting rights law must be tested and implemented. A poverty program will fail without dedicated efforts in communities throughout America. An aid-to-education program stands or falls on the efforts of our teachers, educators, and administrators. And all of our legislative achievements must be guarded against those who fought them all the way and are determined that they shall fail.

And it must be added that most of these programs will require substantially greater appropriations by the Congress in future years.

I deeply believe that, in the programs we have enacted this year and in years before, we have the beginning of the answer to Selma, or Watts, or Appalachia. But we don't have the answer to Berkeley. We are working as never before to break down unjust racial or economic or social or geographic barriers, but we have not always provided meaningful lives to those who have overcome these barriers, or who never had to face them.

This is the problem of Berkeley, the problem of those who seem to have everything but feel they have nothing.

Men search for their identity, for a sense of their importance and worth, for work where they can make a personal creative contribution to the life of their community, State, Nation, and world. Too often today they do not find it.

As Goodwin said, "We went swiftly and hopefully ahead, assuming that if we built and grew rich we would create the conditions of a full life. We were wrong. These things were good and necessary. But they were way stations, not the destination, on the road to the Great Society."

BUILDING GREAT SOCIETY

And the answer to our larger predicament still escapes us. How do we build a Great Society which gives every individual a chance to live a meaningful life, to feel like a participant in America and not some distant spectator, to do work in which he can take pride?

I don't know the answer, and I wonder if anyone does yet. And since we don't know the answer, we don't know yet whether this is something that can be solved by legislation, whether at the Federal or at the State or local level. But we do know we must search for solutions wherever they can be found.

We do know that we cannot provide a contrived answer. You can't do it with some giant advertising campaign, with billboards and TV spot announcements telling people to "feel important." We can't solve the problem with computers, by developing a system of electronic people processing such as some people have proposed.

And just as we know what we can't do, I think we also know some of the things we can do.

For example, we can ask not just whether our economy is producing enough jobs, but whether they are the kind of jobs that are worthy of a lifetime of human effort. We must seek to develop the kind of national life which provides, above all, opportunities for men to give, to create, to build, to sense in their own lives their personal contribution to their society.

We can think of men not just as spectators, but as participants.

And we can, above all, call upon all American citizens to rise to a higher plateau of public commitment. John F. Kennedy put this call in memorable form when he said, "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

YOUNG AMERICA ANSWERS

Young America answered that call with enthusiasm beyond all we could have expected, and the Peace Corps is a monument to that response, irrefutable evidence of your thirst for work that is important and meaningful.

And, there are hundreds and thousands of opportunities in teaching, in youth counseling, and work with the poor, in civil rights, in conservation, in humane law enforcement, in the clergy, in arts and humanities and in many other walks of life where young Americans can make a public commitment to serve their country and their communities, and in this process bring new State, or Nation.

And finally, as so many of you at the convention have already discovered, you can find much of your answer, as individuals, by your participation in this political party.

Your lives are richer, more meaningful, because of your commitment to a lifetime of liberal involvement, to making America the kind of just, progressive, human society we all know it can be and must be.

Some of you can fulfill this commitment by running for political office—as a number of you already have—by seeking the rare privilege of political leadership in your town, State, or Nation.

Others of you will do work that is equally imported by active participation at all levels of our political party.

MEANING TO LIFE

By making this commitment, you know that you are sharing in the accomplishments which are and will be our greatest reward. And in working with others who share this commitment, you will build lasting human friendships with the Nation's best citizens. These things, as so many of you have already found in our Democratic Party, can bring deep and permanent meaning to your lives.

For those persons who are in politics for money, or ego satisfaction or to pull the strings of political power, our answer is—we'd all be better off if they would quit right now.

But the overwhelming majority of delegates here tonight would not be here if they had not already made their commitment to a lifetime of meaningful dedication to a better America.

You have joined this great political party not for what you hope to receive, but what you can give. You are asking to serve your fellow Americans, and to work to build the Great Society.

By making this commitment, you can provide your own personal answer to the search for meaning in modern life.

And in finding your own answer, you are helping to find an answer for the Nation as a whole.

Anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, 9 years have now elapsed since the turbulent uprising of the freedom fighters in Budapest, Hungary, on October 23, 1956. Nine years ago, the myths of Russia's benevolence toward Hungary were torn apart and violence replaced benevolence in the vocabulary of those who would profess Communist amiability. Nine years and a week ago, the Communists were again in control of Hungary, but the spirit of liberty which had burned steadily for a week in many parts of Hungary was extinguished.

The world will always remember the gallant, brave spirit of the men who armed with only a few guns and mostly farm implements fought for a breath of independence from the ruling, overpowering gag of the Communist world—a gag muffling the cries for emancipation and democracy, cries for independence of thought and life, freedom of choice. The trumpet sounded by these freedom fighters was heard through our planet, a trumpet blown during a violent week splattered with blood. For a week, the freedom fighters, unaided by surrounding countries or their world neighbors, continued to fight without surrender for the ideals and principles of liberty. During this torn period, 40,000 were arrested, 2,400 were executed, and 200,000 fled into exile. These brave persons offered their lives for independence and the independence of the future generations who will inhabit Hungary.

In defeat, this rebellion was victorious. Those who would believe that man can be subjugated to tyranny must listen, must learn that persons deprived of freedom through the centuries possess the instinctive trait of freedom.

Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit my voting record on major substantive issues during the first session of the 89th Congress. The record-breaking volume of legislation is reflected by the greatest number of rollcalls in the history of Congress for a single session which has put considerable stress and strain on the time and patience of Members of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding this pressure, I am pleased to report that I was in attendance on the floor of the House for 100 percent of the rollcall votes on legislation during this session.

My voting record follows:

Date	Issue	Vote
Jan. 26	Recommit supplemental Agriculture appropriations providing no funds be used for aid to Egypt	Yea.
Feb. 9	Eliminate requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain gold reserves	Nay.
Feb. 17	Increase authorization of appropriations for arms control	Yea.
Feb. 18	Authorize increased U.S. participation in Inter-American Development Bank	Yea.
Feb. 25	Authorize appropriations for House Un-American Activities Committee	Yea.
Mar. 3	Provide economic aid to Appalachia	Nay.
Mar. 10	Establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs	Yea.
Mar. 15	Increase authorization of appropriations for national arts and cultural program	Yea.
Mar. 17	Increase salaries of Supreme Court Justices	Nay.
Mar. 22	Measures to prevent crime in the District of Columbia	Yea.
Mar. 23	Provide marketing quotas for tobacco, amend tobacco price support	Nay.
Mar. 26	Improving educational quality and opportunities in elementary and secondary schools	Yea.
Mar. 31	Providing grants to States for programs aiding older persons	Yea.
Mar. 31	Providing programs for development of natural resources	Yea.
Apr. 1	Extending Nation's active manpower policy	Yea.
Apr. 5	Return of obscene mail matter	Yea.
Apr. 5	Authorize funds for building chancery in Saigon	Yea.
Apr. 5	Appropriations for Treasury, Post Office Department, and Executive Office of the President	Yea.
Apr. 6	Supplemental appropriations for Appalachia program, Federal pay raises, and other purposes	Nay.
Apr. 8	Medicare bill, on passage	Yea.
Apr. 13	Amend Constitution with regard to Presidential succession	Yea.
Apr. 14	Authorizing additional expenditures for House Un-American Activities Committee	Yea.
Apr. 27	Authorizing increase in International Monetary Fund quota of United States	Yea.
Apr. 28	Authorizing grants for water pollution control	Yea.
Apr. 29	Increase authorization of appropriations for national arts and cultural program	Yea.
May 3	Extend provisions of Public Health Service Act, relating to community health services	Yea.
May 4	Authorizing Federal assistance in acquiring personnel for community mental health centers	Yea.
May 5	Supplemental appropriations for military functions of Defense Department	Yea.
May 5	Authorize appropriations for procurement, research and development for Armed Forces	Yea.
May 6	Authorizing appropriations for NASA	Yea.
May 10	Extending Public Health Service Act for construction of research facilities	Yea.
May 12	Carry out U.S. obligations under International Coffee Agreement	Yea.
May 20	Authorizing appropriations for Atomic Energy Commission	Yea.
May 25	Foreign Assistance Act of 1965, authorizing $2,000,000,000 in expenditures	Nay.
May 26	Appropriations, Department of Agriculture	Nay.
June 1	Appropriations, Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	Yea.
June 1	Amend Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to further provide for prevention of accidents in mines	Yea.
June 2	Reduction Federal excise taxes	Yea.
June 3	Authorizing appointment of Gen. William F. McKee as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency	Nay.
June 7	Amend Railroad Retirement Act to eliminate reduction of annuities of spouses of retired employees by amount of certain monthly benefits	Yea.
June 8	Provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports	Yea.
June 9	Provide temporary increase in public debt limit for fiscal 1966	Nay.
June 9	Allowing U.S. Information Agency film, "JFK—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums" be shown in United States	Yea.
June 16	Establishing a Department of Housing and Urban Development	Nay.
June 16	Authorizing each House Member to employ annually, on temporary basis, a student intern	Nay.
June 21	Establish system of loan insurance assisting students to attend postsecondary business, trade, technical, and vocational schools	Yea.
June 21	Provide consideration for national disasters in the feed grains, cotton, and wheat programs for 1965	Yea.
June 21	Request President to take measures securing world recognition of the rights of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania	Yea.
June 23	Appropriations, Department of Defense, fiscal 1966	Yea.
June 24	Extend Area Redevelopment Act for a period of 2 months	Nay.
June 30	Provide housing for low- and moderate-income families, and urban development	Nay.
July 9	Voting rights bill, on passage	Yea.
July 12	Extension of civil service apportionment requirement to temporary summer employees	Yea.
July 13	Federal cigarette labeling and advertising, conference report	Yea.
July 14	Battin amendment, requiring silver content of quarters and dimes be fixed at 40 percent	Yea.
July 14	Coinage Act of 1965, on passage	Nay.
July 20	Increase rates of basic pay for members of uniformed services	Yea.
July 22	Expand war on poverty	Nay.
July 22	Recommital motion deleting provision for review Governor's vetoes of projects and reduce authorization funds to current level	Yea.
July 26	Adopt rule for consideration repeal sec. 14(b) Taft-Hartley Act	Nay.
July 27	Medicare, conference report	Yea.
July 27	Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, conference report	Nay.
July 27	Mental Facilities and Centers Construction Act, conference report	Yea.
July 28	Repeal sec. 14(b), Taft-Hartley, permitting right to work	Nay.
July 29	Amend Atomic Energy Act, 1954, clarifying portions on electric power	Yea.

Date	Issue	Vote
Aug. 2	Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965	Yea.
Aug. 2	Rehabilitation of Federal prisoners	Yea.
Aug. 2	Appropriations, Interstate System	Yea.
Aug. 3	Voting rights, to enforce the 15th amendment, conference report	Yea.
Aug. 3	Civil service retirement annuity adjustment	Yea.
Aug. 4	Military construction authorization	Yea.
Aug. 4	Permitting U.S. Governors of International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation to agree to amendments to articles of agreement of such Bank and Corporation.	Nay.
Aug. 5	Interest Equalization Tax Extension Act of 1965	Yea.
Aug. 9	Motor vehicles insurance, to amend the Fire and Casualty Act	Nay.
Aug. 10	Prohibition of destruction or mutilation of draft cards	Yea.
Aug. 12	Sisk amendment, to economic development, providing more areas eligible for grants for public works and development facilities	Nay.
Aug. 12	Economic Development Act providing grants for public works and development facilities	Nay.
Aug. 16	Amend Tariff Act of 1930 suspending duty on certain forms of nickel	Yea.
Aug. 16	Establish and prescribe duties of Federal Boxing Commission	Yea.
Aug. 19	Establishing wheat, cotton, wool, dairy, and feed grain price supports	Nay.
Aug. 24	Recommit supplemental appropriations, Department of HEW and Labor	Yea.
Aug. 25	Abolishment national origins system of immigration and establishing new quotas	Yea.
Aug. 25	MacGregor amendment to establish July 1, 1968 a limit of 115,000 immigrants per year from countries in Western Hemisphere	Yea.
Aug. 26	Strengthen educational resources of colleges and universities, provide financial assistance for students	Yea.
Aug. 30	Financial assistance to elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by major disaster	Yea.
Aug. 31	Implementation of agreement between United States and Canada in automotive parts	Yea.
Sept. 1	Authorizing Federal grants as necessary for health professions and educational purposes	Yea.
Sept. 2	Authorize Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation	Yea.
Sept. 7	Authorize certain construction at military installations	Yea.
Sept. 7	Veterans disability compensation, increase rates	Yea.
Sept. 7	Authorizing funds for President's Crime Commission	Yea.
Sept. 14	Establishment of concession policies in areas administered by National Park Service	Yea.
Sept. 15	Recommit Equal Opportunity Act Amendments	Yea.
Sept. 15	Recommit National Foundation of Arts and Humanities Act (passed by voice vote)	Nay.
Sept. 16	Motion to table resolution directing Postmaster General to provide names of temporary employees employed by Post Office Department	Nay.
Sept. 16	Extending indemnity provisions of the Atomic Energy Act	Yea.
Sept. 17	Appropriations, Department of Defense, conference report	Yea.
Sept. 17	Resolution dismissing 5 Mississippi election contests and declaring returned Members are duly elected to their seats in the House of Representatives	Nay.
Sept. 20	Group life insurance for uniformed services	Yea.
Sept. 20	Resolution expressing Sense of House relative to intervention international Communist movement in Western Hemisphere	Yea.
Sept. 21	Establishment of national policy re water pollution	Yea.
Sept. 22	Authorizing construction, repair and preservation of rivers and harbors	Yea.
Sept. 22	Provide participation of United States in Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, Dade County, Fla	Nay.
Sept. 23	Bennett amendment to eliminate exemptions in the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956	Yea.
Sept. 23	Amend consolidated Farmers Home Administration to provide grants to develop water supply and sewage disposal	Yea.
Sept. 24	Requirement of standards for controlling pollution and program for solid waste disposal	Yea.
Sept. 27	Discharge Rules Committee from further consideration home rule for District	Nay.
Sept. 29	Adoption Sisk amendment to home rule providing for election of Charter Board and referendum by District of Columbia residents	Yea.
Sept. 30	Adjust pay for Federal employees and establishment of Federal Salary Review Commission	Yea.
Oct. 1	Foreign assistance appropriations and related programs, conference report	Nay.
Oct. 1	Amend Public Health Service Act to provide for medical library facilities	Yea.
Oct. 1	Construction 3d Library of Congress Building	Yea.
Oct. 1	Construction of Jefferson National Expansion Memorial	Yea.
Oct. 7	Contributions to certain citizens of Ryukyu Islands for death and injuries resulting from activities of U.S. Armed Forces	Yea.
Oct. 7	Construction, operation, and maintenance of southern Nevada water project	Yea.
Oct. 7	Highway Beautification Act	Nay.
Oct. 8	Agriculture and Food Act of 1965, conference report	Nay.
Oct. 13	Extending for 5 years Sugar Act with amendments	Nay.
Oct. 14	Supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1966	Nay.
Oct. 14	Harvey amendment, to delete the rent supplement program	Yea.

My rollcall votes subsequent to October 14 and up to adjournment were on conference reports and were consistent with votes on original legislation.

Personal Explanation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, since 1960, I have served by appointment under three Presidents, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and now President Johnson, as one of the two House congressional advisers to the U.S. delegation to the United Nations on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. It is necessary for me to attend United Nations sessions as well as keeping up with the activities and work of the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, both in this capacity, as well as in my work as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

On Monday, October 11, 1965, and on Tuesday, October 12, 1965, I was in New York City attending to my duties.

If I had been present I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 363, the vote on the rule on the sugar amendments bill, H.R. 11135, which passed by a margin of—yeas 253, nays 80.

Obsolete, Inefficient College Buildings Create Need for Campus Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, college campuses in America are so badly in need of more buildings and facilities to handle the onrush of new students, we may be neglecting to face the problem of removing or modernizing the old, obsolete buildings that often choke the efficient growth of these institutions.

The University of Minnesota, Minneapolis campus, in my own district, has a number of fine old structures that have long since passed their prime in usefulness as college buildings. I am sure that many of my colleagues would find the same picture I found, if they examine the construction records for colleges in their districts.

At the University of Minnesota we have Eddy Hall, built in 1881. Construction is masonry with wood floors. Condition is fair to poor. Pattee Hall, built in 1889 of masonry construction and wood floors, is also in unsatisfactory condition. Wesbrook Hall, 1896; the armory, 1896; Jones Hall, 1901; psychology, 1906; Shevlin Hall, 1906; music education, 1888; Norris Gym, 1914; and a large number of wood frame temporary war surplus structures from 1947 are part of a deteriorating, decaying and hard-to maintain old campus. By comparison, the solid, more efficient, newer structures that handle the bulk of the educational task on the Minneapolis campus, give strength to a growing, dynamic university.

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 might be broad enough to help college campus renewal. However, I am suggesting a short bill to make clear that renewal deserves immediate attention.

The U.S. Office of Education has written me with assurances that the act is broad and flexible enough to apply to campus renewal problems. Their letter said in part:

> Under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, grants and loans are available to assist in financing the construction of academic facilities for institutions of higher education. The acquisition, rehabilitation,

alteration, conversion or improvement of existing facilities are also eligible for assistance under this act.

Included in eligible development costs of a project under this act is the cost of necessary acquisition of the land on which the facility is to be located and necessary site improvements to permit its use for such facility. We have interpreted "site improvements" to include the demolition of existing structures on the proposed project site.

The Commissioner of Education's regulations already in effect are also encouraging. Regulation 107.4 takes into account:

> (c) Efficiency of design, with due regard to safety standards, in placement of common-use areas such as hallways and lobbies, and in placement of plumbing and other utility systems,
>
> (d) Ratio of assignable area to interior space area of the building,
>
> (e) Relationship between the number of floors in the construction and the cost of land in the immediate vicinity,
>
> * * * * *
>
> (g) Reasonable allowance, where appropriate and justified, for harmonious integration of a new facility with architectural characteristics of surrounding buildings, for creative application of proved new developments in educational media and methods, for planned future expansion of the facility.

Regulation 170.15 of the Commissioner of Education also allows a State to include the following standard for determining relative priorities of projects:

> (d) (6) The relationship of the proposed facilities to an adopted plan for development of the institution or branch campus for which it will be constructed.

Yet, I think more is needed. We should amend the law to make clear that campus renewal should be an important part of our long-range program of financing higher education facilities in every State across the land.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I have today introduced the College Campus Renewal Act. Under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of this new bill. It is a simple bill that makes the removal of obsolescence on college campuses part of the national policy of development for higher education. A 10-percent bonus for constructing facilities in accordance with comprehensive planning for the institution should encourage and help finance this important activity.

This Congress is voting bold new programs in shaping a partnership between the Federal and local level in meeting the challenge of education. We have a responsibility to do the job well.

Campus renewal is a necessary part of the development of higher education facilities in the decade ahead.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 11816

A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "College Campus Renewal Act".

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The growing obsolescence of many buildings on the campuses of institutions of higher education in the Nation presents a problem that demands immediate action. Many buildings are no longer adapted to the academic purposes for which they were originally constructed. Many buildings are unsafe, expensive to maintain, and located in such a way as not to allow the most efficient and best arrangement of buildings on the campus. Functional or structural obsolescence and inefficient utilization of facilities and land area on the campus cause an unnecessary drain on the budgets of public and private colleges, and can reduce the effectiveness of grants and loans made under Federal programs in support of higher education. The expansion of facilities to accommodate the ever-increasing numbers of youth in need of higher education must now be accompanied by a carefully planned program for modernization and replacement of obsolete or inefficient facilities on our college campuses.

AMENDMENTS TO HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963

SEC. 3. (a) Section 106 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows:

"ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS

"SEC. 106. An institution of higher education shall be eligible for a grant for construction of an academic facility under this title only if such construction will, either alone or together with other construction to be undertaken within a reasonable time, (1) result in an urgently needed substantial expansion of the institution's student enrollment capacity or capacity to carry out extension and continuing education programs on the campus of such institution, or (2) in the case of a new institution of higher education, result in creating urgently needed enrollment capacity or capacity to carry out extension and continuing education programs on the campus of such institution, or (3) result in modernization or removal or replacement of a facility that is functionally or structurally obsolete or inefficient."

(b) Section 401(b)(1) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) The term 'construction' means (A) erection of new or expansion of existing structures, and the acquisition and installation of intial equipment therefor; or (B) acquisition of existing structures not owned by the institution involved; or (C) rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement (including the acquisition and installation of initial equipment, or modernization or replacement of built-in equipment) of existing structures; or (D) removal of an obsolete facility and restoring and landscaping the land in its place; or (E) a combination of any two or more of the foregoing."

(c) The third sentence of section 107(a) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by inserting after the words "utilizing existing facilities", the words "and making progress towards eliminating obsolete and inefficient structures".

(d) Section 108(b)(5) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows:

"(5) The commissioner determines that the construction will be undertaken in an economical manner and will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials, and (if applicable) will remove functional or structural obsolescence and increase the efficient utilization of the campus or a facility; and".

(e) Section 107(b) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by adding a sentence to read, "The Commissioner may increase the amount of a grant by an additional 10 per centum of the amount of the grant for any project which has been certified to him by the appropriate State commission as being in conformity with a comprehensive plan developed for the institution."

"$$$ and Sense"—A Best Seller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I need hardly mention to my colleagues that despite the remarkable prosperity which our great Nation is enjoying, many families are having difficulty making both ends meet. For this reason, I would like to bring to your attention an outstanding book which Fleet Publishing Corp., has just released. It is Ella Gale's "$$$ and Sense, Your Complete Guide to Wise Buying," with a preface by our good friend, Senator PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan.

In my own congressional district, we have many large families, and it is not at all unusual to find homes with five or more children. And although conditions are improving because of the new taconite plants, it is not easy to properly feed, house, clothe, and educate a large, or for that matter, a small family. This problem is not peculiar to my district. When the session ends, many of us will be going home to face similar conditions. It is for this reason that I heartily recommend Ella Gale's "$$$ and Sense," and would like to take a few minutes to describe it.

This is a book on how to buy wisely. It is not a book on budgeting. Ella Gale believes that strict budgeting is not only difficult in the home, it is the cause of much family friction. The difficulty of budgeting is something all of us in the Congress are well aware of—and—on a grand scale. So, as far as family budgeting is concerned, Ella Gale says:

> You don't necessarily have to cut to the bone to get more out of your income. Nor must you set up a budget, a thing most families detest. But you do have to plan your spending and your saving, and "you" means everyone in the family, children included. Some of the worst money leaks are caused by children whose parents are too soft to admit. It's too expensive.

She warns:

> Mismanaging the family paycheck can bring many problems. Often it means a needlessly lower standard of living. Always, it means doing without some of the things the family would like.

"$$$ and Sense" is jampacked with basic information on consumer problems and how to solve them. Senator HART aptly phrased it in his preface when he said:

> The whole gambit of purchasing decisions is covered here—and covered well. Whether you absorb one or two new facts—or two hundred—I would rate this book as a significant contribution to consumer education.

When Senator HART speaks of the whole gambit of purchasing decisions, he is not exaggerating. For example, in her chapter "How To Save on Household Equipment," Ella Gale not only tells how to get a good buy, but goes into this kind of detail:

> When it comes to demonstrators or floor models—stoves are a good buy, electric dishwashers aren't.

In the chapter "Cut Your Clothing Costs," she says that the best shoe buys, especially for children, are those with leather tops and synthetic soles. She disagrees with shoe people who think the most expensive shoes are a must for children. She thinks the middle-priced shoes are a better buy. Speaking of leather uppers, she admits "many synthetics wear longer and cost less than leather." But she adds:

> I think it's better to have a leather shoe that's comfortable than a synthetic that reverts to its original shape.

She recommends clothes that actually grow with a child. This new development permits the mother to merely pull a thread and add inches to coats, trousers, dresses, and underwear for growing boys and girls.

Ella Gale tells "How to Stretch Your Food Dollars" in a meaty chapter. She describes in detail how to comparison shop, find the stores with the best buys, and she urges consumers to arm themselves against becoming impulse buyers. She warns:

> This kind of buying is a real strain on the income and must be avoided if you are in earnest about stretching your dollars. It is easy. Never go shopping unchaperoned. Take a shopping list with you and stick to it.

"$$$ and Sense," is bursting with information on how to save money, or, to be more accurate, how to stretch your dollar. Her chapter "Buying on Credit" illustrates how you can save as much as $57.58 in interest charges when you make a $200 purchase on the installment plan. She also tells in simple, down-to-earth terms how to figure true interest rates.

Since trading stamps have become a problem of concern to the Congress, her chapter on trading stamps is of particular interest to us in the Congress. She says:

> I found it extremely difficult to compare an item at the trading store with the same thing at one or more discount stores.

Checking the prices of a nationally advertised electric iron, it sold for $17.88 in a discount store, and for 6¾ books of stamps at the trading stamp redemption center. Figuring the stamps are worth $3 per book, the iron cost approximately $20.25 in trading stamps. She concludes with:

> I checked the large department store in town that claims it cuts prices to meet the discount store prices. It carried the same iron for only $13.98—a $4 saving over the discount store. Obviously, the best place to buy was the department store, not the trading stamp center or the discount store.

In the chapter "Your Dream Home," Ella Gale has a 22-point check list for new home purchasers. For those who want to buy older homes, she not only warns of 23 hidden dangers, but lists costs and hazards of renovations and repairs.

The book is full of tips—to save dollars. There is specific information on how to buy sheets, towels, blankets, bedspreads. How to select and save on furniture, carpets, curtains, and mattresses. She carefully describes how to save money on electrical equipment and tells under what conditions it is better to use a self-service laundry than to purchase a washing machine. The food and clothing chapters are loaded with information on how to buy every kind of canned, frozen, fresh, and packaged food, and every item of clothing for men, women, and children. She warns of deceptive advertising, phoney markups, and phoney markdowns, and, a subject of interest to many of us in the Congress, deceptive packaging and labeling.

According to Ella Gale, if a detergent costs, say, $2.15 for 9 pounds, 13 ounces, "it still is almost impossible for the average housewife to determine the best buy unless she has a computer or a cost-weight table." And so, she has included in the book a marvelous new cost-weight table, developed by Cornell University. Readers of "$$$ and Sense" will be able to tell at a glance, the cost per pound of everything from toothpaste to dehydrated potatoes.

This is the first time a book has appeared under the authorship of Ella Gale. And, I would like to take this opportunity to reveal that she is someone many of you know, for she has been a part of the Washington scene for many years. You know her as Ella G. Roller, and under this name she is known to many of my constituents, since as far back as 1948.

I deem it a pleasure to have had the opportunity of bringing to your attention Ella Gale's "$$$ and Sense, Your Complete Guide to Wise Buying." It is complete in its coverage, easy to read and often lively in its style.

America First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which would authorize the House Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation and study of the Office of Education. The purpose of the legislation would be to investigate and study the practices followed by the Office of Education to determine whether such practices adequately insure that Federal funds are not used either to pay salaries or to provide educational assistance to persons opposed to the interests of the United States, either at home or abroad.

In view of the recurring demonstrations against U.S. foreign policy by certain professors and students, it seems high time that Congress investigate all programs under which Federal funds are made available for educational purposes to make certain these persons do not benefit. Americans have every right to responsibly criticize domestic and foreign policies of any administration, and unquestionably a great number now engaged in demonstrating against the administration policy in Vietnam are loyal Americans; but beyond this, a line must be drawn.

The U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary recently released a staff study prepared for the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws. The study indicates that the recent surge of criticism of administration policies in Vietnam could be divided into four broad categories. First. Honest criticism by loyal Americans who oppose communism but believe that the method we are using to fight in Vietnam is wrong. Second. Honest criticism by those who believe that communism is not a real threat or who believe that Vietnam is outside our sphere of influence and that we are pursuing an unwise course in committing ground troops to a war in that area. Third. Honest criticism by convinced pacifists who believe that force is wrong in any and all circumstances.

While many might violently disagree with the views expressed by those in these three categories, my resolution would be aimed at the fourth group composed of those who have been engaged in dishonest criticism and who appear to support the general aims of communism. These persons look upon America as the villain and communism as the real hope of the future.

It was recently reported that one who would fall in the fourth category received a graduate fellowship at the University of Iowa in 1961 under title IV of the National Defense Education Act. It was a 3-year award in international relations and comparative government, amounting to $6,600. The recipient of this grant reportedly admitted that he was a "professed Marxist" and would like to see the Communists win in Vietnam.

It would seem imperative that the Committee on Education and Labor should develop strict guidelines for use by the Office of Education to insure that no Federal funds, from any Federal program, whether it be loans, grants, or otherwise, would be used for the salaries of teachers or to provide educational assistance of any kind to students who intentionally oppose the interests of the United States. Congress should demand, on behalf of the taxpayers of this country and American servicemen everywhere, that if loans or grants are being made to any such person, they be immediately suspended and that proper legal action should be instituted to recover any and all amounts previously loaned or granted to any person, or persons, engaging in anti-American demonstrations, criticisms, or other activity.

Therefore, as previously stated, I am introducing a resolution directing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation of the Office of

Education and requiring the committee to take a look at the present practices of the Office of Education to see what is being done to keep Federal largesse from benefiting persons who have embarked on a course of conduct inimical to the interests of the United States, either at home or abroad.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. Res. 622

To authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation and study of the Office of Education

That the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the practices followed by the Office of Education in providing assistance for education, with a view to determining whether such practices adequately insure that Federal funds are not used to pay the salaries of, or to provide educational assistance to, persons who, though willing to accept such Federal funds, are in fact opposed to the interests of the United States, either at home or abroad.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Committee or any member of the Committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member.

The Committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Toward the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 89th Congress has forged a historic record of accomplishment and progress beyond any session in our Nation's proud history. The Democratic team—combining the vigorous and forward-looking leadership of President Johnson, Vice President HUMPHREY, and the able members of the executive branch with the brilliant and tireless efforts of the leaders of the House and Senate—has carried forward the programs and policies that received such an overwhelming vote of confidence from the American people last November.

Working together to advance the well-being of all Americans, we have made significant progress toward achievement of the Great Society, begun little more than 4 years ago in the New Frontier proposals of our late beloved President John F. Kennedy.

President Johnson outlined the scope of the Great Society program in his remarks at the University of Michigan on May 22, 1964:

> I want to talk to you today about three places where we begin to build the Great Society—in our cities, in our countryside, in our classrooms. The Great Society is not a safe harbor, a resting place, a final objective, a finished work. It is a challenge constantly renewed, beckoning us toward a destiny where the meaning of our lives matches the marvelous products of our labor.

The 89th Congress has moved forward on dozens of important fronts toward the achievement of these far-reaching objectives to help bring about a better life for Americans in all walks of life. As we adjourn after more than some 10 months of intensive legislative effort, it is important that we review our progress:

First, in broad terms of the state of our national economy, our defense posture in a troubled world, and in carrying out our international commitments in our relationships with other nations; and second, in terms of the specific legislative accomplishments that have been enacted into law, many of them the result of years of patient consideration, tireless effort, and review by the Congress.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

We are enjoying the most prosperous period in our long history. The current economic upswing has now continued for 56 months. Unemployment has been reduced to 4.4 percent—September 1965—the lowest rate in 8 years. Our economy is growing at an unprecedented 7.9 percent rate, based on the first half of 1965. Weekly wages are at an alltime high. Corporate profits after taxes are at record highs. Industrial production continues to soar.

Our gross national product is exceeding the most optimistic predictions of a year ago. Living costs have continued stable. Excise tax reductions voted by Congress this year have brought new purchasing power to every household. American families are now enjoying the highest standard of living in the history of mankind. We can take pride in the economic advances of our society, which make possible the tremendous progress we are making in other important areas of our national life.

Much yet remains to be done. We are not complacent or satisfied with these economic gains. Poverty still stalks the lives of millions of our citizens. Crime and juvenile delinquency still afflict our cities. Housing needs, water pollution, transportation, and educational problems are still unresolved. Our nonwhite citizens have not yet fully achieved equality of opportunity. While we have made great progress toward meeting these challenges, we still have much to accomplish to achieve the reality of the Great Society.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Our basic policy of defense in this crucial period of world turmoil has been constant. The primary purpose of our arms is for achievement of world peace through strength—to fulfill our commitments to free nations; to deter any general war—nuclear or conventional; to convince all possible aggressors that any overt action would be futile; to assure mechanism for diplomatic settlement of disputes through the full utilization of the United Nations; and to work for an end to the arms race through enforceable disarmament agreements.

We have continued the policy of balanced military strength, utilizing both nuclear and conventional weapons. We have improved the management and efficiency of our Defense Establishment, saving many billions of dollars. We have provided needed increases in the military pay schedule, to make certain that trained personnel is available to serve in our defense effort. We have increased both the scope and extent of our military capability—in the air, on the ground, and at sea.

FOREIGN POLICY

We have continued our positive policies in dealings with other nations. Castro's Cuba has been increasingly isolated and has become more dependent on Soviet economic support. Cuban refugees have been welcomed to our shores. Our basic immigration policies have been modified to eliminate the discriminatory national origins quota system. We have reaffirmed our commitment to the free government of South Vietnam by increased military efforts to resist continued aggression from the north. We have revitalized our foreign assistance programs in the Western Hemisphere and in other parts of the world, encouraging social and economic reforms in the recipient countries. We have strengthened and expanded the Peace Corps. We have worked to strengthen the role of the United Nations in helping to keep the peace and to promote international cooperation.

MAJOR LEGISLATION ENACTED

At the beginning of the session, the House adopted an important series of procedural reforms in the House rules to expedite the consideration of major bills and to provide for more democratic procedures. Our subsequent legislative achievements in the domestic area have been spectacular. A list of the major bills enacted by the 1st session of the 89th Congress follows:

Medicare and social security amendments: Provides hospitalization, surgical, and nursing home care for persons 65 years and older, financed through the social security system: increases social security benefits, retroactive to January 1, 1965, and makes other liberalizing changes in social security law.

Elementary-secondary education: Provides Federal grant program to improve elementary and secondary education under local control, with bulk of aid for school districts where there are large numbers of children from poverty-stricken families.

Excise tax reduction: Provides excise tax cuts totaling $4.7 billion on various consumer items such as appliances, telephone service, autos, and so forth; eliminates most Federal excises by 1969.

Omnibus Housing Act: Expands current urban renewal, public housing programs, extends FHA loan insurance program, encourages urban planning and beautification in housing; provides new rent supplement program for certain low- and moderate-income families.

Voting rights: Strengthens machinery for guaranteeing right to vote to all citizens by prohibiting poll taxes, literacy tests; provides for Federal registrars in States where less than 50 percent of potential voters are registered or voted.

Public works and economic development: Provides expanded program of grants and loans to communities for public works, development facilities, and other projects intended to aid economically depressed areas.

Water pollution control: Expands water pollution control program, grants for waste treatment plant construction; strengthens Federal enforcement authority to clean up our rivers and streams.

Department of Housing and Urban Affairs: Establishes a new Cabinet-level department to administer programs affecting the 70 percent of our population that now resides in metropolitan areas.

Omnibus farm program: Improves and extends feed grain, wheat, dairy and cotton programs, encourages cropland retirement, bolsters farm income.

Immigration Act Amendements: Abolishes discriminatory national origins quota system over 3-year period; establishes a 170,000 annual limit on immigrants, special preferences given to relatives of American citizens.

Appalachian regional development: Authorizes comprehensive State-Federal program to assist in the development of the economically depressed, 11-State Appalachian region.

Manpower development and training: Extends and expands manpower training program to assist unemployed in learning new skills to qualify them for better jobs.

Higher education: Authorizes expanded 5-year program to assist colleges and universities to improve educational opportunities; provides student loan and scholarship to aid needy students.

Economic opportunity program: Increases authorization for antipoverty program, makes other improvements in the operation of various parts of the war on poverty.

Military pay increase: Provides an average 10.4-percent pay increase for some 4.2 million uniformed personnel of the Armed Forces, effective September 1, 1965—2.7 million on active duty, 1 million reservists, 500,000 retired.

Regional medical centers: Authorizes 3-year program of Federal grants to plan and develop a series of regional medical programs to fight heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

Arts and humanities: Creates a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities to assist and foster broad cultural programs in art, music, films, ballet, and so forth.

Health professions education: Extends and expands program of construction grants to medical, dental, and other similar educational institutions; establishes new program of scholarship grants for needy students, increases student loan program.

Presidential continuity: Adopted proposed amendment to the Constitution to establish procedure to permit Vice President to become Acting President if the President is unable to perform his duties; provides for filling the vacancy of the office of Vice President.

Congressional organization: Created a joint committee to study the organization and operation of Congress and to make recommendations to improve and streamline the work of Congress.

Health research facilities: Provides for extension of program to construct health research facilities; establishes three new Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare to administer expanded programs in this area.

Community health services: Extends programs for public health services providing vaccinations, immunization, other preventive treatment of diseases, migrant health clinics, and grants to States for general health services.

Mental health services: Provides for initial staffing grants for personnel serving in community mental health centers.

Drug controls: Expands Federal control over certain depressant and stimulant drugs to reduce the illegal use of these dangerous drugs that affect the central nervous system.

Older Americans: Establishes new Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop programs to assist the aged.

Juvenile delinquency: Extends present law to assist communities in the development of new programs to prevent or control juvenile delinquency and youth crime.

Water resources development: Extends and broadens research program of converting saline water; another new law provides grants to States for the coordination of water resources planning and development; another new law establishes a grant program to assist in development of water supply and sewage disposal facilities in rural areas; a separate program was authorized to plan a water supply system for the northeastern part of the country.

Air pollution: Establishes machinery for controlling motor vehicle air pollutants, accelerates air pollution research program, creates new program to find methods of disposing of solid wastes.

Highway beautification: Provides for gradual control over billboards, signs, and so forth, along Federal-aided highways of the interstate and primary systems; offers incentive grants for improvement of scenic areas along such highways.

Federal pay: Provides salary increase for Federal classified and postal employees, attempting to achieve more equitable relationship with pay of employees in private industry; makes other fringe benefits in pay and overtime allowances.

High-speed rapid transit: Authorizes 3-year progarm of research and demonstration projects for development of high-speed intercity railroad transportation.

State technical services: Establishes new 3-year program of Federal-State-local-technical cooperation to provide technical service centers to disseminate findings of scientific and technological importance to commerce and industry.

Retired Government employees: Provides for cost-of-living increases in annuities to retired employees of Federal Government.

Vocational training: Expands vocational rehabilitation program to aid disabled persons; another new program provides Federal loan insurance to high school graduates to finance tuition at business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools.

This truly remarkable record of accomplishment has been achieved despite the traditional tactics of harassment and obstructionism of the Republican minority. We of the Democratic majority have acted decisively and responsibly to carry out the overwhelming mandate of the American voters last November. We have fulfilled our campaign pledges. We have kept faith with the people of our Nation who believe in continued progress in the 1960's, in continued economic growth and development of America's great potential, and in continued strength and resolve in our defense and international policies to achieve world peace.

Adjournment Schedule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a Congressman should be in his district to confer and visit with his constituents whenever official duties do not require him to be in Washington.

When Congress adjourns, I expect to return home and to be available for conferences and visits with residents of the Fourth District in the courthouse of each county seat between 8:30 a.m. and 4 p.m., in accordance with the following schedule:

Allen County, Lima: Monday, November 1.

Auglaize County, Wapakoneta: Tuesday, November 2.

Darke County, Greenville: Wednesday, November 3.

Miami County, Troy: Thursday, November 4.

Shelby County, Sidney: Monday, November 8.

Mercer County, Celina: Tuesday, November 9.

Preble County, Eaton: Wednesday, November 10.

No appointments will be necessary. Any problems with, or opinions concerning, the Federal Government will be proper subject for conference.

Of course, I will be glad to see residents of the district, in my Piqua office, any time that Congress is not in session, except on the days scheduled above.

The 89th Congress Achieves Amazing Record in 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago President Lyndon B. Johnson credited the 1st session of the 89th Congress with the "greatest outpouring of creative legislation in the history of this Nation." The legislative record for 1965 has been truly amazing.

It took a great deal of hard work and long, long hours to achieve this record, but as one who is proud to have been a part of the 89th Congress in 1965, I can say it was well worth the effort for this Congress, I am confident, will go down in history as the most productive ever.

This was a legislative experience different from any I have had in the many years I have served in local, State and Federal Governments. The spirit of activity and productivity was present in the House of Representatives from the time the first gavel banged to open session January 4. Meeting at noon for the seating of the Members of Congress, debates began immediately and it was not until 10:30 p.m. we adjourned on that first day of the session. In the 10 months that followed, the pattern was the same, day and night.

For those of us serving northern California and Oregon and on the Public Works Committee, the urgency of the floods gave added impetus to the pace of those opening days and weeks of the 89th Congress. We immediately prevailed upon the President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives to send a team of legislative and executive department experts to the California and Oregon disaster areas. From that point on it was a continuing effort to assure that everything humanly possible was done to help flood stricken areas. The Pacific Northwest Disaster Act, drafted during that tragic Christmas week, was introduced January 4 and became the vehicle by which the Congress offered a large measure of assistance, especially in the area of road and highway rehabilitation. Not only did this help the disaster areas, but proved of financial importance to every single motorist in the State of California. You will recall that the State imposed a 1-cent emergency gas tax to finance its obligations in the road repair program. This was eliminated three months earlier than anticipated because of the additional Federal funds channeled into the State as a result of enactment of my Pacific Northwest Disaster Act.

Here was a problem which was faced and solved in a relatively short time. Another legislative achievement of the 89th Congress is a project on which I have been working for more than 20 years—authorization of construction of the $425 million Auburn Dam-Folsom South reclamation project, on the American River.

This is one of the finest reclamation projects to be considered by the Congress for many years. For every dollar spent in construction, Federal agencies anticipate a return of more than $3.61 over the years. This return will be reflected in flood protection to the city of Sacramento, water for domestic and agricultural purposes, hydroelectric power generation, enhancement of the fish and wildlife of the American River, and recreation attractions to Placer and El Dorado Counties. Included in the project are the Foresthill Divide and Folsom-Malby Canal units, primarily to provide water resources to the counties of origin, Placer and El Dorado.

In the area of national legislation, I have had the opportunity to move through the House of Representatives a bill to extend and broaden the Small Reclamation Projects Act.

A companion bill has been passed by the U.S. Senate and I anticipate the differences will be resolved soon after the 2d session convenes in January and another piece of major legislation will be signed into law. In the field of fish and wildlife, Congress has approved my proposal to initiate a nationwide program for conservation, development and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish. Several years ago hearings were held in California to review the need for such a program in our State. Following these, I drafted a bill, calling for a program in California. A major study by the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service proposed several hatcheries and other installations in the Sacramento River watershed. As the program was considered in the House of Representatives, it was expanded to be nationwide in scope. Congress now has enacted a $25 million, 5-year national program.

A fifth bill on my major legislative program is that to create the 250,000 acre Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area in Shasta and Trinity Counties. A total of $44 million would be authorized for recreation development around Whiskeytown, Shasta, Clair Engle, and Lewiston Reservoirs.

Here, as elsewhere throughout the Second Congressional District where water resources have been developed, we have seen an immediate and heavy demand for recreational use of the area. Black Butte, Folsom, New Hogan are artificial reservoirs which have been built and proved this point. Natural lakes such as Eagle Lake and Lake Tahoe have always attracted a great many fishermen, boaters, swimmers, picnickers, campers, and other outdoor enthusiasts.

It should be noted at this point that we are continuing a public works development program for the Second Congressional District. Shortly before final adjournment Congress put its final stamp of approval on a $51,500,000 irrigation and flood control program for the Second Congressional District in the current fiscal year. This included funds for the first acquisition of lands at Auburn Dam, start of construction of the Stampede Reservoir on the Washoe project, and the New Melones Dam on the Stanislaus River, continued construction on the Cow Creek and Clear Creek water systems in Shasta County, the Corning Water District distribution system and the long Sacramento Valley Canal from Tehama to Colusa Counties. Funds are provided for development of fish facilities on the Tehama-Colusa Canal and recreation facilities at the Red Bluff diversion dam. Construction of the Pacific Northwest intertie, additional loan assistance to the Nevada Irrigation District and a greatly speeded survey of flood control and reclamation needs of the north coast and western Sacramento Valley, including the Paskenta-Newville project, also will be carried out during this fiscal year.

As the Congress adjourns, it is also time to look forward to next year and the budget which will be presented to the Congress by the President in January. I have proposed to the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of the Budget, a $63,700,000 program which will provide for the continuation of these programs.

Serving on two major committees of the House of Representatives has been challenging this year as both the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have had full schedules.

As I have mentioned, the Public Works Committee was responsible for disaster relief legislation, and this year the Nation has had its full share of disasters, starting with the California floods, the midwestern tornadoes, the Mississippi River floods, and the recent devastating Hurricane Betsy which caused so much havoc in New Orleans.

Several other major bills enacted by the Congress on the recommendation of the Public Works Committee, include:

Public works and economic development: Providing expanded programs of grants and loans to communities for public works, development facilities and other projects intended to aid economically depressed areas.

Water pollution control: Expanding water pollution control grants for waste treatment plant construction and strengthening Federal enforcement authority to clean up our rivers and streams.

Highway beautification. Providing for gradual control over billboards along federally aided highways of the interstate and primary systems and offering incentive grants for improvement of scenic areas along such highways.

Omnibus Flood Control Act: Providing a major program of river and harbor development, with substantial emphasis on flood control and prevention of major disasters such as hit the Pacific Northwest and Mississippi River Valley States.

Southeast Disaster Act: Providing relief to the States of Florida, Mississippi and Louisiana, devastated by Hurricane Betsy.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee had an equally impressive record. In addition to my bills on Auburn Dam, Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity national recreation area, and small reclamation projects, the committee considered and recommended construction of the Garrison and southern Nevada reclamation projects, the establishment of Assateague National Seashore and Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area.

This committee also moved legislation establishing a Federal Water Resources Council and a River Basin Commission to coordinate Federal-State planning for maximum use of these resources. The Water Project Recreation Act fixes uniform policies on provision for recreation facilities and fish and wildlife benefits on multipurpose water resource projects. The Interior Committee also is largely responsible for a 5-year $185 million program of research and development for conversion of saline water and also for the drafting, for the first time, of comprehensive policies relating to concessions in our national parks.

In addition to my legislative program of direct importance to the Second Congressional District and that related to the two major committees on which I serve, the legislative record of the 1st session of the 89th Congress was broad and varied, and will touch the lives of every single one of us, through reduced taxes, increased retirement protections, better schools, and a healthier life. Here is a brief summary of major bills which were enacted by the 1st session of the 89th Congress:

Medicare and Social Security Amendments: Provides hospitalization, surgical, and nursing-home care for persons 65 years and older, financed through the social security system; increases social security benefits, retroactive to January 1, 1965, and makes other liberalizing changes in the social security law.

Elementary-secondary education: Provides Federal grant program to improve elementary and secondary education under local control, with bulk of aid for school districts where there are large numbers of children from poverty-stricken families.

Excise tax reduction: Provides excise tax cuts totaling $4.7 billion on various consumer items such as appliances, telephone service, autos, and so forth; elimnates most Federal excises by 1969.

Omnibus Housing Act: Expands current urban renewal, public housing programs, extends FHA loan insurance program, encourages urban planning and beautification in housing.

Voting rights: Strengthens machinery for guaranteeing right to vote to all citizens by prohibiting poll taxes, literacy tests; provides for Federal registrars in States where less than 50 percent of potential voters are registered or voted.

Immigration Act Amendments: Abolishes "'national origins" quota system over 3-year period; establishes a 170,000 annual limit on immigrants, special preferences given to relatives of American citizens.

Manpower development and training: Extends and expands manpower training program to assist unemployed in learning new skills to qualify them for better jobs.

Higher education: Authorizes expanded 5-year program to assist colleges and universities to improve educational opportunities; provides student loans and scholarships to aid needy students.

Military pay increase: Provides an average 10.4 percent pay increase for some 4.2 million uniformed personnel of the Armed Forces, effective September 1, 1965—2.7 million on active duty, 1 million reservists, 500,000 retired.

Regional medical centers: Authorizes 3-year program of Federal grants to plan and develop a series of regional medical programs to fight heart disease, cancer and stroke.

Arts and humanities: Creates a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities to assist and foster broad cultural programs in art, music, films, ballet, et cetera.

Health professions education: Extends and expands program of construction grants to medical, dental, and other similar educational institutions; establishes new program of scholarship grants for needy students, increases student loan program.

Presidential continuity: Adopted proposed amendment to the Constitution to establish procedure to permit Vice President to become Acting President if the President is unable to perform his duties; provides for filling the vacancy of the office of Vice President.

Congressional organization: Created a joint committee to study the organization and operation of Congress and to make recommendations to improve and streamline the work of Congress.

Health research facilities: Provides for extension of program to construct health research facilities; establishes three new Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education and Welfare to administer expanded programs in this area.

Community health services: Extends programs for public health services providing vaccinations, immunization, other preventive treatment of diseases, migrant health clinics, and grants to States for general health services.

Mental health services: Provides for initial staffing grants for personnel serving in community mental health centers.

Drug controls: Expands Federal control over certain depressant and stimulant drugs to reduce the illegal use of these dangerous drugs that affect the central nervous system.

Older Americans: Establishes new Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to develop programs to assist the aged.

Juvenile delinquency: Extends present law to assist communities in the development of new programs to prevent or control juvenile delinquency and youth crime.

Air pollution: Establishes machinery for controlling motor vehicle air pollutants, accelerates air pollution research program, creates new program to find methods of disposing of solid wastes.

Federal pay comparability: Provides salary increases for Federal classified and postal employees to achieve more equitable relationship with pay of employees in private industry; makes other fringe benefits in pay and overtime allowances.

High-speed rapid transit: Authorizes 3-year program of reasearch and demonstration projects for development of high-speed intercity railroad transportation.

State technical services: Establishes new 3-year program of Federal-local-technical cooperation to provide technical service centers to disseminate findings of scientific and technological importance to commerce and industry.

Retired Government employees: Provides for cost-of-living increases in annuities to retired employees of Federal Government.

Vocational training: Expands vocational rehabilitation program to aid disabled persons; another new program provides Federal loan insurance to high school graduates to finance tuition at business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools.

You will agree, I am sure, that this list is impressive, amazingly impressive. Now that the Congress is adjourning, I will return to the 19 counties which comprise the Second Congressional District to discuss what has been done and what will be done in the 2d session of the 89th Congress, opening in less than 3 short months from now.

Justice Department Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] for bringing this important matter to the attention of the Congress. It appears that the Justice Department, in its passion to pursue Jimmy Hoffa, is sacrificing the public interest by supporting and defending its anti-Hoffa witness, Edward Partin. The gentleman from Illinois has outlined the situation surrounding Partin, who has given massive testimony against Hoffa. In exchange, it appears that he is being shielded from the lawful consequences of what can only be called a criminal career. For example, Partin has been under indictment on 26 counts of violation of the provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act, an act intended by Congress for the protection of rank and file union membership. The State prosecution for manslaughter against Partin was recently nolle prossed. Although everyone knows of Partin's whereabouts and activities, he has never been returned to the jail in Oregon from which he escaped and where he had been serving time for violation of the criminal law.

Further, I am reliably informed that U.S. marshals are in constant attendance upon Mr. Partin as he pursues his private activities, marching in picket lines, driving in automobile races in Alabama, and so forth.

It seems clear enough, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Justice has made a policy decision in this case, based on a judgment that pursuit and prosecution of Hoffa outweighs considerations of justice, punishment of criminal offenders, protection of rank and file labor union membership, and of the general public.

I urge the House Committee on the Judiciary to pursue its investigation of this aspect of the Justice Department's administration. There is ample authority for such an investigation—indeed, the committee adopted an authorizing resolution sponsored by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] in September 1964, by a bipartisan vote of 20 to 13. I trust the Committee on the Judiciary will pursue this investigation as a first order of business when the 2d session of the 89th Congress convenes in January 1966.

Publicly Owned Colleges Will Be $1 Billion a Year Short on Building Programs by 1970

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, this month another rush of students to the college campuses has rung the alarm to awaken us to the fact that we are falling behind on providing classrooms and laboratories and libraries for higher education. Last spring we were warned by the results of a study by the Council of State Governments that by 1970 public colleges alone—that will be bursting with 5.4 million students—will be short about $1 billion a year in providing plant and facilities. Another 2.3 million students will be attending private colleges and universities which have just as much—or more—difficulty in financing new buildings.

SEVENTY-FIVE PERCENT FEDERAL AID, $1 BILLION A YEAR PROGRAM SHOULD BE ADOPTED NEXT YEAR

If the young people in elementary and high school today are to have a chance to go to college, we must adopt an expanded program of construction at once. I have introduced today a bill to change the matching ratio and greatly increase the dollars available under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.

Rather than expect the State legislatures and private fund drives to raise two-thirds of the cost of construction, we should set the Federal share at 75 percent and the local matching share at 25 percent. Rather than the minor role that the Federal Government is still playing in financing college facilities, we should move swiftly and surely to meet the shortage as soon as possible.

The proposal I am making calls for Federal aid of $920 million a year for 5 years for undergraduate facilities including public community colleges and public technical institutes, and $240 million a year for 5 years for graduate facilities. In addition Federal funds are earmarked and held for a long enough period to allow State colleges and universities to get matching funds passed by their legislatures, most of which only meet every other year, and to allow private institutions to raise funds on a well-worked out schedule and a well-timed program.

COLLEGE ENROLLMENT UP 13.5 PERCENT OVER LAST YEAR IN UPPER MIDWEST

Last Wednesday's Minneapolis Tribune had a story by Richard P. Kleeman telling how enrollments have risen from 199,000 last year to more than 226,000 this fall at colleges in Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota. That is a 13.5 percent increase in only 1 year.

We have estimated in Minnesota that instead of having 38,000 in college as we had in 1954, we will have 118,000 in 1970.

STATES CANNOT AFFORD TO PAY FOR COLLEGES

The inability of States to meet the rising costs of public colleges is illustrated again and again in Minnesota. The University of Minnesota prepares a 10-year building plan and requests a portion of it from the legislature each session. The university request of $35.7 million in 1961 was cut to $12.5 million by the legislature. The 1963 request of $21.7 million was granted to the extent of only $7.5 million. In 1965 the $48.5 million building program proposed by the university was cut by the legislative building commission to $19 million.

I am afraid that a similar fate may be in store for the university's 10-year building plan for 1965–74 which amounts to $205.7 million. No doubt many other Members of the House recognize this as the same situation that exists in their own States.

I believe that this is one case in which Congress will have to offer a solution to the problem or the problem will not be solved. Certainly the hundreds of thousands of young men and women who will be knocking on the doors of our colleges each fall cannot be told to forget about college, or to go away because we are not ready for them yet.

We must channel a larger share of our Nation's resources into education. This is a pressing national problem. Congress must give it priority attention.

My bill follows:

H.R. 11790

A bill to amend title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to increase the authorization of appropriations and to provide increased Federal matching, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 101(a) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended by striking out "four" and inserting "seven".

(b) The first sentence of section 101(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "and the sum of $460,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the sum of $460,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $920,000,000".

(c) The second sentence of section 101(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "the succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "each of the succeeding fiscal years."

(d) Section 101(c) of such Act is amended by inserting "third" after "close of the".

(e) Section 104(c) is amended by inserting "third" after "close of the".

Sec. 2. (a) The second sentence of section 107(b) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows: "In no case shall the Federal share of the development cost of an eligible project under this title exceed 75 per centum of such development cost."

(b) Section 202(b) is amended to read: "Grants under this title for construction of academic facilities may not exceed 75 per centum of the development cost of any such construction project."

(c) Section 401(d) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The term 'Federal share' means, in the case of any project, a percentage (as determined under the applicable State plan) not in excess of 75 per centum of its development cost."

Sec. 3. (a) The first sentence of Section 201 is amended by striking out "four" and inserting "seven".

(b) The second sentence of Section 201 is amended by striking out "and the sum of $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the sum of $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $240,000,000."

Commission on National Economic Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I introduced H.R. 11651, a bill designed to establish a Commission on National Economic Goals. I believe that an independent, bipartisan commission of this sort is necessary to provide objective analysis and evaluation of the Nation's long-term domestic and foreign economic goals, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to give this measure their complete support.

I view the next 2 months as a time for reflection on our fundamental problems and long-range goals. And just as the Congress needs time for a detached consideration of the trends of our society so too does the country need an institution which is bipartisan and independent of the Government, whose function it would be to identify long-range economic goals and recommend the means of attaining them.

The Commission on National Economic Goals would be composed of 12 members, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, for terms of 6 years. I believe that this Presidential appointment, and the relatively long term of office would lend the Commission stature and independence commensurate with its responsibility, and would serve to attract the able men such a commission would require.

The members of the Commission would be drawn from various segments of our economy to provide expertise on issues of concern to the Commission. Organizations representing labor, business, agriculture, professional economists, and universities would each provide two members of the Commission, who would be selected, of course, by the President. The persons appointed from each category would be from different political parties to assure the nonpartisan quality of the Commission. The objective of this appointment procedure is to provide a breadth of knowledge of economic affairs, not to have each the interests of each category represented, in the narrow sense of the term. In addition, the President would be authorized to appoint two individuals from the general public, and I would hope that these men in particular would be generalists or humanists who would address themselves to the quality of life in America as this relates to our economy. For example, they might concern themselves with the availability of outlets for the time and talents of individuals who may have increased leisure time due to shorter workweeks in the years ahead.

The Commission would have full access to pertinent Government information, but would be independent of the Government. Thus it would not have to concern itself with defending or criticizing economic policies simply because they were formulated by those of a given political persuasion, and it would be free from the pressures and bureaucracy which plague the various Government departments and bureaus.

I believe that we need a commission to identify and periodically revise our economic goals, and to assign priorities among them. We can all agree, for instance, that we want to foster full employment, an everexpanding gross national product, and price stability, but we face extremely difficult problems in planning for the long range attainment of all three objectives. We can certainly increase our production by encouraging automation, but this of course, aggravates our employment situation. And many of the measures designed to increase employment have an inflationary effect which is quite harmful to those who are living on pensions. A Commission on National Economic Goals would address itself to these issues in an effort to define feasible goals with more precision, and to recommend the means of maximizing the attainment of each of these objectives.

The Commission would submit an annual report, which would supplement the shorter-term work of the President's Council of Economic Advisors and the Bureau of the Budget, and would stimulate constructive thought from all quarters interested in strengthening the U.S. economy. In performing its work, this commission would give us all a clearer picture of where we are going and how best to get there, which will certainly add strength of purpose and confidence to our economy.

The Danger of Creeping Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, in certain circles it is, I suppose, unfashionable to worry about inflation any more. Some economists say a little inflation is a good thing; others say some inflation, whether good or bad, is inevitable. For whatever reason, talk and worries about inflation have dropped practically out of sight during recent unparalleled economic expansion.

This may be a useful reflection of confidence in the economy. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it important that we face a few facts.

First. Prices have been going up, both wholesale—especially for industrial commodities—and retail. Significantly, the rates of increase have been going up in recent months in a way which contrasts sharply with figures for the past several years. Many of these increases have been in foods, and therefore, may be seasonal and short-run. But they have taken place: The overall cost of living rose by over 1.7 percent between July 1964, and July 1965. In June, the price of meat had increased 9.9 percent. Cereals and other bakery products went up by 1.6 percent. Wholesale processed food costs were up 5.5 percent in August. There were other price increases throughout the economy. Clothing is up 1.1 percent; transportation is up 1.8 percent; rent is up by the same amount. Wholesale commodity prices were up 2.6 percent in August; overall wholesale industry prices were up 1.5 percent; and the wholesale price of industrial intermediate material was up 1.7 percent. On the price side of the economy, the pattern is general price increases, with the bulk of the increases occurring in the last few months.

The people know about these price increases, and they are worried about them. A recent poll reported that 87 percent of all women think that the cost of living is going up; they are right. Even more important, the same poll reported that 46 percent of housewives think that rises in the cost of living can be avoided; I hope they are right.

Second. On the wage side, the picture is somewhat less grim. The general guideline for noninflationary wage movements is that, overall, increases should not be greater than increases in productivity. The administration's wage-productivity guideline is 3.2 percent. In contrast to this, recent wage increases have run at the rate of around 4 percent per year. The recent labor-management agreement in the steel industry, commonly regarded as a leading indicator industry for wage settlements, is difficult to compute accurately. Most economists tend to think the settlement is around a 3.5 percent increase, although some administration economists say it is within the 3.2 noninflationary guideline.

However, the overall employment picture has a considerable impact on wages. The latest data show a 4.5 percent unemployment figure, well above what is usually considered full employment. With this much unemployment, aggregate pressure on wages ought not to be too strong. However, looking at the figures in the aggregate may well be incorrect and misleading. For example, in Michigan the present unemployment rate is 2.6 percent, a figure close enough to full employment that labor shortages have started developing in certain sectors of the State's economy. Construction, for example, is very tight, and wages in this sector have increased sharply in the past 6 months.

A moderate aggregate unemployment rate may well conceal localized areas of labor shortage, which lead to wage increases, which may in some cases spill over into other sectors of the economy.

Third. As a result of the increased American commitment to the war in Vietnam, the President has asked for an extra $1.7 billion defense appropriation. It is expected that an additional sum will be requested when the Congress convenes in January. In any event, for the current fiscal year, outlays on defense will run a little over $50 billion, compared with an original estimate of $47.9 billion. In itself, this does not look like much, but we should take into consideration the secondary effects of such an injection of defense spending, termed by economists "the multiplier." A generally accepted figure for defense spending multiplier is 2. This means that the overall impact of defense spending on the economy will be around twice the original sum. In the case of the $1.7 billion additional defense appropriation, we can expect that the ultimate stimulus on the economy will be of the order of $3.4 billion. Should the President ask for another $2 billion next January, the total impact on the economy will be of the order of $7.4 billion. Even given the overall size of the American economy, this is a considerable injection, no matter how you slice it. In my own mind, it raises a real possibility of overheating in certain defense-related sectors of the economy.

There is, then, evidence of three sorts of substantial worries about inflationary pressures in the economy. Prices have been going up, particularly in the past several months; wage increases have been running somewhat ahead of productivity gains, with considerable local tightness in certain labor markets; expected increases in defense spending will have a considerable impact on the economy.

In general, those who do not worry much about inflation at the present time use three arguments. I would like to examine them:

First. Increases in defense spending will not have much of an impact on the economy, given that the increases are a very small part of a total gross national product of $665.9 billion. This may well be true, but it should be noted that defense increases will be largely concentrated in defense-related industries, thus bringing up the real possibility of localized overheating in these particular sectors of the economy.

Second. At present tax levels, Federal revenues are expected to grow around $7 billion per year; with this fiscal drag operating in the economy, we should be more worried about maintaining aggregate demand, which will be done by defense spending increases. But if I am correct in my assumptions about the full impact of defense spending, the fiscal drag that so worries some economists will be all but wiped out.

Third. There is still enough aggregate slack in the economy, given that present production is running at around 90 percent of capacity and given an unemployment rate of over 4 percent, to prevent any serious inflationary pressures from building up.

Mr. Speaker, this is a critical turn in the argument. For if there is still aggregate slack in the economy, then we can breathe somewhat easier. I contend that although there may be overall slack in the economy, it is inaccurate and possibly dangerous to think that its existence alone will in some way insulate us against inflation.

Let me try to explain. Usual theories of inflation are distinguished by their concentration on aggregate factors. Demand-pull inflation is explained in terms of an excess of aggregate demand over aggregate supply, leading to price increases. Cost-push inflation is considered in terms of aggregate wage increases exceeding aggregate productivity gains, with price increases the outcome. In both cases, since both prices and wages are considered to be perfectly flexible with respect to changes in demand, the only thing which can lead to inflation is aggregate excess demand.

The reason for this conclusion rests on some assumptions which I think are incorrect. It is assumed that if there is excess demand in some sectors of the economy, balanced by deficient demand in other sectors, there will be some changes in relative prices and wages. But there will be no increase in the general price level, because over the long run resources will shift, demand composition will change, and price increases in excess demand sectors will be offset by price reductions in insufficient demand sectors. Prices and wages, being flexible and responsibe to changes in demand, will move in the long run to balance off excess or deficient demands in particular sectors of the economy, without leading to a general inflationary price increase.

But we all know that in the real world this is simply not so. Neither prices nor wages are that flexible.

As Charles L. Schultze pointed out in a study of Recent Inflation in the United States:

> In particular wages and prices are much less likely to be flexible in a downward than in an upward direction.

The reasons for this are clear. Labor contracts are often pegged to increases in the cost of living index, and industry-wide contracts are unlikely to show a wage decline in an era of rising profits. Business pricing is likely to be on a full cost-plus basis, rather than on a basis of supply and demand; diminished demand will not necessarily set off price reductions if costs remain about the same.

This does not mean that there is any downward flexibility of prices and wages. It simply means that the amount of excess demand required to raise prices is less than the amount of deficient demand required to reduce them. As Schultze puts it:

> There is an upward bias in the general level of prices such that a large change in the composition of demand, even when aggregate demand is not excessive, will lead to a general price rise. The rise in prices will be aggravated by the impact of excess demand in particular sectors of the economy on the prices of raw materials and wage rates.

What all this means is very simple. Inflation is perfectly possible without either excess aggregate demand or an independent increase in costs.

Further, inflation in one sector of the economy can spread to other sectors, even in the absence of excess aggregate demand. Excess demand in one sector, say semifabricated goods, could spread via cost increases to other sectors in which demands are not excessive and in which there may be unused capacity or substantial unemployment. Creeping inflation of this sort is every bit as dangerous as overall inflation of the classical kind. Mr. Schultze suggests that it was this creeping inflation which was responsible for the observed price increases from 1955 to 1957. His judgment is well regarded by other economists.

I fear the economic theory I have outlined above may well apply to our present situation. On the aggregate, there is still some slack left in the economy; but there are areas of localized overheating. Construction labor, as I have mentioned, is extremely tight in Michigan, and increased construction costs could spread over into other sectors of the economy. The impact of recent increases in defense spending, overall, should be slight; but such spending is concentrated in certain already strained areas of the economy. Copper and copper goods are extremely tight now, and sharp price rises have already taken place; increased defense procurement in these areas could lead to further price increases, which may well spread over into other sectors. The same reasoning applies to certain areas of the electronics and machine tool industry. There have been some sharp price increases recently, particularly in food and in some wholesale prices. Although these may not have increased the overall cost of living index too sharply, there is danger that they may spread into other sectors of the economy.

I realize it is always unpopular to warn of inflation during times of economic progress. But I am impelled to do so, partly because of the evidence I have cited above, and partly because I am particularly concerned about the dangers of creeping inflation. This could sap our economic strength and seriously hinder our further progress.

Viewing with alarm is, of course, only part of the matter. Solutions must be suggested, and this is, of course, much harder than pointing to problems. Our overall tools of economic management have, by and large, worked fairly well, particularly since the beginning of the Kennedy administration. Fiscal policy has promoted the orderly expansion of the economy; monetary policy, operating through the Federal Reserve, has in general been fairly responsive to the needs of the time.

But it should be noted that both these tools are effective in the aggregate. This is particularly true of monetary policy, which is particularly undiscriminating in its effects and requires a long lag time to take effect. Fiscal policy changes are more precise—witness the recent tax cuts—but take a long time to come into law. More precise tools, such as the Federal Reserve's Regulation W, limiting terms of consumer credit, or the Defense Production Act, are lacking. The former lapsed in 1952, and the latter has expired. The Office of Emergency Planning has certain contingency plans, but they cannot be used without congressional authorization.

I hope that pointing out some of the dangers which may be ahead will give us all a sharper sense of the inner workings of our economy, and perhaps a little more understanding and responsibility in our economic actions.

Lt. Gen. Robert W. Colglazier, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to dispel certain misconceptions that have resulted from the action taken by Lt. Gen. Robert W. Colglazier, Jr., commanding general, 4th U.S. Army, in connection with the court-martial case of Pvt. Winstel R. Belton. On at least three occasions on the floor of the House, my fellow Texan, General Colglazier, an officer with whom I have had a long acquaintance and a personal friend, has been severely criticized for his action with respect to this case and I feel it is my duty to set the record straight and remove any doubt as to the loyalty and dedication of this fine Army officer. Many of you know General Colglazier and have seen him appear as a witness before your committees when he was serving as deputy chief of staff for logistics. He is a great officer and soldier who has had a very distinguished career. His action in the Belton case was not brought about by callous disregard of all things we hold to be dear, but rather by his compassion for a young soldier, who has acknowledged his guilt and asked for an opportunity to rehabilitate himself by joining his unit in Vietnam where he is presently serving. I have asked the Department of the Army to prepare a statement for me explaining the circumstances of the Belton case, and I am sure that this information will remove any doubt that may have arisen concerning the character and integrity of a devoted Army officer.

A fact sheet follows:

FACT SHEET EXPLAINING THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE CASE OF PVT. WINSTEL R. BELTON

Private Belton was assigned to the 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile) at Fort Benning, Ga., when that division was alerted for oversea movement to Vietnam. On August 17, he informed his commanding officer that he was on a self-imposed hunger strike. As a result of his actions, he was charged with violations of the Uniform Code of Military Justice and placed in pretrial confinement in the post stockade at Fort Benning. Since these actions were of a serious nature requiring a complete and thorough investigation, it was not considered in the best interests of the Army for Belton to accompany his unit to Vietnam. He voluntarily ended his fast on August 18, 1965.

A pretrial investigation was completed and his case was referred to trial by general court-martial. Subsequently, his defense counsel presented a motion for a change of venue, which was granted by the commanding general, U.S. Continental Army Command. His trial was then scheduled for October 5 at Fort Sam Houston, Tex. He was represented by civilian counsel he provided, and by military counsel who was a Judge Advocate General's Corps officer appointed in accordance with the requirements of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The prosecution was represented by two officers of the Judge Advocate General's Corps.

Acting through his defense counsel prior to trial Private Belton offered to plead guilty to the offense of malingering to avoid duty in Vietnam if the convening authority would agree not to approve a sentence greater than 1 year in prison, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, reduction to the grade of private from private first class, and a bad conduct discharge, all except the reduction to be suspended and remitted after 1 year, dependent on Belton's future conduct and performance of duty. Belton's offer was accepted by Lt. Gen. R. W. Colglazier, Jr., commanding general, 4th U.S. Army, who was the convening authority.

Pretrial agreements are common in both military and civilian jurisdictions. The acceptance of such an agreement is within the discretion of the convening authority. In agreeing to the offer of the defense, General Colglazier took into consideration the implied willingness of Private Belton to fulfill his duty by serving in Vietnam as previously ordered and the soldier's military record up to the time of the hunger strike.

Private Belton pleaded guilty and was found guilty by the court. He was sentenced to a dishonorable discharge, total forfeitures, and confinement at hard labor for 5 years (which automatically includes reduction to the grade of private). Following completion of his review of the record of trial, on October 13, the convening authority notified Belton that the sentence, reduced in accordance with the pretrial agreement, had been approved and that he was being ordered to rejoin his unit in Vietnam without delay. The commander exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over Belton may legally vacate the suspension and order the execution of the approved sentence if Belton again fails to perform his military duty properly or is guilty of other misconduct.

There was no irregularity in the request for change of venue, the approval of that request, or the acceptance of the offer of a pretrial agreement. The laws and policies of the Federal Government have been meticulously observed in all actions pertaining to this case. Determinations in the case have been influenced solely by appropriate and relevant factors. The type of discharge Belton eventually receives will depend on the overall quality of the service he renders during the full period of his military duty.

The Congress of the United States Salutes Lewis E. Phillips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, Lewis E. Phillips is a man who never had a childhood. At the age of 9 he found himself selling stove polish that would blacken, but did not polish.

At the age of 13, Lewis and his brother bought a news agency, ran it themselves and did all their own delivering of newspapers and magazines.

He never had any time for the usual childhood pleasantries.

Today, through hard work and a great desire, Lewis E. Phillips is chairman of the board of National Presto Industries of Eau Claire, Wis., and president of Ed Phillips & Sons Wholesale Co., Inc.

And today he spends most of his time providing for others, so that they may enjoy the boyhood that he had never known.

The enthusiasm that Lewis Phillips holds for the Boy Scouts, and takes him to Scouting convocations all over the world, began in 1940 when Judge Merrill Farr imposed on Phillips to go with him to the local Boy Scout camp.

Phillips recalls that the camp was ill-equipped and was using a mobile kitchen borrowed from a highway crew, but the enthusiasm of the boys was undimmed.

Mr. Phillips said:

> After a supper of salmon loaf the boys made a speech of welcome that warmed my heart. From then on I was heart and soul for scouting.

Would Mr. Phillips help them in their drive to build a new kitchen? Phillips decided that a new kitchen was not enough—these Scouts deserved a new camp.

Twelve years and a half million dollars later, Lewis E. Phillips dedicated a new camp for the "men of tomorrow," the Boy Scouts of America.

Nestled in a wilderness area of Wisconsin, surrounded by white birch and contrasting pine, and dotted with small lakes, Camp Phillips, with its many lodges, fine facilities, and excellent staff now serves as the home for thousands of Boy Scouts every summer.

Following his belief that character building is a part of a good education, and that a good education is necessary for every man, Lewis E. Phillips has been a contributor to many colleges.

His donation made it possible for the University of Wisconsin at Madison to build a new art center. And just last week the Lewis E. Phillips Science Hall was dedicated on the campus of Wisconsin State University at Eau Claire.

Mr. Phillips' quarter of a million dollar gift allowed this science building to be finished according to the original plans.

Due to the shortage of State funds, the greenhouse, the planetarium, and the observatory now available to students would not have been completed without his donation.

In his dedication speech at the presentation of Camp Phillips, Lewis E. Phillips stated his beliefs:

> This camp is a symbol of our way of life—a concrete example of democracy at work. For generations to come this camp will stand as living testimony to our bill of rights, as written into the Constitution of the United States.
>
> In that great instrument, the founders of our country, with incredible foresight, realized that the fundamentals of greatness for any nation rest upon the freedom of its people: The freedom of worship; freedom from want; freedom of opportunity; and freedom for all men and women regardless of their race or creed.
>
> Seeking these freedoms, my parents threw off the shackles of an oppressed foreign country to settle here, in the State of Wisconsin. Although not possessed of worldly goods, my parents were blessed with an implicit confidence in the American way of life—in the opportunities it had to offer those who believe that freedom and work are man's salvation.
>
> Words cannot express my gratitude for the opportunities this country gave me, to work from a newsboy in Manitowac, Wis., to the head of a business which now gives employment to approximately 5,000 people.
>
> Words cannot express my gratitude for the opportunities which made possible for me to lend a helping hand in the building of this camp.
>
> By the same token, I am mindful of the great responsibilities that go with material success. Such success is real to any man only as it reflects the success of his neighbors. To a nation, as to its peoples, with material possessions comes responsibility. A man's worldly goods are of little real values unless they contribute to the welfare and to the happiness of his fellow man. We must be mindful that all we have is but lent to us—and that the only way we can repay our debt to Him who has given it is to give to others as we have received.

No Congressman, no Senator, yes, no President could speak greater words to the future leaders of the United States than did Lewis E. Phillips at this camp dedication.

This man, Lewis E. Phillips, who has given so much of himself for Scouting all over the world, and to the cause of higher education in the State of Wisconsin, will receive the only tribute he seeks, he will receive tomorrow, twofold, of all the good works he has done today.

The Congress of the United States salutes a real, honest-to-God American. One who believes by word, and proves by deed, that giving a helping hand to the youth of our land insures the future of this Nation.

The Congress of the United States wishes Lewis E. Phillips a long and healthy life, because our Nation, our world, and the course of freedom need men like him.

Detection of Phenylketonuria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on August 12 the junior Senators from Vermont and Massachusetts introduced a bill to promote the detection of phenylketonuria—PKU—and other inborn errors of metabolism leading to mental retardation. Such legislation would authorize the Surgeon General of the United States to make grants to the States to pay the cost of blood-testing programs and other screening examinations.

The simple blood test used to detect PKU in infants was developed with public funds by Dr. Robert Guthrie at the University of Buffalo and, as I have stated on the floor of the Senate on two previous occasions, is an important breakthrough in the field of medicine. I also stated on May 17 that Miles Laboratories of Elkhart, Ind., having secured an exclusive license from Dr. Guthrie for the life of the patent, that is, for 17 years, planned to charge $262 to produce a kit to test 500 babies, although Dr. Guthrie's cost to produce a similar kit was only $6. Fortunately, a few dedicated public servants in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the source of most of the funds used to develop the kit, became aware of this situation and determined that ownership of the invention belonged to the United States, and the proper action was subsequently taken.

This case illustrates the need for patent legislation which will provide that the results of Government-financed research must be made freely available to the public. In this particular instance, if each newborn child is to be tested for PKU, and the Government is to subsidize this effort, the market for the test kits is extremely large and the normal risks of production are eliminated. Therefore, the customary justification for the granting of exclusive rights for the production of a new invention has no merit in this case. It is obvious that the market for the PKU test kits is virtually built in, when we note that the projected figure for the average annual number of births in the United States over the next 5 years is 4,960,000.

Now, a little quick arithmetic will show us the cost to the Government of the program my colleagues are advocating under present conditions as compared with the cost the taxpayers would have had to bear had Miles been allowed to retain exclusive rights to produce the Guthrie test kit. If Miles had secured a monopoly on the Guthrie test kit and was able to charge 52 cents for each child as it had been planned to do, the annual cost to the Government for the kits alone under the program proposed by Senators PROUTY and KENNEDY would cost $2,579,200 per year. Now that the title to the invention is vested in the United States, however, competition has made it possible for hospitals to purchase the kits commercially for less than 2 cents per infant, and, for those hospitals with adequate facilities to produce the kit themselves, to do so for as little as 1.2 cents per test per infant—a difference of over 50 cents per test per child. The cost, then, to produce kits to test all newborn infants in a year will be $59,520, or $2,519,600 less than would have been the case under the original price of Miles.

The kind of abuse that was almost perpetrated in this case, which would have cost the taxpayers over $2 million annually, can be avoided only if the Government takes title to inventions financed by the public.

Obviously, Senators PROUTY and KENNEDY are vitally interested, as are all citizens of this country, in health research and in seeing to it that the results of this research be made available to the public at a minimal cost. Of course, they are anxious to see to it that PKU be detected in all infants so afflicted, in order that these children can grow up to be healthy and productive members of our society. The junior Senators of Vermont and Massachusetts have, by displaying their intense concern in the PKU testing program, confirmed that the benefits of publicly financed research must be made available to all our citizens. In my judgment, it is an outrage to force the public to pay for research and then force them to pay again exorbitant prices for the results of this research. Private industry must not be allowed to reap the benefits of publicly financed research while our citizens who paid for this effort are denied the benefits which are rightfully theirs without paying monopoly prices as tribute. Advances in science and technology paid for by the taxpayers have no purpose other than to benefit every American.

New Arts and Humanities Foundation Law Will Bring New Spark to Lives of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, just passed by Congress, will bring a new spark to the lives of the people in all parts of the country. The $10,700,000 appropriation we have voted will benefit the people in Minnesota as well as in the rest of the Nation.

With financing of this program, the Minnesota State Arts Council can make great strides toward setting up a program like the excellent work done by the New York State Arts Council. On the basis of an appropriation from the 1965 State legislature, our arts council is already in the process of hiring an executive secretary. With Federal aid, it could bring new vitality to all parts of the artistic life of the upper Midwest and the study and development of the humanities.

In the Minneapolis area we can expand the program of such excellent cultural institutions as the Guthrie Theater, the St. Paul Council of Arts and Sciences, the Minneapolis Symphony, the Walker Art Center, and the Minneapolis Institute of Arts. Such programs as expanding the number of weeks for the performances given by the Minneapolis Symphony, sending out a tractor trailer set up as an artmobile to display works from the Minneapolis Institute of Arts into all parts of our State and region, and providing a resource center for amateur artistic productions and architectural advice, to our communities, are now possible.

Mr. John Meyers, chairman of the Minnesota State Arts Council, and other members of the council are ready with a well-thought-out program to put this Federal law to work now that financing is available.

I am sure that the foundation will soon follow President Johnson's prediction by having "an unprecedented effect on the arts and humanities of our great Nation."

Report to the People of the Third Congressional District of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

THE YEAR 1965: A YEAR OF ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, although we are now ending but 10 months of our 2-year tenure of office, this 89th Congress has already been praised by President Lyndon B. Johnson as the greatest in history.

I am sure that every Member of the House of Representatives, as I do, shares the satisfaction and pride, which you expressed in delivering to us the President's "Salute to Congress," for the privilege of having a part in the massive outpouring of legislation.

I believe, however, that it is difficult for the average citizen—merely from the reading of his daily newspaper or from snatches of radio and TV reports dealing mostly with controversial angles—to fully appreciate the broad scope and deep impact of the programs we have enacted.

Only a comprehensive listing of specific major laws benefiting, as you have pointed out, millions of people and designed to improve our democratic way of life can draw the whole picture.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am appending such a compilation for the benefit of my constituents of the Third District of Pennsylvania. This covers not only the broad fields of international affairs, national economy, education, social security, health and welfare, and the improvement of our governmental and political structure, but also measures emanating from the Armed Services and Merchant Marine Committees on which I have the honor of serving.

Philadelphia, with its Navy yard, Defense Supply Agency, and other related agencies, and with its great port facilities so vital to foreign trade and the export-import business and the shipping industry, has an important stake in the legislation of these two committees.

The matter referred to follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

S. 800: Authorizes $15.4 billion for Department of Defense for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, including $6.4 billion for research and development, tests, and evaluation. (Public Law 89–37.)

H.J. Res. 447: Appropriates $700 million additional for fiscal 1965 to press Vietnam campaign. (Public Law 89–18.)

H.R. 7717: Authorizes $5.18 billion for National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1966, for construction of facilities, administrative operations, and research and development including solid fuel rocket, and nuclear solid-powered system for spaceship. (Public Law 89–53.)

H.R. 10775: Authorizes $1.78 billion for military construction at domestic and foreign installations. Requires notice to Congress of future planned base closings. (Public Law 89–188.)

H.R. 10306: Prohibits destruction or mutilation of draft cards and provides Federal penalty for violations. (Public Law 89–152.)

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

H.R. 7750: Authorizes $3.36 billion for foreign economic and military assistance for fiscal year 1966. Terminates aid to any nation failing to take preventive action against destruction of American property; bars sale of surplus foods to the United Arab Republic unless President determines it essential to U.S. national interest. (Public Law 89–171.)

H.R. 2580: Abolishes national origins quota system in immigration effective July 1, 1968. Provides for admission of immediate relatives of American citizens. Fixes annual limit of 170,000 from all former quota countries, and 120,000 from Western Hemisphere, giving preference to persons with skills and professional abilities. (Public Law 89–236.)

H.R. 2998: Extends for 3 years, to June 30, 1967, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and authorizes $30 million annually for its operations and research. (Public Law 89–27.)

S. 2054: Authorizes $115 million for Peace Corps for fiscal year 1966, including $500,000 for research. (Public Law 89–134.)

NATIONAL ECONOMY

H.R. 8371: Reduces excise taxes by $4.6 billion a year. Repeals levies on furs, jewelry, other luxury items, and on radio, TV sets, cameras, household appliances, musical instruments, records, sporting goods, bowling alleys, and on cabarets and general admissions, effective July 1, 1965. Cuts 10 percent tax on automobiles gradually to 1 percent and eliminates communications tax effective January 1, 1969. (Public Law 89–44.)

S. 3: Establishes Applalachia Regional Commission to initiate and coordinate public works and other programs, Federal, State, and local, to revive economy and improve skills and health of area residents; authorizes $1.1 billion for 1966. (Public Law 89–4.)

H.R. 3818: Repeals requirement of 25 percent gold reserves against Federal Reserve deposits. (Public Law 89–3.)

S. 974: Extends for 3 years, to June 30, 1969, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; reduces full Federal support of projects to 90 percent after fiscal 1966, except payment of allowances for trainees; maximum training period extended from 52 weeks to 104; brings training program of Area Redevelopment Act under MDTA; authorizes $454 million for 1 year. (Public Law 89–15.)

S. 1648: Authorizes 4-year, $3.3 billion program of public works by loans and grants to local governments and other public or private groups in economically depressed areas, communities, or regions, to develop industries, facilities, and create jobs. (Public Law 89–136.)

S. 1588: Authorizes 3-year, $90 million program of research and demonstration projects for development of high-speed intercity railroad transportation. (Public Law 89–220.)

S. 949: Authorizes 3-year, $60 million program of Federal matching funds cooperation with universities, States, local governments, and private enterprise, in establishment of State or regional technical services centers to disseminate findings of science and technology to commerce and industry. (Public Law 89–182.)

S. 2080: Eliminates silver from dimes and quarters, cuts proportion in half dollars from 90 to 40 percent. (Public Law 89–81.)

H.R. 8283: Authorizes $1.8 billion for fiscal 1966 for antipoverty programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; provides for training for chronically unemployed and special task force on problems of aged poor. (Public Law 89–253.)

H.R. 7847: Increases by $120 million to $461 million limit the SBA may lend to small business investment corporations and to State and local development firms. (Public Law 89–78.)

S.J. Res. 81: Authorize increase from $2.9 billion Federal aid for Interstate and Defense Highway System for fiscal year 1967; authorizes apportionment to States; directs Secretary of Commerce to report highway needs January 1, 1968 and every 2 years thereafter. (Public Law 89–139.)

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND WELFARE

H.R. 6675: Amends Social Security Act to provide: Hospitalization for person 65 and over, effective July 1, 1966; optional medical care insurance at $3 a month, matched by Government. Increases by 7 percent all social security payments, liberalizes eligibility rules. Expands and increases payments under Federal-State assistance programs for dependent children, blind and disabled. Increases social security taxes, and income rate base, to finance new and increased benefits. (Public Law 89–97.)

H.R. 2362: Authorizes $1.3 billion to improve elementary and secondary grade-school education; provides for 3-year program of aid to school districts on basis of percentage of pupils from lower income families and 5-year programs for communitywide supplemental educational centers, purchases of textbooks and other teaching aids; research, and help for State education departments. Extends for 2 years to July 1, 1968, aid for impacted schools districts. (Public Law 89–10.)

H.R. 7984: Authorizes $7 billion housing programs for 4 years including FHA, urban renewal, housing for elderly, college housing, 60,000 new units of public housing per year, and $800 million annually in matching grants to communities for water and sewer facilities; authorizes rent subsidy for some low-income families; limits interest charges to elderly and moderate-income home buyers; permits no-downpayment insured loans to veterans; expands rural programs. (Public Law 89–117.)

H.R. 2: Authorizes Food and Drug Administration to establish special controls over sales and distribution of depressant and stimulant drugs (amphetamines and barbiturates); fixes strict penalties particularly for offenses involving persons under 21 years of age. (Public Law 89–74.)

H.R. 8131: Extends Juvenile Delinquency Act for 2 years to June 30, 1967; authorizes $6.5 million for fiscal 1966, $10 million for 1967. (Public Law 89–69.)

S. 510: Extends for 5 fiscal years, 1966–70, the Community Health Services Act, authorizes grants to States and communities for mass immunization programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and adds measles. Extends for 1 year general and special health services, including those for migratory workers, chronically ill and aged, and grants for research to improve such services. (Public Law 89–109.)

H.R. 9567: Higher Education Act of 1965—Authorizes 5-year, $5.5 billion program to help States support community service programs of colleges and universities in urban and suburban areas; for grants to their libraries for training, research, and acquisition of materials; for teaching fellowships to raise quality of instruction at smaller colleges; amends National Defense Education Act to permit use of 25 percent of Federal contribution for scholarship grants to "exceptionally needy" students. (Awaiting President's signature.)

H.R. 8027: Authorizes 3-year program of grants by Attorney General to help State, local police, and other agencies improve enforcement methods and otherwise prevent crime; authorizes $10 million for 1966. (Public Law 89–197.)

S. 306: Authorizes $3.9 million 4-year program for control of air pollution by gasoline- and diesel-powered vehicles, and $92.5 million for action and research programs to improve methods of disposal of solid waste. (Public Law 89–272.)

H.R. 2985: Authorizes $224.1 million through fiscal 1972 for grants to community mental health centers for professional and technical staffing; $205.5 million for training of teachers of handicapped and retarded children, and $80 million for research, demonstration projects and construction of facilities in this field through fiscal 1971. (Public Law 89–105.)

H.R. 2984: Extends for 3 years, to June 30, 1969, expiring Health Research Facilities Act, expands program, and authorizes aggregate of $289 million in matching grants for construction. (Public Law 89–115.)

H.R. 7031: Establishes a national technical institute to provide higher education for the deaf. (Public Law 89–36.)

H.R. 8469: Provides for cost-of-living increases in annuities to retired Government employees. (Public Law 89–205.)

H.R. 3141: Authorizes $755 million for 3-year extension of matching grants program for construction of teaching facilities for physicians, dentists, professional health personnel, optometrists, pharmacists, and podiatrists; for 3-year extension of student loan program; for new 4-year programs to aid such schools, and those of osteopathy to improve scope and quality of teaching and for grants for scholarship aid to their students. (Public Law 89–290.)

H.R. 7743: Provides for Federal insurance of loans to high school graduates, and direct loans by the Government, not to exceed $1,500 per year, to finance tuition at business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools. (Public Law 89–287.)

S. 596: Establishes regional medical programs of cooperative research by hospitals, medical schools, and physicians' clinics to combat heart disease, cancer, and stroke; authorizes $340 million for 3 years. (Public Law 89–239.)

H.R. 8310: Expands Federal program of aid to States for vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons and to increase supply of trained counselors; authorizes $1.05 million for 3 years through fiscal 1968. (Awaiting President's signature.)

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

S. 1564: To effectuate and enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution, guaranteeing the right to vote: Authorizes appointment of Federal voting registrars in areas where discrimination prevails, bars literacy and other tests, directs U.S. court suits to invalidate poll taxes; fixes penalties for threats, intimidation, and violence. (Public Law 89–110.)

H.R. 6927: Established a Department of Housing and Urban Development at the Cabinet level to assume functions of Housing and Home Finance Administration. (Public Law 89–174.)

H.R. 3708: Creates an Administration on Aging, under direction of a Commissioner, within the Department of HEW, to be a coordinating center for information and service to State and local governments, administer grants, promote research, gather statistics, and prepare and publish other data. (Public Law 89–73.)

S.J. Res. 1: Proposes constitutional amendment fixing conditions and procedures for succession of Vice President to the Presidency in event of Chief Executive's disability; provides for filling vacancy in the Vice-Presidency. (Adopted.)

S. 1483: Establishes a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities comprising separate national endowments for each and a Federal council. Authorizes $10 million annually for 3 years, through June 30, 1968, with United States authorized to match private grants. (Public Law 89–209.)

H.R. 10281: Provides 3.6 percent pay increase for Federal employees. (Awaiting President's signature.)

NATURAL RESOURCES

S. 21: Establishes a Federal Water Resources Council and River Basin Commission to coordinate planning for maximum use of resources and assist States in such planning. (Public Law 89–80.)

S. 1229: Fixes uniform policies on provision for recreation facilities and fish and wildlife benefits, on multipurpose water-resource projects. (Public Law 89–72.)

H.R. 6755: Authorizes $944 million for flood control and navigation improvement projects in 13 river basins during the next 2 years. (Public Law 89–42.)

S. 4: Increases authorization for aid to communities to combat water pollution; establishes a Water Pollution Control Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; permits Federal Government to fix quality standards for interstate waters when local authorities fail to do so within 2 years. (Public Law 89–234.)

S. 24: Extends for 5 years, to June 30, 1972, expanded research and development program for conversion of saline water; authorizes $185 million. (Public Law 89–118.)

S. 1623: Authorizes continued study of effects of insecticides and other pesticides on fish and wildlife. (Public Law 89–232.)

H.R. 89: Authorizes Federal purchase of land along Delaware River in Pennsylvania, New Jersey and New York for establishment of Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area as part of Tock's Island Reservoir Project. (Public Law 89–158.)

S. 2300: Authorizes $1.69 billion for program of navigation improvement, flood and beach erosion control, and hydroelectric power projects in 38 States; proposes long-range plan to meet water needs of Northeast United States via system of reservoirs and aqueducts. (Awaiting President's signature.)

S. 2084: Authorizes program of roadside beautification by control of billboards and auto junkyards. (Public Law 89–285.)

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

H.R. 9075: Provides average 10.4-percent basic pay increases for officers and enlisted members of the uniformed services totaling $1 billion. (Public Law 89–132.)

S. 2127: Provides $10,000 life policy for members of Armed Forces on active duty under private insurance blanket coverage plan. (Public Law 89–214.)

H.R. 205: Increases allowances under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act. (Public Law 89–222.)

H.R. 7597: Provides up to $1.65 million as initial capital to establish fund for reopened national life insurance policies (Public Law 88–664), on loan from VA and to be repaid out of premiums. (Public Law 89–40.)

H.R. 206 and H.R. 208: Increases subsistence allowances paid disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation. Increases period of training. (Public Law 89–137; Public Law 89–138.)

H.R. 168: Increases veterans' disability compensation to reflect rise in living costs. (Awaiting President's signature.)

The 175th Anniversary of Gallipolis, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, the city of Gallipolis, Ohio, marked its 175th anniversary with a weeklong celebration October 10–17 that was one of the most impressive, well-organized community undertakings that I have ever witnessed.

This historic city—the second oldest in Ohio—is in my congressional district, and it was my honor and privilege to take part in the celebration. It will always be a cherished memory.

Much of the credit for the success of the celebration must go to the officers of the Gallipolis Area 175th Anniversary, Inc. The corporation was headed by Maj. Gen. George E. Bush, U.S. Army, retired. He was ably assisted by Miles T. Epling; Manning E. Wetherholt; the Reverend A. H. McKenzie; and Mrs. Keith Suiter. Division chairmen were Herbert Bush, Clarence Phalen, Mrs. P. J. Ryal, J. Sherman Porter, and Jack Hudson. Committees were led by Earl E. Tope, Harry Wheeler, and W. H. Sowers.

Many other individuals worked tirelessly to make the anniversary celebration the rousing success that it was. I regret that space does not permit me to name them.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert a brief history of Gallipolis, which, I might say, personifies the gallant history of frontier America:

The Ohio makes a worm-like curve a few miles below the mouth of the Kanawha, and there, where the hills of two States stretch in folds near the great river, stands the city of Gallipolis. The odd name, signifying "city of the Gauls," has a familiar ring; newspaper readers will recall that this is the place about which the late O. O. McIntyre used to write. Visitors will not discover, as McIntyre did, the scent of clover coming over from the hills of West Virginia. They will, however, find many old houses set flush with the sidewalks, evenly spaced cross streets bearing the pretty names of trees, an old-fashioned park with benches, cannon, and a pagoda-like bandstand.

Various singularities are soon noticed. On the landscaped grounds at the city's east end are the buildings of the Gallipolis State Institute. At the west end is Mound Hill, commanding a magnificent view of the town, the river, and the surrounding hills and bottom lands. Behind the town, running parallel with the river, is Chickamauga Creek; the steep slope of its valley squeezes the main part of Gallipolis into a sector 9 blocks long and 4 blocks wide.

Behind the commonplace facade of the town's brick and frame houses, its business structures, and its narrow, tree-lined streets, lurks a romantic beginning. In the fall of 1790 about 500 upper middle-class Frenchmen came here from France to make a home in the wilderness. The enthusiastic reports of travel writers, the fear inspired by the French Revolution, the promptings of an American land office in Paris—these factors brought them here. They moved into log cabins where City Park is now. They made wine, cultivated formal gardens, nurtured fruit trees, and tried to raise vegetables and other crops. Twice a week they met at the community ballroom.

For years they struggled to adapt themselves to the frontier. It was an uneven contest. Fevers plagued them; Indians harassed them; and the cold winters brought near famines. They were unsuccessful as crop farmers, and in the end they had to buy their land a second time. The heartbreaks were too many. One by one they drifted away; by 1805 not more than 20 French families remained.

So Gallipolis became an American town. It built boats and shipped produce during the decades when river traffic on the Ohio dominated life in the valley. After the railroads arrived, the river commerce declined, and Gallipolis turned to manufacturing. It never became completely industrialized, but in the 1880's more than 300 of its residents made wheels, carriages, stoves, woodwork, and foundry articles. Later on manufacturing also declined.

Today this old river town sees only an occasional packet or string of barges passing below its raised site on the majestic Ohio. As the county seat and the only large community in Gallia County, Gallipolis is the marketplace for most of the county's produce, livestock, and dairy products. Located in the heart of the industrial Ohio Valley, it is also an attractive and desirable site for industrial development.

At the request of Hobart Wilson, Jr., managing editor of the Gallipolis Daily Tribune, President Johnson and I both addressed messages of congratulations to the community and its people.

The President's message follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 5, 1965.

Hon. GARY SHORT,
City Manager,
Gallipolis, Ohio.

DEAR MR. SHORT: I can well imagine how pleased the citizens of Gallipolis must be as they celebrate the 175th anniversary of the founding of the town.

We can always draw inspiration from the past. Congressman MOELLER has told me that the old French city of Gallipolis is the second oldest city in Ohio.

Please accept my congratulations on this important occasion.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

I now insert my own letter of congratulations:

OCTOBER 10, 1965.

To the CITY OF GALLIPOLIS:

I extend my heartiest congratulations to the city of Gallipolis—Ohio's second oldest—on the 175th anniversary of its founding.

Settled by French immigrants during the second year of the Presidency of George Washington, the history of your city, more than most, parallels the history of America. The past 175 years have been years of unrivaled national growth and progress. The years immediately ahead will be years of even more fantastic advances. I want Gallipolis, and its sister communities throughout southeastern Ohio, to fully share in these blessings.

It can be done.

The city of Gallipolis itself stands as a monument to what can be accomplished through vision, faith, and hard work. Preceding generations believed in the future; they did not shrink from challenge; they were not content with the status quo. Now, it is the obligation of the present generation to expand on the good works of those who carved out a community from the wilderness and built for posterity a good place to live and work.

I have no doubt that this obligation will be met.

With sincere good wishes, I am,

Respectfully yours,

WALTER H. MOELLER,
Member of Congress.

Tribute to Cecil C. McDaniel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is with considerable regret that I wish to announce that at the end of the present session of the Congress Cecil C. McDaniel, of the staff of the Senate Appropriations Committee, plans to retire after 15 years of service with the committee and over 30 years of service in the Federal Government.

Cecil's position with the Appropriations Committee has been that of chief of the editing and printing department, for which his background and experience admirably fitted him. In that capacity he reviewed the transcript of all testimony taken by the committee, prepared it in proper form for printing and prepared all the records of the committee for publication. The volume of work this entailed is a tribute to his conscientious performance. His cooperative attitude, his painstaking desire for perfection, and the expedition with which he executed his tasks have been of great aid in accomplishing the work of the committee.

I wish to thank him personally for his assistance. It was largely through his painstaking efforts that the monumental printing procedure related to committee work has evolved into the systematized, efficient, and rapid operation it is today.

I am sure that all the members of the committee as well as the committee staff join me in wishing him every happiness in his retirement.

Confirmation of William D. Bechill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on October 1, the President appointed, subject to Senate confirmation, Mr. William D. Bechill as Commissioner of the new Administration on Aging and the Senate confirmed this appointment on Friday, October 22. The President could not have found anyone within the width and breadth of the United States who would have been better qualified to carry out this important new responsibility. Mr. Bechill is well known to those who work in the field of aging throughout the United States as an able, energetic, and imaginative leader in efforts to solve the problems of aging and to take maximum advantage of the opportunities for improving the later years of our people. During the past 5 years he has rendered outstanding service as executive secretary of the Citizens Advisory Committee on Aging in California. We of the Senate Special Committee on Aging have come to know him and of his excellent work in that capacity through our studies, investigations, and hearings in California, on which he has been very helpful. He is also serving as president of the Western Gerontological Society and as a member and advisor to the National Council of Senior Citizens. In 1961 he was a delegate to the White House Conference on Aging.

Mr. Bechill is well qualified by education as well as by experience to undertake the duties of Commissioner of Aging. He received his baccalaureate degree at Beloit College and his master of arts degree at the University of Michigan. He has also done additional graduate work beyond his master's degree at the University of Michigan, and has served as a member of that institution's faculty. After obtaining these excellent educational qualifications, and before entering the specialized area of aging, Mr. Bechill spent many years obtaining firsthand knowledge and understanding in the more generalized area of social work. He served first as a caseworker in Detroit public welfare, rising to the responsibility of area representative of the Michigan Department of Public Welfare.

I emphasize Mr. Bechill's education at the University of Michigan and his practical work experience in the State of Michigan, Mr. President, because that great educational institution and that progressive, enlightened State have been preeminent in gerontological endeavors. Mr. Bechill's education and early experience in Michigan coupled with his more recent specialized experience and service in California constitute a background for a Commissioner on Aging which would be hard to duplicate.

Mr. Bechill is our Nation's first Commissioner of Aging. This position was created by the Older Americans Act of 1965 which became law on July 14. I am confident that all Senators are aware that the able senior Senator from Michigan was the principal Senate sponsor of this measure, which is not surprising in view of his State's leadership in the field of aging.

Mr. President, the President has decided to let his administration's record in the field of aging stand or fall based upon Bill Bechill's ability to carry out this responsibility. Those of us who have worked in aging and who are acquainted with him and his excellent work and qualifications for this new responsibility are confident that the President has chosen wisely.

I am pleased that the Senate confirmed him prior to adjournment. This will enable the programs envisioned by Congress in enacting the Older Americans Act to go into effect without delay.

The 89th Congress—A Congress of Fulfillment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, of the untold number of hours this 1st session of the 89th Congress has spent in this Chamber, in committee, in conferences, in voting and decisions, none, I hold, goes deeper to the inner legislative soul of us all than this moment of résumé and evaluation.

We have come now to the summing up.

If we had to give this Congress a label, a name to distinguish it from other Congresses of the past, a designation in history, what would be the right form of words?

I mean a title for this 89th Congress that matches and defines its role in history to set it apart from all the Congresses since the meeting of the 1st Congress under the Constitution in 1789?

This has been a dramatic Congress and a Congress of infinite scope.

It has done its work well and earned for itself very special praise.

The words that I think fit this Congress better than any others, and that give it the correct chapter heading in the history of the United States, are simple and true.

I would say the 89th Congress of the United States is "The Congress of Fulfillment."

It is the Congress of accomplished hopes.

It is the Congress of realized dreams.

It is the Congress that shaped and crafted the noblest obligations of man to man, the highest moral values, into the workable and statutory language of the practical and the sound; of the legal and the constitutional.

This is the Congress that dealt pragmatically and successfully with the subjects and the profoundest problems that plague the soul of men everywhere.

And this is the Congress that came through with a program of fulfillment.

So I am proud to say that this Congress constitutes a new plateau on what is up to now the highest level of mature government, democratically administered, for some 190 million or more of our people and for the freedom of the world and mankind.

What therefore sets this extraordinary achievement apart from, for example, the early Presidential days of the all-time great Franklin Delano Roosevelt is that this superbly historic record generally was created without the acute pressures of tragic national crises.

It was done out of a sense of a nation's greatness.

It was done without the driving force of an existing or impending disaster.

It was done out of a feeling for humanity bred into us by the great heritage and tradition of our past and out of such leadership as gives our history its glory.

What I am saying is that this Congress—perhaps more than any other Congress that has gone before—reached a higher moral elevation.

What began for the immediate present in our history with President John Fitzgerald Kennedy and the New Frontier surged forward under the impetus of President Lyndon Baines Johnson's grand pronouncement.

Let us continue.

And what we have wrought in this House and in the other body is the creation into the structure of our laws of a sound and compassionate regard for our fellowman.

It is a new statutory upgrading of human values.

In depth, in implementation, in effectiveness, in making moral justice more complete than it has ever been hitherto, I believe what we have done here to be without parallel in time.

I know of no words in the last half century so pregnant with meaning as "civil rights."

I know of no words so pregnant with meaning as "right to vote."

I should like to be shown a word so rich in religious significance, so proudly noble in terms of Holy Writ, as that word coined in these very legislative halls and known now to civilization as "medicare."

Of course none of this is the last word in legislative perfection. Of course some clause, some phrase, some grudgingly wrought compromise in some of this massive legislation will bring with it a train of difficulties. And these in later legislation may have to be ironed out and corrected, adjusted, changed, improved. This is why we have Congresses and why we live so well and achieve so much under the democratic process with its inherent allowance for change.

I emphasize this legislation for humanity because there are critics among us who charge that we are becoming a nation losing its soul. That we are in the throes of the tragic delusion that money and power and affluence guide our will and overwhelm humility and our sense of decency and righteousness.

What this Congress has wrought in this session is a concrete denial of that indictment.

The aged and the blind, the children and the dependent, the disabled and the infirm have felt the healing hand, so to speak, of the 89th Congress.

This was the Congress that gave the Nation its first real "nuts and bolts" Housing Act. There has been housing legislation in the past, but the 89th Congress took dead aim at the heart of the problem—and extended to the less fortunate American an opportunity to raise his family in new and better housing.

The bill, which authorizes more than $7.5 billion for a comprehensive housing program, is especially designed to aid low-income families. Although the rent subsidy provision of the bill failed to gain the necessary appropriations in the waning hours of the first session, we can expect a vigorous effort to restore this kingbolt section early next January. For those whose yearly income ranges below $3,000, grants of up to $1,500 will be available to help restore older, rundown property.

In the passage of the Housing Act, this Congress again demonstrated a vital concern for the people and for the dignity of the individual. Clearly, the Congress has shown an ability to meet squarely a moral responsibility; and in meeting that responsibility it has earned a prominent place in the chronicles of the Republic.

Along with significant housing legislation, this Congress sought to correct a festering inequality and extend to this country's burgeoning urban communities a proper representation in Washington. This move toward equality was achieved through the creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development. Long overdue, this new department will combine under a single head the duties of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Federal Housing Administration, the Public Housing Administration, and the Federal National Mortgage Association. This act will enhance the future planning and development of our great metropolitan centers, and it will help extend to our urban dwellers the blessings of a satisfying and rewarding life.

This is the Congress that thrust itself into the very pit of our neglected national educational problem. The bill that is now law—H.R. 2362—with great care and consideration for detail and universal justice, authorized $1.3 billion to bring about a better educated America. The elementary and secondary gradeschool education for our children throughout the land is to be improved.

There is a 3-year program of aid to school districts.

The primary beneficiaries of this program are to be the pupils from the lower income families. There is, besides, a 5-year program for communitywide supplemental educational centers. Here there is involved the purchase of textbooks and teaching aids, research, and help for State education departments. And there is for 2 years, under this authorization, aid for school districts impacted with our servicemen. The program is comprehensive, exhaustively worked out, and as nearly ideal as legislation can be.

But this was the Congress that also took cognizance of the fact that today a student's education often is not completed with a high school diploma. With thousands of young men and women waiting at the Nation's college doors, this Congress took action designed to keep open those doors to the qualified applicant. The higher education bill will provide scholarships for needy undergraduates; it will provide for an expanding program of national defense education loans; and it will provide for better libraries and better adult-education classes.

Again, the Congress of fulfillment has guaranteed to future generations of Americans that they too will be able to enjoy the fruits of a better education.

Yes, this was the Congress that blazed a new and edifying trail in the field of medical care for the aged. What a beautiful memorial to former President Truman, when President Johnson journeyed to Independence, Mo., to sign into law the medicare bill. Harry Truman was the great Democrat who first sought to lift the burden of medical bills from our senior citizens. And this law does just that. It adds an immeasurable amount of dignity to our fellow Americans who have reached the golden years. The victory for medicare was not an easy battle; but once won, this Congress can be proud that, like St. Paul, "it fought the good fight."

We have legislated to tighten the Federal power in those areas of commerce that have proved themselves incapable of doing their own policing of their own predatory and dishonest commercial delinquents—however much in the minority they may be. Thus we have given certain authority to the Food and Drug Administration. We are putting controls over the sale and distribution of depressant and stimulant drugs to end their special toll of crime and traffic accidents. And we have been justly forcible where this type of profiteer uses, for his victims, children under 21 years of age.

This can hardly be said to be a society that is losing its soul.

Along kindred lines we have enacted the Community Health Services Act in terms of its extension for 5 fiscal years through 1966 to 1970. Here the ancient Biblical injunction about being our brother's keeper was put into practice through authorizing grants to States and communities for a mass immunization program.

Like the all-out war on poverty, this is the all-out war on disease.

It is aimed to strike at polio and diphtheria, at whooping cough and tetanus and—in this act for the first time—at measles. In this act this Congress literally searched out whole areas of mankind within its borders to bring them health: the act extends for another year general and special health services to migratory workers, among others, and to the chronically ill and the aged. And grants are provided to improve research for such health activities.

This, indeed, is the Congress that not only provided fulfillment for democratic government, but instead of losing its soul, found, reactivated and expanded it, and reached out for the noblest works consonant with a great human conscience.

When the furious floods of winter ravaged Oregon and the States of Washington, California, Idaho, and Montana, Congress authorized $111.8 million to repair the devastation nature had inflicted. This bill, now law, is doing its humane job among the dispossessed and the afflicted.

This is the Congress also that saw beyond its basic borders in the grand design for helping the needy and the worthy, and those people of our country who are our own. Thus we enacted, for one example, H.R. 5874, a bill that amends the Aid for School Construction Act or Public Law 81–815, so as to authorize help for building facilities in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. This is the act that reached out to help those children beyond the means of local agencies and for who local authorities are unable to do anything, but who need help. And there is Public Law 89–36, a relatively minor measure in itself, but of powerful meaning for the handicapped since this is the law that establishes a national technical institute to provide higher education for the deaf.

Along the same line and belonging in the same family of legislation is the act that authorizes $224.1 million through fiscal 1972 authorizing grants to community mental health centers for professional and technical staffing. It authorizes also $205.5 million for training of teachers of the handicapped and retarded children, and still another $80 million for research, demonstration projects, and construction of facilities in this field through fiscal 1971. Here is a complex of problems to which the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy was so deeply devoted and to which the Kennedy family has given so much of its energies and its wealth.

There are, of course, other measures on health that mean so much to a Nation of more than 190 million whose strength as a democracy depends on a rugged and an informed population.

This Congress, in the Regional Medical Programs Act, launched a concerted attack on the sadness, the human misery, and the irreplaceable loss of valuable talent through the diseases of the heart, of cancer, stroke, and accompanying ills. An authorization of $350 million over the next 3 years will assist in developing a cooperative regional arrangement among public or nonprofit private institutions engaging in the research, diagnosis, and treatment of those diseases that too often promote despair and cause surrender of life itself.

And, as with the victory over polio, I am confident that this attack will also meet with success; and the victor will be awarded the benefits of a healthier America.

Let me ask the "doubting Thomases": Does this sound like a Nation that is losing it's soul? No, I submit to you, that this Nation and this Congress have made a new covenant with the future—a covenant that will fulfill the historical promises of democratic government.

The strength of a nation like ours is, to be sure, not only in the health and the vigor of its people, but in the health and the vigor of this people's economy. It is in this area that this Congress realized, I believe, to its utmost potential the legislative power given it by the Constitution and affirmed by the electorate that put this Congress in office. Here is the sweep and the scope of which I have been speaking, and here is the fulfillment on a scale that does this Congress proud and that will resound down through the corridors of history for decades to come.

For this is the Congress that enacted Public Law 89–44, reducing excise taxes by $4.6 billion and proving for the first time on a huge scale that more money can come into the Federal treasury by removing the heavy burdens of taxation from the American people, than by increasing taxation, provided this is done with discretion and with economic wisdom.

It is also the first time that Congress, by its courage and its decision, destroyed the long-held myth that once a tax is imposed it is never removed.

This Taxation Extinction Act, which became effective by July 1, 1965, repealed the Federal tax on furs, on jewelry, on a whole catalog of luxury items, and on radio, TV sets, cameras, household appliances, musical instruments, records, sporting goods, and bowling alleys.

This is the law that gradually cuts the 10-percent tax on automobiles, bringing it down to 1 percent.

It is the law also that eliminates the communications tax beginning January 1, 1969.

Here we have, I repeat, legislation that is bold, that is thorough, that is courageous, and that is in keeping with the tradition of the great legislative measures of the Roosevelt, the Truman, the Kennedy, and now the Johnson tradition. I shall have more to say about the Johnson leadership, but it is in the field of the national economy, as was the case with the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt, that this extraordinary leadership manifested itself with striking and dramatic impact for the good of our country and, in the long run, for the good of the free world and—I do not hesitate to insist—for the good of the whole planet and its 3 billion people.

For the solid strength of our economy has its advantageous repercussions on the economies of the world and all peoples, sooner or later, feel its helpful effects.

I ask those who find our country wanting in the spirit of nobility and who charge us with "the new imperiousness of power and wealth," with arrogance and with concentration on money and power, to examine the body and the burden of the legislation of this Congress. For the critics of whom I speak are not necessarily abroad. They are our own critics and they speak—sincerely and with the best intentions, I suppose—in our public places and our public prints.

What, I ask, is Public Law 89–4 but the expression of the finest instincts of the American people, as brought to reality by this Congress. This is the law that established the Appalachia Regional Commission. This is the Commission whose function it is to initiate and coordinate public works and similar programs—not only Federal, but State and local as well, to bring the economy into the homes of those who need it most. It proposes to do this by improving the skills and the health of residents in the area covered by the legislation.

And for this effort Congress authorized $1.1 billion for 1966.

Lest this be not enough, we have Public Law 89–15, the statute that extends for 3 years, to June 30, 1969, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. It is a law that encompasses results achieved, and to be achieved, and therefore establishes a limit, so that it reduces full Federal support of projects to 90 percent after fiscal 1966. Excepted from this reduction are payment of allowances for trainees. Also the maximum training period is extended from 52 weeks to 104. It brings the training program of the Area Redevelopment Act under this Manpower Development and Training Act.

And it authorizes $454 million for the program for 1 year.

If this Congress was busy at all it was busy with the examination of its own soul, its own conscience, and the well-being of its people. This was done in a spirit, not of rhetoric and what might be done at some time in the future, but with principles and law put on the statute books here and now. They are already set to work to give our people help, relief, and the opportunity to exercise their own initiative, their self-reliance, their feeling of being an integral part of the Great Society.

Let me reemphasize the story of the 1965 session of the 89th Congress:

We enacted Federal funds for elementary and secondary schools and, within constitutional limits, we included private and church schools.

We launched Appalachia, providing aid that totaled $1.1 billion for an 11-State program, changing desperation into hope.

We provided $454 million for manpower retraining.

We repealed excise taxes on a massive and historic scale.

We instituted comprehensive health benefits for those from one to one hundred.

We took the best system of higher education and made it even better with continued Federal grants to our colleges and universities.

We showed the free and the tyranny-ridden world where we stood as a Congress on South Vietnam with an increase of $700 million in defense funds.

This is the Congress that had the fiduciary courage to release a substantial proportion of our gold reserve in order to support the international value of the dollar.

This is the Congress that removed the stigma of 100 years of Negro disfranchisement from the soul of America. In no other piece of legislation was the conscience of this Nation put to a more rugged test. That challenge was met by this Congress, and every American should rejoice in the knowledge that today his Negro brother has the legal and moral right to go into the voting booth and cast his equal vote for his equal choice.

This is the Congress that gave new encouragement to the Nation's struggling artists through the establishment of a National Arts and Humanities Foundation.

This is the Congress that had the courage to revise the immigration policy of the United States. This move represents a humane, enlightened, and highly beneficial legislative change not only from the standpoint of those seeking to come to these shores and throw their destiny in with us, but from the standpoint also of our own interests as a Nation. It has taken us some 40 years to bring these changes about. The results show a position of mature statesmanship that does this session great credit.

For this is the Legislature that has brought down, so to speak, the walls of Jericho and helped us into the promised land of international decency and national advantage, free of narrow prejudices that run athwart the American tradition. The change in immigration policy is not merely a technical advance in the matter of the admission of immigrants arrived at after much debate and trained technical advice. It is a high point, again, in the moral eminence we have achieved as a people. We did not merely correct a wrong, but we followed through on a question of simple moral righteousness. It is this that does this Legislature immense credit and that is bound, in the years of the policy's operation, to improve the character and the quality of those coming to our shores, and supply the human needs of our manpower requirements.

In immigration we have raised high the standard of human understanding and promoted with it what is right for us all both morally and materially. The passage of this bill brings great happiness to me because my maiden speech in the House of Representatives in February of 1929 was in opposition to the national origins clause.

This is the Congress that extended and expanded President Johnson's poverty program. Who, among you, can accuse this Nation of losing its soul when through the Job Corps 40,000 high school dropouts will receive the vocational training and educational skills necessary to give them a crack at making a meaningful contribution to the Great Society.

Who can accuse this Nation of turning its back on its less-fortunate citizens when legislation to aid the poorer farmer, the migrant worker, and the American Indian has been passed by this Congress.

And who can accuse this Nation of snobbish neglect when through a regional development program those painfully depressed areas of chronic unemployment will receive a helping hand in the form of grants to modernize their water systems, sewage plants, sewers, and police and fire facilities.

No, all of these accusations are for another time and another place; but in 1965, this Congress was truly the Congress of fulfillment.

Thus when I speak of fulfillment, of promises kept, of commitments lived up to, I do not mean a program of sentimental do-goodism that is all heart and no head. But I mean what I have just delineated: a solid program of hard, sound sense and definite achievement. This is a program that, for the very sweep and scope of its aims, is bound to show some signs of imperfection, some areas of criticism, some details not fully and ideally worked out. But it is a program that shows legislative judgment of the highest order, and that for its massive reach and effect, may well go down as one of the greatest accomplishments legislatively in the history of the United States.

When we dealt with dollars we used the cold, hard laws of arithmetic as our fiduciary legisation well testifies. When we dealt with human beings and our fellow citizens we displayed a sense of what is right and just, what is uplifting and what will teach and rehabilitate, what will build and make for a progressive and an economically well administered citizenry.

We do not want paupers; we want people.

We want people who are self-sustained and proud and capable of doing what needs to be done for themselves, getting only from Government what will enable them to become self-supporting and bring them as quickly as may be to their own feet.

That's the real inner meaning of much of this legislation.

The national defense and internal security is an area of legislation that has always held a high priority in this Congress as in mostly every other. Especially since the end of World War II there has been a feeling of sensitive regard for anything that touches upon our military survival and our military preeminence, for upon our military survival depends every other survival. Yet, in going all out on our defense program, we did not go overboard and the same fundamental good sense that governs our general legislation applied here, except that there was an element of priority and extra consideration that was naturally elicited by the immense importance of the subject.

This is a monumental program that chews up more than half of a $100 billion annual budget. It pays for itself by providing the people of the United States with military protection for our survival and assuring peace and some measure of security for the free world. The choice is so enmeshed in terror that appropriations by this Congress to the military requirement may be said to be in fact a choice between money and death. This more than anything else explains the astronomical money—statistics in the military appropriations of this and former Congresses.

What do we have?

We have Public Law 89-37 authorizing $15.4 billion for the Department of Defense. This is solely for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. It includes $6.4 billion for research and development, for tests, and for evaluation.

It is almost impossible to say in language what a buildup this means of the mighty combination of science and industry, creative research and analysis to create a power for death and destruction undreamt of only a decade or two ago—a combination basic to the continuation of humane life in freedom on this planet.

A sort of profound psychological expression of money-and-military opinion behind our foreign policy protestations of commitment against Communist aggression is Public Law 89-18, which I already mentioned.

In terms of a $700 million additional appropriation this law tells Hanoi and Peiping, and some doubting capitals in other parts of the world, that this Congress surely to the extent of this legislation, is solidly and concretely, absolutely and without the peradventure of a doubt behind the President of the United States in his foreign policy in South Vietnam. Nor does this in any way exclude debate on the subject both within and without the Congress—a debate that the President himself has said he earnestly welcomes. What I am talking about is honorable debate, honorably spoken, not malicious and unwarranted, or evilly inspired, personal strictures against the administration and the strong and lonely man who leads it.

In a collateral category of expenditures is the authorization by this Congress of $5.18 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year 1966. This is to be used for the construction of facilities, administrative operations, and, of course, research and development. This is where the critical problem of solid fuel rockets are handled and questions resolved for nuclear solid-powered systems for spaceships. It is, overall, the brilliant and adventurous project that is shooting mankind into the next century. It has yielded an incredible body of information for science already and it has nurtured many new and remarkable products for ordinary use that are already on the market. It holds an infinite promise of great discoveries beyond anything imaginable at the time in 1492 that this continent was opened for civilization. Its potential for creating solutions—now beyond the knowledge of man—for problems that beset us, is practically without limit. It has already given us a new category of hero called astronauts. More than that, we have, up to now, placed ourselves in the lead of world-prestige in space exploration—a position we once thought we had lost to the Soviet Union.

The same bold and sweeping application of legislative statesmanship may be said to be inherent in Public Law 89–32, which authorizes $2.55 billion for fiscal 1966 for the Atomic Energy Commission. Some $704 million of this sum is for a weapons program, and another $2.5 million for a merchant ship reactor plan, bringing our surface ships within range of this amazing source of energy. Here again we are dealing with an imponderable future and our initiative and diligence today, our effort in money as well as talent, may bring us rewards wholly beyond understanding at the present moment. Doing these things is imperative lest others, unfriendly to us, forge ahead of us in these—the greatest mysteries about matter that until now baffled mankind—and much of which will, for a long time to come, continue to excite man's scientific curiosity.

Fulfillment, as we see, is a very big word.

It becomes bigger when we see what this Congress did to meet our country's responsibilities as the leading Nation of the free world. Here, in the area of international affairs, we see how monumental is the burden that rests on the back of the people of the United States in helping to keep the world's economy viable and at the same time discharge our responsibilities to our own people. And we see how careful, how adroit, how measured, yet how intelligently generous, this Congress has been in fulfilling this phase of its functions to our country and to the nations involved with us in the economic sphere.

When this Congress authorized $3.27 billion for foreign economic and military assistance for fiscal 1966 it stipulated that aid end to any nation failing to take preventive action against destruction of American property. But the Congress at the same time was careful not to preempt the constitutional authority of the President in directing our foreign policy. The act the Congress passed thus bars the sale of surplus foods to the United Arab Republic—one of the offenders against American property—but reserves to the President the right to make the determination on the basis of whether or not withholding the surplus foods is essential to our national interest. I like to think of this wise reservation in the act as a sound and simple example of legislative statesmanship and legislative good manners.

Thus in other laws that are now on the statute books this Congress extended the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for another 3 years, and extended the authority of the President to control the export of strategic or scarce materials for 4 years to June 30, 1969. There are still other laws passed by this Congress that bolster and improve the international banking situation as in the case of the amendment to the Inter-American Development Bank Act. Another very solid lift to the international banking situation was achieved through the authorization to increase by $1.035 billion the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund, broadening our participation by a jump from $4.125 to $5.16 billion.

On matters of governmental reorganization this Congress I believe for the first time, adequately corrected a strategically dangerous loophole in the Constitution of the United States. This is in the matter of the constitutional amendment fixing conditions and procedures for the Vice President of the United States to take over the duties and functions of the President in the event of the latter's incapacity, and making sure that the then occurring vacancy in the Vice Presidency is properly assumed by a constitutionally named successor.

This constitutional amendment is now before the several States for ratification.

This Congress with its sights raised high on the moral and economic and fiduciary and international issues of our time did not neglect the workaday old, and enduring difficulties that confront the Nation.

Cries have gone out that the forgotten citizen is the American farmer. But let me assure you that this administration and this Congress have not forgotten him. His individual well-being is the concern of every Member of Congress, and that concern is reflected in the passage of the omnibus farm bill which authorizes, revises, and extends the acreage allotments and price supports for wheat, cotton, rice, and allied agricultural commodities.

While the Soviet Union exchanges hard gold for Western wheat needed to supplement an agricultural economy laid waste by collective schemes, this Nation's farmers continue to provide the bounties of a blessed soil to the American housewife at bargain-basement prices. No, this achievement will never be forgotten; and this Congress will continue to reward our farmers with the cooperation and help of a sympathetic Government.

Under the heading of "Natural Resources" this Congress took into account the rising and critical question of water scarcity in certain areas. Thus we have the act establishing a Federal Water Resources Council and River Basin Commission. It will become the job of this body to coordinate plans for the maximum use of these resources, helping the States in their planning for a better adjustment of this basic eternal and indispensable need of human, animal, and vegetable life.

Other measures put the Federal strength behind flood control and navigation improvement projects with a $944 million authorization, and struck out at the growing problem of water pollution through the establishment of a Water Pollution Control Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This legislation will give the Federal Government and the States—if they choose to take the initiative—the power and the authority to strike down those individuals and industries who for their own financial gain selfishly exploit and pollute the waters that belong to all the people.

But if this Congress was concerned with the water we drink, it was also concerned with the air that we breath. That air has become the victim of misuse and mismanagement. In the air pollution bill, this Congress moved to kill the source of strangling fumes that has made the air over our urban areas a modern technological disaster. The bill authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish standards governing the exhaust fumes emitted from passenger cars, trucks, buses, and other motor vehicles.

This legislation comes not a day too soon. The romance of the American people and the automobile is legendary, but that romance is threatening to endanger the health of our citizens, and it is a tribute to the work of this Congress that it again has acted to protect the health and well-being of all Americans.

"Conservation," That is the key word. This was the Congress that legislated to conserve the natural, God-given blessings of this magnificent country. It has acted to conserve our waters, our air; and with the enthusiastic support of President and Mrs. Johnson, the Congress has rescued the Nation from a mad dive toward ugliness brought on by a cyclorama of tasteless billboards and rusting junk heaps. The highway beautification bill will help to remove these eyesores and restore to the byways of this land a new birth of scenic wonderment. It is legislation long overdue, and it's advent is welcomed by the majority of our countrymen.

Another conservation measure considered by this Congress concerned the rapidly diminishing level of the world's silver reserves. To help stem the tide of a disastrous silver shortage, and to free adequate supplies of this precious metal for industrial uses, the Congress eliminated or reduced the silver content of the Nation's coinage. Let me rush to emphasize, that this will in no way affect the value of our money—that value has been religiously maintained for 180 unbroken years by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government.

There were still other measures along the same line, all of them pertinent.

And for veterans and servicemen toward whom this House has always extended its legislative hand of meaningful gratitude, there was the reopening of national life insurance and the authorization of special allowances for evacuated dependents of members of the Armed Forces from foreign duty posts.

There was the act which allows the sorrowing families of those Americans who gave "the last full measure of their devotion" to receive compensation for the unused leave accrued by the servicemen at the time of their death.

And there was the military pay bill which grants a justly deserved pay hike to our young men and women who each day give unselfishly of their talents, their energies, and their lives—so that we might enjoy the continuing advantages of a free society. This money cannot begin to compensate these young Americans for the sacrifices they are making in the malaria-infested jungles of Vietnam. But this act does put the world on notice that we have not forgotten those who willing stand in defense of liberty—and we shall not forget them.

Over and beyond this massive legislative accomplishment is the economic state of the country. This is the base, from the standpoint of a position of strength and security, from which all else is derived. For our country is in a condition of economic growth and health beyond anything known to the history of economics since man first organized himself into societies. As I speak, this country is producing at a rate of growth that is in itself a kind of industrial, financial, and economic landmark. For the rate of growth is a phenomenal 5 percent. Now the learned economists of the country may dispute with me, and with each other, some of the interpretations to be drawn from these figures. But all agreed that, on the level of economic magnitude, our country is now in a state of achievement that may classically be defined as the golden age of American business.

The total story of the 1st session of the 89th Congress is for all these reasons, and this remarkable record, a new and brilliant page in the history of our country and the chronicle of man's progress toward the Great Society.

Suppose then we ask ourselves what were the factors that contributed to this pyramid of realized hopes, this catalog of legislative fulfillment?

The answer is to be found not only within the walls of this Chamber, but beyond it.

For, first, there was the dynamic, insistent, unrelenting, tireless, and extremely human and humane leadersip of President Lyndon Baines Johnson. This, as we all know from our actual experience and contact, is leadership on the highest standards of Presidential relationship between the executive and the legislative branches of our Government.

Second, and certainly no less vital, there was this eager, cooperative, deeply informed, and dedicatedly concerned Congress, acting always on its own knowledge and its own independent judgment, and profoundly aware of its role in history.

Third, there were the mighty moral, economic, social, political issues-of-the-first-moment pleading for solution.

Fourth—and equal to all the rest—there was the preeminent and dominant will of the people of the United States as expressed in a bluntly positive and unmistakable landslide presidential election that swept all polling-booth records before it. It was an election that showed the voters of the United States in a ponderous, calculated, and irresistible decision, well backgrounded on the issues and clearly knowledgeable, moving like a mountainous tide to put into office Lyndon Baines Johnson and so many of the legislators I see before me now.

These factors, together, constituted an unbeatable combination.

What, from my point of view, matters as much as anything else, is that there were no so-called crash programs. We were not subject here nor did we subject each other to what is sometimes referred to as the steamroller or the rubberstamp decision.

There were no threats, political or otherwise, to legislate or else.

This extraordinary record of the 1st session of the 89th Congress is all of it, from one act to the other, sound legislation, soundly arrived at, exhaustively planned, discussed, disputed, reported, accepted.

No group, no party, affirmative or in opposition, was asked to take anything on faith.

No one was asked to do anything against principle.

No legislator was asked to act or accept any proposition that had not been first thoroughly argued to the limit of intelligent, detailed, and considered debate.

We heard it all and fought it all out right here in the Chamber and in committee and with each other.

The greatest single influence for the passage of this remarkable body of legislation was the legislation itself.

It is legislation that stands up on morale grounds, and, from the standpoint of arithmetic, it is certainly on solid fiduciary ground.

It is legislation that accepts the needs and wants and rightful claims of all our citizens. It discriminates against no group, no race, no faith, no party.

It is legislation that aims at the totality of the American people.

It is legislation that is ruggedly conceived.

But, of course, legislation cannot be the absolute answer nor cover the whole of the human problem.

What we did in this Congress was to build a road of statutes to a higher social order.

We cannot preempt the functions of the school.

We cannot preempt the duty of the home.

We cannot preempt the teachings of the church.

We cannot preempt the responsibility of the community.

The human heart, as we have been well taught by experience, cannot be shaped and remolded by the cold, hard language of statutory law.

The communication media has its duties to perform in a free and open society.

The organized authority of the professions—the law and medicine—have their own areas of responsibility to themselves and to the rule of the law.

The Congress opened the gate—as this legislation testifies—and now the people must enter and do their share.

We have obeyed Holy Writ and we have accepted fully and honorably the role of being our brother's keeper.

It is now up to our brother and his associates to do some of the keeping on their own.

Yet, as this Nation, under God, must see it, this legislation that we have enacted is touched by a Biblical thoughtfulness.

It is invested with the decency of man's humanity to man.

It is rich in the unique workability that combines compassion with technical competence.

It is legislation that as nearly as possible represents in all its truth what President Johnson calls "a consensus."

Indeed, it is legislation that speaks in the language of Isaiah shaped to the needs of the middle 1960's, rooted in the usages of democracy, and rendered feasible by the phenomenal know-how of a highly pragmatic and politically mature people.

By the time the legislation reached the desk of President Johnson in the White House for his signature, returning to the spot where so much of it had been initiated, it was enveloped in the words from Holy Writ that President Johnson loves so much:

> Come now and let us reason together.

Members of the 89th Congress: It is my opinion that the record of legislation you have just written will live forever in the story of man's progress to the realization of his noblest dreams and the fulfillment of justice and peace through sound government.

The Hungarian Revolt of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Incredible as it may seem, 9 years have already passed since that fateful day, October 23, 1956, when the free world awoke to hear that the Hungarian people had risen to break the shackles which the Soviet Union had placed on them in 1949.

For nearly 2 weeks, the sheer courage and determination of the freedom fighters, as they were aptly called, succeeded in keeping the might of the Soviet Union at bay. With characteristic treachery and faithlessness, the Soviets gave the Hungarians to understand that most of the legitimate demands of the freedom fighters would be acceded to, and that the question of Soviet troops in Hungary would be the subject of discussions with the new and more liberal regime of Imre Nagy. Even while discussions between the leaders of the new government and the highest representatives of the Soviet Union were in progress, Soviet tanks, troops and other equipment were rushed across the border in order to ruthlessly crush the Hungarian attempt to regain some of their most basic human rights.

We and the rest of the free world cannot afford to forget the many lessons which the freedom fighters of Hungary, and officials and army of the Soviet Union, taught us in those memorable 2 weeks. From the exploits of the Hungarians, we have been vindicated in our belief that it is impossible for any dictatorship to repress the desire of mankind to live in an atmosphere of freedom. We learned that human beings around the globe are alike in their determination to achieve this goal, and that they are willing to pay the price in blood if it becomes necessary. We learned that no matter what effort is expended by a tyranny upon repression and subjection, it cannot in the long run root out what the free world has long known is natural to all human beings—the desire for self-rule. These are lessons we should not, indeed must not forget.

From the actions of the Soviet leaders, we learned once more that it is not possible to deal honorably with a dictatorship whose basic ideas about the nature of man are so completely antithetical to our own. We learned that the free world and free men cannot accept the guarantees or promises of a regime which must maintain itself through tyrannical means, for they are broken and discarded whenever it becomes convenient for the dictator to do so. We learned that a meaningful discussion, even if we assume this is possible, can only take place when every action, every suggestion, every thought we express can be and is unmistakably supported by the combined strength which only free men can muster.

I am certain that the struggle of the Hungarian freedom fighters was not in vain, for there are nations throughout the globe who learned from these events—learned the lessons which I have enumerated. If this alone were the result of those fateful 2 weeks in 1956, it was worth more than we can ever know. Of course it was not, and in this fact both we and the Hungarians here and still behind the Iron Curtain can take pride.

In a Democracy the Public Has a Right To Be Heard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, for some days I have given serious thought to a letter received by me from Roger L. Stevens, the White House Special Assistant on the Arts. In that letter, dated October 11, he refers to, and adopts as his own, a statement of a New Jersey Congressman in the October 7 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That same statement is being widely circulated by Mr. Stevens in his other role as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Through these communications, direct official threats are being made against the tax-exempt status and municipal financial support of several cultural organizations in the District of Columbia. They include the American Light Opera Company, the National Symphony Orchestra, the Opera Society of Washington, the Washington Ballet, and the Washington Civic Opera Association. Their offense, according to the document being circulated in Kennedy Center mailings, is that they permitted me to poll their supporters in my own name and in the pursuit of objective and legitimate information related to legislation.

The results of this survey have not been welcome to the Kennedy Center trustees. The heavy response proved that 70 percent of the Washington area concert and theater audiences want the controversial question of the Center's site reexamined in open hearings. Late returns are still arriving daily and, despite the barrage of propaganda by the Center's trustees, the overwhelming vote remains in the same ratio—greater than that enjoyed by the President himself in his landslide victory last November.

Because their ticket-purchasers—who will spell success or failure for the Kennedy Arts Center once it is established—voted "wrong", Washington's leading musical organizations are now being endangered by the threat of, first, losing their tax-exempt status; second, being deprived of the pitifully small payment for services that some of them receive from the District of Columbia Government; and, third, the liklihood that they are disqualified from receiving assistance under the new Federal arts program established by the National Foundations on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, the National Endowment for the Arts of which is to be administered, it appears, by the same Roger L. Stevens.

His recent public and private communications tend to give White House approval to the theory that these organizations, which have outstanding and unblemished records of public service, should be deprived of their tax-exempt status and municipal support. The theory is based on section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue law, which denies tax exemption to organizations which substantially attempt to influence legislation. It is strange that the Kennedy Arts Center itself has spent and is spending many thousand of dollars in order to lobby for legislation in its own behalf. It is the Kennedy Center trustees who are now lobbying against the leading musical organizations of the District of Columbia.

How curious it is that those who are now attacking the resident musical organizations of Washington have consistently sought and frequently obtained their direct intervention in legislative matters. Some of the very groups that are now being severely criticized for allowing a survey that did not involve them by name were regularly requested in the past by Kennedy Art Center officials to take organizational positions before Congress regarding legislation. Apparently the awesome power of the tax laws and the ending of municipal financial support is to be used against those art organizations which do not conform when cultural legislation is the issue.

The hard fact is that these organizations now have a directive from their own supporters and ticket purchasers that the Kennedy Center site should be reexamined and the Kennedy Center itself possibly be relocated. There is every reason, under logic and under law, for these cultural groups to intervene directly in a matter that so closely affects them. They are made up of first-class citizens and they have every right to be heard. I certainly would not press them or even request them to speak up. However, if they wish to be heard, I and many of my colleagues will vigorously defend all their rights.

One of these organizations, the Washington National Symphony, has such high standing with the people of the National Capital area and in other metropolitan centers, such as New York, that it has just been announced that it is a serious candidate for a grant of $2,500,000 under the new orchestral program of the Ford Foundation. The National Symphony is so highly respected that it was one of the major symphony orchestras chosen by the Ford Foundation's art experts for a depth study which led to the decision to set up a magnificent program which will provide $85 million in support for American symphony orchestras. The Ford Foundation is to be commended and congratulated for this decision. It has brought to reality the essential and dominant support that private enterprise should and must devote to the arts under the American system. The Ford Foundation apparently agrees with President Johnson, as I do, that Government involvement in the arts should be supplemental to existing private efforts and should not supplant or try to suppress or control the art organizations, such as the Washington National Symphony, that have, through their own public service, made our lives so much more significant and meaningful.

I include as part of my remarks the following items:

FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
October 22, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: I am enclosing for your information the text of a letter I am sending to Mr. Roger L. Stevens in reply to his letter memorandum of October 15, 1965. This is for immediate release.

I want you to know how much the citizens and performing arts supporters of the District of Columbia appreciate your efforts on their behalf in obtaining a performing arts center which will serve the needs of all the people and not just a select few who drive their own limousines.

We also appreciate the fact that you have come to the defense of local performing arts groups in the face of a threat by the White House Assistant for the Arts to take away the tax-exempt status and all municipal financial support from organizations asking for a reexamination of the Center site.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN R. IMMER, *President.*

FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
October 22, 1965.

Hon. ROGER L. STEVENS,
Chairman, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEVENS: As one of the 144 signers of the petition addressed to President Johnson and his administration I have received from you a memorandum dated October 15, 1965, as well as a large volume of related material. One of the items which you enclosed included a lengthy but inaccurate chronology prepared by Mr. Ralph E. Becker, counsel for the Center. It also included the following statement from the Congressional Record of October 21, 1965, page 27866, as follows:

"It may well prove that these organizations have done themselves the greatest disservice of all. Section 501(c)(3) denies tax exempt status to organizations which substantially attempt to influence legislation. And loss of tax exemption seriously endangers the sources of charitable contributions. In addition, the National Symphony, the Washington School of Ballet, and the Washington Civic Opera received from the District of Columbia Recreation Board over $49,000 of public funds appropriated by Congress and a similar amount is provided in this year's budget. It is hardly appropriate for these funds to be used to support opposition to the Kennedy Center site when that site has been endorsed by the District of Columbia as well as the Recreation Board."

This allegation was made in criticism of a survey undertaken for legitimate legislative purposes by Representative William B. Widnall, Congressman from New Jersey.

I am sure that you are familiar with the provisions of title 18, section 1913, United States Code, relating to lobbying with appropriated moneys by Federal officials, and employees. I would appreciate it if you would advise me, with the provisions of this section of the United States Code firmly in mind:

1. Have you thought about the propriety and the legality of supporting such an intimidating statement by the White House and circulating it by the executive offices and the trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts? Have you had any legal advice that the circulation of this statement is lawful and appropriate?

2. Did the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts approve the statement from the Congressional Record of October 21, 1965, page 27866 cited above and its distribution, which statement threatens to end the tax-exempt status and the municipal financial support of the National Symphony, the Washington School of Ballet, and the Washington Civic Opera, and, also end the tax-exempt status of those organizations plus the American Light Opera Company, and the Opera Society of Washington? If they did approve it, please advise me when and were there any abstentions in such approval and by whom.

3. The officials of the Federal Government who are ex officio members of the Board of Trustees of the Center are as follows:

Assistant Secretary of State for Cultural and Educational Affairs.

Secretary, Smithsonian Institution.

Chairman, Commission on Fine Arts.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Chairman, District of Columbia Recreation Board.

President, District of Columbia Board of Commissioners.

Librarian of Congress.

Director, National Park Service.

From the U.S. Senate: Senators Joseph S. Clark, J. W. Fulbright, Leverett Saltonstall, and Robert F. Kennedy.

From the House of Representatives: Representatives James C. Wright, Jr. and Charlotte T. Reid.

Did any of the above officials approve the statement in the Congressional Record cited above?

4. How much money and time by specific personnel paid by funds from the Center and by the trustees of the Center have been devoted to lobbying activities in each of the years since you have been its chairman?

5. How many times and on what occasions have you and Mr. Ralph C. Becker, counsel for the Center, contacted Members of Congress, or members of their staffs, in connection with any legislation or appropriation bills of Congress related to the arts?

6. How many times and on what occasions have you and Mr. Ralph E. Becker contacted Members of Congress or their staffs on any other matters related to the arts but not necessarily related to the Kennedy Arts Center since commencing your duties with the Kennedy Center?

It is believed that answers to the above questions will put recent activities of the trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in the proper light and may permit an objective analysis of these activities by the appropriate committees of Congress.

In addition, I am enclosing a reply to your memorandum of October 15, 1965.

Reply to Memorandum Letter of October 15, 1965

The JFKCPA is not a performing arts center. It consists only of certain halls and auditoriums where events can be held. There are no other facilities for the performing arts of the District of Columbia or of the rest of the Nation. There are no facilities for the National Symphony, the Washington Ballet, or any other performing arts group. There are no practice rooms, rehearsal halls, working rooms, shops for stage scenery, storage for stage sets not on the stage, meeting rooms for performing arts groups, committee rooms, office space, audition rooms, or any of the many of other facilities needed in a performing arts center.

The concert hall is too small to be used by the National Symphony (2,700 seats compared to 3,500 in the Constitution Hall). I predict that they will never use it and I point out that there has been no commitment to do so. The fact that there is no storage space for extra stage sets forces one to the conclusion that the entire project has been designed primarily and exclusively for the presentation of New York road shows. No repertory theater can use it.

The project as now designed does not satisfy the requirements of the enabling legislation. Where can it present and develop programs for children and youth and the elderly? There are no rooms for these purposes. How can it provide facilities for other civic activities if there are no committee or general meeting rooms? I question whether the Center as now designed is a proper or suitable memorial to the late President. He had a concern for the average man. Is it a proper honor to him if his memorial can be reached only by those in limousines or those who can pay $1.75 for a parking fee in addition to $10 for a ticket? I am surprised that his family would stand by and see such mockery made of the ideals John F. Kennedy expressed while he was President.

There has been a great deal of misrepresentation in connection with this project. The basic figures will not stand up. The work of reputable consulting firms has been distorted in order to provide an acceptable answer. One of the leading parking experts in the country developed figures on parking—but used the criteria given them by the Center trustees—figures which are false and untenable. Only those traffic surveys favorable or acceptable to the project have been revealed. How long it would take to empty the garage of 1,600 cars after a performance? Would it take 3 or 4 hours? The assignments to the traffic studies cited have been carefully defined and no recommendations affecting the site selection have been permitted.

There has been a lot of misrepresentation regarding savings of four structures under one roof. My own alma mater, the University of Illinois, now has under construction a true cultural center, consisting of four auditoriums equal to the size proposed here, each in a separate building rising out of a large elevated platform. It has in addition more parking, plenty of classrooms, workshops, conference rooms and storage areas to serve the teaching needs of a great university. The total cost of this project is $15 million including the foundation and the parking garage. One could construct every building of the finest marble and still be below the projected cost of the present Center design. A congressional committee should compare these projects before proceeding on this project.

SITE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Stone's concept of a large white building in a parklike setting is a truly magnificent one. The only trouble is that there is no parklike setting. Mr. Stevens omits many facts and thereby misleads Congress and the critics. He does not tell you that the approaches to E Street rise 30 feet above the level of the plaza on the east side of the structure; or that at one point an approach road (on the southeast corner) is less than 12 feet from the plaza and 8 feet higher. To the north there is the Watergate Town rising to an impressive height and bulk. Across the freeway to the east looms the Columbia Plaza. To the south there are only the approaches to the Roosevelt Bridge. To the west the 7-acre bulk of the Center overpowers and destroys the rustic effect of the 2-acre Roosevelt Island. The parklike setting is a mockery and the trustees of the Center realize this all too well.

Reference is made to the Watergate complex to the north and the confidence that its height can be kept to that of the Kennedy Center. Even this permits a 13-story building that can be built within 175 feet of the north side of the Kennedy Center Building. This will be the most congested area in Washington when it is completed.

TRAFFIC PATTERN

The traffic pattern is an unbelievable nightmare. There is no direct access to the Center from the inner loop which had been designed to carry the greater part of the traffic in the area. Only New Hampshire Avenue is available to provide direct access to the Center. The park roadway is not wide enough to accommodate large streams of traffic. In times of flood or high water all exits will be closed and the Center cannot be used at all. The only access from the south to the garage must cross over the exit road from the east loading plaza which will create the worst kind of traffic hazard.

The integrated system of pedestrian walks and approaches is a mockery. Ladies attending concerts in the District of Columbia at night do not walk four or five blocks on isolated integrated walkways. It isn't safe. This is an isolated part of the city. It is a "traffic island" surrounded by freeways which can be approached only by automobile or bus.

RAPID TRANSIT

On this point Mr. Stevens plays very loosely with the truth. Mr. Stevens has been given no reason to believe that a subway station will ever be built any closer to the Center than the present proposed station at 23d and H Streets. This whole section presented by Mr. Stevens is highly misleading. It would cost over $6 million to provide a station for the Center. Why does Mr. Stevens not tell the Congress about this figure? Such a subway, incidentally, would have to be blasted out of almost solid rock.

ACOUSTICS (AIR TRAFFIC)

Although Mr. Stevens lists the eminent experts he has called in he very carefully does not provide any assurance that the noise level of jets flying directly overhead can be overcome. There is a very good reason for this lack of assurance on Mr. Stevens' part.

DOWNTOWN AREA

Mr. Stevens has been advised of several suitable sites on Pennsylvania Avenue. He makes no reference to that land to the north of the Archives Building which the Pennsylvania Avenue plan indicates as being suitable for a cultural center. Again it is misleading to refer to 18 acres of parklike setting (unless one includes all the surrounding highways). It is my understanding that Mr. Stevens is not speaking truthfully when he says that the officials of the Pennsylvania Avenue plan have no present plans to include a cultural center. It is plainly marked on the official release of the plan and no disclaimer has been made by those officials.

His reference to the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade may be understandable when it is recalled that Mr. Ralph Becker, general counsel and principal paid employee of the Center, is a director of the board of trade and head of the Culture Center Committee of that organization.

LATENESS OF HOUR

The statement referring to the "over $3 million for the construction work done to date" cannot be correct as no construction work has been done. If the building were moved to the Pennsylvania Avenue area with a saving of $15 million for a garage, $1 million for sound conditioning, $6 million for a subway station and the $5 million spent for additional site—then this would more than offset any loss caused by moving the Center downtown.

REVIEW

There has never been objective consideration of other sites, or at least not in the last 2 years. I attended the hearing held by the National Capital Planning Commission which preceded the approval of the present site and the preliminary drawings and plan. I can tell you that every organization appearing before that subcommittee testified against the site and the plan. Yet 2 days later the plan was approved. No performing arts group in the District of Columbia has approved the final design for this Center and I predict that none of them will. This is not a performing arts center and it is not a suitable memorial to our late President.

JOHN R. IMMER,
President, Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia.

FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
October 5, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I have just received from Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY. I had written to him enclosing a copy of a letter to the editors of the Washington Evening Star and the Washington Post. Both papers published those letters, copies of which are enclosed.

I feel that this letter from Senator KENNEDY is highly significant, and it indicates that the complete responsibility for the site of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts rests with the President. The Trustees of the Center are so deeply committed to the present site, despite its overwhelming disadvantages, and who are completely unwilling to consider the views of the people of the District of Columbia without whose patronage the Center will be a white elephant. As they did not select the original site and since the Kennedy Center Act does not authorize them to select a site they have no authority over the site issue. The responsibility belongs clearly to the President and to the Congress.

In the interest then of the entire future of the performing arts in the Nation's Capital, I request you to transmit this letter to the President along with the latest result to the poll you are taking of the views of the citizens of the metropolitan area who must be relied upon to support this great arts center and Presidential memorial.

Assuring you of the complete support of the federation in this matter, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. IMMER,
President.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
September 27, 1965.

Mr. JOHN R. IMMER,
President, Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. IMMER: I just wanted you to know how much I appreciated your writing and expressing your reasons for opposing the present site for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. I certainly respect your opinion but feel that it is out of my hands and that it is not appropriate for me to be involved at this time.

I have, however, brought your views to the attention of Mr. Roger Stevens. My thanks and best wishes.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

"Capital Assignment" Interview of Senator Mansfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on October 18, two able newsmen, Joe Campbell and James Hall of the Washington Bureau of Mutual News interviewed me on the program "Capital Assignment." Their penetrating and perceptive questions covered a wide range of international and national affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the interview be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"CAPITAL ASSIGNMENT," OCTOBER 18, 1965

Guest: Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana.

Reporters: Joe Campbell and James Hall (both assigned to the Washington bureau of Mutual News).

Mr. HALL. Senator MANSFIELD, as a leader in Congress, you're kept pretty well informed on the progress as to our situation in Vietnam, for example, and other things affecting the country. What is your assessment of the present progress in Vietnam, and what do you feel are the future prospects?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, militarily, we are making fairly good progress and so are the Vietnamese, themselves. But, I would point out that the road in Vietnam is going to be a long one, and we have a long way to go before we reach a conclusion as to what will happen out there. We should not be taken in too much by the victories which we've been able to achieve during the monsoon season. We have to recognize the fact this can be a long, drawn-out affair, and we have to keep in mind that sometime it will have to end at the conference table, and the President still has the avenues open which Hanoi and the Vietcong can tread if they wish to.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Senator MANSFIELD, several important officials in the Government have pointed out that there are other ways to bring a conclusion to this Vietnam war beside negotiations, and Greece is cited as an example, and there, they were pretty well beaten down. What do you think about this other method?

Senator MANSFIELD. I've noticed those stories, and I've noticed the fact that Premier Ky, or at least a spokesman for him in Saigon, has found fault with the efforts of the administration to achieve a negotiated settlement. I believe that these high official sources, which you refer to, should make themselves known. I'd like to know who they are. I certainly would not expect anyone to go against what the President has said would be his policy and which Rusk, as Secretary of State, has emphasized time and time again. So far as I know—I'm quite sure that I speak correctly—the President has not deviated from his position. He is willing to negotiate on the basis of the factors which he has laid down, and if this struggle is going to end, it will have to end at the table, somewhere, somehow, sometime.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, these officials were careful to point out that negotiation was still the main road that we're going to travel, but this other road was being pursued as well.

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes, but they played down negotiations—you say that in the last paragraph—and they placed the emphasis on this new idea of theirs which, I suppose, they figure could be developed from a position of strength. What if the position reverses itself? Are we still not going to negotiate? Again, I'd like to know who these people are, and I'd like to know for whom they speak?

Mr. HALL. Well, there have been some spokesmen, Senator, in these anti-Vietnam demonstrations in many of our American cities. They seem to have gained momentum and frighteningly so. What are your feelings toward this kind of thing?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I believe, of course, that citizens of this country have the right to protest, but I believe that these demonstrators are doing a disservice to the United States and a grave disservice at this time. What they are doing, in effect, is undermining President Johnson's reiterated desires for a negotiated settlement, and they are furnishing fodder which I think is being gobbled up by Hanoi and Peiping and the Vietcong.

Mr. HALL. Now, on this subject—one of their means of demonstrating their feelings is tearing up their draft cards. How about that?

Senator MANSFIELD. There is a law which the Congress passed just a few weeks ago which takes care of that situation, and those who do so are liable to a fine and imprisonment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Where would you draw a line on free dissent?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I believe that this matter should be discussed pro and con in a responsible fashion. I believe both sides should be heard, not just one side or the other. I do not believe, for example, of people advocating that draft cards be destroyed. I do not believe that the issuing of brochures which tell young men how they can avoid draft service by undertaking certain special techniques which are spelled out for them. I believe that in this country every young man has a responsibility to his country, and I think that every young person who should live up to that responsibility, if this Republic is to go on in the future as in the past.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Do you agree with Senator DODD and the others on the Internal Security Subcommittee—a report that there are Communists within the teach-in movement?

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, I have no doubt that there are Communists in there. I would say—I certainly would not say that the majority of them, by any means, were Communist sympathizers but, in any movement of this kind, you can expect the Communists to move into and to do what they can to direct it, to guide it, and to assume some degree of control of it.

Mr. HALL. Senator MANSFIELD, there has been some criticism of the 89th Congress, particularly from the other side of the aisle, some saying that they're long on quantity but short on quality. What's your reaction to this comment?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, no Congress is perfect. We've done the best we could. We've tried to look after the welfare of the people. No doubt we've made mistakes. We hope those mistakes can be corrected next year, and it is for that reason that I've advocated to the committee chairmen that they create oversight committees for the purposes of rounding out the edges, plugging the holes, filling the gaps in this legislation which we have passed this year. On the whole, I would say, though, that the record has been quite respectable.

Mr. HALL. On the subject of the President's illness, do you feel that his illness and subsequent surgery had any effect on the workings of Congress?

Senator MANSFIELD. Nothing. No, not at all. I don't think that there was any effect. He had made his position known on all the pieces of legislation worth noting before he went to the hospital. He had performed his job with discretion and responsibility, and what we're doing now is our responsibility.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I wanted to get back to the legislative record of Congress for just a moment. There are some charges that this issue of 14(b), the repealing of it, came at just the right time, or that the operation on the President came at just the right time. These are some of the charges being made from the people on the other side of the aisle. What's your comment to that?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, you have to expect implications, innuendos, and rumors to become rife. As far as 14(b) was concerned, it wasn't reported out of committee and put on the calendar until September 9. We gave it a reasonable amount of time to stay there so that people could be informed in advance that it was coming up. As a matter of fact, we just couldn't get to a vote on 14(b) because we just couldn't get enough votes to impose cloture, and that's the key to the whole situation. The President did his part. He kept the campaign promise of the Democratic Party in the last election; he recommended that 14(b) be repealed. The House followed his lead, but the Senate refused to face up to its responsibility on the merits of the issue itself, and if there is any one to blame, it is me; and if there is any body to blame, it is the Senate.

Mr. HALL. When do you think you're going home, Senator?

Senator MANSFIELD. I would hope we could go home at the end of this week, but we have some difficulties which may postpone it for a little while into next week.

Mr. HALL. Did President Johnson have anything to do with Congress staying so long as it has?

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, no. As a matter of fact, as long as 3 months, he told me, and has told me several times since, that, whenever we were through, he wanted us to go home because he realized that it would be good for us to meet with the folks and to talk things over with them.

Mr. HALL. Senator MANSFIELD, let's talk about the John Birch Society for a moment. Does the Democratic Party have any John Birchers that you know of?

Senator MANSFIELD. Not that I know of. It seems to me that they sort of veer toward the Republican Party. Why, I do not know. I'm a little bit shocked, for example, to find out that a John Bircher is considering running against a man like KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota. It's hard to understand—hard to figure out.

Mr. HALL. Do you feel that the John Birch Society's ideals or aims more coincide with the Republican Party than with the Democratic Party?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I do not. I think that the founder of the John Birch Society, Mr. Welch, is doing the country a disservice and is harming the Republican Party, which I do not like to see. After all, when he refers to such men as former President Eisenhower as a Communist sympathizer; when he tries to pin the same label on Allen Dulles and Foster Dulles; when he makes snide remarks about General of the Armies George Marshall and other prominent and outstanding Americans, I certainly cannot sympathize with him nor what he advocates.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Sir, every time the issue of John Birchers is brought up in a political discussion, vis-a-vis the Republican Party, some Republican will say, "Well, the Democrats have the ADA." What about the ADA?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I'm no sympathizer of the ADA. I have nothing to do with them. I try to carry on my own affairs, and they have a right to make their views known, but I'm not one of their admirers.

Mr. HALL. On the Cuban situation, Senator MANSFIELD, there's been some comment that Castro's offer to allow all those who wish to leave the island of Cuba—there have been comments on it saying that this is another Castro trick. How do you feel about this?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I think that it is a sign of weakness on Castro's part, and I was delighted that President Johnson took him up immediately when he signed the immigration bill. Of course, it's going to mean an added burden on the State of Florida, but I'm quite sure that the Federal Government will step in and, with the funds necessary, take care of the refugees from Castro's Cuba, and it would be my belief that other States would be prepared to take part of the influx.

Mr. HALL. Do you think that the other States are ready to take some of these Cuban refugees; that is, to ease the overcrowding on the State of Florida?

Senator MANSFIELD. That I couldn't answer though they have been going out into other States. For example, we've had about 20 or 30 Cubans in Great Falls. They've been taken in by the College of Great Falls. They are dispersing from there into other parts of the country as jobs become available, and I think that what Montana has done, other States in the same condition have assumed responsibilities.

Mr. HALL. You mentioned the Senate taking some action to ease the burden there with funds. Is there anything afoot at the moment to do this?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes. The President has requested $12.5 million to take care of the influx of Cubans from Cuba on the basis of the Castro offer.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Sir, I'd like to switch the subject to Europe for a moment. There's been a lot of talk in the NATO nations about a multilateral nuclear force. Germany has been one of the loudest voices in favor of this. I wonder how you feel about it, sir?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I have never felt very happy about the multilateral force—the so-called MLF. I am glad to note that it seems to have become extinct. I hope that's true because to me, while it might bring about a certain degree of coordination among the NATO powers, I think that in the long run, it would be a divisive influence.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In what way? Do you mean that Russia would get hot under the collar about just such a force?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed, and I think that a buildup of Germany, either West Germany or a united Germany, with nuclear capability, even though they didn't have the finger on the button, so to speak, would make the situation, which seems to be working itself out to some degree in Western Europe, much more tense.

Mr. HALL. President de Gaulle, of France, has been sort of the vocal expression of discontent with the NATO and with various other forces, particularly the European market and the Common Market. He has just indicated that he will once again stand for the presidency in the next election. Do you think this means that we're going to have that many more years of dealing with this man?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I certainly do not fear dealing with de Gaulle. I think that he is one of the world's great men. What he's doing, he's doing in behalf of France, and while I disagree with him on many occasions, I certainly do not downgrade him. I think that he's been good for France. I think that in any showdown between—in which our country was involved—that the French would be with us, shoulder to shoulder.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, there are rumblings that he would like to see all NATO bases out of France altogether. What would be your reaction to that kind of move?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, we could do that. We don't have to stay anchored to France all the time. There are the other areas over there in Western Europe which could be used, and incidentally, as long as you've raised the question, frankly, I have not seen any reason why we should maintain in excess of 450,000 men in Western Europe when the Western European nations are prepared, or should be prepared, to undertake their own responsibilities. They have the manpower. They have the means to sustain them. They have most of the weapons outside the nuclear field, and it's about time that they undertook those responsibilities, and I would think think that one division of U.S. troops over there would be just as significant as the five-plus in being at the present time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Including Germany?

Senator MANSFIELD. Including Germany.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Every time this issue is brought up, possible moving of American troops in any great numbers from West Germany, there are all kinds of economic implications over there, as well as political. And you would still favor that?

Senator MANSFIELD. I certainly do. I think that we ought to stand up for what we think is right and not be guided by Mr. de Gaulle, Mr. Erhardt, or any other person.

Mr. HALL. Senator MANSFIELD, on this subject of Vietnam once again. With all the friends that we're supposed to have around the world, why aren't we getting more support?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, that's the question I would like answered. At the present time, we have very little support. I would say that, excluding the Koreans, there are less than 2,000 outside forces; I would include the 1,000 Australians, the 25 or 59 New Zealanders. There are, I think, 2,000 South Koreans there; supposedly a division of some 15,000 is coming or is on the way down. Of course, we've been told that there are 30 nations participating in one form or another, but if you add that up on a dollar and cents basis, I think that it would come to less than $10 million in aid, which, of course, isn't enough to carry on the war for a week.

Mr. HALL. We've certainly put enough money in foreign aid into those countries. Do you feel that we should reevaluate our foreign-aid program?

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, yes, indeed. I think that we ought to reduce it considerably; try to make it more effective; do away with duplications and become more interested in a multilateral program than the continuation of the unilateral program.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This word "multilateral" brings me back to Europe. I just finished a tour over there, and one of the places I visited was Turkey, and another was Greece. We are in the middle. They both are a little angry with us because of the Cyprus situation, especially the Turks. They feel we let them down. Any comment from you on that?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, there are so many places in the world in which we find ourselves in the middle that we ought to be getting used to it by now. What I think we ought to do is bring about a reevaluation of our foreign policy so that we wouldn't be caught in the middle all the time. We realize, of course, that we have to carry the primary burden for the free world. It's a choice that we didn't seek; it's responsibility that we did not want, but it's something that we can't avoid. So we'll have to do the best we can, and our friends will become mad at us on occasion as in the case of Cyprus, but that's the part of the responsibility that goes with leadership.

The Public Health Service Hospital, Staten Island, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak of a matter of great importance to the American people and to my constituents: This is about the value of the Public Health Service hospital system to our commerce, our health, and to our prosperity. I believe evidence to support my contention, in this regard, may best be served by discussing the hospital which serves the merchant mariner in the busiest port in the United States, New York. The Public Health Service Hospital at Stapleton, Staten Island, N.Y., still known to most as the Marine Hospital, has had a long and distinguished medical history.

From the time President John Adams authorized Federal hospitals to care for sick and injured seamen until 1879 care of the ever-growing population of New York merchant seamen was by contract in private hospitals. This was paid for from funds obtained by a direct tax levied on the seamen's wage. Since then it has been by a tonnage tax or more recently by direct appropriation.

By 1879 it became evident that medical care was becoming more complex and that the present method of providing care was neither economical nor satisfactory. Twenty-three other port cities had obtain federally authorized marine hospitals over the years, beginning in 1797 in Boston, and it was increasingly apparent that the seamen of the Port of New York needed one as well. Citizens and members of the merchant marine, in 1831, organized and supported a Seamen's Rest at Stapleton. Near the rest they built a small hospital which today is still in use by the Public Health Service as a dwelling.

In 1854, the population of New York was 800,000 and a new and larger Seamen's Rest Hospital of 100 beds was built. It functioned as a major resource for the medical care of merchant seamen throughout the War Between the States and was the major center for the care of seamen until the temporary Federal Marine Hospital was established at Bedloe's Island in 1879.

In 1883, the Federal Government and the city of New York agreed to a continuing lease-purchasing contract on the Stapleton property. This purchase was concluded in 1903 at a cost of $250,000. Nine years later the hospital was modernized and enlarged to 143 beds. This building, constructed in 1854 and enlarged in 1912, still serves as the outpatient department of the present Public Health Service hospital.

In 1935, a new hospital was built at Stapleton next to the older building, an increase in size to 563 beds and, in 1942, an addition was made to increase the size to approximately 800 beds. Eight hundred employees served the hospital at that time with a million-dollar budget. Under the pressure of war in 1943, by using double-deck beds for many of the patients, 1,200 persons were treated in the hospital at a time. This overuse of the facility continued until the end of World War II. Since that time, progress in the provision of medical care has demanded additional space for services such as medical records, ambulatory care, X-ray and laboratory facilities, thereby decreasing the space available for beds to about 700.

The hospital today, in spite of the age of many of its buildings, functions as a modern medical center, carrying on its tradition of excellence in patient care, research, and training of medical and paramedical personnel. Because of its excellence, it is heavily used by Public Health Service beneficiaries who now, as a result of congressional action, include the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, the Coast Guard and the Department of Defense military personnel and their dependents, the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service commissioned personnel and their dependents, the Peace Corps and the State Department overseas personnel, and many other categories.

Important research has been carried out at this hospital. In 1887, Dr. Kinyoun established here the first American Laboratory of Hygiene, the forerunner of the National Institutes of Health. In 1941, the now widely used method of caudal anesthesia for relieving mothers of pain during childbirth was discovered and proven safe at Stapleton. In 1943, Dr. Mahoney and his coworkers proved that penicillin would cure syphilis and developed the program of treatment which is still accepted the world over as the safest and surest means of curing this dread disease. Now the staff at Staten Island is embarked on a major study of medical means to control hypertension and diseases of the kidney. Research is going on in studies of cancer of the mouth, heart disease, diseases of the eyes, the breast, and the lungs.

The hospital is one of the primary teaching centers for Public Health Service medical personnel, giving training each year to about 93 medical and dental residents and interns. From this group, through the years have come many of the Public Health Service's key personnel. The hospital also provides training to other valuable health personnel such as hospital administrators, pharmacists, dietitians, nurse anesthetists, medical record librarians, and laboratory and X-ray technicians.

Its annual budget is about $8 million and it employs over 1,000 personnel. It has one of the two artificial kidney team centers in New York City. It aids in the training of students and residents in five medical schools, and in turn its residents and interns receive training in these schools and a dozen teaching hospitals. It acts with the hospitals of the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration to implement the President's call for extensive cross-servicing by Federal hospitals by accepting and caring for patients from these organizations. It is an important member of the New York metropolitan medical community.

I should like to bring to your attention a matter about which many of my constituents have written, the proposed transfer of the Public Health Service hospital system to the Veterans' Administration. I believe a transfer of such broad responsibilities to the Veterans' Administration would be a serious mistake. For many years the merchant seamen of America and many other beneficiaries of the Public Health Service have depended on these hospitals for their medical care and have provided a basis for important medical research. During this same period the Public Health Service has depended on its hospital system to attract and develop trained medical personnel for many of its programs in medical care, preventive health, and research. Many of these trained personnel are now serving on Indian reservations, in Federal prisons, aboard Coast Guard cutters, at the National Institutes of Health, and with many other programs of the Public Health Service.

Therefore, I believe that the Public Health Service system of hospitals does not need a change in its administration but needs to be adequately funded to provide modern facilities, sufficient supplies and equipment, and adequate staff.

Speeches by Senator Miller Relating to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, my colleague from Iowa, Senator JACK MILLER, recently made two major addresses before the Iowa State Education Association at its annual convention in Des Moines. One of these, entitled "Federal Aid to Education—An Appraisal," was delivered before the general session of the convention and the other, entitled "The Implications of Federal Aid to Education," was delivered before the county superintendents at their annual banquet. Each of these speeches is timely and perceptive, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—AN APPRAISAL

(By JACK MILLER, U.S. Senator, Iowa)

First I wish to thank you for the honor of appearing on the program of this outstanding convention—the 111th annual convention of the greatest association of educators in our State.

I also wish to compliment you on the theme of this convention—"Teachers, Keys to Progress—ISEA, Key to Teacher Progress." As a former teacher myself who married a public school teacher, I believe very strongly that good teachers are keys to progress; and although I was never privileged to be a member of ISEA, I well know from many years of working with this association that it is truly dedicated to the highest and finest traditions of the teaching profession.

There are, I regret to say, some who argue that Federal aid is per se (by its very nature) a bad thing. One can find a bill, for example, which has been introduced with the following statement: "The Congress hereby finds and declares that responsibility for and control over education is one of the powers not delegated to the United States but reserved to the States or to the people under the 10th amendment of the Constitution."

There are others, I also regret to say, who, in their deeply felt concern and impatience for better education, seem quite prepared to support any proposal which happens to bear the label of "Federal aid."

Neither of these philosophies is helpful.

The very Preamble to the Constitution of the United States declares that the Constitution for the United States is established to "promote the general Welfare". And although the debates at the Constitutional Convention make it clear that the Federal Government is not to be primarily responsible for the provision of education—that this is a responsibility of the various States—the changes which time has wrought since those debates make it equally clear that the general welfare of our citizenry cannot be secured without equality of opportunity for excellence in education.

The equal protection of the laws clause of the 14th amendment directly expresses the responsibility of the Federal Government for seeing to it that equality of opportunity is secured, although legislation to carry out this responsibility has consistently recognized that primary responsibility should be at the State level.

The Federal Government's responsibility for securing excellence in education has long been recognized—going clear back to the Northwest Ordinance of 1785; but, like the general welfare clause, the form and limitations under which this responsibility is to be carried out are not clearly defined and, indeed, are in a state of evolution.

At the same time, it should be recognized that there can be Federal aid which falls within the ambit of Federal responsibility and Federal aid which, either for constitutional reasons or for reasons of public opinion, or both, exceeds the proper and acceptable limits of Federal responsibility. The content and not just the label of a Federal aid program is what matters.

I realize that there are arguments for shifting primary responsibility for education from the States to the Federal Government. Proponents of this doctrine are not concerned over Federal control or Federal standards and, indeed, would welcome them. After all, wouldn't this make our educational system more uniform and efficient? Similar arguments are often advanced with respect to other areas of government—taxation, union shop contracts, building codes, social welfare, election laws, criminal law, and business codes. But we should never forget that our system of government was not devised for the primary purpose of efficiency and uniformity. The first purpose was freedom of the individual, protected by a system of checks and balances between the States and the Federal Government and among the branches at each level of government. And nowhere can this freedom be more importantly affected than in the area of education.

The goal of Federal aid to education surely must lie somewhere between the two extreme points of view to which I have referred. As Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John Gardner writes in the October issue of Fortune magazine: "The need to get things done has to be balanced against the need to preserve freedom."

Perhaps we should not try too hard to specifically define the goal, because, as I pointed out earlier, the concept of Federal responsibility is evolving. "Excellence in education, to be achieved by the State and local governments with adequate Federal financial assistance, but without unacceptable Federal controls, or a foundation for unacceptable Federal controls"—would be one way of putting it. But this only states a general concept over which the deepest of controversies rage.

You may note that I have used the word "unacceptable" rather than "unconstitutional," because even though a Federal educational program may be "constitutional," it may not be "acceptable" to public opinion. Public opinion plays a vital role in the evolution of the form and limitations of Federal education programs.

Federal control is already an accepted fact of Federal responsibility in the desegregation of public education—not only under the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States, but most recently as spelled out in title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Even here, however, there are lines of demarcation between what is regarded as "acceptable" Federal responsibility and the responsibility of the States. Under the new Federal law, for example, "desegregation" is specifically stated to not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance. What constitutes "racial imbalance" and what, if anything should be done about it, is left to the responsibility of the States and local governments.

Federal control of a sort exists over school curriculums under the National Defense Education Act, because the Federal funds must be used for particular critical subjects—science, mathematics, foreign languages, geography, civics, English, reading, history, and now, tucked away in the Higher Education Act of 1965, it is proposed to add economics.

So when one speaks of Federal aid without Federal control, or without unacceptable Federal control, or without a foundation for potential unacceptable Federal control, he must be speaking of a certain quality of control or a certain degree of control which is not to be permitted, or the foundation for which is not to be laid.

There are some who believe that we can find a key to the magic formula of acceptable Federal control in the word "general"—as distinguished from the word "special"—when applied to Federal aid.

This, however, will not be helpful unless we are sophisticated enough to recognize that there is a difference between general Federal aid to special districts, such as those covered by the impacted areas legislation, and special Federal aid to school districts generally, such as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. But having made this distinction, it should be pointed out that some 30 percent of the elementary and secondary school population is in school districts qualifying for aid under the impacted areas program. Does this mean that if the program should be broadened so that over 50 percent of the school population is affected, we would have general Federal aid of the type or degree that is unacceptable? We probably will not reach that question, so it would be prudent for me not to try to answer it.

Just to make the magic formula a little more tenuous, I would point out that there can be different kinds of general Federal aid as well as different degrees of it. General Federal aid which entails the annual close scrutiny of the Education and Appropriations Committees of the Congress and which involves the surveillance of nonelected officials of a large Federal bureau could (I do not say necessarily will) exercise Federal control to a degree which, if not found to be unconstitutional, would be regarded by public opinion as unacceptable. There is a fear among the general public that local control over the education of their children will be eroded away to the point that some Federal official in Washington—far removed from their school and commuinty—will sit in judgment over the destiny of their children. Nor do they wish to see partisan political considerations enter into the education of their children which they fear might be the case under some general, if not special, Federal aid proposals. Suggestions that such fears are groundless fall on deaf ears, because examples of abuses of discretion by Washington bureaucrats are constantly in the news.

Accordingly, I would suggest that a general Federal aid approach which would avoid the establishment, much less the supervision, of a Federal bureaucracy for its implementation, and which would avoid the typical close scrutiny of the Education and Appropriations Committees of Congress, would have the best chance of acceptability by public opinion. Moreover, I believe that such an approach would have the best chance of assuring truly adequate Federal financial assistance to the States to enable them to secure the excellence in education that is our goal.

Five years ago I advanced a proposal which is still the best one I know—namely, that the Congress appropriate a percentage of the Federal revenue collections to the States simply for education purposes. Each State, which surely understands its needs best, would program the specific uses of the money. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 should provide the control mechanism needed for assurance of equal opportunities to share in these State-developed programs. And the National Compact for Education, adopted last September 30 at Kansas City, which established an Educational Commission of the States, should assure standards and needed improvements in programs, techniques, and facilities without resort to Federal controls—whether acceptable or unacceptable.

As you probably have read, this percentage-of-Federal-revenue idea has been receiving an increasing amount of attention in Washington. Of course, it is possible that special Federal aid programs could be provided to such an extent that State and local funds would be freed to support the kind of education our children should have. But this is a piecemeal and cumbersome approach which requires bureaucratic administration in Washington with its inevitable cut from the education dollar. Moreover, the programs being "special," are not so built into the budget that they cannot readily be dropped by a congressional appropriations committee which may happen to be offended by an adverse hearing or an adverse report by one of its staff investigators. Speaking of bureaucratic administration, title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 authorizes withholding of Federal financial assistance to encourage nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs. In less than a year, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates it has received more than 100,000 forms from various State agencies, local school districts, universities, hospitals, rehabilitation workshops, and the like—all preliminary to enforcing title VI. Procedures for checking up on compliance are only in the most rudimentary stages of development, and there is concern over not only the cost of adequate enforcement but over the mass of paperwork which may strangle the program. With the paperwork some of you have experiences in applying for assistance under the National Defense Education Act, you can imagine what it could be like under several special programs.

It is also possible that, after the phasing out of some of the Federal excise taxes, which we provided for earlier this year, the States will decide to make use of one or more of these sources of revenue to find additional money for education. But there is no assurance that the States will tap onto these revenue sources, much less use the money for education.

Whether and to what extent the Federal Government has a responsibility for securing excellence in education for private as well as public school children is another highly controversial matter. There are some who would rest their arguments on constitutional grounds, but no one knows what the Supreme Court will decide on the record of any given case. Also, it seems to me that just because a particular program may turn out to be constitutional does not necessarily mean that it is a good program, a wise program, or a program that is "acceptable" to public opinion.

In recent years there has evolved a policy of providing special Federal aid to both private and public colleges—principally for the construction of dormitories and academic buildings not used for religious services or instruction. The possibility of unacceptable Federal controls, which are equally abhorrent to the private and public school people, is not present in these programs. Moreover, it might be pointed out that attendance at these schools is voluntary.

It is the private elementary and secondary school on which the principal controversy now centers. Here the child is of compulsory school age—an age at which Federal controls over education would have an almost inescapable impact. Since 1958, private schools have been eligible under the National Defense Education Act for loan assistance for certain types of courses. Perhaps it was the national security urgency fever growing out of sputnik which made this type of Federal aid to private schools acceptable to public opinion and the recipient schools. And I suppose most would agree that our national security and our educational needs today are just as great as, if not greater than, they were 7 years ago.

This year, both the administration and the Congress sought an acceptable solution to the church-state problem in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. It was recognized that children of poor families, whether attending public or private school, are in need of better educational opportunities and that their failure to have these opportunities provided would be contrary to our national interest; further, that while the Federal Government may have no additional responsibility to the private school, it does have a responsibility to the child. Let me read the declaration of policy which appears in the act:

"In recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children."

It was also recognized that among the States there are differences in handling the church-state problem. And so the Federal Government now recognizes its responsibility to children of poor families by providing money to the States. In turn, the States must program the use of this money in behalf of these children in such a way as to be in accord with their respective State constitutions and laws.

I might add that the percentage-of-Federal-revenue approach to general Federal aid, to which I referred earlier, would similarly leave the solution of the church-state problem to the respective States, which seems to be the principle the Supreme Court of the United States is following in constitutional questions in this area.

With this convention's theme emphasizing "Teachers as the Keys to Progress," my discussion would not be complete without calling attention to the fact that your Federal Government is becoming increasingly aware of this truism. This is not because all of the Members of Congress have been endowed, from birth, with the light. Public opinion, aided by good public relations of our teachers, has brought the light to them. We have been made aware that over one-fourth of all our citizens are directly involved in educational programs; that we need more facilities for college, junior college, university, and health profession students; and that in just the next 10 years our school systems will need 1,700,000 new teachers to take care of our exploding pupil population. Federal responsibility in meeting these challenges was given unprecedented recognition with enactment of the Higher Education Act of 1962, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, the Expanded Vocational Education Act of 1963, and the Library Services Act of 1963. The Higher Education Act of 1965, title V of which establishes teacher preparation programs, carries this recognition of Federal responsibility still further. This title provides for a Council on Teacher Preparation in the Office of Education; a National Teacher Corps at $60 million a year for 5 years, to include several thousand teachers for assignment to assist school districts having concentrations of low-income families; several thousand fellowships for master's degree study; and extensive grants to pay the cost of improving graduate and undergraduate training programs in colleges and universities. The bill also provides $190 million for student loans under the National Defense Education Act, with the 10 percent per year up to 50 percent forgiveness feature for those who enter the teaching profession, and 15 percent per year up to 100 percent forgiveness for those who teach in elementary or secondary schools determined by the Commissioner of Education to be "hardship schools." Surely these programs should help in the membership drives of Future Teachers of America clubs.

I would sum up my appraisal simply by saying: Federal aid is on the way and, with it, the doors of progress through equal opportunity for excellence in education are swinging open.

The Implications of Federal Aid to Education

(By Jack Miller, U.S. Senator, Iowa)

In its review of the "Educational Responsibilities of the Federal Government," the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association said last year: "There is little doubt that the Federal Government has a responsibility for trying to express the national interest in education. But the question is raised whether the Congress ought to have power to decide which aspects of education are worth reinforcing and which aspects do not need support, and whether the executive agencies which carry out legislation and affect its preparation ought to have influence over such decisions. This power and influence are in fact increasing."

The Commission went on to say that the central Federal decision on education has to do with the amounts of money to be distributed to the States, and it stated its belief that the total sums of Federal money involved come nowhere near meeting the needs that many States and localities are also unable to meet.

Total public elementary and secondary school expenditures in Iowa came to almost $314 million for the fiscal year ended last June 30. Of this, less than $8 million came in from the Federal Government—$1,352,000 under the impacted areas program and $6,300,000 under the National Defense Education Act. With enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, it is estimated that Iowa will receive some $22 million more during the current fiscal year—but this money must be spent for new programs relating to education of educationally deprived children and not serve as a replacement of funds now being spent. Although the new Federal funds will avoid the necessity of using State and local funds for these new programs, which sooner or later would probably have to be undertaken, it is clear that Federal financial support at the primary and secondary education level will still be relatively small. On the other hand, Federal aid to higher education will soon be bearing a considerably higher relative share of the cost under the various programs for construction of dormitories and academic buildings, contracts and scholarships under the National Science Foundation, the Library Sciences Act of 1963, and the Higher Education Act of 1965—under which, incidentally, $6 million is Iowa's estimated share for the current fiscal year.

There are two broad implications one can derive from this picture: (1) that there is less priority being attached to Federal aid programs for primary and secondary education than for numerous other Federal programs, such as, for example, the so-called war on poverty, for which appropriations have expanded from $700 million for the last fiscal year to $1.5 billion for the current year—less priority, that is, as far as the administration and its leadership in the Congress are concerned; and (2) there are problems which have not yet been surmounted over the formulas to be used in allocating Federal money to the States and over the Federal control which might, sooner or later, creep into the allocation of such money. Each of these implications is important to consider.

As might be expected, there is no Member of Congress who does not wish to see poverty in the United States eliminated or minimized; and I am also confident that a majority of the Members of Congress believes that the Federal Government should support a larger share of the costs of education.

Granted that a small portion of the antipoverty program is in the area of education, there has been a failure on Capitol Hill to give due recognition to the fact that the greatest single weapon against poverty is educational opportunity. Formal recognition was given with enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, one title of which is designed to assure equality of educational opportunity. But when it comes to appropriating Federal money, priority has been assigned such programs as the Job Corps, which is costing the taxpayers between $6,000 and $8,000 per enrollee per year, and which, I might add, has been causing friction with some local school districts because of the salaries being paid some of the administrators of the program, when compared with the salaries of long-experienced teachers.

Other programs have received higher priority, such as the "man on the moon" project, greatly expanded programs for the National Institutes of Health, an accelerated public works program, and Appalachia. By the time appropriations for these have been made, the Federal budget is in such a deep deficit position that "budgetary considerations" are offered as an excuse for inaction on a substantial increase in Federal aid to education.

I do not say that budgetary considerations should not enter the picture, because I believe very strongly in maintaining a reasonably balanced budget so that inflation will be stopped. However, either some of these other programs are going to have to be postponed or the money for them reduced, or both, in favor of Federal aid to education; or else little progress is going to be made in the foreseeable future.

The formula proposed for a Federal aid program is always controversial. During my 5 years in the Senate, I suppose there was more controversy over the formula contained in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 than was the case with the formulas contained in any of the other proposals which have been debated. For a school district to qualify under this act, there must (with certain exceptions) be at least 100 children of elementary and secondary school age coming from families with annual incomes of less than $2,000; and the amount of the Federal money is based on the total number of such schoolchildren from such low-income families and the average expenditure per pupil in the State. As Commissioner of Education Keppel testified, the $2,000 family income level is not, of course, a perfect measure of poverty. However, this figure clearly does identify an unquestioned hard core of poverty." But there were arguments that a family having an income of $2,000 in Mississippi would not be nearly as impoverished as a family having an income of $2,000 in New York City; and that the "average expenditure per pupil in the State" would mean more money per pupil going to a high-income and high-cost State, such as New York, than to a State such as Mississippi. However, this latter argument competely missed the point that it costs more money in New York to educate a child than it does in Mississippi, and therefore it should be expected that less money per child would go to Mississippi than to New York.

Other proposed formulas were advanced by way of amendments, which were rejected out-of-hand because orders had come from the White House that there were to be no amendments. I supported some of these amendments, because I believed them to be meritorious. However, Iowa, with its supplemental aid being taken into account in computing the average expenditure per pupil, comes out very well under the formula contained in the new law, and therefore I was able to support the bill in good conscience.

During consideration of the Federal aid bill proposed by the late President Kennedy in 1961, there was a considerable amount of controversy over the formula to be used in allocating money to the States. Under that bill, the first-year allocation of money to New York State, for example, would have been $37,650,000 as against New York's estimated share of the taxes needed for the program of $91,110,000; so that New Yorkers would have been paying $53,460,000 to other States under the program for fiscal year 1962. This excess of payments over receipts for New York would have increased to $66,075,000 for fiscal 1963 and to $78,735,000 for fiscal 1964—the last year of the 3-year program. Other States would have paid in considerably more than they received back, although the formula had been drawn up in such a way as to make sure that many more States would be on the "plus" side than on the "minus" side in order to obtain needed support for the bill.

In my judgment, one of the major defects of the formula proposed in the Kennedy bill was use of a factor called income per pupil for the State, which was defined to mean the total personal income for the State divided by the number of public school pupils in the State. This factor was to be used in comparing the State's effort with the national effort for the purpose of making a reduction in the allocation of money that would otherwise go to a State. It seems to me that mere personal income is not sufficient to make a fair determination of relative effort. Some States have a tremendous amount of corporation tax income—all reported on tax returns filed in the State even though much of the income itself was earned through corporate outlets in other States. Certainly it should be expected that some of this income would be used for education purposes in the State, so that total income for the State (personal, corporate, trusts, estates, and the like) divided by the number of pupils would have been a more fair and realistic factor. And even this could have been further refined to take into account the differences in cost of living among the various States. In short, in seeking to implement the elusive goal of equalization, many Members of Congress are going to require much more than just a comparison of personal income among the States.

The minimum foundation program approach has its advocates in Congress as well as among the professional educators. It takes its form in such recitals as the one which appeared in one bill as follows:

"Equality of opportunity lies at the basis of the entire Republic. No child can begin to have equality of opportunity unless he has in his youth, above all, effective schooling.

"The purpose of this Act is to assist the States in financing a minimum foundation program of public elementary and secondary school education designed to provide more nearly equal opportunities for the Nation's children by raising the quality of such education in the States and districts in greatest need of assistance."

This particular bill, from which I have just quoted, went on to provide a Federal allotment of $20 per public school child, with larger amounts to those States which, after making a "maximum reasonable effort" to provide support for schools, would still be unable to guarantee a minimum education program. The larger amounts, it was said, would help the low-income States bridge the gap between a "fair allocation" to education of their resources and the cost "adequate" public school education. But what constitutes or should constitute a "minimum foundation" can mean many different things to different people. This particular bill set $400 as the minimum foundation, making no differentiation in relative costs of living among the various States. It was, therefore, vulnerable to the argument that $400 might be adequate in Mississippi and inadequate in New York, for example. Moreover, in determining the fiscal capacity of the States to meet their education needs, the sole factor of "personal" income was to be used. No justification was advanced for the flat $20 per pupil Federal aid, although it could be argued that even without this $20 per pupil assistance some States would be providing better education and would be better able to provide it than other States receiving more than $20 per pupil.

Not very many Members of Congress are going to argue over the noble concepts of "equality," "effective," "need," "reasonable effort," "fair allocation," "high income," and "low income." It is when these concepts are reduced to specifics, as they must be in the legislative process, that their advocates gallop off in four different directions.

The problem of Federal control, real or imagined, has been the most difficult to surmount. As former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur Fleming, a strong advocate of Federal aid for construction of facilities, testified: "[There are] citizens who are genuinely fearful of the Federal Government making grants that become a part of current operating budgets at the local school district level. Some argue that there is no basis for such fears. The fact remains that they exist. There are many persons who will support a school construction program, but who will not support a program that also calls for Federal grants to current operating budgets even though these grants are to be used for such a desirable objective as teachers salaries. They believe that such grants afford too great a temptation for Federal controls."

I recognize that limiting Federal aid to construction of facilities is not going to be the answer, but I believe Mr. Fleming succinctly stated the problem of Federal control which lurks behind every Federal aid proposal and which must be answered to the satisfaction of a majority of the Members of Congress if a bill is going to be passed—passed by both Houses of Congress, that is.

Almost every major bill introduced on the subject of Federal aid is accompanied by assurances that no Federal control will be involved. Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, testified in support of the Kennedy bill that "Federal controls are fortunately lacking." Even the bill itself recited: "In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system." Still the problem was not answered.

Probably the main reason it was not answered was that it was a 3-year program. What was to happen after that time ran out and, meanwhile, local school districts had constructed their budgets on the basis of the Federal aid money? Everyone knew the answer. There would be a powerful lobby effort to continue the money—as, no doubt, it should be. Hearings would be held before the Education and Appropriations Committees of the Congress, and there would be questions about the use of the money for teachers' salaries, teachers' qualification standards, textbooks (the bill was amended on the Senate floor to include these), teacher-pupil ratio, curricula, and the like. Without satisfactory answers, threats could be forthcoming to withhold support for a continuation of the money unless some so-called basic standards were incorporated into the new bill. And that is the way Federal controls could come about. As one group testified in opposition to the Kennedy bill, "The greatest control available to the Federal Government is its power to allocate funds."

In other words, although most Members of Congress would have agreed that there were no Federal controls in this particular bill, it was widely recognized that passage of this bill would lay a foundation for Federal controls.

Is one to conclude, then, that any bill providing money to the States for education is going to be opposed because it lays a foundation for future possible Federal control? I don't believe so. For one thing, the bill should not be set up with a time limit, which automatically requires introduction of a new bill (before the time runs out) and hearings before the Education Committees of the Senate and House. For another, a bill which would simply allocate a percentage of the Federal revenue collections to the States "for education purposes" would, once put into effect, have a status not unlike the recurring appropriation to pay interest on the national debt and would run far less risk of being tampered with than the average appropriation for a Federal program.

There are, of course, fears of other Federal control than that which might be written into an act of the Congress. Fears of control emanating out of a Federal bureaucracy established to administer a Federal aid program are not without foundation. The late President Roosevelt's Advisory Committee on Education was cited during testimony in opposition to the Kennedy bill with this quotation: "Much of the very unwise existing Federal control over vocational education results from the fact that Federal officials have assumed the duty of determining in detail what types of education shall be considered vocational."

With the percentage-of-Federal-revenue approach, there would be no Federal bureaucracy, and thus the foundation for future possible control from this direction would be eliminated.

A novel approach was recently introduced by one of the Members of the House of Representatives in the form of H.R. 10696. Under this bill, an educational assistance trust fund would be established into which would be paid 1 percent of Federal revenue collections for the fiscal year 1966, 2 percent for the fiscal year 1967, 3 percent for fiscal 1968, 4 percent for fiscal 1969, and 5 percent for each year thereafter. Half of this money would be allocated to the States on the basis of the number of students enrolled in public schools, and the other half would be allocated according to the respective efforts of the various States determined according to a formula designed to compute effort. As I have pointed out, there are different points of view over how to arrive at a formula for allocating money, but the interesting and unique feature of the bill is that it would require approval (with provisions for judicial review, incidentally) of State plans for spending the money by the Comptroller General of the United States. The General Accounting Office, which is headed by the Comptroller General, is a part of the legislative branch of the Federal Government; and its audit reports and investigative actions are not only extremely thorough, but equally important, nonpartisan. Thus, under this bill, any Federal control would lie in the legislative branch, the one closest to the people, rather than with some nonelected public official who may not share the public's concern over Federal controls.

With any Federal aid proposal there is, of course, the implication that Federal aid is needed. I would merely point out that, rightly or wrongly, there is a fairly widespread opinion in the Congress that the need is sometimes exaggerated. For example, the Kennedy bill was promoted, in part, at least, on the basis that the Federal money could be used for teachers' salaries and that the failure to improve teachers' salaries was causing a critical shortage of teachers. Opponents of the bill cited statistics to show that the shortages actually existed in only a few fields, such as mathematics and science; and that this shortage was the result of competition from the Federal Government itself and from private industry, particularly private industry with Federal Government contracts. Also, it was pointed out that during the previous 5 years, the number of college graduates prepared to teach had increased 47 percent, and the number prepared to teach science and mathematics had increased 100 percent. It was further pointed out that from 1950 to 1960, teachers' salaries increased 70 percent; whereas weekly earnings in manufacturing went up only 53 percent.

Strong criticism was also voiced over the statistics issued by the Office of Education relating to the shortage of classrooms, which ranged all the way from 600,000 down to 132,000. However, the Office of Education noted that its data on classroom shortages should be used with caution because of varying States standards of normal class size and varying definitions of unsatisfactory rooms. Still, using a 10-year projected requirement of 600,000 classrooms to be built, evidence was introduced to show that from 60,000 to 70,000 classrooms per year had been built during each of the 5 preceding years; and the conclusion obviously to be drawn was that this rate would be continued even without Federal aid.

The point to be made, I think, is that the case for Federal aid should be based on statistics which are less vulnerable to attack; and that it is far better to premise the case on the need of the States for more sources of revenue to meet their own specific State needs in education—some being teachers, some being classrooms, some being laboratories, some being higher operating costs, and some being all of these items. The percentage-of-federal-revenue approach would meet this point.

Once a need for Federal aid is established, and I believe it can be, another implication is that the need can certainly be met. This is no doubt true if the problem of relative priorities of Federal spending can be solved. But even then, I believe, the proponents would do well to not rest their case on relatively unmeaningful statistics, such as the gross national product. There are many Members of Congress who are very much aware that the gross national product is merely the sum totals of goods and services purchased by individuals, corporations, and all levels of Government during the course of a period of time; and just because there may be an increase in GNP from one year to the next hardly means that we are enjoying a satisfactory rate of "true economic growth" which would support a certain level of Federal aid. Almost one-third of our increase in GNP now consists of inflation, so that the regular figures usually cited for increased GNP must be reduced to arrive at what is known as "real dollar" increase in GNP. This needs to be further refined to reflect per capita increased GNP, if any, because a mere absolute increase may not keep up with our population increase.

Some economists discount the alarm over deficit spending by pointing out that our national debt is a smaller percentage of our gross national product today than it was 10 years ago. Therefore, they argue, deficit spending to enable a proposed level of Federal aid is perfectly sound. But they fail to point out that, in the present state of our monetary and fiscal policy, for every billion dollars that is added to our national debt, there is a billion dollars of inflation. People like you who are directly and gravely concerned over the rising costs of education do not need to be told what a large part inflation has been playing in these increases.

Here in Iowa there are some implications to be considered—implications arising from the failure of the Federal Government to share a little more of its tremendous revenue with the State in meeting our educational needs. It is true that we, the citizens, are the Federal Government and the State government too; but this doesn't mean that all of the tax money comes out of the same pocket in the same amount. The tax structures of the two levels of government are vastly different. If Federal aid is not provided (and, we should remember that it comes largely from taxes based on relative ability to pay), are property taxes to be increased still more? There are many who believe that the property tax, which is not designed to produce revenue on the basis of relative ability to pay or even on the basis of ability to pay, has reached the saturation point in Iowa; and it has become rather fashionable to intrigue the voters with the thought of "property tax relief" during political campaigns.

Perhaps, then, more aid for schools should be provided by an increase in the State income tax? But there are many who believe that this would jeopardize the future of the very people we are trying to educate by discouraging business growth and its accompanying job opportunities. After all, the existence and the rate of a State income tax is a factor that is given considerable weight in plant location.

One can always turn to an increase in the State sales tax, but this assuredly works hardship on retailers in the border or near border counties located near neighboring States which do not have a sales tax; and there is little question but what the sales tax is regressive—just like the social security tax, which will receive a large boost commencing next January.

The only choice left at the State level is to make do with what we have, but then one sees a statement by the former chairman of the Iowa Development Commission that "education and Iowa's economic growth are inseparable." He was referring particularly to the technical, graduate, postgraduate, and research levels, and the fact that industry is becoming more and more research centered with each passing year. And a little later one reads in the September 23 issue of the Wall Street Journal that the manager of location surveys of a large engineering firm says that a good local school system is a "top requisite" for employees' families and therefore of a plant selection site. Add to these considerations the fact that Iowa has been educating far more men and women for jobs in other States than have been educated in other States for jobs in Iowa, and I believe the conclusion is inescapable that more Federal aid, without Federal controls or the foundation for Federal controls, without more bureaucracy, and with a realistic allocation formula, is the answer.

Tribute to Colonel Vandervort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK R. MILLER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am advised that one of the U.S. Army officers with whom all of us have been in frequent contact and who has served all of us most ably is scheduled to retire from the service in the near future. This officer is Col. Ralph E. "Bud" Vandervort, Jr., U.S. Army, who has been serving as the Army liaison officer for the U.S. Senate for nearly 6 years.

I wish to take this occasion to express my appreciation for the splendid service and cooperation Colonel Vandervort has furnished me and my colleagues, to indicate my regret that he is leaving the service, and to wish him many happy and successful years in a retirement which I trust will be most active.

Results of Government Research Should Be Made Available to the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, to insure that the taxpayers receive the benefits of the results of publicly financed research, I offered an amendment to the higher education bill which would provide that "all information, copyrights, uses, processes, patents and other developments" resulting from Government expenditures "will be freely available to the general public." Such a provision, designed to protect the public interest, should be part of every bill which authorizes research expenditures.

I regret that the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee did not see fit to attach my amendment to the higher education bill, which was passed by the Senate on September 2. Support for the principle of my amendment, however, was recently shown by the U.S. Office of Education, which published in the Federal Register of July 28 a statement of policy that:

> Material produced as a result of any research activity undertaken with any financial assistance through contract with or project grant from the Office of Education will be placed in the public domain. Material so released will be available to conventional outlets of the private sector for their use.

This policy is effective immediately. I would like to congratulate the Honorable Francis Keppel, Commissioner for Education, for adopting this policy which will guarantee that all patentable and copyrightable material amassed at great Government expense will be made available to the greatest number of people, in the shortest amount of time, and at the least cost to all American citizens who have made the research possible. The free flow of information is essential to our democratic form of Government.

Establishing this policy by an administrative ruling is not enough. An agency regulation can be changed quickly, and depends on each administrator who holds office. This policy, in order to be effective, must become law. The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, has assured us that legislation will soon be reported out by his subcommittee, which is now studying the issue of the public availability of information and patentable discoveries which result from Government-financed research. I look forward with great interest to seeing the results of the subcommittee's study of this matter which is very important to the future growth and competitive structure of our economy. I would like to commend the senior Senator from Arkansas for his sincere efforts to design Government policy regarding the disposition of the fruits of publicly financed research which will rigorously protect the interests of all American citizens.

When the taxpayers finance research, whether performed by Government employees or by means of grants and contracts, new information and knowledge gained through these efforts must be made freely available to the press, to scholars, to private enterprise, and the public at large.

Report on 1st Session of 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 89th Congress has been described as the most productive in modern times. From the standpoint of volume of legislation passed as well as the variety of subjects upon which the Congress has legislated, the session will certainly fill this description. This Congress covered the gamut of legislative activity from the earth's subsurface to outer space; from the $130 claim of an Air Force officer to the $49 billion for national defense; and practically every interest and problem which exists in between these geographical and economic extremes. The Nation's health, education, economic well-being, and related subjects occupied the time of our 535 Members of the House of Representatives and Senate during the 10-month session about to close.

HEALTH

More legislation affecting public and private health was added to the Federal statute books than at any time during our Nation's history. Leading this category of legislation was the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (H.R. 6675) including medicare or hospitalization under social security for all citizens 65 years of age and older. Added to this measure before passage were a variety of other programs, including: First, a voluntary program to provide medical care administered by private insurance companies; second, increased social security benefits for older citizens as well as widows and dependents; third, an increase in social security taxes to protect the reserve funds; fourth, a beefing-up of the Kerr-Mills program of health care for the needy aged or eldercare, and fifth, provisions benefiting the blind, the physically handicapped and certain other disabled persons.

The Nation's health also was dealt with in the Community Health Services Act (S. 510) providing matching funds for local health centers, and the Community Mental Health Centers Act (H.R. 2985) providing a corresponding service for the mentally ill. Substantial funds were voted for health research facilities (H.R. 2984) and for concentrated research work on diseases of the heart, cancer, stroke, and related ailments (H.R. 3140).

The Congress has provided substantial funds to educate and train medical practitioners and others preparing for careers in the healing arts in H.R. 3141. Another new program will result in establishing and financing medical library facilities (H.R. 3142), including regional medical libraries to aid the medical profession and those whom it undertakes to serve.

Extensive amendments to the water pollution control laws include a new requirement for standards of quality in our major rivers and lakes. This represents completion of a long-time campaign for reducing pollution of our Nation's waters. A clean air bill (S. 306) is designed to reduce pollution from automobile exhausts as well as other pollutants in our Nation's air. Still another new program entitled "The Rural Water Sanitation Amendment" (H.R. 10232) is designed to assist in providing sewage facilities in the rural sections of our Nation.

Certain specific subjects affecting our Nation's health have also been dealt with, including amendments to further control the distribution and use of harmful drugs, including the so-called pep pills and goofballs (H.R. 2). In recognizing the damaging consequences of cigarette smoking, the Congress has imposed a requirement that all packages of cigarettes shall be labeled to indicate that "cigarette smoking may be hazardous to your health" (S. 559).

EDUCATION

For the first time in our Nation's history, a comprehensive program of Federal aid to elementary and secondary education has been enacted (H.R. 2362). The initial program of providing an annual allowance of $1.5 billion is intended to benefit public as well as parochial and private schools. This legislation also covers our Nation's high schools with all schools benefiting on the basis of a formula which takes into account the families in the school district with incomes of $3,000 or less according to the 1960 census.

The Higher Education Assistance Act (H.R. 9569) stepped up scholarship and loan funds for students seeking a college education. The program of vocational education also was augmented through enactment of the Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act (H.R. 7743). Amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (H.R. 8310) are intended to educate disabled persons in order to make them productive citizens. Funds to provide an additional building for the Library of Congress (H.J. Res. 642) may also be classified as part of the national education effort.

Closely related to the subject of education was the establishment of the Arts and Cultural Council (H.R. 4717). This measure, which began as a purely advisory institution, developed later in the session as the National Arts and Humanities Foundation (H.R. 9460) which for the first time provides Federal subsidies for the performing arts. The Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center is authorized in H.R. 30 which passed the House of Representatives and was pending in the Senate at the close of the 1st session.

TAXES

One of the session's first enactments was the excise tax reduction bill (H.R. 837). This resulted in the elimination of excise taxes on automobiles, cosmetics, jewelry, luggage, and other items and provided for the reduction and future elimination of excise taxes on club dues, telephone and telegraph messages and a great variety of other subjects.

Because the existing tax revenues do not equal the expenditures of our Federal Government, it was necessary to increase again the Federal debt ceiling (H.R. 8464). The public debt authorization is now at an all-time high of $328 billion.

A substantial improvement occurred in our balance-of-payments problem through the voluntary actions of private business concerns. Nevertheless, the adverse balance-of-payments issue and the continuing outflow of gold were the main reasons given for the extension of the interest equalization tax (H.R. 4750) which imposes a tax on foreign investments by American concerns.

The shortage of silver, coupled with a threatened increase in the price of silver, resulted in the elimination of silver certificates and the substitution of Federal Reserve notes in their place. The same conditions gave rise to passage of the Coinage Act of 1965 (H.R. 8926) as a result of which silver will soon be eliminated from dimes and quarters and reduced substantially in half dollars.

It should not be assumed that there were not also some tax increases. The boost in social security taxes to defray the increased benefits to recipients—including hospital care—will amount to more than last year's income tax cut for many persons.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Although the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was intended to provide equal voting rights for all citizens, the denial of voting rights in many Southern States brought a demand this year for additional Federal legislation. Passage of the Voting Rights Act (H.R. 6400) established an unprecedented Federal control of local and State elections and increased penalties against those who deny equal voting rights to all citizens.

A related civil rights issue was involved in the Mississippi election contest (H. Res. 585) under which certain Mississippi citizens sought to unseat the elected Congressmen from Mississippi on the ground that Negroes had been denied voting rights in the 1964 elections at which these Congressmen were elected. While this action failed, a note was sounded in behalf of a fairer administration of the voting laws in future elections in Mississippi and elsewhere.

IMMIGRATION

A new and far-reaching immigration law (H.R. 2580) was enacted which scrapped the national origins quota system and substituted a program which includes a world numerical ceiling of 290,000 on immigration to this country. The new law will facilitate the reuniting of families of American citizens and will also provide improved opportunities for skilled and professionally trained persons to emigrate to this country.

POVERTY

Notwithstanding its deficiencies and the sharp criticism leveled at the politically and poorly administered poverty program, the Congress passed a bill designed to extend economic opportunity to additional Americans (H.R. 8283). This legislation with its multiple aspects includes funds for Head Start projects to aid disadvantaged children from ages 3 to 6, neighborhood community projects for school dropouts, work camps for young men and women, and loan and grant programs to expand educational opportunities of youngsters from poor families.

The Congress also passed the Appalachia Regional Development Act (S. 3). The theory behind this enactment is that by constructing highways and other facilities, prosperity can be brought to those residing near the abandoned coalfields and in the mountainous areas of this 13-State region of the East. The price tag is more than $1 billion.

CITIES

After years of debating the subject, the Congress established a new executive department known as the Department of Housing and Urban Development (H.R. 6927). This is intended to provide Federal service for cities comparable to the service which the Department of Agriculture provides for rural America. However, the bill does little more than to create a new Secretary in the President's Cabinet and to give the Federal Housing Authority a more prestigious title.

An appropriation of $90 million was authorized under S. 1588 to establish a high-speed surface transportation facility along the east coast intended to demonstrate that railroad trains can serve passenger transportation needs at speeds as great as 150 miles per hour. It is common knowledge that the highways of our cities and metropolitan areas are becoming increasingly jammed with automobile traffic. This high-speed railroad experiment is intended to demonstrate the need for increased railroad travel in order to reduce traffic on the highways.

A boon to the city of Washington is expected to result from passage of the District of Columbia Rapid Transit Act (H.R. 4822) to provide a subway system to serve Metropolitan Washington.

Many other subjects affecting agriculture, crime, housing—including rent subsidies—labor-management relations, veterans, military and civil service pay scales, and retirement benefits are among those on which the Congress took action during the 1st session. The list is staggering—the cost unpredictable. However, relative to the cost of this record volume of legislation, two things appear certain: First, the cost is bound to exceed the estimates; and second, the modest starts of some of the programs are bound to increase and expand in future sessions of the Congress.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Many of the highly controversial and most interesting subjects of legislation of the 1st session of the 89th Congress were considered by the Judiciary Committee, upon which this Member of Congress serves. Of these, the voting rights and immigration bills, as well as the constitutional amendment relative to Presidential succession and disability, are among the best known. In addition to these subjects, the committee considered close to 100 bills effecting changes in our Federal statutes and more than 1,000 private bills involving claims against the Government and individual immigration cases.

OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Legislative activity affecting the 12th Congressional District includes the military construction appropriation bill (H.R. 10323) providing funds for the establishment of the 5th Army Headquarters at Fort Sheridan. Military housing at Fort Sheridan and at Great Lakes Naval Training Center, as well as other improvements at both of these important bases, are also of particular interest to 12th District residents. Funds to initiate a feasibility study for a small-boat harbor at Highland Park as well as initial steps for a corresponding small-boat harbor at Zion were part of the legislative work of this session. Other engineering projects are underway affecting the Waukegan Harbor as well as the Fox River and the Des Plaines River.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The huge legislative production of this 1st session of the 89th Congress included many measures which, in the opinion of this Member, might better have been left to State, local, and individual initiative. The resistance to still other proposals indicates that the 2d session of this Congress will be fraught with bitter controversy and very little in the way of new legislation.

Still pending on the agenda at the close of the session is the proposed repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, a proposal aimed at repealing the laws of 19 States where union shop clauses in labor-management contracts have been outlawed. In the labor-management field proposals to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act by increasing the minimum wage to $2, requiring payment of double-time wages for hours worked in excess of 40 or 48 hours per week, and reduction of the standard workweek from 40 to 35 hours per week are included. Measures to legalize secondary boycotts and to consolidate the unemployment compensation programs of the 50 States into one huge Federal program were also pending at the end of the session.

The highly emotional issue of home rule for the District of Columbia remains for the 2d session of this Congress or some later Congress to decide. General revision of the copyright laws is also expected to come to the House floor later. Federal control of firearms, including mail order sales of rifles and pistols, is a red-hot issue awaiting action next year.

COMMITTEE INVESTIGATIONS

These and other proposals which may not yet have been introduced will receive attention by the 89th Congress when it reconvenes in January. During the current recess many Members of Congress will engage in committee and commission work, including investigations occurring in Washington, other parts of the country and abroad. Some members of the Judiciary Committee, including this member, will undertake investigations on pending narcotics legislation aimed at reducing the traffic in narcotics and helping to rehabilitate narcotics addicts. In addition, some investigations of military and civilian claims against the Government originating at overseas bases will be made during this period.

REPUBLICAN CONTRIBUTIONS

The legislative program, including the major bills which have been outlined above, has been prepared and carried out largely through the efforts of the Democratic administration with its overwhelming influence in the White House and its better than two-to-one majorities in the House and Senate. This should not indicate that the Republican Members of Congress have not contributed to the final legislative results. In many cases, as in the voting rights, immigration, health care, water pollution, education and other measures, Republicans have contributed substantially to produce the final form of these measures. In the case of repeal of the excise taxes, the administration carried through on a proposal which the Republicans initiated at the last session of Congress. Numerous recommendations of the Republican minority were adopted in the final form of the immigration bill, and an estimated three-fourths of the health care proposal represents programs initiated or supported by most Republicans. At least one-half of the voting rights measures reflect Republican recommendations.

SMOOTH SAILING

Bills such as the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Water Resources Planning Act, the Community Health Services Act, the Drug Abuse Control Amendments, the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act, and others passed the House of Representatives as well as the Senate unanimously. The fact is there were very few close votes. Even the highly controversial bill creating a new Department of Housing and Urban Development—H.R. 6927—was passed in the House with six votes to spare. This was the narrowest margin by which any of the bills passed which are now among our new laws.

In general the Johnson administration has had smooth sailing in the House and Senate during the 1st session of the 89th Congress. It is the expectation of this Member of Congress that, in this respect at least, the 2d session of the 89th Congress will be quite different.

Congressman Roudebush Reports on 1st Session, 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Congress has adjourned for the year and I will be spending the remainder of 1965 back home in Indiana talking with the people.

It is appropriate at this time that I report to them on the highlights of the 1st session of the 89th Congress, and my activities during the session.

There will be many viewpoints on the accomplishments of this session of Congress, both pro and con. It was one of the longest, lasting nearly 42 weeks; one of the busiest with 86 major bills passed, and one of the spendingest—$119.3 billion.

It is important to remember that the President enjoyed a 2-to-1 majority and therefore the vast majority of his program sailed through by large margins.

Much of the legislation considered, of course, was of a highly controversial nature such as Federal aid to education, hospital care for the aged, and high-costing poverty programs.

Many persons supporting these measures hail the past session of Congress as the greatest in history; other citizens, proponents of limited government and personal liberties and local control, regard the past session as a disaster.

Members of the minority party, such as I am, are often accused of being "negative" and "against everything" because we do oppose some programs of the administration.

The essence of our system of government is the two-party system, and under the current ratio in Congress, our party does fulfill the role of the loyal opposition, whose duty it is to criticize and object when in disagreement.

However, disagreement on basic issues and fundamental philosophy of government does not mean blind opposition. For instance, during the past session my support and vote was cast in favor of such programs as:

Water resources planning legislation, especially necessary at this time when water shortages are threatening some of our cities and of especial importance in Indiana, with so many projects underway or in the planning stage;

Manpower retraining, which helps unskilled workers obtain training for more skilled jobs;

Higher Education Act with student assistance and funds for construction of academic buildings.

Rural water and sanitation loan program which assists local governments meet problems of providing these services.

Armed services pay increase legislation which gave our servicemen a long-overdue pay hike.

Excise tax reduction which removed nuisance taxes on many household items.

Mental health grants to help pay the salaries of professional technical people to assist the mentally ill at community mental health centers.

A voluntary health program to help older people meet the costs of medical costs.

Water pollution control funds and community health services.

These are but a few of the constructive proposals which I supported. Many more were passed on a nonrecord vote which received my support.

At the same time, there were many proposals presented which I considered wasteful and extravagant, or objectionable for other reasons, and not in the best interests of the people of Indiana—and these measures I vigorously opposed.

Included in the administration legislative proposals which I opposed were these:

The auto parts treaty with Canada, which will cost many jobs in the automotive parts industry in Indiana because of dislocations and liquidations of American automotive operations. Pushed by the administration as a public relations gesture to Canada, this bill guarantees a windfall to Canada at the expense of companies and unions in such cities as Muncie, New Castle, and other automotive parts manufacturing areas of our State.

Foreign aid to Communist countries and such tyrants as Nasser and Sukarno who take millions in American tax money with one hand and slap us in the face with the other.

New national debt increases—we now have increased the debt eight different times during the Johnson and Kennedy administrations.

Removal of gold reserve requirement on American money and coinage debasement by removal of silver from some of our coins.

Poverty programs which have wasted millions and are aimed more at creating vast patronage empires, with little real help going to the needy.

Socialistic rent supplement program which subsidizes rent for people earning as much as $11,200 per year.

Altogether, there were 383 rollcall votes on significant legislation during this past session of Congress, and anyone desiring my vote or position on any of these issues is invited to write me in care of room 1532, Longworth Office Building. Congress reconvenes on January 10, 1966, and anyone desiring a weekly report from this office on the activities of the second session is also invited to write me.

This summary would not be complete without some brief comment on the session in general, and some remarks on our foreign policy.

It is my personal opinion that we are moving steadily toward a dangerous centralization of power in the Federal Government. The Founding Fathers warned repeatedly about this trend, and we can see that their fears were not without foundation.

Those who favor an all-powerful bureaucracy in Washington with control over many facets of the American society often blame the local communities or States for not solving their own problems, thus necessitating further reliance on the Central Government in Washington. My response to this is that the power and responsibility seem to go where the money goes, and with increased spending by a rich and wealthy Federal Government, the tendency at the local level, where officials are hard pressed for funds and under terrific pressure to restrain the tax rates, there emerges a natural attitude to let Washington do it.

Another danger, it occurs to me, is the domination of the Congress by the Executive. This has been obvious throughout the past session when highly controversial bills, objectionable to a majority of both parties, have been rammed through by Presidential insistence. The President has even indicated his disdain of the Congress publicly by announcing he will not abide by restrictions written into a public works law. Can this disregard of legality be any less dangerous than the prevalent attitude we observe in many quarters in the United States to obey only the laws one believes just?

Our foreign policy remains vague and confused. American sons and daughters are again serving in combat duty on foreign soil but are being restricted by unwritten ground rules which favor the Reds. Many Members of Congress feel it is not good to commit unlimited American ground forces to southeast Asia and that the war could be won by air power directed at the proper targets without allowing the Reds a sanctuary as in the Korean conflict. The President has the Congress' full support in the prosecution of the war, but views on strategy differ.

There is also fear that far from the last chapter has been written in the Communist effort in the Dominican Republic and the always explosive Cuban situation.

May the Lord give the people, the Congress, and the President the strength and guidance for the important decisions and action ahead.

Report of Voting and Attendance by Congressman Gerald R. Ford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

The report is as follows:

Rollcall No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1965		
1	Jan. 4	Call of the House	Present.
2	Jan. 4	Election of the Speaker. (McCormack, 289; Ford, 139.)	Present.
3	Jan. 4	H. Res. 1: To order a vote on the resolution authorizing the Speaker to administer the oath of office to the 5 Members-elect from Mississippi. (Passed 276 to 148.)	Yes.
4	Jan. 4	H. Res. 8: To order a vote on the resolution providing 3 changes in the rules of the House. (Passed 224 to 201.)	No.
5	Jan. 19	Quorum call	Present.
6	Jan. 19	H. Res. 126: To dismiss a contest of the election of Representative Ottinger of New York. (Passed 245 to 102.)	No.
7	Jan. 26	H.J. Res. 234: On a motion to recommit to committee the supplemental appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture in order to add a provision prohibiting the use of these funds to supply surplus farm commodities under title I to the United Arab Republic. (Passed 204 to 177.)	Yes.
8	Feb. 4	Quorum call	Present.
9	Feb. 8	Quorum call	Present.
10	Feb. 8	H.J. Res. 234: On a motion to instruct House conferees to insist on House provision in supplemental appropriations bill for Department of Agriculture relating to sale of certain surplus farm commodities to the United Arab Republic. (Defeated 161 to 241.)	Yes.
11	Feb. 9	Qurom call	Present.
12	Feb. 9	H.R. 3818: To recommit to committee the bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities. (Defeated 93 to 289.)	No.
13	Feb. 9	H.R. 3818: On final passage of the bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities. (Passed 300 to 82.)	Yes.
14	Feb. 10	Quorum call	Present.
15	Feb. 17	Quorum call	Present.
16	Feb. 17	H.R. 2998: To authorize appropriations for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for 3 years in the amount of $40,000,000. (Passed 302 to 63.)	Yes.
17	Feb. 18	Quorum call	Present.
18	Feb. 18	Quorum call	Present.
19	Feb. 18	H.R. 45: To recommit to committee the bill authorizing funds for the Inter-American Development Bank in order to reduce the amount from $750,000,000 to $725,000,000. (Defeated 142 to 237.)	Yes.
20	Feb. 18	H.R. 45: On final passage of the bill authorizing an appropriation of $750,000,000 for the Inter-American Development Bank. (Passed 288 to 92.)	Yes.
21	Feb. 24	Quorum call	Present.
22	Feb. 25	Quorum call	Present.
23	Feb. 25	H. Res. 188: To recommit to committee the resolution providing funds for the Committee on Un-American Activities in order to hold hearings on justification of the funds. (Defeated 58 to 332.)	No.
24	Feb. 25	H. Res. 188: To pass the resolution providing $370,000 for operation of the Committee on Un-American Activities. (Passed 359 to 29.)	Yes.
25	Mar. 1	Quorum call	Present.
26	Mar. 2	Quorum call	Present.
27	Mar. 3	Quorum call	Present.
28	Mar. 3	S. 3: On a motion to recommit to committee in order to substitute the provisions of H.R. 4466. (Defeated 100 to 323.)	Yes.
29	Mar. 3	S. 3: On final passage of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. (Passed 257 to 165.)	No.
30	Mar. 9	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
31	Mar. 10	H.R. 2: To approve the Drugs Abuse Control Amendment of 1965. (Passed 402 to 0.)	Yes.
32	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
33	Mar. 15	H.R. 4714: To suspend the rules and pass a bill authorizing an appropriation of $150,000 per year for the Advisory Council on the Arts. (Defeated 217 to 113; a ⅔ majority being necessary.)	Yes.
34	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
35	Mar. 16	H.R. 5505: On a motion to amend the Congressional Redistricting Act to provide that the number of Representatives that a State is entitled to may be elected at large pending reapportionment under this act and providing for at-large elections in States that have never established districts. (Defeated 147 to 255.)	Absent.[2]
36	Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.
37	Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.
38	Mar. 17	H. Res. 276: On agreeing to the rule for taking up for consideration H.R. 5374, the bill to increase the salaries of the Justice of the Supreme Court. (Passed 202 to 183.)	Yes.
39	Mar. 17	H.R. 5374: To increase the salaries of the Justices of the Supreme Court from $39,000 to $42,500 and the salary of the Chief Justice from $40,000 to $43,000. (Defeated 177 to 203.)	Yes.
40	Mar. 18	Quorum call	Present.
41	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
42	Mar. 22	H.R. 5688: On a motion to recommit to committee for further public hearings the bill on criminal legislation for the District of Columbia. (Defeated 166 to 216.)	Absent.[3]
43	Mar. 22	H.R. 5688: On final passage of the bill relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia. (Passed 250 to 131.)	Absent.[3]

See footnotes at end of table.

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1965		
44	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
45	Mar. 23	H.R. 5721: To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco. (Passed 206 to 170.)	No.
46	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
47	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
48	Mar. 25	Quorum call	Present.
49	Mar. 26	Quorum call	Present.
50	Mar. 26	Quorum call	Present.
51	Mar. 26	On a motion calling for a vote (previous question) on the motion to consider the House Journal as read. (Passed 274 to 119.)	No.
52	Mar. 26	H.R. 2362: On a motion to recommit to committee the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to change the formula for the allocation of funds. (Defeated 149 to 267.)	Yes.
53	Mar. 26	H.R. 2362: On final passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. (Passed 263 to 153.)	No.
54	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
55	Mar. 30	Quorum call	Present.
56	Mar. 31	Quorum call	Present.
57	Mar. 31	H.R. 3708: To approve the Older Americans Act of 1965. (Passed 391 to 1.)	Yes.
58	Mar. 31	H.R. 1111: To approve the Water Resources Planning Act. (Passed 383 to 0.)	Yes.
59	Apr. 1	Quorum call	Present.
60	Apr. 1	H.R. 4257: To approve the Manpower Act of 1965. (Passed 392 to 0.)	Yes.
61	Apr. 5	Quorum call	Present.
62	Apr. 5	H.R. 980: To suspend the rules and pass the bill providing for the return of obscene mail and making it easier to keep this type of material out of homes. (Passed 360 to 21.)	Yes.
63	Apr. 5	H.R. 7064: To suspend the rules and authorize the appropriation of $1,000,000 for construction of a U.S. embassy building in Saigon. (Passed 378 to 0.)	Yes.
64	Apr. 5	H.R. 7060: To approve the $6,600,000,000 appropriation bill for the Departments of Treasury and Post Office and for the Executive Office of the President. (Passed 344 to 7.)	Yes.
65	Apr. 6	Quorum call	Present.
66	Apr. 6	H.R. 7091: To approve the $2,100,000,000 2d supplemental appropriation bill. (Passed 348 to 62.)	Yes.
67	Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
68	Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
69	Apr. 8	Quorum call	Present.
70	Apr. 8	H.R. 6675: To recommit to committee the Social Security Amendments of 1965 as reported by the committee in order to substitute the provisions of H.R. 7057, a bill similar to H.R. 6675 but without the compulsory medicare provisions and without the increase in social security payroll taxes. (Defeated 191 to 236.)	Yes.
71	Apr. 8	H.R. 6675: On final passage of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 and increasing the social security payroll taxes. (Passed 313 to 115.)	No.
72	Apr. 13	H.R. 2998: On adoption of the conference report on the authorization for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in the amount of $30,000,000 for 3 years. (Passed 315 to 65.)	Yes.
73	Apr. 13	Quorum call	Present.
74	Apr. 13	H.J. Res. 1: On passage of the resolution proposing a constitutional amendment relative to presidential disability and succession. (Passed 368 to 29.)	Yes.
75	Apr. 14	Quorum call	Present.
76	Apr. 14	H. Res. 310: To provide $50,000 for additional expenses of Committee on Un-American Activities for an investigation of the Ku Klux Klan. (Passed 312 to 43.)	Yes.
77	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
78	Apr. 27	H.R. 6497: To recommit to the Committee on Banking and Currency for further consideration the bill to authorize an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States	Yes.
79	Apr. 27	H.R. 6497: To pass the bill authorizing an increase of $1,035,000,000 in the U.S. quota for the International Monetary Fund. (Passed 301 to 88.)	Yes.
80	Apr. 28	Quorum call	Present.
81	Apr. 28	Quorum call	Present.
82	Apr. 28	S. 4: To approve the Water Quality Act of 1965 as amended by the House. (Passed 396 to 0.)	Yes.
83	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
84	Apr. 29	H.R. 7091: To agree to the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill in the amount of $2,200,000,000. (Passed 316 to 55.)	Yes.
85	Apr. 29	H.R. 7091: To agree to the Senate amendment (No. 6) to the supplemental appropriation bill providing $942,000 to continue the Federal subsidy this fiscal year for helicopter service at New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. (Defeated 144 to 228.)	No.
86	Apr. 29	H.R. 4714: To correct a technical error in Public Law 88-579 with the effect of authorizing annual appropriations for the National Council on the Arts of not more than $150,000. (Passed 239 to 115.)	Yes.
87	May 3	H.R. 2986 (S. 510): To extend the Community Health Services Act and to launch a nationwide immunization program against measles. (Passed 347 to 0.)	Yes.
88	May 4	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
89	May 4	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
90	May 4	H.R. 2985: To authorize the appropriation of $172,000,000 during the next 4 years to help pay the cost of staff members of community mental health centers. (Passed 389 to 0.)	Yes.
91	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
92	May 5	H.J. Res. 447: To pass the resolution transferring $700,000,000 to the Department of Defense for use in connection with military activities in southeast Asia.	Yes.
93	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
94	May 5	H.R. 7657 (S. 800): To approve the bill authorizing the appropriations for 1966 of $15,300,000,000 for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces. (Passed 395 to 0.)	Yes.
95	May 6	Quorum call	Present.
96	May 6	H. Res. 366: To adopt the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 7717, a bill to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (Passed 389 to 0.)	Yes.
97	May 6	H.R. 7717: To approve the bill authorizing appropriations in the amount of $5,100,000,000 for the national aeronautics and space program. (Passed 389 to 11.)	Yes.
98	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
99	May 10	H.R. 2984: To approve an amendment to the Public Health Service Act to extend the health research facilities program and to authorize 3 additional Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Passed 333 to 4.)	Yes.
100	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
101	May 12	S. 701: To approve the bill designed to implement the International Coffee Agreement signed at New York in 1962. (Passed 300 to 97.)	No.
102	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
103	May 20	Quorum call	Present.
104	May 20	H.R. 8122: To recommit to committee the Atomic Energy Commission's authorization bill in order to delete $91,500,000 for construction of a large seed and blanket reactor in cooperation with the State of California. (Defeated 43 to 313.)	No.
105	May 20	H.R. 8122: To approve the $2,500,000,000 authorization bill for the Atomic Energy Commission. (Passed 350 to 1.)	Yes.
106	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
107	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
108	May 25	Quorum call	Present.
109	May 25	H.R. 7750: To recommit to committee the foreign aid authorization bill in order to reduce the authorization for the Development Loan Fund by $131,000,000 and to change "free labor unions" to "free non-Communist-dominated labor unions" in connection with institutions to be developed through housing projects in Latin American countries. (Defeated 178 to 219.)	Yes.
110	May 25	H.R. 7750: To pass the foreign aid authorization bill in the amount of $2,000,000,000, making $3,400,000,000 available for fiscal 1966. (Passed 249 to 148.)	Yes.
111	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
112	May 26	H.R. 8370: To recommit to committee the Agriculture Department appropriation bill in order to add an amendment which would prohibit the use of funds to finance the exportation of any agricultural commodity to either the United Arab Republic or Indonesia under title I of Public Law 480. (Defeated 187 to 208.)	Yes.
113	May 26	H.R. 8370: To approve the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture in the amount of $5,700,000,000. (Passed 354 to 41.)	No.
114	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
115	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
116	June 1	H.R. 8639: To approve the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary and related agencies in the amount of $2,000,000,000. (Passed 322 to 60.)	Yes.

See footnotes at end of table.

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1965		
117	June 1	H.R. 3584: To approve the bill amending the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. (Passed 335 to 43.)	Yes.
118	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
119	June 2	H.R. 8371: To approve the bill reducing and/or eliminating certain excise taxes. (Passed 401 to 6.)	Yes.
120	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
121	June 3	H.R. 7777: To approve the bill which would authorize the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee (retired) to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency as an exception to existing law. (Passed 228 to 137.)	No.
122	June 7	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
123	June 7	H.R. 3157: To approve a bill which would permit the spouse of a railroad employee to receive a spouse's annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act and social security benefits or railroad retirement benefits earned in her own right. (Passed 323 to 0.)	Absent.[3]
124	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
125	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
126	June 8	H.R. 8775: To recommit to committee the legislative appropriation bill in order to delete $35,000 for the employment of 16 operators for automatic elevators in the Rayburn Office Building. (Defeated 149 to 244.)	Yes.
127	June 8	H.R. 7105: To adopt the bill extending and amending the Export Control Act. (Passed 387 to 1.)	Yes.
128	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
129	June 9	H. Res. 413: To adopt the rule under which to consider the bill increasing the debt limit to $328,000,000,000. (Passed 273 to 109.)	Yes.
130	June 9	H.R. 8464: To adopt the bill increasing the debt limit from $324,000,000,000 to $328,000,000,000. (Passed 229 to 164.)	No.
131	June 9	H. Con. Res. 285: To amend the resolution to allow the showing in the United States of the Kennedy film produced by the U.S. Information Agency in order to provide that no fee should be charged those who viewed the film. (Defeated 174 to 216.)	Yes.
132	June 9	H. Con. Res. 285: To adopt the resolution authorizing the showing in the United States of the film, "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," produced by the U.S. Information Agency for use abroad: Bill contains no provision against charging viewers a fee to see film produced by tax funds. (Passed 311 to 75.)	No.
133	June 10	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
134	June 10	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
135	June 10	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
136	June 14	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
137	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
138	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
139	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
140	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
141	June 16	H.R. 6927: To recommit to committee the bill establishing a Department of Housing and Urban Development in order to substitute the provision of H.R. 8822 establishing in the Executive Office an Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development. (Defeated 141 to 259.)	Yes.
142	June 16	H.R. 6927: To approve the bill establishing at Cabinet-level a Department of Housing and Urban Development. (Passed 217 to 184.)	No.
143	June 16	H.Res. 416: To authorize each Member of the House to employ, on a temporary basis, a student intern without regard to present restrictions on number of employees and clerk-hire allowance. (Passed 229 to 153.).	No.
144	June 21	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
145	June 21	H.R. 7743: To approve the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, providing to a system of loan insurance to assist students to attend postsecondary business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools. (Passed 300–0.).	Absent.[3]
146	June 21	H.R. 8620: To amend the Agricultural Act to take into consideration floods and other disasters in reference to feed grains, cotton, and wheat programs for 1965. (Passed 296 to 2.)	Absent.[3]
147	June 21	H. Con. Res. 416: To approve the resolution in behalf of freedom for the people of the Baltic States. (Passed 298 to 0.)	Yes.
148	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
149	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
150	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
151	June 23	Quorum call	Present.
152	June 23	Quorum call	Present.
153	June 23	H.R. 9221: To approve the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense in the amount of $45,000 000,000. (Passed 407 to 0.)	Yes.
154	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
155	June 24	H.J. Res. 541: To extend the Area Redevelopment Act for a period of 2 months. (Passed 224 to 167.)	No.
156	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
157	June 28	H. Res. 425: To adopt the rule under which to consider H.R. 7984, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. (Passed 230 to 115.).	No.
158	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
159	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
160	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
161	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
162	June 30	H.R. 7984: To substitute for sec. 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act the Stephens amendment relative to rent supplements making minor changes in that section. (Passed 240 to 179.)	No.
163	June 30	H.R. 7984: To delete from the Housing and Urban Development Act sec. 101, relative to rent supplements, and sec. 106, relative to a new grant program under urban renewal. (Defeated 202 to 208.)	Yes.
164	June 30	H.R. 7984: To approve the Housing and Urban Development Act containing the provision for rent supplements (subsidies) for middle-income groups. (Passed 245 to 169.)	No.
165	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
166	July 6	Quorum call	Present.
167	July 6	H. Res. 440: To adopt the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 6400, the Voting Rights Act: 10 hours of debate with the right to substitute the text of H.R. 7896 (the McCulloch-Ford bill) for H.R. 6400. (Passed 308 to 58.)	Yes.
168	July 6	Quorum call	Present.
169	July 7	Quorum call	Present.
170	July 7	Quorum call	Present.
171	July 8	Quorum call	Present.
172	July 8	Quorum call	Present.
173	July 8	Quorum call	Present.
174	July 9	Quorum call	Present.
175	July 9	H.R. 6400: To amend the voting right bill to provide criminal penalties for giving false information on voting eligibility status, or for paying or accepting money to register or vote. (Passed 253–165.)	Yes.
176	July 9	H.R. 6400: To amend the voting rights bill to permit the courts to remove the Federal examiner in a given county if it is proved that at least 50 percent of Negroes of voting age are registered. (Defeated 155 to 262.)	No.
177	July 9	H.R. 6400: To amend the voting rights bill to allow people illiterate in English to vote if they have completed the 6th grade in Spanish-language schools. (Defeated 202 to 216.)	No.
178	July 9	H.R. 6400: To recommit to committee the voting rights bill in order to substitute the provision of the Ford-McCulloch bill, H.R. 7896. (Defeated 171 to 248.)	Yes.
170	July 9	H.R. 6400: On final passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. (Passed 333 to 85.)	Yes.
180	July 12	Quorum call	Present.
181	July 12	H.R. 8856: To clarify the law relative to the Atomic Energy Commission to correct any conclusion that its activities, as authorized by Congress, are limited by local regulations relative to the generation, sale, or transmission of electric power. (Defeated 216 to 139; a ⅔ vote being necessary to suspend rules.)	No.
182	July 12	H.R. 242: To require that appointments to fill temporary summer positions in the Federal Government in the Washington area be apportioned among all the States. (Passed 336 to 22.)	Yes.
183	July 12	Quorum call	Present.
184	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
185	July 13	S. 559: To adopt the conference report on the legislation requiring a "caution" statement on packages of cigarettes. (Passed 285 to 103.)	Yes.
186	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
187	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
188	July 14	H.R. 8926: To amend the Coinage Act of 1965 to require the silver content of quarters and dimes to be minted under this act be fixed at 40 percent. (Defeated 187 to 218.)	No.
189	July 14	H.R. 8926: On final adoption of the Coinage Act of 1965 reducing the amount of silver in our dimes, quarters, and half dollars. (Passed 255 to 151.)	Yes.
190	July 15	Quorum call	Present.
191	July 15	Quorum call	Present.
192	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
193	July 20	H.R. 9075: To approve the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965 increasing compensation for members of the Armed Forces. (Passed 410 to 0.)	Yes.
194	July 21	Quorum call	Present.
195	July 22	Quorum call	Present.
196	July 22	H.R. 8283: On a motion to recommit to committee the antiproverty bill of 1965 in order to delete the provision giving the Federal Poverty Administration the right to overrule Governors' vetoes of projects and to reduce the authorization for 1966 from $1,900,000,000 to $945,000,000, the amount for 1965. (Defeated 178 to 227.)	Yes.
197	July 22	H.R. 8283: On final passage of the antipoverty bill of 1965 authorizing $1,900,000,000 for the program. (Passed 245 to 158.)	No.

See footnotes at end of table.

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1965		
198	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
199	July 26	H. Res. 437: On a motion (previous question) to halt debate and vote on the resolution calling for only 5 hours of debate on H.R. 77 (to repeal sec. 14(b) of Taft-Hartley) and prohibiting the consideration of meaningful amendments. (Passed 248 to 171.)	No.
200	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
201	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
202	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
203	July 27	H.R. 6675: To approve the conference report on the Social Security Amendments of 1965 including medicare and an increase in social security payroll taxes. (Passed 307 to 116.)	No.
204	July 27	H.R. 7984: To approve the conference report on the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 including the rent subsidy provision. (Passed 251 to 168.)	No.
205	July 27	H.R. 2985: To approve the conference report on the Mental Facilities and Centers Construction Act. (Passed 414 to 0.)	Yes.
206	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
207	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
208	July 28	H.R. 77: To recommit to the Committee on Education and Labor the bill to repeal sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. (Defeated 200 to 223.)	Yes.
209	July 28	H.R. 77: To approve the bill repealing sec. 14(b) of Taft-Hartley law (which authorized States to prohibit compulsory union membership). (Passed 221 to 203.)	No.
210	July 29	Quorum call	Present.
211	July 29	Quorum call	Present.
212	July 29	H.R. 8856: To clarify the law relative to the Atomic Energy Commission to correct any conclusion that its activities, as authorized by Congress, are limited by local regulations relative to the generation, sale, or transmission of electric power. (Passed 275 to 125.)	No.
213	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
214	Aug. 2	S.J. Res. 81: To increase the amount of funds authorized for the Interstate Highway System for the fiscal year 1967 from $2,900,000,000 to $3,000,000,000 and authorizing the apportionment of these funds to the States. (Passed 313 to 11.)	Yes.
215	Aug. 2	H.R. 8027: To authorize the appropriation of $10,000,000 for fiscal 1966 to provide assistance in training State and local law-enforcement officers. (Passed 326 to 0.)	Yes.
216	Aug. 2	H.R. 6964: To approve the bill authorizing the Attorney General to transfer certain prisoners to residential community treatment centers, to grant them leave, and to permit them to work in private employment. (Passed 323 to 0.)	Yes.
217	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
218	Aug. 3	S. 1564 (H.R. 6400): To recommit to committee the conference report on the voting rights bill of 1965 in order to delete the provision which would permit the courts to remove the Federal examiner in a given political subdivision if it is proved that at least 50 percent of Negroes of voting age are registered. (Defeated 118 to 284.)	Yes.
219	Aug. 3	S. 1564 (H.R. 6400): To approve the conference report on the voting rights bill of 1965. (Passed 328 to 74.)	Yes.
220	Aug. 3	H.R. 8469: To provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund. (Passed 394 to 0.)	Yes.
221	Aug. 4	H.R. 8439: To adopt the conference report on the military construction authorization bill for 1966 in the amount of $1,700,000,000. (Passed 389 to 0.)	Absent.[3]
222	Aug. 4	S. 1742: To amend the articles of agreement of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and its affiliate, the International Finance Corporation to permit the World Bank to lend to the IFC. (Passed 330 to 54.)	Absent.[3]
223	Aug. 5	Quorum call	Present.
224	Aug. 5	H. Res. 498: To adopt the rule under which the House would consider H.R. 4750, the bill to provide a 2-year extension of the interest equalization tax. (Passed 329 to 44.)	Yes.
225	Aug. 5	H.R. 4750: To adopt the bill amended to extend for 19 months the interest equalization tax. (Passed 274 to 97.)	Yes.
226	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
227	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
228	Aug. 9	H.R. 9918: To adopt the substitute bill (H.R. 7174) in lieu of bill approved by committee relative to motor vehicle insurance in the District of Columbia, the substitute requiring all insured drivers to cover protection against uninsured drivers and requiring uninsured drivers to pay at least $40 a year into an unsatisfied judgment claims fund. (Passed 173 to 156.)	No.
229	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
230	Aug. 10	H.R. 10306: To amend the Selective Service Act to make it a crime to knowingly destroy or mutilate a draft card. (Passed 393 to 1.)	Yes.
231	Aug. 11	Quorum call	Present.
232	Aug. 11	Quorum call	Present.
233	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
234	Aug. 12	S. 1648: To amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act by making more areas eligible for grants for public works and development facilities, to increase the authorization from $400,000,000 to $500,000,000 and to change the limitation in the program from 5 years to 4 years. (Passed 196 to 194.)	No.
235	Aug. 12	S. 1648: To recommit to committee the Public Works and Economic Development Act in order to cut $85,000,000 from the cost by eliminating industrial and commercial loans and guarantees for working capital, to require the purchase of American-made products, and to provide for an annual review of expenditures by Congress. (Defeated 163 to 224.)	Yes.
236	Aug. 12	S. 1648: On final passage of the Public Works and Economic Development Act authorizing the expenditure of $3,300,000,000 (not including administrative costs) for the initial 5 years of the program. (Passed 264 to 138.)	No.
237	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
238	Aug. 16	H.R. 6431: To suspend the tariff duty on certain forms of nickel. (Passed 297 to 48.)	Yes.
239	Aug. 16	H.R. 8635: To suspend the rules and pass the bill establishing a Federal Boxing Commission. (Passed 346 to 4.)	Yes.
240	Aug. 17	Quorum call	Present.
241	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
242	Aug. 19	H.R. 7750: To approve the conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965. (Passed 244 to 150.)	Absent.[3]
243	Aug. 19	H.R. 9811: To recommit to committee for further consideration the onmibus farm bill. (Defeated 169 to 224.)	Yes.
244	Aug. 19	H.R. 9811: On final passage of the $3,300,000,000 food and Agriculture Act of 1965 (omnibus farm bill). (Passed 221 to 172.)	No.
245	Aug. 24	Quorum call	Present.
246	Aug. 24	H.R. 10586: To recommit to committee the bill making supplemental appropriations in the amount of $1,200,000,000 for the Department of Labor, and of Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal year 1966. (Defeated 139 to 263.)	Yes.
247	Aug. 25	Quorum call	Present.
248	Aug. 25	H.R. 2580: On an amendment to the Amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 which would place a restriction of 115,000 on the number of immigrants to be admitted from the Western Hemisphere. (Defeated 189 to 218.)	Yes.
249	Aug. 25	H.R. 2580: On final passage of the bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. (Passed 318 to 95.)	Yes.
250	Aug. 26	Quorum call	Present.
251	Aug. 26	Quorum call	Present.
252	Aug. 26	H.R. 9567: On final passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965. (Passed 367 to 22.)	Yes.
253	Aug. 30	H.R. 9022: To provide for Federal assistance in the construction and operation of elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster and amend the law relative to impacted school areas. (Passed 304 to 37.)	No.
254	Aug. 31	H. Res. 551: On adoption of the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 9042, the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965. (Passed 364 to 23.)	Yes.
255	Aug. 31	H.R. 9042: On passage of the bill providing for the implementation of the agreement concerning automotive products between the United States and Canada. (Passed 280 to 113.)	Yes.
256	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Present.
257	Sept. 1	H.R. 3141: To approve the health professions educational assistance amendments including provision for Federal Scholarship grants. (Passed 340 to 47.)	No.
258	Sept. 2	Quorum call	Present.
259	Sept. 2	H.R. 5863: On passage of the bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation. (Passed 317 to 24.)	Yes.
260	Sept. 2	Quorum call	Present.
261	Sept. 7	Quorum call	Present.
262	Sept. 7	H.R. 8439: On a motion to table a motion to discharge the Committee on Armed Services from further consideration of the bill, vetoed by the President, which authorized 1966 military construction funds. (Passed 320 to 19.)	No.
263	Sept. 7	H.R. 10775: To suspend the rules and pass the bill adopted by the committee (in lieu of vetoed bill) authorizing 1966 military construction funds. (Passed 347 to 0.)	Yes.
264	Sept. 7	H.R. 168: To increase the rates for service-connected compensation for veterans. (Passed 348 to 0.)	Yes.
265	Sept. 7	S.J. Res. 102: To authorize funds in the amount of $1,500,000 for the Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and the District of Columbia Commission on Crime and Law Enforcement. (Passed 338 to 0.)	Yes.
266	Sept. 8	Quorum call	Present.
267	Sept. 8	Quorum call	Present.
268	Sept. 8	Quorum call	Present.
269	Sept. 8	H.R. 10871: To approve the $3,400,000,000 foreign aid appropriation bill. (Passed 239 to 143.)	Yes.
270	Sept. 9	Quorum call	Present.
271	Sept. 9	Quorum call	Present.
272	Sept. 13	Quorum call	Present.
273	Sept. 13	On a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House in rollcall 272. (Passed 225 to 126.)	Absent.[3]
274	Sept. 13	Quorum call	Present.

See footnotes at end of table.

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1965		
275	Sept. 13	On a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House in rollcall 274. (Passed 241 to 127.)	Absent.[2]
276	Sept. 13	Quorum call	Present.
277	Sept. 13	Quorum call	Present.
278	Sept. 13	Quorum call	Present.
279	Sept. 13	On a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House in rollcall 278. (Passed 256 to 123.)	No.
280	Sept. 13	Quorum call	Present.
281	Sept. 13	On a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House in rollcall 280. (Passed 255 to 120.)	No.
282	Sept. 13	On a motion to lay on the table the motion that the Journal be approved as read. (Defeated 138 to 244.)	Yes.
283	Sept. 13	To order the previous question on the motion to approve the Journal as read. (Passed 257 to 126.)	No.
284	Sept. 13	On the motion to approve the Journal as read. (Passed 264 to 119.)	No.
285	Sept. 13	On a motion to adjourn the House. (Defeated 175 to 204.)	Yes.
286	Sept. 13	H. Res. 506: To discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of H.R. 10065 and to make it in order to consider the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1965 with 2 hours of general debate. (Passed 259 to 121.)	Yes.
287	Sept. 13	H. Res. 506: On a motion to lay on the table a motion to reconsider the vote by which H. Res. 506 was adopted. (Defeated 193 to 181.)	No.
288	Sept. 13	On a motion to adjourn. (Defeated 173 to 201.)	Yes.
289	Sept. 13	Quorum call	Present.
290	Sept. 13	On a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House in rollcall 289. (Passed 243 to 136.)	No.
291	Sept. 13	H. Res. 499: To discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of H.R. 7371 and to make it in order to consider amendments to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 with 4 hours of general debate. (Passed 201 to 171.)	No.
292	Sept. 13	H. Res. 478: To discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of H.R. 9460 and to make it in order to consider the bill providing for the establishment of a National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities with 2 hours of general debate. (Passed 260 to 114.)	No.
293	Sept. 13	H. Res. 536: To discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of H.R. 10281 and to make it in order to consider the bill adjusting salaries of Federal employees with 4 hours of general debate. (Passed 288 to 84.)	No.
294	Sept. 14	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
295	Sept. 14	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
296	Sept. 14	H. R. 2091: To recommit to committee the bill relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by the National Park Service. (Defeated 73 to 298.)	Absent.[3]
297	Sept. 15	Quorum call	Present.
298	Sept. 15	Quorum call	Present.
299	Sept. 15	H. R. 8283: To recommit to conference committee the antipoverty bill and insisting on the retention in the bill of the veto power of State Governors in the form approved by the House. (Passed 209 to 180.)	Yes.
300	Sept. 15	Quorum call	Present.
301	Sept. 15	H. R. 9460: To recommit to committee the bill providing for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. (Defeated 128 to 251.)	Yes.
302	Sept. 16	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
303	Sept. 16	H. Res. 574: To lay on the table the resolution calling upon the Postmaster General to furnish to the House of Representatives the names of all persons employed by the Post Office as temporary employees during the summer of 1965. (Passed 186 to 180.)	Absent.[2]
304	Sept. 16	S. 2042: On passage of the bill extending authority of the Atomic Energy Commission to indemnify licensees and contractors for public liability. (Passed 337 to 30.)	Absent.[3]
305	Sept. 17	Quorum call	Present.
306	Sept. 17	H.R. 9221: To adopt the conference report on the $46,800,000,000 Department of Defense appropriation bill. (Passed 380 to 0.)	Yes.
307	Sept. 17	H. Res. 585: To adopt the resolution as amended dismissing the election contests against the seated members of the Mississippi delegation in the House of Representatives. (Passed 228 to 143.)	Yes.
308	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.
309	Sept. 20	H.R. 10873 (S. 2127): To provide life insurance for members of the Armed Forces at a cost of $2 per month for $10,000 of insurance and $1 per month for $5,000 of insurance. (Passed 360 to 0.)	Yes.
310	Sept. 20	H. Res. 560: To express the sense of Congress approving the action of the President or the Organization of American States in combating Communist subversive aggression in the Western Hemisphere. (Passed 312 to 52.)	Yes.
311	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.
312	Sept. 21	Quorum call	Present.
313	Sept. 21	S. 4: To adopt the conference report on the Water Quality Act of 1965. (Passed 379 to 0.)	Yes.
314	Sept. 22	Quorum call	Present.
315	Sept. 22	S. 2300: On a motion to delete the authorization for the Dickey-Lincoln School project, St. John River, Maine, and to provide for a survey for flood control and allied purposes of the St. John River by the Department of the Army. (Passed 207 to 185.)	Absent.[3]
316	Sept. 22	H.R. 30: To approve the bill providing for the participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and to authorize appropriations for it not to exceed $15,000,000. (Passed 254 to 113.)	Absent.[3]
317	Sept. 22	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
318	Sept. 22	On a motion to adjourn. (Defeated 89 to 204.)	Absent.[3]
319	Sept. 23	Quorum call	Present.
320	Sept. 23	H.R. 7371: To add to amendments proposed by the Committee on Banking and Currency relative to the Bank Holding Act of 1965, an amendment to forbid any company that controls a bank to own nonbanking businesses. (Passed 199 to 178.)	Absent.[3]
321	Sept. 23	H. Res. 580: To order the previous question on the adoption of the rule relative to H. R. 10232, the bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961. (Passed 279 to 70.)	Absent.[2]
322	Sept. 23	H.R. 10232: To approve the bill amending the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act with respect to loans for rural water and sanitation facilities. (Passed 325 to 10.)	Absent.[3]
323	Sept. 24	Quorum call	Present.
324	Sept. 24	S. 306: On the motion to recommit to committee the Clean Air and Solid Waste Disposal Act in order to remove from the bill title II relating to solid waste disposal. (Defeated 80 to 220.)	Yes.
325	Sept. 24	S. 306: On final passage of the Clean Air and Solid Waste Disposal Act. (Passed 294 to 4.)	Yes.
326	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
327	Sept. 27	H. Res. 515: To discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of the bill relative to home rule for the District of Columbia. (Passed 213 to 183.)	No.
328	Sept. 27	H. Res. 515: To adopt the resolution providing an open rule with 5 hours of general debate on legislation relative to home rule for the District of Columbia. (Passed 222 to 179.)	No.
329	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
330	Sept. 27	H.R. 4644: On the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for the consideration of legislation on home rule for the District of Columbia. (Passed 234 to 155.)	Yes.
331	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
332	Sept. 28	Quorum call	Present.
333	Sept. 28	Quorum call	Present.
334	Sept. 28	Quorum call	Present.
335	Sept. 29	Quorum call	Present.
336	Sept. 29	H.R. 4644: To strike out the enacting clause of the bill relating to home rule in the District of Columbia. (Defeated 179 to 219.)	No.
337	Sept. 29	H.R. 4644: To adopt the motion which in effect substituted the Sisk amendment (calling for a referendum in the District of Columbia on home rule) for the charter proposed in the Multer amendment to H.R. 4644. (Passed 227 to 174.)	No.
338	Sept. 29	H.R. 4644: On a motion to recommit to committee the District of Columbia home rule bill as amended. (Defeated 134 to 266.)	Yes.
339	Sept. 29	H.R. 4644: On passage of the District of Columbia home rule bill as amended to provide for a local referendum and for the election of a board to prepare a municipal charter (if the voters so desire) for submission to the voters and to the Congress. (Passed 283 to 117.)	Yes.
340	Sept. 30	Quorum call	Present.
341	Sept. 30	H.R. 2580: To accept the conference report on the amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, which report included a limitation of 120,000 persons per year from the Western Hemisphere. (Passed 320 to 69.)	Yes.
342	Sept. 30	H.R. 10281: On a motion to recommit to committee the Government employees pay raise bill in order to remove the provisions increasing salaries of Members of Congress, and certain top positions in the executive and judicial branches, and providing for a permanent system for establishing and maintaining these salaries. (Passed 238 to 140.)	Yes.
343	Sept. 30	H.R. 10281: On final passage of the Government employees pay raise bill, as amended, granting a 4-percent across-the-board increase. (Passed 370 to 7.)	Absent.[4]
344	Oct. 1	Quorum call	Present.
345	Oct. 1	H.J. Res. 642: To recommit to committee the bill authorizing the 3d Library of Congress building (James Madison Memorial) in order to direct the Architect of the Capitol to study the feasibility of including a visitor's center in this building or in the vicinity. (Defeated 17 to 321.)	No.
346	Oct. 1	H.J. Res. 642 (S.J. Res. 60): On final passage of the resolution to authorize construction of a 3d building for the Library of Congress to be known as the James Madison Memorial Library. (Passed 328 to 5.)	Yes.

See footnotes at end of table.

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1965		
347	Oct. 1	H.R. 10871: On a motion to recommit to conference the foreign aid appropriation bill and to insist upon the original House position that foreign aid is not to go to those nations which trade with North Vietnam. (Defeated 164 to 174.)	Yes.
348	Oct. 1	H.R. 10871: On final passage of the conference report on foreign assistance appropriations for 1966 in the amount of $3,900,000,000. (Passed 204 to 127.)	Yes.
349	Oct. 1	H.R. 3142 (S. 597): To amend Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting needs of medical library services and facilities. (Passed 296 to 3.)	Absent.[3]
350	Oct. 1	H.R. 6519: To authorize $6,000,000 toward construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis. (Passed 250 to 12.)	Absent.[3]
351	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
352	Oct. 6	Quorum call	Present.
353	Oct. 7	S.J. Res. 32: To authorize a contribution of not more than $22,000,000 to certain residents of the Ryukyu Islands for claims against the United States due to actions or omissions of the Armed Forces between Aug. 15, 1945, and Apr. 28, 1952. (Passed 312 to 55.)	Yes.
354	Oct. 7	H.R. 2020: To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project. (Passed 239 to 134.)	Yes.
355	Oct. 7	Quorum call	Present.
356	Oct. 7	S. 2084: To recommit to committee the so-called highway beautification bill in order to give the States authority to zone commercial or industrial sites in rural areas under this act. (Defeated 153 to 230.)	Yes.
357	Oct. 7	S. 2084: On final passage of the so-called highway beautification bill as amended by the House. (Passed 245 to 138.)	No.
358	Oct. 8	Quorum call	Present.
359	Oct. 8	H.R. 9811: To approve the conference report on the omnibus farm bill of 1965. (Passed 219 to 150.)	No.
360	Oct. 11	Quorum call	Present.
361	Oct. 12	Quorum call	Present.
362	Oct. 12	Quorum call	Present.
363	Oct. 12	H. Res. 598: To adopt the rule for consideration of H.R. 11135 (sugar bill) with 4 hours of general debate and the opportunity to act on 2 amendments. (Passed 253 to 80.)	Yes.
364	Oct. 12	Quorum call	Present.
365	Oct. 13	Quorum call	Present.
366	Oct. 13	H.R. 11135: To recommit to committee the sugar bill in order to provide for an import fee to obtain for the U.S. Treasury some of the profits now going to foreign sugar interests. (Defeated 160 to 230.)	Yes.
367	Oct. 13	H.R. 11135: On final passage of the sugar bill. (Passed 246 to 147.)	Yes.
368	Oct. 14	Quorum call	Present.
369	Oct. 14	H.R. 11588: On an amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill to delete $6,000,000 for the rent subsidy program. (Passed 185 to 162.)	Absent.[3]
370	Oct. 14	H.R. 11588: On final passage of the supplemental appropriation bill in the amount of $4,200,000,000. (Passed 242 to 100.)	Absent.[3]
371	Oct. 18	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
372	Oct. 19	Quorum call	Present.
373	Oct. 20	Quorum call	Present.
374	Oct. 20	Quorum call	Present.
375	Oct. 20	Quorum call	Present.
376	Oct. 20	H.R. 9567: To recommit to conference committee the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to delete that part of the bill which would establish a National Teacher Corps. (Defeated 152 to 226.)	Yes.
377	Oct. 20	H.R. 9567: On final passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965. (Passed 313 to 63.)	Yes.
378	Oct. 20	S. 2300: To approve the conference report on the Rivers and Harbors Act including the Dickey-Lincoln School project in Maine which will cost about $300,000,000 and which was deleted from the bill when it was passed originally by the House. (Passed 221 to 139.)	No.
379	Oct. 21	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
380	Oct. 21	H.R. 11588: To approve the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill for 1966. (Passed 251 to 84.)	Absent.[3]
381	Oct. 21	H.R. 11588: To accept the Senate amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill providing funds for the Dickey-Lincoln public works project in Maine. (Passed 165 to 162.)	Absent.[2]
382	Oct. 22	Quorum call	Present.
383	Oct. 22	H.R. 11135: To adopt the conference report amending and extending the Sugar Act of 1948. (Passed 174 to 88.)	Yes.

[1] Speaking engagement.
[2] If present would have voted "no."
[3] If present would have voted "yes."
[4] Personal interest; would have voted "present."

Amendment to Administrative Expenses Act of 1946

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing, by request, H.R. 11773, a bill to amend section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946—5 U.S.C. 55a—to make more uniform the employment of experts and consultants and organizations thereof by Federal agencies.

This bill is patterned after some of the recommendations made several years ago by the Bureau of the Budget following a study of the practices of the departments and agencies of the executive branch in the hiring of experts and consultants, both individuals and firms. It reflects the experience and concern of the National Society of Professional Engineers, many of whose members provide invaluable professional and technical services to the Federal Government on a consulting basis.

I am introducing the bill at this time so that it will be available for analysis and comment during the period between adjournment and the beginning of the next session.

Tribute to Col. Ralph E. Vandervort, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the retirement of Col. Ralph E. Vandervort, Jr., at the end of this month after 24 years of military service marks the close of one career and, I predict, the beginning of another which will be equally distinguished.

Bud Vandervort has been an outstanding liaison officer. He is a credit to his particular branch of the service, the U.S. Army, and to all of the services, for he typifies the finest attributes of the military. Most recently he has served with distinction in the Legislative Affairs Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Many families in Alaska are happier because Bud Vandervort was ever ready to start to work on a problem immediately when called by me or a member of my staff.

We of Alaska thank him and invite him and his family to come north to Alaska in 1967 and join us in celebrating the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia.

Devotion of Greek People to Principles of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on October 28 of this year, the people of Greece will mark a day of great significance in Greek history. Twenty-five years ago, on October 28, 1940, the Italian Ambassador to Greece presented an ultimatum to the Greek Government demanding immediate assent to Italian occupation of strategic points on Greek territory. Mussolini's Italy had already, in April 1939, occupied and then annexed the independent neighboring country of Albania. World War II had begun in September 1939, with Germany's invasion of Poland. The Greek Government, anxious not to become involved in a major world conflict, was determined to remain neutral and to protect the freedom and independence of the country at all costs.

The Italian ultimatum of October 28, 1940, was rejected with dispatch. Italian troops immediately invaded Greek territory, only to encounter fierce resistance. For the Government and the people of Greece were united in their resolve to repulse blatant and unprovoked aggression. The Greek army, under the able leadership of Alexandros Papagos, quickly drove back the Italians, and within a few months, had occupied about a quarter of Albania.

It was only with the intervention of the troops of Hitler's Germany on April 6, 1941, that the tide began to change. The Greeks, with their British allies, waged a stout resistance, but they had to yield before the overwhelming mechanized forces of the Germans. It is probable, however, that this resistance delayed the planned German offensive against Russia for some crucial weeks, and prevented an attempt to break through Turkey to the Caucasus. Although the Germans entered Athens on April 27, 1940, the heroic defense of Crete tied up German troops for another month.

Mr. Speaker, October 28 is first and foremost a day which evokes memories of Greek heroism during 1940 and 1941. But it has broader significance. For Greeks throughout the world, October 28 symbolizes the steadfast devotion of the Greek people to the principles of freedom and self-determination—freedom and self-determination for the people of Greece, freedom and self-determination for others. Mingled with the glorious memories of 1940 and 1941 are those of the long Greek struggle for independence in the 19th century and the more recent memories of the difficult but ultimately successful struggle against internal Communist subversion following World War II. It is indeed a pleasure, on this occasion, to salute a people who have never faltered in their determination to regain liberty lost and to preserve liberty won.

Mail Delivery and the Pony Express

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, while all of us applaud the great strides made by the Post Office Department in the last few years to speed the handling and delivery of mail, it seems appropriate to recall that this proud service has long stood for progress and improvement.

One of the most colorful attempts made to expedite mail in the early days of this Republic was the famed Pony Express, a horseback relay system that stretched from St. Joseph, Mo., to the capital of my home State, Sacramento. It is said that a letter leaving St. Joseph on Monday would normally arrive in Sacramento 10 days later, an astonishing feat for its time.

The Pony Express represented one of those noble experiments in our Nation's history, but it did not prove practical with the advent of improved transportation, and it was abandoned. Nevertheless, the men who carried the mail on this hazardous route remain symbols of the kind of folk heroes that made this country great.

The most recent recognition to these gallant couriers was made on film recently in my home community. The makers of the television series, "Bonanza," were responsible for this salute, a two-part story of the Pony Express, to be seen on the series sometime early next year. In telling this story, "Bonanza" is continuing its high standard as a program that combines entertainment with historical interest, all presented in a quality fashion.

The sponsor of the program, the Chevrolet Division of General Motors, deserves recognition, as well, for its support of such wholesome and rewarding entertainment. They are one of television's major sponsors, and their constant concern for upholding the ideals of family entertainment is commendable. The story of Pony Express on "Bonanza" is the latest in a long series of examples of that concern.

The Facts on Pesticides—Setting the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the persistent attacks on pesticides essential for agricultural production and for health would be ludicrous if they were not harmful and dangerous.

Already this antipesticide campaign, which began with the publication of the book, "Silent Spring," by the late Rachel Carson, has done a lot of damage and will do a lot more if it is continued.

Miss Carson was eloquent, moving, and undoubtedly sincere, but these qualities are not necessarily synonyms for accuracy. By insisting that pesticides present a tremendous threat to wildlife and human life, she did the country a disservice, and her followers are doing still more. I am sorry to say that some officials of the Government itself, including one Cabinet officer, Secretary Stewart L. Udall, of the Interior, are ignoring the evidence and repeating Miss Carson's discredited claims and conjectures.

There have been at least two thorough and objective inquiries into this whole pesticide situation since the publication of "Silent Spring" in 1962. One was conducted by the staff of the House Appropriations Committee and another by the Pesticide Residues Committee of the National Academy of Sciences.

Insofar as I know, the conclusions reached by the committee staff and the Academy of Sciences group have not been challenged. Let me state them briefly:

First. There is no case on record of injury to human beings in the United States where pesticides were used as directed by Government agencies.

Second. The theory that any threat to wildlife and man is posed by the accumulation of pesticide residue in animal fat is refuted and discredited by the scientific evidence available.

Third. Pesticides are not only essential for efficient agricultural production, they also are essential in preventing and combating disease.

Fourth. In the light of modern testing methods, the provision by the Food and Drug Administration that no pesticide residues will be permitted for certain foods, the zero tolerance provision, is impractical and unworkable. The criterion which should be used to establish tolerances for residues is that of safety.

Eventually the impact of "Silent Spring" will be more interesting to students of propaganda than it will be to anyone else. For despite the many scientific references noted in the book, it is a propaganda tract. The work is full of innuendo and half truths. Facts are distorted, and some of the conclusions border on the fantastic. Many eminent scientists and students have pointed this out. Among them are the scientists on the National Academy of Sciences Committee, and world-renowned authorities like Dr. Fredrick J. Stare, of Harvard, and Dr. William Darby, of Vanderbilt, to name only a few.

Consequently, it is both amazing and alarming to find the Carson charges repeated by Secretary Udall in a lengthy article in the magazine, True, for August 1965. In his very first paragraph the Secretary says:

> After almost 3 years of debate, Miss Carson's main hypothesis still stands unchallenged.

This "main hypothesis," was that the use of pesticides presents a grave threat to all animal life. But, as I have also pointed out, there is not one case on record of injury to human beings where pesticides were used as directed. Nor is there any evidence that they threaten injury to humans in the future.

There is, as I see it, no excuse for the misinformation which the Secretary of Interior is foisting on the public. He is discrediting himself and his Department. He is ignoring scientific evidence. Moreover, the Fish and Wildlife Service of Interior and a segment of the Public Health Service persist in issuing scare reports about pesticides which are misleading. These reports can only confuse, bewilder and, if they are taken seriously, harm everyone concerned.

Already many persons are beginning to doubt and question the authenticity of the statements about pesticides which have been issued from the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Public Health Service. For example, Secretary Udall, in his magazine article, says pesticides killed 5,175,000 fish in the lower Mississippi River during the winter of 1963–64.

Actually, the cause of the fish kill has never been definitely determined. In my opinion, the manner in which the affair was handled is a reflection on the processes of government. The Public Health Service, in an announcement on March 19, 1964, pointed to the pesticide, endrin, as the agent which killed the fish. A few days later, the Surgeon General, Dr. Luther Terry, reported that scientists at the "Taft Sanitary Engineering Center have identified the culprit responsible—infinitesmal traces of chemical pesticides draining from farmlands throughout the watershed." Challenged by Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony J. Celebrezze, backed off from the runoff theory. Later the Public Health Service said the endrin source was a plant in Memphis, Tenn.

In the True article, the Secretary of the Interior states:

> The fish kill seemed to run from Memphis, south to the Gulf of Mexico.

However, the discovery of dead fish between Memphis and Baton Rouge is quite belated since the PHS in 1964 located all of them south of Baton Rouge. Nobody could explain why, if Memphis was a source of endrin, no fish were killed by the chemical in the more than 500 miles between Memphis and Baton Rouge. Moreover, 5 million of the fish were menhaden, a salt water variety, and only one menhaden was analyzed. The staff report of the House Appropriations Committee states:

> PHS examined one menhaden, the results of which examination were inconclusive because of an insufficient sample of blood.

The staff study points out that a number of scientists and experts who were interviewed question the PHS findings, and the report stated:

> The scientists opposing the PHS findings believe that the agency's scientific data were not adequate in that the number of samples tested was insufficient.

Nevertheless, Secretary Udall in his magazine article not only blames the deaths of the 5,175,000 fish on pesticides but, by inference, blames pesticides for fish deaths dating back to 1960. Moreover, a newspaper article in the New York Herald Tribune dated August 30, 1965, stated that two PHS officials had attributed the deaths of 9.3 million fish in the lower Mississippi since 1960 to pesticides. The officials, according to the newspaper article, were A. F. Bartsch, who is stationed at Corvallis, Oreg., and William N. Ingram, at Cincinnati. The two, the Herald Tribune story said, made the charges in a report presented at a meeting in Warsaw.

In the summer of 1964 the PHS issued a press release which said scientists would investigate a new series of fish kills in the lower Mississippi River region, and pesticides were mentioned as a possible cause. The fish kills, if any took place, were insignificant, and nothing more has been heard about them.

In the spring of 1964 there were reports of a fish kill in the Missouri River between Kansas City and St. Louis. The PHS rushed investigators to the scene, and Government officials leaked stories to the press blaming pesticides. The inquiries developed that few fish had died in the first place and that the fatalities probably were due to lack of oxygen.

A steady stream of releases and statements issuing from Government sources are aimed at pesticides. In May 1964, the Washington Star reported that Congress was told by Lansing A. Parker of the Bureau of Fisheries and Wildlife that the bald eagle may be on his way out because of pesticides. The decline in grebes, ospreys, and other fish-eating birds due to reduced reproduction also was attributed, again by inference, to pesticides.

A United Press International story out of Washington in October 1964, said the whooping crane, an extremely rare species, might face a new enemy, pesticides, in its fight against extinction. The source, an announcement from the Department of the Interior, said studies showed that whooping crane eggs and two dead chicks contained pesticide residues. However, there was a contradictory and ludicrous aspect to this announcement. In the case of the whooping crane, 42 showed up last fall in the wildlife refuge in Texas where they winter, 28 more than when the count began by Fish and Wildlife 26 years ago. In these 26 years the use of pesticides has greatly increased and there are more whooping cranes. If one adopts the logic of the Fish and Wildlife Service, it could be argued that pesticides are helping preserve the birds.

On September 7 the Fish and Wildlife Service issued a report which said amazingly small amounts of pesticides were fatal to shrimps, crabs, and other aquatic life. The report did not give any instances involving substantial damage to shrimps, crabs, and oysters, but the inference is there. On September 19, 1965, the Public Health Service said a study of more than 350,000 cancer deaths in New York State over the past 25 years had been undertaken in cooperation with the New York State Department of Health to see whether pesticides may have been causative factors. The release is couched in language designed to arouse alarm and apprehension over the use of pesticides. I might point out that, if the research is no better than that which characterized the inquiry into the Mississippi River fish kill, the results will be worthless.

All these releases, statements, and articles are part of a continuing and irresponsible campaign which uses the scare techniques against pesticides and which are becoming increasingly suspect as time goes on.

Some State conservation agencies and conservation organizations have followed the lead of "Silent Spring," the Secretary of the Interior, the Fish and Wildlife Service of his Department, and the PHS. They are likely to blame any decrease in fish and wildlife on pesticides, and the impression mounts to great peril to our natural resources.

There is a curious aspect to this antipesticide campaign. There is almost overwhelming evidence that both wildlife and fish are thriving in areas where pesticides and the persistent pesticides are used in great quantities. But the pesticide foes ignore this evidence.

The reports of the Audubon Society itself indicate that birds over the country are thriving. The figures point to the conclusion that the bird population in the late 1950's, after a period of several years in which pesticides were employed in ever-rising quantity, was about double the population in the 1940's. Bird watchers reported about 2 million birds in 1940. The sample census showed approximately 37.8 million in 1961, and although the 1961 census used four times as many persons to count the birds, still the 1961 total was 19 times as great as that for 1940. Incidentally, the annual Audubon inventory is described by Allan D. Cruickshank, society official, as an accurate source of bird population trends.

Sportsmen know that pheasants thrive in Midwestern areas where chlorinated hydrocarbons have been widely used for years. I have never seen any attempt to explain this by Secretary Udall, or anyone in the Fish and Wildlife Service or PHS. The Secretary does say:

> Every day a great many hunters are eating fish and game containing residues far in excess of the legal limits allowable in domestic meats. This is a matter of grave concern, and even has given rise to the question of whether thousands of acres of prime wildlife habitat ought to be closed to hunting—a consequence no one wants to contemplate.

Once again we have a big scare technique, the inference that hunters are in danger from residues if they eat the game they have bagged. There has not been one verified instance of injury or illness to human beings through eating game which contained pesticide residues: Also it is obvious that the threat to ban hunting because of the pesticide situation is a completely empty one, for this would only call attention to the absurdity of the Secretary's claims and prejudices.

The Secretary and other pesticide foes in Government make little attempt to explain the contradiction between their assertions that pesticides are inimical to wildlife and the fluorishing state of the latter. Such an explanation would indeed be difficult. Mabry Anderson, a frequent contributor to sportsmen's magazines, pointed out in the September 1964 issue of Field & Stream that wildlife population in the Mississippi Delta has increased substantially since 1946 when, in his words, "pesticides became big business."

At a hearing in Baton Rouge in April 1964, Dr. L. D. Newsom, of the Department of Entomology at Louisiana State University, also said that wildlife in Louisiana had risen in recent years. Both Mississippi and Louisiana are

States where the chlorinated hydrocarbons are extensively used. Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, of Mississippi, chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, said in a speech in the House on September 30, 1964:

> In connection with the theory that pesticides accumulate threateningly in the water and soil, I went hunting not long ago in Mississippi for doves. We hunted in an area where pesticides, the chlorinated hydrocarbons, had been used in large quantities for years and years. Yet game was plentiful, so plentiful that the hundreds of hunters got the overall limit, 12, in a very few hours.
>
> The Mississippi Delta, or a large portion of it, is in my district. Pesticides, the persistent kind, have been used to literally drench much of the delta for years in order to protect crops. Nevertheless, fish and game flourish and thrive. Moreover, my constituents of the area are vigorous and healthy. Their life span, like that of the people of the Nation, has risen sharply since the use of DDT eliminated the malarial mosquito and the disease itself. In addition to the scientific evidence, the evidence of commonsense is against the present charges.

In view of the releases issuing from the Fish and Wildlife Service, there is some amazing testimony in the record of the House Appropriations Committee hearings. On January 30, 1964, this bureau formally asked over $600,000 to help combat bird depredations. The presentation stated:

> We request of the Congress the sum of $639,000 for fiscal year 1965 to deal with the problem of too many birds.
>
> We have 47 projects to deal with this problem along with that of rodents. Animal damage problems are becoming more acute as human population increases, and bird depredations to agriculture crops are serious in many parts of the country owing to the change in agricultural technology.
>
> Last winter 227 starling-blackbird roosts were located which contained an estimated 204 million birds. Eighty of the roost contained a million or more birds each.

The majority of the birds were in the Arkansas-Mississippi ricegrowing region, the area of perhaps the greatest concentration of pesticide use in the Nation.

When one takes into account the view of the Fish and Wildlife Service that pesticides constitute a definite threat to birds, the request for money to combat the damage done by too many birds in a section where pesticides, including the chlorinated hydrocarbons, are heavily employed, is quite startling.

Offhand, it would seem that the Department of the Interior is going out of its way to make itself ridiculous. On the one hand, it solemnly issues warnings that pesticide residues may be exterminating the bald eagle, ospreys, the whooping crane, and so on, and on the other, it solemnly goes to Congress to ask for money to combat the millions of birds which are eating rice and other grain in a section where chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides—the great bugaboo of the Department of the Interior—are used more widely than in almost any other part of the country.

There is no question that pesticides are toxic. If they did not poison insects, they would be valueless. The chlorinated hydrocarbons are not only poisonous to insects; they linger in the soil and they continue to kill insect pests. The chlorinated hydrocarbons account for about two-thirds of the pesticides used for agricultural production, and about three-fourths of the pesticides used. Today, ironically enough, many a woman gardener who subscribes to Rachel Carson's views on pesticides uses the persistent pesticides generously in combating insect ravages on her flowers, shrubs, and grass.

Emphasis on the toxicity of pesticides and references to the fact that we are spraying poisons over the land are misleading and mischievous. Almost every drug and food, if overdosed, can kill. One must take into consideration the dose of pesticides and the precautions surrounding their uses, precautions which are extensive and thorough. Every pesticide in use today has been tested over and over. The safety margin in every instance is wide. The Food and Drug Administration itself issued a press release on April 9, 1965, which said:

> Pesticide residues are detectable in the American food supply by today's highly sensitive analytical methods, but the amounts of such residues are insignificant from a health standpoint, according to findings announced today by the Food and Drug Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

When we go beyond the probable and get into the theoretical, which has been done in the case of pesticides, we leave the port of commonsense and sail into a dangerous and uncharted sea. Many fantastic things are theoretically possible. One cannot prove definitely that the most wholesome foods and the strictest health measures actually will not turn out in the end to be injurious. All the evidence points the other way, but still almost any wild assertion can be made about cause and effect and no positive proof against it can be presented. Already action against pesticides has gone beyond the probable, and some of the ill effects are apparent. Let me name a few of them:

First. A ban on the use of the chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides on forest lands has intensified insect damage which will mount unless the restrictions are removed.

Second. Milk in several States has been dumped because traces of pesticide residue were found, although no question of health was involved. Today almost all milk produced is in violation of the law as interpreted by the Food and Drug Administration, although once again there is every indication that the food is completely wholesome. Congress already has appropriated approximately $8 million to compensate dairymen for the damage inflicted.

Third. Restrictions on the use of pesticides have resulted in damage to potatoes in Idaho and in the Northeast, and other damage to producers by interfering with normal crop rotation.

Fourth. The ban on heptachlor and dieldrin on pasture lands has intensified the ravages of the alfalfa weevil and other pests.

Fifth. The attacks on pesticides makes the problem of world hunger, the biggest problem aside from the threat of nuclear war, more difficult to solve. Pesticides, including the chlorinated hydrocarbons, are indispensable to modern agriculture, and farming methods must be drastically improved in many of the underdeveloped and overpopulated countries if famine is to be averted.

Sixth. Because of the persistent assault on pesticides, and in particular the chlorinated hydrocarbons, manufacturers have cut back on the research necessary to develop new chemicals. The effort to deal more effectively with destructive insects has been hampered, as have been efforts to combat insects which have become resistant to pesticides which once destroyed them.

The milk situation today furnishes a good example of bureaucratic bungling and also an almost contemptuous disregard of the welfare of agriculture by Government agencies.

Alfalfa is used extensively for feeding dairy cattle in Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia and in some other States. In these States, the persistent pesticides, heptachlor and dieldrin, have been used against the alfalfa weevil. The Food and Drug Administration says no pesticide residues will be permitted in milk, although there are some paradoxes here which I will point out later. In 1964, the U.S. Department of Agriculture permitted the use of heptachlor and dieldrin on alfalfa on the theory that cows fed the cured hay would have no chemical traces in their milk. This theory was correct so long as FDA used the old methods of testing, but new and more sensitive methods were devleoped. With these the residues could be found. Furthermore, FDA began using the new testing methods without notifying the Department of Agriculture, much less the dairy farmers.

In January 1964, FDA found heptachlor expoxcide and dieldrin in milk in Maryland and reported the presence of the residues to Baltimore officials, and the poor farmers were in for it. FDA also notified the District of Columbia Department of Health that pesticide residues had been found in milk destined for the District. Before the furor was over, the permits of 34 farmers to sell milk were suspended. The agitation spread and milk began to be condemned in other States, including some of the leading dairy States.

Then a curious and alarming development—alarming even to the bureaucrats—developed. Using the new testing methods, almost all milk contained traces of residues, and FDA had to reverse itself in quick order, otherwise, almost all milk would have to be kept off the market. A nationwide catastrophe impended if FDA went through with its strict interpretation of the law. Quietly, I am told, FDA violated its own regulations by passing the word that, if the milk contained no more than a certain amount of pesticide residues, nothing could be done about the situation. The

FDA's excuse for violating its own regulations was, I am informed, that it would be difficult to make milk condemnation stand up in court with anything less than its new and quickly established tolerances.

But what about the dairymen who had their milk condemned and their operations halted? Obviously they were not at fault. They obeyed the rules, but while the game was in progress the rules were changed. I might compare the change to a baseball umpire's decision that two strikes are out, and that three balls constitute a walk. No baseball umpire could get away with rule-changing in the middle of a game, but the Food and Drug Administration did.

As I have stated, the Congress voted some $8 million to compensate dairymen who suffered damage, but I doubt that cash could make up for the disruption and uncertainty which followed the ukase that they could no longer sell milk.

It is certain, according to Secretary Udall himself, that it did not in one instance. The Secretary of the Interior tells the tragic story of Allan Sandvig, a dairy farmer near Wapato, Wash., in his article in True. After commenting that "few organisms, plant or animal, are totally free of the—pesticide—residues," Mr. Udall continues:

> One man who learned these hard facts well is Allan Sandvig, a dairy farmer near Wapato, Wash. Starting in 1946 with $976 saved during a hitch in the Navy, he bought 10 heifers to start a dairy herd. Scrimping and saving, he gradually put together a remarkable herd of 100 milking Holsteins, delivering 3,200 pounds a day of grade A milk. Sandvig was voted "Dairyman of the Year" in Yakima County, Wash.

The Secretary's article continues that in October 1963, State milk inspectors refused to pass Sandvig's milk, alleging that it contained 20 parts per million of DDT, commenting that only 7 parts per million of DDT are permitted in foods such as grapefruit, meat, and apples and "no DDT at all—zero tolerance—is allowed in milk, for the simple reason that milk is the prime food of babies." Sandvig, the dairyman who had worked himself up literally by his bootstraps, could not even feed the milk to hogs or other animals destined for slaughter, for this might have resulted in the meat having more than 7 parts per million of DDT in its tissues.

Secretary Udall writes that the source of the DDT was found in some sweet corn silage which the unlucky Sandvig had bought from a neighbor. The article by Secretary Udall relates the struggle of Allan Sandvig to recover from the blow dealt him. There is poignancy in his story:

> He (Sandvig) tried everything to reduce the DDT levels in the milk, including special diet and chemical treatments. These were somewhat effective, but painfully slow. A year after the pesticide disaster he was able to get the last of the contaminated cows back into production. He now milks 50 head, half of them from his old herd, half new ones. His production is only half what it had formerly been, and his loss is estimated at $80,000. He and his family are understandably disheartened. "We are back where we started 17 years ago," he says, "pinching nickels and dimes."

The Sandvig story, I take it, is intended by Secretary Udall to dramatize what can happen through the use of poisonous pesticides. There is an element of drama in the tale, all right, and an element of horror also, the latter being the things which happened to an upright citizen through no fault of his own. One must take into account the fact that the inspectors banned Sandvig's milk in 1963 after the country had become familiar with the lurid tales which characterize Miss Carson's book and its inferences that pesticides are poisoning the water, the land, and even the air.

Allan Sandvig, according to Mr. Udall, is still hard pressed, and through no fault of his own. There has never been any evidence whatever, nor even any claim, that his milk or any other milk kept off the market involved any threat to health.

I have already stated that, with pesticide residues found in almost every gallon of milk, the Food and Drug Administration itself is ignoring the law. Consequently, it is a pity that the milk inspectors in Washington did not do some investigating of their own before they ruined a hard working and upstanding citizen. Had they looked into the matter they would have found, for example, that Dr. Wayland J. Hayes of the U.S. Public Health Service had done an extensive series of experiments into the effects of DDT on human beings. These took place in 1956 and 1958, several years before the publication of "Silent Spring" and several years before the descent of the bureaucrats upon Allan Sandvig and his dairy farm.

In brief, by feeding convict volunteers daily up to 200 times the normal amount of DDT found in the average man's diet, Dr. Hayes determined that men achieved maximum storage of DDT in about a year and thereafter stored no more of the material despite continued intake. During the entire study, no volunteer complained of any symptom or showed by the tests used any sign of illness that would not have an easily recognizable cause clearly unrelated to exposure to DDT. Dr. Hayes concluded that the storage of DDT in man is proportional to the dose. The convict volunteers were just as healthy as another group of convict volunteers who were fed a diet which contained no DDT.

Before the so-called Ribicoff hearing, a hearing into the pesticide situation conducted by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, Dr. Hayes put into the record data which stated that the average storage of DDT in human tissue is about five parts per million. He also pointed out that experiments had shown that men could consume DDT daily at a level 200 times greater than the amount consumed in the ordinary diet without ill effects.

The Hayes experiments are corroborated by a study under the auspices of the Chicago Board of Health which concluded there had been no increase of DDT in human tissue since 1951.

Offhand, it might seem that the $8 million appropriated to pay dairymen whose milk was banned from sale would take care of Allan Sandvig. But no, he is most definitely out of luck because the program applies only to milk prohibited from commercial sale after January 1, 1964, and the inspectors swooped down on him in October 1963. He will apparently just have to struggle. The way things are going, he may get on his feet some years hence just in time to be wiped out again by the zeal of Federal or State employees stimulated by the publication of another "Silent Spring."

I have pointed out that the report of the National Academy of Sciences blasted zero tolerance, and the staff report of the House Appropriations Committee throws further light on this subject. The staff report said:

> For example, the tolerance for any pesticide in cows' milk shipped in interstate commerce is zero. The scientists advised that no milk available on the market today, in any part of the United States, is free of pesticide residues and it is scientifically impossible to guarantee that any product is absolutely free of some pesticide, as it is only possible to state that a product does or does not contain more than a certain proportion of a pesticide.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Representatives of AMA (American Medical Association) stated that there is no medical reason for singling out cows' milk as an agricultural product for which pesticide residues are not permitted. They stated that babies who are bottle fed with cows' milk are, nowadays, put on a diet containing other foods when they are still very young, and these foods often include processed baby foods for which finite limits for content of pesticide residues have been set under FDA regulations. Therefore, the baby is not permitted to ingest pesticide residues when he is fed cows' milk, but he may take them in other foods.
>
> In contrast to bottle-fed babies receiving cows' milk, breast-fed babies are ingesting pesticide residues contained in the mother's milk because she ingests foods that legally contain pesticide resides. Studies were made by PHS at the Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati, Ohio, and by the Bureau of Occupational Health, State of California, Berkeley, Calif., in which it was determined that samples of mothers' milk contained amounts of pesticide residues far in excess of the pesticide residues permitted by FDA in cows' milk. Further, the study concluded that there were no ill effects on the babies as a result of the pesticide residue in the mothers' milk.
>
> Further examples of such inconsistency in FDA regulations can be illustrated by the following:
>
> 1. Beverages such as juices, beer, and wine prepared from fruit and vegetable sources may contain a finite amount of pesticide residues—but cows' milk may not.
> 2. Beef may contain finite amounts of pesticide residues—but cows' milk may not.
> 3. Margarine and vegetable oils may contain finite amounts of pesticide residues—but butter may not.
> 4. Ice cream containing fresh fruits such as strawberries, cherries, and butter pecans may contain finite amounts of pesticide residues—but vanilla ice cream may not.

We have, then, a ridiculous and contradictory state of affairs. Babies are permitted to absorb pesticide residues from mothers' milk and from other sources, and yet, as Allan Sandvig and other dairymen know, the discovery of pesticide traces in milk can result in a ban on milk sales and grave injury, if not ruin, to the farmers involved. Some ice cream may contain pesticide residues; other may not, and so on.

There have been a whole series of incidents involving the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, FDA, and farmers in which the latter have fared badly indeed. Back in 1959 an alarming release about pesticide residues on cranberries came around Thanksgiving time and virtually destroyed the holiday market, and actually did the cranberry industry damage for a long, long time. Eventually the Government, the taxpayers, paid out about $8.5 million to cranberry producers to compensate for the damage done by overzealous bureaucrats. There have been other similar incidents affecting fruits, vegetables, and cheese. All this hurts, not only the individual farmer and farmers affected, but it hurts the foods affected by arousing public fear that their consumption will prove harmful. I agree that adequate safeguards must surround the use of pesticides. I am in disagreement with excessive zeal, with publicity-seeking officials, and with Government officials and agencies whose prejudices are guiding their attitudes and actions.

The pesticide residues committee of the National Academy of Sciences made a number of recommendations about the use of pesticides. All seem to be constructive, and one is particularly so. It says:

> A pesticide should be registered on the basis of either "negligible residue" or "permissible residue," depending on whether its use results in the intake of a negligible or permissible fraction of the maximum acceptable daily intake as determined by appropriate safety studies.

This is sensible and reasonable. We should establish tolerances to pesticides on the basis of safety factors as we know them. We must not burden agriculture with the unknown if we expect to maintain an abundant and nutritious food supply. We should not ban pesticides on supposition if we expect to deal adequately with serious diseases.

Another recommendation is for an expanded research program on the persistence of pesticides in the total environment, and with that I am in hearty accord. Already some $30 million has been appropriated for studies and for the development of better means of pesticide control.

We need, however, reliable and accurate information, and we are not getting it from some Government agencies. Instead we are getting antipesticide propaganda. Many officials seem to have read and reread "Silent Spring" as a devout person might read the Bible. The frantic attempt to connect pesticides with the vicissitudes of nature, and on very flimsy evidence, is doing a great disservice.

I would like to remind some of the bureaucrats who are agitated over the fact that some fish may have been killed by pesticides that over 10,000 persons die every day of hunger. If the choice is between the life of a catfish and the life of a baby, I for one will sacrifice the catfish.

The world's biggest problem, aside perhaps from the threat of all out nuclear war, is famine. There are approximately 3 billion people in the world today, and about half of them suffer from malnutrition and undernourishment. Moreover, population is increasing much faster than the food supply. As Senator Gruening, of Alaska, so aptly put the matter in a Senate speech in 1963:

> Two grim specters beckon mankind toward oblivion today. One offers instant and wholesale death by nuclear means. The alternative guarantees eventual starvation when the human population exceeds the food supply.

Our marvelous agricultural efficiency must be used more and more to deal with the world scarcity of food. Our immediate problem is surpluses, but we are going to be called upon more and more to help tide over the hungry areas and also to help upgrade their agriculture. A modern agriculture without pesticides, including the persistent pesticides, is impossible. The chlorinated hydrocarbons are the most widely used and are the most effective against pests in many circumstances. Secretary Udall, in the True article proposes a ban on the chlorinated hydrocarbons, but the case against them has not been made and the evidence for them is steadily accumulating. To prohibit their use on the basis of what amounts to superstition would be a catastrophe to agriculture, a disaster for the consumer and, in view of the world food situation, a calamity to the human race.

I suggest that our pesticide foes must concern themselves with human beings and their welfare. If they do, their unreasonable attacks on pesticides will cease. They will ask only that precautions be taken to forfend any ill effects from their use.

Not only are pesticides essential to an efficient agriculture, they are essential from a health standpoint. The foes of DDT and dieldrin never mention the fact that these two chemicals have eliminated malaria, once the foremost scrouge of mankind, from this country and are helping curb it in many areas of the world. They are helping to curb other diseases also.

For the life of me I cannot understand the overweening concern with pesticides by our Government agencies when there are some very real problems under their very noses. It actually seems like a psychosis. Unquestionably our air is getting dirtier, and so are our streams, and very little of this infection comes from pesticide plants. The carnage on our highways is dreadful, and the lack of good water is plaguing more and more communities. In most of our cities, including the Capital of the Nation, our streets are not safe. Crime costs thousands of lives and billions of dollars every year. But the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Public Health Service cannot take their minds off pesticides, although there is no evidence of injury whatever to human beings from their judicious use, and very little of injury to anything else.

I am surprised that Orville Freeman, the Secretary of Agriculture, has been so silent in the face of this situation, which fundamentally constitutes an attack on agriculture. An attempt is being made to take away some of the tools which enable farmers to be the most efficient producers the world has ever seen and to give us the cheapest food supply in the world, comparatively speaking. I think the Secretary of Agriculture has been remiss. I think he is allowing farmers to be kicked around without defending them. He too seems to be listening to the echoes from "Silent Spring."

Most politicians know that only 7 percent of our population today is rural and that 93 percent is urban. Consequently, they are disposed to give agriculture and its problems very little attention. But Mr. Freeman knows, or should know, agriculture. He knows that over 7 million workers are employed directly in agriculture, more than in the automobile, transportation, public utilities, and steel industries combined. Farmers spend more than $40 billion each year. Their purchasing power is a tremendous factor in national prosperity and stability. The efficiency of our agriculture also is a reproach to the inefficiency of Communist agriculture and constitutes the most dramatic difference between our two systems.

Secretary Orville Freeman should tell his fellow Secretary, Stewart L. Udall, some of the basic facts of life. It would help them both.

Most of the hearings and inquiries held thus far, including congressional inquiries, have been directed against pesticides. The latter have been on trial. The pesticide industry which makes a tremendous and valuable contribution to our economy has been harassed. I am told that many companies, in view of the situation, have cut back on pesticide research which is badly needed. The damage done annually by destructive insects in this country is estimated at around $4 billion which sum, in the last analysis, must be paid by the consumers. More and more insects become resistant to the pesticides now in use and new chemicals are needed to deal with them, and new chemicals are needed to augment and improve those now in use.

I think it is time this whole matter should be looked into from a broad and objective standpoint. I have become convinced that, properly used, pesticides pose no health threat, either to human beings, or to fish and wildlife.

In the words of the report of the Pesticide Residues Committee of the National Academy of Sciences:

> Although it is recognized that some pesticide chemicals are more toxic than others to warm blooded animals, and that their use requires greater restriction to protect the public health, the committee believes that their valuable properties can be utilized without exposing people, domestic animals, fish, or wildlife to undue risk.

Report to the People of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin—XIX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin on my voting and attendance record for the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

The report includes all rollcall votes. Its purpose is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through 27,330 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The description of the bills and the amendments or motions in the report are for purposes of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. This word of caution is advisable in view of the fact that the descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bills which, unfortunately, do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill, as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my vote.

The furnishing of this report continues a service I began in the 1st session of the 80th Congress. This is the 19th report of my voting and attendance record. These 19 reports show how I voted on 2,478 questions in the House of Representatives. Based on quorum calls and the record votes, they also show an attendance record of 93 percent.

In addition to the votes shown in this report, there were 182 quorum calls in the House which are omitted to conserve space. This accounts for the nonconsecutive numbering of the rollcalls. I answered "present" to 175 quorum calls, and I was absent for 7 quorum calls.

89th Cong., 1st sess.

Roll-call No.	Date 1965	Measure, question, and result	Vote
2	Jan. 4	Election of Speaker. (McCormack 289, Gerald R. Ford 139.)	Ford.
		H. Res. 1, authorizing seating of Mississippi delegation:	
3	Jan. 4	On ordering previous question (ending debate). (Agreed to 276 to 149.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 8, adopting the rules of House with an amendment giving additional authority to Speaker:	
4	Jan. 4	On ordering previous question (ending debate). (Agreed to 224 to 202.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 126, dismissing contest of election of Representative Ottinger of New York:	
6	Jan. 19	On resolution. (Adopted 245 to 102.)	Nay.
		H.J. Res. 234, making supplemental appropriations for Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1965:	
7	Jan. 26	On motion to recommit with instructions to bar export of farm commodities to United Arab Republic. (Adopted 204 to 177.)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 234, making supplemental appropriations for Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1965:	
10	Feb. 8	On motion to instruct House conferees to disagree to Senate amendment allowing aid to United Arab Republic at President's discretion. (Rejected 165 to 241.)	Yea.
		H.R. 3818, eliminating 25 percent gold cover in Federal Reserve banks:	
12	Feb. 9	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 93 to 289.)	Not voting.[1]
13	Feb. 9	On passage. (Passed 300 to 82.)	Not voting.[2]
		H.R. 2998, extending Arms Control and Disarmament Agency:	
16	Feb. 17	On passage. (Passed 302 to 63.)	Yea.
		H.R. 45, increasing U.S. participation in the Inter-American Development Bank:	
19	Feb. 18	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce funds from $750,000,000 to $725,000,000. (Rejected 142 to 237.)	Yea.
20	Feb. 18	On passage. (Passed 288 to 93.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 188, providing funds for expenses of Committee on Un-American Activities:	
23	Feb. 25	On motion to recommit to Committee on House Administration with instructions to hold hearings. (Rejected 58 to 333.)	Nay.
24	Feb. 25	On resolution. (Agreed to 360 to 29.)	Yea.
		S. 3, authorizing $1,092,400,000 for public works and development programs in the Appalachian region:	
28	Mar. 3	On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute bill authorizing $995,000,000 for 2-year economic development program for all depressed areas in United States. (Rejected 100 to 323.)	Yea.
29	Mar. 3	On passage. (Passed 257 to 165.)	Nay.
		H.R. 2, expanding Federal controls over depressant and stimulant drugs:	
31	Mar. 10	On passage. (Passed 402 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 4714, authorizing annual appropriations of $150,000 for National Council on the Arts:	
33	Mar. 15	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 217 to 113, a ⅔ majority being required.)	Nay.
		H.R. 5505, establishing standards for congressional districts:	
35	Mar. 16	On amendment permitting at-large elections of Representatives. (Rejected 147 to 255.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 276, providing for consideration of H.R. 5374, Supreme Court pay bill:	
38	Mar. 17	On resolution. (Agreed to 202 to 183.)	Yea.
		H.R. 5374, restoring the differential between Supreme Court and lower court salaries existing prior to 1964 Federal pay bill:	
39	Mar. 17	On passage. (Rejected 178 to 202.)	Yea.
		H.R. 5688, amending crime laws of District of Columbia:	
42	Mar. 22	On motion to recommit with instructions to hold hearings. (Rejected 166 to 216.)	Nay.
43	Mar. 22	On passage. (Passed 250 to 131.)	Yea.
		H.R. 5721, providing for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco:	
45	Mar. 23	On passage. (Passed 206 to 170.)	Nay.
		Motion to approve House Journal without further reading:	
51	Mar. 26	On ordering previous question (ending debate) on motion. (Agreed to 274 to 119.)	Nay.
		H.R. 2362, providing grants to States for elementary and secondary education:	
52	Mar. 26	On motion to recommit with instructions to change formula so that the grant for each child from low-income families would be equal. (Rejected 149 to 267.)	Yea.
53	Mar. 26	On passage. (Passed 263 to 153.)	Nay.
		H.R. 3708, Older Americans Act of 1965, providing for development of programs for the aging:	
57	Mar. 31	On passage. (Passed 396 to 1.)	Not voting.[2]
		H.R. 1111, Water Resources Planning Act, authorizing funds for Federal-State water resources development programs:	
58	Mar. 31	On passage. (Passed 384 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 4257, extending and expanding Manpower Development and Training Act programs:	
60	Apr. 1	On passage. (Passed 395 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 980, providing for return of obscene mail matter:	
62	Apr. 5	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 360 to 21.)	Not voting.[2]
		H.R. 7064, authorizing construction of U.S. Embassy building in Saigon, South Vietnam:	
63	Apr. 5	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 378 to 0.)	Not voting [2]
		H.R. 7060, making appropriations for Treasury and Post Office Departments, Executive Office of the President, and 4 independent agencies:	
64	Apr. 5	On passage. (Passed 347 to 7.)	Not voting.[2]
		H.R. 7091, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1965 including $344,328,000 for Appalachia programs to be available beyond fiscal 1965 but to be charged against 1965 authorization:	
66	Apr. 6	On passage. (Passed 348 to 62.)	Nay.
		H.R. 6675, Social Security Amendments of 1965, increasing social security benefits and taxes, and providing medical care benefits for aged:	
70	Apr. 8	On Byrnes motion to recommit with instructions to substitute Byrnes bill, H.R. 7057, providing a voluntary, comprehensive health insurance program for the aged financed by general revenue and contributions from participants. (Rejected 191 to 236.)	Yea.
71	Apr. 8	On passage. (Passed 313 to 115.)	Nay.
		H.R. 2998, authorizing appropriations for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency:	
72	Apr. 13	On conference report. (Agreed to 316 to 65.)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 1, proposing a constitutional amendment relating to Presidential inability and succession:	
74	Apr. 13	On passage. (Passed 368 to 29.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 310, authorizing $50,000 for investigation of Ku Klux Klan by Committee on Un-American Activities:	
76	Apr. 14	On resolution. (Agreed to 313 to 43)	Yea.
		H.R. 6497, authorizing increase of $1,000,000,000 in the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund:	
78	Apr. 27	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 113 to 275.)	Yea.
79	Apr. 27	On passage. (Passed 301 to 88.)	Yea.
		S. 4, Water Quality Act, expanding Federal assistance for water pollution control:	
82	Apr. 28	On passage. (Passed 396 to 0.)	Yea.

See footnotes at end of table.

89th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1965	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 7091, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1965:	
84	Apr. 29	On conference report $109,000,000 higher than House-approved bill and including Appalachia funds for use beyond fiscal 1965 but to be charged to 1965 authorization. (Agreed to 316 to 55.)	Nay.
85	Apr. 29	On motion that House concur with Senate amendment adding funds for helicopter subsidies in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. (Rejected 114 to 228.)	Yea.
		H.R. 4714, authorizing annual appropriations of $150,000 for National Council on the Arts:	
86	Apr. 29	On passage. (Passed 239 to 116.)	Yea.
		H.R. 2986, extending and amending certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act:	
87	May 3	On passage. (Passed 347 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 2985, authorizing Federal grants for initial cost of professional and technical personnel for community mental health centers:	
90	May 4	On passage. (Passed 389 to 0)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 447, providing $700,000,000 in fiscal 1965 supplemental appropriations for U.S. military operations in southeast Asia:	
92	May 5	On passage. (Passed 408 to 7.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7657, authorizing $15,300,000,000 for military equipment procurement and research:	
94	May 5	On passage. (Passed 396 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 366, providing for consideration of H.R. 7717, National Aeronautics and Space Administration:	
96	May 6	On resolution. (Agreed to 389 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7717, authorizing fiscal 1966 appropriations for National Aeronautics and Space Administration:	
97	May 6	On passage. (Passed 389 to 11.)	Yea.
		H.R. 2984, extending and expanding Federal grants for construction of health research facilities:	
99	May 10	On passage. (Passed 334 to 4.)	Yea.
		S. 701, implementing the International Coffee Agreement of 1962:	
101	May 12	On passage. (Passed 300 to 97.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8122, authorizing $2,555,521,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission in fiscal 1966:	
104	May 20	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete authority for cooperative arrangement establishing a nuclear reactor. (Rejected 43 to 313.)	Nay.
105	May 20	On passage. (Passed 352 to 1.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7750, authorizing appropriations for foreign aid in fiscal 1966:	
109	May 25	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce development funds by $131,000,000 and stipulate that labor unions participating in Latin American housing projects be "non-Communist dominated." (Rejected 178 to 219.)	Yea.
110	May 25	On passage. (Passed 249 to 148.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8370, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1966:	
112	May 26	On motion to recommit with instructions to bar use of any funds to finance export of farm commodities to United Arab Republic or Indonesia. (Rejected 187 to 208.)	Yea.
113	May 26	On passage. (Passed 354 to 41.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8639, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary:	
116	June 1	On passage. (Passed 332 to 60.)	Yea.
		H.R. 3584, extending Federal inspection and safety requirements to small coal mines:	
117	June 1	On passage. (Passed 336 to 42.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8371, reducing Federal excise taxes:	
119	June 2	On passage. (Passed 401 to 6.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7777, authorizing appointment of Gen. William F. McKee as FAA Administrator without affecting his status as retired Air Force officer:	
121	June 3	On passage. (Passed 228 to 137.)	Yea.
		H.R. 3157, permitting spouses of railroad employees to receive both railroad retirement and earned social security benefits:	
123	June 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 323 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8775, making appropriations for the legislative branch for fiscal 1966:	
126	June 8	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete funds to provide operators for automatic elevators. (Rejected 149 to 244.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7105, amending and extending the Export Control Act:	
127	June 8	On passage. (Passed 388 to 1.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 413, providing for consideration of H.R. 8464, increasing the temporary national debt limit:	
129	June 9	On ordering previous question (ending debate). (Agreed to 273 to 109.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8464, increasing the temporary national debt limit:	
130	June 9	On passage. (Passed 229 to 165.)	Yea.
		H. Con. Res. 285, suspending the rule against USIA domestic propaganda so that President Kennedy film could be distributed in United States:	
131	June 9	On amendment requiring that the film be shown without charge. (Rejected 174 to 216.)	Yea.
132	June 9	On resolution. (Agreed to 311 to 75.)	Nay.
		H.R. 6927, establishing a Department of Housing and Urban Development:	
141	June 16	On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute bill establishing an Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development in the Executive Office of the President. (Rejected 141 to 259.)	Yea.
142	June 16	On passage. (Passed 217 to 184.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 416, providing funds for each Representative to hire a student intern:	
143	June 16	On resolution. (Agreed to 229 to 153.)	Nay.
		H.R. 7743, providing loans and loan insurance for students attending vocational schools:	
145	June 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 300 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8620, providing price support payments for wheat, feed grain and cotton growers affected by 1965 floods and other natural disasters:	
146	June 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 297 to 2)	Yea.
		H. Con. Res. 416, requesting the President to direct attention of United Nations and others to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania:	
147	June 21	On motion to suspend rules and agree to resolution. (Agreed to 298 to 0)	Not voting.[illegible]
		H.R. 9221, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1966:	
153	June 23	On passage. (Passed 407 to 0)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 541, extending the Area Redevelopment Act for 2 months:	
155	June 24	On passage. (Passed 224 to 167)	Nay.
		H. Res. 425, providing for consideration of H.R. 7984, providing rent subsidies and expanding public housing, urban renewal, and community facilities programs:	
157	June 28	On resolution. (Agreed to 230 to 115)	Nay.
		H.R. 7984, providing rent subsidies and expanding public housing, urban renewal, and community facilities programs:	
162	June 30	On amendment modifying rent subsidy provisions. (Adopted 240 to 179.)	Nay.
163	June 30	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete rent subsidies and other provisions. (Rejected 202 to 208.)	Yea.
164	June 30	On passage. (Passed 245 to 169.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 440, providing for consideration of H.R. 6400, Voting Rights Act of 1965:	
167	July 6	On resolution. (Agreed to 308 to 58.)	Yea.
		H.R. 6400, Voting Rights Act of 1965:	
175	July 9	On amendment providing penalties for falsifying voting or registration information or buying votes in Federal elections. (Adopted 253 to 165)	Yea.
176	July 9	On amendment allowing political subdivisions with more than 50 percent of voting age Negroes registered to free themselves from coverage. (Rejected 155 to 262.)	Nay.
177	July 9	On amendment waiving English literacy requirements. (Rejected 202 to 216.)	Nay.
178	July 9	On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute more comprehensive bill. (Rejected 171 to 248.)	Yea.
179	July 9	On passage. (Passed 33 to 85.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8856, permitting the Atomic Energy Commission to condemn land for overhead power transmission lines notwithstanding local ordinances prohibiting overhead lines:	
181	July 12	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 216 to 139, a ⅔ majority being required.)	Nay.
		H.R. 242, requiring Government summer jobs in Washington, D.C., to be apportioned among residents of all States:	
183	July 12	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 336 to 22.)	Yea.
		S. 559, requiring warning labels on cigarette packages:	
185	July 13	On conference report. (Agreed to 285 to 103.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8926, removing silver from coinage except for 40 percent in half dollars:	
188	July 14	On amendment retaining 40 percent silver in dimes and quarters. (Rejected 187 to 218.)	Yea.
189	July 14	On passage. (Passed 255 to 151.)	Nay.
		H.R. 9075, increasing military pay:	
193	July 20	On passage. (Passed 410 to 0.)	Yea.

See footnotes at end of table.

89th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1965	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 8283, authorizing increase in "poverty" program funds to $1,900,000,000 in fiscal 1966:	
196	July 22	On motion to recommit with instructions to maintain Governors' veto and fiscal 1965 level of spending ($947,500,000). (Rejected 178 to 227.)	Yea.
197	July 22	On passage. (Passed 245 to 158.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 437, providing for consideration of H.R. 77, repealing sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act permitting State right-to-work laws, under procedure bypassing Rules Committee:	
199	July 26	On ordering previous question (ending debate). (Agreed to 248 to 171)	Nay.
		H.R. 6675, Social Security Amendments of 1965, increasing social security benefits and providing medical care benefits to the aged:	
203	July 27	On conference report. (Agreed to 307 to 116.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7984, providing rent subsidies and expanding public housing, urban renewal, and community facilities programs:	
204	July 27	On conference report. (Agreed to 251 to 168.)	Nay.
		H.R. 2985, authorizing Federal-grants for initial cost of professional and technical personnel for community mental health centers:	
205	July 27	On conference report. (Agreed to 414 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 77, repealing sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act permitting State right-to-work laws:	
208	July 28	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 200 to 223.)	Yea.
209	July 28	On passage. (Passed 221 to 203.)	Nay.
		H.R. 8856, permitting the Atomic Energy Commission to condemn land for overhead power transmission lines notwithstanding local ordinances prohibiting overhead lines:	
212	July 29	On passage. (Passed 275 to 125.)	Nay.
		S.J. Res. 81, authorizing increase in funds for Interstate Highway System in fiscal 1967:	
214	Aug. 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 313 to 11.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8027, providing assistance in training State and local law-enforcement officers:	
215	Aug. 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 326 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 6964, authorizing certain rehabilitation practices for Federal prisoners:	
216	Aug. 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 323 to 0.)	Yea.
		S. 1564, Voting Rights Act of 1965:	
218	Aug. 3	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to disagree to Senate language allowing political subdivisions with more than 50 percent of voting-age Negroes registered to free themselves from coverage. (Rejected 118 to 284.)	Yea.
219	Aug. 3	On conference report. (Agreed to 328 to 74.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8469, increasing civil service retirement annuities:	
220	Aug. 3	On passage. (Passed 394 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8439, authorizing certain military construction:	
221	Aug. 4	On conference report. (Agreed to 389 to 0.)	Yea.
		S. 1742, authorizing certain changes in World Bank Charter:	
222	Aug. 4	On passage. (Passed 330 to 54.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 498, providing for consideration of H.R. 4750, extending interest equalization tax:	
224	Aug. 5	On resolution. (Agreed to 329 to 44.)	Yea.
		H.R. 4750, extending interest equalization tax:	
225	Aug. 5	On passage. (Passed 274 to 97.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9918, strengthening motor vehicle financial responsibility laws of the District of Columbia:	
228	Aug. 9	On amendment substituting unsatisfied judgment fund plan. (Adopted 173 to 156.)	Nay.
		H.R. 10306, making it a crime to knowingly destroy or mutilate a draft card:	
230	Aug. 10	On passage. (Passed 393 to 1.)	Yea.
		S. 1648, Public Works and Economic Development Act, authorizing $3,250,000,000 in grants and loans for regional development:	
234	Aug. 12	On amendment further expanding public works and development facilities grants. (Agreed to 196 to 194.)	Nay.
235	Aug. 12	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete loans, provide for annual congressional review, and require use of American-made products. (Rejected 163 to 224.)	Yea.
236	Aug. 12	On passage. (Passed 246 to 138.)	Nay.
		H.R. 6431, providing that certain forms of nickel be admitted duty free:	
238	Aug. 16	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 297 to 48.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8635, establishing a Federal Boxing Commission:	
239	Aug. 16	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 346 to 4.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7750, authorizing $3,360,000,000 for foreign aid in fiscal 1966:	
242	Aug. 19	On conference report. (Agreed to 244 to 150.)	Nay.
		H.R. 9811, omnibus farm bill of 1965:	
243	Aug. 19	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 169 to 224.)	Yea.
244	Aug. 19	On passage. (Passed 221 to 172.)	Nay.
		H.R. 10586, making supplemental appropriations of $1,200,000,000 for Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal 1966 including $1,000,000,000 for elementary and secondary education:	
246	Aug. 24	On motion to recommit so that all supplemental requests can be considered at the same time. (Rejected 139 to 263.)	Yea.
		H.R. 2580, eliminating national origins quota system in immigration, providing for admission of Western Hemisphere immigrants and relatives of U.S. citizens without limitation, establishing priorities, and fixing annual limit of 170,000 for all others:	
248	Aug. 25	On amendment placing Western Hemisphere under numerical limitation. (Rejected 189 to 218.)	Yea.
249	Aug. 25	On passage. (Passed 318 to 95.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9567, authorizing a 5-year program of assistance to institutions of higher education and to students attending such institutions:	
252	Aug. 26	On passage. (Passed 367 to 22.)	Nay.
		H.R. 9022, authorizing disaster assistance to elementary and secondary schools and making more cities eligible for "impacted" school aid:	
253	Aug. 30	On passage. (Passed 304 to 37.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 551, providing for consideration of H.R. 9042, authorizing agreement with Canada on duty-free treatment of automobiles and parts:	
254	Aug. 31	On resolution. (Agreed to 364 to 23.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9042, authorizing agreement with Canada on duty-free treatment of automobiles and parts:	
255	Aug. 31	On passage. (Passed 280 to 113.)	Yea.
		H.R. 3141, expanding the health professions educational assistance program:	
257	Sept. 1	On passage. (Passed 340 to 47.)	Nay.
		H.R. 5863, authorizing research into high-speed ground transportation:	
259	Sept. 2	On passage. (Passed 317 to 24.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8439, authorizing certain military construction in fiscal 1966:	
262	Sept. 7	On motion to table motion to discharge Committee on Armed Services from further consideration of H.R. 8439. (Agreed to 320 to 19.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10775, authorizing certain military construction in fiscal 1966:	
263	Sept. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 347 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 168, increasing veterans' disability compensation:	
264	Sept. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 348 to 0.)	Yea.
		S.J. Res. 102, authorizing funds for the President's Crime Commission:	
265	Sept. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 338 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10871, making appropriations of $4,001,453,000 for foreign aid and Export-Import Bank in fiscal 1966:	
269	Sept. 8	On passage. (Passed 239 to 143.)	Nay.
273	Sept. 13	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under rollcall No. 272. (Agreed to 225 to 126.)	Nay.
275	Sept. 13	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under rollcall No. 274. (Agreed to 241 to 127.)	Nay.
279	Sept. 13	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under rollcall No. 278. (Agreed to 256 to 123.)	Nay.
281	Sept. 13	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under rollcall No. 280. (Agreed to 255 to 120.)	Nay.
282	Sept. 13	On motion to table motion to order previous question (end debate) on motion that Journal of Sept. 9 be approved as read. (Rejected 138 to 244.)	Yea.
283	Sept. 13	On ordering previous question (ending debate) on motion to approve Journal. (Agreed to 257 to 126.)	Nay.
284	Sept. 13	On motion that Journal stand approved as read. (Agreed to 264 to 119.)	Yea.
285	Sept. 13	On motion to adjourn. (Rejected 175 to 204.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 506, providing for consideration of H.R. 10065, Equal Employment Opportunity Act under procedure bypassing Rules Committee:	
286	Sept. 13	On resolution. (Agreed to 259 to 121.)	Nay.
287	Sept. 13	On motion to table motion to reconsider vote on rollcall No. 286. (Agreed to 193 to 181.)	Nay.
288	Sept. 13	On motion to adjourn. (Rejected 173 to 201.)	Yea.
290	Sept. 13	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under rollcall No. 289. (Agreed to 243 to 136.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 499, providing for consideration of H.R. 7371, repealing an exemption from the Bank Holding Company Act under procedure bypassing Rules Committee:	
291	Sept. 13	On resolution. (Agreed to 201 to 171.)	Nay.

See footnotes at end of table.

89th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1965	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H. Res. 478, providing for consideration of H.R. 9460, providing for establishment of National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities under procedure bypassing Rules Committee:	
292	Sept. 13	On resolution. (Agreed to 260 to 114.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 536, providing for consideration of H.R. 10281, increasing pay of Federal employees, under procedure bypassing Rules Committee:	
293	Sept. 13	On resolution. (Agreed to 288 to 84.)	Nay.
		H.R. 2091, establishing concession policies in National Park Service areas:	
296	Sept. 14	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 73 to 298.)	Nay.
		H.R. 8283, authorizing increase in poverty program funds to $1,800,000,000 in fiscal 1966:	
299	Sept. 15	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to insist on House provision maintaining Governors' veto. (Agreed to 209 to 180.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9460, establishing a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities:	
301	Sept. 15	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 128 to 250.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 574, directing Postmaster General to provide names of 1965 summer employees:	
303	Sept. 16	On motion to table resolution. (Adopted 186 to 180)	Not voting.[1]
		S. 2042, extending indemnity provisions of Atomic Energy Act:	
304	Sept. 16	On passage. (Passed 337 to 30)	Not voting.[2]
		H.R. 9221, making appropriations for Department of Defense for fiscal 1966:	
306	Sept. 17	On conference report. (Agreed to 380 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 585, dismissing election contests of 5 Mississippi Representatives:	
307	Sept. 17	On resolution. (Agreed to 228 to 143.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10873, establishing program of group life insurance for members of armed services on active duty:	
309	Sept. 20	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Agreed to 360 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 560, expressing sense of House of Representatives that the United States and other American States take whatever steps necessary to prevent communistic aggression in Western Hemisphere:	
310	Sept. 20	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Agreed to 312 to 52.)	Yea.
		S. 4, Water Quality Act, expanding Federal assistance for water pollution control:	
313	Sept. 21	On conference report. (Agreed to 379 to 0.)	Yea.
		S. 2300, authorizing construction and repair of certain public works on rivers and harbors:	
315	Sept. 22	On amendment deleting $277,000,000 Dickey-Lincoln power project in Maine. (Adopted 207 to 185.)	Yea.
		H.R. 30, providing for participation of United States in Inter-American Cultural Center in Florida and authorizing $15,000,000 for U.S. exhibit:	
316	Sept. 22	On passage. (Passed 254 to 113.)	Nay.
318	Sept. 22	On motion to adjourn. (Rejected 89 to 204.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7371 repealing an exemption from the Bank Holding Company Act:	
320	Sept. 23	On amendment repealing all major exemptions from act. (Adopted 199 to 178.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 580, providing for consideration of H.R. 10232, authorizing matching grants for rural water and sanitation facilities:	
321	Sept. 23	On ordering previous question (ending debate). (Agreed to 279 to 70.)	Nay.
		H.R. 10232, authorizing matching grants for rural water and sanitation facilities:	
322	Sept. 23	On passage. (Passed 325 to 10.)	Yea.
		S. 306, authorizing standards to control air pollution from automobiles and a research and development program on solid waste disposal:	
324	Sept. 24	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete solid waste disposal provisions. (Rejected 80 to 220.)	Nay.
325	Sept. 24	On passage. (Passed 294 to 4.)	Yea.
327	Sept. 27	On motion to discharge Committee on Rules from further consideration of H. Res. 515, providing for consideration of H.R. 4644, home rule for the District of Columbia. (Adopted 213 to 183.).	Nay.
		H. Res. 515, providing for consderation of H.R. 4644, home rule for the District of Columbia:	
328	Sept. 27	On resolution. (Agreed to 222 to 179.)	Nay.
330	Sept. 27	On motion that House immediately consider H.R. 4644, home rule for the District of Columbia. (Agreed to 234 to 155.)	Nay.
		H.R. 4644, providing home rule for the District of Columbia:	
336	Sept. 29	On motion to strike the enacting clause (kill the bill). (Rejected 179 to 219.)	Yea.
337	Sept. 29	On amendment substituting Charter Board home rule plan. (Adopted 227 to 174.)	Yea.
338	Sept. 29	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 134 to 266.)	Yea.
339	Sept. 29	On passage. (Passed 283 to 117.)	Nay.
		H.R. 2580, eliminating national origins quota system in immigration, providing for admission of relatives of U.S. citizens without limitation, establishing priorities, and fixing annual limitations:	
341	Sept. 30	On conference report. (Agreed to 320 to 69.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10281. increasing pay of Federal employees:	
342	Sept. 30	On motion to recommit with instructions to remove automatic future increases for judges, executives, and Members of Congress and the Cabinet. (Agreed to 238 to 140.)	Yea.
343	Sept. 30	On passage. (Passed 370 to 7.)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 642, authorizing an additional Library of Congress building to be named James Madison Memorial Building:	
345	Oct. 1	On motion to recommit with instructions to create visitors center. (Rejected 17 to 321.)	Nay.
346	Oct. 1	On passage. (Passed 328 to 5.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10871, making appropriations for foreign aid:	
347	Oct. 1	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to insist upon retention of provision prohibiting aid to countries that furnish aid to North Vietnam. (Rejected 164 to 174.)	Yea.
348	Oct. 1	On conference report. (Agreed to 204 to 127.)	Nay.
		H.R. 3142, providing Federal grants for medical library services and facilities:	
349	Oct. 1	On passage. (Passed 296 to 3.)	Yea.
		H.R. 6519, providing for completion of Jefferson National Memorial, St. Louis:	
350	Oct. 1	On passage. (Passed 250 to 12.)	Yea.
		S.J. Res. 32, authorizing compensation to Ryukyu Islands for use and damage by U.S. Armed Forces:	
353	Oct. 7	On resolution. (Agreed to 312 to 55.)	Yea.
		H.R. 2020, authorizing $20,000,000 for construction of southern Nevada water project:	
354	Oct. 7	On passage. (Passed 239 to 134.)	Nay.
		S. 2084, authorizing $325,000,000 for highway beautification:	
356	Oct. 7	On motion to recommit with instructions to give States authority to determine areas in which outdoor advertising and junkyards would be permitted. (Rejected 153 to 230.)	Not voting.[2]
357	Oct. 7	On passage. (Passed 245 to 138.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 9811, omnibus farm bill:	
359	Oct. 8	On conference report. (Adopted 219 to 150.)	Not voting.[1]
		H. Res. 598, providing for consideration of H.R. 11135, allocating sugar quotas:	
363	Oct. 12	On resolution. (Agreed to 253 to 80.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11135, allocating sugar quotas:	
366	Oct. 13	On motion to recommit with instructions to add special fee on imports. (Rejected 160 to 230.)	Yea.
367	Oct. 13	On passage. (Passed 246 to 147.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11588, making supplemental appropriations $4,200,000,000 for fiscal 1966:	
369	Oct. 14	On amendment deleting funds for rent subsidies. (Adopted 185 to 162.)	Yea.
370	Oct. 14	On passage. (Passed 242 to 100.)	Nay.
		H.R. 9567, authorizing a 5-year program of assistance to institutions of higher education and to students attending such institutions:	
376	Oct. 20	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to disagree to Senate language providing for a national teachers corps. (Rejected 152 to 226.)	Yea.
377	Oct. 20	On conference report. (Agreed to 313 to 63.)	Nay.
		S. 2300, authorizing construction and repair of certain public works on rivers and harbors, including $277,000,000 for Dickey-Lincoln power project in Maine:	
378	Oct. 20	On conference report. (Agreed to 221 to 139.)	Nay.
		H.R. 11588, making supplemental appropriations of $4,700,000,000 for fiscal 1966:	
380	Oct. 21	On conference report. (Agreed to 251 to 84.)	Nay.
381	Oct. 21	On motion to agree to amendment providing $800,000 for preliminary planning of Dickey-Lincoln power project in Maine. (Agreed to 165 to 162.)	Nay.
		H.R. 11135, allocating sugar quotas:	
383	Oct. 22	On conference report. (Agreed to 174 to 88.)	Yea.

---

[1] Absent. If present, would have voted "nay."

[2] Absent. If present, would have voted "yea."

Winning the Peace in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, A task force of American businessmen is now ready to leave for Vietnam to bring American business skill and capital together with Vietnamese businessmen to help build up a strong and productive society in that war-ravaged land. One American has already left to negotiate a business arrangement with a Vietnamese firm.

Several months ago I proposed a new approach to the problem of securing stability and order in Vietnam—and consequently the whole southeast Asia area.

In April the President proposed a sweeping, long-range program for the economic development of this vital region—the Mekong Delta project. I support this effort. Yet I believe a start should be made now toward stabilizing and strengthening the economy of South Vietnam. And this effort should utilize the free enterprise, capitalistic approach.

Therefore, my proposal involves the encouragement of small business, joint-venture business operations between Vietnamese and American businessmen.

This is a bold effort, but it may be one of the keys to the ultimate success of securing independence in Vietnam.

The struggle in Vietnam is but another phase of the conflict between the democratic nations and the Communist powers that has been the main feature of international affairs since the end of the Second World War. Yet, Vietnam is a new kind of war, and a new kind of challenge.

The military effort is only part of the struggle. It is a necessary part, but without the support and confidence of the people such a military effort can never be wholly successful. The American businessman can help supply the support, confidence, and economic stability necessary to supplement the military effort and ultimately drive the Communist threat from Vietnam.

This plan is designed to provide the catalyst that could spark a new era of hope for the people of Vietnam.

How will the plan actually work?

American businessmen will invest in light industry and smaller business projects with Vietnamese businessmen. These ventures will be aimed at Vietnamese resources, talent, and labor with American business expertise to stimulate the economy to produce basic goods for consumption within Vietnam and to lay the groundwork for future exports.

What security will there be in war-torn Vietnam for such investment?

The Agency for International Development has agreed to guarantee such investment up to 100 percent against losses due to hostile action, and up to 75 percent against commercial losses.

Several months ago, I presented my proposal for the economic development of South Vietnam to Vice President HUMPHREY. He was enthusiastic and has been of great help in cutting through the bureaucratic maze that sometimes seems to be the main feature of our Government operations overseas. I am much indebted to our eminent Vice President for expending his precious time and talent in support of this effort.

On September 8, I arranged to meet in Washington with officials of the Agency for International Development and with American businessmen from industries ranging from plastics to pharmaceuticals. My colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK], also attended.

Problems associated with the Vietnam investment plan were discussed. Many of the businessmen present indicated an interest in further exploration of the proposal. The State Department delegation, led by Mr. Rutherford Poats, Assistant Administrator for AID, indicated their keen interest and support for the concept of American joint-venture investment in Vietnam.

Phu Duc, the distinguished former Ambassador of the Republic of Vietnam to the United Nations, met with me several times while the plan was being developed. His learned counsel has been invaluable, and his enthusiastic endorsement is much appreciated.

On September 24 a further meeting took place. On that date American and Vietnamese businessmen were brought together for the first time to talk about implementing my proposal, and to begin to talk about business arrangements. The meeting was held in the Department of Commerce field office in New York with a delegation of nine Vietnamese, including two women, who came from Saigon for the meeting and to examine American business and industrial techniques. Mr. Selig Taubenblatt of the Far East Bureau of the Department of State and Mr. David Horner of the Department of Commerce's Office of International Investment joined me in welcoming the group, and helped in presenting my proposal to them.

The meeting was a considerable success. After the formal presentation in the morning, individual discussions took place in the afternoon between the Vietnamese and American businessmen. A number of those present have since indicated a desire to go to Saigon to implement this program. Interest in the idea of joint American-Vietnamese investment has spread through the business community.

Now we have reached the operational stage of this effort. American and Vietnamese businessmen have been brought together, the State Department has given its blessing to the proposal, and a group of American businessmen stand ready to go to Saigon for further talks.

Our American economy is today enjoying the 55th month of continuous business expansion. The stock market is at an alltime high. We have even seen recent indications that the Soviet Union is moving toward more private enterprise in their economy. What an opportune time to make a start toward bringing the rich rewards of free enterprise to a people whose lot has been destruction and despair for so many years.

The primary objective of my plan is to demonstrate to the people of South Vietnam the interest and support of the American business community and the American people in their struggle against Communist domination. It is a patriotic effort on the part of American small business, but it is also a positive effort toward building hope and laying the economic basis for eventual peace.

Things are looking up for the forces of freedom in Vietnam. The President's judicious prosecution of our effort there is showing significant gains in crushing the Vietcong's efforts to destroy the political independence of a nation.

Now is the time to capitalize upon our gains with a positive step toward peace.

South Vietnam's National Day, October 26

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, few nations in history have been launched into more difficult circumstances than South Vietnam. Divided from the Vietnamese land and people north of the 17th parallel as a result of the Geneva Agreements of 1954, South Vietnam was originally seen by most Eastern and many Western analysts as a temporary expedient, a face-saving device that would permit France to end a disastrous colonial adventure without a total surrender to the Communist-led Viet Minh. South Vietnam was to be a temporary national entity, independent of both France and the new Democratic Republic of Vietnam to the north, itself considered a temporarily delineated state.

The two Vietnams were to be reunited at a later date and few doubted that the resultant whole would be a Communist nation. But the Republic that declared its sovereignty 10 years ago today did not view itself as a strawman erected to be swept "inevitably" before the tide from the north. South Vietnam took its nationhood seriously and for 8 of its 10 years of existence has been violently engaged in a combat to preserve its national integrity. That bitter, fratricidal war in a small Asian land has developed high international significance; the leaders of Communist China and North Vietnam have declared it the model and the acid test of "the war of national liberation" strategy to be applied to all the developing world. The United States has chosen to join the South Vietnamese nation in its struggle and in this test.

October 26 falls in the season of rice harvest in Vietnam, and for some in the more secure cities there can be celebration, thanksgiving, and feasting as befits a national holiday, but for the Vietnamese and American troops sharing a common vigil over the barbed wire defenses of 500 villages there can be little festivity. Many have died and more have sacrificed that the day might be observed. Since this small nation has shown such courage and tenacity in its national struggle, and since the United States has found firm common cause with South Vietnam in its international confrontation, it is fitting that we pause in commemoration of this Vietnamese National, Republic, and Constitution Day.

It is well to recognize that, had there never been a Vietcong nor a Lao Dong, there would still be a vigorous and abrasive social revolution in South Vietnam today. This revolution is presently proceeding below, above, with and against what the Communists call their war of national liberation. In this bigger, more spontaneous, far less controllable social phenomenon there is occurring a nationalist struggle against the traditional forces of regionalism and localism, a struggle to reshape a colonial land-holding structure into one suited to a nationwide, family, freehold farming system wherein the tiller will indeed own his land, a struggle to modernize and expand the educational system, and a rebalancing of urban political power factors away from the French trained and protected elite which once monopolized the levers of state.

Let us wish them well, the South Vietmanese people with their bright, new, red-on-yellow flag; let us wish them well on this, their national day, not only in the insurgent war but also in their greater, more complex social revolution that is now in progress.

College Boards and Our Nation's Scholastic Profile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, within a few weeks, many of our high school seniors will take a crucial test. On December 4, the College Entrance Examination Board will be administered to next year's prospective college freshmen. Other seniors will take the test later in the school year. For some of them, the CEEB may determine whether or not they receive a college education. The scores they receive are a major determinant of scholarship aid as well as of admission to the college of their choice.

The parents whose children are taking this test, and the students themselves must have been dismayed and concerned to read the article which appeared in the Sunday magazine of the New York Times late last week. The article, written by Banesh Hoffmann, is entitled "The College Boards Fail the Test." I commend it to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be entered in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times magazine]

THE COLLEGE BOARDS FAIL THE TEST

(By Banesh Hoffmann)

(NOTE.—Banesh Hoffmann, a theoretical physicist who teaches mathematics at Queens College of the City University of New York, wrote "The Strange Story of the Quantum" and "The Tyranny of Testing," both available in paperback.)

Millions of American students each year take nationwide tests of scholastic aptitude and achievement that can have decisive effects on their educational futures. Altogether, students fill out well over 100 million standardized test forms a year, and these tests are almost exclusively of the multiple-choice, machine-gradable type.

For many students, testing reaches a climax in the scramble for college admission. In the 1964–65 academic year, for example, an estimated 1,390,000 candidates took the scholastic aptitude tests of the College Entrance Examination Board, and these and their companion achievement tests are by no means the only ones used for college admission purposes, though they are probably the best of their sort.

But how good is this best? How well do the college board tests fulfill their intended function? Even more important, how serious are the side effects of such mechanized tests? These are questions that we dare not treat lightly. Too much is at stake, not only for ourselves and our children as individuals, but for all of us as a nation. The answers are not necessarily reassuring.

With its approximately 600 member colleges and its strategic role in college admissions, the College Entrance Examination Board now occupies a position of enormous prestige and power in education. Its tests and its actions are inevitably reflected in educational practice throughout the country, and whether it wishes to or not, it affects intellectual standards by its own example, which should be one of excellence.

Naturally, in its exposed position, the college board has not escaped criticism. Critics have said, among other things, that its mechanized tests penalize subtlety and originality while favoring quick-witted superficiality and conformity; that they foster intellectual dishonesty; that they are made artificially difficult by means of ambiguity because genuinely searching questions do not readily fit into the multiple-choice format; that they neglect skill in disciplined expression; that they corrupt education.

The aim of the tests is to help in the selection of students for entrance to college, but, as Benjamin D. Wright gently put it a decade ago, when he was president of Smith College: "[They seem] to give the advantage to certain kinds of minds, although not always to those which will take the greatest advantage of college opportunities."

The College Entrance Examination Board was founded at the turn of the century to bring an element of order and uniformity to a chaotic situation in college admissions. It began with a grant from the Carnegie Corp., but is now supported by the fees it charges those who take its tests. It maintains its own full-time administrative staff.

Twelve colleges were the board's charter members and its first examinations were taken by 973 candidates. They were essay examinations.

During World War I, mass testing began to assume national importance, with inductees being sorted by means of what the Army called Alpha and Beta tests. After the war, the college board began to show cautious interest in such methods of mass testing, and in 1926, not without opposition from member colleges, it gave its first "psychological tests," calling them scholastic aptitude tests. In 1929 these SAT's underwent major improvement, being divided into two parts—one to test scholastic aptitude of a verbal sort and the other, scholastic aptitude of a mathematical sort, a separation that is maintained to this day.

Grading essays is expensive and time consuming, and essay graders are distressingly subjective: They do not even agree with their own ratings when given essays to regrade a few months later. During World War II, the board, over bitter opposition from member colleges, gave up essay tests—as a war measure—and substituted achievement tests of the mechanized sort now used. The English composition examination was an exception, but of that story and its strange convolutions, more later.

Meanwhile, in Princeton, N.J., the board had set up modest research facilities which, like the board itself, quickly became involved in extensive wartime activities. Because the research arm continued to expand into various testing activities after the war, it was set up as an autonomous nonprofit organization, Educational Testing Service, so that the board could concentrate on college admissions. Over the years ETS has become enormous: Its psychologists alone are now numbered in the hundreds. It makes up all the board's tests, as well as many others used by schools, graduate schools and governmental agencies, and it has earned a high place in the realm of testing, ranking among the very best in its field.

The SAT's and the achievement tests have different aims. The former seek to measure general academic potential, while the latter, offered in more than a dozen different subjects, are intended to measure specific academic achievement.

They are constructed by ETS with elaborate professional care. Special committees of professors, teachers, and psychologists select and prepare questions that are tried out by being inserted in actual tests (though not used in the scoring of those tests). The responses of the candidates are subject to statistical analysis designed to reveal, for example, which questions perform their intended function well, which are ambiguous and which favor those who actually scored poorly on the nonexperimental part of the test. Only after passing this rigorous statistical screening may a question be used in the nonexperimental part of a test.

But this is only the beginning. The SAT's are validated by comparing students' scores with their subsequent performance in college, statistics once again being brought into play, and it is primarily statistics that have molded the evolution of the SAT's to their present form. If scientific routine were all there is to science it would be hard to refute the claim that the tests are products of science, a claim that has repeatedly intimidated humanists critical of the test.

How well do the SAT's perform their intended function well, which are ambiguous It depends on the college, but on the whole, in the purely statistical sense, they do so no better than a man's weight indicates his height. Many colleges, from Harvard down, find the board's tests valuable, and when the scores are used skeptically, which unfortunately is not always the case, they can give admissions officers useful supplementary data.

However, the University of California, which had been admitting students on the basis of their high school grades, made a 2-year study of the effect of combining these grades with SAT scores. The statistical improvement in prediction turned out to be so slight that the idea of requiring all candidates to take the SAT's was forthwith dropped.

Statistics are not everything, of course. Other things are also important. For the benefit of prospective candidates, the college board, aided by ETS, puts out booklets describing its tests and giving sample questions. We shall consider here the 1964 booklets describing the SAT's and the achievement tests.

Since, in the eyes of candidates and their teachers, these booklets represent, among other things, the quality of ETS and the college board, and since, if only by implication, they set intellectual standards, we would expect them to be prepared with meticulous care. Indeed, they often read as though they had been prepared by committees. It comes as a surprise, then, to find signs of carelessness, such as a "y" instead of an "x" in a sample mathematics question, and even faulty wording, such as: "The SAT can provide only a sample of your verbal and mathematical aptitudes," when what the SAT does is test such a sample, not provide it.

Were such slips the only reason for concern, we could forgive them. At worst we might mention them for the innocent pleasure of causing brief reddening of faces in high places. But, as we shall see, they are not the only reasons for concern, and they may well be symptoms of a wider carelessness with deeper implications.

The SAT is a 3-hour test containing both verbal and mathematical questions. It currently measures verbal scholastic aptitude by means of multiple-choice questions of just four types: questions dealing with antonyms, sentence completions, analogies, and reading comprehension. Samples are given in the booklet describing the SAT's. Let us examine one of each type—not, of course, selecting the four questions for purposes of flattery.

The first sample question in the booklet asks which is most nearly opposite in meaning to the word "exaggeration," the choices being: "(A) slight misunderstanding; (B) silence; (C) accurate representation; (D) truth; (E) understatement.

A competent student would probably pick the wanted answer without hesitation. As the board explains: "Since exaggeration means to overstate the truth about some matter, the appropriate answer is (E)." A deeper student might worry, though, feeling perhaps that precision is an absolute, and that there is an element of exaggeration in understatement. Indeed, when I tried this question out on a few professors and students, three professors in the humanities chose (E), but three in mathematics rejected it, as did a number of my mathematics students. However, since the question is intended as a test of verbal and not mathematical aptitude, let us not press this particular point but look instead at the board's own discussion. It goes as follows:

"If you know the meaning of the word, answers (A), (B), and (D) are obviously inappropriate. Answer (C) is, in a sense, partially correct, but represents what may be called a midpoint between the extremes of 'exaggeration' and 'understatement.' (But it can be regarded as the midpoint of a U.) It can also be eliminated as a possible correct answer if you consider that (C) and (D) are almost identical in meaning. If you reason that (D) is incorrect, then (C), too, must be wrong."

The word "consider" casts a pall of ambiguity over the whole passage. Suppose it is meant in the sense "take into account." Then the board is apparently saying that (C) and (D) are indeed almost identical in meaning. But in that case, why did it previously treat (C) and (D) differently, lumping (D) with (A) and (B) as "obviously inappropriate," and then giving special consideration to the "partially correct" (C)?

Since the above leaves the board in a predicament, let us explore the possibility that "consider" was meant in the sense "believe." This allows an escape, since it gives us a chance to interpret the passage as saying that the board does not itself believe that ((C) and (D) are almost identical in meaning. What the passage is now saying, in effect, is that if the student erroneously believes (C) and (D) are almost identical in meaning, and if he has already eliminated (D), then he can also eliminate (C), for an incorrect reason.

It is hard to believe, though, that the college board would thus deliberately point up one of the basic defects of multiple-choice tests: that they ignore quality, being concerned only with choices of answers and not with reasons for choices. Picking a wanted answer for no matter how stupid a reason scores 100 percent on a question, while picking an unwanted answer, even for reasons of Einsteinian majesty, automatically scores zero.

This ignoring of quality, this all-or-nothing system of scoring, this insistence on conformity, this refusal to let the student express himself in words, this rigorous exclusion of evaluative judgment lest it contaminate the sterile precision of the grading—it bears a proud name. It is called "objectivity." And machine-gradable tests are called "objective tests."

Look next at this question. It is of the sentence-completion type, in which the candidate is required to pick the one set of words which, when inserted in the blank spaces in the sentence, best fits in with the meaning of the sentence as a whole:

"Despite the popular feeling against—in college football, the major teams have found it difficult to ——— without encouraging outstanding athletes with scholarships.

"(A) competition—survive, (B) favoritism—be impartial, (C) professionalism—win, (D) academic standards—discriminate, (E) rivalry—qualify."

Most of us would probably quickly pick (C). Indeed, the question may be too easy: If almost every student picks the wanted answer to a question, the question is virtually useless for test purposes and is usually discarded. How can we make this one more difficult?

There is an easy way. In answer (C), "professionalism" fits excellently into the first part of the sentence, as "win" does into the second. In (A), however, "competition" (if not excessive) makes no worthwhile sense in the first part, and "survive" makes none in the second. Let us, then, simply interchange "survive" and "win" so that (A) and (C) now read: "(A*) competition—win" and "(C*) professionalism—survive." At once we have a harder question.

Do you object that this is utterly improper? That instead of worthwhile difficulty we have introduced a spurious substitute? That no reputable test-maker would offer the above question with "survive" and "win" thus interchanged? Educational Testing Service and the college board do so in the SAT booklet.

It would take too long to go into all aspects of this question. The wanted answer is what we have labeled (C*), but once "survive" is counted as acceptable, "competition" cannot properly be rejected, and a close analysis shows that even the presence of the word "despite" does not save the question from ambiguity at the least.

We may not console ourselves with the belief that defective questions are so infrequently met as to have negligible significance. They are all too frequent, even on tests made by organizations as good as ETS. Dean Harry N. Rivlin, of the City University of New York, unwittingly gave the game away when he praised a test made by ETS with the words: "There are remarkably few items in which the key is challengeable." This is a little like praising the editors of the New York Times by saying that there are remarkably few who are illiterate. Again, the graduate record examinations are made by ETS, yet when Prof. E. M. Hafner of the University of Rochester scrutinized a GRE in his own subject, physics, he expressed the opinion that about 25 percent of the questions were defective in that if one thought deeply one would pick an unwanted answer.

Here is a sample analogy question taken from the SAT booklet:

"Island: Water:

"(A) sand: desert; (B) mountain: ocean; (C) city: meadows; (D) lake: land; (E) river: banks."

The official instructions call on one to select the pair "which best expresses a relationship similar to that expressed in the original pair." Sometimes in these analogy questions the particular aspect of the original relationship that the testers have in mind is fairly easy to guess, as perhaps it is here. At other times it can be quite obscure.

The wanted answer here is (D). But suppose we think of the original pair as expressing the relationship of terrestrial solid to terrestrial liquid. Then the "best" answer is (B), and (D) is quite unacceptable.

There are further points that can be made in favor of (B). For example, in general an island is a protuberance, as is a mountain, and each rests upon and is directly joined to the solid earth; but a lake is not a protuberance, and in general it does not rest on water, nor is it directly joined by water to the oceans. Those who wish to defend (D) would do well not to argue here that a lake can be linked directly to the oceans by a river. If they did, they would negate the implication of insularity, the very aspect of the relationship on which they principally rely.

Again, under appropriate circumstances, a mountain in an ocean can actually be an island in water. Identity being a close similitude, we could hardly deny that (B) can express none too badly "a relationship similar to that expressed in the original pair."

At first glance this question seemed relatively straightforward. Only after we stopped to think did its complexities begin to show—a not uncommon occurrence. A national merit scholar put the matter aptly in these words: "One of the best pieces of advice to give on 'how to take multiple-choice tests' is this: Play your hunches. If you stop to think, you'll only get confused."

The basic fallacy in analogy questions is clear: The given relationship inevitably has many facets, and the particular combination that the tester has in mind is neither specified nor unique, a point that Prof. L. La Fave of Indiana State University has particularly stressed.

In the SAT's the board measures reading comprehension by means of groups of multiple-choice questions pertaining to passages of some 400 words on various topics. The danger here is that imprecision, ambiguity, and worse may enter when the tester paraphrases the passage. For example, the wanted answer to one of the reading-comprehension questions in the SAT booklet is to the effect that the Kennelly-Heaviside layers in the atmosphere "do not affect [radio] waves of certain lengths." But what the passage says is that the layers "are transparent" to the longer waves.

That they are transparent to these waves does not mean at all that they do not affect them. How, for example, does the tester imagine that eyeglasses could perform their function if they did not affect the light waves to which they are transparent? The passage is about a scientific topic, yet the question penalizes the student who knows even a little science while favoring the one whose lack of scientific understanding allows him to equate "are transparent" and "do not affect" without a qualm.

These are samples, culled from the college board booklet, of the four types of multiple-choice questions with which the board currently assesses the verbal scholastic aptitude of candidates for college admission. The board assures us that they are solidly based on scientific research. A closer look at the procedure, though, shows that it is more scientism than science. It is based on statistics, and to use statistics we must first reduce what we seek to measure to numbers. But not everything lends itself readily to arithmetical treatment. Indeed, the most valuable human qualities are often those that are the most resistant to reduction to numerical form.

What does the "scientific" scholastic-aptitude tester do about such recalcitrant qualities? He ignores them—as he ignores all the damaging side effects of his tests. He concentrates solely on those superficial aspects of evaluation that he can conveniently reduce to numerical terms, and these alone he feeds into his computers. If what comes out goes against the sensibilities of scholars, so much the worse for the scholars and their subjective views.

Moreover, the statistical tester is like a man who appraises his milk by its bulk, unaware that part of the cream may have been skimmed off. When our concern is for one student out of a hundred, the tester's mass statistics will not reveal our loss. Yet even one in a thousand comes to a thousand in a million, and though the penalizing and thwarting of this exceptional thousand may seem statistically trifling to the objective tester, it is certainly no trifling matter, and ignoring it does not make his method of testing scientific.

In the arts, subjectivity is rampant. But imagine the sterility that would ensue were the task of separating masterpieces from trash handed over to "scientific" evaluators who relied on statistical techniques for the sake of objectivity. Excellence, in the deepest sense, is not likely to be discovered by such methods.

If the present college boards leave much to be desired, why are they used? A major reason is that they are cheap and convenient and can handle large numbers of students expeditiously. The pressure of numbers is a powerful argument. With so many candidates to be rated for college admission, mechanized tests have obvious economic and practical advantages, as the testers are quick to point out. But not all bargains turn out to be bargains in the long run. If it is bargains we seek, why do we not use lie detectors as a substitute for the whole system of trial by jury—starting in this anniversary year of Magna Carta? The monetary saving could be enormous.

The college board and ETS would have us believe that theirs are searching tests worthy of the best students. But their own actions belie this. On the verbal part of the SAT they give 40 questions to be answered in 30 minutes and a further 50 questions to be answered in 45 minutes. This leaves so little time for contemplation that even if deep questions were present they could hardly elicit deep responses. At such a pace can the SAT's be other than superficial?

Perhaps, though, depth is out of place when we are testing merely for aptitude. Perhaps the deep questions are reserved for the achievement tests, even though those tests too are objective. Alas, it is not so. Here, for example, is what the college board says about the achievement test in history and social science:

"Each test consists of about 100 questions and has a time limit of 1 hour. Some of the easier questions should take you only a few seconds; others, more complex and requiring more thought, will take longer."

One would be hard put to match the delicate, if unconscious, irony of this statement.

On the basis of elaborate experiments, ETS and the board decided that the best way to measure ability in English composition was by means of an achievement test that involved no English composition. To the layman and the scholar this is manifestly ridiculous, and the teacher sees it as threatening to corrupt the teaching of English composition. But to the testers it was apparently an indisputable scientific fact.

Their test contained multiple-choice questions testing the student's ability to perceive such things as grammatical errors, inappropriate wording, tautology and misuse of metaphors; to recast sentences; to match styles; to restore the original order of shuffled sentences, and so on. In addition as a departure from strict multiple-choice objectivity, it asked him to correct a passage written in atrocious English.

But when they included it among their achievement tests it caused much dispute. To counter the criticisms, ETS and the board made a further experiment. They studied statistically the success with which three different tests measured ability in English composition: an essay test, the verbal part of the SAT, and their nonessay objective test (which they had had the audacity to call the "English composition test"). The statistics gave a scientific verdict: The essay test was the worst, the so-called English composition test was in the middle, and the SAT verbal was the best.

Armed with scientific evidence of such seeming cogency, the testers easily overawed the humanists, at least for a time, and this left them free to give their so-called English composition test instead of a test involving essays. So unnerved were the scholars that they failed to note the staggering fact that the board demonstrably did not believe in its own scientific statistical argument—the very one with which it had overawed them. Yet the evidence was clear. Had the board believed in its own argument it would have given up not only the essay test but also its miscalled English composition test and used the SAT verbal instead, for the SAT. Verbal was the test that had statistically, and therefore "scientifically," come out best—despite the fact that it had never been intended as a test of ability in English composition.

After a while, the scholars began to find renewed courage. Their commonsense told them that abandoning essays were wrong, and they forced the board to yield to the extent of giving a subsidiary 1-hour essay test. But the board was clearly reluctant. It gave the essay test the unattractive title "Writing Sample" and refused to grade it. Colleges that insisted on having candidates for admission take the essay test had to make arrangements as best they could to grade it themselves.

But the pressure continued, and to meet it the board incorporated a 20-minute essay into some of its 60-minute English composition tests—though into only a small proportion of them.

The latest twist in this curious tale introduces a note of irony. The board has just completed a new experiment, somewhat different from previous ones, and this experiment shows statistically that essays are, after all, worthwhile tests of ability in English composition. It is easy to be cynical about all this and to wonder whether perhaps science is here following the election returns. But the new experiment, like the previous ones, was performed in good faith, and carefully performed, and we must applaud the courage of the ETS investigators in pursuing an experiment that went against previous ETS findings. And if all that has been presented in this article leaves us with a feeling of misgiving, we have to remind ourselves in all fairness that ETS and the college board are among the very best of the testing organizations. Indeed, their high standing points up the need for establishing a distinguished committee of inquiry to look into the whole testing situation in the public interest.

Because of the new experiment, the board is about to propose to its members that the 1-hour "Writing Sample" be replaced by a 2-hour test, 1 hour of which will be objective and the other devoted to two essays to be graded by the board. It is not yet ready to suggest giving up the present 1-hour English composition test, but if the proposed new test is ultimately accepted it may well end up as the sole English achievement test.

There is a ray of hope in this. Perhaps one of these days ETS will have the courage to pursue an experiment proving "scientifically" what is already clear: that the college boards penalize deep students. The ensuing reforms could be momentous.

Meanwhile, here is a way to make a start on the road toward reform if the 2-hour English test comes into being. As an essay topic give, say, an analogy question, such as the "island: water" one. But do not ask the student to select the wanted answer here. Instead, have him use the question as a springboard for flights of fancy. Have him analyze the question, giving as many reasons for and against each choice as he can think of, both serious and flippant. And above all assure him that critical remarks will be welcomed and not held against him.

Many students would be dumbfounded by such an assignment, and among them could well be uncreative ones with the happy knack of picking wanted answers. But a few gifted students, oppressed by the restraints of the multiple-choice format, would revel in their new-found freedom. Now at last they would have a chance to break through the multiple-choice barrier and, against a background created out of its remnants, show something of their true quality. Imagine the inspired essays that would be forthcoming, the wit, the frolics, the deliberate sophistry, the cogent reasoning, and the gentle, and ungentle digs at the objective testers. Imagine, too, the fun of grading such essays, and their salutary effect on the college board. It is certainly worth a trial. We already have far two many mechanized tests in the United States, and it could start a revolution.

But the revolution lies ahead. For the present, candidates for college admission will have to pay such heed as their intellectual integrity permits to that old prescription for success:

Pick "best," young man—and let who will be clever.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Mr. Hoffmann's book "The Tyranny of Testing," published in 1964, in greater detail, expresses his concern about multiple-choice testing of all sorts. He analyzes demonstrably vague and ambiguous questions which are contained in college examinations, board tests, in the national merit scholarship tests, and other widely used scholastic aptitude tests.

All of us enjoy nit-picking at specific test items and I am sure that every Senator in this body can recall ridiculous questions from tests he took in college and in the armed services. But the questions themselves are not really the central issue. We must continually consider and assess the impact of aptitude tests on our educational system. We must stop to think of how they influence a high school English teacher who is attempting to prepare students for college. We must consider their part in setting intellectual standards for the young people of our Nation.

Commissioner of Education Keppel is concerned with testing also. However, he is not looking for individual levels of "scholastic aptitude" but for a group "profile" of our Nation's scholastic strengths and weaknesses. Those of us who have worked for the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act were gratified to read Commissioner Keppel's speech of September 22, 1965, in which he discussed the need for a better reporting system on the quality and progress of our schools.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Keppel's speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD A NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATION[1]

You were good enough to suggest that I might talk a little bit on what is called national assessment. I wonder if I could start personally with opinion and then shift to fact.

First, with regard to opinion. Personal opinion No. 1: I am personally opposed—and vigorously opposed—to a mammoth national testing of all children. I do not think that the instruments that we have achieved have the sensitivity necessary to justify any such procedure.

Second, I do not believe that any of us are, or probably ever will be, able to resist as teachers the tendency to teach for a test which you know darn well that kid is going to get. This is a personal view, and I don't care whether we are talking about a required national testing or voluntary (testing).

Next, personal feeling. With the immense complexity of the American educational system, particularly since the end of the Second World War, with the extraordinary migration that this Nation is engaged in, almost unlike any other nation in the world—20 percent of our people move every year—I think we are coming to the point where the role of the National Government as demonstrated in legislation this past year will be increasing. I happen to believe that it (the Federal Government) should always be the junior partner, financially and in every other way. It is sounder public policy to keep the majority of the stock locally, a larger portion of the stock at the State level, and a minority of the stock at the Federal level.

We are in an age in which we are going to need a better reporting system than we have had on the quality and the progress of the schools. This is partly documentable, I think, and I do refer to this as a fact because of the language that was written into title I of the Elementary and Secondary (Education) Act. Title I sends money into local school district plans that are approved by the State. You will find Congress inserted language saying that reports had to be submitted by the States to Washington, through the Office of Education and then to the Congress, on what effect these funds were having. That is just one of a good many such requirements of the Congress that amount to saying, if we are going to put up a million dollars we would like to know what happened to it. So then, this is a mixed personal (opinion) and fact here.

Another personal opinion to which I will add some facts, and I hope I can persuade you, is that we are really in a very different position in 1965 with regard to the problem of reporting the educational enterprise than we were in 1935 or certainly 1925.

The major differences are, I think, in two categories: No. 1, the development of the science, may I call it, of statistical handling has been substantial since roughly 1925 or 1935. It is in the last quarter century, anyway, that one can get within 5 percent accuracy or even less by dealing with very small samples.

I don't see that we need 100 percent accuracy. You're going to be putting funds into areas in which society concludes improvements should be made. What you want is a general reporting system. The development in the last 25 or 30 years of statistical sampling is one of the phenomena which we are more accustomed to in opinion polls, but we haven't used it very much in the educational area.

So, my opinion here is that statistical sampling theory and technology have developed to the point where we ought to be able to use them without running the risk—now please note, I am stating personal opinion—without running the risk which I figured at the beginning. If I thought that sampling would lead inevitably to national testing, like the first drink to alcoholism, I would oppose the whole works. But I think we've got to have a better reporting system.

The Office of Education can tell you all sorts of things: How many teachers we have, how tall they are, how many buildings we have, and whether they are painted or not. It doesn't tell you how much the kids know, and sooner or later we are going to be asked.

Very well, then, it was on the ground of these personal opinions and some facts that I encouraged Carnegie Corp. of New York to explore, with private funds and in the private realm, the question of whether it would be possible to get a better reporting system by taking a sampling of the knowledge of children—5 percent samples, 4 percent samples, but much less than 10 percent—to learn whether two things have developed: If the theory, the applications, the methods of statistical handling, could be successfully adapted to our need; and second, whether the testing art had developed to the point where we could do considerably better than guesswork if we used testing in connection with statistical handling.

Carnegie Corp. made a grant—a series of them, I guess—and set up a committee. There is a note on this in the current issue of the Phi Delta Kappan. The committee was headed by Ralph Tyler, of Stanford. He used to be professor of education at Chicago, then became dean, and then went to hell in a hack at the Ford Foundation. That happens to deans. Anyhow, this group consulted with a lot of people.

I think a basic confusion was allowed to develop at the start: The word "testing" got into it. The minute I hear the word "testing" I think of kids in a classroom being tested on the same subject at the same time all over the place. It's inevitable. The idea of 5 percent or less statistical sampling got lost in the discussion the way these things do. The committee had a lot of meetings and then came down to the following statements, which I quote:

"A well-conceived and well-executed assessment would, it is hoped, serve several important purposes." (Not necessarily the ones I started with, incidentally. I was just simple minded and thought we ought to have a way of reporting to the Congress so we wouldn't hurt so much every year I go up there.)

"First, it would give the Nation as a whole a better understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the American educational system. Thus, it might contribute a more accurate guide than we currently possess for allocation of public and private funds, where they are needed, what they achieve, and decisions affecting education.

"Second, assessment results, especially if coupled with auxiliary information on characteristics of the various regions, would provide data necessary for research on educational problems and processes which cannot now be undertaken." If you have a bank of data of this sort you could probably do some research that would otherwise not be possible.

"Third, when sampling and testing procedures are adequately developed, international comparisons might be possible."

As a result of this committee report, Carnegie said, let's try it; make up some tests for four groups. The committee decided that the sensible way to begin sampling was by age level: Children approximately 9 years old, children approximately 13 years old, youth approximately 17 years old, and this charming group known as "adults." That, I presume, is anything over 17. In any case the committee wanted to cut at a certain level.

The committee has made contracts with the American Institute of Research, Educational Testing Service, Psychological Corp., and Science Research Associates to construct initial instruments in reading, language arts, mathematics, social studies, citizenship, fine arts, and vocational education. At least two contractors are working in most areas to develop more than one approach.

These will be quite different from the usual test, which is an effort to diagnose an individual student and predict whether he'd do better at Harvard or Yale or some equally incomprehensible result. The purpose here is not to test the individual; in fact, no one kid would take the whole of any one test. But the purpose is to guess how much they know. Therefore, it is a different kind of instrument. They propose to pretest these things after the first of November and then get a little more serious tryout in spring of this year.

I presume that they will see problems here, try to work them out, see what the results are—whether you get any kind of assessment of groups. The purpose, of course, is not reporting to schools on particular schools—certainly not on particular teachers, because that wouldn't make any sense. You've got such a tiny sample. This test would report, rather, on general levels, regionally or something similar, over a period of time—and I think it would be a great mistake to move too fast on this—so that the United States might have a method of being able to say that our schools have advanced so much, just as you do with children. * * * Haven't you backed yours up against the bathroom wall and put a thing on their head, and drawn a line and said all right, in the time since we drew the last line, at least he has grown up that much? It is about as simple as that, I suppose. Maybe too simple.

At any rate, that's the development of the Carnegie program. I had thought, and continue to think, that explorations in this area are much better done under private auspices and without Government money. I remain interested, very much interested, in the results of this in 6 months from now or so. If the conclusion is that assessment can be done by sampling without the risk of national testing, I shall myself be of a mind to say that we had better go ahead with Government or private or any other kind of money so that we do have this method of reporting.

---

[1] Highlights of remarks by Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, addressing an executive luncheon at the National Education Association, Washington, D.C., Sept. 22, 1965.

Not on individual children. Please let me underscore this. We are dealing with a small percent. Actually, most children would never be tested in the course of their lifetime. And no child would be tested in all subjects anyway, because you take this sample from here, there, and somewhere else.

I would argue that this project deserves the full attention of the professional educational world. We are not now reporting satisfactorily to ourselves, and I must report to you as your representative in the executive branch of the Government that we are not providing satisfactory information to the public and to those who are responsible for making public policy. We've done remarkably well in getting a lot of legislation through, and I suspect it might be useful now to have some numerals.

That's the background.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, unfortunately, when one sees the vast amount of paperwork for every school with which Mr. Keppel's staff has burdened this new program, one recognizes the inconsistency of his protest that the Department is only sampling.

I am sure there are some schools in every State that would find it convenient and suitable to participate in the sampling. But to require that every school—in addition to all the usual paperwork routine of initiating a new program—now test to measure the profile of our Nation's education is stifling and defeating to the objectives of the legislation.

I also share the concern of numerous State education officials and local school administrators who are disturbed about the multiplicity of reports required by the regulations and proposed regulations of the officials in the Office of Education who are in charge of the administration of the Elementary and Secondary Act. There is evidence that a good many of these requirements are based upon the eagerness of these officials to use the reporting requirements of the act as a basis for gathering information for future research projects. Of course, such requirements were never contemplated by the authors of the act or by the Congress. These unduly burdensome reports required of already overworked local school administrators threatens to alienate public support of this legislation before it has had an opportunity to demonstrate its value.

When the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 passed, it was the belief of many that this bill was the most significant improvement in 100 years toward full development of our most precious natural resource, our youngsters. In his recent speech to the final Democratic caucus of the session, Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD called on every committee of the Senate next year to assume the task of the many new Federal approaches to the Nation's problems. I urge that educational testing, as well as the many new reporting requirements, be one of the first areas in which Congress functions as an overseer. The Education Subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee or a specially appointed subcommittee should delve thoroughly into the whole question of educational testing, including widely used privately sponsored tests such as the College Entrance Examination Board, as well as the national survey. The reporting procedures which have been adopted by the Office of Education should be carefully considered in the light of the guidelines laid down by Congress in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Educational Television Facilities Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in 1962 the Congress enacted the Educational Television Facilities Act which made it possible for direct Federal support for educational television stations.

Since 1962 grants have been made under the formula set forth in the Educational Television Facilities Act on a matching basis for the development of new stations and for the expansion of existing facilities. Almost 100 applications have been accepted since the enactment of the Educational Television Facilities Act of 1962.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this time a progress report on the development of educational television that I have prepared.

There being no objection, the progress report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION: PROGRESS REPORT

The educational establishment in this country has been struggling since 1945 to keep up with new techniques and developments in communication. Still, the situation in American education is critical: numbers of students continue to increase at all levels while the number of qualified teachers is not increasing at the same rate. In addition, the amount of information to be taught grows almost daily requiring almost continuous curriculum changes. One of the emergencies is arithmetic: there are too many students who must learn an increasing amount of material through the efforts of too few teachers.

Thus, we must consider education as we do advertising, entertainment and manufacturing, in that the distribution must be efficient. For at least part of our educational effort we are forced to think of the mass media, the most potent of which is television.

The use of television in education is about 12 years old. Between 1948 and 1952 the Federal Communications Commission suspended television licensing while it investigated technical problems in allocations, color compatibility and station separation. During this period educators across the country acted with surprising solidarity in convincing the Commission that a number of television frequencies should be set aside and reserved for the exclusive and specific use of education. With its sixth report and order in 1952, the Commission so reserved 242 frequencies, with the stipulation that they be used to meet the educational needs of communities and that the stations be noncommercial and nonprofit enterprises. Today there are slightly more than 100 educational television stations on the air, and it is expected that there will be 130 by the end of 1966.

In addition to broadcast television, many schools and colleges have installed their own closed circuit systems, which require no Federal licenses. It is estimated that there are approximately 800 such systems in operation, and the prognosis is that the number will double in 5 years.

In 1963 the Commission reserved frequencies between 2,500 and 2,690 megacycles for low-power educational signals, thus providing another type of ETV. With this UHF band a single school system can reach the schools in its community with several different programs simultaneously, which means that scheduling remains a local issue.

There are other means by which educational television signals are transmitted. The midwest program on Airborne Television Instruction, with headquarters at Purdue University, operates DC–6 aircraft, which beams programing to several States and phenomenal numbers of students. Mobile television units are also used in cooperative projects involving several schools or institutions.

The most pervasive of these educational television signals comes from the broadcasting stations, which are Federal licensees, charged with meeting community needs. It is about the stations that I would like to comment, realizing fully that there are other, more restricted means of signal distribution: closed circuit systems, the 2,500 mc. band, airborne techniques and mobile units.

Of the 105 stations on the air, about 20 are owned by school systems. These stations are supported to a large degree by local boards of education, and more than 60 percent of the programing is designed specifically for classrooms.

More than a dozen stations are owned by States, or State ETV authorities, and are committed not only to programs for schools, but also to the education and enlightenment of audiences at home. Several States have interconnected their stations, and now operate educational television networks.

Almost 35 stations are operated by universities, some of which also make use of closed circuit systems. University stations often serve local public schools, under contract with boards of education.

In more than 30 communities, corporations have been formed for the specific purpose of owning and operating educational television stations. The boards of directors are local businessmen, industrialists, educators, public officers, and prominent citizens. These are cooperative educational ventures, committed entirely to the communities in which they operate, and are called community stations. Examples are WQED in Pittsburgh, KCTA in Minneapolis, WGBH in Boston, WTTW in Chicago and KQED in San Francisco.

Educational television programs are produced and distributed to stations by only a few agencies. National Educational Television in New York, which has been supported heavily since 1953 by the Ford Foundation, produces the bulk of ETV's cultural and public affairs programs. These are mailed from station to station. As NET grows older, its library of programs also grows, making available additional material to the newer stations. Educational Television Stations, a division of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters, has recently developed the ETS program service, a second source of general programing for stations. This will be, basically, an exchange system whereby programs produced at local ETV stations are made available to others across the country.

Instructional programs—the tapes and films used for school audiences—are either locally produced or are obtained from one of three instructional libraries. (Each of the libraries was started as a project supported by the National Defense Education Act.) One is operated in cooperation with the Eastern Educational Network, with headquarters in Boston, and another is at the University of Nebraska. The third, the National Center for School and College Television, recently moved to Indiana University from New York City, where it was called the National Instructional Television Library.

Two regional networks exist, though only one of them, the Eastern Educational Network, involves interconnection that crosses State lines. Fourteen stations are affiliates of the EEN, and half of them are interconnected. The member stations which support the operation, stretch from Washington, D.C., to Maine and westward to the Ohio border. The other network is incorporated as Midwestern Educational Television. Its headquarters are in Minneapolis and its goal is the actual interconnection of stations in six States.

A recent study by the National Association of Educational Broadcasters indicates the following about educational television stations:

(a) The average station is on the air between 9 and 10 hours a day, and a little more than 5 days a week.

(b) School stations emphasize classroom television to the extent that more than 60 percent of their programing is of a direct instructional nature. Most stations devote a little less than one-half of on-the-air time to inschool broadcasting.

(c) There are 2,445 people employed by 95 educational television stations on full-time bases, with 1,199 working part time. The average station employes about 25 people full time. University stations tend to make greater use of part-time help than do other types of stations.

(d) More educational television stations, after several years, have investments of between $400,000 and $500,000 each in broadcast properties. Community stations tend to own more property than do other types of stations.

(e) More than half of the money ETV stations receive comes from direct budgeted support—money budgeted each year by a parent organization. A little less than one fourth of the income realized by ETV stations comes from gifts and donations, with approximately the same amount coming from services rendered by the stations.

(f) Community stations show the highest percentage of money earned through services or gifts; State stations are supported directly by State taxes for 95 cents out of every dollar, and earn very little money through contract services.

(g) Average ETV station income, regardless of ownership, is $368,000 per year. Community and State stations tend to operate on larger budgets than school and university stations.

(h) Station incomes range from less than $50,000 to $2,500,000. Community stations are more predominate in the higher income groups, while university stations tend to be found among the stations with lower budgets. However, a full 50 percent of the community stations report that their expenses are greater than their incomes. Of the other varieties, only school stations have no reports of such situations.

(i) Seventeen percent of all stations operate on less than $100,000 per year, and 39 percent on less than $200,000.

(j) Three cents out of every dollar expended by educational television stations is used for procurement of programs from outside sources—44 cents is spent for salaries, and 25 cents for engineering supplies and equipment.

The Federal Government has not only been aware of the growth of educational television, but has also assisted, through several important pieces of legislation. The National Defense Education Act provides for experimentation in the use of new media, and in the past 7 years more than $8 million has been obligated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for studying, planning, and reporting about ETV. Beyond this, almost 40 contracts have been awarded under title VII for the dissemination of information about the use of television in teaching.

The Educational Television Facilities Act, Public Law 87-447, has made possible direct Federal support for educational television stations. Grants have been made since 1962, on a matching basis with States, for development of new stations and for the expansion of existing facilities. Almost 100 applications have been accepted for filing.

The All-Channel Receiver Act makes it mandatory for manufacturers of television receivers to include capability for UHF reception in their products. A large number of the frequencies reserved for educational use are in the UHF band, and this has often been a deterrent to local station activation in VHF markets. Where potential audiences have no UHF receivers, an ETV station broadcasting above channel 13 is not likely to survive. Almost two-thirds of the ETV stations on the air today are in the VHF band, representing 50 percent of the VHF reservations. Only 18 percent of the frequencies set aside in the UHF spectrum have been activated. The impact of the All-Channel Receiver Act is yet to be felt; as more time passes, a greater number of receivers across the country will be able to see UHF broadcasts, and this fact is already spurring many local educational agencies toward activation of UHF stations.

The growth of educational television has been reassuring over the past decade, and the rate of expansion is increasing. Half of the stations on the air today were activated subsequent to 1960.

Private foundations have been committed quite heavily over the years to educational television. Between 1950 and 1960 the Fund for Adult Education, an independent agency established by the Ford Foundation, gave more than $12 million to ETV, after playing a major role in the very beginning of the movement. Since 1960, the Ford Foundation has continued to demonstrate a deep interest in the future of ETV, for which the entire country is very thankful. Other foundations have come to the assistance of stations—at both local and national levels—without which, in some cases, the stations might not have survived.

The educational television station is an instrument that has proven to be useful and powerful. More and better use of it must be made, but is there a single role for television in education? If we were free to mold local and national educational television into whatever shape we pleased, what could we choose?

Some would insist that educational television must be built as part of formal education, making its services aim primarily at the needs of school and classrooms.

There are those who would argue that the 2,500 megacycle band, closed circuit installations and other facilities are available for schools and that educational television station programing should provide "alternate viewing" for American television audiences, offering a steady stream of cultural and informational programs for those who wish to view.

Still others would tell us that the value of educational television lies in its ability to reach minority groups in need of specialized training. Continuing adult education, they would insist, is the area on which ETV must concentrate. Literacy programs, series for the socially neglected, extension courses for professionals in the community and programs in foreign languages should be the work of educational television.

The needs of American education, however, transcend any single philosophy for educational television. ETV must become as many things as possible, depending, in each instance, on the needs of the community and the needs of the station. There can be no single philosophy for educational television, and it is diversity itself—among stations—that will strengthen the national effort. Educational television must become a service; its properties and goals should change from day to day to day and from city to city.

Three fundamental needs in educational television persist, and the future of ETV will depend on these issues.

Educational television stations have no firm financial base on which to operate. The United States is unique in the world because its commercial broadcasting system is a giant in comparison with its educational and information service. We have been careful to define what educational television stations may not do, but we have not clearly described methods by which they may support themselves and expand. Television is as expensive as it is useful, and I do not believe we can expect noncommercial educational licensees to exist without a basic financial structure. This is not to propose Federal support for all of educational television, but it is to suggest that we examine the areas in which the Federal Government can assist, as we have assisted in elementary, secondary and higher education, vocational rehabilitation, and other specialized fields.

Continuity of growth must be assured. Educational television has passed through two important phases. The first included the establishment of a few stations, and the recognition of ETV as an instrumentality of importance. The second was the activation of many stations across the country, their organization into a single body of educational telecasters, and the establishment of distribution systems for programing.

The next phase for ETV is that of expansion. The agencies and foundations that have supported the movement from the start will, it is hoped, continue to contribute to its growth. Networking in the sense of actual interconnection will change during the next number of years from being statewide or regional to national. Interconnection among educational television stations is essential, if the medium is to provide the national service of which it is capable. Efforts are being made now toward this linkage.

For the stations themselves, the costs are prohibitive, but the advantages of a network are such that ways must be found to support the operation.

Additional stations must be activated across the country. Some cities already use more than one ETV station, but 40 percent of the country's population is not within reach of an educational signal. While the All-Channel Receiver Act will act as encouragement toward station activation, all other sources must be tapped to stimulate smaller communities toward the establishment of local ETV stations. I believe the FCC was wise in July of this year when it developed a new allocations plan calling for more than 600 ETV reservations. There is need for that many educational stations.

Educational television must be stimulated to produce a continuously better product. The outcome of education is the enlightenment of citizens; the output of any broadcasting service is its programs. Therefore, it is the mission of educational television to produce and distribute enlightening programs. Since there is intense competition among broadcasters for the attention of viewers, it is clear that ETV programs must be nothing short of excellent. Because of stringent budgets, ETV programs have hardly reached this level.

Instructional libraries and program centers must be nurtured for the good of all ETV stations. Regional centers for educational programs should undoubtedly be developed to serve stations at local levels, and part of the underpinning of these centers could well be a federal responsibility. It warrants serious consideration.

The Educational Television Facilities Act has now been operating for a period of 3 years. Its 5-year period will expire in the next Congress. What has been the impact of this act on the development of educational television? Should the ceiling limitation of $1 million to one State be raised? Should the matching funds formula be modified? Should the formula pertaining to interconnection costs be changed so as to encourage the early development of a nationwide interconnected educational television system?

It is my intention to have a full examination made of this entire subject matter in the very near future. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Federal Communications Commission, the two agencies charged with the administrative responsibility of the Educational Television Facilities Act, will be asked to submit their views and recommendations.

I am hopeful that all individuals and groups interested in educational television will put their minds to work on this subject so that a meaningful analysis and appropriate action can be taken to assure the continued expansion and development of this significant service to the public.

Report on 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my report on the 89th Congress, this summary of my 2-week trip to Asia might be of interest. This was a most informative mission and it is impossible to convey all of the impressions I received in such a short address. My official purpose was to attend the 11th annual conference of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League which met in Manila, Philippine Islands, on September 7–11.

Before going to Manila, however, I visited Japan, Korea, and the Republic of China. Japan is the industrial colossus of the Orient and is western in most respects. They are currently gripped by a strong wave of pacifism which seems to restrain the actions of the government leaders in relation to Communist threats. Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer told me, however, that he has noted a slight movement of the Japanese people into the realization that they, like the Americans, must respond to the Communist challenge in Asia. Mr. Reischauer is one of the most knowledgeable men I met and has served this post since 1961.

Two days in Korea proved to be among the most interesting of the entire trip. The APACL Freedom School is located in Seoul, and is just beginning to function. It is a part of the anti-Communist response which the free nations of Asia have developed in their efforts to cope with Communist propaganda and political subversion. I was the guest of President Chung Hee Park and his political leader and adviser, Jong Pil Kim. Korea has come a long way in the 12 years since the Korean war ended. They are one of our very stanchest allies and have responded well to the call for troops in Vietnam.

A highlight of this tour was a helicopter trip to Panmunjom where the negotiators still meet regularly but resolve little. One of the officers humorously referred to it as "Uncle Mao's Ding Dong School" since little results in the negotiations except the Red tirades and their lengthy philosophical lecturing of the free world representatives. As of that date, 33,182 violations have been charged by the Communists and each must be investigated.

Panmunjom and later visits to Corregidor, Bataan, Hong Kong and the U.S. cemetery in Manila where 17,000 Americans are laid at rest give mute testimony to former war efforts.

VISIT WITH CHIANG KAI-SHEK

In the Republic of China, you are once again on the edge of the Communist world. Quemoy and Matsu well up memories of the Eisenhower confrontation in the Taiwan Straits and our 7th Fleet's response to put down the Red Chinese threat to invade Formosa. An hour with Gen. Chiang Kai-shek certainly must rate as one of the most memorable experiences of my life. He was a world figure when I was a boy and it was stimulating to compare views with the 78-year-old statesman. Incidentally, he looked more like a man of 65. The Generalissimo was particularly concerned about the insistence by American leaders that there be negotiations in Vietnam. His view was that the offer of negotiations was fine and honorable but "to drum at this request week after week is wrong because Asians misunderstand our purposes and the Vietcong will become cocky."

Madame Chiang was in the United States during this time and upon my return she called the office and invited me to a private interview at her Washington hotel. These two persons certainly must be numbered among the great patriots of the world.

The Republic of China is going forward with great reforms, particularly in the area of land and agriculture. The Red Chinese still shell the offshore islands at intermittent periods and the Nationalist Chinese of course have two major international interests: exclusion of Red China from the U.N. and an eventual overthrow of the mainland Chinese Communist oppressors.

APACL CONFERENCE

The conference itself presented an opportunity to exchange ideas with men and women from all over the world. Every continent was represented and all seemed gripped with one concern, world communism. That America is the hope of the free world was etched on their every pronouncement and expression of hope. There were about 20 of us including Walter Judd and Prof. David Rowe of Yale who represented the United States. The keynote address was delivered by Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman, of Thailand. This nation is a good example of the changing sentiment among so-called nonalined nations. A few years ago Thailand was barely interested in the APACL but now that the designs of Red China are clearer to them, they are steadfast anti-Communists.

Excitement and tension was focused on the Pakistan-India war which broke out while delegates from those nations were on their way to Manila. On the whole, there was no rancor except for the usual denunciations. Each nation obviously thought the other was the aggressor.

A particularly interesting opportunity was offered when I was able to discuss Asian problems with Rufino J. Cardinal Santos, who was just leaving for the Vatican Ecumenical session. Cardinal Santos is the Archbishop of Manila and is extremely competent in the field of anticommunism.

The APACL Conference was a great success. I had met with many of these anti-Communist leaders before. They approach their work in dead seriousness. Expressions of strong support for American efforts in Vietnam were included in the many resolutions.

TRIP TO VIETNAM

It would go without saying that the highlight of the trip was the 3 days spent in Vietnam. It gives you a feeling of the unreal. A nation at war but not in the traditional sense of a frontline with opposing forces on each side. The Vietcong are everywhere and most skirmishes are in the southern delta section, far removed from North Vietnam. The Communists use selective terrorism to unnerve the people. Bombs are hurled into restaurants and hotels. Yet the city of Saigon flourishes, showing its French culture. School girls sing merrily on the way home. An air of determination prevails.

I came away with a very healthy respect for the Vietnamese people. Like most of the youthful nations in Asia they are faced with the herculean task of improving economic and political stability while at the same time devoting a major part of their time to staving off Communist efforts to take over their nation. No American can fully appreciate what it means to have the disruptions which these people face in their every day life. The United States of America stands as their only hope and one strong feeling came through in my discussions with hundreds of people there. They feel we are committed—something they had doubts about until President Johnson's strong statement and our resolute military actions. This has been a morale booster to the Vietnamese people and they in turn are making more headway in their three-pronged economic, military and political front.

I spent an afternoon with our troops at Bien Hoa. These are the men of the famous Big Red 1, the 1st Division, 2d Brigade. Their officers were superb. It is comforting to know there are men around like Col. James Simmons, who commands the 2d Brigade. More important, he commands the respect of those who are there in such a difficult situation. The sound of artillery firing in the background punctuated the briefing session. A tour of the facilities would have made any American duly proud.

Let me give you just one example. Bien Hoa is not exactly a garden of Eden. To dump several thousand men at this strategic point and then build the base around them is quite an endeavor. I was there on September 12, and you would have thought the camp was at least a year old instead of a scant half-dozen weeks. Morale? Think of this. It was in the monsoon season, and the mud reminded one of red North Carolina clay. Lumber had been requisitioned, but it could not be obtained expeditiously. This is no fault of the Defense Department. The officers and men, being Americans with gumption and the spirit of Yankee ingenuity, took the matter into their own hands. They used their pay to purchase lumber from nearby Vietnamese farmers and then built their own mess hall and facilities. Even more important, they constructed elevated wooden floors for their tents. This had a great psychological impact, to get a bunk off the muddy ground and up on a dry floor. This is the type of men we have there—no beatniks, draft card burners, or protestors. You would have been proud, as I was. One of the men I met was Sgt. Earl J. Moorehead, whose home is on Route 6, Cambridge.

One night in Saigon I listened to the Armed Forces radio network. The disc jockey was signing off and with a clear voice said:

> Reminding you that Vietnam is the place to be—

Small items but indicative of our morale and commitment there.

I have heard the myth repeated often that the Vietnamese are a weak people, and this is the wrong war in the wrong place. I could not disagree more. Consider just one fact: The Vietnamese people have gone through 20 full years of war and political disruption, and yet there is not one significant peace movement in their nation. Village chiefs in the provinces have been killed one by one by the Vietcong. Yet others immediately take their place. The Vietnamese are a sturdy people, and freedom will prosper if we help them eradicate the Vietcong.

In my conversations with the officers, troops, and the Vietnamese themselves, the question was raised dozens of times: Do the Lippmanns and the teach-ins represent thinking back in America? Walter Lippmann had just that week written a very negative article on American participation in Vietnam, and all of these things had an impact. Of course, this was before the current wave of vocal anti-Vietnamese protests, so they probably wonder even more now.

It is impossible to give more than these few highlights. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge invited me to lunch and we spent 2 interesting hours on a wide range of subjects. From Korea to Hong Kong, I received the benefit of military, political and economic briefings as well as the opportunity to meet with the national leaders of the respective countries. One of the indelible impressions received was in regards to the high caliber of the men in the Foreign Service. Accustomed to seeing the Washington types, I frankly did not expect to see such hard-working, knowledgeable people in our diplomatic posts which I visited. They give a person confidence which is sometimes hard to gain from the higher level State Department bureaucrat. Each day was packed with many interesting visits ranging from the textile mills to the rice paddies. I did not want a planned tour and made up the itinerary after my arrival. One typical day in Vietnam was like this:

Morning: Visit Tran Quoi Buu, president, Vietnamese Confederation of Labor. Visit Pham Ba Thuc, president, Employers' Association. Lunch with Ambassador Lodge. Afternoon: Helicopter trip to Bien Hoa Air Force Base. Evening: Dinner with labor attaché.

At each stop on the trip, I met a wide variety of American and local people. Consider this typical guest list at the dinner referred to above on 1 day in Saigon:

> Mr. Nguyen Xuan Phong, Minister of Labor; Mr. Tran Quoc Buu, president, Vietnamese Confederation of Labor; Mr. Nguyen Van Thang, vice president, Vietnamese Confederation of Labor; Mr. Dam Sy Hien, professor, former Minister of Labor and Minister of Social Welfare; Mr. Pham Viet Tuyen, editor, Tu Do; Mr. Ton That Thien, editor, Saigon Daily News; Mr. Nguyen Ngoc Rao, journalist for New York Times; Col. William H. Crossen, MACV; Mr. Alan Strachan, Deputy Director, USOM; Mr. Leslie Tihaney, chief, economic section of Embassy; Mr. Mel Levine, political officer; Mr. John P. Condon, first secretary of Embassy.

CONCLUSIONS

I was able to meet with young political leaders in each of the nations.

All in all, this trip was one of the most meaningful and rewarding 2 weeks of my life. The Asian people are a warm and friendly people. They look to us for help and leadership. You can well be proud of what we Americans are doing in Asia. I personally hope that we never let them down. In many ways, they are more realistic than we are and they certainly have a better understanding of communism than we in America do. The preamble contained in the Charter of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League declares:

> We, the freedom-loving peoples of Asia, being dedicated to the cause of democracy and keenly conscious of the menace of Communist aggression in various parts of the world, look upon international Communist imperialism as a tyranny working for the enslavement of humanity and threatening world peace. We are convinced that the free peoples can neither compromise nor coexist with Communist imperialism.

Rather to the point, is it not? They need our leadership but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, we can learn a great deal from them. I certainly did.

Americans must not grow weary at our task. We are like the watchman at the bridge who can prevent a wreck. Our duty is clear. We cannot escape responsibility even though the burden is great, the hours are long, and relief is not in sight—even though we have served far beyond the ordinary duty. This is our challenge. The future of all civilization depends on our response.

At this point I would like to include with these remarks the speech I delivered at the conference:

VOTING RECORD

The voting record which is printed at the conclusion of these remarks contains only a brief identification of the issue because of space. Upon request, my office will furnish a record which includes further detail and a summarization of the issue involved in each vote. I will personally be glad to explain or give additional information on any particular issue. Your Congressman was present and voted on all major issues although I missed some votes due to important committee assignments which entailed hearings outside of Washington. My Asian trip and personal reasons such as death in the families also accounted for several absences. The letters "NV" indicate these absences but I have then indicated how I would have voted if present:

Voting record, 89th Cong., 1st sess.

Roll call No.	Issue	Vote	Roll-call No.	Issue	Vote
2	Election of Speaker	Ford.	35	Congressional redistricting	Yea.
3	Seating the Mississippi delegation	Yea.	38	Supreme Court pay raise	Nay.
4	House rule changes	Nay.	39	Supreme Court pay raise	Nay.
6	New York election contest	Yea.	42	Recommit District of Columbia crime bill	Nay.
7	Barring aid to Nasser	Yea.	43	District of Columbia crime bill	Yea.
10	Barring aid to Nasser	Yea.	45	Acreage-poundage tobacco quotas	Nay.
12	Recommit gold reserve bill	Yea.	52	Recommit Federal school aid	Yea.
13	Federal Reserve bank gold reserves	Nay.	53	Federal school aid	Nay.
16	Arms control authorization	Nay.	57	Grants to help older people	Yea.
19	Recommit IDA	Yea.	58	Water resources planning	Yea.
20	Inter-American development authorization	Nay.	60	Manpower training program extension	Yea.
23	Recommit HCUA funds	Nay.	62	Obscene mail return	Yea.
24	House Un-American Activities funds	Yea.	63	Saigon Chancery construction	Yea.
28	Recommit Appalachia bill	Nay.	64	Treasury-Post Office appropriations	Nay.
29	Appalachia bill	Yea.	66	Second supplemental appropriations	Yea.
31	Drug abuse control	Yea.	70	Medicare bill recommit	Yea.
33	Arts Council authorization	NV—Nay.	71	Compulsory medicare bill	Nay.

Voting record, 89th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Issue	Vote
72	Arms control authorization	Nay.
74	Presidential inability amendment	Yea.
76	Ku Klux Klan investigation funds	Yea.
78	Recommit International Monetary Fund	Yea.
79	International Monetary Fund	Nay.
82	Water pollution control funds	NV—Yea.
84	2d supplemental appropriations	NV—Yea.
85	$942,000,000 helicopter subsidy	NV—Nay.
86	National Council on arts authorization	NV—Nay.
87	Community health services	NV—Yea.
90	Mental health grants	Yea.
92	Vietnam military appropriations	Yea.
94	Military procurement authorization	Yea.
96	Space program funds, NASA, authorization	Yea.
97	Space Program Funds, NASA, authorization	Yea.
99	Health research facility grants	Yea.
101	International Coffee Agreement	Nay.
104	Recommit AEC authorization	Yea.
105	AEC authorization	Yea.
109	Foreign aid authorization	NV—Nay.
110	Foreign aid authorization	NV—Nay.
112	Bar sales to Sukarno and Nasser	NV—Yea.
113	Agriculture appropriations	NV—Nay.
116	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations	Nay.
117	Small coal mine safety	Yea.
119	Excise tax reduction	Yea.
121	FAA Administrator	Nay.
123	Railroad retirement increase	Yea.
126	Legislative appropriations	Yea.
127	Export control continuation	NV—Yea.
129	National debt limit increase	NV—Nay.
130	National debt limit increase	Nay.
131	Amend Kennedy film	Yea.
132	Kennedy film showing	Nay.
141	Recommit Housing and Urban Development Department	Yea.
142	Housing and Urban Development Department	Nay.
143	Hiring congressional interns	Nay.
145	Vocational student loan insurance	Yea.
146	Agriculture disaster relief	Yea.
147	Baltic States resolution	Yea.
153	Defense appropriations	Yea.
155	Area redevelopment extension	Nay.
157	Housing and Urban Development rule	Nay.
162	Rent supplements	Nay.
163	Remove rent supplements	Yea.
164	Housing and Urban Development	Nay.
167	Voting Rights Bill Rule	Yea.
175	Clean elections amendment	Yea.
176	Voting rights amendment	Nay.
177	Non-English-speaking amendment	Nay.
178	Recommit voting rights bill	Yea.
179	Pass voting rights	Yea.
181	AEC powe lines	NV—Nay.
182	Summer Government jobs	NV—Yea.
185	Cigarette Labeling Act	Yea.
188	Amend Coinage Act	Yea.
189	Changing coinage system	Nay.
193	Armed services pay raise	Yea.
196	Recommit poverty program expansion	Yea.
197	Poverty program expansion	Nay.
199	Taft-Hartley 14(b) rule	Nay.
203	Conference report on medicare	Nay.
204	Conference report on Housing Act	Nay.
205	Conference report on mental health grants	Yea.
208	Recommit Taft-Hartley 14(b) removal	Yea.
209	Taft-Hartley 14(b) removal	Nay.
212	AEC powerlines	Nay.
214	Highway funds authorization	Yea.
215	Police Training Act	Yea.
216	Prisoner rehabilitation	Yea.
218	Recommit voting rights	Yea.
219	Conference report on voting rights	Yea.
220	Civil service retirement increase	Yea.
221	Military construction authorization	Yea.
222	International banks	Nay.
224	Interest equalization tax	NV—Nay.
225	Interest equalization tax	NV—Nay.
228	District of Columbia auto insurance	Nay.
230	Draft card mutilations	Yea.
234	Regional development	Nay.
235	Recommit regional development	Yea.
236	Regional development	Nay.
238	Nickel duty suspension	NV—Nay.
239	Federal Boxing Commission	NV—Yea.
242	Foreign aid authorization	Nay.
243	Recommit 1965 farm bill	Yea.
244	1965 farm bill	Nay.
246	Recommit Labor-HEW supplemental appropriations	Yea.
248	Western Hemisphere limitations	Yea.
249	Immigration Act	Yea.
252	Higher Education Act	Yea.
253	School aid liberalization	Yea.
254	Rule on tariff bill	Yea.
255	Removing tariffs on Canadian automobiles	Nay.
257	Health education aid	Nay.
259	High-speed transportation	NV—Nay.
262	Military construction authorization	NV—Yea.
263	Military construction authorization	NV—Nay.
264	Veterans compensation increase	NV—Yea.
265	Crime Commission funds	NV—Yea.
269	Foreign aid appropriation	NV—Nay.
296	Park Service concessions	NV—Nay.
299	Preserve Governor's poverty program veto	Yea.
301	Arts and Humanities Foundation	Yea.
303	Patronage employee name disclosure	Nay.
304	Nuclear accident indemnification	Yea.
306	Defense appropriations conference report	Yea.
307	Mississippi contested elections	Yea.
309	Servicemen's life insurance	Yea.
310	Anti-Communist intervention	Yea.
313	Water pollution control funds	Yea.
315	Rivers and harbors	Yea.
316	Florida Cultural and Trade Center	Nay.
320	Bank holding companies	Yea.
321	Rural water and sanitation loans rule	Nay.
322	Rural water and sanitation loans	Yea.
324	Recommit air pollution	Yea.
325	Air Pollution Act	Yea.
327	Discharge District of Columbia home rule	Nay.
328	District of Columbia home rule	Nay.
336	Strike the enacting clause, District of Columbia bill	Yea.
337	Substitute District of Columbia home rule	Yea.
338	Recommit District of Columbia home rule	Yea.
339	District of Columbia home rule	Yea.
341	Immigration conference report	Yea.
342	Recommit Federal pay raise	Yea.
343	Federal pay raise	Yea.
345	Madison Memorial Library recommittal	Nay.
346	Madison Memorial Library	Yea.
347	Recommit foreign aid appropriations	Yea.
348	Foreign aid appropriations	Nay.
349	Medical library facilities	Yea.
350	Jefferson National Expansion Memorial	Yea.
353	Ryukyu Islands damages	NV—Yea.
354	Nevada water project	NV—Nay.
356	Recommit highway environment control	Yea.
357	Highway environment control	Nay.
363	Rule on sugar bill	Yea.
366	Recommit sugar bill	Yea.
367	Sugar bill	Nay.
376	Delete National Teachers Corps	Yea.
377	Conference report on Higher Education Act	Nay.
378	River and harbor conference report	Nay.
380	Conference Report on supplemental appropriations	Nay.
381	Separate vote on Dickey-Lincoln power project	Nay.
383	Conference report on sugar bill	Nay.

International Food and Nutrition Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, because of many inquiries being received requesting copies of S. 2157, the International Food and Nutrition Act, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD following this statement so it will be widely available to persons interested in their libraries, as well as to Members of Congress and the executive departments.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2157

A bill to provide for the United States participation and leadership in an international effort to end malnutrition and human want, and for related purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. (a) CITATION AND EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act may be cited as the International Food and Nutrition Act of 1965, and shall become effective upon its enactment and approval by the President of the United States.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purpose of this Act is to provide for the use of the excess production and capacity of American agriculture and food industries and, insofar as possible, in cooperation with other nations, to eliminate human hunger and malnutrition throughout the world, to assist underdeveloped nations in increasing their own production of food and other human requirements, and to encourage other developed nations to participate in a united effort to eliminate want as a potential cause for international disputes, aggression, or war.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President of the United States for allocation by him to appropriate agencies including an agency of the United Nations, in addition to appropriations for current programs, $500 million for fiscal 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter through fiscal year 1970 an amount equal to the amount authorized for the preceding fiscal year increased by $500 million and continuing at the fiscal year 1970 level through fiscal year 1975, for the following purposes:

(A) Purchase of domestic agricultural products, including high protein animal and vegetable foods, and payment for enrichment of foods, to be sold, exchanged, or donated to nations without adequate nutritional supplies for their citizens, including sales on long-term credit, sales for currencies not convertible into dollars, and grants, as may be necessary in consideration of the economic condition and needs of each recipient nation.

(B) Payments for such processing, enrichment, storage, and transportation as may be necessary or desirable, including loans or grants to recipient nations for such purposes within their boundaries where necessary to assure preservation and countrywide distribution of foodstuffs.

(C) Expansion of the United States Peace Corps to provide personnel which may be usefully employed abroad in assisting with distribution and in training citizens of recipient nations in handling, storage, preparation, and distribution of such foods.

(D) Enlargement of rural technical assistance programs through the Agency for International Development and the colleges, universities, firms, foundations, individuals, and government departments cooperating with it to assist underdeveloped nations in increasing their own food production, or, in areas deficient in agricultural resources, in the production of goods exchangeable for foods through sales and purchases in normal trade channels.

(E) Payment of the additional expenses of departments or agencies of the United States Government required by increased operations under the provision of this Act, and payment of the United States share of the operating costs of any United Nations agency with objectives and programs implementing the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. The President may designate a director of the international food and nutrition (food-for-peace) program, create such advisory groups, and promulgate such regulations governing the administration of this Act as he deems advisable, including regulations to assure proper use and distribution of foods to needy in recipient nations.

SEC. 4. The Congress recommends to the President that he negotiate with other nations, through his Ambassador to the United Nations, for the expansion of the world food program of the United Nations or other multilateral agency of the United Nations to assume as much responsibility for world freedom from hunger as possible with the participation and support of the United States.

Congressman Ancher Nelsen's Report to the Second District on the 1st Session of the 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in order that my constituents in the Second Congressional District of Minnesota may better understand and judge the actions of this 1st session of the 89th Congress, I have prepared a brief summary of major work completed this year. A summary of this sort is essential if the people we are here to represent are to be fully informed. This report cannot include an accounting of all the several hundred bills passed during the last 10 months, of course, but it is intended to inform about important bills passed or rejected.

THE OVERALL PICTURE

By virtually everyone's estimation, in terms of quantity this has been the most lawmaking Congress in American history. In 10 months, scores of old and new ideas have become law. No other single session of the Congress has contributed so much to the continuing trend toward centralization of governmental powers in the National Government in Washington. This has been a Congress devoted to slogans instead of study and characterized by pressures rather than by perfection.

In terms of dollars, this Congress also set alltime records. Only one other Congress in our history spent more—the 1942 Congress which poured $150 billion into the crucial task of winning World War II. The 89th Congress has appropriated some $118 billion, in sharp contrast with the $106 billion appropriated last year. This is an increase of $12 billion in a single year, or 11.3 percent. Around half of this increase is for the many Great Society domestic ventures now underway.

In comparison with other years, our efforts to reduce nonessential spending have not been as successful, I regret. Only a bit more than $2 billion was trimmed from budgetary requests, in contrast to better than $10 billion cut in the 2 previous years of the 88th Congress.

In terms of the merit of the far-reaching congressional actions taken this year, of course, each constituent will want to judge for himself.

EXCISE TAXES

Excise tax reductions to total around $4.8 billion by 1969 were voted. There was little opposition to cutting back these regressive taxes imposed during wartime on many items ranging from cosmetics to telephone services. However, it was disturbing to many of us to find Congress following this action by raising the ceiling on our national debt to $328 billion in order to permit greater deficit spending. The inevitable consequences of such contrary fiscal policies are to bring the Nation nearer bankruptcy by overloading the debt burden of future generations and to encourage inflation, a curse to those on low or fixed incomes because the value of the dollars they earn or save is destroyed. Such contrary policies additionally aggravate our country's serious balance-of-payments problems and contribute to the gold flow away from our shores.

APPALACHIAN DEVELOPMENT, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The first major Great Society measure to clear Congress in 1965, this new law provides $1.1 billion to 12 States in the Appalachian area in efforts to remedy economic depression. Approved in the House without change, it is to do such things as build roads and restore marginal farmland to production. Some 17 amendments designed to improve it were rejected by the House.

Later on in the year, Congress decided to set up another omnibus regional development program for other areas said to be economically distressed, and provided another $3.3 billion for this purpose to be spread over 5 years. Appalachia can share in this one, too. An expanded Area Redevelopment Administration is to handle it. The House rejected 14 amendments during debate on this scheme.

IMMIGRATION

Substantial changes have been made in our immigration laws which should improve on the old national origins law under which we operated for a number of years. Under the new system, key preference is given to reuniting families and to those with skills needed in America, while protections written into the law should assure that no immigrant admitted will deprive an American worker of a job nor impair wage structures and working conditions. Total immigration is increased only slightly, and no more than 20,000 could be admitted annually from any country outside the Western Hemisphere. The first ceiling in our history is imposed on immigration from other countries in the Western Hemisphere.

Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson all sought these improvements, which will hopefully make diplomatic dealings easier now that we have moved away from the quota system some nations interpreted as discriminatory.

VOTING RIGHTS

In the face of evidence that Negro voters continue to be discriminated against at the polls, Congress with big majority votes enacted a bill designed to assure all Americans of their fundamental, constitutional right to vote. While some of us would have preferred dealing with this painful and difficult problem in different legislative fashion to avoid questions of constitutionality, the mandate imposed by the 15th amendment is clear. This amendment reads:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Gratifying to many of us was the inclusion in this law of a provision we had suggested pertaining to Federal voting frauds, such as vote buying, ballot stuffing, and so forth. Guarantee of the right to vote cannot be meaningful unless that vote is fairly counted.

EDUCATION MEASURES

For the first time in our Nation's history, Congress passed legislation authorizing funds for general use in elementary and secondary schools. The new law, with a first-year cost of $1.3 billion, gives grants to some 94 percent of the Nation's counties to assist in educating children from low-income families. This sweeping program passed the House with 1 minor change and after 19 other amendments were rejected.

Many other education measures received support by this Congress. The higher education program established during the Eisenhower years was renewed and substantially revised. It will cost about $643 million a year for the next 4 years. Congress this year incorporated into this program a National Federal Teacher Corps. Corps members will be recruited, trained, and fully paid by the Federal Government and will be sent by the Federal Education Commissioner to local elementary and secondary schools where such teachers are requested and where there are large numbers of poor children.

Vocational education, manpower training, and a wide variety of other educational programs were expanded and extended.

SOCIAL SECURITY CHANGES

With first-year costs pegged at $6.5 billion, the so-called medicare program, part compulsory and part voluntary, becomes partially effective July 1, 1966. The compulsory hospital plan has raised fears that the entire social security system may be jeopardized and many oldsters may be disappointed by its inadequacies. Younger workers, of course, face a heavier tax burden—$35 billion alone for those who have paid nothing into the fund. Within a few years, social security payroll taxes for both employee and employer will be doubled.

Fortunately, overall changes made do increase social security benefits to older citizens by 7 percent, and the Kerr-Mills plan, now effective in Minnesota, is expanded.

FLOOD CONTROL LEGISLATION

Included in flood protection legislation enacted into law are three separate items which will prove most helpful to southwestern Minnesota. The Army Corps of Engineers has been given $150,000 to proceed with its comprehensive survey of the Minnesota River Valley Basin. The survey is designed to eye such matters as flood and pollution control, land, water and wildlife conservation, recreation and industrial development. Eventually, the survey should contribute toward the sound economic development of our whole region.

Second, some $100,000 has been made available to plan a flood control diking project at Mankato and North Mankato, the site of some of the worst flooding during this spring.

Third, I was successful in amending the omnibus flood bill on the House floor to assure the people of the Mankato area that the Government will give consideration to expenses they have incurred this summer in constructing flood protection works when the Government figures the local costs of the Federal diking project to be built there later on.

OMNIBUS FARM LEGISLATION

Congress, after much debate and soul searching, passed an amended omnibus farm bill extending, with some changes, existing programs for wheat, feed grains, wool, and cotton. The legislation also institutes a cropland retirement program patterned after the old soil bank plan, and it establishes a class I base dairy plan. A formula for an increase in the release price of Commodity Credit Corporation grain was not written into the law, though it would have been a definite improvement.

SUGAR LEGISLATION

The sugar act has been extended to insure domestic growers of an increase in permitted marketings, but Congress did not do much to correct the complicated quota system which gives some 40 percent of our domestic sugar requirements to foreign sugar interests.

RURAL WATER SYSTEMS

Congress established a new program of matching grants to help develop water supply and waste disposal systems in rural areas, including sewage systems in towns up to 5,500 population.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROLS

Recognizing present serious water shortages, fish and wildlife losses from contaminated streams, and increasing drinking water needs, Congress enacted new legislation in an effort to reduce serious water pollution of public waterways. States are supposed to establish water quality standards and related enforcement programs, and will get assistance with sewage treatment plant construction and with related needs.

MONEY CHANGES

The Congress eliminated a requirement in existing law that each Federal Reserve bank maintain gold certificate reserves valued at not less than 25 percent of the amount of commercial bank deposits it holds in order to free some $4.9 billions in gold to meet international claims. Each dollar deposited now, of course, has less gold backing.

Another change removes the silver content from quarters and dimes and reduces the silver in half dollars to 40 percent. All heretofore have contained 90 percent silver. These new coins are to be circulated starting around Christmastime. While some reduction in silver may be necessary to counter shortages, totally abandoning the use of silver in favor of worthless tokens runs counter to the lessons of history.

NEW DEPARTMENT ESTABLISHED

The Nation's 11th Cabinet-level department, to be known as the Department of Housing and Urban Development, has been established, though operation of more than 60 Federal programs relating to urban affairs is to remain in other jurisdictions, including some two-thirds of the Government's existing housing programs. The new Secretary has not yet been designated.

FOREIGN AID

The Congress voted $3.2 billions in foreign aid this year, commendably the smallest sum since this controversial program was started in 1947. Unfortunately, however, a ban on aid to nations shipping goods to North Vietnam proposed in the House did not prevail in the Senate, and was not included in the final legislation. It was the view of many that any shipping, even of nonstrategic imports, bolsters the economy of North Vietnam and contributes to its ability to continue a war in which many American fighting men are losing their lives.

OMNIBUS HOUSING

This $7 billion city catchall housing package includes authorization of an additional 60,000 units a year for several years for low-rent public housing, and additional housing for the elderly, college students, and others. It also creates a program entirely new to our country—Government subsidized rent. Fortunately, this new wrinkle created so much consternation when it became known that many thousands of middle-income Americans could receive rent assistance, Congress later refused to appropriate funds for the rent subsidies.

PRESIDENTIAL CONTINUITY

A Presidential continuity amendment was approved. It would give the President the right to nominate a Vice President when the office is vacant and attempts to clarify when the Vice President should become Acting President due to Presidential disability. If ratified by three-fourths of our States within 7 years, it will become our 25th amendment to the Constitution.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

This much debated measure authorizes the appropriation of $320 million for the first 2 years to remove junkyards and billboards along interstate and primary highways, but costs beyond that time are not known. The Secretary of Commerce is given power to withhold 10 percent of a State's highway funds if it does not comply with new Federal standards, though this punishment may be waived if he finds it in the public interest. As many as 18 States may have to amend their constitutions to avoid penalties, while the economic impact on small businessmen using billboards to attract tourist trade may well be severe.

POVERTY WAR

Despite cries from citizens in every part of the country about serious and admitted defects in the so-called war on poverty, Congress chose to ignore the pleas for correction and instead doubled spending for this year-old program. An additional $1.8 billion was authorized to be spent. It is now reported that 1 in every 19 employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity makes over $19,000 a year, and this extravagant situation is likely to continue until the legislative branch exercises more careful control over a program with the worthwhile objective of helping the poor, but primarily benefiting politicians and bureaucrats at present.

ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Also established is a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities which is to provide Federal financial aid to the visual and performing arts and to the humanities. Some $63 million is to be spent helping artists and other cultural groups and persons between now and 1968, with the chairman of a specially established arts endowment to hold broad powers in making recommendations on requests for Federal arts funds.

MILITARY, FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PAY RAISES

A military pay bill designed to remedy the inadequate income situation of so many in the uniform of our Nation has been enacted. The 10.7-percent increase goes to more than 2.6 million Americans on active duty and to military dependents. The need for this increase might best be illustrated by the fact that those in the three lowest grades of our military services have been receiving less pay than the school dropouts in the Job Corps. Additionally, low pay has discouraged reenlistments among those the United States has spent billions to train. Accordingly, the boost may actually reduce ultimate defense outlays.

A Federal worker pay raise of 3.6 percent also was voted. In a preliminary vote, some of us succeeded in eliminating an unwarranted salary increase of 10 percent or more which was planned for top Federal executives, high-ranking judges and Members of Congress. It is to be deplored when Government officials use the needs of underpaid Federal workers as a vehicle to promote their own selfish salary betterment.

PROTECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

Congress has agreed to make it a Federal crime to kill, kidnap, or assault the President or other high Government officials, a measure proposed by many of us. Penalties for trying to hinder or harm any of these individuals would be punishable by fine, imprisonment and, in cases of most serious offense, by death.

WORK OF MY COMMITTEES

This was an especially busy and demanding year for me due to my increased responsibility as ranking minority member on the District of Columbia Committee and added duties on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Our Interstate Committee handled the legislation requiring that a precautionary health warning be carried on cigarette packages and cartons.

The Interstate Committee was also given the task of establishing a 3-year program of Federal grants to aid localities in establishing regional medical programs where emphasis is to be placed on combating such killers as heart disease, stroke, and cancer. The program stresses these regional cooperative arrangements among medical schools, research institutions, and hospitals are to be carried out in cooperation with local doctors, administrators, and others. Our committee substantially altered this measure from the original proposal, which sought to build regional medical complexes around the country.

Another interstate bill enacted is to control air pollution from automotive exhausts and to authorize a national research program for disposal of solid wastes such as garbage, rubbish, and so forth. No deadline is set for establishing standards for car exhaust fumes.

A number of bills expanding the activities of the U.S. Public Health Service in the areas of mental retardation and mental illness, immunization from contagious diseases, health services to migrant workers, and public health nursing all were handled by our busy Interstate Committee, as were proposals for aid to medical and dental schools and for assistance to students in the health sciences.

I was particularly interested in our committee's work toward the passage of the drug abuse control law which provides for restrictions on the manufacturing and sale of such drugs as "goof balls" and "pep pills." These drugs have tragically started some youngsters on the road to lifetime drug addiction.

In our District Committee, we dealt with a multiplicity of home rule bills for Washington, worked up a strong anticrime bill which the Senate did not accept, and handled many other matters dealing with our Nation's Capital.

LEGISLATION FAILING TO PASS

The following legislation did not receive final approval in this first session of Congress, but will doubtless receive further attention next year:

Repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which permits States to enact right-to-work laws.

The administration's home rule plan for Washington, D.C.

Legislation such as I have introduced making it possible for Americans to vote on a constitutional amendment guaranteeing the States their right to decide the composition of their State legislatures.

Changes in the unemployment compensation program.

Changes in minimum wage and hour laws.

Changes in the secondary boycott law.

Acceptance of an income tax credit for parents or sponsors of students seeking a college education, also a proposal on which I have sought enactment into law.

Legislation introduced by many of us from the Midwest assuring an adequate boxcar supply in all parts of the Nation.

David G. Nagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, last week memorial exercises were held in the Superior Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass., in honor and memory of the late David G. Nagle, who served for years with great distinction as associate justice, the superior court, being the great trial court of Massachusetts.

The late Justice Nagle, a dear and valued friend of mine, for years rendered dedicated service in the legislative and judicial branches of government. His service as a judge covered a period from 1936 until his death in 1960. For over 11 years of this service, he served as associate justice of the superior court.

During his years of service, Judge Nagle lived up to the high traditions of the Massachusetts judiciary, making his own contributions to the dignity and strength of the court.

In my remarks, I include an address made on that occasion by way of telephone:

Your honors, Mr. Justice Hudson, and Mr. Justice Murray; Father Nagle; Mr. Justice Kirk, and other members of the supreme judicial court; Chief Justice Tauro, and other members of the superior court; members of the Massachusetts bar; clerks of the court, Edward Keating and Thomas Dorgan; Mrs. Nagle, and your loved ones, it is fitting and proper that we pay tribute to an outstanding representative of the judiciary who sat in these hallowed halls in judgment of his fellow man and in the interpretation and enforcement of the law. Certainly, those of us who knew our beloved friend, Judge Dave Nagle best, miss him the most. We feel his loss because we knew that underneath that quiet and humble facade, was a man whose courage was unquestioned, whose understanding and intellectual capacity were superior to most, and whose love for his family and his friends was unsurpassed.

The following quotation of Platus is most appropriate this day:

"He whom the Gods favor dies young
While he is in his health
Has his senses and his judgment sound."

This year, in our new Boston, in our great commonwealth and in this magnificent country of the United States, we should give pause to reflect as we look at the law, those privileged to administer justice and our status as citizens in our great land. The law has given us new horizons. The rights of man in our land have been greatly expanded. As lawyers and those interested in the law, we must acknowledge that our Government has in this day made it possible for each of our citizens to receive the benefits of a dynamic society. We have, in fact, opened new horizons because we have applied the principles of law and the judicial process to the needs of upgrading our society. Our great President, the Congress, and the courts, working together as equal partners of the finest Government in the world, have wrought benefits for all our citizens. We are all working together for the improvement of our educational system, the elimination of slums, the reduction of crime, the extension of voting rights, assistance to the poor and needy, and comfort to our aged.

The grave responsibility which rests on the shoulders of the judges, the lawyers, the legislators, is known to the majority of our citizens. Certainly, most of our citizens should recognize that the magnificent achievements we see today in our Nation have resulted because this Government of ours and those who govern have, by legislation and by the interpretation and application of constitutional principles, set in motion a new era. It can safely be said that nowhere else in the world is it possible for a citizen to express himself so freely without fear of reprisal by his Government. Why is this so? To a great extent it is because of the courage and independence of our courts and those who serve as justices, many of whom I recognize, are serving at great sacrifice to themselves and their families.

It was the Supreme Court of the United States that led the way in the landmark case in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*. It was our courts, by insisting on the right to picket, to protest peaceably and to demonstrate that enabled the movement for racial equality to achieve its strength.

The Supreme Court and the Federal and State courts, have been in the forefront of this new era because they have protected the rights of all our citizens. The courts are playing a leading part on the judicial level in the fight to protect the underprivileged. Our courts have insisted on the due process of law, have insisted on fair trials and have insisted on the right to counsel.

Our beloved Government has enabled us to move forward because of the rule of law. Our citizens must recognize the rule of law for what it is—is something to be cherished and obeyed. For it is not morally justifiable to break the law openly and notoriously, even if we feel that any law is not correct.

The courts and those of us who are elected officials must not be reluctant to meet lawlessness quickly and firmly. For "where law ceases, tyranny starts." Or on the American scene, in the historical utterance of Patrick Henry, "Give me liberty, or give me death."

We cannot maintain our society in the face of wanton public disregard for law and order. I am sure the sober-thinking citizens of our Nation recognize this, and our courts will continue to lead the way in protecting the rights of all our citizens regardless of their race, creed or color.

We have an obligation as citizens to support our Government, and our elected officials and our courts. Certainly, while our youth and the best in our Nation are giving their lives for the defense of democracy in Vietnam, we owe it to them to aid in every way, and not confuse and deprecate their efforts. Our national conscience should require us to do no less. Our debt and our obligation to our fighting men in all our armed services has never been greater than it is today.

We are at the beginning, not at the end, of a great era. We are striving to uplift our poor and underprivileged. We are striving to wipe out misery. We need to do much more if we are to attain these goals.

We can take pride in our democracy. We can take pride because it is a moving force for good in the world. We can take pride because we recognize the moral and spiritual values which govern our actions. We can take pride because our judges administer the law without fear or discrimination or prejudice. We can take pride because we are recognizing the fact that our police forces should be trained and equipped to prevent crime and apprehend lawbreakers. We in Government have great responsibilities, challenges undreamed of decades ago. It is how we meet these challenges when the history of our day is written which will determine whether our efforts have been worthwhile.

It is well we pause to pay tribute to the life and memory of our late friend, Judge David G. Nagle.

Honorable and trustworthy, Judge Nagle led a dedicated life in the service of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and whose nobility of character was an inspiration for all others to follow.

Judge Nagle did much to serve his fellowman; we should do no less.

Huxley's words were never more appropriate:

Be not afraid, ye waiting hearts that weep,
For God still giveth his beloved sleep,
And if an endless sleep he wills, so be it.

A Record of Press Conference Statements Made by Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen and Representative Gerald R. Ford for the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, pursuant to permission granted on Friday, October 22, I submit for printing in the RECORD, the following record of press conference statements by the joint Senate-House Republican leadership:

THE JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

FOR THE SENATE

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, leader.

THOMAS H. KUCHEL, whip.

BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, chairman of the policy committee.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, chairman of the conference.

THRUSTON B. MORTON, chairman of the Republican senatorial committee.

FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

GERALD R. FORD, leader.

LESLIE C. ARENDS, whip.

MELVIN R. LAIRD, chairman of the conference.

JOHN J. RHODES, chairman of the policy committee.

H. ALLEN SMITH, ranking member, Rules Committee.

BOB WILSON, chairman, Republican congressional committee.

CHARLES E. GOODELL, chairman, committee on planning and research.

PRESIDING OFFICER

Ray C. Bliss, the Republican national chairman.

FOREWORD

This legislative year marks the fifth year of existence of the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership established at the suggestion of President Dwight D. Eisenhower in January 1961.

The format remains that of issuing policy statements on subjects, both foreign and domestic, usually in the form of a press conference by Senator DIRKSEN and Representative FORD. Occasionally, releases were made without the press conference or by some other member of the leadership.

The membership was increased by one member this year with the addition of the chairman of the Committee on Planning and Research, CHARLES E. GOODELL. During the session the leadership was saddened by the passing of Clarence J. Brown, one of the original members of the joint leadership. Representative H. ALLEN SMITH thereby succeeded to the leadership as ranking member of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives. During the year the meetings were presided over by Republican National Committee Chairman Dean Burch and his successor, Ray Bliss.

During this year Robert Humphreys, who served with great devotion and efficiency as the staff consultant of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership since its inception, was granted a leave of absence because of a lingering illness. Mr. Humphreys died on October 15. The Joint Leadership mourns the passing of this irreplaceable colleague. At the time of his death, Columnist David Lawrence paid him this richly deserved tribute: "He made a deep impression here in the National Capital as an honest and conscientious worker in the field of politics * * * he was one of those anonymous workers whose services over the years have been invaluable to the Republican Party."

The members of the joint leadership are members of the Republican Coordinating Committee, a new idea in party politics. During this session the Coordinating Committee held three sessions, formed five task forces, and approved three task force reports. All indications are that the Republican Coordinating Committee will continue as a positive force in the examination of party policy and party operations.

As in previous years, the leadership statements for 1965 are being published as a Senate document. They appear on the following pages and are indexed as to the issue covered.

BERLIN WALL

(By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, August 13, 1965)

August 13 marks the fourth anniversary of a tragedy in American foreign relations and a tragedy for all mankind—the erection of one of man's most hated and degrading structures, the Berlin wall. The wall is an insult to all of mankind. It is an ugly reminder that the Communists cannot command the voluntary allegiance of those trapped by terrible circumstance within their borders.

In 1961, the Communists violated the Four Power Agreement, a pledge among nations, and they violated man's sense of individual diversity, a pledge among all men, when they constructed their cold cement edifice. Now, 4 years afterward, the wall has been warmed many times over by the blood of courageous, imprisoned men who have sought escape from mistrust, compulsion by force, and deadening conformity.

The lust for freedom of the east German people has sent unnumbered hundreds under, through, and over the wall in quest of this freedom. In order to join with their families and friends in the West and escape the tyranny of Communist government, these men have matched bravery and ingenuity against the fiendish traps and obstacles concocted by the Communists. Many German people have died by the bullets of Communist rifles when they sought to escape.

It is a great irony that man's response to the wall, the escape, has become one of the most meaningful and important actions to all freedom-loving men. We feel a common bond with the stifled individuals behind the wall, and every freeman identifies with the individuals who are compelled by conscience and blessed with the opportunity to escape.

Tragically, as more men have escaped and more men have died, the wall has been fortified and enlarged with cement, wire, and explosives. Yet one remains confident that the bravery and genius of such men will not be defeated by a wall.

The return of freedom and unity to all the German people must remain a major objective of the foreign policy of the United States until the wall is no more.

COST OF LIVING

(By Senator DIRKSEN, August 5, 1965)

The most recent figures on the cost of living convey disheartening news. For the third month in a row a substantial increase in living costs were registered. The increase to date in 1965 has been four times the increase during the same period of 1964.

The month of June showed the biggest increase in 23 months. Food prices alone rose 2 percent. The meat, poultry, and fish group was up 10 percent from a year ago.

Food-store prices in the Washington area bring these statistics to life. For instance, in one chainstore since June 1964 the cost of smoked ham has risen from 43 cents per pound to 59 cents per pound. At another chainstore, the past 13 months have seen a rise in the cost of rib steaks of 22 cents per pound, while boneless chuck roast has zoomed from 49 cents per pound to 85 cents per pound. Pork chops at another chainstore have nearly doubled in price, from 69 cents per pound in June of 1964 to today's price of $1.19 per pound. The same store in the same period has seen bacon more than double in price, from 49 cents to $1.05 per pound.

There are signs of continued pressures affecting not only the price of food but also a broad range of commodities and services. Wholesale prices, following a 6-year period of stability, have risen 2 percent in the past year. On top of this, the Labor Department reports that in the first 6 months of this year the increases granted in wage settlements have averaged 4 percent—well above the administration's guidepost of 3.2 percent. And that will tend to push prices up even more.

In spite of these disquieting signs, the press reports that "Administration spokesmen * * * said they were not worried by the recent surge in consumer prices." These sentiments are not shared by the American housewife, the wage earner with a family to feed, the poor, the retired, and others who live on fixed incomes. Perhaps the President should be reminded of that portion of his state of the Union message in which he said, "Our continued prosperity demands continued price stability."

The inflationary trend offsets the billions being expended in the highly publicized war on poverty.

Food prices in Washington, D.C., chainstores

	June 1964	July 1965
Chainstore A:		
Fryers, legs (per pound)	$0.37	$0.55
Fryers, breasts (per pound)	.43	.59
Smoked hams, fully cooked (per pound)	.43	.59
Medium fresh shrimp	.69	.89
2 dozen large eggs	.91	.95
Chainstore B:		
Chuck roast, boneless (per pound)	.49	.85
Fryers, whole (per pound)	.25	.39
Fryers, cut	.29	.43
Rib steaks, 7-inch cut (per pound)	.57	.79
Chainstore C:		
Pork chops (per pound)	.69	1.19
Bacon (per pound)	.49	1.05
Chainstore D:		
Porterhouse steak, USDA choice (per pound)	.95	1.49
Round steak (per pound)	.79	1.35

CUBA

(By Representative Gerald R. Ford, May 20, 1965)

Today is the 63d anniversary of Cubar independence. On May 20, 1902, Cuba assumed the status of an independent Republic with the inauguration of its first president.

On this anniversary, we call for the reestablishment of Cuba's independence. Since late 1960 the present government of Cuba has been a military, economic, and political vassal of the Soviet Union. Today thousands of foreign Communist military personnel remain on Cuban soil. Cuba's rulers continue to serve the purposes of an alien system by carrying on a campaign of terrorism, sabotage, subversion, and sporadic warfare against their neighbors, disturbing the peace of the hemisphere and threatening the security of all American nations.

The policy objective of the present administration toward the Communist government of Cuba has been ambiguous. At times it has been described as "to get rid of the Castro regime and of Soviet Communist influence in Cuba." So Mr. Johnson declared at Midland, Tex., on September 30, 1962. At other times it has been described as "to isolate Cuba * * * to frustrate its efforts to destroy free governments and to expose the weakness of communism so that all can see." So it was formulated by President Johnson on April 20, 1964.

The melancholy events in the Dominican Republic are a forceful reminder that neither objective has been attained. Cuba has not been isolated, nor is it rid of Castro and Soviet Communist influence. Cuba is the breeding ground for Communist subversion throughout this hemisphere.

President Johnson's recent statement that we "cannot permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere" clouds the purposes of administration policy toward Cuba still further.

The administration should fix clearly so that all can see the objective of its policy toward Cuba. The isolation of the Castro regime and the prevention of the export of communism from Cuba should be pursued more vigorously as an immediate policy objective. But the ultimate objective can be nothing less than the elimination of the Communist government of Cuba and the restoration of independence under a government freely chosen by the Cuban people.

This objective is dictated by policies subscribed to by all the nations of the hemisphere at Caracas in 1954. The Caracas Declaration stated:

"The domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America."

In compliance with this doctrine, President Eisenhower said on July 9, 1960:

"Nor will the United States in conformity with its treaty obligations, permit the establishment of a regime dominated by international communism in the Western Hemisphere."

It is time to reaffirm this as our national purpose and the purpose of the other American nations.

THE ECONOMY

(By Senator Hickenlooper, July 1, 1965)

The health of the economy has become a matter of concern and debate since William McChesney Martin pointed out some similarities between present conditions and those of 1929. The President and other administration spokesmen, emphasizing the bright spots in the economic picture, have suggested that anything wrong in the economy results from fright caused by Mr. Martin's speech.

We find it hard to understand how an administration that has been talking constantly of the poverty in the United States can blame Mr. Martin's qualified warning for weakening confidence in the economic system.

A balanced appraisal of the performance of the economy should begin with a recognition of the fact that the period since World War II has been one of steady and sustained economic growth. Downturns have been few, short, and moderate. We should not expect only guaranteed and sustained rises in economic activity for the future, but the attitude that "things are so good they can't continue" is probably too nearsighted.

Nevertheless, there are danger signals in some economic indicators. To ignore them, to sweep them under the rug, or to denounce those who point them out is shortsighted.

The international financial situation is one of the most ominous clouds on the economic horizon. The administration's program of "voluntary coercion" in the balance-of-payments area is based on the same principle of political expediency as so much of its domestic economic wheeling and dealing. In the process of instituting short-run remedies, the President is following a practice of giving glib and pat answers to serious and involved questions. In imposing more and more controls over international trade and capital flows, the administration is abandoning the principle of liberalized multilateral trade embodied in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and supported by the United States throughout the Eisenhower years, in the face of adversity encountered by almost all of our trading partners. If this series of shortsighted treatments for the symptoms in our balance of payments produces serious dislocations in major foreign economies, the United States will not remain unscathed.

We believe that an International Monetary Conference should be called to deal with the basic structural shortcomings of our international monetary system. The problem is one which cannot be further neglected.

(By Representative Gerald R. Ford, July 1, 1965)

Certain strategic imbalances have developed in the domestic economy. Although more than 4½ percent of our labor force remains unemployed, distinct inflationary pressures are evident. Indeed, we are greatly concerned about eroding price increases in view of the employment situation. In particular, nothing seems to succeed in helping young labor force participants—the teenager jobless rate remains close to 15 percent. Yet in May 1965 the Consumer Price Index stood at 109.6 of its 1957–59 base, which was an increase of 0.3 percent for the month of May. If the rate of increase for April and May is maintained for the next 12 months, the Consumer Price Index would rise 3.6 percent, which is inflation in anybody's book. Even more important, the Wholesale Price Index rose by 2.0 percent from May 1964 to May 1965 and this index had been standing still from 1957 to 1964. We note that a number of recent labor contracts have provided about 4 percent in yearly wage increases, substantially above the guidelines set by the administration. These may well lead to cost-of-living increases during 1965 and future years.

We are entering the sixth fiscal year of continuous deficits. They have averaged over $6 billion a year for the past 5 fiscal years. The deficit for fiscal 1965 is somewhat below $4 billion, and this is being hailed as a great accomplishment. We deplore the doctrine of "permanent fiscal irresponsibility" coupled with a politically pressured easy money policy. The continuous use of fiscal "pep pills" has serious consequences—inflationary pressures (so hurtful to the very poor and the elderly retired), a growing interest charge on the public debt, and disruption of international trade as more and more nations lose their faith in the value of our currency. Even more important, Democrats in Congress have lit the fuse on an inflationary "time bomb" by rubber-stamping one expenditure program after another. These extended programs give the administration greater and greater carryover authority to spend and spend—in fact, this carryover unspent authorization ties the hands of Congress in switching to an anti-inflationary policy.

There are definite signs that the quality of much of the debt has been deteriorating and that its quantity may be growing too fast. The so-called temporary public debt ceiling was just raised from $324 to $328 billion. Other debt—of States, local governments, corporations, and individuals—has been growing more rapidly. For example, consumer installment payments now stand at 15 percent of personal income and total debt of the average family is a staggering 60 percent of its yearly earnings. Bank credit has been expanding more quickly than in all previous expansions, although some recent changes are apparent here.

It is our view that the administration may be in great danger of falling from their tightrope. Clearly they are falling off on the side of inflation. It is our view that a balanced economy is important to all. We therefore endorse the suggestion made by Senator Javits and Congressman Curtis, i.e., that the Joint Economic Committee call hearings "at the earliest possible time" in order to explore "the basic issues raised by Mr. Martin" and "the outlook for the economy over the next year."

EDUCATION

(By Representative **Gerald R. Ford**, September 9, 1965)

The 89th Congress has passed several bills increasing the flow of Federal funds available for education. It has added a cut in excise taxes to a reduction of income tax rates in 1964.

Because of administration opposition, the Congress has not, however, provided tax relief specifically directed toward lightening the burden of higher education.

More than 5 million students will settle on the campuses of colleges and universities throughout the United States this month. In the course of the next 5 years, college enrollment is expected to increase by an additional 1¼ million students.

The average cost of a year of higher education at a public institution is now $1,560; it is $2,370 at a private institution. These costs will continue to rise in future years. It is estimated that tuition charges will increase by 50 percent in both public and private institutions in the next decade.

The cost of going to college is a severe strain on the resources of most of the 5 million students now enrolled and on their families. Millions, who on the basis of ability deserve a college education, are deprived of one because of the financial burden.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 will provide Federal scholarships for fewer than 3 percent of the college students immediately and for fewer than 8 percent eventually. It will make borrowing to defray educational expenses somewhat easier, but these provisions are not enough.

The most effective and direct method of lightening the burden of college expenses for all is to provide for a credit which those who are paying for higher education may taken against their Federal income tax.

Assistance of this kind has been advocated by Republicans for many years. We shall continue to fight for it.

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION—A COMMENTARY

(By Senator **Dirksen**, Oct. 23, 1965)

The White House acted wisely in suppressing the motion picture which it had prepared glorifying the 89th Congress. For this session of the Congress would win no Oscar, even in the best supporting role category. From this Congress, we have had an echo, not a choice.

A movie of the 89th Congress would be like an episode of the oldtime serial which always ended as the heroine was pushed off a cliff or was about to be ground up by an oncoming locomotive. Not until you see the thrilling episode that will be presented in this theater next year will you know whether 14(b) of Taft-Hartley is ground to bits under the administration's locomotive or whether the reapportionment amendment survives its fall from the cliff.

We would caution those who judge the work of the session which just wheezed to a close to look, not at the quantity of the legislative product, but at its quality. The test should be not how much has the Congress done, but how well has it done.

Always a candid man, the majority leader of the Senate has confessed serious deficiencies in the legislation enacted this year. Senator **Mansfield** has announced that the 2d session of the 89th Congress should "spend less time on new legislation and more time correcting oversights in legislation we have just passed." He has said the Congress "must tighten up the hasty enactments" and must rectify "a number of gaps and any number of rough edges, overextensions and overlays."

It is highly significant that Senator **Mansfield**, in reviewing the work of this session before the Democratic Conference, could find no adjective to describe it other than the ambiguous word "exceptional."

As a believer in complete candor, I endorse the majority leader's appraisal of the work of this session. I assure him that he will find on the Republican side willing allies in the effort to devote considerable attention during the second session of this Congress to correction of the mistakes of the first session.

(By Representative **Gerald R. Ford**, October 23, 1965)

The 1st session of the 89th Congress clearly demonstrates the evils of one-party dominance of the National Government.

When the party that occupies the White House holds a two-to-one majority in the Congress, the Congress ceases to function as a coequal branch of government, the integrity of State and local governments is undermined, and the public interest is often jeopardized.

The executive branch unchecked becomes careless and arrogant. "Arrogant" is a strong word, but there is no other to describe those who attempted to bull through the appointment to the Federal judiciary of a man totally devoid of qualifications for this high office. There is no other word for the conduct of an agency that withholds Federal funds from a city in defiance of the procedures clearly established by Congress before such action can be taken. There is no other word for the methods used to rush legislation through the Congress without adequate consideration and without adequate opportunity to debate and to amend.

The House had no chance, for example, to consider any meaningful amendment to the bill repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. In the consideration of the administration bill on elementary and secondary education, no opportunity was granted to the sponsors of 14 amendments for explanation and debate.

Protest has been heard from both sides of the aisle. Democratic Congresswoman **Green**, of Oregon, early in the session, condemned the "determined effort to silence those who are in disagreement." Many other Democrats have spoken out in similar terms in frustration and futility.

When either House of the Congress acts in this way, it abdicates its responsibility. It ceases to be a deliberative body and becomes a rubberstamp.

State and local governments have suffered because of one-party dominance in this Congress. Congress has enacted far-reaching programs without concern for the views of responsible State and local officials or the effect of Federal action on existing State and local programs. Especially significant was the Democratic attempt to deprive Governors of any shred of veto power over projects under the poverty program.

Finally, this Congress has been prodigal with taxpayers' money, over and above the military needs of the country. During this year $119 billion has been appropriated—$36 billion more than in the last year of the Eisenhower administration. For many new programs this year's appropriation is only a small fraction of the annual expenditure that will be inevitable when the programs are fully in operation.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS, THE CONDUCT OF

(By Senator **Dirksen**, July 15, 1965)

This is an appropriate time to speak of bipartisanship in foreign policy.

Bipartisanship signifies united support by the two major parties for such policy aims and means as are required for the security of the Nation.

A bipartisan foreign policy imposes obligations on both the majority and the minority parties. For the majority party, it counsels frequent consultation with the minority as policy is formulated and access for the minority to information needed to determine the wisdom of policy.

For the minority party it imposes an obligation to avoid carping about trivia. The minority should avoid the hypocrisy of complaining about measures which it would favor if it were in the position of policymaker. No administration should be blamed for events beyond its control.

Members of both parties must weigh all the consequences of public criticism. There is an obligation to demonstrate to both friend and foe that the American people are united in time of danger. There is an obligation to avoid furnishing grist for the propaganda mills of an enemy.

But bipartisan foreign policy has never meant a cessation of debate, of criticism, of suggestion. Senator Arthur Vandenberg, who, more than any other public figure in his time, personified bipartisanship, said that bipartisan foreign policy "simply seeks national security ahead of partisan advantage." But, he added immediately, "Every foreign policy must be totally debated * * * and the 'loyal opposition' is under special obligation to see that this occurs."

Debate, then, should be encouraged. Only in the crucible of full and candid debate can the Nation forge a foreign policy which will lead to the ends which all Americans seek to attain—peace, freedom, and security. Only thus can public understanding and acceptance of foreign policy be achieved.

Bipartisanship in foreign policy demands that representatives of both parties give each other a respectful hearing, that both deal in facts, that both discuss genuine issues, that both avoid distortion and misrepresentation.

We pray that the national security decisions of the President may always be wise. If we must disagree with any of those decisions, we shall never question his sincere desire for peace. We expect that responsible spokesmen for his party will credit us with similar motives.

"GREAT SOCIETY"

(By Representative **Gerald R. Ford**, March 18, 1965)

In a series of messages to Congress that are almost encylopedic in the listing of problems purportedly to be solved by the Federal Government, President Johnson proposes enactment of laws and the appropriation of funds that will place the Federal foot in the door of every important function now reserved to the States and local communities.

The formula is ingenious. The future needs of every local community for the next 10 to 20 years are fed, computer-like, into the Federal maw to arrive at a gigantic nationwide figure calculated to stagger the imagination and reduce the citizen to a feeling of utter helplessness. The heroic answer is, of course, the one now being set forth almost daily by the Johnson administration: Only the Federal Government can handle the problem.

Had our Founding Fathers examined the problems confronting them on the same basis, this country probably would have remained a British colony with the Crown handling everything. The fact that the States and local communities have been meeting these problems in their relatively simple locales for nearly two centuries of unequaled progress is ignored.

Federalized schools, textbooks, and teachers; federalized zoning building codes, health centers, and transportation; federalized libraries, laboratories, auditoriums and theaters—all these and much more are now in prospect for our States and local communities. In time our State and local governments can only be reduced to resident agents for the huge central authority in Washington.

Perhaps the American people want to abandon a proven system that has worked as no other on earth. We do not believe it. The

Johnson program has been so disguised by platitudes and Madison Avenue adjectives that its real aim has not been recognized. We are told we are approaching the "Great Society."

We deem it our obligation to provide our citizens with full knowledge of the direction in which their Federal administration is heading our Nation. The end of this road is complete Federal control.

(By Senator DIRKSEN, March 18, 1965)

The unveiling of President Johnson's "Great Society" makes it starkly clear that the Federal Government has only begun to grow in size, power, and cost.

The central thesis of the Great Society is that bigger and bigger government means better and better health, better and better education, better and better transportation, and better and better environment. It resembles political "perpetual motion."

How big is the Government today? The answer is: It's enormous.

Here are some samples of the combined impact of Federal, State, and local governments: Taxes and other government levies now consume 35 percent of total national income. One out of every six workers in the United States is a government employee. One out of every five dollars spent in the United States for goods and services is spent by government. One dollar out of every four dollars and a half of personal income in the United States is accounted for by direct government payments.

The impact of the Federal Government alone is startling: Federal aid to State and local governments has risen from $3.8 billion in 1956 to $13.6 billion in 1966—an increase of nearly 260 percent. Federal funds now amount to 14 percent of total State-local revenue.

These figures give some idea of the size of government today. Right now the Federal Government has more civilian employees in 30 of the 50 States than do State governments themselves, including the 5 biggest in the Union—California, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Ohio.

To all this we are now going to add President Johnson's "Great Society." There is no conceivable way to estimate its future cost. The sky's the limit.

The President has already told us that balancing the budget "too quickly" can be "self-defeating." Thus the Congress and the Nation have been put on notice that the "Great Society" will be financed by ever-increasing Federal deficits and, although not predicted by the President, these deficits could break all records, wartime or peacetime, if the "Great Society" expands as projected. It is time all Americans took a look at the hard facts.

LATIN AMERICA

(By Senator DIRKSEN, May 20, 1965)

From the time the President announced to congressional leaders that he had sent forces into the Dominican Republic to protect lives and to thwart the danger of a Communist takeover in that country, the Republicans in the Congress have given him their support.

Support of the President's action in the circumstances does not, however, imply blanket approval of administration policy toward Latin America.

The administration has been slow to recognize danger signals in Latin America. It has permitted problems to grow to crisis proportions before acting. It has been reluctant to provide leadership to make the Organization of American States an effective agency for the defense and development of the Western Hemisphere.

Even now, in its reaction to events in the Dominican Republic, the administration is not manifesting awareness of the extent and the danger of Castro-exported Communist subversion in at least half a dozen other American nations. In the past 3 years, many thousand citizens of other Latin American countries have received paramilitary and ideological training in Cuba and have been sent home to carry on subversion, terrorism, and guerrilla warfare in Central and South America. Since the end of November 1964, there has been renewed emphasis by Cuba on the use of violence to attain political power, particularly in Venezuela, Colombia, and Guatemala. In Guatemala, the activities of 500 terrorists and guerrillas led to the establishment of a state of siege in February of this year. Haiti, Panama, Paraguay, El Salvador, and Honduras are all announced targets of Communist violence.

It is regrettable that the administration did not move to head off the new outbreak of subversion and violence when it was planned at the Havana meeting of Latin American Communist leaders in November 1964.

Clearly there is need now for vigorous and effective action by the Organization of American States and by the individual American nations to put an end to the current Castro offensive.

We urge the administration to present such a plan of action to the OAS before the tragic drama of the Dominican Republic is replayed in other Latin American nations.

"PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE"

(By Senator DIRKSEN, March 4, 1965)

In days past, the members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership have expressed support for a stiffened American military position in South Vietnam. At the very time we spoke, the Soviet and Red Chinese regimes were warning the United States against such action and promising the North Vietnamese increased military assistance. In many nations throughout the world, Communist agents were organizing riots and demonstrations against American diplomatic establishments in an all-out propaganda drive against the United States.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk has stated, as American policy, that there can be no negotiations on the Vietnamese issue so long as the Communist nations promote aggression against South Vietnam. We believe this a worthy policy. In fact, we advocated it.

We suggest that logic would have the United States carry this policy one step farther.

The Soviet Union has been espousing a policy of "peaceful coexistence." This policy was welcomed by the Kennedy and Johnson administrations and numerous moves were made to demonstrate American readiness to respond, particularly in the fields of trade, communications, and diplomatic relations.

Yet the fact remains that the Soviet Union and the other Communist nations have not diminished, but stepped up, their promotion of subversion in the neutral and free world countries. South Vietnam is only the most glaring example. The continued supplying of Cuba, the subversion in South America, notably Venezuela, and in Africa, notably the Congo, and the ceaseless agitation throughout southeast Asia, are typical.

The only thing peaceful about "peaceful co-existence" is the title. In any relaxed relations, it is the United States that is supposed to do the relaxing. The Communist nations continuously outrage the rights of other nations. Too long have we heard the trumpet of retreat from those who seem to favor another Munich.

If we are not going to negotiate the Vietnamese question until the aggression against South Vietnam ceases, an equally necessary step would be to stop entertaining the overtures of the Communist nations for broader trade and diplomatic relations and to intensify our efforts to persuade our friends abroad to do the same, until the Communists have demonstrated their good faith in areas where not only freedom but life and death are at stake.

(By Representative GERALD R. FORD, March 4, 1965)

During the past 3 years the Soviet Union and other Communist nations have, under the so-called "peaceful co-existence" policy, made measurable gains in trade and diplomatic concessions from the United States while offering little in return. Here are some examples:

An agreement has been initiated for the establishment of a New York-Moscow air route which the Soviet Union has long sought.

An American-Soviet treaty has been negotiated, which now awaits Senate approval, that would give the Soviets consular offices they want in New York, Chicago, and San Francisco in exchange for similar American consulates in Russia which would avail us little and only give the Communists more targets for mob violence.

Having purchased $140 million worth of badly needed U.S. wheat on which the American taxpayer paid $44 million in subsidies so the Soviets could buy it for below our domestic price, Russia has now bought $11 million in soybeans which the New York Times speculated might be going to Cuba.

In response to Communist bloc overtures for expanded trade, President Johnson has named a committee to explore stepped-up sales, and the Commerce Department's issuance of export licenses for sales to Communist nations has been increasing steadily.

Even more significant, our Government last month backed down completely on its widely publicized call for the Soviet Union to pay up its assessments to the United Nations, and then compounded this loss of face by lifting a 3-month freeze on voluntary contributions to the U.N. out of the U.S. Treasury.

From a standpoint of bargaining, we constantly give much and get little or nothing in deals with the Communist nations. We, the members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, urge a "no concession, no deal" policy, meaning that the Communists must be ready to make concessions as the price of agreements with the United States. Until we and our allies arrive at such a policy, we can only expect more Koreas and Vietnams and an ever-widening circle of Communist subversion around the earth.

POVERTY

(By Senator DIRKSEN, September 30, 1965)

Republicans have long been engaged in a determined and effective campaign to broaden economic opportunity for all Americans and to reduce the numbers of those in the lowest income brackets.

During the first 4 years of the Eisenhower administration the number of families below the $3,000 income level (in dollars of constant purchasing power at 1962 prices) was reduced at a rate of 400,000 a year. In 4 years since 1960, the number has been dropping at a rate of 250,000 a year.

When President Eisenhower assumed office, 28 percent of the families of the United States had incomes below $3,000. Four years later the percentage was down 5 points to 23 percent. In 4 years of the Democratic administrations which succeeded Eisenhower, the figure has been reduced by 3 percentage points.

Despite the pressagentry of the current war on poverty, progress toward the goal of eliminating this evil has been slower during the past 4 years than it was during the first term of the last Republican administration.

The success of the administration's antipoverty efforts must be judged in these terms. The crucial question is whether these efforts with their vast increase in Federal spending and their sizable bureaucracy accelerate the rate of reduction of the numbers of those in the lowest income brackets. This question has become obscured in a paper blizzard of press releases from the White House and the Office of Economic Opportunity which provide some measurement of the effort of the administration but yield little information about the results.

The public is told how many communities there are in which Federal antipoverty programs have been started, how many Job Corps camps have been established, how many VISTA workers have been recruited, but it is not told how many poor people have increased their income, and by what amounts, because of participation in the antipoverty program. It is not even told the names of the disadvantaged youths who were given summer employment by the Post Office Department.

It is too early to pass final judgment on the effectiveness of the antipoverty program. The evidence available at present makes it appear that the program has not yet proved itself.

(By Representative Gerald R. Ford, September 30, 1965)

There are several glaring weaknesses in the antipoverty program.

The administration of the program is chaotic. It is headed by a part-time Director and a top staff of temporary personnel who simultaneously decided to desert as the first skirmishes of the war on poverty were hardly underway. The office of Economic Opportunity is topheavy with high salaried executives. In this agency, one out of every 18 employees receives a salary in excess of $19,000. In the Defense Department, by contrast, one of 1,000 employees is paid more than $19,000.

The program as administered treats elected State and local officials with cavalier disdain. Though Republican protest in the Congress salvaged some semblance of influence in the operation of the program for State Governors, neither State nor local officials have an effective voice in the program today. This weakening of the Federal system, on top of other centralizing programs of the current administration, is a dangerous trend.

Disregard of State and local governments and their elected officials has made the term "war" an apt title for the poverty program. In too many places it has become a war waged by local officials and competing private groups with each other for control of Federal funds and for partisan and personal advantage. The poor are treated as the spoils in this conflict. They do not participate in decisions on what is to be done for them or to them.

Enough evidence has come to light to raise serious doubts about the Job Corps program. Instances of criminal and immoral behavior suggest inadequate selection processes for trainees and a breakdown of discipline. There is a serious question, too, as to whether the training consists too much of work that keeps youth off the streets but does not nurture skills needed in the job market.

The poverty program needs basic reform and a tightening of administrative practices. Whatever benefits that can be realized from this program can be attained less wastefully by clearer definition of objectives, by more careful structuring of programs, by cooperation with State and local governments, and by elimination of considerations of partisan political advantage.

REAPPORTIONMENT

(By Senator Dirksen, July 22, 1965)

A strange thing happened to the proposed constitutional amendment on apportionment of State legislatures on its way to the Senate floor. Disputes over the wording of the amendment have recently arisen and produced a deadlock in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I am confident that the Senate will in time act favorably on an amendment. Recent discussion shows the need for clarification of the effect of the proposal.

There is universal recognition of the need for reform of the system of representation obtaining in most States at the time of several well-known Supreme Court decisions. In fact, in 1955 a Presidential commission reported to President Eisenhower that the strengthening of State governments called for adequate representation of the interest of urban areas in State legislative bodies. I welcome the reforms now underway in many States in the belief that they provide more equitable representation and help to invigorate State governments. I do not, on the other hand, conclude that mechanical adherence to the "one man, one vote" principle should be imposed on both branches of the legislature of every State by Federal fiat regardless of the desires of the people. Everyone concedes that it is appropriate to require that representation in one house of the legislature of each State be based solely on the factor of population.

The proposed amendment does no more than permit the people of each State to employ factors other than population as the basis of representation in the other house if by periodic referendum a majority of the people in any State so desire.

It would not deny any minority group the opportunity to gain representation. Presumably any system of representation contrived to discriminate against any group would be struck down by the courts as a violation of the 14th amendment.

Experience shows that the "one man, one vote" principle can be used to euchre minorities out of seats in legislative bodies. This can be accomplished by submerging minorities in large constituencies with at-large elections, as has been done in the State of Virginia to render less likely the election of members of minority groups to the State legislature. It can be accomplished by drawing district lines so as to spread the minority population thinly over a number of districts.

The issue which the proposed amendment presents is this: Shall we allow the people to make the decision about the basis of representation in one house of their State legislature, or shall we impose a decision on them whether they want it or not? We propose to meet this issue and fight every step of the way to preserve our Federal-State system and the historic right of the people of the several States to determine the composition of one branch of their own legislature according to their desires.

REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE

(By Senator Dirksen, January 11, 1965)

When defeat comes to a major political party in this country invariably there are outcries for revolutionary changes in party structure, party leadership and party policies. The Republican defeat of 1964 has produced these manifestations of uncertainty, unrest and uneasiness. Many suggestions, both formal and informal, for action pour from numerous sources.

We, the members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, are fully cognizant of the situation. There is no doubt in our minds that action is indicated and we are taking it. In our conversations since the November defeat we have discussed, among ourselves and with other recognized party leaders, numerous paths that might be followed. Always, certain basic facts have emerged:

First, that the only elected Republican officials of the Federal Establishment are the 32 Republican Members of the United States Senate and the 140 Members of the House of Representatives. Obviously and beyond dispute, they will guide Republican Party policy at the national level, in the absence of a Republican President and Vice President, by the record they write in the Congress. It is their responsibility.

Second, that an additional repository of advice and counsel on party policy exists in former Presidents and nominees for President, in our present elected Governors, in the members of the Republican National Committee and the State chairmen of our several States, and of course, in active Republican advocates at all other levels of the party structure. Their wisdom must be channeled into party policy formulation.

In the conviction that the Republican Party for a century has been and is an essential element in this nation's forward progress, and with the firm belief that all Republicans must join the effort, we, the members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, have on this day initiated a proposed mechanism to achieve a broad consensus on vital objectives for our country and our party. It is an honor to introduce my colleague, the new Republican leader of the House, Jerry Ford, to provide the details of the proposal.

(By Representative Gerald R. Ford, January 11, 1965)

We propose to give the Republican Party a unified leadership. We are inviting the five living Republican nominees for President—one of whom, Dwight D. Eisenhower, served two terms in that office—and representatives of the Republican Governors Association to join with us in the establishment of a Republican Coordinating Committee to continuously examine party policy and party operations.

We have asked the presiding officer of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, the Republican National Chairman, Mr. Dean Burch, to serve as presiding and administrative officer of the new Republican Coordinating Committee, and through the Republican National Committee to provide such staff assistance and funds as may be necessary. As Mr. Burch, himself, suggested, we regard this role an implicit responsibility for him or whoever may occupy his office in the future.

It will be the function of the Republican Coordinating Committee, composed of the eleven members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, the five living Republican nominees for President, and five representatives of the Republican Governors Association to facilitate the broadest party representation and the establishment of task forces for the study and examination of major national problems and issues.

For the joint leadership, I have been asked to add these two pertinent points: First, the Republican National Chairman has been requested to immediately invite the other participants to join us in forming the Republican Coordinating Committee. Second, we are convinced that the Republican Party is not only a great force in the American way of life, but it is the only living political instrument which can make the American dream a reality, not a mere collection of words and promises. Our only goal is results and we intend to achieve them.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON GOP COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Question. Does the establishment of the Republican Coordinating Committee mean that the joint Senate-House Republican leadership is surrendering its role as a policymaking body?

Answer. No, policy formulation, when the party does not occupy the White House, still resides in Republican members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives and their elected leaders, but the Coordinating committee will provide a communications center for the exchange of ideas on policy with other important party leaders and elected officials; also the establishment of task forces will be an implementing feature.

Question. Who will appoint the task forces?

Answer. The Republican National Chairman as the presiding officer of the coordinating committee will appoint the task forces with the advice of the joint leadership and, when appropriate, in consultation with the former presidential nominees and representatives of the Governors Association. In all cases the Presiding Officer will circulate his lists of task force appointees in advance to all the participating members of the Coordinating Committee.

Question. Who will direct the staff operation which will assist both the Coordinating Committee and the task forces?

Answer. The Presiding Officer will designate a Staff Coordinator, presumably from the staff of the Republican National Committee. It will be the Staff Coordinator's responsibility to assemble volunteer research help from the sources indicated on the chart.

Question. What about representation on the task forces for organized groups representing agriculture, labor, veterans, etc., etc.?

Answer. It is the hope of the Coordinating Committee the task forces will have help from all the major organizations in our society and such help will be sought.

Question. How often will the Coordinating Committee meet and when will the first meeting be?

Answer. The date of the first meeting will be fixed to suit the convenience of the maximum number of the Committee's members. This will be explored by the Presiding Officer. The continuity of Committee meetings will be established at the first session.

Question. How will the Coordinating Committee be financed?

Answer. By the Republican National Committee.

Question. Has this type of committee ever been set up before?

Answer. As near as can be determined neither major political party has ever attempted to establish a coordinating body such as the Republican Coordinating Committee. It is an innovation.

TAFT-HARTLEY 14(b)

(By Representative GERALD R. FORD, July 22, 1965)

Next week the Members of the House of Representatives will demonstrate by their votes whether they are members of an independent branch of government or simply yes men responding blindly to the manipulation of the executive branch.

The issue which the House will face is fair consideration of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act—a section which simply preserves to each State some right to regulate labor-management relations.

An attempt will be made as a part of President Johnson's program to force repeal of section 14(b) through the House under the most stringent of gag rules. I anticipate a proposal that the House act on this important change of policy with only 2 hours of debate and that no opportunity be given to offer meaningful amendments.

If the House is not to sacrifice its self-respect, it will vote down the proposal that it shut its mouth, plug its ears, close its eyes, and swallow the Johnson administration's prescription without adequate debate and without opportunity to vote on important amendments.

The action expected next week is the latest manifestation of a disturbing tendency to avoid discussion of the subject of the repeal of section 14(b) on its merits. The administration has engaged in a cynical type of logrolling on the subject. It has sought to convince city Congressmen to vote for a bread tax against their convictions in order to get repeal of section 14(b) and farm Congressmen to vote for repeal of 14(b) against their convictions in order to get a farm bill.

If the coalition which the administration is ruthlessly trying to put together is successful, how can Congress be considered to act as an independent branch of government?

(By Senator DIRKSEN, September 9, 1965)

If the President insists on Senate consideration of the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act this year, the present session of Congress will end not with a bang in the fall but with a whimper when the snow falls. Section 14(b) is the provision affirming the right of the States to forbid compulsory unionism.

The Senate will not act speedily on this issue so basic to Federal-States relations. Several Senators have promised extended discussion of the subject, and clearly the votes for cloture will not be forthcoming.

The Congress has done enough for 1965. There is no emergency, no crisis that requires immediate alteration of a law for which the President once voted and which he never sought to amend in the course of his 12 years of service in the Senate.

Undoubtedly there is room for many improvements in labor's relations with management and management's relations with labor. If the repeal of section 14(b) is taken up, it is clear that Members of the Senate cannot be persuaded to refrain from offering numerous and far-reaching changes in labor-management legislation. It would be far wiser for the Senate to turn to the task of overhauling such laws next year after a respite from the hectic pace of the present session and after consulting the folks back home than to attempt to ram through a single highly controversial change this year.

There are dangers in the indiscriminate use of presidential power to compel action from a reluctant Congress—particularly when the President showed little interest in the legislation until relatively late in the session.

UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Representative GERALD R. FORD, August 5, 1965)

It is now more than 4 years since the Council on Economic Advisers set an unemployment level of 4 percent as the "interim goal" of the administration. It is now more than 3 years since HUBERT HUMPHREY declared, "I predict that by the end of the coming calendar year—by December 31, 1962, the problem of unemployment in the United States will be a page in the history book. * * *" The year 1962 is long gone. It has been a long interim, and the achievement of the goal is not yet in sight. The unemployment rate has been stuck around the 5 percent level since early in 1964.

In the four years since 1960 employment in agriculture has declined by 1 million jobs, or 17 percent. This is more than double the rate of decrease in farm jobs under the previous administration.

In spite of the economic upsurge which the Nation has experienced, unemployment remains an unsolved problem. Unlike past periods of upswing in economic activity, the current prosperity has not brought with it an automatic reduction of the ranks of the jobless to tolerable levels.

The problem of unemployment is particularly a problem of the young. The rate of joblessness among teenagers hovered between 15 and 17 percent before schools closed for the summer—a rate more than three times as high as that for the total working force.

Employment of youth promises to be a more difficult problem within the next few years because of substantial increases in the number entering the labor force. In 1964, 2,700,000 Americans reached their 18th birthday. This year 3,700,000 will reach the age of 18, and on through the 1970's approximately 4 million will attain this age each year.

Spending programs by the score have been offered as panaceas for unemployment. They have not attained the administration's stated goal.

We see here a repetition of lessons which should have been learned decades ago. A "Niagara" of Federal spending—a host of Federal programs—has never been provided a real solution to the problem of unemployment.

The administration stands indicted by its obvious failure in dealing with this critical problem.

UNITED NATIONS

(By Senator DIRKSEN, June 24, 1965)

It is now clear that the United States has lost its fight to keep article 19 of the United Nations Charter alive. The fight was waged with neither skill nor vigor.

No sophistry can mask the fact that the United Nations has been weakened and that the present administration has suffered a serious defeat.

Article 19 prescribes the penalty of loss of voting rights in the General Assembly for any member nation in arrears by 2 years or more in the payment of its contributions to the United Nations.

A decision of the World Court in 1962, ratified overwhelmingly by the General Assembly, removed any doubt that the Soviet Union and some other nations are now subject to the penalty of article 19.

The administration at first loudly announced its intention to insist on the application of article 19. It even threatened to withhold its contributions for some U.N. activities if the Soviet Union failed to pay up.

Because of the issue raised by article 19, the last session of the General Assembly was a tragic farce with no voting at all until February 18. In effect, the delinquent members of the United Nations deprived the nations that had lived up to their obligations (including the United States) of their right to vote.

On February 18, a vote was taken. The acquiescence of the representative of the United States in that action constituted an abandonment of the position which he had taken until that time. On that day the position of the administration was exposed as a bluff, and a staggering blow was dealt to the structure of United Nations.

We regret the backdown of last February. Further action to make article 19 a dead letter will further weaken the United Nations.

Until the nations that are in arrears in their payments to the United Nations manifest interest in preserving the international organization by moving to make up their deficit, the United States should make no voluntary additional contribution. Once this Nation embarks on a policy of paying the debts of other countries to the United Nations, there will be no end to the process. It will help neither the world organization nor the cause of peace.

(By Representative GERALD R. FORD, June 24, 1965)

We salute the United Nations with a mixture of satisfaction and apprehension on the occasion of its 20th anniversary.

Republicans (notably the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg) helped to bring this organization into being. They have loyally supported its every effort to attain the noble goals set forth in its charter.

There is some encouragement in its accomplishments in keeping the peace in certain troubled areas and there is reason for satisfaction in its social, economic, and humanitarian activities.

Yet the United Nations today is in difficult straits. It is bankrupt. It has been used as nothing more than a propaganda forum by many nations. It has violated its charter. The General Assembly was unable to take a vote on any substantive issue in its last session.

The survival of the organization as an effective agency is in doubt.

To save it, the United States and its other leading members must move to deal with its problems instead of permitting them to fester and grow.

One problem is posed by the separation of power and responsibility. A two-thirds majority of the 114 members of the General Assembly can be put together by nations representing 10 percent of the population of U.N. members and 5 percent of the contributions to the U.N. budget. Clearly, these small states cannot enforce big decisions, and situations can easily arise in which big states will be unwilling to follow the orders of smaller members.

Another problem is the relationship of the United Nations to regional organizations such as the Organization of American States. In the Dominican Republic representatives of the U.N. have in fact worked at cross purposes with the representatives of the inter-American organization.

Finally, there is the problem of finance. For more than 3 years, the U.N. has teetered on the brink of bankruptcy. At present it is $108 million in the red.

The problems are formidable. Solving them calls for determined action on the part of the administration.

VIETNAM

(By the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, February 17, 1965)

It is undoubtedly difficult for the Communist capitals of Moscow, Peiping, and Hanoi—where disagreement is not tolerated—to understand that because Americans may differ on means to assure the complete independence of South Vietnam, there is no difference among us on the objective.

We, the members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, want to make it clear we support President Johnson's recent order for strikes against Communist supply bases in North Vietnam. If we have any difference with the President in this respect, it is the belief these measures might have been used more frequently since the Bay of Tonkin decision last August and an even stronger policy formulated in the meantime.

These Communist-proclaimed "wars of liberation" are nothing more than a verbal cover for naked aggression. The Communists unmask this aggression when they "stage" mob demonstrations against American embassies as free world resistance to their terrorist tactics in an independent nation is stepped up.

We suggest that so long as there is Communist-promoted infiltration of South Vietnam in violation of the 1954 and 1962 Geneva agreements, there can be no negotiations on the Vietnamese question, and we urge the President to make this unmistakably clear to the world. Agreements can only fail when the Communists negotiate only for domination and we negotiate only for peace.

(By Senator DIRKSEN, June 18, 1965)

To date, the Republicans in the Congress have publicly supported the administration's policy toward South Vietnam in the belief that it was in harmony with that enunciated by the Congress in joint resolution.

That objective, as defined last August, was "assisting the peoples of southeast Asia to protect their freedom."

Now doubt is raised about this objective by recent remarks of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. In a speech, timed so as to make it appear that it had Presidential approval, Senator FULBRIGHT and some other Democrats may wish to redefine the objective for which American troops are being committed to conflict in South Vietnam in ever-increasing numbers.

The Senator calls for a "negotiated settlement involving major concessions by both sides."

Any who talk of concessions by the United States have an obligation to specify the kinds of concessions which they are prepared to advocate. They have an obligation, too, to indicate the limits beyond which concessions cannot be made.

Senator FULBRIGHT suggests the Geneva Agreements of 1954 "in all their specifications" as a basis for settling the conflict in South Vietnam. But this agreement, as Secretary Rusk acknowledged in 1962, contained a fatal flaw in providing veto power to the Communist member of the international commission established to supervise the execution of the terms of the Geneva settlement.

This mistake must be avoided in any future peace settlement. So must the mistake of establishing a coalition government with Communist participation for South Vietnam. Bitter experience should have taught us that such a coalition merely defers a Communist takeover.

To conclude an agreement with such provisions would violate the President's promise of April 7, 1965: "We will not withdraw under the cloak of a meaningless agreement."

We hope for negotiations among representatives of responsible sovereign governments which will both end the fighting in South Vietnam and preserve the independence of that nation. The United States cannot, without violating its word, settle for less. The meaningless Laotian settlement of 1962 should be a lesson to us at this time.

(By Representative GERALD R. FORD, June 18, 1965)

Of all the things that Senator FULBRIGHT has had to say, none was more revealing than his criticism of the Eisenhower administration for "encouraging" the South Vietnamese Government to refuse to permit the holding of a nationwide election in Vietnam in 1956.

The refusal was amply justified if only because the kind of election envisaged by the Geneva Agreement of 1954—a free election—could not have been held. Anyone who thinks that a free election was possible in Communist North Vietnam knows little of how Communists operate and could have fallen into a Moscow-Peiping trap.

The criticism boils down to a complaint that the U.S. Government failed to exert pressure on the South Vietnamese to surrender to the Communists 9 years ago.

Such was not the policy then—and veiled suggestions that it be the policy today should be emphatically repudiated.

The United States could not agree today—any more than in 1956—to legitimatizing Communist control of all of Vietnam by the device of a Communist-style election.

The Eisenhower administration labored to build out of the choas in South Vietnam a durable economy, a progressive social order, and military strength.

That it achieved a considerable measure of success was attested to by several of Senator FULBRIGHT's colleagues.

In February of 1960, Senator MANSFIELD's subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported:

"By any measure, Vietnam has made great progress under President Ngo Dinh Diem in the improvement of internal security, in the creation of the forms and institutions of popularly responsible government where before few existed, and in the advancement of the welfare of the people of Vietnam."

Finally, a major policy paper, issued by the State Department in December 1961, stated flatly that—

"The years 1956 to 1960 produced something close to an economic miracle in South Vietnam * * *. It is a report of progress over a few brief years equaled by few young countries."

Any attempt to equate overall conditions, including the U.S. military commitment, in South Vietnam in 1960 with conditions there today is a crude distortion of history.

(By Representative GERALD R. FORD, July 15, 1965)

Today the President is being called on to make fateful decisions. His efforts to end the fighting in Vietnam by negotiation have been spurned. President Johnson has now decided to increase substantially the commitment of American ground forces in the theater of conflict.

As the military commitment grows, the Nation must be clear about its objectives, its responsibilities, and the consequences in Vietnam. This objective can only be the establishment of conditions under which the people of South Vietnam can live in peace, freedom, and security.

The objective can be attained only when aggression from within or without is brought to a halt.

The establishment of a coalition government with Communist participation in control of South Vietnam is incompatible with this objective.

Evacuation of American troops under an agreement to be policed by a commission including a Communist member with veto power over commission decisions would be incompatible with this objective.

The desire of the Government and the people of the United States to negotiate a peace in Vietnam has been established beyond question. But a peace which would turn South Vietnam over to the Communists—immediately or after some interval—must be forthrightly rejected.

Any doubts as to the resoluteness of the United States in the pursuit of the objective of maintaining the freedom and independence of South Vietnam that has arisen is due to unfortunate statements of some Democrats.

Although we do not quarrel with the President in his invitation to the aggressors to negotiate without any preconditions, we doubt the wisdom of failing to make it clear that the United States is not going to agree to the kind of treaty and truce provisions that have made possible Communist takeovers in the past.

President Johnson has said that the United States will not withdraw from Vietnam under a meaningless agreement. We suggest that the President assure the Nation that no agreement will be made which will make a mockery of the sacrifices already suffered by our American fighting men and the soldiers of South Vietnam.

The Historic 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the old saying goes that "the record speaks for itself."

However, the record of the 1st session of the 89th Congress cannot speak for itself. It is too vast.

We have accomplished so much and made such progress in these past 10 months, implemented so many fine new programs and expanded others of proven value that it is incumbent on each of us who were privileged to participate in the writing of this record to review it for the citizens of our constituency.

It has been said that the 1st session of the 89th Congress will be remembered as the most productive of this century.

History, of course, will pass judgment on this point. However, there is no denying that much has been accomplished. Great strides have been taken in meeting and conquering the social and economic ills which drag on the progress of our great American society.

In reviewing briefly these programs, it is important to note and fully comprehend that each is designed to have a positive effect on every American citizen even though each person may not benefit directly by any specific program. For it is true that many of these programs are designed to bring relief to minority groups. Minority group in this sense does not necessarily imply only the poor, the nonwhite, the elderly, or the young.

We are each a member of a minority group. Each of us are citizens of the United States and in that respect we are members of an absolute majority. Yet, we are each members of some minority group.

Some of us are small businessmen, and we are, thereby, members of a minority group.

There are those among us who are corporate executives, men and women of power but, nonetheless, they form and are members of a minority group.

There are good citizens of this Nation who are in the minority because of their color, their religion, because they belong to a labor union, are white collar workers, are elderly, are preschool children or students. The very rich are a minority as are the very poor.

If we stop to think about it for just a minute, we realize that each of us belongs to at least one minority group and probably several.

It is because of this that Congress and the Johnson-Humphrey administration have sought programs to solve the complicated and interrelating problems of the minority groups to which we all belong.

The aim of these programs is to give strength to our Nation and assist in laying the path to greater security and prosperity for that great majority to which we are all privileged to enjoy membership, the citizenry of the United States of America.

The ills of each minority group sap the strength of the great majority and act counter to the national interest. Thus, by remedying the ills of the part, we strengthen the whole.

In reviewing the progress marked by this session of the 89th Congress, it is appropriate that we first mention specific programs which benefit directly our own districts and citizens of Tennessee.

In the closing days of this session, the Congress passed and forwarded to the President, as part of the public works bill, my bill to permit the sale of 28.2 acres of land on Old Hickory Lake by the Corps of Engineers to the Tennessee Society for Crippled Children and Adults.

The society currently leases the land which it uses for the site of its crippled children's camp. Outright ownership will permit the society to meet the camp's needs for expansion.

Working as a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, I was successful in securing House approval of Senate amendments to the Tariff Act which, without interfering with domestic production or competition, will permit one large Tennessee firm to expand its operations in western middle Tennessee and prevent the threat of a probable cutback in production at four firms in east Tennessee.

A nonlegislative service provided the people of Nashville and middle Tennessee was the Nashville Conference on Small Business.

Held at Peabody College on September 16, 1965, this conference was attended by over 400 persons. The conference was designed to outline to the small business community of Nashville the programs and personnel available to them through the Nashville Small Business Administration regional office.

It was judged to be highly successful and I enclose here a letter we received from the Washington SBA Director of the Office of Development Companies, who played such an important role in the success of the conference:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., October 7, 1965.

Hon. RICHARD H. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FULTON: We wish to express our appreciation for providing us with the opportunity to take part in the seminar on economic development for small business, sponsored by the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce and you on September 16, 1965, in Nashville, Tenn.

The program you and the chamber arranged was most effective as was the mode of presentation which gave everyone present the advantage of freely participating in all five of the workshop sessions held.

The tremendous interest shown by those in attendance, the number and depth of questions asked, as well as the degree of active participation evidenced, certainly established that the community of Nashville can and will continue to expand and strengthen its economy. It established, too, the effectiveness of seminars of this type as a vehicle to provide small businessmen, bankers, community leaders, attorneys, and others with the facts and information on SBA and the programs available to assist them in achieving their individual economic and industrial development objectives.

You might be interested in knowing that as a result of this seminar, Mr. Sam Jennings, our regional director in Nashville, Tenn., reports a substantial increase in requests for assistance in community development projects, for management assistance, and financial counseling as well as loan inquiries and applications.

I am sure that the business community of the greater Nashville area shares with us the appreciation of the value of this seminar which the chamber of commerce and you made possible.

Sincerely,

THOMAS S. FRANCIS,
Director,
Office of Development Companies.

Another program of great promise in the field of international relations was launched in Tennessee this year. With the assistance of the University of Tennessee and its able representative, Dr. Carl Thomas, of the graduate school, a Tennessee Partners of the Alliance organization was formed. The Partners program is designed to strengthen and assist the Alliance for Progress by working with our Latin American friends at the grassroots level.

The foundation of the Partners program is mutual assistance. Under the program each participant contributes to the other. Already Tennessee is making available to its Partner know-how and assistance in the field of electrification. Venezuela, meanwhile, is making a meaningful cultural contribution to Tennessee through an exhibition of Venezuelan art which will tour our State over the coming months.

In the future there are plans for mutual assistance in the field of education and other fields.

This is not a giveaway program. It is a program whereby each party contributes to the benefit of the other. The people of Tennessee understand and approve of this approach to foreign aid and have illustrated their approval by their support of the Tennessee Partners of the Alliance.

A final footnote should be added by way of followup to the work being done in Nashville as a result of the 1964 Conference on Automation, Education, and Jobs, which we cosponsored with George Peabody College.

The conference produced such interest in the problem of automation and its related aspects that a grant for a study and report was secured from the Office of Education in Washington.

This study is now underway and should be completed in the near future.

These are services to the people of Tennessee and Tennessee's Fifth Congressional District. But their effect in better care for the less fortunate, economic stimulation and security will have an impact transcending our borders.

Conversely, the major programs implemented and expanded by the 1st session of the 89th Congress will have their effect not only across the Nation but will have impact in Metropolitan Nashville-Davidson County.

In brief, here are these programs:

SUMMARY OF MAJOR LEGISLATION

Antipoverty amendments: Authorizes $1.5 billion for fiscal year 1966, and extends for 10 months, to June 30, 1967, the period during which the Government could provide up to 90-percent matching funds for poverty projects.

Appalachia: Authorizes $1.1 billion for development of the economically depressed 12-State Appalachia region.

Coffee Agreement: Enables the United States to carry out its obligations under the International Coffee Agreement of 1962.

Department of Housing and Urban Development: Places at Cabinet level a new agency, with all functions now in the Housing and Home-Finance Agency and its constituent agencies, to administer major Federal programs relating to the physical development of our urban area.

Disarmament Agency: Authorizes $30 million for fiscal 1966–68 for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Drug Control Amendments: Place stricter controls on the possession, distribution and disposal of depressing barbiturates and stimulating amphetamines.

Elementary and Secondary School Education: Authorizes $1.3 billion for the first year of Federal grant programs to improve elementary and secondary education with $1 billion earmarked to aid educationally deprived children from low-income families.

Excise tax reductions will reduce excise taxes by $4.7 billion by January 1, 1969, by eliminating all Federal excise taxes except user, regulatory, and sumptuary levies.

Foreign aid: Authorizes $3.38 billion for fiscal 1966 for foreign assistance programs.

Gold reserves: Allows the Nation's money supply to expand by eliminating the required 25-percent gold backing for Federal Reserve deposits.

Higher education: Authorizes educational opportunity grants for needy undergraduate students; provides guaranteed reduced interest loans for graduate and undergraduate students; broadens college work-study program to include all students in financial need of part-time job; establishes National Teacher Corps and teacher fellowship program; doubles funds for construction of academic facilities; provides special help for college libraries, less developed colleges and community service programs.

Immigration: Replaces the discriminatory national origins quota system with a first-come, first-served system of preferential admissions for immigrants with especially advantageous skills, education or training, or close relatives in the United States.

Inter-American Development Bank: Authorizes a $750 million increase in the U.S. contribution to the Bank.

Manpower program: Extends the manpower development and training programs 3 years through June 30, 1970; authorizes $454 million in fiscal 1966; continues 100-percent financing of MDTA training programs through June 1966; liberalized training allowances.

Medical care and social security: Creates first, a basic hospital insurance program providing 60 days of hospitalization—over the first $40; 100 days of posthospital care, and 100 visits by a home nurse; second, a voluntary medical insurance program costing individuals $3 a month and providing physicians' services—over the first $50—and 100 home nursing visits; third, a 7-percent increase, averaging $4 a month, in old-age and survivors benefits; fourth, expansion of medical care programs for the aged, blind, disabled, and dependent children under the existing Kerr-Mills program of Federal-State aid; and fifth, expanded maternal and child health and crippled children's services.

National Arts Foundation: Creates a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities to provide $20 million a year for 3 years in endowments for the creative and performing arts and for scholarships in the humanities.

Older Americans bill: Establishes an Administration on Aging in HEW and authorizes $17.5 million in grants for fiscal 1966 and 1967 for development of programs for the aged.

Omnibus housing: Provides funds for preliminary study of rent supplements under housing built under FHA for low-income families whose rent exceeds one-fourth of their income; increases subsidies for public housing; extends all FHA insurance programs for 4 years; authorizes grants for urban renewal.

Public works and economic development: Consolidates area redevelopment and accelerated public works programs in a new Economic Development Administration in the Commerce Department to make loans and grants to areas crippled by high unemployment and low income.

Presidential continuity: Proposes a constitutional amendment to permit the Vice President to become Acting President if the President is unable to perform his duties, and allows the President, if a vacancy occurs in the Vice-Presidency, to nominate a Vice President subject to confirmation by a majority vote of the House and Senate.

Regional medical centers: Launches a 5-year program of project grants—$50 million for the first year—to develop 25 multipurpose regional medical centers to fight heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other diseases.

Tobacco marketing: Quotas provide acreage poundage marketing quotas for tobacco if approved by two-thirds of growers voting in a referendum. If rejected, present acreage controls will continue.

Voting rights: Enforces the 15th amendment's guarantee that the right to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude by: Prohibiting the imposition or application of voting qualifications or procedures which deny the right to vote on account of race or color; prohibiting tests or devices as a prerequisite for voting; authorizing the Attorney General to appoint Federal examiners or registrars when State or local officials continue to discriminate against potential voters; empowering Federal examiners to give certificates of eligibility to vote to citizens who have been denied the opportunity; providing penalties of 5 years in prison, a $5,000 fine, or both for attempting to deprive a person of his rights under the law or destroying voting records.

Water pollution control: Creates a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration within HEW; authorizes HEW administered control programs; and provides $20 million a year for 4 years for control improvement projects.

PENDING

Air pollution control: Authorizes HEW to set standards for control of automobile exhaust, and launches a major study of methods to control pollution from smoke and other wastes.

Higher education: Authorizes a 5-year—$250 million in the first year—program to provide scholarships for needy undergraduates; insured, reduced-interest loans to graduate and undergraduate students; work-study programs; National Defense Education Act student loan program expansions; improved college libraries and trained librarians; university extension and adult education courses.

This, then, is the record of the 1st session of the 89th Congress. It is a record of progress and of positive action. It illustrates to the people of the United States that this Congress and this administration is more than aware of the problems of our society. It is graphic proof that we are doing something to meet, ease, and eliminate them.

I would like just a few moments more to express my appreciation to the people of Tennessee's Fifth Congressional District for bestowing upon me the honor of being their Representative in the Congress.

Because of them I was allowed the privilege of assisting in the writing and the passage of the medical care-social security amendments.

Because of them I was allowed the privilege of assisting in the writing and passage of the bill to increase social security benefits.

Because of them I was allowed the privilege of assisting in the writing and passage of the bill to reduce and repeal the Federal excise tax.

Because of them I was given the privilege of joining in sponsoring and passage of the bill creating a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities and many of the other bills which have now become public law and a part of the record of the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

Greek "Ochi" Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, "Ochi" Day, October 28, 1940, was the day when all valiant Greeks who cherished the freedoms which their forefathers had established unanimously exclaimed "No," to the Fascist dictator, Mussolini, who threatened to invade them. Mussolini gave the Greek Government 3 hours to surrender, but even before the ultimatum had expired Fascist troops were poised for incursions into Greece. The dictator had planned to achieve an easy victory within 2 weeks, but within 10 days all his troops that had invaded the Greek territory in the Pindus Mountains had been driven out and Mussolini suffered his first ignominious defeat by the heroic men and women of Greece.

Unfortunately, as the Nazi terror spread throughout Europe, it engulfed the Greek territory, forcing the Greeks to flee to the mountains where they fought as guerrillas against the invader. Even the Nazi occupation was short lived, for on October 12, 1944, the Allied forces liberated Greece, aided by the brave Greeks who fought and died to free their country.

Another threat to their territorial integrity and freedom, directed by Moscow's Communists, was witnessed by the Greeks following World War II, but the Communist civil war turned to disaster for Moscow's puppets, and Greece went on to join NATO, the Western alliance, united to stop the spreading danger of communism.

The heroism which the Greek people displayed in fighting oppression in World War II is dramatically evidenced at the present time, as their nation is one of the stalwart pillars of the free world in the continuing struggle against Communist aggression. We salute the brave people of Greece, their traditions, and contributions to the history of the world and reemphasize the tremendous value of the role of leadership they are providing in the present world situation.

Legislative Apportionment: The Latest Proposal Analyzed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there is now pending, on the Senate Calendar, Senate Joint Resolution 103, better known as the Dirksen amendment.

This is the fourth reincarnation of the thrice-killed effort to overrule the Supreme Court's decisions requiring fair apportionment of State legislatures. Since those decisions were handed down in June 1964, the rotten borough legislators and their allies have fought with every resource at their command to perpetuate their minority stranglehold over our State legislatures.

The country is aware that the opponents of fair apportionment first attempted a frontal attack on the Court last year with the Tuck bill in the House of Representatives. That measure would have simply denied the U.S. courts all power to consider apportionment cases. When that effort failed, the foes of fair representation attempted a flanking action on the Court with the Dirksen rider to last year's foreign aid bill. That rider would have temporarily denied the courts jurisdiction over State legislative apportionment suits. When that effort failed, the proponents of malapportionment sought to sabotage the Court's decision with a constitutional amendment, known as Senate Joint Resolution 2.

That remarkable resolution was the subject of full-scale hearings in the Senate. Reacting to the mounting criticism which the hearings evoked, the proponents revised the text of Senate Joint Resolution 2 at least three times. Then, when the Judiciary Committee refused to report the amendment, they bypassed the committee and brought it to the Senate floor as a substitute to an American Legion Baseball Week resolution. Sensing defeat, they kept amending and tinkering with their constitutional amendment right up to the very moment—before—it was voted down last August 4.

Bloodied but unbowed, the foes of fair representation have hastily scraped together yet another version of their amendment. The latest draft, now printed as Senate Joint Resolution 103, cannot escape its heredity. It is the orphan of a succession of political proposals, now deceased, which attempt to overrule the decisions of the Supreme Court. Like its departed parents, Senate Joint Resolution 103 seeks to scuttle the requirements of the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment by permitting some citizens in a State to speak with an unequal vote in the selection of their State legislatures.

Since Senator DIRKSEN's latest amendment has not been the subject of any hearings, there is considerable doubt as to the precise meaning and effect of the new language. The basic purpose is, however, clear: to shrink the votes and sap the political strength of certain groups of citizens. Senate Joint Resolution 103 is thus subject to the same philosophic objections as the earlier efforts to frustrate majority rule by permitting some citizens to cast more votes than others.

In addition to its inherent philosophic defects, Senate Joint Resolution 103 suffers from a great number of technical deficiencies. Based upon the testimony and debate on the earlier version of the Dirksen amendment, and the views of experts who have now studied the new text, one can say with certainty that the present amendment is more vague, more ambiguous, and more confusing than any previous version. Let me suggest a few of the more obvious technical difficulties with the text of Senate Joint Resolution 103.

1. RATIFICATION PROCEDURE

The proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 2 were obviously stung by the charge that a rotten borough amendment to the Constitution should not be submitted for ratification by a rotten borough legislature.

The opponents of the Dirksen amendment argued that if the proponents were really serious about letting the people decide, ratification should be by State constitutional conventions, consisting of delegates chosen at large. This would give the people an effective choice on the fundamental question of amending the Constitution.

Senate Joint Resolution 103 does not adopt this suggestion. Instead, it provides for ratification by State legislatures "provided that each such legislature shall include one house apportioned on the basis of substantial equality of population."

This new approach constitutes half-hearted recognition of the validity of our argument, but there is an obvious effort on the part of the warriors for the Dirksen amendment to avoid the logical consequences of their own battle cry: "Let the people decide." While ratification by a legislature with one fairly apportioned house is better than ratification by a doubly malapportioned legislature, there is still a substantial possibility that a State legislature could ratify this amendment even though it does not command the support of a majority of the people in the State.

As Senator DOUGLAS has pointed out, it is certainly possible that the fairly apportioned house of a State legislature could be blackmailed into ratifying this constitutional amendment by the threat of the other house to withhold consent on important matters of public business. Such blackmail is not unheard of; it has happened in the past.

Senator PROXMIRE has pointed out another fatal weakness in the unique ratification procedure specified by Senate Joint Resolution 103. It is not always possible to tell whether a legislature which has ratified the amendment does in fact "include one house apportioned on the basis of substantial equality of population in accordance with the most recent enumeration provided for in section 2 of article I of the Constitution." This requirement would invite numerous court tests to determine whether the legislatures that ratified the amendment were, in fact, qualified to do so.

2. MANDATORY REFERENDUM

The original Dirksen amendment required that an apportionment plan which deviated from constitutional standards must be approved by the voters in a popular referendum before it could go into effect. Along with many of my colleagues, I believe that a citizen's constitutional right to cast an equal ballot should not be restricted, even if that were desired by public opinion, moreover I believe that the referendum is not, in any event, a fit tool for determining true voter sentiment on so abstract and complicated an issue as legislative apportionment. Nonetheless, once the idea of surrendering constitutional rights is accepted, there is a certain Machiavellian logic to a popular referendum, for it makes it appear that the people who are to be underrepresented are crippling themselves.

The referenda provisions of the latest version of the Dirksen amendment are still subject to the same objections in principle that were leveled against the earlier edition; but, in addition, Senate Joint Resolution 103 has lost all color of logical consistency. It requires that every apportionment plan, even one that clearly meets constitutional standards, must be submitted to the people for ratification. It provides "a plan of apportionment shall become effective only after it has been submitted to a vote of the people and approved by a majority of those voting on that issue in a statewide election." The requirement is not limited to plans of apportionment which deviate from substantial equality of population. Every plan, even a wholly constitutional plan, must be resubmitted to the voters every 10 years.

What possible purpose is served by submitting to referendum an apportionment plan that is consistent with constitutional principles when there is no alternative plan to be considered? Suppose by some fluke or misunderstanding the voters rejected the plan? How would the next legislature be apportioned? Presumably, the constitutional requirement of fair apportionment would still apply, and the State would be in the embarrassing position of having to implement a plan that the voters had rejected.

This confusion in the revised Dirksen amendment is compounded by another provision which loftily proclaims that the legislature of each State "shall be apportioned by the people at each general election following each decennial census." This seems sensible at first glance, but what does it mean?

How can the people apportion a legislature? They obviously cannot meet at one time and place to debate and resolve the question, the way the citizens of Athens did 2,500 years ago. But can it be said that the people have apportioned their legislatures if a plan is drawn by a legislature that is itself malapportioned? Does a rotten borough legislature represent the people for this purpose?

A number of States provide in their constitutions or statutes for automatic reapportionment in accordance with a preestablished formula. Would such a procedure be valid under a constitutional amendment which requires that the legislature be apportioned by the people of that State?

Other States provide for reapportionment by a bipartisan commission or administrative tribunal on a regular basis. Again I ask, does a provision of Senate Joint Resolution 103 requiring apportionment by the people render such reapportionment procedures invalid?

Senator DIRKSEN speaks eloquently of States rights. But what could be a greater infringement on the right of a State to reapportion its legislature than to say it cannot reapportion in accordance with a self-executing formula or by a bipartisan committee provided for in its own constitution without first submitting a referendum plan to all the people of the State?

3. EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATION

At the heart of Senate Joint Resolution 103 lies the notion that one house of a State legislature should be permitted to deviate from constitutional standards of apportionment "in order to insure effective representation in the State's legislature of the various groups and interests making up the electorate."

I must say, with all candor, that I do not have the foggiest idea what that phrase means. I suggest, with all respect, that it has no meaning that is susceptible of consistent or rational application.

The phrase "effective representation in the State's legislature of the various groups and interests making up the electorate" is a direct quote from the dissenting opinion of Justices Stewart and Clark in the case of Lucas against Colorado, decided the same day as Reynolds against Sims. Dean McKay, of New York University Law School, a noted authority on reapportionment, has pointed out that Justices Stewart and Clark proved unable to agree, even between themselves, as to the meaning of the phrase "effective representation." One week following the decision in Reynolds against Sims, they disagreed as to the proper disposition of four of the nine reapportionment cases decided that day.

Let us look more closely at the phrase "effective representation in the State's legislature of the various groups and interests making up the electorate." What, we may ask, does Senator DIRKSEN mean by "effective representation"? And how would he define and determine the "various groups and interests making up an electorate"?

A clue to the meaning of "effective representation" may be found in Senator DIRKSEN's speech of August 11, 1965, the day he introduced Senate Joint Resolution 103. Referring to the new amendment, he said:

> It will make the franchise more democratic because it will insure the appropriate representation in the State legislatures of the 49 percent of the people who might otherwise be denied representation.

He told the Senate that the clear and compelling reason for his amendment was the protection of minority representation. He said:

> Adequate representation for divergent viewpoints in our legislative bodies * * * is the best and most effective check upon a rampant majority.

Note the operative words, "effective check."

It seems clear to me that by the phrase, "effective representation" the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 103 clearly intend an effective check upon the majority. They intend, in other words, a minority veto over majority rule.

We come then to the equally intriguing question of which minority will wield this veto power. The text of Senate Joint Resolution 103 speaks vaguely of "various groups and interests making up the electorate," but Senator DIRKSEN has spoken and plainly of his intent to allow rural minorities to perpetuate their stranglehold over State legislatures:

> I have seen no evidence that the growth of cities * * * has been impeded by legislatures under the guidance of rural representatives. There is a give and take in our form of government which has worked well and will continue to work well so long as we take care to provide that all of the people are fairly and effectively represented in the various legislative bodies.

In other words, representative government works best when a rural minority holds the whip hand.

I do not think our Constitution should be amended to accord any minority the whip hand in a State legislature. Under our system of government, minority rights can be and are protected through the specific guarantees of the Bill of Rights, and not through the exercise of a veto power in the legislature.

But even if the concept of a preferential minority representation were accepted, how should a State determine which minority or minorities would receive special treatment? There are those who wish to preserve special privileges and power for the rural minorities which can put forward compelling claims for more "effective representation."

The Negroes in my State, for example, are an important minority whose needs and aspirations have been long ignored by our legislature. Negroes comprise 18 percent of the population of Maryland. Can they be "effectively represented" with only 18 percent of the votes? By the same logic as is used on behalf of rural minorities, should not Maryland Negroes receive 51 percent of the seats in the Maryland Senate so they can "effectively check" the majority? The suggestion is preposterous, but no more so than giving an 18-percent rural minority 51 percent of the seats.

There are, of course, an unlimited number of groups which make up the electorate in any State. There are obvious groups which come to mind—racial groups, religious groups, business groups, labor interests, and farm interests. But there are also less obvious groups and interests; for example, bird watchers, duck hunters, antivivisectionists, and patriotic organizations. Are they each entitled to elect a State representative? Are they each to be given "an effective check" on the majority?

Moreover, no major group has uniform interests. There are conflicting interests within groups. Would, for example, all Protestants be lumped together under the Dirksen amendment, or would we distinguish between Seventh-day Adventists and Unitarians? How would we differentiate between business groups which desire free trade and those which demand tariff walls? Within the so-called "urban group" there are countless subgroups with radically different interests: bankers and beatniks, housewives and haberdashers, scholars and steelworkers.

By the time all of the various groups and subgroups are broken down to their component parts, we find single individuals, each with unique interests and aspirations. While each man may share some interests with his fellow worker, his coreligionist or his neighbor, there is no other individual who combines all of the same interests in exactly the same proportions. That is why, ultimately, the only fair and effective system of representation must accord each man one vote.

There is one subtle aspect of Senator DIRKSEN's concept of effective representation that deserves some attention. Presumably, he is not advocating proportional representation, but rather a technique for overrepresenting groups and interests whose members live, or vote, in identifiable political subdivisions or geographic areas. If an interest group, such as garage mechanics, is spread throughout a State, it could not be given preferential treatment under Senate Joint Resolution 103, for the only factors that can be considered in apportioning a State legislature are population, geography, and political subdivisions. Thus, only a minority which can be identified by geography or political subdivision can obtain extra representation in the legislature. When one considers the various minorities which might qualify for such favored treatment, one is led again to conclude that Senate Joint Resolution 103 is designed to benefit the rural minority. It is the only readily identifiable minority which is so distributed as to comprise the majority in many political subdivisions and over wide geographic areas.

Finally, we must recognize the antidemocratic bias implicit in the concept of "effective representation of the various groups and interests making up the electorate." Prof. Andrew Hacker, of Cornell University, has pointed out:

> The notion is that there exist certain interests which deserve representatives regardless of the number of people such an interest may contain. There is, in a word, a real class basis here. For such interests as the poor or Negroes or even city dwellers are invariably put in one large group. In contrast, the middle class is usually cut and sliced into literally dozens of groups: architects, applegrowers, accountants, advertisers, etc. Under such a tendency the middle class—and especially businessmen—get far more representation. (Part of this, of course, stems from the fact that we tend to overlook the varieties of groups and interests among the poor, the Negroes, and city dwellers. It takes a certain sensitivity to distinguish among the varied sorts and conditions of, say, Negroes. Needless to say, most of us tend to be rather stereotyped in our image of those at the bottom of the heap.)

Likewise, Mr. Burke Marshall, former Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Rights Division, has written:

> The purpose of the new Dirksen amendment is to create a means by which the people of the cities can be deprived of part of the political voice they would have in the State legislatures based on population. As I stressed in my testimony, this will proportionately affect minority groups more than other segments of our society, and in particular will inevitably do damage to our national efforts to remedy the economic, social, and educational disadvantages which we as a Nation have placed upon Negro Americans.

4. JUDICIAL REVIEW

Senate Joint Resolution 103 provides:

> The legislature of each State shall be apportioned by the people of that State at each general election.

All Members of this body will recall that the first sentence of Senate Joint Resolution 2, as originally introduced, provided that the power to apportion State legislatures shall be in the people. That sentence was deleted by Senator DIRKSEN after it was pointed out that it would preclude judicial review of any apportionment scheme. He removed it under the pressure of our attack.

Is the language of Senate Joint Resolution 103 merely a subtle reincarnation of the first sentence of Senate Joint Resolution 2? Does apportionment by the people as provided in Senate Joint Resolution 103 prohibit judicial review of an apportionment plan?

To be sure, Senate Joint Resolution 103 expressly provides for prior judicial scrutiny of an apportionment plan that is not submitted by a legislature which has one house apportioned on the basis of population. But what about reapportionment plans formulated by a legislature which has one malapportioned chamber? Senator DOUGLAS has shown that the malapportioned house of such a legislature can use its veto power over other matters to wring from the fairly apportioned house an unfair apportionment plan. Since judicial review is expressly required in all other cases the negative implication is that a plan submitted by a partially reapportioned legislature is not subject to judicial review.

This is a crucial matter, for unless there is judicial review to determine whether the "various groups and interests making up the electorate" are "effectively represented," there is no limit to the type of plan that can be put into effect. Despite some perfunctory bows in that direction, it would appear that Senate Joint Resolution 103 does not embrace the philosophy advanced by Senator JAVITS who has advocated that any apportionment scheme which deviates from substantial equality of population be reviewable in the courts for fairness and reasonableness.

5. THE ALTERNATIVE PLAN

Senate Joint Resolution 103 requires that:

> In addition to any other plans of apportionment which may be submitted at such elections, there shall be submitted to a vote of the people an alternative plan of apportionment based solely on substantial equality of population.

This language is subject to the same deficiencies as was comparable language in earlier versions of the Dirksen amendment.

This would permit a legislature which was bent on perpetuating its malapportioned existence to submit as the alternative plan one which would be wholly unacceptable to the people of the State, thus forcing the people of a given State to select the malapportionment plan as the lesser of two evils.

For example, there is nothing to prevent a State legislature from submitting as the "alternative plan" an apportionment scheme which would provide for the election of one house of the State legislature wholly at large. It could even provide that the composition of that other body would be limited to a half-dozen men. While this would meet constitutional requirements of apportionment on the basis of population, it would obviously be unacceptable. The people, lacking a reasonable alternative, would undoubtedly prefer to perpetuate a rotten borough legislature.

This is essentially what happened in Colorado when there was an "alternative plan" presented to the voters. The plan that accorded fair representation to Denver also provided that all the representatives from Denver had to be elected at large. The plan that gave Denver less than fair representation would have created single member districts. The people of Colorado preferred the plan that established single member districts, just as the people of my State would.

6. MULTIPLE PLANS POSSIBLE

Senate Joint Resolution 103 provides no limit to the number of plans that can be submitted at any one time. It states: "In addition to any other plans there must be submitted an alternative plan submitted based on population." This means that the people may be confronted with a choice among three, four, five, or more alternative plans.

What would happen in a statewide election if the people had a yes-or-no choice on each of four plans of apportionment and rejected them all? Would the existing malapportioned legislature continue in existence? Would a new special election have to be held?

Suppose the majority voted in favor of two plans which were mutually contradictory. Which would go into effect, and how would the obvious impasse be resolved?

This problem was debated at length in the constitutional amendments subcommittee during a discussion of Senate Joint Resolution 2. It was finally agreed that the only sensible way to handle the problem was to have the State legislature submit to the voters only one plan at a time for a "yes" or "no" vote, or submit two plans and require the voters to choose between them, without any option to accept or reject them both.

This seems to be the only way to avoid the impasse which would obviously be created if all plans were rejected or more than one plan were accepted.

The present language of Senate Joint Resolution 103 does not deal with this problem, and the opportunities for chaos and confusion are great.

7. INVITATION TO UNICAMERALISM

Senate Joint Resolution 2, as originally introduced by Senator DIRKSEN, provided that unicameral legislatures could deviate from fair apportionment standards by according "reasonable weight" to factors other than population. During the course of the many transformations of Senate Joint Resolution 2, the term "reasonable" was dropped. It was only seconds before the vote to substitute his amendment for the baseball resolution that Senator DIRKSEN accepted an amendment to restore the word "reasonable."

Senator DIRKSEN explained that the word "reasonable" was dropped during the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 2 through oversight. I accept this explanation, but it reinforces my fear that the Constitution should not be amended on the floor of the Senate or in back rooms without detailed, careful consideration.

In any event, it is clear that the word "reasonable" does not appear in Senate Joint Resolution 103.

Senate Joint Resolution 103 provides that a unicameral legislature may be apportioned among the people on the basis of substantial equality of population with such weight given to geography and subdivisions "as will assure effective representation in the State legislature of the various groups and interests making up the electorate."

Again we return to the elusive phrase "effective representation." How much weight would be permitted to geography and political subdivisions in order to accord "effective representation" to some favored group or interest? How far can a unicameral legislature deviate from "substantial equality of population?" I submit there is no limitation: no factor of reasonableness is involved. It would appear that any deviation would be permissible so long as the proponents of the rotten borough plan could point to some "group or interest" in the State which in their judgment needed more "effective representation."

If, as it seems, there is no limitation whatever on the apportionment of a unicameral legislature, is this not an invitation to some of our more resourceful legislators to try to preserve their rotten boroughs by transforming their legislatures into unicameral bodies, where no constitutional standards of representation would apply?

CONCLUSION

Wholly aside from the philosophical question, on which Senator DIRKSEN and I disagree, it seems to me that the language he has put forward is subject to the many technical objections which I have attempted to outline here.

The amendment, if ratified, would become the most confusing, ambiguous, and wholly unintelligible section of our Constitution.

If we are to amend the Constitution to overrule Reynolds against Sims, let us not do it with such a hastily drawn and obviously inadequate provision.

Wheat Processors' Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, during the recent debates on the farm bill, H.R. 9811, a great deal of interest was generated over the administration's proposal that additional revenues for financing the wheat program be derived from an increase in the domestic certificate required of processors of wheat for food use. Since such an increase in certificates would only be shifted to the consumer, this secured the title of "bread tax." My firm opposition to it stemmed from the fact that poor people eat more food derived from wheat than wealthier people; therefore, the tax would have been a greater burden on them and extremely regressive. Also, during the course of debate, the flour milling industry suffered a great deal of criticism. My interest was aroused and I began wondering whether this industry actually was making such profits that they could have absorbed the 50 cents or more a bushel increase in certificate cost or not. So, I looked into the situation, securing material from USDA reports and I will place the tables after my comments to illustrate what I am about to say.

It should be pointed out that the millers and other wheat processors still are required to pay 75 cents per bushel to the Commodity Credit Corporation for each bushel of wheat processed into flour for human consumption in addition to the market price. It was expected when the bill was enacted, requiring this certificate to be paid, that the loan would be $1.25 a bushel and the certificate 75 cents—therefore, the cost of the wheat to the processor would remain at $2 a bushel. The price support loan, without any certificate, the year previously was $1.82 a bushel.

I believe I should also add that in my efforts to prevent an increase in the certificate above 75 cents a bushel, that I continuously supported a program which would bring a fair return to the wheat producer. In fact, I recognize that wheat producers are facing a rather severe cost-price squeeze. I believe that the farmer should have the opportunity to secure the highest price possible for the commodities which he sells. Also, in fairness to the flour millers, I should like to point out that the Miller's National Federation has emphasized that "flour millers want wheat producers to earn a fair return on their capital investment and labor."

I can hardly blame them for opposing the certificate tax since they have seen processors of another commodity, cotton, for 2 years being paid to reduce the cost of their raw material; and now, direct payments to cotton producers will be made directly from the Treasury as has been the case in wool and feed grains heretofore. Millers evidently wanted similar treatment; that is, direct producer payments.

I do recall their pointing out that the adoption of the principle of a processor tax or certificate would eventually lead to attempts to impose greater assessments on them. Their fears were borne out this year and an attempt was made by the administration to expand the principle to rice. However, the hue and cry in that commodity prevented even the principle from being established.

At this point, I include the tables I mentioned earlier in the RECORD:

Wheat and flour—Price relationships at milling centers, year beginning July 1948–49

MINNEAPOLIS [1]

Crop year	Cost of wheat to produce 100 pounds of flour	Wholesale price of—		Total products (flour+millfeed)	
		Bakery flour per 100 pounds	Millfeed obtained per 100 pounds	Col. (2) + Col. (3)	Over cost of wheat
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1948–49	$5.41	$5.60	$0.80	$6.49	$1.08
1949–50	5.41	5.81	.75	6.56	1.15
1950–51	5.73	6.12	.85	6.97	1.24
1951–52 [2]	5.75	5.87	1.01	6.88	1.13
1952–53 [2]	5.72	5.74	.88	6.62	.90
1953–54	5.96	6.36	.79	7.15	1.19
1954–55	6.31	6.82	.72	7.54	1.23
1955–56	5.61	6.22	.68	6.90	1.29
1956–57	5.47	6.04	.70	6.74	1.27
1957–58	5.40	6.10	.57	6.67	1.27
1958–59	5.02	5.68	.64	6.32	1.30
1959–60	5.11	5.44	.61	6.05	.94
1960–61	4.92	5.36	.61	5.97	1.05
1961–62	5.43	5.70	.61	6.31	.88
1962–63	5.61	5.92	.68	6.60	.99
1963–64	5.20	5.52	.66	6.18	.98
1964–65	5.64	5.68	.70	6.38	.74
Average, 1948–49 to 1963–64	5.50	5.90	.72	6.62	1.12
KANSAS CITY [3]					
1948–49	$5.15	$5.24	$0.82	$6.06	$0.91
1949–50	5.13	5.36	.78	6.14	1.01
1950–51	5.38	5.59	.87	6.46	1.08
1951–52 [2]	5.66	5.64	.98	6.62	.96
1952–53 [2]	5.50	5.46	.93	6.39	.89
1953–54	5.52	5.93	.79	6.72	1.20
1954–55	5.87	6.14	.76	6.90	1.03
1955–56	5.34	5.73	.69	6.42	1.08
1956–57	5.29	5.68	.67	6.35	1.06
1957–58	5.18	5.64	.57	6.21	1.03
1958–59	4.81	5.14	.63	5.77	.96
1959–60	4.83	5.03	.60	5.63	.80
1960–61	4.77	5.04	.58	5.62	.85
1961–62	5.13	5.37	.58	5.95	.82
1962–63	5.47	5.65	.68	6.33	.86
1963–64	4.99	5.25	.67	5.92	.93
1964–65	5.33	5.41	.70	6.11	.78
Average, 1948–49 to 1963–64	5.25	5.49	.73	6.22	.97

[1] Minneapolis:
Wheat: (1) No. 1 Dark Northern Spring, simple average of 13 percent and 15 percent protein. Includes 70-cent certificate beginning July 1964. Based on 72 percent extraction rate, 1948–56, cost of 2.31 bushels. Based on 73 percent extraction rate, 1957–64, cost of 2.28 bushels.
Flour: (2) Short patent spring wheat flour (1948 to January 1960). Spring wheat standard patent (January 1960–64). Beginning February 1959, quoted as bulk.
Millfeed: (3) Assumes 50–50 distribution between bran and middlings.

[2] Federal price controls in effect. Data should be disregarded.

[3] Kansas City:
Wheat: (1) No. 2 Hard Winter, 13 percent protein (1948–56); No. 1 Hard Winter, 13 percent protein (1957–64). Includes 70-cent certificate beginning July 1964. Based on 72 percent extraction rate, 1948–56, cost of 2.31 bushels. Based on 73 percent extraction rate, 1957–64, cost of 2.28 bushels.
Flour: (2) Short winter wheat flour (1948 to January 1960); 95 percent patent (January 1960–64). Beginning February 1959, quoted as bulk.
Millfeed: (3) Assumes 50–50 distribution between bran and middlings.

NOTE.—Col. (4) = col. (2) + col. (3); col. (5) = col. (4) − col. (1).

Source: All data from Economic Research Service, USDA.

Cash wheat closing prices—Monthly average at Kansas City and Minneapolis

Year and month	Kansas City		Minneapolis	
	Number 1 Hard Winter, 13 percent protein	Per hundred pounds of flour [1]	Number 1 Dark Northern Spring, average of 13 and 15 percent protein	Per hundred pounds of flour [1]
1963–64				
July	$2.09	$4.77	$2.30	$5.24
August	2.12	4.83	2.20	5.02
September	2.21	5.04	2.32	5.29
October	2.29	5.22	2.31	5.45
November	2.27	5.18	2.36	5.38
December	2.28	5.20	2.35	5.36
January	2.29	5.22	2.33	5.31
February	2.27	5.18	2.28	5.20
March	2.22	5.06	2.21	5.06
April	2.30	5.24	2.25	5.13
May	2.24	5.11	2.32	5.29
June	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
1964–65 [3]				
July	2.34	5.34	2.42	5.52
August	2.37	5.40	2.41	5.52
September	2.40	5.47	2.45	5.61
October	2.39	5.45	2.50	5.71
November	2.41	5.49	2.51	5.73
December	2.38	5.43	2.50	5.70
January	2.34	5.34	2.49	5.68
February	2.36	5.38	2.48	5.67
March	2.31	5.27	2.48	5.65
April	2.28	5.18	2.46	5.63
May	2.25	5.13	2.48	5.65
June	2.26	5.15	2.46	5.61
1965–66 [4]				
July	2.42	5.52	2.51	5.72
August	2.49	5.68	2.50	5.70
September	2.51	5.72	2.54	5.79

[1] Cost of 2.28 bushels of wheat used in producing 100 pounds of flour.

[2] Transition period. Data not meaningful.

[3] 1964–65 prices include a $0.70 certificate cost to millers.

[4] 1965–66 prices include a $0.75 certificate cost to millers.

Source: All data from Economic Research Service, USDA.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, all of these tables were taken directly from Department of Agriculture statistics. They show that the U.S. flour milling industry last year—that is, the year ending June 30, 1965—went through its worst year in the past 17.

The simplest measure of the flour miller's economic condition is his milling margin. This is the amount of money he receives for flour and millfeed, less the cost of wheat. The margin is certainly not profit, since all other costs of producing flour, such as wages, salaries, interest, laboratory expenses, and so forth, must be taken from the margin.

The price relationship table for Kansas City, for example, shows that the average margin—based on wheat costs and flour and millfeed prices in that market—last year was 78 cents, or 19 cents less than the average of the preceding 16 years. Also, it was lower than any of the preceding individual years. In Minneapolis, the decline was 38 cents, from $1.12 to 74 cents. This is a one-third reduction in the milling margin.

The magnitude of these losses in the milling margin—gross receipts less wheat cost—can best be demonstrated by relating them to total flour production for domestic consumption. A decline of 19 cents per hundred pounds of hard wheat flour, as at Kansas City, is equivalent to an industrywide margin loss of about $50 million. The comparable figure for spring wheat flour represented by Minneapolis is some $100 million. Thus, the milling industry is undergoing a cost-price squeeze which cannot be endured for long.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take the time of my colleagues to analyze these tables in detail, but I invite them to do so when the tables appear in the RECORD. I ask them to pay particular attention to the changes in wheat costs, shown in the third table, which took place after the adoption of the wheat certificate program, which went into effect July 1, 1964.

I think you will see that, regardless of what has been said and regardless of what the reasons are, wheat costs to the miller have increased and are continuing to increase over the costs which prevailed during the year prior to enactment of the certificate program. In the long run, this increased cost must be reflected in flour prices if there is to be an economically healthy flour milling industry.

I imagine it was natural for me to be primarily interested in the consumers of wheat products, and it is natural for anyone in politics to do so since the consumers are more numerous than any group in the country. It is also natural to be concerned about the incomes of producers since not only do many of us represent substantial numbers of them, but they are desperately needed in order that the human race might be well fed and well clothed. I must hasten to add that the food processors are an important segment of our economy and should not be used as a whipping boy, as was said during the debate on the farm bill this year. Therefore, I felt it would be wise to submit some facts for the RECORD in order that those who are interested in what is happening to this important industry in our economy can make their judgment of the statements that were made during the debate here and in the other body.

Independence of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, October 28 is the 47th anniversary of the independence of Czechoslovakia, the country born of the aspirations and toil of two nations, the Czechs and Slovaks. It was a country whose ideals were espoused by such men of foresight as Thomas Masaryk and General Stefanik. Czechoslovakia flourished during its first decades—its people were industrious, its civilization was second to none, and its folklore was beautiful to see and listen to.

At Munich Czechoslovakia was chosen as a sacrificial lamb by those whose knowledge of dictators was so scant that they were willing to sacrifice anyone else except their own interests. Following World War II, Czechoslovakia fell again—this time to the Soviet sphere of domination.

The Czechs and Slovaks have always been and shall remain oriented to the West. The people who now suffer under Communist domination still yearn for the day when they can again enjoy the basic freedoms we do. Let us show that we have not forgotten them and that we shall never acknowledge their condition of Communist domination as a permanent status. We join them in looking forward to the day when Czechoslovakia's freedom and independence is restored.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, four or five times in each session of Congress I issue a legislative report to the residents of the 12th Massachusetts District. I include in the RECORD the text of my final "Washington Report" of the 1st session of the 89th Congress, which comments on the activities of the past 10 months and discusses briefly some of the legislative work that must be undertaken in January:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman HASTINGS KEITH, 12th District, Massachusetts)

DEAR FRIENDS: As this final letter of the session reaches you, I will—hopefully—have left room 1111 of the House Office Building for my home offices in West Bridgewater Town Hall and the Post Office Building in New Bedford.

We've finished 10 long months of work in Washington. Now, I plan to use the 2 months remaining before the start of a new session for getting reacquainted with my congressional district and my family. During this period I will travel about—from Hull to Provincetown, Nantucket to Westport, and as many way stations as possible—to meet with town officials and constituents. I hope that circumstances make it possible to see you when I am in your town.

LEGISLATIVE LANDMARKS

It would be impossible to present a detailed summary of all the accomplishments (and failures) of the 1st session of the 89th Congress. But there are some noteworthy highlights:

One of the most significant bills enacted in this session is the new immigration law, which eliminates the 41-year-old national origins quota and substitutes a policy which gives priority to immigrants with specially-needed talents and skills and to the reuniting of families. Because this new law is so revolutionary and complex, I plan to issue a memorandum in the near future to explain the new law, which I will make available to the newspapers and to constituents who request a copy.

The President has proudly said this Congress will "leap into history." Others have been somewhat less enthusiastic. By any measurement of quantity, at least, this session has been a blockbuster. For example, Congress raised social security benefits (and taxes); enacted medicare; cut $4.6 billion worth of excise taxes; raised the national debt ceiling to $328 billion; appropriated $47 billion for defense (together with a special $700 million appropriation for the Vietnam war); passed a highway beautification program; authorized expenditures of more than $15 billion for space, farm, and foreign aid programs; and enacted clean air and water legislation.

And, furthermore, Congress approved a series of seven major education bills, enacted various public works and antipoverty programs costing some $8 billion; appropriated $2.5 billion for the atomic energy program; created a new Department of Housing and Urban Affairs; passed a voting rights bill; and authorized a $7 billion omnibus Housing Act.

Of course, that's only a few of the 260-odd new laws that came out of the first session. (More than 14,000 bills were filed since January, so there is still plenty of unfinished business.)

A HEALTHY OUTLOOK

As I mentioned in my last newsletter, the Commerce Committee worked many hours on legislation affecting the health of our Nation. (This is one of the areas of prime responsibility for this important committee.) In addition to the heart, stroke, and cancer legislation which has been discussed in an earlier report, the committee approved bills dealing with drug abuse control (pep pills), clean air and solid-waste disposal, cigarette labeling, expansion of the community immunization program, financial aid for staffing community mental health centers, health professions educational assistance, and authorization of further public health research projects.

CONGRESS STILL HAS THE LAST WORD—AT TIMES

It hasn't all been roses for the administration. Republican opposition and criticism were major factors in halting or modifying greatly some of the more overly enthusiastic Federal programs.

Funds for the Teacher Corps, for example, were held up when it was pointed out that the Federal Government's complete responsibility for recruiting, training, and paying teachers for services in local school districts could lead to too much Federal interference at the municipal level. And, Congress changed its mind about appropriating money to supplement rent payments (and also 40-year home mortgages at 5¾ percent interest) when debate indicated that, under proposed regulations, some beneficiaries could be earning $10,000 a year and have up to $20,000 in assets.

We Republicans are in the minority—very definitely—but we have had varying degrees of success this session in our role as the loyal opposition. The greatest contribution that we were able to make was in the committees of Congress—here the spending was cut, the programs tightened up, and the role of private enterprise and the responsibilities of State and local governments recognized and defended.

Believe it or not, even after the rapid-fire lawmaking of the past session, there is still a backlog of unfinished business. The fight over repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act is yet to be settled. The proposal for an increased Federal minimum wage will be before the second session. Differences between House and Senate versions of the oceanography legislation must be ironed out. And we're likely to have a package of controversial new maritime legislation to consider. And much more.

A HOOVER COMMISSION FOR BETTER GOVERNMENT

High on my own priority list in 1966 will be a bill I have filed calling for a new Hoover Commission-type of study of the executive branch. The multilayered maze of interlocking and often overlapping Federal bureaus, agencies, departments, et cetera, et cetera, clearly needs an overhaul. I've mentioned before that 19 different agencies have a hand in the national oceanography program, with none having a controlling responsibility. This situation applies in other areas of Government, and the result can only be waste and inefficiency. There are no less than 42 bureaus involved in some aspect of education, for example. The situation in transportation is perhaps even worse. We have the amazing total of 296 Federal programs in the field of consumer protection—administered by some 33 separate agencies or bureaus.

A HUMAN INVESTMENT FOR BETTER JOBS

Next year I will also work for action on another bill I have sponsored—the Human Investment Act—which is based on an idea championed by Vermont's Senator PROUTY. This attacks the problem of a growing shortage of skilled workers by giving private companies the incentive to undertake their own training program, not through the creation of some new federally financed project. The incentive would be a tax credit for authorized apprenticeship and training advancement programs. This is a job that private industry is equipped to do, and one that it can do much better and cheaper than the Government.

Nationwide, about 4.5 percent of our labor force is unemployed. Experts tell us that such unemployment could be wiped out entirely if jobless men and women had the skills sought by industry. This legislation is a sound and practical way of developing those skills.

Safer and better harbors: Southeastern Massachusetts economy has been historically linked with the sea and the coastline. This is still true today with the increasing importance of fishing, boating, and tourism. I'm glad to report, therefore, that $1,377,000 of this year's rivers and harbors appropriation is earmarked for the 12th Congressional District.

Report to 23d District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter to residents of the first and fourth wards of the city of Cleveland as a part of the RECORD:

DEAR FRIEND: As you may know, the 105th General Assembly of the Ohio Legislature last year changed the boundaries of Ohio's congressional districts, which will take effect in the 1966 elections. Although the new area of the 23d District still represents many of the suburbs around the city of Cleveland, it now also includes the ward in which you live.

Since 1955 I have represented the 23d District in the U.S. Congress. During my 11 years in Washington I have made it a practice to keep in the closest possible touch with constituents through frequent newsletters, radio, and television appearances, occasional opinion polls and, when length of the session permits, a traveling office. At the end of each session I send a summary of the year's legislative actions to my district and a copy of this year's report is enclosed for your information.

For your convenience, I maintain a year-round office at 525 Federal Building, Cleveland, CHerry 1-7900, extension 7360, in addition to my office in Washington, D.C. During the months ahead I hope I will have the opportunity of meeting you.

Meanwhile do not hesitate to give me the benefit of your counsel and advice. Please remember I am always ready to be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
Member of Congress.

Aid for the Victim of a Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the victim of a crime is in a very real sense a double victim. He is attacked by the assailant, often brutally beaten, left senseless by the criminal, stripped of his possessions, his body battered and torn. At times, there is only death or permanent injury to one who supports a family or is responsible for the care of children.

The assault victim also loses in another way. Society, which takes upon itself the responsibility of repressing crime and prosecuting those who violate its laws, at present shows little concern for the victim of the mugger, the rapist, or the murderer. Where the accused is provided the important constitutional guarantees of a fair trial and free legal assistance, if necessary, the only interest in the victim on many occasions is that he is in good enough condition to be a possible witness in a prosecution. He is afforded little, even though it is he that has suffered the most.

On October 22, I introduced legislation which would provide some care for the victim.

The problem of how to help the victim is an old one. The ancient penal codes of Babylon, Israel, Greece, Rome, and Anglo-Saxon England required the criminal to reimburse the victim with money or property. The same principle was followed in cases of theft in Connecticut and Massachusetts in the 17th century. During the late 19th century compensation of victims was a topic of discussion at five different international conferences on prison reform, but even though resolutions were passed favoring relief of the victim, nothing further came of the idea. Now Great Britain, as the result of a white paper on the subject, and New Zealand, both have compensation plans, and the State of California recently embarked on such a course.

The distinguished Senator YARBOROUGH, of Texas, has introduced legislation to better balance the values of police protection and constitutional rights for the accused and community care for the victim. His bill would be limited to victims of violent crimes in the District of Columbia and certain other jurisdictions where the Federal Government has general police powers. My own bill has somewhat broader application, and would cover every victim of crime, whether under State or Federal law.

This legislation—H.R. 11818—proposes setting up a Federal Violent Crimes Compensation Commission, a three-man tribunal chosen for their legal prowess, which would consider the claims of those who suffer physical injuries during the commission of crimes. The Commission will decide if the victim is actually an innocent party and it will determine the level of compensation. In setting the compensation the Commission will provide for actual medical costs suffered by the victim, including rehabilitation services involved. In the event of murder, the victim's survivors would be paid, but in no event would the compensation exceed $25,000. A victim of a crime of violence, to receive compensation, would have to give notice of intent to submit his claim within 1 month of injury. In no event would the Commission consider claims that did not total $300. There would be no appeal from the decision of the Commission.

Compensation plans have the backing of some of the Nation's most distinguished jurists. As former Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg has pointed out, the victim of a violent crime "has been denied the protection of the laws in a very real sense, and society should assume some responsibility for making him whole."

Such a law, it seems to me, is the very least we can do for those who innocently suffer from the wanton assaults of those who have no respect for law or authority—or who decide to take the law into their own hands. So far, society has shown little concern for those who must pay the most. There are the days lost from work, the medical costs of recuperation. There is the pain and suffering. There may be years of physical and psychological torment. It is hoped that in a small way this proposal can start the national effort necessary to insure that victims of crimes are protected by society and returned to their jobs and families as quickly and painlessly as possible.

I include the bill in its entirety at this point and I welcome comments and recommendations from members of the bar, penologists, sociologists, and others interested in this area:

H.R. 11818

A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE AND DEFINITIONS

Short title

SEC. 101. This Act may be cited as the "Criminal Injuries Compensation Act of 1966".

Definitions

SEC. 102. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "child" means an unmarried person who is under eighteen years of age and includes a stepchild or an adopted child;

(2) The term "Commission" means the Violent Crimes Compensation Commission established by this Act;

(3) The term "dependents" means such relatives of a deceased victim as were wholly or partially dependent upon his income at the time of his death or would have been so dependent but for the incapacity due to the injury from which the death resulted and shall include the child of such victim born after his death;

(4) The term "personal injury" means actual bodily harm and includes pregnancy and mental or nervous shock;

(5) The term "relative" means his spouse, parent, grandparent, stepfather, stepmother, child, grandchild, brother, sister, half brother, half sister, or spouse's parents;

(6) The term "victim" means a person who is injured or killed by any act or omission of any other person which is within the description of any of the offenses specified in section 302 of this Act.

TITLE II—ESTABLISHMENT OF VIOLENT CRIMES COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Violent Crimes Compensation Commission

SEC. 201. (a) There is established a Violent Crimes Compensation Commission which shall be composed of three members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, solely on the grounds of fitness to perform the duties of the office. The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission who has been a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State for at least eight years, as Chairman.

(b) No member of the Commission shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(c) The Chairman and one other member of the Commission shall constitute a quorum; and where opinion is divided and only one other member is present, the opinion of the Chairman shall prevail.

(d) The Commission shall have an official seal.

Terms and compensation of members

SEC. 202. (a) The term of office of each member of the Commission taking office after December 31, 1966, shall be eight years, except that (1) the terms of office of the members first taking office after December 31, 1966, shall expire as designated by the President at the time of the appointment, one at the end of four years, one at the end of six years, and one at the end of eight years, after December 31, 1966; and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

(b) Each member of the Commission shall be eligible for reappointment.

(c) A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers.

(d) Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

(e) Each member of the Commission shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 except the Chairman who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for level III of such schedule.

Attorneys, examiners, and employees of the Commission; expenses

SEC. 203. (a) The Commission is authorized to appoint such officers, attorneys, examiners, and other experts as may be necessary for carrying out its functions under this Act, and the Commission may, subject to the civil service laws, appoint such other officers and employees as are necessary and fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949.

(b) All expenses of the Commission, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses of the Commission outside the District of Columbia incurred by the members or employees of the Commission under its orders, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Commission or by any individual it designates for that purpose.

Office for service of process

SEC. 204. The Commission shall maintain an office for the service of process and papers within the District of Columbia.

Powers and procedures of the Commission

SEC. 205. (a) Upon an application made to the Commission under the provisions of this Act, the Commission shall fix a time and place for a hearing on such application and shall cause notice thereof to be given to the applicant.

(b) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Commission, or any member thereof, may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony as the Commission or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member. The Commission shall have such powers of subpena and compulsion of attendance and production of documents as are conferred upon the Securities and Exchange Commission by subsection (c) of section 18 of the Act of August 26, 1935, and the provisions of subsection (d) of such section shall be applicable to all persons summoned by subpena or otherwise to attend or testify or produce such documents as are described therein before the Commission, except that no subpena shall be issued except under the signature of the Chairman, and application to any court for aid in enforcing such subpena may be made only by said Chairman. Subpenas shall be served by any person designated by the said Chairman.

(c) In any case in which the person entitled to make an application is a child, the application may be made on his behalf by any person acting as his parent or guardian. In any case in which the person entitled to make an application is mentally defective, the application may be made on his behalf by his guardian or such other individual authorized to administer his estate.

(d) Where any application is made to the Commission under this Act, the applicant, and any attorney assisting the Commission, shall be entitled to appear and be heard.

(e) Any other person may appear and be heard who satisfies the Commission that he has a substantial interest in the proceedings.

(f) Where under this Act any person is entitled to appear and be heard by the Commission, that person may appear in person or by his attorney.

(g) Every person appearing under the preceding subsections of this section shall have the right to produce evidence and to cross-examine witnesses.

(h) The Commission may receive in evidence any statement, document, information, or matter that may in the opinion of the Commission contribute to its functions under this Act, whether or not such statement, document, information, or matter would be admissible in a court of law.

(i) If any person has been convicted of any offense with respect to an act or omission on which a claim under this Act is based, proof of that conviction shall, unless an appeal against the conviction or a petition for a rehearing or certiorari in respect of the charge is pending or a new trial or rehearing has been ordered, be taken as conclusive evidence that the offense has been committed.

Attorneys' fees

SEC. 206. (a) The Commission may, as a part of any order entered under this Act, determine and allow reasonable attorney fees, which if the award is more than $1,000 shall not exceed 15 per centum of the amount awarded as compensation under section 301 of this Act, to be paid out of but not in addition to the amount of such compensation, to the attorneys representing the applicant.

(b) Any attorney who charges, demands, receives, or collects for services rendered in connection with any proceedings under this Act any amount in excess of that allowed under this section, if any compensation is paid, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

Finality of decision

SEC. 207. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, orders and decisions of the Commission shall be final.

Regulations

SEC. 208. In the performance of its functions, the Commission is authorized to make, promulgate, issue, rescind, and amend rules and regulations prescribing the procedures to be followed in the filing of applications and the proceedings under this Act, and such other matters as the Commission deems appropriate.

TITLE III—AWARD AND PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION

Awarding compensation

SEC. 301. (a) In any case in which a person is injured or killed by any act or omission of any other person which is within the description of the offenses listed in section 302 of this Act the Commission may, in its discretion, upon an application, order the payment of compensation in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Commission may order the payment of compensation—

(1) to or on behalf of the injured person; or

(2) in the case of the personal injury of the victim, where the compensation is for pecuniary loss suffered or expenses incurred by any person responsible for the maintenance of the victim, to that person; or

(3) in the case of the death of the victim, to or for the benefit of the dependents of the deceased victim, or any one or more of such dependents.

(c) For the purpose of this Act, a person shall be deemed to have intended an act or omission notwithstanding that by reason of age, insanity, drunkeness, or otherwise he was legally incapable of forming a criminal intent.

(d) In determining whether to make an order under this section, the Commission may consider any circumstances it determines to be relevant, including the behavior of the victim which directly or indirectly contributed to his injury or death.

(e) No order may be made under this section unless the Commission, supported by substantial evidence, finds that—

(1) such an act or omission did occur; and

(2) the injury or death resulted from such act or omission.

(f) An order may be made under this section whether or not any person is prosecuted or convicted of any offense arising out of such act or omission. Upon application from the Attorney General, the Commission may suspend proceedings under this Act for such period as it deems appropriate on the ground that a prosecution for an offense arising out of such act or omission has been commenced or is imminent.

Offenses to which this Act applies

SEC. 302. The Commission may order the payment of compensation in accordance with the provisions of this Act for personal injury or death which resulted from the commission of a criminal offense which is a felony under State or Federal law.

Nature of the compensation

SEC. 303. The Commission may order the payment of compensation under this Act for—

(a) expenses actually and reasonably incurred as a result of the personal injury or death of the victim; and

(b) any other pecuniary loss resulting from the personal injury or death of the victim which the Commission determines to be reasonable.

Limitations upon awarding compensation

SEC. 304. (a) No order for the payment of compensation shall be made under section 301 of this Act unless (1) the Commission has been notified within thirty days after the date of the personal injury or death that an application will be filed with the Commission for the payment of compensation under this Act, and (2) such application has been made within one year after the date of the personal injury or death. Such notice shall be filed with the Commission in such manner and in such form as the Commission may by regulation prescribe.

(b) The Commission shall not enter an order for the payment of compensation under this Act unless it determines that the sum of (1) the expenses incurred as the result of the personal injury to, or the death of, a victim of a criminal offense, and (2) any other pecuniary loss arising out of such personal injury or death, exceeds $300. If the Commission determines that such sum exceeds $300, it may order the payment of compensation in an amount not to exceed $25,000. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing compensation for damage to or loss of any personal or real property.

(c) No compensation shall be awarded if the victim—

(1) is a relative of the offender; or

(2) was at the time of the personal injury or death of the victim living with the offender as his wife or her husband or as a member of the offender's household.

Terms of the order

SEC. 305. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section any order for the payment of compensation under this Act may be made on such terms as the Commission deems appropriate.

(b) The Commission shall deduct from any payments awarded under section 301 of this Act any payments received by the victim or by any of his dependents from the offender or from any person on behalf of the offender, or from the United States (except those received under this Act), a State or any of its subdivisions, for personal injury or death compensable under this Act.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

Reports to the Congress

SEC. 401. The Commission shall transmit to the President and to the Congress annually a report of its activities under this Act including the name of each applicant, a brief description of the facts in each case, and the amount, if any, of compensation awarded.

Penalties

SEC. 402. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18 of the United States Code shall apply to any applicaton, statement, document, or information presented to the Commission under this Act.

Appropriations

SEC. 403. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Effective date

SEC. 404. This Act shall take effect on July 1, 1966.

Retirement of Digest Editor Jerry Allen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment of the 1st session of the 89th Congress the House will lose the services of Jerry E. Allen, House editor of the Congressional Daily Digest, due to retirement. Mr. Allen has edited the House proceedings since March 17, 1947, when the Daily Digest began publication pursuant to the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946. Before coming to Capitol Hill Mr. Allen had worked at the Government Printing Office for 21 years in various capacities ranging from apprentice boy to copy editor. So after 40 years of Government service I am certain I speak for the entire membership of the House when I say "a long and happy retirement to you and yours, Jerry." It will be my earnest prayer that the good Lord will continue to shower you and yours with His blessings and good health.

United Nations Speech of Congressman Barratt O'Hara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois, now a delegate from the United States to the 20th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, made the following speech on the floor of the Assembly:

ADDRESS BY HON. BARRATT O'HARA BEFORE THE LEGAL COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ON TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO PROMOTE THE TEACHING, STUDY, DISSEMINATION, AND WIDER APPRECIATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Distinguished colleagues, I should like to state that, as a lawyer, I can think of no item on the agenda of the General Assembly on which it gives me greater pleasure to speak. I can think of no audience more seasoned than this by experience, learning and dedication, to share in the making of vital determinations in this area of our deep and mutual interest.

I heartily express my personal appreciation as well as that of my Government to Ambassador Dadzie and Mr. Bal for their lucid and informative statements. We are grateful to the special committee for the excellent work they have done as well as to the Secretariat for the helpful information they so kindly and competently supplied.

As the report of the special committee indicates and as we have heard, many of the most important contributions in this field can be made on a bilateral basis, and many have been. There is a need for multilateral effort, but, in planning that effort, full account needs to be taken of what otherwise is being done. I should like to point with what I hope is pardonable pride to the record of my own Government and private American foundations in this field, both prior to and in response to resolution 1816 of the 17th General Assembly and resolution 1968 C of the 18th General Assembly.

I refer to the extensive comments of my Government contained in documents A/5455, addendum 1 and A/5744, addendum 2. I shall merely touch briefly on what is more fully described there.

My Government maintains a number of programs in the field of international law, including scholarships and fellowships, distribution of books and publications, and exchanges of professors, lecturers, and specialists. Efforts are being undertaken so that these agencies will be able to respond to additional requests stimulated by the welcome increase of activity and interest by the United Nations and member nations in this field. The Department of State awards approximately 150 grants annually in the field of law. Of these, roughly two-thirds are to foreign students to enable them to study law in the United States. The remainder include grants to foreign professors and specialists who come to the United States for short periods, and to American professors and students. These grants are primarily for graduate study in international and comparative law.

In the private sector—and here again with what, I hope, is justifiable pride—more than 250 colleges and universities offer training in international law. Many of these schools maintain scholarship programs for foreign scholars and programs to support research in international law by scholars of diverse nationalities, whether student or faculty. A number of leading law schools, like Harvard, Yale, Columbia, New York University, Chicago, and Stanford, offer extensive studies in international law. Certain universities participate in student and faculty exchanges with foreign universities and nations in the field of international law. Now, we think that all of this is worthwhile.

Professional societies and private foundations have extensive programs relating to international law. Professional groups such as the American Society of International Law, the American Bar Association through its committee on world peace through law, and the American branch of the International Law Association issue learned publications, hold professional conferences and sponsor research projects. Mr. Chairman, I should also like to mention the Federal Bar Association which is composed of lawyers working for the Federal Government.

Foundations such as the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Asia Foundation have made grants for study and travel, and sponsored international conferences and made studies. They have provided grants to universities and societies, located, among other places, in India, Burma, and the United Arab Republic. The Carnegie endowment is presently sponsoring the preparation of a basic textbook or manual of international law, with the various chapters being written by outstanding scholars representing all the major geographical areas, legal systems, and traditions.

I have only touched the surface. Nor do we intend to settle for that and rest on the record.

In response to the resolutions of the General Assembly, particularly resolution 1816 (XVII), and in view of the importance the United States accords to the teaching, study, dissemination, and wider appreciation of international law, my Government is planning to assist in the holding of a special international seminar for lawyers, largely from the newer and developing states. It is presently anticipated that the seminar will take place in New York City for about a month in August and September 1966. It is anticipated that young lawyers, preferably in government service, and advanced law students will study salient problems of international law and organization under the leadership of a distinguished faculty. After the seminar, we would hope that the participants will have an opportunity to follow the United Nations General Assembly, acquaint themselves with methods of work of the Office of the Legal Adviser of the Department of State, and visit leading American universities.

The details of the program will be worked out by nongovernmental sources. The U.S. Government will provide full travel grants and per diem to participants. My Government has expressly requested me to invite my colleagues in this committee to help recruit the most qualified participants. Any such help, I can assure you, would be greatly appreciated.

In light of contributions from various quarters, my Government wishes to insure that in this field of such paramount importance there is no waste due to duplication. Each country, each institution, must contribute what it is best, if not uniquely, capable of contributing. My Government has studied the report of the committee with this basic criterion in mind. We have asked ourselves: What aspects of the great need in the field can best be met by multilateral United Nations efforts?

We suggest the following:

The distribution of United Nations publications such as the yearbooks of the International Law Commission, the United Nations Juridical Yearbook, and the invaluable Repertoire of Practice on as wide a basis as possible is of great importance.

The study on training in international law presently being conducted by UNESCO and referred to in paragraph 15 of the special committee's report represents a valuable step toward the type of capital investment in knowledge and understanding that is called for.

My delegation also generally approves the recommendations set forth in paragraphs 36 to 40, that international law be given full attention by the United Nations Training and Research Institute.

My delegation also supports the idea of on-the-job training in the form of intern programs. We would be in favor of such programs at the United Nations headquarters or at the seats of the specialized agencies. Where the training is to take place at the headquarters we would be inclined to explore further the suggestion contained in paragraph 38(b)(i), that the program, insofar as possible, be coordinated with the United Nations Training and Research Institute.

As a natural consequence of the views which I have just expressed, my delegation finds much of merit in the proposed 3-year program set forth in the special committee's report.

Before proceeding to a somewhat detailed examination of parts of this proposed program we are constrained to call attention to the following. As the Secretary General himself has stated, the financial crisis of this Organization has—and I quote—"by no means been dispelled." The Secretary General also stated that the conference program has reached almost unmanageable proportions. It seems clear, particularly in light of the very informative discussion in the committee yesterday, that financing a program of technical assistance in international law through the regular budget would—as a practical matter—most certainly mean additional appropriations. The decision of the technical assistance committee, discussed at some length in the committee yesterday, that it would not be possible under existing EPTA legislation to permit consideration of requests for assistance in the general field of international law, must also be taken into account.

These are sobering facts, Mr. Chairman, facts which must be borne in mind when we examine each proposal for action. These facts make it even more strongly incumbent on us to ask, with respect to each proposal, whether it would duplicate existing efforts, and whether a multinational organization represents the optimum means of meeting the need. They make it incumbent upon us to establish a list of priorities to insure optimum utilization of such funds as may become available through voluntary contributions or otherwise.

I should now like to turn to the program proposed for the first year, limiting, for the time being, my specific comments on the committee's proposals to that year.

In general, it comports with our view that one of the most important functions the United Nations can serve is as an information center and clearinghouse, to pinpoint needs, elicit resources, and match the two. The United Nations, in short, is perhaps uniquely equipped to serve as catalyst for increased bilateral efforts.

Now, one or two particular matters. So far as co-sponsorship of international meetings is concerned, I should like again to call attention to the Secretary General's plea for nonproliferation of conferences. It is to be hoped that any conference will, in large part, be paid for by the host governments or institutions, with the participation of the United Nations or UNESCO being sufficient to assure that the purposes and mode of operation of the conference are such as to justify the use of the name of the international organization. And that, I think, is important.

Insofar as item VII set forth in paragraph 98(a) of the committee's report is concerned, it would seem advisable to await the completion of the study of training in international law being conducted by UNESCO before determining that a model curriculum is desirable. Curriculum is, after all, a function of the skill of the particular teacher, the level of the students, the quality of the library and the nature of other courses being offered—in short, basically a matter for each school to decide for itself.

Subject to the approval by the governing board of the United Nations Training and Research Institute, as my earlier remarks indicate, my Government would hope to see international law play a significant role in the training and research programs of the Institute.

Mr. Chairman, these comments cover only the smaller portion of the specific suggestions contained in the report of the special committee. Since others of these suggestions will doubtless be discussed and perhaps made the subject of proposals before this committee, I should like to reserve the right to speak again as the occasion might require. May I simply note at this point, with respect to the proposals of the special committee for the second and third and succeeding years of the program, that my delegation particularly favors the provision of United Nations legal publications, the provision of advisory services, if they are requested by developing countries, and the award of fellowships for study of legal aspects of U.N. activities. It would hope that priority would be accorded to these proposals. While there is certainly merit in courses and seminars, these are less well-suited to U.N. contributions. We do have doubt about the United Nations giving subventions to international nongovernment institutions active in the field of international law, however meritorious their work. May I now make a few very general remarks on the question of the financing of any projects of assistance in international law, and the question of the practical steps which the sixth committee might take at this stage.

In light of the various financial considerations which have been brought to the attention of the committee, some of which I have alluded to today and many of which were placed before us yesterday, my delegation believes that a renewed call by the Secretary-General for voluntary contributions, from both governmental and private sources, represents the most practical step open to us at this time to obtain the requisite funds. We are hopeful that, in addition, some funds will be available through the expanded program for technical assistance, for that part of any program—which may well be a significant part—for which a case can be made out for EPTA assistance under existing legislation.

Regardless of what financial approach is adopted, Mr. Chairman, it will not be possible for the committee to know exactly how large a sum will be available to it. Accordingly, in our view, it would be wise for any action by the sixth committee at this stage to include the establishment of—

First, certain priorities among possible projects of assistance;

Second, certain guidelines governing the execution of these projects and the use of funds which become available; and

Finally, an advisory committee such as that suggested in paragraph 103 of the report of the special committee, charged with the task of assisting in carrying forward as much of the program as is possible in view of the funds that are made available.

I should like to add one final note, Mr. Chairman. My Government notes with appreciation the tentative commitments made by UNESCO as set forth in document A/C.6/L.565 and as further explained by the distinguished representative of UNESCO yesterday. We find the possibility of a training course for Africa, should the necessary financing become available, of particular interest. In our view this project might well be considered a useful opportunity for cooperation between the United Nations and UNESCO in the planning and execution of technical assistance projects in the field of international law.

In this connection, my Government would like to associate itself with the remarks of our distinguished colleague from Belgium that the maximum benefit will be derived from such a program, and the ends of the international organization involved will be best served, if, and only if, the subjects taught are of a strictly legal nature and are in those areas where the law is well established and not a matter of major contention between the differing legal, political, and social systems of the world. The topics suggested—international rivers, the role of law and the lawyer in the foreign office, certain aspects of treaty law, and the law of the United Nations—would largely seem to comport with these criteria.

A Tribute to Olof Anderson and His Assistants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, President Johnson has correctly stated:

> A people proud of their collective heritage will take pride in their individual health, because we cannot stay strong as a country if we go soft as citizens.

Here in the Senate my colleagues and I owe much to the faithful attendants in the Senate Gymnasium who, for many years, have helped us in our efforts to maintain physical fitness.

I therefore wish to pay tribute to Olof R. Anderson and his capable and ever-attentive assistants—Bo I. Anderberg, Ray Johanson, Gunnar Johanson, and Johnny Ware—for the great help they have been to all of us through the years. Olof Anderson has been with us since 1950—a period of 15 years of devoted service to the Members of the Senate—service which has meant so much to all of us in maintaining the degree of physical well-being necessary to perform our duties here in the Senate.

The Pershing Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the erection of a memorial in honor of Gen. John J. Pershing is bound to occupy the attention of the House very early in the next session. Every Member is interested in this matter and I know of no opposition in the Congress. The President, in expressing his approval, urged that action go forward "without further delay."

We have been optimistic before. For example, S. 3903, 86th Congress, authorizing a memorial, was reported by Senator Carl Hayden and passed by the Senate on August 30, 1960. It failed of passage in the House because of adjournment—a national election required our attention.

It now occurs that the conceptual plans of the temporary Pennsylvania Avenue Commission may not admit of construction and completion of the plan as designed. It may be necessary to seek another site.

The memorial was visualized as looming large, and to be located on its own grounds and be commensurate with the deeds and the stature of the man whose services we seek to honor. Obviously no feature may intrude or clash with the monument. It is not a case of being accommodated or being lived with. These plans were submitted pursuant to an act of Congress by Gen. Jacob Devers' Battle Monuments Commission. They have been accepted by the veterans societies and by the Senate without stint of praiseworthiness.

My bill, H.R. 10107, this Congress, superseding H.R. 17, laid aside, places the entire responsibility upon the Secretary of Interior as to site, erection, and maintenance of the memorial on federally owned land in the District of Columbia. He would be charged with following the plans for the memorial which I have described.

The National Park Service has indicated the availability of a potentially suitable site on Virginia Avenue NW., at C Street. This area, approximately the same size as Pershing Square, has much to offer now. It has much promise for the future. Virginia Avenue is an access route to and from the Capitol and the Southwest to the State Department, the Kennedy Cultural Center, Georgetown and the suburban counties of Virginia and Maryland. This alternate site may or may not be the solution, but it is there and its use may obviate further delay and inevitable invidious considerations.

Be all this as it may, it is hoped that Pershing Square will be the approved site and that necessary approvals for construction may go forward with at least a prayer that construction will be sufficiently advanced to permit dedication on the 50th anniversary of the commencement of the World War, April 6, 1967.

I understand that the Budget Bureau will have cleared the required reports to the Congress from the executive department agencies prior to the convening of the next session.

I am confident that we are on the way to fulfill this long-overdue honor to that great general who created his armies in the field 3,000 miles from his home base and then led them to a certain victory—turning the tide of a battle which otherwise would have been lost. No one who has read and studied the memoirs of Marshalls Von Hindenburg or Ludendorff of the Imperial Germany Army will doubt this statement.

It is trusted that early favorable action on H.R. 10107 may be had. Such will give substance to the Act of Congress of September 29, 1919, tendering its thanks to Pershing for a heroic task well done.

Deep Sea Science Achievements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, American progress in space technology has captured the public imagination to the extent that other noteworthy scientific achievements are sometimes slighted. Litton Industries in my district, Minneapolis, constructed the submarine *Alvin* which recently made a record-breaking dive to a depth of 6,000 feet. This remarkable achievement deserves recognition.

The record-breaking dive was made on July 20 of this year, near New Providence Island in the Bahamas. While bathyscalphs have gone deeper, the *Alvin* descent was the first time that a neutral buoyancy submersible had reached a depth of 1 nautical mile.

Alvin's chief pilot was Mr. William Rainnie and its copilot was Marvin McCamis. They reported that they were able to see 30 to 40 feet with the aid of exterior lights. Rainnie and McCamis stopped the submarine every thousand feet on its descent to check all its systems.

While *Alvin* was submerged in its testing procedures, a heavy thunderstorm arose on the surface, with winds in excess of 25 knots. The recovery operation was the roughest to date. The craft was taken aboard its catamaran tender and brought back to Port Canaveral, Fla., for a postdive checkout. The 22-foot

Alvin was conceived and designed through the cooperative efforts of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution and the Applied Sciences Division of Litton Industries. The construction of the craft by Litton and the research program are supported by funds from the Office of Naval Research.

In our enthusiasm over the Gemini project, we should not forget comparable undersea achievements. Everyone connected with the *Alvin* project should be congratulated.

Rent Supplement Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the rent supplement program, once characterized as a "dead horse" during House debate, will apparently be at the starting gate and off and running when the 2d session of the 89th Congress convenes on January 10.

Personally, I welcome the special emphasis which has been placed on the proposed program by the President and the administration's announced intention to seek $30 million to start the program early next year through another supplemental money bill.

If there is a genuine effort by the administration, the next 10 weeks can be used wisely in establishing a case for this program. It is a legislative matter that can be considered quickly by the Congress.

In this review of congressional action and events concerning the rent subsidy program, which generated so much debate and, unfortunately, some harsh and bitter words as Congress refused to appropriate contract authority funds in the 1966 supplemental appropriation bill, I would respectfully suggest that the administration carefully consider the words of chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations the gentleman from Texas, George H. Mahon. The following quotation of Congressman Mahon's can be found on page 27849 of the October 21, 1965, Congressional Record:

> This conference bill eliminates the rent supplement item put in by the other body, but language is contained in the statement of the managers stating that this is done without prejudice to the program. However, the program had been launched under such an ill omen it became necessary to call a halt, because the administrator of the agency had indicated the announcement and the promulgation of rules and regulations which were abhorrent to many Members of Congress, many of whom were strong supporters of the rent supplement program.
>
> It is true when he observed that he was running against the wishes of the Congress he came to Capitol Hill with a series of letters saying, in effect, "I am sorry, we will change this," and he then offered a different type of proposition than had previously been offered, but a man convinced against his will is somewhat of the same opinion still, and we felt it was wise to take a little time to digest this program and let the agency come up with regulations and let us see with our own eyes what the regulations will be before we take action. If there is anything wrong or illogical with that approach, I fail to see it. This is not a repudiation by this body, it is not a veto of the program. It is an action in good commonsense under the circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, the real issue, which still must be resolved, is whether the HHFA will develop and present reasonable evidence that it intends to comply with intent of Congress; namely, that the rent subsidy program be limited to low income groups having an income less than that prescribed for public housing under the Public Housing Act of 1937—title I, section 101(c)(1).

From the time that the President submitted his housing message to Congress last March, his proposal to inaugurate a multibillion-dollar Federal rent subsidy program has been under fire. I can recall that, during our several weeks of testimony before the Housing subcommittee, even stalwart friends of the administration, both inside and outside of Congress, were openly skeptical with regard to this proposal. When the omnibus housing bill reached the floor of the House last June the issue of rent subsidies completely dominated the debate for three full afternoons. At the time, there was not a single objective veteran Washington observer who did not report that the rent subsidy proposal, as reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee, was in deep trouble. In fact, it was facing nearly certain House defeat. Only after a last-minute floor amendment by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Stephens], limiting the program's benefits to families below public housing income limits, did the House approve the proposal by a slim 6-vote margin. We should recall at this point that this last-minute change on the floor of the House had never been discussed in committee, thereby creating a situation where a majority of the Members of the House were not at all certain as to precisely the nature of that which they had agreed to accept.

In all fairness to those who voted for rent supplements last June, I feel certain most thought that they had some fairly certain idea of the maximum income limits of families eligible for rent subsidies. On the other hand, those of us who opposed this last-minute amendment warned that entirely too much discretion was being left in the hands of housing agency officials and that Congress, in effect, was approving a concept, while permitting the HHFA to do the actual legislating through regulations.

Then on September 28, the Housing Agency released its rent supplement regulations. When I reviewed these regulations I was disturbed at what I saw. Among other things, they made it clear that the Federal Government was willing to subsidize up to 70 percent of monthly rental payments for families earning at least the maximum allowable under public housing regulations. Superimposed on this was the revelation that elderly or handicapped families could have net assets three times the maximum family income limits, with nonelderly families limited to net assets of twice these same maximum family income limits. Nowhere in the regulations, however, was it spelled out for Members of Congress precisely the dollars and cents limits of these public housing income limits. Nor did the regulations indicate the mortgage limits for the units to be occupied by rent subsidy families. Again we were told that these would be supplied at a later date.

Without going into further details in describing the September 28 rent subsidy regulations, it is only fair to recall that these were not available to most Members until 20 days after the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices had held its hearings in considering the administration request for an initial first-year $30 million funding for rent supplements. The Appropriations Committee did not have the needed information contained in these regulations with which to constructively question housing officials during the hearings.

The House Appropriations Committee cut the $30 million contract authority request back to $6 million. On the theory that this program needed further study and that if once it received even a token appropriation it would be off and winging for 40 years, I offered an amendment on the floor to delete the $6 million. This amendment carried by a 23-vote margin with nearly as many Democrats as Republicans voting in support of it—99 Republicans and 86 Democrats. I do not think there is any doubt whatsoever that the House action reflected general disenchantment with the September 28 regulations and that most Members thought that the intent of Congress had been grossly violated.

When I offered my amendment to strike out the funds for this program on October 14, I emphasized that it was not my motive to kill the program. The sum of $170,000, later increased to about $450,000, was left in specifically for the administration of the rent supplement program, under section 101, so that the Housing and Home Finance Agency would have the money to proceed and to continue to work on regulations.

I also added:

> I had not intended to speak on this subject again this year for, very frankly, I believed the question of rent supplements was fully debated over a period of 3 days during the month of June. It was a good debate. It was a fair debate.

My only concern, my only intent—and it remains so today—is that this program should be for the low-income groups, a program for the poor people of America that it was purported to be when it was authorized by the House of Representatives last June.

When on the next to the last day prior to adjournment the Senate-House conferees on the supplemental appropriations bill agreed to comply with the House position in denying contract authority funds for rent supplements, they did so with the apparent support of a vast majority of the conference committee, controlled by a 17-to-8 margin by members of the majority party. It is in this environment that the President issued on the following day, October 22, his blistering indictment of a Congress that otherwise gave him nearly all he asked for. The President blamed defeat of funds for rent subsidies on what he termed "propaganda of fear and mistrust" and "false propaganda and misrepresentation." The President also declared that "cynicism and self-interest preyed on fear of the new and imaginative" and that the "old voices of doubt and misunderstanding" were raised once more.

I have recently taken the liberty of writing a personal letter to the President in an attempt to better relate exactly what took place and why. In particular, I stressed the excellent statement by Mr. Mahon which is included earlier in this report. Further, I emphasized that if HHFA submits a revised set of regulations limiting rent subsidies to the needy, as authorized by Congress, a new, more reasonable approach would not only have my support but that of an overwhelming majority of Members.

With regard to the charges of "false propaganda and misrepresentation," I would point out that during the October 14 debate not a single Member of Congress disputed the facts that I revealed with regard to the maximum income limits and other matters covered in the September 28 HHFA regulations.

Certainly, I would be the first to concede that the administration did not envision that the majority of rent supplement families would be earning $8,100, with $25,000 assets living in four-bedroom apartments with as few as four children. But we should keep in mind that these unrealistic limitations were inserted in the regulations and that in the face of the nationwide controversy over the rent supplement program, the better part of valor would have been for the Housing Agency to have drafted more reasonable and defensible income and asset limitations. On the other hand, in view of the sharp debate over rent subsidies,I feel certain the HHFA must have thought that what some of us regarded as being unrealistic limitations were, in fact, needed in order to make the program work.

With this in mind, it is interesting to recall that on several occasions during the past year the Housing Administrator, Dr. Weaver, admitted that this program would not work for low-income families. It was he, not opponents of the program, who said to a Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce audience shortly after the authorization bill passed that a nonprofit or limited-dividend organization would have to have "a heart of gold or a head of lead" to participate in this program if it were limited to low-income families. To his credit, Dr. Weaver, throughout the year, has never backed down from his original premise that rent subsidies could not be effectively implemented unless such payments were directed at families above the public housing income range. I do not think it would be idle speculation to assume that the September 28 regulations reflected these sentiments when they greatly exceeded what most Members of Congress thought they had voted for.

Now is there any need for this alleged mass confusion to have arisen with regard to the maximum family income limitation under the proposed rent subsidy program? Section 101 of Public Law 89–117 stated clearly that the recipients were "to have an income below the maximum amount which can be established in the area, pursuant to the limitations prescribed in section 2(2) and 15(7) (b) (ii) of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, for occupancy in public housing dwellings." I submit that the HHFA in its regulations could have advised Members of Congress precisely what these maximum income ranges were. Within a few days, data could have been developed by the HHFA which would have specified these maximum income limits in communities where there are existing public housing authorities. We have never seen a complete list of these family income ranges. I do know, however, that Marie McGuire, Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration, stated during our subcommittee hearings that the maximum net family income range for public housing in New York City was $8,100.

I have written to Dr. Weaver wherein I specifically ask for such a list. If this is supplied, then maybe for the first time since this issue began, all Members of Congress will have some idea of the maximum income limitations under the President's proposed rent subsidy program.

In light of all the circumstances surrounding this controversy, I must confess that I have to agree with President Johnson when he said that "the old forces of doubt and misunderstanding were raised once more." However, the doubt and misunderstanding that I refer to was initiated and generated completely within the Housing Agency and not on the floor of the House or Senate.

Where does this leave us now? I think there can be little doubt that the Congress, in refusing to appropriate funds for rent subsidies, made clear its intention and demand that, once and for all, the Housing Agency set forth a complete set of regulations before any funds are forthcoming. During the House floor debate there was absolutely no confusion over the intent of my amendment to strike the $6 million contract authority appropriation. Ample funds for developing new and more reasonable regulations were left intact.

If, on the other hand, the administration insists upon ignoring Congress' desire to become better acquainted with the broad outlines of this program, then I think there can be no doubt whatsoever that rent subsidies will confront the same difficulties next year that it faced during the first session of Congress.

Speaking for myself, I have the utmost confidence in the commonsense of the American people when this issue is brought before them for their judgment. I am convinced beyond any reasonable doubt that our citizens will reject any multibillion-dollar, 40-year, Federal rent subsidy program directed to families whose incomes center around or exceed the median family income in the United States.

Such adjectives as "collectivist," "radical," and "socialistic," in describing this program, did not originate with me or those Members who opposed this program. These were words used by such widely read and respected news columnists as Arthur Krock of the New York Times, Stewart Alsop, of the Saturday Evening Post, and Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, of Publisher Newspaper Syndicate in their honest interpretations of President Johnson's rent subsidy proposal.

In conclusion, may I call your attention to the following two articles from the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal, which very accurately describe the situation which brought about the final defeat of the rent subsidy appropriation:

[From the New York Times]

Blocking the Rent Supplement

(By Arthur Krock)

Washington.—Of all the President's Great Society programs, his rent supplement proposal was the most vulnerable to the objection that it adopts a basic theory of modern socialism. But this concept, that the national income should be allocated by Government action to assure an equitable sharing of its benefits, was only one of the causes of the refusal by Congress to start the program with an appropriation for the first year.

There was an intense dislike in Congress of the principle inherent in a proposal that part of the rent of low-income groups for improved housing should be financed out of general tax revenues. To some Members this undermines the incentive of individuals to better themselves by their own efforts, a traditionally American economic philosophy. To others it was an unconstitutional penalty imposed on honest achievement in a free enterprise society, and a bonus for shiftlessness and other defects of individual character.

WELFARE STATISM

But this country has moved so far toward becoming a collectivist, welfare state by its political decisions since the reelection of President Eisenhower that it required more than the extreme expression of collectivism in the rent supplement measure to block it in Congress. And by the same token the block may prove to have been only a postponement when the question of financing the proposal recurs at the next session. This will happen as a matter of routine, because Congress has already authorized an appropriation to begin it.

WEAVER'S ERROR

This appropriation was denied the President at the current session because the Federal Housing Administrator, Robert C. Weaver, made several grave tactical errors which, superimposed on the burden the project already carried as clearly socialistic in concept, proved too heavy for it to bear. In advance of action by the House Appropriations Committee, he prepared administrative regulations for the program that could be and were successfully attacked on the following grounds:

1. The criteria listed as determinants whether a rent supplemental project would be approached included "full consideration of its contribution to assisting in integrating income groups and furthering the legal requirements and objectives of equal opportunity in housing." In other words, the program was to be used, beyond its stated legislative purpose as housing assistance to low-income groups, as an economic club to compel racial integration.

2. The regulations were so loosely drawn as to support the charge of critics that a family with a net income of $25,000 a year could qualify for a rent subsidy; and a family with four children could be subsidized for occupancy of a four-bedroom apartment.

3. The text of the regulations was withheld from the House Appropriations Committee by Weaver until 20 days after the ending of its hearing on the measure.

4. The regulations failed to set a mortgage limitation on rent supplemental projects. Hence, Congress was left in the dark as to the type of units which would be built with its appropriation.

These aspects of the regulations left them wide open to effective attack from supporters of the proclaimed objective of the legislation—to help the poor get decent housing—as well as from Members of Congress who oppose its basic political philosophy.

The only appropriation in furtherance of the rent supplement that Congress retained is $450,000 for replanning of the operation by Weaver, and for redrafting the administrative regulations,. But this itself is evidence that Congress has not yet rejected the basic concept of the legislation. When the next session assembles in January 1966, there will first be a request from the President for an appropriation for the remainder of the fiscal year with which the Housing Administration can enter into contracts for rent supplement units. The President announced today, somewhat defiantly, that he would ask the full $30 million authorized for the first fiscal year, though the fiscal year will then be half over. If Congress supplies the $6 or $8 million now indicated, the program will be underway. And a Presidential request for second-year appropriation of $75 million or more can then be confidently expected, with good prospects of approval at least in part.

HOW MUCH SOCIALISM?

Therefore, while the President has suffered a sharp setback in the refusal of Congress at this session to give him starting funds for the project, he has not yet suffered defeat. What finally happens will depend to a large extent on whether a majority of Congress, particularly the large Democratic majority in the House, will risk the venture of a socialist program in a general election year.

That the venture is an extreme socialistic concept is implicit in a story told by Marshal Montgomery, of Alamein, of an exchange he once had with Marshal Stalin. Asked by Montgomery for a statement of the difference between Russian communism and Western socialism, Stalin explained that under Soviet communism everyone contributes according to his abilities and receives according to his needs, whereas under democratic socialism the receiver shares according to his merit. "Then you haven't a Communist state in the U.S.S.R.," said Montgomery. "Not yet," said Stalin. "There is only one nation which could afford it—the United States of America."

[From the Wall Street Journal]

Appropriations Authority Gives Congress Chance To Review Great Society in 1966

(By Arlen J. Large)

Washington.—It would be a serious distortion of events to dwell too heavily on the rent subsidy defeat suffered by President Johnson in the last hours of the congressional session. Denial of subsidy funds in the final appropriation bill stands out starkly against a landscape of year-long revolutionary lawmaking. In terms of important legislative tonnage, the 1st session of the 89th Congress was all it has been cracked up to be.

Yet the rent subsidy incident is worth special study as a specimen of next year's possible lawmaking trends. Right now, anyway, everyone says the 1966 session will be different: It will be time to digest the Great Society just wolfed down whole. Things may not turn out that way, of course. New racial emergencies or foreign crises could require continued full-throttle production; what L.B.J. regards as a bland 1966 legislative diet may seem strong spice to others.

But Congress is leaving town now with the expectation that next year's session will be confined mainly to polishing up its 1965 handiwork. On the House Education and Labor Committee, Representative EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, plans to birddog the efficiency with which the Office of Education deploys its multibillion-dollar array of new school aids. Chairman PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, of the Joint House-Senate Economic Committee is getting ready for an ambitious survey of the Great Society as a whole; his staff of professional economists hopes, among other things, to concoct long-range cost projections of Uncle Sam's new activities.

THE MARCH TO CAPITOL HILL

This kind of function is known as congressional oversight, a jargon term for riding herd on the executive branch. And one of the most important mechanisms for overseeing the work of bureaucrats is the appropriations procedure which snared the rent subsidy plan last week. New or old, nearly all Federal activities require annual appropriations of fresh money from the Treasury to keep them going. Fewer new programs may go on the lawbooks next year, but the specialized House and Senate Appropriations Committees will have a heavier workload than ever as Mr. Johnson's agency heads march to Capitol Hill to justify their spending plans.

Congressional appropriations cuts are usually made in the name of economy; in years past such career economizers as the late Representative Clarence Cannon thundered annually against the inflationary perils of all Presidential budgets in their uncut stage. Starting last year, however, President Johnson grabbed the pennypincher image away from Congress; his huge budgets have been successfully sold as "preshrunk." Only a pittance was chopped from his appropriations request this year, and with the same big Democratic majority returning in January there's little prospect of a 1966 outbreak of economy fever.

But even in such an atmosphere the appropriations process still gives lawmakers a powerful lever for influencing Federal programs. Housing Boss Robert Weaver lost his measly $12 million in rent subsidy money not because the House thought it would break the Treasury, but because of dissatisfaction with his startup plans. Those Great Society administrators who fear a lot of congressional back-seat driving next year may profit by analyzing the rent subsidy fiasco.

The rent subsidy plan is intended to lure private builders away from the luxury market and put up more new moderate-rent apartments. The landlords would be churches or other nonprofit groups, receiving Federal rental payments on behalf of poor families; officials hoped to work a little social engineering into the program, encouraging landlords to take nonsubsidized as well as subsidized tenants. Mr. Weaver visualized a happy mixture of rich and poor, black and white, living constructively together at the Methodist Arms.

But for such a simple goal, the rent subsidy mechanism for achieving it was incredibly complex. Everyone—liberals and conservatives alike—kept asking Mr. Weaver how rich a person could be and still get rent subsidies. Because the limit would vary from place to place, Mr. Weaver could quote no single figure. His vague answers either sparked suspicions of a boondoggle for the rich, or confused people hopelessly.

Baffled or not, the Senators agreed to give Mr. Weaver $10 million in initial funds, but only after he bowed to their demands for a change in the proposed eligibility rules.

But the House wasn't convinced that Mr. Weaver, deep down, really wanted to change the original rules. "A man convinced against his will is somewhat of the same opinion still." rhymed Chairman MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, of the House Appropriations Committee. So the rent subsidy money is being held hostage by the House until Mr. Weaver drafts a new plan. In Mr. MAHON's words: "Let us see with our own eyes what the regulations will be before we take action."

VARIATION BY PERSONALITY

The rent subsidy example shows that the appropriations process can be a powerful digestive organ indeed for a raw new Federal endeavor. But results in the past have been spotty, depending on the personalities in charge of reviewing each fragment of the budget. State Department officials testifying before the Appropriations Subcommittee of Representative ROONEY, Democrat, of New York, can assume they'll get a general dressing down for profligacy. But Representative FOGARTY, Democrat, of Rhode Island, just as regularly upbraids Federal health researchers for spending too little.

A Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress may submit proposals next year for making the appropriations process more efficient. This study panel has heard suggestions for increasing the Appropriations Committees' staffs of investigators, and using computers to keep track of all the budget's nooks and crannies. Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, thinks Congress ought to spend the first part of each session considering regular legislation, devoting all of its energy later in the year to appropriation bills.

Any such reform is years away. Meanwhile, the existing appropriations process promises to be a lively battleground in the 1966 session even if the White House runs out of new ideas. If you don't believe it, ask Mr. Weaver.

Slovenian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, October 28, 1918, marks the day when the Slovene nation, established over a millenium and Christianized according to Western tradition, united with the Serbs and Croatians to form the nucleus of the free country of Yugoslavia.

The Slovenes can trace their historical background to the 8th century, with struggles for freedom from the Bavarian Kingdom, Frankish Empire, the Holy Roman Empire, and the Hapsburgs of Austria-Hungary, who ruled them until 1918. Following World War I, the Slovene nation continued to build upon their own traditions and progressed well until March 1941, when Yugoslavia was divided by the Nazi-Fascist dictators emerging to engulf Europe. The Slovenes were an occupied nation until the end of the war, when the Soviet troops helped Tito subjugate Yugoslavia for the Communist bloc.

It is tragic, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Slovenia find themselves controlled by an atheistic Communist dictatorship which is completely contrary to their historic traditions. We encourage the brave people of Slovenia and their compatriots abroad to continue their efforts to produce a restoration of freedom and a legitimate government in their homeland.

A Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the September 1965 issue of the Volta Review, entitled "A Challenge—The National Technical Institute for the Deaf," be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHALLENGE—THE NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

The bill establishing a new National Technical Institute for the Deaf was signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson on June 8, 1965, on the lawn of the White House. Among those who viewed the signing of the bill and who later received one of the many pens used by the President to sign his name, were such stanch friends of the deaf as Senator LISTER HILL and Representative HUGH L. CAREY, both of whom introduced in their respective branches of Congress bill for the new Institute.

Also in the audience were representatives of virtually every national organization concerned with the education and rehabilitation of the deaf and hard of hearing. The day was hot, and the enthusiasm was warm for the most recent enactment of law which has as its special concern the creation of new opportunities for obtaining a technical education by the deaf.

There was also concern expressed for the ultimate nature of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf. If this institution is organized and implemented on a positive and high level, it will be looked back upon as one of the most significant moves of the century in creating new opportunities for the deaf. By its very association with a university for hearing students in an urban area, a requirement written into the law itself, the Institute can be expected to provide many opportunities which have long been sought by the deaf and those interested in them. By emphasizing the development of educational and social skills necessary for work in a normally hearing community, there should be the maximum preparation for prosperous careers in whatever fields are chosen. Among those emphasized will certainly be such areas as engineering, scientific technician, drafting, science, and others.

If, on the other hand, the new Institute is organized along the lines of an extension of the vocational programs of present schools for the deaf, it may be looked upon by historians in our field as a tragedy. If there is not a broad approach to the jobs of the future, then we will have advanced little from where we are today. If there is not a coordinated and cooperative affiliation with industry, labor organizations, professional organizations, and civic groups, then the student graduating from such an institute will have little more to look forward to than he has today.

Unquestionably, there should be on the 12-man advisory committee which selects the university to which the Institute will be attached, some people who are knowledgeable about the education of the deaf. There should be a successful technically trained deaf person, too. There must also be a number of representatives of those parts of the American public who will be expected to accept the graduates of this Institute, once it is in operation. Fresh insights from the fields of engineering, labor, management, and education in general will be imperative if this Institute is to serve its proper purpose. Of utmost importance, also, will be the qualifications of the Director of the Institute. If his background is limited strictly to the education of the deaf, the Institute may have difficulty fulfilling the high purpose set for it by the people of the United States.

There is no precedent for this school. No one else has even attempted what is to be attempted under this new law. It can succeed, or fail miserably. The deciding factor will be the uninhibited foresight of those selected by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to serve on the advisory committee.

TEXT OF PUBLIC LAW 89-36: THE NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

An act to provide for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act."

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. For the purpose of providing a residential facility for postsecondary technical training and education for persons who are deaf in order to prepare them for successful employment, there are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary for the establishment and operation, including construction and equipment, of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf, including sums necessary for the acquisition of property, both real and personal, and for the construction of buildings and other facilities for such Institute.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(b) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State or in the District of Columbia which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State (or in the District of Columbia) to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, (4) includes one or more professional or graduate schools, (5) is a public or nonprofit private institution, and (6) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association. For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner of Education shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

(c) The term "construction" includes construction and initial equipment of new buildings, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings and equipment thereof, and acquisition of land; including architect's services, but excluding off-site improvements.

PROPOSALS

SEC. 4. Any institution of higher education which desires to enter into an agreement with the Secretary to establish and operate a National Technical Institute for the Deaf shall submit a proposal therefor at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as may be prescribed by the Secretary.

AGREEMENT TO ESTABLISH INSTITUTE

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary, after consultation with the National Advisory Board created by section 6, is authorized to enter into an agreement with an institution of higher education for the establishment and operation, including construction and equipment, of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf. The Secretary, in considering proposals from institutions of higher education to enter into an agreement under this Act, shall give preference to institutions which are located in metropolitan industrial areas.

(b) The agreement shall—

(1) provide that Federal funds appropriated for the benefit of the Institute will be used only for the purposes for which paid and in accordance with the applicable provisions of this Act and the agreement made pursuant thereto;

(2) provide that the Board of Trustees or other governing body of the institution, subject to the approval of the Secretary, will appoint an advisory group to advise the Director of the Institute in formulating and carrying out the basic policies governing its establishment and operation, which group shall include persons who are professionally concerned with education and technical training at the postsecondary school level, persons who are professionally concerned with activities relating to education and training of the deaf, and members of the public familiar with the need for services provided by the Institute;

(3) provide that the Board of Trustees or other governing body of the institution will make an annual report to the Secretary. The Secretary shall transmit the report of the institution to the Congress with such comments and recommendations as he may deem appropriate;

(4) include such other conditions as the Secretary, after consultation with the National Advisory Board, deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act; and

(5) provide that any laborer or mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractor in the performance of work on any construction aided by Federal funds appropriated for the benefit of the Institute will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5); and the Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

(c) If within twenty years after the completion of any construction (except minor remodeling or alteration) for which such funds have been paid—

(A) the facility ceases to be used for the purposes for which it was constructed or the agreement is terminated, unless the Secretary determines that there is good cause for releasing the institution from its obligation, or

(B) the institution ceases to be the owner of the facility,

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility an amount which bears to the then value of the facility the same ratio as the amount of such Federal funds bore to the cost of the facility financed with the aid of such funds. Such value shall be determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which the facility is situated.

NATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD ON ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby established a National Advisory Board on Establishment of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, which shall consist of twelve persons, not regular full-time employees of the United States, appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws. The Secretary shall appoint one of the members to serve as Chairman. The appointed members shall be selected from among leaders in fields related to education and training of the deaf and other fields of education, and from members of the public familiar with the need for services provided by the Institute. The Commissioner of Education and the Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation shall be ex officio members of the Board.

(b) Members of the Board, while serving on business of the Board, shall be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including traveltime, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(c) It shall be the function of the Board (1) to review proposals from institutions of higher education which offer to enter into an agreement with the Secretary for the construction and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf, (2) to make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to such proposals, and (3) to make such other recommendations to the Secretary concerning the establishment and operation of the National Technical Institute as may be appropriate.

(d) After the Secretary enters into an agreement under this Act, the Board shall cease to exist.

TESTIMONY EXPLAINING THE AIMS AND PURPOSES OF THE NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF ACT

(May 25 (legislative day, May 24), 1965—Senator LISTER HILL, From the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare)

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to enter into an agreement with an institution of higher education for the establishment, construction, equipping, and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf for the purpose of providing a residential facility for postsecondary technical training and education for persons who are deaf in order to prepare them for successful employment. A 12-member National Advisory Board on the Establishment of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf would be appointed by the Secretary to review proposals from institutions of higher education which desire such an institute, to make recommendations to the Secretary concerning such proposals, and to make such other recommendation concerning the establishment and operation of the National Technical Institute as may be appropriate. The Commissioners of Education and of Vocational Rehabilitation would be ex officio members of the Board.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

There are approximately 3,000 deaf students above the age of 16 who leave or graduate from State and local schools and classes for the deaf each year. A large number have indicated their intense interest and desire for further educational opportunities. Dr. Leonard M. Elstad, president of Gallaudet College, the only institution for higher education for the deaf in the world, in his testimony reported that over 600 student applications were received and reviewed this year. He reported that 275 of these students will be admitted in September 1965.

The other 325 students who could not meet the entrance requirements of the college, by the very act of submitting an application expressed their desire for further education. This number coupled with some 75 to 100 annual withdrawals from the college at various levels from freshmen to seniors, in addition to numerous other deaf persons among the unemployed or underemployed who desire further training, indicates that well over 400 students each year would be eligible for a program that could be offered in a National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

The recent report on the "Education of the Deaf" prepared by the National Advisory Committee on Education of the Deaf in 1964, appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, stated that "five-sixths of our deaf adults work in manual jobs as contrasted to only one-half of our hearing population." If the door to further educational opportunity is not opened for the group who could not be admitted to Gallaudet College, including other qualified students, they have almost no other alternative than to join the ranks of the nonskilled labor force.

Population and enrollment

The Office of Education estimates that there are 37,000 school-age seriously hearing impaired children in our country. According to the American Annals of the Deaf (January issue, 1965), 83 public and private residential schools are attended by approximately 18,400 deaf students. About 12,300 attend 355 public and private special day schools and classes for the deaf. It is estimated that 6,000 additional students not accounted for by the American Annals of the Deaf are either in public school classes that do not provide necessary special education services for these children or they are not in school at all.

Special problems in education of the deaf

Dr. S. Richard Silverman, director of the Central Institute for the Deaf and professor of audiology at Washington University Medical School in St. Louis, in his testimony before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor on April 27, 1965, described the educational problems brought about by severe hearing impairment. A portion of this statement was as follows:

"For the persons we are here concerned with, the essential and primary channel for receiving the acoustic symbols we call speech is either absent or severely restricted. All the skills of communication that depend on learning over this channel are adversely affected. From infancy to early school age, the chief mode of communciation for the normal hearing child is auditory. The child hears and learns to talk from what he hears. Furthermore, he not only learns how to communicate; he also learns what to communicate.

"For a child who does not have the daily experience of listening to language, its acquisition is indeed difficult, if not impossible for some, even with instruction. The teacher is confronted with the task of communicating language to a child in the absence of the sensory system considered to be essential for its acquisition.

"The educator, therefore, must seek ways to manipulate information so that it can be transmitted over whatever sensory system or combination of systems are available—such as vision, touch, and residual hearing. At the same time, we are concerned about the content of what we communicate—language and subject matter, as it is influenced by the demands of society and the child himself."

A young child who has a substantial or total hearing loss, acquired at birth or before the normal age for learning language through hearing, has a serious educational handicap. Every attempt has been made by educators of the deaf to accelerate the acquisition of reading, language, and communication skills by deaf children. For the most part, the objective has been to teach the basic language and communication skills well enough at the elementary level so that these children could go on with their education or further vocational training in our colleges, universities, and vocational training facilities for normal hearing students.

Philosophically, this goal would appear to be a reasonable one. Many educators have been convinced that this kind of preparation is the best way for the deaf child to become a full participant socially and economically in a hearing world. Numerous individual success stories can be and have been produced to support this theory. However, the facts reveal that for the general deaf population this has not been achieved.

Most residential schools for the deaf offer programs that provide for the equivalent of an eighth grade education. Very few of the specialized day school programs go beyond this level. Students desiring more than this are expected to enroll in regular high school and other vocational schools for the hearing. This is a commendable objective and its practice should be encouraged wherever and whenever possible. However, because of the serious communication problem involved a relatively small percentage of these children can really communicate well enough to do this.

A NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

The establishment of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf would, by providing a broad flexible curriculum, be able to meet the many and varied special needs of able young deaf adults who seek the opportunity for further education and training. Adequately trained staff members, who are resourceful, flexible, and imaginative would be required for the successful operation of a technical training program.

Size of the Institute

Since the estimates that have been made regarding the number of students who would be able to profit from a specialized program indicate that at least 400 students each year could qualify for enrollment, provision should be made initially to enroll at least 200 students each year with adequate planning for necessary future expansion. The special needs of individual students for program planning purposes would be determined following complete physical, psychological, audiological evaluations, and a program of orientation and guidance counseling. The goals established for some students could be accomplished in 1 year. The objectives for others might require 2, 3, or even 4 years to complete.

Program objectives

The principal objective of the institute should be the employment of the student upon completion of a prescribed educational and training program. The environment of the school, the curriculum, and general living conditions, along with health and recreational services, should be designed to help the student achieve a high degree of personal development and a sense of social responsibility. The educational and training program should be supplemented by varied civic and social group activities to provide the proper environment for developing concepts of responsible citizenship and social competence.

The focus of effort of the entire faculty on behalf of the students attending the Institute should be directed toward the goals of successful employment and preparation for full participation in community living.

Location

The National Technical Institute for the Deaf should be located in a large metropolitan industrial area so that it could be designed to serve the special needs of deaf youth from any community in the Nation. The area should also have a wide variety of nationally representative types of industrial activities in order to make it possible for the student to return to his home for eventual employment. The Institute should be affiliated with a major university for the administration of its program. This would facilitate securing the medical, audiological, psychological, and psychiatric services needed to supplement appropriate guidance and counseling services provided by the staff of the Institute.

The community where the Institute is located should be able to offer a variety of opportunities for training and experience in a wide range of modern industrial settings. The community should be one that would generally be receptive to a program of this nature and be sympathetic with training needs of the deaf.

Curriculum

The curriculum of the Institute should be very flexible so as to permit a variety of adaptations to meet the needs of individual students without the absolute necessity to conform to traditional accreditation standards, such as course credits, fixed period scheduling, and other curriculum restrictions. Courses of study should be available to meet the needs of students attending the Institute. Upon successful completion of a prescribed curriculum, each student should receive a certificate or other formal recognition that would attest to what has been accomplished. The standards and quality of training offered in all areas will have to be high enough to meet the usual requirements as recommended by labor, industry, and professional associations, including certifying and licensing agencies.

The program offered should be broad enough to include a basic or preparatory curriculum of a remedial nature in such subjects as English, reading, science, and mathematics as may be required to prepare deaf students to take the postsecondary courses intended to increase their educational and work skills to enable them to become qualified candidates for employment at levels commensurate with their ability and training. A supplementary curriculum including such courses as humanities, government, history, and economics should be offered to properly prepare students for living in a modern urban society. A comprehensive supporting curriculum in such subject areas as physics, chemistry, biology, and higher mathematics, should be offered where required as prerequisites for training in technical areas.

The course work offered in preparatory, supplemental, and support curriculums should follow a logical sequence in preparing students for training and experience in a wide variety of technologies. The following suggested technological programs are illustrative of some of the kinds of training opportunities that should be made available to deaf students:

Automotive technology: mechanics and body repair, automotive refrigeration, diesel engine technology; aviation technology: mechanics and engine repair, drafting; building and construction: carpentry, plumbing, architectural drawing; paramedical and chemical technology; chemistry, microbiology, dental prosthetics, optical instruments, embalming; engineering technology: technical math, physics and chemistry, technical drafting, engineering fundamentals, surveying, technical report writing; business accounting, data processing, computer operation, programing; commercial art: basic design, basic drawing, dress design; electronic engineering technology: radio and television repair, industrial electronics; technical graphic arts: lithography, offset; mechanical and metals technology: machine shop, welding, air conditioning, sheet metal work, refrigeration, tool and die.

An enrichment curriculum should be made available to those students who have the ability and desire to pursue further professional training in other institutions of higher learning. Such courses as literature, history, psychology, sociology, foreign language, philosophy, and political science could be offered in the Institute itself or arrangements for study in these areas could be made for the student in other regular university programs.

Essential to the overall program would be the opportunity for continued instruction in communication skills. These would include work toward improving speech and speech reading skills in addition to a continuing support program of auditory training.

Administration

The Institute should be directed by a person who has had professional training and experience as an educator of the deaf. He should be qualified to recruit and direct a competent staff that would be able to organize all the resources of a community and other institutions of higher education in the area in order that the needs of students to be enrolled could be served. All staff members, including counseling, placement, psychological, and instruction specialists, should be adequately trained to deal with deaf students from all types of schools and educational backgrounds. These personnel should know and understand deaf students thoroughly, including their special education and social problems.

Under the provisions of the bill, the governing body of the institution of higher education, subject to the approval of the Secretary, would appoint an advisory group to advise the Director of the Institute in formulating and carrying out the basic policies governing its establishment and operation. Because of the Federal support for the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, it would be anticipated that congressional representation would be included in the membership of the advisory group among those who are designated as members of the public familiar with the needs of educational services for the deaf.

Placement officers on the staff of the Institute should provide for initial placement and followup services directly as well as through appropriate liaison with community vocational rehabilitation agencies throughout the Nation.

As a byproduct, in providing this kind of expert service, the Institute could serve as a practice teaching center for the training of special guidance and rehabilitation counselors of the deaf.

One of the responsibilities of the placement guidance and counseling staff should be to maintain continuous liaison with personnel in all schools and classes for the deaf, vocational rehabilitation agencies, and industry, in order to keep these individuals informed and up to date on all pertinent activities of the Institute and to keep the Institute informed about the employment needs of industry.

Standards for admission

Admission to the Institute should be based on a complete comprehensive evaluation of each student's potential for successfully completing one of the courses of study offered at the Institute. The information needed for this purpose as a part of the application process should include a review of medical, psychological, and audiological records; academic achievement and school progress reports; and recommendations from teachers, school principal and others who are acquainted with the student. Wherever possible personal interviews with potential students at the Institute, at home, or in school should be made by the appropriate staff members of the Institute.

A period of orientation, evaluation, and counseling at the Institute in order to properly prepare the new student for full participation in the program, should be available to those who need it.

Research

In addition to serving as a practice teaching center for the training of teachers, instructors, and rehabilitation counselors the Institute will serve as a research facility for the study of educational problems of the deaf. The Institute will be an excellent proving ground for the development of new and better educational teaching techniques. Such information will be useful to all programs where deaf children are taught.

During the hearings the question was raised as to whether the language of S. 1650 and H.R. 7031 authorized the Institute to conduct research. On this point the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare submitted the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 21, 1965.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: This is in response to your request for clarification of the question raised by Senator MURPHY in the May 17, 1965, subcommittee hearing on S. 1650 regarding plans for including research as an essential component of the program to be conducted at the National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

The concept that the National Technical Institute should serve as a focal point for research related to the education of the deaf was thoroughly discussed in numerous planning sessions that preceded the presentation of our testimony in support of this legislation. The Institute would be an excellent proving ground for the development and evaluation of new and better ways for teaching deaf children. The knowledge that results would be useful to all programs where deaf children are taught.

Our plans definitely include recommending that the research component of the Institute be charged with the responsibility for organizing, conducting, and interpreting research, and for disseminating research information on all educational aspects related to the education of the deaf.

In our opinion the National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act authorizes conducting research as outlined above.

If you have any further questions on this matter, I hope you will get in touch with me.

Sincerely yours,
WILBUR J. COHEN,
Assistant Secretary.

Physical facilities

The Institute should have a sufficient number of flexible classroom accommodations to handle at least 50 groups or classes simultaneously; dormitories for 600 residential students equipped with recreation room, social center, reading and study areas; laboratory and shop facilities for all technological and occupational programs; a special library and instructional media center; group auditory training equipment available in all classroom and other meeting or assembly areas; an auditorium adequate to accommodate the entire student body and staff at one seating; and a completely equipped guidance and counseling and psychological services center.

PROGRAMS FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE DEAF

The National Institute for the Deaf is a most worthwhile, constructive, and long overdue measure. However, the committee regards it as only a step in what should become a comprehensive program to meet the educational needs of the deaf.

The Advisory Committee on the Education of the Deaf appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare pursuant to an authorization contained in the 1965 appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare submitted a detailed report to the Secretary early in February 1965. The report contained a careful analysis of the problems of education of the deaf and made a number of constructive recommendations for both administrative and legislative action.

The committee hopes that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will soon be in a position to make available his analysis of the Advisory Committee's report, and to include with his analysis a summary of the administrative actions to be taken and legislative proposals to be supported in the general area covered by the "Report on Education of the Deaf."

COSTS

Because of the nature of the legislation it is impossible to specify exact costs on an annual basis. However, the committee anticipates that approximately $200,000 will be needed for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, as a planning year budget. Costs for construction, equipping, and operation of the Institute over the first 4 years will amount to approximately $13,500,000. Annual maintenance and operation costs once the construction and equipping expenses are met will require an appropriation of approximately $2 million per year.

Vice President Humphrey's Remarks Before the Economic Club, Detroit, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BILLIE S. FARNUM

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Vice President HUMPHREY before the Economic Club, Detroit, Mich., under date of October 22, 1965:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

There is one great all-important fact which faces us today. It is the fact of interdependence. Interdependence has been thrust on man, involuntarily, by the reality of his ability to destroy himself. Interdependence has been created by man, voluntarily, through his efforts toward more rapid communication, commercial and cultural exchange.

There are very few things in this world which are not tied in some way to something else. We of our generation have certainly learned that during our lifetimes.

But it took us awhile to learn it.

Take the world of economics.

I can remember how, in this country, there were once voices raised debating what was good for business or labor, producer or consumer as if they were separate, unrelated, independent units. There was talk about economic royalists and labor bosses.

There were those who thought that our economic prosperity was a pie of fixed size, with so much for one man, so much for the next, and who seldom thought in terms of a bigger pie for all.

There were those who said that we in America could enjoy prosperity and security with little or no concern about the rest of the world.

Yes, even in the business community there were far too many who believed that foreign trade was something that foreigners did, among themselves—and that trade was of little importance to America.

But, we have learned some hard lessons. We learned lessons of recession and depression. We learned lessons of costly struggle and unresolved dispute within our own society. Most of all, we learned the lesson that a policy of "me first" is wasteful, costly and dangerous. Today we seem to have learned those lessons—at least our domestic economic lessons.

We are in our 56th consecutive month of domestic economic expansion. Wages are up, profits are up, gross national product is up, prices are relatively stable, unemployment is down.

We enjoy this expansion thanks to a creative burst of expression by our private initiative economic system. We also enjoy it because people who used to be antagonists are today working in common cause—business, labor, Government, citizen.

We are agreed to an almost surprising degree on our economic goals and how to get there.

We know the lesson of interdependence in our domestic economy—and, I might add, in other parts of our American society.

But have we learned the lesson of economic interdependence in the world around us?

I have my doubts. I hear lots of talk about the need for a reformed monetary system; about foreign aid; about better credit terms for export; about foreign investment; about commercial negotiations with our Western partners; about trade with the East. But I hear very little about the interdependence of these things.

What are the economic realities of the world?

First, there is the overwhelming reality that two-thirds of mankind is awakening to the fact that poverty is not written in the stars, that life can be better than it is.

Before World War II, there was no such thing as a "developing country."

Our Foreign Service officers—and those of other Western nations were not in fact concerned with economic development. Their days were largely spent dealing with other Western diplomats and occasionally talking philosophy and political theory with the local elite. Now and then an anthropologist, or a student of language or literature, would make his appearance—but seldom someone so mundane as an economist or a businessman.

And, isolated from the world around them, the people in these places lived a miserable peasant life in a modern world. Some of them, in fact, lived literally outside history itself. But in these past few years they have caught up with history and then some.

In the past 15 years alone, over 60 nations have entered the United Nations—nations many of which had previously not existed, except as colonial enclaves, or tribes, or protectorates. Today they are the "developing," the "underdeveloped," the people who live in poverty and want out.

The unpleasant reality is that the rich nations of the world are getting richer, and the poor, poorer.

And there is an unfortunate but growing tendency among the developing nations to regard the three major international economic institutions—the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—as rich men's clubs, pitted against the poor.

What will be our answer to the demands of these people who see unshared affluence around them?

Second, we see the fact of a rapidly expanding world economy trying to exist on slowly increasing monetary reserves and credit.

The fact is that our present monetary system, as useful as it has been, could be a drag on the world economy unless it meets the legitimate need for added economic fuel.

The time will come when our own balance of payments will again come into equilibrium. The resulting shortage of new dollar balances in other places could stifle economic growth in the world.

There was a time for study. Now there is a time for negotiation. There will also be a time to act. We must act to modernize and expand the system which is so indispensible to the general welfare.

In the long run, the situation cannot be solved by restrictive trade policies which limit imports to reverse a balance-of-payments deficit, by emergency loans to prevent one country from foreclosing on another, by patchwork adjustments of interest rates.

Third, we see the need for reduction of trade barriers in the rich, industrialized countries.

There was a time when tariffs produced revenue and protected young, infant industries. But the rich Western World has long since learned that barriers to trade—both tariff and other barriers—often become excuses to protect uncompetitive domestic industries.

There is a good case to be made, in fact, that those nations which have most reduced their own tariffs have most benefited economically by becoming more competitive and export minded.

Today we attach barriers to trade in the Kennedy round negotiation in Geneva. But tariff reduction alone will not solve the problems of international commerce. In fact, global reduction of tariffs, among developed and developing countries alike, would clearly not benefit the developing nations to the degree we would seek. For they are, in the Biblical phrase, "hewers of wood and drawers of water," nations without strong and balanced economies.

Nor can trade liberalization be undertaken without appropriate monetary mechanisms to handle liberalized trade, without elimination of pernicious practices which mock tariff reduction, without the building of competitive industries in nations which yet lack those industries.

Fourth, we face the fact that the old economic alinement of the world is changing.

We used to talk about a world divided between those who lived by the rule of the marketplace and those who were so-called state traders. But let us not fool ourselves. The world today is made up of many and varied complex national economies. Even the Soviet economy has been making great strides toward adopting indeed a profit system—call it "revisionism," or "libermanism." or whatever you will. And many Western nations today engage in trading practices which would hardly bear scrutiny by Adam Smith.

The world economy is in constant change. And how would you classify those young nations where there is today hardly any monetized economy at all?

Can we adjust to this changing world economy by the sending of a few trade missions to previously unknown parts, by reminding ourselves every so often that there have been some changes in commercial regulations or investment policy, or by making speeches to the effect that we can transplant our own economic system, as is, to places whose needs and experiences are far different than our own? Of course not.

We must learn that the world economy is interdependent, too. We must learn that, just as the answers to domestic prosperity are found in a thousand interrelated factors, so are the answers found to a more just and prospering world economy.

Let me give you one simple and concrete example of what I mean. Earlier this week I addressed a meeting of the National Export Expansion Council in Washington. Some of you may be members of that Council. At that meeting I pointed out that our favorable trade balance this year will be almost $1½ to $2 billion less than it was in 1964. I further noted that had our trade surplus not been reduced, we would have achieved this year a surplus in our international accounts for the first time since 1957.

Now, we seek a balance in our payments accounts particularly because we wish to maintain world confidence in the dollar which underpins the world trading system.

A sound dollar will also facilitate discussions toward monetary reform. We consider monetary reform to be of highest priority for developed and developing nations alike—for the developed so that they may expand their commerce; for the developing so that they may in turn have means to build competitive, self-sustaining economies of their own.

The strengthening of these young economies has a great deal to do, in turn, with the size of our commitments in foreign aid and technical assistance—with foreign investment, with creating markets for our own products.

I pointed out to the National Export Expansion Council that only 4 percent of our gross national product is devoted to foreign trade. For American business—with its efficiency, its skilled labor force, its mass production, its management, its capacity for growth—has today still not seriously entered the world market in a competitive manner. If the United States, as other nations, were fully alert to export opportunities, our trade surplus could today be doubly large. And the fact is that a trade surplus would have an effect on all the interrelated matters I have mentioned.

I am not here this evening to preach any sermon of discontent. I am here to reaffirm, for the good of all of us, the fact that man is interdependent and that his economy is especially interdependent.

What can we do in this country to meet this era of international economic interdependence?

First—and most obviously—we must all realize that it is here. Then, each of us who has responsibility in this society—and that includes all of us here tonight—must view this country's foreign economic policy in large perspective.

Let us cease asking: Is a high tariff on product X good or bad? Is monetary reform necessary? Is foreign aid worthwhile?

By now we should know the answers. Let us instead ask these questions:

How can striving, desperately poor young nations become members of a world society without being lost to totalitarianism along the way?

How can a freer world be built unless we have freer exchanges of peoples, goods, and capital?

How can we benefit and our economy prosper if there are not others in the world with income enough to buy our goods?

How can we provide for the needs of a growing world population without a strong world economy to build upon?

Let us then devote ourselves to answering them with positive, forward-looking policies, both public and private. Let us commit ourselves—as businessmen, as Government officials, as a nation—to helping the young and weak nations become economically free and strong.

There are many ways: Through private investment that may sometimes involve some risk, through fair commercial treatment for the products of the developing nations, through foreign aid and technical assistance, through private and public loans, through commitment to international and multilateral institutions devoted to economic development, through encouragement of common-market concepts where those concepts have value, through open consultation and spirit of cooperation among the rich and poor alike.

Let us commit ourselves to the maximum possible reductions of all barriers to trade among the developed nations.

This means full and determined commitment to the Kennedy round negotiation. This means acceptance of the fact that, in any trade liberalization, there must be reciprocity and that we must give as well as get. This means patience and fortitude in finding solutions to the knotty problems of agricultural trade liberalization. This means—yes—the acceptance by those American industries not fully competitive that they must become competitive. This means giving highest priority to the avoidance of inflation, for inflation could rob us of the growth and prosperity we have achieved. This means the examination by many nations of their policies of subsidy, price-support, export-financing, antitrust. This means moving ahead with sometimes painful changes in trading pattern. This means undertaking of measures by business, Government, labor to ease impact of these changes.

Let us commit ourselves to the construction of a world monetary system with adequate liquidity.

This will involve the maximum of tact and restraint in difficult negotiation in the Group of 10 and with other members of the International Monetary Fund—the creation, perhaps, of a new reserve asset, the necessity for discipline in maintaining a strong position in our own international accounts, the recognition that not only the rich and industrialized must be taken into consideration in shaping that system.

The answers lie in the intelligent and sophisticated blending of trade, aid, investment, monetary, and domestic economic policies of this Nation and our partners.

They lie in the increasing recognition by those who are not our partners that they cannot live in a closed economy.

They lie, most of all, in the realization by all of us that we have a common destiny on this planet, shared but a short time, and that man's interdependence need not be a proscribed necessity—it can be a means of extending the benefits of mankind to more of mankind.

Congressman Edward R. Roybal Reports From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my October 1965 newsletter, the 11th in a series of regular "Reports From Washington" which I have made during the past 3 years to the residents of the 30th District of California on my activities as their Representative in the Nation's Capital.

These, plus eight special reports, were designed to cover all major items of legislation considered by Congress, events of national and international significance, and particularly, those matters of special concern to Metropolitan Los Angeles and southern California.

In its 10 months' work, the 1st session of the 89th Congress has compiled one of the most productive records of legislative achievement in our Nation's history.

Working in close harmony with President Lyndon Johnson, Congress has supported a developing national consensus for considered and prudent conduct of the Government's fiscal business, while adopting progressive and forward-looking programs to meet the essential needs of a rapidly growing modern society of nearly 200 million citizens.

Great strides were made toward reaching the goals of a more prosperous economy, equal opportunity for all Americans, a strong defense posture, and lasting world peace with freedom.

I am proud to have had a part in building this constructive record, and I have attempted to outline some of the highlights of the session in this October 1965 "Report From Washington."

The report follows:

THE 11TH REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

This is the 11th in a series of regular "Reports From Washington" made to the residents of the 30th District on my activities as your Representative in the Nation's Capital.

These, plus eight special reports, were designed to cover all major items of legislation considered by Congress, events of national and international significance, and particularly, those matters of special concern to Metropolitan Los Angeles and southern California.

RECAP, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

In its 10 months' work, the 1st session of the 89th Congress has compiled one of the most productive records of legislative achievement in our Nation's history.

Working in close harmony with President Lyndon Johnson, Congress has supported a developing national consensus for considered and prudent conduct of the Government's fiscal business, while adopting progressive and forward-looking programs to meet the essential needs of a rapidly growing modern society of nearly 200 million citizens.

Great strides were made toward reaching the goals of a more prosperous economy, equal opportunity for all Americans, a strong defense posture, and lasting world peace with freedom.

I am proud to have had a part in building this constructive record, and I have attempted to outline for you some of the highlights of the session in this "Report from Washington."

MEDICARE—SOCIAL SECURITY

In a truly historic action, Congress overwhelmingly approved the landmark medicare and Social Security Amendments of 1965.

As one of the bill's congressional sponsors, I am proud to have supported this progressive and forward-looking legislation, for it not only contains the most comprehensive medicare-health insurance plan for America's senior citizens ever enacted, but it also includes the largest increase in social security benefits approved since the program was started 30 years ago.

Of particular benefit to California's 1½ million elderly citizens, as well as the 17 million other Americans over 65, this plan will enable them to prepay in their earlier, more productive working years most of their own hospital and related health expenses during retirement.

In addition, the program provides optional supplementary health insurance available at minimum cost to all persons over 65 to cover their major medical and doctor bills.

Finally, the measure includes a long overdue 7 percent across-the-board cost-of-living increase in social security benefits for some 20 million Americans—a real help to them by raising the minimum level of their basic economic protection.

These three key provisions of the medicare, and Social Security Amendments of 1965, plus several other substantial improvements in current federally assisted programs, make this law the most significant piece of health and social welfare legislation in American history.

I have always been convinced that the elderly are not asking for charity. But they want and deserve a system such as this offering them an opportunity to plan for the future, to permit them to live their remaining years in earned dignity, secure in the knowledge that they have provided adequately for their own needs during retirement years.

EXCISE TAX CUT OF $4.6 BILLION

With President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY at the White House for signing of the excise tax cut into law.

As one of the bill's original legislative supporters, I am happy to report that over 90 percent of this long-overdue multibillion-dollar tax reduction is now being passed on to the Nation's consumers in the form of lower prices on a wide range of retail items such as jewelry, luggage, cosmetics, radios and TV sets, air conditioners, household appliances, typewriters, cameras, autos and auto accessories.

These Federal excise taxes, which hit low- and middle-income families hardest, also have exerted an unnecessary and harmful drag on our country's economic growth. They have been preventing us from reaching our goal of a full-employment economy with worthwhile job opportunities for every American.

On top of last year's $11.5 billion personal and corporate income tax cut, and 1962's $2.5 billion investment for tax credit and liberalized depreciation allowance for business, the new excise tax cut is already helping improve the Nation's economic health, not by more Government spending, but by releasing the pent-up energies of the American private enterprise system.

ELEMENTARY-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Los Angeles' Unified School District will receive more than $15 million during the current school year, under the Administration's landmark program of aid to elementary and high schools approved this spring by Congress and emphasizing better education for America's 5½ million underprivileged youth from families on public assistance or from those with annual incomes below $2,000.

Statewide, California children will receive nearly $80 million in aid under the program, much of it concentrated in our heavily populated urban centers where the ever-increasing demand for more schools and teachers has placed a tremendous strain on existing sources of State and local tax revenues.

Historically, we have always acknowledged the need for education as solid investment in the future of our country. Beginning with the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, setting aside a portion of the new territory for educational use, through the Morrill Land-Grant College Act of 1862, the GI bill after World War II and Korea, and the 1958 National Defense Education Act, the Federal Government has assumed leadership in the effort to provide full educational opportunity for all our citizens.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Under Secretary of State Thomas Mann joins me in congratulating former California Deputy Attorney General Carlos Borja of Los Angeles on his appointment to a key State Department post as Assistant Director of the U.S. Agency for International Development Mission in the strategic Central American Republic of El Salvador.

Dedicated by President Johnson as a living memorial to the faith and idealism of John F. Kennedy, the Alliance for Progress calls for a peaceful, democratic social and economic revolution in the underdeveloped countries of the Western Hemisphere.

Offering a positive and constructive answer to the false claims of international communism, the Alliance is also in line with the objectives of Franklin Roosevelt's good neighbor policy of the 1930's.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

As coauthor of this historic reform measure, I had the honor of being invited to accompany President Johnson as a special official party guest to witness the colorful signing ceremony for the 1965 Immigration Act held in the shadow of the famous Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor.

The first major revision of our immigration laws in over 40 years, the new statute eliminates the highly discriminatory national origins quota system, and sets up a more equitable first-come first-served selection procedure based on a greatly improved system of preference categories.

By helping to reunite families, to admit those with special knowledge or needed skills, while providing safeguards to protect the jobs of American workers, and by abolishing the notorious Asia-Pacific triangle provisions that unfairly discriminated against persons of Asian descent, the new law will make a real contribution to our Nation's foreign policy, and at the same time serve to strengthen our domestic U.S. economic and cultural objectives.

In John Kennedy's words, "we are a nation of immigrants," and Californians in particular have always had a big stake in our immigration policies—because it has been the many thousands of men and women who came to our State from all over the world who have helped make California what it is today: the largest, wealthiest, and most progressive State in the Union, and a pace-setting leader in building an even greater America of tomorrow.

HIGHER EDUCATION

The Golden State is in line to receive an extra $50 million in Federal financial aid during the current fiscal year to help handle the staggering problems caused by our fantastic college student population explosion that has seen enrollments more than double within the last 10 years alone, and promises to continue into the 1970's without letup.

California students and colleges will receive nearly 10 percent of the funds appropriated under the Higher Education Act of 1965, which recognizes that nothing is more important to America and to our Nation's well-being than the fullest possible development of our human educational resources.

Besides doubling present construction grants, the law authorizes a variety of new college aid programs, and, for the first time, offers a comprehensive Federal scholarship grant, loan, loan-guarantee, and work-study program for bright but needy students who would otherwise be unable to continue their education.

SUGAR SUBSIDIES AND CONSUMER PRICES

I voted against the 1965 sugar subsidy bill, because I believe it is time we stopped spending taxpayers' hard-earned money to keep food prices up at artificially inflated levels. Such subsidies, in my opinion, are the kind of special-interest legislation that has long since outlasted whatever economic or social justification it may ever have had.

The House version would have authorized an extra quota premium of $280 million a year to be paid by American consumers for our foreign sugar purchases. So, over the 5-year life of the legislation, U.S. homemakers would have been required to pay nearly $1.5 billion more than the regular world price for the sugar we buy abroad on the world market.

Such a ridiculous situation results from the fact that the American premium price paid to foreign suppliers, in order to artificially support the price of domestic sugar, is presently almost three times the world price.

In my opinion, this is profiteering on a grand scale, with every housewife and consumer in the country forced to pick up the tab through an increased food budget, adding unnecessarily to an already high cost of living.

THE 1965 SERVICE ACADEMY APPOINTMENTS

Five of this year's 30th District service academy appointees are Robin Cababa, Gregory Barnes, Richard Finston, Raynaldo Valadez, and Ernest Wong. The sixth winner Harrison Lobdell, was not present.

We have been most fortunate since I have been in Congress, to have had enough academy openings available so I could appoint every young man who successfully passed the rigorous mental and physical qualification examinations. The six 1965 district winners, three times as many as had qualified in any previous year, all had applied to enter West Point.

THE 1966 SERVICE ACADEMY EXAMS

For the fourth year in a row, I want to offer every young man in the 30th District who is interested an equal chance to compete for the valuable educational and career opportunities provided at our national service academies at West Point, Annapolis, Colorado Springs, and Kings Point, N.Y.

To qualify for one of the freshmen cadet openings available next year to residents of the district at the Military, Naval, Air Force, and Merchant Marine Academies, I am asking all applicants to take the Civil Service Commission's special academy designation exam to be given in Los Angeles on November 6, and again on December 1.

For more information, application blanks, and a letter of authorization to take the exam, interested students should contact my Los Angeles district office—phone: 688-4870.

VOTING RIGHTS

At a conference in his Capitol office, Vice President HUMPHREY outlined legislative strategy just prior to passage of the administration's voting rights bill.

Recent examples of widespread denial of the elemental right to register and vote had clearly shown the urgent need for a strong Federal statute guaranteeing the full and free exercise of this precious right of citizenship for all Americans.

SMOKING HAZARD

In response to the U.S. Surgeon General's report that "Cigarette smoking is one of the greatest health hazards of the 20th century," Congress passed legislation this summer to require a printed health warning on cigarette packages.

The law, however, does not apply to cigarette advertising in newspapers or on radio and TV, and, in fact, actually revoked a Federal Trade Commission order set to go into effect last July, which would have applied uniformly to all these communication media. In addition, the measure prevents all other Federal, State, or local agencies from taking meaningful action to protect the public health in this matter by prohibiting them for 4 years from requiring any kind of advertising warning.

For these reasons, I voted against this legislation, because I am convinced that, instead of protecting the health of the American people, it serves only to protect the economic health of the cigarette industry, and prevents the consuming public, and especially young people, from learning effectively about the serious dangers associated with cigarette smoking.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

The House voted 221 to 203 to repeal section 14(b) of the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act, the so-called right-to-work section which allows individual States to prohibit employers and employees from agreeing, through voluntary collective bargaining procedures, on work contracts which include labor organization security provisions.

Since California voters in 1958 overwhelmingly rejected a proposal to adopt a right-to-work law in our State, the repeal of 14(b), if concurred in by the Senate, would have no effect on existing California law, or on relationships between management and labor in the Golden State.

I voted with the House majority and in line with the decisive expression of California voter preference on this matter, because I do not believe the States should be permitted to override the Federal Government's clear constitutional authority to establish a uniform national policy on labor-management relations in interstate commerce.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

I was extremely pleased this year to receive a coveted assignment to the powerful House Committee on Foreign Affairs—particularly in view of the strong leadership role our country has come to play in promoting the cause of freedom and international peace among the nations of the world.

We Californians have always been an outward-looking people, deeply interested in the success of America's foreign policy—coming as we do from many ethnic and cultural backgrounds, a true melting pot of the strength and diversity that has made America great—and interested in being a good neighbor to the world, working in close harmony with others to promote international cooperation and expand our commercial trade contacts.

As an official congressional observer at Pope Paul's recent historic visit to United Nations Headquarters in New York, I was deeply impressed by this renowned world spiritual leader's wholehearted support for the U.N. as man's "last hope of concord and peace."

Certainly every religion, and every man of good will, must unite in creating the conditions that will lead to lasting peace, for if we fail, we will surely witness the terrible proof of President Kennedy's unforgettable warning that "mankind must put an end to war, or war will put an end to mankind."

RECORD ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

Americans are now enjoying the longest, most stable period of economic growth and prosperity in our entire history. For 56 consecutive months we have seen an all-time record high business expansion and a matching unprecedented increase in jobs, corporate profits and personal income for our people.

The country's gross national product is now approaching an unbelievable $700 billion annual pace (up $200 billion since 1961), with nearly 75 million men and women gainfully employed, while less than 3 million workers are now without jobs (at 4.4 percent of the labor force, the lowest unemployment figure in more than 8 years)—remarkable economic achievements scored during a period of relatively noninflationary price stability, and labor peace almost without parallel—for one of the best records of any modern industrial nation in the world.

Our current prosperity testifies to the dynamic vigor of our private enterprise system, the skill of American workers, and the wisdom of recent public fiscal and tax policies, all of which have been major contributing factors in maintaining a vigorous, healthy economy, and in holding out the promise of a brighter, more secure future for every American.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Housing and Home Finance Administrator Robert Weaver discusses President Johnson's 1965 housing program, describing how many of its progressive features can assist Los Angeles and other major metropolitan centers meet the challenge of continuing rapid growth.

With southern California's population due to triple from 10 million to over 30 million in the 35 years between now and the year 2000, when some 80 percent of our people will be living in cities, the President's forward-looking program is of vital importance to every citizen.

One key element was the creation of a new Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development to serve as a focal point of Federal concern for such pressing urban problems as sharply rising local tax rates, efficient mass transportation systems, adequate housing, expanded educational opportunities, effective air and water pollution control, recreation, and related necessities of modern life in 20th century America.

CLEAN AIR AND PURE WATER

California's outstanding pioneer leadership was recognized this year when Congress took decisive action to organize a truly national effort to eliminate, once and for all, the dangerous impurities in the air we breathe and the water we drink.

Using California standards as a guideline for effective air and water pollution control, the new rules encourage a cooperative local, State and Federal approach to fight the serious pollution problems in America's increasingly crowded metropolitan areas, like Los Angeles, where nearly 80 percent of our population will be living within the next few years.

I was particularly happy at my success in obtaining House and Senate approval of my amendment to start an urgently needed research program to attack the mounting problem of solid waste disposal—another adjunct of our prosperous, growing, highly industrialized, and automobile-oriented civilization.

WAR ON POVERTY

Congressman ROYBAL congratulated Dr. Maurice Dawkins, of Los Angeles, on his appointment as Associate Director of the war on poverty's VISTA program, the domestic version of the world-famous Peace Corps.

Los Angeles, already the recipient of some $25 million in Federal antipoverty assistance, is among the chief beneficiaries of this promising new approach to solving the tragic paradox of extreme poverty for some 30 million disadvantaged citizens, in the midst of an alltime record prosperity for most Americans.

Nationwide, during the 12 months of its operation, nearly 6 million persons have been assisted directly or indirectely by the various economic opportunity programs—the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, basic education and job training, work-study and community action programs, and Project Head Start—in the first comprehensive effort in history to attack the root causes of human poverty and unemployment to assure every American the chance to earn his rightful share of the material blessings this Nation has in such rich abundance.

HEART DISEASE, CANCER, AND STROKE

To fight these three leading killer-diseases, which together cause 70 percent of the deaths in this country each year, Congress authorized a unique nationwide network of regional medical centers. The new centers will encourage closer cooperation between local hospitals, university medical schools, clinical research institutes, and practicing physicians, to speed the life-giving miracles of scientific research from the laboratory to the individual patient, thus making available to the general public the latest advances of medical science to concentrate on the prevention, early diagnosis, care, and treatment of our Nation's most dangerous threats to continued good health.

NEW LOS ANGELES VA HOSPITAL

Architect's sketch of the new $22 million VA hosptial to be built in east Los Angeles adjacent to the USC School of Medicine-L.A. General Hospital medical complex.

Construction on the huge, 14-story, 1,040-bed, ultra-modern health facility is expected to start in the near future.

THE 1965 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

Again this year I sent out a questionnaire soliciting the views of the residents of the 30th District on some of the major legislative issues of special interest to Los Angeles, the State of California, and the Nation.

Like the encouraging experience with last year's congressional poll, I have been highly gratified at the overwhelming response (nearly 10,000 of you returned answers) to this opportunity to participate in the affairs of Government by indicating your opinion on these vital issues.

The time and effort spent in answering this survey is deeply appreciated. You may be sure that your informed and thoughtful advice will continue to assist me in representing our 30th District in Congress, as well as aid my consideration and vote on these important subjects.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

With Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., just appointed by President Johnson to be first Chairman of the recently established U.S. Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity.

A new agency set up under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Roosevelt Commission has a major responsibility to help eliminate, once and for all, unfair discrimination in job opportunities based on race, religion, sex, and national origin.

Double Standard of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I am from a State which has felt the heavy hand of the Justice Department meting out its own peculiar brand of justice. We have noted the double standard of law enforcement which has marked their handling of civil rights cases, wherein the prophets and perpetrators of civil disobedience can apparently do no wrong while the elected officials of the people can apparently do no right. I do not think it unfair to state that, on the basis of the record, the Justice Department has served as a sponsor of civil disobedience in Alabama.

A few days ago, it was impressed on me that this double standard also apparently applies to persons charged with serious crimes, based on their degree of cooperation with the Department. A constituent request called to my attention the strange case of Edward Grady Partin, indicted but never prosecuted on 26 counts of embezzlement of union funds and falsifying records in violation of the Landrum-Griffin Act, and also indicted but never prosecuted on charges of manslaughter and leaving the scene of an accident in Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that cooperation with the Justice Department should purchase for a man an indulgence protecting him against penalty from any crime he has committed or may commit. Consequently, I have written to the attorney general of Alabama, as well as to the circuit solicitor involved, asking that the record be reviewed with an eye toward possibly reopening the case on the manslaughter charge, the statute of limitations having now run out on the charge of leaving the scene of an accident.

The fact that 10 days after these charges were nolle prossed, an Alabama jury awarded $150,000 in damages to the mother of the young airman killed in the accident in question seems ample basis for such review.

Since there was also no action taken on the Federal charges, under a law intended to protect rank and file workingmen against such crimes on the part of union officials as those indicated in the 26 counts of violation of the Landrum-Griffin Act for which Partin was indicted, there seems to be ample basis for congressional review of the Justice Department's handling of this case.

I join, therefore, with others in urging that the investigation of such Justice Department practices by the Judiciary Committee, authorized by the House in 1964, be in fact conducted in the coming year.

Views Concerning NASA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation was shocked at the failure of the Gemini 6 space mission caused by the apparent explosion of the modified Agena rocket.

On October 13, 1965, I set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—page 26922—some views of mine concerning the NASA program of last year.

One of my statements concerned the last two Pegasus shots made as part of the Saturn I development program. I concluded that in my opinion the last two Pegasus shots were not clearly necessary.

The recent failure of the modified Agena rocket raises the further question of whether the major mission of the flight of the Gemini 6 should have been the occasion for the original firing of the greatly modified Agena rocket.

The cost of the failure to our Nation in dollars and prestige was enormous. It is also a fact, Mr. Speaker, that this modified Agena rocket could have been test fired by means of utilizing the last two Saturn I rockets, which carried the additional Pegasus satellites instead. Such a test might have avoided the failure.

I believe the question of priorities in the space program is one that deserves consideration by the NASA Oversight Subcommittee of the Science and Astronautics Committee on which I serve.

The Vice President's Remarks at Oakland University, Rochester, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BILLIE S. FARNUM

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY at Oakland University, Rochester, Mich., under date of October 22, 1965:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

My fellow students, I always welcome the opportunity to speak on a college campus.

President Truman has often said that college audiences are the best. They listen intently—weighing each word with a scholarly mixture of skepticism and objectivity—and then ask questions that make you wish you had stayed in Washington. And he is right.

As a refugee from the classroom—a former professor of political science—I am careful to keep my academic credentials in order by regularly facing campus audiences.

In the past few years, I have found significant changes on campus. Ten years ago, most students were primarily concerned with their own well-being and security. It was "me first."

But this is not true today. This is the era of committed young Americans.

Today's college students are less introspective and more outward looking, less unconcerned and more involved in the political and social issues of the day than at any other time in our history.

You are in the forefront in the battle to restore civil rights, correct social injustice, and enhance human dignity.

You comprise the majority of volunteer workers helping to teach the illiterate, train the unskilled, and administer to the sick and poor.

Your motivation is, I think, based upon the same desire that has prompted us to seek a Great Society—a realization that today we have our best chance in history to better the human condition. And we have our best chance ever of truly becoming an educated and enlightened society.

Education is the fortress of our liberties. And it is the foundation of the Great Society. When every boy and girl with the capacity to profit from a good education can get one, we shall have unlocked the door to universal opportunity.

Without knowledge, we Americans cannot live successfully in the society we are building. In the last decade, jobs requiring a high school education grew by 40 percent; but those open to people without a high school diploma dropped by 10 percent.

Today, 54 million young people are in school—one-fourth of our total population. This tidal wave of enrollment presents a challenge to our 125,000 schools, 100,000 administrators, and 2 million teachers.

(I might add that Oakland is a good example of the enrollment explosion. When your doors opened for the first time in 1959, you had several hundred students; today you have several thousand. And in the next few years, you can expect to double your enrollment.)

We anticipate even greater demands on our educational system in the near future. Four million youngsters must find seats in schoolrooms in the next 5 years. We need 400,000 more classrooms. And there will be 50 percent more college students in the next 5 years.

Under the leadership of President Johnson we have enacted in this session of Congress the most far-reaching education legislation in history. These programs will help us to prepare today to meet tomorrow's demands. And they will enhance the educational opportunity here in Michigan.

Last year, Michigan opened 3,202 new classrooms for 1.1 million elementary school pupils and 793,000 secondary school pupils. The student-teacher ratio was 27. Michigan will need more classrooms and more teachers in the months and years ahead if it is to maintain this ratio, much less better it.

Under all the titles of the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act your State will receive $42 million to aid low-income districts, help purchase library- and textbooks for public and private schools, establish model school programs and educational centers, and to initiate a program of grants to strengthen the State's department of education.

Here in Oakland County, $1.5 million in Federal funds will help 6,800 schoolchildren from low-income families.

Michigan is receiving $10 million this year from the Higher Education Facilities Act; and the University of Michigan ranks among the top 10 universities in the country receiving Federal research grant funds.

The State also receives $916,000 to help finance guidance, consulting, and testing in public schools. And under the Economic Opportunity Act—which Congress has doubled this year—you are receiving $6.5 million for vocational and adult education programs.

These programs, together with the higher education bill, the vocational education amendments, the Manpower Training and Development Act, and the Teaching Professions Act, will help your State realize the potential of each of its children.

These programs cost money. But they are bargains in comparison to the cost of inadequate or incomplete education, to wasted talent and resources.

Inadequate education leads to unemployment: The high school dropout is twice as likely to be unemployed as the high school graduate, and five times as likely as the college graduate.

Inadequate education leads to poverty: Two-thirds of the families in which the father had less than 8 years of schooling find themselves locked in economic hopelessness.

Inadequate education perpetuates itself in future generations: The children of the unemployed and poor become themselves unemployed and poor.

For these reasons, President Johnson proposed in his historic education message to the Congress that we declare a national goal of full educational opportunity.

The evidence indicates that the American people support this goal. This year—for the first time—public opinion polls show that Americans consider educational opportunities to be their most important domestic concern.

My fellow students, the foundations of this Republic rest on a people capable of accepting the burden of choice—a people who can assume voluntarily the burden of freedom.

Our wealth and power represent freedom's best hope in the world. And our people represent the best hope for human, social, and scientific progress.

Two-thirds of all the scientists who ever lived are alive and working today. This age has already produced twice as much knowledge as in all succeeding history. The science student today is learning 400 times the amount of new information that his predecessor did of only a decade ago.

Each new discovery in turn triggers other new advances and more new knowledge. Yet, our ability to harness new progress for the benefit of all is even more challenging and complex than the discoveries themselves.

It has been said that the race of man moves slowly because it must all move together. But we now have the means—for the first time in human history—to extend mankind's benefits to all men.

We have the genius to soar far beyond our own imaginations into the distant reaches of space. But we also have the chance to reach for the human heart—to do what we must to preserve life and make it full and free and bountiful.

My generation had its rendezvous with destiny. Your generation will have its rendezvous with opportunity. For you, and future generations, will have the best chance yet to right old wrongs and offer each person—and each place—in our country the chance to be better than today.

The Great Society offers our people the rare opportunity of self-fulfillment. Let us, then, accept seriously our obligation to liberate the human spirit in America and embrace the responsibilities of freedom. Let us resolve that freedom's holy light shall never be the light that failed.

Today we are embarked on one of the great adventures in human history—to join in the task of building the America begun but never complete.

Young Americans for Freedom Supports a Strong Vietnam Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Young Americans for Freedom, Inc.—YAF—is generally recognized as the leading student organization in the Nation in support of a strong U.S. foreign policy position in Vietnam. For several years, YAF has been regarded as the Nation's largest conservative youth organization on the college campus and in the young business community, but the organization's position in support of a strong U.S. commitment in southeast Asia has given it even greater recognition.

It is indeed encouraging to hear of student organizations who are supporting a strong U.S. foreign policy. During the past few months, when student protest demonstrations against U.S. involvment in Vietnam have increased in number and strength, it is encouraging to hear of students' groups offsetting the protest demonstrations by offering constructive programs for fighting Communist aggression in Vietnam and all of Asia. YAF is such an organization.

Mr. Speaker, the position of YAF on foreign policy questions is derived from the Sharon statement which was adopted in conference at Sharon, Conn., September 9–11, 1960, at the founding of the group on the estate of William F. Buckley, Jr., editor of National Review. In the Sharon statement is found the policy guideline for determination of foreign policy questions by YAF:

> In this time of moral and political crisis, it is the responsibility of the youth of America to affirm certain eternal truths.
>
> We, as young conservatives, believe—
>
> That the forces of international communism are, at present, the greatest single threat to these liberties;
>
> That the United States should stress victory over, rather than coexistence with, this menace; and
>
> That American foreign policy must be judged by this criterion: does it serve the just interests of the United States?

YAF is comprised of thousands of college students across the Nation, and YAF's position becomes even more important, when one considers that those YAF members calling for stronger action in Vietnam are eligible for the draft and service in Vietnam themselves. Responsible students do not have sympathy for the students of the political left who are burning their draft cards, deliberately blocking the troop and supply convoys and trains, picketing Selective Service System local board offices, and by staging riots in major cities which flagrantly disrespect the law. YAF is representative of the other elements of the college campus who are supporting a strong policy. YAF is helping to offset the demonstrations of the student left-wing groups.

Mr. Speaker, the newly elected national chairman of YAF, Tom Charles Huston, a student at Indiana University Law School, recently made a trip to southeast Asia to view the situation first hand. Upon his return to the United States, Mr. Huston issued a press release calling for more effective use of our allies in Asia. This release follows:

CONSERVATIVE HEAD SAYS L.B.J. NOT MAKING GOOD USE OF ASIAN ALLIES IN VIETNAM

> The national chairman of Young Americans for Freedom, a 25,000-member conservative group, charged today that the war in Vietnam is being prolonged by the failure of President Johnson to take advantage of offers of assistance by America's allies in Asia.
>
> Tom Charles Huston, 24, Logansport, a senior in the Indiana University School of Law, recently returned from a 25,000-mile tour of the Far East during which he met with governmental leaders in Korea, Philippines, and the Republic of China.
>
> "There is tremendous support for our strong anti-Communist policy in Vietnam among the peoples and governments of Asia," Huston said. "The only fear is that America, in an effort to achieve peace, will sacrifice the aspirations of the Vietnamese people in order to pacify Red China."
>
> Huston reported that Prime Minister Chung Il Kwan of Korea told him that the Republic of Korea was anxious to send two or three combat divisions to Vietnam. He quoted the Prime Minister as saying that "Koreans are honored to shed blood with their American allies once more in the fight against communism. It is the least we can do to express our gratitude for the American sacrifices made during the Korean war."
>
> Huston also met with President Chiang Kai-shek and Premier C. K. Yen, of the Republic of China, who told him that China was anxious to assist in any way possible in the struggle against communism in Vietnam. According to Huston, President Chiang Kai-shek observed that Chinese personnel are presently assisting in refugee relief and relocation work in South Vietnam, but expressed the hope that the U.S. Government would make it possible for the Republic of China to take a more vigorous part in the struggle. Both leaders denied reports circulating in the United States that Chinese involvement in South Vietnam would be met with resentment from the Vietnamese people. Huston said his conversations with Vietnamese leaders, including former Prime Minister Phan-Huy-Quat, indicated that there is no reason why Chinese personnel could not actively participate in the anti-Communist effort in South Vietnam.
>
> The Philippines, which currently has several medical teams in Vietnam, is anxious to expand its role, Huston reported. "While the Philippines is not in a position to make an extensive commitment of military forces to the war in Vietnam, it is willing and able to extend increased technical assistance," Huston said.
>
> "There is general agreement among Asian leaders," Huston said, "that the war in Vietnam will be won only if there is a two-pronged counteroffensive against communism. The major thrust must, of course, be made by the military. However, political stability must be achieved, and this will occur only if an increased effort is made to provide economic assistance to Vietnam. It is in this area that the present administration has conspicuously failed. Our allies in Asia are willing to help by sending civic-action volunteer teams composed of doctors, nurses, engineers, agriculturists, and socioeconomic development experts, and administrative, military, and other technical advisers in an effort to assist the Vietnamese people and win their hearts and minds away from the clutches of communism. This is the key to permanent peace and stability in South Vietnam. If this administration is anxious to achieve a lasting solution to the Vietnamese war it must rally the support of our Asian allies and take advantage of their offers of assistance."
>
> Huston concluded: "This administration talks of peace. Our Asian allies talk of victory. The time has come for the administration to show some initiative in international affairs and encourage the active participation of our Asian allies in the war in Vietnam. Victory is attainable if only the United States is determined enough to seek it."

Mr. Speaker, at the National Convention of YAF, held in Washington, D.C., during late August of this year, the organization passed a resolution unanimously which called for the commitment of sufficient numbers of ground troops to combat the guerrillas now active in South Vietnam. It also called for several other actions to help win the war. This resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON SOUTH VIETNAM

> Whereas we share the administration's view that what the Communists chose to call "wars of national liberation" constitute nothing more than a new form of aggression which must be resisted as a threat to the establishment of true peace; and
>
> Whereas the current aggression against South Vietnam takes its primary inspiration and direction from the north and has as its ultimate object the conquest of all of southeast Asia; a fact recognized by those coun-

tries in the area who have sent significant amounts of combat personnel to share in the burden of defeating the Communists; and

Whereas we believe that this Nation is required by considerations of national interest and by moral considerations of the highest order to come to the aid of the people of South Vietnam and other countries of southeast Asia in their defense against aggression; and

Whereas, While South Vietnam fails to measure up to the full standards of freedom to which we in this country have become accustomed, the present form of government nevertheless affords a greater opportunity for the ultimate development of truly liberal institutions than would a Communist regime: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Young Americans for Freedom applauds the commitment of U.S. might and prestige on behalf of South Vietnam and supports the recognition that this war must be won on the ground in South Vietnam as military success is a precondition for the political and social developments which will ultimately decrease the ability of Communist recruiters to lure local peasants into giving aid and comfort to the Vietcong; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the administration demonstrate its intent to take whatever action proves tactically necessary to assure that the successful termination of the war will not be unduly delayed, including such measures as (a) the commitment of sufficient numbers of ground troops to combat the guerrillas now active in South Vietnam; (b) effective air action against Soviet-built missile sites around Hanoi and Haiphong, (c) the beginning, by calculated aerial and naval bombardment of the destruction of the industrial capacity of North Vietnam; (d) by instituting a naval and air blockade of North Vietnam, all of these steps to be taken to induce North Vietnam, to cease in its support of the troops in the South, and (e) the clear communications to Communist China that any overt intervention by that country will result in retaliation by the United States and by our allies such as Nationalist China.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution clearly indicates the clear and sound position which YAF has taken on Vietnam. YAF stands on that resolution today as much as it did then, if not more so.

One of the most notable accomplishments of YAF with respect to Vietnam events was the sponsorship of a symposium for freedom in Vietnam. This symposium was held at the International Inn here in the Nation's Capital on Saturday, October 16, 1965, under the sponsorship of the YAF-created Student Ad Hoc Committee for Freedom in Vietnam. This project was YAF-created, YAF-directed, YAF-sponsored, YAF-financed, and YAF-attended. Its national coordinator was the able Alfred Regnery, a recent graduate of Beloit College in Wisconsin and a recent enlistee for duty in the armed services, who is the college director of Young Americans for Freedom, Inc.

This symposium was attended by nearly 1,000 students from throughout the Nation. Prominent officials from the Department of State, staff members from senatorial and congressional offices, prominent scholars, students recently returned from Vietnam, and press corpsmen participated in the symposium. The symposium was climaxed by a peaceful march to the Vietnamese Embassy for presentation to the Ambassador with an American flag as a symbol of YAF's support for the defense of freedom in Vietnam.

It was a substantial contrast to witness this peaceful and orderly march in support of U.S. policy as compared to the nearly riotous protest demonstrations conducted by the Vietnam Day Committee—VDC—and the Students for a Democratic Society—SDS—throughout the Nation which featured such things as the burning of draft cards.

It was most encouraging to hear of this symposium on October 16 at the same time that leftwing students were burning their draft cards, conducting rallies which nearly resulted in riots in major cities, and calling for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam. The VDC, led and directed by leaders of the SDS, was one of the most irresponsible events to have occurred in this Nation in many years.

Mr. Speaker, when students, as they did during the VDC demonstrations, call for open defiance of Federal statutes, when they call for avoiding the draft, when they call for physically blocking troop and supply trains, when they call for withdrawal from Vietnam of American troops, when they call our valiant fighting men in Asia war criminals, it seems to me that it borders on sedition.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost unbelievable to see the amount of disgusting "hate" material that the student left put out during the VDC demonstrations. In California the VDC and its associates were circulating handbills with a picture of former Ambassador Maxwell Taylor with the caption, "Wanted for Mass Murder." It was encouraging to see an organization like YAF out there leading demonstrations to offset such VDC and SDS activities.

I think some of the materials which the YAF-sponsored symposium issued about the event will give everyone a clear idea about the symposium.

A news release of October 9, 1965, giving the general scope of the symposium follows:

Senator Dodd, Columnist Rowland Evans, To Address Symposium for Freedom in Vietnam October 16

Washington, D.C., October 9.—Alfred S. Regnery, national college director of Young Americans for Freedom and member of the steering committee of the Student Ad Hoc Committee for Freedom in Vietnam, sponsors of the symposium for freedom in Vietnam, announced today that Senator Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut, and syndicated columnist Rowland Evans will address the student symposium to be held in Washington, D.C., on Saturday, October 16.

Senator Dodd, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and an outspoken defender of the Johnson administration's policy in Vietnam will make a major address at the morning session of the symposium.

Evans, who, along with Robert Novak, writes the widely quoted column, "Inside Report", will analyze the Vietnam war and moderate the panel discussion at the afternoon session. Evans has visited Vietnam several times and will give his first-hand impression of the war's course.

Approximately 1,500 students from across the Nation are expected to attend the reverse teach-in in Washington, which will be the only student meeting that day endorsing current U.S. policy in Vietnam. The weekend is expected to be filled with left-wing "peacenik" protests against American firmness in that southeast Asian territory.

Representing the State Department will be Joseph Luman, former press attaché in Saigon, who will discuss at the morning session the legal and political reasons for U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Participants in the afternoon panel discussion are four distinguished professors: David Rowe, Yale University; Frank Trager, New York University; Oliver Martin, University of Rhode Island; and Franz Michael, George Washington University.

A special feature of the daylong meeting will be a student panel discussion conducted by four student leaders who have visited Vietnam. They are Arthur Collingsworth, University of Michigan; Jolynn Cappo, Michigan State University; Jay Parsons, SAIS, Johns Hopkins University; and Don Emerson, Yale.

Symposium schedule follows:

10:00: Opening remarks, introductions.

10:15: Address, questions and answers; Senator Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut.

11:00: Address, questions and answers; Republican Senator.

11:45: Address, questions and answers; Mr. Joseph Luman, State Department.

1:30: Panel discussion; moderator, Rowland Evans; Profs: Frank Trager, New York University; David Rose, Yale University; Oliver Martin, Rhode Island University; and Franz Michael, George Washington University.

3:00: Student panel discussion; Arthur Collingsworth, University of Michigan; Jolynn Cappo, Michigan State; Jay Parsons, SAIS, Johns Hopkins University; and Don Emerson, Yale.

4:30: General discussions, reactions, etc.

5:15: Adjournment.

The meeting is open to the public.

The following is from the initial announcement of the symposium:

The symposium for freedom in Vietnam is a meeting national in scope and international in importance. It is a meeting of students who support the U.S. commitment in Vietnam, and who approve of our Government's strong stand against Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

This symposium offers an opportunity to examine the U.S. foreign policy in relation to this country's present involvement in Vietnam. The symposium is an answer to the demonstrations, picket lines, and civil disobedience of those who would have us withdraw from Vietnam. It is a call to all people in the academic world to show support for strong American foreign policy, and a call for a halt to Communist aggression.

This symposium shall also serve as an opportunity to constructively criticize the present U.S. position to halt Communist aggression in southeast Asia. This is the first of a series of meetings. It will be up to you to take what you have learned to your campuses, and to show the people of America and the people of the world that American students support our Government's action in Vietnam. It will also be up to you to take the projects which will be discussed here to your campus, and to see that these projects are undertaken to help the people of South Vietnam.

The list of the supporting professors of this symposium was most impressive. The list of those professors follows:

Symposium for Freedom in Vietnam—Supporting Professors

Comer Clay, professor of government, Texas Christian University.

Leslie Pruitt, associate professor, Parsons College.

Allen G. Erickson, associate professor of education, Moorhead State College.

Theodore L. Shay, professor of political science, Willamette University.

Donald P. Kilpatrick, instructor of mathematics, Siena.

Dr. Frank J. D'Amico, professor, Spanish, studies abroad, Parsons College.

Dr. Kenneth H. Thompson, associate dean of the college, Berea College.

William H. Clements, professor of education, Wisconsin State University.

Walter C. Kitzerow, instructor, Morton Junior College.

Paul Warren Allen, director, School of Music, North Central College.

Stephen A. Janto, professor of history, Siena College.

Beauvais Fox, assistant professor, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn.

L. Lautenbach, dean, School of Business Administration, Bob Jones University.

Lionel Crocker, Department of Speech, Denison University.

Prof. Anthony T. Bouscaren, professor of political science, Le Moyne College.

W. L. Furman, associate professor of mathematics, Spring Hill College.

Rev. Martin A. Stillmock, CSSR, chairman of English department, St. Joseph's.

Dr. L. A. Dellin, chairman of the East European studies, University of Vermont.

O'Neill K. Kane, instructor, Palm Beach Junior College.

Donald L. Strand, associate professor, Bradley University.

David Dautenhahn, associate professor of mathematics, Missouri Valley College.

Kenneth D. Mackenzie, assistant professor of industrial administration, Carnegie Institute of Technology.

George G. Thielman, Ph. D associate professor of political science, Georgia State College.

Robert T. Gillespie, assistant professor, Gettysburg College.

Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J. sociologist, Gonzaga University.

Dr. Raymond C. Suiter, faculty research engineer, Montana State University.

Roland I. Perusse, associate professor of government, Texas Western College.

John J. Kennedy, College of Business Administration, Arizona State University.

Albert Wass de Czege, assistant professor, University of Florida.

Robert R. Neff, associate professor of history, Grove City College.

Robert Samuel Rogers, chairman, classical studies, Duke University.

Edward J. Rozek, professor of political science, University of Colorado.

David N. Rowe, professor of political science, Yale University.

Francis G. Wilson, professor of political science, University of Illinois.

Dr. Justus M. van der Kroef, chairman, Department of Political Science, University of Bridgeport.

William F. Wagner, professor of Spanish, Louisburg College.

William A. Nye, associate professor of insurance, San Diego State College.

Wayne L. Shick, professor of general engineering, University of Illinois.

Maurice G. Porter, associate professor, University of Illinois.

Arthur R. Williams, psychology, Shimer College.

William Nelson, instructor, University of Arizona.

Raymond Eling, assistant professor of pharmacology, University of Cincinnati.

William Fleming, chairman, Department of Political Science, Ripon College.

Oscar Ibele, professor of political science, Kent State University.

Michael Lindsay, professor of Far Eastern studies, the American University.

William Oliver Martin, chairman, Department of Philosophy, University of Rhode Island.

Demetrios F. Nixon, chairman of Social Studies Department, Louisburg College.

William F. Stokes, senior professor of comparative political institutions, Claremont Men's College.

Dr. Walter S. Blake, Jr., dean of students, Willamette University.

Dr. Anthony Kubek, chairman, Department of History, University of Dallas.

W. P. Shofstall, dean of students, Arizona State University.

Father Hugh Halton, chairman, Department of Government, Providence College.

Dr. Nicholas Nyaradi, School of International Studies, Bradley University.

John Alden Clark, professor of mechanical engineering, University of Michigan.

F. T. Quiett, professor of engineering, San Diego State College.

A letter was sent by the Student Ad Hoc Committee for Freedom in Vietnam to the editor of every campus newspaper in the Nation. This letter follows:

Dear Student Newspaper Editor: You are invited to attend the symposium for freedom in Vietnam in Washington, D.C., on October 16. This will be the only national meeting on that day in support of U.S. action in Vietnam. On the same day, from New York City to Berkeley, Calif., students by the thousands will demonstrate, protest, and commit acts of civil disobedience against our foreign policy.

It is therefore of utmost importance that you join with us in this meeting supporting our action in Vietnam. Student body presidents and newspaper editors from all parts of the Nation will participate in this meeting.

The program will include addresses by a Republican and a Democratic Senator, a panel discussion of five professors, all experts on southeast Asia, a panel discussion of five students who spent the summer in Vietnam, an address from a newspaper reporter who recently returned from Vietnam, and an address by an official of the State Department.

We are arranging a briefing with either the President or one of his top aids. One of the most interesting highlights of the afternoon will be a discussion of how students can help the people of South Vietnam—projects such as the collection of money for war orphans, and a program whereby student governments adopt a Vietnamese village.

If you can possibly be in Washington on the 16th, we will look for you. If you cannot attend yourself, send a representative from your paper. Please make every effort to attend this important function to show support for our strong policy in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

Alfred Regnery.

Mr. Regnery also issued a letter dated October 3, 1965, to the general membership of YAF on the symposium detailing its plans and purposes. The letter follows:

October 3, 1965.

To: Members of Young Americans for Freedom.

From: Alfred S. Regnery, YAF college director.

Re an item of vital importance.

On Saturday, October 16, one of the major student activities of the fall will take place in Washington. The symposium for freedom in Vietnam, a meeting of national scope and of tremendous importance, will be sponsored by a bipartisan committee of student leaders. Students from all parts of the Nation will take part in this meeting. The symposium will serve as the starting point of a coalition of liberal and conservative, Republican and Democratic anti-Communists.

This meeting will be the only national effort to counteract the thousands of radical students who will be picketing, protesting, breaking the law, and actually aiding the Vietcong in protest of American involvement in Vietnam on that day. The leftwing students will be on the front page of every newspaper in the country. In order that the entire American population not come under the false illusion that the American student in general is opposed to our anti-Communist stand in Vietnam, you must participate on October 16. You, a member of Young Americans for Freedom, will play a vital role in this meeting by presenting the young conservative voice.

If the efforts of the left are to be counteracted on October 16, this meeting must be successful. To be successful, you must be there. You will hear speeches by Republican and Democrat Senators, an official of the Department of State, panel discussions of professors and of students who have been in Vietnam. Programs will be discussed which can be undertaken by local groups. There will be no charge for this meeting.

If you are in a chapter, help your chapter chairman arrange for a carload or busload of people from your area. If you are not in a chapter and need transportation, contact one of the following people.

A news release on the symposium was also issued by the student ad hoc committee right before the symposium took place. The release follows:

STUDENTS FROM 55 COLLEGES TO ATTEND TEACH-IN SUPPORTING U.S. ACTION IN VIETNAM HERE

Washington.—The symposium for freedom in Vietnam, the first major win-the-war teach-in, will be attended by students from 55 colleges, it was reported today.

The meeting, to take place Saturday at the International Inn from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m., will be keynoted by Senator Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut. Other speakers include Joseph Luman, past aid to Maxwell Taylor, Syndicated Columnist Rowland Evans, of the Evans-Novak team, and a host of professors and students who have spent time in southeast Asia.

Students from as far away as Colorado will fly into Washington for the occasion. Three busloads of students will come from Philadelphia, and official delegations are expected from most eastern universities.

The symposium, being sponsored by a bipartisan committee of members of the Young Republicans, Young Democrats, and Young Americans for Freedom, was organized to counteract leftist demonstrations protesting American involvement in Vietnam. Demonstrations will supposedly take place this weekend in some 28 cities and university campuses. The "peace-niks" are expected to commit acts of civil disobedience and to draw attention to themselves by being arrested. In spite of this, "a great majority of students support administration policy in Vietnam," Alfred S. Regnery, member of the steering committee said. "They simply have not yet had the opportunity to demonstrate that support."

A highlight of the meeting, to take place during the afternoon, will be a panel discussion of four American students who spent last summer in Vietnam. They will discuss their reactions and ways in which American students can show support for U.S. Vietnamese policy, and ways in which they can help the people of South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the symposium was a success. Nearly a thousand college students attended the gathering. Similar symposiums on a more localized level are planned by YAF chapters for this fall and winter.

Typical of the activities of various YAF leaders to aid the war effort in Vietnam is a news release issued by Randal C.

Teague, YAF's southern regional director and member of its national board of directors. YAF leaders throughout the Nation are trying to win press support for the war effort in Vietnam, to arouse public opinion behind the war effort, and to gather the support of college students. The news release follows:

YAF LEADER BLASTS VIETNAM PROTESTS

WASHINGTON.—A leader of the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) blasted the student anti-Vietnam protests here in the Nation's Capital today as a deliberate attempt to defeat the cause of freedom in Asia and the world. YAF is regarded as the leading student organization supporting a strong policy in Vietnam. It is behind the administration's strong policy there.

In making the denouncement, Randal C. Teague, a member of YAF's board of directors and the leader of its southern program, said, "Students who are burning their draft cards and organizing programs to avoid the draft and to thwart the American effort against communism in Asia are in a minority on the college campus. What they are doing is wrong—legally and morally. Those who are in violation of Federal laws should be prosecuted and severely punished by the courts."

Teague, a student himself, went on to say, "These students are not conscientious objectors. Their actions show shades of absolute anarchy. As many national leaders have pointed out, there is strong evidence that many of these protests have been led by the extremists of the radical left who often associate themselves with Communist-leaning groups. Responsible students have no sympathy with those who are deliberately flaunting the law by burning their draft cards, by blocking troop and supply convoys, and worst of all by demoralizing those valient fighting men in Vietnam today who are risking their lives to insure the security of freemen."

The YAF leader concluded by saying, "When our Nation issues a call to arms, it is our duty to respond to it, whether we personally like it or not. Every American, from the youngest to the oldest, deserves to support his Government in time of national emergency, and surely the war in Vietnam is one of the gravest situations confronting the world today."

At its recent national convention in Washington, YAF passed a strong resolution unanimously calling for the commitment of sufficient numbers of ground troops to combat the guerrillas now active in South Vietnam. The resolution also called for effective air action against Soviet-built missile sites around Hanoi and Haiphong, the beginning by calculated aerial and naval bombardment of the destruction of the industrial capacity of North Vietnam, and by the institution of a naval and air blockade of North Vietnam. The resolution concluded with the call to issue a clear communication to Communist China that any overt intervention by that country will result in retaliation by the United States and by our allies.

The national office of YAF has been in the front position on the Vietnam program. YAF is developing a constructive program to aid the war effort, and some of these constructive programs were detailed in a chapter-State-regional chairmen's newsletter issued by David R. Jones, the executive director of YAF. This newsletter follows:

VIETNAM

October 15 and 16 have been designated "Vietnam Day" by the left, and all signs seem to indicate that the "new left" will be very active picketing, protesting, parading, and committing acts of civil disobedience or, more exactly, breaking the law on that day. It is therefore important that members and chapters of Young Americans for Freedom demonstrate their support of a strong policy in Vietnam, in a positive fashion. The national office therefore recommends a number of projects, to be started on the 16th and to be carried out throughout the coming months.

Crisis fund for Vietnamese children of the International Rescue Committee, 460 Park Avenue South, New York, 10016. A fund to send food and clothing to war orphans of South Vietnam. This project should receive prime importance—money should be collected and sent to New York. For more information and brochures, send to the International Rescue Committee.

Vietnam mail call, Post Office Box 3104, Columbus, Ga.: A program of letterwriting to American soldiers in Vietnam. Letters should be written and addressed to Columbus, Ga., and will in turn be forwarded on to soldiers in Vietnam, showing the support of the American people of the Vietnam war. Christmas cards can also be sent.

Petition campaign: A simple petition should be drawn up and as many signatures as possible gathered supporting our war efforts in Vietnam, and sent to the President of the United States. Gather as many names as possible for this program.

Poster and letterwriting campaigns should be launched. Posters should go up on your campuses and in your communities calling for victory in Vietnam, and many letters should be written to the editor of your local papers.

Mr. Speaker, the most encouraging aspect of the YAF participation in the great debate raging on the college campuses of this Nation today over involvment in Vietnam is the constructive aspect of their policy. Instead of merely demonstrating, they are developing comprehensive programs to help the Vietnamese and the American fighting men there. YAF chapters across the Nation are participating and cooperating with the Crisis Fund for Vietnamese Children of the International Rescue Committee in New York. This is a fund to send food and clothing to war orphans of South Vietnam. This project is receiving prime importance on many campuses. Money is being collected and sent to the International Rescue Committee by YAF members to help in this program.

YAF chapters and members are also cooperating with Operation Vietnam Mail Call which operates from Columbus, Ga. This is a program to send letters to soldiers in Vietnam telling them of the support which many college students have for their efforts. Christmas cards by the thousands will be sent to these fighting men who will be on the front fighting for the freedom of a troubled world. They are going to be out in the jungles on Christmas Day, when most of us will be in our comfortable homes enjoying a fine holiday. We must not forget these men and thank them for their efforts. YAF is trying to do just that.

YAF has a nationwide campaign in operation to obtain tens of thousands of signatures supporting our war efforts in Vietnam. These petitions are being sent to the President of the United States, to Senators and Congressmen, and other prominent national political figures.

In cooperation with other organizations, YAF is helping to collect clothing to be sent to refugees fleeing from North Vietnam. Victory in Vietnam committees are being established by YAF on hundreds of college campuses. Students will be sent to Vietnam during future months to look at the situation first hand.

Mr. Speaker, when a student recently burned his draft card in New York, attracting national attention, many Americans were incensed at the idea. Here was a student burning his draft card before a rally of students protesting American action in Vietnam and burning it in open violation of Federal law. The national chairman of YAF, Tom Huston, responded with an outcry which was carried in hundreds of newspapers across the Nation. At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include the news release which was issued from the national offices of YAF in response to this event:

NEWS RELEASE

A national student leader today supported the action of the Justice Department in arresting David J. Miller, the "pacifist" who burned his draft card during last weekend's anti-Vietnam demonstrations.

Tom Charles Huston, national chairman of the conservative Young Americans for Freedom, advised Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach in a telegram today that Miller "must be prosecuted if respect for law and order is to prevail in the student community.

"The demonstrations against the U.S. presence in Vietnam," Huston added, "represent a very small minority of student opinion and of American opinion in general. We certainly support their right to protest by all legal and peaceful means, but we must demand that their protest—and the protests of any other groups, on any other issues—be carried out only through legal and peaceful means."

Young Americans for Freedom also called upon its members "to isolate the new left; to render it impotent" in an editorial in the October issue of the organization's magazine, the New Guard.

The editorial, entitled "Aid and Comfort to the Enemy," says that the anti-Vietnam demonstrators "are not pacifists (though there are pacifists among them); they are a fifth column."

"The touchstone of the antiwar activity," says the New Guard, "is not true pacifism—for that would involve stern condemnation of the Vietcong invaders—but rather a hatred of Western, and especially American institutions, beliefs, and strategic security."

Mr. Speaker, YAF is not merely responding to the demonstrations of the student left. It is taking the initiative. Tom Huston was not satisfied with sitting back and merely issuing news releases. He went right to the heart of the agitation. With courage which few individuals have demonstrated, Tom Huston flew to San Francisco, and during the height of the protest demonstrations, this young man from Indiana led a demonstration supporting U.S. policy. Tom Huston spoke from the steps of the infamous hall at Berkeley, Calif., which was made infamous by the so-called Free Speech Movement several months ago. He was one of the few conservatives to ever speak to a mass audience from those steps, and I think I can safely say that the remarks which Mr. Huston made there were more consistent with the national interests of America than were the remarks made by the Free Speech

Movement leaders, the Students for a Democratic Society leaders, and the Vietnam Day Committee spokesmen. Mr. Huston spent several days going from one end of California to the other rallying support for America's strong commitment in Vietnam. His speeches and appearances attracted statewide coverage by the press.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there is little doubt that YAF represents the majority opinion on this issue on the college campus. YAF deserves to be commended for its efforts, and I sincerely hope that their efforts will be successful in convincing the students on America's campuses that they should support a strong U.S. position in Vietnam. I commend YAF for its efforts.

Final Newsletter to Constituents of the 1st Session, 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD the final issue of my newsletter which will be forwarded to my constituency.

The newsletter follows:

THE 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Some have said that this session of Congress has been productive. Others say that it has been prolific. Some say it has been counterproductive. Other people say that it has been downright destructive. Some praise it highly, while others condemn it roundly. There are those who will tell you that this Congress has opened new vistas to all Americans. There are other equally sincere people who feel that the legislation adopted by this Congress sounds the death knell to individual initiative, and the free enterprise system as we know it.

The true verdict concerning the worth of this Congress will not be rendered for some years. Its true impact on our economy will not be felt for at least 5 years. Neither can the extent to which it will change American life be assayed for some time. But, have an economic impact it will, and change our lives it will.

There can be little doubt that this Congress has pushed the United States further toward a welfare state. The passage of medicare guarantees greater Government involvement in the medical profession and in the operation of hospitals. For the first time the Federal Government will be involved in the administration of our elementary schools, through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Higher Education Act, with its Federal scholarship provisions, will probably result in less private initiative in the establishment of scholarships, and undoubtedly will result in more surveillance of our colleges and universities by Federal bureaus. The Teacher Corps will provide a body of federally oriented and federally trained teachers to work in the school systems of our country, but not to be a part of them. Who can deny that the germs of vast Federal influence, if not Federal control, exist in these measures?

We are propelled farther along the road to the welfare state by the rent supplement program, which was contained in the Housing Act of 1965. When this act was passed the House was assured that (1) only persons eligible for public housing would be eligible for rent supplements; and (2) that the program would not be used for forced racial integration. However, regulations published by the Housing and Home Finance Agency went contrary to both of these conditions. Therefore, Congress deleted all funds for beginning the rent supplement program from the last supplemental appropriations bill.

The impact this Congress has had on the economy is best illustrated by the Appalachia bill, the housing bill, the Economic Opportunity Act, and the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. These bills are aimed mainly at pump-priming even though the country is admittedly prosperous. Some of them concentrate on areas of chronic depression or unemployment, while others sow their benefits broadcast. Most of these laws are well-intentioned, being aimed at helping people through governmental action. The only thing which bothers many of us is the fact that governmental action has never really helped people. These same remedies were tried during the Great Depression—and failed. It still takes private enterprise to provide the jobs and the high standard of living which makes America the great Nation that it is. I would certainly not charge that these bills were all politically motivated. However, I doubt that anyone would deny that they have political significance, and that this fact is certainly not lost on the Johnson administration.

This Congress also reduced excise taxes; it passed an Immigration and Nationality Act which started out to be very controversial, but ended up by having the support of most people. It passed a voting rights bill which was aimed at ending deprivation of the right to vote because of race. It also passed an omnibus farm bill, and an omnibus public works authorization bill. The House passed a bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, but the Senate has thus far refused to do so.

This Congress has created a new department for the President's Cabinet to be known as the Department of Urban Affairs. In this Department will be included most of the activities of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and it will probably include similar activities which are now quartered in other departments or bureaus of the Government.

This Congress has been concerned with water matters. It passed the Water Resources Planning Act, the Water Quality Act, and has continued its support for the program for the desalinization of salt water. It has not yet passed a major reclamation act. It is hoped that the Lower Colorado Basin Project Act, which has now had hearings in both the House and the Senate, will be the first major reclamation bill—not only for the 89th Congress, but for the Johnson administration.

The 1st session of the 89th Congress appropriated $119.3 billion, to be spent through the administrative budget. This is by far the highest level of appropriation ever requested of a Congress, or granted by it. The Honorable GEORGE MAHON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has remarked that the days of $100 billion budgets are probably gone forever. Certainly, if the penchant to spend which we have seen prevail in this Congress is continued, the words of Mr. MAHON are indeed prophetic.

As we look back on the last session of Congress, it is natural for us to think about the next. The President has already indicated that he has another massive legislative program in mind for next year. It seems to involve further spending, further impetus toward welfare-statism, and further encroachment of the Government into areas of endeavor which many feel would best be left to the States and to individuals. Only the people can stop this pellmell rush to the left. Therefore, I hope that everyone who is an American citizen will become immediately active in the political party of his choice, so that he may have a part in the continuance of the great national debate which is now in progress—subject being "Resolved That the United States of America, as a Welfare State, Cannot Preserve the Fundamental Rights, Privileges, and Liberties Granted to Her Citizens by the Constitution."

Report of the House Majority Leader on the Legislative Accomplishments of the 1st Session of the 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere pleasure and great privilege to review the legislative performance of this 1st session of the 89th Congress. The accomplishments that this session has recorded in the annals of legislative history are numerous and far-reaching—many are monumental and even historic. Spanning the horizon of age-old issues that have plagued generations of concerned Americans, they speak to a victory in casting aside the bonds of poverty, ignorance, disease, and oppression that have persecuted men since the beginning of time. They speak also to the challenge of improving the quality of life for all of our people.

Labeling Congress as "the education Congress" or "the conservation Congress" is an irresistible temptation experienced by most students of the legislative process. Too often, however, it creates a false or misleading impression of the record of a Congress—emphasizing one area of national interest and congressional accomplishment and simultaneously subordinating all other spheres of legislative activity. The value of this manner of assessment is, therefore, extremely limited.

As leader of the majority in the House of Representatives, I can say with unrestrained pride that this Congress, with its overwhelming Democratic majority, has heard the clear mandate of the American people and responded with vision and foresight in realizing their concept of an American society that is a Great American Society.

In his efforts to build a Great American Society, President Johnson has fulfilled the promises made by the Democratic Party to the American people and has demonstrated his determination to "serve all the Nation, not one section or one sector, or one group, but all Americans. These are the United States—a united people with a united purpose." The creation of a Great Society is, therefore, the united purpose of a united people.

Henry Ward Beecher observed that "greatness lies not in being strong, but in the right use of strength."

No actual or potential source of strength within our society has been bypassed in these efforts "to enrich and elevate our national life, and to advance the quality of our American civilization." Who would deny that this is not the legitimate or right use of our strength?

Before I review some of the major legislative achievements of this 1st session of the 89th Congress, I wish to pay tribute to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives, who enjoys the deepest admiration of his colleagues for his wisdom and ability, his kind counsel, and his unceasing devotion to the duties of the speakership and to the welfare of his Nation. His leadership during this session has placed his name among those of the great Speakers of all time.

My praise and gratitude go out to my distinguished colleague from Louisiana, HALE BOGGS, for the manner in which he has efficiently and responsibly discharged his duties as majority whip and also to each Member—for each has persevered relentlessly in executing the legislative task and responsibilities entrusted to him by the voters of this country.

In contemplating a job well done, may we be reminded of the sage words of the late Adlai Stevenson who said:

> We shall lead in that degree to which we build a vital and healthy society. As we solve our own problems, economic, social, and above all, moral, we shall help other people solve theirs. By demonstrating the limitless powers of a free society which knows how to liberate the full creative energy of man, we shall fulfill the destiny that history has assigned to us.

NATIONAL SECURITY AND MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

This same great American and outstanding humanitarian whose courage, fortitude, and tireless dedication to the creation of a world order in which peace prevails, earned him the deepest respect of men everywhere, also once remarked that intolerant power respects power, not weakness.

In an age which finds hostile forces determined to destroy American security, and the security of all free and peaceful nations, military weakness and unpreparedness are luxuries we cannot afford. The costs of national security and military strength are high—high in terms of human suffering and loss of life—high in terms of equipment, hardware, and construction.

We are now engaged in the defense of South Vietnam—in a struggle in which the Communist forces of aggressive world conquest pose a genuine threat to the existence of South Vietnam as a free nation and to the security, peace, and national survival of the United States and our allies.

In response to President Johnson's request for additional funds to meet the rising costs of our commitment in southeast Asia, the House and the Senate, as one of its first legislative actions of the session, approved supplemental funds totaling $700 million for the 1965 fiscal year. It was anticipated that $275 million would be allocated for ammunition, $180 million for helicopters, other aircraft, and aircraft parts, $100 million for the construction of supply-storage facilities, and the construction of equipment, and $10 million for miscellaneous costs.

That these supplemental defense funds were speedily approved by almost unanimous rollcall votes in both Chambers of the Congress is a clear indication that a vast majority of the Members of Congress and a vast majority of the American people support our President and our fighting men in their firm stand against wanton disrespect for the rights of those who seek only the enjoyment of peace, freedom, and self-determination.

On August 21, President Johnson signed into law Public Law 89-132, a bill which seeks to effect a fair adjustment in the rates of compensation for members of our uniformed services. To military personnel assigned the awesome responsibilities of protecting the Nation's security, to military personnel from whom we demand a total commitment to duty and advanced skills to direct our increasingly complex and sophisticated weapons systems, and whom we expose to the hardships and hazards of combat and command, we must be willing to offer an annual income and a standard of living comparable in attractiveness to those enjoyed by their counterparts engaged in the various economic activities of civilian life. Effective September 1, 1965, Public Law 89-132 authorized an appropriation of $1,048,029,000 for pay raises for more than 505,000 retired personnel, 1 million reservists, and more than 2,500,000 active-duty members of the Armed Forces. Basic pay adjustments for active-duty members of the Armed Forces counted for $809,855,000 of the total authorization. Within this category, a 6-percent increase, totaling $136.6 million, was granted to officers with more than 2 years' service; $28.8 million was approved for a 22-percent hike in the salary of officers with less than 2 years' service. Four hundred ninety-three and one-tenth million dollars were allocated for enlistees with more than 2 years of service, as well as a 17.3-percent increase totaling $151.2 million for enlistees with less than 2 years of service.

Additional provisions include: an increase from $55 to $65 monthly in "hostile fire" pay for military personnel serving in regions which the President specifies as combat zones; free first-class postal services for servicemen stationed in combat zones; allowances by the Department of Defense of reenlistment stipends of up to four times the present stipend for personnel possessing "critical skills"; immediate increases in pay for retired personnel compensating for rises in the Consumer Price Index since 1963 and future increases should the Consumer Price Index rise 3 percent for any 3 consecutive months.

Public Law 89-149, a legislative recommendation of the Department of Defense, authorizes an increase in the monthly pay of enlisted personnel and officers who are engaged in dangerous assignments on the flight decks of aircraft carriers. Enlisted men will receive $55 a month; officers will receive $110 a month in hazardous duty compensation. Justification for incentive compensations for personnel performing hazardous duties rests on statistics which substantiate the high number of fatalities among aircraft carrier flight deck crews. Moreover, the rate of reenlistment for personnel of flight deck crews is considerably below the overall Navy reenlistment level. This authorization will serve to maintain highly qualified and experienced men on our flight decks.

The Congress has placed its stamp of approval on H.R. 3043—Public Law 89-26—which amends title 37 of the United States Code to authorize payment of special allowances and dislocation allowances for dependents of members of the uniformed services to meet the expenses incident to their ordered evacuation from an overseas danger zone. Under previous law, dependents could receive per diem payments and cost-of-living allowances prescribed for the oversea "safe haven" only when they were evacuated to another oversea area; no special allowances were granted when dependents were returned to the United States. This legislation, now Public Law 89-26, was proposed by the Department of Defense in an effort to alleviate the serious financial hardships which emergency and unexpected evacuations can produce in the way of high-cost, short-term living accommodations, the necessities of housekeeping, and clothing appropriate for the climate of the new post.

Public Law 89-151 amends titles 10 and 37 of the United States Code to authorize the survivors of a member of the Armed Forces who dies while on active duty to receive the monetary value of his unused and accrued leave at the time of his death. The need for this legislation arises from an inequity in the statutes. Presently, other Federal employees' beneficiaries receive the monetary value of accrued leave in the event of the employee's death. Similarly, most industries pay their employees basic pay for unused vacation time and unused leave upon termination or in the event of death. This is a benefit that has been long overdue widows and children of American service personnel who have made the supreme sacrifice.

Public Law 89-150, part of the Department of Defense legislative program, amends section 1485 of title 10 of the United States Code relating to the transportation of the remains of deceased dependents of members of the Armed Forces and authorizes the transportation of such dependents even if death occurs within the continental United States. Under previous law, authority for the transportation of the deceased at Government expense was limited to those situations in which the death occurred while the dependent was outside the United States. This legislation recognizes the financial hardships that can befall armed services personnel stationed in remote areas and the fact that, although stationed within the United States, the deceased may be farther from the place of final rest than some stations outside the United States.

Public Law 89–140 amends title 10 of the United States Code and authorizes transportation, at Government expense, of dependents accompanying members of the uniformed services at stations outside the United States who require medical attention, excluding elective surgery, unavailable locally or below standard in quality. This enactment attempts to provide equal benefits for all dependents and afford them access to first-class medical care regardless of their service location.

Public Law 89–152 amends the Universal Military Training Act of 1951 and makes it a crime knowingly to mutilate or destroy a draft card. Conviction may bring a maximum fine of $10,000 or a maximum prison sentence of 5 years. Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, L. MENDEL RIVERS, expressed the sentiments of many Members of the Congress when he said that this legislation is "the least we can do for our men in South Vietnam fighting to preserve freedom, while a vocal minority in this country thumb their noses at their own Government."

The House and the Senate have appropriated $46,887,163,000 for the 1966 fiscal year expenditures of the Department of Defense. This defense appropriation seeks to maintain and update our military forces so that they will be capable of effectively supporting our basic foreign policy objectives. In addition to authorizing the Commander in Chief to allocate whatever funds may be required to set into operation an airborne alert, this appropriation measure empowers the Secretary of Defense to increase the moneys in the Defense Department's emergency fund by no more than $150 million. This additional $150 million may be drawn from other DOD funds, with no single fund subject to more than a 7-percent reduction in its appropriations. Of the total $46,887,163,000, $1,700 million has been approved for the southeast Asia emergency fund, $14,658,391,000 for military personnel, $12,555,272,000 for operations and maintenance, $11,404 million for procurement, and $6,569,500,000 for research and development.

Appropriations of $1,090,789,000 have been earmarked for the construction of domestic and overseas military installations. An additional $665,846,000 was allocated for use in the building of some 8,500 family housing units for our military personnel and their families.

Chapter 31, title 38 of the United States Code has been amended to include an authorization for a 10-year extension, through June 30, 1975, of the period during which veterans seriously disabled in World War II or the Korean war are eligible for vocational rehabilitation and training. This legislation offers aid, similar to that authorized for blinded veterans by Public Law 87–591, to disabled veterans whose service-connected disability has become progressively worse and consequently prevented the pursuance of occupational activities for which they had been prepared previously. What is more, favorable action by the Congress on this legislation offers hope to veterans who have been hospitalized for long periods of time but who are now capable of participation in rehabilitation and training programs.

Public Law 89–137 authorizes an increase in the subsistence allowance granted to disabled veterans receiving vocational rehabilitation and training under chapter 31, title 38 of the United States Code. Children of permanently or totally disabled or deceased veterans receiving an education under the war orphans' educational assistance program, also will be eligible for increased cost-of-living allowances. In spite of the fact that the cost of living has risen approximately 30 percent since the setting of these allowances in April of 1948, no readjustments have been forthcoming. This legislation, therefore, is long overdue and seeks to provide a realistic revision in subsistence allotments.

One of the last actions of the session was the enactment of a bill providing an average 10-percent increase in the monthly compensation payments for veterans with service-connected disabilities and their dependents. Veterans who are 50 percent or more disabled receive the largest increase in monthly rates. The first-year cost of this increased compensation is estimated at $175,826,663. This bill also authorized 4,000 nursing-care beds for veterans.

SERVICEMEN'S INSURANCE

Legislation—Public Law 89–214—was enacted which authorizes the purchase of group life insurance for all active duty members of our armed services. With the deduction of premiums from monthly pay, each active duty member will be insured against death in the amount of $10,000. Individuals may waive all coverage or select insurance in the amount of $5,000. This life insurance protection will terminate 120 days after severance from the armed services or release from an active duty status. Protection will expire automatically 31 days after a member has been away without leave. Active duty personnel will enjoy full conversion rights to permanent, regular insurance protection without undergoing any medical examination.

Widows, widowers, children, or parents of armed services personnel who died in the course of hostile action, as a result of military or naval accidents, or the extra hazards imposed by military or naval operations will receive a death gratuity payment of $5,000. This death gratuity clause is retroactive and covers deaths occurring—in the circumstances stipulated above—on or after January 1, 1957, through the date when the terms of the group life insurance protection became operational.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATIONS

Functioning as an integral part of the U.S. Navy in time of war and as a protective force in time of peace, the U.S. Coast Guard is credited, during the past 10 years, with rescuing more than 21,000 persons in distress and saving property valued in excess of $15 billion. Public Law 89–13 incorporates appropriations of $114,250,000 authorized for the procurement of helicopters and other aircraft, ships, and the construction of shore and off-shore establishments. The constant and harsh abuse inflicted by the sea makes replacement and improvement of many Coast Guard facilities imperative, if this unheralded but faithful service is to continue to carry out its missions with dispatch and efficiency.

Public Law 89–21 authorizes for the 1966 fiscal year additional moneys totaling $6,260,000 to be used for the procurement of 17 small patrol cutters for the Coast Guard. This legislation allows for the replacement of those cutters ordered transferred to the U.S. Navy for activities off the coast of Vietnam by President Johnson.

SPACE

The Congress continued to support and to promote the highly successful program of the United States. Public Law 89–53, the NASA authorization legislation, and Public Law 89–128, the appropriations legislation provided $5,190,305,200 for the space program for fiscal year 1966. This includes facilities construction, administrative operations, and research and development, including solid rocket fuel and nuclear solid-powered systems for spaceships.

In the Department of Defense appropriations legislation—Public Law 89–213—we earmarked $150 million of the Air Force research and development funds for a manned orbiting laboratory to conduct defense-related research in space.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE, 1965

No one will refute that the mid-20th century is an age characterized by perpetual peril to the national self-determination of peace-seeking and freedom-loving nations everywhere.

And there are few among us who would assert that our national security is divorced from the national security of each peace-seeking and freedom-loving nation, for, in a very real sense, our future security depends on the evolution of a world society of strong and independent and free nations.

To hasten the coming of an age characterized not by perpetual peril but by perpetual peace, not by subversion and aggression but by national self-determination, not by a yoke of oppression but by a full measure of individual freedom, we have appropriated for the 1966 fiscal year, $3,218 million to finance economic and military assistance programs and $714,188,000 in other funds for allied programs.

In the Foreign Assistance Act of 1965 we renew our pledge to offer strength to those who would be free; hope for those who would otherwise despair; progress for those who would help themselves.

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

In a never-ceasing effort to avert a senseless nuclear holocaust and incalculable human destruction and suffering, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was established as a permanent agency in 1961. This Agency has devoted its efforts to the formulation and acceptance of international agreements and understandings halting the proliferation of nuclear weapons and preventing the escalation of limited conflicts into an all-out nuclear exchange.

The late President Kennedy stated our goal as the realization of a "world free from war and free from the dangers and burdens of armaments in which the use of force is subordinated to the rule of law and in which international adjustments to a changing world are achieved peacefully."

Under the terms of Public Law 89-27, $30 million have been appropriated for the fiscal year beginning in 1966 and extending through 1969. No investment that furthers the realization of this goal can be too great. Our continued support of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency underscores our commitment to world peace and hopefully will serve as a beacon to guide other nations of the world along a course that will bring international understanding and the advancement of mankind out of peaceful negotiations among men of good will everywhere.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER AMENDMENTS

President Johnson has said that the United Nations should serve simultaneously the large and the small, the rich and the poor—for the peace of one area is but part of world peace, and the prosperity of one country is but an element of the world's well-being.

The Senate has consented to the ratification of two important amendments to the United Nations Charter—amendments which will allow this association truly to involve more of the nations of the world in its work as a genuine force for peace.

The first of these amendments would increase the representation on the Security Council from the present 11 nations to 15 nations, with an accompanying increase from 7 to 9 in the number of member nations necessary to constitute a voting majority. The second charter amendment would enlarge the Economic and Social Council from 18 to 27 members.

When founded 20 years ago, the United Nations represented 51 countries; today this institution serves 114 nations, 61 of whom are from the African and Asian continents. Remaining steadfast in its dedication to the advancement of world peace and the realization of liberty and dignity for mankind, the responsibilities of this world organization for peace have expanded. Representation on governing councils and bodies has not, however, reflected overall changes. The continued strength and success of the United Nations will depend on how fully it meets the needs of all members, especially the newer nations—alive with the hopes and aspirations of national independence and national freedom.

Adoption of these two proposed amendments will strengthen the foundation by assuring a greater voice and more vital participation to the African and Asian nations. What is more, U.S. support of these two charter amendments will underwrite our faith in this world assembly of sovereign states which, in the words of the late President Kennedy, "is our last best hope in an age when the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments for peace."

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The Congress has authorized a 25-percent increase in the U.S. quota to the International Monetary Fund. Created at the Bretton Woods Conference of 1944, the IMF was established as a permanent institution working to build a world in which economic cooperation prevails among all countries. By providing the milieu in which participating nations may strive for viable solutions to international monetary problems, the Fund has written an impressive record since its operations commenced. Great strides have been made in mitigating specific problems relating to fair and stable currency and exchange convertibility policies, the fluctuations of inflation and deflation, and restrictive practices affecting international trade transactions. The International Monetary Fund must be recognized as an invaluable mechanism for the extension of international credit facilities. Credit facilities provided consist of currency quotas assessed to and paid by each member nation. Borrowing nations may draw out the foreign currency of which they have a temporary shortage and, within a specified period of time, transfer to the currency reservoir an equivalent amount of a specie acceptable in repayment terms to the Fund. The financial assistance which the IMF offers to its members is of a relatively short-term nature and is afforded to ease temporary currency pressures and temporary imbalances in their balance-of-payments situation. This financial respite permits the country in question to implement economic policy revisions designed to restore a balance-of-payments equilibrium.

Based on the recommendations of the Executive Directors of the International Monetary Fund, all of the 102 member nations have been asked to increase their quotas by 25 percent. These additional funds will bring the total IMF pool to the $21 billion level—an increase of $5 billion from its present $16 billion and will allow the IMF to continue to meet the credit demands, especially the convertibility of currencies, imposed by present and projected increases in the volume of international trade negotiations.

The general 25-percent increase authorized by the Congress and signed into law—Public Law 89-31—amounts to $1,035 million, bringing the total share of U.S. contributions to the IMF to $5,160 million.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

The Inter-American Development Bank now functions as the major cooperative banking instrumentality of the Alliance for Progress and is therefore an essential link in a vast partnership for progress—a partnership that unites the developed and the underdeveloped free nations of this hemisphere in a coordinated program of social, economic, and political development.

Convening in Panama City in the spring of 1964, the Board of Governors of the Inter-American Development Bank recommended major revisions affecting the Fund for Special Operations lending "window." The Fund for Special Operations—FSO—offers low-interest, long maturity loans for economic development programs; the Special Progress Trust Fund—SPTF—offers easy repayment loans for social development projects. Cognizant of the fact that Latin American social and economic objectives are interrelated and interdependent, the Board has strongly urged member approval of a consolidation of the Fund for Special Operations and the Social Progress Trust Fund with FSO expanding its financing to incorporate programs relating to higher education, housing, sewerage, water supplies, and similar endeavors heretofore the exclusive interests of the Social Progress Trust Fund. If the FSO is to experience no interruption in its record of solid accomplishments, its capital resources level must be raised. As of December 31, 1964, only $48 million in FSO funds remained available and the exhaustion of these uncommitted funds appears inevitable in the near future. The Board recommended a total increase of FSO funds amounting to $900 million for the 1965-67 calendar years. The United States was asked to contribute $250 million annually; the Latin American nations were asked to contribute a total of $150 million over this time period. If this proposal is approved, American financing of SPTF operations will automatically terminate. Passage of Public Law 89-6 authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, in his capacity as U.S. Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank, to vote in support of the resolution calling for the additional assessment of $900 million for the Fund for Special Operations.

Authorization of a $750 million U.S. contribution to the proposed overall increase also received congressional approval. American representatives to the Bank were instructed to vote against approval of any FSO loans to nations who, after January 1, 1962, have expropriated U.S. properties without making adequate compensation arrangements. Quick enactment of this authorization measure and acceptance of the Board's recommended structural revisions mark an important step in strengthening the objectives of the Alliance for Progress and reflect our sincere determination to support our commitments to bettering the lives of our Latin American neighbors.

INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT

The House and the Senate passed, by overwhelming rollcall votes, an Administration-sponsored measure which would allow the United States fully to assume its responsibilities and obligations as set forth in the International Coffee Agreement of 1962.

Representatives of more than 50 nations vitally interested in coffee import-export transactions signed the agreement on September 28, 1962. Subsequently, the Senate gave its advice and consent to the ratification of the International Coffee Agreement; it became operative October 1, 1963. U.S. compliance with the terms of this agreement was contingent upon the successful enactment of enabling legislation. In the last session of the Congress, the House set aside a conference report which would have authorized active participation by the United States. The 88th Congress adjourned before further consideration could be given to this matter.

The International Coffee Agreement must be placed in its proper perspective. It must be viewed as a concrete measure designed to implement one of the major goals of American foreign policy; it must be viewed as a constructive effort to further the development of social and economic progress in the developing nations of the world.

The need to eliminate the constant threat of sharp price fluctuations on the world coffee market is apparent if we consider carefully one of the major premises set forth by the Honorable George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, in his testimony before the Senate Finance Committee in January of this year. Secretary Ball said, and I quote:

> Coffee is the single most important agricultural commodity in the trade of most of the developing countries, particularly in Latin America. Coffee exports account for more than 50 percent of all exports in 6 Latin American countries and an average of 25 percent in all the 14 Latin American exporting nations. Seven new African countries receive from 30 to 50 percent of all foreign exchange earnings from coffee.
>
> About 20 million persons in the world depend on coffee for their livelihood; more than 60 percent of them are in Latin America.
>
> In a very real sense, therefore, coffee is the lifeblood of the developing nations of the world.

Clearly, coffee is a primary commodity which plays and will continue to play a dominant role in the lives of millions of persons in whose future well-being we have a vital interest. Instability of worldwide coffee prices poses a serious obstacle to the evolution of social and economic betterment within each and every one of the developing nations of the world.

A bipartisan appreciation of this truism has been often expressed. Many of my Democratic colleagues in the House and fellow Democrats in the Senate wholeheartedly subscribe to the sentiments voiced by the late President Kennedy in March of 1961. In outlining his administration's program for Latin American development, popularly referred to as the Alliance for Progress, the late President said, and I quote:

> The United States is ready to cooperate in serious, case-by-case examinations of commodity market problems. Frequently violent changes in commodity prices seriously injure the economies of many Latin nations—draining their resources and stultifying their growth. Together we must find practical methods of bringing an end to this pattern.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, expressed similar thoughts when he commented:

> A sharp decline in the price of one commodity can wipe out in one afternoon our combined efforts to raise standards of living in Latin America via public and private investments.

What are the provisions of the enabling legislation passed by the Congress and now included in Public Law 89-23?

First, the President is authorized to place a limitation on the amount of coffee imported into the United States from nations who are not active participants in the International Coffee Agreement. Moreover, the Chief Executive is authorized to place a ban on the importation of coffee shipments not accompanied by proper certificates of origin or of reexport. Exports of this commodity from the United States must also be certified as to their country of origin.

Second, the President is directed to maintain a dossier of pertinent statistics and facts relating to coffee prices, consumption, distribution, and import-export patterns. Annually he is to forward to the Congress a report detailing world coffee prices together with an evaluation of the status of American consumers vis-a-vis policies implemented by the International Coffee Council.

Third, the President must judge whether or not the workings of the International Coffee Agreement will affect any unwarranted increase in the cost of coffee to U.S. users. The terms of the act will go into effect only if, in his judgment, no unwarranted increase in coffee prices to be paid by the Nation's homemakers is imminent. The continued participation of the United States in the Coffee Agreement is extended through October 1, 1968, or until the Congress adopts a concurrent resolution expressing its opinion that unwarranted increases in coffee prices make future U.S. participation unfeasible.

Fourth and finally, we have authorized an appropriation of $150,000, or 20 percent of the total contributions per fiscal year as our share in the overall costs of this agreement's operations.

Surely the 89th Congress, in passing legislation bolstering the respective positions of the International Monetary Fund and the Inter-American Development Bank and in approving enabling legislation paving the way for American participation in the International Coffee Agreement, has shown to our friends and our enemies alike that the United States continues to act in good faith in her efforts to build a hemisphere—and a world—where all men can hope for the same high standard of living, and all can live out their lives in dignity and in freedom.

PEACE CORPS APPROPRIATIONS

Nearly 14,000 trainees and volunteers have asked not what their country could do for them but rather what they could do for their country and for mankind. These 14,000 men and women, from all walks of American life, are now a part of the Peace Corps.

Engaged in the broad fields of public health, education, agriculture, and community development, Peace Corps personnel is presently serving in 46 countries. The success of the original concept of deploying highly trained, first-quality Americans to swell the trained manpower resources of foreign nations is evidenced by the continuing and increasing demands for additional volunteers at a rate which exceeds the number available.

In partial recognition of the fine work performed daily by this dedicated group of Americans, the Congress has given final approval to several amendments to the Peace Corps Act of 1961—Public Law 87-293. These amendments will expand a variety of measures relating to the health needs of our volunteers and will effect a unification of Washington and overseas personnel operations under the provisions of the Foreign Service Act. Appropriations of $115 million have been authorized for the 1966 fiscal year expenditures of the Corps. We recognize fully that in assisting in the economic and social development of others in all corners of the globe, we are furthering our own national interests by promoting good will and understanding between the United States and host countries while advancing a higher standard of living for our free world allies.

UNITED STATES-CANADIAN RELATIONS

Our good neighbors to the north, Canada, must also know that we seek to maintain and strengthen the good will and understanding that have allowed our two great nations to live side by side in peace and cooperate one with the other in the interests of mutual prosperity. The Congress and the Johnson administration have examined carefully several potentially troublesome issues—issues which, if not amicably and equitably resolved might erupt into tensions disruptive to harmonious United States-Canadian relations. One of these problem areas involved tariffs levied on automobiles and auto parts shipments. In January of this year, Prime Minister Pearson of Canada and President Johnson signed the United States-Canada Automotive Parts Agreement. The major objective of this agreement was the removal of artificial barriers whose imposition has impeded the expansion of the American and Canadian automotive trade and prevented the full integration of American and Canadian auto markets and industries into a single North American automotive industry and market.

While producing essentially the same vehicles as their U.S. counterparts, Canadian manufacturers have not yet achieved economies of scale. As a consequence, lower volume of output, accompanying higher per unit costs, and a smaller consumer demand have brought to Canada a smaller share of the overall North American automobile market. A Commonwealth content stipulation of 60 percent, Canadian customs duties of 17.5 percent on incoming motor vehicles and up to 25 percent on auto parts have served to "protect" Canadian manufacturers but have restricted the expansion and growth of the industry. In a concerted effort to increase production and export levels, the Canadian Government introduced the concept of "import duty rebates," in November of 1962.

To Canadian manufacturers substantially increasing their auto export quota, an import duty rebate was promised on all automotive parts. Convinced that they were now in a disadvantageous competitive position, American parts manufacturers responded by demanding that the Federal Government, under section 303 of our Tariff Act, impose similar duties on incoming Canadian parts shipments.

Interested parties on both sides of the border were aware of the potentially devastating impact that such retaliatory actions could have on the fine trade relations existing between the two countries as well as on the continued friendly relations between the United States and Canada. Their negotiation efforts bore fruit in the United States-Canada Automotive Products Agreement. Canada has already implemented this agreement. Full workability required the enactment of enabling legislation by the Congress. Public Law 89-283 authorizes the President to eliminate the American tariff of 6.5 percent on Canadian autos and the 8.5 percent tariff on original parts destined for use in the production of new vehicles. This agreement is expected to permit a more economical and efficient use of production facilities, price reduction, rising sales, and a more complete integration of American and Canadian automobile interests into one North American industry.

Earlier this session the Senate ratified the Gut Dam Claims Agreement establishing a three-man international tribunal with the authority to settle property damage claims brought by American citizens against the Canadian Government. Composed of one American member, one Canadian member, and a mutually agreed upon chairman, this tribunal will seek equitable settlements for damages caused by rising waters on Lake Ontario which the injured parties allege resulted from the construction, operation, and maintenance by Canada of the Gut Dam.

EXPORT CONTROL ACT

The power of the President to place needed controls on American exports has been extended through June 30, 1969—Public Law 89-63. By extending and amending the Export Control Act of 1949, the Congress has reinforced the authority of the President of the United States to guide American export transactions along paths paralleling defined domestic economic goals, foreign policy objectives, and national security interests. The terms of the act were written with the purpose of offering national decisionmakers a comprehensive yet flexible set of alternatives to effect a safeguard against potential threats to our national welfare. Policymakers have concluded that the best interests of our national security demand the imposition of export controls on specified categories of equipment, supplies, raw and processed materials, and certain technological information to unfriendly nations.

Our NATO allies have joined us in a multilateral effort to exclude sensitive supplies and information from the Communist nations of Eastern Europe and of Asia; the United States has instituted a unilateral export ban on similar cargoes destined for Cuba, North Vietnam, North Korea, and Communist China. We do not wish to further the efforts of those who would employ their full economic and military might to bring to pass our ultimate destruction.

In a concerted endeavor to underscore the importance of this act and in a deliberate effort to foster strict adherance to the terms of this act, the Commerce Department has been authorized to impose yet another penalty on violators. This Department is now empowered to punish infractions by the assessment of fines of $1,000 for each offense. As a means of collecting the equivalent of this assessment, export licenses may be revoked for a 1-year period.

We also stated, in Public Law 89-63, the opposition to the United States to any boycott or restrictive trade practices of any country against any other country with which we are friendly.

GOLD RESERVE REQUIREMENTS

In a special message sent to the Congress in February, President Johnson proclaimed:

> The state of the dollar in the world today is strong—far stronger than 3 or 4 years ago. Clearly, those who fear for the dollar are needlessly afraid. Those who hope for its weakness, hope in vain.

While the President noted that the prospects for the continued stability and prosperity of our economy are indeed favorable, he took cognizance of the fact that certain aspects of our monetary policies were in need of revision in light of present and projected financial trends. Mr. Johnson reiterated his concern over our chronic balance-of-payments deficit and the possible ramifications it may have in relation to the international financial posture of the United States.

Although considerable progress has been made in reducing this deficit, American dollar expenditures abroad still exceeded American dollar earnings from foreigners by more than $3 billion in 1964. The persistent balance-of-payments deficit, together with somewhat outdated domestic monetary policies, could combine to introduce impediments to the maintenance of the gold value of the dollar at the current exchange rate of $35 an ounce. Should the nations of the world come to doubt the future of the free convertibility of the American dollar to gold at the current ratio, the preeminent economic position of this country could be endangered.

A fundamental relationship exists between the balance-of-payments accounts concept and the status of the Nation's gold reserves. Quite simply stated, any transaction which results in a flow of American dollars out of the country contributes to a balance-of-payments deficit; any transaction which results in a return of American dollars to the country, contributes to a balance-of-payments surplus.

Beginning with our efforts to aid those nations ravaged in the holocaust of World War II, a steady stream of American dollars has gone abroad. With each passing year, we have realized an unfavorable balance of payments because we have spent more money overseas than the rest of the world has spent or could spend in the United States.

Since the stability of the U.S. dollar is recognized by all free world governments, it is not difficult to understand why many international business transactions are settled by an exchange of American dollars. Eventually, foreign businessmen, investment brokers, and bankers may accumulate more dollars than they need or desire to retain for working balances or for immediate investment purposes. Should a foreign recipient feel that he possesses an excess of dollars, he may surrender them to a central bank in his country. The central bank, in turn, may elect to choose either of several alternatives: it may retain the dollars as part of its reserve, or it may exchange its dollars for gold. The Treasury of the United States has pledged that it will convert dollars into gold at an exchange rate of $35 to the ounce.

Related to this discussion are the terms of the Federal Reserve Act as amended in 1945. This act required Federal Reserve banks to maintain gold certificate reserves equivalent in value to at least 25 percent of the notes or currency in circulation and to hold gold certificate reserves equivalent in value to at least 25 percent of the value of deposits made by domestic commercial banks.

Former Secretary of the Treasury, C. Douglas Dillon, pinpointed the serious problem which had developed when he made the following statement before the Senate Committee on Finance:

> At the end of 1964, the volume of Federal Reserve notes in circulation—which make up over 95 percent of our basic currency—totaled $35.3 billion. At the same time, Federal Reserve deposit liabilities amounted to $19.5 billion. Together, these Federal Reserve liabilities required a gold certificate reserve of $13.7 billion, absorbing for that purpose all but $1.4 billion of the gold certificates issued to the Federal Reserve against the Treasury gold stock. And since January 1 the Treasury gold stock has declined by $200 million as a result of sales to foreigners, with further losses to be expected.

The twin demands of a respect for international pledges and an adherence to legal reserve requirements clearly could not be satisfied within the limits of our relatively inflexible $1.4 billion free gold supply. To bolster world confidence in the future of the American dollar and to foster continued economic growth at home, Public Law 89-3 removed the legal requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain gold certificate reserves equivalent to at least 25 percent of commercial bank deposits and thereby injected an additional $5 billion into our available gold supply.

TOURIST EXEMPTIONS

A perennial factor contributing to our balance-of-payments deficit is the dollar outflow resulting from expenditures made abroad by American tourists. In 1964 alone, foreign travel by American tourists saw an estimated $2.8 billion outflow while the dollar inflow from foreign travelers in the United States totaled only $1.2 billion. Simple arithmetic tells us that the 1964 balance-of-payments deficit was increased by $1.6 billion on account of American overseas travel. A high percentage of American overseas spending takes the form of the purchase of foreign goods and products. On June 30, the President signed into law a bill which makes permanent the temporary $100 limit on the value of duty-free purchases which returning American travelers may bring into the country. Had this legislation, Public Law 89-62, not been signed into law by June 30, the temporary $100 ceiling would have automatically returned to the $500 permanent limit; our program to reduce our balance-of-payments deficit would have received a serious setback. Calculations of exemptions will now be based on the retail value of the goods instead of the wholesale value as will the $10 exemption on mail gifts. The limit on duty-free alcoholic beverages brought into the United States from other than U.S. possessions will be reduced from the 1-gallon maximum to a 1-quart maximum.

INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX

Executive-congressional study has bypassed no phase or aspect of our economic policy that has a direct relationship to our balance-of-payments posture. President Johnson requested congressional approval of an extension of the interest equalization tax on bank loans. An interest equalization tax is a levy imposed on foreign securities, including foreign stock and debt obligations obtained by Americans from foreigners. Increases in costs to American purchasers will be reflected in higher costs to foreign borrowers. In short, the purpose of an interest equalization levy is to make the costs of acquiring capital in the United States comparable to those prevailing on foreign capital markets. Traditionally, the United States has offered lower interest rates. By alining U.S. and foreign capital interest rates, foreign demands for our capital are expected to decline and thereby effect a reduction in the flow of American dollars out of the country.

Since its initial application in July of 1963, the interest equalization tax has contributed to a substantial curtailment of the dollar outflow. Further savings can be anticipated as a result of the extension and expansion of the interest equalization measure. Public Law 89-243 extends this tax through July 31, 1967, and broadens its coverage to include the purchase of foreign bonds maturing in 1 to 3 years. Prior to this action, only foreign bonds with a maturity period of more than 3 years were assessed.

ANTITRUST EXEMPTIONS

We know that our persistent balance-of-payments deficit will not be brought under satisfactory control until we are able to engage the cooperation of business investors in limiting loans and investments abroad. Full cooperation on the part of our lending institutions requires assurance that the imposition of credit restraints will not result in violation of antitrust laws. Public Law 89-175 assures the investment community that participation in voluntary credit curtailment plans requested and approved by the Chief Executive will exclude involvement in antitrust violation suits.

Revisions in our gold reserve requirements, in the limits of duty-free foreign purchases allowed to returning American tourists, the renewal and expansion of the interest equalization tax legislation, plus antitrust exemptions to American business investors represent sound efforts to alleviate undue pressures on the stability of the dollar and simultaneously effect a reduction in the gap between American expenditures and earnings abroad.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTIONS

All phases of our economic policy must be constantly and critically reviewed; every aspect of our economic program must be justifiable in terms of the advancement of our national economic goals.

The decade of the 1960's poses the challenges of "useful employment opportunities, including self-employment for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

With the explicit purpose of furthering these aims and aspirations, a major tax cut was introduced in 1964. The consequences of this tax reduction have been favorable; unemployment has steadily decreased, while income, production, and employment levels have increased. Notwithstanding the fact that we are experiencing our fifth consecutive year of unequaled economic achievement, our general prosperity is not shared by all; the doors to self-employment opportunities and satisfying, gainful work are not yet open to all. What is more, the productive capacity of our economic structure falls short of its potential. We cannot be content; we cannot boast of our accomplishments until the fruits of our prosperity and the bounty of our unparalleled economic heights are fully and equally distributed among all Americans.

To stimulate investment and to encourage continued economic growth while maintaining stability, the Federal excise tax schedule has been revamped through Public Law 89-44. This tax revision will phase out most Federal excise taxes over a 5-year period, beginning June 22, 1965, and ending January 1, 1969. Certain general assessments will remain in effect after the latter date and will include the following: a 1 percent manufacturers' excise tax on passenger automobiles, Federal taxes on tobacco and alcohol, and regulatory levies on narcotics, gambling, and firearms. Users' charges will be adjusted in an effort to transfer the cost burden from the generality of taxpayers to the beneficiaries and users of a wide range of special services and facilities provided by our highway, aviation, and inland waterway programs.

Since the excise tax reduction will make its impact felt in households and businesses across the Nation, I wish to outline some of the highlights of the scheduled reduction-repeal schedule.

First-phase changes, effective June 22, 1965, include:

Elimination of retail excise taxes on furs, jewelry, toilet articles, luggage, and handbags;

Reduction of the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger automobiles from the current 10 percent to 7 percent, retroactive on all consumer purchases of autos as of May 15, 1965;

Repeal of manufacturers' excise taxes on business machines, radios, television sets, phonographic equipment, fountain pens, ball point pens, mechanical pencils, matches, lighters, playing cards, and sporting goods, with the exception of fishing equipment;

First-phase changes, effective July 1, 1965, include repeal of excise levies on safe deposit boxes, coin-operated amusement devices, bowling alleys, billiard tables, and membership fees in clubs organized after July 1, 1965.

An estimated $1.8 billion reduction will result from these first-phase changes.

Second-phase changes, effective January 1, 1966, include:

Reduction of the tax on local and long distance telephone service and teletypewriter service from the current 10 percent to 3 percent;

Repeal of excise tax on private communications telephone service including such service when connected with general telephone networks;

Elimination of excise tax on admissions to racing events, athletic events, concerts, movies, theater performances, cabarets, and club dues, effective December 31, 1965, to accommodate New Year's Eve users;

Removal of documentary stamp taxes on issuance and transfer of stocks, bonds, and deeds of conveyance;

Repeal of manufacturers' tax on lubricating oil, with the exception of that used in highway vehicles;

Repeal of manufactures' tax on electric light bulbs, and automobile accessories and parts, with the exception of those accessories and parts used chiefly in trucks;

Repeal of the excise tax on manufactured tobacco;

Repeal of the excise tax on telegraph and wire services.

An estimated $1.6 billion reduction will result from these second-phase changes.

Third through fifth-phase changes, spanning the period beginning January 1, 1967, and ending January 1, 1969, include:

Reduction of the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger automobiles to 4 percent effective January 1, 1967, 2 percent effective January 1, 1968, and to a permanent 1-percent level effective January 1, 1969;

Reduction of the tax on local and long-distance telephone service and teletypewriter service to 2 percent effective January 1, 1967, to 1 percent effective January 1, 1968, and complete elimination of all tax on this type of service effective January 1, 1969;

Elimination of real estate conveyance taxes effective January 1, 1968.

An estimated $1.3 billion reduction will result from the third through fifth phase changes in the excise tax schedule.

Other major provisions of this legislation resulted in the following actions:

Seventy million dollars in highway user charges were transferred from the general revenues to the highway trust fund.

Levies placed on cigarettes, distilled spirits, wines, and beer at the time of the Korean war effort have been made permanent. These Korean regulatory rates were subject to automatic annual reevaluations; the time and cost factors involved in the yearly extension of these revenues all but canceled out the returns achieved.

The 5-percent excise tax on air travel was made permanent. Under current law, this levy was subject to automatic annual review. It has been fixed at the 5-percent level in line with the Presidential objective of guaranteeing that users of the airways bear their fair share of airway costs.

The $14 billion income tax cut of 1964 swelled the volume of consumer purchases by $28 billion; business investments, in turn, increased by approximately $6½ billion. Greater consumer purchases and increased business investments resulted in expanded production schedules and the subsequent creation of 2 million new employment opportunities.

We are confident that the authorization of this estimated $4.7 billion excise tax reduction will serve as an additional stimulus for greater consumer purchasing and greater business development and expansion. We are equally confident that the excise tax revision represents a worthwhile investment whose returns will be manifold in the advancement of our goal of full employment within the framework of a progressive, dynamic, and healthy economy.

COINAGE ACT OF 1965

The growing shortage in the world's silver supplies has had its impact on the American currency system. The Treasury Staff Silver and Coinage Study revealed that, in the period from 1960 through 1964, the nations of the free world annually consumed an average of 410 million ounces of silver while they annually produced an average of 210 million ounces. In his message to the Congress requesting legislation authorizing measures which would avert any impending nationwide silver crisis, President Johnson announced that we expect to use an estimated 10,000 tons of this precious metal to meet our 1965 coinage needs. This demand alone will exceed this year's free world production of new silver.

Silver is a vital commodity in many industrial, research, and national defense endeavors. In the manufacture of jewelry, silverware, mirrors, and photographic supplies; in the practice of medicine and dentistry, and in the construction and operation of nuclear submarine batteries, supersonic jets, and solid fuel rockets, silver plays an increasingly important role. The dictates of the law of supply and demand left us only one feasible solution and workable course of action; new coinage policies had to be adopted to effect a reduction in the silver content of our coins, thereby freeing greater quantities of the metal for industrial and research usage.

Accordingly, under the Coinage Act of 1965, dimes and quarters with no silver content will be minted and distributed. The new 10-cent and 25-cent pieces will be composed of a cupronickel-clad alloy. Resembling our familiar dimes and quarters in design and diameter, the new coins will be composite coins containing 75 percent copper and 25 percent nickel bonded to a pure copper core. Presently these denominations contain a 90-percent silver content. Half dollars will be composite coins as well; makeup of the new 50-cent pieces will find the outer layers of high-silver content alloy—80 percent silver to 20 percent copper—bonded to an inner core of low-silver content alloy—21 percent silver to 79 percent copper. As with the dimes and quarters, the outward appearance of these new disks will remain essentially unchanged. The content difference, however, will bring about a reduction from 90 to 40 percent in the silver content.

In an effort to keep national decisionmakers abreast of relevant technological developments and estimates of national and international metal supplies, the Coinage Act of 1965 creates a Joint Commission on Coinage. This Commission will review currency problems as they arise and offer recommendations as to policy revisions which will aid in bridging the gap between silver supplies and demands.

The obsolescence of precious silver as a basis for our Nation's currency system is now common knowledge. A 173-year-old American tradition must yield to contemporary considerations; a pang of nostalgia touches the hearts of millions of patriotic Americans. The prestige of the American silver piece is recognized around the world. We must not blind ourselves to the fact that the prestige of the American silver coin comes from the purchasing power that it represents and not from the percentage of precious metals which it contains. When the new coins join those already in circulation, they too will enjoy the dignity, respect, and prestige of our 173-year-old coinage heritage because their full and equal purchasing power will be as strong as ever.

HEALTH CARE AND FACILITIES

MEDICAL CARE-SOCIAL SECURITY

The gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, described the enactment of the medical care-social security bill as "one of the most significant and far-reaching measures which has been before this or any recent Congress." Successful passage of the so-called medicare legislation drew to a close a decade of frustrated efforts to establish a workable program of insurance protection against the unpredictable and often catastrophic costs of hospital care and related medical services for the elderly.

Former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony J. Celebrezze, pleaded the cause for our senior citizens in the following words:

> It is one of the unfortunate facts of life that in old age, when people are living on substantially reduced incomes, health costs are much higher than in younger years. And since, as a general rule, old people have relatively little in the way of resources that can be readily converted into cash and little or no possibility of gaining new income or assets, many find that their high health costs are too much for them. The years of security and independence that they had hoped for and planned for are spent in a losing battle against dependence.
>
> Despite commendable efforts by the private insurance industry, the voluntary health insurance effort has not proved adaptable to the almost universal need of the aged for adequate health insurance; few of the aged can afford to pay the premiums which older people must be charged for broad health insurance protection.

Under the terms of the expanded social security structure, all persons 65 years of age or older, with minor exceptions, will benefit from the basic health insurance provisions of Public Law 89–97. Excluded from this coverage are Federal employees covered by the Federal health benefits program, aliens unlawfully admitted to the United States, and aliens with residence of less than 5 consecutive years in this country. Also ineligible for the expanded benefits are persons judged guilty of subversive crimes against the Government.

Financed in its entirety by increased social security assessments, the basic health insurance section of the medicare program will assume the costs of all ordinary, inpatient hospital services for a maximum of 90 days per single illness. The patient will pay the first $40 of costs and, after 60 days of hospitalization, will pay an additional $10 daily. Psychiatric hospitalization is covered up to a lifetime maximum of 190 days per individual, with no single hospital stay amounting to more than 60 days.

After any illness period involving a minimum of 3 inpatient hospital days, a person is entitled to a maximum of 100 days of nursing home care. The cost to the patient is $5 daily, following the first 20 days in an extended-care facility.

Outpatient diagnostic service expenses are also included in the provisions of the medicare legislation which this Congress has passed. Patients will contribute the initial $20 toward meeting charges incurred and 20 percent of any remaining expenses.

Posthospital home-care visits made by other than a physician are fully included. Within any single period of illness, the patient may avail himself to up to 100 home-care visits by nurses or therapists.

The basic health insurance section of Public Law 89–97 excludes from payment the expenses incurred for the services of physicians, psychiatrists, anesthesiologists, pathologists, and radiologists.

The second major section of the medical care-social security legislation offers supplementary protection against the mounting costs of health protection. Unlike the basic health insurance plan, the supplementary health insurance coverage is voluntary. What this means is that persons 65 years of age or older may elect to pay $3 monthly premiums; the Federal Government, in turn, will match this premium payment. Eighty percent of the cost to the patient is paid after an initial annual $50 payment. No limitation is imposed on the payments made for a variety of services provided by psychiatrists, dental surgeons—subject to certain stipulations—anesthesiologists, pathologists, radiologists, surgeons, and physicians. What is more, these services may be rendered to the patient whether in or out of a medical institution. An additional 100 home-nursing visits, over and above the number provided under the basic health insurance coverage, are allowed. Among other benefits accruing from election of the voluntary supplementary health insurance are the following: rental of some types of medical equipment, the cost of X-rays, electrocardiograms, laboratory tests, stipulated ambulance service costs, splints, iron lungs, artificial limbs and eyes, and some surgical dressings.

Thus far, we have discussed some of the general provisions of the two major medical insurance proposals incorporated in the liberalized social security program. These, however, do not exhaust the improvements that have been made. The significance and the scope of this legislation become apparent if we look at several additional provisos.

Retroactive to January 1, 1965, approximately 20 million retired or disabled workers will receive an increase of 7 percent in their monthly social security cash benefits. This 7-percent increase was granted to afford some relief from the financial burdens of an increasing cost of living. We have also given effective recognition to the needs of young people between the ages of 18 and 22 who are in the process of completing their formal education and who are, consequently, not completely self-supporting. Payment of insurance benefits for eligible young people has been extended beyond the 18th year through the 22d year providing that the individual is attending school as a full-time student.

Disability insurance payments will be forthcoming to workers whose incapacitation has been or may be for a consecutive 12-month period. Prior to this enactment, disability insurance payments were allotted to workers whose recovery was doubtful or who could not anticipate full recovery within the near future. The eligibility waiting period for disabled workers has been shortened from the current 7 months to 6 months.

Limited cash benefits will now be available to aged persons who have worked between three and five employment quarters; current law set the minimum at six quarters.

Under this new authorization, eligible workers or widows of eligible workers who have reached their 72d year would be entitled to a monthly allowance of $35; eligible wives would receive a monthly cash allowance of $17.50.

Widows of eligible workers may now draw upon their benefits earlier. Election of this early payment option will necessarily result in a reduction of the benefits allowed. In other words, an eligible widow aged 60 may now draw approximately 17.5 percent of the benefits her husband would have received at age 65 if living. Should an eligible widow elect to draw benefits upon reaching age 62, she would then receive 82.5 percent of the benefits her spouse would have received, if living, at age 65. The retirement provisions of the present law have been made more flexible. We substituted a $1,200 to $2,400 income range for the existing $1,200 to $1,700 range. We increased the exemptions on annual earnings of an individual without his sacrificing all or part of his social security benefits. The first $1,500 of annual earnings are completely clear of social security benefit reductions. For each $2 that an individual earns between $1,500 and $2,700, there is a $1 reduction in benefits; above the $2,700 figure, there is a $1 reduction in benefits for each $1 earned.

ADDITIONAL HEALTH LEGISLATION

Legislative action relating to the health needs of our people did not stop with the enactment of the medicare program. Many very successful health programs have been extended and expanded; many very promising measures have been initiated—measures which are certain to aid us in winning our battle against disease and disability.

Let me briefly outline some of the major provisions of the bills which we approved and which were signed into law by President Johnson.

Expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act of Public Law 87–868 were renewed and authorized continued Federal support of a program of mass vaccination protection against a number of diseases which constitute major public health hazards. Through June 30, 1968, local communities and States will be the recipients of grants from the Federal Government for the purchase of vaccine providing immunization against tetanus, poliomyelitis, whooping cough, diphtheria, and measles. Prior to these revisions, in the Public Health Service Act, vaccination protection against measles was not included. Immunization benefits were limited to children under 5 years of age; protection will now be available to all preschool children.

Public Law 87–692, providing health services for our domestic migratory workers, has been extended through June 30, 1968. Twenty-four million dollars have been authorized for Federal grants to public and private nonprofit institutions to assist in meeting the costs of operating migratory worker family health centers at which seasonal farmworkers and their families may obtain a broad range of health services including the treatment of illness, injury, and accident, as well as prenatal and postnatal care.

Approval was given to a 1-year extension, through June 30, 1966, of those provisions of Public Law 87–395, or the Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961, which authorizes Federal public health grants to public, private nonprofit agencies, local communities, and the States for the completion of studies relating to the best ways of improving outside the hospital care methods for the chronically ill and the aged patient. Those provisions of the Community Health Services and Facilities Act relating to grants to the States for application to general, dental, mental, and radiological health services as well as health services for the chronically ill and the aged will continue in effect through June 30, 1967.

To keep pace with the exciting and lifesaving discoveries being made by our medical research teams, we must provide additional, highly specialized health research facilities. To assure the continued progress of our national research effort, the Public Health Service Act was extended and expanded to include $280 million in authorized funds for the construction of the necessary research accommodations for the fiscal 1966 through 1969 3-year period.

Public Law 88–164, or the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963, was broadened to provide for a 7-year program of grants to meet the original costs of manning community mental health centers with well-trained professional and technical staffs. To be awarded by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to public or nonprofit private institutions and agencies, these grants will absorb varying percentages of staffing expenses incurred over a 51-month period, ranging from 75 percent of professional and technical personnel costs for the first 15 months of operation to 30 percent of such costs during the last 12 months. During the fiscal 1966–69 period, $73.5 million will be available for these initial or original grant awards.

The Congress enacted Public Law 89–239, which authorizes a 3-year, $340 million program of grants to establish an estimated 25 regional medical programs in the fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and related diseases. These programs contemplate cooperative research by hospitals, medical schools, and physicians clinics.

Public Law 89–290 authorizes $775 million for a 3-year extension of the existing matching grant program for the construction of teaching facilities for physicians, dentists, professional health personnel, optometrists, pharmacists, and podiatrists. This legislation also extends for 3 years the existing student loan program in specified health fields.

Also, it established new 4-year programs of grants to improve teaching programs and of scholarships for needy students in specified health professions.

Public Law 89–291 authorized $105 million in grants to improve medical library services and facilities over a 5-year period.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT OF 1965

It has been said that old age is more to be feared than death. In an era alive with hopes for a Great Society promising a better quality of life for all, the lives of many of our senior citizens offer little more than deprivation, discomfort, and despair.

The Bureau of the Census estimates that our population presently includes more than 13 million persons past 65. Population projections tell us that this number will increase to 25 million within the next 20 years.

A young nation, proud of its youth, its zeal, and its pioneer heritage cannot turn its back on those millions who share this heritage and whose contributions to our Nation's greatness can never be fairly assessed or fully appreciated.

Approximately one-half of our citizens over 65 live in inferior and often substandard housing facilities. Their need for adequate diets, clothing, varied recreational facilities, extended educational opportunities, and retraining programs equipping them to be volunteer or wage earning workers in our communities are suggestive of the multi-faceted tasks lying before us.

The Johnson administration and the Members of this Congress have recognized their responsibility to our senior citizens and have accepted the challenges which a meaningful later life for the aged pose. Legislation has been signed into law which creates within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Administration on Aging. This new Administration on Aging will coordinate action among Federal, State, and local governments, administer grants, and undertake extensive research studies to develop programs designed to meet the problems of the aging and by so doing repay them in part for their contributions to a society which, in the words of the historian Toynbee, will be rated "by the respect and care given its elderly citizens."

ELEMENTARY-SECONDARY EDUCATION

In my report outlining the major accomplishments of the 88th Congress, I stated that the legislative achievements of that Congress in the field of education were unequivocal and exceptional. The annals of legislative history may record the 88th Congress as the "Education Congress." During its lifetime, that Congress passed the Higher Education Facilities Act authorizing Federal loans and grants to our public and private colleges for the improvement and construction of classroom, laboratory, and library facilities. The Vocational Education Act was passed. Federal matching funds were allocated to aid the States in modernizing and enlarging their programs in the teaching of job skills and job training. For a greater number of deserving students, amendments to the National Defense Education Act provided low-interest loans and the financial means for completing educational programs. The life of the impacted areas program was renewed, and scores of communities received partial reimbursement from the Federal Government for any increase in the costs of school construction, maintenance, and operations brought about by an influx of Federal civilian and military personnel.

Although the education measures passed by our predecessor Congress were progressive and far-reaching, its performance is rivaled by the activities of the present Congress. With a strong and sincere dedication to the principle that all children should be able to attain their full intellectual potential, the Elementary-Secondary Education Act was passed, and became law—Public Law 89-10—on April 11. While this act will benefit school districts in an estimated 95 percent of our counties, special emphasis was placed on the provision of full and meaningful educational experiences to young people from culturally deprived backgrounds.

Title I contains a $1.06 billion authorization for the fiscal year 1966 in grants to State educational agencies for payment to local school districts. To benefit from Federal grants, a local educational agency must belong to a school district in which the number of school-age children of low-income or relief families equals 100 or more or is equivalent to 3 percent of the total number of school-age children. School-age children are defined as those between 5 and 17 years of age; low-income families are families whose annual incomes are $2,000 or less. Qualifying local agencies will receive, at maximum, an amount equivalent to 50 percent of their State's average expenditures per school child times the number of school-age children from the low-income factor families residing in the school district. Beginning in the 1967 fiscal year, eligible local educational agencies may be awarded special incentive grants to be applied to programs consistent with the basic aims of this legislation. The amounts of these awards will be determined by the percentage of increase in current agency expenditures over those for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965.

Subject to final approval by State and Federal educational agencies, local agencies will enjoy a high degree of flexibility in the uses to which these grants may be put.

Title II—School Library Resources and Instructional Materials—institutes a 5-year program for the allocation of funds to local educational agencies, via the States, for use in the acquisition of textbooks and school library resources. One hundred million dollars was authorized under title II for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. Each State's share of the total monetary authorization will bear the same ratio as its number of public and nonprofit elementary-secondary school students bears to the national enrollment in such schools. Federal participation is limited to the role of providing funds for each of the States. State educational agencies, in cooperation with local public school agencies, will determine what types of printed instructional materials and library resources will be purchased. Federal funds will supply nonpublic schools with those books and materials which State educational agencies have approved for distribution in the public schools.

Title III—Supplementary Educational Centers and Services—establishes a 5-year program of Federal grants for supplementary educational centers and services. One hundred million dollars have been authorized under title III for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. Each State will receive a basic allocation of $200,000. Remaining moneys will be distributed among the States on the following basis: 50 percent according to the number of school-age children in a State—compared to the national total—and 50 percent according to the total population of the United States. This title seeks to provide those educational services and facilities unavailable in quality and quantity in our Nation's elementary-secondary school system. Among the many programs for which these funds may be used are: guidance and counseling, remedial instruction, psychological and social work services to enable persons to participate in educational programs, special educational projects for nonschool session periods, academic and vocational education for adults, specialized equipment and instruction for advanced scientific subjects, foreign languages, and other courses not offered in the local schools, or which could be better taught in one central location, specialized equipment and instruction for the handicapped and for preschool age youngsters, specially qualified personnel for temporary teaching assignments, special programs for persons isolated from normal educational opportunities, including home-study courses, visiting teachers, and mobile education units, and the development of educational radio and television.

Title IV—Educational Research and Training—amends the Cooperative Research Act by authorizing the Commissioner of Education to make grants to colleges, universities, other public or nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, and to individuals for research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education and for the dissemination of information derived from this education research. Recipients of such grants may utilize these funds to establish and maintain research traineeships, internships, personnel exchanges, and predoctoral fellowships for training and research in the field of education.

Title V authorizes the establishment of a 5-year program of grants to stimulate and assist the States in strengthening the leadership resources of their educational agencies and to assist those agencies in the establishment and improvement of programs to identify and meet their educational needs. Ten million dollars in grants were authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

In his education message to the Congress, President Johnson said:

> In the life of the individual, education is always an unfinished task. And in the life of this Nation, the advancement of education is a continuing challenge.

With the passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965, we have accepted this continuing challenge and renewed our commitment to equality of educational opportunity for all of our young people.

Title I authorizes a program of matching grants to assist the Nation's colleges and universities in continuing and expanding the scope of adult education and extension programs and strengthening their resources to cope effectively with present community problems, including housing, poverty, youth opportunities, and education.

Authorizations of $25 million for fiscal 1966, and $50 million annually for fiscal 1967 and 1968 have been approved.

Title II authorizes a program of basic grants and supplemental grants to assist institutions of higher learning in raising their standards of their library resources.

Appropriations of $50 million annually during the 1966–68 fiscal period have been approved for the purchase of books, documents, periodicals, phonograph records, and similar library resources.

This title also authorizes a program of grants to institutions of higher learning for the training of persons in librarianship. Appropriations of $15 million annually have been approved for a 3-year library service training and research program.

Title III initiates a 1-year program, with funds of $55 million, to improve the academic quality of our Nation's "developing institutions." The costs of cooperative projects including faculty exchange and improvement plans between developing institutions and other colleges and universities and agencies could be covered under this provision.

Title III also authorizes a national teaching fellowship program to encourage outstanding graduate students to join the staffs of these developing educational institutions.

Title IV authorizes a program of undergraduate scholarships of up to $800 per year for academically qualified, needy students.

Annual appropriations of $70 million in first-year grants have been approved for the fiscal 1966–68 period together with necessary funds to continue each grant for the next 3 academic years.

Title IV also authorizes the release of Federal moneys for the establishment of State and nonprofit institution student loan insurance funds and allows the Commissioner of Education to insure against losses loans made to eligible students unable to secure comparable loan terms elsewhere.

Title IV also amends the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to strengthen "critical subject" instruction and broaden institutes for teacher training.

Title V authorizes the establishment of a National Teacher Corps of specially trained experienced teaching personnel to augment existing staffs in schools drawing their enrollments from low-income areas.

This title also authorizes the establishment of a program of fellowships and grants to advance certain graduate study programs.

Title VI authorizes a program of matching grants to colleges and universities for the acquisition of educational equipment and media.

Title VII authorizes a 100-percent increase in current 1966 fiscal year funds for the construction of undergraduate and graduate academic facilities under the terms of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

June 8 was the date for the signing law—Public Law 36—by President Johnson of a bill establishing a National Technical Institute for the Deaf. In all of the United States there is only one postsecondary liberal arts facility administering to the special needs of our deaf young people—Gallaudet College in Washington, D.C. Postsecondary vocational training and educational facilities are virtually nonexistent. Deaf youngsters are expected to receive their technical training in schools attended primarily by hard-of-hearing students. Generally speaking, such arrangements have proven unsatisfactory because of the serious communications problems which arise. Dropout rates among those suffering from hearing impairments are high and lack of educational training causes a large percentage of the deaf to join the ranks of the unskilled.

The Congress heard and responded to the pleas of the deaf and of those who have a keen interest in their welfare. We authorized appropriations necessary for the establishment and operation of a postsecondary technical institution for the deaf. After consultation with a 12-member national advisory board, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may enter into agreement with any institution of higher education for the establishment and construction of this Institute.

The deaf have long been deprived of the educational opportunities which are essential stepping stones to the mainstream of American life. A nation that strives for greatness cannot expect to attain its goal as long as it deprives itself of the valuable contributions of a deserving segment of our national community.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AND TRAINING

The Congress passed legislation expanding the program of aid to the States for vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons. We authorized $1,005,000 for 3 years through fiscal year 1968.

Public Law 89–287 provides for Federal insurance of loans to high school graduates, and direct loans by the Government, not to exceed $1,500 per year, to finance tuition at business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools.

CIGARETTE LABELING

The results of months and years of medical studies of the relationship between prolonged tobacco smoking and health were made public in January of 1964 in the "Report of the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health." In this report, Luther L. Terry, former Surgeon General of the United States, voiced the warning that "cigarette smoking is a health hazard of sufficient importance in the United States to warrant appropriate remedial action." Extensive studies produced sufficient corroborating evidence to substantiate the conclusion that the continued smoking of cigarettes is a contributory factor in the high mortality toll taken annually by a host of specific diseases.

It was the consensus of this Congress that concrete measures should be enacted to assure that the American public is adequately and continually informed of the far-reaching consequences inherent in prolonged cigarette consumption.

Effective January 1, 1966, each cigarette package, carton, or similar container must bear the statement: "Caution: Cigarette Smoking May Be Hazardous to Your Health." This warning message must be conspicuous, legible, and readily distinguishable from other printed material appearing on cigarette packages, cartons, or similar containers. While the specific format—size, color, and location—of this warning label will be the responsibility of the tobacco manufacturers, final approval of these specifics will rest with the Justice Department.

Within a year and a half after this legislation becomes operative, and annually thereafter, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is to submit to the Congress the results afforded by present and future study of the causal relationship between specific diseases and prolonged cigarette addiction, together with recommendations for possible legislation. The Attorney General of the United States has been assigned to enforce these measures, violation of which will result in an imposition of a $10,000 fine on the guilty party or parties.

DRUG CONTROLS

The illegal manufacture and distribution of drugs have reached alarming proportions. To protect fully the welfare of the American people from those who are without scruples and without concern for the human misery in which they traffic, national controls must be made more comprehensive and more stringent.

The gentleman from Arkansas, Representative OREN HARRIS, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported that approximately 50 percent of the 9 billion barbiturates and amphetamine pills and tablets annually produced in the United States are sold illegally.

In an effort to curb the misuse of drugs and to regulate depressant, stimulant, hallucinatory, and counterfeit drugs, the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act has been expanded to include the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965. In addition to defining broadly the categories of depressant and stimulant drugs and strengthening the powers of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in this sphere, these amendments prohibit the manufacture, compounding, sale, delivery, or disposal of the delineated categories by other than a carefully specified group of persons. With the exception of licensed practitioners, prescribing, such drugs in the course of their professional practice, those engaged in the legitimate manufacture, compounding, sale, delivery, or disposal of depressant and stimulant drugs must maintain for a 3-year period and make readily available to Health, Education, and Welfare inspectors the required records, stock samples, and quarters used for the above activities.

Tight restrictions relating to prescriptions for barbiturates, amphetamines, and other psychotoxic drugs have been made retroactive in their application and prohibit the filling or refilling of prescriptions after 6 months from the original date of issuance. No similar drug prescription orders may be refilled more than five times without the approval and verification of need by the issuing practitioner.

Public Law 89–74 or the Drug Control Amendments Act of 1965 is the legislative embodiment of a commitment by this administration to insure the use of drugs as therapeutic agents to diminish the human suffering of sickness, pain, and disease, and not as debasing masters to increase the suffering of mankind.

SECURITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

The Nation has witnessed a proliferation in the incidence of criminal acts—acts which have increased at a rate five times that of our population increase since 1958. The problem of preventing and combating crime has reached major proportions. The causes of crime are many and complex; the breadth of the crime problem is nationwide, for the mobility of our criminal element ignores the borders of local and State subdivisions. To cope successfully with the activities of the criminal element within our society, local, State, and Federal authorities must join in a partnership to check and control behavioral patterns endangering the welfare of our citizenry. We feel that the rethinking of all aspects of the criminal process will be greatly advanced by the provision of the necessary funds for "projects designed to develop or demonstrate effective methods of increasing the security of person and property, controlling the incidence of lawlessness, and promoting respect for law. To this end, the Law Enforcement Assistance Act authorizes the Attorney General of the United States to make grants to public and private nonprofit organizations, agencies, and institutions for studies pertinent to law enforcement problems and to the improvement of the training of law enforcement personnel. Ten million dollars in Federal moneys have been authorized for the 1966 fiscal year.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH OFFENSES CONTROL

Changing social conditions, especially the overall process of urbanization, have spawned socially unacceptable behavior among our youth as well as among adults. In 1961, the Congress passed the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act, which authorized the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide grants to public and private nonprofit organizations, agencies, or institutions for the demonstration of "new techniques of delinquency prevention and control, for the training of personnel working with youth and youth problems, and technical assistance to communities seeking to combat delinquency and for the dissemination of valuable information."

It would be naive to assume that the enactment of any single piece of legislation could bring quick and easy solutions to the problems of youthful misbehavior. Nevertheless, difficulty in solution does not justify avoidance, complacency, or inaction. On the contrary it poses a challenge to men and women in many fields of learning to apply their skills and their knowledge in a united effort to develop progressive approaches to an effective counterattack on the social conditions that foster delinquency. Demonstration and training programs that will bring to the foreground such promising and progressive approaches must be initiated and continued.

Public Law 89–69 will enable us to continue the progress that is currently being made by extending through June 30, 1967, the life of the Juvenile Delinqunecy and Youth Offenses Control Act and providing authorizations of $6.5 million for the 1966 fiscal year and $10 million for the 1967 fiscal period.

PRISONER REHABILITATION

Our efforts to guarantee the security of the individual will fall short of success if we limit our attention to any one or two phases of the criminal problem. We must extend our support across the entire spectrum—from the causes of crime among juveniles and adults to the all-important questions of methods and personnel employed in correctional rehabilitation.

The objective of prisoner rehabilitation is to return to the community men and women who will again contribute to society in a meaningful and productive way. Correctional rehabilitation techniques must attempt to make first offenders last offenders; correctional rehabilitation techniques which fail to accomplish this goal must yield to new and more effective reorientation methods. Operating within this framework, the Congress favorably acted upon legislation authorizing the trial of several very promising programs in the rehabilitation of Federal prisoners. We authorized the Attorney General of the United States to permit Federal prisoners to take part in community "work release" endeavors. Participants will be allowed to go to training or work locations and then return to their confinement quarters at night or when not actually employed. This new approach is justified in terms of the invaluable employment experience which on-the-job training can offer, the financial support which earnings will bring to the families of these prisoners, and in the community acceptance extended to the individual.

A maximum of 30 days of unsupervised emergency or rehabilitation leave may be granted by the Attorney General to Federal prisoners for legitimate and "compassionate" reasons consonant with the public welfare. By granting furloughs to trusted prisoners in order that they may visit dying or critically ill relatives, attend the funeral services of relatives, obtain medical treatment unavailable within the limits of the penal institutions, and for interviews with potential employers, we are bolstering the rehabilitation process by assuring the individual that, if worthy, he will have the trust of those about him. We are also denying that a man is "marked" for life by virtue of misguided past actions.

Based on our past successful experience in connection with juvenile offenders, we hope that the assignment of adult offenders to prerelease, resident treatment centers of "halfway" houses will ease the period of transition from the rigidity of institutional confinement to the contrasting atmosphere of the home and the community.

CORRECTIONAL REHABILITATION PERSONNEL

To a very high degree, the success of all of our reorientation programs depends on the dedication and training of a sufficient number of rehabilitation personnel. Of their dedication we can well say that it is complete, but all too often forgotten and unappreciated. To reduce the shortage in professional manpower, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has been authorized, with the advice of a 12-man Advisory Council on Correctional Manpower and Training, to award grants for a nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the problem and the means of solving the lack of qualified manpower. Appropriations of $500,000 have been authorized for these studies for the 1966 fiscal year; $800,000 has been approved for fiscal 1967 and 1968.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT

The pressing needs of residents of our urban-suburban communities confront us with perhaps the greatest challenge of the day. The onrush of the tide of urbanization has already swelled the number of metropolitan area inhabitants to 70 percent of our population; this tidal wave has not yet reached its peak. In its wake has followed a labyrinth of problems—problems pertaining to mass transportation systems, educational institutions, water supplies, medical care, sewage treatment facilities, and housing units.

In calling upon us to make the American society a Great Society, our President stated that "our society will never be great until our cities are great." I do not think that our cities will be great until the magnitude and complexity of their problems are challenged by all the boldness, determination, and creative energies that we can apply to their solution. Boldness, determination, imagination, and concert in planning characterize the administration-sponsored Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.

Since this law will affect the daily lives of nearly three-fourths of our people, I should like to discuss some of the significant provisions incorporated in this legislation.

Federal Housing Administration loans, with ceilings of $10 million for individual projects, will become available for private land acquisition and site-betterment undertakings.

Veterans who have not taken part in existing VA mortgage insurance programs will be eligible to apply for Federal Housing Administration home mortgage loans. No downpayment will be required on the first $15,000 of the loan; a 10-percent downpayment will be required for loans between $15,000 and $20,000, and a 15-percent downpayment will be required on loans of between $20,000 and $30,000.

Armed Services personnel may now receive Federal Housing Administration insured loans of $30,000 instead of the previous $20,000 maximum. A 3-percent downpayment will be required on the initial $15,000, 10 percent on amounts between $15,000 and $20,000, and 15 percent down on loans between $20,000 and $30,000.

Federal urban renewal programs will continue over the next 4-year period with the authorization of additional appropriations totaling $2.9 billion.

Two-thirds of the costs of leveling or demolishing unsafe or condemned dwellings in urban renewal areas may be absorbed by demolition grants.

Appropriations totaling $100 million have been authorized for rehabilitation loan funds; termination date for this phase of urban renewal activities was set for October 1, 1969.

Renewal and restoration of nonresident structures will receive increased moneys.

A guarantee of rental payments by small businesses forced to relocate as a result of urban renewal projects or highway construction plans will be forthcoming from the Small Business Administration.

Low-rental public housing benefits will be continued through October 1, 1969; increased authorizations totaling $47 million annually will go to the completion of more than 50,000 units yearly during the lifetime of this program.

Federally owned housing complexes may be sold to nonprofit or local housing agencies if continued use will provide shelter at low-rental rates.

College housing construction funds have been increased by $300 million annually through the 1968 fiscal year. Vocational and technical institutions operating under the auspices of 4-year, accredited, degree-awarding colleges and universities will be eligible for housing construction loans.

Housing and Home Finance Agency grants will be available to qualifying community agencies undertaking the construction of sewer facilities, water storage, distribution, or purification facilities, and health, recreation, social service centers, or related community facilities.

State and local agencies will be eligible for contracts totaling $310 million for the creation of open-land areas in urban communities and for urban landscaping and beautification projects.

Current rural housing programs will be continued for an additional 4-year period through October of 1969. The Secretary of Agriculture has been authorized to establish a low-interest, insured loan program for the improvement of rural dwellings.

The 2d session of the 89th Congress is expected to give further consideration to the feasibility of implementing a program of rent supplement payment to low-income families.

As one of the most comprehensive measures enacted during this session, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 paves the way for cooperative action among Federal, State, and local governments—action that will improve the standards of living within our metropolitan societies.

Passage of this historic legislation is our substantive answer to the challenge of urbanization. In its success lies our vision of the American city as "a place where future generations will come, not only to live but to live the good life."

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

To coordinate all executive department and all Federal agency functions or activities directly affecting urban-suburban problems and to assure planning for the sound development of our metropolitan areas, the Congress enacted legislation establishing a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development. This Department will be headed by a Secretary of Housing and Urban Development appointed by the President and subject to Senate confirmation.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

In the 11-State Appalachian Mountain region of our Nation, poverty among plenty is a harsh reality. More than 16 million Americans reside in an area blessed with an invaluable store of natural resources. Yet millions of these Americans have been bypassed by the full rewards of our Nation's economic growth and general well-being. Lack of individual and collective resourcefulness, determination, and concern does not account for the hardship and privation that have plagued generations of Appalachia's inhabitants. A good measure of the blame for this region's retarded economic development may well be attributed to the confinement and isolation imposed by a difficult and rugged terrain. Theoretically within easy access to more than half of the Nation's population, this area has long awaited a constructive program of local, State, and Federal action to provide administrative assistance, technical know-how, and finances for major capital expenditures to enable maximum industrial and recreational development of its vast resources. Such a program has been enacted by this Congress and signed into law by President Johnson on March 9. Public Law 89-4, or the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, authorizes $1,092,400,000 for the cooperative development of the physical resources of 360 counties in Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. Counties in southern New York may be included in the program at a future date.

Preparation of programs and coordination of development projects to promote the growth and productivity of the Appalachian region rests with the Appalachian Regional Commission composed of the Governor or his representative of each affected State and a Federal Cochairman appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. In addition, the Commission has been designated as a body to foster measures which will result in the formulation of local development districts, encourage private investment in commercial, industrial, and recreational projects. Finally, the Commission will serve as the sponsor of investigations and research studies relating to area redevelopment and as a forum for the consideration of problems and proposed solutions to these problems. Recommendations pertaining to the realization of the goals of the act will be made to the participating States and to the President.

Appalachia lacks adequate major transportation arteries; highways are urgently needed. If the area's abundant natural resources are to be developed, the isolation inflicted by the Appalachian Mountain chain must be ended. New access links with our national highway system must be constructed. An authorization of $840 million has been approved for the construction of 2,350 miles of development highways together with 1,000 miles of local access roads to serve specific residential, recreational, commercial, industrial, or similar facilities. Federal assistance in any highway or road construction project will not exceed 70 percent of the total construction cost. Road sites will be specified by the Appalachian Regional Commission. State members of the Commission will be required to consult with their State highway departments and receive department recommendations before participating in Commission decisions on road sites.

Appalachia knows an abundant annual rainfall; its water resources potential is one of its most valuable assets. Through proper planning and management, winter and spring floods and summer droughts can be avoided, and this all-important resource can help to bring industrial, commercial, recreational, and residential development to fruition. In spite of sufficient quantities of water, more than 75 percent of the area's residents do not enjoy public water supplies or supplies that meet minimum health standards for human use. Pollution from sewage and mine acids now renders large quantities of water virtually useless.

The Secretary of the Army has been authorized to prepare a comprehensive plan for the development and utilization of Appalachia's water resources. Specifically, this plan should encompass recommendations relating to flood control measures, regulation of rivers to enhance their value as industrial and municipal water supply sources, the improvement of rivers for navigation to further industrial development, the prevention of water pollution, and the development of the recreational potential of water bodies in the region. An authorization of $5 million has been approved for this water resources study.

In his inaugural address, Mr. Johnson vowed that "in a land of healing miracles, neighbors must not suffer and die unattended." In Appalachia, however, countless persons suffer and die unattended. Human misery is widespread, because there are too few health facilities to meet the present demands of the residents. Lack of adequate highways and roads make the few existing medical care institutions unavailable to those whose need may be the greatest. A generally low-income level and its accompanying low-taxable base mean that the necessary construction funds for new and needed facilities will not be forthcoming. Stated in somewhat different terms, decent hospitals, clinics, nursing homes, and related health facilities are not and will not be available in sufficient numbers to answer the health demands of area residents.

Grants totaling $41 million have been authorized for use in the construction of multicounty demonstration health facilities such as treatment centers, regional health diagnostic centers, and hospitals. These grants may be used for up to 80 percent of total project construction costs. In addition, $28 million has been authorized for use in meeting the operation expenses incurred during the first 2 years of health facilities operations. These funds will be available for the first 2 years of operation and may cover the total operating costs for this time period. During the third year, funds will be reduced to meet a maximum of 50 percent of total operating expenses.

Land stabilization programs have been allotted a maximum of $17 million. More than 8.6 million acres of land have suffered the consequences of soil erosion and must be protected from additional damage. The topography of the Appalachian Mountain area has not been conducive to successful large-scale farming. It is hoped that this land may be made suitable for the feeding and grazing of livestock. Land stabilization programs will take the form of grants, awarded by the Secretary of Agriculture, to landowners for application to mutually agreed upon programs of land improvement and erosion control on individual holdings not in excess of 50 acres.

Appalachia is potentially one of the Nation's finest timber producing centers. Years of poor cutting practices have reduced the area's timber yield to one of inferior quality. Poor highways and poor access roads pose marketing problems and the number of small timber growing enterprises with limited capabilities make the future of the timber industry seem bleak. In an effort to coordinate improvement efforts and implement timber development programs on a scale large enough to be worthwhile, the Appalachian Regional Development Act authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans of up to 50 percent of incurred costs to aid in the establishment of timber development organizations whose goals wil be those of returning quality and quantity to the timber crop and profitable returns to the area's timber producers and processors. Five million dollars in funds have been authorized to assist in the creation of timber development organizations.

Appalachia counts coal as its No. 1 natural resource but suffers from the serious and damaging aftereffects of "deleterious mining practices." Acid drainage from underground and strip mines pollutes many of the water resources leaving them unfit for most uses. Many private residences are now unsafe because of the constant threat posed by surface cavings. The threat is of sufficient proportions as to cause industrial developers to move on and locate elsewhere. Underground mine fires slowly continue to burn spreading noxious fumes endangering lives and property. Piles of refuse now left as monuments to previous mining efforts burn—polluting the air and preventing acres of land from being profitably developed. Acres and acres of valuable land, now in need of backfilling and replanting, lie in waste because of abandoned strip mines. The Secretary of the Interior has been authorized to make financial contributions to the States for filling in the gaps left by abandoned mines, extinguishing underground mine fires, and for use in the restoration of fish and wildlife to the blighted locales. These moneys will be limited to publicly owned lands and may finance up to 75 percent of the costs of restoration and reclamation projects. Finally, a number of existing legislative programs, including the National Defense Education Act, the Vocational Educational Act, and the Housing Act of 1954, have received supplementary authorizations to allow the communities of Appalachia to share more fully in available facilities and services.

AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

That the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 seeks to wage an unconditional and unlimited war on the causes of poverty can be readily seen by a quick and cursory review of some of the many programs which its passage launched.

A Job Corps program was established for our young men and women between the ages of 16 and 21, and with it, new hope for a productive and rewarding future. As residents of rural conservation or urban training communities, these young people, most of whom lack the rudiments of a high school education, are given another chance to complete a basic education and to receive the benefits of sound guidance and counseling, together with the valuable experience that comes from on-the-job training.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps or work training program concept provides part-time or full-time work and job training for young people in the 16 to 21 age bracket. In many instances, the modest salaries earned make the difference in whether or not these young adults continue their educational programs. In a wide variety of newly created positions in school libraries, parks, playgrounds, and hospitals, Neighborhood Youth Corps trainees are not only exercising their earning powers, but increasing their employment assets and enjoying the self-respect and individual dignity that come with active and rewarding participation in community life.

College work study programs have been designed to allow college and university students from low-income families to be self-supporting and remain full-time students by devoting part of their energies to on-campus and off-campus jobs sponsored by public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations.

Urban and rural community action programs encourage impoverished localities to avail themselves of Federal technical and financial assistance in the planning and implementation of locally oriented projects of self-help and community betterment.

Adult basic education offers training in reading and writing to those whose only qualification must be their earnest desire to learn.

Through participation in job experience and training opportunities, in basic and vocation education programs, work experience projects promise to chronically unemployed heads of households hope today for a self-supporting tomorrow.

Denied credit and financing due to the lack of necessary collateral, low-income rural families and owners of small businesses may receive loans for projects which have the potential to raise their earning levels.

To improve the quality of life in our Indian communities and in those areas of our Nation where our more than 2 million seasonal workers and their families reside, there are special programs authorized under the terms of the Economic Opportunity Act.

To aid local communities in providing learning experiences and much-needed medical and dental care for preschool youngsters from disadvantaged families, we have initiated Project Head Start.

A massive and unconditional assault on poverty is an ambitious but by no means impossible or unreasonable undertaking. That experience is the best guide and teacher may have much meaning in terms of our antipoverty campaign. We must look at our objectives; we must review our progress in achieving our stated goals; we must re-evaluate our operations carefully. We must be willing to make those revisions in our overall plans which will better solve the problems that we seek to eliminate.

The Congress this year scrutinized thoroughly the working of the antipoverty program and incorporated in the original act a series of amendments which experience dictates are necessary if we are to conquer poverty amidst plenty in our time.

For all titles of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 we have authorized appropriations of $1,785 million for the 1966 fiscal year. The current Federal financing of 90 percent of the costs of the Neighborhood Youth Corps or work-training programs, college work-study, urban and rural community action projects, and adult basic education programs will continue through August 20, 1967, with the States expected to increase their contributions thereafter.

We have now authorized the enrollment of persons coming to our shores from Cuba in the Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps.

The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity has been empowered to override the veto of suggested community action and work training programs by State Governors.

Changes have also been made in the terms of title 2 authorizing urban and rural community action programs to require that the public be afforded reasonable access to data relevant to community action projects. The number of potential recipients of Federal moneys has been expanded to include private nonprofit organizations separate from the designated community action agencies that are able to justify or show good cause for such financial assistance. Office of Economic Opportunity officials must, however, inform the official or designated community action agency and the State's Governor of such requests and inquiries from private agencies.

Loans and loan guarantees will now be available to State agencies, local public agencies, private nonprofit organizations, institutions, and cooperatives aiding farmers and seasonal workers in the processing and marketing of farm or dairy foods and in programs of education, sanitation, day care for children, and housing.

Farm families earning less than $1,200 annually are deemed unemployed for the purposes of the work experience project, thus entitling these heads of families to receive basic, vocational, and work-training benefits.

For Project VISTA personnel responding to the pleas of their less-fortunate neighbors and giving of themselves in the finest spirit of humanitarianism, we have adjusted the wage base from the previous GS–2 level to a GS–7 level for the determination of death and disability benefits.

MANPOWER AMENDMENTS

The Johnson administration and the 89th Congress are totally committed to the realization of full employment opportunities for all Americans.

We are confronted with a somewhat paradoxical labor situation. While approximately 3 million of our people are not gainfully employed, thousands of jobs go begging annually for lack of qualified and readily available personnel. Our objective, therefore, must be the enactment of vocational training programs which will elevate our unemployed to a level of proficiency in those skills which are and will continue to be valuable employment assets. Those whose skills are no longer useful due to the increasingly sophisticated training requisites exacted by technological innovations must not be forgotten. We are obliged to provide them with the opportunity for retraining. Those who have never possessed truly marketable skills must also be afforded an equal chance to join the ranks of the productively employed. Our task is one of merging well-skilled personnel and available work opportunities. This was the primary objective of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. Although this legislation focused its initial attention on experienced workers whose skills had been rendered obsolete by the forces of automation and mechanization, it was amended in 1963 to afford more effective relief to the unemployed who are illiterate and to young persons who were ineligible for aid under the 1962 provisions of the act.

Two and a half years of experience with the rehabilitation projects instituted under the Manpower Development and Training Act clearly show that the aspirations of its original sponsors have been more than realized. Through the end of January of this year, 305,000 persons have been approved for vocational training. More than 85,000 persons have successfully completed their training courses, and, of these, 73 percent have been placed and are again an integral and productive part of the American working force. Moreover, our 2½ years of experience have given us insight into the nature of special problem areas which demand our immediate attention if our goal of full employment opportunity for all of our citizens is to be attained.

According to the terms of the Manpower Amendment Act of 1965, the life of the Manpower Development and Training Act has been renewed. The final bill, signed into law—Public Law 89–15—on April 26, extended the act's expiration date from June 30, 1966 to June 30, 1969, and included monetary authorization for fiscal 1966 of $454 million together with such additional appropriations as are deemed necessary thereafter. It has been feared that the financial arrangements contained in the act's original stipulations would place an unbearable burden on the tax structures of the States.

Recall that under the existing law, each of the States would be required to assume one-third of the costs of the Manpower Development and Training Act's administrative and training costs as of July 1, 1965, and one-half of the costs effective July 1, 1966. The States have wholeheartedly endorsed the purpose of the program and are enjoying the benefits which accrue to their residents who are Manpower Development and Training Act trainees. Nevertheless, the dollar demands of the matching funds clause, combined with the mandatory expansion of a wide range of established State programs, have given rise to doubtful prognostications for continued State participation. The withdrawal of thousands of current trainees from frontiers offering new skills and new trades to the doldrums of the "no skill, no job, relief role" syndrome constitutes a disheartening finale.

It was incumbent upon us to establish a more feasible financial basis for the future operation of this vocational education program. Under the new bill signed by the President, the Federal Government will absorb the full cost of the Manpower Development Training Act programs until June 30, 1966. Subsequently, the States will be asked to supply a maximum of 10 percent of the institutional training expenses. What is more, new wording gives the States the option of making their contributions in cash or in kind. Local outlay of matching funds has been further reduced by the repeal of the current requirement that beginning July 1, 1965, one-third of the training allowance allotments—one-half effective July 1, 1966—fall to the States. Revisions accepted by both Houses of the Congres provide for full Federal financing of training allowance costs.

The Secretary of Labor has been authorized to initiate and oversee a myriad of research programs and experimental pilot studies with an eye to applying the expertise of private and public institutions in a concerted effort to arrive at satisfactory solutions to our general manpower problems and specifically to the expansion of employment by meeting the demands of service-related industries.

Through the awarding of contracts and grants, the Labor Secretary has been directed to conduct appropriate experimental studies which will pave the way for constructive efforts to combat chronic unemployment among the long-term unemployed, the mentally and/or physically handicapped, minority group blocs, disadvantaged youth, and those who have passed their prime productive years.

Assuming that we must bring skilled workers and available work situations together, we feel that the extension of the time limit and the increase in monetary allotments for pilot labor mobility-demonstration projects are justifiable. Accordingly, the Secretary of Labor's authority over this study has been extended through June 30, 1967 and the funds available for this undertaking increased from $4 to $5 million annually.

Based on our experience to date under the Manpower Development and Training Act, we have written in an authorization which allocated moneys for an experimental project affording bonding aid to otherwise trained and qualified persons whose past behavioral patterns make it still impossible for them to obtain indemnification.

In order to afford each trainee every chance to exercise his newly acquired skills, we must not overlook what might appear to many as only minor stumbling blocks. To those on the threshold of employment rehabilitation, however, such impedimenta assume major proportions. We have effected a liberalization of other major provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act. The payment of training allowances may be made for as long as 104 weeks or 2 years. Heretofore, training allowance payments terminated at the end of 1 year. The additional time factor should be especially advantageous to those with an extremely low intellectual achievement. Their progress in attaining at least a minimum of the required skills may be somewhat slower. Additional time may constitute an important factor in aiding potential workers seeking admittance to job markets requiring the mastery of highly developed trade tools. To ease the financial pressures experienced by vocational trainees and their families, the following changes have been made: basic training allowances may be raised by $5 a week for each dependent over two and up to a maximum of six; trainees may work up to 20 hours a week without being subject to a reduction in their basic training allowances; trainees will be fully reimbursed for transportation costs incurred; more than one member of a family may now receive training allowances when the head of the household is unemployed. The 1965 amendments have repealed earlier clauses which excluded single persons, regardless of their financial status, from receipt of training allowances. Since one of the well-defined unemployment problem areas centers around the ever-increasing number of young persons unable to compete effectively in the job market, we have eased the limitation on the percentage of young adults eligible for the program's benefits.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

On August 26, President Johnson signed into law the Public Works and Economic Development Act—Public Law 89–136—and in so doing, waged war against poverty and economic stagnation on an ever-widening front. Public Law 89–136 distills from past successful efforts measures which have proved that new opportunities for employment may be provided for residents of areas marred by chronic underemployment and unemployment by improving the social assets and economic capabilities. An economic resurgence within an area may be fostered by rendering assistance to projects that will expand commercial and industrial capabilities and attract and retain industries and enterprises which offer long-range job opportunities. In the spirit of our Federal system, this legislation seeks to construct the overall framework within which the Federal Government, in partnership with the States and local governments, may plan and finance public works and other developmental facilities on a scale otherwise infeasible and above the financial capacities of local communities and individual States.

Title I allows the Secretary of Commerce to award direct grants to States, political subdivisions, Indian tribes, or nonprofit representatives of redevelopment areas characterized by low-incomes and high unemployment levels. These direct grants will be applied to the total costs of necessary public works and public service projects as well as development facilities whose completion will provide attractive settings for industrial and commercial development and expanded long-term employment potential which follows in its wake.

Funds allocated for the construction of facilities for the treatment of sewage require that construction plans receive the approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Eligible areas may receive direct grant funds for 4 years covering a maximum of 50 percent of the total project cost. Annual appropriations of $500 million to meet the costs of title I have been authorized for the fiscal years 1966 to 1969.

In order to enable eligible areas to participate in a number of Federal grants-in-aid programs and thereby provide to their residents services and facilities whose costs would otherwise exceed their abilities to finance, the Secretary of Commerce has been authorized to make supplemental grants to the States—otherwise eligible—but unable to raise the required matching funds.

Direct grants and supplemental grants may contribute to a maximum of 80 percent of the total costs of a single project; grants may not be applied to projects which will compete with operational privately owned public utilities currently serving an area and subject to the regulations of State or Federal agencies unless these utilities are inadequate to meet the demands of the region. Excluded from the category of projects to which funds authorized for this act may be applied are projects eligible for assistance under the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. No State may be the recipient of more than 15 percent of the total financial authorizations for the act.

Under title II, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make loans to and purchase evidence of indebtedness from eligible States, political subdivisions, Indian tribes, or nonprofit representatives of redevelopment areas for application to public works or development facilities and for purchase and betterment of land and facilities earmarked for industrial and commercial usage and to guarantee loans for working capital made by private lending institutions to private borrowers for application to redevelopment area projects.

A total annual authorization of $170 million for all types of guarantees and loans for the fiscal years 1966 to 1970 was approved. Twenty-five million dollars annually has been authorized for the fiscal years 1966 to 1970 to provide technical assistance in the form of aid in the development of plans and studies to alleviate underemployment and unemployment in needy areas across the Nation and financial assistance in the form of grants of up to 75 percent of the administrative expenses of economic development planning organizations.

Redevelopment areas, for purposes of the act, are designated as areas which fall within objective and detailed categories of below national avearge median family incomes and within certain levels of chronic and high unemployment.

Title V provides for the creation of multi-State regional action planning commissions to initiate and coordinate regional programs designed to foster long-range economic development.

STATE TECHNICAL SERVICES ACT

Public Law 89-182 was referred to by President Johnson as the "sleeper" measure of the 1st session of the 89th Congress. This was the State Technical Services Act, which authorizes a 3-year, $60 million program of Federal matching grants to States which establish technical service centers for the dissemination of findings of science and technology to commerce and industry. The programs will be conducted by institutions of higher learning. It is hoped that this legislation will help American businesses and industries have better access to the rapidly growing body of nonproprietary scientific and technical information.

DISASTER LEGISLATION

The period from July 1964 through September 1965 was one of a series of natural disasters for the United States. Several laws were enacted by this Congress to give affected individuals, States, and local communities more comprehensive and rapid disaster relief.

Public Law 89-41 authorized $111,875,000 for emergency public highway and forest road construction in Pacific Northwest areas damaged by floods.

Public Law 89-59 provided additional Small Business Administration assistance to disaster victims and increased by $50 million the Small Business Administration's revolving fund for disaster victims.

In Public Law 89-128 we increased the President's emergency disaster relief fund from $20 million to $55 million for fiscal year 1966.

The Congress also passed legislation authorizing $70 million in Federal aid to Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi to repair public facilities damaged by hurricane. Also authorized were Federal loan adjustment assistance and a study of alternative Federal relief programs.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

On March 30, 1870, the Secretary of State declared that 29 States, or the necessary three-fourths of all the States, had ratified the 15th amendment to the Constitution. With the proclamation of ratification, an inalienable right was unequivocally guaranteed:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Beginning with the Enforcement Act of 1870, which nullified racial considerations as reasonable or justifiable criteria for the denial of voter rights, to the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which streamlined the mechanism for expediting voting rights suits, nearly a century of legislative activity relating to the franchise had elapsed. Time after time, the Congress has sought to protect and to guarantee the right of suffrage to all Americans. Simultaneously, the Supreme Court of the United States has struck down a series of State and local enactments and procedures which affected the disfranchisement of large segments of our population. It is well known that the American Negroes have been the prime targets of most of this legislation and practice.

A variety of techniques have subverted the unmistakable meaning of the 15th amendment and consequently retarded the progress of the Negro in exercising his unalterably guaranteed rights. That his progress has been minimal is documented by the token numbers of Negroes voting in many of our communities.

Those States or political subdivisions in which literacy or similar voter qualification measures were employed and in which less than 50 percent of the total voting-age population was registered to vote or actually voted in the November 1964 election will be automatically affected by the provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965—Public Law 89-110. A failure to meet the minimum voting or registration requirements together with the simultaneous use of literacy or voter qualification tests will automatically trigger the act into operation. Additional States or political subdivisions thereof may be subject to its provisions should a Federal court, on the basis of suits brought before it by the Attorney General of the United States, deem it appropriate in order to insure voting rights or should the Attorney General certify that he has received legitimate complaints of disfranchisement due to race or color from a minimum of 20 residents. To any of these areas, the Civil Service Commission is empowered to send Federal voting examiners whose task is that of determining the qualifications of all applicants who wish to register to vote. Qualified residents would be enrolled and thereby entitled to vote in all subsequent Federal, State, and local elections and to participate in future State political conventions and party caucuses. General registration procedures, including times and places for registration, as well as voter registration forms, will be scrutinized and determined by the Civil Service Commission.

Literacy tests and related voter qualification measures also come under review. In those States and political subdivisions in which less than 50 percent of the voting-age population was registered to vote or voted in the November 1964 election, in States against which the Attorney General has brought voter discrimination suits, and in areas in which widespread patterns of racial discrimination have been virtually ignored by local and State authorities, existing literacy and analagous voter qualifications will be canceled. Included in the overall category of literacy-voter qualification tests are provisions which require an applicant to produce evidence of high moral character, to demonstrate educational attainment or proficiency in any specified subject area, or to exhibit his ability to read, write, or interpret the meaning of any given item.

Before any affected State or political subdivision, whose past voter statistics and procedures automatically triggered the act's provisions into operation, enacts new voting laws, it must receive the prior confirmation of the Attorney General or three-judge Federal court in the District of Columbia that the purpose or probable effect of the proposed statute will not result in voter discrimination for reasons of race or color.

Should an area which is a party to a voter-discrimination lawsuit wish to legislate new voter enactments, it must also receive prior judicial approval from the Federal court in whose jurisdiction the case falls.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 also contains a declaration by the Congress that the levying of poll taxes as a prerequisite to the ballot is a factor contributing to low registration figures and thereby thwarts the intent of the 15th amendment. Acting in accordance with its enforcement power, the Congress had directed the Attorney General of the United States to file suits in Federal district courts against States currently levying poll taxes. During the litigation of these cases and for a 1-year period in States in which the constitutionality of the poll tax has been upheld, no qualified voter may be denied the right to vote by virtue of failure to pay such taxes in the past, if he satisfies payment of the present year's levy 45 days prior to an election.

According to the terms of this enactment, penalties of up to $5,000 and/or 5 years of imprisonment may be imposed on individuals convicted of vote fraud or acts of intimidation directed against persons exercising their right to vote or against those charged with executing the directives of the act. Penalties of up to $10,000 and/or 5 years' imprisonment may be imposed on individuals convicted of falsifying voting or registration data. At the request of the Attorney General of the United States, the Civil Service Commission may appoint poll watchers to oversee actual voting and tabulation of the ballots.

I have attempted to outline some of the highlights of this monumental and historic legislation. May the Voting Rights Act of 1965 commence a century characterized as one in which the dignity of man is accorded its rightful position in the hierarchy of values on which our society was founded and upon which our future greatness as a Nation rests.

PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY

Woodrow Wilson said of the Nation's highest elective position:

> The Office of President requires the constitution of an athlete, the patience of a mother, the endurance of an early Christian.

No other single office in the world is charged with comparable responsibilities and duties; in no other single officeholder in the world have so many millions placed their hopes and aspirations.

Most nations of the world choose to assign to several decisionmakers the duties and responsibilities that we have entrusted to our President. It is because we have equated an individual officeholder with this unique combination of real and imaginary powers that the issue of Presidental succession and disability assumes monumental proportions.

Less than 2 years ago, a grieving Nation mourned the national and personal tragedy that saw an assassin's bullets cruelly and quickly fell our beloved President Kennedy. A bereaved Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson assumed the responsibilities of Presidential leadership and renewed our dedication to the truths and principles which are our American heritage and tradition.

Although our Nation has not known other than smooth transitions from one administration to another, our Presidential succession procedures are replete with ambiguities which could disrupt the continuity of our national life.

The House and Senate have concurred in the provisions of a proposed constitutional amendment which goes far in eliminating the ambiguities inherent in our present Presidential succession procedures.

When this proposal is ratified by three-quarters, or 38 of our sovereign States, it will become the 25th amendment to our Constitution.

In its major provisions, this amendment seeks to alleviate the dangers of uncertain command and disputed responsibilities. In any situation which results in the removal of the President, or in the event of his resignation or death, the Vice President becomes President of the United States. Should a vacancy occur in the office of the Vice President, the President would nominate a candidate for Vice President, who, upon confirmation by a majority of the Members of both Houses of Congress, shall assume the duties of the Vice Presidency.

What of the all-important issue of Presidential disability? Under the proposed amendment, the President may, in writing, voluntarily inform the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate that he is unable to perform his duties as Chief Executive; these duties are then to be carried out by the Vice President as Acting President. When the President has ceased to be incapacitated, he shall, by way of a written statement, so inform the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate. The powers and duties of the Presidency shall once again be his unless the Vice President and a majority of either the Cabinet, or any other body that the Congress may choose to designate by law, conveys within a 4-day period a written statement refuting the President's declaration of ability to resume executive responsibilities.

In this case, the issue will be resolved by the Congress. If the Congress is in session at the time, it shall, within 21 days of receipt of the statement of challenge offered by the Vice President and a majority of the Cabinet—or other lawfully designated body—render its verdict as to whether or not the President is able to execute his powers and duties. If the Congress is not in session, it will assemble within 48 hours and within a 21-day period thereafter, register its will on the disability question. Should two-thirds of the membership of the House and the Senate vote that the President is unable to reassume the role of the Chief Executive, the Vice President would continue to exercise the Executive powers and duties as Acting President. Should less than two-thirds of the Members indicate that the President is unable to resume his activities, all the powers and duties of the highest office of the land would be restored to him.

SECRET SERVICE PROTECTION

Scheduled to expire in December of 1965, the protection of our Secret Service will be offered to the widow of the late President Kennedy for an additional 2-year period.

Similar protection will be afforded to former Chief Executives, their wives and widows, and minor children.

IMMIGRATION

One of the basic tenets to which our Nation is fundamentally committed is that all men are created equal and are to be judged, not on the basis of race, creed, color, or previous condition of servitude, but by the contributions they make to society and on their worth as human beings. For more than 40 years our immigration policies have been to guarantee the status quo of the ethnic balance of our population in the 1920's. An annual ceiling of approximately 158,000 was set on the total number of persons to be admitted; nearly 70 percent of this total was allocated to Ireland, England, and Germany. While these quotas were often not used, they were not transferable to those remaining 100 countries and areas whose nationals could not be accommodated within the limits of the 30 percent quota assigned to them.

How, many have queried, can a nation of immigrants, proud of a tradition expounding individual equality, practice a policy which judges the admissibility of an individual on his national and ancestral origins? Does the concept of a national origin priority system not imply that certain peoples and certain races are essentially more desirable than others because of their racial ancestry or place of birth? In establishing admission quotas on these criteria, we were not fully living up to our heritage of greatness, our commitment to humanitarian and equalitarian principles, and our national interests as the leader of the community of free world nations.

Revisions liberalizing our immigration policy and removing the discrimination have been approved by the 89th Congress and signed into law by the President.

A gradual phasing-out of the national origins quota system will be effected over a 3-year period terminating June 30, 1968. During this time, previous national quotas will remain in effect but unused quotas will now be placed in a pool and made available in an order of preference to immigrants heretofore denied entrance because of an oversubscription of their country's quota. Through June 30, 1968, a maximum of 170,000 may be admitted annually on the basis of this combined national origins quota system and pool concept. Commencing July 1, 1968, immediate relatives of U.S. citizens, including husbands, wives, unmarried minor children and parents; special immigrants, subject to wage employment determinations by the Secretary of Labor, including primarily persons born in independent countries in the Western Hemisphere; resident aliens seeking readmission; some former U.S. citizens and certain U.S. Government employees, all will be granted admission without numerical limitations. Exclusive of the above-mentioned categories, an annual maximum of 170,000 immigrants will be permitted to enter according to the following preference categories: (A) 20 percent for unmarried adult children of American citizens; (B) 20 percent, in addition to any unused numbers from A, for husbands, wives, and unmarried children of legally admitted aliens seeking permanent residence; (C) 10 percent for person possessing special talents, skills, or educational training; (D) 20 percent, in addition to any unused numbers from A–C, for married children of American citizens; (E) 24 percent, in addition to any unused numbers from A–D, for brothers and sisters of American citizens; (F) 10 percent for skilled or unskilled workers whose permanent services are in current demand and unable to be provided by U.S. workers; (G) 6 percent for conditional admission of refugees seeking asylum from Communist countries, Communist-dominated countries, the Middle Eastern area of the world, or areas rendered uninhabitable by catastrophes of nature. Unused quotas will then be available to qualified immigrants on the principle of first come, first served.

In addition to repealing the racial ancestry clause of the Asia-Pacific triangle provision, the new immigration amendments, resting on the criteria of humanitarianism and the individual's contribution to society, set an annual maximum of 120,000 for immigrants from the independent nations of the Western Hemisphere and, exclusive of immediate relatives and certain other broad exceptions designed to prevent the hardships suffered by the separation of children from parents and husbands from wives, a yearly ceiling of 20,000 from any nation outside the Western Hemisphere.

As the Voting Rights Act of 1965 holds forth great promise for eradicating discrimination in the relationship of American to American, we feel that the revisions in our immigration policy will remove discrimination between the United States and countless numbers who ask only for the opportunity to prove themselves worthy of American citizenship.

AGRICULTURE

In the tradition of the great Democratic administrations of former years, the Johnson administration and the 89th Congress are giving their wholehearted support to policies which seek to guarantee parity of income and parity of opportunity to rural and farm families across this land. President Johnson, in his message to the Congress on Agriculture, said.

> The farm people of this Nation have made and are continuing to make a lasting contribution to our national prosperity. As a matter of simple justice they should share equitably in this prosperity. They deserve a place of dignity and opportunity.

That many farmers do not know dignity and opportunity became clear in the statistics presented by Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, who reported that out of 3 million farmers, only 400,000 earn close to the equivalent wage earned by skilled industrial workers.

OMNIBUS FARM PROGRAM

The 4-year omnibus farm program enacted unites a variety of income and price support programs with acreage allotment and land diversion measures—all of which are aimed at establishing a workable relationship between farm produce supplies and projected domestic and overseas demands. Out of this relationship must come a reasonable guarantee to our farmers of an income level that will mean parity of earnings and parity of opportunity.

The highlights of this all-inclusive farm legislation may be summarized as follows:

Wheat: To wheat producers willing to divert 15 percent of their 1966 allotted acreage to land conservation use the Secretary of Agriculture may forward payments of as much as 50 percent of the support rate of the estimated output of the diverted acreage. Farmers who wish to retire acreage over and above 15 percent will be eligible for additional payments. To further aid wheat producers in realizing returns approaching 100 percent of parity, direct Federal payments, and government-issued marketing certificates will be given for wheat grown for domestic human consumption. Calculated on the basis of the world wheat market price level and wheat price, support loans will also be available. All of these measures—land diversion payments, direct Federal payments, marketing certificates, and price support loans must assure the wheat growers of a minimum average of $1.845 per bushel.

Cotton: To cotton growers willing to withhold a minimum of 15.2 percent of their 1966 acreage allotment, the Secretary of Agriculture may forward payments amounting to 25 percent of parity on the estimated yield of acreage diverted from cotton planting and turned over to conservation programs. Growers retiring up to 35 acres would be eligible for maximum payments of 40 percent of parity on projected outputs. Acceptance of acreage diversion quotas entitles cotton growers to receive price-support loans of 21 cents per pound during 1966, as well as direct payments of at least 9 cents per pound on the estimated or projected yield of individual domestic allotments. Support and payment measures must bring the grower a return within the range of 65–90 percent of parity.

Feed grains: To growers of corn, grain sorghum, and barley—the latter if designated by the Secretary of Agriculture—assigning the requisite number of acres to conservation programs, the Secretary of Agriculture may forward payments of as much as 50 percent of established price support rates on the estimated yield of this land. Continuance of direct payments has also been authorized; combined loan and direct payment receipts must equal 65 percent of parity.

Wool: The provisions of the current wool program will continue to operate through 1969 with the Secretary of Agriculture authorized to make direct payments in the amount of the difference between average wool market prices and an annual income return ranging from 60 to 90 percent of parity.

Rice: Acreage diversion measures and land diversion projects may be initiated by the Department of Agriculture whenever the rate of rice acreage allotment dips below the 1965 level. The existing $4.50 per hundredweight support price will apply to the 1966 and 1967 crops.

Cropland adjustment: To reduce the recurrence of unwielding agricultural surpluses, a 4-year program of land retirement has been initiated. By making 5- and 10-year contract agreements of payments of as much as 40 percent of the value of "unplanted crops," it is anticipated that some 40 million acres will be retired from planting.

TOBACCO MARKETING QUOTAS

American tobacco growers have long produced a leaf unrivaled in flavor and aroma. Serious problems, however, plague our growers. Per acre yields have reached an alltime high and production currently exceeds demand by approximately 1 billion pounds.

In order to keep production in alinement with demand, changes in marketing quota procedures were enacted into law—Public Law 89–12.

Acreage-poundage quotas were provided in place of existing acreage allotments for the 1965 Flue-cured tobacco crop and for other tobacco beginning in 1966. The new quotas became effective for Flue-cured tobacco when growers subsequently voted in a referendum to accept the new program. The new quotas will not become effective for other tobacco unless approved by two-thirds of the growers voting in a referendum.

RURAL WATER AND SANITATION FACILITIES

Public Law 89–240 increased the annual ceiling on Farmers Home Administration insured loans from $200 million to $450 million. This important enactment also provided grants to help develop water supply and waste disposal systems in rural communities up to 5,500 in population.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS

The Congress revised and extended through December 31, 1971, domestic and foreign sugar quotas. We increased domestic mainland cane and beet sugar quotas by 580,000 tons a year and granted foreign quotas to 31 nations. This program, in effect since the 1930's, guarantees to the American housewife an adequate supply of sugar at reasonable prices and, at the same time, it plays a vital role in American foreign relations, particularly with our friends in the Alliance for Progress.

FARM DISASTER RELIEF

Legislation was enacted to provide price supports for farmers who participate in acreage reduction projects and who were unable to plant their usual cotton, feed grain, or wheat crops this year due to damage caused by floods or other natural disasters. Farmers are eligible only if their acreage was not planted with other price-supported crops. Losses incurred by land damage prior to crop planting are no easier to sustain than those suffered after crop plantings.

RIVER BASIN PLANNING

National attention is focused on the relationship between national water demands and available supplies when newspaper headlines spell out boldly that water reserves are being depleted rapidly, and measures to conserve existing supplies are being put into effect.

National attention is focused on the necessity for controlling water resources when newsreels show the havoc of unmanaged water supplies.

To meet satisfactorily and successfully our current and projected water needs, local, State, and Federal authorities must launch immediate and coordinated programs with the stated goals set at effectively planning, developing, managing, and utilizing the water resources with which we have been abundantly endowed and which we have carelessly squandered. To advance this undertaking, the River Basin Planning Act was signed into law—Public Law 89–80—creating a Water Resources Council whose membership includes the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Army and a Chairman appointed by the Chief Executive. This Council will be assigned the major responsibility of conducting an ongoing study and making a periodical assessment of the adequacy of regional water stores as well as setting standards and spelling out procedures to be applied in the formulation and evaluation of Federal water and related land resources programs. Finally, the Water Resources Council must oversee the projects of river basin commissions—making certain that the implementation of these plans will be in harmony with our national water conservation objectives.

The President was granted the power to establish Federal-State river basin water commissions whose primary task will involve the preparation and revision of comprehensive and coordinated plans for the water and related land resources development within their respective jurisdictions.

SALINE WATER CONVERSION

Desalting of seawater may well be the answer to one of our major questions: How do we supply the water needs of our large metropolitan areas having access to the coasts—areas which are now chronically plagued by water shortages.

Intensified studies in saline water conversion have been made possible by the passage in 1961 of the Anderson-Aspinall Act, which authorized $75 million for 1962 to 1967, inclusive.

Public Law 89–118 extends the life of our national saline water program from June 30, 1967 through the 1972 fiscal year and authorizes an increase from $75 to $90 million for fiscal 1967 and a maximum of $275 million through the life of this program.

Remarking that success in saline water conversion "could be one of history's most vital contributions to the cause of peace among nations," President Johnson further noted that the legislation extending and expanding our desalination program could well be the most historic product of this Congress—"not for what it provides but rather for what it promises, not for what it accomplishes but rather for what it symbolizes."

With the signing of the Water Quality Act into law—Public Law 89–234—early in October, President Johnson launched a dynamic program of joint Federal, State, and local action against the causes of pollution, which diminish further our already inadequate water stores.

A Federal Water Pollution Control Administration has been created within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and will be charged with the responsibility of coordinating and overseeing the operations of this act.

Authorization has been given for a $20 million annual appropriation during the 1966–69 fiscal period—an authorization that may provide matching Federal grants to interstate, municipal, and intermunicipal commissions in order that they may evolve better techniques for preventing the discharge of untreated sewage and other wastes from storm sewers and sanitary sewers into community water supplies.

A Federal matching grant for any individual discharge-control improvement project may equal 50 percent of the total project costs.

The current annual $100 million community sewage treatment grant program has received a $50 million supplemental authorization, with additional moneys to be awarded to qualifying States agreeing to match equally Federal funds received.

Within 1 year from the passage of this legislation, each of the 50 States will be required to forward to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a letter declaring an intention to set satisfactory water quality standards for interstate waters or portions thereof within its boundaries. This declaration of intent must be accompanied by procedures guaranteeing the attainment and enforcement of established standards.

Failure to carry out this obligation may result in the setting of reasonable quality standards by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The States, however, will be consulted and given every opportunity and any assistance requested in working out acceptable quality control measures. Differences of opinion concerning proposed Federal standards will be aired at a public hearing before a five-member board composed of affected Federal and State representatives. With this panel will rest the final authority to set and implement quality standards.

Failure to maintain set quality standards may result in the invocation of established pollution abatement procedures.

FEDERAL WATER PROJECT RECREATION ACT

Water-oriented recreational activities occupy an increasingly prominent place in the leisure-hour lives of our people. Recreational demands must be examined along with the quality-quantity aspects of water resources development.

The Federal Water Project Recreation Act states that it is the consensus of the Congress that careful attention must be given to the inclusion of fish and wildlife enhancement measures as an integral part of Federal water resource planning. In an effort to stimulate State and local interest and participation in this phase of water planning, the Federal Government is under the terms of this act, authorized to first, assume 100 percent of the "joint" costs or costs contributing to all aspects of project operations as allocated recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement sites; and second, assume a maximum of 50 percent of the "separable" costs or costs related most directly to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement. State and local interests will assume the remaining 50 percent of separable costs incurred by paying in cash or by providing the equivalent in needed lands or facilities.

RIVERS, HARBORS, AND FLOOD CONTROL

Our responsibilities to the welfare of the Nation cannot and will not be fully met until careful and complete consideration is given to each and every potential purpose that the development of our natural resources can advance. Navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, and beach erosion control are vital purposes well-deserving of our sage development and planning scrutiny.

The omnibus rivers, harbors, and flood control legislation passed in the twilight hours of this session of the Congress authorized a total of $1,982,305,000 in funds for 47 navigation betterment projects, 9 land and beach stabilization programs, and 84 flood-control undertakings.

In addition, $75,000 in appropriations has been authorized to enable the continuance and expansion of a national program to control the growth of obnoxious aquatic plants in our waters. Previously limited to the southeastern section of the United States, we feel that all areas and regions experiencing serious and dangerous weed infestation problems should be eligible for control assistance.

The Corps of Engineers will now join forces with Federal, State, and local authorities in the preparation of long-term planning and development projects for the drought-stricken northeastern sector of the Nation.

One final major provision of this legislation is certainly worthy of mention. To areas eligible for aid under the 1965 Public Works and Economic Development Act, the Secretary of Commerce will be empowered to grant loans to and purchase evidence of indebtedness from local authorities, thereby aiding in the completion of water resource projects.

AIR POLLUTION

To expand and accelerate our efforts to abate the contamination of our air and reduce the hazards of air pollution threatening the health of the public, this Congress approved legislation which authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish and implement workable standards for the control of dangerous substances from new motor vehicles.

The manufacture, sale, or importation of any substandard vehicle will result in the assessment of fines of up to $1,000 per unit. To meet the costs of implementing these amendments to the Clean Air Act, we have approved authorizations of $470,000 for fiscal 1966, $845,000 for fiscal 1967, $1,195,000 for fiscal 1968 and $1,470,000 for fiscal 1969.

Included in the air pollution control legislation was provision for a nationwide research and development program designed to advance our methods of disposing of solid waste materials including garbage, discarded agricultural, commercial, and industrial byproducts, and refuse from mineral extraction and processing operations. Excluded from this coverage were domestic sewage, solid wastes, and other polluting agents found in the Nation's water resources.

Under the joint administration of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of the Interior, appropriations totaling $10 million for fiscal 1966, $20 million for fiscal 1967, $30 million for fiscal 1968, and $32.5 million for fiscal 1969 have been approved for the implementation of the solid waste disposal provisions of this legislation.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

On the occasion of the signing of the Highway Beautification Act, President Johnson vowed that "beauty belongs to all the people. And so long as I am President, what has been divinely given to nature will not be taken recklessly away by man."

With its enactment into public law, the highway beautification legislation paved the way for an all-out attack on the forces of ugliness which threaten to deprive present and future generations of Americans from knowing and appreciating the finery of nature with which we have been abundantly endowed.

To aid in the control of outdoor advertising along our Interstate and primary highways and to enhance simultaneously public safety and preserve natural beauty, 10 percent of a State's allotted Federal highway funds may be denied for failure to remove other than specified outdoor advertising devices.

Authorizations of $20 million annually in fiscal 1966 and 1967 have been approved for implementation of outdoor advertising control measures.

The withholding of a maximum of 10 percent of Federal highway funds to which a State would be normally entitled could also be justified by a failure to initiate and maintain effective controls of outdoor junkyards. Seventy-five percent of the costs of removal and landscaping and/or screening costs will be available to the owners of affected junkyards and billboards.

Authorizations of $20 million annually in fiscal 1966 and 1967 have been approved for these junkyard control provisions.

Appropriations of $120 million annually in fiscal 1966 and 1967 have been provided for Federal participation in landscape and roadside development projects along all Federal-aid roads.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON ARTS AND HUMANITIES

With the enactment into law of Public Law 89–209, a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities was established. Encompassing a National Endowment for the Arts,, a National Endowment for the Humanities, and a Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities, the function of this Foundation will be the promoting of a "broadly conceived national policy of support for the humanities and the arts in the United States."

The National Endowment for the Arts has been authorized to award matching grants to the States, to individuals, and to public and nonprofit groups directly involved in the creative or performing arts for activities including production, purchase, or construction of needed facilities, workshops, and similar projects that will contribute to the support of the arts, as well as public enjoyment and appreciation of them.

The National Endowment for the Humanities has been authorized to award matching grants, research loans, and fellowships for research, information exchange, publication of significant works, training, workshops, and similar projects that will contribute to the promotion and appreciation of the humanities.

The establishment of a Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities was authorized. This Council will coordinate the efforts of the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities as well as the relevant activities of all other Federal agencies.

Appropriations totaling $63 million for the 1966–68 fiscal period have been approved for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities and for the implementation of its programs.

COSTS

We know that the primary concern of Government must be the promotion of the welfare of its citizenry. In a heterogeneous nation of approximately 195 million individuals, the promotion of the general welfare is a vast and expensive undertaking.

For the good of the individual and the greatness of a nation and a society, we must be willing to commit the requisite financial resources, for, in the words of the late President Kennedy:

> A strong America cannot neglect the aspirations of its citizens, the welfare of the needy, the health care of the elderly, the education of the young. Wealth is the means, and the people the ends.

The Congress early gave its approval to $1,600 million in supplemental funds for fiscal 1965 for the Commodity Credit Corporation and to $700 million in funds for additional fiscal 1965 Defense expenditures in South Vietnam. Passage of the second supplemental appropriations bill supplied $2,227,563,977 for the additional costs of continuing or completing a number of agency programs during fiscal 1965.

The following agency appropriations are for the 1966 fiscal period: Agriculture, $6,242,929,500; Defense, $46,887,163,000; Federal contribution of $46,122,000 to the approved $360,228,500 budget for the District of Columbia; $14,246,167,800 for the independent offices; $1,212,739,070 for the Department of the Interior; $8,011,331,500 for Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare; $189,993,297 for the legislative branch; $2,057,597,150 for State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary; $7,669,444,000 for the executive offices, Treasury, and Post Office Departments; $3,218 million for economic and military assistance programs and $714,188,000 in related foreign aid programs; $1,756,635,000 for the construction of military family housing units; $1,223,181,500 in supplemental funds for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare; $4,292,866,500 for public works; and general supplemental moneys totaling $4,741,644,602 to finance many of the proposals approved by the 89th Congress during its 1st session.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES PAY RAISE

Throughout our discussion of the outstanding legislative accomplishments of this session, we have spoken of policies, of programs, of projects, of authorizations, and of appropriations. Surely we must understand that the success or the failure of each and every activity of Government depends on one very vital ingredient, and that ingredient is the dedication and devotion to the service of their fellow Americans on the part of our Federal employees.

If the Government service is to retain its dedicated corps of personnel and offer an attractive career to our bright young men and women, it must offer salaries that are comparable to those of other sectors of our economy. To achieve this end, a 3.6 percent pay raise measure has been enacted and will benefit more than 1,600,000 Federal civilian employees.

Col. Ralph E. Vandervort, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BIRCH E. BAYH
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I would like to say a few words in behalf of Col. Ralph E. Vandervort, Jr., who has retired as liaison officer between the Department of the Army and the Senate.

I know that I speak for my colleagues in saying that Colonel Vandervort has been more than a representative of his Department during the last 6 years. He has become a personal friend to many Senators by virtue of his warm personality and his efforts to serve without hesitation or complaint.

Colonel Vandervort distinguished himself long before he became liaison officer to the Senate. During his 24 years of military service, he has accumulated a regular who's who of Army medals. They include the Purple Heart, Croix de Guerre with Gold Star, EAME Campaign Medal, American Defense Service Medal, American Campaign Medal, World War II Victory Medal, Army Occupation Medal—from Germany—DAGS identification badge, National Defense Service Medal, five overseas bars, and the Army Commendation Ribbon with Medal Pendant.

Having entered the service shortly before World War II, Colonel Vandervort served during the Korean conflict and in other areas of the world during the various cold war crises.

Although Senators will miss the advice and counsel of Colonel Vandervort, his many friends wish him well in the years ahead.

Congressman Chester Mize Reports on the 1st Session of the 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, carrying on a tradition which was inaugurated by my predecessor, the Honorable William Avery, who is continuing his career of public service as Governor of Kansas, I am making a report to the constituents of the Second District of Kansas on the activities of their congressional office and the position of their Congressman on vital issues.

This report is being mailed to every household in the district—more than 130,000 of them—so that my constituents can keep track of the stewardship of the congressional office they have entrusted to me. The report follows:

THE RECORD OF THE 89TH

The 1st session of the 89th Congress will go down as a historic one. The quantity of the legislation passed set records in itself. The total impact of this legislation which touches the lives of every man, woman and child in one way or another is yet to be evaluated, however, because of the profound changes which will be wrought. It is indeed safe to say that this year's legislative activity will also affect the lives of generations yet unborn. They will be asked to foot the bill for some of the programs on which payment has been deferred in the mad rush to set records and be all things to all people. History will be the judge of this session's output.

A BUSY YEAR

The tremendous amount of legislation and the record number of votes, plus quorum calls on the House floor, kept my staff and me busy throughout the session. We answered thousands of letters on the hundreds of issues which came before Congress. The controversial nature of so many of the bills provoked comment both pro and con from Second District constituents, all of whom received replies. We handled hundreds of matters for individuals seeking help on problems which were created by an expanding government's rules, regulations and requirements. As centralized Government grows larger, more people are involved and more problems result. A substantial part of our work is aiding constituents in meeting these problems.

Keeping in close touch with the district, I made 15 trips back to Kansas to attend functions and confer with constituents. I also serve on two task forces—one on the United Nations; the other on Latin America.

A BUSY COMMITTEE

As a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I participated in the hearings of some of the most controversial legislation to come before this session of Congress. Such bills as the measures to change the silver content of our coins, to create a Department of Urban Affairs, to include a program of rent supplements in the housing bill, to reduce reserves against deposits in Federal Reserve banks, to extend the Area Redevelopment Act, to amend the Bank Holding Act, and to amend the international wheat agreement. I attended more than 50 meetings of the committee in considering this workload of major legislation, plus deliberation on several minor bills.

WIDE VARIETY OF BILLS INTRODUCED

In addition to representing the Second District of Kansas on all of the issues before Congress, I also took a hand in introducing legislation which I feel is necessary for the district and the general public. I was gratified that the first bill I introduced, H.R. 3307, a bill to pay firms for improvements when they had to move their establishments because of the Milford Dam, became a part of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill. I also introduced legislation to reduce the excise tax on telephone service, hot water heaters, and documentary stamp taxes on real estate transfers. Versions of these bills were incorporated in the excise tax reduction bill approved by Congress.

The increase in social security benefits which I supported in a separate bill was included in the medicare bill. Other bills in which hearings were held were legislation to alleviate the boxcar shortage and a bill to include Kansas Modoc Indians in the distribution of judgment funds.

Some of the bills which I have introduced and on which I anticipate action next session are: A tax credit for higher education expenses; the establishment of a water resources trust fund, the Human Investment Act, the establishment of a Hoover-type Commission to study the organization of the executive branch, legislation to standardize real property acquisition procedures, and a bill to establish the Great Prairie Parkway.

WORKING FOR KANSAS

Besides the promotion of my own legislation, I appeared before various committees in behalf of matters important to Kansas: The establishment of a Grain Marketing Research Laboratory at Kansas State University, the Little Delaware-Mission Creeks Watershed project, the appropriations for the navigation and flood control projects in the Second District, a constitutional amendment to permit States to apportion one house of the legislature on factors other than population, and against the cut in funds for the ACP practices and the Soil Conservation Service as well as against the closing of the VA hospitals and regional offices. I also testified before the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress in behalf of the elimination of omnibus bills.

VOTING RECORD

Here's how I voted on some of the major issues before the 89th Congress this year:

Voted for

The Drug Control Act.

The Elementary Education Act.

Funds to continue House Un-American activities investigations.

The Water Quality Act.

Excise tax reduction.

The voting rights bill.

The Older Americans Act.

The military pay increase.

The farm bill.

Changes in the immigration laws.

Higher education assistance.

Voted against

Eliminating the gold reserves.

The Appalachia bill.

The Foreign Assistance Act.

A compulsory medicare program.

Increase in the national debt.

Department of Urban Affairs.

Reduction of silver in coins.

Repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Omnibus housing bill with rent supplements.

Expanded public works.

Expansion of antipoverty measures (felt existing programs should be checked for effectiveness before any expansion).

THE NEW SECOND DISTRICT

The Congressional Reapportionment Act, approved by the Kansas Legislature on March 11, 1965, enlarged the area of the Second Congressional District to add Dickinson, Morris, and Jefferson Counties. Wyandotte County was realined so that the portion retained in the Second District includes the cities of Edwardsville and Bonner Springs and the townships of Delaware, Prairie, and Quindaro.

Although the area was increased, the population was decreased to bring it closer to the numerical strength of the other four districts. Whereas the district had 445,196 people on the basis of the 1960 census, the new district has a population of 436,085.

We are sorry to lose some of the constituents in Wyandotte County but pleased to add those in the new counties of Dickinson, Morris, and Jefferson. The present Congressmen will continue to serve these counties until the new Congress convenes in 1967; but for the purposes of the 1966 election, voters in Dickinson, Morris, and Jefferson Counties will vote in the Second District.

Vice President Humphrey's Remarks Before the Adlai Stevenson High School, Livonia, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BILLIE S. FARNUM

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY at the dedication ceremonies, under date of October 22, 1965, of the Adlai Stevenson High School in Livonia, Mich., which is located in the 19th Congressional District which I have the privilege to represent:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

It is, for me, a source of particular satisfaction—and humility—that you have seen fit to invite me here today.

The dedication of this high school in the name of Adlai Stevenson—the first so-named in our country—takes its deepest significance not as a monument to his memory, but as a first milestone in the bright new world he foresaw for all men.

Today would have been a day of tremendous satisfaction for him because no man in our time was so dedicated to the idea that the only lasting mark a man can leave is a beacon by which the future generations can guide themselves.

In man's physical world, the trail blaze of yesterday is the highway of today. You need merely look about you to see its proof. Only two centuries ago the French voyagers, pushing westward through the lakes, paddled their birchbark canoes through the blue waters of the wilderness peninsula of Michigan.

Not one of them could possibly have dreamed of the highway he was blazing or the breadth and power of the new civilization which would use it.

It is my firm conviction that today we embark upon another such adventure, for there are future highways of the mind as well as of the wilderness.

Only 400 short years ago man believed he was the center of the universe, that the planets themselves revolved around him and had been doing so for only 5,000 years.

Then Copernicus saw with his mind's eye that the earth itself was in motion, that it was not the center of the universe, but part of a larger and more majestic movement.

Man today stands on the threshold of such discovery about himself.

As man once believed the earth was the center of the heavens, each nation believed it was the center of this earth, and spent its blood and treasure trying to make other nations revolve around it.

This concept compelled other nations, in turn, to preserve at similar cost the independence of their culture and people.

Hundreds of millions of innocent people died, cities were destroyed, libraries of priceless knowledge were obliterated because of this ghastly concept.

But it is no more ordained that the peoples of this world shall revolve around any one nation than that the planets and stars of the heavens shall revolve around this earth.

That was the great idea of Adlai Stevenson. It is man's latter-day discovery. It is the concept underlying the United Nations.

Today our poets and philosophers—yes, and our forward-looking political leaders—already sense that humanity is on the brink of development of a society which may unloose man's spirit and human potential—a society where, as President Johnson has said, men strive not for themselves alone but for all men.

The United Nations represents the triumph of the concept that no nation is the center of this earth any more than man is an island to himself.

Adlai Stevenson, a Copernicus of public life, gave strength and insight to this concept and he marshaled the giants of the ages to the cause of the United Nations.

"Know thyself," said Socrates. Adlai Stevenson added to this the Copernican view: That the key to a man's understanding of himself and of his country will be found in all other men and nations.

In a physical world of clashing arms and nuclear weapons, Adlai Stevenson took the noble path of Athens.

It was the knowledge that the only victory is in civilized persuasion—that that army never existed, nor that weapon ever invented or devised, by which hostile forces can enter into the realm of men's minds or hearts.

He knew that no nation and no man could ever extinguish the light God gave to men of every race, color and creed: the light of man's free spirit.

No physical force ever existed which can turn back the force of the evolution of man's soul. Consider the preponderant force of the pagan emperors of ancient Rome. Their legions were pitted against a forlorn group of men and women who insisted unto death that all men are brothers.

Which has lived through the centuries—the physical force, or the noble idea? Where are the Caesars, where are the legions now? And where is the noble idea?

The idea governs the consciences of billions of people of all religions—and may it soon govern the conduct of nations.

Like the early idea among men, 2,000 years ago, the early idea—as among nations—faces a heavily armed world.

The United Nations today may appear weak in the physical world. But that nation does not exist which is powerful enough to kill it. For the idea moves forward.

And among its allies is the United States of America. The most wealthy and powerful nation on earth, we have made our commitment to the idea and the precepts which underlie the United Nations.

For, in this nuclear age, we have reached the maturity to know that the strongest and weakest in mankind are equally vulnerable to mankind's dangerous inventions.

We have come to realize that, faced with a world two-thirds hungry, sick and ignorant, no one nation, acting alone, can hope to carry the burden of remedying those conditions.

We have come to know that both men's survival and his progress depend on his devising common and peaceful solutions to disputes and disagreements which, in previous history, were settled by force.

We have come to see that the evolution of man's technology has indeed forced evolution in man's organization and behavior.

Adlai Stevenson placed his faith and hope in the United Nations—even in times when it was mocked, belittled, and disregarded as an international instrument.

For his greatness was in his ability to look far beyond the limited horizons of the mockers and belittlers.

Today Adlai Stevenson is not with us. But his aspirations, his breadth of vision, his commitments to the United Nations as an institution, to the interdependence of man as a reality of life are shared by this Nation.

Adlai Stevenson was in his lifetime not chosen for the American Presidency. But the Presidency is today filled by another man of depth and purpose and of equal devotion to the betterment of the human condition. And under his leadership our evolution toward the great idea has moved swiftly forward.

For he knows, as Adlai Stevenson knew: Once men and nations understand the great common bond which sweeps them along together, like the great hidden undercurrents of the sea, new worlds open.

Could the French couriers viewing these wildness shores have imagined modern Detroit?

Could Columbus, tracing his lonely line across the Atlantic, have dreamed he was blazing a trail for ocean liners and jets?

Could Galileo, training his telescope on distant sky, have dreamed that man would one day leave this planet?

These are miracles we today accept.

Adlai Stevenson accepted them and their expanding truths as the challenge of the future.

He believed that man was no more condemned to eternal war than he was to eternal polio, cholera or yellow fever.

He believed—and the coming generations will prove—that the upward striving of man will bring revelations by which he may cure the ills of his body politic as he now cures the ills of his physical body.

You stand on the threshold of these great new perceptions.

If one may presume to speak for his great and gentle spirit, I know that Adlai Stevenson would want this school to stand not as a monument to him, but to the promise and the goal of the true brotherhood of man.

Let us then make our hopes the hopes of all men. Let us make our cause the cause of mankind.

Extremism and Its Threat to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

EXTREMISM AND ITS THREAT TO AMERICA

Mr. Chairman, honored guests and delegates to the Jewish Labor Committee Convention, I am happy that you are holding your national convention here in the Nation's Capital this year and I am particularly glad to have this opportunity to be with you this evening. I would particularly like to welcome those of you who are from California. I have often had the pleasure of working with you back home.

You are in the midst of a concentrated 2 days of work, study, and meetings. We in the Congress have just concluded more than 10 months of continuous session, enacting important milestone legislation in such areas as medicare, voting rights, education, public works, immigration, housing, health, water resources, and dozens of other vital measures. I trust that your deliberations will be fruitful as the work of the 1st session of the 89th Congress. I hope that before you must leave this beautiful city, you will have an opportunity to visit the Capitol Building, the Supreme Court, the White House, and other national shrines.

I spent my day today in the office at the Capitol trying to catch up with the load of committee work for which I am responsible as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The tempo of work does not let up completely even when Congress adjourns. Much remains to be done in committee before the next session begins in January. However, I felt compelled to take the time to think about your deliberations here this weekend. The issues that so deeply concern you are also profoundly my concern.

Your convention is helping to focus attention on two great and interrelated challenges that confronts us today:

One, the need to mobilize our economic, social, and manpower resources in a mighty national effort to extend the benefits of our society to all our citizens; and second, the need to muster our political and spiritual forces to defend our democratic institutions against ever-growing, open and venemous attacks by ultraright and ultraleft extremists.

You and I and national and local community leaders have over the years sought to eliminate from all areas of community life discrimination, and segregation based on race or color or religion or national origin or ancestry.

We have sought to remove the disadvantages, the disabilities, the indignities inflicted on Negroes, Spanish-speaking peoples, and other minority group persons. We have done this through appealing to the courts for redress of wrongs, through legislation to implement constitutional rights, through public information and education concerning prejudice and through voluntary programs by the groups that constitute our local communities.

At the Federal level we developed in Congress—and I have supported—legislation to assure equality of rights and opportunities in employment, housing, public accommodations, and voting. We have made significant progress.

But beyond these measures, we have recognized that equality of opportunity for all is not enough; that greater opportunity for all must be achieved. This is the meaning of the war on poverty and all the other programs geared to the concept of abundance for everyone. This is the purpose of the massive Federal support for educational and economic expansion.

The problems of poverty and discrimination with which we are striving to cope are immense, complex, and deeply rooted in our society. Our progress has been only gradual. Some programs have been temporarily stalled; others bring only long-term results. This has evoked in many persons feelings of helplessness, frustration, and despair.

Meanwhile, the very fact that these great changes in social, economic, and human relationships are not completed has provided an opportunity for ultraright radicals to try to turn back the clock of history.

It is easy to dismiss this growing wave of extremism from both the right and the left as being evidence of fringe malcontents, social and psychological misfits, or crackpots. Some have called such persons part of the lunatic fringe. Not too many years ago Hitler was viewed in a similar way, yet the step between the fringe and the seizure of political power can often be a short one, as mankind discovered to its horror just a generation ago.

Here in America we have been fortunate to maintain greater political stability in our national life, yet we all recall the era of McCarthyism a little more than a decade ago. We note with apprehension that various extremist groups such as the John Birch Society, the Minutemen, the Ku Klux Klan, the Americans for Constitutional Action, and other front groups are doubling and redoubling their expenditures of time and money to spread the gospel of hate, mistrust, and fear throughout the land.

Although still only a noisy minority, they are a larger and more aggressive minority and have succeeded in penetrating into the mainstream of political and community life in some areas.

Many of these groups have already made plans and have assembled political war chests to defeat Members of Congress from both parties who have dared to vote for legislation guaranteeing equal rights for Negroes and other minority groups; who have voted for long-needed reforms of our immigration laws; for medicare to aid our senior citizens; for foreign aid to assist underdeveloped nations; for measures to help improve the living standards of American workers.

They are already circulating purge lists for the 1966 campaign to smear honorable Members of Congress who refuse to accept the peculiar brand of patriotism which they fervently espouse.

Some groups like the Minutemen have assembled secret, private armies equipped with machineguns, rifles, mortars, hand grenades, and other tools of guerrilla war. A few months ago a large cache of arms was discovered less than 50 miles from Washington.

Their purpose is to inflame, to prejudice, to stir fear of change, to promote turmoil, to silence opposition, to paralyze democratic action. We see the results of such exploitation in many ways. Violence against peaceful demonstrators seeking the right to vote in many parts of the South. Riots and racial agitation in major cities such as Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York. Leftwing condemnation of our anti-Communist policies in Vietnam, attacking the integrity of our top national leaders; senseless burning of draft cards; fomenting violence at our military installations.

The Ku Klux Klan has long been the handmaiden of totalitarianism. The KKK was Hitler's echo chamber before World War II. It has recently come to the fore again to impose violence, spread terror, and thwart justice. In short, it is leading the forces of hate in a last desperate effort to stop the inevitable changes which would bring a measure of freedom to the Negroes in the South.

The House Un-American Activities Committee, long the target of some of our liberal friends, this week began its investigation of the Klan. It was interesting to note that totalitarians of both the left and the right invoke the same techniques to avoid the spotlight of publicity being focused on their activities.

The John Birch Society, parading under the banner of patriotism while imitating the techniques of the Communists, is perhaps more typical of rightwing extremists who have lately concentrated their attacks against the national effort for human rights.

The John Birch Society boasts a widespread membership and evidences substantial sources of funds. It has exerted serious influence in some election campaigns. It has disrupted some local communities and civic groups.

The Birch Society budget expenditure has risen from $1.6 million in 1963 to an estimated $6 million today. They have announced new organizational campaigns to raise some $12 million for the 1966 congressional elections. Rightwing spokesmen spread their venomous propaganda throughout the land each day. They now pour forth more than 10,000 broadcasts a week, using more than 2,500 hours of radio and television time—much of it donated by individual stations as a public service.

Like other groups of its kind, it is easily exposed by close scrutiny: it cannot stand the light of day.

In its own structure, the John Birch Society mirrors the kind of social order to which it is directed. It operates on the fuehrer principle. The founder is the final authority and no elections of any kind are held at any level. The John Birch Society operates in secret, through an apparatus of cells and front groups.

None of this is new. But what is new is that the founder has apparently ordered his apparatus to zero in on human rights as his prime target. What began as a campaign for impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren now has become a full-fledged effort to create an atmosphere hostile to the antipoverty program, the progressive legislation of the last several years and the pattern of court decisions to uphold constitutional rights.

All of the fantastic propaganda of the John Birch Society and other ultraright groups is being carried on under the guise of fighting communism. They brand any opinion which differs from their own as Communist or Communist-inspired, and any group or movement of which they are critical as part of the Communist conspiracy.

It is by this irrational reasoning that the John Birch Society has concluded in its last box score, that the United States is now 50- to 70-percent under Communist control. It is by this process that it has consigned most of the rest of the world to the category of being hopelessly Communist controlled, beyond recall.

In reality, the Communists, their fellow-travelers and those in their orbit have for years been rebuffed and discredited in the United States. Their totalitarian ideology has become well known. Their subservience to one or another of the Soviet police states has been thoroughly understood. Their techniques for infiltration and perverting public and private institutions and organizations have been thoroughly exposed.

However, they have been endeavoring to make a comeback. They are probing for soft spots in the life of a nation and in each community to penetrate. In these circumstances the indiscriminate labeling of innocent groups only serves to enhance the real Communists' chance of camouflaging themselves, of hiding among those who are falsely alleged to be Communist.

Thus, the totalitarian groups of the ultraright are the handmaidens of the ultraleft. Both would undermine and finally destroy our American social, economic, and political institutions. Both are alien to the basic principles of freedom, justice, and human dignity on which our Nation was founded.

For obvious reasons we are both the first targets of these extremist forces—you who are associated with the free labor movement, in the civil rights field, in the Jewish community because this represents the strong bulwark against totalitarianism in any form; I too am a target because I hold a responsible public office and work in the legislative arena to help establish the progressive types of programs that will resolve the basic cause of agitation, discontent, and economic deprivation. Since we face the voters of our district every 2 years, we in the House of Representatives who repudiate the totalitarian objectives of both the right and the left become the very special targets for these groups.

Both you and I have correspondingly heavy responsibilities to be particularly vigilant to detect and take action against totalitarian forces that are the cancer on our body politic. We must speak out courageously. We must educate our fellow citizens to the inherent dangers of extremist groups who so often hide beneath a cloak of patriotism. We must act decisively wherever and whenever we can to halt the spread of totalitarian doctrines in our schools, clubs, unions, and other organizations. Yet we must be ever conscious of the fundamental constitutional rights afforded to all citizens to speak, act, and hold such political beliefs as they choose. We must not use the same weapons of smear and innuendo that mark our totalitarian enemies.

The basic objectives of the extreme right and the extreme left are similar. They should be emphasized and reemphasized:

1. Both are committed to the overthrow of our American system of representative government.

2. Both seek to destroy the United Nations as an effective instrument of peace.

3. Both feed on and exploit discrimination against minority groups.

4. Both seek the abolishment of labor unions as effective instruments in advancing the well-being of working people.

5. Both use violence to achieve their objectives.

6. Both have sought to infiltrate the community leadership levels to advance their totalitarian doctrines—the schools, churches, social groups, unions, and governmental organizations.

7. Both seek to nullify the vast social and economic legislative gains over the past generation.

8. Both exploit fear, ignorance, prejudices, discontent, and frustration to help advance their cause.

9. Both seek to destroy the decent and responsible forces in the community and national life who are in a position to most effectively expose them and convince other citizens of their real objectives.

10. Finally, both can draw on almost unlimited financial resources to carry on their campaigns of hate, confusion, and division.

Obviously, the threat of the extremist groups in America cannot be eliminated overnight. It has a strong, well-organized, and highly financed core that has grown and spread its influence over the past several years. We must do more than just talk about it here tonight or just to think about it when we return home. We who are genuinely concerned over the implications of this threat to our American system must work however and wherever we can in our daily lives to spread the alarm among our citizens.

Public scrutiny must be directed to the activities of extremist, totalitarian groups and their leaders and spokesmen in villages, towns, and cities throughout the Nation.

Help strengthen those public opinion leaders who fear to speak out in opposition to such alien doctrines for fear of economic reprisal or physical violence.

Study the tactics and organization of extremist groups.

Mobilize efforts to resist their efforts to infiltrate and capture control of PTA's, clubs, unions, or other organizations to which you belong.

Support public officials who have the courage to take on a fight against well-organized extremists of the right or left.

Work cooperatively with other groups who are mobilizing to meet this extremist threat.

Only by undertaking these and many other courses of action can we make certain that the forces of totalitarianism never become more than a small, but vocal minority in America. Only then can we be sure that our children and our children's children will grow to enjoy this wonderful land of freedom, opportunity, justice, and human dignity and help to elevate our Nation to even greater accomplishments in the achievement of lasting world peace.

Appellate Review of Criminal Sentences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on October 22, I introduced S. 2722, a bill to provide for the appellate review of sentences imposed in criminal cases arising in the district courts of the United States.

Under existing Federal law, the determination of the sentence in a criminal case is left to the sound, but unsupervised, discretion of the district judge before whom the case is pending. As long as the sentence imposed is within the statutory limits, it is unreviewable by appeal. No matter how excessive or unjust the sentence might be, an appellate court is powerless to modify it in any way.

This basic shortcoming in criminal procedure—which is unique to our judicial system—has produced serious inequities and needless disparities in sentences. It has been frequently criticized. While programs such as the sentencing institutes admittedly have made substantial progress toward the development of better sentencing practices, experience has shown that such procedures and techniques are not enough. To adequately cope with the problem of excessive sentences—to correct injustices once they have occurred—the practice of appellate review is also required.

This is not to suggest that the right of appellate review will satisfactorily solve all of the remaining problems in determining a proper sentence. Quite obviously such a claim would oversimplify a complex and controversial subject. However, appellate review will at least provide an additional and important step in the right direction. It would give the judicial process the means of reaching and reviewing undeniable mistakes. It would clearly facilitate the development of proper sentencing practices and standards. It would, in other words, close the gap existing in the present system for which there is little logic and even less justification.

It is not to be denied that variations in sentences for the same crime are essential. Sound results can never be achieved by providing rigid and inflexible formulas. A sentence which may be quite proper in a case involving one set of circumstances may well be grossly inadequate in dealing with the same offense when committed by a different type of offender or under aggravated circumstances. However, where the same crime has been committed by similar offenders and under similar circumstances, it is sensible to expect that the punishment should be reasonably uniform. That any disparity should depend upon which judge happens to hear the case strikes anyone as unjust. Yet under our present system of unsupervised sentencing, this factor unfortunately does account for the difference in many cases.

The determination of a proper sentence involves the consideration of many elements. It can never be reduced to an exact science. Substantial leeway must be left for the exercise of sound judgment and, indeed, the differing views of individual judges in whose hands the sentencing power has been placed. But the determination of a sentence should be on a rational, not an arbitrary, basis. When, however, such judgments cannot be reconciled with reason, it is utterly incredible that the appellate courts should be denied the right to prevent a miscarriage of justice.

To place this matter in perspective, it is appropriate to quote a still applicable passage from the address of James V. Bennett, formerly the Director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons. Speaking to the Sixth Circuit Judicial Conference on April 28, 1961, he observed:

> I have a great and abiding respect for judges and for their courage as demonstrated particularly in this circuit in recent months. I admire them for their dedication to the ideal of equal justice under law. The care that is taken to ascertain the facts about an offender and how he is to be treated constantly amazes me. In no other judicial system in the world do judges now have or are able to obtain so much information about an offender as in the Federal system. And it is being used effectively to improve the administration of justice.
>
> Even though I feel thus and agree that our courts and judges are the bulwark of our way of life, I cannot be so shortsighted as to overlook or shrug off without concern some cases where I have been duty bound to carry out the mandate of the court. Take for instances the cases of two men we received last spring. The first man had been convicted of cashing a check for $58.40. He was out of work at the time of his offense, and when his wife became ill and he needed money for rent, food, and doctor bills, he became the victim of temptation. He had no prior criminal record. The other man cashed a check for $35.20. He was also out of work and his wife had left him for another man. His prior record consisted of a drunk charge and a nonsupport charge. Our examination of these two cases indicated no significant differences for sentencing purposes. But they appeared before different judges and the first man received 15 years in prison and the second man 30 days.
>
> These are not cases picked out of thin air. In January the President of the United States commuted to time served the sentence of a first offender, a former Army lieutenant, and a veteran of over 500 days in combat, who had been given 18 years for forging six small checks.
>
> In one of our institutions a middle-aged credit union treasurer is serving 117 days for embezzling $24,000 in order to cover his gambling debts. On the other hand, another middle-aged embezzler with a fine past record and a fine family is serving 20 years, with 5 years probation to follow. At the same institution is a war veteran, a 39-year-old attorney who has never been in trouble before, serving 11 years for illegally importing parrots into this country. Another who is destined for the same institution is a middle-age tax accountant who on tax fraud charges received 31 years and 31 days in consecutive sentences. In stark contrast, at the same institution last year an unstable young man served out his 98-day sentence for armed bank robbery. An examination of sentencing statistics produce a less dramatic picture, for they inevitably level off the extremes of leniency or severity. But they do serve to prove the widespread extent of disparities. For example, the crime of forgery usually involves similar circumstances and individuals, but last year the district of northern Indiana gave average terms of 52 months, while western Washington imposed an average of 10 months. For auto theft, an offense so often involving similar factors, one court in this circuit imposed terms averaging 48 months, but eastern New York imposed terms averaging slightly in excess of 14 months. The proportion of all types of convicted defendants placed on probation ranged from 67 percent in South Carolina to 10 percent in western Tennessee.

Unquestionably, some of these judgments are the direct result of the absence of any appellate power to review individual sentences or to exercise general supervisory power over sentencing practices. Other phases of the work of trial judges are subject to appellate review and supervision. Only sentencing errors are not capable of being corrected on appeal, apparently for reasons that are for the most part historical. Such reasons are increasingly irreconcilable with prevailing notions of procedural due process and are woefully out of step with the requirements for a fair and just sentencing system.

There appears to be a substantial divergence of opinion as to whether trial judges' sentencing power should be curtailed. The adoption of appellate review procedures would not be necessary if sentencing should cease to be a judicial function, but that is not the case today. Since the sentencing power is in the hands of individual Federal district judges, the right to review the exercise of such judgment should be given to the Federal appellate courts.

Legislation to provide for appellate review of sentences is not new. It was recommended by the American Law Institute in its Code of Criminal Procedure and by Attorney General Cummings in the 1930's. Attorney General Cummings sent his proposal to the Congress with this statement:

> My studies of the disposition of criminal cases in Federal courts have led me to the conclusion that there frequently occur wide disparities and great inequalities and sentences in different districts, and even by different judges in the same district, for identical offenses involving similar states of facts.
>
> While, of course, varying points of view as between individual judges must of necessity lead to a certain degree of divergence in sentences imposed, the result is that the penalty which a person convicted of a crime has to undergo may depend on chance and on the fortuitous circumstances that a particular judge disposes of the case. This situation makes it difficult to maintain that equal, evenhanded justice is attained.

These reasons are as applicable today as they were 30 years ago. The intervening years have, however, intensified the need to cope with the problem of the grossly disproportionate sentence and have witnessed a widespread acceptance of the principle of appellate review. The time has come, therefore, to enact such legislation in the interests of enhancing public confidence in the administration of criminal justice.

S. 2722 confers on the courts of appeal the power to review certain criminal sentences. It would allow a convicted person, who is sentenced to imprisonment for a term or terms aggregating more than 1 year, to appeal his sentence within 10 days after entry of the final judgment or order imposing the sentence on the ground that it is excessive. The courts of appeal, by rule or order, may require the forwarding of such transcripts and records which are deemed necessary to decide the matter from the clerk of the district court. The bill provides that the courts of appeal can make available to counsel any presentence reports and other evaluations relating to the defendant on such terms as are considered necessary for an effective prosecution of the appeal. The bill also provides that the district judge is required to state for the record his reasons for the sentence when imposing a sentence subject to review.

With one exception, the appellate court may decide the matter with or without an oral hearing. It is given the power to reduce, increase, or otherwise modify the sentence as it deems appropriate. However, before any sentence is increased the appellant is given the opportunity to appear for the purpose of making a statement and presenting any information in his own behalf. By taking an appeal, however, he is deemed to have waived any right to plead that as a result of the revision of the sentence he has been twice put in jeopardy.

Because it would not be reasonable to expect an individual to appeal a suspended sentence of any kind, the bill also provides that, in the event probation is subsequently revoked, the right to appeal from a sentence of more than 1 year is preserved until entry of the judgment or order imposing such sentence of imprisonment.

Furthermore, S. 2722 makes clear that the right to bail after conviction remains discretionary with the district court. The legislation does not confer or enlarge any right to be released pending an appeal from the sentence imposed. Because it is contemplated that the courts of appeal will require a reasonable period of time following enactment of the legislation to adopt appropriate rules governing appeals against sentence, the law would become effective 6 months after its approval and would apply only to sentences imposed thereafter.

While this legislation is patterned after bills I have introduced in previous sessions of the Congress, it has benefited from considerable discussion devoted to the subject in recent circuit conferences, as well as the thinking expresed in numerous legal periodicals. The basic departure from S. 823 introduced in the 88th Congress—granting the power to increase as well as reduce sentences—is in response to the recommendation of the Judicial Conference of the United States as adopted in its meeting of September 1964.

Rather than to discuss the merits of each provision of the bill at this time, it is more appropriate to offer two articles for the consideration of the Senate. The first, written by the Honorable Simon E. Sobeloff, was published in the Brooklyn Law Review. The second, by Prof. Gerhard O. W. Mueller, was published in the Vanderbilt Law Review. It is my hope, Mr. President, that, when Congress reconvenes next January, hearings on the bill will promptly be scheduled. To quote Judge Sobeloff in his closing remarks to the symposium of the Judicial Conference of the Second Circuit on September 24, 1962:

> To guard against irrationality, inequity, and oppression, every long sentence warrants a second look.

This bill will provide that opportunity.

For purposes of full information I am having the text of S. 2722 printed at this point:

S. 2722

A bill to amend chapter 235 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the appellate review of sentences imposed in criminal cases arising in the district courts of the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 235 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after section 3741 thereof the following new section:

"§ 3742. Appeal from sentence

"(a) In every case arising in a district court of the United States in which a defendant has been sentenced to imprisonment for one or more criminal offenses where the term or aggregate terms total more than one year the defendant may, upon application to the United States court of appeals within ten days after entry of the final judgment or order imposing the sentence, appeal from the sentence so imposed upon the ground that the sentence, although lawful, is excessive. Upon the making of such application, the clerk of the district court shall certify to the court of appeals such transcripts of proceedings, records, and other information relating to the offense or offenses of the defendant and the sentence imposed upon him as the court of appeals by rule or order may require, including any presentence reports or other evaluations made pursuant to statute or otherwise. The court of appeals shall provide for the availability of such presentence reports and other evaluations, or portions thereof, to counsel for the defendant on such terms as may be necessary for an effective prosecution of the appeal. Any district judge imposing a sentence subject to review under this section shall state as part of the record his reasons for imposing that particular sentence.

"(b) Subject to the provisions of this subsection, any appeal may be determined by the court of appeals with or without an oral hearing thereon. The court of appeals may reduce, increase, or otherwise modify the sentence imposed by the district court as it deems appropriate: *Provided, however,* That before any sentence is increased the court of appeals shall afford the defendant an opportunity to make a statement and to present any information in his own behalf. By taking an appeal from the sentence under this section, the defendant shall be deemed to have waived any right to plead that as a result of any revision of the sentence by the court of appeals he has been twice put in jeopardy for the same offense.

"(c) In any case where a judgment or order of probation is revoked and a sentence of imprisonment is imposed for more than one year, the defendant may appeal from such sentence as provided in this section within ten days after entry of the judgment or order imposing the sentence.

"(d) This section shall not be construed to confer or enlarge any right of the defendant to be released following his conviction pending an appeal from the sentence imposed.

"(e) The procedure for taking an appeal under this section shall follow the procedure for an appeal from a judgment or order of conviction and, where the appeals are joined, a single notice of appeal shall be sufficient.

"(f) This Act shall become effective six months after its approval and shall apply only to sentences imposed thereafter."

(b) The analysis of chapter 235 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"3742. Appeal from sentence."

Exchange Provisions of Oregon Dunes National Seashore Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on July 28, 1965, I wrote to a number of individuals in Oregon calling to their attention a proposal that was then under consideration by the Department of the Interior with respect to the exchange provisions of S. 250, the Oregon Dunes National Seashore bill.

In my letter I pointed out that the Department suggested an amendment to section 2 of S. 250 which would provide for exchanges as follows:

> On page 2, line 5, change "Sec. 2." to "Sec. 2. (a)" and add at the end of subsection (a) the following new subsection:
>
> "(b) In the exercise of his exchange authority the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property, and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property and federally owned property under his jurisdiction which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal and which is of approximately equal value. If the properties are not of approximately equal value, the Secretary may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged."

In my July 28 letter I made these observations:

> I understand that at least one timber company with lands inside the proposed park will, if this section is included, seek to exchange these lands for BLM timber lands in another county.
>
> The result will be to reduce BLM's allowable cut and the amount of timber available for independent operators long accustomed to the purchase of this public timber. Also, there is no requirement that private companies will have to practice sustained yield similar to that on BLM lands.
>
> In addition, there exists the possibility that timber speculators may obtain options on Oregon Dunes properties, then seek to exchange for BLM sustained yield forest. Also, speculators may similarly operate as third party agents.

I received responses from several residents of Oregon, addressed to me between August 3 and 4, 1965. I ask unanimous consent that these communications be included in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Medford Mail Tribune,
Medford, Oreg., August 3, 1965.

Hon. Wayne L. Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Wayne: I am flattered that you should seek my views concerning the various proposals for the Oregon Dunes National Seashore.

They are, in brief, these:

1. Such a seashore is important, not only to protect scenic, scientific, ecological, and recreational values, but also as a major factor in Oregon's economy through its third largest and fastest growing industry—tourism and recreation.

2. The precise size and borders are negotiable, and the important thing is to obtain authorization as soon as possible. But size and borders should not be reduced from the sharply reduced proposals which now verge on the minimal.

3. Condemnation should be used sparingly and only as a last resort, but the authority should be there to use it should all else fail. Life occupancy and limited survivorship rights should be included as a further protection against arbitrary use of the right of eminent domain—which is now well recognized as a valid instrument in obtaining properties for recreational purposes.

4. Land exchange is a valuable tool, but it, too, must be used with the utmost care and caution. I would propose that lands outside the seashore area be exchanged for lands within it under strict provisos that productive forest land, in particular, be retained in that use, and that it be managed under established silvicultural practices for sustained yield. Who owns the land is less important to the overall public weal than how it is managed and used as a renewable resource.

It would be a great tragedy if this seashore is not created. It would also be a great tragedy if, in the process of its creation, forest properties are taken out of production by cut-out-and-get-out methods or used for other purposes.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Cordially,

Eric W. Allen, Jr.,
Editor.

Oregon State University,
School of Forestry,
Corvallis, Oreg., August 4, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: In response to your letter of July 28, I am concerned in maintaining the resource base of Oregon. Knowing the responsibility of companies like Crown-Zellerbach, I would favor giving such long-time operators the opportunity to replace timber crops which would be lost to them by annexation. Surely it would be possible to write into the law stipulations which would exclude the speculators which are your concern, and mine too.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

W. F. McCulloch,
Dean.

The World,
Coos Bay, Oreg., August 3, 1965.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Acknowledgment is made of your letter of July 28 querying my views concerning the land exchange factor in S. 250, the Oregon Dunes National Seashore measure.

The enclosed editorial clipping may be in partial, if unsatisfactory, reply to your query. It is regrettable that the overall principle of land classification and land-use exchanges has not been thoroughly aired by the O & C and Multiple Use Advisory Boards, of the BLM.

It would also be regrettable if this controversial factor were permitted to form an insurmountable and perhaps convenient obstacle to the land-use protection inherent in the Interior Department National Park Service program, typified by the Oregon National Seashore proposal.

I believe that development of a policy of land acquisition by purchase should be encouraged for the National Park Service program.

I believe, further, that the power of eminent domain should be as logical and valid an authority of the National Park Service or Department of the Interior as for State or Federal highway departments. If, as you state, "there exists the possibility that timber speculators may obtain options on Oregon Dunes properties, then seek to exchange for BLM sustained yield forest," it would seem to constitute a convincing argument in favor of resorting to condemnation proceedings for the acquisition of national seashore land.

I am strongly in favor of protecting the sustained yield timber (or any other renewable resource, for that matter) consistent with the highest use of the land or resource involved. I do not believe that "sustained yield" in itself is a sacred doctrine or sacrosanct concept, to be applied only to the dominant industrial resource.

I also favor a sustained yield of scenic, educational and recreational values from our seashores, rivers, lakes, and forests.

I believe that both yields can be developed and realized from those sections of our Nation which are as yet not completely marred by inconsiderate practices. At least it is my knowledge that measures such as Senator Neuberger's and Congressman Duncan's Oregon Dunes National Seashore proposals are a sincere effort are harmonizing the two types of land use values.

It is my hope and my suggestion that the BLM Oregon Advisory Boards consider thoughtfully and deliberatively the land classification, multiple use and land law review legislation and whole complex and interrelated issue of land exchange and public land acquisition. I believe the public is entitled to such deliberation, free from the pressures, urgencies, and inspired influences of political and special interest ambitions.

If such an opportunity presents itself, it is my hope that I can make my views more effective and ample.

Sincerely yours,

Dawn Peseau.

[From the Coos Bay World, July 31, 1965]

Consulting the Public

(By Dawn Peseau)

In matters of public policy, as in forest protection, a little prevention can go farther than a lot of cure. The U.S. Bureau of Land Management should, by now, be just about expert in both areas of conflagration: The kind that threatens timber, and the kind that threatens sound management policies.

The Bureau, the public, and the public advisory boards which in theory form a liaison between them, recently experienced a pretty disturbing episode brought about largely—not by unsound governmental policies, but by a failure to communicate programs, intent and purpose to those who should have been informed. The uproar which reached a crisis of fevered communicating in May subsided into an uneasy truce. BLM personnel matters, which had become symbols of the policy conflicts, were left unchanged—a situation which does little more than indicate a false resolution of the very real policy—conflicts in the background.

We believe that the State advisory boards which have been created by the BLM should be called into session—not for another personnel testimonial, but in a calmer atmosphere, for consideration of the policies involved in the personnel hassle.

A number of development and circumstances prompt this suggestion, beginning with the original fact that the issue of the Point Reyes-Curry County public domain lands exchange has never been resolved within the framework of Federal land management policies.

There is the recently reported declaration from Bill Sweet that he feels justified in pursuing the Point Reyes exchange.

There is the July 22 announcement from Gov. Mark Hatfield to the State land board proposing that Oregon scattered grazing lands be exchanged with the BLM for timber acreages in eastern and southern Oregon. "There has been, as you know, a willingness on the part of BLM to exchange their fragmented timber holdings in certain Oregon areas," the Governor's letter noted with, we suspect, a certain dryness.

And there is the whole interrelated area of multiple use policies, program, and practices. We are thinking especially of the classifying and developing of recreational use lands in Oregon. These are responsibilities of stewardship, clearly defined by Federal intent, which, once defaulted, will be like time running through our fingers.

The content of documents and other information made public through the recently released proceedings of the May 14 joint O & C and multiple use advisory boards more than ever confirms the impression that had these boards been informed and consulted, and the public, through the various public information media, been informed, the big testimonials and hassling could have been avoided. Policy could have been deliberated and decided as policy—and not as an ordeal of hostilities and endurance between the various levels of BLM directorship.

This paper has attempted to comprehend, digest, and report the events in terms of policy. We have endorsed and upheld the record of accomplishment of BLM State Director Russell Getty, one target of the hostilities.

We have deliberately refrained from any attack or concurrence in attacks on the National Director of the BLM, Charles H. Stoddard.

We did not believe then, at the heat of the hassle, that sound public policy and the public interest would be served by such a demand. Nor do we believe so now.

On the contrary, we believe that genuine balanced, multiple use land and resource management policies will best be served by the full and effective service of both the national and State directors of the BLM. A merging and blending of the policies embodied in their respective experience would do much to insure a future of sustained yield timber, identified, classified, and developed recreation potentials, and full public benefit from the mineral, grazing, and other resources inherent in the public stewardship. We do not believe it naive to feel that the public is entitled to such an expectation.

We believe that steps should be taken now to lift the issues confronting our public land management in 1965 out of the sticky, sluggish mire of vested interests and adherence to the status quo. And by vested interests, we do not confine our meaning to the caricature image of private industry. There is no vested interest quite as stubborn and resistent to change as that of the doctrinaire and self-righteously embattled bureau or agency.

The BLM in Oregon has not one, but two public advisory boards: The O & C board made up of some 18 members, and the multiple-use board of a similar size. The men (and women) who have been asked to serve on these boards are not trivial people. They are busy people, representing actively various facets of public, industrial, professional, and economic life in their communities and State.

We believe that they are too busy to concern themselves with recrimination; with wondering who was responsible for the seemingly insolent ignoring of them prior to last May when the Point Reyes controversy was at issue in the BLM.

But we believe that they—the members, individually and collectively, of the advisory boards—are entitled to being consulted now and in the future. We believe that they are entitled to function in the service of the BLM in a truly advisory and consulting capacity, and not as a rubber stamp to be used when convenient but ignored at other times.

Either such a relationship with advisory boards should prevail—or they should openly and with dignity disband.

THE OREGON STATESMAN,
Salem, Oreg., August 3, 1965.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am in receipt of your letter of July 28, addressed to me as chairman of the O & C Advisory Board, and making inquiry regarding the authority included in S. 250 to exchange federally owned property for certain lands owned by private parties within the proposed Dunes National Seashore Recreation Area.

The questions you ask are:

"Do you support this unlimited power of the Secretary of the Interior to exchange BLM sustained yield forest lands for private timberlands? Should public timberlands now designated for sustained yield in this or another county be taken out of BLM allowable cut for this sort of exchange? Should sustained yield forest be exchanged without provision that it must be managed for sustained yield?"

The advisory board has not had before it any proposal for transfer of lands to facilitate acquisition of the land for the proposed Dunes Park in Oregon. However, at a meeting of the board on May 14, the proposal to exchange BLM timberland in southwest Oregon for lands in the Point Reyes National Seashore was under discussion.

At that meeting a motion was offered by member H.R. Glascock, Jr., as follows:

"I move that the O & C Advisory Board recommend to the Secretary of the Interior that the publicly announced policy of the Secretary of the Interior and Under Secretary Carver, that the O & C and public domain lands in western Oregon be managed as one under a common standard for permanent forest production and under principles of sustained yield and multiple use, be reaffirmed."

The motion was carried with only one dissenting vote.

I call your attention to the fact that this motion relates only to specific tracts of public domain which had been grouped for coordinated management with O & C lands, under a program of sustained yield. It would not apply to other lands or property which the Secretary might wish to trade for Dunes lands.

Yours very truly,
CHARLES A. SPRAGUE.

OREGON STATE GRANGE,
Portland, Oreg., August 3, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In answer to your inquiry with regards to exchange of Federal lands, particularly in connection with the Dunes Park proposed legislation, I am enclosing marked copy of my annual address before the State grange convention at Pendleton, Oreg., wherein I discussed briefly the matter of our public lands policy; and would recite also that a resolution was adopted at this session which places the Oregon State Grange on record as being opposed to trading of Oregon land, timberland especially, for private land wherever located, for the purpose of parks, or otherwise.

Both my section of the annual address and the resolution were thinking more especially about the proposed trade in connection with the Point Reyes Recreation Area. However, the same policy would apply, and I feel free to say that both myself personally, and the Oregon State Grange are in opposition to granting to the Secretary of the Interior authority to exchange these public lands at will.

I am currently a member of the BLM Advisory Board, and there also is in Oregon, another board called the O & C Advisory Board. Either of these, or both, are good sounding boards in matters of this nature. Certainly, a State should have at least advisory authority before public land within the boundaries of that State are exchanged.

So I repeat, both personally and speaking for the Oregon State Grange, we are in opposition to granting this blanket authority to the Secretary of the Interior whereby he could exchange public lands at will.

Sincerely and fraternally,
ALLEN P. WHEELER,
Master.

FEDERAL LANDS

(Extracts from address of Allen P. Wheeler, master of the Oregon State Grange, Pendleton, Oreg., June 15, 1965)

Recently, the residents of Oregon have been alerted to possibilities as regards land management policy by the Federal Government. The fact that approximately one-half of the total area of Oregon is owned by the Federal Government, together with the fact that the No. 1 industry in Oregon is timber and timber products, makes this something of great importance to our economy. The proposed exchange of timber lands in Curry County for lands in California needed for the establishment of the Point Reyes recreation area is in reality of minor importance when compared to the total problem, excepting as it is a matter of establishing policy.

In this case, the press has been supplied with ample material for sensational writing. The stories cannot all be true because they are in contradiction. The exact extent to which commitments have been made in this particular situation may never be generally known. One fact is certain, that the Bureau of Land Management did proceed to quite a degree before ever presenting this particular matter to either of the advisory boards now in existence in the State, one being the O & C Advisory Board, the other being the Bureau of Land Management Advisory Board.

Had these matters been presented before either or both of these boards, much of the unfortunate controversy might well have been averted. These advisory groups are supposedly set up as a sounding board and a means of ascertaining local sentiment in matters of this type. Certainly they should be used freely or discontinued. If their function is only as a buffer between the Department of the Interior and the people, then they are of little or no value.

In the midforties, there was a real controversy in Oregon over the matter of setting up sustained yield unit operation of timberlands. Many people were caught in the middle of this development. Those who were inclined to favor sustained yield policies were accused of favoring monopoly, and all sorts of other things. The net result was a modified sustained yield program as to federally owned timber, which has worked a hardship on some small mill operators who are not able to comply with the requirements. However, Oregon is working on a sustained yield program that should provide a constant supply of timber from now on. I think there is not any person who is well informed of the circumstances who would doubt the advisability of such a program.

Returning now to the issue at hand, this proposed exchange enters into our sustained yield program in that timberlands included in our calculations would be exchanged for lands in another State and to be used for another purpose. It matters little to the residents of Oregon whether we are exchanging for lands in California, Alaska, Hawaii, or any other place. Certainly State boundaries should have some meaning in this instance, and the economy of the State should be taken into account before any such exchange policy would be established. Though I have spoken only of timberlands, the situation covers grazing lands as well, and a great many people are dependent upon public lands in their livestock operations. Any withdrawing of these lands from availability would be a blow to the economy. This present, much publicized, situation should give rise to energetic action on the part of the residents of Oregon in protecting our State economy. Let us be alert to guarding against encroachment on our inherent rights in this situation.

DIAMOND, OREG.,
August 4, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for your letter of July 28 in which you refer to your concern about the Oregon Dunes bill, S. 250. Your outline of concern also concerns me and I will try to list my observations and feelings relative to this matter.

The question of unlimited power of the Secretary of the Interior to exchange BLM sustained yield forest land for private timber lands is an important issue. I, of course, am very much interested in private industry and feel that the private timber industry is an important segment to the economy of Oregon. I do not feel that the Secretary of Interior should have such unlimited power and authority in dealing with such complicated matters that affect the well-being of the State of Oregon.

Your important question regarding sustained yield and its relationship to the continuation of this policy concerns me in that I feel the sustained yield principle should be maintained and so stipulated should this exchange take place. I do not question the integrity of private industry but I do feel that the only protection the people of Oregon have where such public lands are involved create the necessity of the sustained yield principle. This, of course, will eliminate the stripping of this valuable resource and will maintain the resource for future generations.

In regards to the public timber lands now designated for sustained yields, the BLM allowable cut should be taken out of the exchange of private lands. It is my personal feeling that should the private lands involved in the sand dunes exchange be traded for BLM lands, the people then who assume the ownership of these Federal lands should have the privilege to do as they see fit with these lands. Therefore, the BLM allowable cut should be reduced accordingly. Certainly the private individual in the State of Oregon should be protected in such an issue.

Please accept my thanks, Senator MORSE, for consulting me about this important issue. I am sure that the problem is complicated and the resources of this State plus the private individual must be protected and safeguarded without serious detriment to the economy and stability of the areas involved.

Senator, I would like to also comment on the principle of condemnation if this is still an issue in the sand dunes situation. I am not in favor of the condemnation of private lands for recreation. The Federal agencies own over 50 percent of the land in the boundaries of the State. Therefore, cannot the recreational needs be met by development of the lands now owned and controlled by public ownership?

On January 9, 1964, I visited with Representative DUNCAN about the condemnation of private land in forming the sand dunes and he explained his views that if you are going to have recreation, you are going to have to have condemnation. I oppose this very much because it would be retroactive throughout the State.

Here is an example:

Suppose I own a spring on the Steens Mountain and someone comes along and decides that the spring would be better suited for recreation and they condemn it—that would hamper me from using as much as 3,000 to 4,000 acres of land for grazing purposes. This, if practiced, I feel would upset the economic stability of our eastern Oregon counties as well as the western counties.

If I have neglected to answer other questions that might be important in this matter, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you for your continued interest in Oregon's resource problems.

Very truly yours,

C. M. OTLEY.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 4, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am definitely opposed to amendment of S. 250 as proposed by Secretary of Interior per your letter of July 28. Amendment would invest too great authority in a single public official. Would reduce BLM allowable cut badly needed for Oregon's future economy. Would also open door for speculator manipulation of public lands. Basic principle of sustained yield practice must be maintained at all costs. Urge you oppose this amendment to S. 250.

WESTERN COUNCIL LUMBER & SAWMILL WORKERS.
JULIUS VIANCOUR.

Stanley Home Products—35 Years of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, much has been written in recent years about the economic ups and downs of New England industry and commerce. No one can deny that many plants and industries traditionally associated with New England have packed up and moved to areas where tax concessions, cheap land, and low-wage labor have been offered. But that is only part of the story.

A great many other industries to whom quality of workmanship, reliability, and craftsmanship outweighed the promise of low overhead and cheap operating costs, have remained in New England to prosper and expand.

One among these is Stanley Home Products, Inc., located in the First Congressional District of Massachusetts which I am pleased to represent in this body. This forward-looking firm is celebrating its 35th anniversary this year; 35 years of constant growth and progress through one of the most turbulent economic periods in history for New England, the Nation, and the world.

Stanley Home Products was built on the unique premise enunciated by its cofounder, Frank Stanley Beveridge, who vowed:

> We will build here an institution the likes of which has never been seen; one that will be a benefit and a blessing to those associated with it.

The institution which Mr. Beveridge and Miss Catherine L. O'Brien, cofounder, originated began with one floor of an old tobacco shed in Westfield. As the business grew, Stanley spread its facilities into several buildings throughout the city until the manufacturing facilities were eventually moved into a former textile mill, which became available after World War II, in nearby Easthampton.

Here there are now almost 700,000 square feet of clean, well-lighted, manufacturing space where over 200 different Stanley products are produced and distributed. On a trip through the plant you see coordinated the many kinds of efforts that go into research and development, buying materials, product design, production, testing, packaging, and shipping. Stanley associates employed in the Westfield-Easthampton area number almost 700.

Mr. Beveridge's original words of prophecy proved to be not only an inspiration, but also a reality to thousands of people who through the years have become independent Stanley dealers. For Stanley has persevered in destroying artificial barriers, long before the working woman came into her own right. Today, most of this company's approximately 25,000 independent dealers are women. They range in age from 21-year-old young ladies to the great grandmother in her late seventies. Incredibly enough, most of them were without prior experience in selling.

During these years, the company has been a dramatic illustration of American economic opportunity. It has proved time and again, how individuals with the drive and ambition to get ahead can be successful, regardless of race, sex, color, national origin, or religion. For the past several years the retail value of merchandise and premiums distributed by Stanley dealers and Stanley subsidiary companies has exceeded $100 million annually.

Stanley Home Products can rightfully take enormous pride in having pioneered sales opportunities for women. Virtually thousands and thousands of women have built important sales careers through the Stanley Hostess Party, which the company originated. Stanley is one of the relatively few large industrial companies that is headed by a woman—its chairman of the board, Miss Catherine L. O'Brien.

Foster E. Goodrich, president, once said about his company:

> There is almost no limit to the growth possibilities for a man or woman as a Stanley dealer. Our company's success is tied directly to the success of each and every dealer.

Individual case histories of successful dealers have underscored his words. The opportunity indeed is almost limitless. An independent Stanley dealer averages about $12 gross profit per regular Stanley hostess party. It takes about 2 hours for the party to take place. This includes playing games, having cake and coffee, and, of course, a product demonstration, dramatizing the convenience of living room shopping. Consequently, the dealer can virtually decide on the kind of income he wants or needs. Naturally, when a good dealer becomes a manager and then goes up the Stanley ladder, the opportunities for financial success and personal gratification are even greater.

This highly successful company has devoted many of its energies to those things that transcend higher profits. It has for years conducted a good neighbor program, sending "cleanup kits" to victims of national disasters. In fact, only a few years ago, in Washington, D.C., General Gruenther, as president of the American National Red Cross, presented the company with a special good neighbor commendation. The company has sponsored numerous scholarships, safety programs, journalism awards, and other public service efforts.

It is an example of the kind of company that those of us who believe in free enterprise take pride in. For it has a proven record of success. It has brought great benefits to its dealers and associates. And yet, at the same time, it has been a good neighbor not only in Westfield and Easthampton, Mass., but in all of those communities throughout the 50 States where people know their Stanley dealers. In the words of its founder, Frank Stanley Beveridge, it has become a benefit and a blessing.

It should be noted that Mr. Beveridge was indeed a philosopher as well as the builder of this unusual company. Mr. Beveridge left behind the following credo, which all of management might well study, and from which it can learn so much. He said at one time:

> We have taken ordinary objects—tangible, inanimate objects like these brushes and like the chemicals we make—and turned them into something whereby people can build their lives with them, whereby people can improve their thinking, improve their living, improve on their ambitions, their working qualities, improve their minds, improve—yes—improve their spiritual thinking.
>
> All these things have been done directly or indirectly through the medium of using Stanley home products. That is a big claim and some people would be inclined to dispute that idea, but any organization can take their products and do the same thing with them.

Mr. Beveridge has since passed on. But his cofounder and now chairman of the board, Miss Catherine L. O'Brien; Foster E. Goodrich, president; A. W. Elzerman, vice president in charge of sales, and the other members of the management team have carried on his eloquent idea and ideals.

As this company celebrates its 35th year, the words of Mr. Beveridge along with his belief that "the man is more important than the plan" should help not only Stanley Home Products, Inc., but help us as well in all of our dealings. and perhaps for years to come, assist us in appreciating a little better the human equation.

Economic Inequities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. CALLAWAY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I was visited by Mr. William D. Pardridge, of Virginia, an economist who brought with him some thought-provoking articles which he has published throughout the country. Mr. Pardridge's purpose in visiting me was to ask that I insert in the RECORD a guest editorial which he had published in one of my district newspapers. In studying Mr. Pardridge's material, I found some points of disagreement, and therefore hesitated to meet his request; yet an exchange of correspondence between us has changed my mind. I want now to insert his material into the RECORD, preceded by our correspondence, which I believe will make clear his purpose and mine: to provoke, in spite of differences, some honest thought about the economic trends of this Nation:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 12, 1965.

Mr. WILLIAM D. PARDRIDGE,
Economic Inequities,
The Plains, Va.

DEAR MR. PARDRIDGE: I enjoyed meeting with you. I think your plan for a book on economics composed of 50 editorials in the 50 States is a unique one.

As you know, I told you that I would go over your editorial in the Columbus Enquirer carefully to see whether I felt it proper for me to enter this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Although I am not one who enters a great deal of material in the RECORD, I would be glad to do it for an important project such as yours, provided I think the editorial contributes to the principles that I believe in.

Having read your editorial carefully now, I find that it is not entirely in accord with my own philosophy on at least two points. First, working teenagers; and second, the national mandatory school age limit of 18.

I, of course, think it is a shame for any teenager to drop out of school in order to work, and thus be handicapped by a lack of schooling for the rest of his or her life. I have always felt that gainful work by teenagers during vacation or during off-school hours is extremely important. I have strenuously opposed the proposed revisions of the minimum wage laws for the very reason that, in my opinion, these amendments would deny teenagers their present share of the work force. I don't think there is a better way to prepare a teenager for the life ahead than productive work at an early age.

I would very definitely be opposed to a national mandatory school age limit. I am not one of those who feels that we can solve all of our problems with national legislation. If there is anything that should by our Constitution and by our entire Federal concept be left up to the States, it should be the question of school truancy laws.

Although there is a great deal of what you say with which I agree, I feel that there is enough with which I disagree to make it inadvisable for me to enter your material into the RECORD.

I feel that I could not do this without some kind of a disclaimer, and that with the disclaimer, it would not serve your purpose.

Sincerely,

HOWARD H. CALLAWAY.

THE PLAINS, VA.,
October 14, 1965.

Hon. HOWARD H. CALLAWAY,
Third District, Georgia,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CALLAWAY: I have your honest letter of October 12.

On August 16 of this year Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Pittsburgh Press, the article being one of the 50 parts of the series entitled "Economic Inequities." I quote Senator SCOTT: "One need not agree with every word to share the author's hope that he will stimulate the public's thinking."

On June 11 of this year Senator ALAN BIBLE, of Nevada, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Las Vegas Review-Journal, it being another in the series. I quote Senator BIBLE: "While I do not necessarily endorse all of Mr. Pardridge's conclusions, I believe that they are worthy of the attention of the Senate."

Mr. Congressman, your letter of October 12 is flat proof that Senator SCOTT's and my hopes that the series "will stimulate the public's thinking" are not forlorn ones. Accordingly, with such hopes held high, I ask you as earnestly as I know how to enter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the disclaimer of your last paragraph along with the article from the Columbus, Ga., Enquirer.

I note that you decry the "proposed revisions of the Minimum Wage Act." I do also, Congressman CALLAWAY, on the economic ground that upward revision will reduce total employment and thus defeat in an aggregate manner the good intentions of those who think in terms of wand-like prosperity for all.

Second, I note that you oppose "a national mandatory school age limit." So do I. This is a State's problem of statute law, not a Federal one. I said in the article that "there is not one honest juvenile court judge in this Nation who would not sleep better if (1) the national mandatory school age limit were raised to 18." There isn't today any national mandatory school age limit. The juvenile court judges, bless them, would be happy as a societal minority group, yes, but the free sociopolitical structure of America would be attacked by any such Federal manifesto.

I have been to many, many parts of our country on foot and by automobile, and I know well that the differences in societal habits between different parts of America provide the basic sociological cause of American individuality. No, Mr. Congressman, I myself want no Federal legislation that could homogenize our geosocial traits. On the other hand, if some peculiar chap were seriously to propose in the Halls of Congress such Federal law, the ensuing hue and cry just might be enough to lead a lot of folk back home in the 50 States to look carefully at their own local laws governing school age limits.

I find it difficult, if not impossible, to deny that modern technological advances have not made mandatory more schooling and education than required when you and I went to grade and high schools. And that wasn't too long ago.

Let me return to Senator SCOTT's remarks of August 16. Again I quote him: "From careful thought, better solutions to our economic problems may emerge, and, for this reason, I believe the provocative points raised are well worth the attention of all of us."

If my article has induced you, not by tricks but by genuine differences of opinion, to think carefully about these matters, then the article has not been a waste but a profit. Give the article, together with the fundamental reasoning of your October 12 letter, to the people of Georgia and the other 49 States.

I urge you, then, to insert the article in the RECORD, but allowing, I see now, our two letters and any remarks my letter may bring to mind to precede its printing point.

Yours could be the finest disclaimer, if that's what it is, made public so far.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM D. PARDRIDGE.

[From the Columbus (Ga.) Enquirer, Sept. 25, 1965]

LABOR ISN'T LOOKING TO FUTURE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article is written by William D. Pardridge, an economist of The Plains, Va. It is one of a series which will be compiled into a book called "Economic Inequities." Pardridge's previous articles have won the praise of Senators and Representatives, and although his pen is sharp and stabbing, he has a surprising message for the persevering reader.)

(By William D. Pardridge)

American management simply cannot be blamed for organized labor's abject failure to see beyond an increase in wages, an increase in fringe benefits, and a decrease in the workweek.

These three goals are justified ends in a normal, progressively productive economy, but they are not goals to satisfy labor's demands to be recognized. Everybody wants a cut of the pie when it's on the window sill, but nobody wants to pick the berries.

Organized labor today has the benevolent power to deliver a body blow to economic unemployment and to be a real hero to its children. But there's no glory for the leaders in fighting to get long-run benefits.

These near-sighted windbags will tell you it isn't moral to take a 10-year-old boy out of school and put him to work.

Making an 11-year-old girl work full time or even part time in a grocery store is not part of the great humanitarian aims of the glorious American labor movement.

That kind of talk is drivel. She isn't there for the same reason her 12-year-old cousin isn't working in the cannery where his father is a foreman. She just doesn't know enough to guide the tomato crates.

In the next county the cannery foreman has a widowed sister-in-law with 13-year-old twins and one boy a year older. The twins are in school, but the 14-year-old boy is a bona fide, real McCoy digit of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. You see, he works.

The widowed woman has a neighbor whose husband works in a steel mill and who drives a late-model car owned by the finance company. They have a 15-year-old daughter and a son. The girl goes to school now and then, but the 16-year-old boy dropped out of school because he didn't like civics and geometry. He plays pool while he looks for a job.

He can escape work, but he cannot escape the U.S. Bureau of Labor statistics, which says he is unemployed. His old man's union doesn't want him—he can't do the work. Things have changed at the mill since the time his own father did go to work there at the age of 16 years.

Across the street live two brothers of the ages 17 and 18. The younger boy also dropped out of school because he didn't like history and geography. He works full time at a gas station on Main Street. The 18-year-old is a senior in high school, and so the BLS doesn't count him as a member of the labor force.

Now, on the north side of town the gas-station boy's uncle is out of work. He is out of work only because he himself was a gas station attendant on Main Street when he was 17.

The uncle is on some sort of a dole, which the Office of Unequal Opportunity calls "an appropriation by the U.S. Congress to wipe poverty off the face of the earth."

This is great. This is nifty. And labor's leaders are bloated with satisfaction. They don't have to worry about the uncle. Besides, it isn't costing anybody any money. Congress just appropriated it. Congress should do this more often.

One day, though, the gas station owner told the uncle he could have the 17-year-old's job because the kid was now going to a brandnew vocational school that never heard of history and geography.

The old-fashioned uncle took the job, went off the dole, and started bringing home the bacon. His neighbors thought he was crazy.

In America in 1964 there were 3 million—count 'em—3 million employed persons under 18 years of age.

And in that same America there were 3 million—count 'em if you dare—3 million unemployed persons over 18 years of age.

The exact figures, from the U.S. Bureau of Labor statistics, are 3,065,000 employed under 18, and 3,350,000 unemployed 18 and over.

While the union big wheels are eating mashed potatoes and gravy, their kids are either starving or playing pool, depending, of course, on how their parents vote. This is not a political party matter, though, as some would say, for Republicans and Democrats alike have their failings.

Tomorrow's job simply is forsaken for today's plum pudding.

Just who, then, is going to mind the store next week? Nobody.

Labor over the past century or so has fought diligently and nobly, at great personal sacrifice, to reduce the workweek from 80 hours to the present 40 hours. But not one of the "leaders" has placed a mortgage on his house of power to increase the mandatory school age of his very own children.

The crafts are dying right in front of the shortsighted eyes of the big, wonderful, humanitarian labor movement. They are dying because of the incredible technological advancement that has no place in it for the untrained, the school dropout—who would not be dropouts, by and large, if there were as many public trade schools as there are public schools for rote history and geography.

The engineers are ahead of the operators, and big labor either doesn't know this or is too afraid to do anything about it.

The 35-hour week is a big deal with much fanfare and immediate glory. So is the Office of Unequal Opportunity. There's room for everybody, folks. Step right up and get your share.

There is not one honest juvenile court judge in this Nation who would not sleep better if (1) the national mandatory school age limit were raised to 18, and (2) the billions of the poverty program were applied directly and immediately to construction and teacher-training programs for as many vocational schools as are needed.

These twin programs would in themselves be good for the economy if, of course, they were financed from the economic profits of the Nation instead of from its working capital.

Labor unions are like nations—they forget guys like Thomas Jefferson and Samuel Gompers, guys who put them in business in the first place.

Is there a single leader in America today who has the courage publicly to agree with Samuel Gompers, the cigarmaker who founded the American Federation of Labor, that "Doing for people what they can and ought to do for themselves is a dangerous experiment. In the last analysis, the welfare of the workers depend upon their own initiative. Whatever is done under the guise of philanthropy or social morality which in any way lessens initiative is the greatest crime that can be committed against the toilers."

Big labor in 1965 is in arrears. And the Devil is watching.

Review of the 1st Session, 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. DUNCAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 89th Congress is now history. It is an appropriate time to review what we have done, yet the full significance of our highly productive 10 months can only unfold as the programs we have initiated or strengthened, as well as funded, reach the communities and people throughout our great land.

What have we done to keep our Nation strong, prosperous, and free, and how have we helped to bring peace closer and to extend basic freedoms in a world in revolution? How have we kept faith with the pledges we made the people who sent us here and what have we contributed to a greater realization of the promise that is America?

I submit that this session of the Congress did as much or more than any session in our history to marshal the great resources of this Nation to achieve more nearly the purpose of our Government as set forth in the Constitution: "to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty."

The steps we have taken are not new, except where before they were promises or pledges, they have now been kept. Many of the programs have been before the Congress in one form or another for many years and had been finely honed in the full legislative process with years of public discussion for guidance. I am certain, as I am sure my colleagues are, that experience will dictate some modifications or alterations and as these become known the Congress will, I am confident, act accordingly.

Thomas Wolfe, the great American writer, stated our goal as well perhaps as it has been said:

> So then to every man his chance—to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity—to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself, and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him. This is the promise of America.

And it is this promise the 89th Congress is keeping.

CONGRESS OF OPPORTUNITY

This has been, more than anything else, the Congress of opportunity. For what we in fact have done is to enlarge the areas of opportunity for full participation in the mainstream of American freedom and prosperity for all our people. We have broadened the horizons of a nation and we have forged the tools for the Federal, State, and community governments to create the opportunity for better lives for the people. And we have charted the route, for those who would take it, from poverty to economic betterment.

While we have strengthened the constitutional rights and liberties of all Americans, we have not neglected our responsibilities to freedom throughout the world. We have met and shall continue to meet the challenge of communism and other forms of despotism wherever and whenever they appear. This is not without its pain and anguish. We all fervently hope for an early end of armed conflict. We know well and deeply the tragedy of young lives lost on foreign soil. But every generation has been called upon to defend freedom anew, and we are no exception. We will in the future, as we have in the past, measure up to this responsibility.

ACTION NEW, NOT THE IDEAS

Mr. Speaker, I said that major programs with which we were concerned in this session were not new. Medicare in various forms has been hotly debated both in and out of the Congress since 1945, with specific legislation in several of the Congresses since that time.

Housing programs were considered first as long ago as 1937 and substantial modifications were made in 1949 and 1961.

Aid to education has been considered actively since 1949 and a Department of Urban Affairs was proposed in 1954 and again in 1963.

The public works, economic development program was considered in 1957, 1961, and again in 1963.

Voting rights legislation was under intense study in 1957, 1960, and 1964.

Water pollution control was considered in 1956 and 1961.

Although some phases of the war on poverty appear new, they have their roots in the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's and even the eminently successful Peace Corps established in 1961 made its contribution through a domestic version of volunteer activity, VISTA. The list could go on and on.

Although there were instances in which I believe we should have given fuller debate to a measure, to explore on the floor the full meaning of a bill—and I expressed this in words and votes at the time—any impartial observer would have to concede that with rare exceptions measures received full and complete committee consideration and careful debate in committee and on the floor.

POLITICAL PARTY PROGRAM

In August of 1964, delegates to the Democratic National Convention at Atlantic City drafted a platform to present to the voters. At that time we announced to the American people that our platform would be our program if we were elected.

A strong majority of this Congress and the President of the United States, elected on the same platform, have worked together to implement an unprecedented 85 percent of the platform—much of which was also in the Republican platform—adopted a little more than a year ago at Atlantic City. These are the principles to which both the executive and the majority of the Congress subscribed with neither subservient to the other.

We have not finished the job, but we have made great strides. Important support, ideas, leadership, and significant contributions have come from Republican Members. Despite the frequent ridiculing of political party platforms, as words without real meaning, the fact is we have been methodically carrying out precisely what we announced in advance we would and exactly what the voters of America charged us with the responsibility for doing.

CONGRESSIONAL DIFFERENCES WITH EXECUTIVE

On important details, we have had our disagreements with the executive and Congress has worked its will. The budget bills, for example, are more than $2 billion below the total amount estimated by the administration. Medicare, as finally passed, is a vastly different and, I believe, improved bill over that originally submitted. Home rule for the District of Columbia, as passed by the House, is far from the recommendation of the administration, and its final form may be changed even more.

The highway beautification program is greatly changed from that submitted. The tax reduction bills were also significantly altered, and I believe improved, for they gave even greater relief from the annoying excise taxes than the executive had urged.

Other measures could be mentioned, but this is sufficient to indicate that an independent and hard-working Congress worked well with an independent and hard-working President in a cooperative and successful effort to advance the welfare of the Nation.

It is accurate to report that every major bill that was a part of the President's legislative program was rewritten, amended, or substantially modified in the normal examination, study, and compromises of the legislative process before being enacted into law.

PERSONAL DIFFERENCES WITH EXECUTIVE

Speaking individually, I found myself disagreeing on details even more than did the Congress as a whole. And this, too, is as it should be.

District of Columbia criminal procedures bill: For example, I opposed the District of Columbia criminal procedures bill, because I believed it unwise and a violation of our traditional legal safeguards of the rights of the accused and the suspected. The administration-supported measure, however, carried.

Federal Water Pollution Control Act: I reluctantly supported the original House version of the water pollution control bill when it first came before us in April. While it was a step forward, it was far less than we should have done. I have urged stronger Federal controls in the establishment of water standards. These standards were later accepted in substance, and I could support the final conference report with greater enthusiasm.

In addition, I introduced legislation to double the authorization for funds available for water treatment facility grants; one-half of this requested increase was authorized together with additional authorization for this same purpose in other programs.

Further, I urged on the Bureau of the Budget, the conferees, and the White House full funding of the entire authorized program since we should and we must do what we can and what we know needs to be done to protect the Nation's water supply. The final bill contained the appropriation for the full $150 million authorized, $20 million of which will be used for research and development.

Section 14(b): The repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law created more emotion than realism, and if my mail was any indication of public understanding of the measure, considerable misinformation has been disseminated concerning the repeal. Oregon was comparatively unaffected because it had no right-to-work law and, should this bill pass, no change will occur. I supported the repeal because I believe this issue should be subject to a common rule equally applicable to competing employers and their employees all over the country, and because I believe the choice of union security should be decided by a majority of the workers in each bargaining unit together with their employers, rather than by a majority of a State legislature not directly involved.

I also supported Mrs. GREEN's efforts, despite the vigorous opposition of the administration and the leadership, to amend the measure to include a freedom of conscience provision. While this effort was not successful, a similar amendment has been added to the Senate bill. This matter goes over for further consideration next year.

Labeling on cigarette packages: I opposed the proposal to require specific warning labeling on cigarette packages basically on the grounds that it accomplished nothing while seeming to do much.

And I opposed the Roosevelt amendment to permit the States to impose other and/or different labeling requirements for one of the same reasons I supported repeal of 14(b); namely, cigarettes move in interstate commerce and the same rule should apply everywhere to avoid a multiplicity of different rules which would create chaos.

Duty on ferronickel: I opposed the successful administration effort to suspend the duty on ferronickel. A number of my colleagues and I managed to defeat the proposal on a teller vote, but on a hurried rollcall, the measure did finally carry. While I expect no lessening of employment in the Fourth District of Oregon where the only domestic nickel mine is located, it may limit exploration and development of new mines and new jobs. It puts more dollars in the hands of France for exchange for gold. And it represents another piecemeal, commodity-by-commodity reduction with no reciprocal concessions to American industry contrary to the overall concept of the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations at Geneva.

Immigration Act: I supported the amendment to the Immigration Act that would limit the immigration from the Western Hemisphere. The amendment was vigorously opposed by the administration and defeated in the House. If our purpose was to remove discrimination among countries and peoples, it did not seem consistent to me to permit unrestricted immigration from the Western Hemisphere while putting a ceiling on immigration from the balance of the world.

It was readily admitted that a ceiling would be necessary in a few years and I felt it should be done now as a part of a major reform rather than later when it could easily be misinterpreted as a unilateral slap in the face of South and Latin America. My judgment was vindicated when the Senate added such a provision; it was accepted in conference and became the law.

Incidentally, no lessening of the security provisions of the immigration law was involved and we will not be flooded with hordes of undesirables. As a matter of fact, the amendment referred to above will reduce immigration.

Arts and humanities: I opposed the administration's bill for aid to arts and humanities. I supported and will support increased assistance to the humanities. I believe firmly that, however masked, government influence over the arts is bad for the arts, for government, and finally, for the people, and that the expenditure of money for this purpose in the face of growing demands for basic education, health, defense, and other more pressing needs, cannot be justified.

Resolution on Western Hemisphere: I opposed the hastily introduced resolution which appears to announce the right to unilateral intervention in the internal affairs of Western Hemisphere countries by any other country. We cannot afford to conduct our foreign affairs from the floor of the House by passing resolutions against a background of heated emotions. We demonstrated in Cuba and the Dominican Republic that we would act in self-defense. Our actions speak for themselves.

Highway beautification bill: I opposed vigorously, as did other Members of the Oregon delegation in the House, the administration's so-called highway beautification bill. My reasons were simple. I was advised that it penalized Oregon unfairly and could cost my State as much as $13 million in highway funds. This, when Oregon, as much or more than any other State, has an effective program of highway beautification of its own. However, in addition, as a member of the Appropriations Committee I could not support what in my judgment amounted to an open-end appropriation to pay the undetermined cost of the experiment. And the bill was poorly designed to achieve its stated purpose.

It is not only on the floor of the House, however, that I and other Members of the House have had differences with the administration.

Camp White saved: In my own case, for example, from the moment the rumor was first heard that the Veterans' Administration was planning to close Camp White Domiciliary and a number of other Veterans' Administration and Public Health Services hospitals and domiciliaries throughout the country, I protested early, and often, and long to the White House, to the President directly, to the appropriate congressional committees, and finally to the President's special commission to study the closings. I contended with full justification that closing of Camp White Domiciliary would not save the Government money and would not give the same or equivalent care to the veterans. As the cost studies I presented showed conclusively, it would have cost more money, and would have seriously lowered the level of care for many of the veterans and greatly inconvenienced the remainder.

At the same time, I contended, that should the administration be able to prove that it could in fact save the Government money and still render as good or better care to the members of the domiciliary I would not only support the plan, but would defend it to the people of the district. This the VA could not do, and we finally won our case. Camp White will remain open. Much credit is due to the Congress, the House Veterans Committee and Chairman OLIN TEAGUE.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF HOUSE MEMBERS

It is not only the responsibility of a Member of the House to criticize and oppose that which he believes is wrong or unnecessary, it is also his responsibility to support and seek to improve those measures he believes to be in the interest of his district and his country.

President Johnson will go down in history, in my judgment, not only as a great President, but as a President with a deep compassion for the problems of his fellow countrymen and for his ability and drive to do something effective about them. His genius lies in his ability to help shape a national consensus and translate it into needed public law.

MAJOR BILLS SUPPORTED

Among the major pieces of legislation I supported that were enacted by the 1st session of the 89th Congress in achieving its great record are:

Medicare and social security amendments: Provide hospitalization, surgical and nursing home care for persons 65 years and older financed through social security. In addition, a program of voluntary medical insurance was established that will assist those who want to participate, in meeting the sudden and high costs of modern medical treatment. This addition I have urged for years. Social security benefits were increased retroactive to January 1, 1965, and other liberalizing changes were made.

Elementary and secondary education: Provides for a Federal grant program to improve elementary and secondary education under local control with the bulk of aid for school districts where there are large numbers of children from poverty stricken families. The program is a major breakthrough in providing at least minimum educational opportunities for all American children and in this we strike a real blow against the circle of poverty producing ignorance, and ignorance, poverty. I was pleased to give my fullest support to the measure. I would have preferred that the bill also include a provision for judicial review to determine finally whether the measure did violate our traditional policy of separation of church and state. I do not believe that it does, yet I felt that the final review of this should be made by the Supreme Court. I spoke on the floor of the House in support of an amendment to provide for judicial review, and I voted for it.

Excise tax reduction: Provides for excise tax cuts totaling $4.7 billion on various consumer items including cosmetics, luggage, jewelry, appliances, telephone service, and automobiles. It eliminates most Federal excise taxes by 1969. This will and is acting not only to increase spendable income for consumers, but to spur business to meet the demand for goods created by the increased spending power. This in turn helps to create more job opportunities. For the most part, businesses have been, and all of them should be, passing on to the consumer the excise tax reductions.

Omnibus Housing Act: Expands current urban renewal and public housing programs, extends FHA loan insurance program, encourages urban planning and beautification and provides for a rent supplement program for low-income families. The Congress did not, however, provide funds to implement the rent subsidy.

Voting rights: Strengthens the machinery for guaranteeing the right to vote to all citizens by prohibiting payment of a poll tax as a condition for voting and by prohibiting literacy tests as a means of discriminating against some voters; provides for Federal registrars in States where less than 50 percent of the potential voters are registered or vote. This interferes with the right of States to set voting qualifications only in those instances in which States have used their right to discriminate against and deny a segment of their population the full rights of American citizenship. States rights cannot be used as a sword to violate individual rights. In the conflict between States rights and the rights of the individual citizen, my choice was clear. I voted for the measure.

Public works and economic development: Provides for an expanded program of grants and loans to communities for public works, development facilities, and other projects and is intended to aid economically depressed areas. The Fourth District was helped considerably by the old ARA; however, this program must be carefully administered to achieve its purpose.

Water pollution control: Expands water pollution control programs, establishes a stronger administrative organization for carrying out the program, strengthens the Federal responsibility in setting water standards, increases the grant program for water treatment plant construction, and increases Federal enforcement powers. Although I supported the bill, I am less than satisfied with it. We know the extent of the pollution problem throughout the country. We know the dangers pollution represents. It is inexcusable for us to do less than we can and less than we should. Yet this bill did represent progress in attacking the problem. I am hopeful the next time we consider this problem in the Congress we will do the rest of the job.

Department of Housing and Urban Affairs: Establishes a new Cabinet-level Department to administer programs affecting 70 percent of our population that now resides in urban areas.

Omnibus farm program: Improves and extends feed grain, wheat, dairy, wool, and cotton programs, encourages cropland retirement and bolsters farm income. While all of these programs can be criticized, and I have done so, they have avoided the chaos of a farm depression which would inevitably envelop the whole economy and have helped make this the best fed Nation on earth at far less cost to the consumer than anywhere else on earth. The alternatives were unacceptable.

I believe that our biggest farm problem of the near future will be how to grow more, not less, to help feed the rapidly expanding population of this country and the world.

Immigration Act amendments: Gradually abolishes discriminatory national origins quota system but maintains all present security restrictions.

Appalachian regional development: Authorizes a comprehensive State-Federal program to assist in the development of the economically depressed Appalachian region. It is basically a program to provide public facilities and technical assistance so that the region can participate in the growing prosperity of the entire Nation.

Manpower development and training: Extends and expands manpower training programs to help the unemployed learn new skills so they become contributing members of the communities in which they live. This is proving to be a worthwhile program.

Economic opportunity program: Expands the antipoverty program and makes other improvements in the operation of various aspects of the war on poverty.

Regional medical centers: Authorizes 3-year program of Federal grants to plan and develop a series of regional medical centers to fight heart disease, stroke, and cancer.

Health professions education: Extends and expands program of construction grants to medical, dental, and other health educational institutions and initiates a program of scholarship grants for needy students as well as increases the student loan program.

Presidential continuity: A long step toward closing a serious gap in the Constitution was taken by adopting a proposed amendment to the Constitution to establish a procedure to permit the Vice President to become acting President if the President is unable to perform his duty and to provide for filling a vacancy in the office of Vice President when this occurs. The amendment has been submitted to the States for ratification and it is hoped this will be accomplished speedily.

Health research facilities: Provides for extension of program to construct health research facilities and establishes three new Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare to administer expanded programs in this area.

Community health services: Extends programs for public health services providing vaccinations, immunization, other preventive treatment of diseases, migrant health clinics, and grants to States for general health services.

Mental health services: Provides for initial staffing grants for personnel serving in community mental health centers.

Drug controls: Expands Federal control and supervision over the distribution of certain depressant and stimulant drugs that are becoming a serious threat to the health and welfare, particularly of young people. This is not the final answer to the increasing problem but it is an important beginning.

I am now studying what our national policy should be and what, if any, changes we should make in the law to achieve an enlightened and effective policy in regard to the use and control of narcotics as well as barbiturates, amphetamines, and hallucinogenic drugs.

Older Americans: Establishes a new administration for aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop programs to assist the growing number of elder citizens.

Juvenile delinquency: Extends the present law to assist communities in the development of new programs to prevent or control juvenile delinquency and youth crime.

Water resources development: Extends and broadens research program of converting saline water; another new law provides grants to States for the coordination of water resources planning and development and another establishes a grant program to assist in development of water supply and sewage disposal facilities in rural areas.

Air pollution: Establishes machinery for controlling motor vehicle air pollutants and accelerates air pollution research programs.

State technical services: Establishes new 3-year program of Federal-State-local technical cooperation to provide technical service centers to disseminate findings of scientific and technological importance to commerce and industry. The rapid acceleration of our scientific and technical knowledge makes it increasingly necessary that these advances be put to the benefit of the people generally through the widest possible dissemination.

Retired Government employees: Provides for cost-of-living increases in annuities to retired employees of the Federal Government.

Federal pay comparability: Provides salary increases for Federal classified and postal employees to achieve more equitable relationship with the pay of employees in private industry and makes other fringe benefits and overtime allowances. The pressure for adjournment prevented achievement of as good a bill as should have been passed, particularly that part of the measure involving overtime pay of postal employees, but I am hopeful that this deficiency can be corrected. A laborer is worthy of his hire, and this is no less true for an employee of the Federal Government than for one in private industry.

And many more measures which I supported were passed which add something to creating a better and more just America.

RESPONSIBILITY TO DISTRICT

Important as is our function as a Member of Congress in participating in shaping national and international policy, it is also my function as a representative of a congressional district to be concerned with, and act in the interest of, my district and its some 500,000 people. It is my job to see that they share in the general prosperity of our country, that Federal responsibility is properly assumed and administered in my district for those functions that properly fall within the sphere of the U.S. Government, and to act as attorney in Washington for the people and organizations in my district who cannot come back here to present their own cases.

This does not mean that I must adopt each citizen's view as my own. No man can do that, for constituents disagree among themselves. Any time two people agree 100 percent of the time, one of them is not thinking.

Edmund Burke once said that the citizens are entitled not to an elected representative's vote but to his judgment. I have tried to exercise my best judgment to accomplish the most good for the greatest number in my district and in my country. I hope that a strong majority of my constituents agree.

There are many issues with which I have dealt this session that are of particular concern to my district or my State. Some involved legislation, some contact with executive departments, and some a combination. Not all efforts met with success, but in each instance I tried, and in many will try again and succeed another time.

Boxcars: For example, a great amount of time was spent seeking ways to obtain additional boxcars, particularly wide- and double-door cars, for Oregon's lumber industry. This involved work with the Interstate Commerce Commission, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, contacts with the President and members of the White House staff, preparation and presentation of testimony to the House Interstate Commerce Committee, as well as extended discussions with railroad officials.

The result: There are now more boxcars available to Oregon shippers; emergency orders have been issued by the ICC for the return to the West of our own boxcars, and legislation that will encourage car ownership and efficient use has moved to near final stages in this Congress. I am hopeful that this can become law early in the next session.

Roseburg Veterans' Administration land: The city of Roseburg has wanted the Veterans' Administration to return some 47 acres of land, part of the more than 400 acres the city had years ago donated to the VA. The agency was willing to release this surplus land, but it took an act of Congress to accomplish it. I introduced a bill to accomplish this last year but was unable to obtain action on it. I tried again this year and, with considerable help from my colleagues in this House and the Senators from Oregon, the law was passed and signed by the President.

A $300 million atomic accelerator: Much time was spent in seeking full consideration for the proposal by the Willamette Valley Research Council to locate the $300 million atomic accelerator in the Willamette Valley and in helping the council in its contacts with the Atomic Energy Commission. Should we eventually be successful, and the competition is extremely intense, it will mean Oregon will share more fully in the mainstream of American science, and that the Oregon economy will reap great direct and related benefits. But this is only one scientific installation.

Research and development contracts and grants: With the Federal Government now spending more than $15 billion a year on scientific research and development contracts and grants, much of it going to a few large institutions, I have sought a more equitable policy for the distribution of such Federal funds and have testified for such a policy before a Senate committee calling for this.

I am happy to note that recently the President has instructed all agencies and departments handling Federal research and development funds to seek a more equitable distribution and greater recognition of the need for the entire Nation to share in the forward thrust of our science and technology. It is precisely this policy that I, and others in the Congress, have been urging and it is one that I believe will have great benefits not only for my district but for the Nation as a whole.

Funding of existing navigation, flood control, and reclamation projects: In addition, I have worked on funding of existing navigation, flood control, and reclamation projects. During the 3 years I have been privileged to serve in the Congress, annual appropriations for the Fourth District have increased from approximately $25 million to over $40 million. And yet, much more remains to be done if we are to harness for man's protection and productive use the rivers and streams of Oregon.

Improvements authorized: Major harbor improvements were authorized for the mouth of the Chetco River at Brookings-Harbor and at Port Orford, and Congress provided first year funding for the Port Orford project. It is very unusual for a project to be authorized and funded in the same year and with both projects in a single county the task was even more difficult. Although Brookings was equally deserving, the conferees on the public works appropriation bill did not approve funds to begin work this fiscal year because the Fourth District already has more than its share. Brookings is not behind schedule; Port Orford is just ahead of schedule.

Obtaining financing for the Chetco River project to the full Army Corps of Engineers capability the first year will be a high priority goal in the coming session. Both projects are fully justified and should be pushed to completion at the earliest possible time.

Other district concerns: Attempting to settle the controversy concerning an Oregon Dunes National Seashore, still unresolved; working with industry and the affected departments to assure the maintenance of an equitable bidding system on Government timber; helping communities with their problems ranging from continued air service to financing water systems and waste treatment facilities; seeking many millions of dollars of flood relief following the tragic floods of last winter; fighting for maintenance of the 35-to-65 ratio in private and Navy ship repair work in order to protect both Oregon employment and the national ship repair capacity; attempting to secure an adequate supply of agricultural labor, improve harbors for the State, increase Oregon's business share in Government contracts, and the like, have occupied many hours, days, and weeks.

In addition, the receipt of an average of 50 first-class letters a day, each requiring research or contact with departments of government and the furnishing of accurate information and assistance to residents of the Fourth District has absorbed much time and effort. I hope this effort has served a useful purpose in proving that government is not a huge, impersonal bureaucracy but does, in fact, have a heart and a conscience. Many letters involve problems of social security benefits, military or civil service pensions, post office personnel, requests for service academy appointments, and the like.

The list is really endless. It ranges from helping a high school student obtain material for a debate to working to obtain the release from a Communist country of the daughter of a constituent.

It has been a good year, a satisfying and a busy one. I hope now, as do all of my colleagues, for the chance to spend some time in the district, primarily to listen and not to talk. And for some time to rest, to fish, to ride my horse, and for some solitude in which to think and gain refreshment for the efforts ahead. Much remains to be done.

My thanks to the people of the Fourth District for permitting me to serve in this Congress of opportunity, in this most demanding and exhilarating office.

Vallejo's Greatest Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Vallejo, Calif., celebrated its greatest day last week when we launched the SSB (N) *Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo*, the last of the current projected construction of Polaris submarines.

We were honored in the West by the appearance of L. Mendel Rivers, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, his wife, Margaret, and my colleagues Representatives Edward R. Roybal, Eligio de la Garza, Don H. Clausen, and Harlan Hagen at the event.

The chairman delivered the following important policy statement indicating the direction of our committee:

> Secretary Nitze, Admiral Fahy, my colleagues from the House of Representatives, Mr. de la Garza, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Leggett, and descendants of General Vallejo, and ladies and gentlemen, I do not know for sure how many of General Vallejo's descendants are here today but I do know that he was 1 of 13 children and the father of 16 children, so I think it is a pretty good guess that some of the family are with us today.
>
> There are several reasons why I am particularly pleased to join in this ceremony. This is the first time I have had an opportunity to visit Mare Island as chairman of the Armed Services Committee and, as far as I know, this is the first time in more than 30 years that a chairman of the Armed Services Committee, or its predecessor, the Naval Affairs Committee, has visited here. As you may have heard, my predecessor, the distinguished Carl Vinson, was somewhat averse to travel. He once told me that he went down in a submarine as a young Congressman in 1917 and since that experience had not felt any need to go down in a submarine again.
>
> I am also pleased for personal reasons to be here, since I have had in my legislative career occasions to take a special interest in this locality. In 1950, I was chairman of a special subcommittee which held 2 days of hearings here in connection with the closing of the Mare Island Naval Hospital. I continue to have a special interest in Mare Island. As I'm sure you know, our committee has always taken a profound interest in naval shipyards. I am very much concerned about assuring the continued capability of our remaining eight naval shipyards and it is an inspiration for me to join with you in the launching of what is perhaps the finest product ever launched by west coast shipbuilding—the Polaris submarine, *Mariano G. Vallejo*.
>
> My being here is also a tribute to the persuasive powers of your Congressman Bob Leggett. He's a mighty effective Congressman.
>
> I am also pleased to represent the Congress in the ceremony today because this ship represents two aspects of our national defense in which the Congress has taken a special interest and, I might say, a special pride—the Polaris and attack nuclear submarines and nuclear power for major surface warships. And I shall have more to say about that later on.
>
> It is singularly appropriate that we should name a Polaris submarine after that great son of California, Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo.
>
> This submarine will be one of our most powerful weapons in containing the world ambitions of communism as directed from Soviet Russia. Over a hundred years ago General Vallejo was busy practicing a policy of containment on the Russians in northern California. At that time, when California was still under Mexico, General Vallejo led an expedition through northern California which held the Russian influence in check and began the colonization of the northern area of the State.
>
> Trained from early years for military service, Vallejo became commandante general of California—the senior military officer in all California—when he was not yet 30 years old. We remember him most, however, for his efforts to bring California under the flag of the United States.
>
> This was at a time when U.S. power in relation to the rest of the world was nothing near what it is today and Russia, France, and England were all seeking domination over California.
>
> Vallejo, as I'm sure you all know, in addition to his military service, served as a legislator during most of his public career and it is a tribute to his statesmanship that the problems of uniting California with the United States were solved. More than any other man, he was responsible for the annexation of California by the United States. I am sure those who will be privileged to be in the crew of this great weapon of freedom will bear in mind that the ship bears a name that is synonymous with selfless service and a tradition of duty to the public trust.
>
> This ship is the 38th to be launched in our current program of 41 nuclear powered Polaris submarines. Your record here in the Mare Island Shipyard in this construction program has been outstanding. Since you launched your first nuclear attack submarine—the U.S.S. *Sargo* in 1957, you have constructed six great Polaris submarines—the *Theodore Roosevelt*, the *Andrew Jackson*, the *Woodrow Wilson*, the *Daniel Boone*, and the *Stonewall Jackson*—and I appreciate your getting a Confederate in there—and you will

soon commission the *Kamehameha* (Ka-ma-ha-may-ha).

Your record in the attack submarine field is also a long and enviable one. I foresee a tremendous future for the capability of this great shipyard complex. Your record of efficiency is a model for the entire American shipbuilding industry.

I know the people of this area have a special interest in the actions we take in Congress, and in the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman, on the matter of naval shipyards.

In our committee this year, with a big assist of one of our most diligent members, Vallejo's own BOB LEGGETT, we included a policy statement—section 303—in the military procurement authorization bill on the so-called 65–35 provision. This is the appropriation rider which directs that at least 35 percent of repair and alterations go to private yards. Our committee convinced the Congress, and I mean both the House and Senate, to join us in voicing disapproval of this hamstringing, uneconomical policy. And the Appropriations Committee followed our lead and took the provisions out of the defense appropriation bill.

While you are interested in our action on naval shipyards, I suspect you also have a keen interest in the matter of base closings.

Our committee has insisted that it must be an equal partner with the White House and the Pentagon on any revamping of our military forces. We recognize that it is necessary to get rid of deadwood from time to time—but our committee insists that we have an opportunity to verify that the wood is really dead before the Pentagon lights the match.

Although the President vetoed our first efforts in the military construction bill, a revised formula was agreed upon and signed into law and I am satisfied it will allow the Congress to carry out its duties in providing for our Armed Forces according to the duties imposed on us by the Constitution.

The Polaris submarine which we launch today is a source of special pride to Members of the Congress. Both in the development of nuclear submarine technology and in the advance to the Polaris concept, the Congress has taken a special hand. Several committees over the years have pushed these developments and I think it is fair to say that without the spur provided by Congress the nuclear submarine program would not be nearly as advanced as it is at this hour.

The Polaris submarine is an undersea launching platform for long-range ballistic missiles. Its advent added to our strategic power the desperately needed quality of invulnerability. One of the greatest assets of this weapons system is that it provides insurance against accidental start of a global conflict for the very simple reason that it provides a barrier against a paralyzing first strike in a surprise attack.

There used to be the fear that a war could start by accident because such a firing would look like a surprise attack and there would not be time to determine whether the attack was real or not until it was too late. By its invulnerability, the Polaris submarine takes away from a potential enemy this option of destroying our capability with one surprise blow. The Navy used to have a photograph it distributed which merely showed a stretch of ocean and the caption was, "Polaris on Station." The message was apt.

You can't launch a surprise attack at what you can't see and what you can't find.

All of us in America sleep a little easier because we know these Polaris submarines are there, and I hope the men who serve on this ship and those who serve on all other Polaris ships who must fight tedium constantly in their long ocean deployments will remember when I say how much we all appreciate the importance and dedication of their service and know that their sacrifices do not go unhonored.

Your Navy, like the other Armed Forces, is improving constantly with the rapid growth of new technology. It has not stood still and it must not stand still in the future.

If it is necessary for the Congress to take the lead to insure this, then the Congress will perform that duty. In approving a $15.3 billion ship, plane and missile program authorization bill this year, my committee included a number of unusually important developments. Among these were four fast deployment logistics ships, a hydrofoil gunboat that is faster than a PT boat, additional nuclear attack submarines and, most important of all, a nuclear-powered missile frigate.

The committee stated that it was unhappy with the rate of application of nuclear power to surface warships. I said at the time: "The committee feels that the Department of Defense has been extremely dilatory in pushing nuclear power for surface ships. It is true that we do have three nuclear-powered surface ships today but this is quite literally a drop in the bucket when viewed in the light of the ships which are still conventionally powered.

"The addition by the committee of this guided missile frigate will at the one time express the will of Congress that greater and more rapid progress be made in the field of nuclear-powered surface ships and help to break the logjam of disinterest—if that is what it can be called—in the Pentagon with respect to nuclear power.

"This is just one manifestation of the intention of the Armed Services Committee to place itself in the forefront of military determination in direct accordance with the constitutional responsibilities of the Congress."

One year ago this month the world's first nuclear-powered task force consisting of the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, the guided missile cruiser *Long Beach* and the guided missile frigate *Bainbridge* made a historic 30,000-mile cruise around the world without logistic support of any kind.

This cruise, named Operation Sea Orbit, proved conclusively the feasibility of operating nuclear surface ships throughout the oceans of the world on a self-sustaining basis.

It gave world leaders the opportunity to witness firsthand the capability of the U.S. Navy to operate nuclear-powered warships anywhere, independent of support ships—a feat out of the question for conventionally-powered ships.

In the last 3 years the *Enterprise*, *Long Beach*, and *Bainbridge* have proved their outstanding reliability in steaming over one-half million miles. In addition to these three operational nuclear-powered surface warships, a fourth, the nuclear-powered guided missile frigate *Truxtun*, will join the fleet next year. This first nuclear-powered task force will be assigned duty in the Pacific in the near future.

Oil-fired warships must be refueled every few days.

This requires a vulnerable, worldwide distribution system to provide fuel oil for conventional ships. As the number of foreign nuclear submarines increases and as the air striking capabilities of our potential enemies increase, the difficulty of providing this logistic support will increase. The basic reason for developing nuclear power for surface warships is to reduce this logistic support—support which will be most difficult, if not impossible, to provide in wartime.

Now that the United States has over 50 nuclear submarines at sea—now that our Polaris armed nuclear submarines stand their watchful guard hidden under the oceans of the world—few remember that it was Congress that arranged to buy the shipboard nuclear power plants for our first two nuclear submarines, the U.S.S. *Nautilus* and U.S.S. *Seawolf*, with Atomic Energy Commission funds for the simple reason that the Defense Department would not give the necessary support to the nuclear submarine project in the early 1950's.

Today history is repeating itself—Congress has had to take the initiative to overcome the reluctance of the Department of Defense to use nuclear propulsion in new surface warships. As I mentioned before, Congress this year authorized construction of the fifth nuclear powered surface warship—a guided missile frigate. This nuclear powered ship was added to this year's Defense Department authorization even though the Secretary of Defense had overruled a Navy proposal to build such a ship.

In doing this, Congress was acting under the power granted to the legislative branch under article 1 of the Constitution, namely the authorities: "To raise and support Armies, * * *; to provide and maintain a Navy; and to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

These clauses were not inserted in the Constitution for the purpose of endowing the National Government with power to do these things, but rather to designate the legislative branch as the department of government which should exercise such powers. Moreover, they permit Congress to take measures essential to the national defense in time of peace as well as during a period of actual conflict.

These powers and the responsibility that comes with them were reaffirmed by the House Armed Services Committee in our report on the 1966 defense authorization bill and I quote:

"I hope that these words will go beyond this room, and that the American public will know that as of now this committee has picked up the gauntlet unhesitatingly that has been thrown down. And I hope in the months to come this committee will have the opportunity to prove to this Nation that we will discharge our responsibility as written in the Constitution and that this committee and the Congress is not the creature of an agency or department, but that department is our creature and it is ours to direct and guide."

Concerning the question of whether or not to build nuclear-powered surface warships, the committee has been told by the Department of Defense that the choice we face is between a given number of conventional ships and a smaller number of nuclear ships for the same total cost. In other words, to improve a weapons system, we are told that we must reduce the number of weapons to pay for it.

We in Congress reject the Department of Defense concept that improvements in our Nation's defense capabilities must be paid for by a reduction in the number of weapons. We reject the idea that we must not build nuclear-powered surface warships because we could build more conventional ships with the same money.

The U.S. Navy needs more warships with the unique capabilities provided by nuclear propulsion. Recognizing this, Congress has supported a major scientific and engineering effort to achieve the capability. Today the U.S. Navy is preeminent in the field of nuclear propulsion throughout the world. We must take advantage of this lead by building more ships which have the tremendous advantages nuclear propulsion can give them.

The argument used today against building nuclear-powered surface warships is the same as that used a decade ago by those in the Defense Department who did not want to go to nuclear power in submarines. It was also the one used by those in authority a half-century ago who did not want to convert our warships from coal to oil, and by those a century ago who did not want to shift from sail to steam. This argument is that the new means of propulsion is more expensive than the old.

Cost effectiveness comparisons have been cited to Congress by the Defense Department to support the contention that the advantages of nuclear propulsion are not particularly significant. These studies, however, contain a fundamental weakness that makes them wrong. The comparisons presented by the Defense Department were based on the assumption that in wartime logistic support forces will not be subjected to enemy attack and will suffer no losses. This is obviously a fallacious assumption. We must prepare our military forces for times of crisis. It is in the heat of battle that the superior mobility, flexibility and reliability of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequaled military advantage which could be crucial to deciding the outcome.

Further, many of the cost effectiveness studies have shown that the overall construction and lifetime operating costs of nuclear-powered surface warships are about the same as the overall construction and lifetime operating costs of conventionally powered ships with their larger logistic support requirements. The higher initial cost of nuclear ships is counterbalanced by the cost of the extensive and vulnerable distribution system required to provide fuel oil for the conventional ships. The small differences in cost calculated for nuclear powered forces compared to conventional forces are less than the errors inherent in the oversimplified assumptions used in the calculations.

There is a real danger in continuing to produce ineffectual cost effectiveness studies to justify decisions affecting our national security. Such studies divert attention from the real issues that should form the basis for making decisions.

Past wars and military developments should have taught us by now that:

First, a war, small or large, does not follow a predescribed pattern laid out in advance. If we could predict the sequence of events, we probably could avoid the war.

Second, when a war starts, we must fight with what we have—not with equipment still on the drawing boards or in the minds of men. You will recall that the aircraft used throughout World War II had been designed prior to the war. Remember that it takes years to produce major military equipment from the drawing board. For example, it takes 4 to 5 years to build an aircraft carrier. We may not be fortunate enough to have such time available in the future.

I have just come back from Saigon and one thought particularly strikes home. It is difficult to know who will be our friends and who will be our enemies in future years. Since World War II our three major enemies have become our friends and two of our previous major allies have become our antagonists. Bases in foreign countries which we must presently depend upon for storage of fuel oil for our conventionally powered warships may not be available when needed in future conflicts due to changes in the international situation. It is dangerous to assume that such advance bases will be there when they are needed to support our combat forces in a time of a national emergency.

It was Congress who took the lead in forcing the shift to nuclear power in submarines. It was Congress who took the lead in spending a half billion dollars to develop nuclear propulsion for surface warships. It was Congress who strongly supported the building of the three nuclear surface warships now in the fleet which have so ably demonstrated to the world the obvious capabilities of nuclear propulsion in warships. It is Congress who must exercise its responsibility to "provide and maintain a Navy" by authorizing more nuclear-powered surface warships.

The new nuclear-powered frigate authorized this year by Congress means a great deal more than a mere addition of a ship to the fleet. There can be no doubt of the wisdom of adding this vessel to the program, but this authorization by Congress goes well beyond that goal.

The House Armed Services Committee feels, and has felt for all too long that the Department of Defense has both procrastinated and vacillated in its approach to nuclear-powered surface ships. It has an in-and-out game, with nuclear propulsion recommended for 1 year and a return to conventional power the next year—and for the same general type of ship.

Since the authorization of the *Enterprise, Long Beach,* and *Bainbridge,* the Navy has added 12 new surface warships to the fleet which are types logically suited for nuclear propulsion. Of these, only one, the frigate *Truxtun,* will have nuclear power; this during a period when nuclear propulsion was technically feasible for all 12 warships.

The House Armed Services Committee was encouraged this year by testimony received from the Secretary of Defense to the effect that it is highly probable that a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier will be requested next year. However, the committee stated at that time that it will ask the House to authorize a nuclear-powered carrier next year whether requested by the Department of Defense or not. A nuclear-powered carrier will appear in next year's bill when presented on the floor regardless of any foreseeable circumstances, technical, fiscal, or otherwise. We may even go further and direct that it be constructed.

It is foolhardy not to build military equipment that is known to be superior to existing equipment presently in use if the technology needed to build the better equipment exists. The technology necessary to build nuclear-powered surface warships exists today. We already have three in operation and they work fine.

I am convinced, and I think it is fair to say that the Congress as a body is convinced, that the Navy of the future must be nuclear powered. There is no reason why our future aircraft carriers, cruisers, frigates, and destroyers cannot be powered by nuclear energy. It is clear that continuing to build conventionally powered warships will, in the long run, be economically wasteful; it would be following a policy of built-in obsolescence. I serve notice here and now that the Armed Services Committee is not going to let that happen. I hope the military planners will come in with a realistic request next year for nuclear power in the surface warship building program. But if they don't, my committee will make its own long and searching study into the problem. We are not going to let the U.S. Navy become obsolete.

In conclusion, I thank you for the contribution you have made here at Mare Island to our national defense as symbolized in this great ship. To the men of the USS *Mariano G. Vallejo,* I say you serve a ship with a proud name and I know that you will serve it proudly.

Report to the People of Maryland on the 1st Session of 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to report to the people of Maryland on the unprecedented accomplishments of the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

From farm to factory, from city to countryside, from Assateague Island to Appalachia, the actions of this Congress have benefited the Nation and the State of Maryland.

For your information, I have compiled with the help of the Democratic Study Group a brief summary of the major legislation enacted in this session of Congress, including legislation to control crime and extend civil rights, legislation to promote the economy and improve our educational system, legislation to advance health and improve housing, and finally, legislation to aid the elderly, preserve our natural resources and natural beauty, and deal with many miscellaneous problems that confront our Nation.

To control crime we have enacted the following:

Drug controls: Expands Federal control over certain depressant and stimulant drugs to reduce the illegal use of these dangerous drugs that affect the central nervous system.

Law enforcement aid: Authorizes 3-year program of grants by Attorney General to help State, local police, and other agencies improve enforcement methods and otherwise prevent crime; authorizes $10 million for 1966.

President's Crime Commission: Authorizes $1,500,000 for the expenses of the two Presidential Commissions on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, and the District of Columbia Commission on Crime and Law Enforcement, both established in July of 1965 by Executive order for crime studies and recommendations to reduce and prevent it.

Juvenile delinquency: Extends present law to assist communities in the development of new programs to prevent or control juvenile delinquency and youth crime.

To extend civil rights, we have enacted:

Voting rights: Strengthens machinery for guaranteeing right to vote to all citizens by prohibiting poll taxes, literacy tests; provides for Federal registrars in States where less than 50 percent of potential voters are registered or voted.

To promote the economy, we have enacted:

Appalachian regional development: Authorizes comprehensive State-Federal program to assist in the development of the economically depressed, 11-State Appalachian region. This bill is of great importance to Allegany, Garrett, and Washington Counties.

Economic opportunity program: Increases authorization for antipoverty program, makes other improvements in the operation of various parts of the war on poverty. In addition to continuing operation Head Start many local antipoverty programs in Maryland will be aided by this bill.

Excise tax reduction: Provides excise tax cuts totaling $4.7 billion on various consumer items such as appliances, telephone service, autos, and so forth; eliminates most Federal excises by 1969. Along with other legislation aiding our economy, this bill helped push the unemployment rate in Maryland to its lowest point in the last 9 years.

High-speed rapid transit: Authorizes 3-year program of research and demonstration projects for development of high-speed intercity railroad transportation. Provides a ground work for "Bullet Train" in the Washington-Baltimore-Boston Northeast Corridor.

Manpower and development and training: Extends and expands manpower training program to assist unemployed in learning new skills to qualify them for better jobs. To date 2,000 Marylanders have been trained or retrained for new jobs under this program.

Public works and economic development: Provides expanded program of grants and loans to communities for public works, development facilities, and other projects intended to aid economically depressed areas.

State technical services: Establishes new 3-year program of Federal-State-local-technical cooperation to provide technical service centers to disseminate findings of scientific and technological importance to commerce and industry. The Maryland Department of Economic Development strongly endorsed this legislation stating that it would not only "encourage the birth of new firms, but will also serve to encourage the healthy expansion of existing Maryland industry."

Omnibus farm program: Improves and extends feed grain, wheat, dairy, and cotton programs, encourages cropland retirement, bolsters farm income.

To improve our education system, we have enacted:

Elementary-secondary education: Provides Federal grant program to improve elementary and secondary education under local control, with bulk of aid for school districts where there are large numbers of children from poverty-stricken families. Maryland schools will receive about $18 million annually under this bill.

Higher education: Authorizes expanded 5-year program to assist colleges and universities to improve educational opportunities; provides student loan and scholarships to aid needy students. Construction funds for Maryland colleges and universities are doubled by this bill.

Impacted aid: Extends and expands program under which Maryland currently receives $18 million annually for elementary and secondary school construction and operation to communities in which large numbers of Federal employees live.

Teacher Corps—part of higher education bill: Provides teacher teams and interns to aid school staff in slum areas. Six thousand teachers will comprise the Corps. This is especially significant to Baltimore City.

Vocational training: Expands vocational rehabilitation program to aid disabled persons.

To advance health, we have enacted:

Health professions education: Extends and expands program of construction grants to medical, dental, and other similar educational institutions; establishes new program of scholarship grants for needy students, increases student loan program. Expansion of the University of Maryland Medical School and Johns Hopkins School of Public Health have already been financed under this program.

Community health services: Extends programs for public health services providing vaccinations, immunizations, other preventive treatment of diseases, migrant health clinics, and grants to States for general health services.

Mental health services: Provides for initial staffing grants for personnel serving in community mental health centers. This bill would staff mental health facilities to be constructed in the Baltimore and Washington metropolitan areas.

Regional medical centers: Authorizes 3-year program of Federal grants to plan and develop a series of regional medical programs to fight heart disease, cancer, and stroke. Both the University of Maryland Medical School and Johns Hopkins Medical School are in the process of planning how best to utilize this program in Maryland.

To improve housing and urban development, we have enacted:

Department of Housing and Urban Affairs: Establishes a new Cabinet-level department to administer programs affecting the 70 percent of our population that now resides in metropolitan areas. Maryland's urban areas, in which 75 percent of our State's population lives, will now have a voice at the President's Cabinet meetings.

Omnibus Housing Act: Expands current urban renewal, public housing programs, extends FHA loan insurance program, encourages urban planning and beautification in housing; provides new rent supplement program for certain low and moderate income families. Expanded open-space programs and planning grants will help Maryland cities develop in a more orderly manner.

To aid the elderly, we have enacted:

Older Americans: Establishes new Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop programs to assist the aged.

Retired Government employees: Provides for cost-of-living increases in annuities to retired employees of Federal Government. This bill aids almost 30,000 Federal retirees and their survivors residing in Maryland.

Medicare and social security amendments: Provides hospitalization, surgical, and nursing home care for persons 65 years and older, financed through the social security system; increases social security benefits, retroactive to January 1, 1965, and makes other liberalizing changes in social security law. The medicare program will aid 264,000 Maryland senior citizens; 270,000 Marylanders will receive increased social security benefits under the bill; and another 15,000 will receive payments for the first time under the liberalized provisions.

To preserve and protect natural resources and natural beauty, we have enacted:

Air pollution: Establishes machinery for controlling motor vehicle air pollutants, accelerates air pollution research program, creates new program to find methods of disposing of solid wastes.

Assateague Island National Seashore: Provides for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia. An estimated 3 million visitors annually are expected to visit the island.

Highway beautification: Provides for gradual control over billboards, signs, and so forth, along federally aided highways of the interstate and primary systems; offers incentive grants for improvement of scenic areas along such highways.

Water pollution control: Expands water pollution control program, grants for waste treatment plant construction; strengthens Federal enforcement authority to clean up our rivers and streams. This bill is important to Maryland's shellfish industry and to communities lacking adequate pollution control facilities.

Water resources development: Extends and broadens research program of converting saline water; another new law provides grants to States for the coordination of water resources planning and development; another new law establishes a grant program to assist in development of water supply and sewage disposal facilities in rural areas; a separate program was authorized to plan a water supply system for the northeastern part of the country.

To deal with numerous other problems that confront our State and Nation, we have enacted:

Arts and humanities: Creates a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities to assist and foster broad cultural programs in art, music, films, ballet, and so forth. A grant to aid the establishment of a Maryland Council on the Arts is included in this program.

Congressional organization: Created a joint committee to study the organization and operation of Congress and to make recommendations to improve and streamline the work of Congress.

Federal pay comparability: Provides salary increase for Federal classified and postal employees to achieve more equitable relationship with pay of employees in private industry; makes other changes in fringe benefits in pay and overtime allowances. This measure is important to the Maryland economy and the 90,000 Marylanders who work for the Federal Government.

House rules reform: Amendments to rules of the House to expedite consideration of legislation and provide for more democratic procedures.

Immigration Act amendments: Abolishes discriminatory "national origins" quota system over 3-year period; establishes a 170,000 annual limit on immigrants from all former quota countries and 120,000 from the Western Hemisphere, special preferences given to relatives of American citizens and persons possessing skills needed to improve our economic growth.

Mass transit for the Washington metropolitan area: Authorizes construction of a 25-mile rail rapid transit for the National Capital area, to be operated through contracts with private concerns, at an estimated total cost of $431 million excluding an estimated $52 million in interest. The bill authorizes $150 million in grants for construction and equipment—$100 million from Federal funds and $50 million from District of Columbia funds.

Military pay increase: Provides an average 10.4-percent pay increase for some 4.2 million uniformed personnel of the Armed Forces, effective September 1, 1965—2.7 million on active duty, including 50,000 Marylanders, 1 million reservists, 500,000 retirees.

Presidential continuity: Adopted proposed amendment to the Constitution to establish procedure to permit Vice President to become Acting President if the President is unable to perform his duties; provides for filling the vacancy of the office of Vice President.

If you desire additional information on any of these programs, please let me know. I appreciate the opportunity to represent you in the House of Representatives.

First National City Bank Files Questionable Application With Securities and Exchange Commission for Exemption From Conflict of Interest Provisions for Its Mutual Fund Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal bank regulatory agencies have gone wild all of a sudden, permitting commercial banks to engage in all sorts of nonbanking businesses. Just a few examples are: equipment leasing, credit cards, insurance, travel services, and mortgage and real estate brokerage. Wherever a dollar is to be made, let the banks make it, so say our Federal agencies, regardless of the harmful effect of unfair competition on small, independent businessmen.

The latest gimmick that the big banks have come up with is to move into the mutual fund business. Mutual fund shares are investment securities and commercial banks have been kept out of investment banking by a law we passed in 1933, growing out of abuses and other misconduct leading up to the 1929 stock market crash. The big banks have been jealous of the growth in the mutual fund industry just as they are jealous of the growth in the savings and loan industry. They want it all to themselves and the Federal banking agencies are going all out to help them get it.

On October 18, in the Congressional Record, I criticized an almost unbelievable ruling by the Federal Reserve Board approving the proposal by First National City Bank of New York, a $14 billion banking giant, to set up a mutual fund. Sections 21 and 32 of the Banking Act of 1933 are crystal clear that Congress wants commercial banks out of securities operations and investment bankers out of commercial banking. The Federal Reserve Board's Vice Chairman, in testifying this year before our Banking and Currency Committee, of which I have the privilege of being chairman, strongly opposed a bill to expand bank underwriting of State and local bonds—H.R. 7539. Vice Chairman Balderston forcefully stated that such a move would turn the clock back over 30 years and raise again the question of conflicts of interest, self-dealing, and abuse of trust which characterized bank operations in the securities field. The Federal Reserve's flip-flop on this question is indeed mystifying, and my request for an explanation is still unanswered, including the reason why the Federal Reserve kept its approval secret for 6 months.

But, Mr. Speaker, regardless of the Federal Reserve's green light, Comptroller Saxon's willing acquiescence to FNCB's wishes, not to mention the FDIC's go-along attitude, there is just a little bit more to the story.

First National City Bank plans to register its mutual fund with the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Investment Company Act of 1940, just like all other funds must do. However, this financial titan is asking the Commission to excuse it from the conflict-of-interest prohibitions contained in that act. This exemption would be an extremely drastic decision for the Commission to make, both with respect to the best interests of the investing public, as well as the matter of fundamental fairness to other mutual funds not enjoying such special treatment.

Although FNCB calls its proposed mutual fund a "commingled investment account" to be registered as a "diversified, open-end management investment company" with the SEC, it would actually amount to the very first collective "managing agency account" permitted under Comptroller Saxon's regulation 9 which sets out national bank trust powers as permitted by a bill before my committee and which became Public Law 87–822 in 1962. That law permits national banks "when not in contravention of State or local law to act as trustee, executor, administrator, or in any other fiduciary capacity in which State banks, trust companies are permitted to act." So it is clear that this law permits national banks to maintain investment accounts only in a true fiduciary capacity as a bona fide trustee.

Furthermore, Comptroller Saxon's applicable regulation under that law (12 CFR 9.18(a)(3)) permits, among other things, collective investment, where not in contravention of local law, of funds held by a national bank as fiduciary under a managing agency agreement expressly providing that such moneys are received by the bank in trust.

Yet, contrary to the clear requirements of both law and regulation that collective investment funds may only be received in trust, FNCB has not the slightest intention of operating its "commingled investment account" as a trust. Not only are ordinary mutual funds not fiduciary accounts under traditional trust law, but in its application to the Federal Reserve for an opinion on possible violations of the Banking Act of 1933, FNCB affirmatively stated that investors contributions to the fund would not be received "in trust."

To put it simply, FNCB is just not permitted by law or regulation to operate a collective investment fund except in a fiduciary capacity. What the bank is proposing to do in registering the account as an investment company is clearly illegal—entirely apart from the serious question of violating sections 21 and 32 of the Banking Act of 1933 flatly prohibiting securities operations. To submit to the Securities and Exchange Commission a proposal clearly illegal under other statutes is possibly a fraud upon the Commission. The application appears to be tainted and illegitimate.

The question is: Will Comptroller Saxon conveniently publish a new ruling just in time to bail out FNCB, reversing his rule that a bona fide trust is necessary, at the same time subverting the will of Congress as expressed in the 1962 trust law?

Report to the People of the 16th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the 16th Congressional District of New York on my voting and attendance record for the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

The report includes all rollcall votes. Its purpose is to collect in one place and in concise form, information which is scattered throughout thousands of pages of the Congressional Record. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

There are 201 votes listed. I was present and voted on 179. I missed no major vote. Of the 182 quorum calls for attendance in the House, I was present for 173. On the votes and quorums for which I was not present, I was on official business of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The report follows.

Date	Roll-call No.	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1965			
Jan. 4	2	Election of Speaker. McCormack, 289; G. Ford, 139	McCormack.
Jan. 4	3	H. Res. 1, a resolution authorizing and directing the Speaker to administer the oath of office to certain Members. (Yeas 276, nays 149.)	Yes.
Jan. 4	4	H. Res. 8, a resolution adopting Rules of the House of Representatives for the 89th Cong. (Yeas 224, nays 202.)	Yes.
Jan. 19	6	H. Res. 126, a resolution dismissing the notice of contest of election by James R. Frankenberry of the 25th New York Congressional District. (Yeas 245, nays 102.)	Yes.
Jan. 26	7	H.J. Res. 234, a joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit. (Yeas 204, nays 177.)	Not voting, paired for.
Feb. 8	10	H.J. Res. 234. (Yeas 165, nays 241.)	Not voting, paired against.
Feb. 9	12	H.R. 3818, a bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities. On motion to recommit. (Yeas 93, nays 289.).	No.
Feb. 9	13	H.R. 3818. On passage. (Yeas 300, nays 82.)	Yes.
Feb. 17	16	H.R. 2998, a bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations. On passage. (Yeas 302, nays 63.)	Yes.
Feb. 18	19	H.R. 45, a bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank. On motion to recommit. (Failed.) (Yeas 142, nays 237.)	No.
Feb. 18	20	H.R. 45, a bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act. On passage. (Yeas 288, nays 93.)	Yes.
Feb. 25	23	H. Res. 188, a resolution authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. On motion to recommit. (Failed.) (Yeas 58, nays 333.)	No.
Feb. 25	24	H. Res. 188. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 360, nays 29.)	Yes.
Mar. 3	28	S. 3, an act to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region. On motion to recommit. (Failed.) (Yeas 100, nays 323.)	No.
Mar. 3	29	S. 3. On passage. (Yeas 257, nays 165.)	Yes.
Mar. 10	31	H.R. 2, a bill to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 402, nays 0.)	Yes.
Mar. 15	33	H.R. 4714, a bill to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 with respect to the authorization of appropriations therein. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed.) (Yeas 217, nays 113.)	Not voting.
Mar. 16	35	H.R. 5505, a bill to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes. On Mathias amendment. (Failed.) (Yeas 147, nays 255.)	No.
Mar. 17	38	H. Res. 276, a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 5374, a bill relating to the salaries of the Chief Justice of the United States and of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 202, nays 183.)	No.
Mar. 17	39	H.R. 5374, a bill relating to the salaries of the Chief Justice of the United States and of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States. On passage. (Failed.) (Yeas 178, nays 202.)	No.
Mar. 22	42	H.R. 5688, a bill relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia. On motion to recommit. (Failed.) (Yeas 166, nays 216.)	Yes.
Mar. 22	43	H.R. 5688. On passage. (Yeas 251, nays 131.)	Yes.
Mar. 23	45	H.R. 5721, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 206, nays 170.)	Yes.
Mar. 26	51	On motion to approve the Journal. On ordering previous question. (Yeas 274, nays 119.)	Yes.
Mar. 26	52	H.R. 2362, a bill to strengthen and improve education quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. On motion to recommit. (Failed.) (Yeas 149, nays 267.)	No.
Mar. 26	53	H.R. 2362. On passage. (Yeas 263, nays 153.)	Yes.
Mar. 31	57	H.R. 3708, a bill to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services for training, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging." On passage. (Yeas 396, nays 1.)	Yes.
Mar. 31	58	H.R. 1111, a bill to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning. On passage. (Yeas 384, nays 0.)	Yes.
Apr. 1	60	H.R. 4257, a bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 395, nays 0.)	Yes.
Apr. 5	62	H.R. 980, a bill to provide for the return of obscene mail matter. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Yeas 360, nays 21.)	Yes.
Apr. 5	63	H.R. 7064, a bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Yeas 378, nays 0.)	Yes.
Apr. 5	64	H.R. 7060, a bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 347, nays 7.)	Yes.
Apr. 6	66	H.R. 7091, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 348, nays 62.)	Yes.
Apr. 8	70	H.R. 6675, a bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed.) (Yeas 191, nays 236.)	No.
Apr. 8	71	H.R. 6675, a bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged. On passage. (Yeas 313, nays 115.)	Yes.
Apr. 13	72	H.R. 2998, an act to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to increase the authorization for appropriations. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 316, nays 65.)	Yes.
Apr. 13	74	H.J. Res. 1, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. On passage. (Yeas 368, nays 29.)	Yes.
Apr. 14	76	H. Res. 310, a resolution authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the additional expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 313, nays 43.)	Yes.
Apr. 27	78	H.R. 6497, a bill to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States. On motion to recommit. (Failed.) (Yeas 113, nays 275.)	No.
Apr. 27	79	H.R. 6497, a bill to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act. On passage. (Yeas 301, nays 88.)	Yes.
Apr. 28	82	S. 4, an Act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 396, nays 0.)	Yes.
Apr. 29	84	H.R. 7091, an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 316, nays 55.)	Yes.
Apr. 29	85	H.R. 7091, an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes. On preferential motion of Mr. Keogh to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 6 to conference report. (Failed.) (Yeas 144, nays 228.)	Yes.
Apr. 29	86	H.R. 4714, a bill to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 with respect to the authorization of appropriations therein. On passage. (Yeas 239, nays 116.)	Yes.
May 3	87	H.R. 2986, a bill to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 347, nays 0.)	Yes.
May 4	90	H.R. 2985, a bill to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers. On passage. (Yeas 389, nays 0.)	Yes.
May 5	92	H.J. Res. 447, a joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for military functions of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 408, nays 7.)	Yes.
May 5	94	H.R. 7657, a bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 396, nays 0.)	Yes.
May 6	96	H.Res. 366, a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 7717, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, and for other purposes. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 389, nays 0.)	Yes.
May 6	97	H.R. 7717, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 389, nays 11.)	Yes.
May 10	99	H.R. 2984, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 334, nays 4.)	Yes.
May 12	101	S. 701, an act to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on Sept. 28, 1962, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 300, nays 97.)	Yes.
May 20	104	H.R. 8122, a bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with sec. 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed.) (Yeas 43, nays 313.)	No.
May 20	105	H.R. 8122, a bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission. On passage. (Yeas 352, nays 1.)	Yes.
May 25	109	H.R. 7750, a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as amended, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit. (Failed.) (Yeas 178, nays 219.)	No.
May 25	110	H.R. 7750. On passage. (Yeas 249, nays 148.)	Yes.

Date	Roll-call No.	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1965 May 26	112	H.R. 8370, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment as follows: On page 32, line 2, insert the following: "No part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1966 to finance the export of any agricultural commodity to either the United Arab Republic or Indonesia under the provisions of title I of Public Law 480, eighty-third Congress, as amended." (Failed.) (Yeas 187, nays 208.)	No.
May 26	113	H.R. 8370, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. On passage. (Yeas 354, nays 41.)	Yes.
June 1	116	H.R. 8639, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 322, nays 60.)	Yes.
June 1	117	H.R. 3584, a bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines. On passage. (Yeas 336, nays 42.)	Yes.
June 2	119	H.R. 8371, a bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 401, nays 6.)	Yes.
June 3	121	H.R. 7777, a bill to authorize the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee (U.S. Air Force, retired) to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. On passage. (Yeas 228, nays 137.)	Yes.
June 7	123	H.R. 3157, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Yeas 323, nays, 0.)	Not voting.
June 8	126	H.R. 8775, a bill making appropriations for the legislative branch of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed.) (Yeas 149, nays 244.)	No.
June 8	127	H.R. 7105, a bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 388, nays 1.)	Yes.
June 9	129	H. Res. 413, a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 8464, a bill to provide, for the period beginning on July 1, 1965, and ending on June 30, 1966, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. On ordering previous question. (Yeas 273, nays 109.)	Yes.
June 9	130	H.R. 8464, a bill to provide, for the period beginning on July 1, 1965, and ending on June 30, 1966, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. On passage. (Yeas 229, nays 165.)	Yes.
June 9	131	H. Con. Res. 285, concurrent resolution to allow the showing in the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy—Year of Lightning, Day of Drums." On Mailliard amendment. (Failed.) (Yeas 174, nays 216.)	No.
June 9	132	H. Con. Res. 285, concurrent resolution to allow the showing in the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy—Year of Lightning, Day of Drums." On agreeing to concurrent resolution. (Yeas 311, nays 75.)	Yes.
June 16	141	H.R. 6927, a bill to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed.) (Yeas 141, nays 259.)	No.
June 16	142	H.R. 6927, a bill to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development. On passage. (Yeas 217, nays 184.)	Yes.
June 16	143	H. Res. 416, resolution to authorize each Member of the House of Representatives to employ annually, on a temporary basis, a student congressional intern. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 229, nays 153.)	Yes.
June 21	145	H.R. 7743, a bill to establish a system of loan insurance and a supplementary system of direct loans, to assist students to attend post-secondary business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Yeas 300, nays 0.)	Not voting.
June 21	146	H.R. 8620, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to take into consideration floods and other natural disasters in reference to the feed grains, cotton, and wheat programs for 1965. (Yeas 297, nays 2.)	Not voting.
June 21	147	H. Con. Res. 416, concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. On motion to suspend rules and agree to. (Yeas 298, nays 0.)	Not voting.
June 23	153	H.R. 9221 a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 407, nays 0.)	Yes.
June 24	155	H. J. Res. 541, joint resolution to extend the Area Redevelopment Act for a period of 2 months. On passage. (Yeas 224, nays 167.)	Yes.
June 28	157	H. Res. 425, resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 7984, a bill to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 230, nays 115.)	Not voting.
June 30	162	H.R. 7984, a bill to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities. On Stephens amendment. (Yeas 240, nays 179.)	Yes.
June 30	163	H.R. 7984, a bill to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed.) (Yeas 202, nays 208.)	No.
June 30	164	H.R. 7984. On passage. (Yeas 245, nays 169.)	Yes.
July 6	167	H. Res. 440, resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 6400, a bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 308, nays 58.)	Yes.
July 9	175	H.R. 6400, a bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States. On Cramer amendment. (Yeas 253, nays 165.)	No.
July 9	176	H.R. 6400. On Boggs amendment. (Failed.) (Yeas 155, nays 262.)	Yes.
July 9	177	H.R. 6400. On Gilbert amendment. (Failed.) (Yeas 202, nays 216.)	Yes.
July 9	178	H.R. 6400. On motion to recommit with instructions. Ford-McCulloch bill and McClory amendment. (Failed.) (Yeas 171, nays 248.)	No.
July 9	179	H.R. 6400. On passage. (Yeas 333, nays 85.)	Yes.
July 12	181	H.R. 8856, a bill to amend section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed.) (Yeas 216, nays 139.)	Yes.
July 12	182	H.R. 242, a bill to extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of Jan. 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Yeas 336, nays 22.)	Yes.
July 13	185	S. 559, a bill to regulate the labeling of cigarettes, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 286, nays 103.)	Yes.
July 14	188	H.R. 8926, a bill to provide for the coinage of the United States. On Battin amendment. (Failed.) (Yeas 187, nays 218.)	No.
July 14	189	H.R. 8926. On passage. (Yeas 255, nays 151.)	Yes.
July 20	193	H.R. 9075, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services. On passage. (Yeas 410, nays 0.)	Yes.
July 22	196	H.R. 8283, a bill to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Yeas 178, nays 227.)	No.
July 22	197	H.R. 8283, a bill to expand the war on poverty. On passage. (Yeas 245, nays 158.)	Yes.
July 26	199	H. Res. 437, resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal sec. 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and sec. 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the 1st provision of sec. 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. On ordering previous question. (Yeas 248, nays 171.)	Yes.
July 27	203	H.R. 6675, an act to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 307, nays 116.)	Yes.
July 27	204	H.R. 7984, an act to assist in the provision of housing for low- and moderate-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to improve living environment in urban areas, and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 251, nays 168.)	Yes.
July 27	205	H.R. 2985, an act to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 414, nays 0.)	Yes.
July 28	208	H.R. 77, a bill to repeal sec. 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and sec. 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of sec. 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. On motion to recommit. (Failed.) (Yeas 200, nays 223.)	No.
July 28	209	H.R. 77, a bill to repeal sec. 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. On passage. (Yeas 221, nays 203.)	Yes.
July 29	212	H.R. 8856, a bill to amend sec. 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. On passage. (Yeas 275, nays 126.)	Yes.
Aug. 2	214	S.J. Res. 81, joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to apportion the sum authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Yeas 314, nays 11.)	Not voting.
Aug. 2	215	H.R. 8027, a bill to provide assistance in training State and local law enforcement officers and other personnel, and in improving capabilities, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Yeas 326, nays 0.)	Not voting.
Aug. 2	216	H.R. 6964, a bill to amend sec. 4082 of title 18, United States Code, to facilitate the rehabilitation of persons convicted of offenses against the United States. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Yeas 325, nays 0.)	Not voting.
Aug. 3	218	S. 1564, an act to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes. Conference report, on motion to recommit. (Yeas 118, nays 284.)	No.
Aug. 3	219	S. 1564. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 328, nays 74.)	Yes.
Aug. 3	220	H.R. 8469, a bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 396, nays 0.)	Yes.
Aug. 4	221	H.R. 8439, an act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 389, nays 0.)	Yes.
Aug. 4	222	S. 1742, an act to authorize the U.S. Governor to agree to amendments to the articles of agreements of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 331, nays 54.)	Yes.
Aug. 5	224	H.Res. 498, resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 4750, a bill to provide a 2-year extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 329, nays 44.)	Yes.
Aug. 5	225	H.R. 4750, a bill to provide a 2-year extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 274, nays 97)	Yes.
Aug. 9	228	H.R. 9918, a bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act and the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia. On Sickles amendment. (Yeas 173, nays 156.)	Not voting.

Date	Roll-call No.	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1965			
Aug. 10	230	H.R. 10306, a bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, as amended. On passage. (Yeas 393, nays 1)	Yes.
Aug. 12	234	S. 1648, an act to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions. On Sisk amendment. (Yeas 196, nays 194.)	Yes.
Aug. 12	235	S. 1648, an act to provide grants for public works and development facilities. On motion to recommit. (Failed.) (Yeas 163, nays 224)	No.
Aug. 12	236	S. 1648, an act to provide grants for public works and development facilities. On passage. (Yeas 246, nays 138)	Yes.
Aug. 16	238	H.R. 6431, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain forms of nickel be admitted free of duty. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Yeas 298, nays 48.)	Yes.
Aug. 16	239	H.R. 8635, a bill to establish and prescribe the duties of a Federal Boxing Commission for the purpose of insuring that the channels of interstate commerce are free from false or fraudulent descriptions or depictions of professional boxing contests. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Yeas 346, nays 4.)	Yes.
Aug. 19	242	H.R. 7750, an act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 244, nays 150.)	Yes.
Aug. 19	243	H.R. 9811, a bill to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs, and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit. (Failed.) (Yeas 169, nays 224.)	No.
Aug. 19	244	H.R. 9811, on passage. (Yeas 221, nays 172.)	Yes.
Aug. 24	246	H.R. 10586, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit. (Failed.) (Yeas 139, nays 263.)	No.
Aug. 25	248	H.R. 2580, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes. On MacGregor amendment. (Failed.) (Yeas 189, nays 218.)	No.
Aug. 25	249	H.R. 2580, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 318, nays 95.)	Yes.
Aug. 26	252	H.R. 9567, a bill to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education. On passage. (Yeas 368, nays 22.)	Yes.
Aug. 30	253	H.R. 9022, a bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Cong., to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster; to eliminate inequities in the application of Public Law 815 in certain military base closings; and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 305, nays 37.)	Yes.
Aug. 31	254	H. Res. 551, resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 9042, a bill to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 363, nays 23.)	Yes.
Aug. 31	255	H.R. 9042, a bill to provide for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 280, nays 113.)	Yes.
Sept. 1	257	H.R. 3141, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 340, nays 47.)	Yes.
Sept. 2	259	H.R. 5863, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 317, nays 24.)	Yes.
Sept. 7	262	H.R. 8439, an act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. Motion by Mr. Hall: "*Resolved*, That the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of the bill H.R. 8439, for military construction, with the President's veto thereon, and that the same be now considered." On Rivers of South Carolina motion to lay on table. (Yeas 323, nays 19.)	Yes.
Sept. 7	263	H.R. 10775, a bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Yeas 347, nays 0.)	Yes.
Sept. 7	264	H.R. 168, a bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation to reflect the increase in the cost of living from the year 1933. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Yeas 348, nays 0.)	Yes.
Sept. 7	265	S.J. Res. 102, joint resolution to authorize funds for the Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and the District of Columbia Commission on Crime and Law Enforcement. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Yeas 339, nays 0.)	Yes.
Sept. 8	269	H.R. 10871, a bill making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 239, nays 143.)	Yes.
Sept. 13	273	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call on roll No. 272. (Yeas 226, nays 126.)	Not voting.
Sept. 13	275	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call on roll No. 274. (Yeas 244, nays 127.)	Not voting.
Sept. 13	279	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call on roll No. 278. (Yeas 256, nays 124.)	Yes.
Sept. 13	281	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call on roll No. 280. (Yeas 255, nays 121.)	Yes.
Sept. 13	282	On motion to approve the Journal. On ordering previous question. On Hall motion to lay on table. (Failed.) (Yeas 138, nays 245.)	No.
Sept. 13	283	On motion to approve the Journal. On ordering previous question. (Yeas 257, nays 126.)	Yes.
Sept. 13	284	On motion to approve the Journal. (Yeas 265, nays 119.)	Yes.
Sept. 13	285	On motion to adjourn. (Failed.) (Yeas 175, nays 204.)	No.
Sept. 13	286	H. Res. 506, resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10065) to more effectively prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, and for other purposes. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 259, nays 121.)	Yes.
Sept. 13	287	H. Res. 506, resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10065). On Albert motion to lay on table. (Yeas 194, nays 181.)	Yes.
Sept. 13	288	On motion to adjourn. (Failed.) (Yeas 174, nays 202.)	No.
Sept. 13	290	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call on roll No. 289. (Yeas 243, nays 136.)	Yes.
Sept. 13	291	H. Res. 499, resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7371) to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 201, nays 171.)	Yes.
Sept. 13	292	H. Res. 478, resolution to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 260, nays 114.)	Yes.
Sept. 14	293	H. Res. 536, resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 10281, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 289, nays 84.)	Yes.
Sept. 14	296	H.R. 2091, a bill relating to the establishment of concession policies in the areas administered by National Park Service and for other purposes. On motion to recommit. (Failed.) (Yeas 73, nays 298.)	No.
Sept. 15	299	H.R. 8283, an act to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Conference report, on motion to recommit with instructions. (Yeas 209, nays 180.)	No.
Sept. 15	301	H.R. 9460, a bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States and for other purposes. On motion to recommit. (Failed.) (Yeas 128, nays 251.)	No.
Sept. 16	303	H. Res. 574, resolution directing the Postmaster General to provide the names of temporary employees employed by the Post Office Department during the summer of 1965. On Morrison motion to lay on table. (Yeas 185, nays 181.)	Yes.
Sept. 16	304	S. 2042, a bill to amend sec. 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. On passage. (Yeas 338, nays 30.)	Yes.
Sept. 17	306	H.R. 9221, an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 382, nays 0.)	Yes.
Sept. 17	307	H. Res. 585, resolution dismissing the 5 Mississippi election contests. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 228, nays 143.)	No.
Sept. 20	309	H.R. 10873, a bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to establish a program of group life insurance which shall be provided by private insurance companies for members of the uniformed services who are on active duty. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Yeas 362, nays 0.)	Not voting.
Sept. 20	310	H. Res. 560, resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives declaring the policy of the United States relative to the intervention of the international communistic movement in the Western Hemisphere. On motion to suspend rules and agree to. (Yeas 312, nays 52.)	Yes.
Sept. 21	313	S. 4, an act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 381, nays 0.)	Yes.
Sept. 22	315	S. 2300, an act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works and rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes. On Clark amendment. (Yeas 207, nays 185.)	No.
Sept. 22	316	H.R. 30, a bill to provide for participation of the United States in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 255, nays 112.)	Not voting.
Sept. 22	318	On motion to adjourn. (Failed.) (Yeas 90, nays 204.)	Not voting.
Sept. 23	320	H.R. 7371, a bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. On Bennett amendment. (Yeas 199, nays 178.)	No.
Sept. 23	321	H. Res. 580, resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 10232, a bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and for other purposes. On ordering previous question. (Yeas 280, nays 70.)	Yes.
Sept. 23	322	H.R. 10232, a bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 326, nays 10.)	Yes.
Sept. 24	324	S. 306, an act to amend the Clean Air Act to require standards for controlling the emission of pollutants from gasoline-powered or diesel-powered vehicles, to establish a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed.) (Yeas 80, nays 220.)	No.
Sept. 24	325	S. 306, an act to amend the Clean Air Act. On passage. (Yeas 294, nays 4.)	Yes.

Date	Roll-call No.	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1965 Sept. 27	327	H. Res. 515, resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4644) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. On Multer motion to discharge Committee on Rules from further consideration of. (Yeas 213, nays 183).	Yes.
Sept. 27	328	H. Res. 515, resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4644). On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 223, nays 179.)	Yes.
Sept. 27	330	H.R. 4644. On Multer motion that House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of. (Yeas 234, nays 155.)	Yes.
Sept. 29	336	H.R. 4644. On recommendation of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that the enacting clause be stricken out. (Failed.) (Yeas 179, nays 219.)	No.
Sept. 29	337	H.R. 4644. On Multer amendment as amended by Sisk amendment. (Yeas 227, nays 174.)	No.
Sept. 29	338	H.R. 4644, a bill authorizing the residents of the District of Columbia to make known their preference on the question of home rule, and, if they wish, to elect a board for the purpose of preparing a municipal charter for submission to the voters and to Congress. On motion to recommit. (Yeas 134, nays 267.)	No.
Sept. 29	339	H.R. 4644. On passage. (Yeas 283, nays 117.)	Yes.
Sept. 30	341	H.R. 2580, an act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 320, nays 69.)	Not voting, paired for.
Sept. 30	342	H.R. 10281, a bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, to establish the Federal Salary Review Commission, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Yeas 238, nays 140.)	Not voting.
Sept. 30	343	H.R. 10281. On passage. (Yeas 370, nays 7.)	Yes.
Oct. 1	345	H.J. Res. 642, a joint resolution to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct the 3d Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed.) (Yeas 17, nays 321).	No.
Oct. 1	346	H.J. Res. 642. On passage. (Yeas 328, nays 5.)	Yes.
Oct. 1	347	H.R. 10871, an act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. Conference report, on motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed.) (Yeas 164, nays 174.)	No.
Oct. 1	348	H.R. 10871. On adoption. (Yeas 204, nays 127.)	Yes.
Oct. 1	349	H.R. 3142, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities. On passage. (Yeas 296, nays 3.)	Not voting.
Oct. 1	350	H.R. 6519, a bill to amend the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98) as amended, providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 250, nays 12.)	Not voting.
Oct. 7	353	S.J. Res. 32, joint resolution to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury to persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after Aug. 14, 1945, and before Apr. 28, 1952. On passage. (Yeas 312, nays 55.)	Not voting.
Oct. 7	354	H.R. 2020, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 240, nays 134.)	No.
Oct. 7	356	S. 2084, an act to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed.) (Yeas 153, nays 230.)	No.
Oct. 7	357	S. 2084. On passage. (Yeas 245, nays 138.)	Yes.
Oct. 8	359	H.R. 9811, an act to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 219, nays 150.)	Yes.
Oct. 12	363	H. Res. 598, a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 11134, a bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 253, nays 80.)	Yes.
Oct. 13	366	H.R. 11135, a bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Yeas 160, nays 230.)	No.
Oct. 13	367	H.R. 11135. On passage. (Yeas 246, nays 147.)	Yes.
Oct. 14	369	H.R. 11588, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. On Harvey of Michigan amendment. (Yeas 185, nays 162.)	No.
Oct. 14	370	H.R. 11588, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 242, nays 100.)	Yes.
Oct. 20	376	H.R. 9567, an act to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education. Conference report, on motion to recommit with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist upon the deletion of pt. B of title V of the bill, which would authorize the establishment of a National Teacher Corps. (Failed.) (Yeas 152, nays 226.)	No.
Oct. 20	377	H.R. 9567, conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 313, nays 63.)	Yes.
Oct. 20	378	S. 2300, an act authorizing the construction repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes. (Yeas 221, nays 139.)	Present (live pair for).
Oct. 21	380	H.R. 11588, an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 250, nays 84.)	Yes.
Oct. 21	381	H.R. 11588, an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes. Conference report, on motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 66 with an amendment. (Yeas 166, nays 162.)	Yes.
Oct. 22	383	H.R. 11135, an act to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 174, nays 88.)	Yes.

New Thinking on Potomac River Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, last June 28, 1965, when addressing the Governor's meeting with Interior Secretary Udall on conservation of the Potomac River, I stated that because of the controversial Corps of Engineers' plan for high dams on the river we should take steps to protect the land involved until a decision is made on whether to follow the corps' recommendations or try something else. I said:

> Regardless of what plan, let's take steps now either through purchase, scenic easements, or otherwise; let's make arrangements to protect the land in the event the new ideas do not work, in the event we do find that impoundment is the only way we can insure adequate water supply, adequate flood control, pollution abatement, and the additional benefits of recreational and comprehensive programs. But let not we, who are in office now, jeopardize the future of this area where we'll have situations of signs where you cannot get water without paying for it, such as the present situation in New York.
>
> Let's get started now, whether it is for part planned now or what; but let's get a plan and have it available in the event that the Corps of Engineers in their expert way are proven to be right. In the event we do not have that technology that some people say is just around the corner, let's not be derelict in our responsibility to the future generations.

This month, Assistant Secretary of the Interior Kenneth Holum stated in a speech that he favored avoiding making a decision now on whether to build the Seneca Dam on the Potomac as recommended by the Corps of Engineers. He said:

> If Seneca Dam were built—and if the Washington metropolitan area grows as everyone predicts that it will—Seneca Reservoir would be one of the largest man-made reservoirs within a major metropolitan area. It is not surprising that Seneca has become a major subject of controversy—not just because it would inundate the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal and a beautiful stretch of the river itself—but, perhaps, even more so because no one quite knows how a man-made fluctuating reservoir would fit into a metropolitan area.
>
> Personally, I think we should avoid making irrevocable decisions for future generations unless they are absolutely essential and unless we are completely certain that the decision we make is in their best interest.
>
> A decision to build Seneca now will force an irreversible decision on our heirs. I would prefer to avoid that decision. It would be particularly unfortunate if the dam were built for purposes that advancing technology can serve through other means.
>
> By the same token, if we do nothing, in 10 years the area will be so completely developed that economics will make it impossible to use the area to serve whatever public purpose may prove to be most desirable in the future.
>
> A more prudent course, it seems to me—and it coincides with the urgent need for more parks, playgrounds and outdoor recreation areas—would be to act now to maintain the present level of economic development so as to free the hands of future decisionmakers. Most of the site can easily and appropriately be incorporated into a Potomac Valley Park. No doubt, new legislative tools would need to be developed to achieve this objective, but, nonetheless, I think it merits careful consideration.

It is very encouraging to see that the Interior Department has chosen this course. It is a wise course and one that can be supported as a compromise by the proponents and opponents of the Corps of Engineers' recommendations. There is no question something will have to be done to insure the Washington metropolitan area an adequate water supply and clean river in the near future.

Until our scientists encounter a technological breakthrough or a majority of the experts agree on a plan for the Potomac River Valley, we could best lay the groundwork for any decision by setting aside the land under easement—donated or purchased.

This will guarantee that if we need the land it will be available in undeveloped or low-density development and large-scale condemnation and relocation will not have to take place. This will allow room for implementation of any one of several courses of action. In preparing for and making a decision of such significance, we need latitude in order to take the best course.

Text of Hon. Bob Ellsworth's Newsletter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of my newsletter which is being sent to my constituents in the Third District of Kansas:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN, BOB ELLSWORTH, REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

A tough and demanding year in Congress has come to a close. I have enjoyed serving you, and thought you might enjoy a few observations from inside Capitol Hill.

ATOM SMASHER FOR KANSAS?

As the Atomic Energy Commission narrows its list, the Third District of Kansas is still in the running for the $300 million atom smasher. Many of us have cooperated and worked hard on this project—our future is bright, we hope to win. If not, we have learned a good deal about attracting and holding new space-age industry for Kansas.

A NEW HOOVER COMMISSION

New programs costing billions of dollars are now being set up by Federal legislation. In the last few weeks over two dozen Republican Congressmen (including House Republican Leader GERALD R. FORD) have joined me in sponsoring legislation to establish a new Commission to review management and operation of the executive branch of Government. It is high time for such a Commission, patterned after the effective Hoover Commissions of the past, to make sure the taxpayer is getting maximum efficiency for each dollar spent on new and old programs.

ELLSWORTH BILLS

As your Representative I have introduced over 50 bills this session of Congress. They are the result of study, research, and discussions with colleagues, and visits and exchanges of letters with citizens of the Third District. Below are a few of special interest:

My first bill, to repeal many of the Federal excise taxes, was introduced on January 4. Many other Congressmen joined as sponsors, and on June 21, the President signed into law a bill repealing the excise taxes.

The Bobby Baker affair pointed to the need for a congressional code of ethics. I have submitted a bill to establish such a code. If passed, I believe it would do much to restore Congress to the position of respect it deserves as the greatest legislative body in the world.

Medicare was one of the hottest issues in Congress this year. I opposed the financing of the mandatory administration program and reintroduced my voluntary medicare proposal to be administered by private insurance companies. My viewpoint did not prevail, although it was accepted in a portion of the final version.

I also introduced a bill to increase social security benefits. Many ideas from my bill were written into the administration's legislation—now law. This will be some help to senior citizens faced with rising living costs.

ELLSWORTH COMMITTEES

Congressional committees are the backbone of our legislative work. Here we study bills and social problems in detail. During hearings public witnesses and administration spokesmen testify and are cross-examined. After long hours, often weeks, of testimony, we committee members roll up our sleeves in closed sessions and hammer out bills and reports that establish policy and law to guide the Nation.

Working in the Joint Economic Committee, I became aware of dangers in our international monetary system. In June, I addressed the Congress and called for reform. Treasury Secretary Fowler liked the speech, talked with the President, and the United States is now providing world leadership in this field. Last month I was on the U.S. delegation which made important progress at the 103-nation International Monetary Fund Conference.

Bills concerning veterans and, often, active servicemen are considered in the Veterans' Affairs Committee. One important bill on which many of us worked, provides up to $10,000 worth of life insurance for American fighting men. On September 20, I told the House of Representatives that the bill is of great importance to our servicemen, their wives and children—it passed unanimously.

When Vivian and I spent an evening at the White House, I had a chance to discuss opening new markets abroad for Kansas wheat with the President. If we could sell to available markets, the impact on Kansas would be about the same as opening a large space-age industry. All of the Kansas congressional delegation has been working on this. The President has expressed interest but has not yet acted.

THIS WAS THE YEAR THAT WAS

This was the year of the galloping Congress. Like a well-oiled machine, it cranked out bills—some good, some poorly drawn, most expensive. This was the year of medicare, higher education, air pollution control, omnibus housing, National Arts and Humanities Foundation, drug controls, omnibus farm program, excise tax reductions. A multitude of "minor" bills also passed. Issues like repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act will still be with us next year.

The Third District of Kansas has everything: Cities, towns, farms, suburbs, flatland, highland, colleges, labor, management, and on and on. A colleague once said it sounded like the entire United States in one congressional district. Your views are as diverse as the district, and I enjoy hearing from you and working for you.

The $100 billion Federal budget holds a multitude of stories affecting our lives. We could talk about taxes, or millions of dollars going to KU for higher education, or thousands going to Pomona for water pollution control, or 30 Olathe children enrolled in Project Headstart. One gratifying activity on which my staff and I spend much time, has been development of flood control, water conservation and recreation projects. The economy of our entire area is boosted by these important programs.

My office is your office. More than 2,000 have visited us this year. When you are in town—come in. We can give you passes to the House and Senate. With advance notice we can arrange VIP tours of various agencies.

Many thousands sent letters this year. Letters help me to know your views on important issues, or allow me to assist you with a problem involving the Federal Government. Keep writing: Congressman BOB ELLSWORTH, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

The space of a newsletter is all too brief, but perhaps this one has given you a glimpse of Capitol Hill this year. I hope we can get together at home, during adjournment, for an exchange of views and a firsthand report.

Sincerely,

BOB ELLSWORTH,
Your Congressman.

Conservation Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the 1st session of the 89th Congress has been labeled by custodians of our natural wealth as the "conservation Congress." In this, I heartily concur. More important than what this Congress has accomplished in conservation and development of our natural resources is the manner in which we proposed the programs. I outlined the need for balanced development of our natural resources when I had the privilege of delivering the keynote speech to the 1965 Pacific Northwest Region Convention of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers, at the University of Idaho.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHURCH

No other section of our country—and possibly no place on earth—has been endowed with a greater abundance of natural wealth than our own Pacific Northwest. We have been blessed with rich mineral deposits, with vast tracts of timber, and with a plentitude of fertile land. Best of all, we enjoy a generous supply of water.

The Pacific Northwest has every physical attribute for a bountiful future. Our responsibility, as the custodians of this rich endowment, is to care for and develop it in such a wisely balanced way as to best promote the general well-being of all the people—now and in the future.

The key word is "balance," for without the proper balance—to use a resource in one instance, to replenish or conserve it in another—we will not be utilizing our natural wealth; we will be exploiting it to depletion and eventual destruction.

It has been said that the difference between a politician and a statesman is that a politician thinks in terms of the next election, while a statesman thinks in terms of the next generation. The same could be applied to the difference between a developer and a conservationist.

At the turn of the present century, half the population of the United States was still engaged in the production of raw products—on the farms, in the mines and forests. Today, only a tenth of our working force is so engaged. This doesn't mean that our national resources have become less important. It indicates, rather, that production of raw materials has become so efficient that 90 percent of our work force can concentrate on the embellishments—manufacturing, processing, servicing, transporting, teaching, engaging in the arts and sciences, the medical or legal professions, or in engineering—the many facets of modern society which, nonetheless, rests upon the base of our natural resources.

The mounting pressure on these resources has been accentuated by the phenomenal growth in our population. By the end of this century, 35 years hence, the number of people living in the United States will double—350 million citizens will be hungrily consuming our natural wealth, and, at the same time, looking to it to furnish them with outdoor pleasure during their leisure time. Projections indicate that they will have more than twice as much disposable per capita income and paid vacation time as in 1960. Their average workweek will have decreased from 39 hours to 32 hours. Plainly, we face a challenging trusteeship, if we are to manage our endowment in such a way as to permit our grandchildren to eat their cake and have it too.

By the year 2000, farm production will have to rise from its 1960 level of $20.8 billion to $38 billion. In the same period, timber needs will grow from 11.5 billion cubic feet to 32.3 billion cubic feet. Where we were withdrawing 84.5 trillion gallons of water a day in 1960, we shall require a withdrawal of nearly 150 trillion gallons, 35 years hence.

If we assume—and I think we can—that the expert management of our forests will prove equal to the test—and that our farmers with the help of modern research, hybrid seeds, commercial fertilizers, advanced education in agricultural methods, excellent extension courses, and the contribution of the soil conservation service, will also manage—this leaves us with the unanswered question of how we are going to handle our water.

It is with this question—the care and development of the water resources of the great Northwest—that I propose to deal this morning.

The modern phase of river development in the Northwest began when President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in 1932, commenced the construction of the Bonneville Dam, followed shortly by the Grand Coulee on the Columbia River. This was the beginning of a comprehensive program, prepared by the Army Corps of Engineers, to harness the mighty Columbia-Snake River system. It was then no more than a dream—an excellent giant's dream, to be sure—but, in the years since it has been given much substance in both the United States and Canada.

Millions of acres of land have been reclaimed and put into production as the Columbia, and many of her major tributaries, have been harnessed to the plowshare and the turbine. Moving hand in hand with irrigation, the dams in the Northwest today generate larger quantities of electricity—to light our homes and turn our industrial plants—than in any other part of the continent.

The needs of commercial navigation have also been well served. By 1970, the great system of Federal dams on the Columbia and the lower Snake will be nearing completion. River barges will be bringing goods from Pacific ports up the river as far as Lewiston, to be reloaded with inland grain, ores, and quarry products for shipment to farflung places. The ocean highway will reach more than 500 miles inland to create a landlocked seaport in Lewiston, Idaho, 25 miles from where we meet today.

As each new dam and its companion generators has gone "on the line," the network of powerlines and irrigation ditches grows, the electricity benefiting not only the American and Canadian parts of the Northwest, but, through interties now abuilding, California and the intermountain West as well. Industry and agriculture expand to meet our burgeoning needs.

Fortunately, we have much water left in the Northwest to put to future use. In the Mountain States and in the Southwest, thirsty States are even now eyeing our unappropriated waters. We can hope that the next few years will see great strides in desalinization of ocean waters to help meet the needs of these water-short regions. But we can't be sure this will happen. As of now, we must assume that a major attempt will be made to divert water from the Northwest into other river basins.

There are now study proposals pending in Congress, introduced by Representatives of water-short States, which relate to possible diversions of water from the Northwest in the future. One such bill calls for a study on the feasibility of diverting 8½ million acre-feet of water into the Upper and Lower Colorado River Basins and to supply irrigation canals along the route of the diversion. This, I would point out to you, is in excess of the total annual flow of the Snake River at the site of the proposed Guffey Dam in southwestern Idaho.

What would this water be used for in Colorado, Arizona, or southern California? To fill the empty water glasses of thirsty people? To provide the necessary sanitation and sewage disposal in Phoenix or Los Angeles? To meet vital industrial demands? Not at all.

The water which would be siphoned away from the Pacific Northwest is mainly to be put to the very same irrigation uses we have pioneered. At fantastic expense, it is to be diverted a thousand miles to reclaim new land in the Southwest, while desert lands, lying next to the very source of the diversion in the Northwest, remain dry.

Incredible? Yes, but the proof can be found in the present use of water in the areas which now search for more. Southern California is now using 90 percent of its water, locally developed and imported, for irrigation. Throughout the arid Southwest, 75 percent of all the water is going into reclaiming new land or irrigating old.

So, if we are not to lose our unused water here in the great Northwest, we must put it to use. Balanced development will not permit the construction of new hydroelectric dams at the expense, or to the exclusion, of new reclamation projects.

The case for comprehensive use is exemplified in a proposal that Congressman Compton White and I recently put forward for a unified southwest Idaho water development project. Briefly stated, this is a half-billion-dollar plan to put the unused water in southwest Idaho to work. When it takes final form, the project may pull together as many as five previous proposals for piecemeal development of the region. Two major dams, two diversion tunnels, and associated generator facilities, fully integrated with existing works, would be entailed. The project would irrigate some 500,000 acres of vacant desertland, putting supplemental water on other land, now irrigated but without adequate water supplies. In addition, the project would generate more than half a million kilowatts of salable Federal power to help repay its construction costs. Municipalities and industry would come in for their share of the water, while recreation, fish, and wildlife would also be served.

If a project of this dimension, and others like it, are to be built in the Northwest, then our vast river system must be made to pay for the full development of the land it drains. We must lift our sights in the Northwest, as other great river basins in the country have already done, and establish an overall basin account. This would enable us to lump together all of the revenues derived from the enormous Government investment in the waterworks of the Northwest, and then draw upon the surplus, as the projects pay themselves off, to help finance new development, wherever it may be located, upstream or downstream, within the drainage system. Until such a basin account is put fully into effect, optimum utilization of the water resources of the Northwest will never be achieved.

From what I have said thus far, it is obvious that I am a devoted advocate of dams, provided they are built to comply with the requirements for complete utilization of their sites. When first elected to the Senate, the proposed Heels Canyon Dam had been made into a scare word in southern Idaho. Nevertheless, I fought for its authorization—which passed the Senate but died in the House—because it seemed to me inexcusable to squander so monumental a site on an insufficient, single-purposed private development.

Whenever the evidence shows that a proposed dam will do more good than harm, I shall work for it. But, by the same token, whenever the evidence shows that a dam will do more harm than good, I shall work against it—with equal fervor.

This brings me back to what I tried to stress at the outset, the need for a properly balanced management of our water resources. Much of our unused water should be put to work irrigating land, generating power, and meeting municipal and industrial requirements.

But not all of it.

Part of it should be put to a different use—to the service of another vital public need, outdoor recreation. If we build a dam on every site, on each and every one of our rivers, we shall relinquish the entire river system to this one use. The rightful claim of outdoor recreation, in all of its different and diverse forms, will be sacrificed.

Yet this is where we are now headed. Since the licensing of dams is in the hands of public agencies which exist for this purpose, the direction in which we are moving is perfectly evident: Ultimately—indeed, within a relatively short time—in the absence of restraining legislation, every feasible site will be used for dam construction. Unless laws are enacted to save some of our few remaining free-flowing rivers in their natural untamed state, wild rivers shall soon vanish from our land.

It is for this reason that I have introduced a wild rivers bill in the Senate. This bill would establish a national wild rivers system, within which dams could not be built. Among those streams initially included would be a long stretch of Idaho's magnificent Salmon River, and a section of the Clearwater, including her wonderous tributaries, the Lochsa and the Selway, as well as a segment of Oregon's beautiful Rogue.

The objective of the bill is to keep these rivers, and certain others located in other parts of the country, in their natural condition unobstructed and free flowing. The system would be administered to promote maximum public use and enjoyment. Other uses of the banklands which are not incompatible, such as farming, grazing, and lumbering, would continue without interference. Even mining on the bankland within the system would not be prohibited, if the operations were conducted in a way that avoided the obstruction or pollution of the river.

I regard the wild rivers bill as an essential part of any program that seeks the balance management of our water resources. Legislation of this character may well prove indispensable to the preservation of our migratory fish runs in the years to come. Meanwhile, we have acres of damsites on obstructed rivers which no longer mother the salmon, on which we can meet our future power needs for as many years ahead as hydro-produced electricity is ever likely to remain competitive with power generated at nuclear plants, where efficiency of operation steadily improves and costs continue to decline.

The discovery of the scenic wonders of the Northwest by the rest of the continent—the fishing, the hunting, the summer vacationers trying to escape the stifling confinement of megalopolis—the inevitable tide of tourists coming our way—this has already come to represent our fastest growing source of new income in the Pacific Northwest.

And the expansion has just begun. By the year 2000, taken altogether, there will be nearly 400 million American and Canadian citizens. Where will these people go to find relief from the clatter, cluster, and smells of the bulging cities? From the oppressiveness of asphalt and concrete? From the frustrating proximity of the crowd?

I think the answer is clear. The 11 Western States, having but 15 percent of the national population, hold 75 percent of the recreation acreage. And about half of this lies in the Pacific Northwest.

So we must prepare ourselves for the rush to come, for—much as we might like to isolate ourselves—there is no way to escape the facts of life.

In the Senate, I have tried to do my part. There, I have served as floor manager of both the wilderness bill and the land and water conservation fund, two measures which should prove of immense help in both conserving and developing our great potential for outdoor recreation.

You, in turn, as interested and responsible citizens of our beloved Northwest, can also play a vital role, if you will stand up for, and insist upon, a wisely balanced management of your inheritance. In the utilization of our water, let no single interest dominate to the exclusion of others, neither the farmer's spade, the angler's hook, or "Reddy-Kilowatt's" switch.

If you will do this, the challenge of the coming years will be fairly met, you will have discharged your custodial duties well—and long after you are gone, your grandchildren will remember you in their prayers.

Tribute to Olof R. Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a Senator's job, with its long hours and steady work, is wearying and fatiguing. It is most fortunate, I think, that we have the Senate gymnasium, small though it is.

We have a most able staff of assistants in the gymnasium, who for many years now, have attended us faithfully in our effort to maintain physical fitness. I wish to pay tribute to each member of the staff: Olof R. Anderson and his capable assistants—Bo I. Anderberg, Ray Johanson, Gunnar Johanson, and Johnny Ware. They have been wonderful to help us through the years. The senior member of the staff is Olof R. Anderson, who has had 15 years of continuous and devoted service to the Senate. The services of all of these men have contributed greatly to the maintenance of our health and physical well-being.

Report on Midpoint Conference of the International Farm Youth Exchange (IFYE) Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, the State of Kansas is proud of its role in the international farm youth exchange—IFYE—program. Kansas was host again this year to the midpoint conference of IFYE, July 29 to August 4. During the course of this conference, 108 IFYE exchangees from 33 countries participated in the meeting.

Because of the importance of this program to improve relations between the United States and other nations around the globe, and because these improved relations promote better understanding between the peoples of the various countries and because this better understanding fosters a climate for peace and progress, I feel that it is important that Members of Congress and their constituents know more about this program and the part Kansas has played in the development of it.

To that end I asked R. B. Tomkinson, of Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans., to prepare a summary of the midpoint conference. Mr. Tomkinson is the division of extension specialist in 4-H work at Kansas State University. He served as coordinator of the IFYE program in Kansas and deserves much of the credit for the success of this year's conference.

In his report, Mr. Tomkinson stated:

> IFYE was started as a cultural exchange to create better understanding between people by living another way of life. One of the strong points has been the opportunity for young people to live with farm families in another country.
>
> Each year a different land-grant college cosponsors the IFYE midpoint conference with the National 4-H Club Foundation. This was the second time Kansas has been host to the event.
>
> This year, the IFYE midpoint conference was held from July 28 to August 4 on the campus of Kansas State University in Manhattan, Kans. We had 108 exchangees from 33 countries participating in the program. As each exchangee visits two States in their 6 months' stay in the United States, the midpoint conference is held between the two State visits.
>
> The objectives of the midpoint conference are to provide opportunities for the exchangee to—
>
> (a) Renew acquaintances with other exchangees from their country—to speak their native language, to share experiences with each other, and to relax and recreate;
>
> (b) Meet and learn to know exchangees from other parts of the world and to learn something of the culture, economy, government, and geophysiology of their countries;
>
> (c) Review the objectives and discuss the operations of the IFYE program;
>
> (d) Pursue their individual interests in educational rural youth work and/or agriculture and home economics;
>
> (e) Review experiences in their first host States and needs yet to be fulfilled; and
>
> (f) Look ahead to the second State visits and the opportunities to meet such needs.
>
> In addition to the experience of young people living with farm families in another country, other countries are now indicating that they want their young people to pick up technical information that they can use in their home countries. This year, four special-interest workshops were included on the agenda of the conference: (1) Rural youth leadership; (2) home economics; (3) animal husbandry and poultry; and (4) field crops. Thus, by including this for the first time in the midpoint conference, we feel the exchangees were able to acquire some technical knowledge and information.
>
> Kansas has the largest IFYE program of any State in the Nation. All 105 counties in Kansas have been active in the program. We have had 739 families host 238 exchangees from 64 different countries. At the same time, we have sent 141 Kansas delegates from 66 countries to 46 different countries. The following is a summary of the highlights of the Kansas IFYE program for 1965:
>
> PARTICIPANTS FROM KANSAS IN 1965
>
> Gloria Bartholomew, Alton (Osborne County) visited Japan.
>
> Mary K. Munson, Junction City (Geary County) visited India.
>
> Richard Hawkins, Colby (Rawlins County) visited India.
>
> Gerald Schmidt, Kinsley (Edwards County) visited Tunisia.
>
> Barbara Symns, Atchison (Doniphan County) visited Jamaica.
>
> Tom O'Dell, Elk City (Elk County) visited Turkey.
>
> Karen Chitwood, Wichita (Sedgwick County) visited Brazil.
>
> Fourteen exchangees from 13 countries lived with 37 Kansas families in 26 counties. This year's IFYE's were:
>
> Miss Ilma T. Arns, Brazil.
> Mr. Matti Sipila, Finland.
> Miss Annemarie Weber, Germany.
> Miss Arati Sahana, India.
> Mr. Shailendera Pathak, India.
> Miss Gabrielle M. Gowing, Ireland.
> Mr. Dante Losco, Italy.
> Mr. Alvaro Aguirre C., Mexico.
> Miss Marit Valstad, Norway.
> Mr. Eladio Saldivar M., Paraguay.
> Mr. Aziz A. Fouzai, Tunisia.
> Miss Nedret Sener, Turkey.
> Mr. Raul G. Bratschi H., Uruguay.
> Mr. Eduardo J. Vasquez G., Venezuela.
>
> The National 4-H Foundation said this was the best midpoint conference yet. Thanks goes to the Kansas IFYE alumni who assisted, Cooperative Extension Service personnel, and other Kansas State University faculty members who worked tirelessly to make it a success.
>
> FRIEND OF IFYE
>
> This was the third year that the Kansas IFYE Alumni Association presented this award.
>
> (a) This year, 1965, Kansas Farm Bureau, the first organization to receive this award, was made "Friend of IFYE" for their support and encouragement of the IFYE program.
>
> (b) In 1963, J. Harold Johnson, executive director of the Kansas 4-H Foundation, and

Roger E. Regnier, State 4–H leader were the recipients.

(c) In 1964, Dr. G. B. Marion, KSU faculty member and one of the originators of the IFYE program was the recipient.

Kansas IFYE alumni planned and conducted the 1965 delegate selection and orientation, Feast of Nations, and National IFYE Mid-Point Conference. The State 4–H advisory committee recommended that part of the additional money raised by the new district 4–H foundation committees be used to lower the county share to $700 from $900 per 1965 delegates.

Letters from Kansas delegates were printed in the major Kansas newspapers and through the cooperation of extension information department. Tapes were used by radio stations for the third year.

Fraternities and sororities hosted incoming IFYE exchangees which gave the exchangees an opportunity to become acquainted with college life, and KSU students to become acquainted with the IFYE program.

The Kansas IFYE Alumni Association sponsored, for the fifth year, a 4–H Club people-to-people project which provides 4–H Club members an opportunity through their 4–H Club experiences to promote world peace and understanding. The 1965 winners were: Kathy Rebecca Jackson, Greenwood County; Teresa Fauss, Sedgwick County; Bonnie Collins, Ford County; Mary Beth Chase, Thomas County; Florence Stein, Leavenworth County; Mustard Seed 4–H Club, Saline County.

The reason, I believe, Kansas has the largest IFYE program is not because of what we do at the State 4–H office, or State extension service but that the people of Kansas, even though landlocked in the middle of the United States, are truly interested in understanding the people of the world.

We felt the one thing that helped make this conference a huge success was that the total university was involved. Not only was the State 4–H staff involved, but our IFYE alumni and other Kansas State University resource people. With the whole university contributing their talents, the conference was highly successful.

In addition to this report by Richard Tomkinson, I want to also include with my remarks an article on the conference which appeared in the August issue of Yield, the publication of the Farmers Union Cooperative Marketing Association. The article follows:

MIDPOINT CONFERENCE FOR 108 INTERNATIONAL FARM YOUTH EXCHANGEES

Kansas State University hosted a meeting of worldwide scope, July 28 to August 4, during the annual International Farm Youth Exchange Midpoint Conference.

The 108 IFYE exchangees from 33 countries now in the United States participated in the meeting, reported Dick Tomkinson, extension 4–H club specialist, KSU and coordinator of the IFYE program in Kansas. The National 4–H Foundation, Washington, D.C., conducts the IFYE program and the conference in cooperation with the State extension service of the host university.

Highlights of the program included workshops on rural leadership, home economics, animal husbandry, and field crops; discussion of the American way of life and world challenges. Dr. A. D. Weber, director of international activities at KSU, gave a major address on "World Challenges" followed by discussion groups and a question period with a panel of KSU faculty members.

For many sessions the exchangees are divided into three groups according to countries—Latin America, Asia, and Europe, Caribbean, Oceania.

The final day of the conference was IFYE day with Kansas IFYE alumni, host families, participants in the people-to-people program, and friends of IFYE as guests. The schedule included a luncheon, people-to-people program, reception, and international banquet and evening program.

The midpoint conference provides the exchangees an opportunity to compare experiences and evaluate the first half of their 6-month stay in the United States. They have lived with rural families in one State and will go from the conference to their second host State. In each State, the rural youth from other countries live with four to six host families.

Ten countries had four or more exchangees at the meeting. India had the largest number, 16, with Brazil, Republic of China, Germany, Israel, Japan, Nepal, Philippines, Turkey, and Venezuela each having at least 4 exchangees in the country this year.

IFYE IS WHEAT FARMER

One of the IFYE delegates was from the wheat growing area of New South Wales, Australia, Maldon B. Yelland, 25, a third generation wheat farmer. "I had hoped to see some of Kansas' famous wheatfields while I was here," he related, "and was disappointed to find harvest already completed."

Yelland explained some about their farming operation in Australia, "We have 200 acres of wheat. It is spring wheat, planted in May and harvested in December. We have three major damaging factors we fear each year: (1) A frost; (2) rust, and (3) root rot. This year we are experiencing one of the worst droughts ever, receiving only 2½ inches of moisture since December 15.

"All wheat is marketed through our Australian Wheat Board, an organization for the selling of wheat and storage of same. At the present time the board is constructing many silos, what you call elevators here. The board guarantees us a price on our grain and pays us when we deliver it to them. This usually runs about $1 to $1.12 per bushel. Then for the next 2 years, as the grain is sold domestically or for export, the proceeds over the original price are prorated back to us, so that we receive about $1.60 per bushel total payment over a 3-year period."

In addition to wheat, the Yelland farm has 150 acres of oats, which they graze and then harvest for feed grain for their 2,300 head of Merino sheep. The national average is one to four sheep per acre of pasture and Yellands have 1,100 acres of grazing land.

Primary exports of the country are (1) wool, (2) wheat, (3) meat, and (4) sugar.

Maldon spent the first 3 months of his exchange tour in Wyoming and was heading for North Carolina for the second half, planning on being home in time for harvest.

Tenth Anniversary of Kaiser Aluminum in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, West Virginia is fortunate to have a great and civic-minded industry, the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., with a plant in our rapidly expanding Ohio Valley. Recently, we celebrated the 10th anniversary of the Kaiser plant in Ravenswood, W. Va., with an appreciation dinner. The dinner came on a weekday night when the House of Representatives was in session, and thus it was unfortunate I could not attend in person, but I did send the following telegram to the editor of the Ravenswood News, who was master of ceremonies for the appreciation dinner:

Mr. PHILIP FOURNEY,
Ravenswood News,
Ravenswood, W. Va.:

Jackson County and the entire State of West Virginia are proud of the outstanding leadership which Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. has demonstrated in the development of the Ohio Valley and our State.

As a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I was personally gratified while witnessing the successful test firing of the 260-inch solid fueled rocket recently to be able to point out Kaiser's role in providing the aluminum for this rocket. This is but one evidence of the importance of Kaiser in the space age.

Even more important, however, is the tremendous contribution which Kaiser has made in furthering human relationships and community development. The list would be too long to detail, but whether it be building schools, the hospital in Ripley, recreation facilities, and just being a good neighbor, Kaiser is always ready to help and all of us join in expressing our sincere appreciation.

Your servant in Congress,

KEN HECHLER.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I also include the texts of addresses at the appreciation dinner by the Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable Hulett C. Smith, and the president of the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., T. J. Ready, Jr. Also included with my remarks is an article by Phil Fourney entitled, "Jackson County's Years of Change, 1955–65," which appeared in the magazine West Virginia Progress:

REMARKS OF GOVERNOR SMITH AT THE INDUSTRIAL APPRECIATION DINNER, RAVENSWOOD HIGH SCHOOL, RAVENSWOOD, W. VA., OCTOBER 14, 1965

This industrial appreciation dinner tonight is noteworthy and important in many respects.

It is noteworthy, because it is being held under the joint sponsorship of the Ravenswood and Ripley Chambers of Commerce. I hope this is just a beginning for you. Both organizations have men and women of great talent, who can devote those combined talents to building a stronger Jackson County.

It is important, because what we are marking is not the success of a company nor the success of a community, but the spirit of a people. This dinner tonight is taking place because over several years, thousands of people have been interested in the progress of their business, their community and their State.

Indeed, West Virginia as a whole could learn a great deal from Jackson County. You should be proud of what you have accomplished.

We all know this story—the decade of change that has transformed this county from a quiet rural area to a bustling industrial complex.

Ten years ago, Ravenswood's population was 1,200. Today, it is over 5,000.

Ten years ago there were 759 students in school. Today, there are over 2,000.

Ten years ago there were 15,000 in this county. Today, that figure has jumped to 20,000.

The reason, of course—an important American aluminum company chose to build and produce in West Virginia. And today, our State is bursting at the seams with pride at the fact that the Kaiser Aluminum plant in Jackson County is the world's largest, most modern fully integrated aluminum plant and that the leaders of Kaiser had enough faith in the future of West Virginia to locate here.

In short, the cooperative spirit of the people of West Virginia and the management of Kaiser Aluminium has answered the hopes of Henry J. Kaiser, who said, 10 years ago in Ravenswood, "we sincerely hope that, in the future, men may look back with pleasure to the day we transformed a part of the landscape into a huge aluminum mill, and say that you and we together built much more than just a new industry."

Now, today, we in West Virginia must ask ourselves the question: Where do we stand today? What are we doing to merit the trust others have placed in our State? And—most importantly, are we doing enough?

There are three yardsticks with which we can measure our growth—jobs, education, and roads.

West Virginia has had to change from primarily a one-industry State to a State of many industries, and this has required a period of adjustment. But we have made progress in providing more jobs—through the location of new industries, through job retraining programs, through vocational education—and we are going to do more.

Every year for the past 4 years, this State has set new economic records, and this is due, in large part, to our growing work force.

In the last 12 months, for example, more than 25,000 persons who were previously out of work were put on the job.

This is progress. This is what we are doing in this field. This is the answer when people ask how we've been combatting unemployment. And Kaiser Aluminum has been a big part of that progress.

Our highway system, which is so important to a State with such geographic factors as West Virginia, will grow into ribbons of modern, first-class highways cutting across our State, so that by 1972, every West Virginian will be within 35 minutes driving time of a major, first-class highway. We're talking here about a billion-dollar road program, really, because plans have already been laid for the post-1972 era of construction. We're going to town on roads and highways, and we intend to meet our commitments here.

Finally, let's look at education. This is a very important matter to the people of West Virginia and to the people of Jackson County.

I hope that I'm not misinterpreted when I point out to the people of this county "what needs to be done in education."

But there are a few things that should be emphasized.

First, your State legislature approved the administration's bill on education last January which will mean an annual pay raise for teachers over the next 3-year period—and a richer curriculum for your boys and girls in school. This is of interest to every parent and this monumental achievement brought me the greatest satisfaction I have had since being in office. It meant a change—and a change for the better.

Project Head Start was an innovation in West Virginia education this year—and every one of us here should take pride in the fact that we led the Nation by having every one of our school districts participating in Head Start.

These are some of the things the State has done.

But the State can only do so much when it comes to education. This is not a matter of choice. It is a matter of law.

The responsibility of operating the schools in this county rest with the people of this county.

I am quite aware of the splendid way in which Kaiser Aluminum has joined with you as a partner to build a stronger educational system through your education foundation in Jackson County. Not just the people of Jackson County, but all the people of this State bow in your direction for the vigor with which Kaiser stepped in and said, "Here we are. Let's go to work on the problem. We want to help out."

This system is working well. But we must be realistic. This, of necessity, must be considered a temporary program. What the people of this county need to do is take a long-range view of educational needs and make long-range plans to solve your educational problems.

The educational foundation is a temporary answer. It has been a good answer, but it is not the answer.

In taking a long-range view, we'd better begin asking ourselves some questions:

Should there come a lull in the aluminum business within the next decade, would Kaiser or any aluminum industry be able to continue its contribution to your school system—or indeed, should it be expected to?

Are we asking industry to do something we should be doing ourselves?

In the past, have we done as much as we could, as well as we could, to see that our county school boards have the adequate finances to strengthen our school system?

Is the present system of school financing going to result in more industries being attracted to Jackson County or fewer industries?

These are questions that need to be asked.

The real answer lies in leadership. If new industries are to come into this part of West Virginia, the leaders of those industries will look first to see if the local people have provided the necessary leadership at that level to meet the problems of this area.

In short, if it is feasible—and this is something only you alone can decide; no State office can decide it for you—a new, equitable means of financing your school system should be worked on, so you could point to your schools, and mean it when you say, "There are our schools for our children, built with our money."

The matter of our children's education is nobody's responsibility but our own. And we must grasp it. Educational excellence in West Virginia today is ours alone to develop. And no one will deny that the quality of West Virginia's educational system is our key to opportunity, and the key to this State's brightest days.

So the leaders of all of our communities—not just Ravenswood, not just Ripley—must ask ourselves, "Are we doing enough?"

And only we can answer that.

What we need is insight and foresight. This means the ability to stand up and say things that may not be popular with 100 percent of the people. It means speaking the hard truth, although it may warp the delicately woven threads of political ideas and prejudices.

It boils down to a pure and simple interest in politics, government, and public affairs, and I use the terms synonymously.

All too often, when someone mentions politics, everyone runs for cover into his own little corner, as if a plague had hit the countryside.

The truth of the matter is, the political system is one of the best ways we have of getting things accomplished. It has been in existence since this country came into existence. It produced Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Roosevelt, and Kennedy. And today, more and more people are becoming more interested in the affairs of political life because this is the outlet for new ideas and the vehicle for placing these ideas before the public.

President Kennedy was fond of pointing out that mothers may still want their sons to grow up to be President, but according to a famous Gallup poll of some years ago, some 73 percent do not want them to become politicians in the process.

I would remind you all that we have pledged excellence in State government, and that we want to attract men and women of highest standards to conduct our generation's most important business, the public business.

And if you have an interest in our generation's most important business—and I'm sure you do—we will welcome you and your ideas to build a stronger State.

Let me say in closing that Kaiser Aluminum has proven its dedication to our State over the past decade, and enriched the cultural economical and educational stance of the entire Ohio Valley by its presence.

Now, we have to work together to improve our State and to reach its goals.

In so doing, we must recognize that leadership on the community level is our greatest strength. We must accept the challenge to provide that leadership, whether it be in Ravenswood or Harper's Ferry; in Chester or Bluefield.

And in so doing, we can work together for a better road system. And I, as Governor, will devote myself to that goal.

We can work together for more job opportunities. And I, as Governor, will aim for the day when no man is without a job.

We can work together to continue our pursuit of educational excellence. And I remain committed to that goal.

And the same spirit that brought Kaiser Aluminum to Ravenswood and national recognition to Ripley's Fourth of July can build the best employment, road, and educational system in the entire State of West Virginia right here in Jackson County.

Remarks by T. J. Ready, Jr., President, Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., at Kaiser Appreciation Dinner, Ravenswood, W. Va., October 14, 1965

Governor Smith, Mayor Moore, Mayor Jordan, members of the county court, distinguished guests, ladies and gentleman, it is a real pleasure for me to acknowledge, on behalf of Kaiser Aluminum, the demonstrations of appreciation and goodwill expressed today by officials representing the State, the county, the cities of Ravenswood and Ripley, and the business community. It is gratifying, to say the least, to hear one's organization accorded this kind of testimonial. Speaking for the some 3,000 men and women who operate the Ravenswood Works and for the thousands of other Kaiser Aluminum employees located around the country and throughout the free world, we thank you all for this recognition.

Kaiser Aluminum has always had great faith in the future of this State and of its people. We have continuously invested in expansion and improvement of the Ravenswood Works since we originally announced its construction here 10 years ago. In so investing, we have demonstrated our continuing belief that West Virginia is a reliable and economic location for major industrial production facilities.

We are confident that you will continue to protect your favorable business climate, and that under the able guidance of your Governor, congressional delegation, legislature, and other dedicated public officials, you will seek further means of encouraging the fruitful partnership of business, industry, and the citizens of West Virginia.

Together, we can look with real satisfaction on the many physical changes that have taken place here during the past 10 years. The extent of this progress struck me today as I toured the county. The evidence is all around us. I'm told that the population has increased by more than a third.

Per capita income in 1954 was $1,106, one of the lowest in West Virginia. It now stands at $2,482, the second highest of West Virginia's 55 counties.

These changes have created greater opportunities for all of the people of Jackson County.

I wish there was some way that I could describe to you in the short time we are together here the great changes that are also taking place in our business and in industry as a whole in the United States and in the free world. Some of these changes have a direct bearing on our operations here at Ravenswood and upon the welfare and the prospects of our employees.

The outstanding new factor with which we all must deal today is the serious impact of increasing competition upon our business—competition from other producers and fabricators in the United States; competition from similar organizations in other parts of the free world, and competition for the established aluminum markets which comes increasingly from other materials.

Competition is expressed in terms of price, quality and range of product and service, including promptness of shipment and reliability in the meeting of customer schedules. The ability to compete in any of these categories is determined largely by the quality of plant operations—high efficiency and low production costs to yield an adequate profit at competitive prices; careful handling and processing to insure highest product quality, and topnotch delivery performance to meet the schedules of our customers.

The most skilled management group and the most modern and efficient equipment cannot accomplish these objectives. The important ingredient is people. The contribution of employees in this chain of factors determines the quality of the product, the cost of production, and the kind of service we can give our customers. Only through a joining together of management, equipment and employees will the Ravenswood works be able to maintain its place in an increasingly competitive business picture as one of the world's largest aluminum production and fabricating establishments.

Speaking for management, I can say that we have every intention of making Ravenswood works the top plant in our whole system of 50 domestic and 28 ovearsea facilities. Our overall objective is for Ravenswood to become known as the industry's most reliable source of aluminum sheet and plate products of the highest quality. We have here all the makings to accomplish this goal—modern plant buildings, the latest in equipment, and capable workers. In short, biggest and best is the image we have for Ravenswood works.

But leadership does not happen all by itself. We will all have to contribute. The truth is that in the final analysis, it is not the company that is in competition with other companies, but the employee—the individual employee who is in direct competition with the employees of other plants in other parts of the country. The aluminum market will accept fabricated aluminum products from any reliable and economic source. We must make sure that we qualify as such a source, so that we can maintain and expand our share of the market and continue to grow.

For there is room for growth. The aluminum industry is one of the most phenomenal growth industries of all time. Since the turn of the century it has doubled, on the average, every 10 years, which represents an annual increase of from 7 to 8 percent. The industry's current growth is at that rate, or better, and the outlook for the future—both short and long term—is for a continuation of this rapid growth.

At this point, I should like to say a few words about the very foundation of our American economy—the system known as the free enterprise or profit system. Like the sunlight and the good air we breathe, it is something many of us accept without much thought, often without really understanding the great importance of the profit incentive in our lives. Certainly, as businessmen, government leaders, and citizens, we should all be doing more about furthering such understanding.

In a very real sense, profits are what make our tomorrows.

Tomorrow's jobs are dependent on today's profits. We all know that more job opportunities have to be created if we are to continue to prosper as a country and as a State. In Kaiser Aluminum, for example, it takes a substantial investment of many thousands of dollars—enough money to start a sizable business—for every single name on our payroll. Furthermore, after the initial investment is made and a plant is operating, today's rapid rate of obsolescence—the result of great technological progress—makes it necessary to continue to invest money in the plant to replace and upgrade equipment. It is necessary to do this to keep abreast of industry progress. We have already made a great deal of this kind of investment here at Ravenswood, and we expect to continue to do a great deal more over the years ahead. Industry needs adequate profit, therefore, not only to provide the original investment, but also to keep its facilities at peak production efficiency.

Where does the money come from to create and maintain new jobs? There is only one place it can come from—that is from the profits of successful business enterprise. We must always be in a position to persuade investors and financial institutions to place their funds in our securities. There is only one way to persuade them to do this, and that is to offer the expectation of greater profit by investing in our securities rather than in other investments of equal safety.

And while we are mentioning the need for utmost industrial efficiency to meet competitive pressures, let us remember that not only business is competitive. States, counties, and cities are in competition too. West Virginia's State Department of Commerce and the various industrial development groups in the State know just how serious that competition is. While the department of commerce and the industrial development groups are trying to sell the advantages of West Virginia to industry, 15,000 other groups are trying to do the same thing for other cities and areas of the United States.

To the extent that West Virginia and Jackson County succeed in such effort, the result will be more payrolls, more businesses, more people, better homes, better schools, and improved cultural opportunities—all supported by a broader tax base. There will be jobs to keep West Virginia's children in West Virginia, and something left over to grow on. It's that "something left over to grow on" that may very well be said to be West Virginia's profit.

As a final note, I would like to talk for a moment about young people and education. In 1920, H. G. Wells, in his "Outline of History," wrote that "human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe." Unless we educate our children, we will lose the peace by default through lack of technological skill or ignorance of political philosophy. In these times, there are other things that require education and understanding, too. And they include the competitive free enterprise system of our country.

This system is eminently worth preserving, if only because none other has worked so well, so long, for so many.

The danger of losing this system, through erosion, if you please, is another race, as Wells wrote, "between education and catastrophe." We can do our part here in Jackson County and in all of West Virginia to protect our way of life by giving our children the education that is theirs as a right.

Kaiser Aluminum stands ready to support any effort that will help further the education and training of all young people. We go on record pledging our cooperation to the partnership that started here 10 years ago. We are steadfast in our desire to assist in the continued improvement of the social and economic climate of this county and its people—remembering at all times that a business can only meet its social responsibility if it is in business—and that it can only stay in business by meeting its profit responsibility.

I have said that "profits make our tomorrows"—but it is up to each of us to maintain and improve the economic and social climate of Jackson County and West Virginia for those tomorrows. Let us continue our partnership in this objective.

Again, I want to thank you, the citizens of Jackson County and West Virginia, for this testimonial of good will and for your always gracious hospitality.

I have had a wonderful day in Jackson County today.

Jackson County's Years of Change, 1955–65; One Man's Personal Report on What Happens When Heavy Industry Moves into a Rural West Virginia County

(By Phil Fourney)

(Note.—Mr. Fourney is editor-manager of the Ravenswood News and is the current president of the West Virginia Press Association. He moved to Jackson County in June 1955 just as Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp.'s giant facility was being built. For this story he was asked to describe the area as he first knew it, and to note changes which have taken place in Jackson County during the past decade. Because he is more intimate with the circumstances in Ravenswood itself, much of his article deals with that community—although the facts presented can be extended across the county to a large degree.)

I arrived in Ravenswood in June 1955, to run the town's weekly newspaper—which had closed its doors and ceased publication a month before.

Two blocks of red brick and painted metal buildings stretched down either side of Route 2, which was just about to be paved for the first time above and below Ravenswood. A single movie house and a few taverns offered the town's night life. There were no intersection traffic lights, few intact sidewalks or curbs, and parking meters had just been added to the town's business district.

The residential section of the town was characterized by old homes, some of them graceful reminders of a more prosperous past. Stately trees lined both sides of the streets.

The town's native population consisted largely of older people, since the youngsters had to leave to find job opportunities.

Ravenswood proper covered about 40 square blocks. Nearly half a mile of open field separated Ravenswood from the small residential community of North Ravenswood.

Except for rural routes, there were no postal carriers in Ravenswood in 1955. The town owned and operated its own electric and water systems.

And this was the way Ravenswood had been for the past 50 years. While a portion of its support came from the railway and a pottery, the larger portion was derived from the agricultural districts.

Then came Kaiser Aluminum. About the time I arrived on the scene, the first of some 9,000 construction workers began to appear. Housing was at a premium. There were no motels.

Life in Jackson County in 1955 was truly a rural life.

But today, Jackson County's economy is based primarily on industry. Some 3,500 people are employed at the aluminum plant.

The annual payroll is in the neighborhood of $23 million. The county boasts a new 41-bed hospital (in Ripley), a remodeled courthouse which gives the appearance and space of a new structure, a vastly expanded youth center at Cedar Lakes, a modern shopping center, and many enlarged and remodeled business houses. New homes are everywhere. Where once there were farms, today there are housing developments.

The transformation from the rural life to the industrial life—while not yet complete—has been an intense experience. There have been problems, of course; but in balance the picture is extremely rosy.

While statistics are quite dull, they sometimes tell a story more effectively than any other means. Let's keep them to the bare essentials, but consider the change in the past decade:

In the summer of 1955, the population of Ravenswood was nearly 1,200; this year that figure stands at 5,000

Ravenswood's school enrollment was 759 in 1954; last year it reached 2,185.

In effect, the presence of Kaiser has meant to Ravenswood the superimposition, on a community of less than 1,200 people, of the populations of three more towns of the same size. Your imagination doesn't have to stretch very far to enable you to see what this kind of growth in such a short span means in terms of utilities, government services, retail trade and all the rest.

In fact, school facilities became so overtaxed that Kaiser Aluminum in 1957 built a modern 20-classroom elementary school in Ravenswood and has since leased it to the county board of education for $1 per year. When a converted apartment building had to be purchased for school use, Kaiser again put up the money and now leases this facility for $1 per year to the county.

But Kaiser's influence has not been limited to Ravenswood alone. Less than one-third of their employees live in Ravenswood. Nearly half commute to work from outside the county.

Yet, with just 1,800 of their employees living in Jackson County, look at the economic impact Kaiser has had upon the county in the past 10 years:

Total population has climbed from about 15,400 in 1954 to approximately 20,000 this year.

Assessed valuation of property has risen from $27 million to more than $62 million last year.

The school population has gone from 3,600 in 1954 to 5,700 in 1965.

Per capita income in 1954 was $1,106, one of the lowest in West Virginia. It now stands at $2,482, second highest of West Virginia's 55 counties.

Retail sales in Jackson County amounted to $8.2 million in 1954; in 1963, they stood at $14.4 million.

In Ravenswood today, that half-mile of field that used to separate the old town from North Ravenswood has been filled in with houses, apartments, and a shopping center. For half a mile, virtually every structure standing has been built since 1956.

The town that 10 years ago was a little river town of 1,200 is now a bustling community of 5,000 * * * with more church socials, PTA meetings, teas, Little League baseball games, dances, and you name it, than the average married couple can keep up with.

With all these impressive figures, what could possibly be wrong in Jackson County? Let's explore some of our problems.

We're a one-industry county. If things go slack in the aluminum business and the plant has to lay off people, there's no steel mill, no chemical plant, no auto factory to take up the slack.

Because of this, groups in both Ripley and Ravenswood have become active in the past 12 months to attract new, small industries. Leaders in both communities have learned they must go out and sell their sites, must offer local financial help in order to attract companies which will boost the economy. Even Kaiser realizes the necessity of diversified industry, and is currently conducting a campaign to attract another major industry. It has distributed a brochure offering for sale some of its prime Ohio River acreage to a major industrial concern. This has resulted in negotiations for property with at least two major manufacturers.

Development of Interstate 77 from Kanawha County is opening up housing sites—particularly in the southern portion of Jackson County—for workers in Kanawha Valley factories who prefer rural living. The movement of such people to Jackson County has the economic impact of adding another industry here.

Our school program isn't what it should be. For that matter, this is one of West Virginia's major handicaps in attracting new industry. In order for the county—or the State—to effect a transition to a new and broader economic base, our schools must help the potential labor force to acquire new skills.

The rapid growth of Jackson County's school population has strained every resource of our educational program. Our school buildings have become too small for the large classes they must house despite a $2.5 million building program in 1959; our transportation system has become overburdened; our teaching load has increased. But our per capita pupil expenditure has not kept pace. And the registered voters of our county have been unwilling to provide additional taxes to meet the need of an expanded instructional program.

The school situation has deteriorated so badly that, in desperation, the people of Ravenswood have formed an educational foundation to supplement their local school program. While county taxpayers continue to vote down excess school levies, patrons of Ravenswood schools, including Kaiser Aluminum, voluntarily contribute $115,000 annually to upgrade the local system.

Ravenswood's approach is not a permanent solution to a pressing problem * * * it simply is a measure to insure that its students receive a topflight education while people of the county wrestle with the problem of financing its school system adequately.

We're too sectional. Since the Civil War, the people of Ravenswood have opposed those things the people of Ripley wanted * * * and vice versa. Or, when the leaders of the two towns could get together (as they did on the most recent school issue), the people of the county have been opposed.

This sectionalism has deterred the growth and well-being of the county's two towns and of the county itself. Instead of cooperating to attract new industry, one town has thwarted the other's changes. Instead of working together for capable government leaders, one area has opposed the other. In instance after instance, sectionalism has deterred progress.

Again, as with the problem of schools, Jackson County is not alone with this problem. This matter of sectionalism and undue rivalry is common to most sections of the State, and has been one of the greatest handicaps of progress.

But here the problem is being exposed for what it is, and leaders in the county now are working vigorously to bring unity and progress. Last spring the people of Ravenswood and Ripley got together on the proposed school improvement program and genuinely worked together. This month, the chambers of commerce of the two towns are cosponsoring an appreciation dinner for Kaiser Aluminum—simply to say they're happy to have such a fine industry and would like to work together as a team for a brighter tomorrow.

Jackson County has been the most looked at, written about, surveyed, and studied place in the State this past decade. While our achievements these past 10 years have fallen far short of the fabulous publicity we've received, our growth has indeed exceeded most every area of the Mountain State.

Jackson County today is a nice place to live and work. There is opportunity. There is a future—a bright one.

We still have but one movie house and only a few more taverns in Ravenswood. There still isn't the night life you picture when you think of Pittsburgh, Washington, or Charleston. A majority of the stately trees remain. Modern housing dots the landscape. There are more and more jobs for the young folks, but not enough even yet.

Planning has been good and most Government services and utilities are adequate and can be expanded as the need increases. Our crime rate is low. We have little water pollution and even less air pollution.

Report on 1st Session, 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, if quantity and quality were one and the same thing, there would be little difficulty in rating the accomplishments of the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

Certainly, the 454 public and private bills enacted into law, the 16,882 measures introduced, the 460 rollcall votes and the 27,816 pages of House and Senate proceedings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are impressive statistics by themselves.

But we well realize that legislative accomplishments are not properly measured by the page or the pound, and that the number of words in an act of Congress is not necessarily an accurate measure of its importance or its impact on our lives.

What we need are more significant yardsticks to give us a better picture of what happened during the 177 days that Congress was in session.

One of these meaningful measurements, to be sure, is the $119.3 billion to be spent by the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending next July—the largest amount ever appropriated by any government anywhere for any purpose in either peace or war.

We realize the meaning of this total, because as taxpayers we realize we are going to have to pay this bill one way or another sooner or later.

But there is another form of payment we will have to make for some of these programs so recently passed into law, and the date due for collection is unfortunately not very far away.

Payment will be made in freedom as well as in dollars. To some extent, each of us will be forced to give up a part of our right to make decisions for ourselves as individuals and for our community as members of it. We will turn that freedom, that authority, over to the Federal Government.

Whether the benefits from these new programs are worth the price we must pay is something which each of us must decide and determine for ourselves.

But there is little doubt that in some cases, the price is going to be high and that some Federal agencies have been given massive doses of power and authority in areas they have never had such power before.

Already, there are serious doubts about the wisdom of some of the programs enacted into law. For instance, Congress refused to appropriate funds for a rent subsidy program which it had authorized only a few weeks earlier.

The reason for the cutoff of funds was that Federal regulations to administer the new program appeared to go far beyond anything Congress had intended and would have amounted to virtual dictation by the Federal Government on some aspects of housing in our local communities.

Families with assets to up to $25,000 would be eligible for Federal subsidies of up to 70 percent of their rent under these new guidelines. This certainly would be outside the category of assistance to needy families envisioned by the proponents of this plan.

REGRETS

Also, it is worth noting that the administration has not offered to amend its regulations to make them more palatable. Instead, it has simply regretted that the regulations were made public before funds for the program were appropriated and when it would have been too late for Congress to do anything about them.

The latest warning has come from the chairman of the House Education Subcommittee who has urged Congress to "stop, look, and listen" after the flood of education programs urged by the administration were enacted into law by Congress, in some cases with little committee consideration and very limited congressional debate.

Many fear that control of the funds and the administration of these programs gives the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare entirely too much power over local school districts.

They fear that the Office of Education will become the virtual dictator of what will be taught, how it will be taught, and who will teach in our schools.

WITHHOLD FUNDS

Already, the Office of Education has been charged with attempting to withhold $30 million in Federal school funds from the Chicago school district, and has tried to exert similar pressures on school districts in Boston and San Francisco even though such efforts were directly contrary to the intent of the law.

They further point out that the Office of Education has grown 800 percent in personnel in the past 20 years, while funds administered by the agency have increased 7,000 percent in the same period of time.

Certainly not all programs passed by Congress this past year have been automatic raids on our freedom or our wallets. Some few of them, such as the voting rights bill and the removal of Federal excise taxes, have had just the opposite effect. They have enhanced and extended both political and economic freedom for many Americans who previously had been deprived of their fair share in years past.

PRICE OF PROGRAMS

It will be up to each of us to determine whether the price paid in freedom and in dollars for these programs was worth it in benefits received.

To comprehend all that has gone on in Congress in the past few months is a difficult task. A great deal will depend upon how programs are administered, the competence of those responsible for them and whether or not they are responsible public servants.

But it is important that the basics of what was done in Congress are understood by our citizens, because they will pay the bills for these far-reaching programs.

MAJOR PROGRAMS

Therefore, I would like to outline the major provisions of the programs considered by Congress since last January and give those I represent my vote on these issues and my reason for voting as I did.

After they have read this report, I would invite them to write me at Room 2435, House Office Building, Washington, D.C., if they have further questions or views on these programs or my position on these issues. I assure them that their letters will receive prompt consideration and attention.

Following are the issues, how I voted on them, and why:

VOTING RIGHTS

Voted "yes." Implements 15th amendment to the Constitution which provides that no one shall be deprived of the right to vote in either national or local elections because of race or religion. Provides for Federal examiners where there are indications that right to vote has been denied by local units of government or where less than 50 percent of voting age population voted in last presidential election.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Voted "yes." For those over age 65, provides hospital care program including inpatient hospital service, posthospital and outpatient diagnostic services. For extra $3 a month, provides doctor and surgeon services, home health services, ambulance, X-ray. Benefits start July 1, 1966.

Also provides 7-percent average increase in social security benefits, plus increased benefits for child care, blind, disabled, needy children. Extends benefits to sons or daughters of recipients to age 22 if full-time students, lowers benefit age to 60 for widows or workers at reduced monthly amount. Provides social security coverage for physicians and interns.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Voted "no" on final passage after supporting more equitable distribution formula. Provides more than $1 billion annually in Federal grants to elementary and secondary schools. Opposed because distribution formula gives more money to richest counties rather than to poor who need it, because State educational agencies would be bypassed in many instances and Office of Education would have arbitrary control over distribution of funds. Because of complaints, House Education Subcommittee has already scheduled hearings next year on the question of possible Federal control of local school districts under this program.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTIONS

Voted "yes." Provides for ultimate repeal of all Federal excise taxes except for special purposes such as highway trust fund, alcoholic beverages and 1 percent excise tax on autos. Provides $4 billion in cuts on such items as autos, telephones, furs, jewelry, appliances, general admissions. Most items reduced on sliding scale before outright repeal of tax.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Voted "yes." Provides community service program, college library and library training assistance, assistance to developing institutions, student scholarships and loans, work-study program extensions. Proposal to create a National Teachers Corps was killed in conference committee after being added in Senate.

APPALACHIA

Voted "no." Authorizes $1.1 billion for 360 counties in 11 States. Opposed because emphasis wrongly placed. Eighty cents out of every dollar provided would go for highway construction, while only 2 cents would go for vocational retraining and the teaching of new skills to the unemployed. Roads without job skills for unemployed would be meaningless.

OMNIBUS HOUSING ACT

Voted "yes" on House passage. Voted "no" when Senate version containing rent subsidies came back to House. Authorizes $8.2 billion. Establishes rent supplement program for Federal Government to pay portion of rent to low- and middle-income families. Provides for 60,000 additional units a year of low-rent public housing for 4 years, including rent certificate feature to be used in connection with single-family housing.

Provides $2.9 billion for additional urban renewal. Increases college housing authorization by $300 million a year. Authorizes matching grants to communities for water and sewer facilities. Provides grants for health, recreational and community centers under poverty program.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS

Voted "no." Doubled authorization of funds for poverty program, removed right of State Governors to veto programs considered undesirable. Opposed because of program maladministration, political patronage of appointments, and because 1 in 19 OEO staff employees had salaries of $19,000 a year or better—the highest ratio of any Federal agency. Programs in big cities too often serve politics rather than poor. What is needed is an impartial investigation rather than more Federal money.

RIGHT-TO-WORK REPEAL

Voted "no." Would invalidate State laws guaranteeing right to work and banning union shop, some of which were adopted by votes of the people of the States. Passed by House but died in Senate. Opposed repeal because it would have given worker no place to go if he were blackballed by union. Supported amendments to prohibit union dues from being used for political purposes, end to racial and religious discrimination in labor unions, end to punishment of union members for exercising constitutional rights of free speech but which were rejected in the House.

ARMED SERVICE PAY

Voted "yes." Provides 11-percent pay increase for soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines to meet cost-of-living hikes and to move them closer to comparable pay with industry and civil service. Provides bonds on first reenlistment to Armed Forces member who is designated as having critical military skill.

IMMIGRATION ACT

Voted "yes." Abolished country quota system for immigrants and replaced it with a new system based on the reuniting of families and the individual merit of each applicant. Sets a limit of 170,000 on the number to be admitted to the United States each year, exclusive of Western Hemisphere, and sets a limit of 120,000 on Western Hemisphere immigration. Provided safeguards from unfair competition and lowering of wages and working standards to American workingman.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS

Voted "yes." Extend to 3 years program of matching grants for teaching facilities for training of physicians, dentists, public health personnel, optometrists, pharmacists and podiatrists. Also extends medical student loan program.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

Voted "yes." Limits signs on interstate and primary highway systems within 660 feet of road right-of-way to directional and official signs and which conform to national standards, except for signs listing real estate on property for sale. If States do not conform, face loss of 10 percent of highway construction funds.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE

Voted "yes." Provided for establishment of locally elected government for District of Columbia. House version called for Charter Commission to draft city charter. Senate called for Mayor-Commission form of government. Conference committee will attempt to reconcile differences for further action by Congress next year.

WATER RESOURCES PLANNING ACT

Voted "yes." Provides for establishment of regional water basin organizations to assure adequate water supply in future. Provides financial assistance to States on a matching basis for resources planning. Authorizes $11.5 million a year for 10 years.

WATER QUALITY ACT

Voted "yes." Provides for cooperative action between local, State, and Federal governments in attacking water pollution.

Authorizes $20 million a year for 4 years for grants to develop demonstration projects of new methods of controlling waste discharges from storm drains or combined storm and sanitary sewers. Increases dollar limit on grants for sewer plant construction. Requires States to file letter of intent on water quality control to receive funds.

ARTS AND HUMANITIES ACT

Voted "no." Provides grants to States, organizations, and individuals to further creative and performing arts and humanities. Opposed because it establishes art czar and leads to official art. As in France, grants would go to those who are more able politicians rather than the best and most creative artists. In France, every major painter and sculptor was banned from official exhibits. Such artists as Rodin, Renoir, Van Gogh were forced to hold own exhibits after being criticized by official art circles.

FARM BILL

Voted "no." Provided price supports and subsidies of more than $2.4 billion to farmers for feed grains, wheat, rice, et cetera. Opposed because surplus stocks now at $7 billion and program has failed in past years. Now 1 Department of Agriculture employee for every 32 farms in United States. Net income of farmers standing still while food and clothing prices for families rising because of artificially high prices and higher taxes because of subsidies.

SUGAR SUBSIDIES

Voted "no." Provides subsidies of $90 million to foreign and domestic sugar producers which in turn raise price of sugar to Americans to almost three times world market price. Testimony revealed that sugar lobbyists receiving as much as $50,000 a year in their efforts to obtain sugar quotas for foreign governments.

MANPOWER ACT AMENDMENTS

Voted "yes." Provides extension of Manpower Retraining Act for encouraging the teaching of new skills to those out of work or employed at unskilled labor. Provides assistance of $432 million to States to establish and administer programs and provides training allowances for those enrolled.

FOREIGN AID

Voted "yes." Provides $3.1 billion for continuance of overseas economic and military assistance programs, including aid to Vietnamese. Also amends Agriculture Trade Development Act by banning sale of surplus foods to United Arab Republic unless President determines such sales in national interest. Increases Latin American housing guaranties, continues limit of arms aid to Africa, directs use of foreign currencies rather than dollars wherever possible.

EMPLOYEE SALARY INCREASE

Voted "yes." Provides 3.6-percent salary increase for Federal employees, based upon comparability formula with private wage increases.

HEART, CANCER, STROKE

Voted "yes." Establishes 3-year program of regional cooperative research, training, education and demonstrations of patient care in fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke and related diseases. Authorizes grants for establishment and operation of regional medical programs. Authorizes $340 million to carry out programs.

MENTAL HEALTH

Voted "yes." Authorizes Federal grants for meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for community mental health centers.

PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY

Voted "yes." Proposed constitutional amendment provides for clear lines of authority in case President should be unable to exercise duties of office. Also provides for filling of vacancy of office of Vice President should one occur. Amendment must be ratified by States.

Mr. Speaker, Congress will reconvene in January for the second half of the 89th Congress.

Let us hope that the measure of its accomplishment will not merely be the number of taxpayer-dollars spent on Federal programs. Spending money, even in the amounts expended by the Federal Government, is not a particularly difficult task.

What is difficult is solving national problems while still protecting the right of our citizens to self-determination. Let us hope that this will be constantly kept in mind.

A Report on the 1st Session of the 89th Congress by Congressman Tom Curtis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, this is a report on the legislation passed by the 1st session of the 89th Congress, which adjourned October 23, 1965. The other work of the Congress; namely, conducting oversight over the actions of the executive branch of the Government and conducting studies on which to base future legislation will be the subject of future reports. The point needs to be made that the legislative work of this session, as of any session, is largely the result of committee studies and deliberations which have occurred in the preceding Congresses.

Unfortunately, with the public's attention directed to the legislation passed by the Congress, too little attention has been paid to Congress' overseeing the manner in which the executive branch of the Government has been faithfully executing the laws already on the books. The President has stated that in his opinion this session of the Congress was the most productive in history. I disagree. It followed pretty closely the rate of activity of its immediate predecessors. Its studying for future legislation was negligible and its oversight of the executive was pampering rather than disciplinary.

Seldom have we seen a period in our history where so many laws already on the books lie unenforced, so many laws inadequately enforced, and so many laws actually violated. New laws have been piled one upon another without proper adjustments to the old laws.

The Congress failed not only in its oversight duties, but it failed to consider and to pass recission bills, bills to rescind the authority granted to the President which the President was not using or was abusing.

The most important test of the legislative activities of any session of the Congress lies in toting up of the cost of the new legislation and the cost of administering the old programs. Almost every bill the Congress passes has a dollar cost that goes with it. This is not to say that we must not also evaluate the legislative activity of a session of Congress in other ways as well. It is to say, however, that a session of Congress which appropriates over $100 billion new authority for the President to spend from the administrative budget is far from a do-nothing Congress. The 1st session of the 89th Congress is not the first, but the fourth, Congress in a row to vote over $100 billion in new power to spend.

This points up the "great lie" technique employed in public discussions of the Congress. The previous sessions of the Congress were not "do-nothing" Congresses. They were by any proper standards very active Congresses; the question really is, were these "do-entirely too much Congresses without adequate study and deliberation?" which, in my judgment, they were.

It also points up the further inaccuracy in referring to this session just finished as somewhat miraculous. The $100 billion sessions immediately preceding this session performed the same kind of miracles, voting to spend more money than the Federal Government was taking in and making up the difference by printing and selling more Government bonds. The administration has stated that this session of the Congress voted $119 billion new authority to spend. Happily, this is an overstatement. Spending power in this context relates to the "administrative budget"—this is the budget over which Congress has direct control through the appropriation process and which relies for financing on the tax revenues and selling more Government bonds. However, there are two other Federal budgets with which the administrative budget is frequently confused. A second budget relates to the administrative budget plus the so-called trust fund revenues and expenditures. The trust funds such as social security, civil service retirement, the Federal highway program are not included in the administrative budget because they are set up on the assumption that the revenues and the expenditures in each trust fund are in balance and that any surplus of revenue over expenditures goes into a reserve fund earmarked for the purposes of each trust fund alone. The funds do not go to general revenue, the administrative budget fund. If the authority to spend trust fund revenues for their statutory purposes was to be included in the administrative budget, the figure for new spending authority granted in the previous congressional sessions would be around $140 billion and, in this session, close to $150 billion, not $119 billion. Actually the administrative budget figures for new appropriations for the present and ensuing fiscal years is about $110 billion, not $119 billion. It would correspond to about a $105 billion figure voted by the previous session of the Congress, one of the so-called do-nothing Congresses.

The third Federal budget is one in which the economists are particularly interested—the total cash budget. It consists of the administrative budget, the trust fund budgets, plus other expenditures of the Federal Government. These other expenditures are made by the many varied Federal governmental agencies and somewhat autonomous Federal governmental corporations. These expenditures and revenues require no new or yearly authorities from the Congress. They operate under permanent laws and only become a drain on the administrative budget when they run out of money, which some of them do from time to time. Add another $20 billion to the administrative budget, plus trust funds, and we get roughly the total impact of actual Government spending—not power to spend—on the economy, around $150 billion for this present fiscal year—$100 billion from the administrative budget, $30 billion from the trust funds, $20 billion from other Federal governmental operations.

There is one other deceit contained in the manner in which the figure $119 billion was announced by the administration. The administration press releases refer to the $119 billion power to spend as if it related to this and future fiscal years. However, one of the first actions taken by this session of Congress in January was to vote a deficiency appropriation of $4.5 billion for the administrative budget of fiscal year 1965, which ended this past June 30—not fiscal year 1966, which began July 1. So, in addition to deducting certain trust funds which the President included in his figure of $119 billion, we must also deduct this $4.5 billion for the last fiscal year to get a figure which is properly comparative with the previous $100 billion "do-nothing" Congresses.

If anyone is getting the impression that the Federal Government's accounting system—or systems—leaves something to be desired, he is entirely correct. I have not attempted to mention all of the more flagrant examples of bad accounting practices. Suffice it to say that if a certified public accountant were to advise a client to follow the Government's system he would lose his license to practice and probably be convicted of fraud and put in jail. I want to make it clear that this criticism I am registering should not be directed solely against the Johnson administration. Regrettably, these archaic accounting methods have been with us for decades. The Federal Government just has not kept pace with modern developments in accounting practices. We are trying to deal with a $150 billion a year Federal Government in the latter part of the 20th century with accounting practices which were probably outmoded even in 1910, when we were dealing with a $700 million a year Federal Government.

Nonetheless, this is no excuse for those in high authority to deliberately deceive the people by juggling the various figures and budgets, by mixing oranges with apples as it were. It certainly behooves us to be wary about putting further strain on this jerry rig system until we do a thorough job of overhauling it. Much of this overhauling is within the powers of a good Executive to do without congressional reference.

EXPENDITURES

All of these budgets I am talking about are separate and apart from the kind of budget the householders or businesses are concerned about, namely, the actual revenues to be collected and money to be spent in a current fiscal year. These budgets I was discussing deal with power to spend granted to the Executive in various ways by the Congresses. Whether the President uses the power to spend he has been granted in the administrative budget is another matter.

At the beginning of fiscal year 1960—July 1, 1959—President Eisenhower had $149.6 billion power to spend—$76.8 billion the first session of the 86th Congress was asked to grant him, plus $72.8 billion balance left over from actions of previous congressional sessions.

At the beginning of fiscal year 1961, President Eisenhower had $151.2 billion power to spend—$79.4 billion new obligated authority asked from the 2d session of the 86th Congress and $71.8 billion carryover.

For fiscal year 1962 the comparable figures for President Kennedy asked in Eisenhower prepared budget from 1st session, 87th Congress were $154.9 billion, $80.9 billion new obligational authority, and $74 billion carryover.

In 1963, $181 billion for President Kennedy—$99.3 billion new obligational authority from 2d session, 87th Congress—actually exceeded $100 billion—$81.7 billion carryover.

The new obligational authority are the figures the Executive estimated he would ask Congress for as set out in his January budget message to the Congress for the fiscal year which would begin in July. The actual figures Congress did grant to the President varied upward, inasmuch as the Presidents asked Congress to enact new programs not included in the administrative budget requests without rescinding old programs. Furthermore, the Presidents from time to time underestimated in the budget requests the amounts that certain programs set by law, like veterans benefits, would of necessity have to spend. These are the type of items which appear in the deficit appropriation bills which almost all of the Congresses have been asked to enact early in their sessions.

In 1964, $195.1 billion for President Kennedy—$107.9 billion new obligational authority from 1st session, 88th Congress; $87.2 billion carryover.

In 1965, $194.2 billion for President Johnson—$103.8 billion new obligational authority from 2d session, 88th Congress; $90.4 billion carryover.

In 1966, $203.1 billion for President Johnson—$106.4 billion new obligational authority from 1st session, 89th Congress; $96.7 billion carryover.

In 1967, the anticipated carryover is $101.5 billion.

An important figure to note is the carryover unspent authorizations enacted in prior years. The figure has grown in 7 years from $72.8 billion in fiscal 1960 to $101.5 billion in fiscal 1967 projected in the President's budget message of January 1965, to this Congress. This increase indicates a failure of both the Congress and the Executive to review, for rescinding, programs already on the books which may be obsolete, ill-advised, poorly administered, or duplicating. It also demonstrates the extent to which the Congress has defaulted to the President in its most important fiscal function; namely, to exercise its judgment on the need for a balanced cash budget in the current fiscal year, and the failure of the Presidents to achieve this balance.

So, the most important piece of legislation enacted in this session of the Congress was increasing the debt ceiling to $328 billion. The President had requested a $329 billion ceiling based upon an expenditure rate for administrative budget items for fiscal 1966 of $99.7 billion from his total power to spend of $203.1 billion. This figure for the debt ceiling was based upon anticipated revenues from taxes revised upward in May to $96.5 billion. In other words, the Congress in its judgment said the expenditure rate should be $98.7 billion, not $99.7, and yet it rescinded none of the excess $203.1 billion the President still had the power to spend. Incidentally, the President stated firmly in respect to both the debt ceiling limitation and the big Federal excise tax cuts that his expenditure and revenue figures were updated to May 1965, and contemplated no increase in expenditures because of either the stepped up Vietnam war nor the Dominican incident.

Our current fiscal status is as follows: Revenues are holding up as anticipated. Expenditures for the first 2 months of fiscal 1966, July and August 1965, were quite gratifying—$7,240 billion and $8,900 billion. This indicated an expenditure level for the full year—averaging $8.1 billion a month—of $97.2 billion, below the $99.7 billion—averaging $8.3 billion a month—estimate in the January budget message.

However, the expenditures for September 1965 are very alarming. Instead of going down seasonably a bit as they usually do, they rose to $9.452 billion, putting us at a yearly rate of well over $100 billion expenditure level for the administrative budget for the first time in our history.

If this continues, and I am afraid it will, the cost of living will rise even more rapidly than it has been. Creeping inflation which already has caused us serious problems in international affairs in our imbalance of payments and loss of gold, and in our domestic affairs in having to take the silver content out of our coins—debasing our currency—and in removing some of the gold backing for our paper currency, will start moving at double or triple its 6-year pace. At the rate it presently is moving, the cost-of-living increase—consumer price index—will be over 2 percent this year, compared to 1.4 percent last year. To the Nation this means a loss of purchasing power of over $11 billion and to the wage earners over $8 billion, in 1 year. This will further damage our balance-of-payments situation and weaken us internationally because inflation tends to encourage further imports of goods and services from abroad and lessens our ability to export and sell our own goods and services abroad. This is entirely apart from the damage it does to us domestically and to the individual person, particularly those in the lower income brackets. Interest rates, too, will continue to go up.

This Congress took more unfortunate steps to curtail our trade and private relations abroad by extending the interest equalization tax, and further hampering our tourists abroad. The President went beyond the authority the Congress had granted to him by imposing what he called voluntary agreements to restrict private investment abroad. All of this was done as a reaction to the serious imbalance of international payments and our continued loss of gold. But these actions only deepen the hole we are in, over the long run. Nothing was done by the President to use his powers to curtail Federal governmental expenditures abroad or to balance our own Federal budget. Quite the contrary—he asked from the Congress, and received, the power to spend $4 billion more in foreign economic and military assistance as well as to add $750 million more to the Inter-American Development Bank, a Federal agency designed to lend money abroad. I emphasize the word "lend" because the terms of the loans are even more liberal than the 2-percent interest loans the Federal Government makes to the Rural Electrification Administration. The Congress also voted to increase the U.S. contribution to the International Monetary Fund by $1.035 billion, the Development Loan Fund by $1.5 billion a year for 2 years, a total of $3 billion. What is incomprehensible to me is the restricting of private investment abroad which is carefully and profitably invested and helps both us and the countries abroad and, at the same time, expanding governmental giveaway programs which the record shows are putting the underdeveloped nations further in the hole.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

The House had 182 quorum calls and 201 yea-and-nay votes this session. The yea-and-nay votes are what the public knows as the record votes, the votes where the Congressmen answer to the call of their names by responding "aye" or "nay." It is the record votes that become the basis for the various voting record guides put out by different lobbying groups and political organizations and are used—properly so—in the election campaigns of the Congressmen. They also become the base for evaluating the records of the two political parties by these same groups—so many Republicans voted for the amendment to prohibit agricultural surplus being sent to Egypt, so many Democrats vote against, for example.

However, the yea-and-nay votes are by no means an indication of what legislation was passed by the Congress because most measures are passed by voice vote. Furthermore, there may be many record votes on different aspects of the same measure. There may be a record vote on whether the measure will be considered under a closed—gag—rule or open rule. There may be record votes on some of the important amendments added to the original bill—if the rule has been open to amendment and not closed. There may be a record vote on the motion to recommit the bill "with instructions" and to have it reported back forthwith with an amendment. Or there may be a vote on what is called a straight recommittal, back to the committee reporting the bill for further study. Then there can be a record vote on final passage of the bill as amended, whether the recommittal motion with instructions passes or fails. Finally, there can be record votes on the conference reports wherein the House version of the legislation is considered by the conferees along with the Senate version and modified so that a common version of the bill is up for passage before both bodies. A vote can be had on the conference report in final form as well as on specific changes made to the original House version. Or votes can be had on sending the bill back to conference with instructions to the House conferees to hold fast to the House version on a specific issue. I recall a few years ago one bill had over 14 record votes taken on various amendments in the bill and at various procedural points on its way to passage.

Inasmuch as most groups putting out voting guides will list about 10 to 12 recorded votes as "key" votes, out of the average 100 recorded issue votes taken in a session, it becomes important for the voter to know what were the 90-odd recorded votes which the group did not select as "key" votes. Furthermore, the groups putting out voting guides may select only one of the several different record votes taken on the same piece of controversial legislation, to make it appear as if this was the real or sole crucial test.

Equally important for the voter to know is what laws were enacted without record votes.

Here are the vital statistics on all legislation passed in the last session of the Congress.

Out of 16,882 total measures introduced in the Congress, 3,084 in the Senate and 13,798 in the House, 295 public bills and 149 private bills became law. With a total of 295 public bills becoming law only 88 had recorded votes and, of these 88, 44 were recorded as unanimous or nearly unanimous. Of the remaining 44 measures on which there was controversy, 40 had sufficient controversy so that the two political parties, or sizable segments in both parties, made a partisan issue out of the measure.

In other words, over 85 percent of the measures passing the Congress met with the accord of the entire Congress and probably would have become law whoever was President and whichever party controlled the Congress. This is probably average for most Congresses.

An example of measures receiving a unanimous or almost unanimous approval by record vote in this last Congress are the following: Amending the Food and Cosmetic Drug Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulative drugs. A bill to provide assistance in the development of new and improved programs to help older people, through grants to the States, for community planning and services for training.

Amending the Manpower Training Act—which was a Republican measure in its inception—passed in 1962. The Natural Resources Act, control over mailing obscene matters, the Foreign Services Building Act, the Presidential succession resolution—amending the Constitution, amending the Water Pollution Act, amending the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, the Community Mental Health Centers Act, Defense Appropriation Act, authorization to Defense Department for procurement of aircraft, missiles, et cetera, extending the space program, extending the atomic energy program, amending the Railroad Retirement Act, loan insurance for Vocational Trade and Technical Training Act, the excise tax reduction, amending the Interstate Highway System Act, assistance in training State and local law enforcement officers, an act to prohibit the destruction or mutilation of draft cards, the Military Construction Act, the Water Quality Act, and the Clean Air Act.

Of course, in addition there were the measures which were not put to record vote because no one was seriously opposed to them.

It is important to have this context in light of the false propaganda which has been spread that the Congress is "fighting" or is unresponsive to the President or that Republicans are negative and always vote against measures. Even in respect to the controversial measures, controversial between the President and the Congress or between Republicans and Democrats, a large part of the law finally enacted has been the result of congressional and Republican help, even though the Republicans might still end up voting against the measure. A good example of this is the very controversial medicare issue. Medicare was placed in a package which included many measures to improve social security, including an increase in benefits by 7 percent to keep up with the past inflation of over 8 percent. These changes were worked out with Republican cooperation. Indeed, many of the changes were originally suggested by Republicans. Even in the medicare part, which Republicans by and large thought was not the right way to assist older people meet their health costs, the inclusion of nursing home care and home health services was the result of Republican suggestions to the original Forand bill which they also had opposed.

Once the matter is placed in this context of areas of agreement then an evaluation of the two political parties or of Congress vis-a-vis the President by considering the areas of disagreement is in order.

THE AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT

In fiscal policy the areas of disagreement between the two parties were three. One, the Republicans by and large sought to cut back appropriation bills; the Democrats sought to increase them even beyond the President's request in a number of instances.

Second, on increasing the debt ceiling. The Republicans sponsored the amendment in committee which cut back the proposed $329 billion to a $328 billion ceiling. Even then they voted against the $328 billion as still too high when the matter was put to a record vote in the House.

Third, on monetary policy. Most House Republicans voted against first, lowering the gold reserves behind our currency, and second, devaluing our silver coinage.

FOREIGN POLICY

The Republicans opposed the extensions of Federal governmental lending abroad, $750 million additional to the Inter-American Bank, $3 billion additional to the Development Loan Fund. Most Republicans also voted against the $1 billion additional to the International Monetary Fund. Their reasons were, first, the President's failure to balance our own domestic budget resulting in continued loss of gold and devaluing our currency and further inflation; second, the restriction placed on private investment abroad; third, the backward steps being taken in our international trade policies; and fourth, the failure to reevaluate our total foreign aid program including Public Law 480, the disposal of agricultural surpluses. To put this in context, it must be realized that Republicans have supported these basic programs in the past and, indeed, were the innovators of the Development Loan Fund and food for peace as preferable to outright grants to underdeveloped countries.

The Republicans opposed agricultural surpluses going to Egypt and other Communist-dominated countries, the International Coffee Agreement, the Sugar Act, and some of the basic aspects of the United States-Canadian Auto Treaty. They also opposed the extension of and broadening of the interest equalization tax designed to restrict private investment abroad. The Republican broad affirmative policy covering these areas is trade, not Government subsidies or aid, and where trade is inappropriate, loans, not grants, and when loans are inappropriate, grants under well-defined guidelines and sound programing.

DOMESTIC WELFARE PROGRAMS

The Republicans opposed the Appalachia road-building program, the extension of the area redevelopment program, the extension of the so-called Economic Opportunities Act—the poverty program, the so-called Economic Development Act—accelerated Public Works Act—for several reasons: First, all are poorly drafted; second, they are duplicating; third, they are heavily involved in spoils politics and logrolling; fourth, they badly weaken instead of encourage local and State governments and private and church welfare programs; fifth, they miss their mark by keeping people on welfare or putting them in "make work" issues instead of putting them on their own feet; and sixth, their cost-benefit ratios are excessive. Note, however, the Republicans supported the further development of the Manpower Training Act which they originally conceived, and vocational and technical training and most features of the extension of the Federal education and research programs. The Republicans, joined by some congressional Democrats, proposed tax credit programs in lieu of direct Federal spending programs to accomplish these desired goals. However, the administration has taken a negative position on these proposals.

MEDICARE

The Republicans opposed the medicare part of the Social Security Amendment Act while strongly supporting most of its other features. The Republicans had helped to develop and pass the Kerr-Mills Act and stood ready to improve it as a sounder method of meeting the problems of the aged.

HOUSING

The Republicans opposed the moderate income housing subsidy bill for obvious reasons—moderate income people can do a better job of getting good housing for themselves than can the Federal Government. The Republicans point out the mess that has been made in the administration of public housing for low-income people. It is regrettable that the urban renewal program which they developed has been perverted through unbelievably poor administration into a program which itself is now subject to much legitimate criticism.

The Republicans opposed the creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. The title is a misnomer because it does not bring together under one department all Federal activities in housing or in urban affairs which was the primary justification advanced by its promoters. Furthermore, if the President was doing an adequate administrative job, much of the inefficiencies, redtape, and duplications could be eliminated without congressional action. Congress, indeed, has been remiss in its lack of oversight and not calling the President to task for the inefficiencies that exist. Finally, the creation of this Department was designed by some to deliberately bypass the State governments. Municipalities are creatures of the States. Where a metropolitan area covers several States, bistate or tristate agencies can be created—by Act of Congress under the constitutional powers specifically granted for this purpose. This power has been exercised in the past for the benefit of metropolitan areas, such as the Missouri-Illinois bistate authority for the St. Louis metropolis but only with the involvement of the State governments.

EDUCATION

Most education measures were developed and passed with bipartisan support. The Republicans did seek to substitute their tax credit education programs for the administration's direct expenditure programs, but when their efforts were unsuccessful they supported the modified administration bill. However, they opposed and sought to eliminate the creation of a National Teacher Corps. Most of the education measures passed by this Congress were not innovations, but extensions and developments of existing programs.

THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

This measure was developed with bipartisan support and would have been proposed and passed whoever was President and whichever party controlled the Congress. However, the Republicans did seek to have their proposal adopted. I think it was a stronger measure than that of the administration. Certainly it was a much fairer measure and, therefore, one which would have received much more cooperation from the southern communities which were primarily affected. A Republican sponsored measure to extend the bill to include vote frauds was adopted in spite of opposition from many big city Democrats in the north.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY BILL

Again, here was a measure which would have been proposed and passed whoever was President and whichever party controlled the Congress. Like the voting rights bill, it had been under congressional study for sometime and was ripe for legislative action. The primary matter reaching an issue on a recorded vote was the so-called McGregor amendment, which applied quotas to the Western Hemisphere in a manner comparable to the quotas set up for the rest of the world. In my judgment, this act has been much overstated and misrepresent. It is not the liberalizing bill that has been advertised. If anything, the control of immigration has been turned over to our national labor leaders as the administration is presently set up. However, something had to be done to correct the erroneous impressions held abroad about our immigration laws, and the new law is a workable one.

ELIMINATING SECTION 14(b) FROM THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

This passed the House by a very close vote, 221 ayes to 203 nays. As a result of the House studies and debate, the matter has been held up in the Senate. I have written extensively on the issues involved here, so I will not discuss it further. Obviously many congressional Democrats had to join the Republicans to have such a high negative vote.

AGRICULTURE

The Republicans opposed the omnibus agriculture bill for many reasons, the inclusion of the bread tax being one of the most publicized. Very few people fail to agree that our agricultural programs need major overhauling. This major overhaul still awaits action and, regrettably, Congress has not been studying the issues with assiduity.

Republicans opposed the Tobacco Price Support Extension Act. Tobacco agriculture is probably more controlled by Government than any segment of agriculture. For many years it was pointed to as the ideal of farm programs. Now the long range ill effects of the political decision-making process being substituted for the marketplace process is being spelled out for all of us to see, even the tobacco grower.

There was a mixed vote by parties on the Federal Cigarette Advertising and Labeling Act. I think a very poor job was done in this matter by both the Congress and the President.

MISCELLANEOUS

An interesting issue developed in the extension of the Atomic Energy Act in respect to the rights of a small community government dealing with a big powerful agency of the Federal Government. This, although becoming an issue of record vote, was not developed along party lines.

The Republicans largely opposed both th National Arts and Cultural Development Act as well as the act creating the National Foundation on Arts and Humanities. We are well aware of the fact that those who differ with us would have the people believe we are against art and culture. From our standpoint we opposed these two pieces of legislation because we are for art and culture. We do not believe the intervention of the Federal political mechanism into these areas benefit art and culture in the long run.

HOME RULE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

This bill serves as a good example of the Congress in opposition to the President, rather than Republicans against Democrats. Of course, the proponents of the President's bill sought to have the people believe this was a case of Republicans and southern Democrats alining to defeat the President's proposals. However, as in most of the cases where this allegation is made, the record vote serves to point up the inaccuracy. In addition, in this instance Congressman SISK, of California, a well established liberal, offered the congressional substitute which passed the House in lieu of the President's proposal.

Congressional reapportionment and the Highway Beautification Act are other measures which did not have the disagreement centered on differences between the two parties, but, rather, differences between segments of both parties, although, because of what was felt to be improper pressures interfering with proper study and deliberation by the President, most Republicans opposed his version of how to get our highways beautified. The Federal pay raise was another example of disagreement between the President and the Congress, rather than disagreement between the two parties. In this instance I supported the President. I thought it important to hold to the President's wage-price guidelines, although I have been very critical over the years of the failure to get Federal wages increased, particularly in a high-cost area like St. Louis. We still do not have a good system of Federal job reclassification and increased remuneration for Federal employees who work in high-cost areas. We are way behind the employment practices of many of our private companies.

Four procedural points came to a record vote which require some comment.

First. To increase the salaries of the Federal court judges. I thought the House behaved badly in making an issue here because of its disapproval—which I share, to a large degree—of some of the recent controversial Supreme Court decisions.

The Congress waived two statutory requirements which Republicans opposed, I thought, with very good reason.

Second. To permit General McKee to maintain his military position and yet be head of the Federal Aviation Authority. The law requires the FAA be headed by a civilian.

Third. To permit a film prepared by the U.S. Information Service for foreign propaganda to be shown in the United States. The law governing the USIS specifically states that no films or other materials prepared for foreign propaganda be released for domestic propaganda.

Fourth. Whether the Post Office Department should be required to give to the Congress the names of the temporary postal employees supposedly to be selected from the lower income groups to assist in fighting the war on poverty. This was a matter I was amazed to find the administration opposing, including Democratic leaders of Congress. Quite clearly Congress, as well as the public, should have this information and all information like it. To do otherwise invites corruption and other improper action on the part of the executive. This is an example of what I meant when I referred to the Congress failing in its oversight function, and actually pampering, instead of disciplining, the executive branch of Government.

Finally, there was the procedural problem involved in the issue of unseating the Mississippi Congressmen. The House looked very bad taking up a matter in September which should have been decided in February. Whatever one might feel about the issue itself, the failure to grant a timely and thorough hearing to those who felt they had a grievance hits at the heart of representative government. If the Congress does not maintain itself as a forum for people with grievances to be heard, then indeed it is difficult to complain if the people take to the street with these grievances. However, such action means that law and order itself have broken down, and this spells the failure of government itself, that is, government by laws, not government by men.

Now I would conclude with this observation. If you will look over the legislation which has become law this year, you will note that in spite of the propaganda to the contrary, most laws are extensions of existing programs or modifications of them. The only real innovations were the culmination of years of study;

namely, medicare, the Immigration Act, and the Voting Rights Act. The debasing of our currency and coinage and the restriction of private investment abroad are innovations all right but the result of temporizing, rather than of deliberation. The drift toward further inflation and international economic difficulties will continue as the trend to increase and extend Federal programs, not so much from introducing new ones, continues. Medicare, it is true, will sorely test the payroll tax on which all social security, unemployment insurance, and workmen's compensation are based.

The differences between the two political parties and between the President and the Congress are primarily differences of degree. All are interested in advancing peace, prosperity, freedom, and justice. The arguments lie over how we best do this for the long pull. No one is surely all right or all wrong. Through study and debate we can best give us the right decisions over the long pull. This is what representative government can provide, but to provide it the people as well as their representatives must take part in the study and debate and not be diverted from this difficult task by either arm twisting or demogoguery.

I hope this little summary will assist to some degree in furthering the study and deliberative process.

The United Nations After 20 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I recently had the honor of addressing the convocation of the College of Idaho at Caldwell, Idaho. This gathering of concerned faculty members and students shared our interest in international cooperation expressed in congressional support for the International Cooperation Year and the continued development of the United Nations.

In my remarks, I attempted to review the silent strengths of the United Nations in its 20 years of existence, and our hopes for the future role of the U.N.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS AFTER 20 YEARS

(Address by Senator CHURCH)

This year marks the 20th anniversary of the birth of the United Nations. As if in celebration, the U.N. has presented the world with a very special birthday gift—a truce in the dangerous war between Pakistan and India.

Such accomplishments account for the continuing respect which most Americans hold for the United Nations. We thought it wholly appropriate, for example, that so eminent a citizen as Adlai Stevenson, twice a candidate for President of the United States, should serve as our Ambassador at the U.N. And we found ourselves in general agreement with Arthur Goldberg, when he gave up a coveted seat on the Supreme Court, in order to become Stevenson's successor.

Fortunately, this esteem for the United Nations is widely shared by the foremost figures of the world. The recent visit to the U.N. by Pope Paul VI is indicative. As the first Catholic Pope ever to journey to the New World, Paul's mission was the cause of peace, but his commitment was to the United Nations.

I was privileged to be present at the General Assembly when Pope Paul delivered his historic message. I was struck by the fervor of his plea for peace, and by the strength of his endorsement of the United Nations. Not only did he call it the "last hope of concord and peace," but he described it as "a bridge between peoples" helping "to hasten their economic and social progress."

The dream of an international organization that would function as global guardian of the peace, was first envisioned by a great American President. Surveying the senseless carnage of the First World War, Woodrow Wilson recognized how desperately mankind needed to put an end to the anarchy among nations. For this purpose, he proposed that the victors should establish a League of Nations, to which the vanquished might also repair, where all sovereign states would act in concert to keep the peace.

But the victors of the First World War fell apart almost as soon as the guns fell silent. Wilson's dream was subverted, not so much by the Allied Governments with whom we fought, as by our own, when the U.S. Senate refused to sanction American participation in the League.

It was left to another generation of Americans, under the leadership of another great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to fashion from the wreckage of the Second World War a successor to the League that was finally to secure the participation and support of our own Government.

Originally, at San Francisco in 1945, we constructed the United Nations upon the great alliance which was winning the Second World War. In the mistaken belief that the victors, united in war by a common enemy, would remain united afterward, we entrusted the peacekeeping power, not to the General Assembly where all countries were to be equally represented, but to the Security Council, where the Big Five would have permanent seats, each equipped with a built-in veto. Our vision was of a Pax Victorum, where peace would be maintained by the United States, acting in concert with her allies, the United Kingdom, France, China, and the Soviet Union. The veto was to guarantee that no policeman's club would be raised to enforce the peace, except by the common consent of the Big Five.

Looking back on those euphoric days, one wonders how so infirm an infant as the United Nations could ever have received so auspicious a christening. We supporters of the U.N., then and now, bear a responsibility for having oversold it to the American people. From the outset, we should have stressed that the U.N. itself lacked the power to preserve world peace, having neither the means to finance its own operation nor to impose its will; that the Security Council could only act with the unanimous consent of its permanent members, the Big Five; that the General Assembly could pass resolutions, but could not enforce them; that the U.N. was not, in any sense, a world government, and could not possibly be described as the "Parliament of Man." Consequently, we should have emphasized that, in keeping the peace and protecting our national interests, the U.N. could be no substitute for our own Armed Forces, our nuclear deterrent, our regional alliances, or our mutual assistance programs abroad.

Having said all this, we could then have endorsed the United Nations for realistic reasons—as a useful instrument through which the sovereign nations of the world might strive to build better procedures for achieving the peaceful settlement of international disputes; as the one forum that could hold out the promise, as it grew in strength and stature, of ultimately replacing today's rule of violence with tomorrow's rule of law.

If, following the San Francisco conference, we had made this kind of factual case for our entry into the United Nations, I believe the American people would not have been left to nurse the exaggerated expectation that the U.N. would prove a panacea for peace. Then, perhaps, the failures of the U.N., which were bound to come, would not have loomed so large. Much disillusionment could have been avoided. And fewer today would be the voices attracted to that mindless chant: "Get the United States out of the U.N., and the U.N. out of the United States." For once the United Nations is seen in its proper light, the wonder is not that it has accomplished so little, but that it has accomplished so much.

First of all, it somehow managed to survive the precipitous breakup of the wartime alliance which had pasted it together. As cold war enmity divided the victors into two camps, the Security Council was quickly manacled by the use of the veto. But most of the member countries were determined that the U.N. should not be rendered impotent so quickly, and they found a way, within the charter, to upgrade the role of the General Assembly. The U.N. remained relevant after all, as a sentinel for peace.

Nevertheless, it seemed, for a time, that the cold war might limit the United Nations to the function of a sounding board for the smaller countries, and a convenient meeting place where the channels of communication could be kept open for the use of the major powers in periods of crisis. Indeed, the U.N. has played a most useful role in this respect. I recall, in 1949, while we were airlifting supplies into blockaded Berlin, how informal talks began between our U.N. representative, Philip Jessup, and the Soviet's Jacob Malik, in the U.N. diplomats' lounge. In this casual setting, Malik first hinted that Moscow might be willing to end the blockade, and here the talks were pursued which eventually led to that result.

Even more dramatic was the mediating role of the U.N. during the dread Cuban missile showdown of 1962. The Russian veto could not prevent the Security Council from serving as a stage on which the United States could tellingly present, before the assembled nations of the world, indisputable evidence of Soviet mendacity, thus helping to galvanize world opinion behind the audacious action President Kennedy had announced. The good offices of the U.N. then served to bring our former Ambassador, the late Adlai Stevenson, and John J. McCloy, into continuing contact with Soviet envoy Kuznetzov, for negotiations in which the Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, played a vital part. Ambassador Stevenson once summed it up this way:

"At a critical moment, when the nuclear powers seemed to be set on a collision course, the Secretary General's intervention led to the diversion of the Soviet ships headed for Cuba and interception by our Navy. This was an indispensable first step in the peaceful resolution of the Cuban crisis. The mere existence of an impartial office which could perform such a service in the middle of the night at such a time, is no small asset to the human race."

So it has happened that the United Nations, while not performing its intended role as policeman for the victors, has served as their mediator instead, helping in this way to keep the cold war from turning hot.

Though nuclear suicide has thus far been averted, the brushfire wars have not, and these peripheral struggles will continue to endanger the uncertain stability which tenuously rests upon the present nuclear stalemate. In dealing with these flareups, the U.N. has developed a role, not confined to mediation, but extending to active involvement as a kind of fire brigade.

It started in Korea in 1950, where force was invoked under the U.N. flag to defend a member state against invasion from without. To be sure, most of the troops were American and South Korean, and all were under U.S. command, but the fact that the operation was carried out in the name of the United Nations, and did entail token forces from a host of other countries, undoubtedly helped to keep the Soviet Union away from a direct confrontation with the United States. Moreover, the U.N. auspices did much to mobilize world opinion against the aggression, to a degree that American unilateral action never could have accomplished.

The limited participation of the U.N. in the Korean war led it to become centrally involved as the principal fireman in snuffing out the fighting at Suez in 1956. This time a way was found to set up a U.N. command, with troops furnished by the smaller member nations, whose mission it was to restore peace and order along the Gaza strip. The presence of these impartial sentinels to patrol the seething boundary between Egypt and Israel proved acceptable to both countries, and enabled the French and British to disengage without disgrace. U.N. forces still remain in Gaza, where they have been successful, thus far, in preventing any new eruption along this uneasy border.

The biggest fire brigade operation yet undertaken by the United Nations occurred in the Congo. Here again, the intervention of the U.N., at the request of the Congolese Government, was indispensable to restoring order out of a chaos which threatened to engulf all of central Africa. Had we gone in alone to do this job, as some of our shrill U.N. critics advocated, I daresay we would find ourselves today in the same bottomless quagmire, faced with the same dreary prospects, with which we are in truth confronted in South Vietnam.

Since the Congo, the U.N. has played a vital part in arranging a cease-fire in both Cyprus, and as mentioned earlier, in the India-Pakistan war over Kashmir. In neither of these situations, do we now have a guaranteed peace, but the chances for avoiding further bloodshed have been brightened by the persistence of the United Nations.

Wherever the U.N. has acted as a world policeman, we have found our own national interests well served. Several months ago, on the floor of the Senate, I advocated that we enlist the help of the U.N. in the search for a peaceful solution in Vietnam, and I have been encouraged by the moves President Johnson has since made in this direction.

The notable peacemaking succeses of the U.N., in Africa and Asia, contain a lesson that we should not overlook. The U.N. has no race, creed, or color; it is as varied in its composition as the 117 countries that now make up its membership. The U.N. bears no onus for ever having engaged in colonialism or imperialism; it lacks the intrinsic power to menace even little countries, and so it is neither feared nor distrusted by them. Finally, the U.N. is a genuine international organization which does not separate the "have" countries from the "have nots," the big from the small, the strong from the weak, the developed from the undeveloped, the capitalist from the Socialist, or even the Communist. It has refused to become the handmaiden of any particular alinement or ideology.

If experience proves anything at all, it is that upheaval among the black, brown, and yellow peoples, now emerging in their own right throughout Africa and Asia, is not likely to be assuaged for long through the unilateral intervention of any white nation. The empires which Western power could not hold, that power cannot now pacify. But because the United Nations has proved itself to be theirs, as well as ours, it can often play the role of "honest broker" and even that of the welcome policeman on the beat, when violence breaks out within, or between, countries which were so recently the restive possessions of the Western World.

One cannot appreciate the full scope or significance of the United Nations without a look at its work to improve living standards. The widening gap between the rich nations and the poor, which, in the main, separates those countries of predominantly white population from the colored, lies like a time bomb beneath our superficial efforts to preserve stability and peace. Unless this gap can be held in check and then narrowed in the years ahead, the time may come when the ideological differences dividing the Western World will be swept aside, as the affluent white nations join common cause against the looming specter of racial war.

To avoid this catastrophe, the United Nations is at work, helping to channel both know-how and capital from the rich industrial countries to the poor undeveloped. Of every 20 U.N. employees, 17 are engaged in these programs of social progress and economic growth. Through the U.N.'s World Health Organization, tropical diseases are under relentless attack—malaria is about to be eradicated from the face of the earth.

Various U.N. agencies are making loans and technical guidance available to promote monetary stability and long-range economic development—the World Bank, the International Finance Corporation, the International Development Association, the International Monetary Fund, the technical assistance program, and the Special Fund.

As for our own foreign aid program, nothing gives us greater trouble than trying to reconcile our belief that improving living standards abroad is a goal in itself, which ultimately serves our national interest, with the awkwardness of extending American grants and loans to countries engaging in policies that we regard as unfriendly. This is not only hard for the American people to understand; it is equally incomprehensible to the recipient governments. Our own people conclude that we are embarked upon the folly of trying to buy friends, while the foreign governments concerned suspect that we are offering them money to make them subservient, and so either demand the money without strings attached, or engage in that now-familiar game of diplomatic blackmail, obtaining their own terms by playing us off against the Russians or the Chinese.

This experience, coupled with the fact that other rich nations should bear their share of the cost, has caused the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to recommend that the United States shift its emphasis—from a bilateral basis to a multilateral basis—in the making of long-term loans for economic development. This would mean expanding the role of the U.N. agencies, an objective I strongly favor, not only for diplomatic reasons, but for sound business reasons as well. Eugene Black, who so ably managed the affairs of the World Bank, has explained the success of investments made through the U.N. lending agencies, in these words:

"Because they are known to have no ulterior motive, they can exert more influence over the use of a loan than is possible for a bilaterial lender; they can insist that the projects for which they lend are established on a sound basis, and—most important—they can make their lending conditional upon commensurate efforts being made by the recipient country itself."

In your home community, a loan extended on hard terms by a self-styled friend is usually resented by the person receiving it, although that same person would expect such terms from the local bank. It is no different in the community of nations.

In its role of nation building, the work of the U.N. has barely begun. Nowhere is this more evident than in the compelling need to vastly expand the world's supply of food.

We Americans find it hard to realize that hunger stalks the world. Most of us have more than enough to eat; our most common problem is overeating, so the doctors say. But more than half the world's people suffer from chronic malnutrition. And the hunger problem is getting worse, not better. If drastic measures are not taken soon, it is estimated that the diet of two out of every three people in the world will deteriorate, rather than improve, in the years ahead.

The reason is not hard to guess. It has taken 100,000 years for the world's population to reach its present level of 3 billion people. In 35 years, between now and the end of this century, 3 billion more will be added.

India exemplifies the incredible population explosion the world must face. Within a scant 15 years, India's population will grow by another 200 million people, which is more than the present population of the United States.

Already, in Latin America, we see the drain on food supply occasioned by the burgeoning population. In the thirties, Latin America was the greatest grain-exporting region of the world. Today, Latin America imports more grain than it exports. By the year 2000, 600 million Latin Americans will compete for a food supply which now scarcely feeds 250 million.

Obviously, the problem is much too big for any one nation to solve, even one with such food surpluses as our own. Only by banding together to achieve more efficient distribution of food, to irrigate vast stretches of now unproductive, arid land, to learn methods for harvesting the untapped bounty of the oceans, and to greatly increase the agricultural yield in the underdeveloped countries, can we hope to meet the challenge of the astounding population growth, and escape the brutal upheaval that the scourge of famine will spread across a stricken world.

Can anyone doubt that the United Nations must become the operational center of this great, global enterprise? Can anyone really believe that its importance to the human race will not grow larger with each passing year?

Yes, there are those who do not believe it. Even in this enlightened country, a militant minority of U.N. haters are zealously at work. Disdaining all things foreign, they see the world through Red glasses. To them, the U.N. is some kind of Communist trick. If you tell them that, on its own voting record, the U.N. has shown itself a friend of freedom—that no Soviet resolution actively opposed by the United States has ever been approved by the General Assembly, they respond that this is but a clever ploy to disguise the true Communist character of the organization. If you remind them that the Soviet Union has had to exercise her veto more than a hundred times in the Security Council, to prevent it from taking action against Russian interests, while the United States has yet to cast her first veto vote, they respond, with straight faces, that this proves U.N. procedures were set up to serve the Russians best. These anguished people can never be persuaded.

But fortunately, the great bulk of our people are better balanced and better informed. Commonsense tells them that, despite the diversity among nations, or the conflicts in ideology, we all share a common interest in survival. As Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, has observed: "In the world of today any breach of the peace could lead to the destruction of civilization. In the thermonuclear age, any instrumentality with the potential for deterring war can hardly be described as less than indispensable to mankind."

In June of this year, I introduced a resolution in the Senate, quickly approved in both Houses, vigorously reaffirming congressional support of the United Nations. A few days later, it was my privilege to accompany President Johnson to San Francisco, where he addressed the 20th anniversary celebration. There, I heard him renew our pledge to uphold the Charter of the United Nations, with these memorable words:

"I do know this: Whether we look for judgment to God, or to history, or to mankind, this is the age, and we are the men, and this is the place for us to give reality to our commitments under the charter. For what was for other generations a hope is for us a simple necessity."

This is the age, and we are the men—and the hour is late.

Independence Day of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, geography has placed Czechoslovakia in the heart of central Europe, and the Czechs as well as Slovaks have been very much in the center of European affairs. The native home of John Huss and Comenius, of Masaryk and Benes, Czechoslovakia was overrun and dominated by foreigners during most of modern times. Before the First World War Czechoslovakia was part of the polyglot Austro-Hungarian dual monarchy. However, alien rule could not subdue the spirit of independence among these indomitable Czechs and Slovaks. Trained in the school of adversity under the leadership of true patriots, they vowed to fight during the war years of 1914–18 for the attainment of their political independence. During those trying years they earned the sympathy of the democratic world in support of their national cause. Then, on October 28, 1918, they proclaimed their independence.

Unhappily this much-deserved and well-earned independence was not destined to last long. Czechoslovakia became one of the first victims of the Second World War. In 1939 it was partitioned among its three neighbors—Germany, Poland, and Hungary. After the Second World War the country was reconstituted once again. But the Czechoslovaks' hopes of preserving and enjoying their regained freedom and independence turned out to be quite illusory. In 1948 the independence of Czechoslovakia was again smothered by totalitarian dictatorship, this time in the guise of communism. The Kremlin's Communist regime could not tolerate Czechoslovakia's independence, and the Soviet Government saw to it that these sturdy and freedom-loving people were once more robbed of their liberty.

Today the people of Czechoslovakia live under totalitarian Communist tyranny. Even though there have been modifications in Soviet policy in the past few years, still the Czechoslovak people detest the Communist yoke imposed upon them by the Kremlin as bitterly as ever. On their independence day we wish them patience and fortitude in their struggle for their freedom.

The 89th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the "do-it-all" Congress, the "fabulous" Congress, the Congress that compiled the greatest record in the history of the country—these are some of the terms used by newspaper observers and other commentators to describe the constructive record of the 1st session of the 89th Congress, which was elected just a year ago with President Johnson.

The passage of a bill setting up a single major new program is generally considered enough to entitle a congressional session to place in history. Thus in the middle years of Franklin D. Roosevelt's Presidency, the Wagner Labor Relations Act was passed in 1935, the Social Security Act in 1936, and the first Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938.

In 1965 Congress produced a great mass of programs—some of them expansions from the past, some of them brand new—that are certain to change the quality of American life across the next several decades.

The President has estimated that about 85 percent of the Democratic platform pledges of 1964 have been enacted into law.

A word must be said about the relationship between the President and the congressional leaders. He has been pictured, by those who write fiction in the pretense that it is news, as an "arm-twister," a ruthless driver who horsewhips and threatens Members of the House and Senate to procure the passage of bills.

Nothing could be further from the realities of life on Capitol Hill. Members of the House and Senate, many of them with 15 or 20 years or more of experience, would be totally resentful of arm twisting and totally resentful of White House pressure to vote for or against pending legislation against their honest convictions.

The President can lead through formal messages, either general or special, that make legislative recommendations and set priorities. His departmental experts can send up draft bills for Congress to consider in committee. But Mr. Johnson spent 12 years in the House and 12 years in the Senate, and it is nonsensical to suggest that he does not deeply comprehend the relationships between the Presidency and Congress, each with its own part to play as a coordinate branch in the framing of legislation.

A specific example is the medicare program, adopted this year, to establish federally sustained health benefits for every citizen 65 years of age and older—partly through the social security system, partly through a supplemental plan to meet the needs of those not on the social security rolls. President Johnson signed the bill with a very proper sense of triumph—but the fact is that the bill Congress approved was sharply modified from the original proposals sent to the House Ways and Means Committee by four Democratic Presidents in succession.

The Ways and Means Committee, with vast experience in the tax and financing fields of old-age care, wrote its own bill in committee, the Senate amended it, the two Houses agreed on a single version—and that was the medicare program the President was invited to sign.

The School Aid Act of 1965 would be rated by most observers as ranking with medicare in importance. Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools has been on the calendar of every Congress with which this Member has been acquainted, since 1945. Suddenly it is an accomplished fact.

Here Mr. Johnson's personal contributions must be rated high. He had courage enough to ask for more money than any President had urged before—$1.25 billion in a single year—and his technical advisers came up with an extraordinary new program of concentrating Federal funds to aid the children of the poor, the city slum schools, rather than clinging to archaic measures of traditional grants-in-aid. The 89th Congress, where more than 70 Members of the House were freshmen and were not involved in stale controversies, welcomed the approach and endorsed it.

Congress also voted a heavy increase in Federal funds for higher education, both at the college levels and beyond, thus becoming the third successive session in a row to place major emphasis on Federal assistance to the upgrading of educational opportunity at these levels.

A major action of the 89th Congress was approval of an immigration-reform measure, killing the 40-year-old national origins quota system that invited migrants from northern Europe who did not wish to come and prohibited or severely limited the immigration of families from the nations of southern and eastern Europe who did want to be a part of America.

Every President since Mr. Truman's day has asked for major revisions in this law, particularly in the national origins provisions that implied some groups were more worthy than others of citizenship in this country. Five years ago it would have been the general judgment that revision and reform of the immigration laws were simply impossible. But with the addition of 70 new Members of the

House and the backing of the White House the quota laws came tumbling in 1965.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was another major achievement of the 1st session of the 89th. It became apparent late last year that the Civil Rights Act of 1964, despite its sweep and scope, did not give adequate protection to minority groups, such as Negroes in some Southern States, in performing the simple acts of registering and voting. The situation in Selma, Ala., this year underscored the fact.

Now we have the new Voting Rights Act, authorizing the appointment of Federal registrars in State areas where there is a pattern of discrimination. Expedited procedures are set up for court tests of the rights of individual citizens claiming a violation of their constitutional guarantees.

It is a credit to the 89th Congress that the Voting Rights Act was approved by heavy bipartisan majorities, just as the Civil Rights Act last year had strong bipartisan support from both Democrats and Republicans.

A program for regional medical programs was cleared by Congress in the last month of its session, together with a parallel bill authorizing Federal funds for medical libraries.

Early in the session the first step was taken toward developing a multi-State economic redevelopment approach in the Appalachia region—a program formulated with the assistance of State governments and designed to provide a wide variety of services to economically depressed and bypassed areas. Most of the Federal money will be devoted to highway development, simply to provide easier communication between the communities of the 10-State region.

Later, Congress passed a bill providing for a more broadly conceived program for regional development, including the financing of local public works, that expanded the original area redevelopment program of 1961.

The 89th Congress took the first step since 1953 to increase the size of the President's Cabinet, authorizing a new Department of Housing and Urban Development headed by a Secretary with Cabinet rank. In addition a new omnibus housing program, maintaining the Government's loan, insurance, and guarantee activities and revising urban renewal was approved.

The water pollution plan gives the States a first right to set up controls to check the pollution of interstate streams and authorizes the Federal Government to impose its own standards if the States fail to act. New funds are provided, as well, for the construction of municipal sewage plants.

The air pollution control program includes two major sections: First, a plan to reduce the smog and pollution that infest the air from the exhaust systems of automobiles; second, a research project designed to develop ways and means of disposal of solid wastes such as demolition debris, abandoned auto hulks, rubbish, garbage, and the wastes from canneries, manufacturing plants, and slaughterhouses.

Two measures were approved that make a direct attack on the root problems of poverty for a few million alongside with affluence, or relative affluence, for 20 or 30 times as many other Americans. The manpower training and development program, designed to teach workers new skills to meet the needs of the job market, was updated and expanded. The antipoverty program President Johnson successfully proposed in 1964 was given an overwhelming endorsement by Congress this year, even to the extent of doubling the Federal funds the administration recommended.

A major bill was passed to reduce, on a selective basis, excise taxes that had been imposed during the Korean war and kept in effect all these years. Reports from Government agencies indicate that these reductions in levies are being substantially passed on to consumers, thus giving lower prices and increased purchasing power and throwing a further strengthening factor under the extraordinary economic surge that for nearly 5 years has maintained high levels of employment, wages, and corporation profits.

The foreign aid program was carried forward but a foundation was laid for a full-scale review of all our economic and military programs abroad with the objective of making them more practical and effective under changing conditions in the world.

The complicated and long lasting farm program was also substantially revised to emphasize a direct attack on the removal of surplus acreage from cultivation. The cotton crop was placed on the same basis as wheat and feed grains, with lower price supports and the substitution of direct cash subsidies where they are needed to undergird farm income.

A military pay increase was approved and a 3.6-percent raise in pay for postal and civil service workers to restore them to levels of parity with income paid workers in private industry.

There was a whole series of bills that can be mentioned only in summary but that stake out new ground:

A National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities was created, with a $60 million, 3-year authorization to promote culture and scholarship.

A gold reserves program was approved to reduce the problem of balance-of-payments deficits.

A new drug control law was approved to strengthen Federal safeguards against the traffic in harmful drugs.

A major achievement of the session, I believe, was passage of a proposed constitutional amendment clarifying and defining the roles of the Vice President, the Cabinet, and Congress itself in the event of Presidential disability. The proposed amendment also provides for the appointment of a Vice President, with the consent of Congress, whenever there should be a vacancy in that Office.

The amendment is subject to ratification by the States, of course, and will take effect only when three-quarters of the States have given their approval. Thus far 10 of the necessary 38 State ratifications have been received. It is of the utmost importance that other States also take action, so that the great gap presently existing in regard to Presidential disability and possible Vice-Presidential vacancy can at last be effectively met in orderly legislation.

As many know, much of the real work of Congress is done in committee, where there is an opportunity for executive department officials to appear and to answer questions of congressional Members who have spent many years working in special fields. This year, as for some years in the past, I have had the privilege of membership on the Committee on Armed Services which deals with our defense structure and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy—a Senate-House committee that reviews the Nation's situation and progress in the whole field of nuclear activity.

There are other matters to mention that may seem relatively small but in fact affect a great many Americans. One of the standards by which a nation is judged is the care it provides for veterans of past wars and members of the armed services.

The 89th Congress was able to reach agreement on a new insurance program under which each member is given the right to purchase $5,000 or $10,000 in insurance at group-insurance rates, with the Government paying any additional costs. The coverage is automatic, with the servicemen having to take affirmative action to remove himself from coverage. Administrative costs are borne by the Veterans' Administration.

Two bills affecting veterans otherwise are on their way through the legislative procedures. The Senate passed a bill to extend to present members of the Armed Forces many of the advantages that in the past were included in the GI bill of rights during World War II and the Korean war. The House Veterans' Affairs Committee has completed hearings. The House, on the other hand, has passed a bill to increase benefits to those with service-connected disabilities, and a comparable bill has been reported favorably by the Senate Finance Committee. Indications are that final action will be completed this session on the bill increasing service-connected disability benefits. Action on the other measure should be completed in 1966 during the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

It is a special pleasure to report that funds were voted by the 89th Congress for initial construction work on the $73 million Kaskaskia navigation project and that these additional funds were voted for other flood control and navigation projects in our district: $1,371,000 in East St. Louis and vicinity, $391,000 for the Chain of Rocks canal and locks, $600,000 for the New Athens levee.

In addition Congress voted $6.1 million in authorization for the Hillside drainage project, that in the long run will cost $9.34 million and $179,000 in authority for a modified Wood River drainage and levee district project.

It occurred to me that voters in our district might be interested in a summary of the many other Federal activities that undergird the economy and furnish both contracts and jobs. For fiscal year 1965, ending last June 30, these were the statistics for our area—

Office of Economic Opportunity and Department of Labor funds include sums for programs to be expended after June 30, 1965:

Agency for International Development	$780,302.57
Army Corps of Engineers	2,457,000.00
Department of Agriculture	3,379,140.00
Department of Commerce	16,967,117.00
Department of Defense	58,051,674.35
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	45,920,266.00
Department of the Interior	5,500.00
Department of Labor	782,300.00
Federal Aviation Agency	54,800.00
General Services Administration	1,012,498.00
Housing and Home Finance Agency	7,256,000.00
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	235,000.00
National Science Foundation	55,640.00
Office of Economic Opportunity	482,597.00
Post Office Department	7,643,560.00
Railroad Retirement Board	8,090,000.00
Selective Service System	46,746.00
Small Business Administration	66,000.00
Veterans' Administration	13,700,000.00
Department of the Treasury	690,000.00

In addition, Madison County may receive $836,000 under the school aid program and $412,000 from the Office of Economic Opportunity program. The figures for St. Clair County are $1,796,000 in school aid and $643,000 under the Office of Economic Opportunity programs.

The 89th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report to my constituents on the activities of the 89th Congress, 1st session:

DEAR FRIEND: The 89th Congress, having just completed its first session, has been widely praised by many, including the New York Times, which has termed it "the best Congress since World War II." The major legislation passed by this Congress has been developing for over two decades and its far-reaching effects will benefit every family in our district. Federal expenditures in education, social security, medicare, immigration, veterans' benefits, and voting rights are but a few of the measures enacted by a Congress that was no longer hampered by obstructionist rules and a rigid seniority system. I have supported and in some instances coauthored much of this legislation. I have also exercised my right to disapprove those administration policies that I believed were not in the best interest of good fiscal government or in the best interest of my constituents. In addition to measures of national scope, I have actively engaged in our local problems of conservation, economy, urban renewal, transportation, and consumer protection. To those who may think this a "do-too-much" Congress, I refer to the enormous task still before us. Twenty-eight pieces of major legislation awaits the second session's scrutiny and approval. In this first session I have represented you on 201 rollcalls and on 172 quorum calls. I have had 12 general pair votes and 2 active pair votes. I was absent for five votes, although my absences were justified by official duties. My attendance record was 95 percent. I am anxious to tell you about my activities and share some thoughts with you about our Nation's political agenda. Our Federal Establishment is now so complex that people and their Government are often precluded from adequate contact with one another. This development I think we should all try to resist. For this reason, and because it enables me to reach the greatest number of you (about 200,000 families), I am sending you my congressional report by postal patron. As always, I welcome your views on the report, and on any other matters which interest, concern, or trouble you.

MAJOR LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS I VOTED FOR

Medicare and social security amendments: Provides hospitalization, surgical, and nursing care for persons 65 years and older, financed through the social security system; provides for increases up to 7 percent in old-age and survivor benefits, retroactive to January 1, 1965, plus other liberalizing changes. If you are a recipient of social security, railroad retirement, or Federal civil service retirement benefits, you qualify automatically for hospital insurance and should be receiving an application for the new program going into effect July 1, 1966. If you are 65 or over and not a recipient of any of the above benefits, or if you will be 65 by January 1, 1966, you should check for information with your local district office of the Social Security Administration prior to March 31, 1966. May I caution you not to cancel any health or hospital insurance you may now have. I coauthored this legislation which is an insurance plan that will do much to alleviate the need for welfare by our senior citizens.

Elementary-secondary education: Provides Federal grants to improve elementary and secondary education under local control, with the bulk of aid for the school districts where there are large numbers of children from poverty-stricken families. I also coauthored this bill.

Omnibus Housing Act: Expands current urban renewal, public housing programs, extends FHA loan insurance, encourages urban planning and beautification in housing; provides grants for public housing for the handicapped. The new act reaches at the heart of causes of much of the spreading growth of crime.

Excise tax reduction: Provides for excise tax cuts totaling $4.7 billion on various consumer items such as appliances, telephone service, autos, jewelry, furs, cosmetics, luggage, and many other items.

Voting rights: Strengthens machinery for guaranteeing the right to vote for all citizens by prohibiting poll taxes and literacy tests; provides for Federal registrars in States where less than 50 percent of potential voters are registered.

Water pollution control: Expands water pollution control programs and grants for waste treatment plant construction, strengthens Federal enforcement authority to clean up rivers and streams. This measure will help to make our beaches safe to enjoy.

Immigration act amendments: Abolishes the discriminatory national origin quota system over a 3-year period; does not enlarge the present total immigration quota but gives special preference to relatives of American citizens. I coauthored this bill.

Department of Housing and Urban Affairs: Establishes a new Cabinet-level Department to administer programs affecting the 70 percent of our population now residing in suburban and metropolitan communities. This measure provides representation for the urban and suburban resident to counterbalance the farmer who has had a Department of Agriculture.

Higher education: Provides scholarships for needy undergraduates and reduces interest on private loans to graduate and undergraduate students.

Arts and humanities: Creates a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities to assist and foster broad programs to meet the cultural needs of our Nation.

Presidential continuity: Proposes amendments to the Constitution to establish procedure to permit the Vice President to become Acting President; provides for filling the vacancy of the Office of the Vice President, and eliminates the dilemma caused by the tragedy of President Kennedy's assassination.

ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS I OPPOSED

On May 26, I voted against H.R. 8370, the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill, because I am in favor of eliminating long-term agricultural subsidies. These subsidies make the farmer totally dependent upon Federal handouts and raise the price of food to the consumer; my vote on July 14 was against the Coinage Act and for sound money; I opposed the administration's position by voting for the military pay raise which I felt our servicemen deserve; on August 3 I voted to increase civil service annuities for retirement and disability as an adjustment to economic reality; because I am concerned with the balance-of-payments problem, I voted against the interest equalization tax which I found to be a burden on private enterprise and did not accomplish the desired result; the public works bill presented on August 12 was poorly drawn and because I do not support the pork barrel theory, I could not support this measure, and in September I opposed a flood control bill because it was also poorly drawn. I favored an increase in Federal salaries over administration recommendations because I feel such salaries should be commensurate with private industry.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

In addition to the many programs enacted, there remain bills which I have introduced that are still pending before the Congress. A partial review follows: House Resolution 144, to establish a special committee on the captive nations living under the Communist yoke; H.R. 3494, to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy; House Concurrent Resolution 240, making known the sense of Congress against persecution of persons in the Soviet Union because of religion; H.R. 5609, to establish a Commission on Science and Technology and aid private enterprise convert from too great a reliance upon defense contracts; H.R. 7074, to provide free distribution of certain Government publications to State and local governments and also to institutions of higher education; H.R. 9875, to provide for the regulation of transportation of dogs and cats intended for research and experimentation, a humane act to protect our pets from cruelty; House Resolution 518, expressing the sense of the House with respect to the Warsaw Convention and Hague Protocol which sharply limits the amount of money survivors of international air disasters can collect. (On October 20, the President authorized the Department of State to withdraw from this treaty unless the insurance limit was increased to a minimum of $75,000. This decision resulted from my resolution.) H.R. 10861, to provide protection for members of families of the Armed Forces from threatening and harassing communications; H.R. 11215, to provide for a Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York; House Joint Resolution 686, to reduce a voting age to 18; H.R. 11557 to provide for a comprehensive plan to preserve, develop, and make usable for the public the Long Island Sound and related shoreline in New York, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, thus eliminating the piecemeal destruction of our natural resources. The last measure I introduced, H.R. 11797, provides for the Federal Government to establish standards for marine heads to eliminate further pollution of our navigable waters by uncontrolled discharge of raw sewage.

PROMOTION OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

The lifeblood of the economy of Long Island rests with increased business activity. In July I led a tour of 17 members of the Armed Services and Space Committees, who had never before visited our area or realized the full potential of our area for space and defense production, through the Republic Aviation plant at Farmingdale. Again, in October, I accompanied Secretary of Defense McNamara and Senator Robert Kennedy on a tour of the Sperry, Fairchild Hiller-Republic, and Grumman installations. These have been unprecedented visits for our district, and I am confident of a better working relationship with the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Early next year I have planned a special Government contract procurement seminar for small businessmen in our district in my continuing effort to promote Long Island as one of the Nation's finest business and industrial areas.

CONSERVATION OF OUR NATURAL HERITAGE

The magnificent heritage of natural beauty found on Long Island must be protected. I have introduced legislation that would provide a "conservation master plan" for the entire Long Island Sound area. This unified approach involves New York, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, and would replace the individual uncoordinated efforts that have so far proved ineffective. This legislation calls for a study that would provide the best method of coping with the problems of water pollution, destruction of marine life and wetlands, the hodgepodge construction of piers and marinas and indiscriminate dredging. It would be a major step toward arresting and reversing the unfortunate trend toward piecemeal destruction of our priceless natural heritage. One reason I am opposed to the construction of a proposed sound bridge at Oyster Bay is that it will destroy one of the finest natural areas in the northeast. I favor two bridges—one at Port Jefferson and the other at Orient Point—for the betterment of the economy of our area, but the cost in the loss of the Oyster Bay natural retreat would be incomprehensible. I brought to Oyster Bay Interior Department officials who joined me in an aerial survey of the wetlands in the area. The possibility of establishing a Federal wildlife preserve was favorably reported. The National Park Service has already agreed to spend $104,400 in fiscal 1966 for the development of the Sagamore Hill National Historical site, the home of President Theodore Roosevelt.

CONGRESSIONAL OFFICES

You may be interested to know that my staff has served over 3,000 visitors in this first session, answered over 100 letters per day, and about the same number of phone calls. I am equally proud of your use of the congressional district offices in Glen Cove, Jericho, and Port Washington.

NEW LEGISLATION FOR OUR CITIZENS

One of the most progressive and long-awaited pieces of social legislation, medicare, is now a reality. Some 5,800 residents of our district, who previously were not eligible, will now be entitled to receive benefits. About 92,000 residents, age 65 and over, will be eligible for hospital insurance protection on July 1, 1966. If you have any questions regarding this or any other new Federal program, please contact my office for assistance. This landmark legislation begins a new era of security for our senior citizens.

VETERANS' LEGISLATIONS

This year there are four major improvements in benefits to veterans: (1) increased compensation to disabled veterans; (2) reestablishment of the national service life insurance program; (3) increased vocational rehabilitation training allowances for service-connected disabled veterans; and (4) war orphans' allowances for educational assistance. Any veteran with questions is invited to contact my office for assistance through our Veterans' Affairs Committee.

I am continuing my efforts to locate a veterans' hospital in Nassau County where it will serve the greatest number of veterans.

FEDERAL AID TO OUR COMMUNITIES

As your Representative in Washington, I take it as my responsibility to make available to the communities in our district, information about the many Federal-aid programs. On November 4, I arranged a meeting in Port Washington between the officials of all the towns in our district and a team of top Washington administrators for the purpose of implementing as many programs in our communities as feasible. To date Federal assistance to housing and urban development—loans, grants, and advances from major programs of Housing and Home Finance Agency totaled $179,282. I am happy to report that after 5 years our urban renewal program in Glen Cove is finally underway. Federal funds totaling $1,843,342 have been granted to our district for the operation of antipoverty projects. Two hundred and sixty-six culturally deprived 4- and 5-year-old children attended 12 Project Head Start centers with the help of 7 grants totaling $45,932. Three residents of our district have joined VISTA, the domestic peace corps. Five hundred and forty unemployed heads of families are receiving constructive work training, and over 73 small business loans have been made to help individuals establish and strengthen their businesses.

WINNING THE PEACE IN VIETNAM

The war in Vietnam is an ideological and economic struggle as well as a military conflict. Ultimate peace depends upon a realization by the Vietnamese people that the democratic way promises a better life to all. Recently I proposed a plan to stimulate American business investment in Vietnam. Backed by Federal Government guarantees, American businessmen would join with their Vietnamese counterparts in producing items of light manufacture that are in short supply. Besides bolstering the war-weary Vietnamese economy, this program would eventually relieve the burden of foreign aid from American taxpayers. With the backing of the State Department, meetings were held in Washington and New York with American and Vietnamese businessmen. Recognizing that this plan could provide a strong key to a successful peace in Vietnam, plans are now afoot to bring this project to fruition.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

As a former businessman concerned with the rising cost of living, I have long questioned the impact and widespread use of trading stamps upon consumer costs. I have concluded a series of informal meetings on this matter both in Washington and New York. Joined by 16 of my distinguished colleagues, I have inquired into all aspects of this multimillion-dollar industry on behalf of the American consumer, for I believe Mr. and Mrs. Consumer have a right to know for what they are paying. It is gratifying to report that at a recent meeting of the trading stamp industry there was talk by a number of reputable stamp companies to seek standards to insure the public from unscrupulous companies by providing adequate bonding regulations. It was also agreed to reexamine the use of the word "free" with reference to premiums. However, the consumer must be protected from irresponsible dealers, and any premium that is paid for directly or indirectly cannot rightfully be called "free." It is high time the consumer was protected. This has been the vigor and thrust of my inquiry.

JET NOISE

I have attended meetings in Washington with Federal Aviation Agency officials who are studying the serious problem of jet noise on Long Island. I actively support all efforts to solve this annoying problem without compromising aircraft safety.

FOR THE INTERNATIONAL TRAVELER

In August, Senator Robert F. Kennedy joined me in seeking an increase in liability of airlines in international travel to survivors of air crashes. Present liability is regulated by the Warsaw Convention and is limited to $8,300 (even to Canada and Mexico) and even if airline negligence is proven. The State Department, at the President's behest, has now advised that the United States will withdraw from this treaty unless coverage of a minimum of $75,000 is available. This is a major victory in protecting the air traveler.

RECESS

With Congress adjourned until January 10, 1966, I have planned for my third visit to Vietnam in the past 18 months. I plan to conduct a series of town meetings this winter to review those issues you wish to bring to my attention for legislation at the next session.

In conclusion, I wish to thank the local radio and television stations for carrying my news reports of Congressional activities to you. The daily and local newspapers have also been generous in reporting my activities in your behalf. I am also very appreciative of the contributions of time given freely to my office by volunteers who have helped to carry on the activities of our congressional offices and by college students from our district who are studying in Washington.

During my trip to Vietnam all of our offices will remain open for your continued use. Please do not hesitate to contact me any time I can be of service. If you are planning a trip to our Nation's Capital, please contact my office in advance so that we may arrange tours and visits that would make your visit more memorable.

Voting Record of the Honorable Lester L. Wolff, 89th Congress, 1st Session

January 4, 1965:

Election of Speaker (289–139): Vote McCormack.

House Resolution 1: Authorizes oath of office to certain Mississippi Members. On ordering the previous question (276–149): Vote "nay."

House Resolution 8: Relates to rules of the House. On ordering the previous question (224–202): Vote "yea."

January 19, 1965: House Resolution 126—Dismissal of contest of election of Richard L. Ottinger. On agreeing to resolution (245–102): Vote "yea."

January 26, 1965: House Joint Resolution 234—Supplemental appropriations for Department of Agriculture. On motion to recommit, designed to bar use of any funds to finance any exportation of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic under provisions of title I (204–177): Vote "yea."

February 8, 1965: House Joint Resolution 234—Supplemental agriculture appropriations, 1965. On motion to instruct the House conferees to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment No. 3, providing Presidential discretion in granting of aid to the United Arab Republic (165–241): Vote "nay."

February 9, 1965: H.R. 3818—Eliminates the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities. On motion to recommit (93–289): Vote "nay." On passage (300–82): Vote "yea."

February 17, 1965: H.R. 2198.—Amends the Arms Control and Disarmament Act. On passage (302–63): Vote "yea."

February 18, 1965: H.R. 45.—Amends the Inter-American Development Bank Act. On motion to recommit, designed to reduce the authorization from $750 million to $725 million (152–237): Vote "nay." On passage (288–93): Vote "yea."

February 25, 1965: House Resolution 188.—Provides $370,000 for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. On motion to recommit, designed to provide for open hearings on authorization of funds for the committee (53–333): Vote "yea." On agreeing to resolution (360–29): vote "yea."

March 3, 1965: S. 3.—Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. On motion to recommit, designed to replace the text of S. 3 with the provisions of H.R. 4466 (100–323): Vote "nay." On passage (257–165): Vote "yea."

March 10, 1965: H.R. 2.—Amends the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. On passage (402–0): Vote "yea."

March 15, 1965: H.R. 4714.—Amends the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964. On suspending the rules and passing the bill (217–113): Vote "yea."

March 16, 1965: H.R. 5505.—Relates to establishment of Federal standards for Congressional redistricting. On Mathias amendment providing that the number of Representatives that a State is entitled to may be elected at large pending reapportionment under this act; also providing for at-large elections in States that have never established districts (147–255): Vote "nay."

March 17, 1965: H.R. 5374—Increases by $3,000 per annum the salaries of the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court. On agreeing to House Resolution 276, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (202–183): Vote "yea." On passage (178–202): Vote "yea."

March 22, 1965: H.R. 5688—Relates to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia. On motion to recommit (166–216): Vote "yea." On passage (251–131): Vote "yea."

March 23, 1965: H.R. 5721—Amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco. On passage (206–170): Vote "general pair."

March 26, 1965:

On ordering the previous question on motion to consider the Journal as read (274–119): Vote "yea."

H.R. 2362—Strengthens and improves educational quality and opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. On motion to recommit (149–267): Vote "nay." On passage (263–153): Vote "yea."

March 31, 1965:

H.R. 3708—Providing assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons. On passage (395–1): Vote "yea."

H.R. 1111—Provides for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources. On passage (383–0): Vote "yea."

April 1, 1965: H.R. 4257—Manpower Act of 1965. On passage (394–0): Vote "yea."

April 5, 1965:

H.R. 980—Provides for the return of obscene mail. On suspending the rules and passing the bill (360–12): Vote "general pair."

H.R. 7064—Authorizes an appropriation of $1 million for construction of a U.S. Embassy building in Saigon. On suspending the rules and passing the bill (378–0): Vote "general pair."

H.R. 7060—Treasury-Post Office Departments, appropriations. On passage (347–7): Vote "general pair."

April 6, 1965: H.R. 7091—Second supplemental appropriations, 1965. On passage (348–62): Vote "yea."

April 8, 1965: H.R. 6675—Provides a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act. On motion to recommit (191–236): Vote "nay." On passage (313–115): Vote "yea."

April 13, 1965:

H.R. 2998—Arms Control and Disarmament Act. On agreeing to conference report (316–65): Vote "yea."

House Joint Resolution 1—Presidential inability and succession. On passage (368–29): Vote "yea."

April 14, 1965: House Resolution 310—Providing $50,000 for additional expenses of Committee on Un-American Activities incurred in investigation of Ku Klux Klan. On agreeing to resolution (313–43): Vote "yea."

April 27, 1965: H.R. 6497—Authorizes an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States. On motion to recommit (113–275): Vote "nay." On passage (301–88): Vote "yea."

April 28, 1965: S. 4.—Water Quality Act of 1965. On passage (396–0): Vote "yea."

April 29, 1965:

H.R. 7091—Supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1965. On agreeing to conference report (316–55): Vote "yea." On preferential motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment (144–228): Vote "yea."

H.R. 4714—Amends the National Arts and Cultural Act of 1964 with respect to the authorization of appropriations. On passage (239–115): Vote "yea."

May 3, 1965: H.R. 2906—To extend and amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services. On passage (347–0): Vote "yea."

May 4, 1965: H.R. 2985—Authorizes assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers. On passage (389–0): Vote "yea."

May 5, 1965:

House Joint Resolution 447—Making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1965 for the Department of Defense. On passage (408–7): Vote "yea."

H.R. 7657—Appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, etc., for the Armed Forces. On passage (396–0): Vote "yea."

May 6, 1965: H.R. 7717—Authorizes appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations. On agreeing to resolution (389–0): Vote "yea." On passage (389–11): Vote "yea."

May 10, 1965: H.R. 2984—Amends the Public Health Services Act provisions for construction of health research facilities. On passage (334–4): Vote "yea."

May 12, 1965: S. 701—International Coffee Agreement Act of 1965. On passage (300–97): Vote paired "for."

May 20, 1965: H.R. 8122—Atomic Energy Commission, appropriations. On motion to recommit (43–313): Vote "nay." On passage (352–1): Vote "yea."

May 25, 1965: H.R. 7750—To amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, after adopting a corrective committee amendment. On motion to recommit (178–219): Vote "nay." On passage (249–148): Vote "yea."

May 26, 1965: H.R. 8370—Department of Agriculture, appropriations. On motion to recommit (187–208): Vote "yea." On passage (354–41): Vote "nay."

June 1, 1965:

H.R. 8639—State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary, appropriation. On passage (322–60): Vote "yea."

H.R. 3584—Coal Mine Safety Act. On passage (336–42): Vote "yea."

June 2, 1965: H.R. 8371—Excise Tax Reduction. On passage (401–6): Vote "yea."

June 3, 1965: H.R. 7777—Appointment of Gen. William F. McKee to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. On passage (228–137): Vote "yea."

June 7, 1965: H.R. 3157—To amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce the annuities of the spouses of retired employees by the amount of certain monthly benefits. On passage (323–0): Vote "yea."

June 8, 1965:

H.R. 8775—Legislative appropriations. On motion to recommit (149–244): Vote "nay."

H.R. 7105—To provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports. On passage (288–1): Vote "yea."

June 9, 1965:

H.R. 8464.—Public debt limit, increase. On ordering the previous question (273–109): Vote "yea." On passage (229–165): Vote "yea."

House Concurrent Resolution 285.—Kennedy film. On request for a separate vote on an amendment to prevent the charging of a fee from viewers of the film (174–216): Vote "nay." On agreeing to resolution (311–75): Vote "yea."

June 16, 1965:

H.R. 6927—Housing and Urban Development. On motion to recommit (141–259): Vote "nay." On passage (217–184): Vote "yea."

House Resolution 416—Authorizes each Member of the House of Representatives to employ annually, on a temporary basis, a student congressional intern. On agreeing to resolution (229–153): Vote "yea."

June 21, 1965:

H.R. 7743—Establishes a system of loan insurance and a supplementary system of direct loans to assist students to attend post-secondary business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools. On suspending the rules and passing the bill (300–0): Vote "general pair."

H.R. 8620—Amends the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to take into consideration floods and other natural disasters in reference to the feed grains, cotton, and wheat programs for 1965. On suspending the rules and passing the bill (297–2): Vote "general pair."

House Concurrent Resolution 416—Requests the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. On suspending the rules and passing the bill (298–0): Vote "general pair."

June 23, 1965: H.R. 9221—Defense Department appropriations. On passage (407–0): Vote "yea."

June 24, 1965: H.J. Res. 541—Extends the Area Redevelopment Act for a period of 2 months. On agreeing to resolution (224–167): Vote "yea."

June 28, 1965: H.R. 7984—Housing and Urban Development. On agreeing to House Resolution 425, the open rule providing for 6 hours of debate on, and the waiving of points of order against the bill H.R. 7984 (230–115): Vote "yea."

June 30, 1965: H.R. 7984—Housing and Urban Development. On Stephens amendment to rewrite section 101, relating to rent subsidies, to limit eligibility to persons eligible for public housing (240–179): Vote "yea." On motion to recommit designed to delete sections 101 and 106, relating to rent subsidy payments, and rehabilitation grants to homeowners in urban renewal areas (202–208): Vote "nay." On passage (245–169): Vote "yea."

July 6, 1965: H.R. 6400—Voting Rights Act of 1965. On agreeing to House Resolution 440 providing for the consideration of, and 10 hours of debate on H.R. 6400 (310–58): Vote "yea."

July 9, 1965: H.R. 6400—Voting Rights Act of 1965. On Cramer vote-fraud amendment to provide criminal penalties for giving false information on voting eligibility status (253–165): Vote yea." On Boggs amendment (identical to the Long amendment in the Senate bill) respecting judicial review (155–262): Vote "nay." On Gilbert amendment to allow people illiterate in English to vote if they have completed the sixth grade in Spanish-language schools (202–216): Vote "yea." On motion to recommit designed to substitute the text of H.R. 7896 prohibiting the denial to any person of the right to register or to vote because of his failure to pay a poll tax or any other such tax, for the language of the committee (171–248): Vote "nay." On passage (333–85): Vote "yea."

July 12, 1965:

H.R. 8856—Atomic Energy Act of 1954, intent of Congress. On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (216–139): Vote "yea."

H.R. 242—To extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment. On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (336–32): Vote "yea."

July 13, 1965: S. 559—Cigarette Labeling Act. On agreeing to conference report (285–103): Vote "yea."

July 14, 1965: H.R. 8926—Coinage Act of 1965. On Battin amendment to require the silver content of quarters and dimes to be fixed at 40 percent (187–218): Vote "yea." On passage (255–151): Vote "yea."

July 20, 1965: H.R. 9075—Military pay increase. On passage (410–0): Vote "yea."

July 22, 1965: H.R. 8283—Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1964. On motion to recommit (178–227): Vote "nay." On passage (245–158): Vote "yea."

July 26, 1965: H.R. 77—Labor, right-to-work provisions (14(b)). On ordering previous question, open rule (H. Res. 437) for consideration of bill (248–171): Vote "yea."

July 27, 1965:

H.R. 6675—Provides a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act. On agreeing to conference report (307–116): Vote "yea."

H.R. 7984—Housing and urban development. On agreeing to conference report (251–168): Vote "yea."

H.R. 2985—Community Mental Health Centers Act Amendments. On agreeing to conference report (414–0): Vote "yea."

July 28, 1965: H.R. 77—Labor, right-to-work provisions (14(b)). On motion to recommit (200–223): Vote "nay." On passage (221–203): Vote "yea."

July 29, 1965: H.R. 8856—Atomic Energy Act of 1954, intent of Congress. On passage (275–126): Vote "yea."

August 2, 1965:

Senate Joint Resolution 81—To increase the amount authorized for the Interstate Highway System for fiscal year 1967 and to authorize the apportionment of such amount. On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (314–11): Vote "general pair."

H.R. 8027—Provides assistance in training State and local law enforcement officers and other personnel and is improving capabilities, techniques, and practices in State and local law enforcement and prevention and control of crime. On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (326–0): Vote paired "for."

H.R. 6964—To amend U.S. Code to facilitate the rehabilitation of persons convicted of offenses against the United States. On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (326–0): Vote "yea."

August 3, 1965:

S. 1564—Voting Rights Act of 1965. On motion to recommit designed to delete the Boggs-Long amendment (118–284): Vote "nay." On agreeing to conference report (328–74): Vote "yea."

H.R. 8469—To provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund. On passage (396–0): Vote "yea."

August 4, 1965:

H.R. 8439—Military Construction Authorization. On agreeing to conference report (389–0): Vote "yea."

S. 1742—Permits U.S. Governors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation to agree to amendments to the articles of agreement of such Bank and Corporation. On passage (331–54): Vote "yea."

August 5, 1965: H.R. 4750—To provide an extension of the interest equalization tax. On agreeing to House Resolution 490, the closed rule under which the legislation was considered (329–44): Vote "yea." On passage (274–97): Vote "nay."

August 9, 1965: H.R. 9918—To amend the Fire and Casualty Act and the Motor Vehicles Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia. On Sickles amendment supplying new text (173–156): Vote "yea."

August 10, 1965: H.R. 10306—Amends the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951 to prohibit destruction or mutilation of draft cards. On passage (393–1): Vote "yea."

August 12, 1965: S. 1648—Provides grants for public works and development facilities, etc. On Sisk amendment to make more areas eligible for grants for public works and development facilities under title I; to increase the authorization from $400 million to $500 million; and to limit the program from 5 years to 4 years (196–194). Vote "nay." On Cramer motion to recommit designed to require funds provided for projects be spent on American products, prevent the making of working capital loans; and provide for annual congressional review of Economic Development Loan Fund (163–224). Vote "yea." On passage (246–138). Vote "nay."

August 16, 1965:

H.R. 6431—To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that certain forms of nickel be admitted free of duty. On suspending the rules and passing the bill (297–48). Vote "yea."

H.R. 8635—To establish and prescribe the duties of a Federal Boxing Commission. On suspending the rules and passing the bill (346–4). Vote "yea."

August 19, 1965:

H.R. 7750—To amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. On agreeing to conference report (244–150). Vote "yea."

H.R. 9811—Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. On motion to recommit (169–224). Vote "yea." On passage (221–172). Vote "nay."

August 24, 1965: H.R. 10586—Supplemental appropriations for Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare. On motion to recommit (139–263). Vote "nay."

August 25, 1965: H.R. 2500—Amends the Immigration and Nationality Act. On MacGregor amendment to establish on July 1, 1968, a limit of 115,000 immigrants per year from countries in the Western Hemisphere and require cancellation of special immigration visas from numerical ceiling of 115,000 when deportation proceedings are stayed or alien status adjusted (189–218); Vote "Nay." On passage (318–95); vote "Yea."

August 26, 1965: H.R. 9567—Higher Education Act of 1965. On passage (367–22); vote "Yea."

August 30, 1965: H.R. 9022—Amends Public Laws 815 and 874, Eighty-first Congress, to provide financial assistance in the construction and operation of public elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster. On passage (305–37); vote "general pair."

August 31, 1965: H.R. 9042—Implementation of Agreement between United States and Canada concerning Automotive products. On agreeing to resolution (H. Res. 551) closed rule for consideration of H.R. 9042 (364–23); Vote "Yea." On passage (280–113); vote "Yea."

September 1, 1965: H.R. 3141—Health Professions Educational Assistance Amendments of 1965. On passage (340–47); Vote "Yea."

September 2, 1965: H.R. 5863—To authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation. On passage (317–24); Vote "Yea."

September 7, 1965: H.R. 8439—Military construction authorization. On motion to table a motion providing for discharging the Committee on Armed Services from further consideration of H.R. 8439, fiscal 1966 military construction authorization (323–19); Vote "Yea."

H.R. 10775—Military construction authorization. On suspending the rules and passing the bill (347–0): Vote "Yea."

H.R. 168—Veterans' disability compensation increase. On suspending the rules and passing the bill (348–0): Vote "Yea."

Senate Joint Resolution 102—Authorizes funds for the Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and the District of Columbia Commission on Crime and Law Enforcement. On suspending the rules and passing the bill (339–0): Vote "Yea."

September 8, 1965: H.R. 10871—Foreign Aid Appropriations. On passage (239–143): Vote "Yea."

September 13, 1965:

(Procedural votes to delay consideration of or in opposition to one or more bills under the 21-day rule or in opposition to the consideration of bills without a rule from the Rules Committee):

On Moss motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of the House (220–126): Not voting.

On Albert motion that further proceedings under the call of the House be dispensed with (243–127): Not voting.

On Albert motion that further proceedings under the call of the House be dispensed with (256–123): Not voting.

On Albert motion that further proceedings under the call of the House be dispensed with (255–121): Not voting.

On Hall motion to lay on the table ALBERT's motion that the Journal be approved as read (138–244): Vote "Nay."

On ordering the previous question on the motion to approve the Journal (257–126): Vote "Yea."

On Albert motion that the Journal, as read, stand approved (265–119): Vote "Yea."

On McMillan motion to adjourn (175–204): Vote "Nay."

H.R. 10065—Equal Employment Opportunity Act. On agreeing to House Resolution 506, the open rule for consideration of (259–121): Vote "yea." On Albert motion to table motion to reconsider vote to adopt House Resolution 506 (194–181): Vote "yea." On Sikes motion to adjourn (173–201): Vote "nay." On McFall motion that further proceedings under the call of the House be dispensed with (243–136): Vote "yea."

H.R. 7371.—Amends the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. On agreeing to House Resolution 499, the open rule providing for the consideration of and 4 hours of debate on H.R. 7371 (201–171): Vote "yea."

H.R. 9460—National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965. On agreeing to House Resolution 478, the open rule providing for the consideration of and 2 hours of debate on H.R. 9460 (260–114): Vote "yea."

H.R. 10281—Government Employees Salary Comparability Act. On agreeing to House Resolution 536, the open rule providing for the consideration of and 4 hours of debate on H.R. 10281 (288–84): Vote "yea."

September 14, 1965: H.R. 2091—Establishment of concession policies in areas administered by National Park Service. On motion to recommit (73–298): Vote "nay."

September 15, 1965:

H.R. 8283—Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965. On motion to recommit the conference report (209–180): Vote "nay."

H.R. 9460—National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965. On motion to recommit (128–251): Vote "nay."

September 16, 1965:

House Resolution 574.—Directs the Postmaster General to provide the names of temporary employees employed by the Post Office Department during the summer of 1965. On motion to table the resolution (186–180): Vote "nay."

S. 2042.—Atomic Energy Act of 1964, indemnification agreements. On passage (338–30): Vote "yea."

September 17, 1965:

H.R. 9221.—Department of Defense appropriations, 1966. On agreeing to conference report (380–0): Vote "yea."

House Resolution 585.—Mississippi contested elections. On agreeing to resolution (228–143): Vote "nay."

September 20, 1965:

S. 2127—Armed Forces, indemnity insurance. On suspending the rules and passing the bill (360–0): Vote "yea."

House Resolution 560.—Communism in Western Hemisphere. On suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution (321–52): Vote "yea."

September 21, 1965: S. 4.—Water Quality Act of 1965. On agreeing to conference report: Vote "yea."

September 22, 1965:

S. 2300.—Rivers, harbors, and flood control. On Clark amendment to authorize the Secretary of the Army to conduct and report to Congress on a survey of St. John River, Maine, for flood control and allied functions separate and apart from the Passamaquoddy tidal power project (207–185): Vote "yea."

H.R. 30.—Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center. On passage (255–112): Vote "yea." On motion to adjourn (89–204): Vote "nay."

September 23, 1965:

H.R. 7371—Amends the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. On committee substitute amendment to eliminate several additional exemptions from the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (199–178); Vote "yea."

H.R. 10232—Water and sanitation systems in rural areas. On ordering the previous question on H. Res. 580, the open rule providing for 2 hours of debate on the bill (280–70); Vote "yea." On passage (325–10); Vote "general pair."

September 24, 1965: S. 306—Clean air pollution program. On motion to recommit designed to delete the provisions for solid waste disposal (80–220); vote "nay." On passage (294–4); vote "yea."

September 27, 1965: H.R. 4644—District of Columbia home rule. On Multer motion to discharge Committee on Rules from further consideration of House Resolution 515, the open rule providing for the consideration of, waiving points of order against, and 5 hours of debate on H.R. 4644 (213–183); vote "yea." On agreeing to House Resolution 515 (222–179); vote "yea." On Multer motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4644 (234–155); vote "yea."

September 29, 1965: H.R. 4644—District of Columbia home rule. On motion to strike the enacting clause and thus kill the bill (179–219); vote "nay." On Multer amendment as amended by the Sisk amendment (227–174); vote "yea." On motion to recommit (134–267); vote "nay." On passage (283–117); vote "yea."

September 30, 1965: H.R. 2580—Immigration and Nationality Act. On agreeing to conference report (320–69); vote "yea."

H.R. 10281—Government Employees Salary Comparability Act. On motion to recommit designed to remove the provisions for a permanent system for the establishment and maintenance of proper salary relationships in Federal, executive, judicial, congressional, and career salaries (238–140): Vote "nay." On passage (370–7): Vote "yea."

October 1, 1965:

House Joint Resolution 642—Third Library of Congress Building. On motion to recommit (17–321): Vote "nay." On passage (328–5): Vote "yea."

H.R. 10871—Foreign assistance appropriation. On motion to recommit with instructions to the conferees to insist on disagreement to amendment No. 7, which deleted North Vietnam from the language prohibiting aid to countries that furnish aid to Cuba or North Vietnam (164–174): Vote "yea." On agreeing to conference report (204–127): Vote "yea."

H.R. 3142—Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965. On passage (296–3): Vote "yea."

H.R. 6519—Jefferson National Expansion Memorial. On passage (250–12): Vote "nay."

October 7, 1965:

Senate Joint Resolution 32—Ryukyu Islands, contributions to. On agreeing to resolution (312–55): Vote "yea."

H.R. 2020—Nevada water project. On passage (239–134): Vote "nay."

S. 2084—Highway Beautification Act of 1965. On motion to recommit (153–230): Vote "nay." On passage (245–138): Vote "yea."

October 8, 1965: H.R. 9811—Food and Agricultural Act of 1965. On agreeing to conference report (219–150): Vote "nay."

October 12, 1965: H.R. 11135—Sugar Act Amendments of 1965. On agreeing to House Resolution 598, the closed rule providing for the consideration of, 4 hours of debate on, and waiving points of order against H.R. 11135 (253–80): Vote "yea."

October 13, 1965: H.R. 11135—Sugar Act Amendments of 1965. On motion to recommit (160–230): Vote "general pair." On passage: Vote "general pair."

October 14, 1965: Supplemental Appropriation for fiscal 1966 (242–100): Vote "Yea."

October 20, 1965: To strengthen educational resources of colleges and universities (313–63): Vote "yea."

October 21, 1965: Supplemental Appropriation (250–84): Vote "yea."

October 22, 1965: Amend and extend provisions of Sugar Act of 1948. On adoption of conference report (174–88): Vote "yea."

The District of Columbia Election Extension Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, last year over 200,000 people in the District of Columbia registered to vote here. These people are U.S. citizens who do not claim the right to vote in any State or territory but who must meet the other usual qualifications for voting. Last November over 90 percent of these registered voters voted in the first presidential election ever held in the District of Columbia.

These people constitute the largest single group of American citizens in any one place who still have no voice of their own in Congress. The time is long overdue to remedy this, within the present constitutional framework, by an amendment of the District election law so as to establish the office of Delegate in the House of Representatives from the District of Columbia, and to provide for his election by the registered voters here. This matter is entirely separate from any home rule proposal.

The Delegate's function and authority in Congress will be comparable to that of the former Delegates from the territories such as Hawaii and Alaska, and of the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

I am confident that once the office of Delegate is established and the elected Delegate installed, we in Congress will find the Delegate will serve a useful and needed function, to the Members of Congress, to the citizens of the District of Columbia, and to the country as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal for Delegate has great merit. There is already a substantial interested electorate here, but under the present election laws its members can exercise their franchise only at 4-year intervals in presidential election years. The Delegate would be elected every 2 years, and I believe that the resulting increased frequency in the use of the electoral system here will add vitality and maturity to the District electorate, and produce a better overall working arrangement for the conduct of affairs affecting the citizens of Washington.

Other changes will be required in the present framework of the District of Columbia election law, not only so as to provide for the Delegate's election, but also to improve the nature and conduct of the quadrennial election operations under the present law.

Earlier today the gentleman from Maryland, Congressman Mathias, introduced H.R. 11822, a bill to amend and extend the District of Columbia Election Act and for other purposes. I had intended to introduce an identical bill for these purposes at the same time, but was delayed in doing so due to the pressure of other business in the House. I wish to make it clear, however, that I want to be considered a cosponsor of Mr. Mathias' bill, and that I believe that the subject matter of this bill will warrant the attention of the House early in the next session.

Mr. Speaker, I have had a section-by-section analysis of this bill prepared, and without objection I shall insert it at this point in the Record:

Section-by-Section Analysis of H.R. 11822, the District of Columbia Election Extension Act

(Introduced by Mr. Mathias, October 22, 1965, and referred to the House Committee on the District of Columbia)

SECTION 1

Section 1 states the title of the act.

SECTION 2

Section 2 provides for permanent registration of voters in the District of Columbia. It changes the existing system of registration, which now requires each person to register again every 4 years. The third section of this bill provides for the election of a Delegate to Congress every 2 years, and this speedup in the election cycle will make a permanent registration system workable here.

Subsection (a) of this section 2 provides for automatic removal of the names of people who have failed to vote in two successive general elections and who have not re-registered, and continues the provision of existing law which charges the Board of Elections with the duty to keep the registry "accurate and current." Subsection (b) puts the permanent system of registration into effect at once and provides that people who were registered at the close of the polls in November 1964 and who continue to live in their precinct will not have to re-register to vote in 1966 elections.

Subsection (c) provides for longer periods of registration than under the present law and shortens to 30 days (from the present 45 days) the period before each election in which the registration office is closed. It also broadens slightly the Board of Elections' power to issue regulations with regard to times and places of registration.

SECTION 3

Section 3 establishes the right of the people of the District of Columbia to be represented by a Delegate in the House of Representatives. The Delegate will have a seat in the House Chamber with the right of debate but not of voting. His term would be for 2 years, along with the Members of Congress. The committees to which he would be assigned would be determined by the House under its rulemaking power. The District Delegate must be at least 25 years old and have lived in the District for at least 3 years, and must continue to live in the District during his term of office. He must be a qualified elector under District law.

Subsection (b) of section 3 provides that the District Delegate shall be elected by the District of Columbia voters in a general election, in the usual case after first winning a primary election. The existing District of Columbia Election Act as amended by this act would govern the election of the Delegate. Subsection (c) provides that the candidate for a primary election for Delegate is to be nominated by a petition containing at least 500 signatures of registered voters of the same political party as the nominee, and accompanied by a filing fee of $200. The section also provides that the primary election of candidates for Delegate will, as in the case of existing District of Columbia law, be by a closed primary, but that the general election of the Delegate will be an open election which will permit voters to cross party lines. Subsection (d) provides that the timing of the primary and general elections of Delegates will coincide, in presidential election years, with the May primaries and the November general elections under existing law. The Delegate would be elected every 2 years, of course, and in nonpresidential election years the Delegate would also be chosen by a May primary and a November general election.

Subsection (e) provides for filling vacancies in the office of Delegate, and also in the position of candidate for Delegate in the event that a candidate wins in a May primary but dies or resigns before the general election in November. In the latter case the local political party committee selects the successor. If a vacancy occurs in the office of a Delegate who has already been elected, the Board of Elections can hold a special election to fill the vacancy, except toward the end of a term of Congress.

SECTION 4

This section makes a series of changes in existing statutes relating to the operation of the Congress, to put the Delegate from the District of Columbia into a position or status in the House of Representatives essentially comparable to that formerly held by the Delegates from Hawaii and Alaska, and presently held by the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico. Most of these changes in law are required simply because the present laws refer to Delegates "from the territories." Since the District of Columbia is not a territory, these changes are required.

As a result of the enactment of these 10 subsections, the Delegate from the District of Columbia would be elected on the same election day as Members of Congress (subsec. [a]); he would receive the same annual salary as a Member of Congress or Resident Commissioner—$30,000 (subsec. [b]); and when elected to fill an unexpired term, his salary would begin with the date of his election and not with the date on which the vacancy occurred (subsec. [c]).

Similarly, the provisions of law relating to the payment of unpaid salaries in the event of the death of a Member of Congress during his term of office are made applicable to the District Delegate (subsec. [d]), and the privileges of participating in the retirement benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act which are applicable to Members of Congress are made applicable to the District Delegate (subsec. [e]).

In the same way, subsection (f) makes applicable to the District Delegate, and to his office, the provisions of law relating to allowances for stationery, telephones, the hiring of clerical help, and the furnishing of office equipment which now apply to Members of Congress and to the Resident Commissioner. The statutory provisions for congressional office space are also made applicable to the District Delegate (subsec. [g]).

The provisions of Federal criminal law which relate to Members of Congress, to their activities, and to their elections, are also made applicable to the District Delegate. Thus, the Federal Corrupt Practices Act is made applicable to the Delegate's position (subsec. [h]), as are also the provisions of law making it a Federal crime to intimidate voters (subsec. [i]), as well as those punishing the use by Federal employees of influence or authority to interfere with elections (subsec. [j]).

Subsection (k) contains the changes required in existing law to assure that appointment of candidates to the armed services academies from the District would be made by the elected Delegate, rather than by the appointed Commissioners.

SECTION 5

This section contains the definitions which are used throughout the bill, and also a number of miscellaneous provisions which will be important in administering the law. Subsection (a) contains the definitions. Subsection (b) provides that in all elections in the District the polls will be open from 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. (present law is 8 till 8.).

Subsection (c) clarifies the power of the Board of Elections to issue regulations to set deadlines where not already set by the statute, but provides that the deadlines must be published at least 30 days before they take effect. Subsection (d) simply brings the provision of the existing election law up to date with respect to the current name of the former municipal court. Subsection (e) amends the law so as to give the Board of Elections authority to accept initially the signatures on duly filed nominating petitions, but sets up a mechanism by which the petitions can be timely challenged and the challenges resolved by the Board of Elections.

Subsection (f) amends the existing law slightly to clarify the authority of the Elections Board to issue regulations to accept some ballots which have been cast outside the precinct in which the registrant lived—as, for example, in the case of a person who was registered in one precinct but on election day is in a hospital in another precinct and is voting as a "shut-in."

Subparagraph (g) changes the system of law slightly so as to require that only one of the officials in the polling place will be needed to assist an illiterate or handicapped voter to vote his ballot, instead of two officials as is now required. The change would also provide that the voter can, if he so desires, have a second official to assist him in the voting process.

Subsections (h) and (i) will shorten and simplify the party primary ballots under the 1955 Election Act, by eliminating the election of alternates to the various party officials. The party primary ballots have been widely criticized because of their length and complexity. The elimination of the election of alternate officials will substantially shorten the ballots in a number of cases. At the same time, the alternates can, of course, be selected by the parties themselves, by caucus or other means not involving the use of the citywide primary election machinery. The party officials themselves (national committeemen and women, delegates to the presidential nominating conventions and, when designated by the parties, members and officials of the local party committees) would continue to be elected by ballots under the present election law.

Subsection (j) amends the existing law to make it clear that the party primary ballots may contain presidential preference questions to be answered by the voter (if the party committee so desires and presidential and vice-presidential candidates do not object). The right to have such questions on the ballot under the present law has been sharply disputed ever since the act passed in 1955, and a 1964 court decision cast a further cloud on the authority of the Board of Elections to permit presidential preference questions under existing law. With this amendment, these presidential preference questions would replace the so-called party questions. These party questions have been criticized as diluting the powers of the elected party officials to formulate party policies, and also because the questions add further to the length of the ballot.

Subsection (k) would remove an ambiguity in existing election law by establishing a clear deadline for filing the designations of the offices of local party committees to be filled by the party primary elections.

Under the existing election law each candidate on the ballot has the right to have one watcher at each polling place. Subsection (l) would change this arrangement slightly in the light of the length of the party primary ballots (in the 1964 election, for instance, there were over 250 candidates on the party ballots), to give the Board of Elections authority to issue regulations reasonably limiting the number of watchers in each voting place, and reasonably to regulate the scope of the watchers' activities, while at the same time preserving their rights to perform their important duties.

Subsection (m) would give the Board of Elections clear authority to declare that duly nominated and unopposed candidates for office are elected without opposition. The fact that they have been so elected would appear on the ballot, together with the names of all the candidates who are opposed and whose election is to be determined by the voters. This change will further simplify and shorten ballot forms, without in any way diminishing the effectiveness of the elections under the act.

Subsection (n) changes the method of compensation of the members of the three-man Board of Elections. They are now paid $25 per day while performing their duties. With the enactment of this act there will be two elections in every even-numbered year, with occasional special elections to be expected from time to time, thus substantially increasing the activities of the Board of Elections. The amount of time spent by Board members in an election year is substantial, and the changeover to a modest, fixed annual compensation is desirable and appropriate under all the circumstances.

Subsection (o) amends the law so as to give the candidates a period of 30 days after each election in order to complete and file their financial reports. At present they have only 10 days in which to perform this work, a period which is insufficient and unworkable.

Subsection (p) tightens up the enforcement provisions of the present law so as to make it clear that any false statement by a registrant with respect to qualifications for voting will render him subject to penalty, whereas the present act limits the applicability of the penal provision to false statements as to the registrant's residence or voting privileges outside the District. The bill also makes the enforcement provisions of the act applicable to the restrictions on contributions and requirements for reporting expenditures.

Subsections (q) and (r) amend the title, and the first section of the existing law, so as to reflect the fact that the act provides for the election of the Delegate to the House of Representatives in addition to the other officials elected under the existing law.

Subsection (s) makes it clear that all the provisions of the act become effective on the date of approval, except the provision which reactivates the registration of voters, and which would take effect 30 days after the act is approved.

The Case of Edward Partin, a Government Witness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have just completed the reading and study of the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] earlier today. I must commend my friend and colleague for bringing these facts, unknown to me, to the attention of the House.

It is difficult for me to comprehend the reason and extent of the action of the Justice Department in the case of Edward Partin, a Government witness. Certainly, the seriousness of these charges made by the gentleman from Illinois concerning the arrest records and the favored treatment of Partin by the Justice Department should be a matter of interest to every Member of Congress. It, undoubtedly, gives emphasis to the action of the House Committee on the Judiciary to look into the matter of procedure by our Justice Department.

I am not concerned with the particular defendant in this case. I question only the reliability of the testimony of the witness, Partin.

Assuming that my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, is correct in his assertion before the House, then such witnesses could be used to either convict or acquit a wrongdoer. Or in a more reprehensible sense, a witness so motivated could be used as an instrument to convict one entirely innocent of charges.

Our great judicial system depends on availability of witnesses, this I must admit. However, the reliability of those available to testify is of equal importance.

Observations on the 1st Session of the 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the record of the 1st session of the 89th Congress is spotty. Along with the enactment of some meritorious and needed legislation, the Congress often acted hastily, blindly, and indiscriminately.

The majority leader of the Senate, Mr. MANSFIELD, of Montana, has confessed serious deficiencies in the laws enacted by the Congress this year. He has announced that the 2d session of the 89th Congress should "spend less time on new legislation and more time correcting oversights in legislation we have just passed." He has said that the Congress "must tighten up the hasty enactments" and must eliminate from the laws of the session just ended "a number of gaps and any number of rough edges, overextensions and overlaps."

The Mansfield confession should be good for the soul of the American people. It should convince them that one-party government does not serve them well.

One conclusion to be drawn from the 1st session of the 89th Congress is that whenever the party that holds possession of the executive branch of the National Government also enjoys overwhelming dominance in the Congress, the Congress becomes a satellite of the President.

The failure of the Congress to act as a deliberative body, coequal with the Executive, is the most striking feature of this past session. Until the closing days of the session, it rubberstamped the proposals of the White House in far too many instances.

The members of the American Political Science Association who gathered in Washington in early September of this year felt that the legislative initiative has passed irretrievably to the executive branch. One of the experts at that convention, Lewis A. Dexter, said that the Congress will come to have the same importance in the American system of government as the House of Lords has in the British, particularly if several future Presidents resemble Lyndon Johnson.

Eric Sevareid wrote:

> We know of a number of Congressmen who would be very grateful to learn what they have really done this year.

He also found that the Congress has so often acted under "a curious kind of intimidation" that the "once-exalted title of Senator or Representative has lost much of its prestige."

One of the leading newspapers in the home State of the Vice President summed it up this way:

> Anyone following the daily deliberations of the House of Representatives must be struck by the ruthlessness with which the Democratic majority of so-called liberals is flexing its muscles. It is not, in fact, a deliberative body. Representative government is in a sad and critical state.

Columnist Ted Lewis said:

> The presidential image of a miracle producer of new laws makes the legislative branch of Government appear to be a creature of the executive branch.

The Chicago Tribune, in an editorial entitled "Legislating by Scoop Shovel," said:

> It would take a truck scale to weigh the legislation forwarded by the White House and automatically approved, most of it wasteful, much of it unnecessary, and all of it putting the individual in the grip of the Federal vise.
>
> He [the President] has been legislating everything and anything, and, with two-thirds majorities in either Chamber, he has a Congress of robots that is totally compliant.

The Knoxville Journal editorialized:

> Any Congress which voluntarily yields its right to perform as a coequal part of the Federal Establishment, as this one has, is a continuing threat to the Nation.

It is one thing for a Congress to adopt Presidential proposals after thorough deliberation and adequate discussion. It is quite another thing for a Congress to rush through such proposals without careful scrutiny and without reasonable debate. No Congress that performed its constitutional duty would do the slipshod job of which Senator MANSFIELD indicted the present Congress when he said that it must now devote most of its effort to tightening up "its hasty enactments."

EXAMPLES OF RUBBERSTAMPING BY THE CONGRESS

On many important bills the House of Representatives acted without adequate consideration, without full hearings in committee, and without sufficient debate on the floor.

The arts and humanities bill was railroaded through the Committee on Education and Labor after about 15 minutes of consideration. Even a motion by the minority that the bill be read was summarily rejected by the majority. When the committee met to act on the bill, the members were presented for the first time with a new committee print, dated the same day, containing a number of significant amendments which the minority members had never seen before. Thereafter, several additional amendments, which the Republican members had never seen, were quickly adopted in committee, and the bill was reported with great haste.

The Education and Labor Committee made virtually no change in the administration bill to provide assistance for elementary and secondary education, despite vigorous bipartisan complaints about the formula for distributing Federal funds contained in the bill. On the floor, at least 10 of 25 amendments were rejected without discussion due to the gag-rule limitation on debate.

As this far-reaching legislation was being considered by the House of Representatives, Democratic Congresswoman GREEN, of Oregon, took the floor to protest, "Today it seems to me we have in the House a determined effort to silence those who are in disagreement."

So little was the elementary and secondary education bill studied before floor action that two of the best informed supporters of the measure gave to the House contradictory explanations of its application to nonpublic schools.

The higher education bill was reported out of the Education and Labor Committee in great haste, apparently at the command of the White House. The Wall Street Journal noted that the committee "under prodding from an impatient White House deliberated for all of 20 minutes." Democratic Congressman PUCINSKI, of Illinois, called the bill's handling "a mockery of the legislative process."

Hearings on the administration's original highway beautification proposals were held by the Committee on Public Works on July 20, 21, and 22. These hearings were adjourned with the understanding that the complex proposals should be studied further and acted upon early next year. Without warning, the hearings were reopened on September 3 and 7, while the committee and its staff were absorbed with the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill. The act was debated and passed by the House on October 7, with the final vote being tallied well after midnight. At one point in the proceedings the House voted 121 to 84 to allow but 8 minutes of debate on 5 separate amendments.

Regarding the very controversial bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, the Democratic majority of the Committee on Education and Labor rejected all attempts by Republican members to amend the bill so as to provide some basic protections for rank-and-file employees compelled to join unions in order to hold their jobs. Because of the restrictive rule under which the bill was considered by the House, amendments which would permit compulsory union membership agreements only if the unions involved refrained from racial and religious discrimination, refrained from using union funds for political purposes, and refrained from denying employees rights guaranteed them by Federal law were rejected as not germane. Other amendments offered, on which the House was not permitted to vote, were designed to insure that unions securing compulsory membership agreements truly represented a majority as demonstrated by winning an NLRB election, to protect the religious liberty of employees whose religious beliefs clash with compulsory union membership, and to insure that employees would be protected from compulsion to join a Communist-controlled union.

The Washington Post commented:

> Several important questions were raised in the House debate and left unanswered.

The Democratic majority rammed through a bill repealing section 14(b) which the Post said "scarcely qualifies as well-rounded legislation in the national interest."

On the important bill to prohibit discrimination in employment and union membership, only the briefest of hearings were held by the Committee on Education and Labor. These hearings contained no testimony based on experience under the 1964 Civil Rights Act and were followed almost immediately by a subcommittee meeting which reported the bill favorably. An hour later the full committee met and reported the bill to the House. No amendments were offered because none of the minority members had any opportunity to study the long and complex measure and analyze even its theoretical weaknesses. This bill was not acted on by the House.

The percentages allocated to the various categories of immigrants in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 were not discussed either in the Judiciary Committee or on the floor.

On the voting rights bill, the administration forces on the Judiciary Committee methodically rejected all significant amendments offered by Republicans. On the floor of the House the same general attitude prevailed. With the exception of the Cramer amendment to prevent election irregularities, any significant amendment offered by a Republican was blindly voted down.

GAPS AND OVERLAPS

The defects in the legislation enacted during the session of Congress just ended will come to light as the bills are put into effect. Problems of duplication and overlap will be encountered.

The Appalachia bill overlaps several existing Federal-aid programs, notably in the fields of highway construction and public health.

The public works and redevelopment bill, providing aid to so-called depressed areas, overlaps the Appalachia bill.

The expanded poverty program overlaps the elementary and secondary school aid bill, which is ostensibly aimed at children from low-income families, as well as vocational education and public assistance programs.

The Manpower Development and Training Act overlaps the poverty program.

One unfortunate oversight in the laws of the session can be cited to illustrate the results of hasty and ill-considered congressional action. By increasing social security payments, the Congress inadvertently caused the termination or reduction of the pensions of tens of thousands of veterans. The added social security payment meant a reduction of the income of these veterans.

WEAKENING OF CHECKS ON EXECUTIVE BRANCH

One-party domination of the legislative and executive branches weakens the constitutional system of checks and balances. The subservient Congress which it produces fails to exercise the restraint which it should over the executive branch. The majority leader of the Senate recognizes that such is the case when he urges the Congress now to undertake its neglected function of legislative oversight over executive agencies.

The executive branch unchecked is prone to carelessness about legal restraints and about the public interest. This carelessness can descend to the level of arrogance in some instances.

Arrogance is a strong word, but there is no other word for the submission to the Senate of the nomination of Francis X. Morrissey to the Federal judiciary nor for the efforts to bull that nomination through the Senate. The American Bar Association and the Massachusetts Bar Association pronounced this nominee unfit for the post. A representative of the American Bar Association testified on the Morrissey nomination:

> From the standpoint of legal training, legal experience, and legal ability, we have not had any case where these factors were so lacking.

There is no word but arrogance for the withholding of Federal funds from the city of Chicago in defiance of the procedures established by Congress.

There is no word but arrogance for procedures in the Congress that silence dissent and preclude careful consideration of legislation.

There is no word but arrogance for opposition to freedom of information legislation which would permit the public to know what is going on in the Government which it pays for. The Freedom of Information Committee of Sigma Delta Chi, the national society of journalists, in its annual report, accused the administration of seeking to "warp the proposed Federal Public Records legislation into an almost unlimited authority for the President to establish broader secrecy practices." The committee also indicted the administration for "the secrecy on the names of Post Office Department employees hired in the summer program in 1965; the Defense Department continues the October 1962, Sylvester directive which requires military and civilian personnel to report all contacts with the press to Sylvester's office; the increased centralization of information releases at the White House, and the increasing sensitivity over leaks of information that have no connection with national security problems; the basic problem of balancing national security interests and freedom for the press in connection with Vietnam and the Dominican Republic."

There is no word but arrogance for the behavior of administration spokesmen, including the President and the Vice President, when they pointedly imply that the consideration which the problems of a locality receives in Washington will depend on whether its local officials are Republicans or Democrats. It is shocking to learn that responsible national officials would stoop to threaten any community with reprisals if its citizens choose officials who are not of the administration's party.

The New York Times reacted with indignation to the threat when it was made in New York City. Its editorial commented:

> This is a remarkable indictment of the Johnson administration. It suggests, for example, that Sargent Shriver, the head of the antipoverty program and a Democrat,

would be less sympathetic and helpful to New York if its mayor were a Republican. It makes the same innuendo about the officials who run the housing, education, mass transit, antipollution, and other programs in which New York has a vital interest. It suggests that President Johnson, Vice President HUMPHREY, and Senator KENNEDY himself would not be so helpful to the mayor of the Nation's largest city if he were of a political faith different from theirs.

FISCAL EXCESSES

The carelessness of a Congress overwhelmingly controlled by the President's party is particularly manifested in big spending. This session of Congress has set a new record in appropriations not approached since the Second World War. The appropriation of $119.3 billion this year is $36 billion more than was appropriated by the last session of Congress during the Eisenhower administration. This staggering figure of almost $120 billion does not include additional backdoor spending of $7 billion made possible by the Congress this year. Nor does it include perhaps $5 to $7 billion needed for the war in Vietnam, a request which the administration is holding back until next January.

The Congress failed to exercise any restraint on reckless spending. The reduction of administration requests for appropriations by $2.4 billion is more apparent than real. The funds denied have only been deferred until 1966.

The following table shows the amount appropriated by Congress in each session since 1960. It reflects an increase of $36 billion, or 43 percent, since 1960. Of this $36 billion increase, only $8.3 billion is for defense:

[In billions]

Session	Appropriations	Change from preceding year
86th Cong.: 2d (1960)	$83.8	
87th Cong.:		
1st (1961)	95.8	+$12.0
2d (1962)	102.3	+6.5
88th Cong.:		
1st (1963)	102.6	+.3
2d (1964)	106.0	+3.4
89th Cong.: 1st (1965)	119.3	+13.3

CONSTRUCTIVE REPUBLICAN RECORD

On February 3, 1965, the Republican leadership of the House of Representatives said:

> House Republicans have a major responsibility as the Representatives of approximately 43 percent of the electorate who voted for a Republican House of Representatives in 1964. That duty, as we conceive it, is to exert whatever influence we can to guide the Nation toward the goals of freedom, security, peace, and well-being with fiscal responsibility.
>
> We cannot accept the statement, "The duty of the opposition party is to oppose." This is too narrow and too negative a formulation of our responsibility.
>
> We must do more than respond to the initiatives of the administration. We must take the initiative ourselves in two ways.
>
> First, we must offer alternative measures to cope with national problems when the administration's proposals are unwise. This we are doing, for example, in the matter of lightening the burden of the costs of health care for older people.
>
> Second, we must press for action to deal with the problems to which the administration is blind or indifferent.

In this spirit the Republican Members of the House of Representatives have discharged their responsibility this year. Their record is impressive.

REPUBLICAN ALTERNATIVES

For six of the major bills proposed by the administration and passed in this session, there were alternative proposals supported by a majority of the House Republicans. In every case the Republican alternative dealt more adequately with the problem without unnecessary extension of Federal power.

VOTING RIGHTS

The administration's bill on voting rights—H.R. 6400—as originally introduced, provided a remedy for discrimination only in six Southern States and Alaska and in 37 counties in certain other States, including one county each in Arizona, Idaho, and Maine. These strange results were achieved by language which limited the application of the bill to places which used literacy tests or tests of moral character for voters and in which fewer than 50 percent of the voting-age population voted in the 1964 election.

Republican House Members and Republican Senators introduced voting rights legislation before the administration got around to deciding to present a bill.

The basic difference between the administration proposal and the major Republican alternative, the Ford-McCulloch bill—H.R. 7896—lay in the fact that the Republican bill provided a remedy for unconstitutional discrimination wherever it occurs and regardless of the device used to achieve discrimination.

The administration bill wiped out literacy and other tests wherever fewer than 50 percent of the voting age population voted in 1964. The Ford-McCulloch bill did not disturb nondiscriminatory qualifications for voting established by States.

The administration bill required Federal court approval of any new voting laws passed by the States to which it applied. The Ford-McCulloch bill did not restrict State authority to enact new nondiscriminatory voting laws.

The administration bill, as originally introduced, approved of the poll tax, providing that Federal examiners would collect it in areas in which they operated to register voters. The Ford-McCulloch bill directed the Attorney General to initiate a speedy court test of the constitutionality of the poll tax.

MEDICARE

The medicare bill, included in the Social Security Amendments of 1965, is an amalgamation of the administration proposal and a Republican alternative offered by Representative JOHN BYRNES, of Wisconsin—H.R. 7057.

In contrast to the bill originally proposed by the administration early in the session, the Byrnes bill provided a system of insurance for the elderly—first, covering all medical expenses, not just hospitalization; second, offering voluntary rather than compulsory coverage; and third, financed by a combination of general tax revenues and premium payments by the insured, avoiding the regressive social security tax.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL AID

The administration's bill to aid elementary and secondary schools—H.R. 2362—presented as a measure to assist poverty stricken children, is in fact the first general aid to primary and secondary schools passed by the Congress. Under this bill, $2.1 million will be granted by the Federal Government to Westchester County, the wealthiest in New York State, for the education of children from poor families. Sunflower County, Miss., with median family income only one-fifth that of Westchester County, will receive only $745,000 for the education of an equal number of children from poor families.

Republicans sought to make it a bill which would do what it professed to do: aid poor children without undue Federal control of State, local, and private schools.

The Republican effort was directed toward first, channeling Federal funds only into areas of need within each State; second, recognizing differences in financial ability and need among States; third, concentrating the program upon the needs of deprived children; and fourth, reducing the discretionary authority of the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

A Republican approach to the problem of expanding and improving elementary and secondary schools was incorporated in H.R. 6349, offered by Representatives WILLIAM AYRES, of Ohio, and THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri, and others. This bill relied chiefly on the device of tax credits for individuals who pay for schools through State and local taxes directly or indirectly as well as for those who incur expenses for students in higher education. This bill would have diverted $3 to $5 billion annually from the Federal Treasury and made it available for additional support for education at the State and local level.

In addition, H.R. 6349 provided $300 million annually to the States for the education of deprived children aged 3 to 7. Unlike Project Head Start under the poverty program, which provides uneven summer schooling for some deprived children, this bill proposed a systematic national effort to give preschool education to children who need it.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

The administration bill—S. 3—which became law, provided for an Appalachian Regional Commission with authority in 360 counties in 10 States to plan the expenditure of funds for various public works, particularly highway construction, in a region that includes many severely depressed areas.

The Republican alternative, offered by Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, of Florida—H.R. 4466—would have extended Federal assistance to all economically depressed areas throughout the Nation instead of to a single region. Unlike the administration bill, which provides aid to prosperous as well as depressed areas in the region to which it applies, the Cramer bill proposed to limit aid to places suffering economic distress and high unemployment.

The Public Works and Development Act of 1965—Public Law 89-136—is, like the Cramer bill, a measure intended to assist depressed areas throughout the Nation. It raises serious problems of duplication and conflict with the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

CABINET DEPARTMENT DEALING WITH URBAN AFFAIRS

The administration bill establishing a new Cabinet agency, the Department of Housing and Community Affairs—H.R. 6927—was defective in many respects. It did no more than confer a more prestigious title on certain existing agencies. It brought together in the new Department less than one-third of the Federal Government's housing activities and only a minor fraction of Federal activities and funds aimed at assisting States and municipalities to solve the problems of metropolitan areas. As passed by the House of Representatives, it made no provision for the continued existence of the Federal Housing Administration, a defect which Republicans sought to correct and which was finally remedied in conference.

The Republican alternative, offered by Mrs. DWYER, of New Jersey—H.R. 5173—and several other Republicans, would have created an agency in the Executive Office of the President to deal with metropolitan area problems. This agency would have been a center of coordination and information for all Federal programs and activities relating to urban areas.

HOUSING

The administration's housing bill—H.R. 5840—as originally presented, offered a scheme of rent supplements for families whose incomes were above the levels set for public housing tenants. Under this plan, some families with an income of more than $11,000 in some places would be eligible to have a part of their rent paid by the Federal Government. Beyond this, the bill provided largely for a continuance of existing Federal housing programs.

A Republican substitute, offered by Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey—H.R. 9501—sought to modify existing housing policy in several important respects:

First, by giving residential redevelopment in urban renewal a higher priority;

Second, by stimulating rehabilitation of existing sound housing;

Third, by utilizing existing privately owned rental housing for low-income tenants;

Fourth, by lower interest rates on loans for college housing and housing for the elderly; and

Fifth, by providing new FHA mortgage financing for veterans.

Many of the features of the Widnall bill were incorporated in the measure which was enacted.

REPUBLICAN IMPACT ON LEGISLATION

In spite of the fact that Republicans in this Congress hold only one-third of the seats, there were occasions when the Republican minority exerted an important influence on legislation.

A 7-percent increase in social security benefits was approved—a proposal which Republicans made in 1964, but which was voted down in the last Congress by Democrats acting on White House orders.

The repeal of Federal excise taxes—a step which Republicans have advocated for many years and which was called for in the Republican platform of 1964—was accomplished in this session. In 1964, a Republican proposal to repeal retail excise taxes was defeated by Democratic votes.

Other changes made in the social security system were influenced by Republican initiatives and conform to longstanding Republican policy. One was the liberalization of the earnings limitation beyond which elderly people become ineligible to collect their social security benefits. The other was the liberalization of coverage requirements for people over the age of 72 in order to qualify for benefits.

Similarly, Republicans took the lead in advocating changes in tax policy to lighten the burden of medical expenses. The Congress repealed maximum limitations on income tax deductions for medical care insurance and authorized a deduction of one-half the cost of medical care insurance up to $150.

The medicare bill passed by the Congress incorporates in its provisions much of the Republican bill offered by Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin. This bill is not limited to hospital care as the administration recommended. In its final version it covers doctors' bills and other medical costs in provisions borrowed from the Byrnes bill.

The Housing Act passed by Congress contains six significant features from the Republican substitute proposed by Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey:

First, low-income private housing: This new program will provide immediate relief to low-income families who have been living in substandard housing in those areas where there is a long waiting list for public housing. It will use any adequate existing housing on a voluntary basis at a cost not exceeding present public housing rental levels, without the gigantic expense of constructing new public housing units.

Second, veterans housing program: The first major veterans' benefits legislation affecting so-called cold war veterans ever to be enacted by the Congress, this will also apply to an estimated 21 million veterans who have failed to use or qualify for VA home loan benefits. Comprehensive benefits include no down payments for homes costing up to $15,000, with as little as $500 down on a $20,000 home.

Third, low-interest-rate college housing: Conferees accepted this proposal, despite the firm opposition of the Johnson administration. It will provide $1.2 billion in lower rent college housing, avoiding an expensive Federal grant program.

Fourth, low interest elderly housing: To prevent the phasing out of a highly successful program administered by churches and other nonprofit organizations, a program with rents at a level they can afford will be available to elderly people of low income.

Fifth, compensation for condemnees: This provides, for the first time, prompt and equitable compensation for homeowners and small businessmen displaced by urban renewal and other housing programs.

Sixth, rehabilitation loan program: Sponsored by Republicans in the 1964 Housing Act, the low-interest loan program for tenants, homeowners, and small businessmen in urban renewal areas received a $400 million authorization. This was not requested by the administration.

A notable improvement in the housing bill was made with the adoption of an amendment offered by Representative JOHN C. KUNKEL, of Pennsylvania, aiding homeowners who became unemployed because of the closing of Federal installations. It placed a moratorium on FHA-insured loan payments of such persons and authorized the Secretary of Defense to acquire their properties for FHA disposal when the owners were unable to dispose of them on reasonable terms.

The Voting Rights Act as passed contains at least two provisions of Republican origin. One was the clean elections provision proposed by Representative WILLIAM CRAMER, of Florida, inserted in the bill over the opposition of a majority of the Democrats in the House of Representatives. The bill as finally passed dealt with the question of the poll tax by directing the Attorney General to secure a speedy court test of the constitutionality of the tax—the approach used in the Ford-McCulloch bill.

The immigration bill contains a ceiling on immigrants from the Western Hemisphere because of Republican effort. Because of opposition from the White House and the State Department, an amendment to bring such immigration under control presented by Representative CLARK MACGREGOR, of Minnesota, was voted down by Democrats in the House. This provision prevailed in the Senate, however, and was incorporated in the final version of the law.

Republican initiative and solid Republican support saved for State Governors some power of veto over projects under the poverty program within their States in opposition to the effort of most Democrats to eliminate any vestige of State control over this program.

Republican initiative and solid Republican support led to the denial of funds for the rent supplement program under the Housing Act.

Republican initiative and solid Republican support led to the denial of funds for a federally directed National Teacher Corps.

On the other hand, an initial Republican success—the prohibition of the use of agricultural funds for aid to Nasser, voted by the House at the motion of Representative ROBERT MICHEL, of Illinois, on January 26—was reversed under severe administration pressure on February 8.

REPUBLICAN INFLUENCE ON EXECUTIVE ACTION

In some instances the policy of the President and other executive agencies responded to Republican proposals.

On April 30, the House Republican leadership proposed the creation of an inter-American police force to restore peace and order in the Dominican Republic. On May 3, the administration offered this proposal to the Organization of American States.

The appropriation of an additional $700 million for defense as a means of emphasizing national unity and national resolve in the face of Communist aggression on two continents was suggested by the minority floor leader at a White House Conference on Vietnam problems. The administration subsequently requested the increased appropriation. It was granted with the unanimous support of Republican Members of both House and Senate.

Since mid-1963, Republicans in Congress have been urging the administration to take the lead in convening an international monetary conference to deal with the urgent balance-of-payments problem. In 1965, the urging was renewed by Representative Robert Ellsworth, of Kansas, and by the joint Republican leadership on July 1. On July 10, Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Fowler, announced that the U.S. Government would issue a call for such a conference.

OTHER NOTEWORTHY REPUBLICAN INITIATIVES

Representative Melvin R. Laird, of Wisconsin, and Representative Glenard Lipscomb, of California, performed important service in bringing to public attention the inadequacy of the administration's defense budget for the prosecution of the war in Vietnam. In order to give the appearance of holding Federal expenditure below the level of $100 billion in the fiscal year and to leave room for Great Society legislation, the administration devised its defense budget on guidelines set in 1963, which did not take account of the involvement of 150,000 American troops in a shooting war in Asia. The result, as the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee under Senator Stennis has found, is a dangerous drain on personnel, equipment, and ammunition in other parts of the world.

Representative H. R. Gross, of Iowa, served as the public conscience, along with Senator John Williams, of Delaware, in endeavoring to raise the ethical standards of the administration with special attention to the treatment given Otto Otepka and the inadequately explored aspects of the Bobby Baker case.

Representative Paul Findley and his task force on NATO and the Atlantic Community issued a thoughtful report on means of strengthening the Atlantic Alliance and improving the strained relations of the United States with France after a study trip to Paris.

Representative Findley, along with Representative Ralph Harvey, of Indiana, also took the lead in an unsuccessful fight against the administration on the sugar bill in an effort to recapture for the taxpayers of the United States a part of the excess profit which foreign sugar producers derive from sales in this country because Government action maintains a domestic price more than double the price in the world market.

Representative Robert J. Corbett, of Pennsylvania, fought unsuccessfully to bring about an adjustment of the pay of Federal employees to provide full comparability with pay scales in private industry. Though full comparability is given lipservice by the administration, it is opposed to putting this principle in practice.

Representative Ancher Nelsen, of Minnesota, continued his efforts to protect Federal employees from illegal political pressures imposed by the administration, particularly in the matter of forced contributions to Democratic fund raising events.

Representative Ross Adair, of Indiana, sought vainly to secure for the servicemen fighting in Vietnam educational benefits similar to those granted to the veterans of the Second World War and Korea.

Representative William S. Mailliard, of California, sought with limited success to secure legislative action to reinvigorate the merchant shipping of the United States.

REPUBLICAN SOLIDITY

Republican ranks in the House of Representatives held fast on important votes throughout the session. On the 26 rollcall votes in which a party position was formulated by the House Republican policy committee headed by Representative John Rhodes, of Arizona, 87 percent of the votes cast by Republican Members were in support of the party position and only 13 percent in opposition.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PARTIES

During this past session of the Congress, there were 93 rollcall votes on which a majority of the Republican Members of the House voted in opposition to a majority of the Democrats. On these votes in the aggregate, 81.4 percent of the Republican votes were on the side of the majority of their party and 80.2 percent of the Democratic votes were in agreement with the majority of their party. These 93 votes reveal some significant differences between Republicans and Democrats.

The general conclusions to be drawn from these votes is a Republican preference for a more discriminating approach to national problems. Republicans opposed and sought to modify the loosely drawn, ambiguous, blank check approach of the Democratic majority.

Republicans showed themselves more concerned than most Democrats about such things as prudent use of tax dollars, the danger of inflation fired by big increases in Government spending and unending deficits, the stifling of State, local, and private initiative by the spread of an overweening Central Government, the peril of runaway bureaucracy, and the application of the commonsense principles of good management in Federal programs.

For all of these reasons, a majority of Republicans in the House of Representatives, in contrast to a majority of the Democrats, voted against such things as—

Doubling the authorization for the poverty program at a time when loose administration prompted the Committee on Education and Labor to launch a full investigation of the program;

A rent supplement program whereby taxpayers would help to pay the rent of families earning in some areas more than $8,000 a year and possessing assets of as much as $25,000;

A foreign aid program of $3.2 billion which all agree needs drastic overhauling;

A farm bill which will mean that Government payments in 1966 will equal one-third of realized net farm income but will not solve the farm problem;

A Public Works and Redevelopment Act modeled after the discredited Area Redevelopment Act and the Advanced Public Works Act; and

A Highway Beautification Act rushed through the House without adequate deliberation.

Republican Members even voted against a pay raise for themselves, again unlike a majority of the Democrats.

In order to provide a more consistent and vigorous foreign policy, Republicans unsuccessfully attempted to place restrictions of foreign aid funds so that the American taxpayer would not be financing anti-American regimes or assisting nations that are helping North Vietnam in the war in which 150,000 American fighting men are now engaged. For these reasons most Republicans supported a prohibition against American aid to nations engaged in supplying North Vietnam and against further shipment of agricultural commodities to Egypt's Nasser and Indonesia's Sukarno.

In order to preserve the integrity of State and local governments, most Republicans sought to—

Retain the veto power of State Governors over poverty program projects;

Maintain the power of the States to forbid compulsory unionism;

Permit the people of each State to decide the basis of representation in one house of their State legislature;

Defeat appropriations for a federally controlled National Teacher Corps;

Secure legislative recognition of the rights of States to set standards of water purity in rivers instead of transferring this authority to the Federal Government;

Maintain State authority to determine the use to be made of areas adjoining highways; and

Maintain the right of States to deny the suffrage to people unable to read or write the English language.

PLANNING AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Early in the session the planning and research committee was established as an organ of the Republican conference of the House of Representatives. This new agency was created to help mobilize activity toward the development of long-term solutions to national problems.

The planning and research committee issued in August a report entitled, "Vietnam: Some Neglected Aspects of the Historical Record." Columnist Roscoe Drummond said of this report:

> This is "loyal opposition" at its best.

Headed by Representative Charles E. Goodell, of New York, this committee supervises the activities of 13 task forces, each of which has spent this year in the study of major public policy problems in its field of jurisdiction. Several of the task forces have made reports containing constructive proposals in 1965. All will make a substantial contribution to the positive Republican program in 1966.

The task forces and their chairmen are:

Agriculture: ODIN LANGEN, of Minnesota.

Congressional reform and minority staffing: JAMES CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire.

Economic opportunity: PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey.

Education: ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota.

Federal civil service: ANCHER NELSEN, of Minnesota.

Latin America: Cochairmen F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts, and DONALD RUMSFELD, of Illinois.

NATO and Atlantic Community: PAUL FINDLEY, of Illinois.

Nuclear affairs: CRAIG HOSMER, of California.

Platform implementation: JAMES BATTIN, of Montana.

Unemployment compensation system: JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin.

United Nations: JOHN B. ANDERSON, of Illinois.

Urban and suburban affairs: CLARK MACGREGOR, of Minnesota.

Voting rights: WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio.

REPUBLICAN SUPPORT OF ADMINISTRATION BILLS

Several enactments of the past session received strong Republican support. Republican House Members judged each bill on its merits and gave approval to administration measures that served the public interest.

Among the bills that were given strong Republican support on final passage were the following: The higher education bill, vocational training loan bill, the immigration bill, the Export Control Act, constitutional amendment on Presidential succession, the Older Americans Act of 1965, various bills in the field of health, excise tax cuts, manpower development and training bill, expansion of veterans' benefits, various anticrime bills, pay raises for military and civilian personnel, legislation for the control of air and water pollution and water resources planning, and the voting rights bill.

A SAMPLING OF REPUBLICAN LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

Republican Members of the House of Representatives introduced bills which comprise a comprehensive, broadgaged, and constructive legislative program.

At least 256 bills expanding and liberalizing social security were offered by Republicans. These bills dealt with such matters as reduction of the age requirements for beneficiaries, increasing the maximum age for eligibility of children, expansion of the system to groups not presently covered, and increasing the amount of earnings permissible without sacrifice of benefits.

At least 61 Republican bills were introduced for the reduction or repeal of excise taxes.

At least 59 Republicans introduced voting rights legislation, generally patterned after the Ford-McCulloch bill.

At least 54 Republicans introduced bills providing for a new program of medical care for the aged. The three major approaches were typified in the proposals of Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS—H.R. 3728; Representative FRANK T. BOW—H.R. 21; and Representative JOHN W. BYRNES—H.R. 7057.

At least 46 Republicans proposed a constitutional amendment to permit the people to employ factors in addition to population in the apportionment of one house of State legislatures.

At least 27 Republicans introduced bills to establish a coordinating office concerned with urban area affairs in the Executive Office of the President.

At least 28 Republicans introduced bills establishing a Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government to do the job which two Hoover Commissions did in the past.

Nine Republicans introduced a freedom of information bill defining the authority of Federal agencies and officials to withhold information in order to make available a maximum of information to citizens and taxpayers.

The House Republican conference adopted the recommendation of its task force on education, headed by Representative ALBERT QUIE, of Minnesota, for legislation granting a tax credit against the costs of higher education. A large number of Members have sponsored bills like Mr. QUIE's which permits a credit up to an amount of $325 per student annually.

At least 78 Republicans have joined with Representative THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri, in offering the Human Investment Act, a bill granting credits against the Federal income tax to business for the expenses of retraining present or prospective employees to upgrade their skills.

At least 60 Republicans have introduced legislation of the type recommended by the House Republican task force on agriculture, headed by Representative ODIN LANGEN, of Minnesota, to establish a World Food Study Commission to determine population trends and food needs for the future.

This list could be extended indefinitely. It is meant to be illustrative, not exhaustive.

CONCLUSION

Looking back on the session just concluded, the Republican Members of the House of Representatives can take pride in the role that they have played. They tried to make the Congress what it should be—a deliberative body, independent of and coequal with the Executive, judging legislation by the sole standard of the national interest. Their success cannot be measured in terms of the votes on which they prevailed—which were few. The verdict on their work will not be known until the people speak in the elections of 1966.

Kenya's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will have adjourned when Kenya celebrates the anniversary of her independence on December 12. We wish to take this opportunity therefore, to extend warm felicitations in advance to His Excellency Jomo Kenyata, President of the Republic of Kenya; and to Kenya's Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Burudi Nabwere.

Kenya with its vicissitudes and triumphs, its variations in recent political history, and its more hopeful future is symbolized, in a way, by its topography. Its soaring mountain peaks, beautiful Mount Kenya and Mount Elgon with their permanent patches of ice and snow, furnish a northern backdrop to the land of contrasts which is Kenya. The wasteland stretching from Uganda and the Sudan to the low-lying plain along the seacoast lined with coconut palms and noble mango trees and pleasant conditions for villas and hotels for holiday makers, the magnificent natural harbor which makes possible the great port of Mombasa, the rise to the inland plateau which is broken by the Great Rift Valley with volcanoes rising from its floor, the westward stretch of land dropping down to the shores of enormous, magnificent Lake Victoria—hill and valley, plain and plateau, farmland, parkland, and desert—with these may be compared the ups and downs, the struggles and successes, the periods of stress and of relative calm, the violence and the victories along Kenya's road to independence.

The second anniversary of that independence we hail this December 12, 1965.

The fact of that independence and the adoption of the Constitution are the more remarkable because the population of Kenya, like the landscape and the fauna—the most varied in the world—is not only multiracial, among the races there are very considerable differences. While the Europeans, Asians, and Arabs constitute only 3 percent of the population, their presence and their activities have been and are of great importance; and among the 97 percent Africans there are over 40 tribes, each with its own culture, customs, and prejudices—as in all societies—leading to rivalries and suspicion. Largely because of the suspicion between tribe and tribe, the 1962 constitution was drawn up so as to allow considerable local autonomy to the regional authorities. Since the country became independent on December 12, 1963, it has gone far to allay that suspicion and build a Kenyan society in which the different tribes and communities will live together with no need, and no wish, for safeguards against the domination of any of them by any others.

The country of Kenya today, multiracial and multitribal as it is, is not the country of strata that it used to be. The people show their determination to live together in friendliness and mutual helpfulness, each group adding its significant contribution toward the forging of a strong and prosperous country.

And progress they have made. Education is expanding. More and more Africans are able to speak and write English, the official language.

Transportation by road, rail, and air is being developed at a rapid rate. Nairobi's new international airport is a major continental terminus for international services from Europe, Asia, and other parts of Africa. The principal towns of Kenya and other east African centers are linked by internal scheduled services operated by East African Airways Corp.

Growing communications provide a comprehensive range of postal, telegraph, and telephone facilities. Radio and television are operated by the Kenya Broadcasting Service, which is responsible for all English, Asian, and African broadcasts, and has a potential audience of 1½ million.

There is a growing and valuable tourist trade and a rapidly increasing industrial development, including the refining of sugar, the milling of flour, and the making of clothing from imported fabrics.

Agriculture is, however, of the utmost importance to Kenya's economy. Agricultural production accounts for some 90 percent of Kenya's exports. Scientific study and planning are increasing the yield, particularly for forest products. The World Health Organization is lending a hand in this as well as in Kenya's efforts to improve the health of her people. And Kenya is also fighting ignorance and poverty with comparable determination.

On this second anniversary we congratulate this young and promising country and wish it well.

A More Beautiful Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it would appear that almost everyone is interested in making our country a better and more beautiful place in which to live and since that is the objective of S. 2084, it would naturally commend itself to the interest and approval of an overwhelming number of the American people.

There is widespread need for the type of program proposed by this bill, which is truly a sound conservation, as well as a beautification measure.

But like everything else, our success in eliminating ugliness and the unfavorable images which exist in very many places throughout the Nation is a task that requires the application of sound concepts and the most discriminating, administrative skills after Congress passes and provides funds for this legislation.

For example, we must be careful in our quest for beauty not to disturb or disrupt many business activities, large and small, which may be adversely affected by the program provided for by this bill.

It is not the billboard industry alone which is involved, although this is a very important business—far flung in its operations, representing huge investment and performing very useful functions and providing valuable services for the American public; in fairness, we must exert every effort to try to reconcile and balance the interests of this business with our esthetic goals concerning the natural beauty of our communities and the Nation of not allowing ugly, unsightly structures or conditions to impair or debase what Mother Nature has so bountifully given us.

There are many other industries involved—the motel industry, retail stores, restaurants, and businesses of all kinds, including service stations for automobile and motor truck transportation and many other private business units that are common to American economic and social activity along our main highways in urban communities and the hinterlands.

Between the extremes of the esthetes who want all beauty, and those functionalists, who want none, there is, I believe, a common denominator—a moderate, middle ground position which the Congress should take on this vital issue, and I believe that the committee has labored diligently, considerately, and efficiently in seeking out this middle ground.

I think it is to be very much deplored, when farsighted, capable, congressional committees hammer out legislation after extensive hearings and mature consideration, to see last minute shifts and changes in the form legislation takes which converts it from an acceptable to a questionable category.

This kind of procedure does not make for sound results and it leaves the House in the unfortunate position of having to consider and act upon some last minute proposals without having adequate justification or evidence justifying them. Such action militates against sound, constructive legislation.

We should remember also that everything cannot be beautiful. We cannot make a purse or a Rembrandt out of a sow's ear. No matter what the Congress does, we do not have the power, which is indeed a power only Providence has, to eliminate every ugly thing in nature, or indeed in human nature.

Moreover, it is necessary to keep this bill in proper financial perspective and not allow its cost to mount into stratospheric proportions and impose undue heavy tax burdens upon our taxpayers.

Many of the programs which Congress has adopted this session call for huge expenditures. On the whole, with some few exceptions these expenditures can be well justified in the results achieved by many of these programs, the new social needs that they meet, the great social good they will permit, the evils they will abolish or minimize, the overall gains they will work for the health, security, safety, education, and the general well-being of the people of this Nation.

We cannot be pedestrian and look backward to dote upon what we did, or did not do, in the past, even though we must keep in mind the worthwhile values, principles and experiences of the past which have served our Nation so well. Above all, we cannot discard the lessons of the past, in fact it is imperative for us to keep in mind and adequately utilize many of the values of the past which contributed so invaluably to the greatness, power, and unequaled blessings of this country.

In a word, in the jet age, in the age of fabulous invention, scientific advancement and social readjustment, the age of exploring space, rapid transport, unbelievable gadgetry and the miracles of modern day living, we simply must adapt the Government and the Nation to the demands of progress.

Medical science has given us many new techniques, many new wonder drugs, new advances in hospital construction, administration, and the diagnosis, treatment and care of human beings in modern American society.

The cost of these innovations is startling and far beyond the reach of the ordinary citizen. It is in this sense that the Government must come into health, into education, into social development and progress to make the Nation truly a better place in which to live.

There would be those, I know, who will not agree with this premise, who seek the sheltered comfort and ivory-tower security of past days. But in my judgment this Nation cannot remain static. It must be dynamic. It must move forward in the stream of history and progress, or it will soon forfeit its claim to greatness, and in time it will fall behind, wallowing in the morass of ignorance, fear, poverty, indecision, and maladjustment to modern conditions that would bar us from keeping pace with what is happening in the country and the world around us.

Much benefit can be derived for our people and the stability of our Government from the programs which enlightened executive and legislative leadership have developed.

We cannot claim that these programs will produce miracles, because that will not be the case.

The human mind, as well as the human body, is limited and so are the political and social organisms with which we have to deal. Yet these programs will enable us to reach higher plateaus of betterment for our Nation and our people and will accomplish these results under the fundamental framework of our great Constitution and upon the immutable principles that have developed and guarded the values and encouraged the progress which we have achieved in every field in making possible the unprecedented advancement that this great Nation has enjoyed.

I repeat that with respect to all these programs, and others like them designed to adapt ourselves and our great Nation to the modern world and to the world of the future, whose problems will reach into distant space, it is imperative that we should keep our feet on the ground as we look to the stars to view new horizons of man's destiny.

We must be reminded constantly that while there may be some new things under the sun, it is always desirable for us to approach these problems with reference to the basic truths and principles which have guided us throughout the years, so that whatever our action may be, whatever subject we treat of, we will be able to retain our basic freedoms, including our great free enterprise system, which in these days of turmoil, strife, and radical doctrine is one of the principle characteristics of our Government that differentiates it from communism and Fascist totalitarian states, the great foundation stone of an unequaled, productive economy.

In our quest for beautification, we must not overlook the bread and butter issues of everyday life that must continue to be the deep concern of representatives of the people. But let no one doubt that man does not live by bread alone, vital though it be. The things of the spirit rule the world.

Gonzalez Scores 100 Percent Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice to keep my constituents in the 20th Congressional District of Texas fully informed as to my activities in Congress and as to matters in which they may be interested or concerned. I am therefore inserting in the Record today my complete voting record for 1965 in the 89th Congress, 1st session. This record includes every one of the 383 rollcalls including the 201 yea-and-nay calls and the 182 quorum calls.

I am recorded as voting on each of the 201 yea-and-nay calls. My voting record this year is a particular source of pride to me, both as to my attendance and the substance of my votes. There were, of course, too many votes this year to allow a detailed discussion of them at this time. Included in this record, however, are my votes in support of the New Frontier and Great Society programs of the past 5 years under the leadership of the Democratic Party in the executive branch and in Congress. After 8 years, 1953 through 1960, of stagnation and backsliding, the Democratic Party has gotten America moving again. We began to move, as President Kennedy promised we would, in 1961, 1962, and 1963, and we have continued to move forward, as President Johnson promised, in 1964 and 1965. We are now experiencing the longest period of uninterrupted economic growth and expansion in the history of this Nation. I have no doubt that this growth and the increasing prosperity of America will continue under the leadership of the Johnson administration and under the leadership of Speaker John McCormack and Majority Leader Mike Mansfield.

"Ye shall know them by their fruits," says the Bible. The fruits of the labors of Congress during 1965 include medicare, the Voting Rights Act, an updated housing program, a strengthened and improved war against poverty, the Appalachian program, the Public Works and Economic Development Act, the Older Americans Act, new regional medical programs to combat heart disease, cancer, stroke and related diseases, an improved mental health program, substantial increases for veterans' rehabilitation, new drug controls, the elimination or reduction of numerous excise taxes, the extension, and expansion of the manpower development and training program, a new program of Federal aid for elementary and secondary education, the Higher Education Act, the Highway Beautification Act, an expanded air pollution program, establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, and a research and development program for high-speed transportation.

I shall be forever grateful to have been given the opportunity to represent the people of San Antonio in the Congress of the United States and to work in the 89th Congress. We have brought in a rich harvest for the American people.

No. and date (1965)	Issue	Vote
1. Jan. 4	Call of the House	Present.
2. Jan. 4	Election of the Speaker. (McCormack, 289; Ford, 139.)	McC.
3. Jan. 4	H. Res. 1: Motion to cut off debate of resolution to seat Mississippi delegation. (Passed 276 to 148.)	No.
4. Jan. 4	H. Res. 8: Resolution to adopt rules of the House including 3 changes. (Passed 224 to 201.)	Yes.
5. Jan. 19	Quorum call	Present.
6. Jan. 19	H. Res. 126: Resolution dismissing contest of election of Representative Ottinger, of New York. (Passed 245 to 102.)	Yes.
7. Jan. 26	H. J. Res. 234: Motion to recommit supplemental appropriation for Department of Agriculture. (Passed 204 to 177.)	No.
8. Feb. 4	Quorum call	Present.
9. Feb. 8	Quorum call	Present.
10. Feb. 8	H. J. Res. 234: Motion to instruct House conferees to insist on prohibition of sale of surplus food to the United Arab Republic. (Failed 165 to 241.)	No.
11. Feb. 9	Quorum call	Present.
12. Feb. 9	H.R. 3818: Motion to recommit bill providing for elimination of requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities. (Failed 93 to 289.)	No.
13. Feb. 9	H.R. 3818: Final passage of bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit liabilities. (Passed 300 to 82.)	Yes.
14. Feb. 10	Quorum call	Present.
15. Feb. 17	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
16. Feb. 17	H.R. 2998: Final passage of bill authorizing appropriation for Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for 3 years in amount of $40,000,000. (Passed 302 to 63.)	NV.[2]
17. Feb. 18	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
18. Feb. 18	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
19. Feb. 18	H.R. 45: Motion to recommit bill to amend Inter-American Development Bank Act authorizing increase in U.S. participation. (Failed 142 to 237.)	No.
20. Feb. 18	H.R. 45: Final passage of bill to amend Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize increase in U.S. participation. (Passed 288 to 93.)	Yes.
21. Feb. 24	Quorum call	Absent.
22. Feb. 25	Quorum call	Present.
23. Feb. 25	H. Res. 188: Motion to recommit resolution authorizing funds for HUAC in order to hold public hearings on justification of the funds. (Failed 58 to 333.)	Yes.
24. Feb. 25	H. Res. 188: Final passage of resolution authorizing $370,000 for HUAC. (Passed 360 to 29)	Yes.
25. Mar. 1	Quorum call	Absent.
26. Mar. 2	Quorum call	Present.
27. Mar. 3	Quorum call	Present.
28. Mar. 3	S. 3: Motion to recommit Appalachian Redevelopment Act in order to substitute a new bill. (Failed 100 to 323.)	No.
29. Mar. 3	S. 3: Final passage of Appalachian Redevelopment Act of 1965. (Passed 257 to 165.)	Yes.
30. Mar. 9	Quorum call	Present.
31. Mar. 10	H.R. 2: Final passage of bill to amend Food and Drug Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs. (Passed 402 to 0.)	Yes.
32. Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
33. Mar. 15	H.R. 4714: Motion to suspend rules and pass bill authorizing an appropriation of $150,000 per year for Advisory Council on the Arts. (Failed 217 to 113; a ⅔ majority required to suspend the rules.)	Yes.
34. Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
35. Mar. 16	H.R. 5505: Motion to amend the bill requiring the establishment of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory. (Amendment failed 147 to 255.)	No.
36. Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.
37. Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.

See footnotes at end of table.

No. and date (1965)	Issue	Vote
38. Mar. 17	H. Res. 276: Resolution to take up for consideration the bill, H.R. 5374, to increase the salaries of the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court. (Passed 202 to 183.)	Yes.
39. Mar. 17	H.R. 5374: Final passage of bill to increase the salaries of the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court. (Failed 178 to 202.)	Yes.
40. Mar. 18	Quorum call	Present.
41. Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
42. Mar. 22	H.R. 5688: Motion to recommit bill relating to criminal procedure in the District of Columbia in order to hold public hearings. (Failed 166 to 216.)	Yes.
43. Mar. 22	H.R. 5688: Final passage of bill relating to criminal procedure in the District of Columbia. (Passed 251 to 131.)	No.
44. Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
45. Mar. 23	H.R. 5721: Final passage of bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco. (Passed 206 to 170.)	Yes.
46. Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
47. Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
48. Mar. 25	Quorum call	Present.
49. Mar. 25	Quorum call	Present.
50. Mar. 26	Quorum call	Present.
51. Mar. 26	Motion calling for a vote to approve the House Journal as read. (Passed 274 to 119.)	Yes.
52. Mar. 26	H.R. 2362: Motion to recommit the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to change the formula for the allocation of funds. (Failed 149 to 267.)	No.
53. Mar. 26	H.R. 2362: Final passage of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. (Passed 263 to 153.)	Yes.
54. Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
55. Mar. 30	Quorum call	Present.
56. Mar. 31	Quorum call	Present.
57. Mar. 31	H.R. 3708: Final passage of the Older Americans Act of 1965. (Passed 396 to 1.)	Yes.
58. Mar. 31	H.R. 1111: Final passage of Water Resources Planning Act. (Passed 384 to 0.)	Yes.
59. Apr. 1	Quorum call	Present.
60. Apr. 1	H.R. 4257: Final passage of bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) of 1962. (Passed 395 to 0.)	Yes.
61. Apr. 5	Quorum call	Present.
62. Apr. 5	H.R. 980: Motion to suspend rules and pass bill to provide for the return of obscene mail matter. (Passed 360 to 21.)	Yes.
63. Apr. 5	H.R. 7064: Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing the appropriation of $1,000,000 for construction of a U.S. Embassy building in Saigon. (Passed 378 to 0.)	Yes.
64. Apr. 5	H.R. 7060: Final passage of bill appropriating $6,600,000,000 for the Departments of the Treasury and Post Office, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies. (Passed 347 to 7.)	Yes.
65. Apr. 6	Quorum call	Present.
66. Apr. 6	H.R. 7091: Final passage of supplemental appropriation bill. (Passed 348 to 62.)	Yes.
67. Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
68. Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
69. Apr. 8	Quorum call	Present.
70. Apr. 8	H.R. 6675: Motion to recommit the bill providing for an increase in social security benefits and establishing medicare for the purpose of crippling the program. (Failed 191 to 236.)	No.
71. Apr. 8	H.R. 6675: Final passage of bill providing for increase in social security benefits and establishing medicare. (Passed 313 to 115.)	Yes.
72. Apr. 13	H.R. 2998: Motion to adopt conference report on bill to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. (Passed 316 to 65.)	Yes.
73. Apr. 13	Quorum call	Present.
74. Apr. 13	H.J. Res. 1: Final passage of proposed amendment to the Constitution relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and cases of Presidential disability. (Passed 368 to 29.)	No.
75. Apr. 14	Quorum call	Present.
76. Apr. 14	H. Res. 310: Resolution authorizing the expenditure of an additional $50,000 by HUAC for an investigation of the Ku Klux Klan. (Passed 313 to 43.)	No.
77. Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
78. Apr. 27	H.R. 6497: Motion to recommit bill to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize an increase in the U.S. quota for the International Monetary Fund. (Failed 113 to 275.)	No.
79. Apr. 27	H.R. 6497: Final passage of bill authorizing an increase in the U.S. quota for the International Monetary Fund. (Passed 301 to 88.)	Yes.
80. Apr. 28	Quorum call	Present.
81. Apr. 28	Quorum call	Present.
82. Apr. 28	S. 4: Final passage of Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1965. (Passed 396 to 0.)	Yes.
83. Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
84. Apr. 29	H.R. 7091: Adoption of conference report on supplemental appropriation bill. (Passed 316 to 55.)	Yes.
85. Apr. 29	H.R. 7091: Motion to agree to Senate amendment to supplemental appropriation bill providing funds to continue the Federal subsidy for helicopter service at New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. (Failed 144 to 228.)	No.
86. Apr. 29	H.R. 4714: Final passage of bill authorizing an appropriation of $150,000 per year for the Advisory Council on the Arts. (Passed 239 to 116.)	Yes.
87. May 3	H.R. 2986: Final passage of bill to extend the Community Health Services Act and to launch a nationwide immunization program against measles. (Passed 347 to 0.)	Yes.
88. May 4	Quorum call	Present.
89. May 4	Quorum call	Present.
90. May 4	H.R. 2985: Final passage of bill authorizing the appropriation of $172,000,000 during the next 4 years to help pay the cost of professional and technical personnel at community mental health centers. (Passed 389 to 0.)	Yes.
91. May 5	Quorum call	Present.
92. May 5	H.J. Res. 447: Final passage of joint resolution appropriating $700,000,000 to the Department of Defense for use in connection with military activities in southeast Asia. (Passed 408 to 7.)	Yes.
93. May 5	Quorum call	Present.
94. May 5	H.R. 7657: Final passage of bill authorizing appropriation of $15,300,000,000 for military functions of the Department of Defense. (Passed 396 to 0.)	Yes.
95. May 6	Quorum call	Present.
96. May 6	H. Res. 366: Motion to take up for consideration the bill (H.R. 7717) to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (Passed 389 to 0.)	Yes.
97. May 6	H.R. 7717: Final passage of bill authorizing appropriation of $5,100,000,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (Passed 389 to 11.)	Yes.
98. May 10	Quorum call	Present.
99. May 10	H.R. 2984: Final passage of bill extending the Public Health Service program of construction of health research facilities, and authorizing 3 additional Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Passed 334 to 4.)	Yes.
100. May 12	Quorum call	Present.
101. May 12	S. 701: Final passage of bill enabling the United States to carry out its obligations under the International Coffee Agreement. (Passed 300 to 97.)	Yes.
102. May 18	Quorum call	Present.
103. May 20	Quorum call	Present.
104. May 20	H.R. 8122: Motion to recommit the bill authorizing appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in order to delete funds for construction of a reactor in cooperation with the State of California. (Failed 43 to 313.)	No.
105. May 20	H.R. 8122: Final passage of bill authorizing appropriation of $2,500,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission. (Passed 352 to 1.)	Yes.
106. May 24	Quorum call	Present.
107. May 24	Quorum call	Present.
108. May 25	Quorum call	Present.
109. May 25	H.R. 7750: Motion to recommit foreign aid bill in order to cripple it. (Failed 178 to 219.)	No.
110. May 25	H.R. 7750: Final passage of foreign aid bill. (Passed 249 to 148.)	Yes.
111. May 26	Quorum call	Present.
112. May 26	H.R. 8370: Motion to recommit appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture in order to prohibit exports of food to the United Arab Republic or Indonesia under title I of Public Law 83-480. (Failed 187 to 208.)	No.
113. May 26	H.R. 8370: Final passage of appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture appropriating $5,700,000,000.	Yes.
114. May 27	Quorum call	Present.
115. June 1	Quorum call	Present.
116. June 1	H.R. 8639: Final passage of $2,000,000,000 appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary and related agencies. (Passed 322 to 60.)	Yes.
117. June 1	H.R. 3584: Final passage of bill amending the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to further provide for the prevention of accidents in coal mines. (Passed 336 to 42.)	Yes.
118. June 2	Quorum call	Present.
119. June 2	H.R. 8371: Final passage of bill eliminating or reducing certain Federal excise taxes. (Passed 401 to 6.)	Yes.
120. June 3	Quorum call	Present.
121. June 3	H.R. 7777: Final passage of bill authorizing the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee (U.S. Air Force, retired) as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. (Passed 228 to 137.)	Yes.
122. June 7	Quorum call	Present.

No. and date (1965)	Issue	Vote
123. June 7	H.R. 3157: Motion to suspend the rules and pass a bill to permit the spouse of a railroad employee to receive a spouse's annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act and to also receive social security benefits or railroad retirement benefits earned in her own right. (Passed 323 to 0.)	Yes.
124. June 8	Quorum call	Present.
125. June 8	Quorum call	Present.
126. June 8	H.R. 8775: Motion to recommit appropriation bill for the legislative branch in order to delete funds for certain employees. (Failed 149 to 244.)	No.
127. June 8	H.R. 7105: Final passage of bill extending the Export Control Act with an amendment protecting American businessmen from the Arab anti-Israeli and anti-Jewish boycott. (Passed 388 to 1.)	Yes.
128. June 9	Quorum call	Present.
129. June 9	H. Res. 413: Motion to take up for consideration the bill, H.R. 8464, to increase the national debt limit. (Passed 273 to 109)	Yes.
130. June 9	H.R. 8464: Final passage of bill increasing the national debt limit. (Passed 229 to 165)	Yes.
131. June 9	H. Con. Res. 285: Motion to amend concurrent resolution to allow the showing in the United States of the USIA film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums." (Failed 174 to 216.)	No.
132. June 9	H. Con. Res. 285: Final passage of resolution to allow the showing in the United States of the USIA film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums." (Passed 311 to 75.)	Yes.
133. June 10	Quorum call	Present.
134. June 10	Quorum call	Present.
135. June 10	Quorum call	Present.
136. June 14	Quorum call	Present.
137. June 15	Quorum call	Present.
138. June 15	Quorum call	Present.
139. June 15	Quorum call	Present.
140. June 16	Quorum call	Present.
141. June 16	H.R. 6927: Motion to recommit bill establishing the Department of Housing and Urban Development, in order to cripple it. (Failed 141 to 259.)	No.
142. June 16	H.R. 6927: Final passage of bill establishing the Department of Housing and Urban Development. (Passed 217 to 184.)	Yes.
143. June 16	H. Res. 416: Final passage of resolution to authorize each Member of the House to employ a student congressional intern annually on a temporary basis. (Passed 229 to 153.)	Yes.
144. June 21	Quorum call	Present.
145. June 21	H.R. 7743: Motion to suspend rules and pass the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 providing a system of loan insurance to assist students to attend postsecondary business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools. (Passed 300 to 0.)	Yes.
146. June 21	H.R. 8620 Motion to suspend rules and pass the bill to amend the Agriculture Act to take into consideration floods and other natural disasters in reference to the feed grains, cotton, and wheat programs for 1965. (Passed 297 to 2.)	Yes.
147. June 21	H. Con. Res. 416: Motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution requesting the President to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. (Passed 298 to 0.)	Yes.
148. June 22	Quorum call	Present.
149. June 22	Quorum call	Present.
150. June 22	Quorum call	Present.
151. June 23	Quorum call	Present.
152. June 23	Quorum call	Present.
153. June 23	H.R. 9221: Final passage of $45,000,000,000 appropriation bill for the Department of Defense. (Passed 407 to 0)	Yes.
154. June 24	Quorum call	Present.
155. June 24	H.J. Res. 541: Final passage of bill extending the Area Redevelopment Act for 2 months. (Passed 224 to 167)	Yes.
156. June 28	Quorum call	Present.
157. June 28	H. Res. 425: Motion to take up for consideration the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. (Passed 230 to 115)	Yes.
158. June 28	Quorum call	Present.
159. June 29	Quorum call	Present.
160. June 29	Quorum call	Present.
161. June 30	Quorum call	Present.
162. June 30	H.R. 7984: Motion to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. (Passed 240 to 179.)	Yes.
163. June 30	H.R. 7984: Motion to recommit the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. (Failed 202 to 208.)	No.
164. June 30	H.R. 7984: Final passage of Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. (Passed 245 to 169.)	Yes.
165. July 1	Quorum call	Present.
166. July 6	Quorum call	Present.
167. July 6	H. Res. 440: Motion to take up for consideration the Voting Rights Act of 1965. (Passed 308 to 55.)	Yes.
168. July 6	Quorum call	Present.
169. July 7	Quorum call	Present.
170. July 7	Quorum call	Present.
171. July 8	Quorum call	Present.
172. July 8	Quorum call	Present.
173. July 8	Quorum call	Present.
174. July 9	Quorum call	Present.
175. July 9	H.R. 6400: Motion to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 in order to provide criminal penalties for giving false information on voting eligibility status, or for paying or accepting money to register to vote. (Passed 253 to 165.)	No.
176. July 9	H.R. 6400: Motion to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 in order to remove Federal examiners in a county if 50 percent of the Negroes of voting age are registered to vote. (Failed 155 to 262.)	No.
177. July 9	H.R. 6400: Motion to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 in order to allow people illiterate in English to vote if they have completed the 6th grade in Spanish language schools. (Failed 202 to 216.)	Yes.
178. July 9	H. R. 6400: Motion to recommit the Voting Rights Act of 1965 in order to substitute new language. (Failed 171 to 248)	No.
179. July 9	H. R. 6400: Final passage of Voting Rights Act of 1965. (Passed 333 to 85)	Yes.
180. July 12	Quorum call	Present.
181. July 12	H. R. 8856: Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill clarifying the language of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 so as to reaffirm the intent of Congress that the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission may not be limited by the regulations of local authorities with respect to the generation, sale, or transmission of electric power. (Failed 216 to 139.)	Yes.
182. July 12	H.R. 242: Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill requiring that appointments to fill temporary summer jobs with the Federal Government in the Washington, D.C., area be apportioned among the States. (Passed 336 to 22.)	Yes.
183. July 12	Quorum call	Present.
184. July 13	Quorum call	Present.
185. July 13	S. 559: Motion to adopt the conference report on the bill requiring a "caution" statement on cigarette packages and limiting further action in connection with the health hazards related to the use of tobacco. (Passed 286 to 103.)	No.
186. July 14	Quorum call	Present.
187. July 14	Quorum call	Present.
188. July 14	H. R. 8926: Motion to amend the Coinage Act of 1965. (Failed 187 to 218.)	No.
189. July 14	H. R. 8926: Final passage of Coinage Act of 1965 reducing the silver content of coins. (Passed 255 to 151.)	Yes.
190. July 15	Quorum call	Present.
191. July 15	Quorum call	Present.
192. July 19	Quorum call	Present.
193. July 20	H.R. 9075: Final passage of the Military Pay Increase Act of 1965. (Passed 410 to 0.)	Yes.
194. July 21	Quorum call	Present.
195. July 22	Quorum call	Present.
196. July 22	H.R. 8283: Motion to amend the bill expanding the war against poverty in order to reinstate the Governor's veto and reduce the authorization for funds. (Failed 178 to 227.)	No.
197. July 22	H.R. 8283: Final passage of bill expanding the war against poverty. (Passed 245 to 158.)	Yes.
198. July 26	Quorum call	Present.
199. July 26	H. Res. 437: Motion to take up for consideration the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. (Passed 248 to 171.)	Yes.
200. July 26	Quorum call	Present.
201. July 26	Quorum call	Present.
202. July 27	Quorum call	Present.
203. July 27	H.R. 6675: Motion to adopt conference report on the bill increasing social security benefits and establishing medicare. (Passed 307 to 116.)	Yes.
204. July 27	H.R. 7984: Motion to adopt conference report on the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. (Passed 251 to 168.)	Yes.
205. July 27	H.R. 2985: Motion to adopt conference report on the bill authorizing the appropriation of $172,000,000 during the next 4 years to help pay the cost of professional and technical personnel at community mental health centers. (Passed 414 to 0.)	Yes.
206. July 28	Quorum call	Present.
207. July 28	Quorum call	Present.
208. July 28	H.R. 77: Motion to recommit bill to repeal sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. (Failed 200 to 223.)	No.
209. July 28	H.R. 77: Final passage of bill to repeal sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. (Passed 221 to 203.)	Yes.
210. July 29	Quorum call	Present.
211. July 29	Quorum call	Present.

No. and date (1965)	Issue	Vote
212. July 29	**H. R. 8856: Final passage of bill clarifying the language of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 so as to reaffirm the intent of Congress that the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission may not be limited by the regulations of local authorities with respect to the generation, sale or transmission of electric power. (Passed 275 to 126.)**	Yes.
213. Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
214. Aug. 2	S.J. Res. 81: Motion to suspend rules and pass the resolution authorizing an increase in the amount of funds for the Interstate Highway System for fiscal year 1967 from $2,900,000,000 to $3,000,000,000 and authorizing the apportionment of those funds to the States. (Passed 314 to 11.)	Yes.
215. Aug. 2	H.R. 8027: Motion to suspend rules and pass the bill to provide assistance in training State and local law enforcement officers and to improve local law enforcement practices. (Passed 326 to 0.)	Yes.
216. Aug. 2	H.R. 6964: Motion to suspend rules and pass the bill authorizing the Attorney General to transfer certain prisoners to residential community treatment centers, to grant them leave, and to permit them to work in private employment. (Passed 325 to 0.)	Yes.
217. Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
218. Aug. 3	S. 1564: Motion to recommit the conference report on the Voting Rights Act of 1965 for the purpose of crippling it. (Failed 118 to 284.)	No.
219. Aug. 3	S. 1564: Motion to adopt conference report on the Voting Rights Act of 1965. (Passed 328 to 74.)	Yes.
220. Aug. 3	H.R. 8469: Final passage of bill to increase certain annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund. (Passed 396 to 0.)	Yes.
221. Aug. 4	H.R. 8439: Motion to adopt conference report on $1,700,000,000 military construction authorization bill. (Passed 389 to 0.)	Yes.
222. Aug. 4	S. 1742: Final passage of bill authorizing the U.S. Governor to agree to amendments to the articles of agreements of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation in order to permit the World Bank to make loans to the IFC. (Passed 331 to 54.)	Yes.
223. Aug. 5	Quorum call	Present.
224. Aug. 5	H. Res. 498: Motion to take up for consideration the bill, H.R. 4750, providing for a 2-year extension of the interest equalization tax. (Passed 329 to 44.)	Yes.
225. Aug. 5	H.R. 4750: Final passage of bill providing for a 2-year extension of the interest equalization tax. (Passed 274 to 97.)	Yes.
226. Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
227. Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
228. Aug. 9	H.R. 9918: Motion to adopt substitute language for the bill relative to motor vehicle insurance in the District of Columbia, the substitute requiring all insured drivers to cover protection against uninsured drivers and requiring uninsured drivers to pay at least $40 per year into an unsatisfied judgments fund. (Passed 173 to 156.)	Yes.
229. Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
230. Aug. 10	H.R. 10306: Final passage of bill to make it a crime to knowingly destroy or mutilate a draft card. (Passed 393 to 1.)	Yes.
231. Aug. 11	Quorum call	Present.
232. Aug. 11	Quorum call	Present.
233. Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
234. Aug. 12	S. 1648: Motion to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act in order to make more areas eligible for grants and to increase the authorization from $400,000,000 to $500,000,000. (Passed 196 to 194.)	Yes.
235. Aug. 12	S. 1648: Motion to recommit Public Works and Economic Development Act. (Failed 163 to 224.)	No.
236. Aug. 12	S. 1648: Final passage of Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 providing grants for public works and development facilities and assistance for the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically distressed areas. (Passed 246 to 138.)	Yes.
237. Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
238. Aug. 16	H.R. 6431: Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to allow certain forms of nickel to be imported without a tariff duty. (Passed 298 to 48.)	Yes.
239. Aug. 16	H. R. 8635: Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to establish a Federal Boxing Commission. (Passed 346 to 4.)	Yes.
240. Aug. 17	Quorum call	Present.
241. Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
242. Aug. 19	H. R. 7750: Motion to adopt conference report on foreign aid bill. (Passed 244 to 150.)	Yes.
243. Aug. 19	H. R. 9811: Motion to recommit the omnibus farm bill. (Failed 169 to 224.)	No.
244. Aug. 19	H. R. 9811: Final passage of omnibus farm bill. (Passed 221 to 172.)	Yes.
245. Aug. 24	Quorum call	Present.
246. Aug. 24	H. R. 10586: Motion to recommit $1,200,000,000 supplemental appropriation for the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Labor. (Failed 39 to 263.)	No.
247. Aug. 25	Quorum call	Present.
248. Aug. 25	H. R. 2580: Motion to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 in order to put a numerical ceiling on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. (Failed 189 to 218.)	No.
249. Aug. 25	H.R. 2580: Final passage of Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 abolishing the national origins quota system. (Passed 318 to 95.)	Yes.
250. Aug. 26	Quorum call	Present.
251. Aug. 26	Quorum call	Present.
252. Aug. 26	H.R. 9567: Final passage of Higher Education Act of 1965 providing financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education. (Passed 368 to 22.)	Yes.
253. Aug. 30	H.R. 9022: Final passage of the bill providing Federal assistance for elementary and secondary schools in areas affected by a major disaster and to make uniform eligibility requirements for schools in impacted areas. (Passed 305 to 37.)	Yes.
254. Aug. 31	H. Res. 551: Motion to take up for consideration the bill (H.R. 9042) providing for implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the United States and Canada. (Passed 363 to 23.)	Yes.
255. Aug. 31	H.R. 9042: Final passage of bill providing for implementation of Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the United States and Canada. (Passed 280 to 113.)	No.
256. Sept. 1	Quorum call	Present.
257. Sept. 1	H.R. 3141: Final passage of bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, to extend provisions of the act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in schools for the health professions. (Passed 340 to 47.)	Yes.
258. Sept. 2	Quorum call	Present.
259. Sept. 2	H.R. 5863: Final passage of bill authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation. (Passed 317 to 24.)	Yes.
260. Sept. 2	Quorum call	Present.
261. Sept. 7	Quorum call	Present.
262. Sept. 7	H.R. 8439: Motion to table a motion to discharge the House Armed Services Committee from further consideration of the military construction bill vetoed by the President. (Passed 323 to 19.)	Yes.
263. Sept. 7	H.R. 10775: Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to authorize military construction, in lieu of the bill H.R. 8439, voted by the President. (Passed 347 to 0.)	Yes.
264. Sept. 7	H.R. 168: Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill increasing the rates of service-connected compensation for veterans. (Passed 348 to 0.)	Yes.
265. Sept. 7	S.J. Res. 102: Motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution authorizing $1,500,000 for the Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and the District of Columbia Commission on Crime and Law Enforcement. (Passed 339 to 0.)	Yes.
266. Sept. 8	Quorum call	Present.
267. Sept. 8	Quorum call	Present.
268. Sept. 8	Quorum call	Present.
269. Sept. 8	H.R. 10871: Final passage of $3,400,000,000 foreign aid appropriation bill. (Passed 239 to 143.)	Yes.
270. Sept. 9	Quorum call	Present.
271. Sept. 9	Quorum call	Present.
272. Sept. 13	Quorum call	Present.
273. Sept. 13	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call on rollcall No. 272. (Passed 226 to 126.)	NV.[3]
274. Sept. 13	Quorum call	Present.
275. Sept. 13	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call on rollcall No. 274. (Passed 244 to 127.)	Yes.
276. Sept. 13	Quorum call	Present.
277. Sept. 13	Quorum call	Present.
278. Sept. 13	Quorum call	Present.
279. Sept. 13	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call on rollcall No. 278. (Passed 256 to 124.)	Yes.
280. Sept. 13	Quorum call	Present.
281. Sept. 13	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call on rollcall No. 280. (Passed 255 to 121.)	Yes.
282. Sept. 13	Motion to table the motion that the Journal be approved as read. (Failed 138 to 245.)	No.
283. Sept. 13	Motion to terminate debate on the motion to approve the Journal. (Passed 257 to 126.)	Yes.
284. Sept. 13	Motion to approve the Journal. (Passed 265 to 119.)	Yes.
285. Sept. 13	Motion to adjourn. (Failed 175 to 204.)	No.
286. Sept. 13	H. Res. 506: Motion to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1965 in order that it might be brought up on the floor of the House for debate. (Passed 259 to 121.)	Yes.
287. Sept. 13	H. Res. 506: Motion to table the motion that the note on roll No. 286 be reconsidered. (Passed 194 to 181.)	Yes.
288. Sept. 13	Motion to adjourn. (Failed 174 to 202.)	No.
289. Sept. 13	Quorum call	Present.
290. Sept. 13	Motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call on rollcall No. 289. (Passed 243 to 136)	Yes.
291. Sept. 13	H. Res. 499: Motion to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of the bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 so that it might be brought up on the floor of the House for debate. (Passed 201 to 171.)	Yes.
292. Sept. 13	H. Res. 478: Motion to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of the bill establishing the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. (Passed 260 to 114.)	Yes.

See footnotes at end of table.

No. and date (1965)	Issue	Vote
293. Sept. 13	H. Res. 536: Motion to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of the Federal employees pay raise bill. (Passed 289 to 84.)	Yes.
294. Sept. 14	Quorum call	Present.
295. Sept. 14	Quorum call	Present.
296. Sept. 14	H. R. 2091: Motion to recommit the bill establishing concession policies in the areas administered by the National Park Service. (Failed 73 to 298.)	No.
297. Sept. 15	Quorum call	Present.
298. Sept. 15	Quorum call	Present.
299. Sept. 15	H. R. 8283: Motion to recommit conference report on the bill expanding the war against poverty in order to retain the veto power of the State Governors in the form approved by the House. (Passed 209 to 180.)	No.
300. Sept. 15	Quorum call	Present.
301. Sept. 15	H.R. 9460: Motion to recommit bill establishing the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. (Failed 128 to 251.)	No.
302. Sept. 16	Quorum call	Present.
303. Sept. 16	H. Res. 574: Motion to table the resolution to compel the Postmaster General to furnish the names of temporary employees employed during the summer of 1965. (Passed 185 to 181.)	Yes.
304. Sept. 16	S. 2042: Final passage of bill extending the authority of the Atomic Energy Commission to indemnify licensees and contractors for public liability. (Passed 338 to 30.)	Yes.
305. Sept. 17	Quorum call	Present.
306. Sept. 17	H.R. 9221: Motion to adopt conference report on the $46,800,000,000 Defense Department appropriation. (Passed 382 to 0.)	Yes.
307. Sept. 17	H. Res. 585: Motion to adopt the resolution as amended dismissing the 5 Mississippi election contests. (Passed 228 to 143.)	Yes.
308. Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.
309. Sept. 20	H.R. 10873: Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill establishing a program of group life insurance which shall be provided by private insurance companies for members of the uniformed services on active duty. (Passed 362 to 0.)	Yes.
310. Sept. 20	H. Res. 560: Motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the issue of intervention of the international communistic movement in the Western Hemisphere. (Passed 312 to 52.)	Yes.
311. Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.
312. Sept. 21	Quorum call	Present.
313. Sept. 21	S. 4: Motion to adopt conference report on the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1965. (Passed 381 to 0.)	Yes.
314. Sept. 22	Quorum call	Present.
315. Sept. 22	S. 2300: Motion to amend the Rivers, Harbors, and Flood Control Act of 1965 to delete the authorization for the Dickey-Lincoln school project in Maine. (Passed 207 to 185.)	No.
316. Sept. 22	H. R. 30: Final passage of bill providing for U.S. participation in Interama. (Passed 255 to 112)	Yes.
317. Sept. 22	Quorum call	Present.
318. Sept, 22	Motion to adjourn. (Failed 90 to 204)	No.
319. Sept. 23	Quorum call	Present.
320. Sept. 23	H. R. 7371: Motion to amend the bill closing a loophole in the Bank Holding Act of 1956. (Passed 199 to 178)	No.
321. Sept. 23	H. Res. 580: Motion to cut off debate on the question of taking up for consideration the bill, H. R. 10232, the bill to provide Federal assistance to rural communities for the construction of water and sanitation systems. (Passed 280 to 70.)	Yes.
322. Sept. 23	H.R. 10232: Final passage of bill to provide Federal assistance to rural communities for the construction of water and sanitation systems.	Yes.
323. Sept. 24	Quorum call	Present.
324. Sept. 24	S. 306: Crippling motion to recommit the Clean Air and Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965.	No.
325. Sept. 24	S. 306: Final passage of Clean Air and Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965. (Passed 294 to 4.)	Yes.
326. Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
327. Sept. 27	H. Res. 515: Motion to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of the District of Columbia home rule bill. (Passed 213 to 183.)	Yes.
328. Sept. 27	H. Res. 515: Motion to take up for consideration the bill providing for home rule for the District of Columbia. (Passed 223 to 179.)	Yes.
329. Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
330. Sept. 27	H.R. 4644: Motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the District of Columbia home rule bill. (Passed 234 to 155.)	Yes.
331. Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
332. Sept. 28	Quorum call	Present.
333. Sept. 28	Quorum call	Present.
334. Sept. 28	Quorum call	Present.
335. Sept. 29	Quorum call	Present.
336. Sept. 29	H.R. 4644: Motion to kill the District of Columbia home rull bill. (Failed 179 to 219.)	No.
337. Sept. 29	H.R. 4644: Motion to adopt the language of the Sisk amendment to the District of Columbia home rule bill providing for a referendum in the District of Columbia on the question of home rule. (Passed 227 to 174.)	No.
338. Sept. 29	H.R. 4644: Crippling motion to recommit the District of Columbia home rule bill as amended. (Failed 134 to 267.)	No.
339. Sept. 29	H.R. 4644: Final passage of the District of Columbia home rule bill as amended. (Passed 283 to 117.)	Yes.
340. Sept. 30	Quorum call	Present.
341. Sept. 30	H.R. 2580: Motion to adopt conference report on the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 providing for a limitation on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. (Passed 320 to 69.).	No.
342. Sept. 30	H.R. 10281: Motion to recommit Federal employees pay raise bill in order to delete provisions for automatic pay increases for Members of of Congress, the executive branch, and judges. (Passed 238 to 140.)	No.
343. Sept. 30	H.R. 10281: Final passage of Federal employees pay raise bill. (Passed 370 to 7.)	Yes.
344. Oct. 1	Quorum call	Present.
345. Oct. 1	H.J. Res. 642: Motion to recommit the bill authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to construct the 3d Library of Congress Building. (Failed 17 to 321.)	No.
346. Oct. 1	H.J. Res. 642: Final passage of bill authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress Building. (Passed 328 to 5.).	Yes.
347. Oct. 1	H.R. 10871: Motion to recommit conference report on the foreign aid bill of 1965. (Failed 164 to 174.)	No.
348. Oct. 1	H.R. 10871: Motion to adopt the conference report on the foreign aid bill of 1965. (Passed 204 to 127.)	Yes.
349. Oct. 1	H.R. 3142: Final passage of bill to amend the Public Service Act to provide grants to aid medical library services and facilities. (Passed 296 to 3.).	Yes.
350. Oct. 1	H.R. 6519: Final passage of bill authorizing construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis, Mo. (Passed 250 to 12.)	Yes.
351. Oct. 5	Quorum call	Present.
352. Oct. 6	Quorum call	Present.
353. Oct. 7	S.J. Res. 32: Final passage of resolution authorizing compensation for certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for deaths and injuries as a result of acts of the U.S. Armed Forces from 1945 to 1952. (Passed 312 to 5.)	Yes.
354. Oct. 7	H.R. 2020: Final passage of bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project. (Passed 240 to 134.)	Yes.
355. Oct. 7	Quorum call	Present.
356. Oct. 7	S. 2084: Motion to amend the Highway Beautification Act of 1965. (Failed 153 to 230.)	No.
357. Oct. 7	S. 2084: Final passage of Highway Beautification Act of 1965. (Passed 245 to 138.)	Yes.
358. Oct. 8	Quorum call	Present.
359. Oct. 8	H.R. 9811: Motion to adopt conference report on the omnibus farm bill of 1965. (Passed 219 to 150.)	Yes.
360. Oct. 11	Quorum call	Present.
361. Oct. 12	Quorum call	Present.
362. Oct. 12	Quorum call	Present.
363. Oct. 12	H. Res. 598: Motion to take up for consideration the bill, H.R. 11135, to amend the Sugar Act of 1948. (Passed 253 to 80.)	Yes.
364. Oct. 12	Quorum call	Present.
365. Oct. 13	Quorum call	Present.
366. Oct. 13	H.R. 11135: Motion to recommit the bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948. (Failed 160 to 230.)	No.
367. Oct. 13	H.R. 11135: Final passage of bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948. (Passed 246 to 147.)	Yes.
368. Oct. 14	Quorum call	Present.
369. Oct. 14	H.R. 11588: Motion to amend the supplemental appropriation bill to delete the funds for the rent supplement program. (Passed 185 to 162.)	No.
370. Oct. 14	H.R. 11588: Final passage of supplemental appropriation bill. (Passed 242 to 100.)	Yes.
371. Oct. 18	Quorum call	Present.
372. Oct. 19	Quorum call	Present.
373. Oct. 20	Quorum call	Present.
374. Oct. 20	Quorum call	Present.
375. Oct. 20	Quorum call	Present.
376. Oct. 20	H.R. 9567: Motion to recommit the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to delete the provisions for the National Teacher Corps. (Failed 152 to 226.)	No.
377. Oct. 20	H.R. 9567: Motion to adopt the conference report on the Higher Education Act of 1965. (Passed 313 to 63.)	Yes.
378. Oct. 20	S. 2300: Motion to adopt the conference report on the Rivers, Harbors, and Flood Control Act of 1965. (Passed 221 to 39.)	Yes.

No. and date (1965)	Issue	Vote
379. Oct. 21	Quorum call	Present.
380. Oct. 21	H.R. 11588: Motion to adopt the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill including an appropriation of $125,000 for the HemisFair planning study. (Passed 250 to 84.)	Yes.
381. Oct. 21	H.R. 11588: Motion to accept the Senate amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill providing for the Dickey-Lincoln project in Maine. (Passed 166 to 162.)	Yes.
382. Oct. 22	Quorum call	Present.
383. Oct. 22	H.R. 11135: Motion to adopt conference report on the bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948. (Passed 174 to 88.)	Yes.

[1] Official leave obtained because of House business.

[2] Not voting. Official leave obtained because of House business.

[3] Not voting, but present while vote in progress.

Independence of Mauritania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when the Islamic Republic of Mauritania celebrates its fifth anniversary of independence on November 28, the 1st session of the 89th Congress will have come to a close. We wish to take note of this great occasion at this time, therefore, by extending warm felicitations to His Excellency Moktar Ould Daddah, the President of Mauritania; and to His Excellency Ahmed-Baba Miske, the Mauritanian Ambassador to the United States.

It is with pleasure that I rise to congratulate this young and prosperous country which touches the Atlantic Ocean in northwest Africa on its fifth birthday.

A young nation, Mauritania is not well known to the American people, but I suspect that will not be the situation for very long. Mauritania, in terms of size alone, is about 418,000 square miles, the approximate size of California and Texas together, but its population is only about 1 million persons, or the approximate size of the city of Baltimore, Md.

The people of Mauritania, which incidentally are nationally biracial being 80 percent Moorish and 20 percent African Negro, are understandably proud of their capital Nouakchott which is presently being built in the desert about 4 miles inland from the ocean. Construction of this beautiful, new, rapidly growing city began in 1958. The city somehow signifies the vigor and vitality of this new nation, and the role it will play in emerging Africa.

French penetration of the area now known as Mauritania began in the early part of the 20th century with a protectorate established in 1903, but it was not until about 1920 that the area could be said to be under French control. The French had a profound influence on the development of the country, abolishing slavery, establishing the French language, reducing or eliminating the payment of tribute, and relying on the administration and authority of the customary chiefs.

By 1957 Mauritania had elected its own officials who enjoyed wide authority, and in 1958 the country entered the French community as an autonomous but not fully sovereign nation. The Islamic Republic was proclaimed in November 1958, and for the next 2 years the country was geared to eventual and early independence as a sovereign member of the community of nations.

Mauritania finally reached its goal of complete independence on November 28, 1960, and 1 year later, in November 1961, Mauritania became an equal among nations when it joined the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I admire the Mauritanians for their social and governmental integrity, a characteristic both old and new nations need if they are to be respected in the court of world politics and opinion. The virtue of integrity is the virtue of excellence and merits our closest consideration and admiration. I hope that all of us will encourage this young country in its pursuit of morality and decency, as it tries desperately hard to provide its citizens with political stability and social justice.

I wish the government and every one of its 1 million inhabitants congratulations and best wishes in the years ahead.

Congressman Wolff Again Protests Against Consideration of Any Further Aid to the United Arab Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a letter to the President about American aid to Nasser:

OCTOBER 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is with considerable concern that I have noted recent news reports that President Nasser of the United Arab Republic is again requesting substantial assistance from the United States for fiscal year 1966.

I know you will understand the reasons why I am again bringing to your attention a matter of great concern to myself and my constituents.

I would like to reaffirm, Mr. President, my steadfast opposition to any further aid to the United Arab Republic unless such aid is absolutely essential to the security of our Nation. I know you will recall that I was one of the Members of Congress who voted last March to place within your sole discretion the power to make such a decision. I remember your assurances at that time that our own national interest and our own national security would be the guide in the event such a decision would have to be made.

May I respectfully submit that, given the limitations of my own knowledge of all the factors involved, further aid to Nasser is not warranted at this time. The Middle East continues to be in turmoil, tension remains high in the area, because of Nasser's intrigues and belligerence. I believe, Mr. President, that we must do what we can to reduce tensions, and must not provide support to those who are a threat to peace.

Respectfully,

LESTER L. WOLFF,
Member of Congress.

Justice Department Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] earlier today disclosed what appear to be certain grave irregularities in the administration of justice by the Federal Government.

I do not presume to judge the innocence or guilt of James R. Hoffa, the president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, on the various charges of wrongdoing made against him by the Department of Justice. Personally, I have strongly disapproved of Mr. Hoffa's conduct of his office and long ago asked him to resign his position because I felt some of his actions have reflected unfairly on the integrity of the American labor movement.

While my appraisal of Mr. Hoffa's role as a union leader has not changed, I have become increasingly alarmed over certain aspects of the Federal Government's prosecution of Mr. Hoffa. To the lay observer it seems as though there is a determination by some officials in the U.S. Department of Justice to "get Hoffa" regardless of price, even if the integrity of Federal justice is compromised.

The gentleman from Illinois has listed a number of amazing irregularities in the consideration of a Government witness which amount to illegal immunity of an informer from prosecution for his many alleged misdoings. The obvious conclusion is that a witness is cooperating fully with the Federal Government to save himself from prosecution on various serious charges.

Any fairminded person who has cherished the tradition that American justice is administered through impartial law should be concerned at the charges which have arisen out of the conduct of the U.S. Department of Justice's cases against Mr. Hoffa. If public sentiment is not generally favorable to Mr. Hoffa it is all the more important an extraordinary effort be made by the Federal Government to curb any tendency toward overzealousness in making its case against him.

It is a perversion of justice, surely, to use highly questionable, if not illegal means to win convictions. It is doubly so, in my opinion, when the majesty of Federal justice stoops to such measures. I am concerned that should we cynically tolerate abuses in the administration of Federal justice wherever unpopular individuals, groups, or causes are involved we will indeed face a serious crisis in our democracy.

Because the gentleman from Illinois has made serious charges, I feel compelled to join my colleagues in urging the House Committee on the Judiciary to implement a resolution adopted in 1964 which authorized an investigation in the operations of the Justice Department. Certainly the committee needs to take the initiative in reviewing the charges and countercharges of wrongdoing so that this serious problem can be settled.

Summary of Activities of Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, 1st Session, 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, pursuant to permission granted, I submit for printing in the RECORD a summary of activities of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, 1st session, 89th Congress:

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, 1ST SESSION, 89TH CONGRESS

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service lost the services of its distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from South Carolina, Olin D. Johnston, on April 18, 1965. Senator Johnston presided over the committee during the 81st, 82d, 84th, 85th, 86th, 87th, 88th, and 89th Congresses. He served as a Member of the Senate for more than 20 years and was one of its most distinguished and respected Members.

Senator Johnston's illness and untimely death delayed the committee in its performance of legislative activity. Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY was appointed chairman of the committee on April 22, 1965. Senator DONALD S. RUSSELL, of South Carolina, was appointed to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Johnston.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Nominations

The committee held hearings on the nominations of four persons to hold high offices in the executive branch. All nominations were reported favorably to the Senate and all were confirmed. The Honorable John A. Gronouski was nominated to continue as Postmaster General on February 17, 1965; the Honorable John W. Macy, Jr., was nominated for a full 6-year term as Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission on March 1, 1965; the Honorable A. Ross Eckler was nominated to be Director of the Bureau of the Census on July 14, 1965; and the Honorable Lawrence Francis O'Brien was nominated to be Postmaster General on August 30, 1965.

The committee received 1,456 postmaster nominations for consideration during the session. Of these, 1,288 were favorably reported to the Senate and were confirmed; 11 were withdrawn by the President; and 157 were pending at the time of adjournment.

Legislative activity

During the session, 89 Senate bills, 2 Senate resolutions, 2 Senate joint resolutions, and 25 House bills were referred to the committee.

The committee reported to the Senate five Senate bills and nine House bills. Ten bills reported by the committee were passed by both Houses of Congress and became public law. Four Senate bills are pending before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Public hearings on 12 legislative subjects were held by the committee and its subcommittees on 20 different days. These included hearings before an ad hoc subcommittee on railway postal service. All hearings were printed by the committee and are available for public distribution. The full committee held 13 executive sessions and its subcommittees 5 executive sessions.

The most outstanding achievement of the committee in 1965 was the consideration of H.R. 10281, the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-301). The full committee held 8 days of public hearings on this bill and met in executive session on six occasions. The bill as reported by the committee and approved by Congress resulted in a 3.6-percent increase in Federal employees' salaries, a new severance pay program for separated employees, and new overtime pay provisions for postal employees.

A second major legislative achievement was the enactment of a substantial increase in the annuities of retired Federal employees. H.R. 8469 (Public Law 89-205) provided for more than a 6-percent increase in annuities for persons retired since 1956 and 11 percent for those who retired prior to the 1956 Retirement Act.

Other measures favorably considered by the committee, each of which has been signed into law by the President, include the following:

1. H.R. 1732, amending the Advance Pay and Allotment Act of 1961 to include the Government Printing Office (Public Law 89-47).
2. H.R. 1771, establishing a 5-day workweek for Postmasters (Public Law 89-116).
3. H.R. 1782, amending the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of the act (Public Law 89-45).
4. H.R. 2594, clarifying the application of certain annuity increase legislation (Public Law 89-17).
5. H.R. 6165, repealing obsolete statute relating to the appointment of women to clerkships in the executive departments (Public Law 89-261).
6. H.R. 6622, exempting the postal field service from the numerical restrictions on permanent employee positions of the Whitten amendment (Public Law 89-114).
7. H.R. 11420, providing free mailing privileges for members of the Armed Forces in combat areas (Public Law 89-315).
8. S. 2572, extending the cutoff date of this year's retirement annuity increase. (The Senate passed H.R. 11303 in lieu of S. 2572.) (Public Law 89-314.)

The following are the four bills favorably reported by the committee which were passed by the Senate but are still pending before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

1. S. 390, extending second- and third-class bulk mailing rates to volunteer fire companies.
2. S. 1495, permitting variation of the 40-hour workweek for Federal employees for educational purposes.
3. S. 1496, repealing the provisions which prohibit the detailing of employees from field positions into the District of Columbia except for the performance of duties in connection with their respective field offices.
4. S. 2393, authorizing additional GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 positions for use in agencies or functions created or substantially expanded after June 30, 1965.

Health Check

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the Congress and to the general public a most noteworthy program dedicated to preserving the health, and extending the lives, of our people. It is called Health Check, and is the creation of the National Capitol Life Insurance Co., who have their home offices in Pennsylvania.

For many, many months now, this Congress has labored to introduce and to pass legislation that has had a greater effect on the health and welfare of the American people than ever before in our history. Among the many programs benefiting the American public are now such health protective features as medicare and other public health grants.

I have been very pleased to notice that the National Capitol Life Insurance Co., a company indicating the firm objectives toward insurance programs that act as public services, has introduced their new Health Check program, which benefits the individual with a significant monetary savings if he takes a physical examination each year.

I take this opportunity to introduce into the RECORD of this Congress the fact that National Capitol Life Insurance Co. is offering the American public the notable remittance of 10 percent of their insurance premiums each year with the presentation of proof that the person has taken a physical examination within the past 6 months.

From the information I have gathered, this is the first time that such a beneficial program, so pertinent to the health and welfare of the people of this Nation, has been put forward by an insurance company within the United States.

In addition, I would like to point out the tremendous efforts upon the part of all our governmental agencies directed toward obtaining the support, cooperation, and assistance of American industry and business in carrying out their many programs upon the part of the public's well-being. Yet, here is a life insurance company that has taken a giant step forward in this area without any solicitation whatever, and has developed a program of communication to the public concerning the necessity for, and the benefits deriving from, an annual physical examination. Moreover, they have taken a major step in seeing to it that the public benefits in its pocketbook immediately, by virtue of an annual physical examination, with their 10-percent discount on life insurance premiums.

This is but a sample of the tremendous effort being put forth by the National Capitol Life Insurance Co., and its president and chairman of the board, Mr. Joseph Dillinger. This company is currently mailing materials, advertising in various media, and seeking support of a multitude of organizations, to spread the word about the benefits derived from taking an annual physical examination. I am particularly pleased that National Capitol Life Insurance Co. has shown the good sense and the bright creativity to offer an incentive to the public where it makes sense. How often we receive messages concerning our welfare that we ignore for some reason or other: we are too busy; we do not wish to expend the effort to read about the material; it is an inconvenience to visit the doctor or the dentist; or, we simply are careless.

However, when we discover that we are going to profit by a significant amount of dollars, then we somehow find the necessary time. And, National Capitol Life Insurance Co., realizing this fact about people, has overcome this obstacle by simply offering them a dollars-and-cents incentive—even though it means that they may earn less on their premium income.

They claim that this program, in reality, will earn them even more premium income. This is a fact. They astutely point out that the concept of preventative medicine has been a boon to the insurance industry, since it has increased the longevity of their insureds, and, thus, increasing the premium longevity of the companies. Here, too, National Capitol will benefit financially, in the long run, by taking a very positive step in keeping their insureds alive and well for a longer period of time. It is this simple: If the insured goes to the doctor and discovers he has the initial signs of either heart disease, cancer, or diabetes, he will surely move immediately to arrest or correct this condition—thus, increasing his chances of living years longer. This, in turn, will increase the premium income of the company, for the additional years the insured will gain over what he might have lost if he had not discovered his malady in time.

I should also like to point out that we here in the Congress are not the only ones who are delighted with this new program on the part of National Capitol Life Insurance Co. For example, Dr. Carl C. Kuehn, director of the Pennsylvania Department of Health, has spoken before the personnel and field force of National Capitol Life Insurance Co., praising them for their efforts on behalf of the public welfare. Members of the Pennsylvania Legislature have gone on record in praise of Mr. Dillinger and the National Capitol Life Insurance Co. for their efforts to increase the longevity and to preserve the health of our citizenry. I should like to quote at this time from a message delivered to National Capitol Life Insurance Co. by Dr. Samuel S. Leiter, member of the Philadelphia Medical Society, where he calls this new Health Check program, and its concomitant 10-percent premium discount for submitting proof of annual physical examination, "a positive public service that should receive the encouragement of all members of the medical and public health professions."

On behalf of myself and those particularly interested in the public health and welfare, I take this opportunity to congratulate National Capitol Life Insurance Co., and its president and chairman of the board, Mr. Joseph Dillinger, for their exemplary Health Check program, and to wish them great success in their efforts to benefit the American public.

One Bank Merger Leads to Another As the Trend to Super Concentration in Finance and Industry Continues Unabated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, starting soon after World War II we in Congress became very much alarmed over the trend toward rapid concentration and centralization of economic power in America.

In 1950 we amended the Clayton Act to apply to mergers, rendering unlawful those which tended toward monopolies.

In 1960 we passed a Bank Merger Act intended to slow a tremendous acceleration in bank mergers.

Recent testimony before your Banking and Currency Committee by experienced bankers as well as public officials strongly opposed any congressional action that would weaken our laws against superconcentration. The thrust of these expert opinions was that not only are individual bank mergers harmful in themselves but carry the additional evil of encouraging other competing institutions to merge so that they will not be pushed out of their markets by the original merger.

A situation in St. Louis, Mo., which has developed just in the last 4 months, is conclusive proof that these witnesses were dead right. On July 6 in St. Louis, the Mercantile Trust Co. and the Security Trust Co. merged with the resulting bank having assets of close to $1 billion. This merger was strongly opposed by both the Attorney General and the Federal Reserve Board, but Comptroller of the Currency Saxon approved it anyway.

The Justice Department went to court and now the case is pending. If a bill presently before your committee, S. 1698, becomes law, this merger will be forgiven from the antitrust laws even though the banks knew that the antitrust laws applied to them as well as the fact that the Justice Department intended to bring suit.

But, Mr. Speaker, what is more to my present point is the fact that in the same city of St. Louis where concentration in the local banking community is already quite serious, I have just been informed that the second largest bank in St. Louis, the $600 million First National Bank, plans to form a new bank holding company system which would also include the fourth largest bank in St. Louis as well as a large trust company. If this transaction goes through, the new holding company will control over $900 million of bank deposits and St. Louis banking will be firmly in the grip of these $2 billion giants. The same pattern can be expected to be repeated all over the country. Bank mergers lead to additional bank mergers, just as night follows day. It has also been shown that concentration in banking leads to concentration and diminution of competition in other industries. The threat to free competition in banking and to our free enterprise system is serious indeed.

We need to strengthen our antimerger laws and not weaken them. We are at the crossroads and the future of American capitalism is at stake.

Annual Legislative Report, 89th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, it has been my custom at the conclusion of each session of the Congress to report to the residents of the 13th Congressional District of Illinois on the activities of the Congress. The record of the 1st session of the 89th Congress certainly has been extraordinary, and it would be impossible to include a detailed account in such a report of each of the issues that have been involved. However, I have attempted to touch briefly on the issues of major interest to my constituents. The report follows:

Annual Legislative Report, 89th Congress, 1st Session

(By Congressman Donald Rumsfeld of the 13th Congressional District, Ill.)

Washington, D.C.—The record-breaking 1st session of the 89th Congress has ended. House action included 13,798 measures introduced, 1,129 passed. Twenty-two rollcalls in 1 day shattered a record on September 13, and 10 days later, when the roll was called for the 308th time, it topped the mark of 307 set in 1951. At the final bell, the roll had been called an amazing 383 times.

This report, as in previous years, will comment on some of the problems which have come before Congress during 1965. Understandably, it can touch only the highlights. I welcome your comments and views on matters before Congress. Full details on any measure may be obtained by writing my office, 241 Cannon Building, Washington, D.C., 20515.

LEGISLATION SPONSORED

Part of a Congressman's responsibility is to identify problem areas and initiate action to resolve them. This year, I have introduced and sponsored various bills and resolutions, including proposals for:

Tax credits for education expenses: To permit individual tax credits for parents and others who are financing students in college.

Voting Rights Act of 1965: To implement voting rights by the appointment of Federal registrars. A composite bill has now been signed into law.

Human Investment Act of 1965: To provide a tax incentive for business to hire and train unemployed workers lacking the skills for available jobs.

Food Study and Coordinating Commission: To establish an 18–member Commission to plan the future U.S. role in the world food crisis.

Miscellaneous: In response to requests from our district, I have introduced bills to grant a Federal Charter to the Hadley School for the Blind, Winnetka; and to permit the Palatine Police Department to withdraw from social security coverage because of existing double coverage.

NEW LAWS

More than 86 major bills, and hundreds of lesser importance, became law in 1965. Some of interest were: Resources: water pollution control, water resources planning, clean air, highway beautification; Health: medicare, community health services, community mental health services, National Institute for the Deaf, Older Americans Act, drug abuse control, health professions education assistance, heart-cancer-stroke aid; Others: National arts and cultural development, excise tax reductions, voting rights, military and Federal pay increases, immigration reform, Federal Crime Commission, Appalachia program, Sugar Act, tobacco subsidies, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Presidential assassination, and Presidential inability and succession laws.

WAR: THE FAILURE OF FOREIGN POLICY

Vietnam, the Dominican Republic—name any trouble spot—the hard fact is that war represents a failure in foreign policy, a failure in communication and diplomacy. Potential trouble spots of the future are as numerous as there are countries which are of interest and attraction to aggressive nations. Testimony documenting activities of the Communist-trained agitators being sent throughout Latin America and Africa warns of future problems. U.S. policy today is determining in large part the seriousness of these situations in the future. Let us hope and pray that through sound foreign policy, the administration will evidence the will and foresight to prevent, before the fact, further breakdowns in diplomacy.

ON THE DOMESTIC FRONT

There are at least three areas to which the Government and the people must devote thoughtful attention:

Rising prices: The cost of living continues to rise. Inflation hits hardest those who can do least about it—elderly citizens living on fixed incomes. Government spending ($119.3 billion authorized for fiscal year 1966 alone) is an important factor in the wage-price spiral. At some point, Government must establish priorities in Federal spending.

Lack of information: All interested citizens are increasingly aware of the fact that the public is not being kept fully informed on the conduct of Government. The purpose of my bill, H.R. 5017, is to require Federal agencies to "make all records promptly available to any person," and to provide for court action to guarantee the right of access, with the exception of specified categories of sensitive information. Up to this point, the White House has vigorously opposed such legislation, and, as a result, it remains bottled up in committee. Hopefully, next year will see sufficient public interest in a freedom of information bill that will achieve favorable consideration. Pope John XXIII, in the encyclical Pacem in Terris, said: "By the natural law every human being has * * * the right to freedom in searching for truth and in expressing and communicating his opinions * * * the right to be informed truthfully about public events."

The law society: Conspiracies to undermine the military draft and the destruction of draft cards are bringing to a peak the trend toward disregard of law. Schools, churches, and the family have a principal responsibility to see that our young people are not misled into believing there is something wholesome in violating the law. The preservation of freedom is closely associated with the preservation of law and order. Without law and order, freedom would mean very little.

Excellence of 13th District's youth: The 13th District will be especially well represented at the U.S. service academies in the new classes of 1969. Ten outstanding men from our area started military careers this summer:

Air Force Academy: Thomas W. Collier, Jr., Golf, and Paul Demmert, Mount Prospect.

Military Academy: James S. Gavitt, formerly of Evanston, and Raymond D. Gruenke, Skokie.

Naval Academy: Peter S. Chalfant, Palatine; Michael E. Fitzsimmons, Skokie; Jay B. Jans, Wilmette; Francis Albert Roberts, Chicago; and George F. Schmoll III, Northbrook.

Merchant Marine Academy: Barry L. Butter, Glenview.

Nominations for appointments are based on Civil Service examinations, physical tests, and leadership potential. Applications should be requested during a student's junior year in high school, and may be obtained from my Washington office.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS—SPACE AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

With the Gemini space flights and progress toward the Apollo moon landing, work on the House Science and Astronautics (Space) Committee continues to be a challenge. In January, I was selected for the Manned Spaceflight Subcommittee. Our committee has jurisdiction over NASA's $5 billion space exploration budget as well as the Bureau of Standards and the National Science Foundation. It is a privilege to be participating in these historic endeavors.

Also, I was selected to serve on the Committee on Government Operations, the chief House investigating committee, the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, and as ranking minority member on the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee.

THE BUDGET BATTLE—A PROBLEM OF PRIORITIES

The year 1965 saw a sharp upturn in appropriations—$13.2 billions above last year's level. Totals are: 1963—$103.8 billion; 1964—$106.1 billion; 1965—$119.3 billion. This most responsive Congress gave the President all he requested and more. The Texas Democrat who chairs the House Appropriations Committee, Representative George Mahon, explains it away by saying: "It reflects the relentless growth—for better or for worse—of centralized government in response to the demand of a majority of the people. There is no ground swell of sentiment for fiscal restraint from across the country."

EDUCATION

It is estimated that during the year ending June 30, 1966, more than $3 billion in Federal funds will be channeled through the U.S. Office of Education to schools and colleges, teachers, students, libraries, and librarians in the form of grants, loans or contracts. More than 10 new measures relating to education passed Congress this year. The most comprehensive direct aid passed this year involved: Elementary and Secondary School Act—a $1.3 bililon, 5-year program for communitywide supplemental educational centers, purchases of textbooks and teaching aids, research, and aid for State education departments; and the Higher Education Act—a 5-year, $5.5 billion program to aid State support of community service programs of colleges, grants to their libraries for training and research, and acquisition of materials, and teaching fellowships.

EDUCATION BILLS NOT ACTED UPON

H.R. 9411 (Rumsfeld, of Illinois): To allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred for higher education. H.R. 10696 (Brock, of Tennessee): To return to States a portion of Federal revenues for use in public elementary and secondary education. S. 2619 (Javits, of New York): To share Federal revenues with States through a trust fund of 1 percent of the individual income tax base to be used only for health, education, and welfare.

A BUSY FALL

My wife, Joyce, our daughters, Valerie and Marcy, and I will be returning to Illinois within a few days. I look forward to seeing many of you during the adjournment period at the various meetings which are scheduled. A few of the local groups with which I will meet during November are: Evanston Rotary Club; Northwestern University Mock Congress Seminar; Illinois Teachers College, Chicago; Wilmette and Winnetka Leagues of Women Voters; Little City Helping Hands, Palatine; the Men Off-Campus Club of Northwestern University; the North Town (Chicago) Community Council; the Purdue Club of Chicago; Golf Junior High School students, Morton Grove; the Evanston-Niles Council of Jewish Women; and others too numerous to list. Between meetings, I plan to be in my district office during this brief fall recess.

WHAT'S AHEAD IN THE SECOND SESSION?

While it is impossible to predict what the Johnson administration will offer in its legislative package in 1966, it is likely that efforts will be made to complete action on the President's three major pieces of unfinished business: Repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, the rent subsidy program, and an increase to $1.75 in the minimum wage. Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield gave another clue when he said (and I fully agree but wish he had noticed it earlier in the year): "We have passed a lot of major bills this session, some of them very hastily. And they stand in extreme need of a going over for loopholes, rough corners, and, particularly, for an assessment of current and ultimate cost in the framework of our capacity to meet it."

Regrettably, there is justification to charges that the 89th Congress did not function as a deliberative body this year. Let us hope that the Congress will concentrate on improving and perfecting this legislation next year. Under our system of separation of powers, it is not healthy when the Executive totally dominates the Congress. We, as a nation, face problems and can settle for no less than the very best solutions to these problems. The best solutions come from debate and discussion, not dictation by an all-powerful Executive.

WE CAN DO BETTER

As 1965 draws to a close and one reflects on the progress made, it is difficult not to feel that we have fallen short of our goals. The power of the American system is great. Our system depends on both private and public effort—and the success of both depends directly on the interest and participation of each person privileged to live in this free society. It is the people of a democracy who must guide its efforts, determine the quality of its leadership, and shape its course.

I believe we can do better.

DONALD RUMSFELD.

A Special Report to Constituents of the 1st Session, 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD a special report of the 1st session of the 89th Congress which will be forwarded to my constituency.

The report follows:

YOUR OFFICE IN WASHINGTON

(By Congressman ODIN LANGEN, Seventh District, Minnesota)

As this session of Congress comes to a close, I am completing my seventh year as your Representative in Washington. For this privilege, I am deeply grateful. I feel that one of my responsibilities to the people is to give them factual information as to the affairs of their Congress. For that reason I am submitting this brief report of actions and concerns expressed during this session. Because of space limitations, it is in the form of a factual account rather than a personal analysis or expression of opinion.

The bunting was barely down from January's reviewing stand when we received the first of many messages from the President on the goals of his administration, followed by the actual bills to implement them. Over 15,000 bills and resolutions were dropped into the legislative hopper this year. All did not receive action, but most major ones did.

This Congress enacted major changes in our social security system, including a health plan that provides hospital care and nursing home care. A supplementary, voluntary health plan requires the payment of a small premium. Regular social security benefits were increased by 7 percent, and new programs for child health care were added. These additional benefits require additional deductions from paychecks. A pamphlet outlining the benefits is available by writing to my Washington office. (Caution: Do not cancel your existing private medical insurance. The new Federal programs do not go into effect until next July.)

Cost-of-living increases were approved for civil service retirees and salaries were increased for postal and other Federal workers. Pay increases were approved for our men in military service and a group life insurance plan was approved to give servicemen a chance to carry insurance without war exclusion clauses.

NEW ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

This Congress enacted legislation to provide Federal assistance to State, area, and local governments to a degree never before attempted. For instance, an Appalachian assistance program was enacted to help 11 Eastern States. The Economic Opportunity Act was then passed to provide similar assistance for other areas of the Nation. Incorporated into this legislation were the old Area Redevelopment Administration and accelerated public works programs.

As program after program rolled through Congress, many Members came to the conclusion that too much was being attempted in too short a time. The feeling developed in both political parties that hastily enacted programs too often resulted in waste and poor administration. The poverty program perhaps received the most public criticism. You undoubtedly noted news reports of $20,000 salaries, $100 a day fees, money for flowers, tuxedo rentals and expensive motel rooms at plush resorts where the planners relaxed in comfort while contemplating the problems of the poor. Such public criticism points up the need for greater planning if programs designed to help the poor are to really accomplish their objectives.

WHERE'S THE MONEY COMING FROM?

When many new programs become law, money is needed to pay for them. Just before adjournment, the Congress approved more than $4.6 billion for new programs and expenditures, and we expect to get a request for at least another $4 billion in January. And we don't even know how many billions the Defense Department will need to finance the war in Vietnam. All of this occurs after we have already appropriated over $100 billion this year. The House Appropriations Committee on which I serve, trimmed budget requests by over $2.4 billion, but even this may be wiped out when pay raises and added personnel for new programs are included in the budget.

This session of Congress also saw enactment of a voting rights bill, and the first major changes in our immigration laws, and a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. A billboard and junkyard control bill was passed. Legislation was enacted to control water and air pollution. Rural communities will be aided in setting up adequate sanitation and water facilities.

This Congress also created a new Cabinet post, that of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. A housing bill estimated to cost $7.8 billion was passed, including a section that some have termed a "rent-a-care" program to provide Federal funds with which to help middle- and low-income families pay their rent.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTIONS

These temporary, wartime taxes on products and services were a nuisance and should have been taken off the books years ago. I was naturally pleased that the final bill incorporated most of the suggestions I made in my own excise tax repeal bill.

MILITARY AND OTHER INSTALLATIONS

We were successful in amending the military installations bill to include a clause that will give Congress advance notice when military or other Federal installations are to be closed. The amendment was aimed at preventing situations such as the one early this year that almost saw the Fargo regional Veterans' Administration office closed. This badly needed office will now remain open after a number of us from the area vigorously protested.

A foreign aid bill was passed with a $3 billion plus price tag. The bill to increase minimum wages, and extend coverage to farmworkers and small businesses was laid over until next year, as was the bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act.

AGRICULTURE, NOW AND IN THE FUTURE

This was a session that found your Congressman faced with additional responsibilities. I served as usual on the Agriculture and Legislative Subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, and was honored to have been chosen by my colleagues to serve as chairman of the minority task force on agriculture and as a member of the minority task force on budget reduction.

The agriculture task force found us deep in research on the problems facing the farmer and the consumer. We heard many prominent people in the field from all over the Nation and have benefited greatly from their views. We have made a number of recommendations, including a new look at agricultural trade policies with the rest of the world. Recently, we recommended and introduced a bill to set up a bipartisan U.S. World Food Study Commission to plan the future U.S. role in the approaching world food crisis. The plan, which has received widespread support, is aimed at bringing a new health and economic vitality to American agriculture while putting food into the hungry mouths of the world.

FARM BILL PASSES

A new farm bill was agreed upon that extends the National Wool Act, removes the necessity for dairymen to produce surplus milk in order to preserve their individual participation in the markets for milk for fluid consumption, extends the authority for leasing tobacco acreage, and institutes a new acreage reserve program.

The bill continues the feed grains program and the one-price cotton program. It also provides for full parity for wheat used for food here at home, or about $2.57 a bushel at current prices, on about 45 percent of the crop. Another 35 percent of normal wheat production would be under export certificates of an unknown value and the remaining 20 percent would get the going price, or $1.25 a bushel. For those participating, the program is expected to establish a national average blend price of $1.84½ a bushel. This compares to a blend price this year of $1.69.

NEW SUGAR BILL

Congress passed a sugar bill that increases the domestic quota by 580,000 tons so that stocks now on hand can be marketed. This was sugar our growers raised at the request of the Government when there was a world sugar shortage. This increase does not provide any opportunity for our U.S. sugarbeet farmers to increase production or for new growers to enter the field. This bill again favors the foreign sugar interests.

EDUCATION BILLS

The National Defense Education Act was implemented with a bill to permit classroom construction, help universities buy books, assist extension programs, help new schools strengthen facilities and faculties, and set up a new Federal scholarship plan. Another bill assists medical schools and other health schools, along with student assistance. Vocational rehabilitation was added to the present vocational school programs. Perhaps the most far-reaching assistance program in education was the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which puts the Federal Government in direct contact with local school systems for the first time. It provides for around a billion dollars for assistance to schools with children of low-income families. The method for distributing these funds has already come under fire by a number of Minnesota educators who say funds are going to schools that don't need them while the needy schools fail to get what they require. My own bill to allow personal income tax deductions or credits to parents with children in college is still under consideration and hopefully will be favorably reported next year.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

I have spent considerable time this year in protesting the curtailment of needed postal services in rural America and the apparent waste of money in the Department. We have already seen one positive result of our probings in that the Post Office Department will now use competitive bids in contracting for the printing of stamped envelopes. The saving to the taxpayers will be about $6 million.

MRS. LANGEN'S CORNER

Lillian spent a long and busy year in Washington, as you've noticed if you receive our monthly newsletter. She lists as highlights her work this year on the Congressional Wives' Prayer Breakfast, the luncheons she helped arrange for the First Lady and the wife of the Vice President, the thrill of greeting our visiting astronauts, and the annual Congressional Wives' Club Bazaar where she again extolled the virtues of Seventh District products.

Her church work has gone on as usual, a most rewarding experience for her.

In her club work, she was chairman of the ways and means committee, the group that has to think up ways of raising money. And they are not allowed to tap the Federal Treasury.

She was honored this year by the executive board at the Wives' Club, which voted to add her name to a plaque listing the names of members who have contributed outstanding service.

Daughter Lois visited in Washington between quarters at the University of Minnesota last spring, which is always an event for both of us, and our few trips home this year provided us with those rare opportunities to see Lynden and Wayne and their families as well as many others of you throughout the district.

Accompanying me to various functions in the Capital City, including the White House, completed Lillian's social season as we met many interesting people including the Crown Prince of Norway, Madam Chiang Kai-shek, and other world-famous personalities. Lillian's only regret is that she never runs across a lutefish dinner or a smorgasbord here in Washington.

CONCLUSION

As we face the next session of Congress, one thought comes to mind—that we must strive to analyze the maze of programs that have already been enacted, try to improve upon them, and move with the utmost caution if we are to avert a tragic upheaval of our entire fiscal system.

It will be a year of continued problems in our international balance-of-payments account. It also will be a year when the patience of America will be sorely tried on both the international and domestic scenes. But whatever the future holds, we face it as free Americans.

As Lillian and I travel across our vast Seventh District, it is hoped that we will get to visit with most of you. But since there is such a short time before we have to be back on the job of serving you in Washington, perhaps this brief report to you will suffice for those we do not see. May the coming holiday season and the new year be happy and fruitful for each of you.

The President Leads the Nation Toward Beauty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last February President Johnson called upon this Congress to help preserve and protect America's wonderful natural beauty, and at the same time he called upon other Americans to do the same.

On October 1, the President released a report of 8 months of study on the parts of the Secretaries of the Interior, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

This report outlines progress which has been made, and programs which are just beginning, and it offers many imaginative ideas for preservation of our beauty in the future. Some of its proposals are already reality—for example, the Highway Beautification Act was still pending legislation on October 1.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this report is excellent for the sense of direction it offers our Nation in an effort to preserve our irreplaceable natural beauty. I would like to have it appear in the Record, and include it with my remarks:

A Report on Natural Beauty to the President

(A summary of the major beautification efforts of the Federal Government, which are designed to beautify our cities and suburbs, protect the American countryside, improve our water and waterways, enhance our highways and roads, repair the ravages of industry, mobilize public support, finance beautification, and redirect Government efforts.)

(From the Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency)

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I am releasing the results of the first 8 months of the Federal Government's efforts to preserve and improve the beauty of America. These efforts are of particular concern to me, because they will determine the kind of America my daughters—and all the children of America—will inherit.

Last February (1965) I sent to the Congress a message on natural beauty. I pointed out, as emphatically as I knew how, the threat of eventual blight to our God-given heritage of natural beauty.

In that message I called specific attention to the fact that our growing population is swallowing up areas of natural beauty with its demand for living space.

I noted with concern that the increasing tempo of urbanization is already depriving many Americans of the opportunity to live in decent surroundings.

I said that a new conservation would be required to deal with these new problems if we are to protect the countryside, save it from destruction, and restore what has been destroyed.

And I also said that this conservation must be not just the classic conservation of protection and development, but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation.

That message was only one of several instances in which I have attempted to convey my interest in preserving and renovating our heritage of beauty.

I spoke of my concern in the state of the Union message.

I reiterated my concern at the White House Conference on Natural Beauty.

I have since reemphasized it in other messages, in speeches, and in great detail in much of my correspondence.

My administration has made a number of proposals to bring the full resources of this Government to bear on the problem of dwindling beauty.

I am pleased to issue the first fruits of these proposals—a report from the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

This report summarizes the major efforts of the Federal Government to lead the way in keeping America beautiful. It is an encouraging report because it indicates that concrete progress is being made.

Among other things, it reflects the plans to make this Capital the Nation's showcase.

It outlines what is being done to beautify locations that range from such diverse areas as New York City to the great open spaces of the West.

It indicates in strong fashion that research and training are important tools to be used in giving natural beauty a foothold in both urban and rural environments.

It sums up what we have done thus far to promote natural beauty in the countryside, to retain and improve our scenic and historic sites, and to preserve our wildlife.

It notes the action we have taken to offer improved outdoor recreation to more of our people.

It details our activities to improve our water and waterways as useful and yet beautiful natural resources, and our plans for controlling pollution of streams and rivers.

It points up what we have done and what we intend to do to make our vast network of highways not only useful but beautiful.

There is much more. This report reflects action that ranges from schools and classrooms to local neighborhood projects, from the disposal of refuse and waste products to the use of trash and garbage as fuels for operating desalting plants.

And yet it is only a beginning. It is a first step. I have asked those who prepared this report to continue to report to me, on a regular basis, the progress which they have made in this all-important area. These reports will be available as they are made.

But I want you to know that this is more than just a report on action taken and action contemplated. It is also a request for help. The task of creating a more beautiful America, of making it a more pleasant place in which to live, is not and cannot be the job of the Federal Government alone. We must have the enthusiasm, the concern, and the cooperation of every level of government—States, counties, cities, and precincts.

I believe that the American people share our feelings. I believe that they want a beautiful country. And I believe that they will respond to the challenge which we have set—to make this the most beautiful Nation on earth.

THE CITY AND ITS SUBURBS

Here is the area of primary challenge—where nature's grass and greenery give way to man-made steel and concrete and where most of our people dwell under the double-barreled pressures of urbanization and industrialization.

Following are some of the Government programs underway to bring natural beauty to the people of our cities and suburbs:

The Nation's showcase

Extensive plans are underway to make Washington, D.C., the Nation's No. 1 showcase of urban beautification, including:

A major effort to create a "Potomac National River" similar to the national park concept. A national river would be a natural beauty and recreation resource for the people of the Great Atlantic Megalopolis that stretches from Boston to Richmond.

Improvement of all area parks. The National Park Service has completed floral beautification of 41 parks out of a projected goal of 119 areas in the National Capital region.

Master planning of the heart of the District. Architect Nathaniel Owings has been engaged to help in the master planning for the center of the Nation's Capital. In addition, he serves with fellow architects Daniel Urbane Kiley, Edward Durell Stone, and Victor Gruen, as adviser to Mrs. Humphrey's Committee of Congressional Leadership Wives on the Beautification of the Capital.

Beautifying Federal buildings

Federal agencies have responded with enthusiasm to the President's desire that they beautify their buildings. Agency heads have issued instructions to put the President's beautification program into effect. Some results of this intensive campaign include:

Numerous requests to the National Park Service from Federal agencies for professional guidance and assistance of Park Service landscape architects.

General Services Administration (which operates more than 5,000 Federal buildings) has a vigorous building beautification program underway. All 10 GSA regions were active this summer in rehabilitating lawns, trees, shrubs, and hedges; increasing flower plantings; screening unsightly equipment and areas; and painting, repaving, and redecorating buildings and grounds.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is insuring that good architectural design is part of its plans for hospitals, schools, and other facilities built under it 13 construction assistance programs. It asks recipient to cooperate with local and area planning authorities to make sure that the federally aided structures fit in with local and area development plans.

Helping to beautify New York City

The Federal Government has responded to New York City's request for help in developing a citywide outdoor recreation plan. It has prepared a systematic inventory of all Federal programs available to aid the city's outdoor recreation efforts. It is also helping the city to acquire new recreation lands, train unemployed workers in park maintenance, improve beaches and swimming places, and protect the scenic Hudson River. The Department of Interior and the Housing and Home Finance Agency are sharing the $100,000 cost of this work.

Improving federally aided housing

The Public Housing Administration is calling for more rehabilitation of low rent housing projects including the restoration and planting of grounds as well as building maintenance.

The Federal Housing Administration and the Community Facilities Administration have proposed up to 1 percent of project cost be devoted to sculpture and works of art.

Parks and open spaces

The Federal Highway Administration is encouraging States to take advantage of the Federal road funds which do not require State matching money to purchase land in cities for small roadside parks, green strips, and playgrounds.

The Department of Agriculture has increased its service to help homeowners, developers, and State and local governments preserve and restore natural beauty in the suburbs. For instance:

In the Chicago, Washington, D.C., and other suburbs, their soil maps and specialists are helping to select the best sites for residential and industrial areas, recreation, and nature study centers. Nationally, some 75 soil surveys are underway for areawide suburban development.

In Stanford, Conn., Agriculture Department technicians helped convert a swamp into a 30-acre recreation area for fishing, swimming, hiking, and just relaxing. Without their aid it might have been converted into a city dump.

The HHFA open-space program is being tailored to waterfront development, an application of great interest to many cities. In addition, the Agency's special study on park and open space needs of metropolitan areas will soon be completed, and this, too, is of great interest.

The Urban Renewal Administration's program of historic preservation is expanding, including the recent grant to aid reconstruction of the New Orleans French Quarter. (The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 makes it possible to relocate historic structures within renewal areas, and, for the first time, to sell them to nonprofit organizations interested in maintaining and restoring historic buildings.)

Research and training

Research and technological advance is helping give natural beauty a foothold in the urban environment. For example:

The Department of Agriculture is working on new ornamental plants, grasses, and shrubs especially adapted for urban conditions. It has developed a hybrid lily, the first of its kind, with bigger and more beautiful blossoms than any other lily now grown.

The National Arboretum in Washington serves as a coordinator for natural beauty programs for botanical gardens throughout the Nation, and develops, tests, and distributes new ornamental plants.

The National Agricultural Library is consolidating all research information on pest control and making it available to cities, real estate developers, and the general public to help them protect their natural greenery.

Agriculture researchers are breeding a new variety of elm resistant to the Dutch elm disease, which threatened to wipe out these shade trees. They have also developed a spray that curbs the disease.

Because improving rundown housing conditions causes good health as well as good looks, the Public Health Service plans a program of technical assistance to States and cities on housing code adoption and enforcement to serve this dual purpose.

THE COUNTRYSIDE

The American countryside—a tapestry of farmland, mountain, forest, and prairie—is three-fourths privately owned.

Here is what the Federal Government is doing to promote natural beauty in the countryside—largely the domain of private property:

Preserving wildlife

Last year, the waterfowl preservation program set a new record: 83,000 acres were purchased; 178,000 acres were protected against wetland destruction; 9 new wildlife refuges were activated.

Preserving the land

Federal programs designed to protect scenic and historic sites are:

Protecting the natural beauty of thousands of miles of free-flowing national forest streams that have been recognized as wild rivers. Their wild state has been restored where damaged.

Encouraging suitable natural development of private lands adjoining these streams.

Setting aside 9 million acres of national forest wilderness to preserve it in its natural state for public enjoyment.

Maintaining 5.5 million acres of national forest as primitive areas.

Expanding outdoor recreation

To make more sites of natural beauty available to the people, the Federal Government has—

Surveyed nearly 800 surplus military properties to see which can be used for conservation and recreation. It has scheduled detailed investigations of 132 surplus defense areas which have known conservation and recreation values.

Surveyed the national forest trail system and its accommodations for hikers and riders. Nothing spoils the beauty of the countryside more than overuse. So this surveying will determine if new trails are needed to handle the growing number of outdoor enthusiasts.

Completed a major study of the historic, wildlife, and other recreation resources along the Lewis and Clark Trail.

Required States to provide for natural beauty in their outdoor recreation plans and to give it special priority, if they want Federal financing through the land and water conservation fund.

Added nine new areas to the National Park System, and recommended 21 more to Congress for consideration.

Helped—with Area Redevelopment Administration funds—to improve State parks, construct artificial lakes, and develop ski facilities.

Research

The agriculture researchers are active in developing flowers, shrubs, trees, and turf that have maximum beauty and adaptability to varying soil and climatic conditions. They put greater emphasis on the esthetic qualities of new plants, and also are giving increasing attention to the economic aspects of natural beauty.

WATER AND WATERWAYS

Several departments have continuing programs to protect our Nation's water and waterways. Here is a summary of Federal activities designed to upgrade rivers and streams to the level of a vital, beautiful natural resource rather than a convenient means of transportation and waste disposal:

Cleanup programs

In the National Capital area, a Federal task force, under the Secretary of Interior, has the mission of making the Potomac a conservation model for the entire country. Its plans are carried out with the active participation of the District of Columbia and of the Governors of all States the river flows through. They will provide an office and full-time staff to work with the Federal agencies. Also in the District of Columbia an experiment will get underway to develop advanced waste treatment techniques that should be of great national interest.

Following the many floods this year, the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture has stepped up the cleaning of debris from streams. This activity will restore the fishing conditions, and the beauty of streams and landscape.

The Area Redevelopment Administration's work to develop port facilities at Cambridge, Md., and New Bedford, Mass., while done for industrial purposes, has helped to clear up and beautify the waterfronts of those cities.

Pollution control

A major breakthrough in treating of domestic sewage and thus cleaning up waterways may result from a process developed by the Rand Development Corporation under contract with the Interior Department. It involves filtering sewage through coal and has performed well on small-scale tests.

The U.S. Public Health Service is demonstrating and evaluating methods to control pollution from acid mine drainage. This program consisted of three projects and may expand to another three.

The Interior Department announced a more stringent "when in doubt do not use" policy on pesticides. Priority is given to nonchemical insect controls and objectionable chemicals are being phased out as soon as possible.

The Environmental Sciences Service Administration (ESSA) which unites the Weather Bureau and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, advises public and private agencies on anticipated water levels of streams and rivers, and the likelihood of runoff. This enables these agencies to gage the potential pollution and check it.

The Maritime Administration is helping to devise an economical process for taking oil out of ballast water before it is pumped overboard. Oil discharged from ships kills birds, fish, and ruins bathing beaches. The Maritime Administration is also studying ways to prevent pollution of the Great Lakes and of harbors from the discharge of untreated sewage from ships.

HIGHWAYS AND ROADS

The average American motorist spends an estimated 2 months of each year behind the steering wheel, plus vacation driving. The vista of this man in motion is the ribbon of roadway he traverses. It can be limited, monotonous, and ugly. But some improvement is underway.

The response of the States to the President's program has been encouraging. State highway officials have endorsed it. By mid-1965, 43 States were beautifying their roads at a cost of $25.9 billion; the Federal share was $20.6 million. Here are some actions the Federal Government is taking to make natural beauty an integral part of the trip.

Signs and billboards

The Interior Department is taking a close look at all commercial signs and billboards on land under its jurisdiction. It will remove inappropriate and offensive ones.

The Agriculture Department carefully controls signs to maintain natural beauty along the 194,000 miles of national forest roads.

Important legislation now before Congress (S. 2084) could prohibit billboards closer than 660 feet from highway right-of-way, and otherwise control them.

Landscaping

The Bureau of Public Roads has taken administrative action to enhance federally aided highway systems by—

Requiring landscaping—above and beyond the usual conservation and erosion control.

Increasing the use of Federal money for high-priority beautification such as screening junkyards, excavation scars, and other eyesores.

Encouraging States to use Federal funds which do not require matching State funds to purchase land adjacent to highways in order to preserve their natural beauty. Minnesota, Maine, and New York have already taken advantage of this provision.

In addition, it has requested State highway departments to establish long-range landscaping programs for their interstate and primary highway systems. Most States have already done so, and an analysis of these long-range programs reveals—

Adequate existing or authorized landscaping on about 25 percent of the Interstate System and 63 percent of the primary system. Landscaping is planned for construction on about 11 percent of the interstate and 3 percent of the primary mileage by mid-1966.

New screening is programed next year for about 16 percent of the unsightly areas along interstate and 8 percent of those on primary routes. Screening is not feasible on about 35 percent of the areas.

Scenic sights and amenities

The Bureau of Public Roads has taken steps to—

Double the number of safety rest areas on the Interstate Highway System, and increase the number on the primary road system to the higher Interstate Highway System standards.

Authorize the use of Federal-aid funds for the construction of scenic view points, scenic overlooks, and sanitary and other amenities of the road.

An analysis of State plans for interstate and primary routes revealed that:

Some 25 percent of the major safety rest areas have been completed or authorized along interstate routes and 51 percent along primary routes. About 21 percent of these facilities are planned for construction during mid-1966.

Some 26 percent of the smaller rest areas and scenic overlooks have been authorized or completed on the Interstate System and 65 percent on the primary system. About 15 percent will be constructed by mid-1966.

RESEARCH

The Commerce Department is completing work on a scenic roads and parkway study for the Recreation Advisory Council. The study will cover data on recreation, transportation, esthetics, and engineering.

THE IMPACT OF INDUSTRY

President Johnson put it very well in his remarks to the White House Conference on Natural Beauty, May 25, 1965:

"The technology which has given us everything from the computer to the teleprompter has created a hundred sources of blight. Poisons and chemicals pollute our air and water. Automobiles litter our countryside. These and other waste products of progress are among the deadliest enemies that natural beauty has ever known."

Here are some of the Federal programs that strike at the ugly underbelly of progress by controlling: Junkyards, overhead transmission lines, strip and surface mining, refuse and waste.

Junkyard control

The Bureau of Public Roads is giving high priority and increased funds to screen auto junkyards along Federal-aid interstate, primary, and urban highways.

The Commerce Department is trying to shrink the growth of junked autos—6 million a year. It is developing processes that would make it more profitable to use auto bodies for scrap steel.

The Interior Department is also undertaking a nationwide survey to determine the factors that influence scrap movement and to find ways of speeding it up. The study will focus on the auto wrecking and other industries that accumulate junked autos.

Interior's Bureau of Mines is attacking the problem through metallurgical research. It is developing a "magnetic separation" process for economically getting the steel out of auto bodies which also contain aluminum, copper, lead, and zinc.

Overhead transmission

The Federal Housing Administration has issued a new regulation. It requires homebuilders to put utilities underground where at all feasible and get rid of ugly overhead wiring. The Rural Electrification Administration is an advocate of underground utilities, particularly in new construction. Over two-thirds of all new REA-financed telephone lines to be constructed this year will be placed underground.

The Interior Department is ready to launch a research program to devise new methods of reducing the cost of underground transmission. It has reviewed and commented on legislation introduced on underground transmission (H.R. 10513, 10514, and 10515).

(The relationship between economic and natural beauty is nowhere better illustrated than in underground installation of utilities. Ten years ago underground installation cost 10 times more than overhead construction; today the cost ratio has been reduced to 1.5 to 1.)

Strip-and surface mining

The Federal Government has launched a nationwide study of strip and surface mining, under the Appalachian Development Act. Governors of all 50 States have been asked to cooperate. Federal field teams are now in Appalachia making several on-site surveys of surface and strip mine land. State laws and regulations will be reviewed in the light of their reports.

The Public Health Service has started a program to reclaim land disturbed by strip mining. The land will be rehabilitated by regrading, burial of acid-forming materials, adequate drainage, and forest cover.

The Interior Department is publishing new regulations on surface and strip-mining operations to insure that the mined land does not produce silt and pollutants in the water that drains from it.

Sixteen projects, costing almost $13 million, have been approved by the Commerce Department and the Appalachian Regional Commission to study the harmful effects of mining, such as surface caveins, erosion, siltation, and acid drainage.

Refuse and waste products

The Public Health Service will broaden its programs dealing with the problems of solid waste, which is generated at the rate of 160 million tons a year. With the Tennessee Valley Authority, it will build a full-scale overuse composting plant which will mix raw sewage and sludge with city refuse. TVA will determine if resulting composts can be sold as soil conditioners and fertilizers.

(Few States have specific legislation giving authority to State health departments to meet the solid waste problems. A "Solid Waste Disposal Act," which would carry out recommendations contained in the President's Natural Beauty Message, has been submitted to Congress.)

The Interior Department's Office of Saline Water is studying the use of trash and garbage as fuels for operating desalting plants. Because they contain more cellulose and paraffin-base materials, trash and garbage have higher energy value and can fill a need for cheap fuel.

The town of Hempstead, N.Y., for example, is now desalting 600,000 gallons of water a day, using urban trash and garbage incinerations as the heat source.

Hong Kong plans to construct a 3.6-million-gallon-a-day desalting plant which will use burning trash and garbage as its heat source.

Thus, garbage and trash, which normally produce smoldering rat-infested dumps, would be used to produce clean water—and beautification would be a byproduct.

The Area Redevelopment Administration which will continue its work in expanded form under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 has provided technical advice that should lead to the elimination of burning culm (coal refuse) banks in Pennsylvania.

The Commerce Department is working on a continuing basis with representatives of the construction industry to encourage them to clean up debris and conduct operations with an eye to preserving the natural appearance of construction sites.

The Interior Department is giving increased attention to the disposal of mine refuse in abandoned mine shafts. The objective would be to—

Prevent mine cave-ins and surface fall-ins that destroy the usefulness and appearance of the land above.

Eliminate pileup of ugly, water-polluting refuse heaps.

Some of the new work is also directed to burying huge quantities of spent oil shale which looms as a major problem.

The Bureau of Mines and Public Health Service are intensifying efforts to cut down air pollution resulting from sulfur emission from coal.

The Commerce Department helps anti-air-pollution organizations by providing them with forecasts of atmospheric conditions that result in heavy concentration of air pollutants. This information gives them time to reduce the amount of burning in their areas.

MOBILIZING PUBLIC SUPPORT

The Vice President mentions the President's beautification program in almost every major speech, particularly when he speaks to local government officials. And he never fails to get a warm response when he suggests that they might give out as many tickets for dirty alleys as for illegal parking.

People seem to be sold on natural beauty; they want to be told what to do to achieve it.

Here are some of the Federal programs that are directing their readiness.

Schools and classrooms

State directors of extension in all but three States have responded to the Agriculture Department's call for a national emphasis on beauty. The Cooperation Extension Service is stressing natural beauty in educational work with some 95,000 4-H Clubs, school groups, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, garden clubs, nursery associations, chambers of commerce, church groups, and county home demonstration councils.

(The administration's proposed title I of S. 600 could support this extension program legislation which would direct the resources of a university on urban communities just as they have long been focused on rural areas. Universities can help provide trained manpower and technical aid needed to keep natural beauty in our civic environment.)

Public information and promotion

The Forest Service is conducting an all-out antilittering campaign so that our Nation's forests and woods will provide clean campsites and uncluttered natural beauty for all visitors.

A nationwide "youth for beauty" campaign has been launched by the Federal Extension Service. Mobilizing the Nation's youth organizations in the cause of beautification, this drive is headed by Honorary Chairman Luci Johnson.

Meetings and conferences

The Housing and Home Finance Agency's major effort right now in behalf of beauty involves a model conference for a series that would be held later in other parts of the country. The model conference, a direct outgrowth of the White House Conference on Natural Beauty, brings together outstanding experts in architecture, landscape architecture, physical planning, urban conservation, and homebuilding, plus top Government officials. They will try to identify and explore the basic problems of improving the total environmental design in sprawling urban areas. They will prepare a formal report on the ideas generated.

The Secretary of Commerce and the Federal Highway Administrator discussed natural beauty with key executives of the American Association of State Highway Officials. They underscored the need to build highways that preserve and enhance the beauty of the Nation.

The National Advisory Committee on Highway Beautification, appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, held its first meeting in May, organized a series of working groups to carry out the President's beautification program, and will meet again in September.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors has commended and endorsed the President's program, in a resolution on urban beautification.

The National League of Cities has adopted policies supporting urban beautification, and created a 25-member committee on urban beautification. The cochairmen are Mayor James Kelly, East Orange, N.J., and Jerome Keithly, city manager, Palo Alto, Calif.

Community action

The Secretary of Agriculture has directed his personnel to help improve the beauty of privately owned lands. They will do it by stimulating soil conservation districts, local rural area development committees, cooperatives, farmer committees, 4-H Clubs, and other organizations. Once motivated, these organizations can do much to beautify America.

In 1964, 4-H members—from 9-year-olds to teenagers—completed more than 325,000 home beautification projects that ranged from planting small flower beds to landscaping entire estates.

The Commerce Department, through its 42 field offices, maintains continuing liaison with businesses and is encouraging their support of Government beautification programs. This type of liaison has been successful in the past in advancing Government programs, such as the export expansion drive, the voluntary balance-of-payment effort, and the youth opportunity program.

The Bureau of Public Roads is encouraging States to enlist civic and garden clubs in efforts to improve the roadside beyond the highway right-of-way, through growth of native wild flowers.

HHFA plans a heavy schedule of meetings, seminars, and conferences aimed at educating the entire urban development and housing community on beautification.

FINANCING BEAUTIFICATION

Making America more beautiful requires the utmost in cooperation and innovation from the Government and its people. To this end the President has issued a call for "creative federalism," which implies "creative financing," for this program's popularity will depend on the heft of its payoff and the thrift of its price tag.

Here is a summary of the Federal programs that help pay for beautification:

Incentives to individuals

Many long-established Federal housing loan programs—Farmers Home Administration, Federal Housing Administration, and Veterans' Administration—contribute to the beauty of America's cities and countryside. By enabling farmers, suburbanites, and city dwellers to own and improve their homes they instill pride of ownership—a prime motive for attractive neighborhoods.

The Agriculture Department plans to make natural beauty an objective of all its assistance programs. The aim: To stimulate rural Americans to take advantage of the opportunities to improve natural beauty.

Federal cost sharing

Increased Federal aid funds have been made available to States for landscaping projects that give a high priority to natural beauty, such as screening junkyards, excavation scars, and other roadside eyesores.

States have been encouraged to use Federal funds that do not require matching to purchase strips of land which preserve a road's natural beauty. These nonmatching funds can also be used to buy land along urban highways for use as small parks, green strips, and playgrounds.

A new formula for making Federal grants-in-aid with land and water conservation funds gives growing urban populations special preference. Their need for natural beauty programs now get double weight.

The Federal departments and agencies are working with the Office of Economic Opportunity to unite beautification and antipoverty programs. Economic Opportunity Act funds are financing improvement projects that benefit—

Low income men and women, by providing needed jobs and useful work experience.

Communities, by increasing their total employment and restoring their natural beauty.

Antipoverty activities with beautification component include:

The joint OEO-NYC-HHFA neighborhood beautification program: This is designed to bring parks, playgrounds, and open spaces to urban poverty neighborhoods. First projects are slated in Atlanta, Ga.; Washington, D.C.; Detroit, Mich.; Miami, Fla.; and New Haven, Conn.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC): During the spring, this program had 9,000 youths doing beautification work in 130 projects in 38 States. Several thousand more young people were engaged in beautification during the summer, helping to spruce up housing projects, municipal buildings, hospitals, airports, schools, parks, playgrounds, and picnic areas.

Community action projects: Nearly $600,000 has been approved for projects with a beautification component in California, New Jersey, New York, and Texas.

Approval of an additional $1 million is pending for projects in Missouri, Oklahoma, Washington, North Dakota, Arkansas, Kentucky, New Mexico, and Florida.

Here are some examples of specific projects:

In Arizona, some 1,000 members of the Neighborhood Youth Corps are as work cleaning up highway litter, removing leaves and rocks, trimming shrubbery, and collecting seeds from native plants.

In Florida, the State road board has hired some 100 youths, age 16 to 21, on a 6-month project that will give them on-the-job training in roadside maintenance.

In our national forests, the war on poverty is contributing to beautification. While learning new skills, young men of the Job Corps are sent to the national forest to plant trees, trim and prune timber stands, construct picnic and camp sites, and carry out landscaping projects.

In widespread sections of the country, 15 projects involving public welfare recipients are underway which will provide work experience and training and also enhance natural beauty. These include: 1,000 persons at work beautifying Rhode Island's secondary roads by removing brush and overgrowth; and 200 persons at work improving an Ohio county's roads by landscaping and tree planting.

REDIRECTING GOVERNMENT EFFORTS

The President's leadership has stimulated a special concern for natural beauty in the Federal Establishment. Departments and agencies are more sensitively aware of how their programs can help build a more beautiful America.

This awareness has been translated into administrative reality; the quest for natural beauty has been written into the operating rules and regulations of many Federal agencies. For example:

Heads of departments and agencies with buildings and facilities under their jurisdiction have issued internal instructions to put President Johnson's beautification program into effect. Others have instructed their staff to work closely with the General Services Administration or other agencies that control the buildings they occupy.

The Agriculture Department has redirected its established programs and begun new activities, all pointed toward natural beauty. Its news agency, the Rural Community Development Service, will coordinate natural beauty activities.

The land-administering bureaus of the Interior Department have issued policy statements and guidelines to carry out the President's beautification program. The Interior

Department is also drafting a revised Executive order for the Recreation Advisory Council. The draft will make natural beauty a council concern, establish a Citizens Advisory Committee on Outdoor Recreation and Natural Beauty, and create a coordinating center for the interest generated by the White House Conference on Natural Beauty.

The Federal Highway Administrator has written directives and guidelines concerning beautification both to all Bureau of Public Roads field offices and to all State highway departments. To insure priority attention to the President's beautification program, the Bureau of Public Roads has established a special task force to review progress of the program.

The Urban Renewal Administration has issued two special technical bulletins that stress design review and design objectives in renewal projects. These guides will aid local developers to realize higher quality design.

In addition—

Through Presidential messages, speeches, and correspondence—the state of the Union message, special message on natural beauty, and remarks to the White House Conference on Natural Beauty—you have made your interest in natural beauty abundantly clear on an unprecedented scale. Presidential letters on the subject, for example, have reached out to all Congressmen, Cabinet members, mayors of cities with over 10,000 population, and county executives. (This is believed to be the first time a President has ever written directly to the heads of county-level governments.)

Your call to action has made a deep impact on the American people. As a result, they are alerted, responsive, ready to act.

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of Interior.
ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture.
JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce.
JOHN W. GARDNER,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.
SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity.
ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Arthur V. Wynne, Jr., Partner of Burrelle's Press Clipping Bureau, Livingston, N.J., Elected President of World Clipping Bureau Federation at West Berlin Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, each of us in the Senate, I think, is well aware of the value of clippings from newspapers and other publications. The "clips," as they are called, provide much useful information as well as an indication of how our individual Senate performances are being received back home.

Clipping services have grown into big business as Government officials, corporations, and other organizations and individuals have found it in their interest to maintain increasingly closer touch with public opinion.

Today clipping services operate in many cities and several even span the Nation. They also are in business in foreign countries. In 1953, the clipping services organized into a World Clipping Bureau Federation.

A few weeks back, the Federation held its 13th annual congress in West Berlin and, I am glad to say, chose a constituent of mine as its president. He is Arthur V. Wynne, Jr., partner of Burrelle's Press Clipping Bureau in Livingston, N.J. It is, I am told, one of only three press clipping services with nationwide operations. Mr. Wynne succeeds Count Gerard de Chambure, proprietor of L'Argus de la Presse, in Paris, who has served as president of the federation since its founding.

Two years ago, Mr. Wynne became the first American to serve as an officer of the federation when he was elected vice president at a congress in Geneva. His election to the presidency this year was unanimous among the 75 members of the federation from more than 40 countries around the world.

As president of the world federation, Mr. Wynne will preside over a program that includes improving the standards of the press clipping profession, prevention of infringements and illegal practices and development of business and friendly relations among all press clipping bureaus throughout the world.

Independence Anniversary of Algeria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the House will not be in session when the Algerian nation will celebrate the third anniversary of her independence. We wish to take this opportunity, therefore, to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Colonel Houri Boumedienne, President of the Republic of Algeria; and to His Excellency Cheris Guellala, the Algerian Ambassador to the United States.

On the first of November in 1954, the people of Algeria launched the long and bloody struggle against French rule that finally won them their independence on July 3, 1962. Few nations have cherished their independence so dearly; fewer still have paid such a high price for its attainment. After 8 years of fighting and the subsequent departure of 300,000 highly trained French personnel, the problems which have faced Algeria have been staggering.

In view of the social and economic challenges which stand before this young nation, the recent efforts by the Algerian Government to look to the solution of domestic problems as their most important task is most encouraging.

The economic problems alone offer a challenge which tests the resourcefulness of the most enterprising of men. The great desert in the neighboring Sahara is filled with the riches of untapped oil and gas, while the heavily populated fertile areas and cities along the Mediterranean coastal belt are filled with poverty.

Fortunately, the Algerian people appear to be equal to the giant tasks which lie before them. The disastrous departure of trained Frenchmen after the revolution was cushioned by the fact that thousands of Algerians who were equally skilled and capable remained distributed throughout the Government and economy. The recent emphasis the Algerian Government has placed on bolstering the domestic economy as its first and foremost goal along with the recent encouragement of foreign investment capital and renewed Algerian-French cooperation add to the possibilities of realizing the wealth of the Sahara, not to mention the possibilities for tourism on Algeria's beautiful Mediterranean beaches.

Throughout its long relationship with France, Algeria has had a long-standing reputation as one of the most western of all the north African nations. Since independence, the free spirit of the Algerian people has blossomed and the appearances of a modern Western nation are even more striking. Nevertheless, the Algerian people retain the quiet dignity and religious awareness that is associated with the Islamic culture.

Great challenges and long-standing problems still stretch before Algeria. Nonetheless, the courage and determination that have marked the history of this proud nation offer encouragement to those who look forward to its future as a leader among the Moslem nations of the East.

It is a pleasure for me to extend my congratulations to the people of Algeria as they celebrate their hard-won independence.

Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, any enumeration of the great women of our time would necessarily include the name of Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post. I understand that Life magazine will, in a November issue, depict some of the highlights of the life and work of this remarkable American woman and I look forward with pleasure to viewing and reading the story.

For many years my State of Florida was privileged to claim Mrs. Post as a citizen and resident. Although this legal relationship was severed by Mrs. Post for personal business reasons, we still claim her as one of our own since she maintains a fabulous winter home at Palm Beach and has done so since the 1920's. Additionally, the Governor and the Legislature of the State of Florida, in June of this year, conferred honorary citizenship upon Mrs. Post in a formal ceremony at the State capitol in Tallahassee.

It is one thing to be the head of a great financial empire but quite another for one so situated to use for the good of mankind the power conferred by such a position. As heir to the fabulous cereal fortune, Mrs. Post has lived a glamorous and a luxurious life. However, if there could be a basis for measure, her philanthropies far exceed and outweigh her personal expenditures.

As one example, Mrs. Post has offered as a gift to the State of Florida her beautiful and expensive home at Palm Beach. Her purpose, although no particular strings were attached, is that the 100-room house, beautifully landscaped grounds and the 9-hole golf course would be used for the public benefit. An embarrassing oddity here is that the State cannot afford, under present authority vested in its board of parks and historic memorials, the high cost of maintenance of the vast property, much as it wants to accept it.

This is just one small incident of the generosity of this great lady. Space here will not permit a listing of the many, many things she has done for the betterment of our country and the brightening of the lives of thousands of people less fortunate than herself.

Florida is grateful to Mrs. Marjorie Post and exceedingly proud to have her even as an honorary citizen. We shall hope that she may soon see the advantage in again becoming one of our legal residents. The State would welcome her with open hearts and arms.

Federal Reserve Chairman Martin's Mumbo-Jumbo Fails To Disguise His Tight Money Policies That Threaten Continued Prosperity and Great Society Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, William McChesney Martin, Jr., occupies a very high office, one of the most important positions in the Government. He is Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board which determines the cost and availability of money to every man, woman, and child in America.

Adequate money and credit are vital to a strong and prosperous America. Credit at reasonable interest rates is the oil without which the wheels of business and commerce would stand still. When money is tight and interest rates high, experience shows that serious economic recession is always the result. Falling employment, falling production, falling incomes are what is reaped when the Federal Reserve sows tight money.

Since Mr. Martin has been Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, we have had three serious recessions, all of which were during Mr. Eisenhower's administration. Due to the wise and sound policies of the Democratic administrations beginning in 1961, we have had unprecedented prosperity, but Mr. Martin and his all-powerful open market committee can bring an untimely end to that prosperity at any time.

At present there is every indication that Mr. Martin is doing just that. Interest rates on both short-term and long-term Government securities are at the highest since 1960, the year of our last tight money recession. Our banks do not have adequate reserves to finance the legitimate needs of businessmen, particularly as the busy Christmas season gets underway. Mr. Martin lives in an ivory tower. He does not understand the needs of the small businessman, the consumer, and the ordinary citizen. There are nearly 200 million Americans, yet Mr. Martin's policies reflect the interests of only a half dozen big Wall Street money market banks. Mr. Martin is far removed from the realities that face the American people.

On the front page of the Wall Street Journal of October 22, the following article appears:

> Mysterious Martin sounds more Delphic than usual in fending off questions about Federal Reserve credit policies. Apparently to hint he isn't moving boldly to lift interest rates, the Reserve Board chairman recites Homer's line: "Ajax retreated, but so slowly and with such a firm and severe visage that the Trojans thought he was advancing."

It is indeed a national tragedy, even scandalous, that such an important Government official tries to make a joke out of the current monetary crisis which the Nation faces. I do not believe the American people take kindly to being fed poetic quips instead of reassurances that the Federal Reserve's monetary policies will not run counter to Government programs for prosperity backed by their elected officials.

Hon. T. A. Thompson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and tragic death of T. A. Thompson has taken from the House a warm, spirited gentleman and most distinguished public servant. We shall sorely miss the pleasure of his companionship and the privilege of his counsel.

Ashton Thompson epitomized the highest ideals of public service, in which, to the profit of his community, his State, and his country, he spent his entire life. He rose to become one of the outstanding budgetary and fiscal authorities of Louisiana—a brilliant career interrupted only by his country's call to military service during World War II. His many achievements well merited the esteem of his fellow citizens, who so wisely chose him as their Representative in Washington. In their loss may they be consoled by the knowledge that he served them to the very limit of his boundless resources of energy and devotion. Yet his duty to his constituents never made him parochial to their interests; like all great Congressmen, he knew that the welfare of the Nation is paramount.

We who are the poorer for his untimely passing shall remember him, too, for his kind and generous character: A man whose great frame held a great heart. To his widow, his family, and his many friends, I sincerely extend my deepest sympathies.

Senator Robertson Addresses Kentucky Bankers Association at Louisville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, our colleague, the distinguished Senator from Virginia, A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, is to address the Kentucky Bankers Association at the Brown Hotel in Louisville next Monday, October 25, 1965. I have talked with Senator ROBERTSON, and I hope to be in Louisville to hear him, particularly as he has been kind enough to show me the address he has prepared for the occasion.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address as prepared by Senator ROBERTSON appear in the RECORD for today.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURRENT FISCAL TRENDS

(By Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON)

It is a cherished privilege to address a State bankers' association in any State, but especially so, when I can call you cousin. Daniel Webster said that no vigor of youth nor maturity of manhood would cause our Nation to forget those early spots that cradled and defended the infancy of our Republic. By the same token, I shall never forget that during our revolutionary fight for freedom, my hometown of Lexington, Va., and the entire State of Kentucky were within the same Augusta County, Va. Therefore, when I was in the House, what a joy it was to me to serve on the Ways and Means Committee with a man like Noble Gregory of Kentucky and later in the Senate with a man like Virgil Chapman. If Virginia could have claimed three men in the Senate, I would have asked for Chapman of Kentucky as our third Member—a patriot, statesman, orator, and a southern gentleman.

So, gentlemen of this great association, I am your Virginia cousin from the Blue Ridge Mountains of West Augusta, sharing your pride in your lovely women; in your rolling blue grass hills, and your determination to pass on to generations yet unborn, those priceless principles of political and economic freedom that were born of the brain and purchased with the blood of our Founding Fathers.

In these hectic days that try men's souls when the fundamental principles of private enterprise and States rights, which we have heretofore taken for granted, are being openly flouted by a politically oriented Court on the one hand and a vote-seeking Congress on the other, I often think of the strong man of mythology whose strength was renewed every time he touched Mother Earth. By the same token, my strength is renewed and my courage to go forward, strengthened, when I am privileged to make contact with a splendid group of bankers who share my views on fiscal policies.

At this season of the year, when the Midas hand of fall has touched the greenery of our mountainsides and the maples, gums, and dogwoods are bidding farewell to summer in a riotous flame of color, it would please me to be able to fill the role of the messenger of whom Isaiah said: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings." But, I would not be intellectually honest if I did not frankly say that, in my opinion, buried deep in an unprecedented boom are two latent troublemakers—inflation and Federal domination of the States.

On a dollar basis, production in this country is at an alltime high, produced national income at an alltime high, personal income after taxes, at an alltime high, and the quoted values of stocks, listed on the major exchanges, at an alltime high. In fact, the once-exciting event of a 9 million share day when the buying and selling orders were placed faster than they could be recorded, has now become commonplace and many are beginning to take for granted that the only direction in which our economy can move in the future is up. My personal viewpoint is that many of the new laws, passed to promote what is called the Great Society, involving the spending of billions of borrowed money, are inherently inflationary is either not shared by many or else is discounted as the price of progress.

I doubt if much attention was attracted by the item in last week's issue of U.S. News & World Report that the new programs undertaken this year will cost us $75 billion over the next 5 years and by 1970 these programs will be costing us about $20 billion a year.

The tremendous increase in Federal spending is illustrated by appropriations for education. I believe in education and would be glad to see our State and local governments spend more on education at every level. But education is not the responsibility of the Federal Government. Incidentally, in the Constitutional Convention in 1787, Jefferson's proposal presented by Madison to authorize a national university, was overwhelmingly defeated. In my opinion, there is no authority in the Constitution for either a national university or for Federal contribution to public schools. When a bill was pending to commence Federal contributions to public schools, I predicted that the 1 billion plus then proposed, would soon be accelerated to $3 billion and that in a few years a program that directly reached so many voters would be measurably accelerated. Those predictions have been fully confirmed because for the current calendar year, Federal spending for education will come to $6.8 billion and for next year, it will move up to $8.7 billion. And, it is anybody's guess as to how fast it will move after that.

In that program alone, are the seeds of inflation on the one hand, and Federal control on the other, because the time is not far distant when the Federal Government will fix standards for teachers just as they now fix standards for Federal aid highways; standardize the curricula for accredited schools and then they will wind up by furnishing the textbooks that all schools which receive Federal aid must use.

It is difficult to know what the actual spending in the current fiscal year will be because no one knows how much may be spent on the war in South Vietnam.

We already have added $2.4 billion to the regular military budget and we expect a supplemental request next January for $2 or $3 billion more. Of course, the President can withhold some of the funds being authorized for domestic programs, but if the military spending is of the nature now anticipated and the domestic authorizations are implemented as now anticipated, the spending in the current fiscal year, exclusive of social security, will range from $107 to $110 billion. Without supplementals next year for war purposes, Congress has authorized new spending for the current budget which is $13 billion above the previous year. While the current boom—which most economists think will continue well into 1966—will probably increase the revenue over the Treasury estimate last June of $95.5 billion, unless the increase exceeds my present guess of $2 or $3 billion we could still wind up the fiscal year with twice the deficit predicted last January in the President's budget message. The economists of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce are of the opinion that the contemplated spending program will be inflationary and I understand that the National Planning Association will soon release a 2-year study in which the same prediction will be made. Therefore, if it becomes established by the end of the fiscal year that we can look for inflation of 2 percent a year or more for a considerable period of time, what prudent investor will want to buy a 20-year 4 or 4¼ percent Government bond, which at maturity will be worth only 60 percent of what it had cost? Should my assumption that much of the borrowing must be from commercial banks be correct, two inflationary factors will be involved:

1. Banks will have a tendency to offer less than par for long term Government bonds, thus advancing interest rates, and,

2. For every dollar of Government bonds that a commercial bank buys, $6 of new credit money is potentially created.

Since the framers of his guidelines have told our President that his Great Society can be financed without inflation, he may be counted upon to bring pressure against any industrial unit that starts the inflationary parade. The makers of aluminum, steel and automobiles already know what I mean. The bankers' turn will probably come next. My advice to bankers is not to have the odium of creating inflation—by increasing interest rates—unloaded on them, even if it may mean a temporary foregoing of a profit which they could easily earn because money is getting tighter. But, the months that lie ahead should be prosperous ones for our banks and it is the function of the Federal Reserve Board, and not our commercial banks to regulate the money supply and fix its value.

Most of the Nation's economic experts have looked into their crystal balls and seen indications that our economy will continue on a high plateau for the remainder of this year and, perhaps, well into 1966, if the war in South Vietnam continues.

Although I do not claim to be an economist, I agree with that forecast. But, in view of the fact that a substantial part of the current boom will be financed by borrowed money, and a considerable part of current production will be war material, slated to be chewed up rapidly in the jungles of southeast Asia, we need not expect a continuation of the present price structure.

In the matter of inflation we have been more fortunate than any other major nation in the world during the past 2 years. But we have now reached the point of relative full employment. A major part of those now unemployed are composed of those who never had a full-time job, and don't want one, and by high school students without the ambition to get an education, and without a willingness to do the type of hard labor which their lack of skill would demand.

Already there are shortages in various categories of skilled workers and those shortages will be accentuated as the draft is stepped up, and as units of the National Guard and Army Reserve are called to active duty and many plants are enjoying full production.

Dr. Gardner Ackley says we will finance the Great Society without inflation. He is a college professor who holds a Ph. D. degree from the University of Michigan, and is relying on his 3.2 guideline concept to prevent a wage-price spiral, which he thinks would automatically cause inflation. However, "It is the Government," says the Wall Street Journal, "in the first instance which inflates the money supply, as this Government has been doing for some time. If a wage-price spiral in due course ensues, it is a result of that basic inflation. Were the authorities doing less inflating, they would not have to worry so much about preserving noninflationary wage and price movements." With respect to the theories of theorists, I recall hearing the late Bernard Baruch tell our Senate Banking and Currency Committee, when a group of college professors had said that the stock market was too high: "If they knew what was going to happen they would have all the money and we would have none." The "we" referred to by Baruch have driven the Dow-Jones industrial average to the alltime high of 945.82. That's their answer to the threat of inflation and I would prefer it to a similar group of Ph. D.'s because I have heard of Ph. D.'s with a Phi Beta Kappa key at one end of their watch chain and no watch at the other.

In recent years of price stability, much of the stimulus for expansion has come from the private sectors of the economy. In the past 5 years, Federal Government purchases of goods and services have increased by a little over 20 percent, while gross national product increased by 30 percent. Personal consumption spending increased almost 30 percent. The largest relative increases have occurred in State and local government expenditures for goods and services (45 percent and in business expenditures for plant and equipment (over a third).

Expansion in consumption, in total output and in productive capacity has been facilitated by credit expansion—both bank and nonbank. Outstanding debt of all kinds—public and private—net of duplications, has tripled in the two decades since the war.

In the past 5 years total debt has increased by close to 40 percent—somewhat more than the 30-percent increase shown for gross national product. Federal Government debt, which at the end of the war comprised three-fifths of all debt outstanding, increased by only 10 percent in the past 5 years and now comprises less than a quarter of total debt of all kinds. In the same 5-year period, State and local governments, businesses in the aggregate, and consumers have each increased their indebtedness by around 50 percent or more.

But, we should not be lulled into a false sense of tolerance toward constant deficit spending by the Government merely because the Federal debt has become a smaller percentage of all debt than it was 20 years ago.

We must bear in mind that there is one big difference between Government and private debt. When you and I borrow money we must be prepared to pay back principal and interest within a specified time.

But because the Government is expected to go no indefinitely, it is only compelled to pay the interest. When one bond issue falls due the Government can simply refinance it with new obligations, and the size of the debt goes on, and up.

You have no doubt heard the familiar line of the free spenders, who brush off a Federal debt which may go up to $328 billion this year, by saying, "Why worry about it, we only owe it to ourselves."

But, even if we take that advice and go on indefinitely without paying off any of the principal, we should worry about the interest, because that must be paid, and it is steadily becoming a bigger slice of the annual Federal budget.

For the current fiscal year interest on the national debt is $11.6 billion. Except for national defense, which takes about half of the budget, interest on the debt has become one of the largest recurring obligations.

Although increases in Federal expenditures and debt have been less in recent years than the increases in private spending and debt, it is not certain that these relationships can be maintained. The war in Vietnam is beginning to boost military spending and no one can tell how much it will cost, or how long it will last.

Moreover, many domestic programs being started in Congress this year undoubtedly will increase as time goes on. As I have said, 5 years from now they may amount to $20 billion per year.

We cannot complacently rely on the hope that growth in the economy will automatically provide the increased tax revenues that will be needed to cover all the expenditures that might be requested.

We now have a new philosophy that taxes must be continually reduced to avoid imposing an unduly restrictive burden on the economy. Unquestionably, reductions in war tax rates were desirable, but not as a permanent policy. Tax cuts can't be justified if such reductions, along with increased expenditures, result in larger budgetary deficits.

You will observe that my comments have dealt primarily with the spending program of the biggest spending Congress in the history of the Nation. Few measures directly affecting bankers have been passed at this session. They include S. 1309, the one check payroll bill; S. 2080, the coinage bill, H.R. 3818, amending the gold reserve requirements, and H.R. 5306, to authorize domestic banks to pay higher interest on deposits of foreign governments.

Sometimes the Congress is more to be commended for what it refuses to do rather than for what it does do. A striking example of that political maxim is to be found in the action of the Senate last Monday, when a majority of those present voted against placing a limitation upon the pending debate on the bill to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. That action killed that bill for this session and I hope for all time to come. Personally, I will never deem any society a great society which can merely boast of an increase in the material things of life. In any event, no great society can be created if it results in the killing of a free society. In my opinion, the keystone of the arch of our representative democracy is what Daniel Webster described as that "skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with States rights, individual security, and public prosperity." Madison and others who were members of the Philadelphia Convention felt that the rights of the States had been fully preserved in the instrument that they prepared, but under the prodding of George Mason, Patrick Henry and others, in the Virginia Ratifying Convention, he promised to spell it out in a new amendment which became the 10th amendment. The trend of both the Supreme Court and the Congress in recent years has been to erode, and ultimately destroy, that amendment. If we destroy the 10th amendment, we have struck a vital blow at the greatest bulwark against dictatorship; namely, the independence and sovereignty of the States that compose the Union. With the loss of State sovereignty and the complete domination of the Federal Government we will lose our personal freedom. As Shakespeare said in "The Merchant of Venice":

> "You take my house when you do take the prop
> That doth sustain my house; you take my life
> When you do take the means whereby I live."

May you never falter in your determination to preserve our system of private enterprise within the framework of constitutional liberty.

Cambodia's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will have adjourned when Cambodia celebrates the anniversary of its independence, November 9. We wish to take this opportunity therefore, to extend warm felicitations to his excellency, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, and to the people of Cambodia.

This small, fiercely independent nation which is celebrating its sovereignty is the modern embodiment of the ancient and distinguished Khmer Empire. Even the word "Cambodia," so familiar an appellative on the tongues of those who discuss the fortunes of Asia, is the Europeanized Kambuja, a name derived from that of the legendary founder of the Khmer Kingdom. Between the 10th and the 14th centuries much of what is now South Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand, as well as Cambodia, was the domain of the Khmer kings. The empire was a prosperous and highly cultured one; a sophisticated Sanskrit literature emerged, and a vigorous trade with India developed both in material goods and ideas. While Europe was groping toward a distant Renaissance and much of east and central Asia smoldered and wept in the wake of the Mongol Horde, the Khmer kings were building the magnificent complex at Angkor. Angkor Wat remains today, a stone testimonial in a dripping jungle to the ancient brilliance.

The past half millenium has not been kind to the Khmer people in terms of wealth, war, territory, and influence. Cambodia, between Vietnam and the Thai Kingdom of Siam, has fared no better than did Poland between Austria-Germany and Russia. Such was the imbalance of powers in southeast Asia by the middle of the 19th century that it can be convincingly argued in hindsight that French colonial intervention prevented the piecemeal conquest and assimilation of the Khmer people by their larger neighbors. The French are gone now and there can be no doubt of the full exercise of Cambodian independence but, in the eye of the nation's leader, Prince Sihanouk, foreign policy has once more become the central issue of state, directly and immediately affecting the continued survival of the Cambodian nation.

If the fortunes of Asian war and politics have not gone well for the linear descendants of the Khmer Kingdom, there have also been desirable compensating developments. Cambodia is not haunted by the specter of starvation; in southeast Asia it is uniquely blessed with a low population density. The soil is rich and only a quarter of the nation's arable land produces rice sufficient to amply feed Cambodia's 5½ million people. The abundance of land permits a substantial and growing livestock industry; extensive inland lakes and rivers provide great yearly fish catches; thus the protein deficiency that saps the vitality of many underdeveloped nations does not plague Cambodia. Further, Cambodia's society is unusually homogeneous and integrated in comparison to those of other southeast Asian countries and, although there are some problems with small minority groups, notably the Chinese and Vietnamese, Cambodia's difficulties on this score are relatively small in scope and intensity.

Prince Sihanouk has long been the principal figure in the Cambodian polity; for his people he appears to embody the national spirit, dignity, aspiration, and identity in the world at large much as does Charles de Gaulle for the French. He is a vital, colorful, sensitive man convinced that his nation is in danger and that a policy of alert, flexible neutrality holds the greatest promise of national survival. He spares neither voice nor energy in pursuing that policy.

We of the United States share the chief hope of Prince Sihanouk and his people that the world shall come to accept diversity among states and that in this milieu Cambodia will long prosper in that freedom and independence to which we direct our congratulations today.

Yearend Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD a report to my constituents on the activities of the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

The headline read: "Congress, Go Home." Finally the advice was taken. The 1st session of the 89th Congress has written its record. Without a doubt, it will be cited as a busy session. But whether the work of Congress in these last 10 months will be recorded as good is another matter. Only the future holds the answer.

Briefly, we have seen this Congress approve major legislation including excise tax cuts, medicare, Appalachia aid, voting rights, education aid for both elementary and high schools as well as colleges, immigration, and the creation of the first new Department of Cabinet rank since 1953—the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Approximately 300 public laws were enacted. This, of course, does not include the number of private bills for the relief of constituents.

One Capitol wag has questioned, "What can the second session—which convenes on January 10—do for an encore?" Perhaps it would be best that it do nothing.

Last April, in speaking engagements in both Port Huron and Saginaw, I commented on the then legislative rush as follows:

> All of this legislation, however, has this single thread in common—that it involves the Federal Government more and more deeply each day in the lives of the ordinary citizen. Life will never be the same again.

In having this opportunity to bring to you this special message on the 1st session of the 89th Congress, I have recalled those words—"life will never be the same again." Certainly, changes are inevitable. And, it should be expected that it would entail some expension and growth of government, be it local, State, or national. But the trend these days is that the Federal Government has to assume practically all of the burdens. Is it a healthy trend? I think not.

Nor do I believe it is a healthy situation when Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield candidly admits that Congress next year—1966—should spend less time on new legislation and more time correcting oversights in legislation we have just passed. Senator Mansfield was quoted as saying:

> We have passed a lot of major bills at this session, some of them very hastily, and they stand in extreme need of a going over for loopholes, rough corners, and particularly for an assessment of current and ultimate costs in the framework of our capacity to meet it.

This, I believe, is a high cost to pay for an eager, try-to-please-everyone administration. Now that it has been forecasted that 1966 will be a year of digestion and consolidation, it is good to know that these new laws, so hastily enacted, will be read, even if tardily. How much better, however, if some of the bills could have been more thoroughly examined, debated, and digested while rocketing through Congress.

It also has been said that the 89th Congress will probably go down in history as the "Puppet Congress." The President, with a two-to-one Democrat majority in the U.S. House of Representatives, and an even greater three-to-one edge in the U.S. Senate, encountered no difficulty, to speak of, in pressing administration programs.

Any self-appraisal of the 1st session of the 89th Congress would have to also include, therefore, the diminishing role of the legislative branch of our Government. In effect, Congress has been reduced to an annex of the White House. Whether you believe that some of this legislation is good legislation or bad legislation, the idea of some major bills going through without a single change or amendment not only reduces the stature of Congress, but it alters its meaning and significance as an independent branch of Government.

This, then, may be the real question the American people will have to answer in the future. It is not whether the goals of the Great Society are laudable goals—because we all share many of them—but whether we shall continue to have representative government in America.

Thus, this 89th Congress may not eventually be recalled for its greatness, but as the one which surrendered, without a struggle, its responsibility and its place in the representative government that we have known in the past.

ON THE DOMESTIC SCENE

Nearly 400 rollcalls and quorum calls were recorded in the House during the first session, breaking the old record of 305 set in 1950. It would be impossible to list, in the limited space, each single vote. I would be delighted to discuss with you any votes or provide you with available information on legislation which was enacted.

Throughout this session there have been differences between the political parties on many major issues. This is as it should be. As a recent newspaper editorial stated:

> The partisan spirit is not alien to the American spirit; rather it is through the debates that result from the partisan spirit that we arrive at the best means with which to govern ourselves.

SPECIAL LEGISLATION

As your Congressman, I also introduced 35 bills and 5 private bills. It is interesting to note the results on a few:

H.R. 4395: social security amendments increasing benefits; lowering age of eligibility; increasing earning limitations—action approved.

H.R. 6826: special housing loans for veterans under FHA –action approved.

H.R. 5295: to increase and adjust annuities for retired civil service employees—action approved.

H.R. 6694: free first-class postage for military. Permitted now for personnel stationed in danger areas.

H.R. 5294 and H.R. 7258: and voting rights legislation calling for the appointment of Federal registrars—action approved.

H.R. 5296 and H.R. 6931: repeal excise tax on passenger cars and on jewelry, luggage, handbags et cetera—action approved.

H.R. 2433: release surplus copper from national stockpile to alleviate serious economic threat to the Port Huron area—action approved.

Assistance also was rendered for the Harbor Beach area's biggest employer, Hercules Powder Co., in pressing for approval of a special food definition in the farm bill. Dredging work was approved for the Bay Port project, while congressional authorization was granted for the Lexington Harbor project. We will be pressing for the appropriation for Lexington next year. For Port Austin Harbor, the Corps of Engineers agreed to remove shoaling. In addition, a Black River feasibility study in the Port Huron area has been finalized.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Our Nation's world problems and commitments are not restricted to southeast Asia, and particularly South Vietnam. The Dominican Republic intervention this year cost many American lives. Danger still lurks in the Southern Hemisphere, where Cuba's Castro is fomenting strife. In Europe the split city of Berlin remains a potential threat. The struggle for peace is a difficult one, but a task that must be relentlessly pursued.

I have supported President Johnson's firmness in Vietnam, for I believe it is the only course of action at this time. It is my hope, however, that through the United Nations or other negotiations the war can be ended. As the late President John F. Kennedy stated so eloquently in his inaugural address:

> Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.

CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

With the legislative production at such a high pitch, my committee schedule and responsibilities were just that much greater. I feel privileged to serve on two major committees—Banking and Currency and Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It has been said that "Congress in committee is Congress at work." This is so often the case. I would be glad to share the details of these committee activities with those I represent. Should you have questions or want information, please let me hear from you.

ACADEMY APPOINTMENTS

One of the real pleasures I have as your Congressman and a great responsibility is the privilege of appointing young men from the Eighth District to the various service academies—Naval, Military, Air Force, and Merchant Marine. My final selections are based strictly on a competitive basis. No other factors are considered in the selections except the ability, both physically and mentally, of each applicant.

It was a proud moment to announce earlier this year the appointments of Blaine S. Ball, of Unionville, and Gary Peckham, of Bad Axe, to the Military Academy; Mark Fischer, of Saginaw, to the Air Force Academy; Daniel Jones, of Saginaw, to the Naval Academy; and Philip Steele, of Chesaning, to the Merchant Marine Academy.

SERVICE TO THE DISTRICT

My principal function as your Congressman is to be your legislative spokesman. In that role, representing the interests of the nearly 410,000 people in our Eighth District, it is important to know how you think and feel. I welcome your letters and the opportunity to be of service.

Dealing with the Government is often complicated. If you have business with a department of the Federal Government, or some problem with one of the governmental agencies, I would be happy to be of help in expediting your case.

Over the years, I have also attempted to create greater interest in the policies and workings of our Government. Our annual questionnaire mailing has attracted thousands of voters. It is an activity we shall always present.

BACK TO THE DISTRICT

The extended session of Congress this year has prevented me from returning to the district as frequently as I have in past years. I did manage to work in nine trips for office hours and speaking engagements. An extended visit in November, stopping in more than 30 communities for office hours and speeches, was on the agenda. I am confident that all will agree that my presence in Washington for the work of Congress must take top priority.

Through our Washington newsletter, the questionnaire, public meetings, correspondence, news releases to radio, television and all newspapers, I will continue to make every effort to help you keep abreast of fast-moving events here in Washington.

The Independence of Libya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, Congress will have adjourned by the time Libya celebrates the anniversary of her independence. We wish to extend warm felicitations at this time, therefore, to His Excellency Mahmud Muntasir, the Prime Minister of Libya; and to His Excellency Fathi Abidia, the Libyan Ambassador to the United States.

This year marks the 14th anniversary of Libyan independence. Libya is located in the center of north Africa, with a coastline which extends 1,000 miles along the Mediterranean between Tunisia and the United Arab Republic. Libya has an area roughly one-fourth the size of the United States and a population of 1.2 million. The majority of the population is of Arab origin.

In ancient times western Libya was ruled by the Phoenicians. The eastern section of the country, known as Cyrenaica, was colonized by the Greeks. In 1911 Libya was invaded by Italy. It is a tribute to the spirit of this great people that the Italians were never able to consolidate their rule beyond the coastal strip. During World War II Italy's control of Libya came to an end. The problem of Libya's political future was taken up at the United Nations, which voted to grant Libya its independence not later than January 1, 1952. On December 24, 1951, Libyan independence was proclaimed at Benghazi.

Libya is a constitutional monarchy with a senate and a house of representatives. The Libyan Government is dedicated to improving the economic and social welfare of the Libyan people. Seventy percent of the country's oil revenues are earmarked for economic development. In fact, the results of the recent discovery of oil are already evident. Roads now cross the vast Western Desert. El Sider and Mersa Brega are now important oil ports. Within 2 years Tobruk will become the third port. Libyans know that economic development must include the development of human resources. Accordingly, a large percent of the oil revenues are being spent on education and public health.

The Libyan Government has also recognized that tourism could become an extremely important source of revenue in the future. Tourists are already being attracted to Libya's magnificent Roman ruins and equally magnificent beaches. New hotels and access roads are being constructed to facilitate the expansion of tourism.

The economy of Libya is largely agricultural and pastoral. Barley, wheat, dates, esparto grass, citrus fruits, and olive oil are the principal products, which now meet domestic requirements and provide some exportable surpluses as well. Livestock, wool, and hides are also exported. Coastal fishing, which provides tuna, sardines, and sponges, is being encouraged and expanded by the Government. But there are also a growing number of small manufacturing establishments engaged in processing agricultural and fishery products, as well as handicraft industries producing textiles, footwear, leather goods, and carpets.

The United States is aiding Libya both directly and through the United Nations. I am confident that through international cooperation and domestic dedication, Libya will achieve her desire to better the lives of her people.

The Record of the 89th Congress, 1st Session: Report to the People of the Fourth District of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, an historic session of Congress is ending. Since January, this 1st session of the 89th Congress has worked unceasingly and has compiled a record of legislative achievement seldom equaled in American history.

Now the time has come to review the accomplishments of the past few months.

As has been my custom since my first election to Congress, I wish to report to the people of my district—the Fourth District of Wisconsin—on the work of the session and, in particular, on my votes and actions as their Representative.

In a sense, a Member of Congress builds his reputation with each vote taken in this body. No piece of legislation is universally popular and no man can hope, or indeed should try, to please everyone.

At the same time, it has been my desire to advance the interests and promote the well-being of the people of my district and the Nation.

THE 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION; AN OVERALL VIEW

Historians almost certainly will view the legislative results of the 1st session of the 89th Congress as the most important and far reaching of any peacetime session.

If the 2d session proves as fruitful as the 1st—which appears likely—the 89th Congress may go down as the Nation's most productive and significant of all times.

During the session a number of lofty social welfare goals were achieved which had long been stymied.

I refer, of course, to Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools, medical care for the aged under social security, and the revision of the outmoded national origins quota system of immigration.

These programs and others enacted during the session had been unsuccessfully pressed by other Democratic administrations, including those of Presidents Truman and Kennedy.

President Johnson succeeded where they had been frustrated because of the Democratic landslide in the 1964 elections. The people of the United States—through their action at the ballot box—indicated their trust in President Johnson and the Democratic Party.

The voters were not merely voting for President Johnson on the basis of his personality; they were delivering a mandate in favor of the Great Society platform and the principles on which it is based.

This they proved by electing many new Democrats to Congress to help speed needed legislation to enactment. In a very real sense, a pact was concluded between the American people and the Democratic Party last fall.

To ascertain how well the party kept its side of the bargain it is instructive to place side by side the promises made by the Democratic platform of 1964 and the fulfillment of these promises in 1965 by a Democratic administration and a Democratic Congress.

MEDICARE AND AID TO OLDER AMERICANS

The 1964 platform promised:

> We will continue to fight until we have succeeded in including hospital care for older Americans in the social security program.

A medicare bill was enacted. It established a program of hospital and medical insurance for the aged which is, in my opinion, one of the best, most comprehensive, and most practical ever proposed.

Perhaps the most sweeping piece of social legislation enacted in the United States, the medicare act provides two basic health care programs.

There is a basic hospital insurance program which provides up to 60 days of hospitalization—over the first $40—100 days of posthospital care, and 100 visits by a home nurse. This is financed through social security contributions and covers almost everyone over 65 years old.

The second program is a voluntary one costing citizens over 65 $3 a month. It provides physicians' services—over the first $50—60 days of care in a psychiatric or tuberculosis hospital, an additional 100 home health visits, and other medical and health services, including diagnostic tests and rental of medical equipment.

The medicare program will aid more than 18 million men and women in the United States who are over 65.

It will free the lives of these senior citizens from fears that ill health may rob them of the savings of a lifetime. It will help insure that no elderly person—no matter how poor—will languish and suffer without needed medical care.

The same bill which established medicare also provided a 7-percent increase in social security benefits, retroactive to January 1, 1965, and expanded medical programs for the blind, disabled, and dependent children.

Further, the 1964 Democratic platform promised that—

> We will enhance the security of older Americans by * * * offering opportunities like those provided for the young under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The 89th Congress enacted the Older Americans Act, which authorizes $17.5 million in fiscal 1966 and 1967 for grants to States and public or private nonprofit organizations for developing programs for the aged.

The act also established a new Administration on the Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to administer the grants, to serve as a clearinghouse of ideas and information, and to do research into the subject of aging.

As an original cosponsor of the Older Americans Act, I believe it is a long step in the direction of making the lives of our senior citizens richer and more satisfying.

AID TO EDUCATION

On the important subject of education, the platform was explicit:

> The demands on the already inadequate sources of State and local revenues place a serious limitation on education. New methods of financing aid must be explored including the channeling of federally collected revenues to all levels of education.

Not only were new methods of providing aid to education explored during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, new methods were enacted in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The first general school aid bill became law. This measure aids approximately 5 million educationally deprived children from low-income families and authorizes grants to school districts in 95 percent of the Nation's counties. The total first year cost of the bill is estimated at $1.1 billion.

The act provides direct grants to poor school districts, gives grants to States to purchase library and text books, establishes supplementary education programs and regional educational laboratories, and strengthens State departments of education.

This bill confirms that the administration and Congress recognize that the youth of America is the best hope for a better world tomorrow and is our greatest natural resource. What is more, all eligible schoolchildren are being assisted, regardless of the kind of school—public or parochial—which they attend.

Of higher education, the platform said:

> In order to insure that all students who can meet the requirement for college entrance can continue their education, we propose an expanded program of public scholarships, guaranteed loans, and work-study programs.

The Higher Education Act passed by the 89th Congress expanded and improved existing programs designed to provide the university facilities and scholarships so necessary to the full education of American youth. It also initiated a program of low-interest Government-insured loans to undergraduate and graduate students.

Congress also has moved to meet problems caused by school dropouts and juvenile delinquents. The sad fact is that almost 1 million young people quit school each year.

Today the dropouts have several programs through which they can direct their energies productively. Some 12,000 have enrolled in the Job Corps. Another 200,000 youngsters are participating in Neighborhood Youth Corps projects. And 80,000 other eager young people are finding new opportunities in the work-study program.

The 89th Congress also extended and expanded a program in which the Federal Government has become an active partner with States and communities fighting juvenile delinquency through special education, recreation, employment and social work projects.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTION—THE ECONOMY

In accord with the admonition in the Democratic platform that "we should carefully review all our excise taxes and eliminate those that are obsolete," the 89th Congress repealed or reduced excise taxes on hundreds of items.

By January 1, 1967, the reductions will total $4.6 billion on automobiles, kitchen appliances, telephone calls, cosmetics, and gift items. This results in savings to consumers and a boost to family budgets.

For example, a new $300 washing machine costs $15 less than it did; a $15 suitcase or handbag, $1.50 less; a $1 tube of lipstick, 10 cents less.

The repeal of the excise taxes has produced more sales for many retailers. They also are spared the paperwork required by these Federal excises.

Tax reduction, according to the economists, has had a healthy impact on the national economy. The monetary and fiscal policies of the administration have been an important factor in sustaining the longest peacetime economic expansion in history; it is now in its 57th month.

In recent months, the unemployment rate has dropped to a nationwide 7-year low. In Milwaukee County the unemployment rate is about the lowest of any major urban area in the country.

Put in human terms, more people have jobs—more people know the security, self-satisfaction, and confidence of steady employment.

ANTIPOVERTY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

In order to spread the abundance of our affluent society to all our citizens and thus insure continued growth and expansion of the American economy, Congress took action during 1965 to continue the war on poverty and to aid the development of depressed areas within our borders.

To aid in this task an Economic Development Administration has been created. This new agency is charged with the responsibility of assisting the development of new jobs and new industries in economically distressed regions.

To Appalachia, the most poverty stricken of distressed regions, Congress directed special attention. A 6-year, $1 billion economic program was enacted for the 12-state Appalachia area.

The war on poverty program was extended through June of 1968 in an expanded form, and $1.8 billion was authorized for the 1966 fiscal year.

Also extended and expanded was the Manpower Development and Training Act. This legislation will provide an opportunity for another one-half million unemployed Americans to be retrained in new and needed job skills.

HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Just as economic development measures were specifically called for by the Democratic 1964 platform, so too was legislation affecting housing and urban affairs. It said:

> We believe a department devoted to urban affairs should be added to the President's Cabinet.

Congress, recognizing the problems caused by the swift urbanization of the Nation, created a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development to administer Federal programs which affect city dwellers.

Also approved was an expanded housing program, including rent supplements for low-income families, housing rehabilitation grants and public housing for handicapped persons.

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT

In the area of health and environmental safety and improvement, it is remarkable to compare the promise of the platform with the performance of the 89th Congress:

> We will further expand our health facilities * * * especially * * * research laboratories.

Congress enacted a 5-year program of project grants to develop some 25 multipurpose regional medical centers to fight heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other diseases. It is hoped that one of the first of these grants will go to the Milwaukee metropolitan area.

> We will * * * continue to insist that our drugs and medicines are safe and effective.

Stricter controls were placed on the possession, distribution, and disposal of depressing barbiturates and stimulating amphetamines.

> We shall * * * continue the attack * * * on eliminating the pollution of our rivers and streams.

Passed was a 4-year, $80 million program to combat water pollution in interstate waters and increased Federal grants for research and construction of water pollution control projects.

> We shall * * * continue the attack we have launched on the polluted air that envelopes our cities.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was authorized by Congress to recommend means to control pollution from automobile exhausts. Also authorized was the construction of a Federal air pollution control laboratory.

> We shall intensify our efforts to solve the critical water problems of many sections of this country by desalinization.

The authorization for the Federal saline water program was extended through 1972 and its funds increased to $185 million.

OTHER IMPORTANT ACTIONS

Among other important actions, the first session of the 89th Congress approved legislation to:

Replace the discriminatory national origins quota system in our immigration laws with a system of preferential admissions for immigrants with needed skills or training, or close relatives in the United States;

Authorize Federal registrars to undertake voter registration in those areas where local officials discriminate against Negro voters;

Establish a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities and provide $63 million through fiscal 1968 for endowments in creative and performing arts and scholarships in humanities;

Restrict unsightly billboards along interstate and primary highways, and undertake the removal or screening of junkyards;

Propose a constitutional amendment establishing procedures for the Vice President to exercise Presidential powers when the President is unable to do so and for filling vice-presidential vacancies.

Three bills in which I was particularly interested passed this session. One established a commission to organize the celebration of the 300th anniversary of the arrival of Pere Jacques Marquette in North America. The second authorized the domestic showing of the USIA film on the life of President Kennedy, "Years of Lightning—Day of Drums." A third bill, repealing the so-called cabaret tax, was included in the general excise tax repeal.

NATIONAL SECURITY AND FOREIGN POLICY

Although the reputation of the 89th Congress rests mainly on the important domestic legislation it has enacted, Congress also has taken some significant actions in national security and foreign affairs.

Approved were appropriations to make possible the expanded Armed Forces necessary for the war effort in Vietnam. The overwhelming majorities by which military appropriations bills passed both the House and the Senate were proof of the strong bipartisan support in Congress for President Johnson's policies for halting Communist aggression in Southeast Asia.

Other funds approved by Congress will allow the pursuit of major new developments in strategic weapons systems, insure the continued progress of America's atomic energy program and help the United States to a first place in space.

In order to help other nations remain strong against Communist aggression and to develop stable, progressive societies, Congress approved $1.2 billion in military assistance and $2 billion for economic aid. It also appropriated funds to continue the highly successful Peace Corps, increased the contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank, and continued programs in arms control and disarmament.

WHAT REMAINS TO BE DONE

Although the accomplishments of the 1st session of the 89th Congress were many, much remains to be done in the 2d session which will convene in January 1966.

Among the essential bills are two of particular interest to the workingman: the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and the extension of the minimum wage laws.

The House voted to repeal section 14(b) way back in July 1965. But the bill was obstructed in the Senate by a Republican filibuster. Minimum wage legislation has been considered by committees of the House and Senate and should be acted upon early in the next session.

I am hopeful of action on bills which I have introduced into Congress, particularly the Adoption Opportunity Act, which provides tax deduction for adoption expenses, and the bill to curb the traffic in obscene literature through the mails by regulating the use of mailing lists.

VOTING RECORD

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I place in the Record a table which lists the major legislative bills considered during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, my position and vote on each of them, and their present status or ultimate disposition:

	Issue	Action
	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	
Voted for	$115,000,000 authorization for Peace Corps activities	Became law.
Voted for	Abolishing the national origins quota system of immigration	Became law.
Voted for	$3,360,000,000 authorization for foreign economic and military aid	Became law.
Voted for	3-year extension of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	Became law.
Sponsored	Allowing the USIA film on President Kennedy to be shown in the United States	Became law.
Sponsored	Creation of an Academy of Foreign Affairs to train Government employees for overseas assignments	Pending in House.
Sponsored	Creation of Byrd Commission to coordinate U.S. activities in Antarctica	Approved by subcommittee.
Sponsored	Congressional consent for a Great Lakes Basin compact	Pending in House.
Voted for	Increased U.S. participation in Inter-American Development Bank activities	Became law.
Voted for	$1,000,000 construction authorization for a new embassy in Saigon	Became law.
Sponsored	Creation of an Atlantic Union delegation to meet with similar NATO country delegations regarding a federal Atlantic Union	Pending in House.
Voted for	Congressional censure of Soviet Russia for acts of religious persecution	Approved by Congress.
Voted for	Resolution urging world attention to the subjugation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania	Approved by House.
Sponsored	Special postage stamps to commemorate Poland's 1,000th anniversary as a Christian nation	Pending in House.
	NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY	
Voted for	$15,400,000,000 authorization for aircraft, missile, and naval vessel procurement	Became law.
Voted for	Additional $700,000,000 appropriation for U.S. efforts in Vietnam	Became law.
Voted for	$5,180,000,000 authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including research on a solid fuel rocket and a nuclear solid-powered system spaceship.	Became law.
Voted for	$2,550,000,000 authorization for the Atomic Energy Commission, including $2,500,000 for a merchant ship reactor program	Became law.
Voted for	$1,780,000,000 authorization for military construction at domestic and foreign installations	Became law.
Voted for	Federal penalties for destruction or mutilation of draft cards	Became law.
Voted for	Federal penalties for assassination, kidnaping, or assault of the President or Vice President	Became Law
Sponsored	Prohibition of political contributions or lobbying by agents of foreign interests	Pending in House.
	SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE	
Voted for	Health insurance for the aged, 7 percent increase in social security benefits, and other amendments to the Social Security Act	Became law.
Voted for	$1,300,000,000 program to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education, including provision of textbooks and library resources in schools, both public and private.	Became law.
Voted for	5-year program to help construct needed college facilities, strengthen school libraries, and aid needy students	Became law.
Sponsored	Regulation of mailing lists to curb the flow of pornography	Pending in House.
Voted for	3-year program to help State and local authorities improve law enforcement, prevent crime	Became law.
Voted for	Standards to control pollution from gas and diesel-powered vehicles; funds for research to improve solid waste disposal methods	Became law.
Sponsored	Extension of certain National Defense Education Act benefits to private schools	Pending in House.
Voted for	Aid to community mental health centers and to train teachers of the handicapped and retarded	Became law.
Voted for	Expansion of health professions educational assistance program to alleviate the shortage of doctors, other health personnel	Became law.
Sponsored	Deduction from gross taxable income of expenses involved in adopting a child	Pending in House.
Voted for	Regional medical centers to combat heart disease, cancer, and stroke	Became law.
Voted for	Insured low-interest loans to students attending vocational schools beyond the secondary level	Became law.
Voted for	Expansion of health research facilities program of matching grants for construction	Became law.
Voted for	Cost-of-living increases in annuities for retired Government employees	Became law.
Sponsored	National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities; 3-year $30,000,000 program of matching grants in the arts and scholarships in the humanities.	Became law.
Sponsored	Reduction of social security retirement age to 60	Pending in House.
Sponsored	Establishment of a Capitol pages' residence	Pending in House.
Voted for	Authorizing special controls over sale, distribution of depressant and stimulant drugs; strict penalties for offenses involving those under 21.	Became law.
Voted for	2-year extension of the Juvenile Delinquency Act	Became law.

	Issue	Action
	VETERANS AND ARMED SERVICES	
Voted for	Pay increases of about 10.4 percent for enlisted members and officers of the uniformed services	Became law.
Voted for	Increased allowances and training periods for disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation	Became law.
Support	Educational and housing benefits for cold war veterans similar to those granted under the GI bill of rights.	Hearings in House.
Sponsored	Veterans' medical benefits for American citizens who fought with allied armies in World Wars I and II	Pending in House.
Voted for	Providing $10,000 special indemnity insurance for servicemen in combat zones	Became law.
Voted for	Increased allowances under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act	Became law.
Voted for	Increasing veterans' disability compensation to reflect the rise in living costs	Became law.
	NATIONAL ECONOMY	
Voted for	$4,600,000,000 a year reduction of wartime-imposed excise taxes	Became law.
Voted for	Commission to coordinate economic development in the Appalachian region	Became law.
Sponsored	Restricting the use of tax-exempt bonds by one locality in luring away industry from another	Pending in House.
Voted for	$3,300,000,000 program of public works to develop industries and create jobs in economically depressed areas	Became law.
Voted for	Repeal of Sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which allows States to outlaw the union shop	Passed by House.
Voted for	Extension of the training, counseling, and placement activities of the Manpower Development and Training Act	Became law.
Support	Extension of minimum wage and overtime provisions to an additional 7,200,000 persons	Pending in House.
Sponsored	Removal of the antitrust exemption from organized professional baseball	Pending in House.
Sponsored	An increase in the personal income tax exemption from $600 to $800	Pending in House.
Sponsored	Small Business Conservation Act to preserve opportunity for free competition in business	Pending in House.
Voted for	Increased Federal aid for the Interstate and Defense Highway System	Became law.
Voted for	$1,800,000,000 for antipoverty programs in fiscal 1966, including training of the chronically unemployed and work among the aged poor.	Became law.
Voted for	3-year $60,000,000 program of matching funds to disseminate findings of science and technology to industry and commerce	Became law.
Sponsored	Authorizing the sale of certain surplus Government property to local governments	Pending in House.
	GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION	
Voted for	Voting Rights Act to enforce the 15th amendment, authorize Federal voting registrars in areas of discrimination, bar literacy tests, direct elimination of poll taxes.	Became law.
Voted for	Proposed constitutional amendment fixing procedures for Vice Presidential succession in case of Presidential disability, choice of new Vice President.	Approved for ratification.
Sponsored	Creation of a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to study recommended changes in legislative procedures	Approved.
Voted for	Home rule referendum for the District of Columbia	Passed by House.
Sponsored	Creation of an Administration on Aging to coordinate information and services to State and local governments and promote research in the field of aging.	Became law.
Voted for	Creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development	Became law.
Voted for	Pay increase for Federal employees making their salaries comparable with those in private industry	Became law.
Sponsored	Creation of a Tercentenary Commission commemorating the work of Father Marquette in North America	Became law.
Voted for	Federal standards for apportionment of congressional districts	Passed by House.
Sponsored	Allocation of an additional Federal judgeship for Wisconsin	Pending in House.
Voted for	Amendment of the House rules to permit House consideration of a bill held more than 21 legislative days by the Rules Committee without action.	Approved.
Sponsored	Creation of a Joint Congressional Committee on Central Intelligence	Pending in House.
Sponsored	Creation of a Joint Congressional Committee on Consumer Interests	Pending in House.
	AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES	
Opposed	Continued level of agriculture price support programs	Became law.
Voted for	Increased aid to communities in their effort to combat water pollution	Became law.
Voted for	$1,990,000,000 program of navigation improvement, flood and beach erosion control, and hydroelectric power projects in 38 States, including Wisconsin.	Became law.
Voted for	Expanded program of oceanographic research and development of the resources of the seas and the Great Lakes	Passed by House.
Voted for	Expanded desalinization research and development program	Became law.
Voted for	Continued study of effects of insecticides, pesticides on fish and wildlife	Became law.
Voted for	Program of roadside beautification through control of billboards and auto junkyards	Became law.

Rollcall record of Congressman Clement J. Zablocki, 89th Cong., 1st sess.

Total roll and quorum calls	383
Rollcalls	201
Not voting	15
Quorum calls	182
Absent on quorum[1]	11

[1] Absence on quorum call does not necessarily mean a legislative day's absence.

Human Investment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. PEARSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, it is heartening to many of us and, particularly, I am sure, to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], to note the continually increasing support for the Human Investment Act. This support is being expressed not only in Congress, but by individuals and organizations across the Nation who are concerned about our manpower problems.

Looking beyond the latest official jobless rate of 4.4 percent, we can discount, to a degree, that segment of these approximately 3 million Americans who may be idle of their own accord, or who are not breadwinners, or who are between jobs. Yet, there still remains what has come to be known as our hard-core unemployed.

Recent in depth studies of our manpower problems indicate the existence of well over 2 million job openings going begging. The conclusion must be drawn, then, that our problem arises from the lack of skills—not the lack of jobs.

The jobless are not statistics. The jobless are men and women, each a human being with dignity and worth. Welfare rolls are not their goal in life. Many of the highly publicized Federal training programs are not supplying the proper and sufficient answers either.

S. 2509 does provide a constructive approach toward meeting this skills shortage and thus alleviating the unemployment problem. This legislation would encourage the private sector of our economy to place increased emphasis on already existing job-training programs by providing a tax credit incentive. Certainly both labor and management have excellent records of long standing in the field of job training. Is it necessary for the Federal Government to go into this area in which it cannot possibly match the effectiveness of private programs? I think not.

However, it is both just and necessary that the Federal Government encourage the private sector to increase its efforts. We give tax credits for investments in machines and equipment. Can we do less for investments in human beings?

It is a privilege, then, for me to join with the many who have commended Senator PROUTY here in the Senate and a number of Representatives in the House for this thoughtful approach to this area of concern and I would be honored if at the next printing, Senator PROUTY will add my name to the many other Senators who are cosponsoring S. 2509, the Human Investment Act.

The Wild Rivers Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the newly created Idaho Water Resource Board met last month in Lewiston, Idaho, to conduct a 2-day hearing on the future of the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers. These are two of the streams to be included in the proposed national wild rivers system which would be established by S. 1446, the bill which I introduced, and which has been favorably reported by the Senate Interior Committee.

I personally appeared and testified on behalf of the bill at the Lewiston hearing. I place my statement at this point in the **Record**:

The Wild Rivers Bill

(Statement of Senator Frank Church, Democrat, of Idaho, chairman of the Public Lands Subcommitee of the U.S. Senate Interior Committee, before the Idaho Water Resources Board held in Lewiston, Idaho, relative to S. 1446)

Gentlemen, I am happy to appear before you to testify on behalf of the wild rivers bill. I am the sponsor of this bill. Eight months ago, on March 8, 1965, I introduced the measure in the U.S. Senate. Thirty-one Senators joined me in cosponsorship.

This is the second public hearing to be held in Idaho on the wild rivers bill. The first was held in Boise, on May 18, by a special Senate subcommittee, on which I served as chairman. My colleague, Senator Len Jordan, was also a member of this subcommittee, as was Senator Milward Simpson, of Wyoming. Fifty-four witnesses testified at the Boise hearing. Written statements were submitted by 119 others who were unable to appear personally. Of those who took a position, 141 generally favored enactment of the will rivers bill, while 26 either opposed it, or objected to certain of its provisions. Altogether, 129 printed pages of testimony were taken at the Boise hearing. This testimony has been published in full, forming part of the public record of the extensive hearings conducted in each State requesting them, as well as in Washington, D.C. I have asked that a set of these published hearings be sent to each member of this board, so that you may review all of the evidence before the Senate Interior Committee, when it devoted 6 days of executive sessions to the markup of the bill, and then, by a vote of 11 to 5, reported the bill favorably to the Senate itself.

A week ago today, the wild rivers bill was scheduled by the leadership to be taken up in the Senate. I have no doubt it would have passed by a lopsided majority, with strong support coming from both sides of the aisle.

However, in deference to this board, and in order that every possible opportunity might be extended to Idahoans desiring to be heard, I asked Senate majority leader Mike Mansfield to defer action on the bill. He consented to my request. As a consequence, it will not be possible for the Senate to consider the wild rivers bill until it reconvenes next year.

The record, then, on the question of timing, is quite incontrovertible. The supporters of this measure have never urged hasty or ill-considered action. By the time the bill comes to a vote on its merits in the Senate, it will have been scrutinized by the Senate Interior Committee for nearly a full year. A series of public hearings will have been held, at which a total of 156 witnesses will have personally testified, with a record compiled of some 611 printed pages. In Idaho itself, two full-dress public hearings will have been completed, one under the auspices of the Senate committee having jurisdiction, and the other under the direction of this board. To my recollection, this in itself is unprecedented.

I, myself, welcome all the attention that can be focused on the wild rivers bill. I am glad that this board is placing its sights on the "ultimate uses of the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers." Ultimate is the right word, for it suggests that we adhere to a common purpose: assigning these two magnificent mountain rivers to a use most beneficial to the economy of Idaho and the general well-being of her people.

We in Idaho are blessed with an abundance of water, much of which we shall want to harness behind dams. Fortunately, we are also favored with a great many potential damsites. If all of them, on each and every river, remain open for dam building, we shall have relinquished our entire river system to this particular use. Other public uses, equally important to our economy and to the preservation of a wholesome outdoor life for our people, will be left without statutory protection. In this situation, since the licensing of dams is left up to public agencies which exist for this purpose, the end result is perfectly evident: Ultimately, in the absence of a national wild rivers system, which the bill in question would create, every feasible site will eventually be used for dam construction. The past 50 years offers no evidence whatever that dam builders will voluntarily stop building dams. Unless laws are enacted to save some of our remaining free-flowing rivers in their natural, untamed state, wild rivers shall vanish from our land.

I recognize that it is the purpose of this board to plan for the utilization of Idaho water. Necessarily, you have become a part of the dam building business, even though the money to finance future dams in Idaho will continue to come—owing to the lack of adequate local means—mainly from Federal rather than State, revenues.

I say this because we must be candid with one another. In no sense do I deprecate the importance of dams. I have been a devoted advocate of dams for Idaho, throughout my tenure in the Senate. When the Hells Canyon Dam was made a scare word in southern Idaho, I fought for its authorization, because it seemed to me inexcusable to squander so monumental a site on an insufficient development.

In the same manner, I worked doggedly for congressional approval of the Dworshak Dam, threatening a one-man filibuster in the Senate in the closing hours of the session. This $200 million dam, the highest in the Northwest, which we renamed in memory of my former colleague, the late Senator Henry Dworshak, is now a building on the North Fork of the Clearwater.

Coming up the Snake, like mighty steps on a giant's staircase, is a whole set of Federal dams—Ice Harbor, Lower Monumental, Little Goose, Lower Granite, and Asotin—for which I have sought appropriations in the Senate each year. We have kept the building of this massive network on schedule, with the result that Lewiston, Idaho, will become a port, with direct access to the Pacific, by the end of the decade.

Other dams I have favored will soon be built in this great region, High Mountain Sheep to the south of us, and Libby Dam to the north. Bills which I sponsored to authorize the Fremont Dam, the Lower Teton Dam, and the Ririe Dam in southern Idaho, have been approved by Congress and signed into law by the President. Just a few weeks ago, Congressman Compton I. White and I announced a joint plan to seek authorization of a southwest Idaho water development project, the largest in the history of the State, which would ultimately reclaim 500,000 acres of desert land, and generate more than half a million kilowatts of electricity.

This plan calls for an unprecedented half-billion dollar investment in Idaho's future development. I urge you, as members of this board, to give the same measure of interest to this vast dam-building program, as you have evidenced in your immediate concern over the wild rivers bill.

The record speaks for itself. I am anything but an enemy of dams. In the face of the most determined opposition of Idaho sportsmen, and fish and wildlife groups, I fought for the construction of Bruces Eddy, now the Dworshak Dam. Wherever the evidence shows that a proposed dam will do more good than harm, I shall work for it. But, by the same token, wherever the evidence shows that a dam will do more harm than good, I shall work against it—with equal fervor.

This brings me back to the wild rivers bill and the reasons why I so strongly endorse it. Insofar as Idaho is concerned, the case for the wild rivers bill is simply the case against the building of the dams which are projected for construction on the Salmon and the Middle Fork of the Clearwater River. These dams has been planned, the sites for them have been designated; their dimensions, storage capacity, and the high and lower water elevations of their respective reservoirs, have been carefully calculated. We know how much electricity they will generate, for, apart from what they may contribute to flood control, these are single-purpose dams, designed to produce hydroelectric power. The dams are as follows:

ON THE CLEARWATER

Penny Cliffs: to be located 4 miles upstream on the Middle Fork above Kooskia. Its reservoir would extend 19 miles up the Middle Fork to the junction of the Selway and Lochsa, then 29 miles on up the Selway, and 20 miles on up the Lochsa. The height of the dam: 620 feet.

ON THE SALMON

Lower Canyon: to be located on the Salmon half a mile above its confluence with the Snake. The reservoir would extend upstream about 70 miles to the site of the proposed Freedom Dam. The height of the dam: 665 feet.

Freedom Dam: this would be about 17 miles downstream from Riggins and 3 miles above White Bird. At normal pool elevation, the reservoir would extend 24 miles up the Salmon to a point 7 miles above Riggins. The height of the dam: 300 feet.

Crevice Dam: to be located on the Salmon about 13 miles above Riggins, Idaho. The reservoir would extend 65 miles up the Salmon, and 10 miles up the South Fork of the Salmon. The height of the dam: 725 feet.

These specifications are the most authoritative available. They are taken from the Water Resource Development, Columbia River Basin Report of the Army Corps of Engineers, dated June 1958.

Under the law, as it now stands, the Federal Power Commission could license the construction of any or all of these dams, upon application of a private power company, or a combination of companies, just as the FPC recently issued a license to the Pacific Northwest Power Co., for construction of the High Mountain Sheep Dam on the Snake River.

There are those who believe that hydroelectric dams should be built wherever application is made to build them, and I would expect these people to oppose the enactment of a wild rivers bill. Certain private power companies (I am pleased to say that the Washington Water Power Co. is not among them) may prefer to see the damsites on the Clearwater and Salmon Rivers left open for their future use. The same may be true for certain public power groups.

On this question, we must simply choose sides. I have chosen mine. I think the weight of the evidence, in terms of what best serves the general public good, overwhelmingly favors saving, unobstructed, these particular rivers so that we might preserve and promote their great recreational value, now and in the years ahead. If we oppose giving these magnificent rivers, which are assets of unique and incomparable value to Idaho, statutory protection now, while there is still time, we shall have only ourselves to blame later, when time has run out. It is not enough to say, as some have contended, that we can settle whether or not to build the dams when the question arises, that is, when the application is filed.

Gentlemen, once an application is filed, who will do the deciding? Not the people of Idaho; there will be no public referendum. Not the members of this board, for you lack the jurisdiction to decide. Not the Idaho delegation in Congress, for we lack the numbers to guarantee the outcome of any vote. Not, indeed, the Congress itself, for it has yet to wrest jurisdiction from the Federal Power Commission, once an application for a license has been duly brought before it.

Let's not fool ourselves. The wild river bill is necessary, if jurisdiction is to be taken from the Federal Power Commission to license dams within the system the legislation creates. Without the bill, once an application has been filed to construct a power dam on the Salmon or Clearwater Rivers, the decision will rest with the Federal Power Commission, and with that Commission alone. You may be satisfied to leave it that way. I am not.

Nor am I impressed with the argument that further study is needed before any judgment can be reached for or against the inclusion of the designated parts of the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers in a national wild rivers systems. What additional information, not now available, will more delay furnish? What facts are now lacking? For 50 years, we have been accumulating exhaustive data on the whole Columbia-Snake River drainage. We have the complete record of the river flows year by year, of the salmon runs, the flood cycles, and the navigational, irrigational, and hydroelectric potential of every river and tributary in the Northwest.

We have all the necessary information at hand. The issue should not be dodged on the flimsy pretext that more facts are needed. The question is simply whether we want to take timely action to give statutory protection to these segments of the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers, or whether we do not. Placing these rivers in the study category of the bill, without any valid reason, would cut the heart out of the proposed wild river system, and leave the bill a shambles. This is why the Senate Interior Committee rejected the proposal, when it was offered as an amendment in the markup session.

I do not contend that the wild rivers bill will cost us nothing. Everything worth having has its price. In the case of this legislation, the price would entail some loss in optimum flood control, particularly as it might affect certain downstream areas in Oregon and Washington. There would also be the loss of the hydroelectric power potential at the sites I have mentioned. Again, the principal impact would be borne by Oregon and Washington, since most of the electricity generated at these dams would be siphoned off to meet the needs of these more highly industrialized and more densely populated neighbor States. In any event, we have scores of damsites on other Idaho rivers to meet our future power needs for as many years ahead as hydroproduced electricity is ever likely to remain competitive with power generated at nuclear plants, where efficiency of operation steadily improves and costs continue to decline.

So the price we must pay for a wild rivers bill can hardly be regarded as onerous. The benefits, however, loading the opposite side of the scale, are very important indeed.

First of all, there is the preservation of the fishery itself, a perpetual source of wealth and pleasure, unless we permit its destruction, either through the erection of high dams, past which the fingerling salmon cannot successfully maneuver, or through our failure to properly regulate the capture of the parent fish on their upstream migration to the spawning beds in Idaho.

You have asked experts to testify on the fish problem, and they can best give you the impressive figures as to the value of this resource. My concern is that appropriate action be taken by the States, acting in concert with the Federal Government, to nourish and protect the migratory fish run mothered by the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers. To this end, very recently, I sought and obtained funds in the Senate to commence construction of a Federal salmon hatchery near Kooskia—a million dollar project.

I am advised by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that, if present plans for such hatcheries and other protective measures are fully implemented, the migratory runs on the Salmon and Clearwater can be doubled, provided, of course, that the rivers remain free-flowing. This is the basic reason why the wild rivers bill has received such a positive endorsement by the Idaho Fish and Game Commission.

Other departments of the State government also join in support of this proposed legislation. Governor Robert E. Smylie, who urges the enactment of the wild rivers bill, tells us that he conferred with the State forestry and reclamation agencies, which joined with the Idaho Fish and Game Commission in the preparation of the Governor's statement on behalf of the bill. Thus a Republican State administration has acted to demonstrate the broad, bipartisan support which the wild rivers proposal enjoys in Idaho.

No doubt this has been occasioned, in part, by a realization of the growing importance of outdoor recreation to the economy of Idaho. Tourism—the discovery of Idaho by the Nation, hunting, fishing, the confinement of megalopolist—this is the most dynamic force at work in creating new income for the people of our State. The figures are startling. Ten years ago, tourism was a $48 million annual business in Idaho. Last year, according to the figures of the Idaho Department of Commerce and Development, tourism accounted for $160 million in earned income for Idaho. This year, the figure is expected to rise above $175 million. In two handfuls of years, tourism has plunged upward to become Idaho's third most important source of revenue.

And the expansion has just begun. In the next 35 years, the population of this country will double. The demand for outdoor recreation will triple. The great majority of Americans will be more affluent and have more time for recreation. Projections indicate that they will have more than twice as much disposable per capita income and paid vacation time as in 1960. Their average work week will have decreased from 39 hours to 32 hours. Idaho's future as a vacationland is filled with promise.

What we make of it depends upon how well we husband our scenic and recreational resources. It depends, in short, upon how farsighted we are in insisting upon a wisely balanced development of our natural endowment. In places, where the terrain permits, we shall want to use unappropriated water for new reclamation projects; in other places, on rivers already obstructed, we shall want to build new power dams; but in still other places, in areas of mountain-locked grandeur where the water still runs fast, pure and free, we should seek to preserve our finest untamed streams by including them within a national wild rivers system.

Nowhere in America are there left such jewels, among our remaining wild rivers, as the Salmon and the Clearwater systems. An extensive survey by study teams substantiates that claim. Naturally, these should be the lead-off rivers in the bill. Anyone who has come to know the pristine mystique of the Selway, or the rampaging white waters of the Salmon, must appreciate how supremely these rivers qualify as the core for any wild rivers bill. To them, in the initial system established by the bill, we add segments of the Rogue in Oregon, the Rio Grande in New Mexico, and the Eleven Point in Missouri.

As the bill is now drawn, it includes the Salmon from the town of North Fork downstream to its confluence with the Snake, and the entire Middle Fork; the Middle Fork of the Clearwater from Kooskia upstream to Lowell; the Lochsa from Lowell to Powell Ranger Station, and the Selway from Lowell upstream to its origin.

Precaution has been taken to fully protect established water rights, and to make certain that State water laws are not infringed in any way. The Senate Interior Committee hammered out amendments to the original language to make doubly sure that the status quo with respect to water law remains unchanged. These amendments are in section 5 of the bill, and are spelled out in the committee report which urges enactment.

Although S. 1446 might be regarded as a corollary to the Wilderness Act, it is very different in concept and application. A limited area along the banks of the river would be included in the system, which would be administered to promote maximum public use and enjoyment. Unlike the restrictions on use in a wilderness area, this bill recognizes and adopts the multiple-use principle. Timber harvesting and livestock grazing which do not substantially interfere with the use and enjoyment of the river will continue along the banklands. Mining would also be allowed, although claims on the banklands located after the effective date of the act would be subject to reasonable regulation to protect the river against pollution. The bill also contains no prohibition against the construction of needed roads or bridges.

Except for the acquisition of scenic easements, the bill confers no power of condemnation of private property along the Salmon or Clearwater Rivers. An amendment I offered, prohibits condemnation where 75 percent or more of the acreage within the wild river area is publicly owned. Both Idaho rivers would fall in this category. The bill does allow for condemnation for scenic easements, where these may be needed.

Nothing in the bill affects the jurisdiction or administration authority of the States with respect to fish and wildlife.

Obstruction of wild rivers by damming normally accomplished through construction or licensing by Federal agencies would be prohibited, except as expressly authorized by Congress.

In addition to these several safeguards, there is also the amendment adopted in the closing session of the Interior Committee which would establish a National Wild Rivers Review Commission to inform the Congress if changing public needs dictate that wild river status should be altered. This amendment was proposed by my colleague, Senator JORDAN, and I supported it.

The Interior Committee, in its report to the Senate, pointed to this amendment as one which would allow a river to be removed from the system, if a greater public need for another use should later develop. However, even without the amendment, it would always be open to Congress to remove rivers from the system, should changing conditions make this desirable. In brief, we can place these segments of the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers within the protection of the bill now, and still admit to the possibility that a higher public need for turning them to some other use might conceivably emerge in the future. But we can't have it the other way around. Once a dam is built, a wild river is lost forevermore.

The cause I plead for is not mine alone. It is that of the President of the United States, who has urged the enactment of this measure; it is that of the foremost conservationists of this country; it is that of the people of Idaho, the large majority of whom, I am persuaded, earnestly favor this bill.

But, I cannot say, with conviction, that the cause finds much support on this board. Before these hearings were called, before any of this testimony was given, I read in the newspapers that an informal poll had been taken among the members of this board on the Wild Rivers Bill. The chairman, George L. Crookham, was reported to have disclosed that six members of the board opposed the bill, one member favored it, and one member took no position. Frankly, gentlemen, if I were accused of murder, and six of my eight judges had announced to the press, prior to my trial, that they believed me guilty, I wouldn't be very optimistic about my chances of being acquitted in their court.

Yet, I have come here to bear witness to my belief in your integrity and good faith. I recognize the importance which attaches to the responsibility you hold. I trust you will act with broad vision so that, in this State, conservation may be the companion of development. In the utilization of our water, I hope you will advocate a balanced program, where no one interest will dominate to the exclusion of others, neither the farmers' spade, the anglers' hook, nor "Reddy-Kilowatt's" switch.

A few months ago, Burton J. Rowles, a writer, movie producer, and lover of the great outdoors, spent some time on the Clearwater and the Salmon. He said they only ask "freedom to flow and to retain purity, in return for supporting life and providing pleasure." The defenses of such a river, he said, "are no stronger than man's concern for its vitality, expressed in his guardianship."

To guard the Salmon and the Clearwater, I am confident we shall find the needed sentinels, here in Idaho, and in the Halls of Congress.

Allegations and Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the allegations and charges laid before the House by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] earlier today, regarding the multiple offenses of one Edward Grady Partin, and the handling thereof by the Justice Department, should give concern to all of us. Surely the matters spread before us call for an investigation by the committee having authority in such cases.

Congress enacted the Landrum-Griffin Act several years ago, to protect union members from union officials who misuse union funds, and who falsify certain union records. It is alleged that more than 3 years ago, this Edward Grady Partin was duly indicted and charged, as an official in a local Teamster union, with 13 separate and distinct embezzlements of union funds, and 13 separate and distinct cases of falsification of union accounts, and that the Justice Department has not prosecuted these cases, and the inference is left that there is no intention so to do.

An investigation should develop the reason therefor, and this is particularly called for in view of the further allegation by the gentleman from Illinois that two of the witnesses who first exposed the alleged embezzlement were attacked and severely beaten in retaliation; that the local union's books and records disappeared; and one of the said Partin's critics was killed in an unusual accident.

Other allegations in the address by the gentleman from Illinois further aggravate the case, and are of such gravity as to emphasize the need for an investigation. These include charges that the said Partin, for more than 3 years, has also been under indictment for forgery and for kidnapping, that he was also under indictments for first degree manslaughter and for leaving the scene in the State of Alabama, which indictments were dismissed. If it inferred that such dismissals were at the instance of the Justice Department, and, if so, why? An investigation would give the answer to this.

Our colleague further set forth a long criminal record sported by the said Partin, including a conviction for burglary, for which he was awarded a 15-year sentence by the State of Washington, and an FBI record showing 15 arrests on charges including burglary, robbery, automobile theft, larceny, theft, robbery with firearms, and others.

As I gather from the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois, he feels the tender solicitude shown to the said Partin was in the nature of a consideration or bribe to reward him for testimony in a case concerning one Jimmy Hoffa, who was Partin's superior in the Teamster Union. I certainly have no brief for Mr. Hoffa. He ought to be duly punished for the crimes he may have committed. Neither do I object to the granting of immunity to make available testimony which would otherwise be denied to the prosecution. I was a district attorney in the State courts for four terms before I came to Congress, and I used that procedure on occasion, albeit sparingly. I never found it necessary to grant complete immunity to a person with a record such as carried by the said Partin, nor did I find it necessary to sweeten the immunity by monetary payments to the person or members of his family. I would doubt the ethics or propriety of such.

I do hope and trust the investigation will be made of the matters of fact alleged by Mr. GRAY. The seriousness of the allegations seemingly demand this action. If the investigation sustains the allegations, it would warrant the prosecution of the said Partin on the multiplicity of offenses for which he has been indicted. Otherwise, the act of Congress intended to protect union members from having their dues money embezzled by union officials will have been in vain.

Hon. Ludwig Teller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on October 4, a former colleague of ours, Ludwig Teller, of New York, passed away.

Lou Teller served but two terms in the House, but to that brief service he brought a truly remarkable background and a most distinguished record of achievements. Indeed, few men are privileged to serve their community in as many varied and eminent ways as Dr. Teller did.

He was a prominent labor lawyer, one of the foremost in the country. He had been a lecturer at New York University Law School and a professor of law at New York Law School. He was a committee chairman in both the American Bar and American Arbitration Associations. He was a conscientious and respected political leader in Manhattan and served three terms in the New York State Assembly before coming to Congress. And he was the author of a dozen books, including what is still the leading authority on labor-management negotiations, "The Law Governing Labor Disputes and Collective Bargaining," first published in 1940.

It was hardly surprising that with this prestigious background he became one of the outstanding freshmen Members of the 85th Congress. In fact, he was credited with being the first freshman in over 100 years to be appointed chairman of a subcommittee.

Nor was it surprising that such a man, who had risen from humble origins by the will of his own self-determination, should be a persistent champion of legislation for the greater welfare of the workingman. It is an extraordinary tribute to the prescience of his brilliant mind that many of the programs he advocated, such as increased social security payments, medicare, and Federal aid to education, have since been passed by the Congress and signed into law.

Lou Teller was a fine American and, had the fortunes of politics been kinder to him, he would without doubt have carved a memorable and productive career in Congress of which not only his constituents, but the entire Nation, would have been justly proud. He possessed that rare synthesis of scholarly insight and practical experience that is the hallmark of great public service. He was truly a man whose counsel I valued.

And he was, equally so, a man whose fellowship I cherished and whose friendship I prized. His untimely death has saddened all of us who were so fortunate to know him intimately. To his widow, Clarice, and his family, I extend my deepest condolences.

"Know Your District of Columbia Government"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a long-needed booklet entitled

"Know Your District of Columbia Government," designed to help residents and visitors alike to obtain a better understanding of the government of the District of Columbia.

This booklet, which is now available, has been compiled from a recent newspaper series coauthored by Calvin W. Rolark, editor and publisher of "The Washington Informer" and Truman J. Keesey, public information officer of the District government.

It includes pictures of District of Columbia government officials, a detailed list of public library branches and their locations, as well as fire and police stations and their locations.

I am sure that citizens and government officials alike will find it an informative and useful guide to District of Columbia government.

Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am told that next month, Life magazine plans an article about one of the outstanding citizens of today's world, Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post. My wife and I have been privileged to count Marjorie Post as a friend, and we well know the care and sensitivity which she has brought to a great variety of interests and activities throughout her life.

Marjorie Merriweather Post is quietly known to many people for many different accomplishments in many different parts of the world. As a woman of substantial means, she has worked to apply her resources in ways that might benefit this generation and those that follow it. In this regard, I think it important to note that the thought which is said to have guided her in the use of her means is that of her father: "Do good with it."

In addition to the attention and the assistance she has given to education and to institutions of learning, Mrs. Post has also given of herself and her substance to the arts and to their encouragement. In the Nation's Capital, where Mrs. Post resides much of the year, she has worked to provide new advantages and opportunities for the youth of the city; and among her many endeavors in Washington, she has had special concern for the National Symphony Orchestra, the National Ballet, and from the outset, the National Cultural Center, later named the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Though widely known for her warmth and charm, as well as for her taste and hospitality, Mrs. Post has never allowed the numerous benefactions and philanthropies for which she has been responsible to be made public. The list of citations she has received is indeed lengthy, and it covers works which range over several continents. These works span a half century of service to mankind, and they have encompassed diverse needs such as those growing out of the wars of this century; those which resulted from the depression of a generation ago; and those which have accompanied the new expansion of the arts in recent years.

I understand that the forthcoming issue of Life magazine, in which many of the possessions and items collected by Mrs. Post will be discussed, will also give attention to the homes she maintains. In that connection, I do not believe that many people know that though she has three homes, she has made provision for the 24 acres of her Washington residence to go eventually to the Smithsonian Institution, already the recipient of many treasures from her collections, and she has arranged for her mountain place in the Adirondacks eventually to be permanently available for the use of the C. W. Post College, named in honor of her father and located in New York.

In like manner, she has been working to insure that her Mar-A-Lago estate near Palm Beach will go to the State of Florida as a gift for use by the public. In appreciation, Mrs. Post was recognized last summer by the State of Florida for her efforts and for her generosity, and a public ceremony was held in the State capital of Tallahassee.

My distinguished colleagues from the State of Florida, Senator HOLLAND and Senator SMATHERS, join me in calling the attention of the Senate to the accomplishments and contributions made by Marjorie Merriweather Post over a long and full life. Their State has honored a woman who has served the Nation, and under unanimous consent I place a listing of citations and decorations and organizations reflecting the good works for which she has been responsible following my remarks.

I also place the letter which Senator SMATHERS wrote me with his high regard for Mrs. Post, and in which he called attention to this listing, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today at the conclusion of my remarks. I know that Senator HOLLAND has a personal statement which he wants to make, and I will yield to him for it.

The material follows:

CITATIONS

American Museum of Natural History, life member, 1923.

Award of Merit for "Figurehead Design," Yacht *Sea Cloud*, 1932 (Italy).

U.S. Navy for use of *Sea Cloud* World War II, awarded 1948.

American Symphony Orchestra League Award for sponsorship of "Music for Young America," presentation, Providence, R.I., 1956.

Washington Board of Trade Award for Music in Nation's Capital, 1957.

South Plains Council of Boy Scouts of America, in appreciation for gift of Scout camp near Post, Tex., 1957.

The people of Garza County, Tex., Golden Jubilee Award, 1957.

American National Red Cross, certificate of appreciation, 1957.

District of Columbia Education Association, for notable services in the field of education, 1958.

American National Red Cross for services fund campaign, 1960.

National Society, Children American Revolution, for practical realism, 1960.

American National Red Cross, volunteer service certificate for staff assistance Palm Beach County Chapter, issued Washington, D.C., 1942.

C. W. Post College, Long Island, N.Y., patroness and benefactress, 1960.

Golden Anniversary Award, National Capital Area Council and Boy Scouts of America, 1960.

Federation of Women's Clubs for Philanthropic Achievement, 1958.

Variety Club, Tent No. 1, for interest in seven lively arts, Pittsburgh, 1961.

American National Red Cross, in appreciation of volunteer service, 1962.

Life member, Greater Southeast Community Hospital Foundation, 1962.

Trustees of Washington Ballet Guild, American Ballet Theater, 1962.

Smithsonian Institution for the presentation of the Napoleon-Marie Louise necklace 1962.

American National Red Cross in appreciation for volunteer services in World War I, presented Washington, D.C., 1963.

Metropolitan Police Boys Club, member of the year, 1963.

National Federation of Music Clubs, citation award for contribution to musical cultural, and artistic life, Pittsburgh convention, April 1963.

American Federation of Musicians for distinguished service in behalf of live music and musicians, April 1963.

Brotherhood Award, National Conference of Christians and Jews, 1963.

Friends of American University Award, patron 1963–64.

American National Red Cross, District of Columbia chapter, for loyalty and devotion, 1964.

Honorary Fellow, Smithsonian Institution, 1964.

Honor list, National Society of Interior Designers, for distinguished design (international award), May 1965.

Honorary citizen of Florida, resolution passed by Florida State Legislature, June 1965.

PHILANTHROPIES

Equipped No. 8 base hospital (2,000) beds Savenay, France, World War I.

Maintained food kitchens in the slums of New York, operated by Salvation Army, 1929–35.

Vice chairman, emergency unemployment drive, New York City, 1929–35.

Honorary chairman, Parcels for Belgian Prisoners and Parcels for Belgium, 1940–44.

Benefactress, District of Columbia chapter, Boy Scouts of America, building fund, August 1955, etc.

Sponsorship of "Music for Young America," since 1956.

Coparticipant with Post Division, General Foods Corp., et al., in building C. W. Post athletic field, Battle Creek, 1961.

Benefactress, Merriweather Post Boy Scout campsite, Woodrow Wilson Reservation, Lorton, Va.

Benefactress, C. W. Post College, Long Island University.

Private and personal educational and assistance funds.

DECORATIONS BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

Cross of Honor, Order of Adolph de Nassau, Luxemburg, November 27, 1939.

Chevalier of the Order of Leopold, Belgium, November 29, 1939.

Commander of the Order of Juan Puablo Duarte, Dominican Republic, February 1946.

Officer of the Order of the Crown, Belgium, June 28, 1947.

Chevalier of the Legion of Honor, France, April 7, 1957.

Chevalier, Order of the Southern Cross, Brazil, December 12, 1958.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
October 12, 1965.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR COOPER: It has come to my attention that Life magazine intends to honor Mrs. Marjorie Merriweather Post, a distinguished American and an honorary citizen of my home State of Florida, in a forthcoming edition.

I believe such an article would be particularly appropriate because Mrs. Post has, through her philanthropies and other civic endeavors, made a substantial contribution toward building a better life in America and many nations around the world.

When the Legislature of the State of Florida last June passed a resolution naming Mrs. Post an honorary citizen of Florida, they expressed gratitude for Mrs. Post's offer to donate her estate, Mar-A-Lago, to Florida.

But the legislature also paid homage to a lady whose citations number a total of 30, who has used her personal resources to assist worthwhile projects of lasting value. Music, art, history, youth groups and humanitarian assistance projects have benefited because of Mrs. Post's interest.

She has been decorated by no less than six foreign governments. Her philanthropies have ranged from equipping a 2,000-bed overseas hospital during World War I to providing food kitchens in New York City during the depression days. During World War II, she was a leading benefactor of beleaguered Belgium.

Domestically, Mrs. Post's assistance has helped the scouting movement, the Red Cross, music and the arts.

Because I believe Mrs. Post has made contributions to society which have often gone unheralded, I am taking the liberty of bringing to your attention a list of the citations which she has received, the decorations awarded her by foreign governments and the philanthropies in which she has engaged.

I am sure that you will agree with me that the record of public service which Mrs. Post has achieved is indeed a most noteworthy one.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
U.S. Senator.

Report on 1st Session, 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BUCHANAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD my report to my constituency upon the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

The report follows:

DEAR FRIEND AND FELLOW AMERICAN: The 1st session of the 89th Congress has now passed into history. The record made by this Congress during 10 short months will have the most far-reaching effect, ultimately touching the life of every American, of any Congress since the formation of the Union. It was a Congress which turned out more legislation than any in the last 30 years, in response to administration demands—and in such volume that much of it will need thorough congressional review and revision.

The cost of the new administration program has received little mention. It has been estimated that appropriations for this session will reach some $118 billion—about $12 billion more than last year's total, and this is only the beginning. No one has any idea as to the eventual cost of these programs as they expand and multiply in future years. And there have been reports that the President has a task force hard at work preparing more new and expensive programs to present to the second session of this Congress.

I opposed much of this legislation because I believe that many of the needs of the people may be met by constructive and progressive plograms planned and carried forward at the State and local level with Federal subsidy and control held to a minimum. Other needs can be met through the independent action of churches, foundations and private citizens. There are new and pressing problems we face as a Nation because of social and economic changes coupled with our constantly expanding population, but we can meet this challenge and solve these problems without substituting our American constitutional system of government for a "welfare state" presided over by a vast, all-powerful bureaucracy in Washington.

There follows my first annual report to the people of the Sixth District of Alabama. May I send with it my gratitude for the privilege of being your Congressman. Rest assured that inasmuch as in me is, I shall continue to do my best for you and for our country.

Sincerely,
JOHN H. BUCHANAN, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

LEGISLATION

Medicare: The first year's cost of this program is estimated at about $3.5 billion to be paid by increased payroll taxes. Also approved: an increase in social security annuities. Medicare and other social security payments will take from the salary of a wage earner, based upon a $6,600 income, a yearly slice of $277.20 as compared with $198 previously. By 1987 medicare cost to the wage earner will have increased by 100 percent. Many of us felt there were other, better ways to meet this need and solve this problem.

Education: For the first time in history, Congress passed legislation to authorize funds for general use in elementary and secondary schools. Under this law approximately 95 percent of the Nation's counties, including some of the wealthiest, can receive grants to assist in the education of children from low-income families. The first year's cost—$1.3 billion. Projected 5-year cost—$6.5 billion. The higher education program was also renewed and revised with a cost of approximately $643 million a year for the next 4 years. This also includes a provision for a National Federal Teacher Corps, members to be recruited, trained, and fully paid by the Federal Government. The student loan program was expanded.

Appalachia and antipoverty: The administration's antipoverty program was expanded with passage of the Appalachia program which provided $1.1 billion to be used in 12 "Appalachia" States. The Congress also set up an omnibus regional development program to include areas designated as "economically distressed" with an additional $3.3 billion to be expended over a 5-year period, the program to be handled by an expended Area Redevelopment Administration. The antipoverty program (OEO) also included authorization for an additional $1.8 billion, in spite of the report that 1 in every 19 employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity makes over $19,000 a year.

Department of housing and urban development: This new Cabinet level department will deal with the problems of cities which will have an estimated increase of 100 percent in the next 35 years. During the House debate, predictions were made that the new department will grow more quickly than the cities. It begins with 13,000 employees and an annual budget of $4 billion.

Housing: The omnibus housing bill includes authorization for an additional 60,000 units a year for several years for low-rent public housing, and additional housing for the elderly, college students, and others. The cost for new and expanded housing programs—$7.8 billion. The public housing bill included the controversial $150 million rent subsidy plan submitted by the President. The Congress later declined to appropriate funds for this purpose.

Money change: This legislation removes the silver content from quarters and dimes, and reduces the silver in half dollars to 40 percent. All of these coins previously contained 90 percent silver. By Christmastime, the new "token" coins are scheduled to be in circulation, and the proverbial adage "not worth a red cent or a plug nickel" can be extended to our quarters and dimes.

Veterans: An increase in the rate of disability compensation for our veterans was passed, with my support, as well as several other measures extending veterans benefits.

Excise tax reduction: Reduction of excise taxes imposed as a wartime measure 20 years ago during World War II—long overdue—was voted to total about $4.8 billion by 1966 and included items ranging from telephone service to refrigerators.

Section 14(b) of Taft-Hartley Act: Repeal of section 14(b) of the act was passed by the House by a narrow margin. Passage was blocked in the Senate. This bill, if passed, would have outlawed State right-to-work laws such as the current Alabama State law.

Voting rights: This measure was one of the most controversial and far-reaching enacted during this session of the 89th Congress. In its final form, it set up a double standard of Federal law plus curtailing the right of the States, including our own State of Alabama, to set the standards for eligibility under which qualification of voters would be established.

Other legislation included highway beautification; a liberalization of the immigration laws; and raising the debt limit to $328 billion. The clean elections amendment was approved, making vote buying in Federal elections a Federal offense. Annuity increases were approved for Federal retirees, and pay increases were approved for Federal employees (Congressmen excluded). A pay increase was voted for members of the armed services, and funds were appropriated for the conduct of the military action in Vietnam. New library funds were authorized. By the end of the session, a total of 769 bills and 360 resolutions were passed by the House, of which 444 bills were enacted into law. The total number of measures introduced was 16,882.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

As a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I have been assigned to the Subcommittee on Manpower; Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits; and Census and Statistics, of which I am ranking minority member.

The effective operation of the Federal Government is dependent on the efficient utilization and performance of Federal employees. My committee has continuing responsibility to evaluate this work, and to take legislative action whenever necessary to assure the highest degree of efficiency in the operation of all Government departments.

The committee is also responsible for legislation which regulates the operation of the Post Office Department and the U.S. Census Bureau.

During the 1st session of the 89th Congress, 579 bills were referred to this committee. Twenty-nine have been reported favorably to the House. Of these, 25 have thus far been passed by the House and 9 have become law.

Of the major reports printed as official reports of the House of Representatives, all five were developed by subcommittees of which I am a member: three by the Subcommittee on Manpower and two by the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics.

H.R. 980, one of the bills reported to the House by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and a bill which I vigorously supported, is aimed at curbing the transport of obscence literature through the U.S. mails. This bill passed the House and is now pending before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

As a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I have participated in hearings of the committee including the continuation of the Cuba travel hearing from the 88th Congress. During the most recent hearings Juanita Castro, sister of Fidel Castro, appeared along with other witnesses.

Investigations of the committee are continuing in areas where there has been evidence of the possibility of Communist infiltration, and I have attended extensive closed and executive hearings concerning subversive activities in our country which are receiving committee attention. The investigation of the Ku Klux Klan is currently in progress.

Legislatively, the committee has reported out of committee a bill providing for the creation of a Freedom Academy, of which I am a cosponsor, and the bill is currently pending before the House Rules Committee, and is expected to come before the House for consideration early next year.

This committee is the congressional guardian of our internal security. Rest assured that we shall not be deterred from our continued surveillance of Communist subversion as long as our Nation's security and the world's freedom are threatened by this tyranny.

IN CLOSING

The President's own Senate leader, Senator Mike Mansfield, recently admitted, "It is hardly possible to set in legislative motion so many new Federal approaches to the Nation's problems, as we have done in recent years, without leaving a number of gaps and any number of rough edges, overextensions, and overlaps."

This sums up surprisingly well my own reaction to the first session of the 89th Congress.

Hon. Clarence J. Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the passing of that noble gentleman from Ohio, Clarence Brown, has taken from us yet another of those great veterans whose loss we have felt so keenly these past few years. His death particularly seemed to echo the end of an age—an age when the simple virtues and native commonsense of Main Street America were the guideposts of the Nation. Clarence Brown called to mind a way of life we shall always fondly remember, though it be gone forever.

My differences with Clarence Brown on legislative matters never tarnished my abiding respect for him. He was proud to be a Member of Congress, proud to be a Republican, proud to be a conservative, and he symbolized the finest traditions and highest ideals of all three. His loyalty to the principles he held so deeply made him formidable in debate, perseverant in the face of adversity, steadfast without pretense. Yet he was not less constructive for the tenacity of his convictions; his sponsorship of, and service on, the pioneering Hoover Commissions amply demonstrated his responsiveness to the continual challenge of new problems.

Above all, his service here was one of complete dedication, for he viewed such service, not as a stepping stone for other aspirations, but as a career of the greatest honor. Like Sam Rayburn, Clarence Brown proudly believed election to the House to be, in the late Speaker's words, "high enough for any man's ambition." Indeed, Clarence Brown exemplified the truly professional type of Representative—the one who keeps the legislative process functioning, day in and day out, and thereby keeps democracy vibrant at its most fundamental core.

The great esteem I held for Clarence Brown is the measure of my deep sorrow at his passing and the wellspring of the heartfelt compassion I extend to his grieving family.

Increased Dental Insurance Programs Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, increased dental insurance provided by the private sector of the economy and through professional associations demands immediate consideration and action. The dentists and their associations have made commendable progress on their own and with insurance companies, and yet I warn that they and their associations should learn from medicare and prepare a comprehensive program which covers our Nation and is available to individuals and families in their own communities and States. This is far preferable and more effective than just another expensive Federal program. The private sector of our economy could best handle this, and I urge the dentists to move promptly during the next 2 months in advancing comprehensive dental programs.

The dental insurance programs that I have in mind could be handled directly by the American Dental Association, tied into Blue Cross and Blue Shield, individual and groups of insurance companies, or some new method. I also would like to mention and praise the role certain unions have played in advancing dental insurance for their members and their families. For example, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters have inaugurated a plan which provides coverage for eligible recipients on an indemnity basis, with the patient to pay personally to his dentist all charges above those specified in a table of allowance within the policy. Also, each member in the plan will have freedom of choice in selecting his dentist, and no dentist will be asked to sign any particular agreements or contracts.

It would be advantageous for the American Dental Association to hold meetings in all 50 States before January, as well as regional meetings for the Northeast, Midwest, South, and Western areas, so that the best thinking of the dental profession and their associates could be brought to bear on these problems. I favor at the beginning varied approaches in different parts of our country and in individual States, tailored to meet the needs of these areas. I am a great believer in the laboratory system. We will get new good ideas in some places and be able to drop ideas that do not work in others. Through trying out a variety of approaches in the marketplace, we should be able to come up with national program alternatives that have been tested in the field. Generally I am pleased with the good work that is being done on this problem and I hope for a major constructive breakthrough, based on scholarship and practical approaches of meeting the dental care needs of American families. We must make progress promptly in developing a sound dental care insurance program and unless this is done professionally there will be a vacuum that the Federal Government will try to fill. In this effort I welcome ideas from all sources as to the best way to serve these needs.

Annual Report of Senator Joseph D. Tydings for 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, with the 1st session of the 89th Congress now complete, it is appropriate that I report to the people of Maryland upon the accomplishments of this Congress and of my role in helping to write that record.

I. THE OVERALL RECORD

This has been rightly called the fabulous 89th Congress. We have enacted more significant legislation in more fields than any other Congress in memory, possibly than any Congress in history.

Much of this legislation had been on the drawing boards for years. Most of it was first proposed by Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, or John Kennedy. But this Congress, under the skillful leadership of President Johnson, deserves the credit for enacting these much discussed and long-overdue measures into law.

As a Member of this Congress I was proud to support, with my vote and my voice, pioneering legislation in the following fields:

Elementary and secondary education: The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 recognizes the Federal responsibility for improving the quality of education which our children receive. The act provides large scale Federal aid to schools with a high percentage of children from low-income families. Maryland will receive up to $18.8 million. This will do much to increase educational opportunities for all of our children.

Higher education: The Higher Education Act provides significant new programs to aid colleges and college students: Federal scholarships and guaranteed loans for needy college and graduate students, aid to struggling small colleges, and grants for college libraries and training. In addition, this legislation authorizes a Teachers' Corps whose volunteer members would augment school programs in slums and other impoverished areas. The President has promised to request funds for this program early next year.

Health: The medicare provisions in the Social Security Amendments of 1965 mark a new departure in American society. From now on, working people will contribute to an insurance fund that will enable them to meet health care needs in their later years. The yoke of staggering medical bills will thus be lifted from the backs of the elderly and their families.

Equal opportunity: The Voting Rights Act of 1965 is a far-reaching step on the road to full equality for all Americans. Under its provisions some 183,000 Negro citizens in 5 Southern States have already been registered to vote for the first time.

Immigration: The Immigration Reform Act eliminates the undemocratic national origins quotas and regulates future immigration on the basis of family need and an individual's ability to make a contribution to our society, rather than color or ancestry.

Housing: The housing amendments of 1965 significantly strengthen existing programs to build houses for low- and middle-income families and for the elderly, and to assist urban renewal. The legislation also authorizes new programs to construct neighborhood centers and to beautify city parks and streets. In addition, the Congress pioneered with a bold program of rent supplements, which, when funded, should dramatically increase the housing opportunities open to the very poor.

Water and air pollution: The Water Pollution Control Act establishes Federal water quality standards and provides increased financial assistance for the construction of community sewage facilities. The Air Pollution Control Act will establish minimum Federal standards for exhaust fumes emitted by new automobiles.

Tax reform: The elimination of most Federal excise taxes will help to keep the economy functioning at its present high level, in addition to removing these burdensome and annoying taxes.

Maryland, Assateague and Appalachia: The Assateague Island National Seashore will preserve the only stretch of virgin seashore between Cape Hatteras and Cape Cod for the benefit of all Americans. Maryland will undoubtedly receive significant economic benefits from increased tourism which the Assateague Seashore will generate.

Garrett, Allegany, and Washington Counties in western Maryland will all be receiving funds under the Appalachia bill, the first Great Society measure passed by the 89th Congress. The legislation will finance a substantial road construction program, plus construction of health facilities, vocational schools, and land improvement.

The foregoing are just the highlights. In addition, the Congress enacted significant new legislation to promote regional economic planning and development, to encourage the arts and humanities and to submit for ratification a constitutional amendment to deal with the problems of a vacancy in the office of Vice President and a disabled President.

Other measures extended and revised the manpower training and antipoverty laws; encouraged regional medical centers for research and treatment benefiting victims of heart disease, cancer, and stroke; raised social security benefits, established a program to clean up the appearance of Federal-aid highways by screening junkyards, controlling placement of billboards and landscaping roads; removed silver from coins and gold backing from Federal Reserve deposits; combated the balance-of-payments deficit; expanded controls over sales of depressant and stimulant drugs; required a health warning on cigarette packages; and created an interurban rapid transit system from Baltimore to Washington.

II. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Of course, no Senator, least of all a freshman, could play a leading role in shaping all or any significant portion of this legislative program. The Senate operates through its committee system. The most significant work is done in committees. It was, indeed, fortunate to be assigned to three important committees.

The Judiciary Committee is one of the most important and prestigious committees in the Senate. More legislation is assigned to it than to any other committee.

The Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee is responsible for review of our multibillion dollar space program and for charting our space objectives after we reach the moon. Maryland is an important center for space research and development.

The District of Columbia Committee presents opportunities to implement model programs in almost all fields of interest to urban communities. The operation of the District of Columbia government is of direct concern to the nearly one million Marylanders who live in the Greater Washington area.

It was primarily through these committee assignments that I was able to play some role in shaping legislation of concern to Maryland and to the Nation.

III. REAPPORTIONMENT

I was fortunate—some call it beginner's luck—in having an opportunity during my first term to play a major leadership role on a national issue of great importance. This opportunity arose because of my assignment to the Senate Judiciary Committee and to the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee, which had for consideration the controversial reapportionment amendment sponsored by Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, and 37 other Senators.

I found that at the opening of the hearings I was the only member of the subcommittee who fully supported the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision. At the outset I presented a statement in which I analyzed the weaknesses of the Dirksen amendment. Shortly thereafter I met with Senators DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, who had led the successful fight against Senator DIRKSEN'S reapportionment efforts in the closing months of the 88th Congress.

The three of us developed a strategy to fight the Dirksen amendment. This strategy included:

First. Taking every reasonable and legitimate opportunity to insure full and complete hearings and to stimulate interested Senators, mayors, law professors, and citizens to present testimony in opposition to this amendment.

Second. A major address on the weaknesses of the Dirksen amendment, to be widely distributed and used as the principal vehicle of public education on the issue. I was chosen to make this speech. It was well received and I have been told that it was a vital ingredient in the defeat of the Dirksen amendment.

Third. Meetings with columnists and reporters and with the leadership of interested groups and organizations, particularly labor, civil rights, religious and civic organizations. These groups mobilized for an extraordinarily effective job of public education and political persuasion.

By the conclusion of the hearings, Senator DOUGLAS, Senator PROXMIRE, and I found, somewhat to our surprise, that our efforts had been surprisingly effective. The Judiciary Committee, which we had originally expected to report the Dirksen amendment by a comfortable majority, was now split 8 to 8, and would not report the amendment. We also found that there were more than enough Senators now opposed to the amendment to assure its defeat on the Senate floor.

When Senator DIRKSEN bypassed the Judiciary Committee and brought his amendment to the floor, as an amendment to a routine bill, I joined my colleagues in several days of debate. During this time we checked and double-checked the list of Senators who had told us they opposed the amendment to be certain that their opposition was firm. As soon as this was done, we were ready to vote.

The result—39 Senators opposed—was 5 more votes than the one-third needed to block a constitutional amendment.

Since the vote on the original Dirksen amendment last August, Senator DIRKSEN has introduced a new and revised amendment to accomplish the same basic purpose. In concert with Senators DOUGLAS and PROXMIRE, I have spoken out against the new amendment and have begun to take steps to insure its defeat next year.

IV. CIVIL RIGHTS

In this area, too, my membership on the Judiciary Committee enabled me to play a significant role in shaping a major piece of legislation.

The voting rights bill came to the Congress a few days after the President's dramatic speech calling for voting rights legislation. The bill was, of necessity, hastily drawn.

During the hearings, it became apparent to me and to several of my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee that significant improvements were possible. Those of us on the committee who supported voting rights legislation caucused on an almost daily basis, and gradually reached consensus among ourselves on the amendments we would collectively support. Among these was the controversial poll tax amendment, sponsored by Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

I played an active role in these deliberations and several of the amendments I recommended were incorporated in the bill at the committee stage. Subsequently, when the bill came to the floor, I served as an assistant floor manager to Senator PHILIP HART, Democrat, of Michigan, and played an active role in the debate.

I sponsored on the Senate floor, with Senator HIRAM FONG, Republican, of Hawaii, an amendment, which the Senate adopted and which was incorporated in the final bill, to authorize the appointment of Federal poll watchers. This is a most important provision. It will insure that Negroes who are registered under the act are, in fact, allowed to vote on election day.

V. OTHER PUBLIC ISSUES

During the first session I spoke out in the Senate and elsewhere on a wide range of public issues. Some of my statements dealt with the following subjects:

Peace: I spoke in favor of adequate appropriations for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, for Senator CLARK's, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, planning for peace resolution, for a permanent U.N. peacekeeping force, and for an end to nuclear proliferation.

Gun control: I advocated effective Federal gun control legislation. At the American Bar Association's annual convention in August, I debated this issue with a representative of the National Rifle Association. At the conclusion of the debate, the House of Delegates voted 186 to 21 to support firearms control legislation.

Population control: I was one of the original cosponsors of Senator GRUENING's, Democrat, of Alaska, population control bill, and have spoken in support of Government-financed clinics, both here and abroad, to dispense birth control information to indigent families that desire such assistance.

Mass transit: I introduced two bills dealing with mass transit. One would authorize Federal highway trust funds earmarked for urban areas to be expended, at the option of local officials, for mass transit as well as highways. The second bill would provide appropriations for research into new and imaginative techniques for moving people into and through our congested cities.

Auto safety: I spoke in favor of legislation to improve highway safety, to require the manufacture of safe automobiles and tires and to help States eliminate unsafe drivers and automobiles from their roads.

Law enforcement assistance: As a member of a special subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I helped shape new legislation to provide Federal assistance to States and local governments that desire to improve the quality of their law-enforcement agencies. In speeches supporting the bill I stressed the need first, to provide adequate compensation, education and equipment for our police officers, second, to develop better scientific techniques to aid the police and third, to improve communications and relations between the police and the Negro communities in our large cities.

VI. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AFFAIRS

As a member of the District of Columbia Committee, and chairman of its Business and Commerce Subcommittee, I was able to play a role in the affairs of the District of Columbia.

Home rule: I cosponsored and vigorously supported home rule for the District of Columbia. I proposed several amendments to the administration's bill that were adopted by the committee and the Senate. These amendments included a provision for a chief administrative officer, to relieve the mayor of day-to-day details; and terms of 4 years rather than 2 for councilmen. Unfortunately, home rule was defeated in the House.

Rail rapid transit: I cosponsored and testified in favor of a subway for our Nation's Capital. Legislation to create the subway was enacted during this session.

District of Columbia budget: I played an active role as an ex officio member of the District of Columbia Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. In a lengthy and detailed memorandum which I circulated among my colleagues on the committee, I pointed out where and how the District of Columbia budget should be increased to meet the health, welfare, and educational needs of the citizens of the District. Many of these suggestions were adopted by the Committee and ultimately enacted into law.

Welfare: In the area of assistance to the dependent children of unemployed parents, the Senate Appropriations Committee refused to take action that I, and others, deemed essential to the welfare of disadvantaged children. I joined actively in bringing this matter to the floor of the Senate where, after spirited debate, a compromise was reached that substantially met my objections.

VII. MARYLAND INTERESTS

Maryland fared well in the 1st session of the 89th Congress. After many years of discussion and consideration, lovely Assateague Island was made a national seashore park. In addition to preserving a spot of great beauty for Maryland residents, the park should provide a substantial source of tourist income. I worked closely with Senator BREWSTER, the principal sponsor of the bill, and testified on behalf of Assateague Island before both House and Senate Committees.

I was largely responsible for suggesting an important innovation in the work of the Maryland congressional delegation. For the first time in 20 years, the entire delegation—House and Senate, Democrats and Republicans—began to work together as a team. Since early summer, the delegation has held weekly luncheon meetings.

As a result of this coordination at least four concrete results have been achieved:

First. The Assateague Island bill was enacted.

Second. After unsuccessful attempts since 1958, the delegation succeeded in enacting a bill which would return to the University of Maryland several acres of vitally needed land that had been donated to the U.S. Government 30 years ago.

Third. The President's original proposal to place the port of Baltimore under a new regional customs office in Miami was reversed, and Baltimore was made a separate regional headquarters with jurisdiction over the mid-Atlantic seaports.

Fourth. The Housing Act was amended on the floor of the Senate to provide additional assistance to cities which carry on extensive urban renewal projects that stress rehabilitation rather than demolition. This amendment, which was retained in the final bill, will provide Baltimore with an additional $500,000 each year.

Finally, I spoke out about the problems confronting our State. In a series of graduation addresses, I discussed the decline of State government generally, and the need in Maryland, and elsewhere, for fair apportionment of State legislatures and constitutional reform. I also focused upon some of the specific problems facing Maryland in the fields of elementary and secondary education, higher education, urban development, water pollution, election reform and judicial reform. While these speeches provoked some criticism, I intend to continue to discuss the problems of Maryland, particularly as they relate to my responsibilities as a U.S. Senator.

VIII. SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMPROVEMENTS IN JUDICIAL MACHINERY

Following the death of Senator Olin D. Johnston, Democrat, of South Carolina, I was appointed to the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I thus became one of the youngest Senators, in terms of both age and seniority, to chair a major standing subcommittee of the Senate. Senate insiders report that they know of no other instance in which a first year Senator has been appointed chairman of such a subcommittee. Four members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, all senior to me, waived their seniority to enable me to assume the chairmanship.

The subcommittee's jurisdiction encompasses the organization and operation of the Federal judicial system. In the 6 months since I became chairman, I have—

Guided through the Senate the omnibus judgeship bill, which would create 44 additional district and circuit court judgeships throughout the country to alleviate the currently overloaded Federal dockets.

Conducted joint hearings on the omnibus bail reform bill of 1965 with Senator ERVIN's—Democrat, of North Carolina—Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. This bill, which updates Federal bail practices, passed the Senate in September.

Conducted hearings, again with Senator ERVIN's subcommittee, on the sensitive problem of assuring defendants a fair trial, free from the prejudice of damaging publicity, while at the same time enabling the press to perform its constitutionally guaranteed responsibility of keeping the public fully informed.

Outlined future activities of the subcommittee, which include an intensive investigation of both the U.S. Commissioner system and the problem of judicial fitness. The U.S. Commissioners are the front line of Federal justice. There is urgent need for drastic overhaul of a system which has not been altered fundamentally in more than 70 years. Our investigation of judicial fitness will emphasize the sensitive but vital questions of the selection, tenure, and removal of Federal judges.

IX. CONCLUSION

This has been an eventful session of Congress for the country. The record of legislative accomplishment we have written will soon be felt in every home, school, hospital, and business establishment in Maryland.

For myself, this session of Congress has been a source of deep personal satisfaction. It was a thrill to take a seat in the same chamber whose walls echoed the voices of such men as Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, Robert LaFollette, and my late father, Millard Tydings. It has also been a great privilege to have an opportunity to work with the present giants of the Senate. Such men as MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana; RUSSEL LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana; RICHARD RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia; EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois; and many others have been most generous in sharing with me their invaluable knowledge of the workings of the Senate.

They have also been generous in permitting me and my freshmen colleagues an opportunity to be heard as well as seen. I am told that not many years ago a freshman Senator's lot was not a happy one. Whatever may have been the case previously, I can say without qualification that I have been given every opportunity to participate fully in the work of the Senate. I will always be grateful to the majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD; to ALAN BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, chairman of the District of Columbia Committee; to CLINTON ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, chairman of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee; and especially to JAMES EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for allowing me to take an active role in Senate business.

Finally, I am most grateful to the people of Maryland for giving me the opportunity to serve in the Senate. The longer I am here, the more I come to know and appreciate the wonderful people of our State. With the continued support of the people of Maryland, I will be able to serve more effectively.

Working Toward President Johnson's Great Society: A Report to the People of Alaska on the Accomplishments of the 1st Session of the 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I include my statement summarizing for the people of Alaska the major accomplishments of the 1st session of the 89th Congress:

CONGRESS AND THE GREAT SOCIETY

Throughout the country, and properly so, there is praise for the magnificent manner in which President Lyndon Johnson is working with the Congress to obtain enactment of a domestic legislative program designed to make the Great Society a reality.

The 1st session of the 89th Congress has responded positively to his inspired leadership, enacting one piece of major legislation after another in a workmanlike manner.

But withal it should be noted that given the determined and dedicated leadership of President Johnson—given the will to achieve of this session of the Congress—these accomplishments could not have occurred if they had not reflected the belief of the vast majority of Americans that the time had come to translate some of the dreams of a better life for all into actualities.

Perhaps for Alaska and Alaskans no Congress will ever equal the 85th Congress which voted for Statehood for Alaska.

And, from the standpoint of Alaska and Alaskans, it will take some doing for any Congress to equal the performance of the 88th Congress which provided so promptly and so generously urgently needed disaster relief for Alaska when it suffered the ravages of the Good Friday earthquake.

But in its own right, the 89th Congress in its 1st session has set a record on the domestic scene unequaled since the memorable first 100 days of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. President Johnson's domestic program has emphasized social progress.

It has insured the voting rights of all people; provided hospital care for the elderly; made sweeping reductions in excise taxes; enlarged the scope of educational assistance; attacked the problem of air and water pollution; and made strides in reducing poverty and improving education and training for the unemployed. Let me list the positive examples.

HOSPITAL CARE—SOCIAL SECURITY

While former President Truman, one of the original sponsors of Government-supported medical care looked on in Independence, Mo., the President signed into Public Law—Public Law 89-97—the administration-backed Hospital Care—Social Security Act.

The legislation has long been misnamed "medicare." It provides hospital care and should be known as "hospicare."

Alaska, a young State, has a young population, but many Alaskans are supporting aged parents in the lower 48 and are confronted with ever-mounting expenses for their hospital and nursing home care. The long-awaited Federal health insurance program will ease this problem.

The measure provides a health care insurance program for persons 65 or older, increases social security cash benefits, and expands the Kerr-Mills program of medical assistance to the indigent aged, child health care programs, and other Federal-State public assistance programs. Many of the social security benefits took effect in September 1965, when some 20 million persons started receiving retroactive social security cash benefits totaling about $1 billion. The basic hospital plan which becomes effective July 1, 1966, will benefit about 19 million aged, providing up to 90 days of hospital care, 100 days of nursing home care, and 100 home health-care visits. The supplementary health plan will benefit about 16.9 million aged. Social security cash benefits affecting about 20 million persons provided a 7-percent across-the-board increase in old-age survivors and disability insurance benefits, retroactive to January 1, 1965.

Also included in the Social Security Act was my amendment, cosponsored by my able colleague, Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, validating social security coverage agreements with Alaska school districts previously determined not to be "political subdivisions" within the meaning of section 218.

I have known many men and women who have completed successful work careers and who have retired with savings and pensions apparently ample to live in comparative comfort for the rest of their lives. Then these individuals have been struck by severe illnesses and in a very brief period have seen their life's savings drained away in paying for the high costs of medical and hospital care and drugs.

For people in such circumstances, this legislation marks a milestone and will go far to enable them to meet the overwhelming burden of hospital expenses—and some medical expenses—attendant all too often on old age.

REGIONAL MEDICAL PROGRAMS—PUBLIC LAW 89–239

This act authorizes a 3-year $340 million grant program to assist in establishing and operating an estimated 25 regionally coordinated medical complexes for the study of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and related diseases.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965—PUBLIC LAW 89–110

And of course the piece of "monumental legislation," as the President has termed it, was the Voting Rights Act of 1965, Public Law 89-110, to prevent denial of voting rights because of race or color. It suspends the use of literacy tests or similar voter qualification devices, and authorizes Federal examiners to register all eligible voters when there is evidence of continued discrimination by the States. It contains a declaration that if State poll taxes deny or abridge the right to vote the Attorney General is directed to institute court action immediately against the enforcement of poll taxes which do in fact deny or abridge a person's right to vote. I cosponsored this bill which, when implemented, will make our Nation stronger and more free.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT—PUBLIC LAW 89–117

A monumental piece of legislation for which President Johnson can claim credit is the Housing Act of 1965. It authorizes a 4-year, $7.8-billion housing program, extends existing programs, and provides for a new supplementary rent program for low-income families limited to $150 million in total new contract authority for fiscal years 1966–69. Regrettably, funds for the supplementary rent program were not appropriated.

This is the most comprehensive housing act ever passed. It should lead us ever closer to realization of the goal of decent housing for every American.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—PUBLIC LAW 89–174

Another measure of importance which I cosponsored in the Senate is an act which establishes a Department of Housing and Urban Development. Such a Department will make possible greatly improved administration of the principal Federal assistance programs for housing and development of the Nation's communities. It will further cooperate with State and local governments and agencies in assisting urban planning and development. It consolidates the functions, powers, and duties of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Federal National Mortgage Association.

We are an urban nation. More than two-thirds of our population today, more than 130 million persons, live in urban areas. These urban areas cross city, county, and State lines.

Anyone who doubts the untoward aspects of the increasing urban sprawl need not go far to find it. On the east coast, the population lives nearly house to house, door to door from the north of Boston to the south of Washington, D.C.

The President has reminded us:

> In the remainder of this century—in less than 40 years—urban population will double, city land will double, and we will have to build in our cities as much as all that we have built since the first colonist arrived on these shores. It is as if we had 40 years to rebuild the entire urban United States.

The challenge is staggering, but I am convinced that we can meet it.

We of Alaska live in a vast area where the facilities of the Department of Housing and Urban Development will be useful. We have cities which have grown fast and often haphazardly and the growth is only begun in Alaska. We can use constructively the aids proposed.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTION—PUBLIC LAW 89–44

The Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965 is a sweeping measure which ends approximately $4.7 billion in Federal wartime excise taxes on jewelry, handbags, television sets, appliances, luggage, toilet articles, furs, cameras, musical instruments, phonograph records, playing cards, and sporting goods except fishing equipment. The 10-percent automobile tax will be reduced in stages decreasing to 1 percent by January 1, 1969. This measure will result in increased purchasing power and a resultant expansion in the economy which in the long run will mean an increase in total Federal revenues at lower tax rates.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT—PUBLIC LAW 89–10

Long debated in the Congress, Federal aid to education at last has received congressional approval. The receptive mood of the Congress, the country, and the administration have been important motivating factors leading to passage of H.R. 2362. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act authorizes $1.344 billion in Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools for fiscal 1966; a 3-year program of Federal grants to States for allocation to school districts with large numbers of children from low-income families; a 5-year program of grants for books and library materials; a 5-year program of grants for supplementary educational centers and services; a 5-year $100 million authorization for construction and operation of regional facilities for educational research; a 5-year program for grants to stimulate and assist States in strengthening the leadership resources of their State educational agencies and a 2-year extension of Federal aid to impacted areas.

America urgently needs the tools embodied in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Education and democracy are one and inseparable. The foundation of a democratic society is a citizenry able to think for itself—and not merely willing, but determined to do so.

In 1810 Thomas Jefferson wrote:

> The information of the people at large can alone make them the safe, as they are the sole depository of our political and religious freedom.

Thomas Jefferson said many times that education was the most effective weapon men had against tyranny.

He wrote in 1818:

> If the children * * * are untaught, their ignorance and vices will, in future life, cost us much dearer in their consequences, than it would have done, in their correction, by a good education.

We know he was right.

I supported and cosponsored this bill. Aid to education long has been needed. The goals of the Great Society cannot be implemented until the educational need for all of our Nation's children is met fully. This act will strengthen Alaska's educational system by $1,989,422 annually.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

Public Law 89–329 authorizes a 3-year, $2.3 billion higher education program. It will provide Federal scholarships for needy students, funds to strengthen colleges, and establishes a 2-year National Teacher Corps whose members would serve in poverty-stricken areas to improve educational opportunities for disadvantaged youngsters. Funding must still be obtained for the Teacher Corps.

Included in the law is my amendment which permits federally chartered credit unions to participate in making loans to students.

In his January 12, 1965, education message to the Congress, President Johnson documented the need to encourage every child to get as much education as he has the ability to take. The President traced the development of educational opportunities in this country from the time of the Northwest Ordinance of the Continental Congress in 1787 which proclaimed that schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

Times change. What was adequate becomes obsolete. What was once progressive no longer is adequate to meet the challenges of the Great Society.

This act is designed to make available to all children, regardless of environment or parental income, the opportunity to learn.

AID TO APPALACHIA—PUBLIC LAW 89–4

A great achievement of the administration and the Congress is the authorization of $1.1 billion to help Appalachia. It aids the economically underdeveloped 11-State Appalachian region by establishing the Appalachia Regional Commission. Of the $1.1 billion to be spent, $840 million is for Federal grants to help pay for a 5-year highway construction program. A 2-year authorization of $252.4 million will be used to finance various economic development projects. I was a cosponsor of this legislation which will go a long way toward eliminating poverty and putting back to work some of the human resources that are presently being wasted. The Great Society cannot afford this tragic loss of its most valuable resource—its people.

EXTENSION OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT ACT—PUBLIC LAW 89–15

Another administration bill that received approval of the Congress is the act extending the Manpower Development and Training Act to June 30, 1969, which authorizes $454 million for fiscal 1966 and provides up to 2 years training in classrooms or on the job for persons unemployed because of lack of education or skills.

Inserted was the amendment proposed by the Alaska congressional delegation which permits the Secretary of Labor to provide subsistence and travel allowances beyond the maximum ordinarily specified because higher costs in Alaska create an unnecessary financial hardship on trainees. The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 was designed to train workers to equip them to fill available jobs. It was oriented primarily toward experienced workers who had lost their jobs because of technological change. As an indication of the success of the program, employment for 72 percent of those completing institutional training and 94 percent of those completing on-the-job training had been found as of December 31, 1964. All 50 States are participating in the program.

PRESIDENTIAL CONTINUITY

Congress also acted to insure adequate succession procedures in proposing a constitutional amendment which fixes conditions and procedures for succession of the Vice President to the Presidency in the event of the Chief Executive's disability, and which provides for filling a vacancy in the Vice Presidency subject to congressional confirmation. I was a cosponsor of this amendment of article II, section 1, clause 5 of the Constitution which must be ratified now by 38 States within 7 years.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL—PUBLIC LAW 89–234

The administration properly has taken a positive stand on conservation and protection of our natural resources. I was a cosponsor of S. 4 which gives the Federal Government authority to establish purity standards for interstate streams if the States through which the waters flow fail to establish approved standards by June of 1967. The act increases the authorizations for sewage treatment grants, including an increase to $150 million a year for the next 2 years in the total authorization and an increase to $1,200,000 individual projects and to $4,800,000 for multicommunity projects.

SALINE WATER

Public Law 89–118 extends for 5 years to June 30, 1972, an expanded research and development program for conversion of saline water. One hundred and eighty five million dollars have been authorized for this project. Already our fresh water resources are dangerously low in many parts of the Nation.

FEDERAL WATER PROJECT RECREATION ACT

Public Law 89–72 establishes prospective standard guidelines on the allocation and reimbursability of recreation, fish, and wildlife costs on Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL—PUBLIC LAW 89–272

Another bill, S. 306, which is important insofar as clean air is concerned, and of which I was a cosponsor, requires standards and proposed regulations to control pollution from gasoline and diesel powered vehicles. Approved by Congress, the act establishes a Federal air pollution control laboratory and authorizes grants for research to improve methods for disposal of solid waste.

DISASTER RELIEF—SBA—PUBLIC LAW 89–59

A matter of considerable consequence to Alaskans is an amendment to the Small Business Act, Public Law 89–59, providing for an increase in the maturity of Small Business Administration disaster loans from 20 to 30 years, suspending for up to 5 years on the payment of principal and interest on disaster loans at the discretion of the Administrator; and for increasing the Small Business Administration's revolving fund by $50 million.

INDIAN ADULT EDUCATION—PUBLIC LAW 89–14

Of special importance to Alaskans is Public Law 89–14 which increases the authorization for Indian adult vocational education by $3 million thereby raising it to $15 million annually.

TLINGIT AND HAIDA INDIANS—PUBLIC LAW 89–130

I sponsored this measure which was cosponsored by Senators BARTLETT and MANSFIELD. Public Law 89–130 amends the act of June 19, 1935—49 Stat. 388, as amended, relating to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska. It amends the definition of Tlingit and Haida Indians and recognizes a central council which would have authority to make plans for use of judgment funds expected to be awarded the tribes in the very near future. It authorizes the advancement and expenditure of any appropriation to satisfy the judgment for any purpose authorized by the official central council, including per capita payments, and for the preparation of a current roll of all Tlingit and Haida Indians. Under the law it is required that following appropriation of funds to satisfy the award, Tlingit and Haida Indians shall submit an additional legislative proposal providing for the use of their money based upon approved plans and recommendations.

ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

Congress also created an Administration on Aging, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to coordinate information and service for State and local governments, to administer grants and promote research on problems of the aging. This is just one facet of the many-pronged attack that is being launched to bring relief to the problems of the elderly.

EXTENSION OF COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES—PUBLIC LAW 89–109

The Congress acted favorably on the administration's health program by extending for 3 fiscal years, 1966–68, authority for grants to States and communities for mass immunization programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus. Measles was included in the immunization program. The new public law extends for 1 year general and special health services, including those for migratory workers, chronically ill and aged, and grants for research to improve such services.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES—PUBLIC LAW 89–209

Public Law 89–209 establishes a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities to develop and promote a broadly conceived national policy of support for the arts and humanities throughout the United States. This is long overdue legislation.

When I introduced the humanities bill, S. 111, at the start of this Congress, I said that humanities encompass the study of the past to create a rewarding future. I pointed out that while we have some splendid blocks upon which to build because learned men of past centuries and vanished civilizations have left us their contributions, some of which we have found, that we dare not be content. The search for knowledge, for quality, must continue.

As the sponsor of S. 111, I am especially pleased that President Johnson endorsed the concept of a national foundation to aid the humanities and arts. This act will help develop the cultural achievements of the Great Society.

ALASKA PUBLIC WORKS

Public works projects in Alaska will be funded by more than $3.3 million provided in the public works appropriation bill, Public Law 89–299. The bill as agreed upon by Senate and House conferees includes $800,000 for preconstruction planning of the Snettishham hydroelectric project near Juneau.

Eliminated in conference was $250,000 added by the Senate to expedite completion of the Snettishham project. I hope the amount can be included in the first supplemental appropriation bill to be considered when Congress reconvenes in January. If the added funding can be approved, power will be produced at Snetishham by 1970.

No funds could be requested for the proposed Rampart Dam project on the Yukon River since that work first must be authorized by the Congress. Studies now underway should be completed when Congress reconvenes so the Alaska congressional delegation can work for authorization and the start of funding of the biggest hydroelectric project in North America, a project long needed in Alaska.

Also included in Public Law 89–299 was $7,000 for flood control study on the Kuskokwim River at Bethel, which had not been in the President's budget as submitted to Congress. Other items were $7,000 for a navigation study of Humboldt Harbor at Sand Point and $6,000 for a navigations study of the harbor at Metlakatla.

Funding for Alaska includes $400,000 to start work on the Anchorage Harbor based on a study made by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The corps estimates the total cost of dredging the harbor to a 35-foot-deep water depth and building two jetties will be $5,722,000.

Other items are: $1,170,000 for the construction and rehabilitation of the Eklutna project and these general investigations for navigation: Auke Bay, $15,000; Dry Straits-Wrangell Narrows, $50,000; Gastineau Channel, $75,000; Knik and Turnagain Arms, $12,000; Kobuk River, $25,000; Kodiak Harbor, small boat basin, $20,000; Naknek Harbor, $5,000; and Sergius Narrows, $23,000.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

Public Law 89–285 provides for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems. This law brings increased meaning to the phrase "America the beautiful."

Great credit for pointing up the need for this highway beautification act goes to our President and his lovely wife, Lady Bird. Mrs. Johnson is an activist. By her action and support of this legislation, she has truly shown how much more beautiful the countryside of America can be when it is properly cared for.

It should be noted that Alaska has no billboard problem. As Governor of the Territory in 1945, I urged adoption of proposed legislation forbidding erection of billboards on the highways. This was done, and later further safeguards were added to the law.

We know that our population increase has made it necessary to change some of America the beautiful. But necessary changes need not be repudiations of America the beautiful.

ASSATEAGUE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE—PUBLIC LAW 89–195

This act provides for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia. It is another positive step to preserve for future generations some of our beautiful scenic areas.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965 PUBLIC LAW 89–253

Public Law 89–253 extends all economic opportunity programs to June 30, 1968. It authorizes appropriations totaling $1,785 billion for fiscal 1966.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST DISASTER RELIEF—PUBLIC LAW 89–41

Remembering the Good Friday earthquake and the Federal assistance that we received, Alaskans can well appreciate the humane purposes of this act, which provides assistance to residents of Oregon, Washington, California, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the catastrophic floods of December 1964 and January and February 1965.

IMMIGRATION REFORM—PUBLIC LAW 89–236

Public Law 89–236 abolishes the national origins quota system in immigration effective July 1, 1968. It provides for admission of immediate relatives of American citizens and fixes the annual limit of 170,000 from all former quota countries, and 120,000 from Western Hemisphere, giving preference to persons with skills and professional abilities.

DRUG CONTROL—PUBLIC LAW 89–74

Public Law 89–74 provides for regulation and control of manufacturers of depressant and stimulant drugs.

MILITARY PAY INCREASE—PUBLIC LAW 89–132

Public Law 89–132 provides an average 10.4 percent basic pay increase for officers and enlisted members of the uniformed services; total $1 billion.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION—PUBLIC LAW 89–188

Public Law 89–188 provides construction and other related authority for the military departments, and the office of the Secretary of Defense, within and outside the United States. It also includes authority for construction of facilities for the Reserve components in the total amount of $1,780,062,000 consisting of $1,739,749,000 in new authority, an increase in prior years' authorization of $9,823,000; and $30,490,000 for Reserve components.

This year's act authorizes the following construction projects in Alaska: $580,000 for an addition to the sewage treatment plant at Fort Greely; $289,000 for alteration of the command post war room at Fort Richardson; $177,000 for an information data systems center at Fort Richardson; $368,000 for range facilities at Fort Richardson, and $411,000 for a command and control center at Fort Wainwright.

Navy projects include $5 million at the Adak Naval Station; $303,000 at the Adak Communication Station and $1,185,000 at the Mount Moffett Radio Station at Adak. The Air Force construction includes $601,000 at Eielson Air Force Base; $4,540,000 at Elmendorf Air Force Base; $374,000 at Galena Airport; $288,000 at King Salmon Airport and $7,837,000 at various locations in Alaska.

These remote base projects include: Barter Island Air Force Station, $1,108,000; Bethel Air Force Station, $116,000; Cape Lisburne Air Force Station, $138,000; Cold Bay Communications Station, $36,000; Delta Junction, $137,000; Duncan Canal Radio Relay Station, $39,000; Glenallen Communications Station, $246,000; Indian Mountain Air Force Base, $157,000; Kotzebue Air Force Station, $91,000; Murphy Dome Air Force Station, $294,000; Neklason Lake Radio Relay, $71,000; North River Radio Relay Link, $135,000; Ocean Cape Radio Relay Link, $90,000; Pillar Mountain Radio Relay Station, $80,000; Shemya Air Force Base, $1,132,000; Soldotna Radio Relay Site, $60,000; Sparrevohn Air Force Station, $301,000; Tin City Radio Relay Link, $4,579,000, and Tok Radio Relay Link, $135,000.

Included will be 200 units of military family housing at Eielson and a like number at Elmendorf. Except for Elmendorf Air Force Base, which was appropriated $3,640,000 instead of the $4,540,000 authorized, all other funds authorized for military construction projects in Alaska received requested appropriations.

COMBAT SERVICEMEN INSURANCE

Public Law 89–214 provides an automatic insurance plan of $10,000 or $5,000 for all members of the uniformed services on active duty on and after the effective date designated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

MILITARY DEPENDENTS—MEDICAL CARE

Public Law 89–140 authorizes transportation at Government expense for dependents of members of the uniformed services who are accompanying members at posts of duty outside the United States where required medical care is not available locally.

MILITARY DEPENDENTS—LANGUAGE TRAINING

Public Law 89–160 authorizes language training for dependents of members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in anticipation of assignment to permanent duty outside the United States.

MILITARY INCENTIVE PAY

Public Law 89–149 authorizes incentive pay for personnel who perform hazardous duty on the flight decks of aircraft carriers.

MILITARY PRIVILEGES (PUBLIC LAW 89–315)

Public Law 89–315 provides free airmail service for first-class letter mail, including cards, for members of the Armed Forces in an overseas combat area as designated by the President, or hospitalized as a result of such service.

A SELECTIVE SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR LEGISLATION PENDING IN CONGRESS

Certainly visionary and far-reaching laws have been enacted in this session of Congress, but much more must be accomplished. Following are a few of the measures introduced in this session of Congress the passage of which I consider essential to the realization of our goals in Alaska.

MINING TAX RELIEF BILL

Long regarded by the mining industry as essential to stimulate exploration for minerals and increased mining activity is H.R. 4665, a companion bill to my bill (S. 338) which would remove existing restrictions on deductions allowable to mining companies for exploration expenditures, which was ordered reported by the House Ways and Means Committee during the closing days of the first session. Tax measures originate in the House of Representatives.

ESTABLISHMENT OF 12-MILE FISHING LIMIT

During the 88th Congress I introduced S. 1816, a bill designed to conserve the offshore fishery resources of the United States by authorizing the extension of the territorial waters of our Nation and its territories to 12 miles. I introduced an identical measure, S. 49, in this session of Congress. It has been referred to the Commerce Committee. Our once great fishing industry is in trouble. The 88th Congress wisely took a long-overdue first step to help U.S. fishermen when it approved a bill introduced by Senator BOB BARTLETT which makes it possible to fine or imprison violators of our coastal waters who come inside our 3-mile limit. But the need persists to extend our territorial waters and give to our fishermen a wider area in which to fish unmolested by foreign competition.

CENTENNIAL BILL PASSED SENATE

The bill to authorize Federal financial participation in the 1967 observance of the centennial of the Alaska Purchase, S. 2614, passed the Senate by voice vote in the closing hours of the session.

The Senate bill authorizes the appropriation of $3 million for programs contributing to the long-range economic development of Alaska. These projects or facilities would be industrial, agricultural, educational, research, or commercial, which would contribute to the purpose of the centennial celebration and be enduring symbols of the significance to the United States of its purchase of Alaska in 1867 by providing permanent contributions to the economy. The State of Alaska, which with local groups would match or surpass any Federal contribution, would have the basic responsibility for planning and executing these programs. In addition, the Federal Government would be authorized to spend $600,000 for preparation of Federal exhibits during the centennial celebration.

If there is one event in our history that deserves the fullest kind of appreciation, applause, and celebration, it is the centennial of this purchase which made possible the inclusion of an area one-fifth as large as the 48 older States in our free society and definitively removed the incubus of totalitarianism from the Western World. Alaska—but for William Henry Seward—might well be a police state.

We propose to celebrate one of the great achievements of American history. It shows that the American people when they went through with the purchase of Alaska, and 6 years ago achieved statehood for our 49th State, proved that they were not declining, but that they were still young, still vigorous and on the march, and that our cherished principle of government by consent of the governed was still in full effect.

The purchase of Alaska has altered the course of history—and it is scarcely arguable that it has not been altered for the better.

Meanwhile, the House Public Works Committee has reported a companion bill, H.R. 9963, introduced by able, hard working Representative RALPH J. RIVERS. His bill would appropriate $5 million for Federal support of the Alaska centennial. No action was taken in the House before adjournment. I am hopeful that positive action can be taken early in the second session to enable Alaska to make the best possible use of its building season.

ASSISTANCE FOR AREAS STRUCK BY MAJOR DISASTERS

I am a cosponsor of a bill (S. 1861) which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to refinance loans in areas struck by major disasters and to waive payment of principal and interest in certain hardship cases. This measure has passed the Senate and is pending before the House Public Works Committee.

ASSISTANCE IN HOUSING FOR ALASKA NATIVES

I am cosponsor of a bill that would authorize $10 million to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator for a program of grants and loans to Alaska to provide housing and related facilities for persons who are unable to finance such facilities on terms and conditions they can afford. This bill has been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

COLD WAR VETERANS ACT

Once again I am a cosponsor of a bill to extend the GI bill of rights to cold war veterans. The bill, S. 9, passed the Senate and is pending before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Since my first term as a Member of the Senate, I have consistently cosponsored and supported legislation that would establish a national park and recreation area on the Indiana Dunes which would preserve their scenic beauty and natural splendor. During this session of Congress a bill (S. 360) to establish a national park and recreation area on the Indiana Dunes passed the Senate and was referred to the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

The preservation of beauty in the midst of urban blight is as much a necessity for the people of this country as the economic progress which brings with it increasing realization of human requirements for this natural resource. As one who has always been a fervent conservationist, I have applauded the wise proposals to preserve and, where necessary, acquire land to satisfy the need of humans for enjoyment of outdoor recreation. This is a form of conservation which truly meets the needs of people, and this is, I believe, the purpose of successful conservation.

A BILL TO FACILITATE USE OF LAND GRANTED UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

I am the sponsor of a bill (S. 2366) to facilitate the use of land granted to the University of Alaska. The bill has been referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EKLUTNA POWER PROJECT

Legislation providing that funds used to prepare the Eklutna project near Anchorage would not be counted against the project's revenue, was introduced by Senator BARTLETT and cosponsored by me. The Good Friday earthquake requires permanent repair to the project estimated at about $3.1 million to be budgeted over a 3-year period. The bill number is S. 104.

THE POPULATION CRISIS

On April 1, 1965, I introduced S. 1676, a bill to coordinate and disseminate birth control information upon request. The bill also authorizes the President to call a White House Conference on Population in 1967. Seven Senators joined as cosponsors and identical legislation was introduced in the House of Representatives.

The bill was referred to the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures, of which I am chairman, and hearings started June 22. Fifteen hearings were held this session and they will resume in 1966. More than 50 witnesses testified as to the various problems created by the population explosion.

By October 1, five more Senators had joined as cosponsors of S. 1676. The bill has bipartisan support and one cosponsor is a member of the Catholic Church.

A BIGGER STATE?

If the inhabitants of the State of Hawaii and the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands so desire, they could become a single State if Senate Concurrent Resolution 50 is enacted. I am a cosponsor of this resolution.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN EXPENDITURES

This Congress I have served as chairman of the recently created Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures. The subcommittee has held 15 hearings on domestic and international population problems and has heard 56 witnesses thus far.

The subcommittee also initiated hearings related to the processing of the Pribiloff fur sealskins which is carried out pursuant to an international treaty signed by the United States, Japan, Canada, and Russia to restrict pelagic sealing in the northern Pacific Ocean.

The subcommittee has initiated a review of the multimillion dollar foreign participant training programs of the Federal Government to ascertain the efficiency and economy with which the training of foreign nationals is being carried out by the multitude of Federal departments and agencies involved. Information compiled by the subcommittee indicates that hearings may have to be held early in the next session of Congress on this subject.

Another subject presently under investigation by the subcommittee concerns a review of the coordination, efficiency and economy of the policies of the Department of State, the Treasury Department, Agency for International Development, and the Department of Agriculture in regard to U.S. holdings of foreign currencies.

The subcommittee has also held hearings on the disposition of Government surplus property. These hearings will continue when Congress is adjourned.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINERALS, MATERIALS, AND FUELS

I serve as chairman of the Interior Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels. This subcommittee has initial responsibility for measures referred to it concerning "mineral interests generally," in the words of the Legislative Reorganization Act, the mineral resources of the public lands, and mineral land laws and claims and entries thereunder.

During this 1st session of the 89th Congress, the subcommittee has devoted a considerable amount of time and effort to finding ways and means to stimulate domestic production of gold, reopen closed mines, and put gold miners back to work.

Three measures dealing directly with gold mining were referred to the subcommittee. S. 2562 was referred by Senator McGOVERN, Senate Resolution 83 was referred by Senator BARTLETT, and S. 1377 was referred by me. All three measures have bipartisan cosponsorship.

S. 1377, which is based on my bill (S. 2125) of the 88th Congress as reported favorably to the Senate, provides for payment to domestic gold producers on an individual basis of amounts predicated on the differences between their cost of producing gold in the last quarter of 1939, our last period of normal production, and average costs of the last quarter of 1963.

The measure carefully refrains from any suggestion for any increase in the $35 an ounce price for gold established as a depression measure in 1934.

Introduced by Senator McGOVERN with seven cosigners S. 2562 would aid and stabilize the gold-mining industry of the United States by maintaining the rate of gold production from currently operating gold mines and by stimulating increased gold production through the reopening of mining properties which have ceased operations prior to January 1, 1965. It would encourage exploration, development, and commencement of new gold mining operations through the Gold Mines Assistance Commission which would be directed to provide financial assistance to domestic producers of gold. It is the intent of this bill that financial assistance payments to domestic gold producers hereunder shall have no relation to the monetary price of gold paid by the Treasury Department of the United States.

Senate Resolution 83 introduced by Senator Bartlett would create a select committee of the Senate on gold production to study the problem in its entirety and report back to the Senate with recommendations.

While the subcommittee took no formal action on these measures directly, they formed the background for a series of informal conferences and discussions with Treasury officials held from time to time throughout the session. There is reason to hope that out of these conferences may come legislation which will have the acquiescence, at least, of the administration to ameliorate the plight of domestic gold producers, who have been put out of business, in a great number of instances, by the direct action of the Federal Government.

Other legislation considered and acted upon by the subcommittee included:

S. 1378, by Senator Moss and five other Senators, to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of 1961. The House companion measure, H.R. 5842, as amended was substituted, and became Public Law 89-238. The law extends the lead-zinc small producers program for an additional 4 years, broadens the base for participation, and clarifies certain provisions of the parent act.

S. 1674, by Senator Bible, to authorize leasing by the Secretary of the Interior of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources on the public lands, was favorably reported, with amendments, by me and passed the Senate on September 7, 1965. The bill opens the way to development of a new natural resource of our publicly owned lands. The steam itself has been proven valuable for production of electric energy. In a number of localities the superheated brines or gases contain mineral required by industry and agriculture. The proposed legislation is a leasing act, providing the Secretary with authority, which he does not now have, to permit development by private enterprise of geothermal deposits, and setting forth conditions and standards of leasing.

S. 2358, introduced by Senator Holland, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests in certain lands in Florida to the surface owners of said lands. The subcommittee held a hearing, in conjunction with consideration of H.R. 7378.

H.R. 7378, introduced by Congressman Haley, proposes selling reserved phosphate rights in certain lands in Florida to the surface owners thereof. This measure and S. 2358 cover different tracts of land. At the hearing, the Department of the Interior urged amendment to require the surface owner to pay the costs of mineral survey, instead of the flat $200 fee provided in the bill as it passed the House. Since such a survey could be very costly, the proposed amendment met with objection and both measures have been set aside for further study by the subcommittee early in the second session.

In addition to its consideration of the gold problem and action on specific bills, the subcommittee conducted a study and held hearings, in Butte, Mont., and in Washington, D.C., on the administration and interpretation of Public Law 167, 84th Congress. This measure is popularly known as the Common Varieties Act or the Materials Act. It provides that common varieties of sand, gravel, stone, and the like shall no longer be locatable under the mining law of 1872, but instead shall be subject to leasing by the Secretary of the Interior, on a competitive basis for limited periods of time. It also provides that the holder of a mining claim can use only as much of the surface, and surface resources, as are necessary for him to conduct actual mining operations.

Over the past several years the subcommittee has received vigorous protests from mine operators on the public lands that the act was being interpreted by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management in a manner inconsistent with the original intent of the bill, and that its administration was so harsh as to be inequitable and to discourage mineral development. At the Butte hearings, spokesmen for the mine operators cited specific instances to support such allegations. In the next session the subcommittee will pursue this matter further in an attempt to remedy the situation.

Department of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I listened to Congressman Gray reveal an amazing list of facts concerning the Department of Justice and its use of Edward Grady Partin, an alleged embezzler, under indictment, as a Federal undercover man in the Hoffa case in Chattanooga. As the Congressman continued to document his remarks, the more amazed I became.

During the interim I thought quite a bit about his statement and I then read it very carefully in the Congressional Record. Seeing it in black and white and systematically listed in chronological order almost made me ill—at least it made me sick at heart.

It is hard to believe—and it is something I do not want to believe—that an agency of our Government would utilize such tactics in an effort to secure a conviction of an individual regardless of who he may be or what his profession might be. If this is an accepted practice of the Department of Justice and one which is often used by its representatives, any individual could be convicted on trumped up charges and accusations.

There is little doubt in my mind but that the Judiciary Committee should carry out the orders of the resolution it passed last year and investigate the operations of the Department of Justice. Let it find out—and report to the Congress—if the statements made by Congressman Gray are correct or not. Let it look into the charges made and confirm or dismiss them.

All my life I have been a firm believer in fairplay and I always expected true justice to be available to all. This is what I would like to see right now, Mr. Speaker, and I join with my colleagues in requesting an investigation by the Judiciary Committee.

Secretary of the Treasury Fowler Tells the Economic Club of New York That a Further Rise in Interest Rates Is Like "the Dog Chasing Its Tail," Threatening Prosperity and Risking Recession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler, speaking before the Economic Club of New York, minced no words in attacking the views of those who find tight money and high interest rates as the only solution to whatever problems, either real or imaginary, that plague our economy. Secretary Fowler pointed out that interest rates have been substantially raised in the last few years and that instead of helping, higher rates will only harm.

The Secretary cautioned against any inflationary panic with the reminder that we have a serious unemployment problem yet to be solved and warned that any substantial change in our monetary and fiscal policies of the last 5 years could be ruinous.

He insists that it would be irresponsible to abandon tried and proven policies, particularly in favor of the drastic, stringent money tightening urged by those who habitually insist that inflation is lurking around every corner and behind every tree. The Secretary wisely pointed out to his audience that it makes no sense to raise interest rates to a point of conflict with domestic expansion and yet not provide a real solution to our balance-of-payments problem. On the inflation question, the Secretary cautioned against any price increases and urged continued cooperative effort of business, labor, and government, stating, however, that there is no sufficient evidence to justify higher interest rates because of any threat of inflation.

This is one of the most forceful and clearly reasoned statements I have read on the subject of monetary policies and interest rates. I commend it to my colleagues for careful study. There is little doubt that the wise and prudent policies counseled by Mr. Fowler, if followed, will assure us, barring international catastrophe, of indefinite continuation of our unprecedented prosperity.

His remarks before the Economic Club follow in their entirety:

Remarks by the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury, Before the Economic Club of New York, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, N.Y.

It has been said that "the Great Society is the one in which businessmen think greatly of their function." The author of that statement was not President Johnson, but Alfred North Whitehead, the great philosopher, speaking more than half a century ago.

A more contemporary American, speaking of our present-day economy said: "It is an economy where the health of business benefits all the people. It is an economy where the prosperity of the people benefits the health of business. It is an economy where, in large measure, the fortunes of each are tied to the fortunes of all."

Gentlemen, that speaker was not the head of our giant corporations—it was the President of the United States. Incidentally, in the spate of economic statistics which confuse us daily, one thing emerges loud and clear: namely, what is good for the country is certainly proving good for General Motors. And the same is true of virtually every business represented here tonight.

Instead of fortifying that last statement with a barrage of statistics about what has happened in the last 2 or 5 years to profits before taxes, profits after taxes, cash flow, gross national product, personal disposable income, consumption, weekly pay, employment, and numerous other indexes; let me be one speaker out of Washington who spared you a glorious statistical recital. There is no need to belabor the statistics, when to paraphrase one well-known commentator: "In your heart you know I'm right." And, I might add, in your annual report, too.

Behind all those heartwarming statistics you are being spared, there is an important fact of life in this good year 1965—you in business and we in government are a partnership for progress. We are bound by a common conviction that the right answer to our problems on both the domestic and international economic fronts must be based on a dynamic private sector as the prime mover in the achievement of our economic goals. Business, labor, and government have learned that by pulling together we can all achieve much more than by pulling apart.

It is against this background of a fruitful, working partnership between business and government that I would speak to you tonight about the most important task of that partnership—sustaining the greatest, longest, and best balanced economic advance in the Nation's history as it moves through its 57th month.

You will forgive me for speaking frankly and in a more personal vein than is customary. This is a very personal subject to you, and both this partnership and the economic advance are a personal and public thing to me. Much of the last 4½ years of my life have been given to promoting both—because it is good business for the Treasury and the country.

My personal credentials for a deep and demonstrated conviction that we must enable the private sector to play the prime and dynamic role in our national economy, include scars and bruises incurred in helping to secure the development, adoption, and execution of the liberalization of depreciation allowances—the investment tax credit in 1962—the corporate tax cut and further improvement of the investment credit in 1964—individual tax reductions of 1964 that included top-to-bottom rate reductions—and excise tax reductions this year.

But my most important credential by far is that I serve under a President of the United States who has done more and worked harder than any man in our long national history to bring about the better understanding that is essential to a fruitful working partnership between business, labor, and government. Night after night, day after day, as no President before him, President Johnson has brought together leaders of business, finance, and labor to meet with him, his Cabinet, and White House staff members—seeking advice, swapping ideas on what each could do separately and all could do together for a better America. He has made, "let us reason together", a national slogan as well as his personal expression of heart and mind.

It is in that spirit that we turn to our task—sustaining the economic advance.

Debate is raging on how best to keep it rolling. A number of my friends have engaged publicly in this debate. An even larger number are debating privately. There are those who are fearful of "overheating" or inflation. There are those who feel that the economy may run out of power and lose its upward thrust. Some of my friends see the expansion exploding with a boom and a bang because it is being excessively stimulated. And some of my friends see the expansion running out of gas unless there is more stimulus. My own position on this issue is frank and forthright. I am for my friends.

Since I am a mere lawyer by profession, I am not eligible to join either of these economic schools. So I have been thinking of starting my own new school of economics. To be a member you must have the capacity to worry about both inflation and deflation at the same time. Students in this school, when they read each morning's ration of glowing economic statistics, will not know whether to laugh or cry. They must be aware of the dangers of unbridled optimism either as a strategy for successful performance or as a medium for successful prophecy. They must also not be inclined to surrender to pessimism. In my school, neither Cassandra nor Pollyanna will be eligible as coeds.

The curriculum will be simple. It will consist of persistent study of the policies which have been employed to sustain the present expansion and the adjustments, adaptations, and changing emphasis appropriate to new problems, new needs, or new facts.

The unprecedented economic expansion we are seeking to sustain has consistently confounded those who have failed to discern its true course and character—those, often, who have also failed to comprehend the policies that have supported and sustained its progress.

And those policies have amply proven their worth. While they have not—and I would not dare to claim they have—eliminated the business cycle, it has been demonstrated that the cycle does not move by the calendar but by our private and public policies.

In considering the future of the current economic expansion and my views of the policies necessary to sustain it, my thoughts instinctively go back to the summer and fall of 1961. The views I held then—and hold now—were perhaps best expressed in my response to a request by the late President Kennedy at a Cabinet meeting in mid-November 1961—just 4 years ago to the week—for suggestions with reference to the coming year's legislative and administrative program. It was entitled: "A Recommended Program To Avoid Recession in 1963–64 or Minimize Period of Decline." Sparing you the analysis and commentary and much of the detail of the program recommended, let me outline the policies to which it was directed:

First, a steady and healthy increase in the rate of business investment in modernized plant and equipment, providing the capacity and efficient facilities essential to support more rapid growth at stable prices but without encouraging an unsustainable burst of investment activity;

Second, coordination of monetary and fiscal policies to promote this growth by providing new investment incentives in our tax structure, while maintaining the availability of ample credit for investment, homebuilding, and State and local construction at reasonable rates of interest;

Third, an early attack on structural problems potentially constricting our growth potential, including especially the training of additional supplies of manpower equipped to play a useful role in modernized industry or expanded services, private and public, and enactment of a Federal aid to education bill;

Fourth, the avoidance of destabilizing price, wage, inventory, and budgetary policies, including action to avoid a violent shift back and forth between large deficits and large surpluses in the Federal budget, to develop productivity measures and guidelines, and to encourage labor-management-Government understanding of appropriate price and wage changes;

Fifth, improvement of countercyclical tools through the enactment of automatic or discretionary countercyclical tax and expenditure devices that could be promptly brought to bear, in coordination with monetary policy, when desirable to counter actual or reasonably forecast sharp changes in demand.

What stands out, as we look back upon the expansion of the 4 years that have ensued since that early analysis, is how far we have come toward those goals, and how smooth the ride has been. For this expansion has remained remarkably free from the excesses and imbalances that too often in the past have upset our periods of prosperity.

There were tests that might easily have tripped up a less solidly based expansion—but that we have met and mastered, avoiding recession on the one hand and inflation on the other, as business, labor and Government have worked together in a climate of mutual cooperation and confidence.

I am not here tonight to contend that there is no need for flexibility in the public and private policy mix we have so successfully lived by for nearly 5 prosperous years.

Of course, new facts and new circumstances may call for a reexamination of policies. Policies must be adjusted and adapted to new problems and new needs as they emerge. And we must not airily dismiss potential new dangers. But there are dangers, too, in acting prematurely in response to fears for the future that are not grounded in hard facts and hard analysis.

A few months ago, many were concerned that the expansion might sputter and fall—particularly after the turn of the year, when the large rise in payroll taxes to finance medicare and increased social security payments would take effect. We took steps to meet the legitimate problem that did exist. Now that fear has largely receded and the principal concern seems to be that there will be inflation entailing risks to the expansion. This position must be examined and dealt with frankly. Are there solid grounds for these fears or, as Fortune magazine recently put it, has "the curve of business activity and the curve of sentiment about it parted company"?

In amassing the gains from our expansion, the Nation has brought unemployment down from 6.8 to 4.3 percent. We have raised industry operating rates from about 78 percent to some 90 percent of capacity in recent months. In so doing, we have brought our economic performance far closer to our rising economic potential. These welcome developments are the fruits of efforts which have been zealously pursued. Are they to become bitter fruit, giving rise to inflation and the loss of our expansion?

What is the situation?

The situation is that private demand is increasing at a healthy rate and defense expenditures are rising because of Vietnam at a time when the gap between demand and the availability of manpower and unused capacity has narrowed to the lowest point in this 57-month expansion.

Defense Department spending currently accounts for less than 8 percent of our total output, and the current levels of the buildup will mean no appreciable change in that percentage. During the Korean war period, by contrast, military spending necessarily zoomed from 5 to 13 percent of a much smaller gross national product.

There is still some room to absorb that spending through the fuller use of our current resources. For instance, unemployment is still significantly above the levels that we feel represent a realistic noninflationary target for our economy.

Much larger elbowroom is assured by the growth in our productive capacity. There is the prospect of large annual net additions to the labor force averaging 1.5 million each year. There is under way in both the public and private sector the most massive effort ever undertaken to attack the problem of structural unemployment, involving the training and retraining of young and old and those whose skills have been outmoded or never properly developed to take a more useful and efficient role in our economic society.

Furthermore, industry is already adding to capacity at a rapid rate, and most industries are ready and able to expand production substantially, even with present facilities. The McGraw-Hill reports last week of projected plans for 1966 expenditures for plant and equipment were reassuring. In no sense do they add up to a nonsustainable rate of expansion or modernization or an inflationary strain on the capital goods industry such as characterized 1956–57. The bulk of the new capacity seems to be going to the right places—to those industries where operating rates are highest.

Thanks to rigid Federal expenditure control in fiscal 1965 and 1966, our budgetary deficit position was rapidly approaching a balanced condition until the additional expenditures of the conflict in Vietnam intervened. At present tax rates, we can look forward to a revenue growth of some $6 to $7 billion or so a year as the economy grows in line with its potential—revenues which can be allocated to meeting increased budget requirements.

There are also several restraining factors on the economic horizon—including not only the rise in payroll taxes I mentioned earlier, but the runoff of steel inventories and the less than exuberant outlook for housing.

In the price sector, some disturbing signs have appeared. The last year has seen more of a tendency for price increases to outweigh declines than any year since 1958. Industrial wholesale prices have risen by 1.5 percent in twelve months after 6 years of comparative flatness. Consumer prices are 1.7 percent above a year ago, as compared with yearly increases averaging 1.3 percent since 1958.

In summary, the situation calls for confidence in our capacity to adjust to increased demands upon our economy. But, at the same time the situation requires us—both in the public and in the private sector— to recognize that the margin for error is much smaller and the need for responsible action is much greater.

What are some of the elements of responsible action? The situation requires that we forego further tax cuts until some more opportune time when the stimulation that would result from increased private consumption and investment will be more appropriate. Fiscal dividends from our economic growth in the form of tax cuts seem, for the present, to be a casualty of the increasing requirements for the defense of freedom in Vietnam. A favorable change in that situation might call for a review.

Responsibility also requires a budget that will enable us both to meet our domestic objectives and our international commitments without fostering inflationary pressures. It requires a budget that, without neglecting national needs, seeks to finance new programs from savings on old ones to the maximum extent possible. It requires a budget that achieves all possible savings to offset greater defense needs by eliminating or reducing low priority civilian programs, and by stretching out or deferring the impact on spending of some of the new and proposed civilian programs—without delaying basic authorizing legislation or otherwise unduly impairing important, but longer-run objectives.

It requires, in short, the kind of budget that President Johnson is going to give us—a budget that reflects both the most stringent kind of fiscal discipline and the most effective response to essential national needs.

Some are not content to tackle any present or potential risks of inflation with that responsible kind of fiscal policy. They advocate abrupt restrictions on the expansion of money and credit to restrain the growth of demand, and would invite sharply higher long-term interest rates. This would be a substantial change in our policy mix of the last five years and amount to a new ball game. It would raise in the minds of our producers and consumers serious questions about whether or not to continue to buy and expand in the light of increased cost of money and tightness of credit.

The important point is that no sufficient evidence has yet developed to justify this kind of treatment of the price situation or of the supply-demand relationship by cutting back on demand rather than emphasizing efforts to expand supply. To restrain demand at this time would be to admit that the continued growth of the U.S. economy in amounts comparable to the advances of the last 2 years is beyond our resources. In those years our pluses and minuses have added up to a generally smooth and well-phased expansion of about ten and a half billion dollars a quarter in our gross national product. The pluses and minuses that are in prospect, according to the analyses of most of our economic forecasters, public and private, do not suggest a marked deviation from that pattern in the next year—either upward or downward. Is it too much? I believe the answer is, and should be, "no."

I would urge that from here on our priority objective should be to achieve that growth without increasing pressure unduly on reserve capacity. To do so we must increase our efforts to provide the capacity to absorb that growth so that the risks of pressure on prices and of aggregate demand on productive capacity are minimized by increases in supply rather than restraint of demand.

We must intensify our attack on structural causes of unemployment by more job training and retraining, a better organization of the labor market, and the decasualization of many types of seasonal or part-time employment. We must use every effort to increase productivity and hold down costs. In that effort, we must not forget the lessons of the 1950's—that the steady gains in productivity required to absorb increases in wages and other costs rest on steady growth and output—that the investment required to enhance efficiency, cut costs, and assure ample capacity over the longer run is dependent on the combination of steadily expanding markets and profits.

And to digress for a moment, we hear again a refrain that a solution to the balance-of-payments problem can be found in tight money and higher interest rates. Presumably proponents of this approach must be referring to rather drastic measures since that is what would be necessary to bring into equilibrium the interest rate levels that characterize the U.S. economy and other capital markets.

Let me also remind you that twice before the Federal Reserve has raised its discount rates—one half percent in the summer of 1963 and one half percent in the fall of 1964—to deal with balance-of-payments problems. We have clearly not overlooked this instrument. But our rises were followed by rises abroad and the gap remained—and in some important areas widened. Only a few months after the second increase it was necessary to request voluntary action to restrain an accelerating outflow of capital from our banks and nonbank financial institutions. As my predecessor, Douglas Dillion, several times pointed out—as early as Rome in 1962—the problem of disparity between interest rates and capital availability here and abroad is rooted in rates abroad that are far too high, and in the woeful inadequacies of foreign capital markets. This kind of substantial disequilibrium cannot be eliminated or reduced to manageable proportions under present circumstances by any monetary action at all consistent with our domestic needs.

May I suggest that the zealous exponents of the use of monetary policy to achieve a better balance among international interest rates have a fertile field for missionary work in Western Europe. We should not play the game of the dog chasing its tail to the point of severely damaging our economy and risking a recession. It makes no sense to raise persistently our interest rates to a point where they may conflict with the maintenance of our domestic expansion and yet not provide a real solution to our balance-of-payments problem.

But in no sense is this the end of the discussion. In any marriage or partnership, there comes a time for frank talk. That time has now arrived in the partnership between business and government—if we are to maintain our excellent record of price stability, which must continue to be a key element in sustaining the current expansion, as well as in bringing our balance-of-payments deficits to an end.

There is a particular danger today—when we are engaged in war in Vietnam at a time when margins between supply and demand have narrowed, in hasty and ill-considered action in wages and prices—a misguided effort to exploit present markets for short term individual advantage at the inevitable expense of damaging the prospects for future markets and for healthy growth for all.

I would like every single businessman who is now contemplating or who may be contemplating in the future an increase in price to stop, look, and listen. Do changes in his unit costs and profit trends justify that action or permit him to hold steady? Or do gains in productivity and lower costs offer an opportunity to lower prices, broaden markets, and increase sales?

The wage-price guideposts of the Council of Economic Advisers point out the kinds of policies that serve the public interest in this sphere, but they can do no more than point out. It is business and labor that must carry the burden of responsibility.

The man who unnecessarily raises prices today or fails to take advantage of opportunities to cut costs and reduce prices will only add to other producers' costs tomorrow. That is a cycle that we must stop before it starts.

Everyone in the business and financial community, and in labor organizations, and everyone concerned with wages or prices, should look beyond their own personal and professional responsibilities to their very real—and much broader—common responsibility toward the economy at large.

That standard would be true in any season or year. But the need for responsible action of this nature is particularly acute in the period ahead against the background of smaller margins of unutilized labor and production capacity and the especial responsibility that the situation in Vietnam places on every American.

Today's prosperity reflects a combination of sound fiscal and monetary policies, intelligent business planning, and responsible restraint by business and labor in making wage and price decisions.

The future is in our hands—government, business, labor, and the public. It is not in the private interest and it is contrary to the public interest to gamble with that future for the sake of immediate—and very possibly temporary—gain.

In conclusion, I do not see before us any economic problems in sustaining our economic advance which we cannot handle—and without abandoning the essentials of the policy mix that has served us so well thus far.

Our task is simply to prove that we can stand prosperity. I have no doubt that we can and will—if we remember that the one thing which prosperity cannot stand is to be taken for granted. It must, on the contrary, be earned anew every day, every week, every year—earned by the continued cooperative effort of business, labor and government. For it is that effort—and not some phantom force—that determines how well our economy performs.

Once again we are approaching a crossroads of national decision. There are those in the private sector—in both business and labor—who would abandon this time-tested policy mix which has served so well as the basis of the working partnership between business, labor, and government and has given the Nation 57 months of uninterrupted and unparalleled prosperity. If it should be abandoned, what is to be used as a replacement? Old formulas that have not worked? New formulas that have not been thought through or grounded on a new consensus? Or the chaos of divergent policies that add up to no policy at all? The real question is: Why give up a winning combination? My answer is: Let's not throw it away.

Dr. Edwin Bancroft Henderson—Community Leader and Civil Rights Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a heartwarming privilege to say a few words about my friend, Dr. Edwin Bancroft Henderson, who has devoted his life to improving the education and human rights of the people in the District of Columbia and Fairfax County, Va. Few people epitomize so well the selflessness and dedication which give vitality to the principles of equality that are the backbone of this great Nation. Now, at age 82, Dr. Henderson and his lovely wife, Mary, are moving to Tuskegee, Ala., to live with their son's family and to enjoy the pleasant company of their grandchildren.

Thousands of persons, spanning three generations, have been inspired by Dr. and Mrs. Henderson in their tireless fight fof the civil rights for all citizens.

Dr. Henderson was born in Southwest Washington, but has lived for the past 55 years in Washington's suburb of Falls Church, Va. In his youth, "E. B."—as we all call him—was a champion athlete. He sparred with professional boxers and led his Washington YMCA basketball team to a national championship. His interest in young people led him to become a teacher of physical education in the District of Columbia public schools, where he eventually rose to be the director of physical education for the Negro division of the school system. It is a fitting coincidence that 1954, the year of his retirement from the District of Columbia schools, was the year the Supreme Court issued its historic decision in Brown against Board of Education invalidating racial segregation in our country's public schools.

During his years with the District of Columbia school system, Dr. Henderson worked vigorously and constantly to eliminate all forms of racial discrimination. He fought racial segregation all his life. He was the major leader of the Committee Against Segregation in Recreation, which fought so valiantly against the soul-shattering racism which formerly pervaded the District's recreation program. His continued interest in athletics and the Negro's achievements in sports is reflected in his fine book, "The Negro in Sports." He did more than any other person I know to encourage Negro athletes and to end the debasing practice of white-only sport and athletic contests. It was largely as a result of his indefatigible work that the old Uline Arena—now the Washington Coliseum—was desegrated.

He led the long fight to end segregation at the National Theater.

His constant flow of acute and trenchant letters to the newspapers contained some of the most perceptive comments on local, State, and National politics that have ever been printed. They were an important factor, especially during the 1940's and 1950's, in educating the public into awareness of the evil of segregated facilities. His vast knowledge of civil rights and his keen intellect made him one of the foremost consultants to citizens fighting against racial discrimination.

Dr. Henderson's first major battle against racism came in 1912 when the Town Council of Falls Church proposed an ordinance to confine Negro residences to a small ghetto section. Dr. Henderson organized the opposition to that proposal and it was defeated. The group he organized eventually became the Fairfax County branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. This branch recently celebrated its 50th anniversary at a banquet honoring Dr. and Mrs. Henderson as its founding members.

Dr. Henderson had a leading role, also, in the fight against racial segregation on buses traveling between the District of Columbia and Virginia, a practice which the Supreme Court held unconstitutional in 1946. He fought against the Ku Klux Klan which paraded regularly in Fairfax County and committed frequent acts of violence and malicious mischief.

His struggle against great odds to improve the educational facilities in the "separate-but-equal" schools of Fairfax County—which were indeed separate, but surely not equal—was a saga that could fill a book.

Dr. Henderson's contribution to the human rights struggle in the District and Fairfax County was aided in fullest measure by his wife. Enthusiastic, conscientious, young in heart, full of the joy of life, Mrs. Henderson was for many years principal of the James Lee Elementary School in Falls Church. She was a charter member and the first Negro in the 10th District Women's Democratic Club. She was outstanding and indefatigable in bringing hundreds of new members into the Fairfax County NAACP. She has been, I know, a source of great support to her husband during the more than a half-century of their marriage.

Their sons are carrying on the Henderson tradition of community service. One, Dr. Edwin Meriwether Henderson, is a dentist; the other, Dr. James Henry Meriwether Henderson, is engaged in cancer research at the famed Tuskegee Institute. E. B. and his wife are justly proud of them.

The Nation's Capital and Fairfax County, Va., are better places for all people because Dr. and Mrs. Henderson worked and lived there. Theirs is a lasting contribution, to be long remembered by all who believe in decency and goodness. As they leave the area to begin a new life in Alabama, I say to these generous and gentle folk: "Godspeed, good health, long life, and our heartfelt thanks to you, for your deeds, your inspiring selflessness, your humanitarian example, and the gift of optimism and hope you have given to us all."

Report to the People of the Second Congressional District of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to my people in the Second Congressional District of Nebraska on my voting and attendance record for the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

This report includes all rollcall votes. As you know, rollcall votes are those upon which a Congressman is publicly recorded for or against an issue. However, the 201 votes listed in this report represent only about one-third of the bills acted upon by the House. Rollcall votes are not taken on the majority of the bills. The majority of the laws are decided by voice vote. In addition to the rollcall votes listed, there were 182 quorum calls—attendance checks—taken in the House which are omitted here to conserve space. This accounts for the nonconsecutive numbering of the rollcalls listed in this report.

Based upon the total of 1,129 measures passed by the House of Representatives, I had a voting and attendance record of 96 percent.

The report follows:

Rollcall No.	Date 1965	Measure, question, and result	Vote
2	Jan. 4	Election of Speaker. (McCormack 289, Ford 139.)	Ford.
		H. Res. 1, authorizing seating of Mississippi delegation:	
3	Jan. 4	On ordering previous question (ending debate). (Agreed to 276 to 149.)	Yes.
		H. Res. 8, adopting the rules of House with an amendment giving additional authority to Speaker:	
4	Jan. 4	On ordering previous question (ending debate). (Agreed to 224 to 202.)	No.
		H. Res. 126, dismissing contest of election of Representative Ottinger, of New York:	
6	Jan. 19	On resolution. (Adopted 245 to 102.)	No.
		H.J. Res. 234, making supplemental appropriations for Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1965:	
7	Jan. 26	On motion to recommit with instructions to bar export of farm commodities to United Arab Republic. (Adopted 204 to 177.)	Yes.
		H.J. Res. 234, making supplemental appropriations for Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1965:	
10	Feb. 8	On motion to instruct House conferees to disagree to Senate amendment allowing aid to United Arab Republic at President's discretion. (Rejected 165 to 241.)	Yes.
		H.R. 3818, eliminating 25-percent gold cover in Federal Reserve banks:	
12	Feb. 9	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 93 to 289.)	Yes.
13	Feb. 9	On passage. (Passed 300 to 82.)	No.
		H.R. 2998, extending Arms Control and Disarmament Agency:	
16	Feb. 17	On passage. (Passed 302 to 63.)	Yes.
		H.R. 45, increasing U.S. participation in the Inter-American Development Bank:	
19	Feb. 18	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce funds from $750,000,000 to $725,000,000. (Rejected 142 to 237.)	Yes.
20	Feb. 18	On passage. (Passed 288 to 93.)	No.
		H. Res. 188, providing funds for expenses of Committee on Un-American Activities:	
23	Feb. 25	On motion to recommit to Committee on House Administration with instructions to hold hearings. (Rejected 58 to 333.)	No.
24	Feb. 25	On resolution. (Agreed to 360 to 29.)	Yes.
		S. 3, authorizing $1,092,400,000 for public works and development programs in the Appalachian region:	
28	Mar. 3	On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute bill authorizing $995,000,000 for 2-year economic development program for all depressed areas in United States. (Rejected 100 to 323.).	Yes.
29	Mar. 3	On passage. (Passed 257 to 165)	No.
		H.R. 2, expanding Federal controls over depressant and stimulant drugs:	
31	Mar. 10	On passage. (Passed 402 to 0.)	Yes.
		H.R. 4714, authorizing annual appropriations of $150.000 for National Council on Arts:	
33	Mar. 15	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 217 to 113, a ⅔ majority being required.)	No.
		H.R. 5505, establishing standards for congressional districts:	
35	Mar. 16	On amendment permitting at-large elections of Representatives. (Rejected 147 to 255.)	Yes.
		H. Res. 276, providing for consideration of H.R. 5374, Supreme Court pay bill:	
38	Mar. 17	On resolution. (Agreed to 202 to 183.)	No.
		H.R. 5374, restoring the differential between Supreme Court and lower court salaries existing prior to 1964 Federal pay bill:	
39	Mar. 17	On passage. (Rejected 178 to 202.)	No.
		H.R. 5688, amending crime laws of District of Columbia:	
42	Mar. 22	On motion to recommit with instructions to hold hearings. (Rejected 166 to 216.)	No.
43	Mar. 22	On passage. (Passed 250 to 131.)	Yes.
		H.R. 5721, providing for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco:	
45	Mar. 23	On passage. (Passed 206 to 170.)	No.
		Motion to approve House Journal without further reading:	
51	Mar. 26	On ordering previous question (ending debate) on motion. (Agreed to 274 to 119.)	No.
		H.R. 2362, providing grants to States for elementary and secondary education:	
52	Mar. 26	On motion to recommit with instructions to change formula so that the grant for each child from low-income families would be equal. (Rejected 194 to 267.)	Yes.
53	Mar. 26	On passage. (Passed 263 to 153.)	No.
		H.R. 3708, Older Americans Act of 1965, providing for development of programs for the aging:	
57	Mar. 31	On passage. (Passed 396 to 1.)	Yes
		H.R. 1111, Water Resources Planning Act, authorizing funds for Federal-State water resources development programs:	
58	Mar. 31	On passage. (Passed 384 to 0.)	Yes.
		H.R. 4257, extending and expanding Manpower Development and Training Act programs:	
60	Apr. 1	On passage. (Passed 395 to 0.)	Yes
		H.R. 980, providing for return of obscene mail matter:	
62	Apr. 5	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 360 to 21.)	Yes.
		H.R. 7064, authorizing construction of U.S. Embassy building in Saigon, South Vietnam:	
63	Apr. 5	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 378 to 0.)	Yes.
		H.R. 7060, making appropriations for Treasury and Post Office Departments, Executive Office of the President, and 4 independent agencies:	
64	Apr. 5	On passage. (Passed 347 to 7.)	Yes.
		H.R. 7091, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1965 including $344,328,000 for Appalachia programs to be available beyond fiscal 1965 but to be charged against 1965 authorization:	
66	Apr. 6	On passage. (Passed 348 to 62.)	Yes.
		H.R. 6675, Social Security Amendments of 1965, increasing social security benefits and taxes, and providing medical care benefits for aged:	
70	Apr. 8	On Byrnes' motion to recommit with instructions to substitute Byrnes bill, H.R. 7057, providing a voluntary comprehensive health insurance program for the aged financed by general revenue and contributions from participants. (Rejected 191 to 236.)	Yes.
71	Apr. 8	On passage. (Passed 313 to 115.)	Yes.
		H.R. 2998, authorizing appropriations for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency:	
72	Apr. 13	On conference report. (Agreed to 316 to 65.)	Yes.
		H. J. Res. 1, proposing a constitutional amendment relating to presidential inability and succession:	
74	Apr. 13	On passage. (Passed 368 to 29.)	Yes.
		H. Res. 310, authorizing $50,000 for investigation of Ku Klux Klan by Committee on Un-American Activities:	
76	Apr. 14	On resolution. (Agreed to 313 to 43.)	Not voting.
		H.R. 6497, authorizing increase of $1,000,000,000 in the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund:	
78	Apr. 27	On motion to recommit (Rejected 113 to 275.)	Yes.
79	Apr. 27	On passage. (Passed 301 to 88.)	No.
		S. 4, Water Quality Act, expanding Federal assistance for water pollution control:	
82	Apr. 28	On passage. (Passed 396 to 0.)	Yes.
		H.R. 7091, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1965:	
84	Apr. 29	On conference report $109,000,000 higher than House-approved bill and including Appalachia funds for use beyond fiscal 1965 but to be charged to 1965 authorization. (Agreed to 316 to 55.)	No.
85	Apr. 29	On motion that House concur with Senate amendments adding funds for helicopter subsidies in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. (Rejected 114 to 228.)	No.
		H.R. 4714, authorizing annual appropriations of $150,000 for National Council on the Arts:	
86	Apr. 29	On passage. (Passed 239 to 116.)	No.
		H.R. 2986, extending and amending certain provisions of the Public Health Service Act:	
87	May 3	On passage. (Passed 347 to 0.)	Yes.
		H.R. 2985, authorizing Federal grants for initial cost of professional and technical personnel for community mental health centers:	
90	May 4	On passage. (Passed 389 to 0.)	Yes.
		H.J. Res. 447, providing $700,000,000 in fiscal 1965 supplemental appropriations for U.S. military operations in southeast Asia:	
92	May 5	On passage. (Passed 408 to 7.)	Yes.

Roll-call No.	Date 1965	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 7657, authorizing $15,300,000,000 for military equipment procurement and research:	
94	May 5	On passage. (Passed 396 to 0.)	Yes.
		H. Res. 366, providing for consideration of H.R. 7717, National Aeronautics and Space Administration:	
96	May 6	On resolution. (Agreed to 389 to 0.)	Yes.
		H.R. 7717, authorizing fiscal 1966 appropriations for National Aeronautics and Space Administration:	
97	May 6	On passage. (Passed 389 to 11.)	Yes.
		H.R. 2984, extending and expanding Federal grants for construction of health research facilities:	
99	May 10	On passage. (Passed 334 to 4.)	Yes.
		S. 701, implementing the International Coffee Agreement of 1962:	
101	May 12	On passage. (Passed 300 to 97.)	No.
		H.R. 8122, authorizing $2,555,521,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission in fiscal 1966:	
104	May 20	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete authority for cooperative arrangement establishing a nuclear reactor. (Rejected 43 to 313.)	No.
105	May 20	On passage of bill. (Passed 352 to 1.)	Yes.
		H.R. 7750, authorizing appropriations for foreign aid in fiscal 1966:	
109	May 25	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce development funds by $131,000,000 and stipulate that labor unions participating in Latin American housing projects be "non-Communist dominated." (Rejected 178 to 219.)	Yes.
110	May 25	On passage of bill. (Passed 249 to 148.)	No.
		H.R. 8370, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1966:	
112	May 26	On motion to recommit with instructions to bar use of any funds to finance export of farm commodities to United Arab Republic or Indonesia. (Rejected 187 to 208.)	Yes.
113	May 26	On passage of bill. (Passed 354 to 41.)	Yes.
		H.R. 8639, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary:	
116	June 1	On passage. (Passed 332 to 60.)	Not voting.
		H.R. 3584, extending Federal inspection and safety requirements to small coal mines:	
117	June 1	On passage. (Passed 336 to 42.)	Not voting.
		H.R. 8371, reducing Federal excise taxes:	
119	June 2	On passage. (Passed 401 to 6.)	Not voting.
		H.R. 7777, authorizing appointment of Gen. William F. McKee as FAA Administrator without affecting his status as retired Air Force officer:	
121	June 3	On passage. (Passed 228 to 137.)	Not voting.
		H.R. 3157, permitting spouses of railroad employees to receive both railroad retirement and earned social security benefits:	
123	June 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 323 to 0.)	Yes.
		H.R. 8775, making appropriations for the legislative branch for fiscal 1966:	
126	June 8	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete funds to provide operators for automatic elevators. (Rejected 149 to 244.)	Yes.
		H.R. 7105, amending and extending the Export Control Act:	
127	June 8	On passage. (Passed 388 to 1.)	Yes.
		H. Res. 413, providing for consideration of H.R. 8464, increasing the temporary national debt limit:	
129	June 9	On ordering previous question (ending debate). (Agreed to 273 to 109.)	No.
		H.R. 8464, increasing the temporary national debt limit:	
130	June 9	On passage. (Passed 229 to 165.)	No.
		H.Con. Res. 285, suspending the rule against USIA domestic propaganda so that the President Kennedy film could be distributed in United States:	
131	June 9	On amendment requiring that film be shown without charge. (Rejected 174 to 216.)	Yes.
132	June 9	On resolution. (Agreed to 311 to 75.)	Yes.
		H.R. 6927, establishing a Department of Housing and Urban Development:	
141	June 16	On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute bill establishing an Office of Urban Affairs and Community Development in the Executive office of the President. (Rejected 141 to 259.)	Yes.
142	June 16	On passage of bill. (Passed 217 to 184.)	No.
		H. Res. 416, providing funds for each Representative to hire a student intern:	
143	June 16	On resolution. (Agreed to 229 to 153.)	No.
		H.R. 7743, providing loans and loan insurance for students attending vocational schools:	
145	June 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 300 to 0.)	Not voting.
		H.R. 8620, providing price support payments for wheat, feed grain, and cotton growers affected by 1965 floods and other natural disasters:	
146	June 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 297 to 2.)	Not voting.
		H. Con. Res. 416, requesting the President to direct attention of United Nations and others to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania:	
147	June 23	On motion to suspend rules and agree to resolution. (Agreed to 298 to 0.)	Not voting.
		H.R. 9221, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1966:	
153	June 23	On passage. (Passed 407 to 0.)	Yes.
		H.J. Res. 541, extending the Area Redevelopment Act for 2 months:	
155	June 24	On passage. (Passed 224 to 167.)	No.
		H. Res. 425, providing for consideration of H.R. 7984, providing rent subsidies and expanding public housing, urban renewal, and community facilities programs:	
157	June 28	On resolution. (Agreed to 230 to 115.)	No.
		H.R. 7984, providing rent subsidies and expanding public housing, urban renewal, and community facilities programs:	
162	June 30	On amendment modifying rent subsidy provisions. (Adopted 240 to 179.)	No.
163	June 30	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete rent subsidies and other provisions. (Rejected 202 to 208.)	Yes.
164	June 30	On passage of bill. (Passed 245 to 169.)	No.
		H. Res. 440, providing for consideration of H.R. 6400, Voting Rights Act of 1965:	
167	July 6	On resolution. (Agreed to 308 to 58.)	Yes.
		H.R. 6400, Voting Rights Act of 1965:	
175	July 9	On amendment providing penalties for falsifying voting or registration information or buying votes in Federal elections. (Adopted 253 to 165.)	Yes.
176	July 9	H.R. 6400, Voting Rights Act of 1965:	
		On amendment allowing political subdivisions with more than 50 percent of voting age Negroes registered to free themselves from coverage. (Rejected 155 to 262.)	No.
177	July 9	On amendment waiving English literacy requirements. (Rejected 202 to 216.)	No.
178	July 9	On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute more comprehensive bill. (Rejected 171 to 248.)	Yes.
179	July 9	On passage. (Passed 333 to 85.)	Yes.
		H.R. 8356, permitting the Atomic Energy Commission to condemn land for overhead power transmission lines notwithstanding local ordinances prohibiting overhead lines:	
181	July 12	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 216 to 139, a ⅔ majority being required.)	No.
		H.R. 242, requiring Government summer jobs in Washington, D.C., to be apportioned among residents of all States:	
182	July 12	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 336 to 22.)	Yes.
		S. 559 requiring warning labels on cigarette packages:	
185	July 13	On conference report. (Agreed to 285 to 103.)	Yes.
		H.R. 8926, removing silver from coinage except for 40 percent in half dollars:	
188	July 14	On amendment retaining 40 percent silver in dimes and quarters. (Rejected 187 to 218.)	Yes.
189	July 14	On passage. (Passed 255 to 151.)	No.
		H.R. 9075, increasing military pay:	
193	July 20	On passage. (Passed 410 to 0.)	Yes.
		H.R. 8283, authorizing increase in "poverty" program funds to $1,900,000,000 in fiscal 1966:	
196	July 22	On motion to recommit with instructions to maintain Governors' veto and fiscal 1965 level of spending ($947,500,000). (Rejected 178 to 227.)	Yes.
197	July 22	On passage. (Passed 245 to 158.)	No.
		H. Res. 437, providing for consideration of H.R. 77, repealing sec 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act permitting State right-to-work laws, under procedure bypassing Rules Committee:	
199	July 26	On ordering previous question (ending debate). (Agreed to 248 to 171.)	No.
		H.R. 6675, Social Security Amendments of 1965, increasing social security benefits and providing medical care benefits to the aged:	
203	July 27	On conference report. (Agreed to 307 to 116.)	Yes.
		H.R. 7984, providing rent subsidies and expanding public housing, urban renewal, and community facilities programs:	
204	July 27	On conference report. (Agreed to 251 to 168.)	No.
		H.R. 2985, authorizing Federal grants for initial cost of professional and technical personnel for community mental health centers:	
205	July 27	On conference report. (Agreed to 414 to 0.)	Yes.
		H.R. 77, repealing sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act permitting State right-to-work laws:	
208	July 28	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 200 to 223.)	Yes.
209	July 28	On passage. (Passed 221 to 203.)	No.

Roll-call No.	Date 1965	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 8856, permitting the Atomic Energy Commission to condemn land for overhead power transmission lines notwithstanding local ordinances prohibiting overhead lines:	
212	July 29	On passage. (Passed 275 to 125.)	No.
		S.J. Res. 81, authorizing increase in funds for Interstate Highway System in fiscal 1967:	
214	Aug. 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 313 to 11.)	Yes.
		H.R. 8027, providing assistance in training State and local law-enforcement officers:	
215	Aug. 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 326 to 0.)	Yes.
		H.R. 6964, authorizing certain rehabilitation practices for Federal prisoners:	
216	Aug. 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 323 to 0.)	Yes.
		S. 1564, Voting Rights Act of 1965:	
218	Aug. 3	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to disagree to Senate language allowing political subdivisions with more than 50 percent of voting-age Negroes registered to free themselves from coverage. (Rejected 118 to 284.)	Yes.
219	Aug. 3	On conference report. (Agreed to 328 to 74.)	Yes.
		H.R. 8469, increasing civil service retirement annuities:	
220	Aug. 3	On passage. (Passed 394 to 0.)	Yes.
		H.R. 8439, authorizing certain military construction:	
221	Aug. 4	On conference report. (Agreed to 389 to 0.)	Yes.
		S. 1742, authorizing certain changes in World Bank Charter:	
222	Aug. 4	On passage. (Passed 330 to 54.)	Yes.
		H. Res. 498, providing for consideration of H.R. 4750, extending interest equalization tax:	
224	Aug. 5	On resolution. (Agreed to 329 to 44.)	Yes.
		H.R. 4750, extending interest equalization tax:	
225	Aug. 5	On passage. (Passed 274 to 97.)	No.
		H.R. 9918, strengthening motor vehicle financial responsibility laws of the District of Columbia:	
228	Aug. 9	On amendment substituting unsatisfied judgment fund plan. (Adopted 173 to 156.)	Not voting.
		H.R. 10306, making it a crime to knowingly destroy or mutilate a draft card:	
230	Aug. 10	On passage. (Passed 393 to 1.)	Not voting.
		S. 1648, Public Works and Economic Development Act, authorizing $3,250,000,000 in grants and loans for regional development:	
234	Aug. 12	On amendment further expanding public works and development facilities grants. (Agreed to 196 to 194.)	Not voting.
235	Aug. 12	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete loans, provide for annual congressional review, and require use of American-made products. (Rejected 163 to 224.)	Not voting.
236	Aug. 12	On passage. Passed 246 to 138.)	Not voting.
		H.R. 6431, providing that certain forms of nickel be admitted duty free:	
238	Aug. 16	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 297 to 48.)	Not voting.
		H.R. 8635, establishing a Federal Boxing Commission:	
239	Aug. 16	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 346 to 4.)	Not voting.
		H.R. 7750, authorizing $3,360,000,000 for foreign aid in fiscal 1966:	
242	Aug. 19	On conference report. (Agreed to 244 to 150.)	No.
		H.R. 9811, omnibus farm bill of 1965:	
243	Aug. 19	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 169 to 224.)	Yes.
244	Aug. 19	On passage of bill. (Passed 221 to 172.)	No.
		H.R. 10586, making supplemental appropriations of $1,200,000,000 for Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal 1966 including $1,000,000,000 for elementary and secondary education:	
246	Aug. 24	On motion to recommit so that all supplemental requests can be considered at the same time. (Rejected 139 to 263.)	No.
		H.R. 2580, eliminating national origins quota system in immigration, providing for admission of Western Hemisphere immigrants and relatives of U.S. citizens without limitation, establishing priorities, and fixing annual limit of 170,000 for all others:	
248	Aug. 25	On amendment placing Western Hemisphere under numerical limitation. (Rejected 189 to 218.)	Yes.
249	Aug. 25	On passage. (Passed 318 to 95.)	Yes.
		H.R. 9567, authorizing a 5-year program of assistance to institutions of higher education and to students attending such institutions:	
252	Aug. 26	On passage. (Passed 367 to 22.)	Yes.
		H.R. 9022, authorizing disaster assistance to elementary and secondary schools and making more cities eligible for "impacted" school aid:	
253	Aug. 30	On passage. (Passed 304 to 37.)	Yes.
		H. Res. 551, providing for consideration of H.R. 9042, authorizing agreement with Canada on duty-free treatment of automobiles and parts:	
254	Aug. 31	On resolution. (Agreed to 364 to 23.)	Yes.
		H.R. 9042, authorizing agreement with Canada on duty-free treatment of automobiles and parts:	
255	Aug. 31	On passage. (Passed 280 to 113.)	Yes.
		H.R. 3141, expanding the health professions educational assistance program:	
257	Sept. 1	On passage. (Passed 340 to 47.)	Yes.
		H.R. 5863, authorizing research into high-speed ground transportation:	
259	Sept. 2	On passage. (Passed 317 to 24.)	Yes.
		H.R. 8439, authorizing certain military construction in fiscal 1966:	
262	Sept. 7	On motion to table motion to discharge Committee on Armed Services from further consideration of H.R. 8439. (Agreed to 320 to 19.)	Yes.
		H.R. 10775, authorizing certain military construction in fiscal 1966:	
263	Sept. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 347 to 0.)	Not voting.
		H.R. 168, increasing veterans' disability compensation:	
264	Sept. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 348 to 0.)	Not voting.
		S.J. Res. 102, authorizing funds for the President's Crime Commission:	
265	Sept. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 338 to 0.)	Not voting.
		H.R. 10871, making appropriations of $4,001,453,000 for foreign aid and Export-Import Bank in fiscal 1966:	
269	Sept. 8	On passage. (Passed 239 to 143.)	No.
273	Sept. 13	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under rollcall No. 272. (Agreed to 225 to 126.)	Yes.
275	Sept. 13	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under rollcall No. 274. (Agreed to 241 to 127.)	Yes.
279	Sept. 13	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under rollcall No. 278. (Agreed to 256 to 123.)	Yes.
281	Sept. 13	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under rollcall No. 280. (Agreed to 255 to 120.)	Yes.
282	Sept. 13	On motion to table motion to order previous question (end debate) on motion that Journal of Sept. 9 be approved as read. (Rejected 138 to 244.)	No.
283	Sept. 13	On ordering previous question (ending debate) on motion to approve Journal. (Agreed to 257 to 126.)	Yes.
284	Sept. 13	On motion that Journal stand approved as read. (Agreed to 264 to 119.)	Yes.
285	Sept. 13	On motion to adjourn. (Rejected 175 to 204.)	No.
		H. Res. 506, providing for consideration of H.R. 10065, Equal Employment Opportunity Act, under procedure of bypassing Rules Committee:	
286	Sept. 13	On resolution. (Agreed to 259 to 121.)	Yes.
287	Sept. 13	On motion to table motion to reconsider vote on rollcall No. 286. (Agreed to 193 to 181.)	No.
288	Sept. 13	On motion to adjourn. (Rejected 173 to 201.)	Yes.
290	Sept. 13	On motion to dispense with further proceeding under rollcall No. 289. (Agreed to 243 to 136.)	Not voting.
		H. Res. 499, providing for consideration of H.R. 7371, repealing an exemption from the Bank Holding Company Act under procedure of bypassing Rules Committee:	
291	Sept. 13	On resolution. (Agreed to 201 to 171.)	No.
		H. Res. 478, providing for consideration of H.R. 9460, providing for establishment of National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities under procedure bypassing Rules Committee:	
292	Sept. 13	On resolution. (Agreed to 260 to 114.)	Yes.
		H. Res. 536, providing for consideration of H.R. 10281, increasing pay of Federal employees, under procedure bypassing Rules Committee:	
293	Sept. 13	On resolution. (Agreed to 288 to 84.)	Yes.
		H.R. 2091, establishing concession policies in National Park Service areas:	
296	Sept. 14	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 73 to 298.)	No.
		H.R. 8283, authorizing increase in poverty program funds to $1,800,000,000 in fiscal 1966:	
299	Sept. 15	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to insist on House provision maintaining Governors' veto. (Agreed to 209 to 180.)	Yes.
		H.R. 9460, establishing a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities:	
301	Sept. 15	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 128 to 250.)	No.
		H. Res. 574, directing Postmaster General to provide names of 1965 summer employees:	
303	Sept. 16	On motion to table resolution. (Adopted 186 to 180.)	No.
		S. 2042, extending indemnity provisions of Atomic Energy Act:	
304	Sept. 16	On passage. (Passed 337 to 30.)	Yes.
		H.R. 9221, making appropriations for Department of Defense for fiscal 1966:	
306	Sept. 17	On conference report. (Agreed to 380 to 0.)	Yes.

Roll-call No.	Date 1965	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H. Res. 585, dismissing election contests of 5 Mississippi Representatives:	
307	Sept. 17	On resolution. (Agreed to 228 to 143.)	Yes.
		H. R. 10873, establishing program of group life insurance for members of armed services on active duty:	
309	Sept. 20	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Agreed to 360 to 0.)	Yes.
		H. Res. 460, expressing sense of House of Representatives that the United States and other American States take whatever steps necessary to prevent communistic aggression in Western Hemisphere:	
310	Sept. 20	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Agreed to 312 to 52.)	Yes.
		S. 4, Water Quality Act, expanding Federal assistance for water pollution control:	
313	Sept. 21	On conference report. (Agreed to 379 to 0.)	Yes.
		S. 2300, authorizing construction and repair of certain public works on rivers and harbors:	
315	Sept. 22	On amendment deleting $277,000,000 Dickey-Lincoln power project in Maine. (Adopted 207 to 185.)	Yes.
		H.R. 30, providing for participation of United States in Inter-American Cultural Center in Florida and authorizing $15,000,000 for U.S. exhibit:	
316	Sept. 22	On passage. (Passed 254 to 113.)	Yes.
318	Sept. 22	On motion to adjourn. (Rejected 89 to 204.)	Yes.
		H.R. 7371, repealing an exemption from the Bank Holding Company Act:	
320	Sept. 23	On amendment repealing all major exemptions from act. (Adopted 199 to 178.)	No.
		H. Res. 580, providing for consideration of H.R. 10232, authorizing matching grants for rural water and sanitation facilities:	
321	Sept. 23	On ordering previous question (ending debate). (Agreed to 279 to 70.)	Yes.
		H.R. 10232, authorizing matching grants for rural water and sanitation facilities:	
322	Sept. 23	On passage. (Passed 325 to 10.)	Yes.
		S. 306, authorizing standards to control air pollution from automobiles and a research and development program on solid waste disposal:	
324	Sept. 24	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete solid waste disposal provisions. (Rejected 80 to 220.)	No.
325	Sept. 24	On passage of bill. (Passed 294 to 4.)	Yes.
372	Sept. 27	On motion to discharge Committee on Rules from further consideration of H. Res. 515, providing for consideration of H.R. 4644, home rule for the District of Columbia. (Adopted 213 to 183.)	No.
		H. Res. 515, providing for consideration of H.R. 4644, home rule for the District of Columbia:	
328	Sept. 27	On resolution. (Agreed to 222 to 179.)	No.
330	Sept. 27	On motion that House immediately consider H.R. 4644, home rule for the District of Columbia. (Agreed to 234 to 155.)	No.
		H.R. 4644, providing home rule for the District of Columbia:	
336	Sept. 29	On motion to strike the enacting clause. (Rejected 179 to 219.)	Yes.
337	Sept. 29	On amendment substituting Charter Board home rule plan. (Adopted 227 to 174.)	Yes.
338	Sept. 29	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 134 to 266.)	No.
339	Sept. 29	On passage. (Passed 283 to 117.)	Yes.
		H.R. 2580, eliminating national origins quota system in immigration, providing for admission of relatives of U.S. citizens without limitation, establishing priorities, and fixing annual limitations:	
341	Sept. 30	On conference report. (Agreed to 320 to 69.)	Yes.
		H.R. 10281, increasing pay of Federal employees:	
342	Sept. 30	On motion to recommit with instructions to remove automatic future increases for judges, executives, and Members of Congress and the Cabinet. (Agreed to 238 to 140.)	Yes.
343	Sept. 30	On passage. (Passed 370 to 7.)	Yes.
		H.J. Res. 642, authorizing an additional Library of Congress building to be named James Madison Memorial Building:	
345	Oct. 1	On motion to recommit with instructions to create visitors center. (Rejected 17 to 321.)	No.
346	Oct. 1	On passage. (Passed 328 to 5.)	Yes.
		H.R. 10871, making appropriations for foreign aid:	
347	Oct. 1	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to insist upon retention of provision prohibiting aid to countries that furnish aid to North Vietnam. (Rejected 164 to 174.)	Yes.
348	Oct. 1	On conference report. (Agreed to 204 to 127.)	No.
		H.R. 3142, providing Federal grants for medical library services and facilities:	
349	Oct. 1	On passage. (Passed 296 to 3.)	Yes.
		H.R. 6519, providing for completion of Jefferson National Memorial, St. Louis:	
350	Oct. 1	On passage. (Passed 250 to 12.)	Yes.
		S.J. Res. 32, authorizing compensation to Ryukyu Islands for use and damage by U.S. Armed Forces:	
353	Oct. 7	On resolution. (Agreed to 312 to 55.)	Yes.
		H.R. 2020, authorizing $20,000,000 for construction of southern Nevada water project:	
354	Oct. 7	On passage. (Passed 239 to 134.)	Yes.
		S. 2084, authorizing $325,000,000 for highway beautification:	
356	Oct. 7	On motion to recommit with instructions to give States authority to determine areas in which outdoor advertising and junkyards would be permitted. (Rejected 153 to 230.)	Yes.
357	Oct. 7	On passage of bill. (Passed 245 to 138.)	No.
		H.R. 9811, omnibus farm bill:	
359	Oct. 8	On conference report. (Adopted 219 to 150.)	Not voting.
		H. Res. 598, providing for consideration of H.R. 11135, allocating sugar quotas:	
363	Oct. 12	On resolution. (Agreed to 253 to 80.)	Not voting.
		H.R. 11135, allocating sugar quotas:	
366	Oct. 13	On motion to recommit with instructions to add special fee on imports. (Rejected 160 to 230.)	Yes.
367	Oct. 13	On passage. (Passed 246 to 147.)	No.
		H.R. 11588, making supplemental appropriations $4,200,000,000 for fiscal 1966:	
369	Oct. 14	On amendment deleting funds for rent subsidies. (Adopted 185 to 162.)	Yes.
370	Oct. 14	On passage. (Passed 242 to 100.)	No.
		H.R. 9567, authorizing a 5-year program of assistance to institutions of higher education and to students attending such institutions:	
376	Oct. 20	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to disagree to Senate language providing for a National Teachers Corps. (Rejected 152 to 226.)	Yes.
377	Oct. 20	On conference report. (Agreed to 313 to 63.)	Yes.
		S. 2300, authorizing construction and repair of certain public works on rivers and harbors, including $277,000,000 for Dickey-Lincoln power project in Maine:	
378	Oct. 20	On conference report. (Agreed to 221 to 139.)	No.
		H.R. 11588, making supplemental appropriations of $4,700,000,000 for fiscal 1966:	
380	Oct. 21	On conference report. (Agreed to 251 to 84.)	No.
381	Oct. 21	On motion to agree to amendment providing $800,000 for preliminary planning of Dickey-Lincoln power project in Maine. (Agreed to 165 to 162.)	No.
		H.R. 11135, allocating sugar quotas:	
383	Oct. 22	On conference report. (Agreed to 174 to 88.)	No.

Interregional Water Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the past year has been a year in which the importance of one of our most strategic resources—water—has been forcefully brought to our attention at a national level. Devastating floods within my State and in the Midwest, the continuation of drought conditions in the Northeastern States, the Florida Everglades, and the Pacific Southwest, and the wasteful and tragic pollution of our waters have all caused us to be more thoughtful and concerned about our water supplies than ever before.

Our increasing awareness of this need and our research for devices and programs to assist in overcoming our water crisis have caused a number of us to recognize many similarities in the problems of each region, indicating that a sharing of experiences on an interregional scale would be valuable. While the specific solutions to drought in New England may vary considerably from that in the arid Southwest, the vehicles for their solution may have much in common.

This becomes of increasing importance when answers are being sought and solutions developed at the Federal level. And it is encouraging to know that we are abandoning more and more localized short-term projects and looking toward regional development of our natural resources to meet the accelerating needs of people. A most important step in this direction and indicative of this thinking was taken this year when Congress passed the Water Resources Planning Act.

We have also seen enacted this year the new water pollution control law, a new program for rural water systems, acceleration of the saline water program and enhanced criteria for development of recreational opportunities in connection with our water resources. It is becoming evident that the success of these programs will depend upon a more adequate understanding of the legislative objectives of each region and area in developing and supporting these legislative efforts.

With these thoughts in mind, I am pleased to note that the Southern California Water Conference, an informal group of water leaders, has called for an interregional conference on "Water Problems and Their Solutions." Various responsible officials from New York, the Delaware River Basin States, and the Colorado River Basin States have been invited to participate, to probe and examine each other's problems with the hope that it might be productive of new ideas and approaches.

James Krieger, chairman of the conference, has called the meeting for November 15 in Los Angeles and the exchange of ideas should be most productive and serve as a guide for further conferences.

It is imperative that we intensify our efforts to coordinate Federal programs and enlarge the role of local government in seeking answers to local problems while serving the best interests of the Nation. I feel exchanges of this type can be very beneficial and I look forward to a better understanding of the crisis in our national water picture as a result.

James A. Reed, Former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury—An Appreciation by Congressman James C. Cleveland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on September 1, Mr. James A. Reed left his post as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to return to private life after 4 years' service.

His departure is a loss to the Government. During his tenure, Secretary Reed had responsibility for administration of the Coast Guard, the Bureau of Customs and the Bureau of Narcotics. Administrative procedures in each of these areas were improved and reorganized with resultant increases in efficiency and substantial savings to the taxpayer.

During Mr. Reed's tenure, long-range plans for the procurement, development and maintenance of Coast Guard vessels, shore stations and aircraft were finally developed. As a result of this planning and foresight, Congress appropriated more money for the Coast Guard than ever before. In the 1950's the average annual appropriation for acquisition, construction and improvement of Coast Guard facilities was only $5 million. Greatly underfinanced, this service also lacked firm goals and was threatening to drift aimlessly. Under Mr. Reed, there has been rapid improvement.

For fiscal year 1966, Congress saw fit to appropriate $116 million for acquisition, construction, and improvements. For the next 8 years, annual appropriations of close to $200 million will be needed to complete this modernization program. By the mid-1970's, because of the careful groundwork laid by Mr. Reed, his office, and the Congress, the Coast Guard will have a modern fleet, modern shore stations and modern aircraft. It will be more efficient and more economical to the Government; better able to carry out the critical missions assigned to it day in and day out.

Another noteworthy accomplishment of Mr. Reed's work with the Coast Guard is that for the first time a separate authorization bill for the Coast Guard was enacted 2 years ago. For the first time the Coast Guard has thus been given the opportunity to present its programs to the Congress in an orderly manner, first to a legislative committee and then to the Appropriations Committee. This has had an excellent effect on the morale and efficiency of the Coast Guard as, indeed, has the modernization program. In connection with this morale problem, which had been reaching critical dimensions in the opinion of many informed authorities, money now has been appropriated to provide an official residence in the Washington area for the commandant of the Coast Guard, hitherto the only head of a military service without such a residence.

Similar modernization of the Customs Service took place under Secretary Reed's direction. Complaints from passengers concerning Customs personnel which once flooded the Bureau are now virtually zero because of the increased courtesy and service to the traveling public being given by Customs personnel.

Mr. Reed early recognized the imperative need for modernizing the procedures of the Customs Bureau, which was operating under an administrative structure dating back to 1789. After intensive study conducted with the aid of outside consultants, improvements were embodied in Reorganization Plan No. 1 presented to the Congress by the President this year and approved. This should provide the public with much more efficient service and save millions of dollars each year.

Developments within the Bureau of Narcotics, while not so dramatic, have resulted in a marked improvement of operations under Mr. Reed's direction. The groundwork has been laid for further improvements. This is particularly true of the Bureau's overseas operations. Until 3 years ago, responsibility for suppressing the manufacture and exportation of illicit drugs overseas was divided between the Bureau of Narcotics and the Bureau of Customs. A certain amount of friction existed between the agencies because of this. As a result, it was decided to assign responsibility for all overseas operations relating to illicit drugs to the Narcotics Bureau and that Customs should be concerned with smuggling alone. Cooperation between the two agencies has improved markedly since the change and the cases developed by each agency have increased.

These are only some of the main highlights of the accomplishments of former Secretary Reed. I think the House will agree that they have been of great value to the Nation and will join me in this expression of appreciation to Mr. Reed.

Congressman Jacobs States Opposition to Reapportionment Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, because so much public attention has been focused upon the fight over Senator DIRKSEN's reapportionment amendment here in the Senate, it is sometimes forgotten that any constitutional amendment must pass the House of Representatives, as well as the Senate, by a two-thirds vote. We who opposed the Dirksen amendment always believed that there was a better chance of beating the amendment in the House than in the Senate.

The original rotten borough amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 2, was defeated in the Senate last August 4, while its stepchild, Senate Joint Resolution 103, appears to have little chance of passage in the Senate next year. I find it heartening to know there is continued opposition in the House of Representatives. One dynamic and outspoken young Congressman, ANDREW JACOBS, of the 11th District of Indiana, has written an effective and hard-hitting statement of what reapportionment means to the voters of Marion County, Ind.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter for the October 1965 issue of the Marion County Democratic Central Committee Newsletter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IT MEANS TO YOU

(By ANDY JACOBS, JR.)

We hear a lot these days about reapportionment and equality of representation in the legislature.

Most people, who don't have an extremely dull ax to grind, would agree that it only makes sense in a free country to allow no more and no less than one vote to each citizen. In America it only makes sense that all citizens are equal politically and that no one is "more equal than another."

If this were not so, then a lot of men have wasted their time, and, far more tragically, their lives and limbs, crawling in muddy foreign soil to defend America and its way of life.

We know that some Americans have found it possible to say, with faces as straight as Senator DIRKSEN'S, that if you live in or near a city you don't deserve to have your vote count for as much as that of your country cousin.

These people say that Indiana's 50 State senate seats should not be divided equally among the citizens of Indiana. They say that "interests," rather than people, should be represented in the State senate.

Thus, if only 1 man owned all the farms in Indiana, under the Dirksen theory, that 1 man should be given 26 State senators while the other 24 senate seats would be divided among the other 4.6 million citizens of Indiana.

Of course, there's nothing new about the Dirksen position. It's the sort of thinking that led some in our history to advocate allowing the right to vote only to the landowner, the so-called town voter.

"But," one asks, "why at this late date would a man like Senator DIRKSEN advocate a system so alien to the American belief in political freedom and equality?" Senator DIRKSEN, the man who placed Senator Goldwater's name in nomination at San Francisco, believes that property and money should speak louder than people in the State Senate?

What does all this mean to the people who live in Marion County?

Consider this: In the 1963 legislature, by a one-man, one-vote system, Marion County would have had two more State Senators representing us.

The State Senate that year passed a sales tax which in many instances applied to the city dweller but not the farmer. And, that tax passed the State Senate by one vote.

Thus, we started by being cheated out of two votes and then lost the battle for fair and equal taxation by one vote. That's what it means to you.

And, that's what it meant to America when she fought the Revolutionary War over the trespass of taxation without representation.

Senator DIRKSEN says we should have a referendum on whether each citizen should have an equal vote and voice in the State legislature. Your Congressman says that there are some things too basic even to vote on.

We don't take a vote on whether an innocent citizen has a right to life or liberty. And we don't need to take a vote on whether a citizen has a right to vote and have his vote count for as much as the next fellow's.

Your Congressman believes it to be self-evident that a citizen is endowed by the "Creator with certain unalienable rights and among these is life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" and an equal vote to protect them.

Forty Billion Dollars of U.S. Government Bonds Held by Federal Reserve System Have Already Been Paid for Once, as Chairman Martin Has Admitted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve System holds in its open market account approximately $40 billion in interest-bearing U.S. Government securities acquired over time pursuant to purchases in the bond market. These securities were acquired from private holders and resulted in a credit to the total reserves of the commercial banking system. The seller of the bonds would receive either a demand deposit in his favor upon the books of his bank or receive cash. In the event cash is desired, the commercial bank would make demand upon its Federal Reserve bank in an amount equal to the credit to its reserve account. Thus, upon issuance of the Federal Reserve notes in the amount of the bond purchase, the Federal Reserve is thus acquiring an interest-bearing obligation of the Government in exchange for a non-interest-bearing obligation—currency in the form of Federal Reserve notes which are legal tender. Thus, at this point, the bonds have been paid for once and logically should be canceled.

This was admitted to be true by Mr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, on December 11, 1956, testifying before the Joint Economic Committee. The colloquy, appearing on pages 117–118 of the printed hearings, proceeded as follows:

> Chairman PATMAN. In practice, it is a bookkeeping operation. But the truth is, all the bonds that you have—and you have about $25 billion worth of bonds, do you not?
>
> Mr. ROUSE. Something less than that; yes, sir.
>
> Chairman PATMAN. About 24 or 25?
>
> Mr. ROUSE. About 24.
>
> Chairman PATMAN. Every one of those bonds have been bought, not on the resources of the Federal Reserve banks, but on the credit of the Nation by exchanging Federal Reserve notes for them, have they not?
>
> Mr. ROUSE. Yes; they are bought by the—out of Federal Reserve funds.
>
> Chairman PATMAN. No; you are mistaken there, are you not? You do not say that they are bought with Federal Reserve funds. The money is created by those bonds. Do you not understand that?
>
> Mr. ROUSE. It is created—yes, indirectly.
>
> Chairman PATMAN. Well, directly.
>
> In other words, if you buy bonds, you must pay for them, and those $24 billion worth of bonds were paid for, but not by Federal Reserve bank funds; they were paid for by Federal Reserve notes.
>
> Now, I will not insist on your answering that. I will ask Mr. Martin to answer that.
>
> Is that not correct, Mr. Martin?
>
> Mr. MARTIN. It would be the same thing, sir.
>
> Chairman PATMAN. In other words, that is where the power to create money comes in through the Federal Reserve.
>
> Mr. MARTIN. Yes.
>
> Chairman PATMAN. You create the money. In other words, the money is printed, it is paid for by the bonds, the $24 billion worth of bonds.
>
> Mr. MARTIN. We have the power to create money.
>
> Chairman PATMAN. And you did do it to buy these bonds?
>
> Mr. MARTIN. In the purchase of bonds, we ease the money market; in sales of bonds——
>
> Chairman PATMAN. I am not talking about the reasons or arguments. I am just asking.
>
> Mr. MARTIN. I was just talking about the process. The purchase of bonds would ease the money market, and the sale of bonds would contract it.
>
> Chairman PATMAN. Let's divorce it from any argument about any market, easy or hard, and confine it to the bonds that you already have. You have $24 billion worth of bonds. Now, those bonds were bought by giving of Federal Reserve notes in exchange for the bonds, were they not?
>
> Mr. MARTIN. Well, Federal Reserve credit.
>
> Chairman PATMAN. What is that?
>
> Mr. MARTIN. Federal Reserve credit. They were not specific——
>
> Chairman PATMAN. That is what I mean. But every one of them is an obligation of the U.S. Government, is it not?
>
> Mr. MARTIN. That is correct.
>
> Chairman PATMAN. And every one of those notes that you trade for those bonds of the Government says on its face that it is an obligation of the U.S. Government?
>
> Mr. MARTIN. That is correct.
>
> Chairman PATMAN. And that is what makes it good.
>
> Mr. MARTIN. That is right.
>
> Chairman PATMAN. Now then, whenever you take that Government obligation from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and you trade it for $24 billion worth of bonds which you have, and you have those bonds now, you draw interest on those bonds, do you not?
>
> Mr. MARTIN. We do.

Furthermore, in hearings on H.R. 7601, before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, July 7, 1965, to retire $30 billion of U.S. Government bonds held by the Federal Reserve System, Chairman Martin on pages 79 and 80 of the printed testimony again admitted that these bonds had already been paid for once:

> Mr. MARTIN. The bonds were paid for in the normal course of business.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. That is right.
>
> Mr. MARTIN. And that is the only time they were paid for.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Just like we pay debts with checks and credits.
>
> Mr. MARTIN. Exactly.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. In the normal course of business they were paid for once, you will admit that, will you not?
>
> Mr. MARTIN. They were paid for once and that is all.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Congressman Cleveland Evaluates the 1st Session of the 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my practice of past years, I offer at this time an assessment of the 1st session of the 89th Congress, including an accounting of my own stewardship as U.S. Representative from the Second District of New Hampshire.

This Congress, now at its half-way point, has been called variously the greatest in history and a mere rubber stamp on the road to socialism. I do not subscribe fully to either statement. Some good laws were passed, a few bad ones were defeated, and a large number of measures were enacted which will require skillful administration and may require revisions by Congress.

The Congress appropriated more money than any other in peacetime history—more than $119 billion. The national debt increased sharply and $11.5 billion of the appropriations was to pay the yearly interest on these obligations.

MANY CRITICAL PROBLEMS IGNORED

In spite of these enormous activities and appropriations Congress failed to deal with numerous critical areas such as crime, inflation, the rising cost of living, tax refunds to the States, congressional reform, foreign aid reform, labor law reform, modernization of the social security system, reform of agricultural programs and, of course, balancing the budget.

New directions, however, were taken in such major fields as medical care to the aged, voting rights, aid to education, special Federal assistance to particular disadvantaged areas, immigration, air and water pollution, public mass transportation, Presidential succession, highway development, public health, the coinage and taxes.

GREAT SOCIETY TIDAL WAVE

A tidal wave of Great Society legislation swept over the Congress and the country. Effective discussion and reasoned criticism were well nigh obliterated. The minority party, overwhelmed more than 2 to 1 by the majority party, could do little to stem the flow or gain consideration for its views. Denied a fair share of professional staff and laboring against such heavy odds, the minority party did well to create as many proposals and offer as many alternatives as it did. Time and again—on the Appalachian bill, on voting rights, on medicare, on education, on tax reform, on highway beautification, and others—the minority was shouted down and shunted aside, in some instances, without ever being given an opportunity even to explain its proposals. The decision had been made; our opponents were not interested in dissent.

This mass production of complex, poorly drafted, Presidential "must" bills has resulted in programs that will take a long time to assess. Even some of the top leaders of the majority have called for a "go slow" second session of Congress next year to give Congress time to plug the loopholes and tighten the programs established so hastily.

"COME, LET US REASON TOGETHER"

This Congress bowed to the wishes of the executive branch to a degree perhaps unequaled in American history. The traditional balance, decreed by the Constitution, between the legislative and executive branches, seemed suspended in tribute to a very powerful Chief Executive.

The White House exerted unprecedented pressure upon the Congress, cloaking its action under the name of reason and consensus. The President, himself, frequently referred to his favorite Biblical text: "Come now, and let us reason together," as authority for his methods. The citation is Isaiah, chapter 1, verse 18. The session had operated only a month under Johnsonian techniques when I felt constrained to point out in the House the two verses of Isaiah which follow and which describe what was actually happening. The 19th and 20th verses read:

> If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land: But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.

NEW MINORITIES?

During my tenure in Washington, in particular during this session, I have been disturbed by the accelerating transfer of power to large special-interest blocs and by the accompanying trend to concentrate decisionmaking in Washington. Big business, big labor, big politics, big corporate agriculture, and, indeed, big government itself, exercise a disproportionate power. Small farmers, small businessmen, small communities and the millions of individual and unorganized citizens throughout the country who are not immediately part of a special interest still have rights but are increasingly less able to exercise them.

This is not a new phenomenon on the American scene. Throughout our history we have seen groupings of excessive power in the hands of one or another combination of interests. It is, however, rising again in a new form and ought to be guarded against with vigilance. The small farmer, businessman and the small communities and States must be protected if our country is to continue to foster individual initiative and enterprise, which are still the mainsprings of our Nation's greatness. Under present conditions they are rapidly becoming the new minorities.

KEEPING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

In the following paragraphs, I shall set forth the major issues on which votes were recorded and state my position on them. I want this record crystal clear. In my last campaign I was dismayed by the misrepresentation of my voting record. I was accused of voting against bills which I voted for. One glaring example was the charge that I opposed the higher education bill when, in fact, I voted for it. This charge was based on the ground that I had voted for a motion to recommit the bill to committee with instructions to amend it. The motion to recommit with instructions—really a vote to amend—for which I voted in this instance would have added a nondiscrimination clause to the higher education bill. This was before the Civil Rights Act and it would have helped greatly to counteract racial discrimination in a most important area. Most Republicans and many Democrats voted for it. Yet, my vote for this motion to recommit was taken up and presented to the people of my district as a vote against the education bill. This sort of distortion leaves a bitter memory and I am determined to do everything I can to see that it will not happen again.

MINORITY AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

An important function of the minority party is to criticize the majority's programs and to offer counterproposals where indicated. Republicans, being in the minority, presented their positions in minority and supplemental views filed with many of the committee reports on major legislation. The views of the minority thus become part of the official record of legislation, help determine the party's record and, very often, form the basis for future legislation. In the research and scholarship which goes into each of these, it is important for the minority to have adequate professional staff. Even if Members of Congress were all scientists, engineers, economists, lawyers, educators, and military experts, the demands on their time would never permit them an opportunity to make the meticulous probings and investigations required in drafting valid proposals. Adequate professional staffing is essential to the formulation of sound laws.

Following is my record on the major issues in the 89th Congress to date, not necessarily in order of importance:

FOREIGN POLICY

In a year which further tested this country's resolve to defend freedom, I supported the President's foreign policy moves, particularly his efforts to stem the Communist conquest of South Vietnam and to break the attempted Communist coup in the Dominican Republic. I reserve the right to criticize the administration, however, when I believe it is making mistakes. I believe that had we made our determination to resist aggression clearer at the beginning we might have averted much of our present difficulties both in Latin America and in southeast Asia.

DEFENSE

In line with our foreign policy, which requires us to maintain a constant state of powerful readiness to meet any military challenge, I voted for the President's defense requests.

FOREIGN AID

I continued my support for the foreign aid program, while voting for cuts in the program and urging far tighter administration of it. I voted to eliminate Egypt and Indonesia from the program and joined those who believe that the military and economic aspects of the program should be separated.

CIVIL RIGHTS

I voted for the administration's voting rights bill after first supporting a Republican bill that was broader in application. I voted against the dismissal of the challenge brought against Representatives elected from Mississippi. This matter should have been heard in public hearings. While defending every citizen's right to protest injustice, I strongly deplore taking to the streets in destructive riots.

FISCAL POLICY

I voted for repeal of the wartime excise taxes but fought for reductions in Federal spending. Prosperity based on deficit spending and taxcuts is temporary. When inflation, which is underway again, waters down the value of the dollar and prices rise, pay raises and increased Government benefits are eaten away. In an effort to impose a measure of discipline on Federal spending, I voted against raising the national debt limit to $328 billion.

EDUCATION

I voted for both the Higher Education Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I voted against providing funds for the National Teachers Corps at this time because the subject needs more examination by the Congress. I was one of the sponsors of the National Arts and Humanities Act which will help restore the balance between the arts and sciences, which are so heavily endowed with Federal funds.

I also authored a bill by which parents of college students would receive income-tax credits to ease the burden of tuition costs. Another bill of mine proposes a massive Federal program to expand and upgrade the Nation's educational radio and television network. The electronic media are superb teaching tools and not nearly enough has been done to exploit them.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

My Committee on Public Works was deeply involved in this area. From the committee this year came the Appalachian Regional Development Act, the Public Works and Economic Development Act, the Highway Beautification Act, and the Omnibus Public Works Act. I helped draft the Republican alternative to the Appalachian bill, the National Resources Development Act, which would have aided every eligible disadvantaged area in the country. I voted against the Appalachian bill which concentrates special aid on an 11-State area to the exclusion of all other areas of the country where the need is just as great, northern New Hampshire among them. I supported the Public Works and Economic Development Act, which combined the former area development and accelerated public works programs. My vote for the bill came after I was able to get the bill amended so that every State would qualify for at least one project and so that Federal funds cannot be used to set up businesses producing goods already in oversupply. I opposed the Highway Beautification Act, nominally written in the committee but in fact dictated by the White House, whose aids actually sat in closed committee sessions to direct the writing of the bill. I am for a good program but this bill is so vaguely written that no one could say how broad its effect will be. Its loose provisions fall heaviest on the small businessman and the bill has rightly been called a lawyer's bill because of the costly litigation it is certain to generate. I vigorously opposed the Lincoln-Dickey hydroelectric project on the St. John River in northern Maine. This $300 million affair was included in the Omnibus Public Works Act and represented about 10 percent of the entire bill. This project is really part of the Passamaquoddy tidal power project that has been rejected time and again as technically unfeasible. The Lincoln-Dickey project would build an old-fashioned facility to produce electric power that will be duplicated by the private utilities for about $71 million over the next few years. This costly project will consume tax money while the private utilities will pay taxes.

HOUSING

I voted for the Housing Act but opposed the proposal to subsidize rent payments because it seemed wrong to provide tax money for families whose incomes could be as high as $11,200 in some places. This was supposed to be a program for the needy. I voted against creation of the new Cabinet post of Housing and Urban Development, proposing instead the creation of a new Office of Urban Affairs in the Executive Office of the President.

HEALTH

I voted for the administration's program to provide medical care for the aged after first voting for the Republican counterproposal, which, in my opinion, offered a much better, broader range of benefits for those truly in need. The chief trouble with the compulsory program is that it will either cost too much by carrying those who do not need it, or there won't be enough money to provide proper help for those who do. The need for a Federal program was clearly demonstrated, however. The medicare bill also carried in it much-needed, long overdue increases in social security benefits.

In other health legislation, I voted for the Drug Control Act, programs establishing or increasing aid to community health research centers, mental health centers, and centers to conduct research into major diseases. I voted for continuing the Health Professions Assistance Act and authored a successful amendment by which doctors and dentists will be encouraged to locate in rural areas lacking proper medical care. I also sponsored a bill to provide humane treatment for laboratory animals used in federally financed research. It gained wide support across the Nation and public hearings were held, which, hopefully, will lead to a good law.

IMMIGRATION

I voted for the Immigration Act, which ends the outmoded national origins quota system, and will make it easier to reunite separated families and obtain those persons whose skills are needed in this country.

FARM LEGISLATION

I voted against the massive farm bill which continues to favor the big corporate farmer at the expense of the small farmer. It also continues an infamous wheat program which amounts to a bread tax. I voted against the administration's sugar bill, which is loaded with unwarranted sweetmeats for special interests. The benefits of generous subsidies to foreign countries line the pockets of the big sugar owners and dealers and do not reach the people. I also opposed the International Coffee Agreement as against consumer interest.

RIGHT-TO-WORK

I voted against repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act, which would have invalidated so-called right-to-work laws in 19 States. This is a matter properly left to the States to decide for themselves and, in any event, should be considered as part of general reform of labor laws, not as a separate issue. If the right-to-work option is destroyed, Congress ought to take steps to guarantee greater democracy in unions.

PRESIDENTIAL CONTINUITY

I voted for the Presidential continuity resolution, now awaiting approval by the States to become part of our Constitution. It fills a serious governmental gap by providing for the Vice President to take over if the President is unable to carry out his duties. It also provides for filling a vacancy in the Vice Presidency. Another bill I supported makes the assassination of the President a Federal crime.

HOUSE RULES

I opposed the changes in the rules of the House by which nearly total control over the flow of legislation is concentrated in the hands of the Speaker of the House. With these changes, the House reverted almost to the days of Speaker Cannon who ruled with such an iron hand that his grip had to be broken with rules changes voted in 1912. Memories are short.

MILITARY CIVILIAN PAY

I supported pay raises for both the Armed Services and the civilian employees of the Federal Government. The civilian pay increase won my support only after another increase in Congressmen's salaries, provided in the original bill, was taken out, along with raises for certain other high Government officials. These were adequately taken care of by the last Congress.

WAR ON POVERTY

I opposed continuing the present course of this program which has become so involved with politics as to negate much of its value. The whole program should be revamped.

VETERANS

I supported measures to increase compensation to veterans with service-connected disabilities and their dependents, and which increased assistance for disabled veterans receiving vocational rehabilitation training. I introduced a bill which would provide a GI bill of rights for combat veterans of the cold war. I joined the vigorous, successful protests against Veterans' Administration plans to move the main functions of its offices in Manchester and White River Junction to Boston.

CANADIAN AUTO AGREEMENT

Illustrating the tremendous power of big business, this measure permits the removal of United States and Canadian tariffs in auto parts. I voted against it. It is special-interest legislation of the first order and is a direct threat to American jobs.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

I voted for all measures to aid the fight against air and water pollution and supported the Water Resources Planning Act. In addition, I voted for measures creating new national parks in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, and California.

SILVER AND GOLD

With the greatest reluctance, I voted for the bill removing silver from dimes and quarters and dropping the silver content of half dollars to 40 percent. I did so only when it was clearly demonstrated that there simply was not enough silver left to meet the demands of coinage and industry. However, I voted against repeal of the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain a 25 percent "gold cover" to back their deposits. The repeal represents further relaxation of fiscal discipline, which is so badly needed.

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

At the end of the session, I was designated ranking Republican member of the newly created Subcommittee on Public Works which will act as watchdog over Federal programs to assist development of disadvantaged areas. These consist of the Economic Development Act programs and the Appalachian regional development program. In January, I was named chairman of the Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing. The task force participated in and closely followed the public hearing conducted by the Joint Committee on Congressional Reform, and engaged extensively in research and preparation of proposals that will be advanced for public and congressional consideration next year.

During this busy year, I attempted to keep my constituents informed through regular newspaper columns and radio and television reports. All postal patrons in the district received a questionnaire as well as the results, which included my own answers.

I visited as many communities in my district as time allowed and welcomed numerous New Hampshire visitors to Washington. My district office remains open year around in Concord to receive constituents.

The 1st Session of the 89th Congress—A Record of Accomplishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, for many months, newspapers throughout the Nation have vied with one another to find new adjectives to describe the 1st session of the 89th Congress. We have heard nicknames ranging from "The Action Congress," the "Do-It-All Congress," and the "Fabulous 89th." Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY has labeled it "The Education Congress." Senator PAT MCNAMARA calls it, appropriately, "The Congress That Kept Its Promise to the American People."

There is no question that this Congress has compiled an outstanding record of accomplishment. As a Member of Congress, and as a member of the Democratic majority which carried through this tremendous program, I am well aware of this record, and I am proud of it. Every American family will be affected and benefit directly from these legislative achievements, and Americans for many generations to come will continue to benefit from new programs now undertaken by the Congress.

President Johnson has called this session of Congress the greatest in American history and described our work as "the greatest outpouring of creative legislation in the history of this Nation."

I should perhaps, be more restrained in my remarks, lest I be accused of immodesty. But it is difficult to restrain the enthusiasm I feel when I look back on our record. We have built the foundation to fulfill goals first sought more than 30 years ago by Franklin D. Roosevelt, and advocated since then by Harry S. Truman, John F. Kennedy, and Lyndon B. Johnson.

Let me review for a moment some of the highlights of our legislative accomplishments:

MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

The medicare law will enable every American to enjoy his retirement years without the constant fear that illness may wipe out his savings and make him a burden upon his loved ones. The law provides hospitalization, surgical, and nursing-home care for persons 65 and older, financed through the social security system. It also offers an optional, low-cost insurance program to help pay physicians' fees, with half the cost of the premiums paid by the Government. Pension benefits for all social security retirees were increased by 7 percent, retroactive to last January 1, and the first checks for this increase have already reached the people.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

This landmark law provides, for the first time in the history of our Nation, direct Federal aid to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education. It authorizes $1.3 billion for the first year of a 3-year program designed specifically to raise the quality of education and reach every American child with a real opportunity to learn. Although the bulk of the money is earmarked to help children from low-income families, all school districts will share in the benefits. I was proud, indeed, to serve on the House Education and Labor Committee, and its General Education Subcommittee, which drafted this legislation and guided it through hearings and debate until its final passage by Congress.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

This legislation provides a 5-year program of assistance on the college and university level, with a first-year authorization of $250 million. The bulk of the money will aid needy students, through an undergraduate scholarship program. As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, and the General Education Subcommittee, I also helped to draft this legislation, and worked for its adoption. In a day when a college education is as vital as a high school education was a generation ago, this act should make it possible for any qualified high school graduate to continue his education. This measure will be especially helpful to the children of middle-class workingmen's families who wish to continue their education beyond high school.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

President Johnson signed the immigration bill into law at the Statue of Liberty. This was a truly significant location, for the nationality quota provisions of our Nation's immigration policy had stood for many years as a contradiction to the "open door" policy symbolized by the famous statue. The new immigration bill abolishes the old national origins system, which set the immigration quota for any nation at one-sixth of 1 percent of the persons of that national origin who lived in the United States in 1920. This system, which discriminated heavily against the nations of southern Europe, is replaced with a first-come, first-served system of preferential admissions for immigrants with special skills, education or training, or those with close relatives in the United States. Immediate family members may join parents or children from whom they have been separated for years by the old law.

WAR ON POVERTY PROGRAM

Congress extended the Economic Opportunity Act through 1968, and authorized nearly $1.9 billion for antipoverty programs in the coming year. This major assault on poverty throughout the Nation is being carried out through a series of programs including the community action program, Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, adult basic education, and small business loans. This many-pronged attack is designed to train both youngsters and older persons in new fields of employment, and to encourage local-citizen participation in antipoverty campaigns.

HEART DISEASE, CANCER, AND STROKE PROGRAM

This far-reaching legislation allocates $340 million for a 3-year program of research into the cause and treatment of heart disease, cancer, and strokes—the three leading causes of death in the United States. Its goal, as outlined by President Johnson, is "to speed the miracles of medical research from the laboratory to the bedside." By this act we are finally bringing the tremendous resources of the Government into the fight against these killer diseases.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT

Congress, for the first time, has taken special notice of the growing number of older Americans, and their unique problems. This act creates an Administration on Aging, within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Funds are authorized to make extensive studies into the problems of the aged, including income, health care, housing, employment, retirement, and recreation.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

This law strengthens the machinery for guaranteeing the right to vote for all citizens, by prohibiting poll taxes and literacy tests. It also provides for Federal registrars in States where less than 50 percent of the eligible electors are registered.

HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Taking note of the fact that 70 percent of our population now lives in metropolitan areas, Congress established a new Cabinet-level Department to administer programs affecting cities. The new Department will take over the functions now in the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituent departments, and gives the problems of our cities, and their growing suburbs, special attention.

OMNIBUS HOUSING ACT

This law extends the current urban renewal and public housing programs, continues the FHA loan insurance program, and encourages urban planning and beautification.

AID TO DISASTER AREAS

I was particularly pleased with the passage of this bill, since I was its original sponsor. It authorizes Federal funds to assist school districts which are hit by natural disasters such as tornadoes, hurricanes, earthquakes, and floods. Money is available both for repair and rebuilding of school facilities, and for operational purposes. The bill also provides for Federal aid to State-operated or State-supported institutions which offer free training to handicapped children, and eases the requirements for large cities to qualify for Federal aid under the impacted-area program.

These are only some of the highlights of the first session. We also adopted a new farm program, water pollution and air pollution control, military pay increases, drug controls, highway beautification, water resources development, and an arts and humanities program.

REDUCTION IN TAXES

With such a tremendous list of programs to help assure a better life for all Americans, it is particularly noteworthy that we have been able to reduce Federal taxes. Many persons are inclined to think that the Federal Government is responsible for the continuing upward spiral of taxes. The excise tax reductions of 1965 are proof that this is not so. This act slashes nearly $5 billion from the Nation's annual excise taxes. This is a savings to citizen-taxpayers and a healthy boost for the Nation's businessmen. It completely eliminated excises on jewelry, furs, luggage, appliances, and scores of other items, and it authorized a gradual reduction in excise taxes on automobiles and telephone bills. Many businesses burdened by the so-called emergency or wartime taxes are given a new lease on life.

This action followed on the heels of the income tax cuts of 1964, which made the largest Federal tax reduction in U.S. history—some $11.5 billion in income and corporate taxes.

What these figures mean, in effect, is that Federal taxes will have been slashed by nearly $16.5 billion as a result of income and excise tax cuts signed into law in the past 2 years.

In Michigan, it is estimated that the income and excise tax reductions will give taxpayers $666 million more money to spend each year. Citizens in the Detroit metropolitan area will have an extra $272 million.

In 1966, Michigan residents will benefit to the extent of $54 million in lower automobile taxes, $33 million in lower telephone and telegraph taxes, and $73 million on such items as handbags, luggage, jewelry, furs, and cosmetics. These annual savings will be even higher in following years, when further tax cuts go into effect on automobiles and telephone service.

Let us look at the revenue side of the Federal financial picture. Despite the massive tax reductions, President Johnson announced last March that gross collections of Federal taxes had hit an all-time high of $114.4 billion for fiscal year 1965. That represents an increase of $2.2 billion over the previous fiscal year.

On the spending side, the picture is bright. Twenty years ago, the Federal budget amounted to 45 percent of the gross national product, which was then $218.3 billion. Today, the Federal budget is only 15 percent of the gross national product, which has reached the $650 billion figure. And this, despite the fact that defense and war-related spending accounts for about 75 percent of our current Federal expenditures.

In relation to gross national product, our Federal public debt also has decreased. In 1945, it was 118.7 percent; today the national debt is only 49.5 percent of the gross national product.

As the 89th Congress completes its 1st session, I think we can take considerable satisfaction in our work, and in the state of the Nation. Despite the grave and vexing problems that we face today, both at home and abroad, Americans can be proud of our great strides toward making this land a better place in which to live, and a model for the entire world to follow.

I repeat, I am proud to be a Member of the 89th Congress; I am proud of the accomplishments that we have made, and I look forward to another fruitful session when we return in January.

Alfred Hayes, of New York Federal Reserve Bank, Undermines Administration Efforts for International Monetary Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, international monetary problems are a common topic of conversation these days. There are many reasons for this, probably the most important of which are free world security as well as our own balance-of-payments situation.

Very recently, Secretary of the Treasury Fowler went abroad to represent our best interests in solving the shortage in international liquidity. The time has come for action, and this is an area in which the administration, under the President's leadership, is working ably and hard. An increase in international reserves is necessary to insure growth in world trade which is very profitable to America, and it is time some hard work was done at the conference table toward this goal.

Negotiations with foreign central bankers and other monetary officials are hazardous at best and are characterized by many of the difficulties one associates with complex international diplomacy.

So, it is deplorable indeed that, while these ticklish negotiations are in progress, a high Government official, Mr. Alfred Hayes, president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, should undercut the administration's efforts for a conference to discuss the problem. Mr. Hayes is selected for his $75,000 a year job, plus liberal expenses, by the big-money market bankers on Wall Street. He has no direct responsibility at all to the American public who support him in fine style. Mr. Hayes claims, although his bank holds $40 billion of Government securities which are public property, that his bank and he himself are not really part of the Government. But, in any case, there is no excuse for his recent sounding off to financial men in New York on a subject which is certainly not his responsibility as fixed by Congress during a time when the administration is struggling to bring some order out of the international monetary situation. Mr. Hayes is against reform, but for higher and higher interest rates as his pet cure-all.

Mr. Hayes sits up in a walnut-paneled ivory tower in New York City calmly sabotaging his own Goverment by shaking the confidence of the people in the efforts of their elected officials. If Mr. Hayes feels compelled to dissent from official administration policy, then he should do so with care and discretion. But if he feels unable to resist a public outburst against the administration, then at least he should have the decency to wait until the Government's views have had a fair chance to take hold toward a successful solution to the problem. If a vitally needed conference on this problem falls through, one of the individuals the American public can thank is Al Hayes.

Activities and Accomplishments of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in the 89th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is generally acknowledged, and with justification, in my opinion, that the 1st session of the 89th Congress was one of the most productive legislative sessions in the history of our Nation. I am proud to have served in this body during this crucial period. The past session has been similarly fruitful for the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. As chairman of the committee, I have had the staff prepare a brief report highlighting the committee's activities and accomplishments during that time.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this report shows that the Joint Committee has contributed significantly to the continued preeminence of the United States in the peaceful and military applications of atomic energy. Moreover, I believe the activities of the committee bring credit to Congress—and to our system of Government as a whole—by demonstrating the ability of a representative democracy to cope with the increasingly complex technological problems of our day.

I wish to thank all the members of the committee, from the majority and minority sides and from both Houses, for their devotion to duty and close cooperation in the committee's work. In order that Members of Congress and the public may be better informed, I include in the Record at this point the report on the activities and accomplishments of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the 89th Congress, 1st session.

Activities and Accomplishments of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in the 89th Congress, 1st Session

Foreword

The following report on the activities of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the 1st session of the 89th Congress (1965) has been prepared at the direction of the chairman for the information of the Congress, the executive branch, and the public.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was first organized on August 2, 1946 and is a House-Senate Committee consisting of nine members from each body, of which no more than five from each body can be members of the same party. Following is a listing of the present membership:

Chet Holifield, California, chairman.
John O. Pastore, Rhode Island, vice chairman.
Melvin Price, Illinois.
Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado.
Albert Thomas, Texas.
Thomas G. Morris, New Mexico.
Craig Hosmer, California.
William H. Bates, Massachusetts.
John B. Anderson, Illinois.
William M. McCulloch, Ohio.
Richard B. Russell, Georgia.
Clinton P. Anderson, New Mexico.
Albert Gore, Tennessee.
Henry M. Jackson, Washington.
Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Iowa.
George D. Aiken, Vermont.
Wallace F. Bennett, Utah.
Carl T. Curtis, Nebraska.

The Joint Committee is one of the few committees established by statute, rather than by rule of each House, and is unique in several respects. For example, it is the only joint committee of the Congress with legislative functions, including the initiation and reporting of legislative proposals. The committee is also charged by law with legislative responsibility as "watchdog" of the national atomic energy program. It follows closely the classified activities of executive agencies, including the Atomic Energy Commission and the Departments of Defense and State concerning the military applications of atomic energy.

Of equal importance, the committee plays a major role in stimulating the peaceful applications of the atom. For example, the committee has encouraged such programs as the development of civilian nuclear power, the preservation of food through irradiation and the application of nuclear power in space.

In all these activities, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as the representative of Congress and the public, seeks to assure the implementation of the following statutory policy expressed in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954:

"* * * the development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be directed so as to make the maximum contribution to the general welfare, subject at all times to the paramount objective of making the maximum contribution to the common defense and security * * *."

During the 89th Congress, 1st session, the Joint Committee conducted a total of 86 hearings and other sessions, 52 of which were public and 34 of which were executive. These sessions occupied a total of 185 hours. In addition to the three Joint Committee reports which were filed on pending legislation, a total of 16 publications consisting of hearings and committee prints were published or are in the process of printing by the Joint Committee in the first session of the 89th Congress. These publications include a number of records of hearings in executive session, with classified material deleted. A list of these publications follows:

AEC authorizing legislation, fiscal year 1966: part 1, hearings January 27, February 2, 3, 4, 10, 16 and March 10, 1965; part 2, hearings February 8, 9, 10 and April 8, 1965; part 3, hearings March 11, 18, 19, 24 and April 13, 1965.

International agreements for cooperation (hearings April 22 and June 30, 1964).

Current membership, publications, and other pertinent information on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, committee print (February 1965).

High energy physics program: Report on national policy and background information, committee print (February 1965).

High energy physics research, hearings March 2, 3, 4, and 5, 1965.

Peaceful applications of nuclear explosives—Plowshares, hearings January 5, 1965.

Proposed amendment to section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, hearings May 27 and June 2, 1965.

Selected materials on atomic energy indemnity legislation, committee print (June 1965).

Proposed extension of AEC indemnity legislation, hearings June 22 to 24, 1965.

Space nuclear power generators, hearings August 6, 1965.

Radiation processing of foods, hearings June 9 and 10, 1965.

Federal radiation council protective action guides, hearings June 29 and 30, 1965.

Development, growth, and state of the atomic energy industry, hearings August 10 and 11, September 8, 1965.

International agreements for cooperation, hearings April 29, June 4 and 17, July 13 and 27, 1965.

I. LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

A. AEC Fiscal Year 1966 Authorization Act (Public Law 89–32)

In accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended in 1963, the Joint Committee reviewed the authorization for all appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission, including both operating and construction funds.

The committee held extensive hearings on the AEC-recommended fiscal year 1966 authorization bill over a period of 11 weeks beginning January 27, 1965, and reviewed each major atomic energy program in considerable detail. The complete hearings, including unclassified portions of the classified executive sessions, were published in three volumes under the title "AEC Authorizing Legislation, Fiscal Year 1966."

The hearings culminated in the introduction of "clean bills" by Chairman Holifield (H.R. 8122) and by Vice Chairman Pastore (S. 1957). These bills were reported in the House on May 13, 1965 (H. Rept. No. 349) and in the Senate on May 14, 1965 (S. Rept. No. 191). The report included comprehensive statements by the committee on virtually every major atomic energy activity.

The bill, which was passed without substantive amendment by the House and Senate, authorized appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1966 in the amount of $2,555,521,000, as follows:

Operating expenses	$2,260,776,000
Plant and capital equipment	294,745,000
Total authorization	2,555,521,000

In addition, the bill authorized the AEC to enter into two new cooperative arrangements for the construction and operation of civilian nuclear power reactors.

Operating expenses: The authorization bill provided approximately $2.3 billion for "Operating expenses" for the AEC's program. The Joint Committee's report broke this sum down among the AEC's principal programs. Among the highlights of the operating budget authorization are the following:

1. In the civilian power reactor program, the committee bill authorized a total of $70.8 million—$1 million less than the amount requested by the Atomic Energy Commission. The committee noted that the AEC program is characterized by a continued shift in emphasis from development of low conversion ratio light water reactors to the more advanced breeder-type reactors which hold the promise of a more effective utilization of our nuclear fuel resources. Although the committee strongly indorses a Government-supported program directed toward development of advanced converter and self-sustaining breeder reactors, and ultimately high-gain breeders, it believes that continual vigilance must be exercised to phase the Government out of further developments of types of reactors which are commercially available, which efforts should be carried forward by private industry. In this connection the committee recommended that AEC accelerate its withdrawal from the basic superheat program, in which field additional developments should be supported by private industry.

2. In the cooperative power reactor demonstration program, the AEC requested new authorization in fiscal year 1966 of $91.5 million for the 525,000-kilowatt large seed-blanket reactor (LSBR) and $40.8 million for the 330,000-kilowatt high-temperature gas-cooled power reactor (HTGR). The LSBR is under consideration for construction by the State of California to supply power to pump water for the State's water supply project. The Public Service Co. of Colorado plans to build and operate the HTGR on its electric utility system.

(a) LSBR—The committee approved the requested authorization of $91.5 million for this project. The basic objective of this project is the development of a power reactor utilizing ordinary water reactor technology which will generate or breed as much nuclear fuel as it burns. The committee believes the LSBR project will produce valuable information which will be of significant benefit to the entire utility industry in the United States.

The AEC'S proposed authorization bill limited the AEC to a cooperative arrangement with the State of California. However, the committee recommended that the authorization for the project be broadened to include potential participants other than the State. The committee further believed that research and development in the seed and blanket technology should be continued without interruption, and accordingly included a provision in the authorization bill which permitted the AEC to utilize not in excess of $25 million appropriated to the AEC pursuant to the bill, for performing research and development work on the LSBR prior to execution of a contract for this project.

(b) HTGR—The committee recommended that the $40.8 million requested for this project be approved. Like the large seed-blanket reactor, the high-temperature gas-cooled reactor is expected to offer significant advantages over commercial reactors available today. Moreover, as in the case of the LSBR, this reactor system is aimed at developing a means for making extensive utilization of another energy source—thorium.

In recommending approval of this project the committee made a change in AEC's recommended authorization bill to provide that the cooperative arrangement must be in accordance with the basis for an arrangement described in the program justification data sheet submitted by the AEC in support of the fiscal year 1966 authorization, consistent with previous authorizations for cooperative projects.

3. In the merchant ship reactor program, the committee recommended an increase of $1.1 million in the authorization for operating funds requested by the AEC, bringing the total program to $2.5 million for fiscal year 1966. The committee recommended this increase because it believes this application of nuclear energy has the potential of contributing significantly both to our national security and to the commercial posture of the United States.

The committee noted its dissatisfaction with the lack of direction which has been provided within the executive branch for this country's nuclear merchant ship program. In addition, the committee strongly urged the AEC to proceed expeditiously in the setting forth of a maritime reactor program and then in carrying out the critical research and development work needed to make this application of nuclear energy a success.

4. In the SNAP (Systems for Nuclear Auxiliary Power) program, the AEC requested $70.5 million which included $22 million for development of an Advanced Space Power System (SNAP 50).

The SNAP 50 project, which was started in 1962, was originally designed to develop an advanced reactor for use in space capable of generating electric power in the 300–1,000-kilowatt range. The project was started in 1962 and experienced a series of cutbacks in its objectives in each of its 3 years of existence. The changes in SNAP 50 included the cancellation of the original flight test objective, the cancellation of an experimental reactor test and the cancellation of the objective of developing a complete SNAP reactor system for ground test.

These actions taken by the executive branch in the last 3 years all pointed to the fact that work on the SNAP 50 was in the advanced technology phase and that SNAP 50 was not seriously considered as a project with significant development objectives.

Accordingly the committee recommended a $10 million reduction in the level of effort for this program, from the requested $22 million to $12 million. In line with its general conclusions concerning the SNAP 50 program, the committee reduced AEC's plant and capital equipment request by a total of $2.2 million, and recommended that the AEC consider transferring the SNAP 50 work from the CANEL (Connecticut Advanced Nuclear Engineering Laboratory) research and development laboratory. The AEC subsequently transferred this development program to another laboratory and declared the CANEL facility excess to its needs.

Another development in the SNAP program of considerable importance was the flight test of the SNAP 10A device. This device which consisted of a reactor and associated thermoelectric conversion system producing 500 electrical watts, mounted on an Agena rocket, was placed in orbit on April 3, 1965, and operated continuously for 43 days. SNAP 10A thus demonstrated the ability safely to launch, start up, and operate a reactor in space and established an important first in the U.S. space effort. The orbiting of the SNAP 10A was the result of the insistence of the committee and Congress that the United States complete the development and flight test of the world's first nuclear reactor for space.

5. In the physical research program, the committee recommended a total of $239 million in operating funds. While the total amount recommended by the committee was equal to that requested by the AEC, the committee made a number of significant changes in individual subprograms.

(a) High-energy physics—At the committee's request, the AEC submitted to the President in January a report on policy for national action in the field of high-energy physics. This report, which was submitted by the President to the Joint Committee, clearly made the point that the high-energy physics research program is a national one and not solely the mission of any one agency.

Included within the AEC's request for high-energy physics was $1.9 million for advanced accelerator design studies on a 100 to 300 billion electron volt proton accelerator. In its report to the President and Congress, the Commission recommended that such a machine be authorized for design in fiscal year 1967, and for construction in fiscal year 1968.

While no final decision has been made to build the accelerator, the committee believes that any consideration in the next fiscal year of funds for engineering design of the proposed large accelerator will necessitate prior selection of an appropriate site. Site selection activities are currently underway by the Commission, and by the National Academy of Sciences under an AEC contract.

(b) Medium-energy physics—Among the highlights of the committee's recommendations for this subprogram was the allocation to it of $500,000 from the high-energy physics subprogram, to be utilized with other available funds for research and development and advanced design studies for a proposed meson physics research facility to be constructed at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory. In supporting work on this facility the committee noted that the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, which has a special interest and competence in medium-energy physics, had already developed a preliminary design for the meson facility, which would be the highest intensity proton accelerator of hundreds of Mev energy in the world. When built, this accelerator will permit scientists from the entire country to perform unique research on the atom's nucleus; and scientists from the Rocky Mountain States will have available to them in their region a research tool of outstanding merit. The committee also authorized funds in the amount of $1.2 million for partial architect-engineering for the meson facility.

(c) Controlled thermonuclear research—The committee reduced AEC's $22.5 million request for the controlled thermonuclear research program by $1 million. In this connection the committee has required that the AEC lay before the committee prior to the fiscal year 1967 authorization hearings a thorough study as to where this program is going and what the probabilities of practical success may be for controlled fusion.

Plant and capital equipment: The authorization bill also provided $294.7 million for "plant and capital equipment" for the AEC program for fiscal year 1966.

Final Action on Bill

On May 20, 1965, the authorization bill was debated and passed in the House of Representatives by a rollcall vote of 350 to 1. On May 24, 1965, the Senate considered and passed the bill by a voice vote. The authorization bill was then forwarded to the President and approved by him on June 2, 1965, as Public Law 89–32.

B. Extension and amendment of the Price-Anderson legislation (Public Law 89–210)

The Price-Anderson Act (so-called in recognition of its sponsorship by two members of the Joint Committee, Congressman MELVIN PRICE, and Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON) was enacted in 1957 as an amendment to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and has often been referred to as one of the cornerstones of our national atomic energy program.

The Price-Anderson Act affords protection to the public, and to AEC's licenses and contractors, from the risks associated with atomic energy by providing for a program of private insurance and governmental indemnity amounting to a maximum of $560 million to cover damages that conceivably could arise from a nuclear incident. The act further provides for a limitation of liability of all persons indemnified in the event of a catastrophic nuclear incident resulting in damages which exceed the total amount of private insurance and governmental indemnity, subject, of course, to further congressional action in light of the particular circumstances.

As originally enacted, the Price-Anderson Act was limited by its terms to AEC licenses and contracts which became effective on or before August 1, 1967. It was understood that a comprehensive review would be undertaken by the Joint Committee toward the end of the act's 10-year term in order to determine whether the need which originally prompted Congress to approve this legislation still existed.

On May 26, 1965, Congressman MELVIN PRICE and Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON introduced H.R. 8496 and S. 2042, respectively, identical bills to amend and extend the Price-Anderson Act. The introduction of these bills followed many months of informal meetings and discussions among members of the Joint Committee, the Atomic Energy Commission, and their staffs, and representatives of private industry. On May 27, 1965, the Joint Committee announced that public hearings would be held on these bills. In announcing these hearings, Chairman HOLIFIELD and Vice Chairman PASTORE identified the following policy questions to which the Joint Committee expected to address itself:

1. Will there still be a need for Price-Anderson type legislation after August 1967?
2. Will additional nuclear liability insurance be available from commercial sources in the immediate future, and, if so, in what amounts? Will increasing amounts of such insurance become available over the next several years?
3. If Price-Anderson type legislation should be extended, what should be the period of the extension?
4. If an extension of a governmental indemnity program in the nuclear field is warranted, what changes, if any, should be made in the Price-Anderson legislation?
5. Should the amount of the governmental indemnity available under the Price-Anderson legislation be reduced as more commercial nuclear liability insurance becomes available?

Public hearings on these bills were held June 22–24, 1965, before the Subcommittee on Legislation. Every individual and organization that requested permission to testify was invited to appear before the committee. Among the points identified during these hearings was the willingness of the commercial nuclear liability insurance pools to increase the amount of liability insurance available to the nuclear industry from $60 to $74 million as of January 1966. Under the amendments to the Price-Anderson Act contained in H.R. 8496 and S. 2042 this would reduce the amount of governmental indemnity available for large power reactors from $500 to $486 million. The total protection available to the public would, however, be unchanged. The hearings, with extensive supporting data, were printed by the Joint Committee under the title "Proposed Extension of AEC Indemnity Legislation."

On August 26, 1965, the Subcommittee on Legislation met in an executive session and after full discussion voted without dissent to approve the bills, H.R. 8496 and S. 2042, with two technical amendments. The full committee met on the same date to consider these bills and after careful consideration voted unanimously to report them out with the technical amendments approved by the Subcommittee on Legislation (H. Rept. No. 833; S. Rept. No. 650).

Following are the highlights of the legislation as reported by the Joint Committee:

1. The legislation would extend the effective period of the Price-Anderson indemnity provisions of the Atomic Energy Act for an additional 10 years, from August 1, 1967, to August 1, 1977;

2. The legislation would require a decrease in the $500 million governmental indemnity afforded under the Price-Anderson indemnity provisions corresponding to the amount whereby the financial protection required of an AEC licensee or contractor exceeds the amount of commercial nuclear liability insurance currently available; i.e., $60 million. In this respect, the bills reported by the Joint Committee differed from the recommendation of the AEC, which had proposed a simple extension of the Price-Anderson Act for 10 years;

3. The legislation would provide that in no event would the liability of all persons who might be liable for public liability arising from a single nuclear incident exceed $560 million; i.e., the maximum amount of governmental indemnity which could be afforded under the Price-Anderson indemnity provisions, as they would be amended by the legislation, together with the maximum amount of financial protection required in accordance with these indemnity provisions.

The extension and amendment of the Price-Anderson Act recommended by the committee (S. 2042) was considered and passed in the Senate on August 31, by voice vote, and by the House of Representatives on September 16 by a rollcall vote of 337 to 30. The bill was signed into law (Public Law 89-210) by President Johnson on September 29, 1965.

C. Amendment to Section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act (Public Law 89-135)

In 1961, Congress authorized construction by AEC of a $114 million linear accelerator facility on the property of Stanford University, in California. In order to obtain electrical power for this facility, the AEC attempted to arrange with the local public utility for construction of the necessary high voltage transmission line. Two local governmental authorities in the State of California thereafter refused to permit this power line to be constructed unless it were placed underground.

The AEC was eventually compelled to institute condemnation proceedings to obtain an easement for this line. These proceedings were contested and after an initial U.S. District Court ruling favorable to the Government, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit reversed the lower court's decision and held that section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act subjected the AEC to the authority of these local governments with respect to their ordinances prohibiting overhead transmission lines.

On May 25, 1965, identical bills were introduced by Chairman HOLIFIELD, Mr. HOSMER, Vice Chairman PASTORE, and Senator HICKENLOOPER for the purpose of reiterating the intent of Congress underlying section 271 and clarifying the meaning of the section to show that it in no way limited the sovereign immunity possessed by the AEC by virtue of the supremacy clause of article VI of the U.S. Constitution. The bills accordingly would make it clear that section 271 did not prevent the AEC from constructing and maintaining an overhead transmission line for the Stanford linear accelerator, notwithstanding the authority or regulations of local governmental authorities.

Public hearings were held on these bills before the Subcommittee on Legislation on May 27 and June 2, 1965. These hearings were printed under the title "Proposed Amendment to Section 271 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954."

On June 8, 1965, the Subcommittee on Legislation met and after careful deliberation voted without dissent to adopt certain amendments to these bills which had been suggested as a result of informal conferences between the staff of the committee and representatives of the Department of Justice and the AEC. The subcommittee also voted to file identical "clean bills," which were introduced on June 8, 1965, by Chairman HOLIFIELD (as H.R. 8856), and by Mr. HOSMER, Vice Chairman PASTORE and Senator HICKENLOOPER.

The full committee met to consider these bills on June 16 and 29, 1965. After full discussion, the committee voted unanimously on June 29, 1965, to report out the bills as approved by the Subcommittee on Legislation, without amendment, and to adopt a committee report on the bills (H. Rept. No. 567; S. Rept. No. 390).

The bill (H.R. 8856) was considered in the House on July 12 and July 29, 1965, and passed on the latter date by a rollcall vote of 275 to 125. The bill was considered and passed in the Senate by a voice vote on August 10, 1965.

On August 24, 1965, H.R. 8856 was signed into law by President Johnson as Public Law 89-135.

II. AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION

Section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 provides that no cooperation with foreign nations concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy shall be undertaken until the proposed agreement for cooperation has been submitted to and lain before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for a prescribed period of time. Pursuant to that requirement a proposed agreement for cooperation with one nation and amendments to existing agreements with five other nations were submitted to the committee by the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission during 1965. Each of these proposals was the subject of a hearing before the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation.

The lone new agreement was with the Government of Brazil and superseded the existing agreement with that country. This agreement, like the amendments to the agreements with the Republic of Korea and the Government of Israel, authorizes a 10-year period of cooperation and provides that the International Atomic Energy Agency will be promptly requested to assume responsibility for safeguards inspections to insure against the diversion of fissionable materials to military purposes. In this connection the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation in April held a hearing at which the U.S. representatives to the IAEA and various representatives of the Department of State and the AEC gave testimony relating to the current activities of the Agency. Pursuant to the policy of transferring safeguards responsibilities to the IAEA—a policy which the Joint Committee vigorously supports—arrangements thus far have been made for the assumption by the international organization of the responsibility for applying safeguards under 13 agreements for cooperation. Five additional countries that have received U.S. nuclear materials and equipment through the IAEA in connection with IAEA projects have agreed to the application of Agency safeguards. Two other countries with advanced nuclear development programs—the United Kingdom and Canada—have also concluded safeguards agreements with the IAEA and other nations with which they are cooperating in the civil uses of nuclear energy.

Two agreements for cooperation—with Turkey and the United Kingdom—were amended in 1965 to extend their effective period for 1 year. The agreement with Austria was also amended to permit the AEC to transfer to that country uranium more highly enriched than that which the AEC was previously furnishing the Austrian Government.

Several of the amendatory agreements submitted during the year were not submitted to the Joint Committee at a date which would allow the full statutory period (30 days) to elapse before the existing agreements expired. As a result the committee on June 28, 1965, wrote to the Secretary of State and the Chairman of the AEC requesting that henceforth any proposed extension to an agreement for cooperation be submitted at least 2 to 3 months in advance of the existing agreement's expiration date.

No agreements for cooperation for mutual defense purposes, which under section 123 of the act must also lie before the Joint Committee, were submitted during 1965.

III. INFORMATIONAL HEARINGS

As noted in section I of this report the Joint Committee during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, held extensive hearings as part of its legislative activities. In addition, the committee conducted a number of informational hearings in both public and executive session on a wide range of subjects. Highlights of the committee's information hearings follow.

A. Plowshare program

The committee held its first hearing of the 89th Congress on January 5, 1965, to receive public testimony on the AEC's program for the development of peaceful applications of nuclear explosives, commonly known as the Plowshare program. The Commission provided the committee with a progress report on recent underground nuclear detonations devoted to advancing Plowshare technology for excavation, industrial, and scientific uses. The AEC also outlined plans for future developments in the Plowshare program, including possible use of completely contained underground nuclear explosions to stimulate the production of gas and oil. In addition to AEC witnesses, Dr. Gerald Johnson, Associate Director (for Plowshare) of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Livermore, Calif., testified.

B. Guaranteed purchase prices for plutonium and U-233

On February 10, 1965, the committee received public testimony from the AEC concerning AEC's proposed guaranteed purchase prices for plutonium and U-233 produced in licensed reactors, which were submitted to the committee on January 18. These prices would be established pursuant to authority contained in section 56 of the Atomic Energy Act, and would apply to material delivered to AEC before January 1, 1971. By law, proposed guaranteed purchase prices must lie before the committee for a statutory 45-day period before becoming effective. Subsequent to the committee's hearing, the AEC published these guaranteed purchase prices in the Federal Register. This constituted the first formal step to implement the legislation, enacted in 1964, authorizing private ownership of special nuclear materials.

C. High energy physics program

The Joint Committee received from President Johnson on January 26, 1965, a report on Policy for National Action in the Field of High Energy Physics, prepared by the Atomic

Energy Commission in collaboration with other executive agencies, in response to the committee's 1964 request. The committee printed this report together with other background information in early February 1965 in preparation for its hearings on the U.S. high energy physics programs.

On March 2, 3, 4, and 5, 1965, the Subcommittee on Research, Development and Radiation held intensive open hearings on the objectives and needs of high energy physics. The leaders of high energy physics research—theoretical and experimental—testified before this committee during those hearings. In addition the committee heard a panel chaired by Dr. Frederick Seitz, President of the National Academy of Sciences, and including other eminent scientists from diverse fields discuss the Relation of High Energy Physics to Other Sciences, Education and Technology. One of the seven sessions of the high energy physics hearings was devoted to a discussion with Government witnesses on the organization for Management of Proposed Large Accelerators. Dr. Leland Haworth, Director, National Science Foundation; Dr. Donald F. Hornig, the President's Science Adviser; Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, AEC; and Dr. Gerald F. Tape, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, participated in this discussion.

D. Radiation processing of food

On June 9, and 10, 1965, the Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation held open hearings on radiation processing of food. The committee received information on the Government's research program being carried out by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense (U.S. Army). Special attention was directed toward the future program extending through the next 5-year period. In addition, representatives of industry testified concerning present and expected future applications of radiation processing of food products.

E. Federal Radiation Council protective action guides

On June 29 and 30, 1965, the Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation held open hearings on the protective action guides published by the Federal Radiation Council. Guides for iodine 131 were made public in August of 1964 and those for strontium 89, strontium 90, and cesium 137 were made public in May of this year. The technical bases for the guides were presented by a representative of the Federal Radiation Council and advisers who had assisted in the formulation of the guides. Testimony was received from Federal agencies which would become involved in the use of the guides should a contaminating situation develop. In addition, invited witnesses and those who had specifically requested an opportunity to appear presented their individual views on the usefulness of the Federal Radiation Council's protective action guides.

F. Development, growth, and state of the atomic energy industry

On August 10 and 11, 1965, the committee held open hearings on the development, growth, and state of the atomic energy industry, often referred to as the "202" hearings. Prior to 1964, annual hearings on this subject were required by law. As a result of an amendment to the Atomic Energy Act in that year, the holding of these hearings is now permissive and at the discretion of the committee. The last such hearings were held in 1963.

This year there was special emphasis placed on the civilian nuclear power program and the plans by private industry for expansion of the Nation's nuclear electric capacity. In addition industry representatives presented views on licensing procedures, plutonium technology, toll enrichment services, oceanographic applications, and the nuclear merchant ship program.

In a second phase of these hearings, on September 8, representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission provided their views on comments expressed by the industrial representatives during the earlier phase.

G. Confirmation of Presidential appointees

The Senate section of the Joint Committee met in public session on July 13, 1965, to consider the nomination of Mr. Verne B. Lewis to be Deputy U.S. Representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency. Mr. Lewis was nominated by the President on June 7, 1965, to fill the vacancy created by the transfer of Mr. Frank Hefner to other State Department duties. Mr. Lewis' nomination was reported favorably on July 13 by the Joint Committee and approved by the Senate on July 15, 1965.

The Senate section also confirmed Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, to be the representative of the United States of America to the Ninth General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The following-named persons were designated to be alternate representatives to the conference: Henry DeWolf Smyth, John Gorham Palfrey, James T. Ramey, Verne B. Lewis, and Kenneth Holum. These executive nominations were confirmed by the Senate on September 14, 1965.

IV. CLASSIFIED ACTIVITIES

In addition to the open hearings described in previous sections of this report, the Joint Committee conducted an extensive number of hearings in executive session on classified matters. These hearings covered a broad range of subjects related to the relationship of nuclear energy to the worldwide national defense and security interests of the United States. Highlights of the committee's executive hearings, and other classified activities, follow.

A. Intelligence briefings

On January 28, February 4, and June 16, 1965, the Joint Committee received intelligence briefings on recent developments affecting the field of atomic energy from Mr. John A. McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and Adm. William F. Raborn, his successor.

These meetings were a continuation of the regular practice of committee briefings by the CIA on vital matters affecting the security of the United States.

B. Weapons program and nuclear test ban treaty safeguards

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 requires that the development of the U.S. nuclear program be organized so at all times to make the maximum contribution to national security and the common defense. In pursuing this paramount objective, the Joint Committee has consistently paid utmost attention to the Commission's weapons program, the Department of Defense's activities in the nuclear weapons area and to all activities of the Federal Government relating to the limited nuclear test ban treaty safeguards.

On January 13, 1965, the Military Applications Subcommittee of the committee held executive sessions to receive testimony from the AEC and its weapons laboratories on U.S. nuclear weapons research, development, production, and test readiness programs. Among the witnesses heard were Commissioner Gerald Tape; General Delmar Crowson, AEC's Director of Military Applications; Dr. Norris Bradbury, Director, Los Alamos Weapons Laboratory; Dr. John Foster, Director, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory-Livermore, and Mrs. S. P. Schwartz, president, Sandia Corp.

In connection with its authorization hearings the committee held executive hearings February 3 and 4 on the AEC's weapons program and the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty safeguards. In addition to AEC witnesses, the committee received testimony from Mr. W. J. Howard, Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Atomic Energy); Lt. Gen. J. Donnelly, Director, Defense Atomic Support Agency; Dr. Robert Sproull and Dr. Robert Frosch, Director and Deputy Director, respectively, of the DOD's Advanced Research Projects Agency; and Maj. Gen. Jermain Rodenhauser, Director, Air Force Tactical Applications Center.

The four Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty safeguards proposed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff in connection with U.S. ratification of the treaty are so important to our national security that a yearly review by the Congress of their implementation is in order. This year combined executive hearings of the Joint Committee's Military Applications Subcommittee and the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee's Special Committee on Nuclear Safeguards were held on August 16, 17, 23, and September 2, 1965. The hearings were chaired by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON. Testimony was received from the AEC, the Directors of the AEC weapons laboratories, the Department of Defense, the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, and the Deputy Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. While the staffs monitor the implementation of the safeguards on a continuing basis, it is the intent of the committee to hold periodic hearings to review these safeguards.

In summary, during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, the committee held 11 executive hearings on the weapons program and the related Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty safeguards.

C. Safeguarding naval nuclear propulsion information

The Subcommittee on Security held executive hearings on January 26, 1965, to investigate the possible transfer of naval nuclear propulsion information and technology to foreign nations under commercial agreements with U.S. industrial firms concerning maritime nuclear propulsion technology. As a consequence of these hearings a special procedure for the review by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Departments of State and Defense of each such prospective commercial arrangements was instituted to assure that naval nuclear propulsion information and technology is not transferred under such commercial arrangements.

D. Special nuclear materials production

The production of enriched uranium, plutonium, and other nuclides for use in our Nation's military and civilian nuclear energy program represents a continuing and important national effort. The Joint Committee held three executive hearing sessions on February 3 and 4, in connection with the AEC's authorization bill, on the special nuclear materials production program. In addition to Chairman Seaborg and other AEC witnesses, testimony was received from Mr. W. J. Howard, Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Atomic Energy) on weapons requirements and their relationships to needs for nuclear materials.

E. SNAP program

During an executive information hearing on August 6, 1965, on the Systems for Nuclear Auxiliary Power (SNAP) program, the committee received an up-to-date assessment of plans of the AEC, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Defense Department for utilization of SNAP units in space applications, including the lunar probe. There was discussion of the potential uses of SNAP devices for the performance of DOD classified missions. Applications of isotopic heat, reactor heat (including thermionics), solar heat, and thermoelectric conversion systems were compared from the standpoint of efficiency, cost, and practicality.

F. Review of practices and procedures for protecting classified information by Government contractors

The Joint Committee staff has undertaken a study to review practices and procedures used to protect classified information by Government contractor personnel handling restricted data and formerly restricted data. The results of these studies will be published. This study, upon its completion in the latter part of 1965, will be used as a basis for providing the executive department with suggestions for improving security methods used for the protection of restricted data and formerly restricted data.

G. NATO agreement for cooperation regarding atomic information

On March 12, 1965, a NATO agreement for cooperation regarding atomic information, which superseded a 1955 NATO agreement, entered into force. During 1965 the Joint Committee followed progress in implementing this agreement quite closely. Several classified letters involving policy considerations concerning this new NATO agreement were exchanged with the Departments of Defense and State, as well as with the Atomic Energy Commission. Committee members and staff visited NATO installations in connection with this new agreement during April, August, and October 1965. Committee staff also visited NATO Headquarters and SHAPE (Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe) in Paris, France, in connection with NATO matters.

H. NATO multilateral force

The committee has closely followed developments in NATO with particular attention to the multilateral force (MLF) and the allied nuclear force (ANF) concepts. In this connection the chairman of the committee met with newly designated U.S. Ambassador to NATO, Harlan Cleveland, and Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer during a committee visit to NATO Headquarters and SHAPE in October. During this visit committee members and staff received a thorough briefing on the current U.S. position and projected planning regarding the possible creation of a multilateral entity within the NATO complex. Throughout the year the committee staff has held meetings with the State Department, Defense Department, and AEC on this subject.

V. OTHER ACTIVITIES

A. International Atomic Energy Agency Ninth General Conference

Four members of the committee, including Chairman HOLIFIELD, participated as official congressional advisers and observers in the Ninth General Conference of the IAEA, which was held in Tokyo, Japan, on September 21–28. This was the first year since the IAEA was founded in 1957 that a general conference was held away from the organization's headquarters in Vienna, Austria. The change in location was especially fitting in light of the increasingly worldwide responsibilities of the organization.

The development of an effective international safeguards system has been a major objective of U.S. policy in the international atomic energy field since the initiation of the atoms-for-peace program. This country, therefore, has been and continues to be a principal supporter of the International Atomic Energy Agency, one of whose major functions is to administer a system of inspections to guard against the diversion of fissionable materials for nonpeaceful purposes. In February of 1965 the Agency's Board of Governors adopted a resolution whereby it provisionally approved a revision of the IAEA safeguards system. This improved system, which is applicable to power reactors as well as research reactors, was endorsed by the Ninth General Conference.

Desalination is another field in which the IAEA is expected to make a significant contribution. The Ninth General Conference of the organization supported a move to initiate a study of means whereby the Agency might play an increasingly useful role in desalting.

B. International atomic energy conference on plasma physics and controlled nuclear fusion research

A staff member of the committee participated as a member of the U.S. delegation to the IAEA's Conference on Plasma Physics and Controlled Nuclear Fusion Research. This Conference was held at the Culham Laboratory in the United Kingdom during the period September 6–10, 1965. The multinational conference was devoted to the technical aspects of experiments designed to study the behavior of plasma (ionized gases) at temperatures and densities approaching that necessary to achieve controlled and sustainable thermonuclear power. Progress is being made in the understanding of the problems associated with the confinements of very hot plasmas.

C. Disarmament negotiations

On May 10 and September 2, 1965, the Joint Committee held hearings on activities under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The September 2 session dealt principally with negotiations which were in progress at that time at the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva.

Committee members and staff attended several of the sessions of the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference held in Geneva during August. For additional information relating to the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty safeguards program, see section IV B., above.

D. Inspection visits

1. The committee members and staff continued their practice of obtaining firsthand information by visiting various Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Defense, and U.S. Government contractor installations in the United States. During the 1st session, 89th Congress, visits were made to the following facilities, among others:

Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, Ill.

Bendix Corp., Washington, D.C.

Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton (Long Island), N.Y.

Cambridge Electron Accelerator, Cambridge, Mass.

Connecticut Advanced Nuclear Engineering Laboratory, Middletown, Conn.

Hudson Institute, New York, N.Y.

Large Aperture Seismic Array, Billings, Mont.

Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Berkeley and Livermore, Calif.

Lockheed Space Systems Division, Sunnyvale, Calif.

Nevada Test Site, Nevada.

Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Wash.

Punta Higuera, Puerto Rico.

Research Analysis Corp., McLean, Va.

Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Palo Alto, Calif.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif.

In addition, committee staff observed reactor licensing hearings conducted by Atomic Safety and Licensing Boards of the Atomic Energy Commission at Los Angeles, Calif., and Oswego, N.Y., in the following proceedings:

In the matter of Department of Water and Power, City of Los Angeles (Malibu Reactor).

In the matter of Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. (Nine Mile Point reactor).

2. Committee members and staff visited the following installations abroad involving atomic energy activities:

Government of India atomic energy establishment facilities, Trombay, India.

National Tsing Hua University, Institute of Nuclear Science, Hsin Chu, Taiwan, Republic of China.

Soreq research establishment, Nahal Soreq, Israel.

Tarapur atomic power project, Tarapur, India.

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay, India.

United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority installations at Calder Hall, Windscale, Aldermaston, Culham, Harwell, and Foulness in England. Other United Kingdom research establishments visited were: Daresbury Nuclear Physics Laboratory, Lancashire; Royal Aircraft Establishment, Farnborough; and Rutherford High Energy Laboratory, Berkshire.

Visits to a number of classified sites abroad were also made by committee members and staff, including NATO installations and the Holy Loch nuclear submarine base in Scotland.

The Edward Partin Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of adjournment of the 1st session of the 89th Congress, one of my esteemed colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY], brought a very serious matter to the attention of the House.

This pertained to the protective cloak in which the Department of Justice has wrapped Edward Grady Partin, a self-confessed informer who was faced with three lifetime jail sentences at the time he volunteered to help the Department of Justice "get" the president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

The information we have been given leaves little doubt that the Justice Department, in its drive to nail Mr. Hoffa, is sacrificing the public interest by supporting and defending its anti-Hoffa witness, Edward Partin. In return for the extensive testimony furnished by Partin, it appears the Department is shielding him and absolving him of his wrongdoings. Are we to infer from this that a criminal can avoid prosecution by turning himself in as a Government witness?

Mr. Speaker, the questions raised in connection with the handling of the Partin matter are very serious indeed, and immediate action should be taken by the responsible congressional committee to investigate the charges of favoritism and privileged treatment by the Justice Department in cases of criminal offenders who are under indictment.

The guilt or innocence of Mr. Hoffa, on the various charges of wrongdoing, is not for me to judge. But if he is found guilty of wrongdoing, he should not be exonerated. Why, then, should a witness who has been under indictment on 26 counts of violation of the provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act, be exonerated? Why should the taxpayers foot the bill for the expense of U.S. marshals who must constantly attend Edward Partin while he is free to carry on his private and perhaps questionable pursuits in Alabama? Does Partin's role as an informant and anti-Hoffa witness absolve his crimes? Apparently, the Justice Department thinks so, and it is time the Congress probed into the policies and procedures of the Department in these matters.

The Record the Administration Doesn't Talk About

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. **ASHBROOK**. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal about the accomplishments of this administration and the 89th Congress. There were many accomplishments and I was happy to do my part in writing a record which could be classified as great in the field of conservation, air and water pollution, and other areas. Yet, an honest look at the 89th Congress and the Johnson administration gives some cause for thought. I am reminded of a statement Mark Twain made at one time. He said that the Bible gave him some concern and doubts. He added that his real problem came from the fact that these doubts came from the part he understood and not from those he did not understand. When you understand what this administration is trying to accomplish with the virtual "yes, sir" approval of a rubberstamp suppliant Congress, you can well have cause for concern and doubt.

There was little real effort to get to the root of our many problems but instead this Democrat administration and Congress persist in their traditional approach of setting up bureaucratic agencies, delegating broad authority, and furnishing billions of the taxpayers' dollars. Poverty, unemployment, agriculture, and metropolitan areas are but a few of the areas of legislative concern where we see the same patchwork quilt approach which did little but add to the problem. In the case of the poverty program, for example, no area in recent years has been shown to be so poorly administered, so politically inspired, and so top heavy with bureaucracy and yet the Congress continued this travesty on commonsense and doubled the appropriation to almost $2 billion. In the area of farm legislation, no real effort was made to correct the many problems facing the farm family. Instead, the same bureaucractic approach of forcing programs on the backs of the farmers and taxpayers—programs that the farmers had rejected in their referendum—was continued. Controls have been extended in sugar and coffee legislation and the consumer and taxpayer must pay for it.

One of the prime areas where we see this administration and rubberstamp Congress turning a deaf ear is in the vital area of trade balances, foreign imports, and dumping of foreign products in the United States of America. Our distressing trade policy is a hodge-podge of inconsistencies, fumbling, and generosity which again must be paid for by the businessman, the worker, the farmer, and the taxpayer. President Johnson and his Congress act as if this is no problem and increase the quotas for the dumping of residual oil into the country, thus depriving thousands of coal miners of their jobs and bestowing an economic bonanza on foreign nations who often desert us when we fight the Communists in Vietnam or the United Nations.

All in all, the approach of this administration and Congress has been one which should cause grave concern and doubts. In the face of economic difficulties they voted to increase the national debt ceiling, spent at unprecedented levels, stretched the arm of bureaucratic control over more and more of the private and free sector of our economy, started us on the road to devaluing our currency, added tens of thousands to the Federal payroll and forwarded the concept of a socialistic federal government to answer all of mankind's ills.

A LOOK AT THE RECORDS

It is usual for the administration spokesmen to point out the record prosperity that we have with figures citing the gross national product, profits, employment, and so forth. No one would argue with the fact that many of these records do indicate unprecedented prosperity. However, there is the expedient standard utilized which points out only the good side and minimizes the other factors which should be taken into consideration. Basic to all of these considerations is the fact that this administration is hopelessly embarked on an uncharted course into fiscal irresponsibility with mounting deficits and an increased inability to constitutionally balance the Federal budget. Appropriations this year passed the $119 billion mark and in many cases multibillion dollar programs have gotten only meager appropriations now which will explode like a time bomb in mushrooming the budget in the future. Let us look at a few of the records which the Johnson administration does not care to talk about:

The national debt reached a record high, standing at $317.6 billion at the end of fiscal year 1965.

The 1st session of the 89th Congress has appropriated more money than any earlier Congress, except in time of world war. Appropriations this year total $119.3 billion, $36 billion more than the last Eisenhower Congress in 1960.

The gold holdings of the Federal Government reached a record low in August 1965 when they amounted to $13.9 billion, down $1.5 billion since the end of 1964.

The cost of living reached a record high in July 1965, when the Consumers' Price Index was 110.2—1957-59=100.

During the second quarter of 1965 total spending by the Federal Government reached a record high except in time of world war, rising to $120.8 billion at an annual rate.

The wholesale price index hit a record high in September 1965, rising to 103.7—1957-59=100—3 percent above the level of December 1964.

Consumer debt reached a record high in July of 1965 at a level of almost $81 billion.

Nonfarm mortgage debt stands at a record high, in excess of $200 billion.

Nonfarm mortgage foreclosures at more than 108,000 homes in 1964 were at a record high since 1938. Nineteen hundred and sixty-five foreclosures are higher. The second quarter of 1965 was 6 percent above the second quarter of 1964.

Strikes in August 1965 idled 220,000 workers who lost 2.3 million man-days of employment, the highest record since 1959.

Crime keeps setting new records, rising 5 percent above the 1964 rate for the first half of 1965. In 1964 serious crimes were 13 percent higher than 1963. Since 1958 serious crime has increased 6 times as fast as the growth of population.

Farm debt, up nearly 50 percent since 1961, stands at a record high. Expenditures of the Department of Agriculture are at a record high. The number of employees of the Department is at a record high.

Public assistance payments by Government reached an all-time high of $5.1 billion in 1964.

Columnist David Lawrence hit the nail on the head in his recent column when he wrote:

> It's natural for an administration which has behind it a rubberstamp Congress to try to brainwash the public by boasting about the quantity of bills passed. But it's not the quantity of laws enacted or the vast amounts of taxpayers' money spent that counts—it's the quality of the legislation and what the American people will get in return. The principal fault of the Congress which has just completed its first session was the indifference shown to waste and to the need for safeguarding the people's interest against political corruption.

Mr. Lawrence went on to point out that one of the persistent mistakes of the 89th Congres was to hastily enact programs in the field of welfare—medicare, poverty, education—and choose the wrong way rather than the right way to solve the problem. As he put it:

> Haste is too often rationalized as at least getting a start on reforms which, it is argued, have too long been neglected.

This is the usual liberal argument that the ends justify the means and pork barrel tactics pour so much money out that the shortcomings of the program are not seen right away. Take medicare for example. A course was chosen which will bring compulsory medical control and will foster dependency rather than encourage self-reliance. I was one of those who advocated programs which would be far more successful and comprehensive while at the same time avoiding big government and the socialistic concept of dependency. By simply spending billions of dollars, however, some good will result and the flaws will not be seen until we are well down the road that the Federal bureaucrats are taking us.

A DO-NOTHING CONGRESS?

Mr. Lawrence went on to sum up this Congress by saying it might just as aptly be called a do-nothing Congress as those generous descriptions affixed by the advocates of big government and deficit spending. Some of the areas where the Congress failed are:

Congress did nothing to curb or stop the rise of serious crime in America.

Congress did nothing to stop the irresponsible spending of billions of dollars of taxpayers' money as the purchasing power of the dollar steadily weakened.

Congress did nothing to halt the reckless misuse of union power in the industrial field.

Congress did nothing to stop the use of the strike weapon as a means of demoralizing an industry, forcing higher prices and causing the shutdown of factories and plants because of artificially imposed costs by labor organizations.

Congress did nothing to protect the rights of companies in the free-enterprise system to carry out management functions. It permitted instead the use of boycotts and picket lines to paralyze many a business which did not conform to union demands.

Congress did nothing to curtail the abuses that are going on abroad in the foreign aid program.

Congress did nothing about trading with the enemy. Although Congress has the power to make war in Vietnam, it did not insist that all countries aiding the Communists in southeast Asia should not be given the benefits of world trade.

Congress did nothing to prevent injustices against public school systems which are punished because they do not obey arbitrarily phrased edicts of the Federal Government.

Congress did nothing to straighten out the long-overdue overlapping in tax systems between the Federal and local governments.

Congress, although it investigated the Ku Klux Klan, did nothing about investigating the activities on the campuses of many colleges and universities where Communist subversion has appeared in incipient stages.

Congress did nothing about a code of ethics that should govern all Federal employees.

Congress did nothing to curb the power of labor unions to stop American ships from going to foreign countries, to halt railroad trains and to paralyze the operations of our major industries.

I might add that the Congress did nothing to aid wheat farmers in Ohio who are still unjustly treated by lumping our Soft Red Winter wheat in with the quotas of Western wheat. Our wheat is not and has not been in surplus, but the Department of Agriculture continues the arbitrary controls which adversely affect our farmers.

Congress did nothing about Communist Cuba which is a threat to the Western Hemisphere. Despite all evidence to the contrary, this administration insists that Cuba is not a base for subversion.

Congress and the administration did nothing about establishing a freedom academy to direct our efforts toward developing effective world leadership to challenge Communist political and ideological advances throughout the world.

The Congress did not take action on an issue which evinced tremendous public interest this year; namely, apportionment. As of early November of this year 30 State legislatures had requested a constitutional amendment to reverse the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision requiring both houses of a State legislature to be apportioned by population only. In contrast, not one entire legislature of any State approved the Supreme Court's ruling, with one house only in both the Illinois and New York Legislatures in agreement with the Supreme Court. In the face of such public interest in this issue, pressure maneuvers from the White House were curiously missing.

States such as my own State of Ohio have been forced to reapportion because of a failure to act on Republican proposals such as the Dirksen amendment. I sponsored such a proposal. The Democrat platforms at the national level and in Ohio expressed their support of the Supreme Court decision, and thus many counties in my State will lose their own representative because of this failure to act and restore to States their constitutional right to determine the composition of their own legislative bodies.

Congress failed to act on legislation which would have removed the cloud which currently hangs over the entire matter of prayer in public schools. It can readily be seen that we failed to act in about as many areas as we acted. This was due in large part to reverse arm twisting. Not only is this accomplished to achieve the passage of desired legislation, it is also used to block reforms which are badly needed but are not desired by the White House.

This administration has not satisfied school officials that national legislation affecting primary and secondary schools will not increase Federal jurisdiction over local schools. Dr. William Elena, associate secretary of the American Association of School Administrators, who has talked to at least 5,000 school superintendents in the past 4 months, described their reaction to the new law as "troubled and uncertain." According to Dr. Elena some school administrators seeking information at the U.S. Office of Education here in Washington "have been treated very shabbily," and the new people at USOE delegated to write the new rules and regulations are "people who have never had a day's experience in school administration." In addition, Dr. Elena stated the school administrators are concerned lest Federal funds for textbooks and library materials, provided in the new law, lead to federally dictated content.

ATTITUDE IS EXAMINED

Yes, you can readily see that there is another side to the story. As much as anything else, the attitude of our leaders is one which should cause concern. Constitutional checks and balances are scoffed at and this administration believes that it has a mandate to rewrite any of our basic concepts that it chooses. U.S. Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel has embarked on a massive Federal control of education and has asserted that education is too important to leave to the educators or local boards of education. Probably the best indication of this attitude was the announcement by President Johnson at the end of the session that he didn't like a law passed by the Congress and although he signed it he would not observe it. We passed a bill authorizing $2 billion for public works projects but stipulated that no money should be used to construct, operate, or maintain future water-resource projects costing under $10 million without specific approval of the Public Works Committees in the House and the Senate. Most leaders would have said they wanted it changed by the next Congress or request a court test. Mr. Johnson simply said he would pay no attention to it.

If this was the attitude of the Executive, the attitude of the Congress was one of subservience to the President. From the first major issue in January when the Congress retreated from its position of cutting off aid to Nasser after Presidential arm twisting to one of the last measures in the session when we junked comparability for Federal employee compensation after White House pressure, the story was the same. What Lyndon wanted, Lyndon got. Public opinion was against the repeal of 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law but it was rammed through the House of Representatives anyway. Only the unlimited debate rules in the Senate have staved off this payoff to the labor bosses who played such an important part in the election of the rubberstamp Congress in 1964. A Representative is supposed to have as his first interest, the public interest and that of his own constituency in particular. This is an outmoded concept in the Great Society where the first interest is to "Amen" every Presidential request.

This attitude which has developed is a serious one. Politics is treated not as a vehicle for public service or statesmanship but as a mechanism to gain power. When power is achieved, the public interest counts for naught. Cronyism is the first rule—reward your own. We saw this attitude very clearly in the appointment of Abe Fortas to the Supreme Court. Mr. Fortas was known in Washington not for his legal ability but as the President's fixer. Francis X. Morrissey was nominated for one of the most important positions which can be bestowed on a citizen, that of Federal district judge. The judiciary committee of the American Bar Association described Morrissey's fitness for the office as the "worst qualified judicial candidate" it had ever encountered. He had little to offer except the devotion of a political hack to his sponsors. This was one of the most brazen efforts to cram a political appointee down the throats of the American people that has ever been witnessed.

INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS SCOFFED

The attitude of big, benevolent government has its other side, too. The people's individual rights count for less all of the time. We see the Post Office Department using mail cover to open first-class mail and inspect its contents; wiretapping and even eavesdropping on the privileged conversations between a lawyer and his client; polygraph tests administered to applicants for Federal positions; brainpicking tests which are given without parental consent to our schoolchildren under Federal directive. All of these encroachments are the inevitable consequence of power hungry bureaucrats and a Federal Government which now believes it is the master and not the servant of the people. Congress did little to challenge these intrusions into individual privacy and right.

Secretary McNamara continued his heavyhanded treatment of National Guard and Reserve units. His policies brought the resignation of two of our most outstanding admirals, William A. Brockett and Charles A. Curtze, who opposed his arbitrary policies. The morale in the services has come to the worst stage that military men can remember in the history of the 20th century. Rubberstamp Congressmen are easier to find than rubberstamp admirals and generals, and we see a struggle in the Defense Department which jeopardizes our national preparedness.

Yes, this Congress had some noteworthy accomplishments. We should be thankful for these. At the same time it embarked on the uncharted course of increased reliance on deficit spending, cheapened currency and more bureaucracy. As usual the liberal Democrats place an overreliance on Federal controls and overspending. It should be our goal to think more about the future of our Nation than the next election. Spending and giveaway programs have wide public appeal and there is little glamor in working to preserve our constitutional system and achieve fiscal sanity. Again, David Lawrence puts the question well. He noted:

> Congress must go before the people again in just a year. Will the American people be sufficiently informed by that time to repudiate those Members of the National Legislature who have been profligate with the people's money? That's the billion-dollar question.

The outcome of this election, Mr. Speaker, is far more than a billion-dollar question. The outcome is the future of this country and whether we will have checks and balances, our free enterprise system and a limited government responsive to the needs of the people. Clearly, we need to examine what we are doing and where we are heading.

Treatment Afforded Edward Partin by Justice Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have read with interest and concern the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] concerning the treatment afforded Edward Grady Partin by the Justice Department in connection with Partin's testimony against James Hoffa.

The statements are shocking and I agree that the Congress should investigate the matter thoroughly. Public confidence in the administration of justice in this country will be seriously undermined if we fail to do so.

Profiles in Wyoming Greatness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of Wyoming's 75th anniversary of statehood, I am happy to present the capstone in my series of profiles of Wyoming citizens.

TRACY S. M'CRAKEN

Wyoming's most successful newspaperman, a classic example of the best of the Horatio Alger tradition, builder of a publishing empire and a dominant figure of the Democratic Party of his State for nearly three decades—such was Tracy Stephenson McCraken. He was the youngest of six children born to a family of modest means. His father was well into the fifties when Tracy was born, March 11, 1894, in Evanston, Ill. He graduated from high school in Belvidere, Ill. Determined to earn a college education, he worked through the summer months to save the fare for a train ride to Laramie, Wyo., where he was met at the railroad station by a few other transplanted Illinois natives including his older brother, Harry.

Many of the stories surrounding McCraken's 30 years at the University of Wyoming are now so apocryphal that to separate fiction from fact must be left to less partial and more leisurely students than I. Suffice to say, he managed to stay in school by working at odd jobs around the campus, including a part-time stint as a reporter for the Laramie Boomerang.

In 1917, he was graduated from the university and then joined the Army as a private in an infantry division. Later he attended officers candidate school and was discharged as a first lieutenant. Returning to Laramie following World War I, he was named manager of the Laramie newspaper, a position he held until he left to join the staff of Wyoming's Gov. William B. Ross as executive secretary. He left Wyoming for Washington and a new job as secretary to the late Senator John B. Kendrick.

In 1919 in Laramie, he married the former Lillian Davis, a native of Ohio, who also had attended the University of Wyoming and then was teaching school in Rawlins. The couple had two sons, Robert and William.

THE "M-O-M"

During these years he also formed the first friendships with a young Boston Irish transplant to Wyoming, Joseph C. O'Mahoney, and with a native Wyomingite, Leslie A. Miller, all of whom were the "young men in a hurry" of their generation. O'Mahoney was later to become one of Wyoming's most distinguished Senators and Miller one of its most able Governors.

McCraken paid a visit to Cheyenne in 1925 at the suggestion of Senator Kendrick in order to look at a sick weekly newspaper in Cheyenne, which was at the time the only newspaper in the State with a Democratic editorial policy. In order to keep it alive, he borrowed $3,000 from the late John D. Clark. This served as his base capital investment in the weekly Eagle. McCraken himself told the story of his first month as a publisher. To meet the overhead, he sold advertising at a furious clip. How pleased he was to gather a handful of statements and go out collecting what promised to be a healthy gross. Instead of money he found most businessmen had in their cash registers "advertising script" which, completely unknown to him, had been passed out by his predecessor. Thus, in place of cash after his first month's operation, Tracy had a pocketful of useless paper.

THE EARLY EAGLE

Located in a small office above what is Roedel's Drugstore in Cheyenne, McCraken and one printer worked feverishly through 18-hour days to nurse the sick publication into the State's dominant weekly. Often the tiny press literally had to be held together with paper clips and bailing wire. With the help of a vital and dedicated assistant, O. D. Koerfer, he turned the weekly into a 5-day-a-week daily during the depression's darkest hours. Five years later, in 1937, he merged the Eagle with the opposition evening paper, the Wyoming State Tribune, which he acquired that year.

His other publishing interests included associations to publish a daily at Rock Springs in 1931, at Worland in 1938, at Laramie in the 1930's, and at Rawlins in 1946. He had also been a partner in various other weeklies throughout Wyoming in the early 1930's. In addition to six daily newspapers and a monthly farm magazine, the Wyoming Stockman Farmer, McCraken pioneered television in Wyoming and was also the owner of several of its early radio stations.

A LEADER IN EDUCATION

McCraken's outstanding contribution to the young people of Wyoming was his lifetime dedication to the University of Wyoming. He served for nearly two decades on the university's board of trustees and was at one time its president. He founded scholarships for worthy students. He received the university alumnus award for outstanding and original achievements in 1956 and was awarded the University of Wyoming's highest honor—an honorary doctor of law degree in 1960.

A WISE AND PRACTICAL POLITICAL LEADER

McCraken succeeded the late Joseph C. O'Mahoney as secretary to Senator Kendrick. He was State Democratic national committeeman from 1942 to 1960. His last year in that post brought him one of his great triumphs. At the Los Angeles Democratic National Convention in July of 1960, as chairman of the Wyoming delegation he cast Wyoming's votes which nominated the late John F. Kennedy for President. During the last days of his life he was offered an appointment to the U.S. Senate which he declined saying:

> I would rather be a newspaperman.

Often the object of inevitable backlash to one of his means, power, and talent, he was nevertheless deeply admired by his associates and most of his adversaries for his acumen, for his dynamic personality, for his delightful sense of humor, and for his dedicated love of the State of Wyoming and its economic well-being.

This latter affair, I believe, he put ahead of all else, for he felt his responsibility to his fellow citizens of Wyoming was a preservation of a healthy climate in which to live, a business community in which to prosper, and a State of which all could be proud.

During the last 30 years he was a close personal acquaintance and a confidant of several Presidents of the United States, of many prominent business and professional leaders, and of nationally prominent politicians from both parties.

MY BOSS AT 14

Tracy was intensely loyal to those who reached positions of importance in his own organization and also proud of the fact that many of his top employees started well down the ladder. He was on a first-name basis with everyone he knew and his door was always open to workers, visitors, salesmen, and to anyone else with the ambition and drive to improve their lot in life. For several decades he wrote a weekly column for the Wyoming Eagle, and I am in hopes a collection of his writings someday will be published.

I was honored and privileged to be an employee in his organization from time to time from my 14th year on earth. This association, which meant so much to me and helped shape my career, lasted until his death on December 26, 1960.

Communists See Victory in U.S. Peace Demonstrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the Communist plan to defeat the United States in Vietnam has been well documented by Maj. Gen. Song Hao, the political head of Ho Chi Minh's army. In an article in a North Vietnamese journal General Hao says that when the going gets tough U.S. public clamor will force Washington to give up. Hao says:

> The movement (in America) to protest the war in Vietnam is growing in size and intensity.

COMMUNISTS COULD USE "JUDAS GOATS" TO ACHIEVE TAKEOVER

Communist hopes for victory follow a plan in which "Judas goats" would lead those who are free to defect from freedom. So-called students and Communist stooges here and abroad would lead the lambs in anti-American demonstrations; they would downgrade the United States in the eyes of the world and would shake the confidence and faith of our own citizens in our democratic way of life.

China's Communist overlords make no secret of their aims and strategies. Lin Piao, vice chairman of the Communist Party Central Committee and Minister of National Defense, in a recent speech, says:

> The struggle of the Vietnamese people against U.S. aggression and for national salvation is now the focus of the struggle of the people of the world against U.S. aggression * * *. Like a vicious wolf, it is bullying and enslaving various peoples * * *. At present the main battlefield of the fierce struggle between the people of the world on the one side and the U.S. imperialism and its lackeys is the vast area of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

COMMUNIST SUBVERSION AND FEAR USED TO WIN GOALS

These demonstrations are fiendishly clever facets in the Communist technique of launching a campaign of subversion and fear, both mental and physical, hoping to gain by this method a victory unobtainable by their economic or military strength. Fear is being used in South Vietnam where Communists have murdered about half of the village mayors. They also have murdered 14 of the village mayors in Thailand. It is the same in the Congo, where there is a concerted effort to murder all people who have sufficient ability and education to build a free society. These actions are reminiscent of the Red murder of 5 million kulaks, the educated and the economic and political leaders, in the Ukraine by Lenin, and of the Katyn Forest massacre of the cream of the Polish Army in World War II.

For the Communist Vietcong to achieve their goals of a complete takeover of southeast Asia, and particularly Vietnam, it has become necessary for them to defeat the U.S. forces in that area. At the earlier stages of the war, the Vietcong boasted of their victories and of their military successes against both the Vietnamese and the United States. When the United States commenced air attacks on North Vietnam in February 1965, the Communist propaganda began changing from the accounts of military successes to bragging about antiwar protests and marches within the United States.

Just 48 hours after the first air attack on North Vietnam by the United States on February 9, 1965, the great anti-American propaganda riots were launched against the American Embassy in Moscow. In this riot, students under the direction of the Government threw bricks and ink against the Embassy, and destroyed several Embassy cars. It was rather ludicrous, however, that before this "spontaneous" riot, the Embassy was called and told to keep personnel away from the Embassy windows, so that no one would be hurt.

This is reminiscent of an experience a few years ago in Bucharest, Rumania, where a similar but small scale anti-American riot was staged. Government trucks hauled up stone and bricks and dumped them near the American Embassy and the next day returned, hauling the "spontaneous" student demonstrators to throw the stones.

ANTI-AMERICAN RIOTS ARE SIMILAR

After the Moscow anti-American demonstrations, similar riots were staged in other Communist countries and by Communist groups in other countries in Asia and Africa. The United States did not react to these riots as the Communists may have expected, but accelerated its attacks against the Vietcong. Russia and China and other Communist countries made many threats of violence against the United States unless it withdrew, but we kept up our military pressure on the Vietcong.

Then the so-called American student demonstrations began for the same avowed purpose as the Moscow demonstrations; namely, to force the United States to withdraw from Vietnam. To try to accomplish this, some American professors and student groups have publicly expressed their desires that the Vietcong should win over American forces. They have sent money to the Vietcong, and have attempted to stop American troop trains; they have held teach-ins at which our foreign policy and our leaders are held up to scorn and ridicule; they have burned their draft cards, and have held in the past and plan for the future, protest marches on Washington.

The Communists see in these demonstrations a weakness and breakdown of the morale in the United States. Such is not the case; but this false appearance of weakness in the United States could well encourage the Communists to believe that the United States will capitulate. Therefore, the acts of these demonstrators could easily lead to a vast expansion of the war which they say they are attempting to stop.

These demonstrators express little interest in or sympathy for the South Vietnamese who have been murdered, tortured, and displaced by the invading Vietcong; nor for those Americans killed in combat at a time when it appeared we were losing the war. Now that we are returning blow for blow, these riots abroad and the demonstrations at home are being waged at an increasing tempo seeking to frighten and deter the United States and to cause us to capitulate to the Communists, giving them a victory which they could never hope to gain by military strength.

We hear the constant refrain, "We should negotiate, not fight" and that we must have a "political instead of a military solution for Vietnam." Both of these suggestions, if they were possible and could be achieved with justice, are infinitely preferable to war. However, even the most naive should realize that such solutions are dependent upon the willingness of the Communist nations backing the Vietcong to negotiate and the degree of dependence we can put in the outcome of any negotiations. The Vietcong absolutely refuses to negotiate, relying on the belief that the United States will capitulate. These so-called peace demonstrators who are demanding U.S. withdrawal and then a second Geneva conference disregard the fact that if the Vietcong would obey the Geneva conference of 1954 and withdraw north of the 17th parallel as they agreed, then the war would be ended.

RED CHINESE AND NORTH VIETNAMESE NEWSPAPERS EMPHASIZE U.S. ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATIONS

On my desk are translations from official publications of the Red Chinese and North Vietnamese Communist Parties. These translations clearly indicate that, as the United States increases its forces in Vietnam and moves from the defensive to the offensive, the press in North Vietnam discusses the actual military operation less and less but increases its forebodings of the discontent and breakdown of the war effort within the United States itself.

Two newspapers, Peoples Daily of Peiping, China, and Nhan Dan of North Vietnam, carry the same propaganda line as does the Communist mouthpiece in the United States, the Worker—formerly the Daily Worker. Peoples World—the Communist publication of the Pacific coast; Pravda, the New China News Agency International Service, and the Hanoi radio publicize American teach-ins and antiwar demonstrations almost simultaneous with their happening.

To those who have had little experience with Russia or China and know little of their history and people, these happenings seem frightening and confusing. However, after a close scrutiny of the patterns of aggression of Russia and China, even for centuries before Lenin and Stalin were born, their current actions would cause no surprise.

In the extensive study and research which I did for the writing of "Russian Frontiers: From Muscovy to Khrushchev," I traced the pattern of aggression through the centuries as Russia grew from the small principality of Muscovy to the tremendous empire that it is today. Time after time I saw Russia win by threats, broken promises, chicanery, and subversion when their armies could not accomplish the goal.

Russia, China, and Japan have made great use of the military strategy set out by Sun Tzu, a Chinese military writer and general of 25 centuries ago. Typical statements of Sun Tzu are:

> All warfare is based on deception. Hence, when able to attack we must seem unable. When using our forces we must seem inactive. When near, we must make them believe that we are far away; when far away, we must make them believe that we are near.
>
> As the water avoids the high and seeks the low, so should you avoid the strong and strike the weak.

DECEIT AND DUPLICITY ARE WEAPONS COMMON TO COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

Deceit and duplicity are considered with pride by the Communists, as suggested in statements from Stalin:

> Words must have no relation to action—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask of concealment of bad deeds.

Lenin is reputed to have said:

> Push out your bayonets. If you strike steel, pull back. If you strike soft flesh, push, push hard.

Truong Chinh, a North Vietnamese leader, wrote "A Primer for Revolt," in 1946, which is probably the best treatise on the theory of guerrilla warfare that has ever been written. It is far superior to the relatively unimaginative works by Mao Tse-tung on the same subject. The teachings of this book clearly were used by Gen. Nguyen Giap, the North Vietnamese general who, in 1954, captured Dienbienphu. Perhaps if the French military leaders had studied "A Primer for Revolt," the results of the fiasco at Dienbienphu would have been different. General Giap, who at one time was a French history professor, is today in overall command of the Vietcong forces and is still following the philosophy so well depicted in "A Primer for Revolt."

STUDY TO KNOW THE ENEMY

Perhaps one of the most constructive things our leaders can do is to study "A Primer for Revolt" and all such works that set out the philosophy, military techniques, and historical background of our enemies and our potential enemies. We do have military teams making such studies, but they need to be done in greater detail and depth. In addition it behooves the American public to acquaint themselves with the philosophies and the methodology of our enemies. Then we would understand the happenings and would not allow a few loud-mouthed students and professors to shake our faith in democracy and the American way of life.

The United States, Britain, and France refused to believe "Mein Kampf," in which Hitler clearly explained his plans, and thereby allowed him to almost destroy the world. Our failure to understand Stalin's designs during and after World War II, of which only a casual study would have alerted us, allowed Russia to take over all of Eastern and much of Central Europe during the conferences at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

WAGING THE COLD WAR YEAR AFTER YEAR IS USED TO WEAR DOWN OUR RESISTANCE

We need to keep ever in mind, however, that when we win in Vietnam, the Communists will still cause us trouble in Berlin, in Cuba, in the Dominican Republic, in the Congo, and scores of other places at home and abroad. And we should keep in mind that when communism is gone, the oncoming would-be tyrants will devise other methods to enslave men. We must realize that we are still engaged in a cold war that will go on. We do not like the cold war; but we can rise above it in strength and courage and fortitude. One of our great daily papers expressed it thus:

> Americans must realize that the Soviet method is to confuse, divide, and frighten us into accepting their aims and claims when there is no real reason why we should do so. Step by step, year by year, they try to wear down our nerves until we will finally say wearily, "All right, we have had enough. Go ahead and do with us as you will." The slogan will become, "I'd rather be Red than dead."

Unless the American people can understand the real reasons and the goals of our enemy, they will find it all most confusing and upsetting. The weak-hearted may be willing to yield to Communist demands and surrender the freedom of ourselves and our friends, when such surrender is totally unnecessary.

ONLY THE STRONG AND THE BRAVE CAN KEEP REAL FREEDOM

If the United States were willing to bow to the will of the Communist design, we could at least temporarily stop anti-American demonstrations and fighting. If we were willing to pay the price that such activities would entail, we could surrender freedom to Communist aggression on behalf of ourselves, our friends, and our allies. That is the action that the Kremlin and Peiping are planning for us to take. Surrender has been the escape for countless peoples throughout the ages, but thinking Americans know that no civilization has gained by surrender to the tyrant who would "climb on human hearts to reach thrones" whether Nazi, Fascist, Communist, or the thousands of tyrants or would-be tyrants who lived centuries before such names were invented.

We must keep ever before us the lessons of history. There have been only brief periods in history when tyrants, either by force or honeyed promises, were not destroying or attempting to destroy the freedom of man. It also is true that all civilizations that were destroyed were probably lost because of a weakness and decay from within that allowed the tyrant to destroy their freedom.

Freedom is the priceless heritage of man, but it can be enjoyed only by the brave and strong of heart who are willing to maintain a constant vigil and who are ready to fight for freedom if the need arises.

Polish Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on November 11, 1918, an armistice was signed which formally ended World War I. On this day 47 years ago, the German occupation forces were expelled from Poland and the Polish Government reinstated in Warsaw.

This important date in history is remembered by Polish-Americans and free Poles the world over as Polish Independence Day. It is a time when we should all stop and remember the courage displayed by the people of this beleaguered nation, the strength they have shown, and the suffering they have endured since 1918.

In terms of change, the years since World War I seem to us to be an eternity. Another and even greater war shook Poland and the very foundations of the world, strengthening those forces which were set in motion by the first war and which have shaped the world of 1965. Freedom and tyranny, democracy and totalitarianism emerged as the two great opposing forces.

The annals of modern Polish history record the struggle for independence and the devotion to freedom of a strong and courageous people. Because of her strategic geographical location, Poland has necessarily been involved in the great power struggles and has had to endure onslaughts from both sides. And because she has resisted and refused to submit easily to foreign domination, her people have been subjected to greater suffering beyond the battlefield.

Invaded and occupied by German Nazi forces, the battles waged by freedom-loving Poles in Warsaw and elsewhere remain an inspiration to opponents of oppression. Those who protested the postwar occupation by the Red army and the establishment of a Soviet puppet regime were brutally silenced, but they were not forgotten.

Only the sudden arrival in Warsaw of Moscow's highest officials and the threatening advance of Soviet troops prevented an upheaval in 1956 as dramatic and tragic as that which took place in Hungary a few weeks later. Since then, any slight relaxation of Government control has resulted in great rumblings of protest and dissatisfaction with the existing order and an expressed desire for freedom from Kremlin control.

Thus, this day is doubly significant for our Polish-American population—on the same day that the United States pays highest tribute to the thousands of American veterans who have given their lives for the cause of democracy and freedom, we also think of freedom for the captive nations of Europe.

Although this date of Polish independence cannot be celebrated in Poland itself, we in America can rededicate ourselves to the goal of a free Poland and a free world.

Let us never forget that the desire for liberty, freedom of choice, and self-determination is a spark not easily extinguished. We must remember and commemorate November 11, 1918, with the faith that Polish freedom will not become a thing of the forgotten past.

Aid to the United Arab Republic?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am disturbed by reports that the administration is considering the resumption of aid to the United Arab Republic, in the form of sales of surplus commodities for Egyptian currency.

The Congress has made very clear its opposition to such a step by prohibiting aid to the United Arab Republic unless the President explicitly determines that it is "essential to the national interest."

It is difficult for me to see how that determination could be reached in the case of the United Arab Republic at the present time. On the contrary, President Nasser's actions and policies in the Middle East would seem to point to the opposite conclusion.

The United Arab Republic today remains the fountainhead of Arab efforts to subdue Israel. Nasser has only delayed, not disavowed, his plans to launch a war of extermination against Israel, which meanwhile remains the target of vicious propaganda and economic warfare directed from Cairo.

Elsewhere, the United Arab Republic continues its efforts to undermine American policies and positions, from Libya to Vietnam, from Cyprus to the Congo. But it is in the Middle East that Nasser's will to power poses the greatest threat to peace and stability, and where any aid he received from us could only strengthen his position and capacity for mischief.

I do not dismiss the possibility that, under certain circumstances, aid may have a salutary effect on the national policies of the recipient. But the United States so far has funneled more than one billion dollars into Egypt with no discernible effect on Nasser's adventurism. If aid is to be resumed, surely the American people have every reason to demand some ironclad assurances that Nasser will order a "cease-fire" in the United Arab Republic's aggressive external policies.

The Record of the 1st Session of the 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been a great privilege to have served as a Member of the 89th Congress. It is no exaggeration to say that this Congress has made for itself a notable place in American history. Resting to a very large degree upon the consensus established by President Johnson and the Democratic Party this Congress has been able to pass legislation, both foreign and domestic, which has been long overdue. In a great sense this has been a "housekeeping Congress."

Since the end of World War II of necessity, a large share of our productive capacity and national energy has been poured into the cold war—the defense of the free world. As a consequence we put aside many domestic needs. We delayed many programs in education, urban renewal, transportation, housing, cultural affairs, communications, health, and conservation. Now we are able to turn our attention toward the Great Society.

In this session we enacted legislation in the broad area of social security. We increased the benefits themselves. We passed medicare, and we extended additional funds to medical research and medical and dental education.

In the field of education we passed for the first time in history, aid to elementary and secondary education. We broadened Federal assistance to higher education and we made a striking contribution to our cultural development by creating the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities. This Foundation will redress the balance with the development of the sciences which has been a necessary part of our national defense posture.

In many ways this Congress will be remembered as the "urban Congress." We took formal recognition of the fact that the United States has moved from the agrarian society of Thomas Jefferson to the urban society of Lyndon Johnson. We raised to Cabinet status a new department of the Government—the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In this same field we passed an Omnibus Housing Act. We also took action in one of the most vital areas of our needs: mass transportation. Despite a well developed highway program we are well aware that one of the most pressing needs of our urban society is the development of an extensive, fast moving, safe, efficient, and low-fare system of public transportation. To those of who live in the vast megalopolis developing between Rhode Island and Virginia this is of greatest urgency.

Our hard-working First Lady, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, nudged us into taking a good look at the Nation's growing ugliness. Under her inspiration we passed the Highway Beautification Act. We also took a hard look at our growing problem of water pollution. The rivers, the streams, the lakes of America have been a part of our national heritage. But in an industrialized society we have allowed them to be filled with refuse. The Water Resources Act and the numerous conservation acts we passed will, within 10 years, restore their pristine beauty.

Yet this Congress was realistic. Despite overall prosperity and the expansion of our gross national product we took a hard look at the "other America." We now recognize that an affluent society unfortunately creates its own poor. There are those who simply fall below the net of economic well being. The reasons why are many, varied, and complex. Our War on Poverty may well be but a beginning, but it is a good beginning.

Two pieces of legislation can be called acts of conscience. One is the historic Voting Rights Act. In this we offered the power of the Federal Government and the authority of the Constitution to guarantee that every American may exercise his birthright—to freely cast a secret ballot. Second, in the amendments to the Immigration Act we returned to this country's proud, traditional role as the haven of the oppressed. Because of this the Statue of Liberty stands a bit taller.

Let us bear in mind that we were able to appropriate the moneys for these extensive housekeeping tasks, and yet reduce taxes. We will pay the bills of the

Great Society out of the growing abundance of an expanding gross national product.

In foreign policy we have worked toward strengthening the U.N. as an effective forum for world opinion and as a peacekeeping agency that rises above East-West conflict. The Congress has authorized the funds to be contributed to the U.N.'s subsidiary agencies which are devoted to international economic and social development such as the World Health Organization, the World Bank, the Food and Agricultural Organization, and the U.N. Special Fund. We have consistently upheld President Johnson's hand in his threefold program:

First. To contain Communist aggression.

Second. To assist the economic and social development of other free nations.

Third. And to foster organizations of international cooperation among sovereign nations of the world.

In Vietnam we face the naked sword of Communist aggression; this Congress has provided the sinews of war.

It has been my privilege to place before this House a number of pieces of legislation. These include legislation to provide for orderly succession to the Presidency when the President is disabled; a bill to provide for a bipartisan committee to study our election system at every level; a bill to provide an exemption from the draft for persons serving in the Peace Corps, and Volunteers in Service to America; a bill to provide that teachers may deduct additional educational expenses from their Federal income taxes; a bill to provide the benefits of the GI bill to veterans of the cold war. I have also offered a concurrent resolution asking the five States which border on New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Vermont to restrict the sale of alcoholic beverages to those persons 21 years or older.

As the New York Times put it, the "89th Congress has been the best Congress since World War II." At last the Nation has had the benefit of the work of a modern-minded Congress that addressed itself to the needs of a complicated society entering the last third of the 20th century.

Address by Senator Hartke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, when the Congress enacts broad legislation for the benefit of the country as a whole, the laws often bear heavily on individuals and small segments of society.

One of the most important tasks of a legislator, therefore, is to foresee the impact of proposed legislation on all groups of society—and guard against inequities and severe disruptions.

One of the leading Members of Congress in this respect has long been the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. The Senator recently gave another indication of his concern in this area in a speech to the Associated Third Class Mail Users, dealing with the impact of mandatory adoption of ZIP code numbers at an early date. Because I feel that the issues he raised are worthy of careful consideration, I ask unanimous consent that his speech be reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANCE HARTKE, INDIANA ASSOCIATED THIRD CLASS MAIL USERS

Ladies and gentlemen, I come to you as a member of the Senate Committee on Commerce, the Senate Finance Committee, and a relative newcomer to the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

It would be easier for me to talk with you about the International Monetary Fund, the balance-of-payments question, or free trade and the Kennedy round.

Among my major concerns today is the runaway importation of foreign steel which threatens American jobs and corporate profitability. Another is a special agreement negotiated by the State Department with Canada which could undermine U.S. employment with a part of the auto industry moving to Canada.

But I don't suppose this would interest you, except in the very real possibility that a segment of the population would lose purchasing power. We are now in the 56th consecutive month of an unprecedented economic upturn. The continued growth of business generated by direct mail and specifically by third class mail users depends upon consumer disposable income.

Your business growth also depends upon a cooperative postal system, and I intend to address myself to postal matters today.

First, I would like to add my greetings to those of mailers everywhere in welcoming my great and good friend, Lawrence F. O'Brien, to the Office of Postmaster General. I know that he will receive your cooperation as he will mine in the very difficult and demanding management job facing him. He succeeds two very able and dedicated Postmasters General, each of whom contributed much in bringing the postal establishment into position where it can cope with today's astronomical mail volume and still remain within cost guidelines.

Nevertheless, there are some questions I should like to introduce today in our discussion of the relationship of a cooperative mail service with business mailers.

I believe that the business mail industry is an essential cog in the economic machinery of our Nation. Your industry has played a significant role in stimulating the flow of consumer capital throughout the bloodstream of our economy.

I am convinced that an industry generating a quarter of all U.S. mail is a vital part of this monetary transfusion process.

It is estimated by the Department of Commerce that this industry generates more than $30 billion a year in the sale of goods and services. That's a noteworthy contribution to a rising gross national product.

Back in 1959 and 1960, I twice addressed the Brookings Institution on the proposition that a general tax cut would stimulate business and jobs, and results in greater rather than less Federal tax revenues. The favorable results of the 1964 tax cut proved me correct in this hypothesis.

When I introduced no fewer than three bills to end excise taxes, this also was on the assumption that new money would enter the economic bloodstream. It has.

This is why I cannot now believe in the broad-brush approach to postage rates expressed in the special panel report. Should business users of the mails be charged with rate increases to absorb the many nonmail functions of the post office? I think not, unless we are deliberately attempting to slow down business generated by mail.

Should special rates for nonprofit organizations be abolished?

Why? As an attorney, I'm pretty good at asking why. My colleagues know me as probusiness. Mail users will find me consistently in favor of removing rather than creating obstacles to business expansion.

I believe that the policy making authority for the postal service should remain where the Constitution places it—in the the Congress of the United States.

I believe that the Congress is interested in improving and extending mail services so that it shall produce the maximum benefits for the maximum number of our citizens, at prices they can afford to pay.

I believe absolutely in the congressional philosophy. I feel the benefits of the postal service should be physical and financially available to the most humble and the most distant of our citizens.

I also believe that the so-called postal deficit establishes misleading guidelines when it is used as a means of service curtailment. I feel the Postal Policy Act of 1958 should be broadened in scope and brought up to date. I also feel that the so-called income gap—the difference between revenues and expenditures—which the Post Office Department sustains each year is an investment in the prosperity of the Nation, in the social well-being of the populace, in the education and cultural development of the people, and it pays enormous dividends in human happiness, human welfare, human security.

I believe that reasonably low rates for books and similar materials have been a major factor in the creation of the tremendous culture explosion that has swept the Nation in recent years.

I go further than this. Now that the phonograph recording companies have developed the long-playing, unbreakable, high-fidelity records—phonograph records are just as important, in their way, to the cultural well-being of the Nation as are books. They should receive the same intelligent treatment by the Post Office Department.

You may not realize it, but my State of Indiana is one of the major centers in the world for the production of phonograph records. There are some 6,000 Hoosiers permanently employed in this industry. One Indiana firm mails some 2 million a month. I am not only proud of that fact, but I intend to do everything in my power to protect the jobs of these people.

From a cultural point of view, let's consider this for a moment: what would a serious student of the drama or of English literature give to hear David Garrick, let us say, playing Hamlet? Or to hear Mozart playing his own compositions on the harpsichord? Or to hear Shakespeare read his own sonnets? Or to hear Charles Dickens read from his novels? The boon would be beyond all price.

Unfortunately, we shall never be able, this side of eternity, to hear such marvels. But all future generations from now until the crack of doom will be able to hear the greatest writers of our own time read from their writings—and they will also be able to listen to the greatest actors and actresses of our age interpret the world's greatest dramatic works, and hear the greatest musicians of our day perform, and be able to compare the standards of our day with the standards of their day. The phonograph recording industry is not only contributing mightily to the cultural explosion of today—it is making an enormous contribution to the cultural life of countless generations to come.

And now I would like to question Post Office Department wisdom in another area—that of mandatory compliance with ZIP code requirements by January 1, 1967.

Again, I shall ask "why?"

There are some 300,000 third-class permit holders in this country. As people move and addresses change, some 20 to 25 percent of their lists have to be updated annually in any event. It seems to me that it would be a much more orderly process—and considerably less expensive to business mailers in all classifications—to accomplish the transfer to ZIP code in the 4 or 5 years of normal list updating.

I question the wisdom of the postal administration in setting the January 1, 1967, from another standpoint. Computerized major mailers have already incurred substantial costs in coding their lists. Thousands of smaller mailers are striving to catch up. And the post office is still tinkering with and rearranging the numbers in multicoded cities.

Again, why? If it has become necessary to announce that extensions will be granted, why the haste of the original order?

I shall be asking a lot of such questions in my service on the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Perhaps the Third Class Mailers can help us find the right answers. Your comments will always be welcome to me. Thank you.

Report to My Constituents on 89th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, now that the first session of this Congress is preparing to adjourn, it is time to take a breath and reflect on some of these farranging decisions made during the last 9½ months. This session has established a new record for quorum calls and rollcall votes. It has produced many new programs which will have an effect on the lives of every one of us. There are many who feel it has been longer on quantity than on quality.

One of the most disturbing aspects of the session has been the tendency of the administration to pressure measures through without adequate deliberation on the part of the Congress. For example, one of the most important measures in 30 years—the so-called medicare bill, a complex bill containing nearly 300 pages—was rushed through the House in its "three-layer cake" form without public hearings on the part of the Ways and Means Committee. The $1.3 billion Federal aid to education bill was rushed through Congress with one minor amendment in the House and none in the Senate. The Appalachia aid bill was approved by the Senate Public Works Committee after only 2 days of public hearings, shutting off witnesses who wanted to testify. Republican proposals to apply the Appalachian formula to other depressed areas of the country were beaten.

We must remember that we cannot create new Federal programs without considering the impact upon the pocketbook of the already hard-pressed taxpayers. The new domestic programs will require about 33,000 new Federal employees next year. The much publicized $99.7 billion budget submitted by the President last January is likely to exceed $115 billion after passage of supplemental appropriation bills. At the same time substantial requests for more money to meet the costs of the war in Vietnam can be expected in January.

The administration's majority leader in the Senate, Senator MANSFIELD, has predicted that Congress may spend much of its time next session overhauling some of the hastily enacted legislation of this first session. He said:

> We have passed a lot of major bills at this session, some of them very hastily, and they stand in extreme need of a going over for loopholes, rough corners, and particularly for an assessment of current and ultimate cost of the framework of our capacity to meet it.

ESTIMATED COST OF PROGRAMS

To illustrate the scope and depth of the new programs passed in this session, here are some examples by categories of estimated authorizations for appropriations, showing first-year costs and cumulative costs:

Example of legislation	1st year cost	Term of authorization
Education	$3,063,500,000	$15,916,750,000
Housing	935,000,000	7,400,000,000
Health	6,729,200,000	33,850,200,000
Welfare	3,390,300,000	11,625,500,000
Conservation-recreation	3,407,100,000	3,833,600,000
Federal employees-military personnel pay increases	1,763,500,000	12,620,645,000
Space programs	5,190,000,000	26,000,000,000
Transportation	575,900,000	645,900,000
Peace Corps-international programs	275,000,000	525,000,000
Total	25,329,500,000	112,417,595,000

The estimated costs above would certainly seem reason enough why Senator MANSFIELD came to the conclusion that we will spend much time next session going over the recently enacted programs "particularly for an assessment of current and ultimate cost in the framework of our capacity to meet it."

While it is impossible to list all legislation considered in this first session, here are some of the major issues and a summary comment on them.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT—PUBLIC LAW 89-4

This is a massive public works program—initial cost $1,092,400,000. While I could not do less than favor governmental efforts to promote the economic well-being of our less fortunate citizens, I believe that those efforts should be consistent with the basic concept that private enterprise and self-help are the keystone of national strength, and that massive Federal intervention should be resorted to only as a last and unavoidable measure. The administration bill is objectionable for three major reasons: it is patently discriminatory in offering special Federal assistance in one region only, despite the known existence of equally depressed areas in other parts of the Nation; it would create a new regional supergovernment with absolute veto authority over State and local decisions and thus establish dictatorial power in the person of a single Federal representative on the Appalachian Regional Commission. An alternative Republican proposal, the Resources Development Act, was offered by Representative CRAMER, ranking Republican member of the House Public Works Committee, which would give asisstance to all areas eligible under the accelerated public works program. I voted for the Cramer substitute but could not support the administration bill for the above reasons.

DRUG ABUSE CONTROL AMENDMENTS OF 1965—PUBLIC LAW 89-74

This bill established greater control over the manufacture and distribution of depressant and stimulant drugs, including barbiturates and amphetamines. Prior to reporting this bill to the House, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held lengthy and complete hearings. Testimony presented at the hearing indicates that over 9 billion barbiturate and amphetamine tablets are produced annually in the United States. Of this amount over 50 percent, or 4½ million tablets, are distributed illegally through illicit channels. This is a shocking situation, reaching not just the large cities, but every community and town in the country.

Barbiturates and amphetamines, like most drugs, when used properly under medical prescription and direction, can be effective in the alleviation of illness and suffering. However, when misused they become a social and legal problem which is of grave public concern. Drug abuse is associated with crime, juvenile delinquency, and highway accidents.

There is clearly an urgent need for more effective control over the manufacture and distribution of barbiturates and amphetamines. I strongly supported this legislation.

FEDERAL AID TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION—PUBLIC LAW 89-10

Total first-year cost of this program is $1.3 billion. The expressed purpose of this bill is to meet the needs of educationally and economically deprived children, but in addition, it establishes a farreaching Federal aid to education program which of necessity will provide more and more Federal control of our educational systems in this country. Title I, the heart of the bill, provides some $1.06 billion in aid to local school districts. An examination of the table showing how the funds will be allocated indicates that whoever devised the formula was not advised that the alleged purpose of the bill was to aid the needy: far more money goes to the wealthier counties with very small percentages of deprived children than to the poorest counties with much higher percentages of children from low-income families. Thus, the inequities that currently exist among the various States in terms of how much they can afford to spend on education is perpetuated by the Johnson administration bill.

Under title I the bill appears to leave approval of local programs for educationally deprived children to the State education agency, where such power belongs. However, almost hidden in the language of the bill is the power of the U.S. Commissioner of Education to require that such approval be consistent with the basic criteria established by him. This centralization of power runs throughout the entire bill. For example, under title II, which authorizes $100 million for purchase of textbooks and library materials, the Federal Government will purchase the textbooks and library materials for the States. While the material is to be selected by the States, there is no language to guard against subsequent Federal controls. Under title III, which authorizes $100 million for supplementary education centers, we have separate Federal-local schools teaching youth, training teachers, and responsible only to the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Under title IV—$100 million over a 5-year period for cooperative research—the Commissioner will select research areas and be involved with curricula, tests, and course content fed into schools from the laboratories and through the Federal-local schools. And under title V—$24 million to "strengthen" State departments of education—the Commissioner will be authorized to assign employees from his office to the State Department of education and vice versa.

Every effort of the Republican minority to amend the legislation in order to clarify its vague language and make clear that local and State control of education should prevail was beaten back. Indeed, there was every effort to shut off all discussion completely. It was, as one Member put it, a case of: "My mind is made up; don't bother me with the facts."

One of the Republican proposals was to give those bearing the major part of school expenses certain credits toward their Federal income tax—included would be tuition expense for higher education. This type of assistance would be free from Federal control over educational policies. Moreover, there would be no need to expand the Federal bureaucracy to administer such a program. It would provide a new and powerful incentive for educational development at the local level where it belongs.

The Federal Government can obtain money to subsidize education only by borrowing, thus adding to the national debt, or by taking it away from taxpayers in the States. Would not the people be much better off to keep their money at home, for programs which local taxpayers themselves approve? The administration bill actually sets up a formidable Federal education system. I doubt very much if that is what the American people want.

SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE—PUBLIC LAW 89–97

There were nearly 300 pages in this complex measure which makes numerous changes in the social security program. Briefly, the major provisions are as follows: For the first time, effective July 1, 1966, there would be established a medicare program for those over 65. This would consist of:

First. A compulsory plan providing for hospital and nursing home care through increased social security payroll taxes on both employee and employer. The patient must pay the first $40 of the hospital bill for the first 60 days, and $10 per day from the 60th to the 90th day.

Second. A voluntary supplementary plan providing payments for physicians and other medical and health services financed through monthly premiums of approximately $3 per person and matched by the Government through general revenues. This is similar to the general voluntary plan offered by Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee.

Third. A greatly expanded medical assistance program through Kerr-Mills Act for needy persons financed through Federal-State matching funds.

In addition to the medical program, the bill makes the following revisions and improvements in the benefit and coverage provisions of the Social Security Act:

First. A 7-percent increase in cash benefits with a minimum of at least $4 per month.

Second. Those persons over 72 with at least 3 quarters coverage—instead of 6 as under present law—to be made eligible for minimum benefits of $35 per month.

Third. Age for dependent children receiving benefits extended from 18 to 22 so long as they remain in school. This is the subject matter of a bill I introduced this year—H.R. 417—as well as in previous years.

Fourth. Widows would be permitted to receive benefits at age 60 with reduced annuity.

Fifth. The Amish and other religious sects which conscientiously object to social security would be exempt from payment of social security taxes.

Sixth. Earnings limitation would be slightly liberalized. A person would be permitted to earn up to $1,200 a year without loss of benefits, from $1,200 to $2,400 there would be $1 lost for every $2 earned and after $2,400 there would be loss of $1 for each $1 earned. My bill, H.R. 415, would permit unlimited earnings.

This legislation came to us under a closed rule, which meant that no amendments could be offered during the course of the debate, and there could be only one motion to recommit in order to substitute provisions. This meant there could be no separate vote on the various alternative medicare plans. A recommittal motion to substitute a Republican voluntary medicare program—which would have offered more benefits—failed.

By including medicare under social security, the whole social security program may be jeopardized because of the high payroll tax which must come from workers and employers. The earnings base for taxes goes from $4,800 to $6,600. An employee earning $6,600 will pay $277.20 in 1966; in 1967 he will pay $290.40. The employer must pay a like amount. This hits hardest those in the lower income levels—especially the young people—some of whom will be paying for many years before they become entitled to any benefits at age 65. Initially the social security-medicare bill carries a price tag of between $6 billion and $7 billion. This will soon escalate to $11 billion or $12 billion. Without a doubt there will have to be even greater social security taxes in the future.

There is a possibility that such a program could lead to a lower quality of medical care for all concerned. We simply do not have enough doctors, nurses, and other personnel to meet the needs. One of the benefits under the bill—post-hospital care in skilled nursing homes—will be very difficult to obtain because very few of such facilities are now in existence. I am afraid the law will be a disappointment to many who look upon it as the solution to their difficulties. In some cases the limits of care imposed will result in inadequate relief for catastrophic illnesses. It will be necessary to undertake large hospital and nursing home construction projects before the program can really meet the needs expected as well as training of personnel to staff such facilities.

While I generally supported most sections of the social security bill, I preferred the voluntary medicare proposal and its method of financing rather than the compulsory approach financed through increased social security taxes. Therefore, regretfully I could not support the bill on final passage.

WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965—PUBLIC LAW 89–234

No more important single issue faces our country today than the problem of good water. The steadily increasing pollution of the once-clean waters of the United States has been a problem of immediate concern to all citizens. The magnitude of this problem is so great that a solution must be found in short order, and such a solution will require the concentrated action of all levels of government. We Clevelanders are, perhaps, more aware of this than others because of the condition of our own Lake Erie and Cuyahoga River. In a rare show of unanimity the House passed by a vote of 396–0 a bill—S. 4—aimed at reducing the pollution of our waterways. Under the new program a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration will be established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. An increase in Federal assistance—on a matching basis—will make possible an acceleration in the construction of municipal waste treatment plants. A new 4-year program of Federal research grants is also authorized to demonstrate ways of controlling wastes from storm and sanitary sewers.

With the continuing increase in our population and the growing demands of our industries, Ohio needs more water, and water of high quality. Increased participation by the Federal Government along with State and local cooperation—made possible under this bill—should facilitate further progress in this area, in a partnership in which responsibility is shared. I strongly supported this legislation.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965—PUBLIC LAW 89–171

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1965, caused a great furor of debate but, as predicted, it emerged with few changes as reported from the committee.

As I pointed out in my speech on the floor, those of us who over the years have been in the battle for foreign aid are suffering from combat fatigue—not because we weary of a long fight but because the program has grown confused and disordered. First things seem to come first except in foreign aid, where first things come second or third—or not at all. For example, through the sale of our surplus commodities we help the underdeveloped feed their ever-growing populations today, but little has been done to help them establish their own agricultural economy to cope with tomorrow's needs.

Instead we disperse our manpower and money in fields of industry, transportation, and multitudes of very costly projects. The result is that we contribute to the growing gap between the agricultural sector and the urban sector of those countries.

After participating in the hearings and studying the testimony before the committee, I was disappointed that the reductions made were so small—just $12.7 million out of the request for $2,004,195,000 of new money. Only two items were cut—one for administrative expenses, which could well be cut, and the other for programs in the field of international organization. In the latter instance, the administration reported that it could not use the money it had originally requested.

In view of these circumstances I voted for the motion to recommit designed to reduce the Development Loan Fund authorization by $131 million. Unfortunately, this failed by a vote of 178 yeas to 219 nays. On final passage—249 to 148—I voted for H.R. 7750 but with more than usual reluctance. Our country has undertaken grave responsibilities and I felt compelled to support our commitments to carry them out. My concern for the program and my vote to reduce it is not an attack on the principles behind it but a protest over the manner in which it is being carried out. It is my hope that the criticisms pointed out during committee hearings and debate will be taken by the executive branch in the constructive manner they were intended, and that we will see an improvement in the administration of programs as a result.

PEACE CORPS—PUBLIC LAW 89–134

The Congress approved a bill authorizing $115 million to finance the operation of the Peace Corps during the next fiscal year. A little more than 4 years ago when the Peace Corps was set up on a pilot basis, many of us were quite honestly skeptical that it would fulfill its stated purpose, "to help foreign countries meet their urgent needs for skilled manpower." I was one of those who was skeptical. Today, I consider the Peace Corps one of our better efforts. In these few years, our volunteers have made a real impact. Each of the 45 countries in which the Peace Corps now operates has asked for more volunteers, and there are two dozen additional countries which have asked for the Corps. Since the Peace Corps began, 13,725 volunteers have been sent overseas. Our State of Ohio has produced the fourth largest number of volunteers of any State—654 in all.

The Peace Corps is a wonderful outlet for the earnest, honest spirit of American youth and its deep need to serve others. It appeals to all races and creeds. It provides our young people, and some of our senior citizens as well—70 people over 60 years of age are serving with the Corps—with their enthusiasm and their selflessness, a unique opportunity to do what needs to be done if America—the real America—is going to be understood across the world. It provides an opportunity for dedicated citizens to demonstrate the American dream to million of people in other lands who will never have the opportunity to visit us here.

Our Committee on Foreign Affairs has explored the costs, ratio of staff members to volunteers, and so forth, very carefully. The study indicates the Peace Corps has made a good record in handling its money. The average annual cost per volunteer has gone down consistently, from $9,074 in fiscal 1963 to $7,927 for fiscal 1966. Unlike some Government agencies, the Peace Corps has never shown any tendency to put on a last minute drive to make sure that all of its funds are obligated before the end of the fiscal year. The Peace Corps, it seems, is the least expensive of our foreign assistance projects, and I was happy to add my support to its continuation.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—PUBLIC LAW 89–174

The Congress passed H.R. 6927, to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development. This is not a new idea—you will recall that it was a little more than 3 years ago that the House decisively rejected a similar bill.

Both Democrats and Republicans agreed that urban programs, scattered through many departments and agencies, need a coordinating hand, but there was disagreement on how to achieve this objective. Certainly the administration bill to expand the Federal bureaucracy through establishment of a new Cabinet-level department is not the answer. H.R. 6927 will not include all housing programs nor will it encompass all those programs dealing with our urban areas. However, it will create a new Cabinet member, a new Under Secretary, four Assistant Secretaries, a General Counsel, and an Administrative Assistant Secretary plus more redtape for the municipal governments in cities across the country.

Minority members of the House Government Operations Committee, who considered this legislation, wisely included in their report:

> Bureaucracies once established have a way of growing not only in size but in power. This is especially true with bureaucracies which handle vast sums of public funds.

Although the present programs of the Housing and Home Finance Agency will be included in the proposed Department of Housing, these represent less than one-third of the Federal Government's housing activities. The Veterans' Administration has guaranteed over 5 million home loans and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board as of January 1, 1964, had advanced members $27.1 billion and been repaid $22.3 billion. These two agencies, not included in the new Department, account for two-thirds of the housing financing activities of the Federal Government. Other activities of interest to our urban areas will remain outside the jurisdiction of the new Department. For example, welfare and poverty programs, water pollution, sewage disposal, vocational education, public health activities, the Federal highway program—all would remain under their present jurisdictions in other departments and agencies.

While I could not support the administration bill, I did vote for the motion to recommit, designed to substitute a Republican proposal to establish an Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President. This plan would have provided the coordination and assistance needed by our local and State governments in their relationship with the Federal Government. However, it would avoid the creation of a huge, new Government bureau. Unfortunately, the recommittal motion was defeated 149 to 259.

HOUSING ACT OF 1965—PUBLIC LAW 89–117

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 was passed by a vote of 245 to 169. Prior to this the very controversial section providing rent subsidies won its place in the bill by a narrow margin of 6 votes—208 to 202. Although there are some good points in the housing program, I voted against the rent supplements and could not support the bill on final passage with such a provision in it. On June 20 I spoke on the floor:

> Mr. Chairman, I feel that this bill, instead of just dealing with superficial things, serious as they may be—the housing of our people—deals with something infinitely deeper and more serious.

I finished with these words:

> I am wondering if you are at all aware of the dangers of this new doctrine? Are you quite certain that when you make it possible for a man to feel little if any responsibility for his home, you are not endangering the very foundation stones of our free land? I am wondering also whether such an attitude can hold a real woman's love and earn the respect of children.

Other speakers emphasized the duplications with public housing and the fact that whereas public housing is financed through bond issues carrying an interest rate of 3¼ percent, the rent supplement housing must be constructed under FHA rates of 5¾ percent. Thus it reflects a surrender to high mortgage interest rates.

It is claimed that this Federal rent subsidy program is designed to help low-income families meet their monthly rent payments. But it will do far more than that. The power given the Housing Administrator to determine income limits, and so forth, is supreme. Eligibility income limits could run over $11,000 a year in some localities. Is this low income? Let me point out a few of its obvious results. Basically the family is the keystone of the arch of the nation. It has been our dream that each family would own its own home. But H.R. 7984 shoves that dream out the window. All incentives for homeownership are abandoned.

Even the most ardent supporters of the rent supplement proposal admit that it is definitely an experiment. But can we afford a $6 billion experiment which could well undermine the moral fiber of our people? How long will it take to change us from a nation of homeowners to a nation of subsidized renters? At a time when we need to renew our moral strength and spiritual fiber, is it not tragic for us to take from even a part of our people the consuming need to be responsible? What a way we have come from the time our forefathers carved their homes out of the wilderness with little more than an ax.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS—PUBLIC LAW 89–253

A total of $785.4 million was appropriated last year for the poverty program and as of the end of May 1965, about $650 million had been obligated. Most of the funds were hurriedly committed during the closing month of the fiscal year.

Although it was admitted by administration spokesmen that it was not possible to judge some of the programs as they were only in the initial stages of operation, this year's bill more than doubles last year's authorization. It is interesting to note that the Office of Economic Opportunity had asked for $1.5 billion for fiscal 1966, but it was increased by the majority of the committee to $1.895 billion. This is broken down as follows: Title I, Job Corps, work training and work-study programs, $825 million; title II, urban and rural community action programs, $680 million; title III, special programs for rural areas, migrant workers, $70 million; title V, work experience and training—adults—$300 million; title VI, VISTA volunteers—volunteers in service to American or Domestic Peace Corps—$20 million.

This year's legislation follows closely the bill passed last year with the exception of asking for more money and with the seriously objected to major change removing the only effective State control over Federal poverty programs, to wit: the veto power of the Governor. It gives authority to the Poverty Director to veto the veto of a Governor. This action has been strongly opposed by Governors of both parties inasmuch as it takes away from them their only check on the Federal Government and its determination as to what is good for a State.

The brief hearings by the Committee on Education and Labor on the community action program were shut off abruptly over the protests of committee Republicans. The Republicans then set up a task force, holding hearings in various parts of the country, in an attempt to get a true evaluation of the various programs.

As a result, a number of constructive proposals were made—all of which were turned down by the administration. A recommittal motion was offered to restore the veto power of the Governors and reduce the authorization of funds to the current level. I supported this motion but it was defeated 178 to 227. Therefore, I voted against final passage. It does not seem wise nor businesslike to double our country's financial commitment in a venture that has been initiated so recently and its usefulness has not yet been proven and which is little more than 50 percent operational—a venture that is entirely novel and which from its very inception raises very many practical questions. As was predicted in the debate last year, great administrative and substantive problems have arisen in the program—as worthy as its goals may be. It was my hope that these problems would receive close attention in this session by the committee, and I am sorry to say that they have not.

THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT PUBLIC LAW 89–110

Debate on this important voting rights measure was spirited for 4 days. While there was general agreement that some Federal measure should be enacted, there was a sharp division between backers of the administration bill, introduced by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and the Republican substitute, by Congressman WILLIAM McCULLOCH, of Ohio. Incidentally, the Republican task force on voting rights, under the leadership of Mr. McCULLOCH, called for voting rights legislation long before any proposal was advanced by the administration.

The most outstanding difference between the approaches of the two bills was in the triggering provisions which bring the Federal law into play. The automatic trigger in the Celler bill provides that Federal examiners shall be sent into States in which less than 50 percent of the voting-age population was registered or voted in the 1964 general election and in which certain literacy tests and devices were used to determine qualifications for voting. At present, this applies only to seven States and a few counties in other States even though hard-core discrimination exists in many other areas of the country. On the other hand, the McCulloch bill called for action whenever the Attorney General certified to the Civil Service Commission that he had received valid complaints from 25 or more persons who allege they could meet the voting requirements but had been denied the vote on account of race or color. An examiner would be appointed and if he determined that in fact 25 or more of the complaints were valid, those found qualified would be placed on the voting rolls as eligible voters. Thus, the Republican substitute would have applied equitably throughout our Nation.

The McCulloch bill also attempted to set Federal penalties for election fraud aside from racial discrimination, to insure not only the voting rights of all Americans, but to wipe out the practice of illegal voting, such as votes cast by those who have already voted in other precincts or voters who are no longer even alive. Fortunately, an amendment, sponsored by Representative CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, which attempts to get at such practices, was adopted.

I voted for H.R. 6400 on final passage after the McCulloch bill failed on the recommittal motion. The 15th amendment provides that the right of citizens to vote shall not be denied or abridged by any State on account of race or color and authorizes the Congress to enforce this amendment by appropriate legislation. The right to cast a meaningful vote lies at the very heart of our republican form of government.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT—PUBLIC LAW 89–136

This legislation is basically a pump-priming measure, which means that it should be used when the status of our economy shows clear evidence that this kind of approach is necessary. It authorizes $3.3 billion to be spent over the next 5 years in grants and loans for various public works projects and to aid establishment of industries in areas of substantial unemployment. The definition of eligible areas is vague, leaving much discretion to the Secretary of Commerce.

The administration repeatedly in the last few months, through statements and news releases, has called attention to the fact that it expects this year will set many new records from the standpoint of the height of our economy. In this case, should we be passing a $3.3 billion pump-priming bill at this time?

We have a deficit that we incurred in the fiscal year just completed, ending June 30, 1965, of approximately $3.5 billion. The Treasury Department has estimated the deficit for the next fiscal year will be $5.3 billion. Under such circumstances, it does not seem logical to saddle the taxpayers with this additional spending program.

The General Accounting Office has submitted 17 adverse reports on the administration of the Area Redevelopment Act as it has existed to the present time. In each of these reports, the Comptroller General has stated he feels this program should be tightened up. Yet the recommendations of the administration as incorporated in this bill loosens the program even further. In recent years we have had a whole series of programs brought to the floor of the House and in each case the argument has been made that if that particular program was passed, we would be able to solve the problems of unemployment. Among the programs passed in this Congress alone are: the $1.9 billion antipoverty bill, the $1 billion Appalachian Development bill, and a $7.5 billion housing bill. Now we add a $3.3 billion public works bill.

With our actual national debt over $318 billion and the debt limit set at $328 billion with the President calling for ever-increasing expenditures on the

Vietnam conflict, this did not seem the appropriate time to pass a $3.3 billion loosely drawn, pump-priming measure. Therefore, I voted against this bill.

OMNIBUS FARM BILL—PUBLIC LAW 89-321

I opposed the omnibus farm bill which is largely an extension of existing subsidy programs which have failed in the past, and the establishment of several new programs—cotton subsidy and increased wheat subsidy—that will necessarily result in the spending of billions of dollars in the next 4 years. An amendment was adopted, largely through Republican efforts, to eliminate the bread tax by financing the wheat subsidy through general revenues rather than increasing the price of bread and other wheat products. Nevertheless, the programs have not proven to be good for either farmers, consumers, or taxpayers. Ten years ago the farmer received 42 cents from each consumer food dollar. Today he receives only 37 cents, less than in the depression days of 1935. Retail food prices have increased 29 percent in the last 16 years, while the net income of agriculture has gone down 29 percent.

Even though the cost-price squeeze has forced more and more farmers off the land, the cost of running the Department of Agriculture has increased. In 1933 there was 1 USDA employee for every 203 farms. In 1961 the ratio was 1 to 37, and today there is 1 USDA employee for every 32 farms. In spite of substantial increases in Government payments to farmers—estimated at $2.4 billion in 1965—net farm income has not been materially improved. Government investment in surplus farm crops still stands at $7 billion. H.R. 9811 only perpetuates this unfortunate record. It will make more difficult constructive efforts to establish a sound and workable farm program that serves the best interests of farmers, consumers, and taxpayers. Just as the problems of our urban areas cannot be solved by transferring them to Washington, the farm problem will not be solved by making a "czar" of the Secretary of Agriculture.

A NEW IMMIGRATION ACT—PUBLIC LAW 89-236

Effective July 1, 1968, the bill repeals the national origins quota system, which has regulated only one-third of our total immigration in the last 10 years but has been harmful in the conduct of our diplomatic affairs. From December 1, 1965, until July 1, 1968, unused quota numbers will be pooled and reallocated among the countries with heavily oversubscribed registration lists. Under this procedure those intending immigrants who have already satisfied the qualitative tests for admission but whose admission has been delayed by reason of present quotas, may be admitted. Overall immigration is limited to 170,000 annually, exclusive of the Western Hemisphere, but this number includes provision for 10,200 refugees so that the net figure represents a very slight increase over the present quota of 158,561.

The system of preferences has been revised so that hereafter primary emphasis will be upon the reuniting of families. A program for conditional admission of refugees from communism and totalitarianism will be incorporated into our immigration law and the fair share law repealed. This means that hereafter selection of refugees and control of the number to be admitted will no longer be subject to an international organization. The new bill provides for a far more restrictive policy with respect to the admission of persons to enter our labor market. Under its terms, petitions must be filed by those coming for employment and, more particularly, by all immigrants from the Western Hemisphere, and the Secretary of Labor must make an affirmative determination in each individual case that the immigrant does not preempt a resident of the United States from a job opportunity or upset competitive wage scales. There are a number of other tightening-up provisions in the bill, including a requirement for a report from the President to the Congress if immigration from the Western Hemisphere should increase substantially.

In my judgment this bill, providing for a selective immigration program which places first emphasis upon the reuniting of families, the need of our country and the protection of our economy, is constructive legislation. I voted for it and supported it.

EXCISE TAX RELIEF—PUBLIC LAW 89-44

One of the more constructive actions of this session was passage of legislation to repeal or reduce most excise taxes. For years I have sought to repeal these taxes because they have been discriminatory and unfair. Most of them were enacted as special temporary wartime measures, but they lingered on for all these years. As a sponsor of bills calling for repeal, I strongly supported this legislation.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION AND INABILITY—SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

The recent, and happily successful, removal of President Johnson's gall bladder underlined the wisdom of the approval by this Congress of an amendment to our Constitution which will insure continuity should the Chief Executive be incapacitated. Before the amendment can take effect it must be ratified by 38 States. It will permit the President to nominate a Vice President, should that office become vacant, who would take office if the President's choice is approved by a majority of both Houses of Congress. In case of Presidential incapacity, the Vice President and a majority of the Cabinet could make a determination of inability. In the event of a disagreement with the President on this point, the Congress would render the final judgment. I supported this amendment.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965—PUBLIC LAW 89-329

This bill, which I supported when it initially passed the House, as well as the final action on the House-Senate conference report authorizes a $2.6 billion program to aid State support of community service programs of colleges, grants to their libraries for training and research, acquisition of materials, and teaching fellowships and scholarships. Unfortunately, the Senate attached a Federal Teacher Corps program to this bill. Under this program, the U.S. Commissioner of Education would recruit, train, and assign teachers to teach in local school districts. The Federal Government would pay the full cost of training and salaries. I opposed this provision as it would seem there is nothing which would better promote Federal control of education than Federal subsidization of teachers' salaries. Also there was no real opportunity for House debate and consideration. The operation of the Federal Teacher Corps has been temporarily delayed because funds were denied by a joint House-Senate conference committee on appropriations. However, the administration certainly will be back requesting money for the Corps next January.

MY OWN BILLS

Among my bills I have sponsored this session have been the following: H.R. 415, to amend the Social Security Act so as to remove the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits; H.R. 416, to make educational benefits available to peacetime veterans; H.R. 417, to amend the Social Security Act to make it possible for a dependent child to continue receiving benefits to age 22—included in Public Law 89-97; H.R. 420, to authorize the commissioning of male persons in the Regular Army in the Army Nurse Corps and the Army Medical Specialist Corps, and the Regular Air Force; H.R. 421, to make the fraudulent use of credit cards in interstate commerce a Federal offense; H.R. 4226, to repeal excise taxes—similar bill passed, Public Law 89-44; H.R. 7204, to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution; H.R. 11320, to allow a credit against income tax for college tuition expense; H.R. 11320, to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expense of providing training programs for employees and prospective employers.

CONCLUSION

These are exciting times and it is a very great privilege to serve the 22d Ohio District in the many areas of national life that grow increasingly important all the time. May I express my appreciation to each of you for the support given me during this present session of the Congress.

Estimated Cost of Each New Law Enacted in the 1st Session, 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the minority staff of the Appropriations Committee has been answering many requests for information concerning the amounts authorized in the long list of new legislative enactments of this session, and I have had prepared the following tabulation, indicating the estimated cost of each new law, when an estimate was available, or the amount stated in the legislation.

In very many instances, there is little information available. In many cases, an estimate is available for the first year only, with future years "open." This points up the need for legislation, such as I have proposed, that the administration send to Congress in the budget a tabulation of estimated 5-year costs of new legislation, and that such estimates be included in the legislative reports of the committees.

The tabulation follows:

Public law	Bill No.	Subject	Cost estimate
89-1	S.J. Res. 3	Date for transmission of Budget and Economic Reports	
89-2	H.J. Res. 234	Supplemental appropriation, Agriculture	Appropriation.
89-3	H.R. 3818	Eliminate requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates.	
89-4	S. 3	Appalachian Regional Development Act	$1,092,400,000.
89-5	S. 301	Astronautics, Goddard Day, ceremonies	
89-6	H.R. 45	Inter-American Development Bank	1965, $250,000,000; 1966, $250,000,000; 1967, $250,000,000.
89-7	S.J. Res. 48	Bennett Place Commemoration	
89-8	S.J. Res. 47	Professional Photography Week	
89-9	H.R. 1496	Release amounts of zinc, lead, and copper from stockpile	
89-10	H.R. 2362	Elementary and Secondary Education Act	1966, $1,344,700,000; 1967, $1,861,400,000; 1968, $2,431,500,000; 1969, $479,000,000; 1970, $543,500,000; total, $6,660,100,000.
89-11	S. 307	Consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses between 5 States and the District of Columbia.	
89-12	H.R. 5721	Acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco	
89-13	H.R. 4527	Coast Guard, 1966, authorization for appropriations	$114,250,000.
89-14	H.R. 4778	$3,000,000 increase in annual appropriations authorized for Indian adult vocational training program, from $12,000,000 to $15,000,000.	$3,000,000 annually.
89-15	S. 974	Manpower Act of 1965	1966, $454,000,000; open annually thereafter until June 30, 1969.
89-16	H.R. 7091	2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965	Appropriation.
89-17	H.R. 2594	Civil service retirement annuities	$65,000,000.
89-18	H.J. Res. 447	Defense supplemental appropriation bill ($700,000,000, southeast Asia)	Appropriation.
89-19	S. 60	Nez Perce National Historical Park, Idaho	$1,967,000.
89-20	H.R. 5702	National Commission on Food Marketing, 1-year extension for report	$1,000,000 additional.
89-21	H.R. 7855	Procurement, 17 small patrol cutters, U.S. Coast Guard, fiscal 1966	$6,260,000.
89-22	H.R. 7064	Foreign Service buildings, Vietnam	$1,000,000.
89-23	S. 701	International Coffee Agreement Act of 1965	$150,000 annually (until Oct 1, 1968).
89-24	H.R. 66	District of Columbia Parole Board authority to discharge parolees	
89-25	H.J. Res. 195	American Legion National Convention, District of Columbia	
89-26	H.R. 3043	Evacuation, Armed Forces dependents	Estimate, $220,000 Vietnam dependents; for others (?).
89-27	H.R. 2998	Arms Control and Disarmament Act	1966 through 1968, $30,000,000.
89-28	S. 702	Disposition judgment funds on deposit to credit of Quinaielt Tribe of Indians	
89-29	H.J. Res. 436	Tobacco acreage allotments, filing of lease	
89-30	H.R. 3995	Functions of Secretary of Treasury	
89-31	H.R. 6497	U.S. quota, International Monetary Fund	$1,035,000,000.
89-32	H.R. 8122	Atomic Energy Commission, 1966 authorization for appropriations, rescission of $5,455,000.	$2,555,521,000.
89-33	S. 339	Agate Fossil Beds National Monument, Nebr	$2,143,150.
89-34	H.R. 6691	Validate payments to National Forest Service employees, 1961, 1962, 1963	
89-35	H.R. 806	Amend Textile Fiber Products Identification Act	
89-36	H.R. 7031	National Technical Institute for the Deaf	Estimate, 1966 planning $200,000; costs of construction, equipping, and operating over 1st 4 years, $13,500,000; annual operation and maintenance after 4 years, $2,000,000.
89-37	S. 800	Annual Armed Forces research and procurement authorization, $105,600,000 above President's request.	$15,402,800,000. (1966).
89-38	H.R. 821	Relief, Kure Beach, N.C	$100,000.
89-39	S. 435	Extend boundaries, Kaniksu National Forest, Idaho	$500,000 from land and water conservation fund.
89-40	H.R. 7597	Veterans' insurance fund reopened (transfer from veterans' special term insurance fund to veterans' reopened insurance fund, to be repaid).	$1,650,000.
89-41	S. 2089	Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act	$111,875,000. ($50,000,000, 1965 appropriation; $20,000,000, 1966 appropriation; $38,000,000, 1965 continuous authorization, $3,875,000, appropriation.)
89-42	H.R. 6755	Authorize appropriations for river basin projects	$944,000,000.
89-43	S. 1135	Extend termination date of authority for President to submit reorganization plans.	
89-44	H.R. 8371	Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965	
89-45	H.R. 1782	Retired Federal employees health benefits, Government contributions	
89-46	H.R. 7777	Federal Aviation Agency, appointment of Gen. William F. McKee, Administrator.	
89-47	H.R. 1732	Government Printing Office, civilian employees' pay	
89-48	S. 1000	Movable property, title transfer	
89-49	H.R. 8464	Increase in public debt limit (to $328,000,000,000 during 1966)	
89-50	H.R. 214	Veterans' benefits mustering-out payments (not more than 200 Army and Air Force officers eligible, DOD said could be absorbed).	
89-51	H.R. 7762	Reserve Officers' Training Corps, Naval Reserve; correct technicalities, no added cost.	
89-52	H.R. 6767	Interior Appropriation Act	Appropriation.
89-53	H.R. 7717	Annual NASA Authorization Act	$5,190,396,200.
89-54	H.R. 3165	Pecos National Monument, N. Mex	$500,000.
89-55	H.J. Res. 541	Area Redevelopment Act extension, 2 months	$12,300,000.
89-56	H.R. 5988	Federal Maritime Commission, term of Commissioners	
89-57	H.R. 7060	Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act	Appropriation.
89-58	H.J. Res. 553	Continuing appropriations for fiscal 1966 until July 31, 1965	
89-59	S. 1796	Amends Small Business Act to provide increase in maturity of SBA disaster loans from 20 to 30 years; suspension of up to 5 years on payment of principal and interest on disaster loans at discretion of Administration, and increase in SBA's revolving fund by $50,000,000.	Increase in revolving fund, $50,000,000.
89-60	H.R. 6032	Mann Creek reclamation project, Idaho	$690,000.
89-61	H.R. 4493	Metal scrap, 2-year suspension of duties	
89-62	H.R. 8147	Tariffs, returning residents	
89-63	H.R. 7105	Regulation exports	
89-64	H.R. 6848	Crime, conveying false information	
89-65	H.R. 3994	Air Force, 1 claim	
89-66	H.R. 4525	Merchant marine, mobile trade fairs, June 30, 1965, to June 30, 1968	$500,000 annually for 3 years, 1966 through 1968.
89-67	H.R. 3996	Admiralty claims settlement	
89-68	H.R. 6507	Interstate crimes, arson	
89-69	H.R. 8131	Extend Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act	1966, $6,500,000; 1967, $10,000,000.
89-70	H.R. 5283	District judges, service time, Alaska	
89-71	H.R. 3415	Intercoastal shipping rates, penalties	
89-72	S. 1229	Federal Water Project Recreation Act; a general policy bill, funds to come under projects in regular legislative process.	
89-73	H.R. 3708	Older Americans Act of 1965	1966, $6,500,000; 1967, $11,000,000; 1968, 1969, 1970, open.
89-74	H.R. 2	Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965	$10,000,000 annually.
89-75	H.R. 6453	District of Columbia Appropriation Act	Appropriation.
89-76	H.R. 5184	Claim, port of Portland, Oreg	$6,226.80.
89-77	H.R. 5874	Amend Public Law 815, school construction, Puerto Rico, Wake, Guam and Virgin Islands.	$2,000,000 and $100,000, annually.
89-78	H.R. 7847	Small Business Act, revolving fund increased from $341,000,000 to $461,000,000	Revolving fund increased $120,000,000.

Public law	Bill No.	Subject	Cost estimate
89-79	H.R. 5306	Banks, foreign government deposits	
89-80	S. 21	Water Resources Planning Act	$11,700,000 (title III, 10-year authorization, $5,000,000 annually).
89-81	S. 2080	Coinage Act of 1965, increases amount authorized to be appropriated from $30,000,000 to $45,000,000. However, it is estimated that the seigniorage from the additional coins produced will result in increased Treasury receipts of $900,000,000 in 1966, $1,000,000,000 annually).	
89-82	H.R. 9497	Wheat-marketing-quota referendum, extension of time	
89-83	H.R. 4185	Patent fees, estimated in Senate report to increase receipts from $8,900,000 to $23,461,000, against costs of operation of $31,451,000.	Reduction in expenditures.
89-84	S. 2154	Puerto Rico Commission on Status (increases authorization to $465,000)	$215,000.
89-85	S. 998	Fishing vessels and gear, loans (revolving fund would expire June 30, 1965, extension to June 30, 1970).	$20,000,000.
89-86	H.R. 5246	Common carriers, securities	
89-87	S. 956	Construction, immigration and customs facilities, Guam and Virgin Islands	$100,000 each project.
89-88	H.R. 225	Presidential memorial certificate	$35,000 annually.
89-89	H.R. 4526	Merchant marine war risk insurance, 5-year extension	No added cost.
89-90	H.R. 8775	Legislative Branch Appropriation Act	Appropriation.
89-91	S.J. Res. 71	South Pacific Commission	$200,000 annually, U.S. share of expenses.
89-92	S. 559	Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act	$2,000,000.
89-93	H.R. 5242	Consolidations, common carriers	No appreciable difference in ICC administrative costs.
89-94	S. 1462	Pueblo Indian lands, conservancy district	
89-95	H.R. 5041	Common carriers, regulations	
89-96	H.J. Res. 591	Continuing 1966 appropriations, extension from July 31 to Aug. 31	
89-97	H.R. 6675	Social security amendments: The fiscal year table was presented during House Appropriations Committee hearings this year. The actuarial data was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in connection with the conference report and reflects 1st year costs as estimated at that time, and includes 1st year of various segments of the program which actually are in different years.	
89-98	H.R. 8721	Legislative expenses, government of Virgin Islands	
89-99	S. 627	Exempt oceanographic research vessels from certain laws	
89-100	H.R. 8720	Payment legislative salaries, government of Guam	
89-101	H.R. 8484	Transportation at Government expense of automobiles of military personnel	$80,000 annually.
89-102	S. 26	Golden Spike National Monument, Utah	$1,168,000
89-103	S.J. Res. 83	Proclamation, authorization, founding of Coast Guard	
89-104	H.R. 8862	Increase annual contribution to International Council of Scientific Unions and Associations from $65,000 to $100,000.	$35,000 annually.
89-105	H.R. 2985	Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act Amendment (initial grants included).	1966, $45,000,000; 1967, $62,500,000; 1968, $76,000,000; 1969; $51,500,000; plus continuing grants 1967 through 1972, $150,000,000; total, $385,500,000.
89-106	H.R. 5508	Facilitate work of Agriculture Department	
89-107	H.R. 5860	Disposition assets of Choctaw Tribe	
89-108	H.R. 237	Missouri River Basin project, Garrison division	$207,000,000 plus fluctuations in cost plus operation and maintenance.
89-109	S. 510	Community health services, extension	1966, $18,000,000; 1967, $79,000,000; 1968, $20,000,000; total, $117,000,000.
89-110	S. 1564	Enforce right to vote	Depends on number of examiners, etc.
89-111	H.R. 903	Add 5,620 acres to Kings Canyon National Park, Calif.	
89-112	H.R. 8620	Take into consideration natural disasters in reference to feed grains, cotton, and wheat programs in 1965	

[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal years		
	1966	1967	1968
Trust funds	2,627	5,690	6,228
General funds	312	916	1,017
Total	2,939	6,606	7,245

E. ACTUARIAL DATA RELATING TO BILL

TABLE 1.—*Summary of 1st year costs under H.R. 6675*

[In millions of dollars]

	Conference	
	Trust funds	General Treasury
Health care programs:		
Basic hospital insurance	2,210	290
Voluntary supplementary medical	[1] 600	600
MAA liberalization		200
Total	2,810	1,090
OASDI:		
7-percent benefit increase	1,470	
Child school benefit	195	
Broader definition of child	10	
Child disabled at 18 to 21		
Blind disability	5	
Reduced benefits at 60	165	
Transitional benefits at 72	140	
Disability definition	40	
Retirement test	295	
Total	2,320	
Public assistance and child health:		
Increase in formula		150
TB and mental exclusion		75
Coverage of MA		40
Maternal and child health		61
Miscellaneous		13
Total		339
Income tax changes		−97
Total, all programs	5,130	1,332
Conference	6,462	

[1] Contributions of participants.

Public law	Bill No.	Subject	Cost estimate
89-113	S. 1321	District of Columbia bond property attachments	
89-114	H.R. 6622	Eliminate limitation on number of permanent employees, postal field service, convert estimated 20,000 temporary employees to career status.	$3,200,000 annually.
89-115	H.R. 2984	Public health services extension	$280,000,000 over 3 years, 1967, 1968, 1969.
89-116	H.R. 1771	5-day week for postmasters	$19,000,000.
89-117	H.R. 7984	Housing and Urban Development Act	$8,200,000,000 (table attached).
89-118	S. 24	5-year extension, 1968-72, saline water conversion program, increase authorized by.	$185,000,000.
89-119	H.R. 8111	Herbert Hoover National Monument, Iowa	$1,650,000.
89-120	S. 579	Relief, State of New Hampshire	$23,292.50.
89-121	H.R. 7954	Implement provisions London Convention Safety of Life at Sea	
89-122	H.J. Res. 481	Expand types of equipment and number of electric typewriters for House Members.	
89-123	H.J. Res 324	Reappointment, Robert Fleming, Smithsonian Board	
89-124	S.J. Res. 56	Bicentennial celebration, birth of James Smithson	
89-125	H.R. 4714	National arts and cultural development	$150,000 per annum.
89-126	S. 1742	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and International Finance Corporation.	
89-127	H.R. 4346	Merchant marine subsidy, construction differential extension, June 30, 1965, to June 30, 1966, 55 percent new merchant vessels, 60 percent reconstruction passenger ships: Construction differential subsidy—1961, $102,118,519; 1962, $136,858,263; 1963, $97,715,325; 1964, $79,987,066. Reconstruction differential subsidy—1961, $657,379; 1962, $3,906,765; 1963, $3,550,308; 1964, $2,349,230.	1 year around $100,000,000.
89-128	H.R. 7997	Independent Offices Appropriation Act	Appropriation.
89-129	H.J. Res. 454	Statue of Liberty, National Monument, development, Ellis Island	Authorizes $6,000,000; limits to $3,000,000 during 1st 5 years.
89-130	S. 893	Define Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska	
89-131	H.R. 10139	20 percent increase in telephone and telegraph service of House Members	$480,000 annually.
89-132	H.R. 9075	Increase military basic pay	$996,000,000, ($1,048,029,000 annually).
89-133	S.J. Res. 100	National American Legion Baseball Week	
89-134	S. 2054	Amend Peace Corps Act	$115,000,000 for fiscal 1966.
89-135	H.R. 8856	Amend Atomic Energy Act re electric power produced through use of licensed nuclear facilities (without this authority AEC would be forced to build powerlines underground costing well over $4,000,000).	
89-136	S. 1648	Public Works and Economic Development Act	1966, $710,000,000; 1967, $760,000,000; 1968, $760,000,000; 1969, $760,000,000; 1970, $260,000,000; total, $3,250,000,000.
89-137	H.R. 206	Increase subsistence allowance, disabled veterans pursuing vocational education	1966, $2,200,000; 1967, $1,800,600; 1968, $1,600,000; 1969, $1,300,000; 1970, $1,200,000; total, $8,100,000.
89-138	H.R. 208	Extend time limitations, totally disabled veterans pursuing vocational education	$1,400,000, 1966 and $16,000,000 1st 5 years.
89-139	S.J. Res. 81	Increases by $100,000,000 sum authorized for National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and authorizes apportionment for 1967 based on revised cost estimate increase of $3,000,000,000 over the 1965 estimate (which does not include highway beautification of $600,000,000, plus cost of control of outdoor advertising and elimination of junkyards). The law authorizes apportionment for fiscal year 1967 based on the new estimate but "Congress reserves the right to disapprove" that cost estimate. Inasmuch as that may never happen, attention should now be called to the increase, under which the highway will proceed under the 1967 apportionment this law authorizes.	$3,000,000,000.
89-140	H.R. 7595	Transportation dependents requiring medical care who accompany members of uniformed services overseas. DOD expected this authority to be used infrequently, cannot estimate cost, but expects it to be "relatively small."	
89-141	H.R. 6097	Federal crime, assassinate or assault President or Vice President	
89-142	H.J. Res. 431	Extend duration copyright protection pending enactment of copyright revision law.	
89-143	H.R. 5034	Facilitate disposition unclaimed personal property at Defense or Treasury, estimated to save $35,000 annually plus administrative expenses.	
89-144	H.R. 546	Retrocede to Wisconsin concurrent jurisdiction of rights-of-way of certain highways.	
89-145	S. 1309	Authorize Federal checks to be drawn in favor of banking organization for credit of person's account in instances of more than 1 person designating same bank: may result in savings, smaller number of checks written.	
89-146	H.R. 2176	Conveyance of land in Dare County to State of North Carolina	
89-147	H.R. 9947	Reimbursement for transportation expenses of House Members and clerks	$400,000 annually.
89-148	H.R. 3320	Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site, Ariz	$1,000,000.
89-149	H.R. 3044	Incentive pay hazardous duty on flight decks of aircraft carriers	$5,326,000 annually.
89-150	H.R. 3037	Payment of transportation for remains of deceased dependents, members of Armed Forces.	$670,000 annually.
89-151	H.R. 7843	Authorize survivor member of Armed Forces who dies while on active duty to be paid unused accrued leave.	$2,000,000 annually.
89-152	H.R. 10306	Mutilation or destruction of a draft card a criminal offense	
89-153	H.J. Res. 95	Name "Lake Meredith"	
89-154	H.R. 881	Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle, Pueblo Culture National Monument.	$265,000.
89-155	H.R. 7181	Commemoration of historical events in Kansas with appropriate markers	$805,700.
89-156	H.R. 7765	Labor-HEW appropriation bill	Appropriation.
89-157	H.R. 7596	Increase number of officers on active duty in grades of colonel or lieutenant colonel, Air Force.	
89-158	H.R. 89	Tocks Island National Recreation Area in Pennsylvania and New Jersey	$55,600,000.
89-159	H.J. Res. 639	Continuing 1966 appropriations to Sept. 30, 1965	
89-160	H.R. 5519	Armed Forces, dependents, language training	$200,000 annually.
89-161	H.R. 485	Auburn Folsom south unit, Central Valley project, California	$425,000,000 (1965 prices) adjusted to fluctuations in construction costs.
89-162	H.R. 1763	Payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases, etc	
89-163	H.R. 3997	Recording U.S. district court proceedings by electronic equipment	No additional expense.
89-164	H.R. 8639	State, Justice, Commerce, USIA appropriation act	Appropriation.
89-165	H.R. 3990	Increase in per diem and allowances for Federal jurors	$1,400,000 annually.
89-166	H.R. 5497	Require filing fees to be paid in full before court may discharge bankrupt; estimated annual savings between $150,000 and $200,000.	
89-167	H.R. 3992	Federal district court trial manuscripts	$10,000 annually.
89-168	H.R. 9544	Authorize disposal of 620,000 long tons of rubber from national stockpile	
89-169	H.J. Res. 632	Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Archival Depository, agreement with University of Texas.	
89-170	H.R. 5401	Federal-State cooperation in enforcement and administration national transportation system.	
89-171	H.R. 7750	Authorize funds for foreign aid, 1966	$3,360,000,000 (1966).
89-172	H.R. 6007	Authority for promotion of qualified Air Force Reserve officers to Reserve grades of brigadier and major general; Department of Defense said no increase in budget but did not indicate cost.	
89-173	H.R. 4822	National Capital Transportation Act of 1965, construction, exclusive of $52,000,000 in interest, $431,000,000 of which $50,000,000 will come from District of Columbia general fund.	$100,000,000 Federal funds. $50,000,000 borrowing authority.
89-174	H.R. 6927	Create Department of Housing and Urban Development	
89-175	H.R. 5280	Exemption from antitrust laws, to assist balance-of-payments position of United States.	
89-176	H.R. 6964	Rehabilitation of U.S. prisoners	
89-177	H.R. 496	Name lock and dam for William O. Huske	
89-178	H.R. 2263	Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965	1966, $500,000; 1967, $800,000; 1968, $800,000.
89-179	H.R. 1044	Exchange of land, Norfolk, Va	
89-180	H.R. 4905	Real property conveyance, Florida	
89-181	S. 511	Increase authorization for permanent annual appropriation for Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, Canal Zone (increase from $250,000 to $500,000 annually).	$250,000 annually.

Public law	Bill No.	Subject	Cost estimate
89-182	S. 949	State Technical Services Act of 1965	1966, $10,000,000; 1967, $20,000,000; 1968, $30,000,000.
89-183	H.R. 4465	District of Columbia Code, pt. III—Decedents Estates and Fiduciary Relations	
89-184	H.R. 9570	Federal Firearms Act Amendments	
89-185	H.R. 5024	Claims settlement, uniformed services and civilian employees, Federal Government authorizes Federal agencies to settle claims up to $10,000 for damages to or loss of personal property.	$327,126 for reconsideration of old claims; amount of future claims (?).
89-186	S. 2420	Continuing authority for protection of former Presidents and their wives or widows.	
89-187	S.J. Res. 53	Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission	
89-188	H.R. 10775	Military Construction Authorization Act	$1,780,062,000.
89-189	H.R. 727	Administration of Coast Guard Band	
89-190	S. 795	Lummi Indian Reservation, Wash.; land assessments within diking projects	
89-191	H.R. 725	Clarify responsibility for making obstructions in navigable waters	No new cost.
89-192	S.J. Res. 89	2-year extension of existing authority for erection in District of Columbia of memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune.	
89-193	H.R. 3039	Armed Forces, early payday authorization before a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday.	Cost "negligible" and to be absorbed by Defense Department.
89-194	H.R. 5989	Transportation empty cargo vans in vessels	No added Federal cost.
89-195	S. 20	Assateague Island National Seashore, Md.-Va	$16,250,000 for land acquisition.
89-196	S.J. Res. 102	Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and District of Columbia Commission on Crime and Law Enforcement.	$1,500,000.
89-197	H.R. 8027	Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965	$10,000,000 1966; open for 1967 and 1968.
89-198	H.R. 8333	Armed Forces cash award program—for Coast Guard when not operating as part of the Navy—estimated annual savings of $186,091,000 against expenditure of $6,680,000.	
89-199	H.R. 10586	Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Supplemental Appropriation Act	Appropriation.
89-200	H.R. 7779	Retirement of enlisted members, Coast Guard Reserve	Cost to increase gradually from $2,400 in 1965 to $26,400 in 1985 and level off.
89-201	H.R. 8761	6.5-percent increase, retired pay, Lighthouse Service (as of May 31, 1965, the Service had 546 retirees with 82 still on active duty).	
89-202	H.R. 10323	Military Construction Appropriation Act	Appropriation.
89-203	S.J. Res. 5	Name Washington Channel bridge Francis Case Memorial Bridge	
89-204	H.R. 6431	Permit duty-free importation of certain forms of nickel	
89-205	H.R. 8469	Cost-of-living increases in annuities payable from civil service retirement and disability fund, increase 11 percent of all annuities having commencing date prior to Oct. 1, 1956, and a 6-percent increase for all having commencing date after Oct. 1, 1956.	1st year cost $103,200,000; the total cost of the increase until the oldest retiree expires will be $1,054,000,000.
89-206	S. 1903	U.S. participation in United Nations	
89-207	S. 7	Establish Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, W. Va	Purchase 6,000 acres under act, have other authority for purchase of 54,000 acres, will come out of land and water conservation fund, $3,500,000.
89-208	S. 1317	Authorize District of Columbia Commissioners to prescribe penalties for handling and collection of dishonored checks and money orders.	
89-209	S. 1438	National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities	Major portion of law: (1) 1966, $10,000,000; 1967, $10,000,000; 1968, $10,000,000; 1969 and after, open; (2) $7,250,000 annually, (3) $2,750,000 annually, plus authority for administrative costs. Financial assistance for strengthening instruction in humanities and the arts: 1966, $500,000; 1967, $500,000; 1968, $500,000; open thereafter. Teacher training institutes: 1966, $500,000; 1967, $500,000; 1968, $500,000; 1969 and after, open.
89-210	S. 2042	Extend authority of Atomic Energy Commission to indemnify licensees and contractors under Atomic Energy Act for public liability.	This is a contingent liability of $500,000,000 for each nuclear incident. This it is expected would be reduced by private insurance coverage. Authority runs until Aug. 1, 1977.
89-211	H.R. 10014	Additional office space in districts for Members of House of Representatives	$267,600.
89-212	H.R. 10874	Amend Railroad Retirement Act and Railroad Retirement Tax Act by eliminating provisions reducing annuities of spouses of retired employees by the amount of monthly benefits payable under OASI.	
89-213	H.R. 9221	Defense Department Appropriation Act	Appropriation.
89-214	S. 2127	Special indemnity insurance for members of Armed Forces serving in combat zones.	All costs traceable to extra hazards of servicemen will be borne by the Government; premium rates are expected to be $2 a month on $10,000 and $1 on $5,000, deducted from pay.
89-215	H.R. 3989	30-day extension of time for filing petitions for removal of civil actions from State to Federal courts.	
89-216	H.R. 5883	Requiring bond under Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act to provide protection from loss from acts of fraud or dishonesty.	
89-217	H.R. 948	Amend District of Columbia laws relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage.	
89-218	H.R. 6294	Power of arrest extension for Secret Service agents	
89-219	S. 906	Provide measurement of gross and net tonnages for seagoing vessels having 2 or more decks.	
89-220	S. 1588	Authorize funds for research and development in high-speed ground transportation.	1966, $20,000,000; 1967, $35,000,000; 1968, $35,000,000; total, $90,000,000.
89-221	H.J. Res. 673	Continuing 1966 appropriations from Sept. 30 through Oct. 15, 1965	
89-222	H.R. 205	Amend War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act	1966, $5,704,000; 1967, $5,892,000; 1968, $6,392,000; 1969, $6,629,000; 1970, $5,690,000.
89-223	S. 1190	Authorize land disposition, Alaska	
89-224	S. 664	Disposition judgment funds, Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians.	
89-225	H.R. 5252	Validating subsistence payments made to enlisted personnel stationed at Tainan Air Force Station in Taiwan Oct. 1, 1960, to June 30, 1962.	
89-226	S. 1764	Land acquisition, Uinta National Forest, Utah	
89-227	S. 1988	Real property conveyance to State of Maryland, University of Maryland campus	
89-228	H.R. 2414	Land conveyance, Roseburg, Oreg	
89-229	H.R. 5768	Extension of duty suspension, silk yarn	
89-230	H.R. 8715	Contribution to International Committee of the Red Cross	$50,000 annually.
89-231	H.R. 9877	Remove restriction on value of property which may be owned by the American Hospital of Paris.	
89-232	S. 1623	Extension of study of effects of insecticides on fish and wildlife	1966, $3,200,000; 1967, $5,000,000; 1968, $5,000,000; total, $13,200,000.
89-233	S. 1975	Provide facilities for International Pacific Halibut Commission	$500,000.
89-234	S. 4	Water Quality Act of 1965	Increase in construction grants: 1966, from $100,000,000 to $150,000,000; 1967, from $100,000,000 to $150,000,000. Grants for R. & D.: 1966, $20,000,000; 1967, $20,000,000; 1968, $20,000,000; 1969, $20,000,000; (total increase, $180,000,000).
89-235	S.J. Res. 98	Requesting President to extend proclamation "See the United States"	
89-236	H.R. 2580	Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments	
89-237	H.R. 4152	Loans to production credit associations by Federal intermediate credit banks without necessity of collateral.	Increases by $560,000,000 limit on amount of obligations Federal intermediate credit banks may have outstanding to aid producers and reduce need of Government capital.
89-238	H.R. 5842	Extend Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act	
89-239	S. 596	Authorize funds for combating heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other major diseases.	1966, $50,000,000; 1967, $90,000,000; 1968, $200,000,000; total, $340,000,000.
89-240	S. 1766	Authorize Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to public agencies and nonprofit corporations for development of water systems serving rural areas.	Provides for grants and increased loans for water facilities in rural agricultural areas; expands Farmers Home Administration-insured loan authorized from $200,000,000 to $450,000,000.

Public law	Bill No.	Subject	Cost estimate
89-241	H.R. 7969	Amend tariff schedules of United States	
89-242	S. 1620	Consolidate 2 judicial districts in South Carolina	
89-243	H.R. 4750	Interest Equalization Tax Extension Act	
89-244	H.R. 8035	Accept donation of additional land, Fire Island National Seashore, N.Y.	
89-245	H.R. 10516	Disposal of vegetable tannin extracts from national stockpile	
89-246	H.R. 10714	Disposal of colemanite from stockpile	
89-247	H.R. 10715	Disposal of chemical grade chromite from stockpile	
89-248	H.J. Res. 309	Increase number of electric typewriters furnished Members of House of Representatives.	
89-249	H.R. 2091	National Park Service concession policies	
89-250	H.R. 9417	Revise boundary of Jewel Cave National Monument in State of South Dakota	
89-251	H.R. 10748	Authorize transfer of copper from the national stockpile to Bureau of the Mint	
89-252	H.J. Res. 330	Disposal of chromium metal, acid-grade fluorspar, and silicon carbide from stockpile.	
89-253	H.R. 8283	Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965, expand war on poverty	Extends all economic programs to June 30, 1968, and authorizes appropriations of $1,785,000,000 for fiscal 1966.
89-254	H.R. 728	Broaden and extend vessel exchange provisions of Merchant Marine Act	
89-255	S. 1065	Land exchange, Great Falls property, Virginia; connection with George Washington Memorial Parkway.	$1,000,000 for land acquisition.
89-256	H.J. Res. 695	Continuing 1966 appropriations from Oct. 15 through Oct. 23, 1965	
89-257	H.R. 3045	Authority for military personnel who have served in Vietnam since 1961 to accept decorations from the Government of Vietnam or its allies.	
89-258	S. 2232	Loan service of captioned films and educational media for deaf persons	1966, $3,000,000; 1967, $3,000,000; 1968, $5,000,000; 1969, $5,000,000; 1970 and annually thereafter, $7,000,000.
89-259	S. 2273	Exempt from seizure under judicial process certain objects of cultural significance imported for temporary display.	
89-260	S.J. Res. 69	Authorize construction of James Madison Memorial Bldg. to serve as 3d Library of Congress building.	$75,010,000.
89-261	H.R. 6165	Repeal statutory provision specifically authorizing appointment of women to clerkships in the Federal Government.	
89-262	H.R. 9336	Amend International Claims Settlement Act regarding claims against the Government of Cuba.	Amount necessary.
89-263	H.R. 7329	Convey land owned by the Navy to the city of San Diego.	
89-264	H.R. 10234	Eliminate requirements for reimbursement among military departments for medical care furnished a member of another department.	
89-265	H.R. 5665	Authorize advance of funds to disbursing officers for members of armed forces of friendly foreign nations.	
89-266	S. 1856	Authorize purchase of naval uniforms by members of Naval Sea Cadet Corps without expense to the Government.	
89-267	H.R. 724	Authorize transfer to the custody of the Attorney General of certain prisoners of the Canal Zone who are U.S. citizens.	
89-268	S. 903	Relating to the painting, illumination, and dismantlement of radio towers	
89-269	S. 1576	Construction of Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo.	Increase $5,990,000 (from $17,260,000 to $23,250,000).
89-270	S. 1689	Relating to hiring or rental of private property by the Forest Service	
89-271	H.R. 9975	Authorize shipment of vehicles owned by deceased or missing military personnel	
89-272	S. 306	Provide research programs relative to controlling air pollution resulting from fumes from gasoline- and diesel-powered vehicles.	1966, $10,470,000; 1967, $20,845,000; 1968, $31,185,000; 1969, $33,970,000.
89-273	H.R. 10871	Foreign Aid Appropriation Act	Appropriation.
89-274	S.J. Res. 106	Allow showing to the public of the film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums".	
89-275	H.R. 1805	Authority for promotion of below-the-zone Naval Reserve captains to grade of rear admiral.	
89-276	S. 1516	Authorize GSA Administrator to enter into contracts not to exceed 3 years for servicing equipment in Federal buildings.	
89-277	S. 1715	Extend penalty for assault on District of Columbia police to employees of institutions for confinement of juveniles.	
89-278	H.R. 5571	Clarification of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines who are attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders.	No increase in cost.
89-279	H.R. 6852	Disposal of abaca from national stockpile	
89-280	H.R. 7059	Increase authorization for Smithsonian Institution	Authorize $350,000 annually.
89-281	H.R. 7707	Authorize appointment of crier-law clerks by district judges	
89-282	S. 1719	Authorize overtime pay for Metropolitan Police, District of Columbia Fire Department, U.S. Park Police, and White House Police.	$885,000 annually (of which $741,000 would be annual recurring cost to District of Columbia).
89-283	H.R. 9042	Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965	
89-284	H.R. 9247	Participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 exposition to be held at San Antonio.	$125,000.
89-285	S. 2084	Promoting more effective control of outdoor advertising and junkyards near Federal highways, highway beautification.	1966, $160,000,000; 1967, $160,000,000; administrative expenses, $5,000,000; administration of safety program, $500,000; total, $325,500,000.
89-286	H.R. 10238	Labor standards for certain persons employed by Federal contractors to furnish services to Federal agencies.	
89-287	H.R. 7743	National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act	Sec. 2 authorized appropriation, $2,125,000 and sums necessary; $75,000,000, contingent liability; sec. 10, 1966 through 1970, $1,000,000 annually for direct loans. Authorized to borrow from Treasury if vocational student loan fund balance not sufficient to cover defaults in payments. Also, provision for Federal payment to reduce student interest costs.
89-288	H.R. 7484	Provide rank of lieutenant general or vice admiral for military officers serving as Surgeons General.	
89-289	H.R. 7169	Increase fees for filing registration statements under the Securities Act	
89-290	H.R. 3141	Health Professions Educational Assistance Amendments of 1965	1966, $23,353,000; 1967, $231,972,000; 1968, $254,832,000; 1969, $787,504,000; total, $1,297,661,000; plus 1970, 1971, 1972 continuation.
89-291	S. 597	Authorize funds, medical library	1966, $11,000,000; 1967, $21,000,000; 1968, $21,000,000; 1969, $21,000,000; 1970, $21,000,000; total, $95,000,000.
89-292	S. 32	Construction, water project, southern Nevada	$81,003,000 plus construction cost fluctuation.
89-293	H.R. 7919	Establish Roger Williams National Memorial, R.I.	$700,000.
89-294	H.J. Res. 571	Designate week of Oct. 25 as National Parkinson Week	
89-295	H.R. 7888	Designate patent, United American Veterans of U.S.A.	
89-296	S.J. Res. 32	Contribution to Ryukyu Islands arising from acts of U.S. military forces, from Aug. 15, 1945, to Apr. 28, 1952.	$22,000,000.
89-297	H.R. 2853	Increase in copyright fees	
89-298	S. 2300	Rivers and harbors and flood control	$2,000,000,000.
89-299	H.R. 9220	Public Works Appropriation Act	
89-300	H.R. 5167	Settlement of tort claims by Veterans' Administration	
89-301	H.R. 10281	Government Employees Salary Comparability Act	3.6-percent increase, $488,175,000; fringe benefits, $53,300,000 annually; total, $641,475,000.
89-302	S. 1735	Marine laboratory, University of California use of	
89-303	H.R. 10198	Tariff, lumber, Shipping Act requirements	
89-304	H.R 23	Conservation and development, fish, anadromous	Authorization until June 30, 1970, $25,000,000.
89-305	H.R. 9495	FDR Commission	
89-306	H.R. 4845	Provide for economic purchase, lease maintenance automatic data processing equipment. Estimated to save $60,000,000 to $100,000,000.	
89-307	S. 516	Extend St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission	
89-308	H.R. 4170	Foreign Service Annuity Adjustment Act	For the 1st fiscal year $94,900 increase to high of $208,900 in 1976 and thereafter diminishing.
89-309	H.R. 11588	Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966	Appropriation.
89-310	H.R. 11096	Disposal from stockpile of graphite, quartz, and lump talc	

Public law	Bill No.	Subject	Cost estimate
89-311	H.R. 168	Increase compensation for service-connected veterans	$178,000,000.
89-312	H.R. 10369	Bus taxation proration compacts, Connecticut	
89-313	H.R. 9022	Construction of schools in areas affected by disasters	
89-314	H.R. 11303	Extension of retirement annuities for Federal employees	
89-315	H.R. 11420	Certain mailing privileges to members of Armed Forces	
89-316	H.R. 8370	Agriculture appropriation act	Appropriation.
89-317	H.J. Res. 397	District of Columbia, lands, transfer to United States	
89-318	H.R. 9545	Preservation of evidence pertaining to the assassination of John F. Kennedy	
89-319	H.R. 1781	District courts to be held in Clinton, N.C	
89-320	H.J. Res. 597	Memorial to Dr. R. H. Goddard	
89-321	H.R. 9811	Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, other estimates have been reported of $4,500,000,000 annually, amounting to $18,000,000,000 for 4 years.	Latest estimate of Agriculture Department is $4,000,000,000 a year for 4 years, $16,000,000,000.
89-322	H.R. 9047	Disposal of zinc from stockpile	
89-323	H.R. 10305	Disposal of nickel from stockpile	
89-324	H.R. 7812	Loan naval vessels to foreign countries	
89-325	H.J. Res. 641	Authorize Father Flanagan's Boys' Home to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia.	
89-326	H.R. 1778	Condemnation of insanitary buildings, District of Columbia	
89-327	H.J. Res. 671	Authorize President to proclaim month of November as Water Conservation Month.	
89-328	H.R. 5026	Authorize Burt County Bridge Commission to refund bonds	
89-329	H.R. 9567	Higher Education Act, estimates of $4,700,000,000 apparently include continuing authorizations not included in these specific figures show in the law.	1966, $845,350,000; 1967, $786,280,000; 1968, $953,020,000; total, $2,584,650,000. For 1969 and succeeding years such sums as authorized.
89-330	S. 2092	Permit agricultural marketing orders applicable to celery, sweet corn, limes, or avocados to provide for paid advertising.	
89-331	H.R. 11135	Sugar Act Amendments, subsidies run $90,000,000 a year and will continue at that level 6 years; excise tax collected brings into the Treasury general fund about $95,000,000 annually; in addition there is a tariff.	
89-332	S. 1758	Representation by attorneys before Federal agencies	
89-333	H.R. 8310	Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments; 1969 and thereafter such sums as Congress may authorize.	1966, $385,000,000; 1967, $461,000,000; 1968, $526,000,000; total, $1,372,000,000.
89-334	S. 2542	Increase small business revolving fund	$120,000,000 increase in revolving fund.
89-335	H.R. 5493	Flag to be flown 24 hours each day in Lexington, Mass	
89-336	H.R. 797	Establish Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area, Calif	$44,300,000.
89-337	S. 2679	Amend Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, increase watershed authority, build dams ranging up to 12,500 acre-feet instead of 5,000 acre-feet.	
89-338	H.R. 7475	Name lock and dam No. 6 on Arkansas River for D.D. Terry	
89-339	H.R. 11539	Assistance to Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi for reconstruction of areas damaged by recent hurricane.	
89-340	H.J. Res. 788	Jan. 10, 1966, meeting date for 89th Cong., 2d sess	
89-341	H.R. 5597	Relieve physicians of liability for negligence in treatment at scene of accidents in District of Columbia.	
89-342	H.R. 11267	Remove certain limitations relating to electrical equipment and mechanical office equipment, House of Representatives.	
89-343	S. 1004	Government property and services procurement	
89-344	H.R. 9830	Amend Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, authorize reimbursements to State or political subdivision for sidewalk repair.	$50,000 annually.
89-345	H.R. 4421	Land transfer, Cheyenne, Wyo	
89-346	S. 2118	Validating certain ship mortgage bonds on American-flag vessels	
89-347	S. 1320	Clarify criminal laws of District of Columbia	
89-348	S. 2150	Eliminate certain reports and other publications prepared by executive departments and agencies.	
89-349	H.R. 227	Entitle certain war orphans (of veterans) benefits	$400,000.

Record of Committee on Public Works in the 89th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following summary of public works legislation reported by the Committee on Public Works during the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

GENERAL STATEMENT

First, I wish to express my appreciation for the efforts of the Committee on Public Works for the first year that I have been chairman. I particularly want to say that the members of the minority, as well as those of the majority, have been helpful in the passage of legislation which has been of great value to the country as a whole.

The committee had 488 bills referred to it during the first session. These dealt with such subjects as authorization for additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; navigation improvements, flood control, and beach erosion; extension of authority to construct facilities for the enforcement of customs and immigration laws to Guam and the Virgin Islands; amended the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to increase the amount authorized for the Interstate System for fiscal year 1967, and authorized the apportionment of such amount, as well as studies of future highway needs and highway safety programs; the cooperative development of the physical resources of 360 counties in the 11 State Appalachian Mountain region of our Nation—Appalachian Regional Development Act; the establishment of a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment works, and to require establishment of water quality criteria—Water Quality Act of 1965; a program of Federal financial and technical assistance for citizens of depressed areas in the Nation to carry out effective programs for economic betterment of citizens—Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; civil works authorizations for 150 flood control, navigation, water conservation and other water resources projects, having an estimated Federal cost of $1,985,785,000—omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill for 1965; highway beautification legislation, which provides for an all-out attack on the forces of ugliness which threaten to deprive present and future generations of Americans from knowing and appreciating the finery of nature with which we have been abundantly endowed—Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

The committee adopted 50 navigation, flood control, and beach erosion resolutions proposed by individual Members of Congress, which require only committee action. The civil works resolutions authorized review survey studies by the Corps of Engineers Department of the Army, that will ultimately result in the submission of project reports to Congress if the projects are found feasible and are approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers. The committee adopted 37 watershed resolutions, approved pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act—Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended—which requires major watershed projects having not more than 12,500 acre-feet of flood control capacity to be approved by the Committee on Public Works.

The committee approved 81 public building projects under the Public Buildings Act of 1959. These included Federal office buildings, courthouses, post offices, customhouses, immigration quarters, and warehouses throughout the Nation. Five lease construction projects proposed under the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1965 were also approved by the committee. While most of these were for new construction, some of them represent repair and remodeling of existing structures.

In addition, subcommittees made special inspection trips to areas affected by floods in California, Oregon, and adjacent States in the Northwest, as well as the upper Mississippi River area, following the devastation which occurred from unprecedented floods in that area.

Subcommittees were also appointed to inspect the floods in San Antonio, Tex., the disastrous floods in the South Platte River Basin in Colorado and Kansas, and the tremendous devastation which occurred from Hurricane Betsy in Louisiana, Florida, and Mississippi. As a result of such inspection trips, the committee held extensive hearings on legislation to provide assistance to the States of California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by floods and high waters during December 1964, and January and February 1965, after which a bill was reported to the House, was passed by both Houses, and was signed into law by the President—Public Law 89-41. Also, extensive hearings were held on legislation authorizing Federal aid to Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi to repair public facilities damaged by Hurricane Betsy in October 1965. A bill which authorized $70 million in Federal aid to the three States named above, as well as Federal loan adjustment assistance and a study of alternative Federal relief programs, was reported out and approved by both Houses and signed by the President—Public Law 89-339.

The committee also acted on legislation which would authorize the construction of the third Library of Congress building in the District of Columbia to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall, and for other purposes. This was acted on by both Houses and signed into law by the President—Public Law 89-260.

The committee has held hearings and executive sessions almost continuously since the beginning of the session, in addition to the inspection trips of special subcommittees, and every member has contributed in great part to the accomplishments of this past year.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program conducted public hearings on March 30, 31, April 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, May 24, 25, and June 1 and 2, 1965, on highway construction practices in the State of Louisiana and related matters. The hearings followed many months of intensive investigation by the subcommittee staff. Printed transcripts of the testimony are available under the designation of "Committee Document No. 89-10."

Although construction practices in Louisiana was the main topic of the hearing, the scope was broadened to include such related aspects as the record sampling program, unrealistic construction specifications and the manner in which the Federal-aid secondary road program has been administered.

At the hearings, witnesses disclosed how unrealistic construction specifications coupled with inadequate external and internal controls helped bring about irregularities including substandard construction, counterfeited samples of material, fraudulent haul tickets, "faked" test reports and other abuses. These revelations followed the subcommittee's previous disclosures of inadequacy of construction controls in Oklahoma, House Report No. 364, 87th Congress, 1st session; New Mexico, House Report No. 1819, 87th Congress, 2d session; and Arizona, House Report No. 1494, 88th Congress, 2d session. Although the conditions found in Louisiana followed the same general pattern of operational deficiencies which had been revealed in the other three States, certain inadequacies of internal controls had been corrected by the State by the time the subcommittee held the hearing.

Despite the picture of woefully inadequate controls over construction painted by the Louisiana witnesses, an encouraging note was offered in testimony by officials of the Arizona and New Mexico Highway Departments. It was particularly gratifying to the subcommittee to learn of the general upgrading of techniques and internal controls over construction practices that followed its hearings on practices in those States.

Testimony by Bureau of Public Roads officials, as well as that by State highway officials, indicated that the lessons learned from the Louisiana investigation will result in positive improvements in both State and Bureau controls, even as previous hearings before the subcommittee helped bring about such upgraded techniques as the record sampling program and the Bureau's intensified system of inspections in depth.

The subcommittee's ninth interim report, based on the Louisiana hearings, is currently being prepared.

In addition to the public hearing on Louisiana, the subcommittee took testimony in executive session on July 12, 13, and 14, 1965, on Federal-State highway management practices and procedures. Staff inquiry into this area is continuing.

The effectiveness of the audit function is currently under review, with particular reference to the application of audit procedures to Federal-aid projects at both the Federal and State levels.

The staff is also continuing to review and study other matters, with emphasis on the particular areas described below, in expectation that public hearings may subsequently be held.

The impact of toll roads upon the interstate program is one of the matters currently under study by the staff. The incorporation of toll roads, bridges, and tunnels into the Interstate System, and the location of toll facilities between free sections of Federal-aid highways are among the problems under consideration.

Policies, practices, and procedures in a number of States with reference to right-of-way acquisition is the subject of another staff study which is continuing. This involves the question of the effectiveness of controls over State practices and procedures in the general acquisition of land for Federal-aid highway purposes. A companion study in the right-of-way field involves the advisability of broadening the existing provisions of title 23, United States Code, relative to the advance acquisition of right-of-way.

Following is a more detailed listing of the specific major bills and items which the committee has considered or approved:

BASIN AUTHORIZATION FOR 1966 AND 1967—PUBLIC LAW 89-42

The bill authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins, now Public Law 89-42, provided funds for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for 11 river basins, totaling $908 million, as follows: Alabama-Coosa, $38 million; Arkansas River, $290 million; Brazos River, $14 million; Central and Southern Florida, $30 million; Columbia River, $223 million; Lower Mississippi, $53 million; Missouri River, $116 million; Ohio River, $89 million; Ouachita River, $11 million; Upper Mississippi River, $27 million, and West Branch Susquehanna River, $17 million. This act also authorizes the completion of the Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway, New York, project, approved in the River and Harbor Act of August 30, 1935, as amended, at an estimated cost of $5 million. It also authorizes the completion of the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Los Angeles River Basin, approved by the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended and supplemented, at an estimated cost of $31 million.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956, AMENDMENT—PUBLIC LAW 89-139

This amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 provides an increase in the amount of funds authorized for the Interstate System for fiscal year 1967 from $2.9 billion to $3 billion, and authorizes the apportionment of these funds for fiscal year 1967, using the apportionment factors contained in the 1965 Interstate System Cost Estimate—House Document No. 42, 89th Congress—but reserves the right of Congress to disapprove the cost estimate for completion of such national system by the Secretary of Commerce.

This act also authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of certain future highway needs. It also creates a new section 135 of title 23 of the United States Code, to provide for highway safety programs within the several States.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965—PUBLIC LAW 89-4

The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 provides public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in development of the 11-State Appalachian Mountain region of our Nation.

It was found that the Appalachian region of the United States, while abundant in natural resources and rich in potential, lags behind the rest of the Nation in its economic growth and that its people have not shared properly in the Nation's prosperity. The region's uneven past development, with its historical reliance on a few basic industries and a marginal agriculture, has failed to provide the economic base that is a vital prerequisite for vigorous, self-sustaining growth. The State and local governments and the people of the region understand their problems and have been working and will continue to work purposefully toward their solution. Congress recognized the comprehensive report of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission documenting these findings and concluded that regionwide development is feasible, desirable, and urgently needed.

The purpose of this act is to assist the region in meeting its special problems, to promote its economic development, and to establish a framework for joint Federal and State efforts toward providing the basic facilities essential to its growth and attacking its common problems and meeting its common needs on a coordinated and concerted regional basis. The public investments made in the region under this act shall be concentrated in areas where there is a significant potential for future growth, and where the expected return on public dollars invested will be the greatest. The States will be responsible for recommending local and State projects within their borders which will receive assistance under this act.

As the region obtains the needed physical and transportation facilities and develops its human resources, the Congress expects that the region will generate a diversified industry and that the region will then be able to support itself, through the workings of a strengthened, free enterprise economy.

Following is a section-by-section highlight analysis of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965:

Highlights of Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965

Section	Description	Authorization (millions)	Duration of authorization
101	Creates an Appalachian Regional Commission to plan the expenditure of the funds authorized by the bill. The Commission is composed of representatives of the 11 States and 1 Federal member who speaks for the entire Federal Government. To take action a majority of the States and the Federal member must vote in the affirmative.	$2.4	27 months.
201	Provides for the construction of 2,350 miles of major arterial roads and 1,000 miles of access roads. (Department of Commerce.) [1]	840.0	6 years.
202(b)	Provides for the construction of comprehensive health centers to serve multicounty areas. (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.)	41.0	6 years.
202(c)	Provides grants to local organizations to administer and operate the hospitals constructed under sec. 202(b). (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.)	28.0	27 months.
203	Provides a series of grants for land treatment to prevent erosion and to promote soil conservation. These grants may finance 80 percent of the cost of such treatment for 50 acres of land. (Department of Agriculture.)	17.0	27 months.
204	Provides, 1st, a series of grants for technical assistance to small landowners to improve their timber stands. Provides, 2d, loans to assist in the formation of timber development organizations for better management of small timber holdings. (Department of Agriculture.)	5.0	27 months.
205	Expands present programs to fill in underground mines, to extinguish fires, and to remove burning and nonburning refuse piles. Also permits the reclamation of strip-mined public land. Establishes a study to recommend long-range programs for strip-mine reclamation. (Department of the Interior.)	36.5	27 months.
206	Establishes a comprehensive water resource survey for the entire Appalachian region. The study will be coordinated by the Secretary of the Army assisted by all interested agencies. (Department of the Army.)	5.0	27 months.
211	Enables the acceleration of vocational education facilities construction. (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.)	16.0	27 months.
212	Enables the acceleration of sewage treatment facilities under the Water Pollution Control Act. (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.)	6.0	27 months.
214	Provides a series of grants to ease the burden on local communities in matching existing Federal grant-in-aid construction and equipment programs. These grants are to be used to provide the difference between the normal Federal contribution to such a Federal project and 80 percent of the total cost of the project. Examples of programs eligible for supplementation: Airport construction, college and junior college construction, hospital construction, and others. (Department of Commerce.)	90.0	27 months.
302(a)	Establishes a program to finance 75 percent of the administrative costs of State or local development organizations for the 1st 3 years of their existence. (Department of Commerce.)	5.5	27 months.
302(b)	Provides grants for research and demonstration projects, leading to better economic development of the Appalachian region. (Department of Commerce.)		
	Total	1,092.4	

[1] Following the description of each section of the bill is the name of the agency which will allocate the funds under each program.

WATER QUALITY ACT OF 1965—PUBLIC LAW 89-234

This act amends the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment works, to require establishment of water quality criteria, and for other purposes.

The purpose of this act is to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and to establish a national policy for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution.

In this legislation, in connection with the exercise of jurisdiction over the waterways of the Nation and in consequence of the benefits resulting to the public health and welfare by the prevention and control of water pollution, it is the intention of Congress to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution, to support and aid technical research relating to the prevention and control of water pollution, and to provide Federal technical services and financial aid to State and interstate agencies and to municipalities in connection with the prevention and control of water pollution.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall administer this act through the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration created by this act, and with the assistance of an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare designated by him, shall supervise and direct, first, the head of such Administration in administering this act; and second, the administration of all other functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to water pollution, and such other additional functions as the Secretary may prescribe.

The Secretary shall, after careful investigation, and in cooperation with other Federal agencies, with State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, and with the municipalities and industries involved, prepare or develop comprehensive programs for eliminating or reducing the pollution of interstate waters and tributaries thereof and improving the sanitary condition of surface and underground waters. In the development of such comprehensive programs due regard shall be given to the improvements which are necessary to conserve such waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses. The Secretary is authorized to make joint investigations with any such agencies of the condition of any waters in any State or States, and of the discharges of any sewage, industrial wastes, or substance which may adversely affect such waters.

The Secretary shall encourage cooperative activities by the States for the prevention and control of water pollution; encourage the enactment of improved and, so far as practicable, uniform State laws relating to the prevention and control of water pollution; and encourage compacts between States for the prevention and control of water pollution.

The Secretary shall conduct in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and encourage, cooperate with, and render assistance to other appropriate public—whether Federal, State, interstate, or local—authorities, agencies, and institutions, private agencies and institutions, and individuals in the conduct of, and promote the coordination of, research, investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and studies relating to the causes, control, and prevention of water pollution.

The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the purpose of assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes, and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith. The Secretary is authorized to provide for the conduct of research and demonstrations relating to new or improved methods of controlling the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes, by contract with public or private agencies and institutions and with individuals without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes, except that not to exceed 25 percent of the total amount appropriated under authority of this section for any fiscal year may be expended under authority of this sentence during such fiscal year.

The act authorizes to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, $3 million, and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $5 million for grants to States and to interstate agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of water pollution.

The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into any waters and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith.

There is established by this act in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, composed of the Secretary or his designee, who shall be chairman, and nine members appointed by the President, none of whom shall be Federal officers or employees. The appointed members, having due regard for the purposes of this act, shall be selected from among representatives of various State, interstate, and local governmental agencies, of public or private interests contributing to, affected by, or concerned with water pollution, and of other public and private agencies, organizations, or groups demonstrating an active interest in the field of water pollution prevention and control, as well as other individuals who are expert in this field.

The pollution of interstate or navigable waters in or adjacent to any State or States—whether the matter causing or contributing to such pollution is discharged directly into such waters or reaches such waters after discharge into a tributary of such waters—which endangers the health or welfare of any persons, shall be subject to abatement as provided in this act.

Consistent with the policy declaration of this act, State and interstate action to abate pollution of interstate or navigable waters shall be encouraged and shall not, except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to court order under provisions of this act, be displaced by Federal enforcement action.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965—PUBLIC LAW 89-136

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is designed to provide new industry and permanent jobs in areas where they are most needed. Its main emphasis is on long-range economic development and programing for areas or communities that are burdened with persistent unemployment and low family incomes. The new act is based upon a combination of proven ingredients—the area redevelopment and accelerated public works programs—and incorporates the regional planning concepts of the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

The act recognizes that economic development of distressed areas, districts, and regions is an enormously complex process, requiring the full cooperation of both public officials and private enterprise. It also requires partnership among officials at every level of government—local, county, State, and Federal.

The new act has a single primary objective: to create a climate conducive to the development of private enterprise in America's economically distressed communities. It does this by insisting upon local initiative to design and implement community redevelopment in partnership with Government, in order to harness the economic potential of areas that have too long been outside the mainstream of the Nation's prosperity.

The Economic Development Act provides some of the tools necessary to alleviate the conditions of our depressed areas. These tools include needed public works, industrial and commercial loans, and a wide variety of technical assistance to remove obstacles to sound and sustained economic progress.

The act does not automatically provide funds for the program. Projects may not be approved until funds are appropriated by the Congress.

KEY PROVISIONS OF THE ACT

First, public works: More than two-thirds of the funds authorized by Congress for the new program—$500 million annually for 4 years—will be used for public works and development facility grants. Loans of up to 100 percent are also authorized for these projects in areas where funds are not otherwise available. Public works provide such facilities as water and sewage systems, access roads, and the like, to encourage industrial development that will result in long-term employment. These development facilities will be constructed by providing direct grants of up to 50 percent of the cost of eligible projects and supplementary grants which can bring the Federal share as high as 80 percent in the neediest areas.

Second, business loans: To encourage private investment, the Economic Development Act provides low-interest, long-term loans to businesses expanding or establishing plants in designated redevelopment areas. Loans of up to 65 percent of the total project cost—including land, buildings, machinery, and equipment—may be made for up to 25 years at a rate of interest based on Federal borrowing costs. These loans will be made for projects which cannot be accomplished by financing solely through banks or other lending institutions. Federal guarantees for working capital loans made by private institutions in connection with these projects are also available.

Third, technical assistance: To help distressed areas understand the scope of their problems as well as their economic potential, the Economic Development Act provides an extensive program of technical assistance. This assistance may be in the form of studies to identify area needs or to find solutions to industrial and economic development problems. It also takes the form of grants-in-aid of 75 percent of the cost of planning and administering local economic development programs. It may also include management and operational assistance to private firms.

Fourth, research and information: Funds are provided under the act to develop a continuing program of study, training, and research into the causes of unemployment, underemployment, and chronic depression, and to devise programs and projects to help raise income levels. The act also authorizes the providing of information to areas whenever such information would be useful in alleviating or preventing conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment.

Following is a section-by-section highlight analysis of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965:

Highlights of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965

TITLE I—GRANTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES

Section	Description	Annual authorization (millions)
101	Provides direct grants (up to 50 percent) and supplementary grants (up to a Federal maximum of 80 percent) for public works and development facilities	
102	Authorizes the designation of areas as eligible for grants under title I if the Secretary of Labor finds that they have been areas of substantial unemployment for the preceding calendar year	
103	Establishes a 15-percent limitation on the amount of total authorization that may be expended in any 1 State	
104	Prohibits the duplication of assistance for projects which have been approved under the Appalachian Regional Development Act	
105	Authorizes the appropriation of $500,000,000 annually until June 30, 1969, for grants under this title	$500
106	Requires the Secretary to obtain a certification from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that proposed waste disposal facilities meet applicable standards	

Highlights of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965—Continued

TITLE II—OTHER FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Section	Description	Annual authorization (millions)
201	Authorizes loans (up to 100 percent) to assist in financing public works or development facilities	
202(a)(1)	Authorizes loans (up to 65 percent) for the purchase or development of land and facilities for industrial or commercial usage	
202(a)(2)	Provides for guarantees (up to 90 percent) of private working capital loans made in connection with direct loan projects	
202(b)	Sets forth standard loan provisions	
201(c)	Authorizes $170,000,000 annually for secs. 201 and 202 loans and guarantees until June 30, 1970	$170
203	Establishes an economic development revolving fund in the U.S. Treasury to receive collections and repayments and to extend financial assistance under secs. 201, 202, and 403	

TITLE III—TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, RESEARCH, AND INFORMATION

Section	Description	Annual authorization (millions)
301(a)	Provides for technical assistance studies in designated areas or other areas that have a substantial need for assistance	
301(b)	Provides grants (up to 75 percent) to defray the planning and administrative expenses of qualified organizations	
301(c)	Provides for a continuing program of study and research	
301(d)	Authorizes the Secretary to provide redevelopment and other areas with information or advice which would be useful in alleviating or preventing conditions of excessive unemployment	
301(e)	Provides for the establishment of an independent study board to investigate effects of Government procurement and other programs on economic development	
302	Provides an appropriation authorization of $25,000,000 annually until June 30, 1970, for this title	25

TITLE IV—AREA AND DISTRICT ELIGIBILITY

Section	Description	Annual authorization (millions)
401	Establishes standards for the designation of redevelopment areas on the basis of unemployment and low family income. Authorizes the continued designation for a period of approximately 1 year of areas which were eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act as of Mar. 1, 1965. Insures that every State will have at least 1 redevelopment area	
402	Provides for an annual review of area eligibility	
403	Provides for the designation of multicounty economic development districts containing 2 or more redevelopment areas and at least 1 development center. Provides for 10 percent bonuses on grants to redevelopment areas within designated districts and for loan and grant assistance to centers for district projects. Provides an appropriation authorization of $50,000,000 annually after June 30, 1966, until June 30, 1970	50

TITLE V—REGIONAL ACTION PLANNING COMMISSION

Section	Description	Annual authorization (millions)
501	Provides for the designation of appropriate economic development regions	
502	Provides for the establishment of regional commissions	
503	Sets forth the functions of the regional commissions	
504	Establishes program development criteria for the guidance of the regional commissions	
505	Provides Federal technical and planning assistance (100 percent for first 2 years, 50 percent thereafter) to the regional commissions in the development of regional programs. Authorizes an annual appropriation of $15,000,000 for such purposes until June 30, 1970	15
506	Establishes the administrative powers of the commission	
507	Authorizes the commissions to obtain information necessary to carry out their responsibilities	
508	Prohibits conflicts of interest in connection with commission activities	
509	Provides for comprehensive and detailed annual reports with respect to the commission's activities and recommendations for programs	

TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION

Section	Description	Annual authorization (millions)
601	Affixes responsiblity for administering the act with the Secretary of Commerce and provides for the appointment of an Assistant Secretary in addition to the Administrator	
602	Authorizes the appointment of a National Public Advisory Committee on Regional Economic Development composed of 25 members	
603	Provides for the Secretary to consult with other persons and agencies which can assist in meeting the problems of area and regional unemployment	

TITLE VII—TECHNICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Section	Description	Annual authorization (millions)
701	Sets forth the powers of the Secretary necessary to the administration of a loan program	
702	Prohibits assistance to projects in industries which have excess efficient capacity	
703	Sets forth "savings provisions" relating ARA program to new program	
704	Provides for transfer of functions for Area Redevelopment Administration to the Secretary of Commerce	
705	Declaration of "separability" as to provisions of the act	
706	Defines the term "State" for the purposes of the act	
707	Provides for an annual report to be made to Congress for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966	
708	Authorizes the use of the facilities and services of other agencies in carrying out the provisions of the act	
709	Authorizes appropriations to carry out those provisions of the act for which no specific authorization is provided	
710	Provides penalties for falsifying applications	
711	Establishes restrictions on use of expediters and administrative employees under the act	
712	Requires the payment of prevailing wages in the construction of projects receiving assistance under the act	
713	Requires the maintenance of a permanent record of all approved applications for financial assistance which shall be kept available for public inspection	
714	Requires the keeping of sufficient records for the purpose of audit	
715	Provides that benefits extended under other programs to redevelopment areas designated under the Area Redevelopment Act will also be made available to areas designated under this act	
716	Requires all financial and technical assistance under this act to be in addition to Federal assistance authorized under other legislation, so that there is no reduction in funds allocated under other programs to areas designated under this act	
	Total	760

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1965—PUBLIC LAW 89–298

The Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act of 1965—Public Law 89–298—which authorizes the Army Corps of Engineers to construct, modify, or otherwise participate in the provision of 150 flood control, navigation, water conservation and other water resources projects, has an estimated Federal cost of $1,985,785,000. This includes 91 flood control—including multiple purpose—projects at a cost of $1,635,766,000; 50 navigation projects at an estimated Federal cost of $343,338,000; and 9 beach erosion projects at an estimated Federal cost of $6,681,000. This act also authorizes 33 surveys for flood control and allied purposes and 18 surveys in the interest of navigation and beach erosion control.

The new law also—

First, authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to purchase evidence of indebtedness and make loans to enable local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation in connection with Corps of Engineers projects in areas eligible for financial assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

Second, raises the yearly limit of $1 million authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1960 for flood plain information studies to $2,500,000.

Third, raises the cost limits of small navigation and beach erosion projects as follows:

Navigation: From the $200,000 present limit per project to $500,000; and the present overall yearly amount from $2 to $10 million.

Beach erosion: From the $400,000 present limit per project to $500,000; and the present overall yearly amount from $3 to $10 million.

Fourth, authorizes the Secretary of the Army to transmit to the Committees on Public Works suggested legislation revising and codifying the laws relating to Corps of Engineers civil works projects.

Fifth, authorizes a study by the Corps of Engineers of the need for and feasibility of reimbursing States and other local interests for expenditures incurred by them in connection with Corps of Engineers authorized projects.

The bill contains a number of other minor provisions aimed at dealing with local situations or details of previous acts.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION ACT OF 1965—PUBLIC LAW 89-285

The Highway Beautification Act of 1965 provides for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems.

Following is a section-by-section summary of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965:

TITLE I

Section 101 amends section 131 of title 23, United States Code, as follows:

Subsection (a) is a declaration of policy with respect to the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices in areas adjacent to the interstate and primary systems.

Subsection (b) provides for a 10-percent reduction in all Federal-aid highway apportionments to any State that has not made provision for "effective control" of outdoor advertising within 660 feet of the right-of-way of a highway on the Interstate and Federal-aid primary systems on or after January 1, 1968, until such time as the State shall provide for "effective control." The Secretary may, when deemed in the public interest, suspend the application of this subsection to a State. Any amount withheld shall be reapportioned to the other States.

Subsection (c) defines "effective control" and states that outdoor signs, displays, and devices shall be limited to directional and other official signs, including signs and notices pertaining to natural wonders and scenic and historical attractions. These signs shall conform to national standards which the Secretary is authorized to promulgate. Signs advertising the sale or lease of property upon which they are located and signs advertising activities upon the property on which they are located would be permitted.

Subsection (d) provides that signs, displays, and devices may be erected and maintained in areas which are zoned industrial or commercial under State law, or in unzoned industrial or commercial areas as may be determined by agreement between the several States and the Secretary. Size, lighting, and spacing of such signs, consistent with customary use, is to be determined by agreement between the several States and the Secretary. The States retain authority to zone areas for commercial or industrial purposes under their own zoning laws and their action in this regard will be accepted for the purposes of this act. Signs advertising on-premise activities are exempt from this subsection.

Subsection (e) provides that signs, displays, and devices, lawfully in existence on September 1, 1965, that do not conform to this section shall not be required to be removed until July 1, 1970. Any other sign, display, or device lawfully erected which does not conform shall not be required to be removed until the end of the fifth year after it becomes nonconforming.

Subsection (f) provides for the erection of signs, displays, and devices, in consultation with the States, within the right-of-way on the Interstate System, at appropriate distances from interchanges, giving specific information in the interest of the traveling public. These signs, displays, and devices shall conform to national standards promulgated by the Secretary.

Subsection (g) provides for the payment of just compensation upon removal of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices which were lawfully in existence on the date of enactment of this subsection; those lawfully on any highway made a part of the Interstate or primary system on or after the enactment of this subsection and before January 1, 1968; and those lawfully erected after January 1, 1968. The Federal share of just compensation is 75 percent. Compensation is to be paid to the owner of the sign, display, or device, and to the owner of the real property on which the sign, display, or device is located.

Subsection (h) provides for the control, by national standards, of all public lands or reservations of the United States which are adjacent to any portion of the interstate or primary system.

Subsection (i) authorizes the State highway departments to maintain maps and to permit informational directories and advertising pamphlets to be made available at safety rest areas for the traveling public. Subject to the approval of the Secretary, the States may also establish information centers at these safety rest areas.

Subsection (j) provides for the continuation of bonus payments to States which entered into agreements to control outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices in areas adjacent to the Interstate System provided they continue to control under the terms of their agreement or this section, whichever is stricter. This subsection also states that the continuance of these agreements shall not be construed as exempting any State from controlling outdoor advertising as provided in this section.

Subsection (k) provides that a State may impose stricter limitations with respect to signs, displays and devices on the Federal-aid highway systems than those established under this section.

Subsection (l) provides for written notice, a statement of reasons, and an opportunity for a hearing whenever the Secretary determines to withhold funds from a State under the provisions of this Act. After the hearing, the Secretary shall issue a written order and the State may appeal such order to any United States district court for such State. The judgment of the district court is made subject to review by the U.S. appellate courts.

Subsection (m) authorizes to be appropriated out of the general fund of the Treasury not to exceed $20 million for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967. The use of the highway trust fund is prohibited.

Section 102 amends the heading of section 131 in the title of sections of chapter 1 of title 23.

TITLE II

Section 201 adds a new section 136 to title 23, United States Code, as follows:

Subsection (a) is a declaration of policy with respect to the establishment, use and maintenance of junkyards in areas adjacent to the Interstate and primary systems.

Subsection (b) provides for a 10-percent reduction in all Federal-aid highway apportionments to any State that has not made provision for "effective control" of junkyards within 1,000 feet of the right-of-way and visible from the main traveled way of such systems on or after January 1, 1968. The Secretary may, when deemed in the public interest, suspend the application of this subsection to a State. Any amount withheld shall be reapportioned to the other States.

Subsection (c) defines "effective control" as screening junkyards so as not to be visible from the main traveled way of the highway or removal from sight.

Subsection (d) defines the term "junk."

Subsection (e) defines the term "automobile graveyard."

Subsection (f) defines the term "junkyard."

Subsection (g) provides that notwithstanding the provisions of this section, junkyards, auto graveyards, and scrap metal processing facilities may be operated in areas zoned industrial by State law or in areas which are not zoned by State law but which are used for industrial activities, as determined by the States subject to approval by the Secretary.

Subsection (h) provides that any junkyard in existence on the enactment date of this section which does not conform to the requirements of this section and which the Secretary finds cannot be screened is not required to be removed until July 1, 1970.

Subsection (i) provides that the Federal share of landscaping and screening costs is 75 percent.

Subsection (j) provides that just compensation be paid the owner for the relocation, removal, or disposal of those junkyards lawfully in existence on the enactment date of this subsection, those junkyards lawfully along any highway made a part of the interstate or primary system on or after the enactment of this subsection and before January 1, 1968, and those lawfully established on or after January 1, 1968. The Federal share of such compensation is 75 percent.

Subsection (k) provides that all public lands or reservation of the United States, adjacent to the interstate and primary systems shall also be controlled in accordance with this section.

Subsection (l) permits a State to impose stricter limitations with respect to junkyards than those provided under this section.

Subsection (m) authorizes to be appropriated out of the general fund of the Treasury not to exceed $20 million for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967. The use of the highway trust fund is prohibited.

Section 202 amends the table of section of chapter 1, title 23, United States Code, by adding section 136.

TITLE III

Section 301(a) amends section 319 of title 23, United States Code, as follows:

Subsection (a) of section 319 provides the Secretary may approve the costs of landscape and roadside development as part of the construction costs of Federal-aid highways.

Subsection (b) of section 319 provides for an allocation out of funds appropriated under authority of this subsection equivalent to 3 percent of Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to a State, for landscape and roadside development within the highway right-of-way and for the acquisition of interests in and improvement of strips of land necessary for the restoration, preservation, and enhancement of scenic beauty adjacent to such highways and for the acquisition and development of publicly owned rest and recreation areas and sanitary and other facilities within or adjacent to the highway right-of-way. These funds are not to be matched by the States. The Secretary is authorized to make exceptions to this requirement where a State shows the amount is in excess of its needs for these purposes. Any funds not so used shall lapse. This subsection authorizes an appropriation out of the general fund of the Treasury of $120 million for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967. The use of the highway trust fund is prohibited.

Subsection (b) redesignates the heading of section 319 in the table of sections of chapter 3 of title 23, United States Code.

Section 302 provides for a detailed estimate to be made of the cost of carrying out the provision of this act including the economic impact of these programs, their effectiveness, and the public and private benefits derived therefrom. This detailed estimate, to be made by the Secretary in cooperation with the States, must be submitted to the Congress not later than January 10, 1967.

Section 303(a) provides for public hearings in each State before the promulgation of standards, criteria, and rules and regulations by the Secretary of Commerce.

Subsection (b) requires the Secretary of Commerce to report to the Congress not later than January 10, 1967, the standards, criteria, and rules and regulations to be applied in carrying out the provisions of sections 131 and 136 of title 23, United States Code.

Section 304 authorizes an appropriation of $500,000 to enable the Secretary of Commerce to carry out his functions under section 135 of title 23, United States Code (highway safety programs).

Section 305 provides that the act shall not be construed to authorize the use of eminent domain to acquire any dwelling.

TITLE IV

Section 401 provides that the act shall not be construed to authorize the taking of private property or restricting its existing use without compensation as provided in the act.

Section 402 authorizes an appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury not to exceed $5 million for administrative expenses in carrying out this act.

DEATH OF COMMITTEE MEMBER

One of the most sorrowful events the committee experienced was the loss of one of its ablest members, Congressman T. A. Thompson, of Louisiana, chairman of the Public Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee. His death was a tragic thing for one so vital and active. He contributed over the many years he served on the committee a great deal to the work of the committee, and all of us, as well as our colleagues in the House and his many friends, mourn his passing. We shall miss him.

SUBCOMMITTEE AND STAFF WORK

I want here to express my sincere appreciation for the splendid cooperation of the committee members, particularly the subcommittee chairmen, Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK, chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee as well as the Federal-Aid Highway Program Subcommittee; Congressman ROBERT E. JONES, chairman of the Flood Control Subcommittee; Congressman JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, chairman of the Roads Subcommittee; Congressman KENNETH J. GRAY, chairman of the Public Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee who succeeded T. A. Thompson; and Congressman JIM WRIGHT, chairman of the Watershed Development Subcommittee.

My deep and sincere appreciation also goes to Congressman WILLIAM C. CRAMER, of Florida, the ranking minority member of the committee, as well as the other able members of the minority side who have done so much to further the work of the committee.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation for the work which the members of the committee have done, and this includes work of the staff of the committee, in carrying forward one of the most tremendous public works programs in the history of the country.

SUMMARY

Following is a summary of the bills and resolutions acted upon by the committee in the first session:

Bills and resolutions enacted into law

Public Law No.	Bill No.	Date approved	Title
4	S. 3	Mar. 9, 1965	Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.
41	S. 2089	June 17, 1965	Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965.
42	H.R. 6755	June 18, 1965	Additional monetary authorizations for certain river basin plans (1966–67).
87	S. 956	July 24, 1965	Extend authority to construct facilities for enforcement of customs and immigration laws to Guam and the Virgin Islands.
136	S. 1648	Aug. 26, 1965	Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.
139	S.J. Res. 81	Aug. 28, 1965	Amend Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to increase amount authorized for the Interstate System for fiscal year 1967; apportionment of such amount; future highway needs study; highway safety programs.
177	H.R. 496	Sept. 10, 1065	Designate lock and dam No. 3, Cape Fear River, N.C., as the William O. Huske lock and dam.
234	S. 4	Oct. 2, 1965	Water Quality Act of 1965.
260	H.J. Res. 642 (S.J. Res. 69).	Oct. 19, 1965	3d Library of Congress building, to be named James Madison Memorial Building.
285	S. 2084	Oct. 22, 1965	Highway Beautification Act of 1965.
298	S. 2300	Oct. 27, 1965	River and harbor and flood control omnibus bill, 1965.
328	H.R. 5026	Nov. 7, 1965	Authorize Burt County Bridge Commission to refinance toll bridge across Missouri River, from Decatur, Nebr., to a point in Monona County, Iowa.
338	H.R. 7475	Nov. 8, 1965	Designate lock and dam No. 6, Arkansas River, Ark., as the David D. Terry lock and dam.
339	H.R. 11539	do	Southeast Hurricane Disaster Relief Act of 1965.

Bill vetoed by the President

Bill No.	Date vetoed	Title
H.R. 7303 (S. 327)	June 5, 1965	Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act of 1965.

Bills passed by the House and pending in Senate committee

Bill No.	Passed House	Title
H.R. 790	Aug. 2, 1965	Rename Silver Springs lock of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal as the R. N. Bert Dosh lock.
H.R. 2208 [1]	Mar. 1, 1965	Modify flood control project for the Scioto River, Ohio.
H.R. 3788	July 19, 1965	City of Clinton Bridge Commission, revive and extend time for construction of a bridge or bridges across Mississippi River, vicinity of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill.
H.R. 3976	May 17, 1965	Muscatine Bridge Commission, extend time for construction of a bridge across Mississippi River, vicinity of Muscatine, Iowa, and Drury Ill.
H.R. 4606	Mar. 1, 1965	Modify flood control project for Four River Basins, Fla.
H.R. 6790 [2]	July 19, 1965	Emergency relief for repair or reconstruction of highways under sec. 125 of title 23, United States Code.

[1] Included in Public Law 89-298. [2] See Public Law 89-41.

Bill reported by the committee and pending on the House Union Calendar

Bill No.	Date reported	Title
H.R. 9963	Oct. 21, 1965	U.S. participation in the 1967 statewide celebration of the centennial of the Alaska Purchase.

Water and the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, policies for full and comprehensive use of Western States' water resources have involved Members of the Senate for decades. Critical water shortages will accelerate that involvement in future years, I am sure. It will require statesmanship of high order to balance the available supply against the growing demand and protect various regional, State, and local interests at the same time.

Some guidelines for formulation of future policy have been laid down by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. As chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, he speaks with the authority of extensive knowledge concerning water uses. In an address to water leaders of California and the Nation on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the first delivery of water from the Central Valley project, he also spoke as a water statesman. Senator JACKSON's views warrant the attention of everyone concerned with proper use of water resources in the West. I ask consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with my remarks, the text of the address by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington entitled, "Water and the West."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER AND THE WEST

(By Senator HENRY M. JACKSON)

I am with you today as a friend and neighbor. I share your pride at this anniversary celebration as one who has supported your efforts in behalf of the Central Valley project during 25 years in the Congress of the United States.

The year you first received delivery of water from the Central Valley project—1940—is the year I was first elected to the House of Representatives. Since then I have had the privilege of working with the many fine people who have represented your area and California in the Congress.

We have fought many battles together on behalf of the Central Valley project. I can recall, particularly, the struggle to secure appropriations during the period 1948 to 1952, when I was a member of the Interior Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. Close to $190 million was appropriated for the CVP during that period. I was convinced that the project would prove to be a worthwhile investment, and indeed it has.

Since 1953 I have been a Member of the Senate and its Interior Committee. We have authorized the Trinity River division and the San Luis unit. This year, after some struggle, we finally authorized the Auburn-Folsom South unit. Just 2 weeks ago, I brought before my committee a bill authorizing the Whiskeytown-Shasta national recreation area, which will mean so much to this area. We reported this bill from committee, and the next day passed it on the floor of the Senate and sent it to the President for signature.

I am glad to have had these and other opportunities to work with the California congressional delegation on legislation of importance to California. Let me hasten to add that I have been pleased—at least equally—to have them work with me on matters of importance to the State of Washington.

In 1940 the economy of this area was based largely on irrigated agriculture; now deliveries of water from the Contra Costa County Water District facilities are primarily for industrial and municipal purposes. This transformation is a dramatic example of the change taking place in American life.

The Southwest has experienced more of this change than any other part of the country—the growth of population, the shift from rural to urban living, and the transformation of the landscape. As you well know, this can be a burden as well as a boon. What you have done in California to meet the inevitable problems presented by this transition is an almost unbelievable record of accomplishment. The success of your efforts is demonstrated by the excellence of your educational system, the strength of your great arteries of transportation and commerce, and the richness of your economy.

What you have done in water resource development is a landmark achievement. The great Central Valley project itself is only a part of the vast program you have undertaken to meet the water needs of your State—a program which enlists the best efforts of State, local, and private agencies along with the Federal Government.

The people of California and the other States of the Southwest are very water conscious. In many parts of the Southwest, people have always had to live with and deal with the problems of a limited water supply.

In this year 1965, more than ever before, Americans all over the country have personally experienced the water crisis that faces the Nation. In the Northeast air conditioning was limited, salt water moved perilously close to municipal water intakes, and industries had to curtail production in a formerly water-rich area. In the Midwest people looked with despair at the lowering level and rising pollution of the Great Lakes.

This year we saw the spectacle of our Nation's largest city perilously close to running out of water. New York had to impose regulations prohibiting watering lawns, filling of pools, and carwashing. They stopped serving water in restaurants unless it was demanded, and restricted the use of water for cleaning streets and public buildings.

All of this in a city which delivers unmetered water to most of its consumers and loses large quantities of water from an archaic, leaky distribution system. Furthermore, New York must bring its water from reservoirs high in the upland area of the Delaware and Hudson River basins because the Hudson River, with plenty of water flowing past its front door, is polluted.

All over the country we are learning, through bitter experience, the problems of water supply. We try, sometimes, to explain the problem by pointing to our growing population and tremendous increase in per capita water consumption. But this is not getting at the root of the problem. In most cases, water problems are really of our own making. They are not the inevitable result of population growth or technological change. They are created by pollution, waste, and mismanagement of water resources. This is a matter of very great concern to me as chairman of the Senate committee which serves a major responsibility for dealing with these problems.

The water problems I particularly wish to discuss with you are those of the West—though we must, of course, always remember that our problems are only one aspect of a great national problem. My purpose is to talk candidly and openly with you about a subject which threatens to divide the West—the proposals for importing water into the Colorado River.

It is important that there be no misunderstanding on this matter—and understanding may not come easily. Already there has been a considerable escalation in the war of words. I will speak frankly in the best tradition of one westerner talking to another. Our text for today might well come from a remark of the late President John F. Kennedy, who said, "Anybody who can solve the problem of water will be worthy of two Nobel prizes—one for peace and one for science."

The Southwest is concerned that there is not enough water in the Colorado River to satisfy all the demands predicted for that river. For some years, the fact that there is a limited supply of water in the Colorado has caused dispute and discord among the States concerned. A number of attempts have been made to come up with a plan for providing the water everyone wants at reasonable cost and without exciting objections within the Southwest itself. Most of the efforts have failed on the last point.

You may recall the united western investigation of the Bureau of Reclamation which studied what was called the northern California diversion. This study, in 1950, contemplated making the Klamath River a major source of supply for central and southern California and, by discontinuing the Colorado River aqueduct diversion, make more water available in the Colorado basin by displacement. This report, which was called an interim reconnaissance report, also suggested a great many other sources for future investigation, including the Columbia River.

More recently, you may recall, the Southwest water plan was put together under the auspices of Secretary of the Interior Udall. It also contemplated developing northern California rivers as a source of water for the Southwest.

The Southwest water plan did not enjoy the support of all concerned in the Southwest, so this year a new plan was conceived and introduced in the Congress as the Lower Colorado River Basin project. Bills to authorize this project were the subject of hearings before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. A key provision of these bills is a guarantee to California of 4.4 million acre-feet of water from the Colorado River. This guarantee is to endure until such time as the President has proclaimed that works have been completed and are in operation capable, in his judgment, of delivering annually not less than 2.5 million acre-feet of water into the Colorado River from sources outside the Colorado River basin.

Even this latest plan has not been universally accepted in the Southwest, and I understand a new one will be proposed next year which will identify a considerably larger volume of water to be imported. The claim has been made that speedy action must be taken to get water importation works underway so they will be in existence when needed.

I want to tell you why, as one who is concerned with the welfare of his State and his country, I am disturbed by the demands for hasty commitment to a massive program for transporting vast quantities of water over long distances at great expense.

Let me talk first about the reaction in the Northwest to proposals for diverting water from the Columbia River—this being the most apparent goal of any studies or plans to import water into the Colorado.

It should come as no shock to anyone here that the immediate reaction of the Northwest is considerably less than enthusiastic.

It occurs to me that some of you may have experienced similar emotions when confronted with a proposal for taking water from an area in which you reside and shipping it to another area. Some people in the Northwest have charged that the diversion proposals amount to an attempted raid or steal of Northwest resources. Some people in the Southwest have responded that the attitude of the Northwest is selfish or an example of regional chauvinism.

It is natural for you to ask: What is the Northwest really concerned about? After all—it has been suggested—what is wanted is only a small quantity of water, which the Northwest obviously does not need, taken from a point where it could not possibly hurt any existing or future uses; and the Northwest can have the water back at any time it needs it. What could be more reasonable than that?

Let me take these points one by one and tell you why they have not been entirely persuasive to northwesterners.

Point No. 1: Only a small amount of water is wanted. I believe that illusion is somewhat shattered. When the Lower Colorado River project bills were introduced, people talked about 2.5 million acre-feet of water. The actual language in the bill said a minimum of 2.5 million and this raised a suspicion that, perhaps, more was intended. The latest proposal, I understand, suggests an additional 2 million acre-feet for the wants of the Upper Colorado River Basin, 2 million more for the lower basin, and another 2 million for areas along the course of the new riverbed which would have to be constructed between the Columbia and the Colorado. This makes a grand total of 8.5 million acre-feet per year, plus whatever allowances must be made for evaporation and other losses en route. Eight and a half million acre-feet is more than half of the average amount of water that annually flows through Hell's Canyon of the Snake River.

Point No. 2: Only water that the Northwest does not need will be taken. This requires definition of the word "need." If consuming uses are meant—domestic, agricultural, and industrial—then the Northwest is a long way from using up the Columbia River and I hope we always will be. But considerable volumes of water are required on the Columbia for such nonconsuming uses as power, recreation, navigation, dilution, and fish. Studies are now underway by States in the Northwest with the objective of predicting water requirements.

Life on the Columbia, as we know it, cannot go forward if the river is committed to consumptive uses in the same way the Colorado is. Studies by the Bonneville Power Administration have already indicated that by 1990, 99.6 percent of the entire average annual streamflow at the Dalles Dam will be usable for power production. The same will be true at Bonneville Dam with the addition of a second powerhouse.

The Columbia is a mighty river which discharges a large volume of water into the sea. But that water is not necessarily "wasted," and the loss of the amount of water being discussed could not possibly go unnoticed.

Point No. 3: The water will be taken where its loss will not hurt uses in the Northwest. The place usually suggested is below Bonneville Dam. I think I should point out parenthetically that Bonneville Dam is more than 100 miles upstream from the mouth of the Columbia, because a few people seem to have the impression that one place is about the same as the other. On the Columbia River, below Bonneville Dam, are the largest city in Oregon, several of the principal cities of Washington, and many industrial plants.

It is true that if water were taken below Bonneville Dam, there would be no interference with power generation. However, this premise arouses some skepticism. In order to deliver water from the Columbia River to the Colorado, a lift of 4,000 to 6,000 feet would be required, even if extensive tunneling were undertaken along the route. Would it make sense to take the water at the lowest elevation in order to achieve the maximum generation of electricity, and then have to use a good deal more electric power, and construct expensive works, to pump it back up again? Would not a study reveal that it would be far more economical to Southwest water users to take the water out at a higher elevation even if that does do damage to downstream uses? In any event, if the principle of a diversion were once accepted by the Northwest, would not the water users of the Southwest, who would pay for at least part of the cost of pumping, naturally make such an argument?

Point No. 4: Finally, it is said, iron-clad guarantees can be written so that the Northwest can cut off water deliveries to the Southwest at any time in the future when we need the water. Quite frankly, current history must discount the value of such a guarantee. People in my area express the fear that long before the Southwest's water would be cut off, it might use its great power and influence in an effort to make certain that the Northwest develops no need for the water. The diversion of Colorado waters to southern California is the case they cite. The Supreme Court of the United States, after a decade of litigation, held that Arizona is entitled to a larger share of the Colorado water than it now gets. But Arizona cannot use this larger share unless it first secures from Congress the authorization of what was formerly called the central Arizona project to build the necessary diversion works and canals from the Colorado River to central Arizona. I need not remind you how long Arizona has been trying to secure authorization of the central Arizona project. This is a project needed to maintain an agricultural economy in Arizona presently sustained by large overdrafts of ground water. But California fears the central Arizona project could threaten its supply of water from the Colorado. It is unwilling to share with Arizona the risk of loss in a short water year. People in the Northwest can understand that point of view, but it is of no comfort to them when they contemplate a diversion of water from the Columbia.

Parenthetically, the solution of the problem of regional protection of hydroelectric resources, as provided in the Northwest-Southwest intertie legislation, does not reassure northwesterners in this matter of diverting the waters of the Columbia. The intertie program, which I sponsored at a time when the proposal was not altogether popular in the Northwest, is different from a program to divert the Columbia. Electric energy flows in two directions, and with the cooperation of many members of your congressional delegations, and carefully drawn legislative safeguards, we were able to prove that a high voltage intertie will benefit both the Northwest and the Southwest. Because of seasonal load diversities, it will increase the power resources of both regions. But a diversion of the Columbia, unlike a power intertie, would always be a one-way street. We have no plans to bring Central Valley project water northward, and I am sure you would not want us to make any such plans.

Does all of this mean that the Northwest wants to hoard its water while other areas of the country are thirsty? I do not think so. What it means is that the Northwest is not going to be lulled into a false sense of security about a proposal which casts such a long and dark shadow on its future.

Why, you ask, does the Northwest object even to studies of diversion? Such studies, from the point of view of people in the Northwest, would not put first things first. The people of the Northwest deeply believe that before any other region asks for a study of the diversion of the Columbia River, such region first must establish that it actually needs additional water and that it cannot obtain additional water by any reasonable means except diverting the Columbia.

To confuse the question of water need with that of water diversion inevitably will make it difficult to reach an objective decision on the question of need. The temptation will be great for those conducting the study to sidestep, or least postpone, hard decisions of water management and conservation by recommending the importation of water from another region. If the study is being conducted by an agency with a large staff of engineers eager to build the biggest ditch in the world, the temptation may be irresistible. To ask an agency whose business is to construct water projects whether it is necessary to divert the Columbia is something like asking an automobile salesman's advice on whether you should purchase a new car.

The people of the Northwest are generous and goodhearted, but not profligate. Perhaps you have heard about a tribe of Northwest Indians who observed a quaint custom called the potlatch. The objective of the potlatch was to give away all of one's worldly possessions. He who gave away the most enjoyed the highest status. This tribe and its custom no longer flourish in the Northwest.

So much for the concerns of the Northwest.

I hope you will give these comments thoughtful and friendly consideration just as the people of the Northwest will give the same consideration to your needs and desires. The fates of our regions are bound together. The Northwest will not prosper unless you do. You will not flourish if the Northwest's economy withers. It is absolutely essential that a problem which involves the vital interests of both regions be solved by mutual agreement. To solve it, we must assemble the facts that are relevant to the problem.

The country as well as the West must seek answers to many questions: Does the Southwest need more water? What does it need it for? How is it using existing supplies? Can sufficient water be secured through conservation and reuse to satisfy its needs? To what exent and under what criteria should the Federal Government assist local water conservation measures? What are the prospects for improving water supplies within the Southwest by desalinization, weather modifications, or other means? Are present irrigation practices wasteful? Does it make sense to transport water 800 to 1,000 miles for irrigation?

Many questions must be asked about the Northwest, for example: What are the needs of the Northwest? Is there water to spare? How will the economy of the Northwest be affected if large quantities of water are taken away? What are potential benefits and liabilities?

These are all questions which, I believe, have not been fully and carefully explored, but must be answered before a decision is reached as to whether or not water must be imported into the Colorado River. To answer these questions requires study. A study for this purpose will have my full and immediate support. It should get underway as soon as possible. It must be authorized by the Congress.

I have reached no final conclusions in my own mind as to how this study should be performed, except that it must be under auspices of maximum independence and objectivity. The findings of this study, to be useful, must command the respect of all.

The Bureau of the Budget, in reporting to the Congress on the lower Colorado River project bills, recommended the establishment of a National Water Commission to be composed of distinguished citizens outside of Government. In testifying before my committee in hearings on the Northeast water crisis, Elmer Staats, Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, said, "Establishment of a National Water Commission has strong administration support. * * *"

He said that "a national commission, drawing on the expertise available outside the Federal Government, would complement and enhance the effectiveness of existing sources of information and advice available within the executive branch, including the Water Resources Council. A national commission would take full advantage of work accomplished by the Kerr committee, updating projections and exploiting data not available to the committee. Thus, the specific reason for a commission is that, in view of the urgent timing for a definitive study, all the intellectual resources of the country—in and out of Government—must be marshaled and brought to bear on our water resources development problems. The future of this country will be determined in large measure upon the soundness of the decisions we make today in this area."

He went on to say: "In addition to developing projections of water supply and requirements and identifying alternative ways of meeting future water demand—including conservation and more efficient use of existing supplies, steps to encourage the highest economic use of water, and the impact of such techniques as water importation and large-scale desalting—the National Water Commission would advise the President and the Water Resources Council on such specific water resources matters as may be referred to it. The Commission, as envisioned by the administration, would consist of about five to seven members, be adequately staffed and financed, and terminate not later than 5 years from the date of its establishment."

This is a proposal which, in my opinion, has considerable merit. However, I realize that distinguished representatives of the Southwest have expressed reservations about it. Whatever is done should have the blessings of all concerned. Therefore, I am not pressing for this as the only way to approach the problem.

The task outlined by the administration is one which must be performed. I am open to any alternative suggestions as to how best we can do the job.

Whatever we do, we must do it together. With reason and good will we can find answers that will serve the best interests of us all.

Why the United States Should Not Resume Aid to Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, currently, we are faced with a decision as to whether it is in the best interests of the United States to resume aid to Egypt. Once again, we must decide whether to bail President Nasser out of an economic crisis. The quandary is not a new one. The crisis is of Egypt's own making. The very conditions which caused it—foreign adventure, domestic neglect—have been familiar to us for a decade.

We made this decision twice before, in 1956 and in 1959. Each time we were told that we must provide Nasser with an alternative to the Soviet Union, and each time Egypt undercut the pro-Western position and with renewed strength undermined the United States and its allies. It seems strange, but true, that when Nasser is down he leans on us and when he is up he praises others.

Any realistic appraisal of the Egyptian leader argues against resumption of unconditional aid to Egypt. Furthermore, such an appraisal indicates that now is the time when we can place those conditions with greatest hope of making them stick.

We are told that Egypt has forsaken foreign adventure. The Congo is cited; so is the withdrawal from Yemen. We should not be impressed with these examples. The cause of the Congo rebels was a losing cause; and Nasser cut his losses. The settlement in Yemen was not a voluntary peace. Nasser went to Jidda because a fanatic group had pinned down 60,000 of his best troops, far from home, in a bloody war of attrition.

I do not see any reason for us to believe that his original motivation—to gain a foothold on the Arabian Peninsula from which he could menace Saudi-American oil, British-south Arabia, and the east coast of Africa—has been altered.

We are told that Egypt is loosening its internal restrictions—that Premier Mohieddin was appointed precisely to effect reforms that would encourage foreign investment and spur economic development. We should await developments to see if Nasser has really recognized his mistakes. The costly Yemen adventure was not popular with the people, who are more concerned about their own poverty than Arabia's wealth. If he needed proof of the unpopularity of his policies, he had only to count the turnout for the funeral of a former royalist in Cairo—or count the guns that the Moslem brotherhood had stacked away, waiting for their target, in secret cells.

We are told that the new face of a chastened Nasser bodes well for those he has threatened in the past. But we must judge this man by his words and deeds, not his smile. Genocidal war against Israel, our ally, is still threatened, albeit for 4 years hence. The delay encourages our diplomats to think that 4 years means never. I believe we might in the next 4 years see a Palestine Liberation Organization composed of ill-used refugees, men who are not free to work in Egypt but who are unleashed by Egypt to fight Israel, growing into a dangerous army: an army honed on Egyptian propaganda, supported by increasingly militant Arab States because of Egyptian pressure, paid for by wealthy Arab States such as Kuwait because of Egyptian blackmail.

The reason given to encourage optimism is not good enough. For the first time in too long, we have a clear chance to exercise that influence which we have been told we have over Nasser. He needs our food. He cannot acquire it elsewhere. If we give it to him without conditions, we may be feeding him while he prepares for this war he has always spoken of—the war against Israel.

If we make resumption of our aid conditional on the fulfillment of Egypt's commitment under the U.N. Charter to negotiate a settlement with her neighbors, to stop this exhausting arms buildup toward the military ultimate, then we may be able to effect a lasting peace.

Insurance Industry: The States Are Acting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the continuing erosion of our system of dual-federalism is exemplified by attacks on the ability of the States to regulate insurance. Here is an area which Congress, in 1945, judged to be particularly appropriate for State control.

Nevertheless, failures of some high-risk automobile insurers have served as the platform for those who favor more and more centralized control of our country to raise their voices in that immodest and terribly inaccurate cry that "We can do it better."

The premise must be that a Federal system of control would provide more knowledgeable and more dedicated administrators than can be provided by the States. The premise is a false one. And it is demonstrably false.

It is true that companies have failed. It is true that failures in the insurance industry have far-reaching effects.

It is not true that the number of failures is disproportionately high. It is not true that failures can be attributed to State laxity.

It is simply not true that failures would not continue to occur if regulation were in the hands of a central bureaucracy. What of the banks subject to Federal control? Have none of them failed? Of course, they have. And under our free enterprise system, conducted by people subject to the weaknesses of the flesh, this is to be expected.

The fact is that the States have not been remiss. They have done and are doing their job. There is room for improvement. There is always room for improvement. But the record shows that the States have responded.

My point is that this vital and important industry with the tremendous dollar volume and risk element involved is far from being sick. Its successes and concomitant service to the public are so overwhelming when compared with its failures that the investigators stand in awe. State governments deserve their share of the credit. State insurance commissioners and their departments, sensitive and quick to meet the needs of their areas, are to be applauded.

What is the nature of this urge to tinker with a system proven sound, this tendency to damn the whole because of the few?

The insurance industry is unquestionably one of the most important segments of our national economy. Both its social and economic effects have made it an integral part of the foundation for our free enterprise economy.

The insurance companies, as coordinating institutions engaged in allocation and distribution of capital funds, relieve a part of the burden of numerous risks from the shoulders of those who take advantage of the service. In so spreading the risk, not only are third parties protected, but also private funds are released for productive investment.

Due to the great public concern that each component part of the industry remains fiscally sound, it has been accepted that some form of regulation is required. Originally, such regulatory authority vested in the individual States by virtue of the fact that insurance was not considered commerce and therefore not under Federal jurisdiction.

The Supreme Court, in *United States* v. *South-Eastern Underwriters Association*, 322 U.S. 533 (1944), changed this by holding that insurance is interstate commerce and therefore subject to Federal jurisdiction. In 1945, the McCarran-Ferguson Act was passed by the 79th Congress to restore the power to the States. This act was founded on the sound principle that the States were in a better position to regulate the insurance industry than was the Federal Government. That principle is equally appropriate and applicable today.

State legislatures, State commissioners of insurance, and the industry have joined in devising stringent regulations. Operating within the framework of State regulation, appropriate authorities were able to adopt rules to fit local needs. Under this arrangement utilizing the joint judgment and accumulated wisdom of local authorities and industry leaders, reliable systems of laws and regulations have been established which lend themselves to efficacious solutions of problems which are often inevitable and which vary in different States and districts.

It is true that not all of the failures in the insurance industry have been inevitable. Some were the direct result of fraudulent misrepresentations by predators bent on public bilking and milking. But indictments have been issued in cases where mismanagement has been discovered.

The States are taking swift action where required. Steps are being taken to assure full and accurate disclosure of company finances and realistic levels for expected loss reserves. Proper capitalization for high risk insurers is the object of further State regulatory efforts to protect the public.

Failures have not been covered up or ignored. States are adopting measures to allow for immediate action by State officials to move in for the protection of the public when the failure of a company is imminent. In many States, these provisions have long existed and have been vigorously enforced.

While some States may not have adequately regulated insurance or effectively enforced existing regulations, it is equally obvious that great efforts are being made to strengthen the local laws and to achieve proper enforcement. The testimony of the commissioners of insurance from Illinois, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina, before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee in May of 1965, attested to the continual efforts of those States to keep up to date and to strengthen insurance codes to reach troubled areas and to obtain more funds for better enforcement.

The National Association of Insurance Commissioners is an effective agency for opening channels of communication between the various States to facilitate coordinated action where necessary. Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, in a speech before a group of insurance agents and executives in October of this year, complimented the insurance commissioners for establishing a special committee "to address the problem of the gaps in communication and cooperation among the insurance commissioners of the several States."

The concerted efforts of such a coordinating body and of the various States themselves demonstrate most profoundly that the regulation of the insurance industry is properly vested in the individual States.

In the course of the hearings conducted by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee on high-risk automobile insurance, the insurance commission of the State of Illinois stated succinctly:

> It is my conviction that the tremendous growth of the insurance industry since 1945 has resulted in large part from the careful decision of the Congress of the United States in 1945 in approving the McCarran Act.
>
> Under this assignment to the States of basic responsibilities for policing an industry which grosses close to $40 billion annually, State regulators have been compelled to live closely with the companies doing business within their jurisdictions.
>
> That is as it should be. The insurance industry reaches so intimately into the economy of every home that its most effective regulation must, perforce, come at a level close to the home—and the State regulator is closest to the problems involved.

It is also interesting to note that in reports of this subcommittee in the past the belief has been affirmed "that the regulation of insurance by the States is in the public interest," and that there is no appeal for Federal regulation arising from "any of the important segments of the industry."

In 1963, at a time when a particular bill, S. 1705, was introduced to amend the McCarran-Ferguson Act, I said in a speech before the National Association of Insurance Commissioners:

> Since the McCarran-Ferguson Act is sound law today, a heavy burden rests upon those who now advocate revision. A clear case for such amendment must be made. It must be demonstrated that any resulting advantage which any new law might bring will outweigh the loss suffered by impairment of the system and its principles. Included in such a showing must be substantial evidence that there is no other non-Federal way of accomplishing the desired purpose.
>
> There are grave dangers in adopting any amendment to this law, however, nominal, disarming, limited in character or meritorious it may appear on the surface.

Certainly, that burden must be great indeed when it is remembered that under the present law the industry has flourished for the past 20 years with resulting benefit to the economy and to the public.

The basic principles of our Republic dictate that regulation should come from that political unit more closely associated with local operation. Here, it is the States.

Any amendment to the present law must be extensively debated. The initial amendment, no matter how innocent appearing, can open the gates. Again, allow me to quote from the speech delivered to the National Association of Insurance Commissioners:

> No well-established concept of freedom can be destroyed by an open, all-inclusive attack. Rather, it is eroded and eventually lost by a series of movements, no single one of which seems of sufficient size to warrant resistance or to raise any suspicion.
>
> The unwary will be caught by surprise and soon dismayed at the tardiness of their attempts to preserve their liberties.

Certainly an industry which serves our economy so well must not be exposed unthinkingly and unnecessarily to the stifling effect of Federal control.

The States are doing their job. Let them continue to do so.

Summary of Record and Accomplishments of the Committee on Ways and Means During the 1st Session, 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, just completed, the Committee on Ways and Means has again continued its record of diligent attention to the legislation falling within its jurisdiction. As Members will recall, the jurisdiction of this committee is exceedingly broad and complex, including matters which affect the day-to-day activities of all of our citizens. In this 1st session of the 89th Congress, the committee has considered and reported legislation in each of its major areas of jurisdiction.

Three major bills were reported to the Congress by the committee and have now become public law. In addition, a large number of minor bills were reported passed, and have now become public law. Two of the three major bills were of extraordinary significance, and serve as good examples of the important part which the Committee on Ways and Means plays in the economic life of the Nation and of its citizens. The first of these measures was the Social Security Amendments of 1965, which included the hospital insurance program and the voluntary supplementary medical plan, in addition to an across-the-board increase in social security benefits and many major changes in practically all titles of the Social Security Act.

The second of these measures was the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965, which repealed and thus eliminated the vast majority of excise taxes imposed at the Federal level. Each of these measures has far-reaching and significant ramifications not only with respect to the immediate present but also with regard to the years to come. At a later point in this summary, there is a detailed explanation of each of these major measures.

In addition to the foregoing two principal examples of the work of the committee, mention should also be made at this point of the important technical changes which were made in the tariff schedules of the United States by the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965. This bill made changes and modifications with respect to more than 85 items in the tariff schedules of the United States.

As I have pointed out in the past, and can again state without reservation, the members of the Committee on Ways and Means have devoted themselves diligently and conscientiously to the quite heavy work of the committee. The members have been assiduous in pursuing their responsibilities and in the attendance of meetings of the committee almost daily throughout this session of the 89th Congress. While individual members of the committee have of course not always agreed on all the measures considered by the committee, clearly each Member can be justly proud of the work which has been accomplished and the record which has been established.

During the course of this session, the Committee on Ways and Means has held public or executive hearings on a total of 58 days, exclusive of executive sessions, and has directly received testimony from more than 364 individuals during those hearings. In addition, comments, recommendations, and statements of views were received for the printed record from many hundreds of other interested persons and organizations. A detailed review of the subjects covered by the public hearings may be found in the calendar of the Committee on Ways and Means, which is available to the public.

In addition to the public hearings, during the first session of the 89th Congress the full Committee on Ways and Means met in executive session 102 times, covering 74 days. This included approximately 48 sessions, covering 31 days, on the subject of medical care for the aged and social security.

Of the 13,791 public and private bills and resolutions introduced in the House during the course of this session, there was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means a total of 1,952 bills and resolutions, in addition to 30 executive communications. Of this total, there were 1,072 tax bills, 450 social security bills, 337 tariff bills, and 93 miscellaneous bills. This total represents approximately one-sixth of all the public bills and resolutions introduced in the House of Representatives during this session.

During this session of the 89th Congress, the committee favorably reported to the House of Representatives a total of 44 bills, which includes 8 tax bills, 1 social security bill, 30 tariff bills, and 5 bills of a miscellaneous character. Of the 44 bills reported to the House, 40 bills have passed the House, which includes 8 tax bills, 1 social security bill, 27 tariff bills and 4 miscellaneous bills. The table which follows gives a further detailed history of the action of the Congress with respect to these measures:

Bills and resolutions referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, 89th Cong., 1st sess., by category (as of adjournment)

	Tax	Social security	Tariff	Miscellaneous	Total
Bills referred to committee	1,072	450	337	93	1,952
Bills reported to House	8	1	[1] 30	[1] 5	[2] 44
Bills passed House	8	1	[1] 27	4	[1] 40
Bills reported to Senate	2	1	[1] 21	[1] 3	[2] 27
Bills passed Senate	2	1	[1] 21	[1] 3	[2] 27
Bills enacted into law	2	1	[1] 7	2	[1] 12

[1] Including 1 Senate bill.

[2] Including 2 Senate bills.

Mr. Speaker, for the further information of the Members, I submit a summary of the legislation reported to the House of Representatives by the Committee on Ways and Means during the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

PUBLIC BILLS

H.R. 6675—Mr. MILLS—Public Law 89-97, approved July 30, 1965. Following is a brief summary of the provisions of this legislation, the Social Security Amendments of 1965:

A. HEALTH INSURANCE AND MEDICAL CARE

The legislation provides three programs for health insurance and medical care for the aged under the Social Security Act by establishing—

First. A basic hospital insurance plan providing inpatient services, related post-hospital care (skilled nursing home and home health visits), and outpatient diagnostic services for individuals 65 or older who are eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits. These benefits are financed through a separate payroll tax and separate trust fund, except that the benefits for railroad retirement eligibles will be financed through their payroll tax system, if certain financing conditions are met.

Also, benefits are provided to currently aged people who are not social security or railroad retirement beneficiaries. They are financed from general revenues. Effective date: Benefits are first effective on July 1, 1966, except for skilled nursing services in extended care facilities which are effective on January 1, 1967.

Second. A voluntary supplementary medical insurance plan providing physicians' and other medical and health services financed through monthly premiums of $3 initially by individuals 65 years or older matched equally by Federal general revenue contributions. Effective date: Benefits are first effective July 1, 1966.

Third. An expanded Kerr-Mills medical care program for the needy and medically needy combining all the vendor medical provisions for the aged, blind, disabled, and families with dependent children, now in five titles of the Social Security Act, under a uniform program (with an increase in the Federal share matching formula) in a single new title with certain prescribed Federal standards. Effective date: Matching under new title—XIX—will be available January 1, 1966.

B. CHILD HEALTH AND WELFARE AMENDMENTS

First. Maternal and child health, crippled children, and child welfare authorization: The amount authorized for the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs over current authorizations will be increased by $5 million for each program for fiscal 1966 and by $10 million in each succeeding fiscal years as follows:

Fiscal year	Prior law	Under new law
1966	$40,000,000	$45,000,000
1967	40,000,000	50,000,000
1968	45,000,000	55,000,000
1969	45,000,000	55,000,000
1970 and after	50,000,000	60,000,000

The somewhat different authorizations for child welfare services under prior law are revised to bring them in line with those for the other two programs, so that authorizations for all three programs are identical.

Second. Training personnel for the health care of crippled children: Grants are provided to institutions of higher learning for training professional personnel for health and related care for crippled children, particularly children who are mentally retarded or have multiple handicaps. Authorizes $5 million for fiscal 1967, $10 million for fiscal 1968, and $17.5 million for each succeeding fiscal year.

Third. Health care for needy children: The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to carry out a 5-year program of special project grants to provide comprehensive health care and services for preschool or school-age children, particularly in areas with concentrations of low-income families. An appropriation of $15 million is authorized for fiscal 1966; $35 million for fiscal 1967, and an additional $5 million for each succeeding year rising to $50 million for fiscal 1970. An authorization of $500,000 for fiscal 1966 and 1967 is made for grants to study the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of emotionally disturbed children.

Fourth. Mental retardation planning: Grants totaling $2,750,000 for each of 2 fiscal years (1966 and 1967) are authorized for the purpose of assisting States to implement and follow up on planning for treatment of mental retardation authorized under section 1701 of the Social Security Act.

C. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

First. Increased assistance payments: The Federal share of payments under all State public assistance programs is increased a little more than an average of $2.50 a month for the needy aged, blind, and disabled and an average of about $1.25 for needy children, effective January 1, 1966. This is brought about by revising the matching formula for the needy aged, blind, and disabled—and for the adult categories in combined program in title XVI—to provide a Federal share of $31 out of the first $37—formerly $29 out of the first $35—with matching above this amount varying according to State per capita income up to a maximum of $75—formerly $70—per month per individual on an average basis. The law revises matching formula for aid to families with dependent children so as to provide a Federal share of five-sixths of the first $18—formerly fourteen-seventeenths of the first $17—with matching above this amount varying according to State per capita income up to a maximum of $32—formerly $30. A provision is included so that States will not receive additional Federal funds except to the extent they pass them on to individual recipients. Effective January 1, 1966.

Second. Tubercular and mental patients: The exclusion from Federal matching in old-age assistance and medical assistance for the aged programs—and for combined program, title XVI—is removed as to aged individuals who are patients in institutions for tuberculosis or mental diseases or who have been diagnosed as having tuberculosis or psychosis and, as a result, are patients in a medical institution. As a condition of Federal participation in such payments to, or for, mental patients it is required that certain agreements and arrangements assure that better care results from the additional Federal money. States will receive no more in Federal funds under this provision than they increase their expenditures for mental health purposes under public health and public welfare programs. Also restrictions as to Federal matching for needy blind and disabled who are tubercular or psychotic and are in general medical institutions are removed. Effective January 1, 1966.

Third. Protective payments: A provision is added for protective payments to third persons on behalf of old-age assistance recipients—and recipients on combined title XVI program—recipients of aid to the blind, and recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled unable to manage their money because of physical or mental incapacity. Effective January 1, 1966.

Fourth. Aid to families with dependent children in school: The optional provision in present law allowing States to continue making payments to dependent children up to age 21 if they are in regular attendance at a high school or vocational school is extended to include attendance at a school, college, or university.

Fifth. Income exemptions under public assistance: The following income exemptions are provided:

(a) Old-age assistance: The earnings exemption under the old-age assistance program—and aged in combined programs—is increased so that a State may, at its option, exempt the first $20—formerly $10—and one-half of the next $60—formerly $40—of a recipient's monthly earnings. Effective October 1, 1965.

(b) Aid to families with dependent children: At their option, States are allowed to disregard up to $50 per month of earned income of any dependent child under the age of 18 but not more than $150 of earnings may be exempted in the same home. Effective July 1, 1965.

(c) Aid to the permanently and totally disabled: States, at their option, may exempt earnings of recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled. As in the case of the aged, the first $20 per month of earnings and one-half of the next $60 could be exempted. In addition, any additional income and resources could be exempted as part of an approved plan to achieve self-support during the time the recipient was undergoing vocational rehabilitation. Effective October 1, 1965.

(d) Income exemption for all public assistance programs: States, at their option, may disregard not more than $5 per month per recipient of any income in all five public assistance programs. Effective October 1, 1965.

(e) Old-age and survivors insurance—retroactive increase: States, at their option, may disregard so much of the OASDI benefit increase—including the children in school after age 18 modification—as is attributable to its retroactive effective date.

(f) Economic Opportunity Act earning exemption: A grace period is provided for action by States that have not had regular legislative sessions, whose public assistance statutes now prevent them from disregarding earnings of recipients received under titles I and II of the Economic Opportunity Act.

(g) Income exempt under another assistance program: A provision is added stipulating that any amount of income which is disregarded in determining eligibility for a person under one of the public assistance programs shall not be considered in determining the eligibility of another individual under any other public assistance program.

Sixth. Definition of medical assistance for aged: The definition of medical assistance for the aged is modified so as to allow Federal sharing as to old-age assistance recipients for the month they are admitted to or discharged from a medical institution.

Seventh. Judicial review of State plan denials: The law provides for judicial review of the denial of approval by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of State public assistance plans and of his action under such programs for noncompliance with conditions in the Federal law.

Eighth. Uniform matching: The new law permits a State that has a medical assistance program under title XIX to claim Federal sharing in total expenditures for money payments under other titles, under the same formula used for determining the Federal share for medical assistance under title XIX.

D. OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE

1. BENEFIT CHANGES

(a) 7-percent across-the-board increase in old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits.

A 7-percent across-the-board benefit increase is provided, effective retroactively beginning with benefits for January 1965, for the 20 million social security beneficiaries on the rolls—with a guaranteed $4 a month minimum increase for retired workers who are age 65 or over in the first month for which they are paid the increased benefit.

Monthly benefits for workers who retire at or after 65 are increased to a new minimum of $44—formerly $40—and to a new maximum of $135.90—formerly $127—on average earnings up to $4,800. In the future, creditable earnings under the increase in the contribution and benefit base to $6,600 a year would make possible a maximum benefit of $168.

The maximum amount of benefits payable to a family on the basis of a single earnings record will be related to the worker's average monthly earnings at all earnings levels. Under prior law, there was a $254 limit on family benefits which operated over a wide range of average monthly earnings. Under the legislation the highest family maximum would be $368.

(b) Payment of child's insurance benefits to children attending school or college after attainment of age 18 and up to age 22: A provision is included which will continue to pay a child's insurance benefit until the child reaches age 22, provided the child is attending a public or an accredited school, including a vocational school or a college, as a full-time student after he reaches age 18. Children of deceased, retired, or disabled workers will be included. No mother's or wife's benefits will be payable if the only child in the mother's care is one who has attained age 18 but is getting benefits on the basis of school attendance.

This provision is effective retroactively to January 1, 1965. It is estimated that 295,000 children will be eligible for benefits for September 1965, when the school year begins.

(c) Benefits for widows at age 60: An option to widows of receiving benefits beginning at age 60, is provided with the benefits payable to those who claim them before age 62 being actuarially reduced to take account of the longer period over which they will be paid. Full widow's benefits are payable at age 62.

This provision is effective beginning with monthly benefits payable for September 1965. It is estimated that 185,000 widows will claim benefits during the first year of operation.

(d) Amendment of disability program:

(i) Definition of disability: The requirement that a worker's disability must be expected to be of long continued and indefinite duration is eliminated and instead an insured worker will be eligible for disability benefits if he has been under a disability which can be expected to result in death or which has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 calendar months. Benefits payable by reason of this change will be paid beginning with benefits for September 1965. An estimated 60,000 persons—disabled workers and their dependents—become immediately eligible for benefits as a result of this change.

(ii) Disability benefits offset provision: The social security disability benefit for any month for which a worker is receiving a workmen's compensation benefit will be reduced to the extent that the total benefits payable to him and his dependents under both programs exceed 80 percent of his average monthly earnings covered by social security prior to the onset of disability, but with the reduction periodically adjusted to take account of changes in national average earnings levels. The offset provision will be applicable with respect to benefits payable for months after December 1965 based on disabilities commencing after June 1, 1965.

(iii) Blindness as a disability factor: (a) Young workers who are blind and disabled: Establishes alternative insured status requirement for workers disabled before age 31 of one-half of the quarters elapsing after age 21 up to the point of disability—with a minimum of six quarters—or, in the case of individuals disabled before age 24, at least one-half of the quarters in the 3-year period ending with the onset of the disability. To qualify for this alternative the worker will have to meet the statutory definition of blindness for the disability "freeze." Workers will, however, have to meet the other regular requirements for entitlement to disability benefits, including inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity.

(b) Older workers who are blind and disabled: Provides that those individuals age 55 or over who meet the statutory definition of blindness for the disability "freeze" could qualify for cash benefits on the basis of their inability to engage in their past occupation or occupations. However, their benefits will not be paid for any month which they are actually engaging in any substantial gainful activity.

(iv) Rehabilitation services: State vocational rehabilitation agencies will be reimbursed from the social security trust funds for the cost of rehabilitation services furnished to individuals who are entitled to disability insurance benefits or to a disabled child's benefits. The total amount of the funds that could be made available from the trust funds for purposes of reimbursing State agencies for such services cannot, in any year, exceed 1 percent of the social security disability benefits paid in the previous year.

(v) Entitlement to disability benefits after entitlement to benefit payable on account of age: A person who becomes entitled before age 65 to a benefit payable on account of old age could later, before he reaches age 65, become entitled to disability insurance benefits.

(vi) Allocation of contribution income between OASI and DI trust funds: An additional 0.20 percent of taxable wages and 0.15 percent of taxable self-employment income is allocated to the disability insurance trust fund bringing the total allocation to 0.70 percent and 0.525 percent, respectively, beginning in 1966.

(e) Benefits to certain persons at age 72 or over: Eligibility requirements are liberalized by providing a basic benefit of $35 at age 72 or over to certain persons with as few as three quarters of coverage acquired at any time since the beginning of the program in 1937. To accomplish this, a new concept of transitional insured status is provided. Prior law required a minimum of six quarters of coverage.

Effective for monthly benefits for September 1965, at which time an estimated 355,000 people will be able to start receiving benefits.

(f) Wife's and widow's benefits for divorced women: Payments of wife's or widow's benefits are authorized to the divorced wife of a retired, deceased, or disabled worker if she had been married to the worker for at least 20 years before the date of the divorce and if her divorced husband was making (or was obligated by a court to make) a substantial contribution to her support when he became entitled to benefits, became disabled, or died. The legislation also provides that a wife's benefits will not terminate when the woman and her husband are divorced if the marriage has been in effect for 20 years. Provision is also made for the reestablishment of benefit rights for a divorced wife, a widow, a surviving divorced wife, or a surviving divorced mother who remarries and the subsequent marriage ends in divorce, annulment, or in the death of the husband. Effective in September 1965.

(g) Retirement test: The amendments liberalize the retirement test so that a beneficiary under age 72 may have annual earnings of $1,500—instead of $1,200 as in prior law—and still get full benefits for the year. If a beneficiary earnings exceed $1,500 for a year, $1 in benefits is withheld for each $2 of annual earnings between $1,500 and $2,700 and for each $1 of earnings thereafter—under prior law the $1 for $2 adjustment applied to annual earnings between $1,200 and $1,700. A beneficiary will nevertheless get full benefits, regardless of his annual earnings, for any month in which he earns wages of $125 or less (rather than $100 as in prior law), and does not render substantial services in self-employment. These changes are effective for taxable years ending after 1965.

Also, certain royalties received in or after the year in which a person reaches age 65, from copyrights and patents obtained before age 65, are exempted from being counted as earnings for purposes of the retirement test, effective for taxable years beginning after 1964.

For 1966, an estimated 750,000 persons—workers and their dependents or survivors—either will get more benefits under the new law than they would have gotten under prior law, or will get some benefits where they would have gotten no benefits under prior law.

(h) Continuation of widow's and widower's insurance benefits after remarriage: Under prior law, a widow's and widower's benefits based on a deceased worker's social security earnings record generally terminated when the survivor remarried. The new legislation provides that benefits would be payable to widows age 60 or over and to widowers age 62 or over who remarry. The amount of the remarried widow's or widower's benefit will be equal to 50 percent of the primary insurance amount of the deceased spouse rather than 82½ percent of that amount, which is payable to widows and widowers who are not remarried.

(i) Adoption of child by retired worker: The provisions relating to the payment of benefits to children who are adopted by old-age insurance beneficiaries are changed to require that, where the child is adopted after the worker becomes entitled to an old-age benefit, first, the child must be living with the worker in the month when application for old-age benefits is filed or adoption proceedings have begun in or before that month; second, the child must be receiving one-half of his support from the worker for the entire year before the worker's entitlement; and third, the adoption must be completed within 2 years after the worker's application for benefits.

(j) Definition of child:

(i) A child will be paid benefits based on his father's earnings without regard to whether he has the status of a child under State inheritance laws if the father was supporting the child or had a legal obligation to do so. Under prior law, whether a child met the definition for the pupose of getting child's insurance benefits based on his father's earnings depended on the laws applied in determining the devolution of intestate personal property in the State in which the worker was domiciled. It is estimated that 20,000 individuals (children and their mothers) became immediately eligible for benefits under this provision.

(ii) Also an exception is provided so that child's benefits will not terminate if child is adopted by his brother or sister after the death of the worker on whose earnings record he is getting benefits. Under prior law benefits terminated upon adoption unless he was adopted by his stepparent, grandparent, uncle, or aunt.

2. COVERAGE CHANGES

The following coverage provisions were included:

(a) Physicians and interns: Self-employed physicians are covered for taxable years ending on or after December 31, 1965. Interns are covered beginning on January 1, 1966, on the same basis as other employees working for the same employer.

(b) Farmers: Under the new law, farm operators whose annual gross earnings are $2,400 or less will be permitted to report either their actual net earnings or 66⅔ percent of their gross earnings, for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965. Farmers whose annual gross earnings are over $2,400 will be required to report their actual net earnings if $1,600 or more but if actual net earnings are less than $1,600, they will be permitted to report either their actual net earnings or $1,600.

(c) Cash tips: Cash tips received after 1965 by an employee in the course of his employment are covered as wages for social security and income-tax withholding purposes, except that employers are not required to pay the social security employer tax. The employee is required to give his employer a written report of his tips within 10 days after the end of the month in which the tips are received. To the extent that the employer does not have sufficient wage payments—or funds turned over to him by the employee—to offset the required withholding, he notifies the employee and the employee reports this amount to the Government directly.

(d) State and local government employees: Several changes would facilitate social security coverage of additional employees of State and local governments.

(e) Exemption of certain religious sects: Members of certain religious sects who have conscientious objections to insurance (including social security) by reason of their adherence to the established tenets or teachings of such sects could be exempt from the social security tax on self-employment income upon application accompanied by a waiver of benefit rights.

(f) Nonprofit organizations: Nonprofit organizations, and their employees who concur, may elect social security coverage effective retroactively for a period up to 5 years (rather than 1 year, as under prior law). Also, wage credit may be given for the earnings of certain employees of nonprofit organizations who were erroneously reported for social security purposes.

(g) District of Columbia employees: The legislation provides for social security coverage of certain employees of the District of Columbia (primarily substitute schoolteachers).

(h) Ministers: The deadline for electing social security coverage by ministers who have been in the ministry at least 2 years since 1954 is extended 2 years. Also, social security credit may be obtained for the earnings of certain ministers, which were reported but which cannot be credited under prior law.

3. MISCELLANEOUS

(a) Filing of proof: The period of filing of proof of support for dependent husband's, widower's, and parent's benefits, and for filing application for lump-sum death payments where good cause exists for failure to file within the initial 2-year period, is extended indefinitely.

(b) Automatic recomputation of benefits: The benefits of people on the rolls will be recomputed automatically each year to take account of any covered earnings that the worker might have had in the previous year and that would increase his benefit amount. Under prior law there are various requirements that must be met in order to have benefits recomputed, including filing of an application and earnings of over $1,200 a year after entitlement.

(c) Military wage credits: The provision authorizing reimbursement of the trust funds out of general revenue for gratuitous social security wage credits for servicemen is revised so that such payments will be spread over the next 50 years.

(d) Extension of life of applications: The new law liberalizes the requirement that an application for monthly insurance benefits be valid for only 3 months after the date of filing, and for disability benefits 3 months before the beginning of the waiting period. The new law allows an application to remain valid up until the time the Secretary makes a final decision on the application.

(e) Underpayments: The new law provides specific authority, lacking in prior law, for the Secretary to settle certain underpayments of benefits.

(f) Authorization for one spouse to cash a joint check: The Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized, under a new provision, to issue regulations so as to permit a surviving spouse (or other surviving payee) to cash a benefit check issued jointly to a husband and wife if one of them dies before the check is negotiated; any overpayment resulting from the cashing of the joint check would be recovered.

(g) Social security records—deserting parents: The new law provides that, under certain specfied conditions, the address of a deserting parent of a child applying for or receiving public assistance may be given to a welfare agency or a court through a welfare agency.

(h) Attorney's fees: A provision is incorporated which permits a court that renders a judgment favorable to a claimant in an action arising under the social security program to set a reasonable fee—not in excess of 25 percent of past due benefits which become payable by reason of the judgment—for an attorney who successfully represented the claimant. The Secretary is permitted to certify payment of the fee to the attorney out of such past due benefits.

(i) Waiver of 1-year marriage requirement: The legislation provides an exception to the 1-year duration of marriage requirement for social security benefits for any widow, wife, husband, or widower who was, in the month before marriage, actually or potentially entitled to railroad retirement benefits as a widow, widower, parent, or disabled adult child.

E. SCOPE, COSTS AND FINANCING

1. HEALTH INSURANCE AND MEDICAL CARE FOR THE NEEDY

The scope of the protection provided is broadly as follows:

Basic plan: It is estimated that approximately 17 million insured individuals and 2 million uninsured will qualify on July 1, 1966.

Voluntary supplementary plan: It is estimated that of the total eligible aged of 19 million, from 80 to 95 percent will participate, which will mean approximately 15.2 to 18 million individuals will be involved.

Medical assistance for needy: The expanded medical assistance—Kerr-Mills—program is estimated to provide new or increased medical assistance to about 8 million needy persons during an early year of operation. States could, in the future, provide aid to as many as twice this number who need help with medical costs.

The costs and financing are as follows:

Basic plan: Benefits and administrative expenses under the basic plan would be about $1 billion for the 6-month period in 1966 and about $2.3 billion in 1967. Contribution income for those years would be about $1.6 and $2.8 billion, respectively. The costs for the uninsured—paid from general funds—would be about $280 million for the first full year.

The level-premium—long range—cost of the hospital insurance program is 1.23 percent of payroll broken down as follows:

	Percent
Hospital and extended care facility benefits	1.19
Posthospital home health	.03
Outpatient diagnostic	.01
Total	1.23

Separate payroll taxes to finance the basic plan, paid by employers, employees, and self-employed persons, would be earmarked in a separate hospital insurance trust fund established in the Treasury. The same contribution rate would apply equally to employers, employees, and self-employed persons.

The tax rate, base, and tax amount for future years is shown in the following table:

TABLE 1.—*Tax rate, tax base, and tax amount applicable to employers, employees, and self-employed persons under the basic hospital insurance program of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89–97), 1965–87 and after*

Year	Tax on employer, employee, and self-employed (each)		
	Tax rate (percent)	Tax base	Tax amount[1]
1965			
1966	0.35	$6,600	$23.10
1967	.50	6,600	33.00
1968	.50	6,600	33.00
1969–72	.50	6,600	33.00
1973–75	.55	6,600	36.30
1976–79	.60	6,600	39.60
1980–86	.70	6,600	46.20
1987 and after	.80	6,600	52.80

[1] For each self-employed person and employee with earnings or wage equal to or in excess of the tax base; employers pay same amount on behalf of such employees.

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

The benefit provisions of the law are financed by first, an increase in the earnings base from $4,800 to $6,600 effective

January 1, 1966; and, second, a revised tax rate schedule.

The tax rate schedule under prior law and the revised schedule under the new legislation for the OASDI program is shown by the two tables which follow:

TABLE 7.—*Tax rate, tax base, and tax amount applicable to employers and employees (each) under the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89–97) and under prior law, old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, 1965–87 and after*

Year	Tax rate employer and employee (each)		Tax base		Tax per employee with base wage under Public Law 89–97 [1]			
					Amount of tax		Increase under Public Law 89–97	
	Under prior law	Under Public Law 89–97	Under prior law	Under Public Law 89–97	Under prior law	Under Public Law 89–97	Over prior law	Over 1965
	Percent	*Percent*						
1965	3.625	3.625	$4,800	$4,800	$174	$174.00		
1966	4.125	3.850	4,800	6,600	198	254.10	$56.10	$80.10
1967	4.125	3.900	4,800	6,600	198	257.40	59.40	83.40
1968	4.625	3.900	4,800	6,600	222	257.40	35.40	83.40
1969–72	4.625	4.400	4,800	6,600	222	290.40	68.40	116.40
1973–75	4.625	4.850	4,800	6,600	222	320.10	98.10	146.10
1976–79	4.625	4.850	4,800	6,600	222	320.10	98.10	146.10
1980–86	4.625	4.850	4,800	6,600	222	320.10	98.10	146.10
1987 and after	4.625	4.850	4,800	6,600	222	320.10	98.10	146.10

[1] Employers pay same amount on behalf of such employees.

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

TABLE 8.—*Tax rate, tax base, and tax amount applicable to self-employed persons under the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89–97) and under prior law, old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, 1965–87 and after*

Year	Tax rate		Tax base		Tax per self-employed with base earnings under Public Law 89–97			
					Amount of tax		Increase under Public Law 89–97	
	Under prior law	Under Public Law 89–97	Under prior law	Under Public Law 89–97	Under prior law	Under Public Law 89–97	Over prior law	Over 1965
	Percent	*Percent*						
1965	5.4	5.4	$4,800	$4,800	$259.20	$259.20		
1966	6.2	5.8	4,800	6,600	297.60	382.80	$85.20	$123.60
1967	6.2	5.9	4,800	6,600	297.60	389.40	91.80	130.20
1968	6.9	5.9	4,800	6,600	331.20	389.40	58.20	130.20
1969–72	6.9	6.6	4,800	6,600	331.20	435.60	104.40	176.40
1973–75	6.9	7.0	4,800	6,600	331.20	462.00	130.80	202.80
1976–79	6.9	7.0	4,800	6,600	331.20	462.00	130.80	202.80
1980–86	6.9	7.0	4,800	6,600	331.20	462.00	130.80	202.80
1987 and after	6.9	7.0	4,800	6,600	331.20	462.00	130.80	202.80

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

TABLE 10.—*Combined tax rate on employer and employee under the Social Security Amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89–97) and under prior law, old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program and basic hospital insurance program, 1965–87 and after*

[In percent]

Year	Combined tax rate on employer and employee							
	Old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program		Basic hospital insurance program		Old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program and basic hospital insurance program			
							Change under Public Law 89–97	
	Under prior law	Under Public Law 89–97	Under prior law	Under Public Law 89–97	Under prior law	Under Public Law 89–97	Over prior law	Over 1965
1965	7.25	7.25			7.25	7.25		
1966	8.25	7.70		0.70	8.25	8.40	+0.15	+1.15
1967	8.25	7.80		1.00	8.25	8.80	+.55	+1.55
1968	9.25	7.80		1.00	9.25	8.80	−.45	+1.55
1969–72	9.25	8.80		1.00	9.25	9.80	+.55	+2.55
1973–75	9.25	9.70		1.10	9.25	10.80	+1.55	+3.55
1976–79	9.25	9.70		1.20	9.25	10.90	+1.65	+3.65
1980–86	9.25	9.70		1.40	9.25	11.10	+1.85	+3.85
1987 and after	9.25	9.70		1.60	9.25	11.30	+2.05	+4.05

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

H.R. 8371—Mr. MILLS—Public Law 89–44, approved June 21, 1965. Following is a brief outline of the provisions of this legislation, the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965:

Item	Prior law		Public Law 89–44	Effective date
	Base	Rate		
A. RETAILERS				
Furs	Retail price	10 percent	Repealed entirely	June 22, 1965.
Jewelry	do	do	do	Do.
Luggage and handbags	do	do	do	Do.
Toilet preparations	do	do	do	Do.

Item	Prior law		Public Law 89-44	Effective date
	Base	Rate		
B. MANUFACTURERS				
Passenger automobiles [1] (refunds as to sales after May 14, 1965)	Manufacturers' price	10 percent	Reduced to 7 percent on June 22, 1965, 6 percent on Jan. 1, 1966, 4 percent on Jan. 1, 1967, 2 percent on Jan. 1, 1968, 1 percent on Jan. 1, 1969.	
Schoolbuses	do	do	Exempted	June 22, 1965
Camper coaches and bodies and self-propelled mobile homes	do	do	do	Do.
Farm feed, seed, and fertilizer equipment	do	8 or 10 percent	do	Do.
Small 3-wheeled motor vehicles	do	10 percent	do	Do.
Auto parts and accessories [1] (except parts primarily used for trucks and buses).	do	8 percent	Repealed entirely	Jan. 1, 1966.
Used parts incorporated in new trucks	Value	10 percent	Value of parts exempted from tax on new trucks.	June 22, 1965.
Casinghead and natural gasoline	Gallon	4 cents	Taxable only when used as motor fuel.	July 1, 1965.
Gasoline	do	do	Taxable only when suitable for use as a motor fuel.	Do.
Lubricating oil [1]	do	6 cents	Repeals tax on cutting oil and on other lubricating oil used otherwise than in a highway motor vehicle. Tax on oil used for a highway motor vehicle to be allocated to the highway trust fund.	Jan. 1, 1966.
Cutting oil [1]	do	3 cents		
Refrigerators [1]	Manufacturer's price	5 percent	Repealed entirely	June 22, 1965.
Freezers [1]	do	do	do	Do.
Airconditioners [1] (refunds as to sales after May 14, 1965)	do	10 percent	do	Do.
Electric, gas, and oil appliances [1]	do	5 percent	do	Do.
Electric light, bulbs [1]	do	10 percent	Repealed entirely on Jan. 1, 1966, except tax on bulbs used in previously taxable items repealed on June 22, 1965.	
Radios and phonographs [1]	do	do	Repealed entirely	Do.
Television sets [1]	do	do	do	Do.
Phonograph records [1]	do	do	do	Do.
Musical instruments [1]	do	do	do	Do.
Sporting goods [1] (except fishing equipment)	do	do	do	Do.
Cameras and film [1]	do	do	do	Do.
Projectors [1]	do	5 percent	do	Do.
Business machines [1]	do	10 percent	do	Do.
Pens and mechanical pencils	do	do	do	Do.
Lighters	Each (but not more than 10 percent of manufacturer's price).	10 cents	do	Do.
Matches:				
Plain	2 cents per 1,000, but not more than 10 percent of manufacturer's price.		do	Do.
Fancy	5½ cents per 1,000		do	Do.
Playing cards [1]	Pack	13 cents	do	Do.
C. FACILITIES AND SERVICES				
General admissions	Amounts exceeding $1	10 percent	Repealed entirely	Noon, Dec. 31, 1965.
Horse and dog races	Amount	20 percent	do	Do.
Cabarets	Bill	10 percent	do	Do.
Club dues	Annual dues, if exceeding $10.	20 percent	Repealed entirely on Jan. 1, 1966, except the tax in the case of initiation fees for new clubs which is repealed on July 1, 1965.	
Air travel	Amount	5 percent	Exempts certain travel of Armed Forces personnel by redefining uninterrupted international air travel.	July 1, 1965.
Safe deposit boxes	Rent	10 percent	Repealed entirely	Do.
D. COMMUNICATIONS				
Local and long-distance telephone and teletypewriter service	Bill	do	Reduced to 3 percent on Jan. 1, 1966, 2 percent on Jan. 1, 1967, 1 percent on Jan. 1, 1968, 0 on Jan. 1, 1969.	
Certain private line and PBX service	do	do	Exempted	Jan. 1, 1966.
Telegraph service	do	do	Repealed entirely	Do.
Wire and equipment service	do	8 percent	do	Do.
E. DOCUMENTARY STAMP TAXES				
1. Bond and stock issues:				
Stock	$100 value	10 cents	do	Do.
Mutual funds	do	4 cents	do	Do.
Bonds	do	11 cents	do	Do.
2. Bond and stock transfers:				
Stock	$100 value (but no more than 8 cents per share nor less than 4 cents per sale).	4 cents	do	Do.
Bonds	$100 value	5 cents	do	Do.
3. Conveyances (deeds, instruments, or writing conveying realty).	$500 value	55 cents	do	Jan. 1, 1968.
Wagering taxes (State sweepstakes, pools, and lotteries)	Amount of wager	10 percent	Exempted wagers placed after Mar. 10, 1964.	
F. OTHER TAXES				
Coin-operated amusement devices (not including gaming devices).	Machine	$10 per machine per year.	Repealed entirely	July 1, 1965.
Bowling alleys and billiard and pool tables	Alley or table	$20 per alley or table per year.	do	Do.
Distilled spirits	Gallon	Varying	Redefines term "export" to exempt from tax shipments to Wake and Midway Islands.	Do.
Manufactured tobacco (chewing, smoking, snuff)	Pound	10 percent	Repealed entirely	Jan. 1, 1966.
Poultry exchanges	Exempts certain poultry exchanges from income tax for taxable years beginning after Dec. 31, 1953, and ending after Aug. 16, 1954, which begin before Jan. 1, 1966.			

---

[1] Provision is made for floor stock refund.

H.R. 318—Mr. JENNINGS—passed House October 7, 1965: The purpose of this bill is to provide that the manufacturers' excise tax on tires and inner tubes in the case of manufacturer-owned (or importer owned) retail stores is to be imposed at the time of delivery to these stores, rather than at the time these tubes or tires are sold. Under present law, a tax of 10 cents a pound is imposed on a highway-type tire and 5 cents a pound on other tires, and a tax of 10 cents a pound is imposed with respect to inner tubes, at the time they are sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer. In the case of tire and inner tube manufacturers—or importers—maintaining their own retail stores or retail outlets, this means that no tax is imposed until the manufacturer makes a retail sale. As a result, where a manufacturer has his own retail store, this means that no tax is paid on his retail inventory. On the other hand, the independent tire dealer, because the sale by the manufacturer, producer, or importer occurred prior to or at the time of his acquisition of the tires and tubes, can have only tax-paid inventory.

H.R. 318 would remove this competitive discrimination against independent tire dealers by providing for the imposition of the tire or inner tube tax at the time the tire or inner tube is delivered to a retail store or retail outlet of the manufacturer, producer, or importer.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means and was passed by voice vote under suspension of the rules.

H.R. 327—Mr. KEOGH—passed House October 21, 1965: As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, the purpose of this bill is to exempt from income taxation mutual, nonprofit organizations organized before September 1, 1957, and operated to provide reserves for building and loan associations, cooperative banks, and mutual savings banks, if at least 85 percent of their income is attributable to providing such reserve funds and to investments. The bill extends this tax-exempt status to organizations which are similar in essential respects to those already exempt. Present law, however, exempts such organizations only if they provide both reserves for, and insurance of shares and deposits of, member associations.

The bill also provides that net income derived by such organizations—both that of the organizations exempted by this bill and that of the similar organizations already exempt—which is not related to the provision of reserves or insurance will be taxed as unrelated business income thus confining the privilege of tax exemption to income derived from the specific services upon which that exemption is based.

H.R. 4260—Mr. KEOGH—passed House June 17, 1965: As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, this bill amends the real estate investment trust provisions of present law to provide that the term "real estate investment trust" means a corporation as well as an unincorporated trust or unincorporated association. Real estate investment corporations which meet the conditions specified in the statute now applicable to real estate investment trusts would be eligible for the "pass through" type of tax treatment, where 90 percent or more of their income is distributed, in substantially the same manner as regulated investment companies. Thus, where the specified conditions are met, the distributed income would be taxed to the shareholder in the real estate corporation and not to the corporation itself. The income taxed to the shareholder, as presently provided in the case of real estate investment trusts, would be treated as ordinary income—not eligible for the dividend exclusion—except in the case of capital gains, which would be treated in the same manner as is presently provided for real estate investment trusts.

H.R. 4493—Mrs. GRIFFITHS—Public Law 89–61, approved June 30, 1965: The purpose of this bill, which was enacted into law in the form reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to continue for 2 years, to the close of June 30, 1967, the existing suspension of duties on scrap of various metals. Favorable departmental reports were received on this legislation, and the committee was advised that the conditions which prompted the initial suspension of the duty on metal scrap, and the continuations thereof to the present time, have not changed. The committee was unanimous in recommending enactment of the bill.

H.R. 4750—Mr. MILLS—Public Law 89–243, approved October 9, 1965: This bill extended to July 31, 1967, the interest equalization tax which, in the absence of legislation, would have terminated on December 31, 1965, and broadened its application to include debt obligations having a maturity of 1 or more years—instead of 3 years or more. The tax, originally enacted as a part of the overall program to improve our balance-of-payments position, increases the cost of foreign borrowing in the case of securities and debt obligations in this country by approximately 1 percent. The Committee on Ways and Means was of the opinion that the tax had proven to be useful in our efforts to counter the deficit in our balance of payments, and its extension was urged by the administration.

H.R. 5768—Mr. HERLONG—Public Law 89–229, approved October 1, 1965: As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this bill was to continue for 3 years, until the close of November 7, 1968, the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of spun silk yarn. This suspension of duty, which has been in effect continuously since November 1959 was originally enacted in order to enable domestic producers to import fine silk yarns free of duty so as to make it more economical for them to produce fine-yarn fabrics in competition with imported similar fabrics. The committee was advised that the continuation of the suspension is justified on the basis of the same reasons that prompted the original suspension. Favorable departmental reports were received on the bill. The Senate added a provision to the bill creating a specific tariff category for certain textured yarn composed of continuous manmade fibers and providing a rate of duty for this product of 25 cents per pound plus 30 percent ad valorem. This provision was not included in the conference agreement and as the bill became law, but the President was requested to cause a study to be made of this matter with a report, including recommendations as to the appropriate rate of duty for such yarns, to be made to the Congress not later than February 1, 1966.

H.R. 6319—Mr. BOGGS—passed House October 21, 1965: As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, the purpose of this bill is to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide, in the case of recoveries of foreign expropriation losses, a new set of rules generally limiting the tax on the recovery to the benefit previously received in deducting the loss (but applying current tax rates). In hardship situations the bill also makes provision for payment of the tax on recoveries in 10 equal annual installments bearing interest at 4 percent. A special rule is provided in the case of life insurance companies, and the bill also makes provision for taxing recoveries with respect to foreign expropriation losses where a benefit from a tax deduction was received by one corporation holding securities in another whose property was expropriated.

H.R. 6431—Mr. SCHNEEBELI—Public Law 89–204, approved September 27, 1965: As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means and subsequently enacted into law, this legislation provided for the suspension, through June 30, 1967, of the duty on certain forms of nickel, and authorized the President to proclaim the continuance of such duty-free treatment after June 30, 1967, in order to carry out a trade agreement entered into under the authority of section 201 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The committee was advised that the United States is heavily dependent upon imports for its supplies of nickel, and that the duty on these products constitutes a significant cost burden on U.S. manufacturers, particularly producers of stainless steel and alloy steels, and that removal of the duty would help to improve the competitive position in the domestic as well as the export market of U.S. products manufactured from imported nickel-bearing raw materials. Favorable departmental reports were received on the legislation.

H.R. 6568—Mr. KEOGH—passed House October 18, 1965: As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill would, first, repeal the 3-cent processing tax on coconut oil, which has been suspended by temporary enactments continuously since 1957, as well as the duties of palmnut kernels and palmnuts; second, increase the duty-free quota of Philippine coconut oil from 120,000 to 160,000 long tons for the years 1965, 1966, and 1967; third, condition the duty-free quota increase for 1966 and 1967 and suspension of reduced duties on copra upon the Philippine Government having waived its existing 1¼-cent preference on copra.

This legislation was reported by the committee after full public hearings and careful consideration of all sides of the issue involved, and represents the unanimous view of the committee as to the most equitable treatment of the situation.

H.R. 7502—Mr. Ullman—passed House August 3, 1965: The purpose of this bill as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House is to amend the provisions of existing law relating to the income tax treatment of casualty losses to provide that if property is destroyed or damaged by a storm, flood, or other casualty which is designated by the President of the United States as a major disaster then, if the losses exceed the gains, both the losses and the gains will be treated as ordinary for tax purposes.

Under present law, uninsured business losses—or those from property held for the production of income—arising from a fire or other casualty are treated as ordinary losses without regard to any gains the taxpayer may have. This rule is not changed by the bill. In the case of major disasters, the bill supplements this rule of existing law to provide substantially similar loss treatment for partially insured business property—or property held for the production of income. This loss treatment also is provided in the case of major disasters for losses of personal assets held for over 6 months (such as a personal residence—whether or not it is covered by any insurance.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it has no objection to the enactment of this legislation.

H.R. 7621—Mr. Dow—passed House June 9, 1965—Public Law 89-241: As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, the purpose of this bill was to close a tariff loophole by amending the Tariff Schedules of the United States to limit the term "button blanks" to raw or crude blanks suitable for manufacture into buttons. The substance of this bill was adopted by the Senate as an amendment to H.R. 7969, the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965, and it became law as a part of that legislation.

H.R. 7723—Mr. King of California—passed House October 21, 1965: As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, the purpose of this bill is to suspend the duties on certain tropical hardwood lumbers until January 1, 1968, and to authorize the President to proclaim the continuance beyond that date of the duty-free treatment of such lumbers in connection with a trade agreement which may be entered into under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 as though such temporary duty-free treatment were permanent treatment under the tariff laws. The products covered by the bill are hardwood lumbers, rough, dressed, or worked, which the Tariff Commission has determined to be tropical forestry commodities of kinds not produced in significant quantities in the United States. Although the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 provides for the elimination of duties on such lumber under the trade agreements procedure, this cannot be accomplished until after the conclusion of the Kennedy Round negotiations, and the Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that the U.S. foreign economic interests would be served by the immediate temporary suspension of these duties.

Favorable departmental reports were received on the bill, and the Department of Commerce advised that it knows of no objection on the part of domestic industry to its enactment.

H.R. 7969—Mr. Mills—Public Law 89-241, approved October 7, 1965: The purpose of this legislation, the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1965, was to provide for the correction of certain errors which, through oversight, inadvertence, or lack of adequate information, had been made by the Tariff Commission in preparing the tariff schedules of the United States—TSUS.

TSUS was the product of many years of work by the Tariff Commission under legislative directive to compile a revision and consolidation of the laws prescribing the tariff status of imported articles with a view to their simplification. Duty changes were to be avoided except where required as an incident to the accomplishment of the purposes of the legislation. The result of the Tariff Commission efforts was a revised set of tariff schedules which the Congress ultimately adopted by the Tariff Classification Act of 1962. After some revision under legislative criteria, the new schedules became effective on August 31, 1963.

Since the adoption of the new schedules, a number of errors had come to light, and the purpose of H.R. 7969 was to gather these errors together and make corrections in one bill, rather than deal with them piecemeal.

H.R. 8147—Mr. Mills—Public Law 89-62, approved June 30, 1965: As enacted into law, this legislation made permanent the previously temporary reduction to $100 in the exemption from duty that a returning resident of the United States may bring back into this country free of duty and changed the basis of valuation from wholesale value to fair retail value. The bill also contained provisions which, among other things, first, reduced the quantity of alcoholic beverages that may be included in the exemption from 1 wine gallon to 1 quart—except in the case of persons returning from the Virgin Islands, Guam, or American Samoa—and limited the exercise of this privilege to persons age 21 or over; second, reestablished and made permanent with certain changes the special temporary exemption provisions which had previously applied to U.S. residents returning from the Virgin Islands and extended those provisions to also include persons returning from American Samoa or Guam; and, third, limited the exemption to articles accompanying the individual on his return to the United States.

The legislation was recommended by the administration as one of several steps proposed by the President to deal with the continuing deficit in our balance of payments. The Secretary of the Treasury advised the Committee on Ways and Means that the reduction in duty-free exemption had been effective in bringing about balance-of-payments savings, and the committee concluded that this action was warranted.

H.R. 8210—Mr. Miller—passed House October 21, 1965: As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, this bill provides that at the discretion of the President the European Space Research Organization—ESRO—an organization of 11 Western European countries engaged in the planning of scientific activities in the peaceful use of outer space which is interested in establishing a small satellite telemetry command station near Fairbanks, Alaska, may be designated by the President as an international organization for purposes of the International Organizations Immunities Act. Upon such a designation, the organization, to the extent provided by the President, will be exempt from customs duties on property imported for the activities it engages in, from income taxes, from withholding taxes on wages, and from excise taxes on services and facilities. In addition, the employees of the international organization—other than nationals of the United States—may not be subject to U.S. income tax on the income they receive from ESRO. Favorable departmental reports were received on this legislation.

H.R. 8436—Mr. Mills—passed House October 21, 1965: As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, this bill would amend those provisions of the Tariff Schedules of the United States granting exemption from duty to articles produced in insular possessions of the United States with use of foreign materials so that such exemption will no longer be allowed in the case of certain timing devices so produced in any of such possessions other than in the Virgin Islands of the United States.

The need for the legislation arose out of the rapid development of a watch assembly industry in the Virgin Islands which was threatening to assume such proportions as to constitute primarily a tariff-avoidance scheme. This threat was avoided by the recent action of the Virgin Islands Legislature in enacting legislation establishing what are, in effect, quotas on shipments of watch movements to the United States. Following close on this action, however, rumors have spread that some U.S. firms and possibly others are planning to establish watch-assembly operations on Guam and American Samoa and thus defeat the effect of the action of the Virgin Islands Legislature. The bill would frustrate any such action by withdrawing the special exemption privilege with respect to timing devices produced in those possessions.

H.R. 8445—Mr. Mills—passed House October 21, 1965: As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, the purpose of this bill is to eliminate an inequity in the provisions of existing law which prescribe the formula for computing retired pay for judges of the Tax Court of the United States. Under present law the retired pay of a judge of the Tax Court, unlike the retired pay of judges of other Federal courts, is based on the salary payable to him as judge "at the time he ceases to be a judge" rather than on the salary of the office, the normal basis utilized in computing retired pay for judges of the U.S. district courts and of the U.S. Court of Claims.

H.R. 8445 would eliminate this disparate treatment in the law by providing for the calculation of retired pay of Tax Court judges in a manner similar to that presently provided for judges of the other Federal tribunals.

H.R. 8464—Mr. Mills—Public Law 89-49, approved June 24, 1965: This legislation, which was enacted into law without amendment, provided a temporary increase in the public debt limit to $328 billion for the period beginning July 1, 1965, and ending on June 30, 1966. In the absence of legislation, the debt limitation would have reverted on July 1, 1965, to the permanent limit of $285 billion.

In the report of the Committee on Ways and Means on this bill, it was noted that the committee had requested the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget to determine whether in their view there are guidelines for establishing a new permanent debt ceiling which would be realistic in light of the present level of the debt, and to report back to the committee on this subject.

H.R. 9042—Mr. Mills—Public Law No. 89-283, approved October 21, 1965: This legislation, the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965, provided for the implementation of the Agreement Concerning Automotive Products Between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada, signed by President Johnson and Prime Minister Pearson on January 16, 1965.

The legislation marks a milestone in the trade relations of the United States and her greatest trading partner, Canada. H.R. 9042 provides authority to the President to carry out the U.S. undertaking under the Automotive Products Agreement to remove the U.S. duties on imports of Canadian motor vehicles and original equipment for new motor vehicles. Canada removed its duties from U.S. imports on January 18, 1965. The agreement was the culmination of the efforts of representatives of both Governments to solve a problem which had led to actions that threatened a trade war between the two countries. The problem arose out of the desire of Canada to increase its share in the North American automotive market.

H.R. 9570—Mr. Jennings—Public Law 89-184, approved September 15, 1965: The purpose of this bill, which was reported to the House unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means and was enacted into law without amendment, was to amend the Federal Firearms Act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to relieve applicants from certain provisions of the act if he determines that the granting of relief would not be contrary to the public interest, and that the applicant would not be likely to conduct his operations in an unlawful manner. The committee concluded, after examination of a situation which had been brought to its attention, that under certain circumstances it would be desirable to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to grant relief from the disabilities imposed under the Federal Firearms Act in the case of felony convictions, where the felony concerned did not involve the use of firearms or other weapons or any violation under the Federal or National Firearms Act. The Departments of the Treasury and Justice submitted reports interposing no objection to the enactment of this legislation.

H.R. 10625—Mr. Mills—passed House October 21, 1965: As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, this bill would make a series of amendments to the Internal Revenue Code designed to provide essentially the same tax treatment under the retired serviceman's family protection plan where provision is made for annuities for surviving spouses or certain child beneficiaries as already is provided in the case of the civil service retirement program and other qualified pension plans. Both the Department of the Treasury and the Department of Defense favor this legislation.

H.R. 11029—Mr. Keogh—passed House October 5, 1965: H.R. 11029, as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, aims at closing certain loopholes in the U.S. Tariff Schedules which enable foreign manufacturers to so manipulate the manufacture of certain fabrics as to avoid higher duties that would apply in the absence of such manipulation. Like other legislation designed to frustrate tariff avoidance practices, the purpose of this bill is to assure the full payment of the duty actually intended to apply to particular products.

H.R. 11216—Mr. Mills—passed House October 21, 1965: The purpose of this bill, as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, is to eliminate an impediment to allowance in duty under item 807.00 of the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to U.S. products previously exported and returned to this country as components of articles assembled abroad. A clause in item 807.00 denies the benefit afforded unless the particular U.S. products contained in the returned assembled article are prior to their exportation identified to the U.S. Customs as being intended for assembly abroad and returned to the United States as components of particular articles. This requirement has proven to be onerous both to the U.S. exporters and to the customs authorities. The bill would eliminate the requirement, which was not a feature of the law prior to the adoption of the new tariff schedules.

S. 701—Senator Mansfield, by request—Public Law 89-23, approved May 22, 1965: As amended by the Committee on Ways and Means and enacted into law, the purpose of this legislation was to grant the President the authority that would permit the United States to carry out its obligations under the International Coffee Agreement of 1962, which had previously been signed by the United States and ratified by the Senate.

S. 1760—Senator Fulbright—reported to House October 8, 1965: The purpose of the bill, S. 1760, as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to conclude the settlement of a debt arising from a loan by the United States to Greece in 1929, on which no payments have been made since the early years of World War II. Under the terms of the settlement, Greece will repay at interest $13,155,921 in 82 annual installments; the latter with one exception will each amount to approximately $329,000, and the payments thus will total $26.7 million. The bill provides that the sums so paid by Greece shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States, and it authorizes the appropriation of amounts equivalent to the sums so deposited for use in financing educational and cultural exchange programs authorized by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 in relation to Greece and the people of Greece.

Both the Department of Labor and the Department of State have recommended this legislation and requested its prompt enactment.

PRIVATE BILLS

Seventeen private bills were reported by the Committee on Ways and Means during the past session of the Congress. Most of these bills provided for the duty-free entry of certain scientific instruments for the use of specified educational institutions. A listing of the private bills reported by the committee, noted as to the items covered by each and the status of the bill at adjournment, follows:

Private bill number and author	Status at adjournment or last action	Item for which duty-free entry provided	Institution involved
H.R. 1317, Mr. Gubser	Private Law 89-198 (approved Nov. 2, 1965)	Mass spectrometer	Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.
H.R. 1386, Mr. Lipscomb	Private Law 89-172 (approved Oct. 30, 1965)	do	Pomona College, Claremont, Calif.
H.R. 2565, Mr. O'Hara, Illinois	Private Law 89-199 (approved Nov. 2, 1965)	do	University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
H.R. 3126, Mr. Pelly	Private Law 89-181 (approved Oct. 31, 1965)	do	University of Washington.
H.R. 4599, Mr. Rogers, Colorado	Reported to House Oct. 19, 1965	Stained glass	Congregation Emanuel, Denver, Colo.
H.R. 4832, Mr, Karsten	Private Law 89-174 (approved Oct. 30, 1965)	Mass spectrometer	St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.
H.R. 5831, Mr. O'Brien	Reported to House Oct. 19, 1965	Stained glass and cement windows.	Our Lady of the Angels Seminary, Glenmont, N.Y.
H.R. 6906, Mr. Stratton	Private Law 89-193 (approved Nov. 1, 1965)	Mass spectrometer and split-pole spectrograph.	University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.
H.R. 6666, Mr. Stratton	Private Law 89-208 (approved Nov. 8, 1965)	Spectrograph system	University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
H.R. 7608, Mr. Jarman	Private Law 89-187 (approved Oct. 31, 1965)	Distribution machine	University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.

Private bill number and author	Status at adjournment or last action	Item for which duty-free entry provided	Institution involved
H.R. 8232, Mr. Steed	Private Law 89-195 (approved Nov. 1, 1965)	Mass spectrometer-gas chromatograph.	Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla.
H.R. 8272, Mr. Thompson, New Jersey	Private Law 89-175 (approved Oct. 30, 1965)	Isotope separator	Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.
H.R. 9351, Mr. Reifel	Private Law 89-196 (approved Nov. 1, 1965)	Shadomaster measuring projector.	University of South Dakota.
H.R. 9587, Mr. Aspinall	Private Law 89-197 (approved Nov. 1, 1965)	Craig countercurrent distribution apparatus.	Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.
H.R. 9588, Mr. Boggs	Private Law 89-177 (approved Oct. 31, 1965)	Rotating chair	Louisiana State University Medical Center, New Orleans, La.
H.R. 9903, Mr. Giaimo	Private Law 89-209 (approved Nov. 8, 1965)	Multigap magnetic spectrografh; and Senate amendments as follows:	
		(1) Mass spectrometer	Yale University.
		(2) Mass spectrometer	Ohio State University.
		(3) Digital polarimeter.	Smith College.
		(4) Photomicroscope	Utah State Training School.
		(5) Rheogoniometer	Catholic University of America.
H.R. 8647, Mr. Irwin	Reported to House Oct. 19, 1965	Authentic troubador uniforms.	Troubadors Drum & Bugle Corps, Bridgeport, Conn.

Fifth Annual Meeting of Episcopal Society for Cultural & Racial Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Episcopal Society for Cultural & Racial Unity, a nationwide organization of bishops, priests, and laity of the Episcopal Church, headquartered at 5 Forsyth Street NW., Atlanta, Ga., recently held its fifth annual meeting in Jackson, Miss. In view of the gunning down of the Selma, Ala., based ESCRU field representative, Jonathan M. Daniels, on August 20, and the serious injury sustained by a Roman Catholic priest, the Reverend Richard Morrisroe, I was deeply concerned at the time that adequate steps be taken to insure the safety of the participants in the meeting. I urged the Department of Justice to take all appropriate measures to this end, and I am happy to report that the conference proceeded without incident.

Among their activities were firsthand inspection in the delta of church work and voter registration projects. ESCRU has made a fine record in encouraging progress in the field of civil rights and all human rights for all Americans. The executive director of ESCRU, the Reverend John B. Morris, is one of the most respected priests of the Episcopal Church. The assistant director, the Reverend Albert Dreiseach, Jr.; one of the field representatives, the Reverend Malcolm Boyd; and the director of the southern field service, the Reverend Henri A. Stines, are all experienced priests of the Episcopal Church with full-time responsibility in the field of civil rights and in bringing about cultural and racial unity.

Mr. Frederick H. Sontag of Montclair, N.J., who has since been named consultant to the national board of ESCRU in recognition of his long-time work in the field of civil rights, has called to my attention the fact that originally the conference program included a talk entitled, "Selma, a Continuing Ministry of Presence," by Jonathan Daniels. Before the conference was held, the tragedy at Selma occurred. In a sense the conference became a living memorial to Jonathan Daniels. I am glad that New Jersey Episcopal priests, laymen, and laywomen had a share in these sessions.

October 28, 1918: Czechoslovakian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, 47 years ago, on October 28, 1918, the independent Republic of Czechoslovakia, comprising Bohemia, Slovakia, and Ruthenia, was established by the peace treaties which ended World War I. The creation of Czechoslovakia freed the Czech people from foreign domination for the first time in 300 years.

Under the outstanding leadership of Thomas Masaryk and Eduard Benes, the new Czechoslovak Republic built a liberal and progressive democracy and instituted far-reaching land reforms, a system of social insurance, special guarantees to protect the rights of minority groups, unionization and rapid industrialization.

Then came the betrayal of the Czech people and their nation in the cowardly appeasement at Munich.

The young Czech Republic fell under the heel of Nazi totalitarianism and soon became an important and tragic victim of the Soviet Communists.

On June 7, 1948, after a bloodless coup and sham elections had cemented Communist control, Eduard Benes resigned his position as the second President of the Czechoslovak Republic

The Republic was dead.

October 28 will mark the anniversary of the proudest, happiest day in Czech history.

It is indeed tragic that while people of Czechoslovak descent in America commemorate this independence day, it is not observed in Czechoslovakia.

It is tragic that Czechoslovakia, which enjoyed a brief but vital period of freedom, remains under Communist domination and has even become a Communist showcase and model satellite.

I believe, nonetheless, that within the hearts of the captive Czech people there still beats the same love of freedom and liberty which inspired and charted the early course of the Czechoslovak Republic.

I join all Czechoslovak-Americans today in paying tribute to the indomitable Czech spirit of freedom.

In observing this independence day, we reaffirm our trust that the Republic of Czechoslovakia may again take its place among the free nations of the world.

People-to-People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, recently I was privileged to address a national meeting of an organization known as People-to-People. This organization is dedicated to the very worthwhile purpose of promoting international understanding. Indeed, this aim represents an essential ingredient to the restoration of peace to this troubled world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR GALE McGEE BEFORE THE PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE NATIONAL CONFERENCE, OCTOBER 7, 1965, KANSAS CITY, MO.

It is a privilege to be here in Kansas City tonight to speak to this first national meeting of People-to-People. That there are representatives from nearly half the States of the Union speaks well for the dedication of those who are so generously giving of their time and effort in furthering the cause of personal diplomacy.

The purposes of People-to-People I readily salute, for in their belief that individuals all have the same fundamental aspirations, hopes, and dreams, they capture the one universal language of all nations and all individuals.

It is true of nations as of persons, as Emerson said, that "there can never be deep peace between two spirits, never mutual respect, until, in their dialog, each stands for the whole world."

It is easy to say that we must stand for the whole world; the concept of universal brotherhood and understanding is not difficult to grasp. What is difficult is to put it into practice, even upon the most elementary scale. For as individuals differ in tastes and viewpoint, so do cultures differ and the variety of outlooks and customs that make up a culture have been strengthened and solidified by centuries of separation by distance or terrain. But now man's ingenuity has eliminated those distances and bridged those physical obstacles that once separated one people from another. In a matter of hours we can transport ourselves to the most remote spot on the earth where until now the people did not know we exist, much less comprehend who we are and what we stand for.

The marvels of communication and transportation, however, have not been accompanied by similar marvels of understanding and mutual respect. To go to a foreign land is easy; to bring a foreigner here requires some money and a little time. But to understand how that person thinks or why his culture honors and esteems that which we consider worthless or even repugnant is not a process of a few hours, a few days, or even a few years. To be accomplished on a nationwide scale it will require generations.

Too often, when faced with a task of this magnitude, the human tendency is to say it cannot be done. I am proud to be addressing a group that not only thinks it can be done, but has gotten off to a very good start doing it. The People-to-People program has been in operation only 9 years, yet it has chalked up a remarkable record of achievement in bringing together the peoples of the world so that they might begin the process of mutual understanding.

What is needed, however, is a direct person-to-person approach that will help to strip away the facade of government stereotypes in every capital of the world and to expose the inaccuracies of the hasty generalization of national images around the world. Too often have we tended to judge the people of another country through the image of their national leader or some outspoken critic in their ranks. Thus, in the 1930's, all Germans were Hitlers. In the 1940's all Russians were Stalins. And in the 1950's all Indians were Krishna Mennons. Or even now, all Egyptians are Nassers, or Cubans Castros, and all Indonesians are Sukarnos.

Or to frame this same projection oppositely through the eyes of our international neighbors, there is an equally facile tendency to judge the United States through the headlinemakers of the news. Thus, any sharp criticism from a Member of Congress or from a spokesman in any other public group is headlined around the globe and quickly produces an image of the typical American. Our own countrymen sometimes fail to understand how a foreigner does equate congressional statements. In other capitals of the world, any statement from any member of the government would be regarded as official policy since many areas are not as freely accustomed to open criticism within their administrations. But, when a U.S. Senator sounds off, foreigners fail to understand that this is merely his personal view and tend to equate it instead as reflecting official policy or typical public attitudes toward whatever nation was the object of that particular Senator's attack that day.

In short, a part of the problem of misjudgment around the world stems from the fact that we all are headline hunters and tend to formulate generalizations about strangers whom we do not know. The nub of our difficulty is, therefore, that we tend to judge each other by the excesses of our most outspoken or more extreme public figures.

This is the reason why People-to-People becomes so important. So for the next few minutes that we have here together, I would like to suggest to you first some general attributes about people of the rest of the world which all Americans should come better to understand and to make allowances for as we seek to judge others. Then I would suggest secondly certain stereotypes regarding Americans that foreigners seem to accept too readily and to indicate how desperately important I feel it is that we not contribute to the deepening of these impressions in this latter category of so-called American traits. All of these factors, as you will soon gather, have long since been obvious to you as individuals because of your leadership in this program which we are meeting here to discuss this evening. But I beseech you to take up the cudgels of the cause of which these factors are but a part and carry the message person to person here at home.

For those of us who live in America, it behooves us all to work a little harder at understanding other people. There are several qualities about the rest of the human race which it is important for us to grasp if we are to project realistic and intelligent foreign policies in our national interest. I shall mention four in particular.

First, it is important to remember that most of the rest of the world is nonwhite. At least until the civil rights questions reached their current peaks, many of our countrymen tended to think of the rest of the world in their own image, including the color of their skin. Very few indeed pondered seriously the makeup of the human race either geographically or racially. To put it as sharply as possible, let us assume for a moment that we could place 100 people here at the front of the room that would accurately represent in proper proportion a cross-section of the populations of the globe. Who would they include? What would they look like? Well, 1 would be from Australia, New Zealand, or the South Pacific; 5 would be from the United States and Canada; 6 would be from the Soviet Union; 8 would be from Africa; 9 would be from Latin America; 14 or 15 would be from Western Europe; and 56 would be from Asia.

A world that is already 3 billion and racing toward 5 in the predictable future thus has to be viewed in something other than white skins or residing within the 3-mile limit of the coast lines of the United States. Either we can choose to shrink from this prospect in fear because of its immensity, or we can strive to understand it and realistically plan toward it as the kind of world in which we hope to survive.

Second, the people of the world are desperately poor. Poverty is currently a very common word in the American vernacular. But what it means to the typical resident of the United States is quite something else again in contrast to what it may mean to a Montagnard tribesman in Vietnam or a Congolese medicine man in Kivu. Much as some of us recall even the desperate plight of millions of Americans in the depths of the depression in the 1930's, we still ought to appreciate that in Asiatic terms our countrymen have never know poverty in its harshest form. When we recall that two-thirds of the world lives in some measure of hunger and sickness, is ill-clothed and ill-housed in ways too primitive for us to comprehend, we can only then begin to measure the meaning of poverty for hundreds of millions of individuals. One young man I talked to who was driving a water buffalo in a rice paddy in Thailand explained to me as best he could that, for a full day—dawn to dark—wading in mud above his knees, he could expect to receive the equivalent of four American pennies.

In the center of the Congo a chieftain explained that he and the half dozen young males in his clan could expect to earn in an entire year all added together about the equivalent of one American workingman's wage for one 8-hour day. Unless we can grasp the appalling gap between American affluence and the desperation of most of the rest of the people of the earth, we may miss the point.

Former President Eisenhower once noted that an even greater threat to the peace of the world than communism was the ever-widening gap between the very rich and the very poor nations. That's why it is increasingly imperative that in ways as constructive and as reasoned as we know how we should continue to share our affluence with those who are less fortunate than we. To do so only increases the chances that we may some day have an opportunity to live in peace.

As the late President John F. Kennedy put it, "If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich."

Third, the people of the world are in a hurry. In much of the world the citizens are discovering for the first time, and understandably with shock, how much they have been cheated. World War II did as much as anything else to open the eyes of Asians and Africans in particular to the extent to which their colonial subservience had denied them their fair share of the fruits of the earth. And now in the wake of the war they seem united in their determination to make up for lost time—to take every short cut possible into the future.

The Russians afford an interesting example. About 10 years ago when I first landed in a small Russian plane at the airport in Stalingrad, we taxied alongside a large two-wheeled cart pulled by a pair of oxen. The cart was being loaded with bundles of hay by a group of women. The idyllic setting of rural Russia could just as well have been set in medieval times were it not for the presence of the aircraft. But here indeed was a capsule of modern Russia—a nation in a hurry, from the oxcart to the airplane—indeed to the space age—in a single generation; a nation very much in a hurry.

Or in another instance as recently as the Bolshevik revolution in 1917, a majority of the people of Russia were illiterate. Today—scarcely a generation later—we have reason to believe that there is no measurable illiteracy in the Soviet Union. Russia is in a hurry.

I still recall with some surprise my first experience landing in a 707 jet on a modern airstrip near Leopoldville in the Congo and on what was represented as being, in those years, the longest jet airstrip in the world. Yet, from the edge of that same strip I viewed a Congolese village that still lived somewhat under the spell and magic of its witch doctor. Here again was a microcosm of people in a hurry. Indeed, Africa may be likened to an impatient man grasping the hand of a witch doctor on one side and the tail of a jet plane on the other and somehow in a simple way trying to have the best of both but nonetheless determined to close the gap separating his past from his future.

The same impatience characterizes the quest of millions of souls for the dignity of national independence. To be sure, most of them may not be ready for the responsibilities of self-rule by our terms; but who is to say who is ready for independence? I can even yet recall as a graduate student at the University of Chicago reading the debates in Parliament and the correspondence of public figures in England relating to the brewing restlessness in the American Colonies in 1776, and how in innumerable instances the suggestion was made by the British, "Don't worry about an explosion in America. They are not ready for independence." Obviously, a few impatient souls like Tom Jefferson, or Sam Adams, or Patrick Henry didn't agree. Readiness is really a state of mind rather than a material condition which can be easily defined.

Since the beginning of World War II, we have witnessed the birth of more new independent nations than existed in the world up to that time in modern history. In our Nation's Capital where I live and work, a majority of the foreign ambassadors were born as subjects of a colonial power. This reflects the driving impatience that also unites the peoples of many skins and cultures and philosophies. It behooves us as the people who more than any other have inspired this drive for independence to at least understand what it means to them even as it did to our own Founding Fathers nearly 200 years ago. Instead of looking down our noses at these people as though we resented their rocking the boat, we ought to understand what their new status means to them and encourage and inspire them to rise to its emerging responsibilities. The revolution of human expectations is a fact of our time. We either roll with it and seek to channel it constructively, or we will be swept away by it. President Kennedy put it much better when he said, "Unless we make peaceful revolution possible, we shall make violent revolution inevitable."

Fourth, people are different. On this front we may be slowly learning. After the experience of nearly 12 million young men and women in the Armed Forces scattered all over the world, we have acquired a nucleus of people who understand that people are different and that those differences can even be enriching rather than troublesome. There are rich cultures in the world much older than ours, and at least as rewarding as ours. Some of them may, in the course of time, be more enduring. None of us here can say—yet. But what we can say is that differences among nationalities and races and cultures can and must be respected. It would be a commonplace to suggest that the good Lord gave no monopoly of truth to any one color of skin, no special insight into all wisdom to any one nationality, nor the ultimate in values to any one culture.

An old college chum of mine once went to Paris to study at the Sorbonne. He spent several days in locating a simple room which he might call home for the year of his study in France. Somewhere along the Left Bank, he climbed the stairs to a cold-water flat, rapped on the door, and was greeted by the lady of the house. When asked if there might be room, she replied that there were four members of her family and that they had only three rooms and a bath as it was, but that to come back the next day and she would see if she might be helpful. On returning the following day, he was notified that they had decided to close out their simple bathroom, and convert it into a sleeping room for this new face from America. Even as he protested that they should not, indeed, could not, do such a thing as that just for him, she patiently explained there were public toilet facilities just down the block that would serve their purposes and that it was worth it to them to have a visitor from America that they might get to know and through him they might come to understand better a foreign land. He was overwhelmed by their standards. "Imagine," as he expressed to me later, "an American family giving up their bathroom in order to house a foreign visitor for a year." Well, people are different.

Or better still an experience Mrs. McGee and I had in Italy while leading a group of schoolteachers around Western Europe in the summer of 1954. In those days, as some of you here will appreciate, the plumbing facilities in Italy were none too good and even downright primitive in the rural areas. One evening our busload of 43 schoolteachers stopped in a little coastal town on the west side of Italy to stay all night. It had been a long, hard day—dusty, dirty, and hot. Tempers were short, patience was conspicuous by its absence. In the small, third-rate inn, which teachers then had to afford, there was only one bathroom. The resulting shuffling and juggling for seniority rights and priority position was something to behold. Needless to say, more than one of the school marms let the innkeeper have a piece of her mind. In desperation the poor fellow came to me and said, "Professor McGee, what's the matter with your ladies. They all complain about my toilet facilities. Tell me, sir," he said, "other Americans who stop here always seem to complain about the plumbing. May I ask you a very serious question about your country?" Then he put the question as he asked, "Does everything that's important in America take place in your bathrooms?"

The more I reflected on this question, the more I realized how the typical American tourist must invite that kind of inquiry. Well, people are different.

No incident illustrates cultural difference with quite as much warmth as the story related by James Michener during the seige of the capital city of Seoul during the Korean conflict a few years ago. As the city was under attack by the Communists, a quick decision had to be made as to the evacuation at least of the VIP's from the area. The means, however, were limited. The American commander notified the city officials that one small barge would be available, and its capacity was limited to 100 people. The decision the city fathers needed to make naturally was who were the 100 most important people in the town. They did not hesitate. On the barge they placed the 100 members of the Seoul Symphony Orchestra. The American commander was reported to have exploded with an expletive which reflected more amazement and lack of understanding than it did one of indictment. But people are different.

Even as we seek to understand others, so we should strive to have them understand us. Much as we might say to our friends of other lands that you should allow for our differences as we allow for yours, we should also strive to project the best face of America rather than some of our less favorable attributes that occasionally pop out in headlines. It is not without point that some foreigners look upon us as too materialistic, as more obsessed with dollar values than with human values, or that in our present role in the world we appear to be a nation of militarists or that we appear to be a frightened people bent only upon destroying communism, or a jittery people who lack so much confidence in ourselves that we see only the hobgoblins of the enemy behind every change that takes place elsewhere.

In a very large sense, the harsh demands of the cold war have forced upon the United States a negative image around the world. Even though we attempted to travel the other route—namely, the nonmilitary, the Soviets refused to permit us that alternative. Not only did we dismantle most of our 12-million-man military force at the end of World War II, but we offered to share with the Russians what was then our monopoly on atomic power. In addition, we extended to the Reds an offer of Marshall plan assistance to help them rebuild from the devastation of the war—no strings attached. But the answer was always the same—"no." History surely will judge that each of these proposals in turn was sincere and magnanimous, if not realistic. The hard fact remains, however, that the flagrant disregard of treaties and the determination of the Russians to expand their influence around the world wherever possible required that the only other big power in the world capable of thwarting their ambitions—namely, the United States—meet its responsibilities. This we have done. Soviet expansionism has been curbed, world communism has been stopped, and the balance of political power around the globe has been reconstituted in more favorable terms. These have been the result of a long, tortuous, and costly cold war diplomacy.

Having mostly succeeded in the cold war phase, however, is not enough. We should constantly remind ourselves that it represents only a beginning rather than the end which we seek. For necessary as it was, it has still left our country with a negative profile in the eyes of other nations. As a young college girl in Saigon put it to me during an interrogation while I was there inspecting American positions, "Mr. Senator, I'm on your side. I understand that you must halt the Russians, that you must stop the Chinese, and that uncontrolled communism is a threat to us all. My people also have gotten the message. They know that you're against Communists, and Chinese, and Russians. But they continue to ask me, and in their heart ask you, 'America, what are you for?' "

We have to work harder at telling the rest of the world what we are for as well as revealing through our actions what we are against. We must get through to them loudly and clearly that we are for people, that we are for human dignity, that we are for freedom, that we are for national independence. It is time to accentuate the positive.

Sometimes as we stress our nonmilitary qualities, we tend to stress the wrong thing. Many times I have heard travelers from the United States describing in glowing terms the skyscrapers of Manhattan or the speed of our automobiles, or the conveniences of our supermarkets. These are materialistic qualities and tend to underscore the opinion held by many foreigners that the Americans are too materialistic. When Mr. Nehru was the Prime Minister of India, I had the occasion to visit with him at length with another Senator about some of the difficulties our two countries were having. In the course of our conversation that great Indian statesman and philosopher passed along a significant observation. He said, "You know, sometimes you people in America miss the real point of your greatness. You talk too much about the speed of your jets, the number of your automobiles, and the luxury of your homes. But these are not your great qualities. They simply reflect the consequences of your ingenuity. Your truly great qualities are contained in the great philosophies of Thomas Jefferson, or Abraham Lincoln, or Franklin Roosevelt. They are reflected in the conscience of your people, in your respect for the dignity of the individual person, in your humanitarian impulses to help others, in your dedication to religious beliefs, in your tolerance of religious and political differences, in your respect for national independence. These are your deep-running marks of greatness." He concluded, "You should talk about them more and your material successes less, for it's your great qualities that inspire my people—indeed all people who look to you for leadership."

Finally, we have to accept the differences among people. We cannot make little Americans out of everybody. We should not if we wished; we could not if we tried. What works for us may not work in Pakistan. What benefits us may boomerang in Africa.

We must accommodate ourselves to change—rapid change. History teaches nothing if not the inevitability of change. Our capacity to change fast enough and in time will be the ultimate measure of our ability to survive in this generation. It requires that we adjust and think about what's taking place in the world. The time is at hand when we quit blaming everything on the Communists, that we stop attributing every convulsion, or revolution, or adjustment to their sinister plotting. While I do not intend to suggest that the Communists can be taken lightly, neither should they be made 10 feet tall. And in the very nature of the changes which now threaten to engulf us everywhere around the world we are distressed by certain sweeping tides of change that may in fact have little if any connection with Communists at all. To put it another way, if the Russians should disappear overnight and if the Chinese were to drop into the bowels of the earth tomorrow, most of the same bewildering problems of peoples and nations would still be plaguing us and challenging us to come up with the right answers. Anticommunism as a cliche or a slogan can become very dangerous. It can lull us into the acceptance of oversimplified causation for problems to which we would then only come up with the wrong answers. Anticommunism is a mighty poor substitute for thinking. It becomes desperately important, therefore, that we construct an American policy toward the world that is motivated more by a sense of being right than by a sense of being afraid. Fear can produce great deeds, but fear is also the brother to panic. And panic can lead to disaster.

We have every reason in these times to be confident and reasonably sure of ourselves if only we do not permit bigotry and narrowness and fear to blind us to the realities of the world around us. The American example can be one of both challenge and inspiration to other nations, and most of all to the people within those nations. Tom Paine once observed during the great revolution that produced American freedom, "the cause of America is the cause of all mankind." But it was President John F. Kennedy who reminded us of the importance of updating Tom Paine's thoughts. "Now," said President Kennedy, "in the great world revolutions, the cause of all mankind is the cause of America."

This Land of Plenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech:

THIS LAND OF PLENTY

(Speech by Congressman JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Democrat, of Mississippi, to the Mississippi Poultry Improvement Association Convention, Biloxi, Miss.)

It is a real pleasure for me to be here with you today. One of nine members of the committee which handles all defense appropriations, I could talk of Vietnam, of Panama, and the Dominican Republic. One of the few members who handles appropriations for domestic public works, I could repeat the argument I made several years ago in successfully overriding the President's veto of the public works appropriation bill on the second try, the only time this has ever been done. Instead, I shall talk about labor and industry's biggest customer, the people's best and most economical supplier, our greatest dollar earner in world trade, the key to continuing prosperity and—when neglected—cause of depression, American agriculture.

Born and reared on the farm, my ambition was to practice law. With a 1-year detour to teach school, I was in the Mississippi Legislature at 21, was licensed to practice law, began practice as the junior member of the law firm of Denman, Breland & Whitten, and was elected district attorney of the 17th District (five counties) when 23. I served in that position and practiced law until elected to Congress in 1941.

You may well ask how I got back so close to agriculture. That is easy. In 1944 my successor as district attorney ran against me for Congress and told the truth on me. He said I had served 2½ years in Congress and had not made a single speech for the farmer. Though I had voted consistently for fair treatment of agriculture, I had not spoken for I felt others knew more about the subject than I.

After this campaign, in which I was victorious, I set out to get on the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture. This I did and have now served 15 years as chairman of that subcommittee. Though I also serve on the Appropriations Subcommittee for National Defense and the one for domestic public works, my greatest challenge comes from the fight each year to get over to an urban Congress, and to an urban-oriented public, the importance of a sound, healthy agriculture to the rest of our economy.

AGRICULTURE IS OUR BASIC STRENGTH

During this period, I have witnessed one of the greatest paradoxes of modern history. I have seen the increasing contribution made by the American farmer to prosperity in the United States and to the abundant supply of food for a hungry world. At the same time, I have seen decreasing public understanding of agricultural problems and less and less public appreciation of the role of American agriculture in our economy. I have seen better fed, better clothed, and better housed people questioning whether the American farmer should participate in the "good life" which he has had a major part in creating. I have seen organized efforts to weaken and even eliminate those farm programs which have made possible the major contribution of agriculture to the American economy. I have seen the American consumer "bite the hand that feeds him" time and time again without ever realizing that he was thereby endangering the basis for his own well-being.

Yet our farmers have written one of the greatest success stories in history. The efficiency of American agriculture has become the envy of the rest of the world and has helped to place the United States in the forefront of international affairs. The abundance of food and fiber provided by American agriculture has made this country the largest contributor of food and economic assistance to the less fortunate nations of the world; and our agricultural producers have made possible the highest standard of living in the United States of any nation in history.

We have consistently increased the quantity and the availability of the good things of life, while our life expectancy has constantly increased. As machines, electricity, fertilizers, pesticides, and other chemicals have replaced manpower on our farms, 92 percent of our people have been freed from farm labor to provide the 1,000 and 1 things which make for our high standard of living.

In 1962 we had approximately 78 million automobiles and commercial vehicles and, of course, we have many more now; the rest of the world had an estimated 62 million. We had an estimated 60 million television sets; the rest of the world had around 69 million. We now have approximately 2.6 million miles of paved and surfaced highways; the rest of the world, exclusive of the U.S.S.R., has 1.4 million miles; and so it goes.

Ours is the only nation where the cost of food averages only 18 percent of individual income. United Nations reports show the average for certain other countries as follows:

	Percent
Russia (estimated)	50
Ceylon	50
Great Britain	28
Italy	43
Nigeria	70
South Korea	54
Japan	44
France	31
Yugoslavia	45

A few months ago, desiring to compare farm costs under law with those which labor obtains under various laws, I requested the Library of Congress to supply me with information on "the gross increase in cost of living due to minimum wage laws and the right of labor to organize and to strike."

I received a nine-page reply. The information supplied in the nine pages, however, was contained in the second sentence, which read as follows: "Unfortunately we find it impossible to reduce these phenomena to measurable terms."

Thus, I cannot provide you with facts and figures. However, you know and I know that as long as we have minimum wages and the right of labor to organize and to strike, to increase their share of the consumer dollar, as long as industry has the right and ability to set its margin above cost, just so long must we have support prices for agricultural commodities, our basic raw materials, the basic requirement of life.

It is equally important that we oppose any policy, the results of which would be to break up sizable and economic farm operations into small and uneconomic units which would result in higher cost of essential commodities to the consumer, and possibly their elimination. Such a course would result in a drastic lowering of our standard of living. If we should take such action it would be just about as sound as to require the manufacturing of automobiles by hand.

Department of Agriculture reports indicate that about 27 percent of the Nation's producers (those with annual gross sales of $10,000 or more) account for some 80 percent of the U.S. agricultural production. These nearly 1 million commercial farmers are the ones to which the consumers must look for the dependable and plentiful supply of high quality and low cost food and fiber.

Within the next decade or two, unless we continue to increase the efficiency of our farm production and provide the economic incentive to induce young and efficient producers to remain on the farm, food surpluses in the United States will likely disappear and the consumer will be faced with possible food shortages and much higher food costs. The 1959 census shows that some 17 percent of all farmers in the United States were 65 or older. An additional 22 percent were 55 to 64 years of age. By 1970, nearly half of the farmers will be 55 years of age or over.

Despite the fact that surplus quantities of certain commodities have been produced in recent years because of the efficiency of agricultural production, it is important to note that supplies on hand are sufficient to meet domestic needs for only a short period of time in the event of a national emergency. For example, the 900 million bushels of wheat now on hand would meet domestic needs and dollar exports for about 1 year or, if necessary, they would meet domestic needs alone for nearly 2 years if exports were discontinued. The 1.2 billion bushels of corn on hand represent only a 3- to 4-month supply for domestic use and export. The 13.6 million bales of cotton in stock would meet the normal annual domestic demand of 9 million bales, plus 1 year's export supply. For dairy products, the 5.2 billion pounds is only 5 percent of a full year's supply.

My friends, with so few people on the farm, our job in the Congress and in other legislative bodies is to get over to all Americans that it is their supply of food and fiber that we deal with; it is their market we must protect. We must not advocate any program of scarcity either for ourselves or for our neighbors.

If we are to help the underprivileged peoples of the world, we will keep producing our bountiful supply of food and fiber and keep them offered, for dollars, on the counters of markets of the world for what they will bring.

With the fire which could upset the world already burning in Vietnam, it is unsound for the U.S. Department of Agriculture to pay American farmers not to produce food and fiber; to hold U.S. cotton off world markets; to cut down U.S. acreage, thus promoting increased foreign production at a time when we need dollars so badly; to advocate programs which would tend to break up large, economic farming operations into small and high-cost ones.

I pointed out to the House during its recent consideration of the 1965 farm bill the fallacy of creating scarcity by paying farmers not to produce. At that time I stated:

"Now is a poor time for this Congress to come in with a bill the purpose of which is to pay the producer not to produce, to cut down supplies on hand when the world may be on fire. May I say, at this time, when you are perhaps on the ragged edge of a downturn in our financial condition, by this bill, you are likely to be setting off not a recession but an actual depression. Price is one thing and volume is another; and if you cut down the farm volume, you are cutting down the farm producers' purchasing power to purchase from you folks and your constituents in the cities who manufacture machinery and equipment.

"Let me give you a little homely illustration. There is a story told about the good king who had the welfare of everybody at heart and it hurt him to see anyone do without what he wanted because of lack of money. So this kind king, knowing little about economics, decreed that plenty of money should be printed and everybody should be given all the money that they wanted. With all this money from the king in their pockets the people all quit work; no one produced; and in 2 years everyone was ragged and hungry.

"Mere money may look all right for the farmer—but neither he nor the rest of us can forgo production, distribution, supply and business activity.

"Money may take care of the farmer's immediate problem but it is not going to put groceries on your tables."

THE NATION'S STAKE IN AGRICULTURE

According to recent figures, our gross national income is approximately $491 billion per year, of which $89.4 billion goes for food. Just think what would be our situation if an additional $49.1 billion of our gross income had to go for food, leaving that much less with which to purchase the products of industry and labor—as would be the case if it took 28 percent of our income for food as it does in Great Britain. And if it took 50 percent of our average income for food as it does in Russia, we would have $157.1 billion less for purchasing industrial and other goods and services.

As I recently told the American Society of Agricultural Engineers at Cornell University. Agriculture is our largest industry. It employs 12 times the number of people in the steel industry, 9 times the number in our automobile industry, and twice the number in the transportation and public utility industries. In addition, it supports directly another 10 percent of our nonfarm population which supplies the farmer with his needs, and processes and markets his products.

It is interesting to note that three times as many people are engaged in the processing and marketing of farm products as in the production of commodities.

Agriculture is a major dollar earner in world markets and, despite the fact that the Department of Agriculture has ignored the law requiring us to sell cotton at competitive prices to maintain our foreign markets, the sale of farm products plays an important role in solving our balance-of-payments problems.

Agriculture is one of the major markets for the products of labor and industry. It uses more steel in a year than is used for a year's output of passenger cars. Agriculture uses more petroleum products than any other industry in the country. It uses more rubber each year than is required to produce tires for 6 million automobiles. The inventory of machinery and equipment for the farms of our country exceeds the assets of the steel industry. Agriculture uses enough electricity to power the six New England States.

Urban workers benefit directly from this rural demand for machinery, equipment, supplies, and the other items used on the Nation's farms. Significant changes in this demand, therefore, have a direct effect on business and employment in urban areas. According to the new input-output study recently completed by the Office of Business Economics, every dollar of agricultural products that is delivered for final demand requires about 78 cents in the products and services of nonagricultural industries.

Agriculture is the principal source of our new wealth. It is the main supplier of basic raw materials which support all segments of business and industry; about 65 percent of the basic raw materials used in industry come from the farm. Reliable estimates indicate that each dollar of wealth taken from the soil generates $7 of income throughout the rest of our economy.

THE WORLD'S STAKE IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Aside from the possibility of nuclear conflict, probably the foremost problem in the world today is hunger. Approximately half of the world's 3 billion people suffer from malnutrition and the World Food Congress was told in 1963 that around 10,000 persons die every day from starvation.

India had a food crisis in 1963. I should say an accentuated food crisis since that vast subcontinent has a year-round hunger problem; so do many other areas in the world, mostly the underdeveloped ones. Moreover, hunger probably will grow more and more intense with the passage of time. The world's population increase is almost unbelievable. Each year births exceed deaths by almost 60 million.

As Senator Gruening, of Alaska, said in a speech in 1963:

"Two grim specters beckon mankind toward oblivion today. One offers instant and wholesale death by nuclear means. The alternative guarantees eventual starvation when the human population exceeds the food supply."

American agriculture will become increasingly vital in the future as the world's population explosion creates even larger demands for food and fiber. This alarming population expansion can be fully appreciated when it is realized that the population of the world, which reached the first billion by the year 1830, took only 100 years, 1830 to 1930, to reach 2 billion and only 30 years, 1930 to 1960, to reach 3 billion. It is expected to exceed 6 billion people by the turn of the century. The population growth in the United States is more than keeping pace with world expansion. U.S. population increased from 13 million in 1830 to 123 million in 1930 and 179 million in 1960. It is expected to reach 340 million by the year 2000.

Also, the efficiency of American agriculture is a most important and practical weapon in the struggle with communism. The failure of Communist agriculture, a failure which is chronic and deep-seated, has tremendous implications to the hundreds of millions constantly plagued by hunger. The Communist inability to produce efficiently and abundantly plainly tells them—if they get the message—that there is little hope along the Communist road. If they follow this path, as they are being urged to do every day, all they have to look forward to is more starvation and misery.

In my opinion, this contrast between our systems, the contrasts in agriculture, should be used to the fullest. I cannot think of any better answer to Communist propaganda. As Don Paarlberg, of Purdue University, in his book "American Farm Policy," said:

"Agriculture represents our greatest absolute advantage over the Communist world."

OUR FUTURE IS BRIGHT

Recently, in addressing the Mississippi Rivers and Harbors Conference at Jackson, I pointed out that Mississippi can and does look forward to a prosperous future. A few years ago the executive vice president of the American Bell Telephone Co. told me that in a speech to a large civic club in New York City he said that if he were a young man he would move to Mississippi or South Carolina, for he believed those States had the brightest prospects for economic development of any States in the Union. I truly believe him to be right. We all take pride in our industrial development, largely initiated under that outstanding Mississippi Governor, the late Honorable Hugh White, and carried forward by each succeeding Governor on down to our present Governor, the Honorable Paul B. Johnson, who is doing a splendid job. However, with all of this development, I believe all will agree that we have only scratched the surface.

I sometimes wonder if we Mississippians fully appreciate our many assets. We are prone to compare our standing and influence in national affairs with Illinois, California, New York, and other States far more populous and wealthy. In fact, we do compare favorably, notwithstanding our relatively limited wealth and few people, about 2 million, or approximately as many as South Chicago. No State has made more rapid advancement or can look forward to more complete development; nor have the people anywhere applied themselves to a greater degree to meeting their problems. We all regret some unfortunate occurrences—few though they be—which we have had in some sections of our State. The sum total of all these unfortunate occurrences in our State over a period of years, however, is less than the number which have occurred in many sections of the country on one weekend.

We have only 5 Members, a little over 1 percent of the total of 435 Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, as compared to the 38 Members from California, 24 from Illinois, and 41 from New York. Our Senators have 2 votes of the 100 in the Senate, or 2 percent of the membership there. However, because of your continuing support through the years, both our Senators and my colleagues in the House, with their long length of service, are most influential on the Committees on Appropriations, Judiciary, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Armed Services, Agriculture, Rules, and others. As I stated before, I am right at the top of the House Committee on Appropriations, where I serve on the Subcommittee on Public Works, the Subcommittee for Defense. In addition, I have served for many years as chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations. These assignments, certainly, have been a great help in securing the cotton and poultry laboratories at Mississippi State; the weed control, ginning, chemical, and physiological labs at Stoneville; and the sedimentation laboratory at Ole Miss. They have helped, too, in getting special attention to our watershed programs, which are so important to the hill areas of our State, to flood control in the Mississippi Delta, to Jackson and East Jackson. They have resulted in needed attention to the Meridian area, and to harbor development at Greenville, Pascagoula, and Vicksburg, not to mention their worth in funds for rivers and harbor development and for soil conservation.

Although Mississippi's 4 or 5 Members out of the total of 435 in the House of Representatives cannot run the country, do not discount our influence in nearly all areas, which, because of our positions, exceeds our numbers many, many times over.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Agriculture's claims and responsibilities for the use of water are second to none, for agriculture provides our food, clothing, and shelter, the basic necessities for life.

This year our Committee on Appropriations recommended and the House of Representatives approved the following amounts for projects of the Corps of Engineers in Mississippi:

Jackson and East Jackson	$1,500,000
Okatibbee Creek Reservoir	2,400,000
Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi	400,000
Sardis Reservoir	70,000
Enid Reservoir	80,000
Arkabutla Reservoir	70,000
Grenada Reservoir	80,000
Greenwood	300,000
Upper auxiliary channels	50,000
Main stem	500,000
Tributaries	950,000
Big Sunflower River, etc	700,000
Yazoo backwater	2,400,000

The following funds will be provided for studies by the Corps of Engineers:

Big Black River	$87,000
Pascagoula River Basin	230,000
Pearl River Basin, Miss. and La	230,000
Tombigbee River at Columbus, including Luxapalila Creek	50,000
Town Creek at Jackson	26,000
Total	623,000

WATER FOR INDUSTRY—WONDERFUL MISSISSIPPI

Today, where other sections of the country are literally crying out for water, while they almost pray for rain, we in Mississippi are spending our time and our efforts on projects for flood control, for watershed protection and for flood prevention.

There are some 4¼ million acres in the Yazoo Valley protected by the main line Mississippi River levee system, extending from the hills near Memphis to above Vicksburg, a distance of 272 miles. These levees, which are to grade and section, and the Mississippi River channel improvement program which insures the integrity of the levee system, have permitted rapid development of this vast area.

On the Mississippi River proper, navigation continues to increase, with the port of Greenville reporting 1,233,197 tons of traffic in 1964, and the port of Vicksburg reporting 1,382,785 tons for the same year.

The so-called Yazoo headwater project, extending from the vicinity of Yazoo City northward along the Yazoo-Tallahatchie-Coldwater system, is about 68 percent complete. The regulation provided by the Arkabutla Reservoir on the Coldwater River, the Sardis Reservoir on the Little Tallahatchie River, the Enid Reservoir on the Yocona River, and the Grenada Reservoir on the Yalobusha River, supplemented by extensive downstream improvements, provides major benefits to about 1,200,000 acres of land. These four reservoirs also are providing major recreational opportunities at a very large rate, with total attendance in 1964 reported at 4,321,030.

Construction is underway, and will be continued, on levees along the main stem of the Yazoo River and along its tributaries. The program of protection from the various smaller hill tributaries entering the delta is coordinated with the work of the Soil Conservation Service in the adjacent hill area.

The Yazoo backwater project, designed to benefit about 600,000 acres of land from Mississippi River overflow, is moving well along, with some 10 miles of levees either complete or under construction, and with a flood gate, costing about $3.1 million, under construction at the mouth of Steele Bayou. The Sunflower River and tributaries project, as envisioned and originally authorized in 1944, is essentially complete. This involves some 600 miles of channel improvement. The further improvement of 110 miles of Steele Bayou and its tributaries, as found justified by studies for the Mississippi River and tributaries report, is now under construction.

The survey report to determine the feasibility of 9-foot navigation on the Yazoo River, from its mouth to the vicinity of Greenwood, has been completed by the Vicksburg district and is now under review by higher authority in Washington.

There is no comprehensive interagency basin study underway in the Tombigbee River Basin, but there are two projects of great interest in that area.

One is an extensive channel improvement project intended to protect agricultural lands against the small but frequent localized floods which do a great deal of damage to crops on tributaries of the upper Tombigbee. The improvement will consist of clearing and snagging, channel enlargement, and the construction of new channels and cutoffs for a total of 466 miles along 22 tributary streams in 9 counties in northeast Mississippi and several counties in northwest Alabama. It is estimated that the overall project will cost approximately $27,500,000 and that the total annual benefits will amount to over $2,500,000. Since benefits from this project will be felt largely in the vicinity of the streams improved, local citizens are required by the authorizing legislation to pay a part of the cost of construction as well as to comply with other conditions of local cooperation.

The other project of widespread interest in the upper Tombigbee basin is the much-discussed Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway, which would extend from Demopolis at the junction of the Tombigbee and Black Warrior Rivers in Alabama up the Tombigbee River and through the divide between the Tombigbee and Tennessee basins to the Pickwick Reservoir on the Tennessee River, an overall distance of 253 miles. Joining the Tennessee River with the Tombigbee River would create an entirely new transportation artery connecting much of the interior of the United States with the eastern gulf coast, cutting waterway distances dramatically between many points. The waterway would stimulate business and industry along its course through northeast Mississippi as well as along the waterways it connects and would benefit all area producers and consumers of commodities suitable for movement by barge.

Construction of the waterway would be a tremendous undertaking, involving improving 168 miles of the Tombigbee River by dredging and constructing four dams, building a 45-mile-long canal with five locks, building a high dam with a lock at the end of the canal, and making a 27-mile-long cut through the dividing ridge. The latest approved estimate of the cost, based on 1958 prices, is $281 million. Because of the magnitude of the project, it has been studied and restudied both before and after its authorization in 1946. The District Engineer at Mobile is now studying it again to determine its economic feasibility on the basis of present-day construction costs, interest rates, and savings in transportation costs. The study should be completed early next summer.

Mississippi is greatly blessed in the richness of her water resources. Much has been done to control and develop them and much more is being done. It is up to us, her citizens to see that the development progresses in a wise and timely fashion so as to contribute most to the wealth and beauty of our great State.

CONCLUSION

During my years in the Congress I have seen the position of agriculture in the legislative halls grow weaker and weaker as the rural population has declined; and I have learned how much more difficult it has been to pass sound farm legislation with a decreasing number of Representatives of rural areas in Congress. I have continuously faced the difficulties involved in providing adequate appropriations to finance our agricultural programs, with a national policy of giving less attention to agriculture while expanding appropriations for urban programs of all types.

In a recent speech to the National Agricultural Chemicals Association, I pointed out that farm purchasing power is probably more essential to the national economy than is that of labor and industry, since it is the supplier of raw materials. A breakdown in income from agricultural production and the resulting decline in farm purchasing power could set off another depression, just as it has triggered other depressions in the past.

As I said earlier, aside from the possibility of nuclear conflict, the world's foremost problem today is hunger. Certainly we should never promote a program of scarcity. It is unsound to pay American farmers not to produce food and fiber; to limit American commodities offered in world markets; to reduce our reserves on hand and cut U.S. acreage while promoting increased foreign production at a time when we need dollars so badly. Cash instead of labor, cost and risk may look good to the farmer, but neither he nor the rest of us can forego the production, supply, distribution, and the business activity resulting from American farm production. The maintenance of agricultural efficiency, including the incentives to keep young and able people on the land, is necessary to prevent possible food shortages and much higher food costs in the next decade or two.

With so few people on the farm, our job in the Congress and in other legislative bodies is to get over to all Americans that it is their supply of food and fiber that we deal with; it is their market we must protect. It is up to all of us to get these facts over to the American people, that our Nation may continue to enjoy the highest standard of living ever known to man, that we may truly remain the land of plenty.

National Security Seminar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, recently I was asked to give the keynote address before the National Security

Seminar in Duluth, Minn., sponsored by the Duluth Chamber of Commerce and conducted by the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. The objective of this seminar, as with similar meetings, is best stated by Lt. Gen. August Schomburg, Commandant of the Industrial College. He says:

> The objective of these seminars supports the thesis that the people of the United States have a right to know all the information about our military economic posture that is consistent with national security; a right to know and understand national and international issues; a right to receive an up-to-date, factual analysis of the threats to our security and the security of the rest of the free world; a right to understand communism, its meaning, objectives and techniques in the basic ideological conflict.

I am inserting my address to the seminar at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS TO NATIONAL SECURITY SEMINAR, DULUTH, MINN.

The United States today is embarked on a unique and challenging mission. To preserve individual freedom we are developing ways and means of arresting the Communist goal of world domination through subversion. In the sixties, the new aggression is called wars of national liberation. We see this threat to our national security in two forms:

In the Moscow version, the Communist goal can be attained either by wars of liberation, which Kremlin leaders have stated they will continue to support, or by peaceful revolution.

In the more militant Peking version, violence is the only means. It is this Peking version, subversion terrorism, which now involves us in our first and foremost case—South Vietnam. But despite their differences, the end goal of these methods is the same, and the threat is real and it is widespread.

Meeting this challenge of lower spectrum warfare, and on a worldwide basis, is something relatively new for the military services and the other executive branches of our Government. Admittedly the United States does not know all of the answers, but we are making a tremendous effort to find them and to put together a team of political, economic, psychological, and military specialists to cope with this subversion. Our rightful aim is to give the people of the countries plagued by revolutionary subversion, and especially the Vietnamese, the opportunity to determine their own future or to find their own place in the sun.

The leaders of our country have made it unmistakably clear that we will not be pushed out of South Vietnam. I fully agree with this resolve, but, for your sake, I would like to express it in a somewhat different manner.

I have spent some time in the Orient with over 2 years in Burma and adjoining countries in World War II. My Army assignment was intelligence and guerrilla work with native forces. I like these people, and I do not think there is anyone who has the right to force his form of government or economic system upon them. To my mind, as freedom-loving people, it is our responsibility to insure that they, too, are free; free to determine their own form of government, their economic system, their destiny. We should not try to recreate them in our own image, but to resolve to assist them to the extent that they can determine their own future and establish a secure society of free people.

We should bear in mind that all of the military services consider the first and fundamental objective is for them, working with other U.S. executive agencies such as the State Department, the Agency for International Development, and the United States Information Agency, to assist friendly nations in preventing subversive insurgency or in suppressing it at a low stage; that is to say, before it gets to the advanced or active state of insurgency such as is evidenced today in South Vietnam. This is being done in many countries around the world, but it does not make many headlines. I will confine my remarks to Vietnam, rather than recite examples of these successes. Vietnam is the spearpoint, the testing ground, the full-blown pilot project of the new Communist aggression.

The implementation of our overseas internal defense policy there is coordinated through the mechanism of the country team. This simply means that the Ambassador or senior State Department representative is charged with coordinating the activities of all other U.S. agencies in the country. The nature of insurgency is such that it requires counteractions based not only on military means, but fully coordinated actions pertaining to economics, politics, psychology, and the entire social structure.

As a matter of logic, it can be said that because of the landbased nature of counterinsurgency, the Army must furnish the predominant number of people and skills to carry out this task. Counterinsurgency is a responsibility of every man, unit, and activity in our Army.

The Army philosophy has been very well stated by Gen. Harold K. Johnson, the Chief of Staff. He has on many occasions emphasized three basic facts:

"1. We will most likely be involved in this type of warfare for a long time to come.

"2. These missions aren't exceptional, or something outside the real task of the Army, and they are not to be reserved for a small group of specialists.

"3. In consideration of these facts, counterinsurgency, or 'stability operations,' has become a third principal mission of the Army, going hand in hand with the mission of being prepared for conventional or nuclear warfare."

Counterinsurgency is the whole range of military, political, economic, and psychological actions taken to prevent or defeat subversive insurgency. Its ultimate aim is to create a free and secure society under a popularly responsive and stable government. Counterinsurgency is a form of war and not a technique of war, as are psychological operations and unconventional warfare.

We have now found it necessary to supplement our basic advisory structure with large numbers of ground forces. I emphasize supplement, as these additional resources do not substitute for our advisers with all elements of the South Vietnamese military. Our advisory efforts with the Republic of Vietnam Armed Forces, RVNAF, must go on.

Militarily, South Vietnam is divided into four tactical corps zones. With each of these corps headquarters of the ARVN, or Army of Vietnam, there is an American advisory team which includes advisers to the commanders and various staff sections—intelligence, personnel, operations, logistics, etc. These people live and work with their Vietnamese counterparts assisting and advising them in their job of pacification and in the elimination of the Vietcong underground, guerrilla and hard-core units.

In each of these corps areas, there will be two or three ARVN divisions which also have U.S. advisory teams assigned to work with them. Additional advisory teams are working with the regiments and so on down to the battalion level.

There are also separate battalions of rangers, airborne, and marines which likewise have advisory teams working with them. The U.S. Navy is similarly working with the Vietnamese Navy, the junk fleet, and river patrol to assist and advise them. The Air Force is doing a comparable job with the Vietnamese Air Force. Thus, the principal job of U.S. personnel in Vietnam has been, and still is, that of an adviser. That is, to help them fight their own war.

Politically, South Vietnam is further subdivided into provinces of which there are a total of 45. On the military side, the province chief is referred to as the sector commander. As the sector commander, he also has a group of American advisory personnel working with him on such problems as intelligence and counterintelligence to identify and eliminate the Vietcong internal structure, also on such matters as psychological operations, public safety, education, health, and sanitation, and other problems related to the psychological and sociological well-being of the people in the province. Obviously, in addition to their military background, these advisers must be qualified in a wide and varied field of activities. On the military side, the sector chief also directs the operations of the regional forces and popular forces in his area, and in some parts of the country may also command regional Army of Vietnam units. It is therefore quite apparent that the advisers to the province chief, or sector commander, must be a "Jack of all trades."

Each of the provinces, or sectors, is further subdivided into districts, or subsectors. Some provinces have as few as 2 districts while some have as many as 11. All told, there are 242 districts. Since last spring, specially organized teams have been assigned to work on this level. Today, about 180 have such advisory teams. Their activities are comparable to those of the sector advisers, but they are often located in remote areas, bringing them into even closer association with the people of the area, which is really the heart of the problem. It is often said that the job of counterinsurgency is to win the hearts and minds of the people. The assignment of subsector advisory groups is a relatively recent innovation, but these advisors are down at the grassroots levels working and living with the people. Here lies the salvation of South Vietnam; it is considered by all concerned that it will pay extremely high dividends.

Operationally, the Government of Vietnam carries out its pacification program or rural reconstruction, by what is referred to as the "oil spot" concept. This is the utilization of Army of Vietnam units to clear an area of Vietcong, that is generally a city or urban area, then the clearing operation spreads into surrounding areas. Meanwhile, other Government and military forces will move into the previously cleared area to continue security operations by developing intelligence and counterintelligence to indentify the Vietcong organization, to establish law and order, conduct civic-action type activities, and improve the living conditions of the people. As the clearing and securing operations spread out into additional areas, other governmental agencies are moved into the secured area to assist in the development of sound government, improve the economic conditions, and generally win over the people to the Government of South Vietnam.

We are putting into practice many of the lessons learned in the successful campaigns to defeat Communist-supported subversive terrorism in the Philippines and in Malaya. An essential element in each of these campaigns was a decentralization of the central government, a program of giving villagers and lesser government officials throughout the countryside a greater voice in the decisionmaking process by which they were governed.

While we preach the advantages of decentralization abroad, we are stressing a tendency toward increased centralization of the decisionmaking process in our own Government. This centralization has a great many virtues in that it makes any organization absolutely controllable from the top. As long as the decisions made at the top are sound, and as long as the methods of execution are left to subordinates, things will go well. The weakness of such a system is due to the frailty of individuals—any individual. Those decisions are orders and to an increasing degree, people below do not question those orders. As a result, there is no real check on the correctness of the decision at the top. This eventually has the result of the top echelon believing itself to be omniscient, and the people below losing their ability to think for themselves.

In any large organization, governmental or private, the creative ability of the organization is dependent upon disciplined imagination of all the individuals in the organization and organized effort, rather than on the inspiration of a small group. We live in an era of rapidly changing technology, and it is impossible for any one person or even any one group to keep abreast of all the possibilities of these changes. In large organizations, particularly, it is necessary for the majority of the people in the organization to be able to innovate and create new methods of doing new things, based on knowledge and the opportunity for subordinates to develop and use new tools, new methods, and new ideas. Policy should be centralized at the top, but the people below must feel that their imagination, their ideas, the techniques they develop to carry out the policy, must be up to them. Otherwise, there will be stultification, blind obedience, lack of interest, and all the other evils that go with an organization of people who are not permitted to think for themselves.

It is very difficult for a top echelon to lay out a sound policy, the goals and the objectives of the organization, and encourage and inspire subordinates to carry out those policies. It too often happens that the top people want to direct the execution of their own policy, and this kills the initiative below. This results in a slow death of the effectiveness of the organization.

Since the continuing strength of any organization rests upon free exercise of individual initiative and ingenuity, we must not stifle the voice of dissent. It is never easy to draw a proper line between the legitimate exercise of the right to disagree and the unlawful act of undermining an organization or a government. The recent rash of draft card burnings may offer a case in point.

Unfortunately, agitators who have inspired draft card burning in colleges will soon shift their attention to high schools. Their plan is to dissuade high school students from registering for the draft when they reach draft age. You must remember that burning or otherwise destroying a draft card is a Federal crime. You may think it should not be a crime. Or you may think that the penalty of up to 5 years in jail or a fine of up to $10,000 for committing this crime is unnecessarily severe. It is your right to disagree, but not to disobey. It is even your civic duty to act on your convictions in trying to repeal or change the law, but not to participate in or encourage its violation.

It is a healthy sign when youth disagrees with its elders, but survival often means trusting people you don't agree with. I didn't always agree with my commanding officer in World War II, but luckily I reserved my right to express my disagreement until a time when my life and those of my fellow soldiers was not in danger.

You may believe the draft law to be unnecessary, unwise, or unjust. But the U.S. Supreme Court in 1918 declared the Selective Service System to be constitutional. Of equal importance is the 1919 decision of the Supreme Court on the matter of agitation. At that time, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes said: "When a nation is at war, many things that might be said in time of peace are such a hindrance to its efforts that their utterance will not be endured so long as men fight, and that no court could regard them as protected by a constitutional right." Of course, we are not formally at war with the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese, but formal declarations of war appear to be passé. What is important today is the spirit of these Supreme Court decisions.

We have had too many people in high office imply that there is something inherently and constitutionally right about unlawful activities. There are those in leading academic institutions and in highly placed positions in the civil rights movement who argue that progress can only come through a flaunting of the law. They sincerely believe that you must shock people to effectively call attention to injustice. They cite as historical examples of their thesis the French Revolution and the American suffragette movement.

But the French citizens revolted against an oppressive, unfeeling, dictatorial government. There is no analogy to our present Government of and by the people. And we have established by law the equality of both sexes. We have legislatively pronounced and enhanced the dignity and equal worth of each individual, regardless of the circumstances or location of his birth.

In short, we are a self-governing society, enjoying the fruits of freedom under law, and prospering under a system of justice according to law. The exercise of the right of freedom of speech, and the right to peaceably assemble and to petition the Government, must not be subverted into a license to undermine that very Government.

I have been deeply interested in civil rights and individual liberties. As a Congressman, I have taken pride in my role in the draftsmanship and passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The first amendment to the U.S. Constitution prevents Congress from making any law abridging the freedom of speech. In addition, it guarantees "right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." Those who would speak out freely in bitter dissent of our policy in Vietnam should consider the degree to which they are prolonging the conflict and increasing the casualty lists by giving encouragement to the Communist-supported forces who oppose us. Those who assemble to advertise their grievances must remember the constitutional limitation on their rights; an exhibitionary demonstration which adversely affects the rights of others at a point far removed from the seat of government does not clothe any exhibitionist in a first amendment right. We must be vigilant to protect and preserve the legitimate exercise of constitutionally guaranteed freedoms, but equally, we must reject the subverted use of these privileges.

Human progress is based on a combination of rebellion of thought and obedience to authority, and we must guard against a blind extreme of either. The main function of active dissent is to keep the people in power at the top from getting arrogant or soft and complacent. The main function of respect for law is to pull together to get things done once we have decided what to do. It is clear that the United States has decided to stay in Vietnam until the job is done.

The CAB's Role in Promoting Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, many of us in Congress are concerned about Civil Aeronautics Board efforts to curtail airline service to small communities. The CAB is following a policy of permitting local service airlines to drop cities which enplane less than five passengers daily.

Congress never intended that the CAB should set up any such arbitrary criteria for making decisions about local service. Three factors should be taken into consideration by the Board.

First, local service airlines are necessary to the financial well-being of trunk carriers. They help to generate the large volumes of traffic necessary for efficient trunkline operation.

Second, airline service to smaller cities is necessary for the commercial success of the community. Modern companies demand airline service and they seldom locate in towns which cannot provide it. The CAB should act consistently with other agencies, such as the Office of Economic Development, which are attempting to preserve the prosperity of smaller cities.

Third, local service airlines are essential to strong postal and national defense systems.

Mr. Speaker, my district, the city of Minneapolis, is not threatened by the direct loss of service. However, taking airline service away from several cities in the upper Midwest will have a strong adverse effect on Minneapolis. Businessmen who travel to these towns will find other methods more expensive and less convenient. It will become more difficult for Minneapolis to serve as a commercial center for the area.

Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Budget and the CAB should not fear that Federal support for air transportation will be too costly. Government subsidies are decreasing as a percentage of local service airline revenue. As the volume of air travel continues to grow, we can look forward to further decline in this ratio. The CAB should consider the maintenance of airline service to every section of the country its primary duty. Congress will continue to support a strong system of air transportation for our Nation.

Greek Resistance Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, there are many occasions when we join with the people of Greece to commemorate milestones in man's search for freedom. But none is more significant to us than Greek Resistance Day, which many believe may have turned the tide of World War II.

At 3 a.m., on October 28, 1940, Mussolini's Ambassador handed an ultimatum to General Metaxas demanding that Greece give Italy ports and other strategic areas in Greece.

A resolute "no" was the Prime Minister's reply as he coldly showed the Fascist representative to the door.

Three hours later Italy attacked Greece.

The greatly outnumbered Greek Army, under the brilliant leadership of Gen. Alexandros Papagos, met the Fascist legions and defeated them.

This was the first Allied victory of World War II, and one of the most important of the entire war.

It took Hitler's best forces to finally conquer Greece temporarily after the Germans came to Italy's rescue in April 1941.

Many historians believe that in resisting Mussolini's army so effectively, the Greeks actually dealt a decisive blow to the entire Nazi cause, for the diversion of Hitler's forces into the Greek peninsula seriously impaired the timing and strength of his Russian invasion.

The Greek nation has, throughout the centuries, opposed the forces of tyranny time and time again in defense of liberty, freedom, and self-determination.

The entire world is indebted to these stalwart and gallant people.

We say of the modern Greek nation what Pericles said of the ancient Greek defenders of liberty:

> Choosing to die rather than to live submitting, they fled only from dishonor, but met danger face to face, and, after one brief moment, while at the summit of their fortune, escaped, not from their fear, but from their glory.

Report of Minority on Activities of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, during the 1st session of the 89th Congress the Republican members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee made a significant and constructive contribution to the extensive legislative work of the committee, of which I am the ranking minority member. The following report supplements from this point of view the report printed in today's RECORD, which cataloged the major legislative items considered by the committee. Included are the principal minority contributions to those measures finally enacted into law:

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, H.R. 2362, Public Law 89-10. No amendments to the bill were entertained in the Senate as a matter of administration policy, but a number of minority proposals were adopted in the committee report, Senate Report 146:

1. Including handicapped children within title I as educationally deprived, in addition to poverty-related children (Senator PROUTY);

2. Including parents of handicapped children under title III (Senator JAVITS);

3. Avoiding overlapping, duplication, and conflict with the Office of Economic Opportunity by giving precedence to the Office of Education on programs contemplated by titles I and III (Senator JAVITS);

4. Requiring State consultation under section 203(b) of title II, providing library resources for the use of children and teachers who cannot be served by a State; and under section 2(a)(1) of title IV, authorizing grants for educational research within a State (Senator JAVITS);

5. Restricting criteria which the Commissioner may require State agencies to impose upon local school districts' applications, beyond those stipulated in the bill (Senator PROUTY);

6. Requiring continuous monitoring of open-ended authorization for stipends to researchers under section 2(b) of title IV (Senator PROUTY);

7. Including academically gifted and creatively talented children under section 503(a) of title V (Senator JAVITS);

8. Clarifying church-state relationships, especially regarding nonsegregation by religious affiliation of dual enrollment classes, and the availability of judicial review (Senator JAVITS);

9. Restating the applicability of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, precluding discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin, to all programs carried on under this act (Senator JAVITS);

10. Requiring equitable distribution of research facilities grants under title IV to all regions (Senator PROUTY).

Manpower Act of 1965, S. 974, Senate Report 123, Public Law 89-15. Minority amendments adopted:

1. Modifying the new 90 percent Federal, 10 percent non-Federal matching requirement to make it workable, by exempting private training institutions, authorizing matching in kind as well as in cash, and deferring the matching requirement for one additional planning year (Senators PROUTY, JAVITS, and MURPHY);

2. Authorizing delegation to State authorities of approval of projects not exceeding $75,000, in order to speed up implementation of the act (Senator JAVITS);

3. Limiting reapportionment of funds allocated to a State but not yet spent (Senator JAVITS);

4. Authorizing refresher or reorientation courses for professional employees who are unemployed because of defense cutbacks (Senators JAVITS and PROUTY);

5. Avoiding overlap of authorizations by repealing the training provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act simultaneously with the enactment of the bill, which transfers such training to the Labor Department (Senator JAVITS);

6. Continuing training allowances for trainees who become 22 years old during training (Senator PROUTY);

7. Authorizing increased use of private training institutions (Senator PROUTY);

Minority report language adopted:

1. Insuring that training allowances authorized by the bill will be added to existing training allowances (Senator JAVITS);

2. Directing greater emphasis on the on-the-job training program and on promoting its use (Senators PROUTY and JAVITS).

National Technical Institute for the Deaf Act, H.R. 7031, Senate Report 245, Public Law 89-36: Minority report language adopted urging the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to evaluate and implement the report submitted by the Advisory Committee on the Education of the Deaf (the Babbidge committee) pursuant to an authorization contained in the 1965 appropriation for the Department. The Secretary has since responded with implementation and recommendations (Senators JAVITS and MURPHY).

Extension of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, H.R. 8131, Senate Report 318, Public Law 89-69: Minority amendment adopted increasing the authorization for fiscal year 1966 by $1.5 million over the administration request in order to emphasize training of youth workers and other much-needed personnel (Senator JAVITS).

Older Americans Act of 1965, H.R. 3708, Senate Report 247, Public Law 89-73: Minority amendment adopted requiring State consultation for grants under title IV, research and development projects, and title V, training projects (Senator JAVITS).

Community Health Services Extension Amendments of 1965, S. 510, Senate Report 117, Public Law 89-109.

Minority amendments (Senator JAVITS) adopted:

1. Easing burdensome paperwork requirements in the expanded national immunization program;

2. Doubling the subceiling on appropriations for schools of public health.

National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, S. 1483, Senate Report 300, Public Law 89-209: Based upon four bills previously introduced in the Senate, including one, S. 310, introduced by Senator JAVITS.

Minority amendments (Senator JAVITS):

1. Earmarking $2.75 million to help support and stimulate arts programs by the States;

2. Emphasizing the need for standards of professional excellence in the arts;

3. Authorizing the National Endowment for the Arts to support research;

4. Making clear that the prevailing wage provision does not preclude use of volunteers and amateurs.

Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke Amendments of 1965, S. 596, Senate Report 368, Public Law 89-209. Minority amendments adopted:

1. Limiting centers to the named diseases and those related to them (Senator DOMINICK);

2. Requiring a report of the Surgeon General on or before June 30, 1967, rather than waiting until 1969 (Senator JAVITS).

Captioned films for the deaf, S. 2232, Senate Report 649, Public Law 89-258: Minority amendment adopted establishing a permanent National Advisory Committee on the Deaf (Senators MURPHY and JAVITS).

Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965, H.R. 8283, Senate Report 599, Public Law 89-253. Minority amendments adopted:

1. Requiring regulations to prevent Job Corps from displacing presently employed workers or the impairment of existing contracts for services (Senators SIMPSON and DOMINICK);

2. Prohibiting payments solely as compensation for referring candidates for the Job Corps (Senator DOMINICK);

3. Requiring maximum public disclosure about developing community action programs, including public hearings and open books and records (Senator JAVITS);

4. Requiring consultation with State agencies on the development, conduct, and administration of community action programs (Senator JAVITS);

5. Authorizing direct community action grants where citywide "umbrella" agencies bypass a local private nonprofit group (Senator JAVITS);

6. Requiring notification of the Governor of a State in which a local private nonprofit group applies for a direct grant (Senator SALTONSTALL);

7. Restoring the voluntary assistance program for needy children (Senator JAVITS).

The Senate-House conference report (H. Rept. 1061) included language proposed by the minority (Senator JAVITS) requiring informal hearings before the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity will override the veto of the Governor of a State. The conference report also included language insuring that consumer credit education and consumer debt counseling programs will continue to be parts of the community action program; a minority amendment had been adopted by the Senate to this effect (Senator FANNIN).

The conferees rejected two significant minority amendments which had been adopted by the Senate:

1. Extending the Hatch Act prohibitions against political activity to those employees of community action programs paid in principal part from Federal funds, and to VISTA volunteers (Senators MURPHY and PROUTY);
2. Making the National Advisory Council an independent and meaningful entity (Senator PROUTY).

The Senate committee report adopted minority (Senator JAVITS) proposals:

1. Directing the Office of Economic Opportunity and local and State officials to enforce the act's requirement that community action programs are to be developed, conducted, and administered "to the maximum extent feasible" by the poor themselves, to avoid domination of citywide "umbrella" agencies by political officials, and to take the necessary action to correct any program failing in these respects;
2. Urging that announcements of project approvals be made by the Office of Economic Opportunity and not by political officials;
3. Urging the establishment of a system of regional offices to deal with local problems;
4. Directing the implementation of the provision in the act for a center at the Office of Economic Opportunity to coordinate information about the status of applications in all Federal agencies and departments under the act.

At Senator JAVITS' request, the minority staff conducted an inquiry into the New York City antipoverty controversy and filed a report, which was printed at pages 19 through 25 of the hearing record on H.R. 8283 and upon which a number of minority proposals were based.

Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965, S. 597, Senate Report 756, Public Law 89-291: Minority (Senator JAVITS) amendment adopted giving priority to libraries having the greatest potential for fulfilling the needs for regional health science libraries.

Service Contract Act of 1965, H.R. 10238, Senate Report 798, Public Law 89-286. Minority (Senator JAVITS) proposals adopted in Committee report:

1. Requiring the Secretary of Labor, in determining the prevailing rate in the locality, to consider the compensation paid in similar service work in the locality;
2. Urging the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies to afford any employees not covered by any of the acts or by this bill the minimum wage coverage provided by the bill.

National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, H.R. 7743, Senate Report 758, Public Law 89-287. Minority (Senator JAVITS) amendment adopted:

1. Encouraging States and nonprofit private institutions and organizations to establish adequate loan insurance programs for students in eligible institutions;
2. Establishing a Federal program of student loan insurance for students who deserve reasonable access to State or private nonprofit programs of student loan insurance.

Health Professions Educational Assistance Amendments of 1965, H.R. 3141, Senate Report 789, Public Law 89-290. Minority (Senator JAVITS) amendments adopted:

1. Including students of pharmacy in the scholarship program;
2. Clarifying the accreditation of schools of nursing.

The bill included the provisions of S. 576, introduced by Senator COTTON and earlier passed by the Senate, permitting the canceling of a portion of the unpaid balance of a student loan to a physician, dentist, or optometrist who practices in a shortage area.

Higher Education Act of 1965, H.R. 9567, Senate Report 621, Public Law 89-329. Minority amendments adopted:

1. Adding National Defense Education Act loan forgiveness for those who teach in poverty-impacted areas (Senator PROUTY);
2. Recognizing outstanding students by making available an additional $200 scholarship per annum grant for those students ranking in the upper half of their class (Senator JAVITS);
3. Postponing the cutoff of the Institutes for School Librarians established by the National Defense Education Act to permit a phaseout rather than a sudden disruption (Senator DOMINICK);
4. Broadening the scope of the Higher Education Facilities Act to include arts and humanities (Senator PROUTY);
5. Reducing to 3 percent of the maximum interest rates for construction loans under title III of the Higher Education Facilities Act (Senator JAVITS);
6. Authorizing a college to transfer 25 percent of its scholarship fund to its National Defense Education Act student loan fund (Senator DOMINICK);
7. Broadening the title VI equipment grant provisions to include the arts and humanities, in addition to other areas of instruction (Senator PROUTY);
8. Enhancing the role of State and private, nonprofit institutions in guaranteeing low-cost student loans (Senator JAVITS);
9. Increasing the authorization for fiscal year 1966 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (Senator CASE);
10. Broadening the title V fellowship program to include nonpublic school teachers (Senator PROUTY);
11. Streamlining and reforming National Defense Education Act loan procedures (Senators JAVITS, PROUTY, and DOMINICK);
12. Making more flexible the use of funds for construction grants to public community colleges and public technical institutes under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (Senators CASE and TOWER);
13. Adding "industrial arts" of title XI of the National Defense Education Act (Senators PROUTY and JAVITS);
14. Authorizing payment in kind by colleges under the work-study program (Senator JAVITS);
15. Adding "economics" to titles III and XI of the National Defense Education Act (Senator PROUTY);
16. Adding "civics" to title XI of the National Defense Education Act (Senator JAVITS);
17. Emphasizing high-quality substantial courses in the title V teacher fellowship program rather than on the so-called educational method courses (Senator PROUTY);
18. Broadening title II so that institutions with modest resources can obtain maximum library assistance without a matching requirement and requiring institutions with resources to match Federal funds (Senator JAVITS);
19. Training of college administrators for developing institutions (Senator JAVITS);
20. Barring title I extension course funds from use for sectarian instruction, religious worship, or divinity school courses (Senator JAVITS);
21. Moderately decreasing Federal matching contribution under title I to encourage greater college participation in accord with recommendations of land-grant colleges (Senator JAVITS);
22. Limiting the section exempting sororities and fraternities from title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, regarding cutoff of Federal funds from discriminatory activities, to those financed exclusively by funds derived from private sources (Senators DIRKSEN and JAVITS).

Minority provisions (Senator JAVITS) adopted in committee report:

1. Urging that moneys allocated to colleges for purchases of library materials under title II not be eroded by unwarranted increases in the already very high cost of books and periodicals;
2. While recognizing the importance of research, encouraging college teachers to devote more time to the classrooms and the student.

The conference report adopted language proposed by the minority (Senator JAVITS) making it clear that the 1963 Higher Education Facilities Act provisions for construction of graduate schools includes all graduate schools, including those offering programs leading to a first degree in law.

School construction assistance in disaster areas, H.R. 9022, Senate Report No. 783, Public Law 89-313: Minority amendment adopted authorizing aid in the form of a repayable advance to financially capable school districts which are in need of immediate funds (Senator JAVITS).

Minority report language adopted precluding, to the extent feasible, the segregation of classes by religious affiliation where services are provided to non-public-school students (Senator JAVITS).

Congressman Stratton's Report on the Accomplishments of the 1st Session of the 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as this 1st session of the 89th Congress draws to a close it is clear that this has been a tremendously productive session, for the Nation and for the people of New York's 35th Congressional District whom I have the honor to represent. In keeping with a tradition I have followed each year I would like to review this record briefly for the information of the people of my district.

MAJOR LEGISLATION ENACTED

Rarely has a single session of Congress seen the enactment of so many pieces of legislation with such far-reaching implications. And rarely too have so many measures been of such direct benefit to the people of upstate New York. Here are some of the highlights.

A $4.5 billion excise tax cut: Coming on top of last year's $11.2 billion cut in Federal income taxes, this measure provided a further stimulus to the Nation's economy that has been plainly felt in the developing boom across much of upstate New York, and has reduced our unemployment to the lowest level in more than 10 years.

Medicare and social security boost: As finally enacted, this program represented a successful compromise between the original medicare proposal of President Kennedy and the eldercare plan put forward by the AMA. Some subsequent amendments may be needed, however, to correct the adverse effect which the 7-percent boost in social security benefits is having on pensions now being paid to disabled veterans.

Aid for elementary and secondary schools: A measure that has been discussed for years, this bill was finally enacted in a form that avoided earlier constitutional problems. It did this by gearing its help primarily toward improving the education of children from poorer families. Its help has been welcomed by school boards across upstate New York as a means of easing the burdens of local school taxes.

Aid for colleges: In a district which includes 10 colleges, this bill can help us with expansion programs already underway. It sets up a new system of Federal college scholarships to help deserving students. The bill contains special aids for new, developing colleges, like Eisenhower College in Seneca Falls, of which I was honored to be named a trustee.

Immigration without discrimination: After years of trying unsuccessfully, Congress finally enacted a law removing discrimination in our immigration laws against people from countries such as Italy, Greece, and Poland. I was invited by President Johnson to be on hand at the Statue of Liberty for the signing of this bill, and received one of the pens he used.

Upstate Appalachia: 13 New York State counties, including Cortland, Chenango, and Otsego, are eligible for assistance under this program. This money, for roads and needed public works, will enable communities in these counties to become growth centers within the overall 11-State mountain region.

Economic Development Act: This law continues the help in attracting new industries which the Area Redevelopment Act provided, plus the stimulus in public works and hospital expansion under accelerated public work. Montgomery, Cayuga and, to some extent, Otsego Counties are now eligible for this help. I have also proposed that Yates, Ontario, and Seneca Counties be made eligible as part of a five-county Finger Lakes planning region.

Water and sewer construction: Congress passed a number of laws to help local communities pay for needed water and sewer facilities. One was the 1965 Housing Act, with help for water lines in city areas. Another was the 1965 Antipollution Act, which finances sewage treatment plants. A third was a law to help with water and sewer facilities in rural areas, a bill which I cosponsored. Every community in our district is vitally affected by these bills, for example, communities like Bainbridge, Sherburne, Greene, Branchport, and Dundee.

Antipoverty extension: Despite continuing problems in administration, the antipoverty program has proved of value to our district and its assistance has now been extended. Many communities, from Geneva through to Amsterdam, have set up Neighborhood Youth Corps, with dramatic results like the construction of an Olympic-sized swimming pool in Amsterdam, or have found the Head Start program for pre-school children helpful, as in Geneva.

Manpower training: This valuable program was also continued. Its help in training people for paying jobs has been demonstrated and praised in such cities as Cortland, Geneva, Amsterdam, Auburn, and Oneonta.

Housing legislation: The 1965 Housing Act continued funds for urban renewal projects, such as those already underway in Penn Yan, Auburn, Norwich, Cortland, Geneva, Oneonta, and Amsterdam, and for senior citizens housing in Cortland and Geneva.

Voting rights law: A new bill was enacted to enforce the provisions of the 15th amendment, ending discrimination in voting by race or color.

Presidential disability: Congress passed and sent to the States a proposed new constitutional amendment plugging a serious gap in the law governing periods of Presidential disability or when we are without a Vice President.

Military pay raise: Both Houses of Congress unanimously passed a 10.7 percent pay raise for the Nation's Armed Forces.

Postal and civil service pay raise: Also enacted was a 3.6 percent raise for postal and civil service employees. I joined in the successful fight against extending this boost to Members of Congress, who had received a pay boost last year.

1965 Sugar Act: This new bill embodied a 14-percent quota increase for upstate New York's only sugar plant in Cayuga County. This boost will mean an increase in income of up to $400,000 for farmers growing sugarbeets over a 16-county area.

Reorganizing Congress: I joined in sponsoring legislation to create a joint committee to streamline Congress. Their report should make Congress a more efficient agency of the Government and a more effective servant of our people.

Veterans legislation: Several key bills of benefit to veterans were passed, including a boost in pensions for those with service-connected disabilities.

NO RUBBER STAMP

In the 7 years I have had the honor of serving in Congress I have always called the shots as I saw them, without regard to partisanship. I have never regarded my duties as requiring my being a rubber stamp for anyone. This year was no exception. While I supported administration programs I believed to be right and of benefit to our district, I did not hesitate to oppose those I believed to be harmful or clearly opposed by our people. Three examples stand out.

Omnibus farm bill: I voted against the administration's farm bill. Though it contained several provisions beneficial to dairy farmers, which I supported, sections dealing with wheat and cotton were harmful to our district and had been strongly opposed by our farmers. I did lead a successful fight to prevent inclusion of an amendment that would have undermined the Federal milk order under which most of our dairymen operate.

Highway beautification: While I support the goal of highway beauty I do believe it can be carried out without harm to upstate New York's tourist industry. I opposed the administration's bill because it was too loosely drawn and would harm small businessmen in the tourist field. I will work for amendments to protect the interests of these small businessmen.

Aid to Nasser: Though the administration made it a party issue, I opposed sending wheat and other aid to Nasser's Egypt at a time when Nasser was openly working to undermine our security and that of our allies in the Middle East.

Canadian auto parts agreement: I voted against an agreement providing for unlimited shipment of auto parts into this country from Canada, believing it would be harmful to auto parts manufacturers in our district like the General Products Corp. of Union Springs.

OTHER PROJECTS BENEFICIAL TO OUR DISTRICT

Besides these achievements, the past session has seen a number of other activities of benefit to our district.

Our fight against big dams: Once again we have blocked an effort to disrupt our villages and flood out much valuable farmland by construction of big dams whose contribution to flood control and water conservation would be dubious, as at Genegantslet in Chenango County. At the same time we passed other legislation which could come up with a plan that could handle flood threats without the need for costly big dams.

Finger Lakes weeds: Also included in this year's rivers and harbors bill were funds to begin work towards dealing with weeds in places like our Finger Lakes. As a result of my action authority was also included to permit the Army Engineers to work with State conservation officials in water studies helpful to our Finger Lakes area.

Maple sugar, mink, and chafer research: Following strong protests from myself and other, Congress voted to nullify the Department of Agriculture order closing agricultural research projects of benefit to our district—maple products, fur-bearing animals, and the European chafer project now underway at the experimental station in Geneva.

VA hospitals: As a result of strong protests by Congress, in which I took part, the VA backed down on an earlier decision to close hospitals at Bath and Castle Point, N.Y.

Three hundred and forty-eight million dollar atomic accelerator project: I was delighted to take the lead in presenting to the AEC the proposal of the Cayuga County development group to locate the Government's new 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator—with its 2,000 new, top-level scientific jobs—in our district, just east of Cayuga Lake.

Clean bill of health for Canandaigua: As a result of my intervention the U.S. Public Health Service issued a strong statement completely repudiating distorted and misleading press accounts regarding Canandaigua.

Keymark Co. loan: I was glad to help in obtaining an ARA loan to assist in the growth of this important new Montgomery County industry at Fonda.

STRATTON BILLS ENACTED INTO LAW

Any Congressman is naturally proud to see his bills enacted into law. In this session the following bills I introduced or cosponsored were adopted:

Voting rights legislation.

Rural water and sewer facilities bill.

Law allowing showing the USIA film on President Kennedy, "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," within the United States.

A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Dr. Moffett, former president of State University College at Cortland.

A bill to permit entry of a spectrograph for atomic research purposes at the University of Rochester.

A bill permitting the Army Engineers to cooperate on water studies in New York State.

A bill extending the accelerated public works program.

A resolution to create a joint committee to streamline Congress.

Also my bill to raise the pay of teachers in defense schools abroad passed the House and is pending in the Senate.

And a resolution urging freedom for the Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia passed the House and is pending in the Senate.

In short, of 39 bills I introduced 8 have been enacted and 2 have passed the House and are in the Senate. This gives me an overall legislative batting average of .220, compared with a general average on House bills of only .003.

IMPORTANT COMMITTEE ACTIONS

A Congressman's service on his own committee is one of his most important functions. This year I moved up to ninth place on the Armed Services Committee. In that position I led a successful fight to retain $500 million in vital military research funds in the budget. I supported the President's action in seeking an emergency appropriation for carrying out our policy in Vietnam, and was on hand at the White House and received one of the pens used when that legislation was signed into law. I served as a member of the Board of Visitors at the U.S. Naval Academy. And I was one of the leaders in the not entirely successful fight to give Congress a more decisive say in closing down such important defense bases as the Rome Air Force Base, the Schenectady Army Depot, and the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

Since the first session has been so productive, one may wonder what is left for next year. I am sure we will have other measures to consider. But we will have plenty to do anyway. First, we must see that the many programs we have enacted this year are efficiently administered. Second, we must make sure that with all the built-in costs which these programs entail, we still live within our budget in a period of such substantial prosperity.

OPEN-AIR CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE HOURS

In keeping with my usual practice, as soon as Congress adjourns I shall schedule a series of open-air office hours at post offices throughout the eight counties of our district, so as to be available in every part of our district to any who may need help, or may wish to express their views and recommendations on legislation we have enacted or will be considering next year.

In closing, let me express again my deep appreciation to all of you, regardless of party affiliation, for giving me the opportunity to serve you in the immensely exciting and challenging responsibility of your Representative in the Congress of the United States.

Summary of Veterans' Legislation Reported, 89th Congress, 1st Session—Summary of Veterans' Affairs Committee Action—Bills and Resolutions Referred and Hearings-Executive Sessions Conducted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, 450 bills and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Testimony taken in hearings conducted in the 38 open sessions consisted of 3,093 printed pages. There were 21 executive sessions, resulting in the reporting of 18 bills. Of this number, 10 have been enacted into law; 7 passed the House and were pending in Senate committees at adjournment; and 1 bill reported by the committee, was left on the House Calendar at adjournment:

Summary of Veterans' Affairs Committee action in 81st Cong. through 89th Cong.—Bills and resolutions referred and hearings-executive sessions conducted

	Congress								
	81st	82d	83d	84th	85th	86th	87th	88th	89th, 1st sess.
Bills and resolutions referred	619	436	402	537	491	628	592	508	450
Hearings sessions	64	50	46	71	69	55	45	50	38
Hearings, printed pages	2,355	2,562	5,337	4,271	4,834	3,472	3,055	3,927	3,093
Executive sessions	34	27	55	37	28	21	15	21	21
Bills reported	44	36	36	48	44	42	52	41	18
Bills in House	1		14	1	5	2	[1] 8	[5] 5	[6] 1
Pending in Senate committees	16	14	2	17	11	6	[2] 13	7	[6] 7
Bills on Senate Calendar or in Senate	1	1	2			1	[3] 2	0	0
Recommitted	1	1			1				0
Bills vetoed	2	4			1				0
Bills passed over veto	1	2							0
Laws enacted	24	22	25	30	26	33	[4] 32	29	10

[1] Including 4 bills enacted as amendment to other legislation; 1 left in House when similar Senate bill returned to Senate; and 1 similar to another bill enacted (Public Law 87-645).

[2] Includes 2 bills enacted as amendments to other bills.

[3] Includes 1 bill enacted as amendment to another bill.

[4] Some laws included the substance of more than 1 bill reported separately. 39 separately reported bills were enacted, 7 as amendments to other legislation.

[5] Provisions of 3 of these bills were passed by the House as a separate bill, and the provisions of 1 bill were included as an amendment to another bill which was enacted.

[6] Purpose of 1 bill in Senate committee accomplished administratively; 2 other bills in Senate enacted as sections of another bill; and portions of 1 bill left in House enacted as sections of another bill.

LAWS ENACTED—1ST SESSION, 89TH CONGRESS

Public Law 89-40 (H.R. 7597)—Funding of national service life insurance reopening provisions of Public Law 88-664: This law provided funds to meet initial administrative and operating costs for the national service life insurance reopening program authorized by Public Law 88-664, by authorizing transfer of $1,650,000 from the veterans' special term insurance fund—a nonparticipating fund, no dividends—to the veterans' reopened insurance fund established by this law, such funds to be repaid to the Treasury, with interest.

Public Law 89-50 (H.R. 214)—Repeal of obsolete provisions of law relating to mustering-out payments for Korean conflict veterans: Mustering-out payments of between $100 and $300 for Korean conflict veterans repealed effective July 1, 1966, the date following date of expiration of other benefits provided by the Korean GI bill.

Public Law 89-88 (H.R. 225)—Memorial certificates: Provides statutory authority for Veterans' Administration to assist the President in a program of honoring the memory of deceased veterans by means of a certificate to be sent to the next of kin or other close relative or friend.

Public Law 89-137 (H.R. 206)—Vocational rehabilitation allowance increase: Public Law 16 of the 78th Congress, enacted in 1943, authorized vocational rehabilitation for veterans who have a service-connected disability. Under this program, the Veterans' Administration pays the full academic or training cost, and in addition, pays a subsistence allowance, which varies generally from $115 to $135 per month, depending on the degree of the veteran's disability and his dependency status. This law eliminates the old method of determining the amount of subsistence paid veterans receiving vocational rehabilitation training, and provides for payment of the following amounts:

Type of training	No dependents	1 dependent	2 or more dependents
Full-time institutional training	$110	$150	$175
Institutional on-farm, apprentice, or other on-job training	95	125	150

Public Law 89-138 (H.R. 208)—Vocational rehabilitation, extension of time for training: Under provisions of earlier law, vocational rehabilitation training is provided for service-connected disabled veterans of World War II, the Korean conflict, or veterans of subsequent service. Generally speaking, vocational rehabilitation may not be afforded after 9 years following the date of the veteran's discharge or release from active service. Blinded veterans are permitted training until June 30, 1975, or 10 years after general termination date, when it is determined that the veteran has not been previously rehabilitated or where his disability has worsened to such a degree that he requires retraining. This new law extends the time limitations for seriously disabled veterans who require retraining in the same manner as that previously available for blinded veterans.

Public Law 89-214 (S. 2127 and H.R. 10873)—Life insurance for member of Armed Forces:

Servicemen's group life insurance program—

First. Provides a group life insurance program for all members of the uniformed services who are on active duty, effective after midnight, September 28, 1965.

Second. Coverage is automatic, with the serviceman required to take affirmative action to take himself out of the program. The coverage provided is in $10,000 or $5,000, no other amounts. If the serviceman elects out of the program after the automatic coverage and later applies for readmission, he must pass a physical examination to show good health.

Third. Premium rates, for servicemen, are expected to be $2 a month for $10,000 of group insurance and $1 per month for $5,000 of group insurance, including claim and administrative costs. This cost may be adjusted, hopefully downward, as experience dictates.

Fourth. Servicemen's premiums will be deducted from their pay by the Department of Defense and remitted to the Veterans' Administration.

Fifth. The deductions from the pay will cover administrative expenses of the Veterans' Administration.

Sixth. The extra hazard cost of insuring servicemen will be paid by the United States after determination on an actuarial basis, with the total payment for extra hazard cost estimated at $4 million a year during periods when casualties are at present levels. Peacetime costs will not entail any extra hazard contribution, or at most a very small one.

Seventh. Mode of settlement, to be determined by the beneficiary or beneficiaries in the absence of instruction of the serviceman, is limited to a lump-sum payment or settlement over a 36-month period in equal monthly installments. The serviceman may designate any person as a beneficiary. If an affirmative designation is not made, the insurance will be paid in the following order: Widow or widower; child or children; parents; if none of the above, to the executor or administrator of the estate; if none of the above, to the next of kin of such member or former member under the laws of domicile of such member at the time of his death.

Eighth. Upon discharge from the services, the individual is protected in the full amount of his policy for 120 days, the cost for this being borne by premiums paid during the period of his active service.

Ninth. While covered by insurance under this program an individual will have the right to obtain from a private insurance company an insurance policy without medical examination in an amount equal to the group insurance policy under which he was protected during the period of service.

Tenth. If the man has a service-connected disability, he will be eligible for a commercial policy without medical examination under this program and, in addition, will be eligible for a $10,000 service disabled veteran's insurance policy administered by the Veterans' Administration.

Eleventh. The number of participating companies is to be determined by the Administrator, the expectation being that the number of participants will at least equal or closely approximate the number under the Federal employees group life insurance program. The primary insurer or insurers will be required to be eligible to do insurance business in all 50 States and the District of Columbia, while reinsurers will not be so limited.

Twelfth. Group life insurance coverage under this program will be in addition to any U.S. Government life insurance or national service life insurance which the serviceman might hold.

Death gratuity program—

First. Covers death incurred in the active military, naval, or air service during the period from January 1, 1957, to the effective date of the servicemen's group life insurance program—midnight, September 28, 1965. The death must have resulted from first, action of hostile forces; second, an accident involving a military or naval aircraft; third, as a direct result of the extra hazard of military or naval service, as such hazard is determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; or fourth, the performance of service for which certain incentive or special pay for hazardous duty is authorized.

Second. Death gratuity payments will be made to the widow of the veteran; if no widow is living, then to his child or children; and if no widow or child is living, then to his living parent or parents. No other persons are eligible.

Third. Recipients of death gratuity payments will have to waive all future death compensation or dependency and indemnity compensation on account of the death of the veteran with respect to whom the death gratuity is paid.

Fourth. The amount of death gratuity payment will be $5,000, reduced by the amount of U.S. Government life insurance or national service life insurance paid or payable on account of the death of the veteran and any death compensation or dependency and indemnity compensation received on account of the death of such veteran by the recipient of the death gratuity.

Public Law 89-222 (H.R. 205)—War orphans' educational allowance increase: Authorizes an increase in the amount of educational assistance allowance paid to the sons and daughters of deceased or permanently and totally disabled service-connected veterans pursuing a program of education, or special restorative training, under the war orphans' educational assistance programs, as follows:

Type of training	Old monthly rate	New monthly rate
Institutional:		
Full time	$110	$130
Three-quarters time	80	95
Half time	50	75
Institutional combined with training in business or industrial establishment	90	105
Restorative	[1] 110	[1] 130

[1] Earlier law permitted increase in restorative allowance where monthly charges exceed $35 per month by the amount of charges in excess of $35, with period of entitlement for training reduced by 1 day for each additional $3.60 expended. This law increases the $35 per month to $41 per month, and the $3.60 to $4.25.

In addition, the law changes eligibility requirements for children of veterans with service beginning from September 16, 1940, and continuing so long as the draft exists by removing the requirements that the veterans' death or disability occurred as a result of first, armed conflict; or second, from injury or disease while engaged in extrahazardous service, thus placing these children in the same status as children of veterans whose disabilities or deaths occurred during a period of war.

Public Law 89-228 (H.R. 2414)—Land conveyance, Roseburg, Oreg.: Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., without consideration, approximately 47 acres of land situated in the reservation of the Veterans' Administration hospital, Roseburg, Oreg.

Public Law 89-311 (H.R. 168)—Compensation increase for service-connected disabled veterans: Provides for an increase in compensation payments averaging approximately 10 percent, effective December 1, 1965, with the larger increases going to the most seriously disabled, as outlined below:

Degree and paragraph	Wartime cases	Old wartime rates	New wartime rates	Monthly increase above old rates	Peacetime cases	Old peacetime rates	New peacetime rates	Monthly increase above old rates
10(a)	743,516	$20	$21	$1	62,975	$16	$17	$1
20(b)	230,665	38	40	2	21,097	30	32	2
30(c)	256,529	58	60	2	19,775	46	48	2
40(d)	152,352	77	82	5	8,900	62	65	3
50(e)	95,348	107	113	6	7,500	86	90	4
60(f)	83,980	128	136	8	5,700	102	109	7
70(g)	44,216	149	161	12	3,400	119	129	10
80(h)	25,790	170	186	16	1,400	136	149	13
90(i)	8,237	191	209	18	400	153	167	14
100(j)	72,971	250	300	50	11,379	200	240	40
(l)	3,563	340	400	60	368	272	320	48
(m)	2,599	390	450	60	306	312	360	48
(n)	378	440	525	85	27	352	420	68
(o)	30	525	600	75	10	420	480	60
(p)	3,192	525	600	75	290	420	480	60
(r)	4,965	200(+525)	250(+600)	50(+75)	1,100	160(+420)	200(+480)	40(+60)
(s)	4,582	290	350	60	520	232	280	48
Total	1,782,913				145,147			

In addition to increase in basic rates of compensation, provides increases in dependency allowances paid to veterans 50 percent through 100 percent disabled; permits payment of an educational allowance for children of these veterans—or a widow receiving dependency and indemnity compensation payments—between the ages of 18 and 23, in lieu of the dependence allowance otherwise payable; and permits payment of either dependency allowance or educational allowance, where the child is pursuing a course of instruction at an approved educational institution, until attainment of age 23. The educational allowance for the child of a 100-percent-disabled veteran is $40. Educational allowances or dependency allowances are computed in the same manner for those 50 percent through 90 percent disabled. Lesser amounts are paid based on degree of disability with, as an example, a 50-percent-disabled veteran receiving 50 percent of the rate payable to 100 percent disabled. A comparison of dependency allowances for 100 percent disabled under previous law and that made available by this new law follows:

Dependency status	Old allowance	New allowance
Veteran totally disabled and has—		
(A) a wife but no child living	$22	$25
(B) a wife and 1 child living	39	43
(C) a wife and 2 children living	50	55
(D) a wife and 3 or more children living	[1] 62	[2] 68
(E) no wife but 1 child living	15	17
(F) no wife but 2 children living	27	30
(G) no wife but 3 or more children living	[1] 39	[2] 43
(H) 1 or 2 parents dependent upon him for support	[3] 19	[3] 21

[1] Plus $12 for each living child in excess of 3.

[2] Plus $13 for each living child in excess of 3.

[3] Payable in addition to other dependency allowance to which veteran is entitled.

The law also permits payment of compensation, in the case of a veteran who suffers from bilateral deafness of both ears, if service connection is established for deafness in one ear but not the other, as though deafness in both ears were service connected.

In addition, the law contains the following provisions not related to compensation: First, extends veterans' preference to veterans injured en route to report for active duty in the military service; second, removes the requirement that a holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor must attain the age of 40 years in order to be eligible to receive a special pension of $100 per month; third, removes certain restrictions on utilization of funds provided States for assistance in construction of nursing care beds; fourth, permits the Attorney General to defend civil actions brought against physicians, dentists, nurses, and paramedical personnel in malpractice or negligence suits, and if decision is made in favor of plaintiff, permits the Government to bear the cost of meeting the claim; and fifth, makes statutory a 125,000 hospital bed ceiling in VA hospitals, and specifies that the 4,000 nursing care beds provided by Public Law 88-450 are in addition to that maximum.

Public Law 89-349 (H.R. 227)—Extension of eligibility to war orphans' education to certain children: Makes war orphans' educational assistance available to the sons and daughters of those veterans who died or were totally and permanently disabled from a service-connected disability during peacetime periods after the Spanish-American War and prior to September 16, 1940, on the same basis as though the disability or death occurred because of service during a period of war.

BILLS PASSED BY THE HOUSE, PENDING IN SENATE COMMITTEES

H.R. 203—Research in spinal cord injuries and diseases: Would require that in each fiscal year during the 6-year period beginning July 1, 1965, and ending June 30, 1971, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs set aside $100,000 in funds appropriated for use of the Veterans' Administration for the conduct of research into spinal cord injuries and diseases, and other disabilities that lead to paralysis of the lower extremities. Reported in House, January 28, 1965; House Report No. 4. Passed House, February 2, 1965. Referred to Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, February 3, 1965.

H.R. 228—Statutory awards for anatomical losses: Authorizes payment of the statutory award of $47 per month for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified in the law in addition to the basic rates of disability compensation and the rate payable to those who are permanently housebound. Reported in House, with amendment, January 28, 1965; House Report No. 6. Passed House February 2, 1965. Referred to Senate Committee on Finance, February 4, 1965.

H.R. 235—Repeal of obsolete law, education of Korean conflict veterans: All education and training under the subject provision of law was terminated on January 31, 1965, and this bill would repeal chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code in its entirety, except that disposition of claims and liabilities accrued or incurred under that chapter prior to February 1, 1965, would be permitted. Reported in House, with amendments, June 8, 1965, House Report No. 455. Passed House, June 14, 1965. Referred to Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, June 15, 1965.

H.R. 2656—Burial flags, size prescribed: Would require that the flag furnished by Veterans' Administration to drape the casket of deceased veterans be 5 feet in width and 9½ feet in length. Reported in House, June 8, 1965, House Report No. 456. Passed House, June 14, 1965. Referred to Senate Committee on Finance, June 15, 1965. The purpose of this bill was accomplished administratively.

H.R. 3413—Veterans' preference for persons receiving compensation for injuries incurred en route for induction: Would extend veterans' preference to individuals injured while en route for induction into active duty in the Armed Forces. Reported in House, April 1, 1965, House Report No. 216. Passed House, May 17, 1965. Referred to Senate Committee on Finance, May 18, 1965. Rereferred to Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, May 19, 1965. A section having this same purpose was included as a part of H.R. 168, enacted as Public Law 89-311.

H.R. 4421—Land conveyance, Cheyenne, Wyo.: Would authorize conveyance to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., without monetary consideration, for park and recreational purposes, of 27 acres of land, more or less, a portion of the reservation of the Veterans' Administration Center in Cheyenne. Reported in House, May 5, 1965, House Report No. 289. Passed House, May 17, 1965. Referred to Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, May 18, 1965.

H.R. 7571—Veterans' Administration housing program, collections of indebtedness: Prohibits the withholding by the Veterans' Administration of veterans' benefits due a veteran or his widow in order to satisfy an indebtedness arising from a loss suffered under the Veterans' Administration loan programs, unless the individual consents in writing to such withholding. Agencies of Government other than Veterans' Administration would be prohibited from withholding any payment due the veteran or his widow arising from such an indebtedness without the consent of the individual or in the absence of a judgment. Reported in House, with amendments, August 12, 1965, House Report No. 783. Passed House, September 20, 1965. Referred to Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, September 21, 1965.

REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, NOT CONSIDERED ON HOUSE FLOOR

H.R. 202—Construction, alteration, or closure of Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliaries: Would provide that in the case of any new construction or acquisition of a hospital or domiciliary involving an expenditure in excess of $100,000, or alteration of an existing hospital or domiciliary which involves the expenditure of in excess of $500,000, such construction, alteration or acquisition may not proceed until it has been approved by a resolution of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. In the case of alteration of an existing hospital or domiciliary which involves an expenditure in excess of $200,000, but equal to or less than $500,000, a prospectus giving full details on this proposal would be filed with the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and such alteration could proceed 60 days thereafter unless the committee adopts a resolution stating that it does not favor such proposal. Also provides that no hospital or domiciliary over which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has direct jurisdiction and which is in operation on the date of enactment of the proposal shall be closed until such closing is approved by a resolution adopted by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Provides statutory authority for operation of not less than 125,000 hospital beds and 17,000 domiciliary beds in the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical system, in addition to the 4,000 nursing care beds authorized by Public Law 88–450.

Provides protection for physicians, dentists, and nurses in the Veterans' Administration, in the event a malpractice suit is brought against them, by permitting the Attorney General to defend any civil action against such medical personnel, and if the Attorney General is unsuccessful and decision is made in favor of the plaintiff, then the Government would bear the cost of meeting this claim. Sections with similiar purposes to paragraphs 2 and 3 above were included as a part of H.R. 168, which was enacted as Public Law 89–311. Reported in House, with amendments, June 8, 1965, House Report No. 450.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS

Bills providing for appropriations for the Veterans' Administration are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations and are included as a part of the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts. A summary of legislation pertaining to veterans could not be considered complete, however, without reference to the large appropriations which the Congress annually provides for operation of the vast system of veterans' benefit programs.

The chart which appears below will provide a comparison of appropriations for Veterans' Administration for fiscal years 1963 through 1966.

Comparison of appropriations, fiscal years 1963 through 1966

	1963 appropriation [1]	1964 appropriation, Public Law 88–215 approved Dec. 19, 1963	1965 appropriation, Public Law 88–507 approved Aug. 30, 1964	1966 appropriation, Public Law 89–128 approved Aug. 16, 1965
General operating expenses	[4] $161, 279, 950	$159, 750, 000	$155, 125, 000	$160, 238, 000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses [2]	13, 981, 950	14, 800, 000	14, 200, 000	13, 496, 000
Medical and prosthetic research [2]	30, 500, 000	33, 742, 000	37, 000, 000	40, 893, 000
Medical care [3]	1, 048, 172, 300	1, 081, 186, 000	1, 115, 935, 000	1, 191, 956, 000
Compensation and pensions	3, 874, 000, 000	3, 921, 000, 000	3, 963, 000, 000	4, 142, 000, 000
Readjustment benefits	95, 800, 000	67, 000, 000	37, 100, 000	36, 500, 000
Veterans insurance and indemnities	32, 000, 000	30, 200, 000	13, 700, 000	9, 900, 000
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities	77, 000, 000	76, 796, 000	98, 103, 000	90, 511, 600
Construction of Corregidor-Bataan memorial				
Grants for construction of State nursing homes				2, 500, 000
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	[4] 350, 000	310, 000	310, 000	386, 000
Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief				25, 000
Total	5, 333, 084, 200	5, 384, 784, 000	5, 423, 973, 000	5, 688, 405, 600

[1] Includes supplementals.

[2] Separate appropriation for "Medical and prosthetic research" in 1963.

[3] "Inpatient care" and "Outpatient care" consolidated into "Medical care" in 1962.

[4] $150,000 transferred from "Grants to the Republic of the Philippines" to "General operating expenses."

Activities of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, 1st Session, 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I submit to the Senate a report of the activities of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia during the 1st session of the 89th Congress. This presentation provides in full a report in detail of the committee's activities for that period of time.

However, before I do this, may I extend to my colleagues on this committee my appreciation for their helpfulness and assistance in our work. I believe that they are deserving of the gratitude of the entire Congress, the people of the District of Columbia, and the people of the entire country for the hours they spend in tending to the business of the Nation's Capital City while carrying on their other major activities incident to their service in the Congress. May I further express my deep appreciation to my subcommittee chairmen who gave of their time and energy; namely, the very effective and hardworking senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is chairman of the Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety Subcommittee; the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], whose energies and devotion to committee matters have been invaluable to our committee as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee; and the capable junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who has served as the committee's chairman of the Business and Commerce Subcommittee, during his first year as a Member of the Senate. To the other committee members, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], whose service as former Attorney General for the United States made his work most valuable to the committee; the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], whose long and effective service was particularly useful to the committee; and to the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], whose experience in the House of Representatives and in the legislature of his home State has done much to assist the committee with its many problems. I wish to express my sincere thanks for the hours they gave to our committee.

I would also like to express my deep appreciation for the cooperation I received personally as committee chairman from the Honorable JOHN MCMILLAN, chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, and the individual members of his committee. Likewise, I wish to commend the cooperation and assistance that the staff members of the House District Committee have extended to the staff members of my committee during this session of Congress.

During this session of this Congress, the full committee considered a number of important bills. As in the 88th Congress, the committee continued to push legislation that would provide more effective law enforcement in the Nation's Capital. As part of the committee's overall study of the crime problem, the committee gave careful and thorough consideration to the House-passed crime bill, H.R. 5688, which proposed changes in the complex and controversial Mallory and Durham rules.

The increased crime upsurge in the District of Columbia, pushed by a trend that, at its present rate, will make 1965 a record crime year, resulted in a call by the committee for emergency measures. The District of Columbia Commissioners responded by putting into operation police saturation patrol techniques, additional scout cars, and investigators, an increase in nonpolice school crossing guards leaving regular duty men for crime prevention work, a review of present assignments of police officers to administrative, clerical, and technical duties, looking to a possible takeover of some of these positions by nonpolice personnel, implementation of two-way radio communication for footmen, and Senate and House passage of S. 1719, authorizing overtime pay for members of the Washington Metropolitan Police Department, the White House Police, and the U.S. Park Police, in addition to the Washington Fire Department.

Additionally, the committee, believing that crime represented the District's foremost local problem, continued its in-depth examination of the need for strengthening the District of Columbia Criminal Code in 9 days of hearings in April, May, July, and August 1965. It heard 36 witnesses update hearings held in the general field of a District of Columbia omnibus crime bill, such hearings having been started in the 87th and 88th Congresses.

After careful study of various crime measures before the committee, H.R. 5688, as it passed the House, was amended substantially and reported to the Senate where it passed with a minor amendment. Title I of the Senate-passed version of H.R. 5688 dealt with the modification of the Mallory rule. Under its provisions, standards and safeguards were written in for in-custody interrogation of persons arrested on probable cause. In addition to providing these safeguards for an accused during a period of detention, the Senate version also spelled out the aggregate period of time that law enforcement officers would be able to legally detain an accused for interrogation.

In addition to making this change in existing law, the Senate amendments to H.R. 5688 also included the following:

Title II amended existing law so as to require an accused in a criminal case to give notice of an insanity defense.

Title III expanded existing law so as to provide more extensive procedures for the detention of material witnesses to criminal offenses.

Title V made certain changes in the maximum and minimum sentences for crimes of violence and other criminal offenses in the District of Columbia. Also, this title amended the law relating to indecent publications. At adjournment of Congress, this bill was pending before a Senate-House conference.

S. 1719, authorized overtime pay for members of the Metropolitan, White House and U.S. Park Police Departments for additional hours worked in excess of the basic 40-hour workweek. The Washington Fire Department was also included.

Under the provisions of S. 1719, now Public Law 89-282, members would be paid overtime when working first, on special designated assignments; second, during off-duty days; and, third, on second and subsequent court appearances.

In reporting this legislation, the committee felt that paying overtime for hours worked in excess of a 40-hour week would make more police officers available for duty on the streets during periods when street crimes are at their highest peak.

S. 1320, another crime bill, was favorably reported by the full committee to the Senate. S. 1320 clarifies, as well as strengthens, certain of the criminal laws of the District of Columbia; also, it broadens and conforms to the Federal immunity statutes the immunity statute of the District of Columbia which is applicable to certain civil proceedings relating to disorderly houses. The bill provides for the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia to represent the District in prosecutions involving violations of acts relating to licensing and regulation of certain professions—Public Law 89-347.

As another important legislative measure, the committee provided extensive study of a home rule bill for the District of Columbia. In the 89th Congress two home rule bills were introduced in the Senate—S. 268 and S. 1118. The committee updated previous hearings on both of these legislative proposals and heard from numerous witnesses. S. 1118 was reported by the committee in amended form, and was passed subsequently by the Senate. Such bill provided in some measure for self-government for the citizens of the District of Columbia. The bill as it was approved by the Senate made provision for the election of the following: a city mayor; a city council of 19 members—5 to be elected at large; a school board consisting of 14 members; and a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives.

The bill also provided that the Congress would retain full residual, ultimate and exclusive legislative jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. In addition, the bill empowered the President to veto any act of the local government where such act adversely affects a Federal interest.

In order to meet the fiscal requirements of the city government the bill provides authority for a regular annual payment by the Federal Government to the District of Columbia to be computed by means of a flexible formula. It was the committee's view that a formula method would provide a more equitable basis for measuring the Federal responsibility to the Nation's Capital as it would provide a built-in incentive to utilize local taxes to meet local needs. At the same time, local residents are assured that the Federal Government will automatically recognize its obligation to provide additional revenues that are needed to meet legitimate increased expenditure requirements. At adjournment, the Senate had before it a House-passed charter commission version of the Senate home rule bill.

Also in the 89th Congress the committee continued to meet its obligation to develop a comprehensive and effective transportation system for the National Capital region. The committee, after careful study, reported H.R. 4822. This legislation as it was reported by the committee became Public Law 89-173. Such legislation provided for the development of a transit program for the National Capital region, in furtherance of the objectives of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960. The bill authorized the National Capital Transportation Agency to design, engineer, construct, equip, and to take such other actions necessary to provide for the establishment of a system of rail rapid transit lines and related facilities for the mass transportation of persons within the District of Columbia and between the District and points in Montgomery County, Md., and Arlington County, Va.

The proposed rapid rail system would be limited largely to the District of Columbia. However, there would be one extension into Arlington County, Va., to serve the heavy Federal employment concentration at the Pentagon, and a short extension into Montgomery County, Md., in order to reach a suitable terminal location. The total system would be 24.9 miles long, with double track throughout, and would include 20 stations. Approximately one-half—13.1 miles—would be in subway, 7.5 miles would utilize a portion of existing railroad rights-of-way, and the balance would occupy other exclusive rights-of-way.

The estimated capital cost of constructing this system is $431 million, exclusive of interest requirements, and would be financed as follows:

	Million
Federal contribution	$100
District of Columbia contribution	50
Public sale of revenue bonds	281
Total system cost	431

The system would be designed and constructed by private engineering firms under contract with the Federal Government.

The system will be operated by private transit companies, or other private parties under contracts with the Agency. The Federal Government would retain control over essential matters such as fares and safety standards but would not be involved in day-to-day transit operations.

The full committee, during this session, also provided careful study to the increasing backlog of cases in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions. In order to help the court remedy the backlog problem, the committee favorably reported S. 2263. Under the provisions of S. 2263 the number of judges assigned to the court of general sessions was increased from 15 to 20. In addition the bill provides that two of the judges in the court of general sessions would serve on a full-time basis in the traffic branch of such court. The Senate passed S. 2263, but during this session no action was taken on the bill by the House.

H.R. 11487, a major District of Columbia revenue-producing bill, was considered by the full committee during the last days of this Congress but there was insufficient time to provide the consideration it required. The bill would first, increase District of Columbia income tax revenues; second, increase the District of Columbia tax on motor vehicle fuels from 6 to 7 cents per gallon; third, increase the borrowing authority of the District for highway construction from $50,250,000 to $85,250,000, an increase of $35 million; fourth, authorize the District of Columbia Commissioners to abate the unpaid portion of any tax when, in their judgment, the amount of money involved would not warrant the cost of collection; and, fifth, authorize the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners to participate with Maryland and Virginia authorities in comprehensive planning for transportation facilities for the National Capital region.

The District Commissioners advised the committee that if the major highway building program was to continue in the District of Columbia, additional revenues, the earmarked gasoline tax increase and loan authority for highway construction, would be essential.

Additional consideration of this broad measure by this committee will continue in the early stages of the 2d session of the 89th Congress.

The 1st session of the 89th Congress was a busy one for the Judiciary Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia.

The subcommittee favorably reported and the Senate passed S. 1611, a bill designed to transfer from the U.S. district court certain administrative functions of a local nature and convey such functions to the court of general sessions or appropriate District of Columbia agencies. The functions transferred from the jurisdiction of the district court relate generally to docketing judgments, recording liens, filing trademarks, trade names, and issuing marriage licenses.

In the domestic relations field the subcommittee reported H.R. 948, which eventually became Public Law 89-217. This bill had the beneficial purpose of liberalizing the District of Columbia law relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage. The bill as it was finally enacted into law brings the District's divorce and annulment laws into closer conformity with the laws of Virginia and Maryland.

The Judiciary Subcommittee also acted on several other legislative proposals, all of which had the intended purpose of assisting the various law-enforcement agencies of the District of Columbia. These bills were passed by the Senate and are as follows:

First. S. 1319 authorizes a work release program for defendants sentenced by the courts of the District of Columbia. Under this legislation, selected offenders will be eligible for release from prison confinement at specified times to enable them to obtain or engage in gainful employment.

Second. S. 1715 made it a felony criminal offense for inmates of penal and correctional institutions to assault the employees of such institutions. The effect of this legislation will be to provide District correctional and juvenile confinement employees the same felony statutory coverage with regard to assaults on their persons as Federal penal and correctional officers are provided under U.S. law—Public Law 89-277.

Third. H.R. 66 provides authority for the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term for which he was sentenced. The authority of H.R. 66 permits the Board of Parole to terminate supervision of a parolee where the Parole Board in its discretion determines that a parolee has made a proper adjustment in the community and no longer is in need of supervision—Public Law 89-24.

S. 1317 and H.R. 647 were also reported by the subcommittee. S. 1317 authorizes the District Commissioners to impose monetary penalties for the handling and collection of dishonored checks and money orders—Public Law 89-208.

H.R. 647 provides for the substitution of trustees under deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by means of a written instrument entered into by all parties or their successors in interest, notwithstanding any provision of the deed of trust to the contrary.

The bill provides that before any such instrument is valid, notice of the appointment of the new trustee, bearing the signatures under seal of the parties, and acknowledged by them, shall be recorded in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds.

The subcommittee reported to the Senate S. 1321. This bill amends section 501(e) of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code so that a plaintiff, in a civil action which allows for attachment of the defendant's property before judgment, may be allowed by the court, when the property has less value than the claim against the defendant, to post bond in an amount equal to twice the value of the property attached rather than twice the amount of the claim. When this provision is invoked, only that specific property may be levied upon instead of the general property of the defendant—Public Law 89-113.

This session of the Congress was also an important one for the Business and Commerce Subcommittee of the Senate District Committee.

The subcommittee held hearings and reported two measures dealing with urban renewal in the Southwest redevelopment area.

The first, S. 1314, which passed the Senate on September 30, 1965, grants the District of Columbia the right to close streets in urban renewal areas upon the written consent of the private owners of the remainder of the property. This bill has the purpose of simplifying street-closing procedures in connection with urban renewal activities. Under existing law, two separate hearings are required to be held on proposed street closings, the first when an urban renewal plan for a particular area is taken up for public consideration, and the second when the specific street is proposed to be closed. The provisions of S. 1314 dispense with the necessity of the second street closing hearing when a street closing is embodied in an urban renewal plan, and there has been a public hearing on such plan.

House Joint Resolution 397 passed the Senate on October 18. This resolution was designed to clear title to certain properties in the Southwest redevelopment area used by a number of railroads under the Union Station Act of 1903. The resolution settled outstanding ownership questions by authorizing the District of Columbia to convey title to the Redevelopment Land Agency so that these parcels could be developed. Additionally, that portion of the Southwest Freeway which utilized rights-of-way across designated redevelopment land was conveyed to the District of Columbia Government for $82,000—Public Law 89-317.

The Business and Commerce Subcommittee also held hearings on S. 1316, a bill which would permit the District of Columbia to enter into joint contracts with other local governments in the National Capital region for the purchase of supplies and services. This measure passed the Senate on October 1, 1965. The committee, in favorably acting on such legislation, felt that substantial savings in procurement, production, and service costs might be effected through the increased purchasing power of the various governments acting cooperatively. Under the procedures of this bill the District of Columbia Government would be the clearinghouse and purchasing office under the joint contracts, but the participating jurisdictions would share the additional administrative costs.

Hearings were held but no final action was taken by the committee in two additional important and significant legislative proposals.

The Business and Commerce Subcommittee held 4 full days of hearings on various pieces of legislation concerned with amending the Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, and also providing coverage of uninsured motorists. Four bills dealing with this broad and difficult subject were considered by the subcommittee and one bill, H.R. 9918, was reported favorably to the full committee.

Under H.R. 9918 a motorist registering his automobile in the District must include uninsured motorist coverage in his insurance policy, or, in lieu of this coverage, pay into an unsatisfied judgment fund. The latter provides the source through which District residents not having a registered motor vehicle in the District of Columbia may obtain compensation when injured by an uninsured motorist. H.R. 9918 is essentially a combination of the approach to uninsured motorist coverage now in effect in Maryland and Virginia.

Finally, the Business and Commerce Subcommittee held hearings on H.R. 10274, a bill to amend the Chancery Act of 1964, to permit chancery uses in low density residential areas in buildings used for chanceries between 1958 and 1964, even if such chancery use was then contrary to District of Columbia law or regulations if the property owner had no notice that such use was unlawful. Considered late in the session, this matter was still under consideration at adjournment.

The Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee acted upon a number of measures as follows:

First. Senate Joint Resolution 5, a resolution naming the bridge across the Washington channel of the Potomac River on Interstate Route 95 the "Francis Case Memorial Bridge"—Public Law 89-203.

Second. House Joint Resolution 195, authorizing the District Commissioners to promulgate special regulations for the American Legion National Convention to be held in the District of Columbia during the summer of 1966—Public Law 89-25.

Third. H.R. 4338, authorizes the Veterans of Foreign Wars to rent or lease any part of their Memorial Building at 200 Maryland Avenue NE., for office purposes only, to any agency of the Federal or District of Columbia Governments, or to any nonprofit organization, and would require the VFW to pay real estate taxes on that portion of the building so rented or leased—Private Law 89-1.

During this session, a number of bills were considered by the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety. The committee, after holding extensive hearings, reported H.R. 8126 to the Senate. This bill amends the minimum wage law of the District of Columbia which became operative in 1918, to provide a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour for all persons employed in the District of Columbia with the exception of employees employed in a bona fide executive, administrative or professional capacity or in the capacity of outside salesmen—as such terms are defined and delimited by regulations or the Commissioners—and employees engaged in the delivery of newspapers to the home of the consumer. Provision is made for adjustment in such minimum wage rate to make allowances for special conditions, circumstances, such as the existence of facilities and services customarily furnished by employers and of gratuities customarily received by employees. Wage adjustments may also be made in the case of learners, apprentices, handicapped workers, and students.

Several other bills were considered by the subcommittee and are as follows:

First. H.R. 1778, amending the act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia relating to taxes resulting from such condemnation—Public Law 89-326.

Second. H.R. 5597, relieving physicians of liability for negligent medical treatment at the scene of an accident in the District of Columbia—Public Law 89-341.

Third. S. 1817, amends the District of Columbia public assistance law to clarify the categories of federally aided assistance recipients.

Fourth. S. 2212 authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish and administer a plan to provide for the care and protection of children through public day care services, and to provide public assistance in the form of foster home care to certain dependent children.

Fifth. H.R. 3314, a bill to protect the health and safety of the people of the District of Columbia and the welfare of their issue by requiring a laboratory test for syphilis before the issuance of a marriage license.

Statistical data of action by the Senate District of Columbia Committee during the 1st session of the 89th Congress

Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations referred to committee	110
Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations reported to Senate	33
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions on which hearings were held	47
Number of hearings held by subcommittees on Senate bills	49
Number of hearings held by subcommittees on House bills	18
Number of hearings held by full committee on bills and nominations	47
Number of hearings held by full committee in joint session with House committee	0
Number of bills which have passed both Houses and are still awaiting President's signature	0
Number of bills which have become public law	14
Number of studies and investigations	1

Annual Report of Your Congressman, Lloyd Meeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LLOYD MEEDS
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, as the Congressman from Washington's Second District, I am privileged to work for constructive legislation that will benefit the Nation and my State.

The creative programs we have passed into law this year take their inspiration from our traditions, from the complexity of the problems facing us, and from the hearts and hopes of Americans everywhere. We will soon adjourn this dynamic 1st session of the 89th Congress. Now I would like to talk with my constituents about the enacted legislation of particular importance to the Second District of Washington State.

EDUCATION

As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I work in the development of all education legislation. The accomplishments of 1965 have been widely recognized as the most significant since Congress first established land-grant colleges in 1862.

First. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides funds for programs which are developed and administered by our local schools. The central purpose of this act is to improve the quality of schooling in low-income areas where children are often educationally disadvantaged. In this way, we are investing in our children's potential so that as adults they will be able to give their best to America.

All public schools can receive assistance for textbooks and library materials. The Elementary and Secondary Act also encourages local schools to establish special programs. For example, if the Edmonds School District wanted to create a children's remedial reading course, Federal funds might help to promote such a project.

Second. When we were working for the Higher Education Act, we were helping to make college a reality for all qualified high school graduates. This act offers loans, scholarships of $200 to $1,000, and Government backing of private loans to students and parents. Lack of money should not prevent a qualified student from securing a college education. In addition, we have expanded the highly successful job programs which help students to work their way through college.

The Higher Education Act will assist colleges in meeting the classroom shortage and in furnishing public services, such as adult education and speech and hearing centers. The act also contains a provision for graduate fellowships to supplement the abilities of those now teaching or planning to teach in our grade schools and high schools.

Third. Our April 29 earthquake was but one of several major disasters crippling the United States during 1965. The School Disaster Assistance Act, similar to a bill I sponsored, will help our schools to meet future emergency expenses.

Fourth. As one of the sponsors of the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities, I hope that this new endowment can be useful to groups in our area. The Anacortes Summer Arts Festival, the Snohomish County Little Theater, the Port Townsend Summer School of the Arts, and others could perhaps share in the funds that will be administered by the Washington State Arts Commission.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND SENIOR CITIZENS

First. When Congress enacted the Social Security Amendments of 1965, we were responding to a basic fact of life: our elderly people have more frequent and more expensive medical costs than any other group in the United States. And older citizens must often live on low fixed incomes. Medicare provides a certain amount of hospitalization, and a second program of voluntary medical insurance can be secured for $3 a month. The act also includes a 7-percent increase in social security benefits.

Second. The Older Americans Act recognizes that 18 million citizens in the United States are past 65 years of age and have special problems. This constructive legislation creates a new Administration on Aging; $50,000 has been authorized for Washington programs for our elderly people, and these funds could be of use to such local programs as the Bellingham and Everett Senior Activity Centers.

NATURAL RESOURCES

First. Washington State is famed throughout America for its lakes, rivers, and Puget Sound. But now we face the threat of pollution. The Water Quality Act underwrites State-Federal action to promote local pollution control and to establish adequate clean water standards.

Second. Senator JACKSON and I cosponsored a bill to remove the legal obstacles which for many years have blocked equitable financial participation in the Lummi diking project near Bellingham. This bill is now law.

Third. We all remember the bad floods last winter. Congress has made $21 million available for rebuilding Pacific Northwest highways and forest roads which were damaged by those floods.

Fourth. New legislation calls for the creation of clean air standards. We are moving now to control industrial smoke and automobile exhausts, which injure our health.

Fifth. In 1961 the Washington State Legislature passed a law regulating billboards. The Federal Highway Beautification Act of 1965 is not as strong as our 1961 State measure. Before the House voted on the Beautification Act, I made sure that it would not weaken or overturn Washington's stricter regulations. The new national law insures effective control of billboards near interstate and primary highways in rural areas. It also seeks to have junkyards near these highways moved or screened from sight.

FISHERIES

First. The Anadromous Fisheries Act will invest $25 million to help conserve salmon and other fish that swim upstream to spawn. It is my feeling that fish farms need a proving ground. This legislation, combined with State of Washington action, could provide such an experimental farm in the Second District.

Second. The International Pacific Halibut Commission is located in Seattle, but it is housed in a very old building. Senator MAGNUSON, Representative ADAMS, Representative PELLY, and I successfully sponsored legislation that will modernize the Commission's facilities and promote more efficient conservation of our halibut resources.

Third. Since 1956 over 150 loans to commercial fishermen in Washington State have been made to help replace or repair fishing vessels. Senator MAGNUSON's bill has extended the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to make these loans.

BUSINESS AND LABOR

First. We are now in the 53d month of continuous economic expansion, and the excise tax cut, passed this year, is helping to sustain this momentum. Taxes which are being repealed on household appliances, TV sets, cameras, entertainment, sporting goods, and other items will amount to nearly $54 million in Washington State during the next year. Both consumers and business will benefit, especially by the reduction of excise taxes on automobiles and telephone calls.

Second. Today there is a demand for skilled workers. Shipbuilders, for example, are badly needed in Washington State. Congress has extended and expanded the Manpower Act, legislation which stimulates local job retraining and specialized skills programs, such as the excellent project at Peninsula Junior College. In addition, we have acted to provide Government insurance for private loans made to vocational students.

Third. There has been a lack of comparability between private industry wages and civil service salaries. A new pay raise for postal workers and other Federal employees will help remedy this condition. I voted for this pay raise, but voted against any salary increase for Members of Congress.

Fourth. Our small businesses are vital to the national economy. This year Congress approved extra funds to help small firms hit by floods, storms, and other disasters. Action was also taken to increase by 300 percent the amount the Small Business Administration can lend to "local development corporations."

FARM

First. The Omnibus Farm Act seeks to insure our dairymen of a fair return for their investments. Another beneficial feature of this act contains a cropland retirement section that will reduce farm surpluses. This provision seeks to retire 40 million acres of farmland so that it can be converted into other uses, such as wildlife refuges, forests, and water storage areas. I am enthusiastic about the provision which compensates farmers for land they release for hunting and fishing.

Second. New legislation provides matching grants for rural water and sewage facilities and increases by $250 million the amount of loans insurable by the Farmers Home Administration. Recently, for example, the FHA made a $544,000 loan to the Cross-Valley Water Association in Snohomish County.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

First. The overwhelming majority of Americans back our firm policy in Vietnam. This year Congress on two occasions voted funds to finance our commitments in southeast Asia. In recent months, the Communists have suffered military and diplomatic setbacks. I agree with President Johnson that an honorable peace settlement must uphold freedom in Vietnam.

Second. One of the brightest moments came this year when we voted funds for the Peace Corps. Two hundred and eighty-two volunteers from Washington State are serving overseas in the cause of good will, progress, and freedom. One young man, Vern Hild of Marysville, was among several Peace Corpsmen receiving special commendation for a rescue at sea during a violent Philippine storm.

Third. In the West we have always admired the man who could do a good job, regardless of whether he or his parents came from Sweden, Norway, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, or wherever. The Immigration Reform Act allows highly trained people with skills we need to make their home in America. Reuniting families is another object of this humanitarian legislation. This act contributes to a stronger United States while, at the same time, protecting the jobs of our workers.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

First. Congress has approved an increase in service-connected disability payments, and the amount varies from $1 to $50 with the degree of disability. This act also authorizes the Veterans' Administration to construct more hospital beds, and it offers greater benefits to disabled veterans with children in school.

Second. A long-overdue measure will now provide an average 10.4-percent increase in military pay. The largest increase, 17.3 percent, goes to enlisted men with less than 2 years' active duty. For soldiers in combat zones this act provides free first-class postage and higher pay.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

First. With the Voting Rights Act of 1965 we will be able to enforce more effectively the 15th amendment to our Constitution. The freedom to choose our representatives and other officials is fundamental to democracy. But without the right to vote there is little freedom of choice. The Voting Rights Act honors the American belief that citizenship is founded on natural rights.

Second. To prevent crime we need more efficient law enforcement. Recognizing this need, Congress has passed the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, a measure which authorizes grants to our local police to undertake special projects, such as police academies and scientific detection studies.

Third. Congress has moved to control the illegal traffic in "goof balls" and other depressant-stimulant drugs, over 50 percent of which, in the past, have been manufactured and sold illicitly. The new law allows only doctors, pharmacists, and companies to handle these drugs.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

In 1965 Congress has enacted additional legislation that will make our communities a better place in which to live. In order that our local government agencies have information and assistance about these programs, we have arranged a Community Development Conference to be held in Everett on November 6, 1965. The conference will be attended by local officials from throughout the Second Congressional District.

First. In my August newsletter, I reported how the Housing and Urban Development Act will strengthen our communities and reinforce our prosperity. Appropriations have been made for college housing, FHA home loan insurance, water and sewer facilities, and other features. Earlier this year, for example, a large Federal loan was made to Western Washington State College to construct a new dormitory.

Second. The purpose of the Economic Development Act is to promote the national interest by encouraging free enterprise. This act will invest public funds in areas of high unemployment and will lead to efficient planning and use of economic resources. In this way, the counties with higher-than-average unemployment can attract industry and jobs. The city of Port Angeles, now planning water and sewage facilities, could make use of this act as well as the Housing and Urban Development Act. These measures may also assist the urban renewal plans of Anacortes.

Third. In recent years, Washington State has mounted a determined effort to combat mental illness. Congress has adopted legislation underwriting some of the costs of staffing our community mental health centers and of training teachers to educate handicapped and retarded children.

LOOKING AHEAD—WHAT IS TO BE DONE

First. An inconsistent and outmoded policy faces pilots and boaters who cross the Canadian border on weekends and holidays. They often have to pay as high as $60 in customs fees. I have introduced legislation to abolish these unfair charges, and the response from the Second District has been heartening.

Second. The Senate has passed, and the House is considering, a bill to construct a third powerhouse at Grand Coulee Dam. We need this powerhouse if we are to assure the continued industrial growth of Washington State.

Third. We hope to get final House approval for the legislation sponsored by Senator JACKSON and myself to establish a national historical park on San Juan Island at the site of the famous Pig War.

Fourth. Northwest industries are facing a crisis that has been getting worse for 20 years. Washington does not have enough railroad freight cars to ship our products—particularly plywood—to markets throughout the United States. Legislation to overcome the boxcar shortage has been blocked repeatedly. But now only final House action is needed on a bill cosponsored by Senator MAGNUSON and myself. This legislation will encourage the railroads to purchase new boxcars and to speed the return of existing empty cars to the Northwest.

Fifth. Congress will be considering a measure to extend the GI bill of rights to our cold war veterans. The original GI bill helped me and thousands of others to get through college. This opportunity should be offered to servicemen who may be called upon to sacrifice their jobs, to leave their families, and even to give their lives for our country.

Sixth. We must assure the jobs and profits of small mills. I am continuing to meet with officials of the Small Business Administration and the Forest Service and with local businessmen in order to find new ways of assuring an adequate supply of raw materials for our forest products industries.

Seventh. A project on which there is a "must" priority is the North Cross-State Highway. Senator MAGNUSON, Senator JACKSON, and I are working to get the necessary funds to complete this vital and scenic road.

MY RECORD AND OUR RESPONSIBILITY

The key to effective representation is attendance and participation during the debates and voting. In 1965 the House of Representatives had 201 rollcalls. I was present and voting at 199, an attendance record of 99 percent.

The honor of working for you in Congress demands more than just being present and voting. There must be a partnership in public affairs. This year I have made 11 trips home and have met with people in every county of the Second Congressional District. It is always a pleasure and a great help for me to confer here and at home with businessmen, labor officials, workers, veterans, educators, mayors, county officials, dairymen, students, loggers, fishermen, and interested citizens. Your letters are greatly appreciated, and I trust you have found my reports to be informative.

Reporter Bill Prochnau, of the Seattle Times, has termed the 1st session of the 89th Congress as "the most productive in decades." This enacted legislation will benefit people in Washington State. We have made these accomplishments because we all share the responsibility for a stronger and wiser America. With your help, I am continuing to work for the United States, for the Second District, and for you.

Address of Postmaster Lawrence F. O'Brien

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following:

ADDRESS BY LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN, POSTMASTER GENERAL, TO POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES

I have asked you to assemble here today—my first working day as Postmaster General—to make a commitment to you:

A promise that beginning here and now, I join with you to devote all of my energies toward providing the best possible postal service for the Nation.

Better service to the American people will be the overriding goal of my administration.

We will spend the taxpayers' money wisely, frugally, while fulfilling our mission to deliver the mail on time and in good condition.

We will consider each one of our 600,000 employees as a partner in improving the postal service and with our employee organizations we will strive for the best working conditions and salaries.

I ask those of you in this hall today and those of you who have joined us across the country in our regional offices to carry that message from me to every member of the postal family.

When President Johnson gave me this assignment, he told me that I would be moving from an 18-hour-a-day job of searching for votes to a 24-hour-a-day job of delivering the mail.

My responsibilities are clear.

A responsibility to administer the Post Office Department in the most progressive, most efficient, most economical way possible.

And a responsibility to give our citizens the quality of service they need and deserve.

The President insists that we strive for excellence in the postal service—nothing less.

After I leave this office, I want to look back upon my term as Postmaster General with a sense of satisfaction in having applied the best business practices to one of the most vital Government services.

To do this, I need your cooperation and I need your loyalty.

My predecessors, John Gronouski and Ed Day, have accomplished a great deal in the last 5 years and we can be proud of the really significant contributions they made.

Ambassador Gronouski, who now goes from delivering the mail to delivering the peace, has told me that I am joining one of the finest organizations in the land and I know he is right. He has told me of the excellence of the managers we have here in Washington, in our regions, and in our local post offices. He has told me of the great army of workers in our nearly 40,000 installations.

Wherever I go in the United States, he said, I will have friends, because there will always be a post office close by.

I take great comfort in this and in turn I want you to know that you have a friend in Washington.

You have a friend who wants your ideas and your suggestions on how we can make our service better than it has even been. You are the people who will make my administration successful. You have the experience and the know-how.

I know that the problems we face are great and that our mission is important. The postal service touches the lives of every one of our citizens. It has a profound effect upon the economy of our Nation. And it is experiencing an incomparable rate of growth.

The fact that mail volume is increasing at an unprecedented rate is something we should welcome because it means that the economy of the Nation is strong. I need not tell you that 80 percent of the 72 billion pieces of mail this year is generated by business.

The unprecedented period of prosperity our Nation is experiencing has given the postal service its greatest challenge. The old ways of moving the mail will no longer suffice. The traditional concepts must give way to modern technology and we must plan today for even greater challenges 10 or 20 or even 50 years from now.

Since 1961, under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, the postal service has made amazing progress. While I was in the White House, I had a close working relationship with the Department. I know that the last 5 years have been filled with change and innovation. But there were many prior years of indecision and aimless drifting to overcome.

Recently, I noted an article in the October issue of the Postal Record, the magazine of the National Association of Letter Carriers. The article discussed our ZIP code program and the new network of sectional centers.

"The Post Office Department is the largest business * * * in the world," it said. "Every change in its operation affects every business and every individual in the country in one way or another. The responsibility involved in effecting major changes is enormous. For this reason, postal administrations for many decades were absolutely resistant to even the most obvious improvements."

And then the article concluded:

"The administration of the past 5 years must be congratulated on its courage and imagination in undertaking such massive programs aimed at improving the service. Time will tell whether or not these changes accomplish what is hoped for them."

Ladies and gentlemen of the postal service, I ask you to join with me in proving that we can innovate, that we can modernize, that we can administer this vast organization with efficiency and skill.

We will not allow any special interest groups to turn back the clock on progress in the Post Office Department. We will always be guided by what is best for the American public and not by what is best for individuals or groups with axes to grind.

I want and I need the continued cooperation of the business mailers. We are well aware that many mailers in recent years have made sacrifices of time and money in behalf of better postal service. The investment will bring dividends for all of us.

I want and I need both the loyalty and the constructive criticism of our employee organizations. Our employees have benefited greatly since President Kennedy's Executive order provided for recognition of postal unions and I am totally committed to that policy.

I want and I need the continued friendship and the help of our friends in Congress—in both Houses and on both sides of the aisle. We will work together and I will consult frequently with them on legislation and other matters that are important to their constituents and important to the postal service.

One of the most satisfying thoughts to me as I take on this assignment is that I need not start from the beginning. The framework is already built.

The ZIP code program and the 552 sectional centers give us the opportunity to make dramatic improvements in mail service. With the cooperation of the public and the business mailers, we will have the most modern, most efficient method of routing and distributing mail of any postal system in the world.

With the optical scanner and other advances in mechanization, we will be able to keep pace with the continually growing volume of mail.

With proper planning and with the necessary legislation, we will be able to provide a new class of priority mail that will be delivered overnight almost anywhere in the country. The artificial distinctions between first class and air mail will be abandoned.

With real dedication to the cause of equal employment, we will make certain that no one is denied a job or a promotion in the postal service because of his race, his creed, or the color of his skin.

With proper direction and emphasis from headquarters, we can make use of all of the talents of our 34,000 postmasters to be managers in a real sense.

We can achieve these goals. We can take pride in working for one of the finest service organizations anywhere. Let us continue our effort to do the best possible job for the people we serve.

You have the blueprint for the future. Together, we will make it a reality.

Thank you.

Record of the 1st Session of the 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to serve in Congress as the Representative of more than 500,000 persons who live in the Third Congressional District of New Jersey which is comprised of Monmouth and Ocean Counties.

As a former schoolteacher and school principal, I am a strong believer in homework and report cards. For that reason I plan to contact almost every person in my district through the mails and ask them to write me and grade the work we have done in the 1st session of the 89th Congress. The people who have given us the privilege of serving them in Congress certainly should be provided with a full report of our activities.

The 89th Congress has been referred to as the "Education Congress" because of its legislation in this field. Basic to our democratic way of life and to our national future is the principle that every American child is entitled to as much education as he wants and can usefully absorb. I am sure most of my colleagues will agree that ability to learn, rather than ability to pay, must be the standard of educational opportunity.

As a freshman Member of the House, it was my good fortune to be assigned to the House Committee on Public Works as well as several of its important subcommittees. I say fortunate because this committee assignment is not only extremely important for my district but it also has given me the opportunity to learn under some of the most able men in this great body.

I sought an assignment to the Public Works Committee because its scope of operations, I felt, deals most directly with the needs of my district. For instance, the Water Quality Act of 1965, which I was proud to cosponsor, is aimed at ending pollution in the streams and rivers throughout the Nation. The people of my district are vitally concerned about water pollution and they have expressed overwhelming support of this measure.

Another measure which was sponsored by the House Public Works Committee and approved by the Congress was the omnibus rivers and harbors bill. This bill included approval of a $8 million inlet across the Sandy Hook Peninsula. Another item included in this bill should help alleviate the problems of the obnoxious weeds along the Metedeconk River in Ocean County. Congress voted a $5 million study of this problem which has harmed fishing, swimming, and other outdoor sports in many areas of the Nation.

Those residents of the shore area who suffered financial damage during the 1962 storm can attest to the importance of an insurance program which would cover losses caused by such a disaster. I introduced a bill in the House which instructs the Federal Government to investigate how such an insurance program can be operated. That bill is now law. My bill will determine whether the Federal Government can assist private insurance companies in providing such insurance protection at a reasonable cost.

Mr. Speaker, the first session of the 89th Congress has accomplished much. As the New York Times said in a recent editorial:

> The 89th Congress, nearing the end of its 1st session, has been the best Congress since World War II.

President Johnson, in describing this first session of the Congress, said:

> From your committees and both your Houses have come the greatest outpouring of creative legislation in the history of this Nation.

From those who oppose the work of the Congress we hear the term "rubber stamp." Mr. Speaker, if these people mean we were rubberstamps when we approved such legislation as medicare, then I urge all of my colleagues to plead guilty. This legislation affects more than 61,000 people in my district and I was glad to give it my support.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that those who hurl the rubber stamp charges must disagree with other legislation we passed such as the excise tax cut, the Immigration Act amendments and the voting rights bill. I, for one, feel confident that the people who elected me to office would be greatly disappointed if I became sensitive to rubber stamp charges and opposed these worthwhile and necessary programs.

At this point I place in the Record a list of major bills which I supported and which were approved by the 1st session of the 89th Congress. In doing so I feel it will give my more than half million constituents an opportunity to study the legislation we have passed and comment on what they feel also should be done in the 2d session of the 89th Congress:

Medicare and social security amendments: Provides hospitalization, surgical, and nursing home care for persons 65 years and older, financed through the social security system: increases social security benefits, retroactive to January 1, 1965, and makes other liberalizing changes in social security law.

Elementary-secondary education: Provides Federal grant program to improve elementary and secondary education under local control, with bulk of aid for school districts where there are large numbers of children from poverty-stricken families.

Excise tax reduction: Provides excise tax cuts totaling $4.7 billion on various consumer items such as appliances, telephone service, autos, and so forth; eliminates most Federal excises by 1969.

Omnibus Housing Act: Expands current urban renewal, public housing programs, extends FHA loan insurance program, encourages urban planning and beautification in housing; provides new rent supplement program for certain low- and moderate-income families.

Voting rights: Strengthens machinery for guaranteeing right to vote to all citizens by prohibiting poll taxes, literacy tests; provides for Federal registrars in States where less than 50 percent of potential voters are registered or voted.

Public works and economic development: Provides expanded program of grants and loans to communities for public works, development facilities, and other projects intended to aid economically depressed areas.

Water pollution control: Expands water pollution control program, grants for waste treatment plant construction; strengthens Federal enforcement authority to clean up our rivers and streams.

Department of Housing and Urban Affairs: Establishes a new Cabinet-level department to administer programs affecting the 70 percent of our population that now resides in metropolitan areas.

Omnibus farm program: Improves and extends feed grain, wheat, dairy, and cotton programs, encourages cropland retirement, bolsters farm income.

Immigration Act amendments: Abolishes discriminatory national origins quota system over 3-year period; establishes a 170,000 annual limit on immigrants, special preferences given to relatives of American citizens.

Appalachian regional development: Authorizes comprehensive State-Federal program to assist in the development of the economically depressed, 11-State Appalachian region.

Manpower development and training: Extends and expands manpower training program to assist unemployed in learning new skills to qualify them for better jobs.

Higher education: Authorizes expanded 5-year program to assist colleges and universities to improve educational opportunities; provides student loan and scholarship to aid needy students.

Economic opportunity program: Increases authorization for antipoverty program, makes other improvements in the operation of various parts of the war on poverty.

Military pay increase: Provides an average 10.4-percent pay increase for some 4.2 million uniformed personnel of the Armed Forces, effective September 1, 1965—2.7 million on active duty, 1 million reservists, 500,000 retired.

Regional medical centers: Authorizes 3-year program of Federal grants to plan and develop a series of regional medical programs to fight heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

Arts and humanities: Creates a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities to assist and foster broad cultural programs in art, music, films, ballet, and so forth.

Health professions education: Extends and expands program of construction grants to medical, dental, and other similar educational institutions; establishes new program of scholarship grants for needy students, increases student loan program.

Presidential continuity: Adopted proposed amendment to the Constitution to establish procedure to permit Vice President to become Acting President if the President is unable to perform his duties; provides for filling the vacancy of the office of Vice President.

Congressional organization: Created a joint committee to study the organization and operation of Congress and to make recommendations to improve and streamline the work of Congress.

Health research facilities: Provides for extension of program to construct health research facilities; establishes three new Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare to administer expanded programs in this area.

Community health services: Extends programs for public health services providing vaccinations, immunization, other preventive treatment of diseases, migrant health clinics, and grants to States for general health services.

Mental health services: Provides for initial staffing grants for personnel serving in community mental health centers.

Drug controls: Expands Federal control over certain depressant and stimulant drugs to reduce the illegal use of these dangerous drugs that affect the central nervous system.

Older Americans: Establishes new Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop programs to assist the aged.

Juvenile delinquency: Extends present law to assist communities in the development of new programs to prevent or control juvenile delinquency and youth crime.

Water resources development: Extends and broadens research program of converting saline water; another new law provides grants to States for the coordination of water resources planning and development; another new law establishes a grant program to assist in development of water supply and sewage disposal facilities in rural areas; a separate program was authorized to plan a water supply system for the northeastern part of the country.

Air pollution: Establishes machinery for controlling motor vehicle air pollutants, accelerates air pollution research program, creates new program to find methods of disposing of solid wastes.

Highway beautification: Provides for gradual control over billboards, signs, and so forth, along Federal-aided highways of the interstate and primary systems; offers incentive grants for improvement of scenic areas along such highways.

Federal pay: Provides salary increase for Federal classified and postal employees, attempting to achieve more equitable relationship with pay of employees in private industry; makes other fringe benefits in pay and overtime allowances.

High-speed rapid transit: Authorizes 3-year program of research and demonstration projects for development of high-speed intercity railroad transportation.

State technical services: Establishes new 3-year program of Federal-State-local technical cooperation to provide technical service centers to disseminate findings of scientific and technological importance to commerce and industry.

Retired Government employees: Provides for cost-of-living increases in annuities to retired employees of Federal Government.

Vocational training: Expands vocational rehabilitation program to aid disabled persons; another new program provides Federal loan insurance to high school graduates to finance tuition at business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools.

Additional Aid to Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a letter which I have sent to the Secretary of State protesting the possible grant of surplus foods to Egypt.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of recurring reports that our Government contemplates granting Egypt's request for surplus foods, I would like to add my voice to those who feel that an affirmative decision at this time would be most unwise.

The proponents of food sales to Egypt maintain that it increases our influence in the Middle East. According to their theory, we acquire more "leverage" in Cairo by making the Egyptian Government dependent on or, at least, appreciative of our good will. But history makes clear that the theory is faulty. After years and years of dealing with the Egyptians, it appears incontrovertible that the more generous we are to them the more hostile they become to us and to our Middle Eastern policies.

By selling food to Egypt for soft currency, we allow the Cairo government to divert its resources to stir up trouble. It uses its arable land to grow not food for its people but cotton which it sells to the Russians and rice which it sells to the Chinese. It then uses the hard currency it acquires to buy arms with which to threaten peaceful neighbors. Our aid enhances Nasser's strength and his prestige at home and abroad. Our programs have clearly helped to perpetuate his power. Since it now seems at its lowest ebb since Suez, I feel it would be particularly shortsighted to renew our assistance program at the current juncture.

I, of course, have no desire to see Egyptians starve. But Egypt has substantial resources for raising its own food which go unused. I would not object if the money it acquired through our largess were diverted to raising living standards at home, helping to resolve the Arab refugee program, or on other peaceful and constructive projects.

I would suggest that if we must, for humanitarian reasons, extend aid to Egypt, it should be clearly contingent on their accepting such conditions as the following:

1. Initiation of peace talks with Israel.
2. Halting of arms purchases from the U.S.S.R.
3. Embarkation on a regional program of controlled disarmament.
4. Ending discrimination in the use of the Suez Canal.
5. Development of a program to resettle Arab refugees in Arab lands.
6. Restriction of trade with China to nonstrategic items.

I propose, as you see, that we use our food shipments as an instrument for the promotion of peace. They are now being used to increase Egypt's power to wage war.

As you know, Congress has expressed itself forthrightly against aid to Egypt. The President has been empowered to overrule Congress by demonstrating a compelling reason for resuming the aid program. You have not thus far given any such reason. In the absence of new data to indicate that Egypt has adopted a peace program, I feel it would be ludicrous to acquiesce in the Egyptian request. I heartily recommend its rejection.

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
Member of Congress.

"Vietnam Hearings: Voices From the Grass Roots"—Reports Congressman Kastenmeier's Hearings in Madison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the transcript of hearings on Vietnam held in Madison by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] is now available at bookstores as a small paperback called "Vietnam Hearings: Voices From the Grass Roots."

The hearings come to life as we read the calm, reasoned statement of an expert on southeast Asia, the more dramatic quotation from Dr. Dooley's book "Deliver Us From Evil," and the measured logic of an historian. Fifty witnesses testified to their own ideas or the positions of the organizations they represented.

His constituents are clearly proud to have the opportunity to discuss with their Congressman this vital topic. His own feelings are reflected in a postscript:

> Those having concern for the vitality of democracy should be encouraged by the hearings as I was. Government by discussion has provided the strength needed to meet past crises and new means, whether in the form of these hearings or some other, will be developed to bring this strength to bear on future challenges and crises.

An editorial quoted on the back cover of the pocket book deserves repeating:

> New York Times, August 14, 1965: "The notion that free discussion must be a casualty of the Vietnamese war impresses us as much

more destructive of American values than any viewpoint that might be set forth at the hearings. We hope more Congressmen will hold them as a demonstration of democratic vitality."

Congressman KASTENMEIER is to be congratulated for letting us share his experience through the pages of this book.

Financial General's Olmsted Predicts That Stockholders Will Benefit From Divestiture Under Holding Company Law—His Statement Puts Lie to Argument That Illegal Bank Mergers Must Be Forgiven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Financial General Corp. is a $1 billion-plus financial holding company owning, among many other companies, 26 banks with 104 main offices and branches in 6 States and the District of Columbia.

In 1956, Congress enacted the Bank Holding Company Act because of the apparent necessity to control the quickening pace of concentration in banking through expansion of holding companies as well as through mergers. Unfortunately, a House-passed bill to tighten up provisions in the antitrust laws applying to asset acquisitions by banks died in the Senate. Furthermore, although the holding company law was a broadly supported, bipartisan measure, it was shot through with serious loopholes. President Eisenhower in signing the 1956 act stated that removing the exemptions would require the further attention of Congress.

Included among the exemptions was the loophole enjoyed by Financial General all these years, permitting it to escape meeting standards and abiding by the same rules applicable to other bank holding companies.

The Banking and Currency Committee, of which I have the privilege of being chairman, conducted hearings during the summer on H.R. 7372, a bill part of a legislative package to plug the important loopholes in the act. H.R. 7372 would remove the exemption of Financial General as well as approximately 275 other investment companies. H.R. 7371 which passed the House on September 23, included a provision having the same effect as H.R. 7372.

In testifying against H.R. 7372 before our Domestic Finance Subcommittee last July, Mr. George Olmsted, of Financial General, claimed that the bill was punitive legislation aimed at Financial General's stockholders, policyholders, depositors, and customers. He stated that requiring Financial General to become a bank holding company and divest itself of its nonbanking enterprises would have a "harsh effect upon innocent investors."

Personally, I never agreed with this argument and I am glad to see that upon further study, Mr. Olmsted no longer feels that his stockholders will suffer from divestiture. A recent issue of Investors Reader, published by a large investment firm, quoted Olmsted as explaining that "several tickets will be worth more than one." He predicted that the "breakup value" of the company will be $35 per share whereas the firm's stock is now traded on the exchange at about $14 per share.

Although the broad public interest must always be Congress' first consideration, I am glad that Financial General's stockholders will not be harmed by plugging this serious loophole in the law. Mr. Olmsted's prediction would also seem to be applicable to several illegal bank mergers which the courts have ordered dissolved. In fact, it is probably a much more simple matter to sell off a number of small branches as has been ordered in the Manufacturers-Hanover merger decision than it would be for Financial General to divest itself of entire companies. Furthermore, it would be no more of an inconvenience to the stockholders, depositors, and customers of Manufacturers-Hanover for that bank to "demerge" as it was in 1961, when the two banks merged in the first place. Certainly, such alleged inconveniences are not grounds for enactment of S. 1698, a very unwise and even dangerous bill to weaken our antimerger laws.

Activities of Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere pleasure to call to the attention of the House the accomplishments of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries during the 1st session of the 89th Congress. The committee has produced a record of activity which is outstanding in comparison with those of most others in recent years.

This past year has brought many challenges to the committee, especially with the illness of our beloved chairman, HERBERT C. BONNER, early in the session. However, accepting its responsibility, the members through their cooperative efforts, carried on magnificently and I, as acting chairman, am delighted to point to a solid record of real accomplishment. I sincerely feel that the work done by this important committee has been most constructive.

During the first session, the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine carried on its traditional role of striving to strengthen the American Merchant Marine better to enable it to serve the national interests in its dual capacity as a vital link in our transportation system and as a military and naval auxiliary in readiness for emergencies.

Perhaps one of the most significant pieces of legislation reported out of the committee was the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1965, considered by the Subcommittee on Oceanography. This legislation would provide for the first time the development, encouragement and maintenance of a comprehensive, long-range and coordinated national program in marine sciences. Similar legislation providing for a national oceanographic program passed the House in the last Congress, but failed to receive action in the Senate.

Other matters of considerable importance were considered by the Subcommittees on Panama Canal, Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, and Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Navigation.

In the close of the committee's activities, forcible attention has been brought to the needs of reviewing the effectiveness of the present maritime education institutions in meeting the manning problems of the merchant marine and the curriculum designed to keep pace with industry technology, such as automation. Accordingly, a Special Subcommittee on Marine Education and Training was appointed and the subcommittee is expected to commence its investigation and study early in the second session of this Congress.

I have attempted to mention only some of the highlights of the constructive record of the first session. A detailed activity report is now being prepared by the committee staff and will be printed later.

Finally, I wish to take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks to all of the members of the committee on both sides who gave so generously of their time to carry forth the committee's programs.

Government Should Guard Constitutional Rights of Accused

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, recently there have been questions raised about certain aspects of the Justice Department's case against James Hoffa, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. Specifically, concern has been voiced about the apparent cloak of immunity that has been draped over Edward Grady Partin, admitted informer in the case, who, according to reports, has been granted several considerations that go beyond what is expected in the normal administration of justice.

Without commenting on the substantive issue of Mr. Hoffa's guilt or innocence, concern has centered around the Government's action toward and relationship with Mr. Partin. Surely, it is reasonable to expect the Government to conduct itself in the highest manner so there is no question about the infringement of constitutional rights. If guilt is proven it should be done so in a way which is consistent with our legal precepts and constitutional framework.

In any event, our system of justice should not be deprecated for the sake of the Government obtaining a conviction against an individual, no matter how controversial that person may be.

Congressman Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Reports to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, once again I have the privilege of reporting to my neighbors and constituents in the 10th District on accomplishments of this past session of Congress and on my work as their Representative.

This has been a unique year, and in fact the most productive session since I came to Congress in 1949. We have implemented approximately 85 percent of the specific legislative goals of the Democratic platform which the people of the Nation so overwhelmingly endorsed in the 1964 election. This Congress has thus kept faith with the American people and has responded amply to President Johnson's call for a Great Society. I am proud to have had a part in achieving what the President has called "the greatest outpouring of creative legislation in the history of the Nation." For in my assignment as assistant majority whip and a member of the House Steering Committee which works with the Speaker and the White House on legislative programs, I have had a heavy responsibility in participating in decisions of our House leadership on legislative prospects and scheduling.

It has always been my policy to weigh every issue with care and objectivity, for I consider myself the representative of all the people of the 10th District, regardless of political affiliation. And this I have adhered to in considering legislation during this session. I have had differences of opinion on some measures, on their provisions, priority, or procedure. But in the end, I believe the bills I supported constitute constructive approaches to solving the myriad problems, many so long neglected that they are matters of crisis, which now confront us all.

THE INTERNATIONAL AREA: FOREIGN POLICY AND DEFENSE

During this 1st session of the 89th Congress we have had foreign policy problems of considerable concern. Throughout this time of world turmoil, however, we were able to carry on our basic policy of seeking world peace while maintaining our strength. We have fulfilled our commitments to free nations seeking to resist Communist aggression; we have worked for an end to the arms race and proliferation of nuclear weapons; and we have sustained efforts of the United Nations to prevent conflicts and achieve diplomatic settlements of disputes. The cease-fire in the India-Pakistan conflict which threatened world peace is a cogent example. In the Caribbean, Castro's Cuba has been increasingly isolated. And the success of our policy is evidenced by the exodus of so many Cubans. In Santo Domingo, our initiative, together with forces of the Organization of American States, has prevented the spread of communism in this hemisphere.

Vietnam is, of course, still our major crisis in the international area. Faced by the growing threat of the Vietcong and heavy infiltration of North Vietnamese troops, we supported an increased U.S. role in the struggle. The wisdom of this decision has been sustained by the course of events.

Our actions in Vietnam serve notice that we intend to stand by our commitments to liberty and prevent the spread of communism in this area of key importance. But at the same time, as President Johnson has firmly and repeatedly stated, we are constantly seeking a negotiated solution leading to a workable peace beneficial for all southeast Asia.

To support our effort in Vietnam and our servicemen there, specific legislative measures were enacted: First, a $700 million appropriation for essential construction and materiel; second, an automatic insurance plan for servicemen on active duty, the bulk of which will be underwritten by the Prudential Insurance Co. centered in Newark; and third, free mailing privileges for servicemen in combat areas. And the military pay bill, providing an average increase of 10.4 percent, will benefit all members of our armed services. These were all measures I strongly supported, and they have in my judgment increased both the scope and effectiveness of our military capability.

This Congress, while fulfilling its proper role in matters affecting our national security and foreign relations, has also compiled a magnificent record in meeting the challenges at home.

As a senior member of the Judiciary Committee I have been privileged to take an active role in winning approval of two major measures of importance to the Nation which have also been issues of long concern to me.

VOTING RIGHTS

Since 1960 we have made notable progress in the area of civil rights. But it remained for this Congress to pass the basic legislation necessary to guarantee for all our people the right to vote. This landmark measure will wipe out the century-old obstacles to exercise of the franchise promised our Negro citizens in the 15th amendment to the Constitution. I again had the rewarding task of authoring the report on this vital bill, which should enable Negro Americans to walk openly and without fear to the polling booth.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Ever since I came to Congress I have sought to improve our outdated and discriminatory immigration system, and with passage of the administration bill, which I cosponsored, we have at long last done justice to American humanity and conscience. We have abolished the odious national origins quota system. Now we will have an enlightened and fair policy placing emphasis on the reunification of families and on the admission of immigrants with special skills beneficial to our economy or who can fill labor shortages. The bill at the same time includes protective provisions to insure that immigration will not jeopardize the jobs of American workers. Finally we have an immigration policy in keeping with our Nation's ideals and traditions, one which does not ask "Where do you come from?" but "What can you bring to America?"

Other significant measures which our Judiciary Committee developed are the bills: First, providing a method to deal with the difficult problem of Presidential inability and succession. This measure, ending more than 176 years of uncertainty, now awaits ratification by the States; second, making it a Federal crime to kill, kidnap, or assault the President. This has become law; and third, establishing Federal standards for congressional redistricting, to carry out the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision. This measure has passed the House but still needs Senate action.

Our committee also had a heavy burden of other measures. For of the approximately 14,000 legislative proposals introduced in the House, or referred by the Senate, my committee received 38.5 percent for consideration, a very heavy proportion when one realizes there are 20 standing House committees. A number of these were private bills for the relief of individuals who suffered hardships under present law through no fault of their own.

MEDICARE AND OTHER MEASURES FOR OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

After long years of effort, this Congress enacted the medicare bill for our older Americans. As a cosponsor of the original bill, I was pleased that we not only approved the basic provisions for hospital and related benefits through the social security system, but also developed a supplementary voluntary program to cover doctor bills and certain other medical expenses. The struggle for this program was long, arduous, and often bitter. But the final result is a sound system by which Americans, during their working years, can assure themselves of dignity and security during their retirement years.

Another important step toward recognition of the role of our older citizens in our society was approval of a bill I had long sponsored to create a separate governmental agency devoted to the problems of our senior citizens. With establishment of the administration on aging we will have one agency where all programs affecting our older people can be effectively guided, coordinated and implemented.

The medicare bill also included an essential 7-percent increase in social security benefits and other provisions to help the indigent aged, needy children, the disabled and the blind. Other measures approved to aid many of our older people increase Federal retirement annuities and eliminate the restriction on dual spouse benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act.

EDUCATION: INVESTMENT IN THE FUTURE

Giant strides in education were made in the last session. At all levels we enacted legislation to meet the urgent needs of our youth and the Nation in our increasingly complex and technological society.

The Elementary and Secondary Act authorizes over a billion dollars for the first year of a grant program to improve schools, with the bulk of this aid going to local school districts with large concentrations of poverty-stricken children.

The Higher Education Act builds upon existing programs by authorizing Federal scholarships for needy students, guarantees for loans and expansion of the work-study program. It also establishes a National Teachers Corps to help improve educational opportunities for disadvantaged children. To make sure facilities will be available, the bill doubles authorized funds for construction and provides special help for college libraries and less developed colleges.

Vocational-school loans is a fine new program providing insured low-interest loans to students entering post-high-school business, trade, technical, and other vocational education schools.

The National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities was approved to provide aid for individuals and groups to stimulate and support the creative talent of our Nation, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill.

HEALTH

Accomplishments of this session in the field of health are widespread, with help for Americans from the cradle to the sunset of life. In addition to the medicare bill, we approved a number of major and minor bills to meet our Nation's complex and growing health needs.

Water and air pollution control: These problems are especially acute in New Jersey, the most urbanized State in the Union, and for years I have sponsored and strongly advocated legislation to solve them. The Clean Air Act will require standards and regulations to control motor vehicle pollution and also establish a grant research program to develop improved solid waste disposal methods. The Water Quality Act, which I introduced, provides for establishing purity standards and for their enforcement on interstate waters and expands the program of grants for sewage treatment plant construction. To implement the program, the act also creates a new Water Pollution Control Administration.

Another major health bill which I sponsored will extend the construction and student loan programs for medical and other health professions and expand them by authorizing a scholarship program for needy students and aid to improve the quality of teaching in health professional schools.

Of importance to all Americans is the bold new program of grants to institutions to plan, establish, and operate regional medical programs to fight the major killing and crippling diseases—heart, cancer, and stroke. Another major bill authorizes grants for the initial personnel needed to staff the vitally essential community mental health centers approved in the 88th Congress.

In addition to these major new programs, we enacted a number of other health bills, ranging from that improving controls over depressant and stimulant drugs to extension of the vaccination program.

ECONOMIC GROWTH AND THE FIGHT AGAINST POVERTY

This Congress has approved several measures which will, I believe, improve the lives of literally millions of people in the Nation and contribute to the health and growth of our economy.

The antipoverty program was doubled to create new and to expand existing opportunities for young people to obtain work, education, and training and to provide community action and adult education programs.

Also approved was a comprehensive 5-year program of grants and loans for public works and development/technical aid for economically depressed areas throughout the country. The bill includes authority for multicounty and multistate planning through regional commissions. And we also approved the essential bill geared specifically to rehabilitation of the long-depressed Appalachian region.

I was particularly heartened by the extension and improvement of the manpower development and training program, which has been of such value to New Jersey. I anticipate it will continue to benefit our State, with its highly varied and complex industrial structure.

TAXATION AND AID TO SMALL BUSINESS

One of the long-proposed moves to stimulate our economy and aid business was the bill eliminating excise taxes. Most were eliminated last July, while the remaining few will be completely wiped out by 1969.

This and other measures I have already mentioned will help to create the kind of dynamic climate needed to help business and industry flourish. In addition, some specific measures became law to aid small business: the maturity of SBA disaster loans is increased from 20 to 30 years, with discretionary authority to suspend for up to 5 years payment of the principal and interest; the SBA revolving fund was increased by $120 million; and the portion of the revolving fund which may be on loan to small business investment corporations was also increased by this amount.

I had the privilege of presiding when the House debated another important bill, the State Technical Services Act. Under this act, $60 million over a 3-year period is authorized for matching grants to States which establish technical service programs to provide business and industry with the latest scientific and technological information.

As ranking member of the Judiciary Special Subcommittee on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce, I had the opportunity to expedite and introduce legislation developed as a result of our 4-year study of this complex problem. It was introduced on the last day of the session so all interested individuals and governments can study it before the hearings I will press for early next session. The bill should achieve a more orderly and equitable method for States taxing businesses which sell across State lines, and I believe it will benefit both business and the States.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND THEIR CONSERVATION

In the last several years we have made great progress in preserving our dwindling natural resources throughout the Nation. I am particularly glad to report that three new bills will create recreational and historic areas close to people in northeastern New Jersey. Across from Jersey City, the Liberty National Monument will be developed on Ellis Island, with special attention to its role as the threshold to America for so many immigrants. Within a day's drive, there will be developed around the Tocks Island Dam a magnificent recreational asset in the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. Down the Atlantic coast, off Maryland and Virginia, the Assateague National Seashore will be available to residents of the Northeast. And the new highway beautification bill, providing for control of billboards and junkyards and aid for landscaping, will transform many ugly highways into roadsides of charm and beauty.

Water: Beyond a doubt, this priceless resource loomed greatest among resource conservation needs for the 10th District and the entire Northeastern United States. We faced, and will in the future, a water shortage problem. But several vital measures enacted in the last session will bring all feasible efforts of the Federal Government to bear on the problem.

When the crisis developed, as dean of the New Jersey congressional delegation I called a bipartisan meeting, and as chairman of an ad hoc committee formed, we investigated all possible sources of relief. As a result of our study, and fine cooperation from governmental agencies and the White House, I developed an amendment which was approved as part of the omnibus public works bill. This will authorize a system of reservoirs and conveyance facilities in the Northeast.

In addition to the Water Quality Act, which should help make now unusable water fit for varied uses, we also expanded and extended the saline water conversion program. This is a promising effort which I have advocated for some time, both here and also internationally, as a member of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference Scientific and Technical Committee.

URBAN AFFAIRS AND DEVELOPMENT

Many measures I have previously mentioned, ranging from air pollution control to manpower retraining, are, of course, of special interest to urban areas, such as our heavily congested 10th District. There are in addition several of immediate impact.

We have now established a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development, a bill I have introduced and long advocated. For the first time we have recognized that America is rapidly becoming an urban society. With concentration of urban problems in one department, we can begin to effectively attack and solve the mounting problems of our cities and suburbs.

The omnibus housing bill expands the urban renewal, elderly, and public housing programs, and extends the FHA loan insurance program, all of which have meant so much to our district and State. It also assists urban planning and open-space preservation and authorizes community facility grants for basic needs such as sewage treatment works. The bill also provides an imaginative new program for rent supplements for certain low-income families. These programs, coordinated by the new Department, should help turn back the tide and revitalize our decaying older cities.

Mass transportation has been a chronic problem for our State, and with passage of a new rapid transit research bill we hope to develop an effective solution to this problem which plagues the entire Northeast.

VETERANS

Measures of importance to our veterans were approved last session. One measure increases service-connected disability compensation benefits and the related additional allowances an average of 10 percent; another provides for a realistic cost-of-living increase in subsistence allowances paid to disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation training.

Two issues of special interest to New Jersey veterans are the need for expansion of the Beverly National Cemetery and veterans' hospital facilities. I will continue to work closely with the State in seeking from the Army Department a feasible solution to the Beverly Cemetery situation. Earlier I introduced a bill requiring that additional beds be made available at the East Orange hospital, and I am glad to say Congress approved this session a resolution urging an increased bed capacity for all veterans hospitals.

THE WORK AHEAD

Despite the phenomenal record of this past session, there is still work to be done. In the labor area, still pending are the measures to increase and expand the minimum wage, to improve the unemployment compensation program, and repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which has been used to lure industry to move from New Jersey. Home rule for the District of Columbia, revision of our copyright laws, and a fair but effective firearms control bill still remain to be acted upon.

I shall also continue to work for several bills of my own. Particularly, I shall press for my bill to establish a Foreign Service Academy to give us a pool of highly skilled and trained talent to represent us abroad; for income tax deductions for the disabled for expenses of transportation to work; and a tax deduction for expenses of higher education. Also urgently needed is action to combat the narcotics problem and to curb the dissemination of obscene literature. I have introduced legislation to provide aid for hospital facilities for the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts and to increase the penalties for mailing and distribution of obscene materials. These will be of high priority on my legislative program next session.

This recital of legislative activity is necessarily restricted to a summary of the most important actions of the last session. But it indicates without doubt an extraordinary record of solid achievement by an industrious Congress working with an energetic President for the national benefit.

As in previous years, the Speaker appointed me a representative of the House to two international bodies: the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference. The former deals with problems of refugees and their resettlement, as well as ordinary immigration among free world nations. The NATO group deals with policy matters affecting the security and economic and political progress and development not only of the NATO nations themselves, but also that of the emerging nations of the world.

Despite the heavy burden of legislative work, I also spent considerable time providing assistance whenever possible to residents of the 10th District in expediting or clarifying personal problems they encountered in dealing with governmental agencies. It continues to be my desire to be of all possible service and help to people, either through my district office in Newark or my Washington office. So please call upon me whenever I can be of help or whenever you have views or suggestions on legislative issues.

Labor-Management Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, when it is closely analyzed, the debate over 14(b) is almost like a tempest in a teapot.

So far as the people of our great State of Massachusetts are concerned, the issue could be defined as quite academic, because the right-to-work law does not prevail in our State, and in general we enjoy markedly favorable, friendly relations between labor and management.

One of the most priceless and precious possessions of our American society is, of course, that the humblest citizen of our land has the right to be respected in his person and in his contractual agreements.

If there were truly a right to work and a right to a job, it would be a great boon to the many who are unable to find suitable jobs even in times of prosperity.

In the more ideal society toward which we are aspiring, perhaps this right to work in the true sense may be guaranteed, but this right certainly has no reference to and certainly should not be confused with the claim urged by the opponents that any worker on his own motion and for his own reasons should have the right to interfere with or break up a valid existing contract freely and voluntarily entered into between an overwhelming majority of workers and their employers outlining the wages, hours, and conditions of work of millions of faithful, hard working Americans, simply because they do not want to join with their fellow workers' unions and in collective-bargaining agreements.

There are few things more important to the maintenance of our free enterprise system than amicable, constructive relations between labor and management and fairness and a spirit of harmony and good will between those who toil and those who employ and manage.

In fact, industrial peace is essential to the proper functioning of our great system. It is a condition precedent to our prosperity.

For Congress to encourage and bring about a situation where an individual would be legally allowed, in effect, to reach in and set aside existing contracts in the labor field and gain for himself the advantage of these contracts without assuming the obligations and responsibilities entailed by them, and inherent in them, would inevitably substitute bitterness and strife for harmony and cooperation between workers and their employers, and this is one of the last things we would want to see in our economy and the Nation.

Both labor and management must realize it, and the American people must realize it. There should be less emphasis on misconceived slogans, generalities, recriminations, and more stress upon pursuing the real interests of the working people, the business managers and the stability and prosperity of the country as a whole.

Our own State is not a right-to-work State, so-called, so here again our people, in viewing this legislation, should be mindful of the fact that we have never given our approval to so-called right-to-work laws.

At the same time, we cannot blind our eyes to the fact that our industrial strength and vitality has been and is being sapped and weakened by the loss of industries we have sustained at the hands of 19 right-to-work States where wages, conditions of work, and other labor standards are not on a par with our own and thus permit these States to pirate our industries and thus harm our economy and prosperity.

It is a plain and disconcerting fact that the right-to-work States, so-called, have been and are in a position to attract some of our industries, and this they have done and are doing today to our detriment, since they are underbidding us out of both the national and Government markets.

Do we want to see this situation get worse by impairing the stability and amicability of our labor-management relations and turning the industries of our State into hotbeds of labor-management controversy?

We do not seek to hammer others into a senseless uniformity, nor to produce blind conformity in the Nation, either politically, educationally, socially, industrially, or to permit individuals or minorities to trample upon the contractual rights of labor and management.

The soundness and perpetuity of the free enterprise system, is and must be, one of our greatest aims. The system is under fierce attack these days from many sources, and it is being weakened to no inconsiderable extent by some current trends in government and business that are narrowing the area of operations of small business and militating against the continued existence, as well as the growth of free incentives.

It should be recognized that small business is the very keystone of the free enterprise system. It is the area where personal initiative, ambition, enterprise, ability, creativity and success through individual effort, and the spirit of venture, find their easiest expression and fulfillment. It is the place in our economy where free opportunity is open for those who seek it.

Since that is so, government at every level should be doing its utmost to safeguard and encourage small business. Yet I fear that in the light of many things that are happening today in government, that is not being done.

To the contrary, taxes, costly government regulations, destructive, private competition by large monopolistic units, the impact of so-called new innovations and government programs on local economies and mercantile units have been responsible for the serious decline in the number, vigor, and strength of small business in this country.

I make this observation in connection with my remarks on 14(b) merely to show the presence of harmful trends in our industrial and economic life being prompted and augmented by some governmental policies to encourage mass assault upon collective bargaining and contractual agreements stemming therefrom, could be just as harmful to the economy and free enterprise as various discriminations against small business.

Both would militate against true cooperation between different parts of our economy, both would engender bitterness and discord where amity should exist, and both would have the effect of weakening the sources of good will, mutual aid, and wholehearted cooperation which our governmental and economic systems need today to carry out the great work that lies ahead of us of adapting the American way of life, under ordered personal liberty, stability, and opportunity to the rapidly changing patterns which modern science, explosive population growth and the demands of progress have imposed upon us.

It should be noted that in the discussion of 14(b), several States have already repealed the so-called right-to-work laws, after trial periods proved they had created new and serious problems for both management and labor and the various communities of the States concerned, and when it was clearly demonstrated that the people were overwhelmingly opposed to them.

It should also be noted, as I have suggested above, that millions of workers are now covered under employment security clauses in two-party contracts, and that efforts to disturb present amicable contractual relationships would undoubtedly result in more confusion, dissension, resentment, bitterness, and trouble that the Nation can ill afford at this or any other time.

With due and respectful deference to those who feel otherwise about this matter, I would like to point out that in my humble judgment Congress must assiduously and continually search for solutions to great social and economic questions that will minimize conflict and bring desirable results for labor and management and every other group, and in our endeavors do the best we can as legislators to promote industrial peace, prosperity, and the true well-being of the Nation.

The National Conference on Sea Grant Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently my home city of Newport, R.I., was host to a National Conference on Sea-Grant Colleges. It was an extremely successful gathering, bringing together 240 distinguished scholars and experts in the field of oceanography and related fields. They represented institutions in 35 States.

The conference had special meaning and significance for me personally because it was convened for the specific purpose of considering a concept which I have submitted to the Senate in legislative form. My bill, S. 2439, provides for a Federal program of sea-grant colleges supported by revenues, rents, and royalties from offshore oil properties on the ocean floor.

In order to examine the concept and explore its possibilities, the University of Rhode Island and the Southern New England Marine Sciences Association joined in sponsoring the 2-day conference at Newport.

The highlight of the conference, to my mind, was the keynote address delivered by Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, dean of the Institute of Technology at the University of Minnesota, who is the true originator and "father" of the sea-grant college concept. It was a tribute to him that the conference voted to endorse the general concepts incorporated in my bill, and appointed a committee of distinguished scientists and scholars to maintain continuing support for the plan.

Dean Spilhaus' speech, reflecting as it did his years of study and experience, describes in detail the present discrepancy between oceanographic science and applied engineering and explored in detail the steps we could and should take to make better use of the vast resources of the seas. His speech should be part of the official RECORD of Congress in view of the growing public concern in this field and also in view of the hopeful prospects for congressional action on this legislation next year. I ask unanimous consent that Dean Spilhaus' speech may be inserted in the RECORD at this point, along with my own address to the same conference.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONCEPT OF A SEA-GRANT UNIVERSITY

(By Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus)

President Horn, Senator PELL, Dean Knause, and friends, I don't suppose that many people have the pleasure and honor that I feel today on this occasion when at this wonderful place on the sea under the auspices of a fine university and with so many of those who've contributed much to the science of the ocean—that I feel on being invited to explore and develop with your help my own sea-grant-university idea.

My friend, Dr. Chapman, wrote me about a year ago to ask whether the sea grant university sprang full blown from my mind. I would say, rather, that it resulted from the recognition of a need, a conception, a period of labor, delivery at the right time, gradual acceptance of the young infant and I now hope that its sponsors here may make it have a productive and useful life.

When Harrison Brown formed the National Committee on Oceanography in 1957, some of us jokingly yet with much truth stated that our first objective would be to get our public leaders to at least be able to pronounce the word "oceanography." Harrison not only managed this but with his fellows on the committee succeeded in stirring an amazing public and legislative awareness of the importance of knowing about the sea.

Early on, we recognized the need to use engineering in support of the study of the sea. We had a panel of the National Academy Committee which devoted itself to special engineering devices, vehicles, instruments, and the like. When I became chairman in 1961, I was already beginning to see that engineering in support of oceanographic research, while important, was not enough. And I recall on being asked, in a joint meeting with the governmental interagency committee on oceanography, what the task of the Academy group should be over the next 5 years, that I said that marine science and oceanography were going strong but that the real gap was between our excellent science and the pitiful state of the U.S. performance in the exploitation of the sea. Our pitiful fishery effort—our poor merchant marine—the fact that when we needed a bathyscaphe we purchased it in Europe—all symptoms of a lack of purpose and a failure to apply our science through ocean engineering and biological engineering or aquaculture.

In 1963, in a keynote address to a national meeting on fisheries, I voiced my unhappiness and recalled that just about a hundred years before, a positive purposeful action had been taken by Congress to stimulate "the mechanic arts and agriculture"—the act that established land-grant colleges. There can be no question that the Morrell Act establishing a land-grant fund for the support of such colleges, passed by Congress in 1859 but vetoed by President Buchanan and subsequently signed by Lincoln in 1862 contributed mightily, through the mechanic arts to lead to our national preeminence in the mass production of things that people need—including agricultural products.

Why not then provide a focus, a commitment and continuing support in the context of sea-grant universities today to bring the United States to a position of leadership in ocean engineering and aquaculture.

After this talk, I received many letters expressing interest in the concept. One was from Professor Saila, of Rhode Island. As a result of his expressed interest I wrote to President Horn and Dean Knauss and received inspiring and heartening responses. They wanted to do something to explore the idea. Dean Knauss suggested early in 1964 that a conference be held—this is the conference.

Senator PELL, with a long interest in the sea, its contribution to his State and its potential, talked with me. I remember quipping to the Senator that Rhode Island would be a fine launching place for a sea-grant university in connection wtih its land-grant university—after all, I said, you have very little land.

So, you see, it is most appropriate that this first national conference on the sea-grant university concept should be held here where the original interest was sparked.

What is ocean engineering? From time to time we give names to assemblages of our different scientific disciplines for no better reason—and for the very good reason—that they apply and suit our principal current preoccupations. So polar science is all the good science that is done relating to the Arctic and the Antarctic. Space science is all good science that relates to space, or more facetiously any science that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will pay for. Similarly, oceanography and marine science comprises the work of any scientist in any discipline who chooses to use the sea as focus for his intellectual endeavors.

On the other hand, in engineering the qualifying nouns become even more meaningful. The engineering problems of the polar regions are quite special and unique. How do you get rid of sewage when everything is frozen. How do you build foundations that sink in permafrost? How do you build structures in slowly flowing ice? Engineering for space, too, has its special problems. Metals can cold weld themselves together in the vacuum of space. Special lubricants are needed, and vacuum tubes may not need an outside cover. So it is in ocean engineering. Materials behave quite differently at the 7-ton-per-square-inch pressures encountered in the abyss. Structures must be built to resist the onslaught of marine borers and other living organisms that attack them and they must withstand entirely different catastrophic forces—earthquakes, currents, wave forces, and underwater landslides.

We must recall that where science aims at finding out enough about our environment to describe it and then to find common truths, engineering intervenes, alters, and uses the environment. The uses and controls that are found good—ones that society wants or can grow to want—industry repeats so that they can be used by as many people as possible. There are two kinds of ocean engineering: there is that kind that has gone on for centuries, like the building of ships to get from one point of land to another, the building of dikes to keep the sea from encroaching on the land, but these are merely in support of peripheral activities of land based and oriented people not using the sea but withstanding its abuse of the land. There is another kind of ocean engineering, and that is the ocean engineering which must come about when we decide to intervene in the marine environment with the ultimate objective of using it, occupying it, and enjoying it.

When you occupy a place whether it be an enemy country, uninhabited polar or desert wastes, the moon, the planets, or the depths of the sea, essentially you have to start by worrying about the five basic things for people to live; a way to get there and back, shelter while you're there, power, water, and food.

Of course, it's not necessary to occupy the ocean right now. We could wait, but somebody else would occupy it. Or, we can make the decision that we will occupy the ocean. We can choose freely to expend part of our efforts and apply our marine, scientific, and oceanographic knowledge toward the peaceful exploitation and colonization of the sea.

A way to get there and back, shelter, power, water, and food—to these five basics that we need for the occupation of land on earth must be added a sixth shared by the environments of space and the sea. We can live quite a while without food and water, but you could not have heard my last few sentences without breathing. The most fundamental ocean engineering that is going on today is the medical engineering on breathing at high pressures supported by the physiological science related to mammals breathing with their lungs full of water. The latter science may point to engineering developments way in the future, but at the present time men are spending weeks below hundreds of feet of water breathing mixtures mostly of inert helium, with just the right small percentage of oxygen so that at those depths it's compressed to about the oxygen pressure in the normal atmosphere.

Ocean medicine has found that helium does not give the narcotic effects "rapture of the deep" that comes from the great solubility of nitrogen in fatty nerve cells. Ocean medicine, by studying decompression, is beginning to overcome the dangers when the aquanaut comes up and reduces his pressure too quickly. If he does, the gases expand in bubbles blocking arteries, attacking joints, and giving him the fatal "bends."

Of the other five basics, three deal mainly with physical engineering—the provision of new surface and submarine vehicles, structures under the sea, and power generators. But ocean engineering also includes food and water—fishing, fish farming, hybridizing marine plants, and even water divining in the sea, the search for undersea fresh water springs. In the meantime, we can, of course, desalt sea water, but this is a clumsy interim method. Ocean engineers must face problems quite different from usual engineering experience on land. Electrolysis dictates a different choice of metals. The mechanical stresses of current, waves, and undersea earthquakes are quite different from their counterparts on land. Biological activity can bore, excavate, and undermine undersea structures, and other organisms can create unwanted noise. Thus, biological engineering is a necessary adjunct even to the physical engineering in the oceans. Biological engineering will play a far greater part in the oceans than it has in the physical engineering of the land. I do not mean to imply that the ocean engineer must be any more competent than the most competent land engineers. He must have a different mix of the basic sciences and, even more important, a different focus. The focus of the land engineer is to prevent the encroachment of the sea, to concrete up coastlines, to fill estuaries for land habitations. The ocean engineer will consider it more important that beaches and estuaries be retained or that even new ones be built, because they are the habitat of many valuable shellfish and the nursery of many fishes of the deep sea.

For many years while being engrossed in oceanography and marine science, and while being active in contributing engineering devices in support of this science, I recognized the gap that exists between the scientists and oceanographers who have made such great strides in describing and understanding the ocean environment—its shores, its bottom, its physical and living contents—between these scientists and the fishermen, navigators, sea captains, sailors who use the sea. The missing link is ocean engineering which will pull out many useful scientific findings and translate them into better ways of using the sea.

Up to now the main uses of the sea were for surface ships and fishing. Surface ships operate at the worst possible level—on the surface of the sea. At this interface they are plagued by wind, waves, and ice. If they go a little way up or a little way down, they're better off. The harvesting and husbandry of the food we take from the sea is utterly primitive and has not in any sense kept pace with the magnificent progress in fertilizers, farm machinery, cross-breeding and hybridizing that has developed on the land.

It is worthwhile to catalog some more immediate and some more distant exciting and potentially useful things, we can do in and with the oceans. If some seem like irresponsible dreaming, remember we live in days where purposeful dreaming becomes reality so rapidly that it's almost regarded as respectable. If some seem like "stunts," it is worthwhile to remember that such spectaculars that form milestones of human achievement contribute honestly to people's self esteem. They are the necessary steps to give us the confidence to go on to even greater achievements. Yesterday's "stunt" is tomorrow's useful routine.

Remember, we are inventing the future, not merely predicting it. When people asked, "What will the new deep research submarines look for?" the best answer was: "For things we don't yet know." To survive in a new environment, true readiness is to be ready for the unexpected.

Let us start at the coastline. Instead of smoothing and concreting coastlines, we may scallop them to build as many harbors and estuaries as we can and to lengthen the total coastline of the earth. There is a snowflake figure in mathematics which shows that any area, however small, can be enclosed by a line of infinite length. The smaller the scallops or harbors we build, the longer will be the coastline. But if our purpose is to provide seashore not only for the organisms in the sea but for peoples' recreation, the theoretical concept of infinity becomes finite in terms of the quantum of people size.

Next, perhaps, we should heat up some coastal waters not only so that you can swim in them but also to make suitable warm water habitats for transplanting useful fishes that previously could not multiply there. With the coming rash of large nuclear reactors, waste heat is regarded by the land engineers as a problem because when it is introduced into cooling water, it produces profound ecological effects.

Many conventional conservationists consider any changes of this kind with the environment to be bad. But if we go about it in a sound engineering way, we can introduce waste heat into the sea in a number of different ways and find those effects on the ecology which are beneficial. Thereafter, this heat would no longer be waste but be useful.

Because land engineering with its parochial focus in conserving our land and preventing it being washed into the sea and because of the almost total use and reuse of fresh waters so that rivers will no longer flow into the sea, the sand that maintains beaches along the shorelines no longer simply comes down from the land. Beaches are not just there. Sand is continually being taken away to accumulate in the canyons on the continental shelves or even in the deep sea. We'll need to dredge the sand back and remake the beaches. The beaches will still be in dynamic equilibrium but one link in the cycle will be provided by man's intervention through ocean engineering. When we leave the shoreline, we will need vehicles to supplement the conventional ones which are so limited by the wind and wave at the air-sea interface. We need increasingly to go down in submarines or up in true air seacraft. Present seaplanes can only make emergency landings in the sea. We need the kind of air seacraft that can fly out, settle, do its work in a high sea, take-off—vertically, perhaps, and move on to the next job.

The present factory ships with their catchers that catch and process whales and fish will grow into floating oceanic cities. We are beginning to get inklings of how to quiet waves by punching holes in harbor walls, much the same as we punch holes in acoustical tile to absorb sound energy. With these elements as a beginning, floating artificial harbors or wave-stemming walls of the floating cities become possible. Or, more comfortable dwelling quarters may be floating stably a hundred feet or so below the surface where any wave motion is so damped out as to be unnoticeable. The artificial barbors and other mother ship platforms must be arranged to retrieve small submersibles, to retrieve them underwater so that a rendezvous in the high seas—a much more difficult job than a rendezvous in space—becomes unnecessary.

After surface cities, habitations floating under the water, the next step toward widespread structures on the bottom of the sea necessitates some ocean bottom engineering surveys. We'll need to develop bottom vehicles to travel between the ocean cities. But even before this, we'll have to develop a whole body of knowledge on submarine soil mechanics. How will the ocean sediments support foundations and crawling vehicles? How stable will be the natural slopes or the embankments we construct on the ocean bottom? How does the bottom erode? And how well will it hold moorings? We need an expedition across the bottom of the Atlantic and the Pacific in crawling vehicles containing men to survey the terrain—a Lewis and Clark transocean bottom expedition. Until then we will not know how currents, erosion, and sediments will affect our engineering works. We do know from broken submarine cables that there are catastrophic phenomena much stronger than our concept of the "quiet in the deeps" would lead us to believe.

Also in advance of the widespread use of bottom structures we need to study the properties of materials at very high pressures. Materials suffer effects at these pressures which are quite outside the domain of ordinary land engineering. Glass apparently becomes less brittle. The analytical mechanics of thick shell structures must be tackled without the simplifications which are satisfactory for the thin shells we use on land.

Already, thanks to the work of the physiologists, divers can live and work a few hundred feet down. There seems every prospect that a thousand feet is now not out of the question. This refers to living at the ambient pressures. In the greater depths the structure to which we have referred, which will withstand the pressures, will be necessary. Once people can work and live at a thousand feet, the whole of the Continental Shelf, an area of 10 million square miles, larger than North America, is opened up as a new continent for our use. Oil drilling, mining, salvage, and even fish farming can be done by people down there and not, as now, on the end of the string from a wobbly surface.

So far I haven't mentioned power. And we are becoming accustomed to think that the potential of nuclear power is so great that we can dismiss other sources of power. The ocean is such a source, but it is termed a low-grade source because you need to imprison, or otherwise use, a great deal of sea water to get a usable quantity of power. So that in general the power of the sea has been regarded as a nuisance rather than a potential to be tapped. Usually when people think about the ocean's power, they think of tidal power and, indeed, there are several tidal powerplants operating; in fact, tidal power was used to mill grain a century ago in places like Maine.

But many times the tidal power potential exists in the difference in temperature between the top and the bottom of the ocean—the thermal gradient power. There are many places in the sea where differences of 10° occur over very short horizontal or vertical distances. So far, there is only one small thermal gradient plant in operation. With huge structures at sea, wave power becomes a possibility. It's not easy to harness the up-and-down motion of the waves in any practical or efficient way when we have small objects bobbing on the surface even though the wave energy withstood by a ship's hull may be many times that required to propel the ship. But with the size structure we envision—huge artificial harbors, and stable platforms, wave power becomes a possibility.

The ocean engineering in support of what we may call conventional fishing is already here. The behaviorial scientists have a wealth of information on the response of fish to sonic, chemical, and electronic stimuli that may take the place of ordinary bait. And floating chemical engineering factories can take the whole catch, sort the fish automatically—trash fish for meal, more valuable fish for canning or freezing, and more importantly, count the species to keep a check on what is the renewable harvest.

Where existing advanced methods have been used in fishing, there is already the danger of overfishing—of making the whales become extinct—and this implies the urgent need, before we go much further in harvesting the living resources of the sea, to have a way of keeping an inventory of all the species we take from the sea so that we may be sure that they are renewed each year. And also to get an idea of how much we can increase the sustained yield when we itervene.

In gathering the living things of the ocean, ocean engineers should consider whether other living things themselves, may do our building and collecting more efficiently than mechanical machines that we can devise. It would be very expensive to collect enough euphausid shrimp, but whales collect and convert them very efficiently. Perhaps we should be breeding whales instead of exterminating them. Can we accelerate the coral animal to build reefs? Can we use shellfish to concentrate minerals? Can we plant seaweed to stabilize beaches? Can be hybridize the plants that grow in sea water, the seaweeds, and use them much more extensively as sea fruits and vegetables? Perhaps we can even contribute to the land by using the wealth of information on halophytes—salty habitat plants—not only to grow useful food in sea or brackish water but actually to desalinize water by the use of plants which concentrate salts within them. Seaweed is a good source of iodine, for instance.

These are the beginnings of farming the plants of the sea, but what about the animals? Plants are easier to farm and harvest because they may be rooted or even if they are floating they are easy to control. Shellfish, which are indeed farmed, are the next easiest for the same reason. Oysters, clams, and shrimp are cultured to a greater or lesser extent in ponds and semienclosed arms of sea. Next it is not much of a step to conceive of lobster traps on the bottom of the Continental Shelf acres in extent—in fact, bottom fishes in general would seem to be most easily susceptible to fencing. Then how do we fertilize the sea? There are two ways in land farming; namely, plowing and adding nutrients. The counterpart of plowing in the sea is upwelling that brings nutrients from deeper water to the euphotic zone. The idea of doing this artificially by heating up the ocean with a nuclear reactor at the bottom has been thought of, but on analysis does not seem economical. But the waste heat from nuclear reactors for other purposes may well be used in this way. The motions of the sea itself, which indeed cause upwelling notably in such productive waters of the Humboldt Current, may be studied and ocean engineering intervention may devise ways of making the sea plow itself more efficiently.

How can we fertilize the sea? It is manifestly impossible to add sufficient of the basic nutrients to open sea water, although this is possible in estuarine or pond water. In the sea it's stirred and mixed away, unlike the use of fertilizer on land. It does seem possible, however, to add the trace substances once we know which are most important to growth. The study of trace elements, too, will lead us to more successful transplantation of useful fishes from one area of the world to another. Then, too, by using what the marine scientists know about the food chain, we can eliminate some of the unnecessary and less useful species, that is, intervene in way that might be called "weeding the sea."

One other aspect of the use of the sea which is already with us and may grow even faster and stimulate ocean engineering more than these "more serious" uses of the sea is the important part the sea can play in recreation of the people in an increasingly crowded land world. Already you can purchase a small sporting submarine for not much more than the cost of an automible. Thousands of people go down in the sea in aqualungs. Millions of dollars are spent on boats, elaborate fishing equipment and underwater cameras for people's recreation at sea.

Perhaps some of the first underwater structures will be for recreation. As mass-produced underwater vehicles come within the reach of many, underwater resorts will develop where people will drive their submobiles and visit reefs, watch the oceanic wildlife in its natural habitat much the way we do in the wilderness and park areas on land.

These examples give you something of a vista of what ocean engineering can do in the sea and show you how engineering and technology can bring everyone close to the oceans and develop the sea's resources for everyone's use just as on land. Engineering has provided us with our dams, our fuels, our skyscrapers, highways, planes, ships, satellites, and the biological engineering which we call agriculture has supplied us with our abundance of good food. I have said that ocean engineering will fill the gap between marine scientists and those who use the sea. But we need a way of bringing the vast body of scientific knowledge about the sea to the people who use it. We need to bring knowledge of the ocean to people other than the scientists who develop it, and not only to the engineers but to all the professions that must be related in a vast world development of this kind. We need an educational plan far broader than the existing ones that produce excellent marine scientists. There is not a single activity of people that would not be affected by our man-in-the-sea program and there is hardly any facet of man's knowledge and experience that will not be needed to complement the ocean engineering effort.

Under the land-grant-college program, scholars did not disdain to tackle hard practical engineering and biological engineering—that is, farming—problems in parallel with basic scientific work. In fact, often the arts of engineering and agriculture outstripped the sciences by building things and growing things better before physics, botany, or zoology quite understood why. Working in parallel, discoveries in the basic sciences were quickly put to use. So successful was this idea that we would be remiss if we did not use it as a blueprint for our ocean venture.

The sea-grant colleges not only would concentrate on applications of science to the sea, such as prospecting underwater, mining, developing the food resources, marine pharmacology and medicined shipping and navigation, weather and climate, but they would relate these to the natural sciences which underlie them; to the social sciences, economics, sociology, psychology, politics and law, as they are affected by and, in turn, affect the occupation of the sea. They would also be associated with the liberal arts—literature, art, and history—which describe man's relation to the sea and enhance his enjoyment of it.

Just as the land-grant colleges were given in perpetuity grants of land for their experimental plots, in some cases lands in which mineral resources were found or that grew to be otherwise useful and served to provide income for the ongoing of the total enterprise, so sea-grant colleges should be given grants of seashore or lakeshore, sea water and bottom within territorial limits as their experimental plots to stimulate the development of aquaculture in the waters and the prospecting and ways of exploiting the natural resources of the seabed. These watery grants would serve the additional purpose of preserving tracts of seashore and open waters from the fiercely competitive pressures due to increase of population and industrialization—preserve them not only as natural habitats for ecological studies but as the important nursery areas for high sea fish and residences for in-shore food fish and shell fish. The sea-grant college, to do its job, will also need its county agents in hip boots—an Aquacultural Extension Service that takes the findings of the college or university onto the trawlers, drilling rigs, merchant ships, and down to the submotels. The sea-grant college to do its job in aquaculture and ocean engineering will need sea home economics, too. Even if we had abundant protein from the sea today, a selling job would need to be done to remove taste prejudices and taboos, and this is done by such a down-to-earth service, yet one which touches more people than the erudite things we do in universities, home economics. As we breed and farm fish, we will need to have fish vets, fish pathologists, and experts on the diseases and parasites that may plague our flocks in the sea or our plants. We will no longer be able to tolerate epidemics like the blooming of a red tide of dynaflagellates that make widespread fish kills and are concentrated by mollusks so that these poison people.

Law is an utterly important adjunct to any widespread exploitation of the sea. We need a clarification of the law of the sea and a way of, on the one hand, being able to grant rights so that a group investing capital in vast projects may be assured of some stability toward a reasonable return and, on the other hand, better legal controls to prevent overfishing. Economics, too, must play a major role. The reason that nobody pays attention to preserving the inventory of whales in the sea and that nobody confines himself to a catch that is calculated to build up the stock and take the renewable amount as harvest, is an economic one. The whales in the sea are not on anyone's books as an economic asset. Public administration, with due regard to national and international politics, must find a way out of the dilemma that is posed that when nobody owns what's in the sea, and when nobody feels responsible for its controlled exploitation.

The marine engineer who emerges from our sea-grant institutions will be as different from the old-fashioned marine engineer as the satellite engineer is from the one who operates a heating plant. The aquaculturist will be as different from the conventional fisherman. Oceanic engineering and aquaculture, the control of the sea for man's purposes, will take all our imagination and inventiveness as a magnificent challenge.

The oceans will offer us military, recreational, economic, artistic, and intellectual outlets of unlimited scope. Thus they'll offer us more space than space itself in which to remain human. The sea—beautiful and dangerous, elegant and strong, bountiful and whimsical—not only challenges us but offers to every "man in the street" the exciting participation of being a "man in the sea." Like a military operation where a war is not won until the area is occupied, we will master the sea only when we occupy it.

But to do this we must have sea-grant universities and colleges that focus with commitment on the sea—that seek to impinge all our intellectual disciplines on the mastery, exploitation, and preservation of the sea. Just as the scholars in the land-grant colleges developed a passion for the land and led not only, in ways to benefit by it, but also in the ways to preserve it—we must seek through a welding together of science, art, literature, engineering, medicine, law, public administration, and politics to develop a public which will not only homestead our new spaces in the sea but colonize and civilize them through an integrated interdisciplinary education in the sea-grant universities.

Speech by Senator Claiborne Pell Before the National Sea-Grant Conference, Sponsored by the University of Rhode Island and the Southern New England Marine Sciences Association at Newport, R.I.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am delighted to have this opportunity of sharing in this national conference to develop plans and ideas for implementing the concept of sea-grant colleges.

Under the sponsorship of the University of Rhode Island and the Southern New England Marine Sciences Association, this conference is of great meaning to our own State and to the goals we seek for advancing, in the best possible fashion, our knowledge of oceanography and education in the marine sciences. Such increasing knowledge and education can bring highly important benefits to Rhode Island and to the United States in the years ahead.

I am particularly delighted to participate in this conference with so many leaders distinguished in the broad area of oceanography. Dr. Horn, as president of the university and Dean Knauss, as head of its graduate school of oceanography, have brought the University of Rhode Island to a position of not only State but national prominence. I have long admired the imaginative and pioneering programs established at the University of Rhode Island. And it is also a singular pleasure for me to share in this conference with Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, dean of the institute of technology at the University of Minnesota. Dr. Spilhaus is a pioneer of the sea-grant college concept—which I have sought as a Senator to implement within the framework of new legislation.

As you may know, I have recently introduced in the Senate proposals for national sea-grant colleges and for a program of education aimed at making maximum use of our country's marine resources. They are an asset which we have only begun to explore. The legislation, I believe, can be of benefit to this university, to Rhode Islanders, and to our country as a whole.

Rhode Island has had a long and historic association with the sea. Eighty-eight years ago, Alexander Agassiz, a resident of this very city of Newport, organized the three cruises of the Coast Guard vessel *Blake,* voyages which marked the first major effort of the United States in oceanographic exploration. Until the end of the last century, the Alexander Agassiz laboratory in Newport, stemming from a concept originated by his father, Louis—was our Nation's historic center of early research into the mysteries of the marine environment.

Thus Rhode Island can lay rightful claim to the beginnings of oceanographic studies which this university has so well expanded. History combines fittingly in this respect with continuing and improving purpose. A great deal more needs to be done, however, if we are to make full use of our potentials and develop the skills and understandings we will need for the future.

The oceans and their deeps constitute a last physical frontier here on earth which man has by no means fully investigated.

Until recent times, as President Johnson has pointed out, the oceans have been looked upon chiefly as barriers to invasion. "We must now see them as links," the President has stated, "not only between peoples, but to a vast new untapped resource. It is becoming increasingly clear that there are large mineral deposits under the oceans. But before this treasure becomes useful, we must first locate it and develop the technology to increase it economically. We must also learn more about marine biology, if we are to tap the great potential food resources of the seas."

President Kennedy in a message to Congress said that our very survival may hinge upon the development of our knowledge of the oceans and the resources they contain.

Emphasizing the growing concern of Members of the Congress in oceanography is the number of legislative proposals in this area made during the 1st session of the 89th Congress. Let me pay tribute, at this point, to the oceanographic pioneer of the Congress—Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, whose bill, as I have said in the Senate, provides for the first time a clear statement of our Nation's goals in oceanography, and a means to determine how the Federal program can be organized most effectively to meet these goals.

My proposals, I believe, would serve to augment Senator MAGNUSON's concept of a well-coordinated National Council for Marine Resources and Engineering Development. Specifically, my proposals would help engender the skilled manpower and technology for the many important facets of evolving work in which the Council, envisioned by Senator MAGNUSON, would be engaged.

Under my bill, sea-grant colleges would be those supported by the act, either in part or in whole. The bill would provide immediate assistance to already existing institutions, enabling them to expand established programs and to develop corollary programs—

as, for example, the university's creation of a 2-year school to train fisheries technicians.

As it is in so many other areas relating to our country's future accomplishments, education, I believe, is a key factor to the beneficial harvesting of the seas. We need more young scientists skilled in oceanography; but, just as importantly, we need the technicians to translate into practical results scitific theories and discoveries. We need more young engineers accomplished in the marine sciences, and we need the facilities and the equipment which imaginative and educated minds can help us produce.

In the past we have made tremendous strides forward in agriculture. Now we need to concentrate with equal zeal on aquaculture.

There is a close parallel between the National Sea-Grant College and Program Act I have introduced in the Senate and the legislation, originating almost 100 years ago, to establish the land-grant colleges which provided such a great stimulus to the development of agriculture. Modern methods of contour plowing, crop rotation, the development of hybrid plants and modern farm machinery and equipment, all testify to the inceasing advances in agriculture which continue to benefit our country and its land.

Before the advent of the land-grant colleges, the average American farmer produced enough food to feed himself and four other people. Today 1 American farmer produces food for 37 people, including 5 in foreign countries. In other words, the American farmer has increased his productivity sevenfold.

Contrast this 700 percent productive increase with that of the average individual American fisherman—which stands at only 33 percent on a comparable basis over the same period of time—and we can conclude that today's farmer has increased his efficiency twentyfold over today's fisherman.

To further pinpoint these factors, statistics from the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries show that the average medium-sized U.S. trawler fishing the North Atlantic is 24 years old, that smaller trawlers have an average age of 27 years, and that a large percentage of our American fishing fleet is 50 years old. A man may be in the prime of life at these ages—but not a fishing vessel. Obsoleteness in this case accompanies age—and, you might say, Neptune cruises the seas along with Davy Jones.

Our fishing industry employs today approximately half a million people whose catch is estimated as worth a billion dollars to our national economy. Imports, however, provide more than half our country's supply of fishery products. The old days of American preeminence in the harvesting of the seas—the days, for instance, when the world whaling industry was dominated by American skills—have been washed back into the history books. We cannot, like King Canute, expect to turn back the waves, or reverse the tides of history, by mere demand or edict. But we can create new channels for our ingenuity to follow; and, just as we have made the land more and more valuable to us, so can we make the seas of ever-increasing advantage.

Already our country is receiving a substantial amount of revenues from the ocean deeps, chiefly from rents, royalties and bonuses from offshore oil properties under governmental lease. Over the past 10 years these revenues have amounted to over $1.5 billion. My proposals envisage using 10 percent of these revenues annually for the sea-grant college program.

Not all the revenues are immediately available—a proportion is held normally in escrow. However, it can be predicted that by the means I suggest an annual sum of at least $10 million would be available to finance the program. And we can also forecast that this amount would grow as the program itself made possible the expanded useful exploitation of marine resources. Thus, a cumulative and evolving process would be established. What better investment could we make from revenues which come from the seas? The same concept applied to the land-grant colleges; and that investment has been returned many, many times over.

In recent years our offshore revenues have varied considerably. Last year they amounted to approximately $100 million, and this amount is expected to increase during the current year. So that there can be appropriate funding for the program I envision, my bill calls for the deposit of 10 percent of these revenues in a special account in the Treasury. They would then be available for appropriations on a stable annual basis.

The legislation I have introduced calls for administration of the sea-great college program by the National Science Foundation. Although I remain open minded on this subject and there may well be other proposals we will wish to consider, the National Science Foundation would seem a logical and appropriate choice. It is already engaged in helping support oceanographic undertakings in some 18 institutions of higher education, including the University of Rhode Island. The Foundation has achieved a reputation of excellence and has contributed substantially to scientific advancement in a great many areas which invlove our national interest and our future goals. And these—both our national interest and the goals we seek for our Nation—are basically involved in the concepts we are discussing at this conference.

It has been suggested that we consider how best to orient our existing institutions within the concept of greater and more meaningful emphasis on oceanography—whether a sea-grant college should be constituted so as to focus entirely on studies in the marine sciences, or whether it should be oriented so as to offer a variety of education in other subjects. Dr. Leland J. Haworth, director of the NSF has pointed out that "the outstanding characteristic of modern oceanography is the extent to which the fundamental sciences—physics, chemistry, and biology—are being used to develop understanding of the subject."

It would seem to me best, for our long-range interests, to utilize our existing universities insofar as possible. I am a great believer in a broad-based education as an antidote to an age of increasing specialization. That is one of the prime reasons why I have worked during three Congresses toward the establishment of a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities—and let me say how very pleased I was when this legislation finally came to fruition a few weeks ago. I believe it can strengthen the whole fabric of our society in future years, in sharpening our awareness of excellence, in giving us a greater ability to evaluate the past in terms of the present and future. Dr. Haworth—in a statement submitted to our Senate Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities, under my chairmanship, said he was convinced that the new Foundation would "ultimately bring added strength and vitality to our science and technology," and Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, in testimony before the subcommittee on the legislation, said that "in a democracy it is essential that science and the humanities be firmly united in a creative partnership."

Thus, it would seem to me that the university with a balanced program of education, with opportunities for expanding man's knowledge in diverse fields, would be the ideal home for the sea-grant college concept—in a word, it would afford the opportunity to specialize in a relatively new and immensely exciting scientific area, within the framework of broad-based higher education.

A sea-grant college, as I visualize it, would have, of course, special facilities, a special curriculum. Ideally, as in the case of the University of Rhode Island, it would be located on the sea itself, so that its students could have access to the kinds of technical equipment and facilities we will need increasingly to develop if we are to harvest the full potentials of the seas. Such facilities could include experimental stations, as adjuncts to the college, to develop new techniques in underwater mining, in ship design, in the numbers of devices which will allow man to explore the ocean depths. And we will also need to experiment in methods of conservation, and in developing the crops which the seas are now known to afford, and in seeking out new harvests and the means of making them most beneficial. In this connection, it is estimated that man derives only 1 percent of his present food requirements from the salt-water environment. It would be hard, indeed, to underestimate the beneficial food potential of the seas—particularly in view of the rapidly expanding population.

I do not believe that a sea-grant college need necessarily be based on the oceans themselves—in States bordered, for example, by the Atlantic or Pacific or the Gulf of Mexico—although as I have pointed out such locations would have certain advantages, and I believe these States could properly take the lead in the sea-grant college program I would envision a national effort evolving with courses in oceanography offered at universities in our inland States, and of course in those bordering on the Great Lakes.

However, a national effort of this magnitude needs to begin in the right manner. At the outset it would seem best to utilize the resources of institutions which have already established a reputation of leadership in oceanography, such as the University of Rhode Island, to provide them with adequate funding so that they can become the nuclei around which a national effort and program can evolve. In a new and pioneering field, let us recognize the pioneers and provide them with the necessary facilities to lead us forward.

As our knowledge in oceanography grows, and indeed as integral to its development and beneficial uses, I can foresee great new opportunities opening up for the business community in our own State of Rhode Island and throughout the country. In fact, many businesses are now making plans to develop the type of special equipment we will require to explore the deeps—where pressures are intense, where the environment is hostile to the human being, where man needs skillfully tooled devices made of noncorrosive materials to act as his arms and fingers to extract samples from the ocean floors.

It is interesting to note that some of the equipment we are developing for the exploration of outer space can also apply to our deep sea explorations. Sophisticated electronic devices that will help chart the topography and content of the ocean floors, as well as having the applicability to the realms of outer space, are within the reach of our ingenuity. Here is where industrial research and development and the sea-grant college concept go hand in hand—for the trained technician helps the industry find new avenues for expansion, and these in turn create a demand for the greater skills which our educational process can provide.

Not long ago we celebrated Columbus Day. We thought in terms of discoveries made almost five centuries ago, and of man's quest across an ocean which men once thought flat and demon-surrounded, of watery abysses and plunges into a limitless unknown. We may have exercised the demons and the myths; but we are still only on the threshold of plunging into that unknown. The great White Whale of Herman Melville's imagination, the image of mystery and fascination, continues to travel the deeps. We know only that the plunge can be richly rewarding—in terms of man's increasing knowledge, in terms of the tangible benefits to our society.

We can estimate with considerable exactness for example, that with modernized vessels, equipment and gear, the harvest of our off-shore fisheries can be increased tenfold.

We know that our petroleum engineers and geologists believe we have only commenced to tap the vast submarine oil reserves which lie along portions of our coasts where the water is relatively shallow—and that vast additional oil reserves can be predicted at greater depths, and that their economic benefits simply await the development of our technology.

We know that gold is being mined off the Alaskan coast, and phosphorite for fertilizers off the coast of California.

We know that glauconite, used as a soil conditioner and water softener and as a source of potash, has been discovered off the east coast of our country.

We know that platinum, iron, chromium, tin and tungsten are among other valuable minerals to be mined from the ocean floors.

These are among the "known" factors in the great unknown area of the seas. And in a fashion we are like Columbus, on the threshold of new discoveries. We travel on different vessels in a different time—but let us make sure that we don't "miss the boat"—that we voyage forward in the best possible way. That is really what this conference is all about—and why I am so pleased to have had this opportunity of sharing with you my own views.

Support for the United Nations on Rhodesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Rhodesian question is now before the Security Council of the United Nations. That is the most appropriate place for it.

The civilized world is virtually unanimous in condemning the Rhodesian Government's act of rebellion, engaged in solely for the purpose of perpetuating an indefensible racism.

I regard this as an excellent opportunity for the United Nations to demonstrate its capacity to react against evil influences, the kind that offends the decent opinions of mankind. The United States, standing forthrightly as a member of the world community, will certainly be guided by the Security Council's action.

I urge the United Nations to act with prudence but with firmness.

I urge the United States to give its full support to whatever course the United Nations decides upon.

This is an opportunity for us to stand up simultaneously for the cause of human equality and the cause of world order.

Saxon Claim That Banking Is a Closely Regulated Industry Is Wide of the Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Comptroller of the Currency James J. Saxon has often asserted that no industry is more completely regulated by Government than banking. Based upon this dubious premise, Mr. Saxon insists that banking is somehow different from other businesses and thus deserving of special treatment under the laws.

The constant goal of the big bankers is exemption from the jurisdiction of all Government agencies except the Federal banking agencies, which they themselves dominate. Frequently they have succeeded; for instance, the amendments to the Federal Securities Acts in 1964 for the first time applying disclosure standards to the larger banks contained a provision insisted upon by the bankers that the banking agencies, and not the Securities and Exchange Commission, administer the new law with respect to banks. It is just as logical to let the Federal Power Commission administer the securities laws as to Consolidated Edison or the Federal Communications Commission as to A.T. & T. The truth is there is no real logic to this, but the big bankers like it because the banking agencies will always go easy on them. Of the agency officials, only Hon. J. L. Robertson, Governor of the Federal Reserve, has spoken out in firm opposition to the "competition in laxity" that characterizes Federal bank regulation. Witness the pathetically weak "disclosure" regulations issued by Comptroller Saxon. Even a spokesman for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation could not resist recently taking a poke at the lack of adequate disclosure that Saxon is permitting. Obviously, bank stockholders are the ones who suffer.

More recently, the big banks are spearheading a drive they hope will, in effect, excuse them from the merger curbs in the antitrust laws. S. 1698, if passed, would forgive 2,200 past bank mergers, even including mergers adjudged illegal by the courts. More importantly, it would take the traditional antitrust laws out of bank mergers and instead of the Justice Department, bank mergers would be regulated hereafter only by the merger-minded banking agencies. These agencies tend more to be supertrade associations for the banking industry, rather than guardians of the public interest, and Congress would be most unwise to once again give special treatment to banking.

The American Bankers Association and the big-bank fat cats who support it claim that banking is unique and already overregulated. In the first place, all industries are unique from one another. In the second place, banking is definitely not a highly regulated industry, particularly from the public service standpoint. Banking is supervised from the standpoint of soundness and solvency through the examination process. And even this area of Federal oversight has shown alarming weaknesses. Witness the recent failure of the San Francisco National Bank where uninsured losses to the public may exceed $30 million. If this is what Mr. Saxon means by close regulation, then we certainly should consider a shakeup among our bank regulators. If banking is so well supervised and regulated why is it that so many hoodlums are discovered in the banking business?

In testifying on S. 1698, the bank merger forgiveness bill, Mr. Wallace Kirkpatrick, speaking on behalf of the 6,200 strong Independent Bankers Association of America, had this to say, and I quote from page 164 of the Senate hearings:

> Moreover, although commercial banking is subject to a variety of governmental controls, the regulatory scheme does not cover many areas of banking and particularly is largely absent from the area of interrelation of bank and customer.
>
> There is no banking control over interest rates a bank may charge; charges for banking services are free of governmental regulations.
>
> Unlike certain other of the so-called regulated industries, banking is left free of control in numerous vital areas, such as the availability of loans and the rates charged for them.
>
> Competition regulates the market forces in those areas, and that competition must be guaranteed its freedom by the protection of the antitrust laws so that it may perform its function.
>
> The Supreme Court in the Philadelphia Bank case has described the extent of banking regulation in these words:
>
> "Moreover, bank regulation is in most respects less complete than public utility regulations, to which interstate rail and air carriers, among others, are subject.
>
> "Rate regulation in the banking industry is limited and largely indirect; banks are under no duty not to discriminate in their services; and though the location of bank offices is regulated, banks may do business, place loans, and solicit deposits where they please.
>
> "The fact that the banking agencies maintain a close surveillance of the industry with a view toward preventing unsound practices that might impair liquidity or lead to insolvency does not make Federal banking regulation all pervasive, although it does minimize the hazard of intense competition" (374 U.S. at 352).
>
> If banking were to be immunized from the antitrust laws, there would have to be, in the public interest, far more direct and pervasive Federal regulation than has been proposed.
>
> Although it is true that the presently proposed bill would exempt from the antitrust

laws only mergers approved under the Bank Merger Act, still this novel legislation might easily be the first step to more extensive and complete regulation of the industry.

What the ABA and the big bankers fail to realize, as Mr. Kirkpatrick so clearly pinpoints, is that when an industry succeeds in an antitrust exemption, it is flirting with even more restrictive types of Government regulation, such as price controls, and even the possibility of nationalization. I am personally unalterably opposed to any change from a sound dual banking system where effective competition and free enterprise prevail.

Frankly, I do not believe that Mr. Saxon and other spokesmen for the big banks want public-utility type regulation in banking anymore than I. But in their haste to get what the big bankers think they want today, they have lost sight of the really important considerations—what will American banking be like in the 21st century, competitive free enterprise? Or will we, instead, find ourselves at the loan window at the local U.S. post office for our borrowing needs? Its not an impossibility at all, and certainly demands consideration by those who shout that only they have the best interests of banking and the banking public at heart. It is a short step from monopoly to socialism.

A Protest Against Actions of the Turkish Government Against the Ecumenical Patriarchate of the Greek Orthodox Church in Istanbul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, many members of the Greek Orthodox Church in the United States as well as many other Americans have expressed their grave concern about the measures taken by the Government of Turkey against the ecumenical patriarchate of the Orthodox Church in Istanbul.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a copy of a resolution on this matter which was unanimously adopted by the St. Andrew's Greek Orthodox Church community of South Bend, Ind., in my own congressional district and sent to me.

I also insert the text of my reply to the presbyter of the church, the Reverend George C. Massouras, and the church president, Mr. Andrew P. Poledor:

RESOLUTION

The Greek Orthodox Church of America, through its exarch and representative of the ecumenical patriarchate in the Americas, Archbishop Iakovos, has made known and has strongly denounced the present situation in Turkey, to President Johnson, to the United Nations Secretary General U Thant, and to other civic and religious leaders. In the past few months, we have been gratified at the deep concern voiced by these leaders. Following an audience with Pope Paul VI during his historic 1-day visit to the United States on October 4, 1965, Archbishop Iakovos issued the following statement:

"It was a great privilege for me to be received by His Holiness Pope Paul VI during his crowded and epochal day in New York. I feel very moved that the spiritual leader of the Roman Catholic Church showed such deep concern at the present day sad situation confronting the ecumenical patriarchate and our Greek Orthodox brethren in Turkey, and at his desire to help His Holiness Athenagoras I and his flock in their present trials."

But the oppressive measures of the Turkish Government against the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople in Istanbul, and the Greek Orthodox minority there continue unceasingly. It therefore behooves us to bring to your attention the fact that these measures by the Turkish Government include: "control" of patriarchal finances and activities; the seizure of two churches of the ecumenical patriarchate in Istanbul by followers of the "Turkish Pseudo-Orthodox" movement; the expulsion of thousands of Greek nationals; the closing of schools and philanthropic institutions of the patriarchate; refusal to allow students of the Greek Orthodox parochial schools to participate in commemorations of religious holidays; the forceful closing of the printing plant of the patriarchate; and the arbitrary ousting from Turkey of Prelates of the Holy Synod of the ecumenical patriarchate.

Having just commemorated the 25th anniversary of the historic day of October 28, 1940, when the people of Greece said "No"—the famous "OXI" in Greek—to the Italian demands for surrender and successfully resisted the invaders, and thus thwarted the Axis powers' plans for a speedy overthrow of Europe, we, as members of the second largest Christian religious body in the world, emphatically say "No" in protest against the trampling upon of religious freedom, by the nation of Turkey, which does not comprehend the meaning of freedom and which does indeed scorn its existence.

We beseech you to examine the atrocities of late in Turkey against the ecumenical patriarchate and the Greek Orthodox minority, and then join with us in protesting the unacceptable religious persecution in Turkey; unacceptable not only to us, but to the age in which we live and to the entire civilized world, but above all to America, the greatness of which has been blessed by its freedom of religion.

We thank you for the consideration given our plea. We are confident that through your efforts and the prayers of freemen everywhere, that the day will soon come, when religious persecutions will be no more.

Respectfully,

THE GREEK ORTHODOX CONGREGATION OF ST. ANDREW'S GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH OF SOUTH BEND, IND.

LETTER FROM CONGRESSMAN BRADEMAS

The Reverend GEORGE C. MASSOURAS,
Presbyter.
Mr. ANDREW P. POLEDOR,
President, St. Andrew's Greek Orthodox Church, South Bend, Ind.

DEAR FATHER MASSOURAS AND MR. POLEDOR: Thank you very much for sending me the text of the resolution which was adopted unanimously by the St. Andrew's Greek Orthodox Church community in general assembly.

I am pleased indeed to have the opportunity to express my own deep concern about the recent reports I have been receiving of the harassment and expulsion of the Greek subjects in Turkey. Ever since the conflict erupted between the Greeks and the Turks on the island of Cyprus, retaliation against the Greek nationals in Istanbul has been "an open policy" of the Turkish Government.

It is true that the recent crises in the Greek Government have complicated any moves designed to reach a solution to the Cyprus situation. Yet methods such as those being used by the Turks will do nothing more than complicate this situation even further and diminish the possibility of effective negotiations.

The Greek minority community in Turkey has lived there for generations. As of this summer, 5,000 of the 11,000 Greek nationals living in Turkey had been expelled and the remainder are being systematically ousted. Since those who are deported are often heads of families, their dependents, who are Turkish citizens, are in many cases forced to leave. The Greek Orthodox community in Istanbul, which a few years ago numbered 100,000 members, has now dropped to half that number and is being further reduced every day as a result of the systematic campaign to drive Hellenism out of Turkey. Unless a solution is soon found, the Greeks in Istanbul fear their community will soon be entirely dispersed. As of September 15, an agreement under which Greeks have been privileged to live in Turkey has been canceled. And recently the Turkish Government has been enforcing a long-overlooked law barring Greek nationals from 30 professions and occupations. Greeks are not permitted, for example, to be doctors, nurses, architects, shoemakers, cooks, guides, or tailors.

Greeks scan the Istanbul newspapers for published lists, fearing they will find their names. When they do they are given a week to leave the country and police escorts insure that they make the deadline. Many of those deported are small shopkeepers or craftsmen, priests, teachers, students, and housewives. All have to leave Turkey with almost no money following preventive seizure of their property against alleged nonpayment of taxes. Turkish officials contend that all Greeks deported are guilty of subversive activities. That the list of deportees is drawn up at random is clear from the fact that such lists have included the names of several persons long dead. All were described as "major security risks."

There is fear now in the hearts of 60,000 Turks of Greek descent.

The ecumenical patriarchate of Istanbul, headed by Athenagoras I, is the patriarchate which has jurisdiction over the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America, which is the largest of the Eastern Orthodox bodies in America, with an estimated 2 million communicants. Much as Rome is the center of Roman Catholicism, the patriarch is the primate of the approximately 200 million Eastern Orthodox Christians and his See in Istanbul is Orthodoxy's center. Because of the patriarchate's universally important position, it is particularly unfortunate that the Turks should persist in these humiliating measures. The patriarchate has maintained its spiritual role for more than 16 centuries. Yet in the last few months the patriarch has been a virtual hostage of the Turkish Government and even the orphanage of the patriarchate has been shut down.

Turkey claims that these measures have been adopted in retaliation for maltreatment of Turkish Cypriots by Greek Cypriots but this pretext is senseless because neither the Greeks of Turkey nor the ecumenical patriarchate are a party to the Cyprus dispute.

I sincerely hope that the Turkish Government will not persist in this policy which is not only harmful to the Turks as a bargaining counter in the Cyprus dispute but which violates internationally accepted covenants and principles of law and morality expressed in the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne, which established the rights of non-Moslem minorities in Turkey to religious and cultural freedom—all of which agreements have been solemnly subscribed to by Turkey.

I do not want to believe that what is going on in Turkey today will become a full-force anti-Greek persecution policy. With deep respect for the Greek people and the independent nation which their courage has created, I wish to add my voice to the hundreds of ecclesiastical and civic leaders and organizations both here and abroad protesting this tragic situation in the hope that we might penetrate the conscience of the Turkish Government—that they will cease this merciless persecution of a minority unable to defend itself.

In order to give further voice to the concern which you and members of St. Andrew's Greek Orthodox Church and I share about this matter, I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of your resolution and my response to President Johnson and Secretary of State Rusk, and I shall also have the text of both your resolution and my letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN BRADEMAS,
Member of Congress.

Dr. James E. Mooney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, an illustrious career of Government service will come to an end on December 31 with the retirement of Dr. James E. Mooney, assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Antarctic Matters.

When Dr. Mooney began his outstanding work as an associate of Adm. Richard E. Byrd in the Department of Defense in 1950, he had already distinguished himself as an editor, author, and educator. Besides serving as a university president and in other important capacities, he studied aeronautics in England and France and wrote such books as "Knight Without Armor," "Ernie Pyle," "French in Florida," "Each Tomorrow," "Wheels Up," and "Roaring Wheels and Shining Rails." His works before 1950 also included "Airport Area Planning" and "Flights to Nature's Wonderlands."

As Special Assistant for Antarctic Matters, Dr. Mooney has been a highly respected and effective member of the Department of Defense. His knowledge and experience came to be especially appreciated during the International Geophysical Year in 1958, when he convincingly advocated full U.S. participation. Having visited Antarctica at that time, I found Dr. Mooney's advice and cooperation to be invaluable.

The most important focal point of great interest at this time, scientifically, is in the Antarctic, where the United States is participating in the scientific work at seven different locations. The scientific disciplines studied include the following: auroras, cosmic rays, geomagnetism, glaciers, gravity, geodesy, ionosphere, meteorology, oceanography, seismology, and solar activity. The United States has a considerable stake in the Antarctic and has been exploring in that area since 1820, the most extensive explorations having been carried on by U.S. citizens and the Navy since 1925. Well-known figures who have participated as leaders are widely known and have included such names as Byrd, Dufek, Ellsworth, and Ronne.

The United States has seen more Antarctic territory than all other nations combined. What natural resources are hidden in this vast area twice the size of the United States and what the future holds—scientifically—in this area, yet to be revealed, is largely a matter of time and evaluation of the scientific, economic, and geographic factors. This is especially true in this new space age.

Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that Dr. Mooney will no longer be an active component of the scientific effort that is delving into the mysteries of Antarctica, but none of us would deny him the opportunity to retire after so many years of tireless dedication to his duties in Government service. He was one of nine persons to make the first flights over the North and South Poles in continued flight plans, and he insisted upon resuming his work after a severe operation as a result of an aircraft accident while flying toward Antarctica. He has more than earned every honor bestowed upon him.

Dr. Mooney was recipient of the American Polar Explorers Award in 1938. Five years later he received the Award of Merit, U.S. Navy. A mountain in the Queen Maude Range of Antarctica was named for him. He has received commendations from the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Chief of Naval Operations in addition to the Government's Distinguished Service Award. His latest honor was the Belgian Government's award of the Order of the Crown.

Dr. Mooney's contributions will continue to be recognized long after his retirement. And history will record his name among the few outstanding figures who have been prominent in the scientific development of Antarctica.

What About Creeping Socialism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the 89th has been a remarkable Congress, but as many observers have pointed out it has been involved primarily in fulfilling the unmet promises of the New Deal. This Congress has helped America catch up on a tremendous backlog of needs, such as the plight of the forgotten fifth of our population, and the need to expand educational opportunity. But much remains to be done.

Still the cries of "creeping socialism" and "the welfare state" fill the air as a shorthand way of criticizing the work of the Congress. How much truth is there in the charge? How close are we to socialism?

I discussed this question in the Gaston lecture at Georgetown University April 7. I attempted to provide some sense of perspective on such questions as the size of the Federal debt, the number of Federal employees and the role of State governments. I ask that the lecture be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LECTURE BY MR. CHURCH

Ever since I can remember, I have been hearing about "creeping socialism" in the United States. After all these years, I am prepared to admit there is something to the argument. Since the end of the Second World War, socialism has been creeping, not into, but out of, our national life.

"Socialism" is defined by Webster as "the collective or governmental ownership * * * of essential means of production of goods." Just how does our Government stack up against that definition?

Immediately following the war, the Federal Government commenced to divest itself of manufacturing plants, food processing establishments, warehouses, and other holdings of a business character. Many of these properties had been built at public expense for wartime needs. They were sold, often for a few cents on the dollar, in order to place this productive potential in private hands. The program of divestment, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, has been a direct repudiation of socialism, and a deliberate endeavor to bolster and enlarge the private sector of our economy.

After World War II, the Government gave away or sold at a fraction of its cost $40 billion worth of factories and other real and personal property. In 1954, total proceeds from sales had dropped to only $8.6 million. Since then, however, the acceleration of the Government divestment program has been consistent and impressive. In the years since 1960, sales proceeds from real property have never fallen below $70 million a year. In 1964, the Federal Government disposed of over $90 million worth of its realty. Since 1955, the Government has sold personal property worth $261 million and given away $3,075 million in personal property.

Indeed, we are now engaged in an effort to close down Government-owned Navy years—Socialist operations going back nearly a hundred years—for the purpose of strengthening the private shipbuilding industry.

With a similar intent, the Kennedy administration opted against putting the Federal Government into the telestar business, out of preference for private enterprise. Even though the research had been almost entirely financed by the Government, the satellite communication business was turned over to a special corporation, created by an act of Congress. The Federal Government now leases facilities back from the corporation.

Under the present administration, the Office of Economic Opportunity is letting contracts to private business to render social services exactly as the Pentagon lets contracts to produce missiles, putting a profit motive even into the war on poverty. Already four private corporations have contracts totaling $44 million to run Job Corps camps, and there are more to come.

Creeping socialism? Pierre Salinger was asked about it at an Idaho Press Association meeting last year. His reply was: "I've spent a lot of time around the White House, and believe me, none of it is creeping around there."

There was a time when socialism was a living force in American politics. A few years before I was born, Eugene Debs, running for President on the Socialist ticket from a jail cell, collected nearly a million votes. During the depression years, many Americans still considered socialism as the only answer to chronic unemployment, spreading poverty, and general misery.

The industrial societies of Western Europe turned increasingly to socialism as a solution to the problems brought on by the sweatshop, the factory town, the inequitable distribution of wealth, and the excessive concentration of economic power in the hands of the few. The movement toward socialism carried many a European country far down the road, but the momentum is waning at last. It now appears, more and more, to be a spent force, except in the underdeveloped regions of Africa and Asia, where the lack of private capital makes socialism the only choice.

To be sure, we have been living through a time of ferment, marked by rapid political, economic, and social change. In the least fortunate lands, this upheaval has led to the extremes of the right and left—to fascism or to communism. But nowhere have these changes been better contained, or more restrained, than in the United States.

The New Deal harnessed the wild horses of revolution to the wagon of measured reform. Roosevelt sought to build, upon the foundation of free enterprise, a system of stability truly responsive to the needs of the Nation, a peoples' capitalism of wealth widely shared. For four-fifths of our people, that goal has now been achieved.

Look, for example, at how we are solving the problems created by our massive urban population: the need for housing, for old-age protection, and for electrical energy:

1. While other industrialized countries put the Government in the business of building most of the housing, we chose a system of tax incentives and an FHA program of low-interest loan guarantees, which left the vast majority of building and lending in private hands. The Federal Government now finances housing projects almost exclusively in those areas of low income where private capital cannot, or will not, venture.

2. Other industrialized countries, such as West Germany, spend as much as 20 percent of the gross national product on social security, 24 of them spending a larger part of their national budgets on the program than do we. The United States has maintained a relatively modest social security program, while encouraging private retirement plans to assume the bulk of the load.

3. While other countries have nationalized their power systems in the United States, 76 percent of our power is today generated by private industry, with only 13 percent generated by the Federal Government. Since John F. Kennedy—one of those so frequently accused of promoting creeping socialism—became President, private power companies have each year obtained a larger share of the market, while that of public power has steadily declined. Now, President Johnson is joining private and public power agencies in compacts to build joint transmission lines, with the benefit going to both sides, and to the consumer.

It is true that our economy is a mixture of things. There is a certain amount of Government ownership, particularly at the State and local level. We also have our farm cooperatives, our REA's, and our nonprofit associations. But the essential character of our economy has been sturdily preserved. Even public transportation—railroads, airlines, buses, steamships—and public communications—telephones, telegrams, radio, television—all have remained largely in private hands.

In fact, the privately owned and operated sector of our economy has been experiencing unprecedented growth. Never has new investment been greater, or earnings higher, or employment larger, than in recent years. By any standard of measurement, free enterprise in America is just doing fine.

This is not to say that all our problems are solved, not by any means. Nor is it to say that our present affluence, enjoyed by 80 percent of the American people, just happened that way. It didn't. What we have today is, in large measure, the result of what we have learned in the art of government over the past 30 years, the assured retirement income we have provided the aged, the unemployment compensation for between-job grocery money, and the minimum wage standards we have written into law. Also noteworthy are the tools for fiscal management of the economy that we have perfected, such as the control of interest rates to stimulate or contract capital investment, or the resort to public works in order to stem a downward turn in the business cycle.

More recently, we have been learning about the dramatic growth that can be achieved from a calculated tax cut. Contradicting every orthodox preachment that taxes must not be reduced during a period of deficit spending, three consecutive tax cuts for business, with a fourth coming this year, have resulted in a business expansion so pronounced that unemployment has fallen to the lowest level in 84 months. The resultant increase in overall revenue to the Federal Government now promises the prospect of a balanced budget 2 years hence. Henry Ford's discovery that more money could be made by selling a cheaper car has finally been recognized on the banks of the Potomac.

But if it be true that the United States is moving away from socialism, what about those other charges—the ones about the welfare state—which have become so familiar, and which go something like this:

The do-gooders have taken over. They want the Federal Government to act as wet nurse for the whole population, from the cradle to the grave, insuring that every want is uniformly satisfied. They are extracting, through high taxes, the good citizen's money, and doling it out to shiftless, improvident citizens. In the process, the Government is becoming insolvent, and a monstrous bureaucracy has arisen which stretches its tentacles around the 50 States, slowly squeezing them to death. Our traditional system of checks and balances is thus being undermined, and the liberties of the people eroded away.

For those more interested in pulling the sheets off hobgoblins than quailing before them, just what are the facts about this somber indictment?

To begin, what accounts for the big government we have in Washington today, and the relatively high level of Federal taxation needed to support it? A look at recent Federal budgets will make the answer at once evident. Big government on the Potomac is chiefly the product of the warfare state, not the welfare state.

More than half of the Federal budget goes directly to the Armed Forces. Nearly $10 billion a year goes to pay the $269 billion portion of the national debt accumulated in World War II. More than $5 billion goes to the space budget. Other expenses, such as those for the Atomic Energy and Central Intelligence agencies, and the swollen costs of diplomacy and foreign aid, including military assistance to our allies, all relate directly to the security requirements of the United States.

Add these up and the total amounts to about three-quarters of the entire budget. Of your Federal tax dollar this year, the Government will spend about 11 cents on all of its programs for health, housing, and welfare.

Far from strangling the States, the Federal Government is assisting the States to finance their programs of public assistance, roads, and education. Here, for example, are three measures either recently enacted or awaiting congressional action:

1. Appalachia, which provides slightly more than a billion dollars to promote the recovery of a chronically depressed area. It will actually be subject to the control of the Governors of the 11 affected States.

2. The much-discussed war on poverty program, which is basically a community action approach. Local communities draw up their own plans for needed social services, retraining courses, or new industry, and come to the Federal Government for seed money and technical assistance. All begins and ends at the local level.

3. The aid-to-education bill, now before the Senate. Again, the money will go directly to the States and local school districts for use within general categories, but administered entirely by local people. Even with passage of this bill, less than 2 percent of the Federal budget will be spent for education.

Everyone recognizes that public relief, as carried on by most State and local governments, merely perpetuates poverty. The new programs approved by Congress, such as area redevelopment, Appalachia, and the so-called war against poverty, are directed toward job training and the building of new industry. They are calculated to get people off the relief rolls and onto payrolls. I don't see anything wrong with that.

As to the next hobgoblin—the alleged growth of the Federal bureaucracy—let's compare it with that of the States. Actually, Federal employment no longer keeps pace with the growth of the country. Twenty years ago, there were 16 Federal employees for every 1,000 inhabitants. Today there are only 12. In the same period, the number of State and local government employees rose from 24 to 37 per thousand. Since 1946, Federal employment has increased by only 4.2 percent, while State and local government employment has gone up 114 percent.

And what of the Federal debt? Most of it was accumulated in wartime. Since 1947, it has risen by 16 percent. In the same period, private debt held by individual citizens increased 586 percent, that of corporations by 323 percent, and that of State and local government by a whopping 578 percent. If debt accumulation is the measure of fiscal irresponsibility, the self-styled sentinels would do better if they stationed themselves closer to home.

This brings us to an examination of the last hobgoblin in the spook-show version of the welfare state to which I earlier referred, the familiar assertion that the huge Federal octopus is crushing our basic freedom. This question ought to be paramount in any appraisal of the larger role the Federal Government has come to play in our society.

The expanded scope of Federal activity has naturally engendered suspicion. The Founding Fathers assigned a very limited role to the National Government, one suited to the life of a rural and sparsely populated colonial America. They could not foresee the sweeping changes the future held in store for their infant country. They could not possibly have envisioned how our lives would be transformed by stampeding science, by mammoth industries, and by the burgeoning growth and urbanization of America.

Our own history furnishes the evidence that the Federal Government has been extended, not because anyone planned it that way, not in pursuit of any conspiracy to concentrate power in Washington, not, indeed, because any body of doctrine required it, but simply because the country grew and changed, new problems arose which existing machinery could not solve, and new ways were worked out, usually on a trial-and-error basis, to meet them.

Has this expanded role of the Federal Government infringed upon our freedom? If by freedom, one means the bundle of individual rights guaranteed to each citizen by the Federal Constitution, then there is no evidence to support the charge. The whole movement of our history has been in the direction of enlarging the bundle: Slavery has been abolished, women's suffrage has been won, the many restrictions that once made voting the privilege of the propertied few have been steadily sluffed away.

And the process continues. This very day, Negro citizens are engaged in an heroic endeavor to secure for themselves, in practice, the equality which the Constitution promises them in principle. Their racial revolution is further extending the frontiers of freedom in America.

Our political ancestors did not bestow upon us a system of freedom, finished and fine. Rather, they set us upon the road that leads toward freedom; they lighted a lamp for us, and they gave us a Constitution as a vehicle; but it has been up to those Americans who came after them to make the long journey. The history of the United States has been one of steady progress along the road. As long as we continue the march, so long shall we keep the faith of our fathers—so long shall we be able to share an honest pride in the greatness of our country.

A Republican editor from my State has written some wise words recently about this historical course:

"We would do our children a favor—seeing to it that so many of them do not remain children politically all their lives—if we taught them not merely the greatness of a few men dead but also of the relative lack of dignity in which our recent ancestors lived.

"At this country's birth you could not vote it were you female, if you owned no land (as most did not), if you were indentured or a slave. Most children didn't go to school as we know school; they were chattel.

"In mills and factories and mines, tens upon tens of thousands of children worked for as little as 50 cents a week paid to their parents or to owners-by-indenture.

"Many Birchers are at most the great-grandsons of Irishmen who died for no greater offense than being Irish; Calvinists, Catholics, Jews, and then Mormons, lost life or property or citizenship because of their religion or nationality.

"A hundred years ago our American ancestors were slaughtering each other; less than half that long ago real warfare was waged in the mining camps and railroad yards and in the streets and docks of industrial cities.

"In hundreds of communities it was only in the schools, as education became a birthright, that children of different ancestry met—and by no means unanimously, and by no means is the process over—and learned however grudgingly, to believe that persons reared differently from themselves might be entitled to the same rights and opportunities as themselves in a free society.

"We have come a long, long way. We are freer, happier, healthier, and more knowledgeable and peaceable than any generation of our ancestors. The difference is phenomenal. Many an extremist is simply a child who never learned this, and so remains a child."

In concluding, I do not want to leave any impression that we Americans can be either smug or satisfied with our past achievements. A fifth of our people still live in squalor and ignorance. Slums fester like open sores in every major city. Our rivers are contaminated, and our air is befouled. Millions of our people are still denied fundamental rights. There is much to be done.

But there is much too which has been done—accomplishments in which we can take a rightful pride. The federal system has been preserved, excessive concentration of political power has been averted, our private economy has been made to flourish for the many instead of a few. Ours is a great and free land, rich beyond dreaming, powerful beyond belief; a land still striving to reach the goals of personal liberty, equality and opportunity to which we pledged our Nation in the days of its infancy.

God only knows what our fate is to be, but on this earth we can shape our destiny. We can best prepare for it by facing the future, instead of the past, and by recognizing that our society, as we know it today, has been fashioned by the effort of freemen to regulate their affairs in the response to the needs of the changing times.

Let the process continue, for it cannot be stopped. And let us pray that it will be directed in the future as it has in the past, by unbigoted and pragmatic men, who have no fear of hobgoblins, and who are dedicated to the everlasting quest of keeping our society open and free.

A Report To the People by Congressman George M. Rhodes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the 1st session of the 89th Congress, the Johnson administration and the Democratic majority of Congress have honored the pledges given to the American people in the Democratic platform of 1964.

As a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, I was closely associated with the writing of two pieces of major legislation: the expansion of the social security program to include medical care for the aged, and the excise tax cuts which acted as a boost to our already booming economy.

The progressive and humanitarian programs enacted this session have been championed by the Democrats since 1933. Opponents of these programs have leveled charges that this Congress has acted hastily and has rubberstamped President Johnson's legislative requests.

President Johnson's Great Society measures are extensions of reforms that emerged from the New Deal of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Fair Deal of Harry Truman, and the New Frontier under the late President Kennedy.

Eight years under a Republican administration slowed the pace of social and economic reforms. The American people by electing John F. Kennedy reaffirmed their desire to meet necessary public and human needs and President Johnson has been faithful to this commitment. In my 17 years as a Member of Congress, I have supported these programs which provide hope and opportunity for all Americans.

They are made necessary by the complex technological and social changes which are taking place in this country. The advance of automation and the population explosion have brought changes which must be dealt with by intelligence and foresight. We must expand our economy fast enough to offset the effects of automation. The Federal Government must cooperate with State and local governments in solving the problems caused by increased population such as the need for adequate schools, housing, care for the aged, and providing necessary social services.

The funds used to solve these problems are an investment in our country's most valuable resource—people. The Democratic Party has consistently promoted legislation which meets this Nation's human and public needs. The Johnson administration gives further evidence of that historical fact. The 1st session of the 89th Congress has been described by competent and impartial observers as one of the most constructive in the annals of American history. It has enacted more legislation, met more national needs, than any Congress of this century.

I am thankful for the privilege to have participated in the work of a Congress which has made a significant contribution toward the creation of a truly Great Society.

The list of accomplishments includes some 70 pieces of major legislation. This report will outline briefly those which are most important to the citizens of our Sixth District.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Passage of the social security-medicare bill marked a real breakthrough for America's senior citizens. I am sure I convey the sentiments of my Democratic colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee when I say that having helped write this humane and progressive legislation has been the most rewarding experience of my 17 years of congressional service.

The law now provides hospital care insurance for citizens 65 and over, optional insurance to help meet other medical expenses, and an across-the-board increase of 7 percent in monthly social security cash benefits.

Our Sixth District which is successfully fighting unemployment and economic distress will benefit substantially as a result of this act. Residents of our district will receive an increase of more than $13 million in benefit payments as a result of the added 7 percent.

Total social security payments to citizens in our district will rise to $94 million per year by 1967. This money will be spent for food, shelter, and services. It will provide an additional boost to the economies of our local communities.

In addition to supporting this legislation, I introduced bills to further expand and liberalize the social security system. It is my firm belief that expansion is necessary if we are to have a better and more fair distribution of our national wealth and prosperity.

One of my bills calls for the Federal Government to pay one-third of the contributions to the social security fund, matching the amount paid by employees and employers. The one-third Federal contribution would increase social security fund reserves by 50 percent. This would strengthen the fund and make possible badly needed improvements without an additional unjust tax burden on low-income wage earners. It would finance a needed increase in benefits, a reduction of retirement age to 60, and disability benefits after 1 year of coverage.

I was privileged to have flown with President Johnson and other Democratic leaders to Independence, Mo. The signing of the Social Security bill took place in the Truman Memorial Library in the presence of Harry Truman who like myself has been a longtime advocate of legislation to quiet the anxieties and ease the ills of old age.

STATE OF THE ECONOMY

November marks the 58th month of uninterrupted economic expansion that began under the leadership of the late President John F. Kennedy. Employment rates in our sixth district have risen to a record high due largely to the foresighted economic policy of the Kennedy-Johnson administrations.

A combination of enlightened Federal policies and prudent business and labor cooperation have enabled production and income to grow without the danger of inflation. The $4.7 billion excise tax cut passed by this Congress has proved to be an important factor in securing our economic growth. It was a high honor for me to have been invited to the White House by President Johnson to participate in the ceremony when this legislation was signed into law.

It is my belief that the buying power of lower and middle income groups should be increased. This will prove an added stimulus to the economy. To this end I have introduced legislation to increase income tax exemptions for individuals and dependents by $200, from the present $600 to $800.

EDUCATION

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act passed by this Congress will form the foundation of a renewed effort to build an educational system in this country unparalleled in the history of man.

The funds appropriated to carry out this effort are investments in our children and the future of the Nation. The materials and funds provided by this legislation will be used to enhance the educational opportunities of all American schoolchildren regardless of race, creed, or color. This Nation cannot afford the loss of talented youngsters. Our schools must have the financial support necessary to educate every child to his fullest potential. Over $2.7 million in Federal aid will flow into Sixth District schools. The money will be distributed through the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction and will be allotted on the basis of the number of low-income families within each school district. It has been estimated that Berks County will receive $913,000; Schuylkill County, $1,289,000; and Northumberland County, $800,000.

The success of this aid will depend entirely on how the local school boards use these funds. The Federal Government will not dictate how they are to be used. I am working closely with local school districts in their efforts to bring the full benefit of these programs to all the schoolchildren of our sixth district.

The Higher Education Act will provide similar aid to our Nation's colleges and universities. The law will make possible scholarship and loan assistance to help needy college students finance their educations. In addition, Federal matching grants will be made available for the construction of classrooms, laboratories and libraries. This program is necessary if we are going to provide the young people of the next generation with the educational opportunities necesssary to lead productive and fruitful lives.

WAR ON POVERTY

Programs under the Economic Opportunity Act designed to fight the war on poverty have been favorably received by the residents of our Sixth District.

I have been heartened by the progress we have made and I feel sure that narrow political interests will not slow the pace of these programs. Berks, Schuylkill, and Northumberland Counties have formed community organizations to fight the local antipoverty campaigns in both urban and rural areas. The Federal Government will pay 90 percent of the cost of these local projects. The response to the Economic Opportunity Act is evidence that citizens in urban and rural America share many common objectives. These objectives include more employment, better education opportunities for our young, and improved health facilities. The war on poverty has each of these as its objectives.

Grants by the Federal Government totaling close to $1 million have already been approved for our district in the short time that the Economic Opportunity Act has been in existence. One of the most successful programs in our district has been the Neighborhood Youth Corps. This component of the poverty program provides worthwhile jobs for young students who need financial assistance in order to continue their high school educations. The Neighborhood Youth Corps is now in operation in Sunbury schools, Berks County, Shenandoah, Mahanoy City, the Reading school district, the Reading and Pottsville YMCA's, and the Pottsville school district.

In addition, grants have been approved which provide training for the unemployed who have dependent children, for preschool medical and educational services for children who come from families stricken by economic misfortune.

It is not going to be the Federal Government's fault if our communities do not benefit fully from the Economic Opportunity Act. It will be the responsibility of local communities to select capable and dedicated administrators who are interested in the success of the war on poverty. Throughout this session of Congress, I have worked closely with every local group which has contacted me and requested assistance. I will keep fully advised of every facet of the economic opportunity program so that the residents of our Sixth District can avail themselves of the opportunities which it affords.

These and many other programs reflect the objectivity of the Johnson administration in seeking to meet human and public needs and in building a stronger and more prosperous America.

Public Sentiment on the War in Vietnam and the Student Left Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the vast majority of the fine Americans who are the students of our universities fully understand and unashamedly support America's policy in Vietnam. It is an unfortunate shibboleth of our free press that good news is no news. If the various media properly reflected the prevailing sentiment on the war in southeast Asia, there would be graphic evidence for all to see attesting to the overwhelming measure of public support our fighting men have.

Ther is, however, in many universities a disenchanted element of discord and despair which is either manipulated by Communist causes or which is naive enough to think that the right of students to dissent does not carry with it a commensurate responsibility.

I can inform the Senate with no small measure of pride that the student body at the University of Wyoming has rejected the confused counsel of the Vietnam dissenters. Many students have signed up for the blood drive which opens November 13. They, like thousands of other students across our Nation, will be shedding blood for their country and their fighting men in support of the battle for individual liberty underway in southeast Asia.

On numerous occasions I have commented on this philosophy of dissent; as well as on the war in Vietnam, and much has been said and written about both. I ask at this time that a resolution passed by Wyoming's Floyd Minch Post No. 44, American Legion, and a number of newspaper articles, speeches, and items which have emanated from my office, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY FLOYD MINCH POST NO. 44, AMERICAN LEGION, WORLAND, WYO.

Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States are currently engaged in conflict in southeast Asia; the purposes of which are to stem the flow of insidious communism and to allow freedom and self-determination for the peoples of South Vietnam; and

Whereas, adjunct to this national endeavor, some people in the United States, by various means, are undermining this undertaking by open defiance of our laws and ridicule of those who are supporting or participating in the conflict, most notably by draft card burning, "sit-ins," "lay-ins," "teach-ins," various "hate" programs and by objecting to military service on religious, moral, or psychological grounds when no such grounds actually exist; and

Whereas no nation, no matter how conceived, nor how strong, can long endure in an atmosphere of fraud, deceit, and criminal or civil disobedience: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Floyd Minch Post No. 44, American Legion, at a meeting regularly convened this 4th day of November 1965 does hereby deplore, decry, and chastise those American citizens—

Who, while accepting the benefits and blessings of this great Nation, are openly and actively defying the law of the land;

Who cry "freedom" and yet are undermining our national effort to insure this freedom;

Who under the guise of civil liberties or moral compulsion are giving aid and succor to an enemy whose foundations are the antithesis of morality and liberty of any kind;

Who, in insisting on free speech and expression, are raising their voices in ridicule of those Americans who are fighting; and be it further

Resolved, That the Floyd Minch Post No. 44, American Legion, strongly urges each and every American to do his duty; that he be honest with himself, his neighbor, and his country; that he accept, not only the multitudinous benefits of being an American, but that he also embrace its obligations; that he recognize that in times of distress, individual motives, feelings, and even convictions, must be subordinated to the constitutional "General Welfare"; that he ascribe to the philosophy of the patriot, Patrick Henry, when he said: "Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance by lying supinely on our backs?"

J. W. SEAWRIGHT,
Commander.

Attest:

A. R. GUSTAFSON,
Adjutant.

[From the Laramie Daily Boomerang, Oct. 20, 1965]

WE'RE PROUD OF UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING STUDENTS

We're proud of University of Wyoming students.

We're proud they were mature enough and sensible enough to see through the so-called peace demonstrations sweeping the Nation.

We're proud they turned a deaf ear to bearded beatniks who are unwilling to defend the Bill of Rights and who cry long and loud about rights being violated.

We're proud it wasn't a University of Wyoming student pictured burning what may have been his draft card.

We're proud of the students who were not caught up in action which would have been called treason in 1941.

We hope the students from other campuses who went along with the organized demonstrations against U.S. involvement in Vietnam will someday have second thoughts.

We hope they come to realize the war, they say no one is winning can't be won if there's widespread dissension on the homefront.

We hope they come to understand that the very Government they're trying to undermine makes it possible for them to speak and demonstrate freely. America is one of the few countries in the world where the right of the individual is protected to the extent he can criticize governmental actions without fear of reprisals.

We hope demonstrators talk with their fathers about freedoms fought for on two fronts two decades ago and with older brothers about rights protected in the snows of Korea.

We hope they come to recognize the "give-an-inch, take-a-mile" philosophy of the Communists and the need to take a decisive stand in Vietnam to stop the cancerous spread of Communist ideals.

We hope they come to emulate students at the University of Wyoming who don't rush blindly into anything.

[From the Wyoming State Tribune]

CALL IT WHAT YOU MAY

It is very well to suggest, in an atmosphere of intellectual asepsis and far from any direct personal involvement, that the activities of the anti-Vietnam marchers must be afforded all the sanctity of the free speech guarantee.

But that should not at the same time prevent critics of the demonstrators and protesters from inquiring into their purposes, motives and aims; from raising questions about their activities; from calling them to the public's attention, or even from denouncing them.

There are several salient points to remember about the current situation that makes it more than just a simple matter of ordinary citizens expressing an opinion on a given subject.

This country is at war. It is a war against a vicious and grimly determined enemy of indeterminate capability to conduct military operations, and of resources whose limitations are not immediately apparent to us.

Even though the Government of the United States has not officially declared this a war, for its own good reasons, the indisputable fact is that it is one anyway.

It is a war, because already we have 145,000 American military troops of various categories committed to this action, and there are uncontroverted predictions that by the first of this coming year, only 2 months away, this figure will have exceeded 200,000. The military buildup is rapid. It also is large.

We were committed to war when President Johnson sent the first American troops to Vietnam earlier this year to serve not as advisers to the South Vietnamese Government, but as direct interventionists in that conflict.

Constitutionalists argue that the President lacked authority to do this; but arguments against flouting of the basic law of the land have been raging for decades without any visible lessening of the encroachment on constitutional authority. Furthermore some of those who have been most vociferous in their contentions that the President of the United States had exceeded his power in a foreign matter, have been altogether willing to overlook such actions in domestic issues, so their arguments cannot be considered as advanced in good faith.

It must be accepted as fact, therefore, that the United States now is committed to a conflict no different, except as to scope, from any of the military engagements of its history to which it has been a party.

From numbers of personnel engaged, it is the fifth biggest such military action—larger than the American Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Indian Wars or the Spanish-American War; and next only after World War II, World War I, the Civil War, and the Korean war in that order.

Either as an extension of politics, or as a consequence of the failure of politics, whichever viewpoint one accepts, war does not admit of argument where political action may do so. It is a whole, unified, effort to prevail by means of arms instead of by reason or logic. It therefore does not admit of debate and never has.

With this as the background, then, it would seem perfectly understandable for citizens of this country to be aroused and disturbed by the activities of various groups seeking to thwart the national purpose that not only has been expressed, but now is being carried out, in Vietnam.

Such activities offer aid and comfort to our enemy in many ways, not the least of which is boosting his own morale. This is important in the present situation because there are indications that the nominal enemy we face in Vietnam has begun to suffer major losses. He now is losing a war that up until a few months ago he had been winning for years, with this development having occurred only through the U.S. military intervention that was effected this year.

The activities of the anti-Vietnam marchers plainly encourage the North Vietnamese Communists to persevere in their fight against us and the South Vietnamese. This is the great wrong that is being committed against our country by the anti-Vietnam demonstrators.

Further, they seek to thwart the military effort of the United States by defeating the recruitment, through the draft or by enlistment, of its military forces to combat this enemy. At the same time they either deliberately or consequentially work against the United States by adversely affecting the morale of our servicemen who are committed to action in Vietnam, and who daily must face the threat of death, wounds, illness or even capture by a relentless and remorseless enemy.

No one has denied these demonstrators against a national military effort by this country the right to publicly dissent.

But in the estimation of many, including ours, theirs is a treasonable activity.

If this should therefore make us superpatriots or "extremist busybodies," then we shall gladly suffer the label.

[Release from the office of U.S. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON, May 20, 1965]

SIMPSON ADDRESSES ALBIN GRADUATES

ALBIN, WYO., May 20, 1965.—U.S. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON zeros in on "radical leftwing student groups on college campuses" as he urges high school graduates here to "work as hard as you want to effect changes in our social system, but work within the system to help it, not outside of it to hurt it."

In remarks prepared for delivery tonight, Senator SIMPSON says many of today's high school graduates must enter universities which are influenced by students who form the second generation of Communists and radical leftists.

The Wyoming lawmaker will say the strength of the leftwing campus influence is the strongest today of any time since the 1930's. "Organizations such as Progressive Labor, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the W. E. B. Dubois Clubs, the Trotskyite Young Socialist Alliance, Students for a Democratic Society, and more than 200 others are setting the pace on many campuses." He says the students are being joined by a small, but loud minority of leftwing professors in forcing control of our universities out of the hands of their administrations. He says university life today on many campuses centers more around student radicalism than academic excellence.

SIMPSON is sharply critical of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. He says it is recognized by friend and foe alike as the most radical of the civil rights groups. He says it is a major influence on the campuses of more than 100 universities, has a paid permanent staff of 230 members and more than 150 chapters throughout the Nation. He says SNCC is by far the biggest student movement of the left and he quotes a Government investigator as saying that SNCC has been "thoroughly infiltrated by Communists."

"One great tragedy and danger of the student left is that it appeals to many sincere student nonconformists who have a genuine interest in changing what they consider inequities in our society. As a republican form of government, we can never oppose such legitimate change. At the same time, we must realize that our basic constitutional system of government is the oldest enduring form of government in the world, the most emulated in the world, and the only system that has ever been able to bring a significant and substantial measure of freedom, progress, and material comforts to those it governs. Our system has enabled us to produce one-third of the world's wealth even though we are only one-sixth of the world's population. The student left on many of our campuses today is seeking, not to better the faults of our system, but to change the system itself. This by their own admission is what they seek, whether they be disciples of the Chinese or Soviet version of leftism. A measure of their success can be seen in the inordinate influence they are exerting in the Vietnam dialog. They continuously whine that they live in a dangerous world that they didn't make. I can only say: thank God they didn't make it," Senator SIMPSON says.

The Wyoming Republican acknowledges many faults of the American system. He says Negroes in many Southern States do not have the right to vote, nor do they have equal protection under law. Both of these faults can be corrected by working within our constitutional system and by a greater public awareness of conditions that need correction. SIMPSON urges the Albin students to "jump into the middle of adult life and participate. To really have lived life, you must participate in it, but take care that your participation does not tear and torture the basic system of government from which all our freedoms and privileges, our benefits and responsibilities are derived."

Senator SIMPSON says that almost every American who is today a leader in business, politics, and society will within two decades have been eclipsed by a student who is graduating or about to graduate. He said there is nothing so temporary as political leadership. The man at the wheel is constantly being changed as new, aggressive, and competent leaders arise from the student ranks.

Senator SIMPSON will tell the graduates the two most important words in their adult lives will be decision and responsibility. He says that today's students will be faced with responsibilities which were unknown to the students of earlier eras. Your decisions must be quicker, tougher, and of unerring accuracy, for many of you will take positions in government, business, and science, and be in a position to chart the future progress of our State, our Nation, and the world.

[Release from the office of U.S. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON, May 18, 1965]

THE STUDENT LEFT

KINNEAR, WYO., May 18, 1965.—U.S. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON in a speech prepared for Morton High School graduation ceremonies says students "must take a long and profound look at their values and standards before leaving their homes to enter business or university life." He says the contest for the minds and allegiances of today's students is the sharpest in history and he urges the graduates to never underestimate the seriousness of the responsibilities they must assume as they leave the environment of their homes.

Noting that the graduates represent part of the first generation of Americans to live entirely in the cold war era, SIMPSON says the students face problems and decisions unknown to earlier generations.

"I believe Wyoming has an educational system which is more adequate than most in preparing you for the challenges that await you. As a graduate and long-time devotee of the University of Wyoming, I can enthusiastically recommend that campus which ranks in the top 10 percent of all American universities. However, there exists in many universities a challenge to your convictions and consciences that is only beginning to exist at our own school in Laramie."

Senator SIMPSON says the political left spawned on campuses throughout the country is reasserting itself in its strongest form since the depression. He cited a recent article in the Saturday Evening Post ("The Explosive Revival of the Far Left") together with speeches by the president of Howard University, in pointing out the danger to the American social and political system represented by the "unthinking, unconcerned, and Communist-oriented student left.

Senator SIMPSON will tell the Morton graduates that the influence of the student left on enlightened debate is being magnified and blown completely beyond its credibility by the Nation's press. He says the vast majority of students in our universities, their professors, and the overwhelming majority of Americans outside of academic circles favor President Johnson's Vietnam policy, but he says, "A vocal and violent minority playing on our constitutional guarantee that every minority can be heard has captured enough headlines and enough TV newscasts to create the false impression that theirs is the popular opinion in this country. As they work assiduously to oppose American policy, the hundreds of thousands of students who support the President and defend our social and political system but who neither sit-in nor riot, are made to appear in the minority."

Senator SIMPSON draws a comparison between the "fine young officers" at Cherry Point Marine Air Station, N.C., and the "unwashed and beer-soaked kooks and beatniks who were allowed to parade about the Nation's Capital last month in protest of America's policy in Vietnam." He says the clean-cut, clear-thinking young men and women in our Armed Forces, who fight for our country and not for pay, represent the vital consensus of American opinion. "This consensus must not be drowned out in the frantic clamor of the far left."

[From the Wyoming State Tribune]

THE CAMPUS COMMUNISTS

On May 18, 1965, Wyoming's Senator MILWARD SIMPSON in a speech delivered at a high school commencement exercise at Morton, Wyo., expressed alarm over the growth of leftwing political strength on the Nation's college campuses. He also called attention to the apparent development by which students involved with the Progressive Labor Party, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the W. E. B. Dubois Clubs, and the like, were being joined by a small percentage of their professors.

At the time he drew some barbs from the political opposition for these statements, but occurrences across the country and particularly within the past few weeks have tended to not only bear him out but also to bring out the distressing fact that if Mr. SIMPSON erred in any respect, it was on understatement rather than exaggeration.

One of the calmest, most professional but most disturbing views of the campus Communists came yesterday from Dr. Stefan Possony, an international authority on Communists and their techniques. Possony is director of the program of international political studies at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University.

Dr. Possony says the Communist infiltration of the campuses is nothing to be lightly regarded; that while this trend does not necessarily represent the efforts of the orthodox Communist Party of the United States, which is Moscow oriented, that it is one of Communist ties nevertheless. Possony made his comments in a copyrighted interview published by U.S. News & World Report.

The CPUSA is relatively weak, says Possony, and weaker than it has been in years; but the Communist agencies making the most gains are those which are Peiping rather than Moscow oriented. "They have been making considerable progress," he says.

Among working people? Among Negroes? None with the former, says Dr. Possony, and there is little evidence with the latter.

"But I am quite certain," he says, "that they are making progress with the college youth. In fact, the directive which was issued by the Communist Party several years ago was aimed precisely at that particular group. This is the most vulnerable group in the United States, and I would enlarge this group to include some of the college and university teachers, as well as the students."

In terms of total enrollment, the Communist following in the Nation's institutions of higher learning is small. Most students are not actively interested in politics, he says; but the Communist game is not one of numbers but of influence. Neither is it one of seeking to overthrow the United States by revolution, according to this authority; but rather of exercising a fundamental Communist principle of war and revolution through a technique known as revolutionary antimilitarism.

"The idea is to cut down the power of the military," says Possony. "It really doesn't make any difference whether the Communists disarm the military or whether they just make it impossible for the military to function efficiently as a security organ of the United States. The same idea applies to the police or to other vital institutions." Possony says the pacifism the student demonstrations are trying to promote is known as revolutionary pacifism.

The Vietnam war can be debated on a genuine, honest basis, but not with the Communists, says Possony, observing: "A true pacifist is against war—any war. A Communist is only against a war that does not serve communism. He is not against a war if it's a Communist war."

"To a Communist, pacifism is just a means to an end," he says. "He is pacifist in the United States today because he wants us to lose in Vietnam. Obviously, the same Communist is a 'bellicist,' or warmonger in North Vietnam because he wants his side to win this round."

If the situation changed where it were to the Communists' best interests to get the United States into a war, the Communists would become militarists just as they did in 1941 when the Reds switched suddenly from pacifism to advocating war when Hitler attacked the Soviet Union. "The line changed within 24 hours," says Possony. "The slogans changed but the demonstrators remained the same."

Legislative Accomplishments of the 1st Session of the 89th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my frank opinion that the 1st session of the 89th Congress will go down in history as one of the greatest in deed and accomplishment. Its legislative accomplishments will affect the lives of every American citizen and future generations. It has laid a foundation for a better world and an improved way of life for the entire world. In this day and age we hear restless youth, misguided adults, foreign elements, some friendly, and domestic groups who have prospered under our system, clamor for a change in our form of government. Smears and accusations were commonplace and used as a tactic by agitators in attempts to influence congressional action. Even the Halls of Congress were invaded by irresponsible elements in an attempt to influence and intimidate Members of Congress.

All these actions were futile and Congress progressed along the steady course of our national interest. Our governmental system is the best the world has ever known. Evidence of this is clear and can be seen at every turn. Under our constitutional form of government the American people have prospered beyond the greatest expectations of our forefathers. Congress fully realized this situation; therefore, instead of changing our form of government, it wisely accepted its responsibilities and worked diligently to improve our system.

This is the course I chose, not a change of our institutions and Government, but a wise and calculated improvement which would enrich and advance the quality of our civilization and improve the lot of every citizen of this great country. I am most proud to be a Member of the 89th Congress and especially the contributions I was able to make to the 1st session of this great Congress. I had the responsibility of being chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the House Judiciary Committee. Through arduous work and the cooperation of members of the subcommittee, we were able, after many delays and interruptions, to get an immigration bill passed which was in the best interest of our country.

IMMIGRATION

On January 27, 1965, soon after the 89th Congress convened, I announced that hearings on immigration legislation would begin on February 16, 1965. Members of Congress, the executive branch of Government, private organizations, and interested citizens were invited to testify.

I directed the hearings toward the realities of our immigration policy. The complexities of the law had led to a great deal of confusion and misunderstandings. Both the theories and actual practices had to be clarified and simplified. The first and foremost issue to be examined was the national origins quota system and the motives and meaning behind this system of admitting immigrants.

However, before full scale hearings began, I decided to hear the views of my constituents. On Saturday, February 20, 1965, I provided an opportunity for interested organizations and individuals in Greater Cleveland to express their views on the major issues related to the pending immigration legislation. The results of that hearing and the enthusiastic response to a questionnaire I had prepared were both revealing and encouraging. Results of these hearings provided a sound basis for the hearings before Congress.

The hearings before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality opened on March 3, 1965. As a direct result of testimony given before the subcommittee, on June 1, 1965, I introduced H.R. 8662, a bill to establish a selective immigration system. This bill was introduced after several conferences with President Johnson during which we examined the full range of problems involved. The provisions of my bill established a new selective immigration system, with qualitative and quantitative controls consistent with our domestic needs and our international commitments.

On October 3, 1965, the new immigration legislation, Public Law 89–236 was signed by President Johnson. The bill, H.R. 2580, as amended, was truly and genuinely bipartisan. In all respects it serves the national interest. Its bipartisanship is reflected in the unanimity by which its basic provisions passed my House subcommittee and the strong vote of confidence given to it by the full Judiciary Committee.

The effective date of the immigration legislation is December 1, 1965. Repeal of the national origins quota system and conditional limitation in Western Hemisphere immigration becomes effective July 1, 1968. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, I prepared 25 questions couched in the nontechnical language of the man in the street who wishes to know more about the law. These questions were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 7, 1965.

PRIVATE BILLS

During the first session of the 89th Congress, the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality held a total of 16 meetings devoted solely to the consideration of private bills introduced during the session. These included 3,014 private bills introduced in the House, and 151 private bills introduced in the Senate which were subsequently referred to the subcommittee. Of this total of 3,165 private bills considered, final action on 2,792 is still pending. Of the total of 373 bills on which final action was taken, 183 were tabled, 135 became private law, and the remainder of 55 bills are awaiting further action by the House or the Senate.

In addition to the private bills considered above, the subcommittee also took final action on 1,027 suspension of deportation cases referred to the Congress under sec. 244(a) (1) and (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, denying suspension for 42 of these cases.

The remaining 27 of the total of 46 meetings held by the subcommittee were devoted to hearings and executive sessions concerning H.R. 2580 in amending the Immigration and Nationality Act. H.R. 2580 became Public Law 89–236 on October 3, 1965.

MEDICARE

I introduced in Congress a bill to provide health insurance and medical care for the aged. I supported and voted for H.R. 6675, which legislation provided for this long awaited action by Congress. The bill in addition to medicare, provided for medical assistance programs for the needy, blind, disabled, and families with dependent children. The bill also provided for changes for which I introduced legislation to: First, increase widows' benefits and benefits to surviving children of deceased insured workers; second, permit payments of child's insurance benefits after the age of 18 years in the case of a child attending school; third, increase allowable earned income by retired workers; fourth, increase old-age survivors and disability insurance benefits.

H.R. 6675 incorporated these changes which I sponsored. It provides for an across-the-board increase of 7 percent in benefits to widows and surviving children and to old-age survivors and disabled persons. It is estimated that 20 million Americans will be the beneficiaries of this increase in monthly payments. The change authorizing payments of child's insurance benefits after 18 years and up to the 22d year, for those attending school, is expected to help 295,000 surviving children of deceased workers. By raising the ceiling on allowable earned income of retired workers, conditions of life for many of our aged citizens will be substantially improved.

VOTING RIGHTS

I supported this all important legislation because I believe that every citizen, regardless of his economic status, his color or his race, should be permitted to exercise the right of franchise. I firmly believed that the Congress of the United States should express itself clearly on this vital issue. In so doing we assured every citizen of his constitutional rights and that we would support his efforts to achieve this goal which is rightfully his.

ELLIS ISLAND

On May 11, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson requested my presence at the White House to witness the signing of a proclamation adding Ellis Island to the Liberty Island National Monument. This was a moment of great personal satisfaction to me, because the day was exactly 6 years to the day, May 11, 1959, that I introduced H.R. 7054 in the 86th Congress, 1st session, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Ellis Island National Shrine.

WAR ON POVERTY

I supported this legislation because I believe that Congress could do no less than support and strengthen the mobilization of our resources in the war on poverty. On July 21, 1965, and again on September 23, 1965, I called for our local community to galvanize into action and stand for the principle of equal justice under law. Under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 plans were developed in many communities throughout the Nation to provide adequate legal aid to the indigent for all their legal problems.

I am making every effort to see that my home city, with its great tradition and civic pride, will move forward at an accelerated pace in providing legal assistance for the needy.

H.R. 10518—MINIMUM WAGE

On November 2, 1965, I presented to the Congress a petition signed by thousands of Greater Clevelanders, in which they expressed themselves clearly that the present Federal minimum wage law is inadequate to meet the needs of our time. I urged the leadership to schedule this bill for floor debate as early as possible in the next session of Congress.

PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL

On October 21, 1965, I introduced House Joint Resolution 781, which proposes that the U.S. Constitution be amended to permit Congress to regulate and control the distribution of pornographic material. I intend to pursue this action most forcibly in the next session, since I believe curbs should be placed on these materials, otherwise their production and distribution will continue to increase in alarming proportions.

DEFENSE

I supported all measures which increased the strength of our armed forces. I supported strong measures in Vietnam and protested the communistic, inhumane treatment of prisoners and civilians. In a major address, I described the reason for, and extent of Communist atrocities and terrorism in South Vietnam. On April 5, 1965, I strongly protested to the Secretary of Defense the "death" of our proud 37th "Buckeye" Division in the proposed reorganization of U.S. Army reserve components.

CLEVELAND AREA PROJECTS

On June 22, 1965, I commended my able colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. KIRWAN], for the favorable action taken on my request for an authorization of special funds to continue the work of the Corps of Army Engineers in cleaning up debris in the Cuyahoga River and Cleveland Harbor. I will continue to do all in my power to control pollution of our fresh-water sources in the Cleveland area.

I took the lead in having the Crile Hospital site become a Greater Cleveland educational center. Within weeks the Broadview Heights Veterans' Administration Hospital will be turned over to the Ohio Department of Hygiene and Corrections for use as a diagnostic treatment, training, and educational facility for the mentally retarded. Both of these worthy projects were for the good of the community and will provide needed services for our citizens.

On April 8, 1965, I announced that the Cleveland Army Tank Plant was assured employment until October 1969 by award of a multimillion-dollar contract. This award was made after numerous meetings with Department of Defense officials.

Jobs for the people of Cleveland are of primary interest. Numerous meetings have been arranged on the Ravenna Arsenal project to bring the National Accelerator Laboratory to our area. This $280 million plant will employ over 3,000 people. I intend to pursue this project with increased determination and vigor this coming session of Congress.

RAPID TRANSIT EXTENSION

On April 15, 1965, I accompanied Mayor Locher and party to the office of Housing and Home Finance Agency Administrator, Robert C. Weaver, where a presentation was made of the final application for $9,215,000 in Federal funds for the extension of the existing rapid transit to Cleveland's Hopkins International Airport. This effort came to a successful conclusion and the grant was made to the city of Cleveland. I look forward to working with Mayor Locher and the Cleveland City Council to extend the rapid transit eastward.

COMMEMORATIONS TO FREEDOM

I have made it a firm policy throughout the years to encourage freedom and expose the machinations of the Communist tyrants. Free peoples should fight to retain their freedoms and those peoples behind the iron and bamboo curtains should be given hope. As the strongest and most powerful Nation in the world we have a solemn duty to assure them that they are not forgotten and their resistance is not in vain. To this end the following tributes have been made by me, as an official part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On January 25, 1965, the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian nation; February 16, 1965, the 714th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian state; March 11, 1965, Slovak Independence Day; March 24, 1965, Greek Independence Day; April 28, 1965, Special House Committee on Captive Nations; May 3, 1965, Polish Constitution Day; May 10, 1965, Rumanian Independence Day; June 15, 1965, Red army invasion of Lithuania; September 3, 1965, Captive Nations Week; October 22, 1965, Hungarian Freedom Fighters Day.

An Experimental Program of Job Development by Private Industry To Employ Disadvantaged Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, we recognize that making maximum use of our human resources is one of our Nation's greatest challenges. President Johnson has stated our goal in these words:

> Each individual must have a fair chance to develop his abilities and to engage in productive and rewarding activity. In the Great Society, all men must have the self-respect and economic security that flow from full use of their talents.

For that part of our labor force with the least opportunity, skill, and education, we continue to develop programs which help match the man and the job. But still there are quite a number not reached by these programs, largely because our effort is directed at a special age group or type of disability or is of limited size.

For example, on-the-job training under the Manpower Training and Development Act, the work experience program under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, private operation of sheltered workshops, and other programs, have built-in limitations.

By introducing H.R. 11815, I have proposed greater involvement of private enterprise in the task of job development. This would be an experimental program of payroll assistance payments to make economically possible the employment of workers unable to meet the standards of the existing labor market.

Designing the job to fit the abilities of the worker is a sensible and necessary approach to employment of a portion of our potential work force. The conventional approach of designing jobs to match technology or tradition or according to efficient layout alone must be supplemented by a willingness to create a certain number of positions that can be handled by persons who do not possess otherwise marketable skills. To a large extent this means jobs for the unskilled laborer who cannot be, or is not likely to be converted to a semiskilled or skilled status.

I do not suggest that plants should not use modern efficient procedures and techniques that increase the productivity of their workforce. But I do believe that with a payroll assistance program, many companies could afford to have work done which is not now being done because it is uneconomical for the firm to hire anyone to do it.

It seems to me that the vast resources of private enterprise could be harnessed in this way to absorb thousands of men, women, and youth who are willing to work but find themselves unwanted in today's labor market.

The text of H.R. 11815 follows:

H.R. 11815

A bill to establish an experimental program for employment of workers unemployable in existing labor markets

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

PURPOSE

SECTION 1. It is the purpose of this Act to increase opportunities for long-term gainful employment in private or public establishments by providing payroll assistance payments to employers of workers whose productivity at the time they are hired will be less than the minimum required to meet the standards of the market.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM

SEC. 2. To carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to establish a program for—

(1) contracting with employers for their employment of individuals referred as eligible under the program,

(2) selecting, counseling, and referring individuals for employment under the program,

(3) reimbursing employers for any excess of wages and other designated costs of employing workers under this program over the fair value of goods and services estimated to have been produced by these workers, and to prescribe rules and regulations and make necessary arrangements for administration of the program.

STATE AGREEMENTS

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary is authorized to enter into an agreement with each State, or with the appropriate agency of each State, pursuant to which the Secretary may, for the purpose of carrying out his functions and duties under this Act, utilize the services of the appropriate State agency and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may make payments to such State or appropriate agency for expenses incurred for such purposes.

(b) Any agreement under this section may contain such provisions as will promote effective administration, protect the United States against loss and insure that the functions and duties to be carried out by the appropriate State agency are performed in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary.

(c) Each agreement under this section shall require counseling interviews and on-the-job inspections by competent personnel of the State agency at least once during each three months of employment of each individual employed under the program. Interviews and inspections shall be directed to ascertaining whether each individual under the program is being employed properly, productively, efficiently, and effectively in a suitable occupation and at an appropriate and reasonable rate of pay; whether the employer is providing adequate supervision, on-the-job instruction, safe and suitable working conditions, and is endeavoring to prepare each individual for continuing employment in a suitable occupation; whether the employer and the worker are complying with requirements of this Act and of rules and regulations applicable thereunder; and other pertinent facts.

(d) Each agreement under this section shall provide for a quarterly report to be filed with the Secretary by the participating State agency not later than forty-five days after the close of the calendar quarter covered in the report. Each report shall contain information about the operation of the program in the State in such detail as the Secretary may prescribe. Each report for the quarter ending with June of each year shall be accompanied by an annual report covering the full year in such detail as the Secretary may prescribe. The annual report may include recommendations from the participating State agency relating to future conduct of the program.

SELECTION OF ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary shall formulate, and the appropriate agency of each State which has entered into an agreement shall administer, a program for identifying, counseling, and selecting for employment under this Act those unemployed or underemployed persons who cannot reasonably be expected to secure continuing full-time employment without payroll assistance payments to employers.

(b) Priority in selection shall be extended to unemployed persons who have been unemployed for six months or longer at the time of selection or have exhausted their entitlement to unemployment compensation benefits. Persons in families with less than $1,200 net family income in the preceding year shall be considered to have been unemployed for six months or longer.

(c) Participation in the program shall be limited to permanent residents of the United States who have attained age eighteen at the time of selection.

(d) Employment subject to payroll assistance payments under the program shall ordinarily be limited to eighteen months for any one individual. The Secretary may prescribe in uniform rules and regulations that a State agency referring individuals for employment under the program shall give preference to persons who have not previously held employment under the program. Such rules and regulations may specify terms and conditions under which renewed eligibility may be accorded to an individual who has completed eighteen months of employment subject to payroll assistance payments under this Act or to an individual who, under the rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary, has been discharged with cause before completing eighteen months of such employment.

CONTRACTS WITH EMPLOYERS

SEC. 5. (a) Under the agreements with the Secretary, the participating State agency in each State may enter into contracts with cooperating employers. Cooperating employers shall undertake to employ in their usual and customary commercial, industrial, a specified number of individuals selected service, or other activities within the State from those referred for employment under this program.

(b) The number of persons concurrently employed under this program in any single establishment or by any employer shall not ordinarily exceed one person in each establishment plus one additional person for each fifty persons regularly employed in the establishment or by the employer on the average during the six months preceding the date of the contract. The Secretary may, however, provide by regulation for exceptional cases in which the number of persons employed under this program may exceed this allowance.

(c) Contracts with cooperating employers may provide for payroll assistance payments measured by the excess of the sum of wage payments and other direct expenses incurred by the employer in employing individuals under the program over the estimated fair value of goods and services produced by these workers. Contracts with employers may specify procedures for determining and revising the amount of payroll assistance payments to which each employer will be entitled, subject to regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

(d) Each contract shall be for a term of not to exceed eighteen months, subject to renewal during continuance of this program upon a determination by the participating State agency that the employer has cooperated effectively and the program has resulted in useful gainful employment for one or more persons who otherwise might not have been employed.

(e) A contract under this Act shall not operate to exempt an employer from requirements of any other Federal, State, or local law or of any collective bargaining agreements. However, under proper safeguards established by the regulations and with agreement by representatives of the union affected, a contract may provide that individuals employed under this program may be compensated at rates below those established by a collective bargaining agreement for similar employment in the same participating establishment, business firm, or place of employment.

(f) A contract may not provide for payroll assistance payments with respect to employees covered by special certificates (for waiver of minimum wage restrictions) under section 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

(g) Contracts may provide that payroll assistance payments may be made monthly or quarterly on the basis of claims submitted by the cooperating employer to the participating State agency and reviewed by that agency.

(h) Each contract shall provide assurances that (1) employment of individuals under this program will not result in the displacement of any employed worker or impairment of any existing contract for services, (2) rates of pay and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical location, and prevailing rates of wages and other conditions of employment in the establishment, business firm, or place of employment, and (3) the employer will make all reasonable efforts to prepare individuals hired under this program for regular employment and to retain them in such employment after the period for which payroll assistance payments are applicable with respect to any such persons.

(i) Each contract shall provide for on-the-job visits and inspections to be made by personnel of the State agency to the place of employment of each individual placed in employment under the program, and for time off, if necessary, for a periodic counseling interview with personnel of the State agency.

(j) Each contract shall include such other provisions as the Secretary deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 6. In planning and supervising the program under this Act, the Secretary shall seek recommendations and suggestions from the National Advisory Committee appointed under section 205 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–415, section 205; 42 U.S.C. 2585), as amended. The Secretary may, to the extent that he deems appropriate, utilize any labor-management-public committees and similar groups organized under that section, or other existing groups organized for similar purposes.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 7. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for payments to States $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1968, to be available for payroll assistance payments to contracting employers and for administrative expenses of participating State agencies under agreements entered into with the Secretary. Amounts appropriated for any fiscal year shall remain available beyond the end of that fiscal year to pay obligations incurred under contracts and agreements entered into prior to the end of that fiscal year.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for administrative expenses of the Secretary in administering the program authorized by this Act $300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $400,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 8. (a) From the amount appropriated for payments to States, the Secretary shall make available to each State agency which has entered into an agreement under this Act such sum for administrative expenses as may be necessary to provide an average of 25 cents monthly for each one thousand inhabitants of the State, but in any event not less than $1,000 monthly for any State agency.

(b) From the remainder of the amount appropriated for payments to States, the Secretary shall make payments to each State agency as required to make payroll assistance payments to employers under contracts in effect within the State. The amount payable for this purpose to any one State agency in any fiscal year shall not exceed 12½ per centum of the total sum available for payments to all States in that fiscal year.

ANNUAL REPORTS

SEC. 9. Within ninety days following the close of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall make a report to the President, for transmittal to the Congress, reviewing and evaluating the operation of the program under this Act. Each annual report shall list the States which have entered into agreements and name the participating State agencies and shall also report for each State the number of contracts entered into or in effect during the fiscal year, the number of individuals who applied for employment in the program, the number referred to cooperating employers, and the number actually employed, together with State, industry, and occupational totals of their man-hours of employment, remuneration paid to them by employers, other direct expenses of their employment as reported by employers, and the amount of payroll assistance payments to employers; the amount paid to each State for administrative expenses of the program; frequency distributions of hourly or other rates of remuneration paid to such employees and of hourly or other rates of payroll assistance payments; and other pertinent information about the program. The first annual report may and subsequent annual reports shall include the Secretary's findings respecting the efficacy of the program and his recommendations for legislation or other measures for termination, continuance, or improvement of the program.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 10. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "State" means a State or the District of Columbia. It does not include Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands.

(2) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor.

Health Insurance for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 22, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this session of Congress has been very fruitful in terms of constructive legislation but few measures have been more vital, or will be more helpful to very many Americans, than health insurance for the aged and the social security amendments of 1965.

Health insurance is divided into two branches: hospital insurance and medical insurance.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE

Hospital insurance will help pay the bills when covered individuals are hospitalized, and provides for skilled, nursing care and other services in an extended care facility after hospitalization, outpatient, hospital diagnostic services, and home health services.

This insurance is financed out of special contributions paid by people while they work, with matching contributions from employers, so that people will not have to pay for this protection, when they are old and not working.

MEDICAL INSURANCE

Medical insurance will help pay the bills for doctor's services, and for a number of other medical items and services not covered under the hospital insurance program. This program is voluntary, and every individual can decide whether to choose this important, added protection at the low cost of $3 monthly, the Government paying an equal amount toward the cost.

A word on how these programs work.

First, most people will not have to go to the social security office to qualify for protection under the hospital and medical insurance programs.

If you are getting social security or railroad retirement benefits, you qualify automatically for hospital insurance, and an application card for medical insurance benefits will be mailed to you by December 1965 with a leaflet explaining both these programs.

If you are receiving a Federal Civil Service retirement annuity, you will get further information by mail and will be told if it is necessary to go to the social security office later.

If you are receiving public assistance payments, in most cases, the Public Assistance Agency will assist you in applying for hospital insurance and will advise you about enrolling for medical insurance.

If you are not receiving any of the above payments, and you have worked under social security, but have never applied for benefits, the people in your social security office will help you apply for hospital insurance and will also advise you how you can enroll in the medical insurance program.

If you have never worked under social security, get in touch with your social security office between September 1, 1965, and March 31, 1966. Nearly every American, 65 or over, will be protected under the hospital insurance program when it starts in July 1966. If you qualify, these are the benefits for which you will be eligible:

First. Hospitalization for up to 90 days in a "spell of illness"—the program pays for covered services during 60 days of care in a participating hospital, except for the first $40, during a "spell of illness."

If you are hospitalized for more than 60 days during your "spell of illness," the program will pay all but $10 daily for covered services during an additional 30 days of care.

Second. Outpatient, hospital, diagnostic services—the program will pay 80 percent of the cost for diagnostic services you receive as an outpatient of a participating hospital during a 20-day period, except for the first $20 for each 20-day period.

Third. Posthospital extended care in a qualified, skilled nursing home, or part of a hospital after a hospital stay of at least 3 days—the program pays for 20 days of extended care during a "spell of illness." If you need this care for more than 20 days during a "spell of illness," the program will pay all but $5 daily for an additional 80 days.

Fourth. Posthospital home health care services—the program will pay the cost of up to 100 visits in the 365 days after your discharge from the hospital after a stay of 3 days or more, or from an extended care facility, if these services are furnished under an approved plan. Services of visiting nurses, physical therapists and other health workers—but not doctors—who come to your home to furnish health care services are covered. Doctor's visits are covered only under the voluntary, medical insurance plan.

Fifth. Covered services in a hospital or extended care facility—benefit payments will cover, except for the deductible amounts, the cost of your room and board in semiprivate accommodations, ordinary nursing services, and the cost of drugs, supplies, and most other items of service you receive which are customarily furnished for the care of patients by the hospital or extended care facility.

Effective dates—the benefits described above will become payable beginning July 1, 1966, except for posthospital or extended care benefits which start on January 1, 1967.

Under supplementary medical insurance you can provide in advance toward paying your doctor bills by signing up for medical insurance. The hospital insurance program will not help you pay your doctor's bills.

The medical insurance program pays 80 percent of the reasonable charges for covered services, except for the first $50 in a calendar year.

Services covered under medical insurance include:

Physician's and surgeon's services wherever you receive them.

Home health visits—up to 100 home health visits under an approved plan each year with no need for prior hospitalization. This is in addition to the 100 visits you get under hospital insurance.

Other medical and health services regardless of where rendered including diagnostic tests, X-rays, laboratory services or radium treatments, surgical dressings, splints, casts, certain ambulance services, braces, artificial legs, arms, and eyes, rental of medical equipment such as iron lungs and many other medical items and services.

The voluntary medical insurance plan becomes effective starting July 1, 1966. If you enroll in the plan, your medical coverage will start on that day. This program will not pay for goods or services received before July 1, 1966.

If you are 65 or older on January 1, 1966, you must sign up during the first enrollment period September 1, 1965 to March 31, 1966.

If your 65th birthday occurs after January 1, 1966, your first enrollment period runs for 7 months beginning with the third month immediately before the month you reach 65 and ending 3 months after the month you are 65. For example, you reach 65 in February, you may sign up anytime between the preceding November 1 and the following May 31.

You will have protection as soon as you reach 65 only if you apply during the 3-month period just before the month in which you reach 65. Your medical insurance will not take effect before July 1, 1966.

You must enroll in timely fashion, or you may have to pay a higher premium for the same protection, and your coverage will not begin until 6 to 9 months after you enroll.

It is important for individuals to enroll at the times specified. When you qualify for the hospital insurance program you will receive a health insurance card by mail. If you enroll in the medical insurance program, your card will show that you have both medical and hospital insurance.

Some items and services are not covered under either plan: routine physical checkups, eyeglasses, hearing aids, private duty nurses, custodial care, and personal services such as telephone or television in your hospital room.

The foregoing outlines the major features of the health insurance plan for the aged made available by the bill which is indeed a historic, new health charter for the American people.

Social Security Amendments of 1965 made many important changes in the social security program, including making nearly all Americans 65 and over eligible for hospital insurance and additional voluntary, medical insurance for those who choose to take it.

If you are receiving social security benefits the amount will be increased by 7 percent under the bill and payments of the increase being made for January 1965 and following months.

Very salutary is the increased social security cash benefits and the benefits that may be paid to students up to the age of 22 for unmarried sons or daughters of persons receiving old-age or disability insurance benefits or a person who has died. These new student benefits are retroactive to January 1965 and your social security office will give full information about individual cases.

Another very desirable provision of this law is benefits for widows at age 60 under reduced monthly amounts. The closer the beneficiary is to age 62 when they start receiving benefits, the smaller the reduction will be. On the average, a widow who accepts benefits before age 62 will collect about the same value in total benefits over the years, but in smaller installments to take account of the longer period during which she will be paid. Social security offices will also have full information about this new provision.

Still another helpful change in social security laws is in the reduction of the amount of social security credit required for people 72 or over to qualify for benefits.

If you are 72 or over and have not been able to qualify for social security benefits because you (or your husband) have not worked long enough under social security, you may now be eligible for payments up to $35 a month. Although some social security credit is still required, the amount of work required under the new law is less for certain people 72 and over than it has ever been in the past.

If you are 72 or over and are not receiving social security benefits, you should check with your social security office if you—or your husband—ever received social security credit for work. Payments under this provision can begin for September 1965.

It is also very important to know that if you work after you apply for benefits after 1965, if you earn no more than $1,500 per year, you may receive benefits for all months of the year. Under the law in effect through 1965, the payments you receive are reduced if you work and earn more than $1,200 in a year.

After 1965, if you earn more than $1,500 a year, the general rule is that $1 in benefits will be withheld for each $2 of earnings over $1,500 and up to $2,700. In addition, $1 in benefits will be withheld for each $1 of earnings over $2,700.

There are two exceptions to this rule—if in any month you neither earn more than $125 working for someone else nor do substantial work in a business of your own, there will be no deduction from your benefits for that month no matter how much you earn the rest of the year.

For months after you are 72, there will be no deduction from the benefits because of work after you reached 72.

Another important change for people 65 or over who receive royalties from copyrights or patents obtained before they reached 65, after 1965, this income may be excluded in figuring your earnings.

If you work after applying for old-age-insurance benefits, your additional earnings may increase the amount of your monthly payment.

There are also certain benefits for divorced women to receive benefits from her former husband's account. To do so she must have been married to him at least 20 years before the divorce and he must have been contributing voluntarily or under court order to her support when he became entitled to social security benefits or died.

Under the new law disability provisions have been changed and this is in large part, the results of long, intensive work, interest, and efforts which I made in pressing with the very distinguished, able chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MILLS, and his associated very able, distinguished colleagues on that committee, to change the limited, inadequate, disability standard heretofore in effect.

The new law provides that an insured worker whose disability is expected to last for at least 12 months may qualify for disability benefits beginning with the seventh month of his disability. The first month for which payments can be made under this change is September 1965.

Workers whose applications for disability insurance benefits have been denied because their disability was not expected to continue indefinitely, but who are severely disabled, should get in touch with their social security office.

The new law also liberalizes requirements affecting people who are disabled by blindness and this is indeed a blessing.

For more information about the changes in disability benefits, get in touch with your social security office.

The new law also provides social security for doctors and medical and dental interns and this also is a great advance because these groups are obviously entitled to such benefits.

Cash tips you receive in your work for one employer provided they amount to $20 or more a month, will now count toward social security benefits for you and your family.

Beginning in 1966 you will be required to report in writing to your employer the amount of tips you receive and to pay social security contributions on the tips. Your employer will include your tips in his social security tax reports and Form W-2 along with your wages, but he will not have to match your social security contribution on the tips.

The law requires that you report to your employer the amount of your tips within 10 days after the month you receive them. Your social security office can give you full details concerning this provision.

I recognize that there is a great deal of opposition on the part of waiters and others who receive tips and I am impressed with the fact that many of them have good reasons to be disturbed.

It can be said, however, that the requirement enabling them to put additional money in their social security pool will in many cases add very materially to their ultimate social security benefits.

Under the new law, all clergymen have at least until April 15, 1966, to elect to be covered by social security. The time allowed for the decision had expired for many ministers of the Gospel. Now they have another opportunity to become covered.

There has been a change also in the coverage for farmers. If you are a self-employed farmer and your gross earnings from farming in a year after 1965 are $2,400 or less you may report two-thirds of your gross earnings instead of your net earnings for social security purposes. If your gross income from farming is more than $2,400 and your net earnings are less than $1,600, you may report $1,600 for social security purposes.

Financing the new benefit provisions has also been provided for in the bill by increasing the earning base on which social security contributions are based from $4,800 to $6,600 on January 1, 1966.

In addition, the law establishes a separate payroll contribution to finance the program of hospital insurance for the aged. These contributions are going into a separate trust fund in the U.S. Treasury.

I recognize that these new health and social security programs are not perfect. I also realize that in some respects bitter controversy exists in some areas concerning new health programs. However, it is my feeling, that an overwhelming number of the American people not only desire, but will be greatly benefited, by these new programs, and I am sure that those who for good reasons of their own, have opposed them in the past will realize now that they have become the law, that they must be implemented, and I hope and believe that these groups, good Americans that they are, will now lend their great influence and best efforts to make these enlightened new programs for the benefit of the people work effectively to promote better health, more adequate security and more abundant well-being for all Americans.